UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 99—PART 2

FEBRUARY 26, 1953, TO APRIL 8, 1953
(PAGES 1441 TO 2846)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1953

J
11
.R
v.99
pt.2

DEP. SITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
1-20-54

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Richard A. Dempsey, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Glen Ellyn, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, we would begin our common tasks today remembering Thee, for we know that without Thee we can do nothing and with Thee all things are possible.

Forgive us and save us from every selfish and enslaving attitude lest, while we seem to be bearers of light and freedom, we come as rulers of darkness, because we rule apart from Thee, O God, who alone imparteth truth and freedom.

Help us, O God, to seek first Thy kingdom and Thy righteousness; that being rooted and grounded in Thee, we have a foundation not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

This we pray in the name of Him who came that we might have life and have it abundantly. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 10. An act to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce;

S. 11. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter;

S. 35. An act to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes;

S. 799. An act to amend the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce for the RECORD that on Tuesday last when the vote was taken on the appropriation for the Un-American Activities Committee, I was at the White House, along with other Members of the House, attending a luncheon with the President of the United States. Had I been in attendance I would have voted enthusiastically in favor of the resolution.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTIONS AGAINST RELIGIOUS PERSECUTIONS BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today offering a resolution expressing it as the sense of the House of Representatives "that the United States express in the United Nations and in every other way open to it the indignation of its people against the religious persecutions in the Soviet Union and in the Communist satellite states, its sympathy with the tragic victims of these religious persecutions and its determination that international law and human rights be preserved in the world."

A good many resolutions have been introduced protesting the calculated policy of the Soviet Union and its Communist administrations in the satellite countries to persecute people for their religious beliefs culminating in the anti-Semitic persecutions currently in progress which are so reminiscent of the Hitler era in Germany. It must be noted that in Nazi Germany these persecutions heralded armed aggression against the whole free world. The Foreign Relations Committee of the other body has already acted on a resolution—Senate Resolution 84—respecting treatment of minority groups by the Soviet Union and its satellites. I believe that the Foreign Affairs Committee will soon act on such a resolution and hope very much that it will receive early consideration in the House.

I believe the greatest service is rendered by those who protest against these religious persecutions behind the Iron Curtain as they sound the tocsin for the whole free world against the dangers to freedom everywhere by the situation which these persecutions reflect rather than confining themselves alone to the fight against the particular persecution involved against a particular faith.

In 1906 the Congress by joint resolution expressed its "hearty sympathy with the Hebrews in Russia," then the subject of Czarist pogroms. It is in our noblest tradition to do the same thing now. The weight of moral condemnation by the Congress representing the American people directed against Communist religious persecutions is of vital importance in the free world. That it counts is evidenced by the fact that after the reaction against Soviet anti-Semitism set in, the Soviet Union felt it had to manufacture a story (which appeared in Izvestia) accusing me and another Member of this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], of participating in some plot in Israel respecting the Soviet Union. Certainly no one in the free world will believe this and the Communists know it, but an effort must be made by them, apparently, to try to discredit within the Communist countries themselves those who protest articulately against religious persecutions behind the Iron Curtain. The moral indictment by the people of the United States through a resolution adopted by its House of Representatives can help greatly in the struggle against communism within the free world and in the Communist world.

AMENDMENTS OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 40) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services, be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. A similar bill was referred to that committee last year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 1534) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services and to provide for a copy of disability record and to provide for presumption of service-connected injury or disease, be referred to the Committee on Armed Services. A similar bill was referred to that committee last year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I saw the announcement of the recommendation of Secretary of the Interior McKay of B. Frank Heintzleman as Governor of Alaska to President Eisenhower.

I have known Mr. Heintzleman for many years; in fact, he graduated 3 years prior to my graduation from the State Forest Academy at Mont Alto, Pa. He immediately proceeded to advance himself in forestry work by getting his master's degree at Yale. For the last 27 years he has been the official representative of the Forest Service in Alaska.

It makes me feel doubly happy to see the type of men our President is continuing to appoint to these very important offices.

I would suggest that if you have the time you read the following item from the Harrisburg Patriot on the life of Mr. Heintzleman. I know you will be pleased, as I was, to become acquainted with his advancement. It will be a nice recognition and advancement in his very productive career for our country.

AREA NATIVE CHOSEN FOR ALASKA JOB—B. FRANK HEINTZLEMAN, BORN IN FAYETTEVILLE, PICKED FOR GOVERNOR

A central Pennsylvanian will be the next Governor of Alaska if the Senate confirms B. Frank Heintzleman, a native of Fayetteville, Franklin County, for the executive post. Heintzleman's name is expected to be submitted to the Senate for confirmation today by President Eisenhower on the recommendation of Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

Heintzleman, a career man in the United States Forest Service, has served that department in Alaska for the last 27 years. He received his training in forestry work at the old State Forest Academy at Mont Alto, from which he graduated in 1907. He is described as being an excellent student and fine man by George Wirt, of Camp Hill, retired chief State forest fire warden and then head of the academy.

STUDENT AT YALE

Following graduation, Heintzleman worked for the State Department of Forestry for a short time. He attended the Yale University School of Forestry and was graduated with a master's degree in 1910.

Entering the United States Forest Service Heintzleman was assigned to service in Oregon and Washington. In 1918 he transferred to the Alaskan Division of the Forest Service and has been there ever since, with the exception of 2 years in Washington, where he was assigned to the National Recovery Administration in 1934–35 in connection with forest conservation work.

The 64-year-old bachelor was appointed regional forester, the top post of the Service in Alaska, in 1937. He was named special representative of the United States Secretary of Agriculture in the Territory, with the title of Commissioner, and also represented the Federal Power Commission.

AIDED DEVELOPMENT

Heintzleman has been most successful in acquiring industries for the Territory in the form of pulp mills, sawmills, and plywood factories. He was recently successful in negotiating the location of a $46 million pulp mill now under construction by the American Viscose Corp., at Ketchikan. As forester he has been instrumental in developing recreational facilities for the attraction of tourists and for the use of the natives in some 20 million acres of forest land and in agricultural settlement.

"I would be most honored, naturally, by the appointment," Heintzleman told the Patriot last night over the telephone from his Washington hotel. He is in the Capital on Forestry Service business and expects to return to Alaska in 10 days. "I have never taken an active interest in politics because of civil service regulations and therefore have never sought any office." The Pennsylvanian admitted, however, that he was a Republican.

If he receives confirmation by the Senate, Heintzleman will succeed as chief executive of Alaska Gov. E. L. Bartlett, a Democrat.

STANDBY AUTHORITY FOR A 90-DAY WAGE, PRICE, AND RENT FREEZE

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I favor granting the President of the United States standby authority to invoke a 90-day wage, price, and rent freeze if he finds any economic dislocations seriously threatening our national security or the stability of our domestic economy.

This authority, if granted by the Congress, would protect those most cruelly hit by any sharp inflationary rise resulting from any new, serious national emergency.

During the 90-day period Congress could take action on any overall legislation required to handle the problem.

The lessons learned from our experience in 1950 should not now be forgotten. The greatest spiraling rise in prices occurred immediately after the start of the Korean war. Had authority of this type been used at that time much of our present-day economic trouble could have been avoided.

I believe legislation of this type provides much-needed and much-desired protection for the people.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

PROVIDING INSPECTION UNDER FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 704 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to protect the public health and welfare by providing adequate authority for factory inspections. My bill is to authorize inspectors to enter at reasonable times any factory, warehouse, or establishment in which food, drugs, devices, or cosmetics are manufactured, processed, packed, or held, after first exhibiting appropriate credentials to the owner, operator, or custodian thereof. This type of inspection law will insure the inspector that he is seeing the plant under normal operating conditions. I am sure the consumer is entitled to that kind of an inspection by the FDA men, and that is the only kind of inspection that will carry out the purposes of the statute.

I am sure that honest business feels the same way and does not want the fringe operator to be free to operate without meeting the same requirements of sanitation and quality as the legitimate operator. I believe that proper, effective factory inspection should be regarded as a right of the people—a right to clean and wholesome products produced under sanitary conditions and honest labels, and a right to the measures necessary to make it effective.

The Congress, regardless of party, has always been ready to act whenever that was threatened, and I am confident that this Congress will make this possible. I urge this bill be acted upon promptly by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DREW PEARSON

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, February 22, in the course of his radio program, Drew Pearson leveled a foul and slanderous accusation against me as an individual and what is more serious to me, against my son.

Mr. Pearson charged that I exerted pressure on the Air Force to transfer my son to Washington, D. C. I first want to set the record straight on this matter.

I have, as has probably every Member of this House, at one time or another, called the Air Force on behalf of constituents, which is one of the duties to be expected of a Representative. I wish

to state here categorically that I have never discussed with the Air Force, nor any branch of the armed services, the matter of having my son assigned to any particular location of duty.

Mr. Pearson lied when he said my son was attending Bradley College in Missouri. My son is actually attending Bradley University in Peoria, Ill.

I realize that when I state that Drew Pearson is an unmitigated liar, I am not doing so with any ingenuity. Mr. Pearson's aversion to the truth has been pointed out by at least 2 Presidents and more than 70 Members of Congress. That he has attacked me now that I have become chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is only consistent with the slanders that Pearson has leveled against my predecessors in the chairmanship of that committee. In this sense, I feel that I have now come into my own by having Pearson make false charges against me and members of my family. Because of the volume of congressional duties and the despicable character of the source of these charges, I regret that it has been necessary for me to devote even this much time to correcting the record, and I am sure that you and the Members of the House will agree that, as a Member of this body and as a father, I could not let these lies go unanswered.

AMENDING SECTION 2 (A) OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 27.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think there should be some explanation made. I understand this is identical with the joint resolution that was passed in the House yesterday.

Mr. TALLE. The distinguished minority leader is correct. It is identical with House Joint Resolution 160, which passed the House yesterday without a dissenting vote.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the last sentence of section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: "The aggregate amount of all loans, advances of credit, and obligations purchased, exclusive of financing charges, with respect to which insurance may be heretofore or hereafter granted under this section and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed $1,750,000,000."

SEC. 2. Prior to June 30, 1954, the Federal Housing Commissioner shall pay out of the capital account of the title I insurance fund to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of $8,333,313.65 which constitutes the Government investment in the capital account of the title I insurance fund. The amount payable hereunder shall be paid in the discretion of the Commissioner either in one lump sum or in installments except that the first payment shall be made on July 1, 1953.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby House Joint Resolution 160 was passed were vacated and that joint resolution was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order that I may query the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] as to the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday there will be the Consent Calendar; on Tuesday the Private Calendar.

On Wednesday and Thursday we hope to have some resolutions from the Rules Committee providing for committee studies and investigations, similar to those which were passed last week.

Then, these are only possibilities for consideration next week, but I think I should mention them. There is a possibility that House Joint Resolution 200 may be considered next week. This is a resolution joining with the President of the United States in a declaration regarding the subjugation of free people by the Soviet Union. In other words, this is the so-called secret-agreement resolution.

Then there is only a bare possibility that we may have up for consideration next week the question of Hawaiian statehood. That is not too likely, however.

Mr. RAYBURN. There is no likelihood of the Alaskan statehood bill being brought up for consideration?

Mr. ARENDS. Not right away.

DOES THE RFC COMPETE WITH PRIVATE BANKS?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of emotion mixed with misinformation regarding the question of whether or not the RFC should be abolished. Of course, there are a few people who favor its elimination in a thoroughly cold-blooded manner, as they realize how the very existence of the RFC helps the small-business man, helps maintain the very essence of private capitalism.

I can understand—even though I cannot share their point of view—why a few large banks—the number must be very few—might object to the continuation of a Government banking institution which aids struggling small-business men, whom they would rather see become statistics on the business obituary page.

ONLY WHEN DESERVING BORROWER CANNOT GET HELP ELSEWHERE

The only way in which the RFC competes with private banking is clear to all those who care to see. I refer to the fact that the RFC gives assistance on a business basis to energetic and able businessmen whom the private banks are either unwilling or unable to help. If large companies, whether they be banks or not, prefer to make it increasingly difficult for small businesses to grow or even to exist, then in a sense the RFC is an obstacle in their way to their goal.

On the other hand, the RFC does not compete with private financial institutions in the sense that they try to take any lending business away from such private institutions. In fact, quite the contrary is true. Every businessman who even comes in or writes in to talk about a loan is advised by the RFC to go first to his bank or banks and see if the funds cannot be obtained there. It is not enough for the would-be borrower to say that he cannot get the money from private banks. The RFC demands convincing evidence of the nonavailability of credit on reasonable terms before it will even consider making a loan.

BANKS HELPED BY PARTICIPATION

Even when the RFC is convinced that the needed funds are not available without Government assistance, an effort is made to see if the private bank or banks will not take a part of the loan with the RFC taking the other part. This participation arrangement is an aid to small banks, who cannot take the whole loan but who would like to get some of the borrower's business. Certainly, that is a far cry from competition with private financial institutions.

NO COMPETITION WITH BANKS WRITTEN INTO LAW

Understand that this practice of not competing with private banks is not just a policy of the RFC, which might change with changes in the administration of the Corporation. It is written right into the law. The Congress saw the possibilities of the Government entering the lending field in competition with private lenders and plugged the hole before it ever developed.

Any time that the RFC does take up a loan, which might have been made under reasonable terms by a private bank, it is an instance of a weakness in the RFC's administration, and everyone can make mistakes. But, and let me emphasize this, it is not an indictment of the existence of the Government lending institution or of the purposes for which such institution has been established.

I feel it to be only fair to point out at this time that, to the best of my knowledge, and I have kept up pretty well on the matter, the RFC has been well administered in this respect by its present Administrator, Harry McDonald, and by his immediate predecessor, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, United States Senator from the great State of Missouri.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to share the gentleman's views and associate myself with them. I have had experience under the procedure followed by the RFC, and I will say that I think the gentleman is absolutely right. I

thank him for bringing this issue to the floor of the House.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to join with my colleague from Texas and the gentleman from Louisiana. One of the hardest blows that could hit the small businesses of this country would be the abolition of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As far as I am concerned I am not going to have any part in doing away with it.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the leader of the Democratic Party in the House for his statement.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas for bringing this matter to the House. It is a matter of tremendous importance. We all know that the so-called RFC was established under a former Republican President. It has rendered a great job not only to the big business of the country but to small business as well. I have received many communications from small-town bankers who ordinarily you might think would feel that RFC was in competition with them; however, these small bankers urged that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be not discontinued, but that it be continued in order that capital be not dried up in this country.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a great feeling of fear, I find, among the small-business people of the country as to the future, a feeling of uncertainty; and I am sure it is not being lessened by this talk of abolishing the RFC. In my opinion it only increases that fear because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as the gentleman so well said, does not compete with private banking; it implements, supplements, and strengthens; it is an agency which has worked very effectively and very well, and its termination in my opinion would only increase the fears and anxieties of many small independent businessmen.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for his statement.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not true also that the banks cooperate or participate often in these RFC loans?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right; it really helps things. Furthermore, it does not compete with the banks, but even if it were to compete with the banks it would probably not be considered unfair. After all, the banks themselves receive lots of aid directly and indirectly from the United States Government. If that help should be withdrawn from the private commercial banks of this country they could not operate profitably right now.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to say further that only this week I have received letters from two firms in my district, manufacturing plants, that are operating very successfully, but they say they could not have begun operations had it not been for the help of the RFC.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

In a country such as our own every person should have a place where he can receive fair consideration for any proposal involving the extension of credit to him. In practice I doubt without the RFC—in fact I know, every citizen could not have received consideration of applications for credit; I know that to be true. The number of banks has been reduced 50 percent in the last 25 years. Ordinarily you would think the number would increase, but banking is becoming monopolistic in some areas. I am not, however, going to talk to you about that, but I am talking to you about the number of available banking units in the country actually being used. We had 100 percent more banks 25 years ago than we have today. Imagine that.

Today a person with a good idea, a person who wants to produce, a person who has everything except the available credit for operating capital, without the RFC can go to only one institution, the bank. His banker might not look with great favor on his idea, he might not understand it, it might involve something he is not familiar with in that section of the country at all and he turns the individual down. Well, that poor fellow is out then because if he goes to another bank they will ask, "What happened at your bank?" "Well, they turned me down." That man then cannot get any consideration there, so he is entirely out.

There should be some agency where that person can go and get consideration if he has a worthy meritorious, constructive project that he wants promoted.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate my views with those of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Do we not find the situation, too, that some banks in small areas do not have the capital structure sometimes to extend the size of a loan that a small business might need, yet your local bank is perfectly willing to participate with the RFC in a satisfactory loan which will work out the situation of the local citizen in that community?

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. May I call the gentleman's attention to this fact: If the RFC is to continue, and the gentleman and I hope it will, as a useful instrument in our economy, it must overcome some of its timidity. It must fill that vacuum which is created by the inability of local and small lending institutions or banks to make certain loans. The RFC in the last few years has not been doing that job which it ought to do. It started out on the right track. It saved the railroads and other great industries. But today it must overcome its fright and criticism, it must overcome its timidity, and be a useful instrument not only to the great industries that it saved from destruction, but it must fill a vacuum that exists so far as small industry is concerned. It is not doing that today, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe it can do a lot more. Of course, it has possibly become overly cautious by reason of the many investigations and unfair abuse heaped upon it.

Mr. LYLE. That is correct.

Mr. PATMAN. We want to give the RFC more courage by giving it more and better backing.

Mr. LYLE. That is why I am up here right now, to help give it more courage. If it does not have the courage to fill its proper place in our economy, then it has not the right to exist.

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right. We must encourage it to fill the vacuum. The gentleman's criticism is justified to some extent.

May I say to the gentleman from Louisiana that if a person wanted credit to go into the pig-iron business or the steel business or something like that in the great State of Louisiana, he would go to his local banker. The local banker would not know anything about that business. They know all about cotton loans, cattle loans, petroleum loans, and things like that, but they do not know anything about the iron or steel business or things of that nature.

Therefore, there should be some agency where that person could turn and get consideration. As I stated, it gives the local banks an opportunity to help small business. It creates a lot of business for them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that serious consideration will not be given to abolishing the RFC and if the effort is made that it will fail.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 7 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TAXES

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the question of individual tax exemptions suggested yesterday by the gentleman from Ken-

tucky and the reply from the gentleman from New York, who expressed opposition to that method for cutting taxes. Some of us will not agree with the estimate by the gentleman from New York that revenue would drop $2 billion for every $100 of exemption. I believe that the budget should be balanced before a tax reduction is made. However, if there is to be a tax cut there is no way that is more fair than to increase personal tax exemptions. If $200 is not the proper figure then it should be made $50 or whatever would be most practical. It is inconsistent to talk about a tax cut to help the average person and to oppose an increase in tax exemption for individuals and dependents. Some of the proposals for tax cuts look like an effort to shift more of the tax burden on those least able to pay.

OPENING SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to this House that, together with the Honorable THOMAS GORDON, of Illinois, and the Honorable EDNA KELLY, of New York, both of them like myself members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we had attended, as observers, the opening session of the General Assembly of the United Nations and subsequent committee meetings.

It was, indeed, inspiring to be present at that occasion, and to see the representatives of most of the nations of the world come together under the same roof, with the hope of solving the problems facing their respective peoples through the means of peaceful discussion, persuasion, and agreement.

Although the General Assembly of the United Nations has been criticized on occasion as an ineffective instrument of world peace, to my mind it continues to hold a promise of attaining that goal. The U. N., subject to further improvement, remains as the best means mankind has so far discovered of meeting global issues on collective basis, and of solving world problems through peaceful, common effort of all nations of good will.

In the course of the opening session of the General Assembly, we had the opportunity of meeting and conferring with the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and with other members of the United States delegation to the United Nations. I would like to take this opportunity, therefore, of commending to the attention of the membership of this House Ambassador Lodge's fine address, which reads as follows:

TEN FACTS

To appear before this gathering of statesmen from all over the world as the representative of my country is a unique distinction. It is an honor to be associated here with all of you—an honor of memorable significance to me.

Since the last meeting of the General Assembly, there has been a change in the Government of the United States—a change in which the losers have neither been disgraced—nor, I may say, liquidated.

The American people wish to establish a lasting peace and regard the United Nations as a vital means to that end. As President Eisenhower said: "Respecting the United Nations as the living sign of all peoples' hope for peace, we shall strive to make it not merely an eloquent symbol, but an effective force. And in our quest for an honorable peace, we shall never compromise, nor tire, nor ever cease."

Every element of American life is eager for peace. For the sake of peace we have put up our resources; we have sent our men. Even the most fanatic critics of the United States are unable to point a finger at any group having the slightest weight or importance in America which does not believe in peace.

This love of peace exists in all Americans regardless of party. It was for that reason that my predecessors at the last Assembly voted for the Indian resolution—a resolution which spared no effort to meet the issues; which declared unequivocally for peace; which was passed by a vote of the General Assembly which was overwhelming. If ever an action represented the conscience of the world and the striving of suffering humanity for peace it was the passage of that resolution.

It seemed impossible that there could be rulers in this world who would object to this offer, but it soon appeared that there were. The regimes of China and of North Korea have turned it down, and, of course, when they did it, they must have known that they were telling the world in effect: "We wish to continue the bloody struggle in Korea; and, therefore, tell you that you can only solve the Korean problem on our terms." We, who are determined to end the war on a just basis, must all note this development with regret and seek the reasons for it.

CHINESE WORDS AND SOVIET ACTS

Therefore, we should first ponder the statement of Mr. Chou En Lai, the Foreign Minister of the Chinese Communist regime, who in his political report of February 4, 1953, spoke of the Korean war and said that it "has greatly"—and I quote—"reinforced the strength and influence of the world camp of peace and democracy headed by the Soviet Union"—an unwittingly candid admission, by the way, as to the identity of those whose word he heeds.

Mr. President, for many generations Americans have had close relations with China and have learned to esteem the wisdom of the Chinese people. We realize that there are genuinely democratic forces at work throughout the world, which have been suppressed in some areas including China. These forces reflect the human desire for a richer, freer life. Forces of this same kind built our own country.

There is no doubt that some Chinese believed the promise of progress which was made to them by their present rulers. Such promises are always attractive. But being an intelligent people with a long tradition of wisdom they certainly cannot approve of the present situation in which young manhood of China is being slaughtered in response to a policy which appears to be admittedly dictated from Moscow.

Apparently, the Soviet Union, with its own special brand of magnanimity and generosity, is determined to carry on the war to the last Chinese.

Mr. Chou En Lai's description of the Korean war as a positive good to communism shocks us. We repudiate it. We are sure the Chinese people would repudiate it if they were free to do so.

This brings me naturally to another somber truth. This is: that the Soviet Union is actively assisting the aggressors in Korea on a scale which makes possible the continuance of that aggression and determines its scope. The following facts therefore, should be placed clearly and frankly before world opinion.

TEN FACTS

Here are 10 facts which the world should face:

Fact No. 1 is that Soviet planning instigated the original aggression, which was subsequently maintained by Soviet training and equipment, notably Soviet aircraft, Soviet artillery, Soviet T-34 tanks, and Soviet automatic weapons.

Fact No. 2 is that the North Korean forces which were virtually destroyed after the Inchon landing in the fall of 1950 fled across the Yalu River, behind the screen of the Chinese Communists who were then entering Korea. They reappeared on the battlefront in late winter reconstituted, reorganized, and almost completely equipped with weapons of Soviet manufacture.

Fact No. 3 is that the flow of Soviet equipment is constant and steady, and accounts for the increase of combat effectiveness of the enemy over the past year.

Fact No. 4 is that the Chinese Communists who entered the fighting with normal light equipment are now fighting with heavy equipment, supplied by the Soviet Union.

Fact No. 5 is that naval mines in large number, which have been picked up or washed ashore off the Korean coast have been mines of Soviet manufacture.

Fact No. 6 is that the planes which the United Nations Command has been encountering over North Korea have been MIG-15's and other aircraft, manufactured, and supplied by the Soviet Union.

Fact No. 7 is that recently United Nations forces have encountered a new type of Soviet plane, the IL-28, which is now a part of the air forces of the Communist aggressors over North Korea.

Fact No. 8 is that in spite of heavy losses, the Chinese Communist and North Korean air forces have grown until they today have some 2,500 aircraft of which half are jets, all manufactured and supplied by the Soviet Union.

Fact No. 9 is that the Soviet Union provides the replacements for these aircraft which United Nations forces shoot down over North Korea. Our experts estimate that the Soviet Union has contributed in excess of 4,400 planes to fight against the United Nations in Korea.

Fact No. 10 is that the antiaircraft guns in North Korea, including many which are radar controlled, are of Soviet origin.

The Soviet representatives are hereby challenged to disprove these facts. They show how far the Soviet Union has gone to broaden the war—how, since the fall of 1950, the United Nations has not been fighting a local enemy, but the vast manpower resources of Communist China supported by the material resources of the entire Soviet world.

And then, Mr. President, there are people who have the crudity to come here and make sanctimonious speeches about world peace.

The whole world knows the truth: that except for the active aid furnished to the North Korean and Chinese Communist aggressors by the Soviet Union, the war in Korea would now be over. Like the ostrich who sticks his head in the sand and thinks that no one sees him, the rulers of the Soviet Union are so bemused by their own propaganda that they do not recognize the extent to which world opinion holds them responsible for aiding and abetting this great crime against the peace of the world.

The rulers of the Soviet Union can stop the war whenever they want to—and Mr. Vishinsky knows it.

TO BUILD PEACE

Mr. President, peace not only depends on collective security; it must also be based on

equal treatment of human beings. As long as there is racial or religious discrimination, just so long is the day of peace postponed. Conditions are not perfect in any country in this regard but in many lands—I know this is true in my own—great and successful advances are being made.

We have, however, observed with indignation the persecution of Christians, Moslems, and Jews that has been taking place in the Soviet Union for some time. That discrimination is not only wicked; it will also in the end prove to be totally ineffective because there is an undefeatable quality in human nature which will always resist totalitarian attempts to destroy religious and ethnic freedom.

Mr. President, I conclude.

To build peace there must, of course, be collective security.

To build peace there must be equal treatment of people without discrimination as to race, creed, or color.

To build peace there must also be freedom from the specter of want. There is no use in talking to a starving man about freedom or democracy. We stand ready to work for peace along all these lines, too.

Finally, we believe that peace, like every other great human problem, is best solved by governments which are controlled by the people, in which public officials are the servants of the people, countries in which the word "dictatorship" is a bad word, and not countries in which officials proudly boast of dictatorship and give it the misleading title of "Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

We believe that the counsel of many men of good will produces more collective wisdom than that of a few. We believe in the people; we have faith in the people. We believe the people are competent to make their own decisions, and that a man is not rendered all wise by being made all powerful.

Mr. President, the facts I have just presented concerning the words of the Chinese Communists and the actions of the Soviet Union are a monstrous answer to the adoption by this assembly of the Indian resolution. For these reasons there is little point in reformulating at this session the principles on which that resolution was based. The Indian resolution, in the words of a great American on another occasion, raises a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. When the day comes that the aggressors in the Far East have a change of heart—for whatever reasons, and they can be many—it will not be difficult for them to show it. Failure to end the fighting in Korea is not due to any lack of cleverness with words here in the United Nations. It is due to the frankly announced desire of the Communists to continue the war.

Mr. President, I reserve my right to speak further on the Korean item at a later point in the debate.

CONTROLLING INFLATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on February 18 the gentleman from New York, Representative MULTER, introduced a bill, H. R. 3184, to aid in controlling inflation, and on February 24 the gentleman from New York, Representative DOLLINGER, presented a bill, H. R. 3414, with similar provisions. I congratulate both of my colleagues for their constructive actions.

The theory of these bills is that it is essential to safeguard our economic stability in time of crisis to provide the Executive with power to freeze prices, wages, and rents for a period of 90 days, subject to congressional review of the necessity of, or a continuation of a freeze of that kind. Thus, a mechanism would be available at all times, for immediate use in the event of emergency, to cushion our economy against the shock of another world crisis. In effect, the Multer and Dollinger bills provide us with an insurance policy which pays off when we need it most, which insures our internal stability at a time when the greatest defense spending, material shortages, and scarce buying threaten that stability.

Mr. MULTER's bill was presented at a time when, in this Congress, considerable confusion reigned on the subject of the future of price controls. His bill evidences a sound and basic approach to this difficult problem. More than that, his bill evidences a statesmanlike approach to the new role being played by the Democratic Members of this House—the role of a constructive opposition. And I believe the best concrete evidence of the value of Congressman MULTER'S constructive contribution to the solution of the difficult question of future controls which now plagues this Congress, is the fact that on February 25 Senator CAPEHART, the new chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, as well as all the Democratic members of that committee, introduced in the Senate a controls bill whose approach was substantially similar to that presented to this House 1 week earlier by Mr. MULTER.

Clearly, in the light of the history of the cold war—and more especially in view of present administration plans in the Far East—it is incumbent upon us to take steps now which, in the event of new crises, would forestall any repetition of the runaway inflation of the post-Korea period of June to December 1950. In those few months, food prices increased 11.5 percent; wholesale prices rose 16 percent; and raw material prices spiralled 47.2 percent. In a scant 6 months, the consumers of this country suffered a loss of over $16 billion, and our defense costs rose in some cases from 50 to 150 percent through inflation alone.

The rollback of prices is as difficult as getting the chicken back in the egg. It just cannot be done.

Upon a finding and declaration of a national emergency, the President, under the Multer and Dollinger bill, issues his freeze of prices and wages when first the emergency is upon us. However, Congress retains its ultimate responsibility with respect to legislating for the common defense and the general welfare. Within the 90-day period of the freeze, it may end such freeze forthwith, extend its termination date, or enact such other legislation with respect to controls as it deems fit.

Clearly, this approach represents a great step forward in the protection of our economy in the light of world conditions which we presently face. Clearly, it is a step which this Congress must take, or face the charge of disregarding the overriding public interest in the performance of its duties.

I sincerely trust that the House Banking and Currency Committee will schedule early hearings on the Multer and Dollinger bills in order that the American people may not be left without protection, should a crisis develop.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS ON SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, there are two urgently needed amendments to the social-security laws which Congress has an obligation to give immediate consideration to, due to commitments made in the closing days of the last Congress.

I refer to two provisions which were contained in H. R. 7800 when it passed the House. This bill became the Social Security Act amendments of 1952.

The first of these provisions related to the preserving of the insurance rights of workers under the old-age and survivors insurance program upon their becoming permanently and totally disabled. The effectiveness of this provision as the bill became law is contingent upon further action by Congress, since the provision terminates on June 30, 1953, and applications for a freeze of periods of disability cannot be filed prior to July 1, 1953.

In my opinion, the freezing of periods of disability so as to preserve the insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled persons would remove one of the greatest inequities in the present social-security-insurance program. At the present time, the least harm that periods of disability can do a worker is to reduce the size of his eventual benefits, and in the worst situation, periods of disability may deny workers any benefits whatsoever upon reaching retirement age, or his survivors upon his death.

The House conferees, Republicans and Democrats alike, stated in the conference report, in referring to the conference agreement on the provision relating to the preservation of insurance rights:

> It is the intent of the conferees that hearings will be held on this entire matter early in 1953.

The second amendment to the social-security laws which the Congress is committed to is an amendment which will permit State and local employees who have retirement systems of their own to elect also to have social security insurance coverage.

When H. R. 7800 passed the House, it contained such a provision, under which State and local employees who already have retirement systems—with the exception of policemen, firemen, and teachers in elementary and secondary schools—could also have social-security coverage if there were a State or local law in effect on January 1, 1951, providing for coordination of the State or local retirement system with social security, or if two-thirds of the employees covered by a State or local retirement system voted in favor of social-security coverage.

Here again is a provision which would remove another grave discrimination in the present social-security laws. We all know that in the case of many corporations, employees have the protection of both a company pension plan and social security. This provision merely makes possible the same protection to public employees in State and local governments.

The Senate deleted this provision from H. R. 7800, and this deletion was agreed to in conference with the promise that early in 1953 consideration would be given to the subject. I again quote from the conference report, joined in unanimously by Republicans and Democrats:

It is the intent of the conferees that the entire matter of the extension of Federal coverage to employees already covered by State and local retirement systems will be explored early in 1953, when the disability provisions are to be reexamined.

This amendment has a long history. In 1949, the House passed a bill permitting State and local employees who have retirement systems of their own to elect social-security coverage. The Senate deleted this provision then. Many Members of Congress have in bills in the current session which would amend the social-security laws along these lines.

The provision relating to a freeze of periods of disability so as to preserve the insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled workers also has a long history. In 1949, the House passed H. R. 6000, which contained a provision providing for disability insurance benefits. This went much further than merely freezing the periods of disability.

I believe that Congress has a moral obligation to honor these promises.

The Committee on Ways and Means has just appointed a Subcommittee on Social Security. This subcommittee has not yet set up an agenda. It could very promptly begin hearings on these two matters, and report to the full committee its findings and conclusions in a very short period of time, because both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee have already made exhaustive studies of these two proposed amendments.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] on his statement. I have always felt that our social-security laws should be further liberalized and broadened without doing any harm to the present social security trust fund. This fund deserves the special attention of every Member of this body because any plan that would make workers who contribute to the present fund pay for those who do not contribute to the fund is damaging on its face.

I feel that we should go even further and enact a disability provision which will take care of the permanently and totally disabled. Such a provision was in the bill enacted by this body in 1949 but was deleted in the Senate by the Knowland amendment, thereby placing the people with disabilities in the same category as the people on old-age assistance.

Naturally I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we should permanently freeze rights of workers during periods of total and permanent disability so that they would not lose benefit rights because of their disability. Pensions to the aged, widows with children, the blind, the totally and permanently disabled, and the retired employee should be raised.

Mr. Speaker, I likewise agree with the gentleman that this Congress should fulfill its obligations and commence immediate hearings on legislation to further liberalize our social-security laws, and to include other groups that are not now covered. Employees of State and local governments and of the teaching profession should have the right of coverage if they want it, notwithstanding their own retirement plans.

I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in urging the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee who have been appointed to study social-security legislation to give this important subject careful consideration at an early date in order that a suitable bill may be reported out and enacted during the 1st session of the 83d Congress.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the observations of the gentleman from Kentucky, and thank him very much for making them.

Mr. Speaker, in House Report No. 1944 on H. R. 7800, of the 82d Congress, the Committee on Ways and Means stated that the changes in the bill, including a provision which would preserve the insurance rights of workers during periods of total and permanent disability and a provision permitting social-security coverage to State and local employees who already have a retirement system of their own "are all within areas which were intensively studied by your committee over a period of 6 months of hearings and executive sessions prior to the 1950 amendments, and thus do not require prolonged consideration now. These changes do not affect the fundamental principles of the program. Your committee recognizes that there are other amendments to the old-age and survivors insurance program which are needed, but these six have been selected because of their urgency and because of the widespread agreement on their desirability."

For these reasons, I do not believe that prolonged hearings or deliberations would be necessary now for action to be taken on these two amendments. Every month of delay means a substantial loss of protection to thousands of individuals who have been urging Congress to give them this protection. Prompt action is required to insure that the necessary legislation will be enacted before this 1953 session of Congress adjourns.

ESCAPE CLAUSE UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues present today will recall that I am the author of the escape clause in the 1951 renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. You will recall that the escape clause was written in the law by the Congress for the express purpose of providing a procedure by which small industries could carry their complaints before the Tariff Commission and secure an open hearing in an effort to prove that they were being injured by excessive foreign imports. I have before me a case filed by the manufacturers of safety pins by a firm in Philadelphia and in Connecticut that has just been turned down by the Tariff Commission. They would not even entertain a hearing for them, on the ground that they were not following the procedures outlined by the Commission in order to get a case before the Commission.

I am not aware of anything in that escape clause that may be set up in the way of rules and regulations to prevent the Commission from hearing anyone, so long as they file an application. The Commission might find, after they had gone into it, that there was some additional information needed, but certainly I am going to insist on the Tariff Commission carrying out the provisions of that escape clause and giving these people a hearing. If they turn them down on the basis of the facts, that is something else, but it was intended that they be given a hearing, and I am going to insist on it. It is going to lead to a request for another investigation, despite the fact that the House has so many pending at the present time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include an article by General Vandenberg.

Mr. BEAMER and to include a concurrent resolution from the General Assembly of Indiana.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. GATHINGS) and to include an address.

Mr. PERKINS and to include a plan of action on developing a public library service in rural areas, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mr. FRIEDEL (at the request of Mr. PRICE) and to include an article entitled "A Salute to Dwight D. Eisenhower."

Mr. PRICE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LONG and to include a speech he made recently.

Mr. DELANEY and to include a sermon.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include an article on Soviet-American relations, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER).

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 10. An act to prohibit the transportation of obscene matters in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 11. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the mailing of obscene matter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 35. An act to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 799. An act to amend the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

493. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the 32d Annual Report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

494. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines, Anthracite Research Laboratory constructed at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., pursuant to the act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

495. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., pursuant to the act of March 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 85); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3528. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the construction and improvement of the national system of interstate highways designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OAKMAN:

H. R. 3529. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 for the construction and improvement of the national system of interstate highways designated in accordance with section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3530. A bill to provide for the payment of Federal unemployment taxes into the Federal unemployment account to be available for the administration of unemployment compensation laws and public employment offices, and to return to the States the excess of such taxes over such administrative expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3531. A bill to provide for the payment of Federal unemployment taxes into the Federal unemployment account to be available for the administration of unemployment compensation laws and public employment offices, and to return to the States the excess of such taxes over such administrative expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3532. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3533. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 3534. A bill to authorize the extension of patents covering inventions whose practice was prevented or curtailed during certain emergency periods by service of the patent owner in the Armed Forces or by production controls; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3535. A bill to prevent Federal acquisitions of land from interfering with sustained-yield timber operations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3536. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Camp Beale, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 3537. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Camp Beale, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 3538. A bill to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability or previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 3539. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 3540. A bill to restore certain provisions of law affected by the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701); to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 3541. A bill to simplify and consolidate the laws relating to the receipt of compensation from dual employments under the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3542. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant easements for rights-of-way through, over, and under the parkway land along the line of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, and to authorize an exchange of lands with other Federal departments and agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3543. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Camp Beale, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3544. A bill to provide retroactive promotions for certain postal transportation clerks engaged in military service or service on war transfer during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3545. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Camp Beale, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 3546. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Camp Beale, Calif.; to to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3547. A bill to change penalties for the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 3548. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3549. A bill authorizing the Tennessee Valley Authority to construct a bridge across the Power River arm of Norris Lake; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3550. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 3551. A bill to amend section 704 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to protect the public health and welfare by providing adequate authority for factory inspections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3552. A bill authorizing acquisition and interception of communications in interest of national security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHARTON:

H. R. 3553. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 3554. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution providing that the Public Housing Commissioner shall assist the village of Greendale, Wis., recently sold by the Federal Government, in defraying its operating expenses during the temporary period in which it cannot lawfully raise its own adequate revenues; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and in the persecution of Roman Catholics behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. Res. 156. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Select Committee on Small Business entitled "Review of Small Business" (H. Rept. 2513, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 159. A resolution expressing the condemnation of the people of the United States of religious persecutions behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the 33d session of the South Dakota State Legislature, relative to providing for the control of noxious weeds on federally owned or controlled lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAY (by request):

H. R. 3555. A bill for the relief of John Musich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3556. A bill for the relief of Humberto Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL (by request):

H. R. 3557. A bill for the relief of Captain Walter C. Wolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (by request):

H. R. 3558. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Erato Aranopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3559. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Loukas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3560. A bill for the relief of Sotiros Andrew Economou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3561. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3562. A bill for the relief of Emery Geller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 3563. A bill for the relief of Joji Maeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3564. A bill to provide for the extension of Design Patent No. D-168,296, relating to an ashtray design; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3565. A bill for the relief of Antonio Colabelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3566. A bill for the relief of Pimen Maximovitch Sofronov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3567. A bill for the relief of Moe D. Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3568. A bill for the relief of Joseph, Bertha, and Salomon Leifer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3569. A bill for the relief of Josephine Lisitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 3570. A bill for the relief of Henry Kraemer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3571. A bill for the relief of Sigmund Spitz and Gertrude Spitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3572. A bill for the relief of Paolo Longo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3573. A bill for the relief of Edna V. R. Decker, Barbara P. R. Moore, W. S. Rosasco, Jr., and Gordon Wells, as administrator cum testamento annexo of the estate of Anna I. R. Wells, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3574. A bill for the relief of Lodewyck Bruckman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

73. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Miami Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, Federal social security for all, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, whom we seek in all our need and through all the mystery and perplexity of life, without whom we cannot live bravely or well: Show us Thy will in all the maze of paths our uncertain feet may take. As we draw near to Thee now in prayer at the beginning of this session, do Thou graciously draw near unto us, until we become more sure of Thee than of midday light. Come to us in the common life that entangles us. Meet us in the thorny questions, national and international, which confront us. Make Thy highways through the avenues of sense clothe Thy glory in our failing and fallible judgments.

"Breathe on us, breath of God,
Until our hearts are pure,
Until, with Thee, we will one will
To do and to endure."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 25, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. ALBERTO ARISPE, SENATOR IN THE CONGRESS OF PERU

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] wishes to present a visitor to the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may present to the Senate a distinguished visitor from a South American country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Iowa may proceed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Last August I was the beneficiary of very great hospitality on the part of the Legislature of Peru. At that time I became acquainted with a gentleman whose kindness to me I appreciate, and who is now present on a good-will visit to the United States. It affords me great pleasure to present to the Senate the Honorable Alberto Arispe, a Senator in the Congress of Peru from the Department of Arequipa. [Applause, Senators rising.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. TOBEY was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from Monday, March 2, 1953, to Tuesday, March 17, 1953.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate this afternoon, and that they may meet during the Senate session today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in asking that the members of his subcommittee may be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, the Senator from North Dakota should realize that if there is a rollcall, they will have to attend the Senate session.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio is correct in his statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in order to expedite the work of the Appropriations Committee in the remaining months of the present session of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be permitted to meet when necessary during the sessions of the Senate. Such permission will not be abused.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does that mean that the Committee on Appropriations can meet at any time?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. It must meet week after week if we are to get away by the time that has been suggested.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to have the same privilege with regard to meetings of the Committee on the Judiciary.

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications

and letters, which were referred as indicated:

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 20)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the Post Office Department, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DRAFTS OF PROPOSED PROVISIONS PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATIONS, NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 21)

A communication from the President of the United States transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations for the fiscal year 1953, for the National Mediation Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. DOC. NO. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, in the amount of $58,451, for the legislative branch, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, THE JUDICIARY (S. DOC. NO. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $11,500, for the judiciary, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to loan authorizations of the Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF VIOLATION OF SECTION 3679, REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATION IN EXCESS OF ALLOTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the expenditure of an appropriation in excess of a .otment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY LAWS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to restore certain provisions of law affected by the act entitled "An act to amend or repeal certain Government property laws, and for other purposes," approved October 31, 1951 (65 Stat. 701) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO BUREAU OF MINES ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory, Schuylkill Haven, Pa., for the calendar year 1952; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF LIST OF POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the Executive Director, United States Civil Service Commission, informing the Senate, that in the letter of the Commission dated February 20, 1953, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 19, the lists of positions not under civil service rules and regulations, the Commission inadvertently failed to state that the lists do not include certain Department of Defense positions which were not reported to them because of security considerations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the West Palm Beach (Fla.) Townsend Club No. 1, favoring the substitution of the so-called Townsend plan for old-age pensions for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for a revision of the so-called McCarran immigration law relating to the treatment of merchant seamen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Council of American Master Mariners, New York, N. Y., signed by Thomas Sheridan, secretary-treasurer, remonstrating against the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Legislative Resolution 6

"Whereas the various States have enacted primary election laws that vary in the method of obtaining an advisory vote on presidential candidates; and

"Whereas it would be more representative of the people if the advisory vote obtained before the national conventions was uniform: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-fifth session assembled:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact a law establishing a uniform election procedure for obtaining an advisory vote for presidential candidates.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"CHARLES J. WARNER,
"President of the Legislature."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF LITHUANIAN SOCIETIES, BALTIMORE, MD.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Council of Lithuanian Societies, Baltimore, Md., at recent ceremonies marking the 35th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, citizens of the United States of Lithuanian descent of the city of Baltimore, Md., in commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the people of Lithuania, held on the 16th day of February 1953, at the Lithuanian Auditorium, 851 Hollins Street, sponsored by the Council of Lithuanian Societies, unanimously adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas in the eyes of people around the world, the United States has been the strongest champion of the oppressed; and

"Whereas the traditional American leadership in principles of justice, morality, and equal rights to all human beings on the earth paved the way for the American supremacy in the political, military, and economic world affairs which this country is today providing for the benefit of mankind; and

"Whereas intolerable conditions which now prevail in Eastern and Central Europe, including Lithuania and other Baltic States, should be of greatest concern to the United States as no peace and stability in the world is possible without participation of that part of Europe which comprises a force of over 100 million people separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain; and

"Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims of that area, when not accompanied by any positive action on the part of the United States to back its stand, do not and will not bear the slightest effect on the Kremlin masters: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent, concerned about security and prosperity of this great country and over the fate of our native land, Lithuania, now under brutal Soviet yoke, appeal to the Government of the United States—

"1. To adopt a clear and firm foreign policy such as America's leading role in the world affairs necessitates.

"2. To incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved counties, as an integral and inseparable part, in the program of the United States foreign policy.

"3. To inaugurate all suitable means to aid liberation movements in the Soviet-enslaved countries and to enlist their cooperation in the global efforts to fight international communism.

"4. To speed ratification of the Genocide Convention and to implement the ratification by a decisive action within the United Nations to make Soviet Russia responsible for the crimes committed in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this meeting pledge all possible support of the Lithuanian Americans to the Federal Government in its efforts to resist the evil Communist forces of aggression and to sustain peace and freedom everywhere; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Maryland Members of both Houses of Congress, the United States representatives in the United Nations, the Governor of the State of Maryland, the mayor of Baltimore City, the diplomatic and consular representatives of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the United States, and the press."

ANTHONY J. MICEIKA,
President.
MATAS BRAZAUSKAS,
Secretary.

COLLECTION OF FEDERAL GASOLINE TAXES BY THE STATES—RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF INDIANA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and

printing in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing Congress to enact legislation to repeal Federal laws requiring States to collect and turn over to the Federal Government gasoline taxes.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution to memorialize Congress to enact legislation to repeal Federal laws requiring States to collect and turn over to the Federal Government gasoline taxes

Whereas the State of Indiana, by virtue of the laws heretofore enacted by the United States Congress collects a tax on each gallon of gasoline sold in the State of Indiana; and

Whereas each year in compliance with said Federal laws, the State of Indiana, as well as many other States, sends millions of dollars more to the Federal Government, than it receives from the Federal Government for highway purposes; and

Whereas the highway systems of many States, including Indiana are in such a critical condition as to make it necessary that all taxes collected by the States for highway purposes be retained by the States and used for the purposes for which they are collected: Therefore be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Indiana:

SECTION 1. This, the 88th session of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States of America to enact appropriate legislation repealing laws which require the States to collect and send to said Government the tax on gasoline.

SEC. 2. The secretary of the senate shall send a certified copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana.

EVACUATION OF RUSSIAN TROOPS FROM LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN AID ASSOCIATION, WORCESTER, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Association, at the hall of the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, Worcester, Mass., relating to the evacuation of Russian troops from Lithuania.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a mass meeting held under the auspices of the Lithuanian Aid Association, at the hall of the Lithuanian Naturalization Club, Worcester, Mass., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

"Whereas Russia, by force of arms and in utter violation of all legal and moral laws, continues to occupy the territory of the Republic of Lithuania; to deport, imprison, and exterminate Lithuania's Nationals, to commit atrocities against the civil population of Lithuania; to systematically destroy Lithuania's democratic form of government; Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., do most vigorously condemn and protest against Russia's such unlawful by force of arms occupation of the Republic of Lithuania, against the deportation, imprisonment, and extermination of Lithuania's Nationals, against the commission of atrocities against the civil population and against the systematic destruction of Lithuania's democratic form of government; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Lithuanians of Worcester, Mass., most fervently petition the President of the United States of America, to use to the utmost the influence of the Government of the United States of America, to the end that all Russian military forces and Government be forthwith evacuated from Lithuania, and Lithuania and her people be restored as a free and independent Republic among the nations of the world according to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States of America, the Secretary of State, the Senators and Congressmen of the United States from Massachusetts, and to the United Nations."

M. ZEMAITAITIS,
Chairman.
J. PALUBECKAS,
Secretary.

THE KOREAN PROBLEM—PETITION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, nothing so well evidences the interest of the American people in the Korean problem and in the question of subversion and doubtful loyalty within the structure of government than the avidity with which more than 4,000 people have signed a petition addressed to the President and Members of the 83d Congress. The petition has been circulated by the Rockford Chamber of Commerce as a matter of public service and they have enrolled literally thousands of signatures. I believe it quite worthwhile to have the petition printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done, and that it may be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION AND PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE MEMBERS OF THE 83D CONGRESS, OCTOBER 18, 1952

American families are concerned about the position in which we find ourselves in Korea. Their concern grows out of their inability to determine in their own minds what is the right thing to do.

Throughout the history of our country, parents and America's young men have courageously made great sacrifices to obtain or defend our freedom.

The United States Armed Forces have fought victoriously in all corners of the world. They have been sure they were fighting for the freedom of themselves and their fellow countrymen, defending their homes, or preserving the freedom of citizens of an allied country—and always with the clear understanding that their efforts were in support of established fundamental American concepts that peace and individual freedom are the divine rights of man.

Today there is a deep-seated conviction on the part of a large number of our people that we are operating without a clear-cut foreign policy. It may be that Congress knows what our basic foreign policy is. It may be that some folks in the State Department know what it is, but it is obviously not clear to the American public. Further, it is increasingly clear to a great many that there are those in the State Department who by action and belief support the philosophies, ideologies, or the actions of Soviet Russia and her satellites in preference to the fundamental principles that we of America stand for.

Proof of the foregoing statement is supported by findings and recommendations of congressional committees and has been conclusively presented in sworn testimony before congressional committees, by competent Government officials and military leaders and by citizens well informed through personal experience on the problems of the Far East in particular.

It is clear from the testimonies mentioned above that men who follow the philosophies of Soviet Russia have been promoted or sheltered in the State Department.

China was a loyal and active Ally during World War II. We have enjoyed a friendly relationship with the Chinese people for generations. Today China is closed to Americans and American trade for the first time since the Boxer Rebellion. This has happened under the leadership of our present State Department officials. Sworn testimony before congressional committees and findings of these committees make it tragically clear that our State Department policies aided the Communists in taking over control of all China.

We can no longer depend upon the State Department to give us the unbiased truth or to direct a sound foreign policy until employees disloyal to American principles are removed from the payroll.

Unfortunately, the startling evidence that has been published has been swallowed up in the political arena before the American people have had an opportunity to take a square look at it without political prejudice or distortion.

We therefore have a right to expect that men of integrity, loyalty, and honest purpose in both parties of the Congress will join together in the post-election period to demand that present investigations of the State Department be expedited with two basic objectives in mind:

1. To develop a practical program to reestablish American friendly relations and trade with Nationalist China and any other countries now closed to us where such moves are possible.

2. To recommend to the 83d Congress a basic foreign policy that the Congress can approve and will insist that all departments of Government carry out.

Further in this regard, that the 83d Congress charge the appropriate committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate with the serious responsibility of keeping the Congress advised of any failure on the part of any department of Government to carry out the will of the people as expressed by the Congress.

FOREST ROADS AND BRIDGES IN SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST—RESOLUTION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, LAKE COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the county commissioners of Lake County, Minn., relating to forest roads and bridges in the Superior National Forest.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Government ownership in the Superior National Forest in Lake County as of June 30, 1952, comprises 703,731 acres, or more than 51 percent of Lake County; and

Whereas this area, which includes most of Lake County's valuable inland lakeshore property, is tax exempt; and

Whereas the acreage of Federal-owned land in the Superior National Forest is constantly increasing and county taxable area decreasing; and

Whereas Lake County is expending much more than its meager in-lieu-of-taxes return from the Superior National Forest for construction on the forest highway primary system; and

Whereas the funds allocated to the local forest administration for the maintenance of their own system of forest roads is totally inadequate; and

Whereas due to lack of funds for proper maintenance, the forest roads, portages, bridges, and buildings have depreciated to a deplorable and unsafe condition and through no fault of the competent local forest administration; and

Whereas as a result, Lake County, a distressed county, has had to take over more forest roads into the county system and even provide for snow plowing of forest logging roads in order that children may be transported to school; and

Whereas Lake County cannot continue to be deprived of taxable value, and, at the same time, continue to assume additional responsibility and expend additional funds to relieve the Federal Government of its responsibility; and

Whereas this deplorable forest road, portage, and bridge condition can easily result in the wiping out of this vast region of natural resource in event of fire during a drought period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress be, and it hereby is, requested to provide yearly emergency funds to the extent of 10 times more than is now provided for the maintenance and reconditioning of the forest roads and bridges in the Superior National Forest and until said deplorable and disgraceful condition is corrected; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senator Edward J. Thye, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Congressman John A. Blatnik, and Galen W. Pike, forest supervisor, Superior National Forest.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the General Council of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians, relating to a per capita payment of $50 to each member of that band of Indians.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the Red Lake Chippewas have much unemployment during the winter and spring months, and living expenses are higher during that period; and

Whereas many Indians need to have their homes repaired; and

Whereas the Red Lake Indians can use extra funds during the planting season: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council representing the Red Lake Band hereby requests the Congress of the United States through the Honorable Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to enact and pass legislation to distribute $50 of tribal funds to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians in the spring of 1953, who are living on the date the act becomes law. This distribution of tribal funds shall be known as a per capita payment. The tribal funds to be used for this purpose shall be from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Indian Reservation or from any other tribal funds deposited to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; it is further

Resolved, That no money paid to Indians under this per capita act shall be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other persons, except the Red Lake Band of Chippewas; it is further

Resolved, That payments made under this act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in the Social Security Act as amended.

REDUCTION IN NUMBER OF BEDS AT FORT SNELLING HOSPITAL—RESOLUTION OF POST NO. 1172, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, EVELETH, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution unanimously adopted by VFW Post, No. 1172, Eveleth, Minn., at its regular meeting on February 2, 1953, protesting against the reduction in the number of beds at the Fort Snelling Hospital, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many sick and wounded veterans are returning daily from Korea, and many of the older veterans of World Wars I and II are needing medical care; and

Whereas veterans' hospitals are now crowded to the point where it is difficult for a sick veteran to get immediate hospitalization; and

Whereas the news has reached this post that the Veterans' Administration is contemplating reducing the number of beds at the Fort Snelling Hospital by 100, or more: therefore be it

Resolved, That this post protests the above action, and petitions you to do all in your power to prevent any further reduction in veterans' hospital facilities, and be it further

Resolved, That efforts be made to increase the number of beds available at Fort Snelling by using the old wing of the infirmary as well as the new wing; and, be it finally

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to honorable Senators HUMPHREY, THYE, and Congressman JOHN BLATNIK.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF THE FERNWOOD GRANGE 770, NEWBERG, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Fernwood Grange 770, Newberg, Oreg., be printed in the RECORD. The resolution asks that social security be extended to cover all farmers and professional men.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present Social Security Act does not cover the farmers and certain professional men: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Fernwood Grange, No. 770, of Yamhill County goes on record as favoring the extension of social security to cover all farmers and professional men.

A copy of this resolution to be mailed to the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD and Senators WAYNE MORSE and GUY CORDON.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 48) thereon. I hope we will be able to take action on the bill early next week.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 86), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending March 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $190,000 for the period beginning March 18, 1953, through March 31, 1954, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1082. A bill to approve a conveyance made by the city of Charleston, S. C., to the South Carolina State Ports Authority of real property heretofore granted to said city of Charleston by the United States of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1083. A bill for the relief of Kurt Glaser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1084. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1085. A bill to amend the act which incorporated the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; and

S. 1086. A bill to amend the act of February 24, 1925, incorporating the American War Mothers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1087. A bill for the relief of Mario Sebac; and

S. 1088. A bill for the relief of Elena Greenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1089. A bill to amend section 1715 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of firearms in the mails to or from persons or concerns having lawful use for them in connection with their businesses or their official duties, and for other purposes;

S. 1090. A bill to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect; and

S. 1091 (by request). A bill to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1092. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1093. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1094. A bill for the relief of Markos Demetrius Spanos; and

S. 1095. A bill for the relief of Lt. Gen. Ying Hsing Wen, Tseng Shui-Chin Wen, and Howard Hsinhsiung Wen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1096. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Marie Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1097. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Stanislaw Sluzewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1098. A bill for the relief of Sister Elvira Stornelli;

S. 1099. A bill for the relief of Sister Augusta Sala;

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of the John D. McWilliams Co., Inc.;

S. 1101. A bill for the relief of Beatrice O. Haidostian;

S. 1102. A bill for the relief of Rev. Milan Ignacio Hleba; and

S. 1103. A bill for the relief of Ciriaco Catino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1104. A bill to revive and reenact the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1105. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1106. A bill relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1107. A bill for the relief of King F. Trione and Dera Trione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1108. A bill to amend the laws relating to the construction of Federal-aid highways to provide for equality of treatment of railroads and other public utilities with respect to the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of such highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1109. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National War Memorial Arts Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1110. A bill to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. CASE):

S. 1111. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to Oliver P. Livermont; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1112. A bill for the relief of Lo Bianco Letizia Maria Genoveffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1113. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1114. A bill relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1115. A bill to authorize a $50 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1116. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to review the operation of the projects for flood control for Red Lake River, Minn., with a view to determining whether further projects are necessary; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1117. A bill to provide for the construction of a chapel at the Fort Snelling National Cemetery, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request):

S. 1118. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1119. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis (Peter) Goudes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1120. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1121. A bill for the relief of Kimi Hashimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY):

S. 1122. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1123. A bill for the relief of Kosmas Vassilios Fournarakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1124. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1125. A bill for the relief of Daniel R. Ng;

S. 1126. A bill for the relief of Sandy Michael John Philip;

S. 1127. A bill for the relief of Seiko Nakagawa (Mochizuki);

S. 1128. A bill for the relief of Fermo Breda;

S. 1129. A bill for the relief of Jozo Mandic;

S. 1130. A bill for the relief of Kim Dong Su;

S. 1131. A bill for the relief of Mariko Kuniyuki;

S. 1132. A bill for the relief of Spiridon Platis;

S. 1133. A bill for the relief of Orsolina Cianfione;

S. 1134. A bill for the relief of Daniel S. Delani-Beltayne;

S. 1135. A bill for the relief of Stamatios James Bratsanos;

S. 1136. A bill for the relief of Pedro P. Dagamac;

S. 1137. A bill for the relief of Utako Kanitz;

S. 1138. A bill for the relief of John Soudas;

S. 1139. A bill for the relief of Helen Hoff; and

S. 1140. A bill for the relief of O. E. Hambleton and Mrs. Harriet Elizabeth Hambleton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1141. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Noble; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1142. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigration inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service," approved March 2, 1931; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1143. A bill for the relief of Teresa Lee Tipton (Kinuko Sakai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1144. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Lower Cumberland Dam and Reservoir on the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1145. A bill to authorize the improvement of Blaine Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; and

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to designate the 1st day of May in each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for administrative expenses of the office of Administrator of Rent Control for the period ending April 30, 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PARITY PRICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of

1949, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1084) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended—

(a) by deleting from the first sentence thereof the language "at a level not in excess of 90 percent of the parity price of the commodity nor less than the level provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) as follows" and substituting therefor the language "at 100 percent of the parity price therefor."

(b) by deleting subsection (a), (b), and (c) and paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d); redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (a) and paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) of such subsection as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3); and redesignating subsection (3) as subsection (b).

SEC. 2. Title II of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding a new section at the end thereof as follows:

"SEC. 202. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary is authorized and directed to make available, through loans, purchases, parity payments, or other operations under existing law, price support to producers as follows:

"(a) The price of wool, hogs, eggs, farm chickens, beef cattle, whole milk, and butterfat, respectively, shall be supported at 100 percent of the parity price therefor, beginning with the marketing year or season commencing in 1954, or such earlier date as the Secretary may determine.

"(b) The price of soybeans, flaxseed, dry edible beans, and rye, respectively, shall be supported at 100 percent of the parity price therefor, beginning with the 1953 crop.

"(c) The price of grain sorghums, barley, and oats, respectively, shall be supported at a level which is equivalent to 100 percent of the parity price for corn on the basis of comparative feeding value, beginning with the 1953 crop."

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall not affect the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, under section 402 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to make price support available at higher levels.

SEC. 4. Section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity and for any of the commodities, grain sorghums, barley, oats, edible beans and rye, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

The statement of Mr. MANSFIELD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

The rapidly deteriorating situation on the family farms of this Nation warrants our most serious attention. This is not a time for histrionics and oratory. The average prices farmers received for the commodities they produced for sale dropped by a staggering 6 percent in a single month between November 15 and December 15 last. This occurrance, significantly serious in and of itself, is an even more serious signal of disaster ahead if we allow the underlying trends that caused it to continue in the direction they are going.

I am speaking today to invite the attention of my colleagues to the situation and prospects of the family farms of the Nation and the good people who live and work on them. There are 15 millions of these people working substantially full time on their own farms. But it is not in their behalf, alone, that I speak to you today. The facts I shall set before you are of national concern, of direct importance to every man, woman, and child in the United States, and indeed throughout the democratic world.

The very existence in society of a large group of farming families owning the resources with which they work, directing their own efforts, and having the opportunity to earn respectable livings is uniquely essential to the preservation and strengthening of the democratic form of government. On the family farm the terrible tensions of class and economic group cannot exist. The farm and home are one; members of the family are managers, owners, and laborers combined. Such people are a stable political group that forms one of the major bulwarks of organized democratic government. The very stability of these people is the base upon which democratic freedoms, liberties, and strong unharassed and unsuppressed private associations and other democratic forms and procedures can persist and prosper. I say to you that the rights and opportunities of the people to strive for their economic well-being and the right to participate in governmental decisions can only be preserved in an atmosphere that precludes the suppressions of private associations organized and financed by the people themselves and of the other democratic institutions that through tolerance protect the rights of the individual to freedom of expression and thought. Such protections cannot be preserved if bitter economic group tensions characterize the full body of society. The large number of family farms in this country is a safeguard against the development of this sort of thing and a protection against political excesses, repressions, and intolerance.

The great cities of this country are not maintaining themselves. Even from the standpoint of population numbers, the great seedbed of the Nation is on its family farms. Our cities would wither and die but for the farm-born children that migrate to them. If, even for just a few days, the abundant flow of food and fiber from the farms were cut off, the cities would be helpless.

The direct relation of the production and prosperity of family farms to general national interest is not confined to the large cities alone. The ebb and flow of economic opportunity and results of the farm people is, also, of direct importance to the people on the Main Streets of a thousand rural towns and small cities and regional market centers all over this great Nation. This is true not only because the farm is the source of such a very high proportion of our food and clothing, but because the processing and distribution of farm-produced commodities and the manufacturing, transportation, merchandising and sale of farm production and farm family living supplies is a major or contributing source of income to so many people. The purchasing power of a farm family in Montana is of direct concern to everyone along the long chain of workers, owners and managers of businesses from the automobile factory in Detroit to the car dealer in the county seat. What's true of automobiles is true of farm machinery, petroleum products, refrigerators, and every item in the long list of goods and services that go into modern farming and farm life. The production and income of the farms and ranches of the Nation are thus directly related to continued national well-being and the rise or fall of national prosperity.

Great national depressions in the history of this and other countries have almost always been preceded by depression and economic reverses on the farms. Is that where we are headed again? I don't know whether the cause and effect relationship is absolute. But I say to you the Nation can ill afford to take the chance.

Not only do current farm problems have a direct and significant importance to the nonfarm people of this generation. The farm people of today are the custodians of the great water and soil resources of the Nation. The improvement and preservation of our farm land are of utmost importance to the millions as yet unborn. If the farm people of today are financially unable or psychologically too discouraged to make the extra effort and undertake the extra costs of a permanent farming system, we are thereby taking a needless risk with the continued stability of the food and fiber supply of the Nation.

The implications of this relate directly to national security in a troubled world where food products produced on the farms of the United States have helped to maintain our Armed Forces and those of our Allies. These supplies have, also, been of crucial importance in bolstering up the morale of other nations where progressive reductions in food rations have threatened the stability and continuance of democratic government.

For all of these reasons, I invite attention to some of the threatening trends in the farm sector of our national economy. The national security and the national interest, in my opinion, demand that we give early and responsible attention to these matters. These are matters of immediate concern; we cannot afford to come to them at our leisure. The danger to the Nation is current, pressing and present. We should initiate action now, before the trends to which I shall address these remarks have continued for too long in the wrong direction.

The 1950 Census of the United States reported 5,382,000 farm units in this Nation. Some 100,000 of these so-called farm units could better be designated as "industrial agricultural enterprises." They are "factories-in-the-fields" where ownership and management do not reside in the workers. Rather there is a split between management and working that lends itself to the same economic group tensions that are always threatening in the manufacturing and distribution areas of the national economy. If all agriculture were characterized by this factory system, farming would lose one of its major functions as a bulwark of democracy.

Fortunately, farming in the United States is still largely characterized by family-size units, some largely adequate, many inadequate. Of the 5,382,000 farm units counted by the Census of 1950, 5,276,000 are not in the "industrial category." Not near all of these so-called farm units are actually full-time family farm enterprises, however. Approximately 1,679,000 of them are residences in rural areas of part- and full-time city and town workers and retired people, and a few are such businesses as greenhouses, nurseries, and the like. Making these deductions from the total reported by the Census, we find 3,597,000 farm units that provide substantially the sole source of income and place of work for a farming family.

Statistical data collected, tabulated and published by the Bureau of the Census and the Council of Economic Advisers allows us to get a pretty thorough look at the conditions under which the full-time farming families of the Nation are living and working. The personal income of the approximately 157 million people in the United States last year was an average of $3,264 per year for each family, after you make adjustments to express city income in terms equivalent to farm family purchasing power.

Not more than one-ninth of all the full-time farm families of the United States have income this high or higher. Official figures are not available that would enable us to say with certainty what income a farm family should be able to earn to have what might be called a decent American standard of living.

But for the sake of having a figure, I have chosen the level of only 80 percent of the average family income of all the people in the United States. Surely that figure is low enough to distinguish between what we could legitimately call an adequate family farm and one that we could agree was inadequate. Using this figure as a basis, 1.6 million of the full-time family farms of the Nation are inadequate for some reason or another; the other 3,597,000 are more or less adequate from the standpoint of the opportunity provided to the family to earn a decent income.

The 1950 census reports the following numbers of full-time family farms in the different income categories:

Inadequate:	
Net family incomes of approximately—	
$100–$479	707,000
$480–$999	896,000
Total	1,603,000
Adequate:	
Net family incomes of approximately—	
$1,000–$1,999	882,000
$2,000–$3,999	726,000
$4,000–$9,999	386,000
Total	1,994,000

That was the situation in 1950; not one of which this Nation can be overly proud. As bad as this situation is, it would not be so great a source of concern if prospects for improvement were apparent and real. But such is not the case. In fact, the underlying trends are going in the wrong direction.

I have mentioned the startling drop in farm prices of 6 percent in the one month from November 15 to December 15 of the year just closed. But I want to put this occurrence into a larger setting to find out, if we can, where farming and ranching may be headed. The purchasing power of farm families, what they can buy with the net incomes they are able to earn by operating and working on their farms has dropped more than one-fourth in the past 5 years. Farm people are the only large economic group in this Nation that has had to absorb such a large drop in buying power. In fact, farm family income is the only major indicator of economic change, published by the Federal Government, that bears a minus sign before it. Farm family income is going down; most other economic indicators are up. Profits of corporations are up. The purchasing power, in constant dollars, of the dividends paid by corporations to stock owners is up by 20 percent in the past 5 years. The interest rates obtained by those fortunate enough to have money to loan, including the bankers, has been rising with tremendous speed. Three-month United States Treasury notes interest rate has increased by almost 400 percent since 1947; the rate on what is called bankers acceptances is up by 124 percent in those 5 years. The buying power of the weekly earnings of manufacturing workers has increased less, but is up by 19 percent. And so it goes. Farming families practically unique in this respect; their purchasing power is down—way down. November 15 to December 15, 1952 additional 6 percent drop in prices received by farmers indicates that the end of this kind of thing is not yet.

Prices received by farmers in December 1952, were down 12 percent from a year earlier. The parity ratio between prices received by farmers and those they have to pay, was down from 107 in December 1951 to 96 percent in December 1952. During the same year the prices paid by farmers for commodities and services they do not buy from each other continued to climb. This continuing price squeeze can but show up later in the official statistics as a further reduction in farm family income.

I say that we cannot with safety to the Nation and justice to farm people, allow this kind of thing to continue any longer. There is considerable reason for serious thought in reading the price drops of a list of farm-produced commodities. Here are a few typical examples: Wheat down 19 percent in 5 years; corn down 40 percent in 5 years; soybeans down 31 percent; rye down 5 percent below the 1947–49 average. Prices received by farmers for flaxseed are down 32 percent from the 1947–49 average; dry edible beans down 16 percent. The price ranchers get for wool is down 21 percent in just a year, and cotton down a similar percentage, in the same period.

These are more than just cold figures from an official Government publication; they are living every-day realities to millions of farm families all over this country. These farm people have to get their living from the sale prices of the commodities they produce.

These price drops are serious. The price declines that the producers of perishables have taken are sometimes even worse, and we are, so far, less prepared with legislation to do anything about them. The price farmers receive for beef cattle is down by 28 percent within a year; veal calves down 26 percent; sheep down 47 percent; lambs down 33 percent; and eggs were down 5 cents per dozen in the past year. The prices of live hogs is down 27 percent from the 1947–49 average and farm chickens down 10 percent.

Alone, among these major perishables, milk, for which this Congress has provided a mandatory farm-price-support program, shows no reduction. Turkeys are down 5 cents per pound.

Our Nation and this Congress has through many years and many statements in legislation pointed to parity prices as a fair price for farm commodities. Milk is selling at 100 percent of parity, though butterfat in cream was being sold in December at only 85 percent of parity. Hogs were selling in December at only 76 percent of parity; lambs at only 86 percent of parity; turkeys at 88 percent; eggs at 79 percent; chickens at 83 percent and beef cattle at 95 percent of parity.

Keep these figures in mind when you hear stories of farmers getting rich. Right now, as shown by official figures for December, the producers of the major perishable commodities are getting less than parity for the farm-produced commodities they sell.

I have today, introduced legislation that if enacted would correct this situation and prevent its becoming worse or recurring.

First, the bill I have introduced eliminates the sliding scale of price supports for wheat, cotton, and other basic commodities. These commodities and others would be supported at a fixed level that would not fall with production in increased abundance nor with accumulating safety stockpiles. As you know, under the 1949 act supports can fall as low as 75 percent of parity if farmers produce abundantly and the Nation accumulates a safety stockpile of the commodity.

Second, my bill provides mandatory price supports at 100 percent of the parity price for the basic commodities—wheat, corn, cotton, tobacco, rice, peanuts; for the important livestock, dairy and poultry products—wool, hogs, eggs, chickens, beef cattle, milk and butterfat; for soybeans, flaxseed, dry edible beans, and rye; and at a feeding value equivalent to 100 percent of parity for corn to the feed grains—barley, oats, and grain sorghums. These are all commodities that the Nation requires in greater abundance. All are basic to the farm families that produce them.

Third, the bill I have introduced provides for eliminating the rollback parity provision of the 1949 act. My bill continues the present parity formula system in full force and effect beyond the December 31, 1953, cutback date now set up in the 1949 act. This provision added to the other two would prevent the mandatory minimum support price of wheat, for example, from dropping to the neighborhood of $1.50 per bushel in 1954.

Fourth, my bill provides authority for the Department of Agriculture to resume the use of parity payments where needed in conjunction with loans, purchases, and other price-support methods to provide desirable protection to the producers of perishable commodities. We would have the administrative devices to prevent what has just been happening to eggs and hogs.

The bill I have introduced may not be the only possible solution to the problems I have discussed with you; it may not even be the best solution. However, no better proposals have come to my attention. And I say to you it is incumbent upon us to act, before the situations I have described get worse. We should study this problem and bring this bill or other proposed legislation to the floor so that this body can take positive action to prevent any further deterioration in the economic situation of the producers of perishable commodities. We have a little more time in which to act with respect to the storable, particularly the basic commodities such as wheat, corn, and cotton. But even there we cannot delay beyond this year.

In connection with wheat, we are faced this year with the termination of the International Wheat Agreement if it cannot be renegotiated with the other nations and ratified by this Senate. I hope that this important protection of our national economy and its wheat producers can be renewed on a satisfactory basis.

Adequate price and income protection for farm families is even more important to national and farm welfare now than in earlier years. The rapid and vast increase in cash farm operating costs make attention imperative. Here are a few examples in terms of typical family operated farms, as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture.

On the average, a family-operated cattle ranch in the intermountain region could operate for a year in 1941 with $2,500 cash operating expenses; by 1951 the figure was $5,000. Cash expenses on sheep ranches increased from $6,000 per year in the pre-War II period to $28,000 in 1951; similar increases in cash costs took place on winter-wheat farms—typical increases are: from $1,000 to $3,000 in the northern plains; in the southern plains from $1,300 to $4,000. Cash operating expenses on dairy farms in Wisconsin made similar percentage increases. Cash expenses on typical family cash-grain farms in the Corn Belt have increased from a pre-War II figure of around $1,500 to over $3,500. And so it goes.

The cash costs of farming are not only very high in relation to past standards, they are also very high in respect to the bite they take out of gross farm cash income. As late as 1947, cash operating expenses took up but 63 percent of gross cash farm income; in 1952, they took up 66 percent.

The high level of farm costs is of considerable concern to thoughtful farm people for still another reason. Cash costs are not only high but also quite inflexible. Once farm costs go up history indicates that they come down but little. In earlier years, cash farm operating costs could be reduced by slowing down on purchases from off the farm. In those days this could be done for several years without endangering too greatly the ability of the farm family to put in another

crop and bring it to harvest. Such is no longer the case. Tractors cannot be put out to graze like horses and mules. Present high level of farm production is predicated and made possible by the continued ability of farmers to buy greatly increased quantities of fertilizer, electric energy, farm machinery and equipment, and spare parts. Here are just a few examples.

Farmers now use 76 percent more power and machinery, 230 percent more fertilizer, 654 percent more hybrid seed corn, 260 percent more insecticides, and 730 percent more electric energy than in the period just before World War II. There are more than twice as many tractors on farms, more than twice as many trucks, more than twice as many milking machines, 5 times as many mechanical cornpickers, and 4 times as many combines.

This means that the gross income from the sale of farm-produced commodities must continue to be large enough to cover these increased cash expenses if farm people are to be able to feed and clothe the increasing population of this country and sufficient extra to support the needs of national security and an intelligent and careful foreign policy.

By 1975 there are expected to be approximately 200 million people in the United States, approximately a third more than now. We don't have the extra acres to produce this needed increase even if we expand our irrigated and better-drained lands as much as I feel we should.

The only way we can get this needed additional food and fiber will be by producing even more on each of the acres we have. An appraisal of farm output expansion by the 48 State productive capacity committees concluded that American agriculture could increase its total output by approximately one-fifth within 5 years, provided there were favorable cost-price relationships during the period as well as availability and use of greatly increased quantities of fertilizer, machinery, and other production goods.

The President's Commission on Materials Policy projected a 14-percent increase over 1950 in food consumption per person in the United States and a 28-percent increase in population; this would necessitate an increase in farm production of about 49 percent, almost half again as much as we produce now.

To attain that goal, the farmers of the Nation must not only maintain their land, they must improve it; they must shift from presently exploitative systems of farming to permanent conservational systems of farming that will make possible the sustained production of an increasing abundance. We cannot afford to allow any more of our rich topsoils to wash away down the rivers, we must save what we have and improve it.

With the world situation being what it is, 20 years is not too short a period within which we should plan to have developed a completely permanent type of agriculture in this country. We should start now a program of sufficient magnitude that all of needed farm woodlots and other protective vegetative cover, all of the needed springs, seeps, and seedings; all of irrigation and drainage on existing farms; all of the mulching and stone barriers; all of the needed dams and contouring and terracing; and all of the other needed practices can be completed in time. We should chart a course that will see that all of this is done within not more than 20 years. Careful estimates by Department of Agriculture technicians and farmer-elected committeemen working to encourage and assist farmers to shift to conservational farming methods indicate that, at the present rate, we are making less than one-sixth of the progress we should make each year to reach the 20-year goal.

Inability to attain the needed rate of adoption of needed conservation practices and installation of needed facilities results from a combination of many factors, not the least of which are the lack of a stable prospect for a favorable cost-price relationship and the lack of credit sources. The public needs to view the prospect realistically and understand that farmers cannot and will not be able to act as the good custodians of the national soil and water resource if the public refuses to shoulder its share of the financial burden, and to provide the technical and educational encouragement and advice that is needed.

Currently the farmer-elected committees of the Department of Agriculture and the Soil Conservation Service through the soil-conservation districts established under the laws of the various States have been working together on an integrated program of such assistance. Soil Conservation Service technical assistance has been costing the Federal Government about $300 million per year, with ACP assistance and payments to farmers amount to about $250 million per year. These special programs have resulted in a total performance each year equal to about three times the amount of the cost of the Federal Government. In other words, farm families have put up about $2 for each $1 invested by the public toward sustained abundance of farm production.

It would be disastrous, in my opinion, if this Congress should do other than to increase the present scope of both of these programs. The budget request before us calls for no increase nor reduction. I hope that the Appropriations Committees of the Congress will bring out a bill that calls for a more positive and expanded public effort to encourage and assist farmers to make large strides toward a permanent agriculture, with funds appropriated somewhat commensurate with the large stake in this effort represented by the general public interest.

Not all of the needed soil and water conservation measures will require Federal assistance. Much of the needed work could be paid for by farm families themselves out of the increased income obtained thereby, if they have some assurance that the prices they will receive for the commodities they produce will not be allowed to fall below the high and rigid cash operating cost structure that modern farming entails.

Moreover, the adoption of conservation practices and installation of facilities such as livestock fences, forest seedlings, and terraces does require the expenditure at the beginning of the period of substantial sums of cash funds. The increased income from such improvements does not materialize for some years and often is spread out over periods of up to 10 or 12 years.

Currently there is practically no sources where loan funds on advance and repayment terms adapted to this conservation purpose can be obtained by operating farmers. We need to encourage the development of a new kind of farm credit adapted to gear in with the need of the Nation to shift to a permanent type of agriculture.

I understand that the Agriculture Committee of the Senate is contemplating such a study. I urge you to give this matter the serious attention it deserves. We should make this a matter of high priority and attempt to enact needed legislation at an early date.

Lack of available credit adapted to needs for adopting permanent farming systems is not the only area where adequate credit is almost totally lacking. There are two others. One of these is the need for credit by the more than a million and a half farm families who are working full time trying to make a living on the inadequate family farms of the Nation. I hope that the farm-credit investigations of the Agriculture Committee will cover this area as well. According to reports that have already been filed with the Congress by its Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Nation is denying itself of a greatly increased productivity by virtue of not in some way expanding the availability of adequate farm credit for these low-income farm families.

Moreover, it is becoming practically impossible to get started in farming unless you inherit an already equipped farm. Here again adequate credit sources are almost totally lacking. We have allowed almost insurmountable barriers to become erected against the young couple that wants to begin farming as owner-operators or even as well-equipped tenants. The cost of buying the resources to get started is almost prohibitive for all of them. Here is the reported value of just the machinery and equipment on typical family-sized farms of several different types: Cash grain farms in the Corn Belt, $4,000; hog-beef fattening farms in Corn Belt, $3,200; dairy farm in eastern Wisconsin, $4,800; winter wheat and grain sorghum farm in southern Great Plains, $5,400; spring wheat farm in the northern plains, $3,400 to $4,800. The required livestock herds could be purchased for not much less than similar figures. Of course, we would expect the typical young married couple to start on a somewhat more modest scale than this, but even so, just the equipment and livestock investment required of a tenant is no small amount.

I realize that this Congress established the Farmers Home Administration and its predecessor agencies to meet the credit needs of low-income and beginning farmers who were unable to obtain adequate credit on reasonable terms from any commercial or cooperative sources. However, the loan funds we have appropriated for this agency have been so far short of the need that they are able to fill but a very small percentage of the applications they receive. Many farmers who need and are eligible for this type of credit do not even bother to file their applications because they know that applicants are already being turned away and a long waiting line is ahead of them. I hope that we can this year appropriate the full amount of funds authorized by present law for these purposes and that we can enact additional enabling legislation that will authorize the appropriation of more nearly adequate amounts of loan funds for this agency.

For a farmer who wants ultimately to become an owner-operator in fulfillment of the traditional national dream of this Republic of every farmer "under his own figtree," as the great Senator from Missouri, Thomas Hart Benton, phrased it, is faced with the additional large investment required to obtain ownership of the necessary land and buildings of an adequate family farm. Just a list of the current valuation of the land and buildings of typical family farms of different types is an eyeopener, indicative of the problem to which I am inviting your attention. Here are some of the figures as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics: Value of land and buildings on typical family operated farms: Corn Belt cash grain farm, $65,000; Corn Belt hog-beef fattening, $46,000; Corn Belt hog-dairy, $28,000; eastern Wisconsin dairy, $20,000; tobacco-livestock, $19,000; southern plains winter wheat, $42,000; wheat, grain, sorghum, $45,000; northern plains wheat $18,000; sheep ranches, $44,000. That gives you an idea.

This is a serious problem, one that this Nation must face up to if we do not wish to see ourselves become a nation of tenant farmers. Over the past 20 years this Nation has taken steps to reduce the rate of farm tenancy from 42 percent of all farms to less than 25 percent of all farms. Yet the almost total lack of available credit for the next generation getting started in farming is a threat looming up before us that the favorable trend of the past 20 years will be reversed.

I realize that some may question my feeling of foreboding on this farm-credit situation. They will point to the relatively solvent present condition of most farmers and recite the statistics that farmers' real-estate

debts are but 8 percent of the total value of farm land and buildings. But this national statistic overlooks the dire circumstances of the returned veteran and other farmer who has started farming in recent years when economic trends have been against him. Moreover, this optimistic view also overlooks the by now obvious fact that the underlying situation is deteriorating rapidly. Real-estate debt is increasing rapidly, the short-time debts of farmers are mounting at an even more rapid rate, and the interest charges on these debts is also increasing. Just this past year 2 of the 12 Federal land banks found it necessary to raise the interest rates they charge. The rate of interest on newly recorded farm mortgages in 1952 was 4.75 percent, up significantly from the 4.5 percent of the previous year. I have already invited the attention of the Senate to the very rapid increase in other commercial interest rates.

These rising interest rates are of important concern not only to farmers but to everyone. Higher interest rates choke off investments in new manufacturing plants and equipment, raise farmers' costs, and reduce the purchasing power of nearly everyone of modest means. This can only result in a slowing down of economic progress and eventual economic stagnation if we do not take deliberate action to reverse the trends.

Not only are the interest charges that farmers have to pay increasing, the cost of things the farm family has to buy are being unduly increased, and the prices they receive for the products they sell are being unduly reduced by increasing freight rates and the cost of transportation. Freight rates on agricultural products are about 70 percent higher than at the end of World War II. The rail freight-rate increase authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission in April 1952 was the 11th increase granted since July 1, 1946.

Need I remind you that it was the increasing burden of freight rates and interest payments that made the farm depression of the 1920's more difficult to bear than it would otherwise have been? Need I point to the well-known fact that rising interest and freight rates relative to agricultural prices and farm income have always characterized periods preceding the development of national financial crises and depressions. While the purchasing power of farm families has dropped by more than one-fourth in the past 5 years, freight rates on farm products have increased by 46 percent.

Viewing these trends in the farm situation that I have been describing, I cannot be other than concerned—deeply concerned—with what we are allowing to happen in our farm economy. Freight rates paid by farmers are up, interest rates on farm loans is going up; the amount of actual short- and long-term indebtedness is going up; cash farm operating costs are going up, both because the price per units are up and because the amount of goods and services that must be bought off the farm is up; the incomes and purchasing power of most other economic groups in the country are still going up; yet prices received by farmers are going down; and farm family incomes and purchasing power are going down rapidly.

At the same time that these things are happening, the Nation is making provision for less than one-fifth of the soil conservation on farms that it needs to make progress toward eventual establishment of a permanent agriculture; credit sources are still almost totally lacking for that purpose and to allow the farm improvement and enlargement needed to increase the productivity and income of nearly 2 million low-income full-time farm-operating families, as they are, also, almost totally lacking for young couples wanting to start farming as owner-operators or even as well-equipped tenants. In the face of this situation, one cannot remain complacent if he loves his country and wants for it the maximum strength needed to uphold our hand in world affairs and to shoulder our world leadership responsibilities.

One cannot help but feel that national security itself is at stake if we fail in our responsibility to take immediate action to enact an improved farm price support program along the lines or similar to the bill I am introducing today—if we fail to raise the level of appropriations for our soil conservation programs and the Farmers Home Administration.

There is one other farm matter of which I should like to remind my colleagues. Neither adequate farm price supports, available credit, nor better markets are of avail to relieve the critical problem of the farm family when drought, hail, flood, or other natural catastrophe wipes out the crop, greatly reduces the harvest, and ruins the pasture and range. The 80th Congress enacted enabling legislation by which an experimental Federal crop-insurance program would be initiated in a few counties and expanded into additional counties as experience warranted. This small and careful beginning has been found to be sound and a godsend to the farmer who has lost even his seed and operating expenses due to crop failure through no fault of his own.

This fine piece of legislation expires this year. Unless we act this session to renew it, the expansion of the crop-insurance program into additional counties will be blocked. I hope that the appropriate committee of the Senate will bring the necessary proposal before us so that we may act upon this important matter before the session closes.

The conversations and discussions I have had with farmers in my State the past several months—and you know that I have talked with many of them—convinces me that the farmers of this Nation are going to be watching our actions very closely. As they watch their purchasing power and income go down as their costs go up; as they realize more and more that they are not being enabled to be as good custodians of their lands as they would like to be; as they see farm debts piling up and interest rates rising; they are going to be asking us more and more pointed questions as times goes on. I hope that we shall not fail them. Free, unharassed and unsuppressed private associations and private individuals are the essential elements of democracy; only by preserving and improving the strength of the large group of family-size farms in this Nation can we maintain the conditions necessary for preserving our way of life.

EXTENSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY PROVISIONS TO CERTAIN STATE AND LOCAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 1993) to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the proposed legislation calls for amendment of the present Federal social-security law so as to include State and municipal government employees now under other retirement systems.

In essence, the bill states that employees of any town, city, or State government under a retirement system, may elect if they so desire, to be covered by the provisions of the Federal old age and survivors insurance law. The bill does not apply, however, to elementary and secondary school teachers, and members of the police and fire departments.

The manner of election is through a referendum vote whereby at least two-thirds or more of the employees voting must indicate their preference for inclusion. Ninety-day notice will be given all employees calling for a referendum and such vote will be conducted by the governor of the State and appropriate administrators designated by him.

I have always believed that these people, as public servants, are entitled to the same considerations as their counterparts occupying similar positions with private business. They should have the opportunity to decide for themselves, free from Federal pressure, whether or not they desire inclusion under the Federal social-security law.

CONSTRUCTION OF CHAPEL AT FORT SNELLING NATIONAL CEMETERY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the construction of a chapel at the Fort Snelling National Cemetery in Minnesota.

There is great desire on the part of veterans' organizations, families of veterans and many of our church groups of Minnesota for such a chapel. They desire a modest building to seat about 150 persons. I have met with these people on a number of occasions and know that the need for such a chapel is deeply felt among those directly involved. It is my hope that the Congress will see fit to meet that need.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1117) to provide for the construction of a chapel at the Fort Snelling National Cemetery, Minn., introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, at the request of the Independent Bankers' Association of America, I introduce a bill for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes. If possible, I should like to have the bill referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, to be considered by that committee in conjunction with its consideration of certain other legislation now before the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1118) to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 4 or 5 minutes on the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and, without objection, the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BUSH. Senate bill 1081 proposes to provide authority for temporary economic controls. It was introduced by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and cosponsored by many members of the Banking and Currency Committee, including myself.

In recent days, this committee has had the privilege of conferences with leaders of the new administration on the economic outlook in the light of present world conditions. These conferences have convinced many of us, including myself, that there is need for this legislation.

While we regard direct economic controls with distaste, and are ridding ourselves of them as rapidly as possible, it would be reckless to assume that there can be no future need for ceilings on wages, prices, and residential rents. Should a future emergency arise which threatens the economic well-being or security of the Nation, the President should have power to freeze prices, wages, and rents for a limited time until the Congress has an opportunity to act.

One amendment which I submit would insure a review of the need for this kind of legislation by the 84th Congress. It proposes a termination of S. 1081 on April 30, 1955, with a provision extending its life not more than 90 days beyond April 30, 1955, in case the President had invoked a freeze on or shortly before that date. The amendment would assure the 84th Congress the same amount of time as we now have to review this entire problem in the light of the conditions which may exist at that time.

This amendment thus modifies S. 1081, which makes its own termination dependent on the end of the Korean war. We dare not assume when the war in Korea will end. Nor does it follow surely that the need for temporary freeze authority will end with peace in Korea. Situations may unhappily develop at another trouble spot abroad which would create the very type of inflationary emergency which this bill is intended to meet. This amendment recognizes such a contingency.

The other amendment would remove provisions in S. 1081 creating a National Advisory Council and requiring that the President consult this Council before placing ceilings on prices, wages, and rents. This provision is opposed for several reasons.

I feel confident that the members of the President's Cabinet can and would perform as notable a service in advising the President on these matters as would the proposed Council. This Cabinet will not likely be drastically changed in the next 2 years, and it is so constituted as to give excellent advice to the President on economic matters. It is representative of labor, business, agriculture, and the armed services. Each member is outstanding in his field. Therefore, why should we incur the delays and expense of requiring the President to consult with a special council whose advice he can, in any event, under the terms of S. 1081, disregard?

Moreover, there may be danger that the meeting of the proposed Advisory Council would have the undesirable psychological effect of attracting undue attention to the possible imminence of a freeze. This could stimulate inflationary pressures and prompt increases in prices, wages, and rents in order to have them at the highest feasible levels at the time ceilings might be imposed. It might also set off scare buying because of uncertainty as to the supply of goods which would be made available during the freeze period. Scare buying would result in an abnormal increase in demands for goods and services, adding more fuel to the fire of inflationary pressures.

These dangers are reduced by eliminating the Council. The President has frequent Cabinet meetings which attract no special attention. Many topics are discussed. But a meeting of the proposed new Council obviously would be called to discuss a freeze, and nothing else. This would attract wide attention, and set in motion the inflationary trends we want to avoid.

Finally, while the amount in dollars and cents might be small, elimination of the Council would result in economy in conducting the Federal Government and more streamlining of its operations. Certainly, we should avoid the creation of any new councils or agencies whenever we have a choice.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES—AMENDMENTS TO SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 7, line 12, before the period insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

Mr. BRIDGES also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3053, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending July 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 8, after line 10, insert the following:

"BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS—CONSTRUCTION

"Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of land from appropriations for Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contained in the act of July 9, 1952, Public Law 470, 82d Congress, 2d session, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appropriation not to exceed fifteen hundred acres of nonreservation lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately 5 acres of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., for use of the Wapato irrigation project."

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER) also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 3053, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. TOBEY:

Address delivered by him before the Traffic Club of Chicago on February 12, 1953.

By Mr. BYRD:

Address delivered by Senator ROBERTSON at a meeting of the Winchester Area Poultry Improvement Council at Winchester, Va., on February 18, 1953.

Letter appearing in the Washington Post of February 23, 1953, entitled "Rochambeau Memorial."

By Mr. WELKER:

Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator JENNER at Boise, Idaho, February 14, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Dishonesty and Deceit," published in the Boise (Idaho) Statesman of February 23, 1953.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address delivered by Hon. Adlai E. Stevenson at Western States Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner, Los Angeles, Calif., February 26, 1953.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Address delivered by Claude G. Bowers, Ambassador of the United States to Chile, on December 15, 1952, together with remarks by Miss Isabelle Entrikin, on the occasion of the inauguration of the Poinsett Library, Santiago, Chile.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by James K. Knudson, Defense Transport Administrator, before Traffic Club of Topeka, at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1953.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Statement by Edward W. Barrett, former Assistant Secretary of State, regarding current investigation of the Voice of America.

Statement entitled "The United Nations, UNESCO, and American Schools," released by Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators.

Transcript of television program "Meet the Veep," broadcast on February 22, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Statement by Donald C. Cook, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on the occasion of his resignation.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Editorial entitled "Utah's Cattlemen Add Their Votes for Freedom," published in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City, Utah, February 21, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Editorials from Baltimore Sun concerning recent appointments of Marylanders to significant diplomatic posts.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "If This Be Liberty," published in Collier's for February 28, 1953.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial from Minneapolis Tribune of February 15, 1953, paying tribute to the work of Mrs. Eugenie Anderson as Ambassador to Denmark.

Article by Gordon Mikkelson, entitled "Attempt to Grab Oil Marked by False Charges."

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Poem entitled "The Gift of Nancy Hanks Lincoln," in memory of Abraham Lincoln and his mother, composed by Irvin E. Perigo, of Boonville, Ind.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the nomination of William McNear Rand, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security and the nomination of Francis White, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico have been received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I announce that the usual 6-day period will ensue before the nominations are taken up. They were received in the Senate on February 25, which will enable the committee to consider the nominations on Tuesday of the coming week.

The nominations of Livingston T. Merchant, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and Nepal, were received in the Senate today and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and will be due for consideration on Thursday, March 5.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, at a session of the Select Committee on Small Business this morning six subcommittees were created. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement showing the names of these subcommittees and the names of Senators appointed to those subcommittees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, 83D CONGRESS

EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota, chairman; CHARLES W. TOBEY, New Hampshire; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey; ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Kansas; JAMES H. DUFF, Pennsylvania; JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana; GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota; LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida.

SUBCOMMITTEES

Taxes

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey, chairman; EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota.

Monopoly

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Kansas, chairman; CHARLES W. TOBEY, New Hampshire; HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan; RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana; GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa.

Financing

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama, chairman; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey; JAMES H. DUFF, Pennsylvania; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida.

Military Procurement

HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan, chairman; LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts; JAMES H. DUFF, Pennsylvania; RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana; GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa.

Relations of Business With Government

EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota, chairman; ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, New Jersey; CHARLES W. TOBEY, New Hampshire; LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming; GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Florida.

Retailing, Distribution, and Fair Trade Practices

JAMES H. DUFF, Pennsylvania, chairman; ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, Kansas; EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota; LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming.

WILLIAM VAUGHAN

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that the aide to our former distinguished Vice President, Mr. Barkley, terminates his duties at the Capitol today.

This young man, Mr. William Vaughan, has, in my opinion, rendered outstanding service in his work with the Vice President. In particular, he has been very helpful to me in arranging for numerous Delawareans to meet the Vice President when he was in office.

I sometimes feel that members of the staffs of the Vice President and of the Senators are not always accorded the recognition which their duties warrant.

In the case of Mr. Vaughan, who was, I believe, the first aide to be appointed by the Vice President under provision of law, it was evident that he was well acquainted with the responsibilities expected of him. Mr. Vaughan is former Assistant Superintendent of the Senate Radio Gallery, and former Superintendent of the House Radio Gallery. He has also had executive experience as a member of radio stations in his native State of Kentucky, and thus was familiar with the many public relations problems confronting an office as high as the Vice President.

I understand that he assisted the aide to our new Vice President in becoming acclimated to his duties.

Speaking for myself, Mr. President, I am happy to wish Mr. Vaughan every continued success in whatever private endeavor he now chooses to lend his talents.

BRIEN McMAHON, LATE SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a week ago some of the associates of the late Senator Brien McMahon, of Connecticut, expressed their admiration and affection for this great American in speeches on the floor of the Senate. It was a very moving occasion.

I have just received a letter from our former colleague, Senator William Benton, in which he pays a fine tribute to his beloved colleague.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks Senator Benton's letter as well as an address delivered on November 15, 1952, by Gordon Dean, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, in tribute to the memory of Brien McMahon.

There being no objection, the letter and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA,
New York, N. Y., February 19, 1953.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate, Washington D. C.

DEAR HERBERT: Only today, on the 19th, have I learned that Senator KNOWLAND has designated this date to honor the memory and achievements of my senior colleague for the last 3 years, Brien McMahon.

I understand that the custom of setting aside a Senate session to memorialize a deceased member has not been followed for some years. That it is being revived is

moving tribute to a man who gave so much intelligence and humanity to the Senate and to the Nation.

I am deeply grateful for the close relationship that Brien McMahon and I shared. Through you I would like to speak of my friend in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We knew Brien McMahon as a man carefully and profoundly devoted to world peace and understanding. We admired him as one who dedicated himself to the major problems of the mid-20th century, and especially to the problem that dominates and threatens the lives of people everywhere. Atomic energy was a source of fear; at its unleashing over Hiroshima, Brien McMahon was among the first to realize not only its awesome actuality and fearful potential but also its promise for health and well-being. Because Brien McMahon did not shrink in fright or confusion, so has his country developed atomic energy sanely, with civilian control and with development both for national security and human welfare.

We knew Brien McMahon as a man of scope. We have made tangible advances in world affairs because of his leadership, especially as he expressed it as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. We take courage and hope from his efforts toward greater international understanding. As we pause to reflect on his goals and achievements, we can gain new energy, new vision, renewed purpose.

We are forever grateful for his leadership. We propose that the leadership of his principles continue.

I would be most pleased if you inserted this letter in the RECORD. I turn to you because you represent Connecticut's great neighboring State, New York, and because I know of your deep admiration for Brien, expressed to me so often during the tragic weeks of his last illness.

I am attaching a pamphlet which has just come to me from the Honorable Homer Cummings, of Connecticut, former Attorney General. You will recall, I am sure, that Attorney General Cummings brought Brien to Washington from Connecticut, for his distinguished career in the Justice Department. Twice each year for the last 20 years friends and admirers of Homer Cummings have gathered in North Carolina to do him honor over a weekend of golf. Brien was always a leading member of this group. And most fitting it was that under Homer Cumming's leadership the group paid tribute to Brien McMahon at its most recent meeting. Gordon Dean, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, who made the principal address, reprinted in this pamphlet, was intimately associated with Brien over a long period of years, at one time as his law partner.

I think you will agree that Mr. Dean's speech would be a most appropriate addition to the statements already honoring Brien McMahon in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope you will be able to enter it.

I am grateful to you for helping me honor Senator McMahon.

With very best wishes.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BENTON.

ADDRESS BY GORDON DEAN

General Cummings and friends, I know of no one who can match your words when you are moved to speak of one who has been close to you and who has captured your affection. Brien McMahon was such a person. It is, therefore, difficult to follow you on this program tonight. I do feel honored, however, to have been selected by you to speak of my warm friend of many years.

As many of you know, Brien and I worked closely together for many years as associates in the Department of Justice, later in private law practice, and finally on the problem of war and peace.

I shall not attempt to speak of Brien's early life because I think to do so would be simply to try to improve upon a score of biographers who have adequately covered it. I think the only thing that is appropriate upon an occasion such as this is to recall the character of the man who was one of our company here at Mid Pines.

I watched Brien, as did all of us here, with the exception of his brother Bill, who is with us tonight, from a much later period in his life than others who knew him as a youth, as a college man, and a law student.

I first met him in 1934 as a young, aggressive lawyer with the Tax Division of the Department of Justice. Shortly thereafter he went "upstairs," as we used to say in Justice, to the office of the First Assistant Attorney General. In that post, as in every post Brien held, the light in his office was always on late.

He came to national attention first when he was assigned to prosecute John Dillinger's lawyer, and shortly thereafter was assigned to try the killer of two FBI agents. He secured convictions in both cases; and was named Assistant Attorney General, in charge of the Criminal Division. Then came the Harlan County cases and the slavery cases in Arkansas.

In 1940, having almost been named Attorney General of the United States, Brien entered the private practice of law, where he enjoyed four very successful years.

Then came the Senate. The fact that he secured the nomination of his party—having been absent from his State for 10 years—was in itself remarkable. His election was even more so.

He took his oath of office as the war was coming to a close.

His great power in the Senate can be related, in large part, to the fact that as soon as the tremendous potential of atomic energy was demonstrated at Hiroshima he, as a junior Senator, tackled the drafting of the legislation upon which the American atomic-energy program is based. He was one of the first Americans to grasp the great potential of atomic energy—for good or evil.

He will be remembered in history as one of the first rational spokesmen for peace in this hysterical era. He knew that time is growing very short to save civilization.

While many thought of Brien as "Mr. Atom," of the legislative branch, he was at the same time one of the most effective members of the Foreign Relations Committee. He brought to the Senate uncommon sense. He said things on the Senate floor which, had they been said by a person high in the executive branch, might have had a highly significant effect upon our foreign policy. He tried zealously to find a way to detach the Russian people from their leaders, who insist that the United States is a warmongering nation. And, at the time of his death, he left behind a veritable sermon on the urgency of learning how to live with one another in peace. He was a thinking Senator—a man of imagination and vision.

It is somewhat ironic that Brien's death came at the age of 48 from the grim disease of cancer, which may some day be wiped out through the use of atomic fission; for no person could have dedicated his life more fully to leashing the destructive forces of the atom and unleashing the constructive forces.

Brien was Irish and upon occasion someone would get his Irish up. I personally loved him more for some of the persons who aroused his anger. He liked to sing and his laugh was deep and loud. But Brien never really thoroughly relaxed. If he ever did so, I am sure that it was at Burning Tree and here at Pinehurst and at Mid Pines. But even at golf he was intense.

Brien was the kind of a man who didn't know his own limitations, but who once having taken on a scrap, somehow found he didn't have any. He was a courageous fighter, and an indefatigable worker. He was that enviable combination of a politician—shrewd enough to be elected, yet great enough, after election, to become a statesman.

He was a man of very sincere purpose. His heart was right. To know him was to love him.

We shall miss him from our company—and from our country—more, I am sure, than these words of mine could ever express.

LIFE OF BRIEN MCMAHON

Born: Norwalk, Conn., October 6, 1903.

Attended Norwalk public schools; graduated from Fordham College in 1924 and from Yale Law School in 1927.

Began the practice of law in Norwalk and became judge of the city court in 1933.

Appointed special assistant to Attorney General Cummings in Washington, D. C., in 1933.

Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, United States Department of Justice, 1935–39.

Resigned from the Department of Justice and established a law practice in Washington, D. C., 1939.

Elected to the United States Senate from Connecticut in 1944 and reelected in 1950 by a large majority.

Author of the McMahon Act (Atomic Energy Act of 1946) which established the principle of civilian control over atomic energy.

Chairman of the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, 1945–46. Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, 1949–52. Leading member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Democratic Policy Committee.

Died July 28, 1952.

Survived by his widow, Rosemary Turner McMahon, and one daughter, Patricia.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the very near future the Senate will concern itself with the supplemental appropriation measure which includes funds for the Council of Economic Advisers.

As a sponsor of the Employment Act of 1946, under which the Council of Economic Advisers was created, I was shocked to learn of the action of the lower House of Congress in denying funds to the one agency of Government which has the high responsibility of helping to avoid another depression and to promote the growth and stability of the American economy.

On February 25, therefore, I wrote to President Eisenhower asking that he recommend a specific sum for the Council's operations during the remainder of the current fiscal year.

I also asked for the President's views on the question of whether the three-man Council should be continued as such or whether it should be supplanted by a personal economic adviser. I pointed out in the letter some of the reasons why the Congress originally provided for a three-

man body. Let me quote from my letter as follows:

In the congressional consideration of the Employment Act of 1946, we explored possible alternatives to the three-man Council idea, including the idea of a single economic adviser. We came to the conclusion that a single adviser would not have the prestige of a three-member Council in dealing with the many departments and agencies of Government. We felt that a single adviser would tend to become an anonymous personal assistant. We believed that a three-man Council—as finally provided for in the law—could be of more service in reconciling conflicting points of view, developing policies that would win public support and respect, working with the congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and consulting with other economic research agencies, the representatives of business, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments.

Yesterday, I received a reply from President Eisenhower, transmitting a letter of the same date, which the President had sent to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. In the letter the President specifically requested the sum of $60,000 for the fourth quarter of this fiscal year.

On the question of the structure of the agency, however, President Eisenhower expressed no views. He indicated that he was having a study made of the functions of the agency and that if any statutory changes may be needed in the Employment Act, he will promptly recommend them to the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks my letter of February 25, to President Eisenhower, and the President's letter of February 26 to myself and to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
February 25, 1953.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Many Members of the Senate are considerably concerned over the future of the Council of Economic Advisers, an agency which, despite its very small size, is one of the most important in the entire executive branch of the Government.

This concern is shared by the many people in organizations throughout the country who, during the 6½ years of the Council's existence, have rightfully come to regard the Council as a valuable guide in avoiding another depression and promoting the growth and stability of the American economy.

As the sponsor of the Employment Act of 1946, under which the Council was created, I have surveyed the present situation with respect to the Council of Economic Advisers and have found that there seems to be considerable uncertainty in the Congress concerning your views on two important questions. Our concern on this matter has been alleviated to a small extent by learning yesterday that on February 4, 1953, the Assistant to the President, Sherman Adams, wrote to the Senate Appropriations Committee asking that the agency be continued. I presume that a similar expression of views was sent to the House Appropriations Committee.

However, after the receipt of this letter of February 4, the House of Representatives eliminated the $75,000 supplemental appropriation for the Council. If this action is sustained, it will, in effect, abolish the Council and defeat the intention of the Congress as expressed in the Employment Act of 1946.

It would seem essential, therefore, that the Members of the Congress have the benefit of your views on the new situation that has been created since Mr. Adams' letter of February 4.

There are two questions which merit attention.

The first of these questions is whether the three-man Council is to be maintained in its present form or is to be supplanted by a single economic adviser.

The House bill, while denying funds for the Council, provided $25,000 for a single economic adviser. At the same time, speculation has developed concerning the possibility of a reorganization plan that would change the setup of the agency to fit the prescription of the House Appropriations Committee.

In the congressional consideration of the Employment Act of 1946, we explored possible alternatives to the three-man council idea, including the idea of a single economic adviser. We came to the conclusion that a single adviser would not have the prestige of a three-member council in dealing with the many departments and agencies of Government. We felt that a single adviser would tend to become an anonymous personal assistant. We believed that a three-man council—as finally provided for in the law—could be of more service in reconciling conflicting points of view, developing policies that would win public support and respect, working with the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and consulting with other economic research agencies, the representatives of business, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments.

We also recognized that every President should be entirely free under the law to appoint to the Council an entirely new set of economic advisers, and that now Council members need not be bound by the specific views of their predecessors. It is for this reason that I have not thought it relevant in this communication to express my personal views on the achievements of the Council under its former leadership. It is for this reason that I hope you will soon announce your intention to appoint the three Council members provided for under the law.

The second question is whether, if the Council is continued, sufficient funds will be provided for its operations.

In recent years, the Council has been operating at the rate of about $300,000 a year. While there is some doubt as to whether this sum would be sufficient for it to advise on the perplexing economic problems that face us this year and in future years, there is no doubt but that the Council's work would be seriously impaired by cutting its budget by two-thirds. Yet if it is given only the $25,000 presently provided in the House bill for a single personal adviser, the Council would be in the position of having to operate at the rate of $100,000 a year. This would be merely another way of undermining the Employment Act of 1946.

I deeply regret that Mr. Adams' letter of February 4 did not deal concretely with this matter. His letter mentioned no figures whatsoever. Subsequently the figure of $50,000 has been mentioned as a possible sum for the Council's operations during the fourth quarter. Yet this would reduce the Council's operations by one-third, a reduction which scarcely seems justifiable to me.

Moreover, I see no reason for departing in this instance from the customary budgetary procedure whereby the President presents to the Congress his specific proposals for appropriations.

I hope, therefore, that you may see fit to recommend a specific sum for the Council and that this sum will be sufficient to allow it to continue its full operations under the Employment Act.

I and other Senators fully recognize the tremendous number of problems that face you and under ordinary circumstances we would be reluctant to press you for your views concerning a small item in an appropriations bill. However, the significance of this particular matter extends far beyond the dollar funds that are involved in the appropriation.

It raises the issue of whether a law passed by the Congress after careful and complete consideration and extensive hearings is to be rendered ineffective or is to be enforced.

It involves the still more important issue of whether or not our country shall be fully prepared to prevent both depression or inflation, and to maintain in the future the economic well-being which is essential to our national and world leadership.

It seems to me, therefore, that a statement of your views on this matter would be exceedingly helpful.

With assurances of my high esteem, I remain

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 26, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I deeply appreciate your thoughtful letter of February 25 respecting the Council of Economic Advisers. I have written to Senator BRIDGES on this subject as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and believe that my letter to him contains substantially the information that you have requested. I therefore enclose a copy of my letter to Senator BRIDGES by way of reply.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

FEBRUARY 26, 1953.

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of recent developments respecting the Council of Economic Advisers, I think it would be well to make my own position on this matter clear for the purposes of your committee's deliberations.

I want to emphasize, first, that it is not my desire or intention to undermine or set aside the Employment Act of 1946. I believe firmly in the principles enunciated in that measure and have made this clear, or have sought to, on a number of occasions. I also am convinced that the machinery established by this act is essentially sound.

I have found, however, since assuming office, that one of the instrumentalities established by the act, the Council of Economic Advisers, seems not to have the stature that it should have. This is evidenced by the manner in which the prior Congress limited the term of its appropriation. The employment Act of 1946, in creating the Council of Economic Advisers, did, I believe, make wise provision for aiding the President in his responsibilities with respect to economic stabilization. To my mind, it is essential that the President be able to look to such an agency for long-range thinking and planning in this vital field. My intention is to reinvigorate that body and augment its influence by means of some new personnel and a thorough

rethinking of its functions. If the conclusions of this study should indicate a need for statutory change, I shall promptly recommend those changes to the Congress.

I should like to mention specifically the funds which, in my opinion, are needed in the fourth quarter of this fiscal year to carry out the purposes of the statute. I hope that the Congress will provide a sum of $60,000. By the time hearings can be held on the 1954 budget, we will have proceeded with our reorganization and will request funds in an appropriate amount. If the funds for the fourth quarter of the 1953 fiscal year are too sharply curtailed, it is likely to embarrass us in obtaining the appropriate new leadership required. This amount I have suggested is $15,000 less than was appropriated by the Congress for each of the first three quarters of the 1953 fiscal year.

With warm personal regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

QUOTA LIMITATIONS ON IMPORTS OF FOREIGN RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1092) to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil, introduced by Mr. COOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for a short time upon the bill which I have introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in President Eisenhower's state of the Union message on February 3, when he asked Congress to study the Trade Agreements Act with a view to extending it, he made a most important statement:

> This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture, and labor standards.

The same sentiment was expressed by President Roosevelt when he transmitted the Trade Agreements Act to Congress in 1934. He stipulated that the provisions "must be carefully weighed in the light of the latest information so as to give assurance that no sound and important American interest will be injuriously disturbed." In emphasis he added:

> The adjustment of our foreign trade relations must rest on the premise of understanding to benefit and not to injure such interests.

There are few who will dispute the wisdom of this principle, yet there are so many complexities inherent in the very nature of any trade agreement that unanimity of opinion upon its impact on the various phases of our economy is seldom to be expected. When, however, in the conduct of our business with other countries, there arises a situation which causes obvious injury without some offsetting compensatory considerations, the bases of disagreement should be removed. Such a case has been in existence for the past several years, and it has now reached such a point that immediate remedial action is necessary on the part of Congress. This situation is the damaging effect of the importation of foreign residual oil upon the coal mining industry of the Nation and upon mine employment.

The importation of foreign residual oil got under way on a comparatively moderate scale in the early postwar years, but reached the flood stage in 1949, and by the following year had deluged industrial markets of our east coast. It has grown in intensity, and for the past 3 years has caused great and unnecessary harm to America's coal industry, to allied industries, and to communities and States where coal is produced. Meanwhile there is little evidence that consequent advantages have accrued to anyone—either here or abroad—except to the importing companies. To realize the significance of this situation requires an understanding of what residual oil is, the circumstances under which it is brought into this country, and its actual capacity to displace coal mined in this country.

Residual oil is the residue left over in the refining process after gasoline, kerosene, lubricating oils, and other products are removed from the crude in the oil refinery. It has been described by one of the larger oil importing companies as "the unprofitable end product of the refining process." There is no production cost to be considered when its selling price is set, for it is in the same category with sawdust that accumulates at a lumber yard.

Most of the foreign residual oil now coming into the United States is chiefly the product of Venezuela, and is shipped from refineries in Aruba and Curaçao, two small islands just off the north coast of Venezuela, owned by the Netherlands.

Aruba has a population of less than 50,000 and an area the size of the District of Columbia, and Curaçao is perhaps twice as big in each respect. The total number of employees at the refineries on these islands would in no way approach the size of the labor force in the coal mines of my own State of Kentucky, yet the oil produced at these refineries is directly responsible for reduced work time and unemployment in the mining communities of Kentucky and other States. While the import of residual oil reduces mine employment, ironically it is not the production of residual oil that provides employment for the natives of these islands. If every barrel of residual were prohibited from entering our ports, the economic impact on these foreign refineries would not be conclusive, because gasoline and kerosene and lubricating oil would continue to be produced regardless of the disposition of residual oil.

It follows that the employees in Venezuela's oilfields, where the crude originates, do not depend upon the sale of residual oil for their jobs. The crude will be taken from the ground and shipped to the refineries as long as there are markets for the principal products, and regardless of what happens to the residual. On the other hand, however, the amount of residual oil coming into this country has a direct adverse effect upon the welfare of our own coal miners, our railroaders, and the merchants and business houses in our coal communities and coal producers. The reason may be briefly stated.

Residual fuel oil is used primarily for the generation of electric power and under boilers in industrial plants. These are traditional coal markets, and what has happened in the utilities field in the important markets of New England and the Middle Atlantic States since residual oil began to flow our way is very strikingly illustrated by a table that shows the amount of residual oil imports for the years 1948 to 1951, inclusive, and the percentage of electric utility generation by bituminous coal and oil for selected States in those areas.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD the table to which I have just referred, which I shall designate as "table A."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE A

Year:	*Barrels of residual imports*
1948	53,269,000
1949	74,555,000
1950	120,036,000
1951	118,675,000

Electric-utility generation by type of fuel and power

	1948	1949	1950	1951
Massachusetts:				
Bituminous	87.0	42.1	27.6	30.0
Oil	4.1	48.0	63.1	50.0
Connecticut:				
Bituminous	75.0	47.6	46.1	66.2
Oil	18.0	46.4	47.6	26.6
New York:				
Bituminous	65.9	59.6	52.0	60.8
Oil	5.0	10.4	18.6	7.4
New Jersey:				
Bituminous	85.1	88.0	43.4	60.4
Oil	12.3	38.2	55.7	32.5

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I point out that the table to which I have just adverted indicates that in 1948 the total number of barrels of residual oil imported numbered 53,269,000, and in 1951 the number had risen to 118,675,000.

While coal regained a small portion of the lost ground as the quantity of residual imports took a slight dip in 1951, the overall losses since 1948 have been tremendous. The 1952 figures are not yet available, but they will show a continued downward curve for coal and further amplify the losses suffered by coal as a result of the great inroads made by the residual oil from foreign refineries.

Those areas were selected because they are the coal markets most severely damaged by residual oil imports. But the impact has had a telling general effect, as indicated in table B, which I desire to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and which contains the indices for the annual supply of energy from all mineral fuels in the entire United States. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE B.—*Annual supply of energy from mineral fuels (waterpower excluded) in the United States, 1941–51, in trillions of British thermal units* [1]

Year	Total mineral fuels	Index No. (1941 = 100)	Imports of residual oil (in thousands of barrels of 42 gallons)	Index No. (1941 = 100)	Bituminous coal and lignite	Index No. (1941 = 100)	Pennsylvania anthracite	Index No. (1941 = 100)	Petroleum (total crude)				Natural gas (marketed production)	Index No. (1941 = 100)
									Domestic production	Index No. (1941 = 100)	Imports	Index No.		
1941	26,354	100.0	235	100.0	13,471	100.0	1,432	100.0	8,133	100.0	294	100.0	3,024	100.0
1942	28,198	107.0	116	49.4	15,267	113.3	1,532	107.0	8,043	98.9	71	24.1	3,282	108.5
1943	29,487	111.9	171	72.8	15,463	114.8	1,540	107.5	8,733	107.4	80	27.2	3,671	121.4
1944	31,532	120.8	239	97.4	16,233	120.5	1,618	113.0	9,732	119.7	260	88.4	3,989	131.9
1945	31,110	118.0	199	84.7	15,134	112.3	1,395	97.4	9,939	122.2	429	145.9	4,213	139.3
1946	30,433	115.5	281	119.6	13,989	103.8	1,537	107.3	10,057	123.7	517	175.9	4,333	143.3
1947	34,248	130.0	341	145.1	16,522	122.5	1,453	101.5	10,771	132.4	576	195.9	4,926	162.9
1948	35,155	133.4	335	142.6	15,707	116.6	1,451	101.3	11,717	144.1	746	253.7	5,534	183.0
1949	29,964	113.7	473	201.3	11,472	85.2	1,085	75.8	10,683	131.4	897	305.1	5,827	192.7
1950	33,858	128.5	749	318.7	13,527	100.4	1,120	78.2	11,449	140.8	1,009	343.2	6,753	223.3
1951	37,076	140.7	[3] 746	317.4	14,017	104.1	1,054	73.6	13,021	160.1	1,029	350.0	7,955	263.1
1952			[3] 802	341.3										

[1] The unit heat values employed are: Anthracite 12,700 B. t. u. per pound; bituminous coal and lignite, 13,100 B. t. u. per pound; crude petroleum 5,800,000 B. t. u. per barrel of 42 gallons; natural gas, 1,075 B. t. u. per cubic foot; residual oil, 6,287,400 B. t. u. per barrel of 42 gallons.
[2] Preliminary.
[3] 10 months actual; last 2 months estimated.
Authority: U. S. Bureau of Mines.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a rising population, production for defense, and a continued increase in living standards are steadily increasing energy requirements, yet coal—which comprises 92 percent of all mineral energy reserves in the country and would logically be expected to assume a progressively greater role in meeting these demands—has not only been deprived of the opportunity to share proportionately in the rising market, but has actually experienced a decline as a result of the onrush of residual oil from abroad. While the foreign residual importation rose from 142.6 to 317.4 in the short space of 4 years, coal's index was dropping from 116.6 to 104.1. The latter's table for 1952 is not yet available, but the import index climbed to 341.3—a gain of approximately 141 percent since 1948.

Therein lies the story of the effect of the importation of residual oil upon markets that have normally belonged to coal but are being surrendered and lost because of an inequitable provision—or lack of provision—in our trade-agreement laws. But, in reality, this is only half the story. The other half takes place in the mining towns of Kentucky and other coal-producing centers of our Nation. Each ton of coal is equivalent in energy value to 4.167 barrels of residual oil. The 126,964,000 barrels of residual fuel that entered our ports from abroad in 1952 would, therefore, represent a loss of some 31 million tons of coal. That loss is tragically reflected in Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and in all other States where coal is produced.

Last year the mines in my State of Kentucky produced 70 million tons of coal, a decline of 7 percent under the previous year. That decline brought reduced pay checks to hundreds of miners, and caused hundreds of others to lose their jobs. Most of the other 23 producing States were even less fortunate than Kentucky, for the national decrease in coal output was 13 percent. It is true that the long steel strike was accountable for heavy production losses in the coal industry in 1952, but the 4,208,000 lost man-days and the more than $75,750,000 in lost wages can be attributed to the 31-million-ton decline suffered by coal at the expense of foreign residual oil.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, table C, which shows that the 31-million-ton drop in coal production tonnage resulted in a loss of more than $85 million in railroad revenue during 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE C.—*Postwar economic effects of foreign residual oil imports, 1946–52*

Year	Residual imports				Bituminous coal revenue loss			Man-day loss		
	Barrels of oil (000)		Coal equivalent tons [1] (000)		Value per ton	Aggregate value (000)		Tons per man-day	Aggregate loss (000)	
	Amount	Cumulative	Amount	Cumulative		Amount (4)×(6)	Cumulative		Amount (4)÷(9)	Cumulative
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
1946	44,647	44,647	10,714	10,714	$3.44	$36,856	$36,856	6.30	1,701	1,701
1947	54,244	98,891	13,018	23,732	4.16	54,155	91,011	6.42	2,028	3,729
1948	53,209	152,100	12,784	36,516	4.99	63,792	154,803	6.26	2,042	5,771
1949	74,555	226,715	17,892	54,408	4.88	87,313	242,116	6.43	2,783	8,554
1950	120,036	346,751	28,806	83,214	4.84	139,421	381,537	6.77	4,255	12,809
1951	178,675	465,426	28,480	111,694	4.87	138,668	520,235	7.00	4,069	16,878
1952	[2] 126,964	592,390	30,469	142,163	4.95	150,822	671,057	[3] 7.24	4,208	21,086

Year	Miners wage loss				Freight revenue loss					
	Average hourly earnings	Average daily earnings (assume 8 hours)	Aggregate loss (000)		Percent of coal carried by rail of production transported	Tons lost (000)		Revenue per ton	Revenue loss (000)	
			Amount (10)×(13)	Cumulative		Amount (4)×(16)	Cumulative		Amount (17)×(19)	Cumulative
(1)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(21)
1946	$1.40	$11.20	$19,051	$19,051	67.0	9,321	9,321	$2.27	$21,159	$21,159
1947	1.64	13.12	26,607	45,658	66.0	11,195	20,516	2.49	27,876	49,035
1948	1.90	15.20	31,038	76,696	63.4	10,918	31,434	2.74	29,915	78,950
1949	1.94	15.52	43,192	119,888	63.7	14,976	46,410	3.00	44,928	123,878
1950	2.01	16.08	68,420	188,308	62.9	23,860	70,290	3.09	73,769	197,067
1951	2.21	17.68	71,940	260,248	64.0	23,638	93,928	3.16	74,696	272,363
1952	[4] 2.25	18.00	75,744	335,992	[5]	25,289	119,217	[6] 3.40	85,983	358,346

[1] Based on 4.167 barrels of residual oil=1 ton of bituminous coal, Bituminous Coal Annual, 1952, p. 162.
[2] December estimated. Based on 4-week daily average ending Jan. 3, 1953. New York Journal of Commerce, Jan. 8, 1953.
[3] January–September 1952 average, Accident Analysis Branch, Bureau of Mines, Coal Mine Injuries No. 57.
[4] January–October 1952 average.
[5] Assume 1951 figures.
[6] Based on first 3 quarters of 1952.
Source: Cols. (2), (6), and (9)—U. S. Bureau of Mines; col. (12)—Bureau of Labor Statistics; col. (16)—Bituminous Coal Annual, 1952, p. 106, and proposed table for 1953 annual, Bituminous Coal Institute, basic figures from Bureau of Mines; col. (19)—ICC, total bituminous coal freight revenue divided by tons originated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the cumulative losses, as shown in each of the columns in the table, since foreign residual oil began to flow into this country in 1946 are a startling reminder that somewhere along the line there has been sad neglect in the administration of our import policies or in regard to legislation in connection therewith.

It is a discouraging situation for an industry which, when the outbreak of hostilities in Korea in 1950 brought an immediate demand for increased quantities of fuel, responded by producing 22 percent more coal than was produced in the previous year. That accomplishment was made possible by heavy investments in new machinery and new properties, plus a new determination on the part of both management and labor; but at that time it was not anticipated that the competition of residual oil would interrupt the production schedules which were set up for this national effort.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky a question in connection with the very interesting presentation he is making. Does he have any figures in regard to the loss of revenue to the United States Government, the State governments, and the local levels of government, which occurs by reason of the loss of full production in the coal, oil, and gas industries?

Mr. COOPER. No; let me say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, that I do not have such figures. I have not yet gone into that factor of this situation, although I expect to do so, and to continue my work regarding this subject.

Today I am simply trying to point out that the importation of residual oil is directly displacing the production of coal, is adversely affecting the employment of miners, and is adversely affecting communities throughout the Nation. I hope greater interest will be shown in this subject.

I know that my friend, the Senator from Pennsylvania, is very much interested in it, and I hope that we can develop more information, for the benefit of the Senate and the entire Congress, regarding the damage that is being done to one of the great industries of the United States as a result of the importation of residual oil which, as I have tried to point out, does not really give any compensatory benefit to the countries with which trade agreements have been made.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will yield further, let me say that the loss of revenue or taxes to the three levels of government—Federal, State, and local—will be considerable; and as a result of the loss of that revenue, it will be necessary to secure revenue from other sources.

Mr. COOPER. That is true. Twenty-three States are affected by this problem. I do not believe the revenue which is derived from the importation of residual oil, as a result of the small tax which is placed upon it, can in any way meet or compensate for the loss of revenue to the Nation, the States, and the local communities. I think there can be no question about that.

Mr. President, this situation is discouraging to the mining men and their families, who contributed so generously to the great national effort in World War II, and who in the postwar effort produced magnificently to meet the coal requirements of our foreign allies and friends. It is not selfish, I believe, for miners to ask for reasonable protection against the importation of residual oil, which is at least one cause of unemployment, although not making any discernible contribution on the other side of the ledger.

In addition to creating these conditions in our economy, foreign residual oil imports can weaken our national security, for they tend to cause us to place reliance upon a source of fuel that cannot possibly be depended upon in time of emergency. As each tanker unloads its cargo of unemployment for mining men, a double blow is struck at the coal industry. Without work, those men must seek means of livelihood outside the mining communities. Idle mining companies cannot be expected to expand capacity or even keep their mines in good working condition. Should another war come, or even if there is expansion of the present war—events which we earnestly work to prevent—and if traffic in ocean shipping lanes should be disrupted by enemy action, as was the case during World War II, where would we turn for our increased fuel requirements? We would turn to our coal industry, as we have always done in past emergencies; but the ability of that industry to meet the new demands will depend directly upon the strength it has been able to muster in the intervening period.

New mines cannot be opened overnight, nor can men be recruited at will and set to work extracting the coal from the earth from 1½ to 2 years is required for the opening of a new underground mining operation; and only trained mine workers can fill the jobs required by modern mining methods. An inexperienced man could no more operate one of today's intricate mining machines than an inductee at a Navy boot camp could operate a rocket weapon without having training in its operation.

In viewing the effects of the floods of foreign residual oil into this country, the Congress must, therefore, consider national security in today's world and in terms of the future, as well as the immediate economic aspects of the situation. The Congress ought to consider now the effect of unlimited imports of a product that not only inflicts serious injury upon a basic industry, but has an important bearing upon the security of the Nation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota would like to know what kind of coal is produced in Kentucky. Is it soft coal or hard coal?

Mr. COOPER. It is soft coal, the bituminous variety.

Mr. LANGER. Is there any lignite in Kentucky?

Mr. COOPER. There is very little, if any.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to inquire about the freight rates in Kentucky. Are they satisfactory, or are they too high?

Mr. COOPER. In the opinion of our people, the freight rates are not satisfactory.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, the rates are considered to be too high. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. We think the freight rates covering the transportation of coal in Kentucky are adverse, when compared with and considered in connection with the freight rates imposed upon coal mined in Ohio, West Virginia, and other coal-producing States.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my friend that it is impossible to develop the lignite fields of North Dakota, because of the very high freight rates. Suits have been instituted, some of which have gone to the Supreme Court of the United States, in an effort to get a lower coal rate. We were finally successful in obtaining a slight reduction in the case of coal compressed into briquettes. However, the rates are so high that it is impossible to develop the coal fields within the State. I wondered whether the State of Kentucky was in a similar situation.

Mr. COOPER. The State of Kentucky is in exactly the same situation. There is a great deal of complaint on the part of our communities, as well as on the part of the coal miners and producers. The complaints are based upon the adverse freight rates, resulting from failure to develop water transportation. Finally, as a result of the impact of the importation of residual oil, our great coal industry is being very severely damaged, and thousands upon thousands of miners are being thrown into unemployment. My position is that this industry is so important in the economy of the Nation that the entire problem of freight rates and of importations should be given very careful consideration by the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I remember that upon another occasion the distinguished Senator from Kentucky addressed the Senate on the subject of REA.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. I do not know on the floor of the Senate of a better friend of rural electrification for the American farmers than the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Is there a steam plant in Kentucky at which some of the coal is used in the generation of power for use by the farmers of Kentucky, or is dependence had solely upon hydroelectric power?

Mr. COOPER. Steam plants of course, afford a wonderful opportunity for the use of coal. I very well remember the incident to which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota referred. I remember that in 1948, when the question of the construction of a steam plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority arose, there were many other issues involved at that time, some having to do with the

question of legality, some with the question of policy and interest. But, referring to this particular problem, the building of steam plants in Tennessee has provided a market for coal in both Tennessee and Kentucky. Likewise, the building of the atomic-energy plant in Ohio and the proposed building of steam plants to furnish electrical power for that plant will provide a market for some of the coal produced in Kentucky. I agree with the Senator that steam plants designed to produce the power which is so badly needed, afford an advantageous opportunity for the utilization of coal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Kentucky has said, and I realize how greatly concerned he is about the welfare of one of the leading industries of his State. However, I should like to say that if the people of my State were offered Kentucky coal free at the mines, they probably would be unable to use it, even on that basis, because of the terrific increase in cost of transportation. In my opinion, the increase in cost of transportation is one of the critical problems facing our country today. It seems that every few days we read of applications for still further increases in rates. Quite recently I read that the Railway Express Agency wants to make a minimum charge on any package—even a 2-pound package, shipped only 10 miles, of $2.30 plus a tax, or a total of about $2.40.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Vermont will permit, I may say that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky took the floor for a few moments, in order to make a brief speech. I make the point of order that we are now getting into a general debate on the subject. If possible, I should like to return to the regular order of business, if the Senator from Kentucky has completed his remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Kentucky how much longer he intends to speak.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my speech will be concluded within 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Kentucky may not yield, since he obtained unanimous consent to make a few remarks only. I think his remarks should be completed, in order that we may proceed with the regular business, if possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The point of order of the Senator from Ohio is well taken. By unanimous consent, the Senator from Kentucky may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, my interest in this question was quickened last fall as I traveled in the coal producing section of my own State of Kentucky.

Kentucky is the third largest producer of coal in the Nation and, as I have said, produced last year 70 million tons of coal. There are approximately 60,000 miners in Kentucky who are for the most part organized in the United Mine Workers of America. Many of our counties, communities, and much of our business depends directly upon the production of coal.

Last fall I saw mines that had recently closed; mining companies that were considering closing their mines, and miners out of work. I am informed that in 1952, 16 mines employing 2,200 men in Kentucky were closed and thus far in this year, 4 mines, employing 600 men have been closed. Of course there are smaller mines which are closing in larger numbers.

In closing, I would say that it is true that other economic factors have their influence upon the coal industry as they do upon all other industries, but it cannot be denied that the importation of residual oil can be easily identified as one of the major factors which is damaging to the coal industry of my State and of the Nation.

This is easily understood when we consider the simple fact that approximately 500,000 barrels of residual oil are coming into this country each day and are displacing the production of approximately 100,000 tons of coal a day.

It is for this reason that I have today introduced a bill to fix quotas upon the importation of residual oil. I believe that, consistent with the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives over revenue matters this situation deserves the earliest consideration by the Senate. There are other ways in which this problem can be met. I shall continue to bring to the attention of this body the importance and urgency of taking remedial action to protect one of the great coal industries of the Nation and those who are employed in the mines against inequitable competition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, is the morning hour concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). No; the morning hour has not yet been concluded.

AWARD OF GEORGE WASHINGTON HONOR MEDAL TO EARL GODWIN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Freedoms Foundation has awarded to Earl Godwin, one of the leading radio commentators, the George Washington Honor Medal. This is a very deserved tribute.

Freedoms Foundation is a privately endowed body which describes its objectives in this way: "To maintain the American way of life and pass it intact to succeeding generations is the responsibility of every true American." It stands for and declares "a fundamental belief in God; and constitutional government designed to serve the people."

It is the practice of this foundation to present annually awards to schools, institutions, and individuals. This year Vice President NIXON announced the list and handed awards to 18 national institutions and persons, as well as several hundreds of sectional wards.

The award to Earl Godwin was announced by Vice President NIXON and is a medal for a single national broadcast. This broadcast by Earl Godwin was so fine that I desire it to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EARL GODWIN'S WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 18, 1952

This happens to be the last program I will do in this series, as Mr. Kaltenborn returns to this time, beginning next Saturday, and so I am going to end up in a barrage of my own sentiments on a subject which someday will be the cause of another American revolution if the spirit of 1776 can ever get its head above the swamp of statism into which a lackadaisical generation led it.

Right now the courts, and particularly the great Supreme Court at Washington, whose white marble building rises on the city square where Washington's Earl Godwin was born in the days when Americans took patriotism as a matter of course just as the air they breathed. (I got too far along in that sentence.) The courts today are called upon to defend the treachery, called Communism, with the same shield that the patriots provided in the Constitution as a bulwark against the tyranny of king's courts or big government. The civil rights which so many of our deadliest internal enemies bring to court to protect them against the punishment they deserve are used so they are no more than a racketeering device, such as would be used by an adroit and snide trickster of the underworld's lawyer type.

I am leading up to the thought I have had ever since I learned the words fascism and communism.

Many, many of the young people who slid into the area of communism and who joined the party or some of the various Communist-front groups did so because they were induced by a fear of what they called fascism. They seemed to think that fascism, which is a European blight, was about ready to spread throughout the United States and so they took as an alternate the same sort of thing in another name and guise—communism.

They had Americanism for their escape from fascism or any other wornout Europeanism, but the great error of the times was the trap, called communism. Between two dirty little isms like that they seemed unable to see the wonderful divinely inspired Americanism which is responsible for the strength of the Republic and which is the key to peace and prosperity.

And so the fight should not be betwixt fascism and communism, but it should be Americanism against all else, the undiluted 1776 type of Americanism at that. The modern generation which has not heard of or experienced any patriotic thrill may wonder why I say that and they will pour another cocktail and devastate me with the cry of "hopeless reactionary." Why, Americanism is as far from reaction as the unhampered deluge upon this earth of the power of the universe. It is a divine inspiration. It is the departure from it which is reactionary. Time and time again in the story of mankind a lot of patent political medicine salesmen have lured the mass of people away from the path of progress to some fake cure-all and this occurs from the time of Aaron and the golden calf right down to the present. One of the poisonous ingredients in the false medicine of communism and fascism is the bad grace into which private industry and private

ownership has fallen when as a matter of fact it will be only private endeavor, private initiative and individual sweat and toil which will bring America back to American strength.

One reason why the proponents of these various un-American isms try to stop the religious impulse which is a spiritual heritage of mankind is because in God's religion the truth is that mankind is urged to work, create, and own and not to turn over his stewardship to the state.

This was one compelling thought in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution of the United States and it was on the adoption and application of the principles in these two God-given documents that America became the wonder country of the globe. When you remember the Biblical phrase "a little child shall lead them," do you realize that the child of the nations was our America and that while the rest of the world has been losing strength in the rot of wrong ideals the child America has led the world. It is the fruit of our private enterprise which has fed the enslaved and state-owner nations of the rest of the world and yet in spite of all this in some circles a man is called progressive the minute he starts shooting at the only remaining goose that lays golden eggs. I quote that sentence from Dean Manion's all-American book The Key to Peace.

The common man, he continues, is being recruited en masse against the only system which has consistently offered men a chance to become uncommon.

The propagandists for the State-owner program defend their errors by speaking of their works as the produce of modern thinking. They may be right, but they cannot assume that it is correct thinking.

In this long-drawn battle in which a handful of Communists or fellow-travelers hold up the rest of the country in the courts, you do not find the poor down-trodden working man. No. The fight against Americanism is conducted by well-to-do crusaders. The card-carrying Communists of today, if they carry cards, are the rank and file of the political party with the name Communist and they are negligible and uninfluential. It is the hidden, wary, socially and financially strong man or woman who spreads the theory and stays hidden.

The influence of these powerful hidden characters can be seen in the spread of big Government which has come to the point where the presidency in this republic is about as powerful an office as there is on earth, with certainly the power of life and death over enterprise. There are few Americans today who are not listed on some State or Federal Government list with the necessity of reporting to the Government on something or other periodically. One of these days this may get too burdensome and a wave of what is going to be called the new Americanisms will make a change and it will not be new at all. It will be as old in this country as the Constitution itself.

Now the basic factor of this whole matter of American success as a Nation of people is in the mysterious actions of God's spirit and that is something the politicians as well as the religionists and theologians must begin to realize as a practical matter. Just as practical and just as effective as any of the physical elements with which science works. Freedom is the main ingredient and freedom can be choked out of sight more easily than it can be maintained. There has been an awful mess made out of the word democracy, which has come into the forefront since the time Woodrow Wilson began saying that the world should be made safe for democracy (which is job rule). The Founding Fathers never made use of the word. It was the individual the Founding Fathers worked with, as James Madison put it, and he certainly fathered the Constitution: "We rest our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

This inspired truth spread tremendously in our early days and is alone responsible for the jump ahead young America took in the days of the clipper ships and the unbeatable and unbounded American spirit.

After a while along came a set of folks who claimed that all these riches are the product of robber barons and in the rush to take it away from those who built it up and hand it to those who never had a thing to do with it, the process crushes the small man and family brought up in thrift and hard work, whose earnings are so depleted they are the forgotten generation.

Unfortunately the matter of communism has become a partisan political matter and is a rife subject in this campaign and I suppose I am almost alone in this United States of America with the idea that it should not be a matter between Republicans and Democrats but that both parties should quit their fighting over it and start in on a bipartisan all-American drive to end the blight in this country. It has been highly unfashionable to fight communism (that is until lately). For at least 10 years the world of fashion and that section called society shunned the idea of protesting against anything un-American unless it be fascism. And what is that? Something nonexistent in America, so the influence of the Reds certainly dominated American life for more years than anyone knows and in that time we saw Communists commissioned as officers in the American Army; we saw high Government officials stop an investigation in communism among radio operators aboard merchant marine vessels; we saw the late Dies Committtee lauded to high heaven when it undertook its crusade against nazism and German espionage in this country and then trampled almost out of existence when it finished up on nazism and took to prying into communism.

Volumes have been written about it and very late volumes include the reports of the Senate's Committee on Internal Security which show that communism is still hidden in Government and is laughing at us. As long as we make it a matter for Republicans to attack and Democrats to defend it will be the best thing on earth for communism. Instead of that we should have an all-American truce. Let each side decide to let bygones be bygones and join hands.

We have joined hands for a war on the physical threat of cancer; we have joined hands for the Red Cross; we have joined hands in a thousand ways to put the strength of America against an evil, but we seem stalled and ineffective when it comes to a fight against internal domestic communism because politics gets in the way.

Let's run up the flag and sing God Bless America and take an old-time Fourth of July delight in bringing back the old-time home gingham apron-type of Americanism.

We do not have to say we are anti-Fascist, freedom-loving people. We are certainly all for the ideal of worldwide human brotherhood, but we don't have to find any new phrases. The best formula produced so far for everything we hope to be and started to be is Americanism. The one system which recognizes the divine plan for the complete dignity of the individual.

Right now we see our foreign-policy officials adopting, at long last, a hard-boiled attitude against the diplomacy of the Iron-Curtain countries and the American public is fairly well advised on that point. But what is not so apparent is the fact that the motivating power in Communist policy is the Communist plan for an eventual armed conquest of the rest of the world. If not from without a country from the inside and this is ever present in every move Russia makes. Oddly enough very little public attention was paid to the most recent address of Premier Stalin at the opening of the 19th Communist Party Congress, that is, to those few brief sentences in which he once more laid down the Communist principle of gradually infiltrating Communist poison into every nation and forming world brotherhoods of communism so that gradually freedom would be wiped out of the human race. God never intended humanity to be a race of state-driven slaves. If such a thing ever occurs it may be the signal for the Angel Gabriel's last trumpet. God would certainly lower the boom on that experiment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to object, but I hope the Senator from Florida will wait until we complete the business of the morning hour. I have not been very strict in this matter, but many Senators attend the beginning of the session for the purpose of introducing bills, and presenting other routine matters, and it seems to me that speeches during the morning hour should be confined to 2 minutes with reference to some bill which is being introduced or on some matter related to the business of the morning hour. I wonder if the Senator from Florida would mind withholding his remarks until we complete the business of the morning hour.

Mr. HOLLAND. No, indeed. I understood I was complying with the suggestion of the majority leader. I shall be glad to withhold my remarks until the completion of the business of the morning hour, and then I hope that I shall be recognized before the Senator makes a motion to take up a resolution or bill for consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, Mr. President, any Senator can speak as long as he wants to, but I should like to get something definite before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection to that.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the intention of the majority leader to complete action on the resolution today?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; and also action on the nominations on the Executive Calendar. Then I shall move to adjourn until Monday, March 2, at noon, when memorial exercises on the late Senator La Follette will be in order. After that, I hope the Senate may take up the supplemental appropriation bill and dispose of it, if possible, on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the Senator give us his plan for the other sessions next week?

Mr. TAFT. So far as I am advised, probably no bills of great importance will be reported or will be ready to be taken up on Wednesday or Friday. It is proposed that the Senate meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week for the transaction of routine business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Ohio for the information.

CONDEMNATION OF TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43, Senate Resolution 84.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. 84), as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups such as the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic and Balkan States and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them as may be suitable under its Charter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I think the purpose of the amendment is obvious from its text. I wish to commend the Committee on Foreign Relations for the resolution which they have drafted and placed before the Senate for consideration. It is inclusive, and it covers the important points which, it seems to me, should be covered by a resolution of this type. However, I feel that in the last resolve—that is, the second resolve—it would be well to go further than the resolution now goes. The second resolve now reads as follows:

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages—

I concur wholeheartedly in that statement, but it seems to me that, in order to pin down our intention and action, we should go one step further. In order to take that one step, I have offered the amendment, which the clerk has read. The amendment continues the second resolve, as follows:

in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them—

The "them" referring to the outrages—as may be suitable under its charter.

It seems to me that, instead of calling on the President to urge the United Nations to act purely as a debating society in this particular instance, it would be better if the resolution as modified by this amendment were to be adopted, and the President, acting through the United States delegation to the United Nations were thus to be requested to act, insofar as such action might be possible, to the end that the purpose of the resolution may be realized through appropriate action taken by the United Nations.

In other words, it seems to me that the General Assembly, instead of merely debating the matter contained in the resolution, should itself at the least adopt a resolution protesting and condemning the conditions cited in the first resolve of the resolution now before the Senate. This is the reason why I have submitted the amendment to the resolution. I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. I have canvassed the situation among members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I find the amendment of the Senator from New York to be acceptable. I so announce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the resolution as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 84), as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups such as the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic and Balkan States, and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages, in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them as may be suitable under its charter.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I reported to the Senate as an original resolution the pending resolution from the Foreign Relations Committee condemning in the strongest terms the vicious and inhuman persecution of minority groups by the Soviet Union and its satellite states. The resoluton further calls upon the President to protest these persecutions and in particular suggests the United Nations General Assembly as an appropriate forum for protest.

The pending resolution grew out of Senate Resolution 70, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and 21 other Senators, and Senate Resolution 71, submitted by the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. Those two resolutions were submitted on February 16 and referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, and became the working basis of the resolution on which the Senate is now about to act.

Each of these resolutions condemned the recent manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Senate Resolution 70 expressed the expectation that the United States Government would convey its concern to the Soviet Government, while Senate Resolution 71 invited the attention of all persons believing in democracy and human freedom to the similarities between communism and fascism. Senate Resolution 70 spoke only of the U. S. S. R.; Senate Resolution 71 was directed to the Soviet Union and its satellite states.

When we considered these resolutions in the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. President, it at once became apparent that what we were dealing with was not simply anti-Semitism but widespread, calculated persecution of any minority group where such persecution would further the vicious designs of the masters of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

A subcommittee was therefore appointed, consisting of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] to consider the broader aspects of the problem; and the resolution which is now before the Senate is the result of the subcommittee's deliberations.

The resolution condemns Soviet persecution of minority groups in general, and it specifically mentions the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, the Ukraine, the Baltic States, the Balkans, and elsewhere, and the recent increasing persecution of people of the Jewish faith.

It further urges the President "to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages."

Mr. President, this is a much stronger resolution than either of those originally presented to the Senate. It condemns the actions against minority groups, not only of the Soviet Government but also of its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia. It also makes it plain that these actions are aimed at all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom. In short, the resolution recognizes the fact that the question of minority rights is indivisible, that no religion is safe where one is in danger, and that a despotism which seeks to destroy the integrity of one ethnic group today will attack others tomorrow.

The entire civilized world has been horrified at the most recent anti-Semitic outrages on the part of the Soviet Union and its satellites—the phony trials in Czechoslovakia, the charges against Jewish doctors in Moscow, and other events culminating in the severance of diplomatic relations with Israel following the bombing of the Soviet Legation in Tel Aviv. It is not beyond belief that the bombing was deliberately carried out by the Communists themselves in order to provide the pretext for actions which they intended to take in any event.

But, Mr. President, this wave of anti-Semitism is completely consistent with the whole Soviet record toward minorities. It is part of a pattern of persecution which calls for action against whichever minority happens to provide the target best calculated to achieve the Kremlin's ends at home or abroad.

Communism is, of course, basically antireligious. It is against any religion and all religions. Thus the Kremlin has carried on a consistent campaign of harassment and oppression against the Russian Orthodox Church, which is the largest in the Soviet Union. The Roman Catholic Church is the largest in most of the satellites, and it has been the object of a similar campaign. Catholic prelates have been imprisoned and in some cases executed. Protestant groups likewise are controlled and regulated, and the state has attempted to suppress the large Moslem communities in the U. S. S. R. The Shariat, the Mohammedan code of laws and rules of life, has been liquidated, and in some areas Moslems are not allowed to be married by mullahs.

In addition to these activities directed against religious groups, the Kremlin has persecuted and attempted to destroy many ethnic groups within the Iron Curtain area. I think it could be fairly said that the campaigns against some of these groups, particularly those in the Ukraine and the Baltic States, as well as in Poland and the Balkans, amount to genocide. Whole peoples have been deported en masse, and in some areas have been the targets of systematic campaigns of extermination.

Mr. President, by adopting the pending resolution, we can make it clear that we will not remain silent in the face of such premeditated terror. We can let the oppressed peoples of Russia and the satellites know that we have not forgotten them in their agony. The conscience of mankind can still be heard, Mr. President. I hope the vote on the resolution will be unanimous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that I commend him and the committee for the action they have taken in connection with the pending resolution. I have received much correspondence on this subject, and have had many talks with citizens of Massachusetts whose ancestors came from the countries mentioned, and who are intensely concerned about these outrages. I am happy to join with the chairman and other members of the committee in supporting the resolution, as amended.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also wish to congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin and his committee for reporting this very timely and necessary resolution.

I wish it were the privilege of every American citizen to join with us in adopting this resolution, because indeed it embodies the very spirit of Americanism.

If our way of life were stripped of its basic freedoms our institutions would be different and we, as individuals, would suffer an intolerable life. I do not think we can place one liberty above another in importance, but if we were called upon to take them in order, I think freedom of religion would be listed as No. 1. In a real sense, without freedom of worship all our freedoms would become meaningless. As our civilization was born from a love of complete freedom of worship, we as a nation have an obligation to unceasingly protect and strengthen this freedom in the world when freedom and slavery are in contest.

It is wrong to persecute people for any reason. It is inhuman and evil to persecute people because of their faith. The recent outrages committed by the Soviet Union against the Jews deserve the strongest condemnation from all free people. I am glad that the framers of the committee resolution have seen fit to condemn the unjust and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Union and its puppet governments against all minority religious groups.

I consider it an especial privilege to vote for this resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice in commendation of the committee, and to join in the expressions of Senators who have preceded me in strongly supporting the pending resolution. I am happy to say that I shall now report to the Senate briefly an episode in international relations which is much happier than the one against which the the pending resolution is directed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

HEMISPHERIC HIGHWAY PROBLEMS—PAN AMERICAN HIGHWAY CONGRESS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, last October, official representatives of 16 American Republics met in Mexico City to consider hemispheric highway problems. As in the case of some other technical assemblies where matters affecting the economic well-being of millions of persons are discussed, the general public gave little indication of great interest. Nevertheless, the meeting was important in its immediate action and significant in its future potentialities.

The occasion was a special Pan American Highway Congress, convened under the sponsorship of the Organization of American States—Pan American Union. I had the privilege of attending as a member of the United States delegation, which consisted of the following official delegates: Jack G. Scott, Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation, chairman; Spessard L. Holland, congressional delegate; Robert B. Brooks, consulting engineer; Edwin W. James, Bureau of Public Roads; Henry H. Kelly, Department of State; Charles P. Nolan, Department of State; Paul Reinhold, president, American Road Builders' Association; Russell Singer, executive vice president, American Automobile Association; Francis C. Turner, Bureau of Public Roads; Melville Osborne, American Embassy, Mexico City, secretary of the delegation.

There were also present 16 or more official observers from our Nation representing various technical, professional, and commercial bodies. At a plenary session of the congress I made a brief statement on behalf of our entire delegation on a subject which was close to the heart of all of us—that of speeding the completion the inter-American highway from the United States to Panama. I said:

> The United States favors the early completion of the Inter-American Highway, which will provide modern and efficient overland communication through the friendly Republics extending from Panama to the United States. As tangible evidence of our continuing interest and cooperation, the United States has given substantial assistance, technically and financially, to the construction of the highway.
>
> For example, under legislation enacted by the United States Congress and through bilateral agreements entered into with individual Republics for the purpose of sharing construction costs, more than $40 million has already been spent or committed by the United States, most of it in recent years. As further assurance of our sincere and friendly interest, the United States Congress has this year authorized, but not yet appropriated, an additional sum of $16 million, consisting of $8 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years, 1953 and 1954, for the purpose of continuing the construction of this highway on a cooperative basis.
>
> We all look forward to the early completion of the highway from Panama to the United States, so that all kinds of motor vehicles may move readily across this magnificently interesting and important region and promote its economic development, along with better hemispheric understanding and greater solidarity.
>
> Mr. President, I wish to express the cordial appreciation of our Nation for the friendly mention appearing in the pending resolution of the part which the United States has played in this joint venture. We firmly believe that the completion of the Inter-American Highway will be highly beneficial to our Nation and to each of our friendly neighbors which it will traverse.

In the same statement I included, for the entire delegation, an informal but warm expression of appreciation and congratulations to our next-door neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, for its having already completed, wholly at its own expense, the more than 1,600 miles of the Inter-American Highway extending entirely across Mexico from the border of the United States to the Guatemalan border.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Is that highway surfaced with black top or cement, and how wide is it?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is a very wide highway, a very fine highway, comparable with our trunk highways.

I am glad the Senator has asked the question, because it shows his own surprise, similar to the surprise entertained by me to find that Mexico had proceeded so quickly in fulfilling its entire obligation in connection with the construction of the Inter-American Highway. From the Texas border, where the Inter-American Highway leaves our Nation, to the Guatemalan border is 1,629 miles, and the highway for that entire distance has been completed, except for a few miles at the Guatemala border which lacks only the final surfacing.

Mr. WILEY. Are there stations all the way along?

Mr. HOLLAND. There are stations, and the road affords a fine opportunity for travel. As soon as the links in Central America, which I shall mention in a moment, are completed, it will be possible to go easily by automobile all the way to Panama City, which will be highly advantageous to our Nation in reaching the canal. Likewise, it will be highly advantageous to all travelers and to those engaged in commercial enterprises of many kinds to have this highway completed at an early date.

Mr. WILEY. Does the highway extend to Mexico City?

Mr. HOLLAND. It goes through Mexico City.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator for the information he has given.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his interest.

At this time I ask leave to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list showing the status of the links of the Inter-American Highway in Central America, from the southern border of Mexico down to Panama City, as of January 1953, furnished by the State Department and the Bureau of Public Roads. While I shall not read the entire list, I wish to make it clear that the distance of 1,590 road-miles has been dealt with as follows:

Five hundred and seventy-one miles are paved highway. Seven hundred and eighty-two miles are graded and constructed, all-weather highways. Only 237 miles of the entire distance of 1,590 remain still in an impassable condition, which is the challenge of the bottlenecks yet to be taken care of, which are found solely in Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Panama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Status of links of the Inter-American Highway in Central America, as of January 1953 (furnished by the State Department and the Bureau of Public Roads)

[Miles]

	Paved	All weather	Impassable	Total
Guatemala	40	260	25	334
El Salvador	174	21	.....	195
Honduras	.....	94	.....	94
Nicaragua	132	106	.....	238
Costa Rica	60	155	198	413
Panama	156	146	14	316
Total	571	782	237	1,590

GUATEMALA

The first 25 miles of the highway in Guatemala, extending from a point near Ocotal, at the border with Mexico, to San Sebastian are impassable.

COSTA RICA

From the Nicaraguan border to point near the town Bagaces, 64 miles is passable by jeep in dry season only; however, it is hoped that this section in the northern part of Costa Rica will be put in such condition by the end of 1953 or early 1954 that it will be possible to pass at all times between the capitals of Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

From the town of San Isidro about 83 miles south and east of San Jose to the border with Panama, it is completely impassable. This stretch is about 134 miles long. A survey is now being undertaken to lay out the route for this now impassable part.

PANAMA

From the border with Costa Rica it is impassable for 15 miles to the town of Concepios. From Concepios on to the Canal Zone it is passable at all times.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope Senators will read this list, because it shows that we are in sight of the completion of an epochal line of communications which will bring us much closer to people who are our traditional friends, and bring them closer to us, and help in avoiding the terrible things happening elsewhere on the earth, such as are mentioned in the resolution which is now pending. After all, we are getting along well with our neighbors in Central and South America, and they with us.

Mr. President, the Inter-American Highway was only one of the topics which these distinguished officials and technicians from 16 nations had under consideration. What they were striving for, in addition, was the establishment of some sort of continuity in their handling of general highway problems. All of them recognized that the public highway, and the traffic upon it, are the very essence of economic life in many regions. Our Latin American friends know that in their great cities they already have problems of traffic congestion and construction and maintenance just as troublesome as those in the United States; they also know that in the development of highway networks in rural areas and throughout their vast undeveloped stretches they are only at the threshold of the future.

It was most encouraging to all of the participants to see the United States, which daily produces more vehicle-miles than all the rest of the world together, working shoulder-to-shoulder with its neighbors in Central and South America in this common task.

The Mexico City congress did some definite planning for the immediate future—planning of the most practical kind. It set up three committees of experts, among whose combined membership will be distributed qualified representatives of all the 21 American Republics: one to make recommendations as to how to establish a modern highway department in each country, another to map the routing of the whole Pan American Highway and its feeder road system from Alaska to Argentina, and a third to propose plans for the financing of public highways. The very subjects of these committee tasks kindle the imagination.

Mr. President, I think it only proper to say at this time that the Inter-American Highway, in which we have a more direct interest, is but a part of the Pan-American Highway contemplated, much of which has been constructed, and which, when it is completed, will afford automobile access all the way from Alaska clear down to Patagonia.

Furthermore, the delegates at Mexico City supported continuation of periodic highway congresses—there have already been five of them, starting in 1925, and the sixth is scheduled for Caracas in 1954—and added a provision for an interim committee which will keep working on the Mexico City assignments and see that they are carried out properly before the Caracas assembly is held. This interim committee will also study plans for a permanent Pan-American Highway organization, which is favored by many Latin American countries.

Secretariat services for these tasks will be provided by the Pan American Union.

All of this activity means that in a fundamentally important economic and governmental field, that of the development of highway facilities and services, men of competency and good will throughout the Western Hemisphere are now working together intelligently and with determination for mutual benefit and the solving of common problems. In these days of confusion and misunderstanding in so many places throughout the world, it was heartening to see the tangible evidence of understanding, friendship, and common effort in the Western Hemisphere, working out in the hospitable environment supplied by our generous hosts in Mexico.

CONDEMNATION OF TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 84) remonstrating against the treatment of minority groups by Russia and her satellites.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on my own behalf, and on behalf of the Senators who joined with me in submitting Senate Resolution 70, I wish to express our full support of Resolution 84, which has been reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I am in perfect accord with everything that was said by the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the chairman of the committee. I agree with him that no single racial group or religious group is exclusively involved in the deplorable activities of Soviet Russia and her satellite states. I believe that every race and every religion in the country is very much interested in the conditions which prevail in those unhappy countries. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin is entitled to commendation for the fine work he has done on the pending resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD certain information prepared at my request by the Library of Congress, showing that the Senate on other occasions has adopted resolutions similar to the one now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME RESOLUTIONS REFLECTING CONGRESSIONAL SENTIMENT RE FOREIGN MINORITY GROUPS, 67TH TO 82D CONGRESSES

SIXTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

House Resolution 434, providing that the President be requested to express to the Government of Turkey the moral protest of the United States against the outrages on Armenians, Jews, and Christian peoples (62 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 12970).

House Concurrent Resolution 74, regarding the treatment of the Christian people in Turkey (64 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 124).

Senate Resolution 470, relative to the protection of the Armenian people under the Sevres treaty (64 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5271).

SIXTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Senate Resolution 54, relative to the protection of the Armenian people under the Sevres treaty (65 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 228).

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 574, directing the President of the United States to suspend commercial relations with the Empire of Japan during the occupation of Chinese territory by Japanese armed troops (83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 1160).

House Resolution 264, favoring the notification of Japan of the intention of the United States to abrogate the treaty of 1911 (84 CONGRESSIOAL RECORD 9544).

House Resolution 369, requesting the President of the United States to express the abhorrence of the United States against the brutal treatment of the peoples of Poland (86 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 815).

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

House Resolution 329, that the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, respectfully requested to use his constitutional authority to sever all diplomatic relations with the German Government (87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8370).

House Resolution 231, creating a special committee to investigate charges against the Jewish race (87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4992).

House Concurrent Resolution 51, abrogating authority under the lend-lease bill with respect to the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics (87 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6802).

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

House Resolution 350, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe (Mr. Baldwin) (89 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9371).

House Resolution 352, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe (Mr. Rogers) (p. 9371).

Senate Resolution 203, favoring the appointment of a commission to formulate a plan to save the Jews of Europe from extinction by Nazi Germany (S. Rept. 625) (89 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9305, 10933) (indefinitely postponed, p. 599, vol. 90).

House Resolution 458, authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "A study of the legality of the annexation of Austria by Germany under international law and Austrian constitutional law and the policy of the United States toward the annexation" as a document (Mr. Jarman, Committee on Printing, p. 2178; reported back (H. Rept. 1228), 2252, 2255; agreed to, 2252 (90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD)).

House Resolutions 622, 623, 624, 625, that the Congress recommend and urge the President and the Secretary of State to use their offices in effecting the establishment of emergency shelter in Palestine for persecuted Jews of Europe (90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7302).

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, favoring the restoration of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10407).

House Concurrent Resolution 119, to assist the Polish people in their aspirations for complete freedom (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 12491).

Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, relative to the opening of Palestine for free entry of Jews (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (passed House, p. 12396, in lieu of H. Con. Res. 113)).

House Concurrent Resolution 31, to express the disapproval of the Congress of the decision made at the Crimean Conference relating to the partition of Poland (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4470).

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

House Concurrent Resolution 94, to assist the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union, who constitute one-half of the population, to obtain liberation from their present Communist enslavement and for early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms, and for other purposes (97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4022).

House Concurrent Resolution 120, expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Polish people from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms (97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 6282).

House Concurrent Resolution 138, expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the peoples of China from their present enslavement and for early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms, and for other purposes (97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7612).

House Concurrent Resolution 139, expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the peoples of Czechoslovakia from their present enslavement and for early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms, and for other purposes (97 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7612 (text, Appendix, A4445)).

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey would first like to compliment the Foreign Relations Committee and its distinguished chairman upon having reported to the Senate Senate Resolution 84.

On Monday, February 16, together with my colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], I submitted Senate Resolution 71, wherein it was stated that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Union and its satellite states against members of the Jewish faith deserve the strongest condemnation.

On the same day I addressed this distinguished body on this subject, a subject that is now shocking the conscience of the world—the continuing anti-Semitic campaign of the Soviet dictatorship against the helpless victims of the Jewish faith living behind the Iron Curtain and in the satellite countries that are completely under its domination. In West Germany alone we are now witnessing a whole torrent of human suffering, the young and old, the sick and the suffering, escaping from this tyranny in order to breathe the free air of democracy.

For the first time we are calling this Soviet tyranny by its proper name—the Union of Savage Sadistic Ravagers.

Soon—very soon, I hope—we will learn again, while we are still free, that the enslavement and murder of people in other lands, directly or indirectly, and sometimes very swiftly, affects our freedoms and our liberties here at home.

As I stated here last week, it is high time that we unmask the brutality of this despotic Soviet regime and expose it to the world for what is truly represents; namely, a sadistic ravager of all that is fine and decent in the hearts of free men everywhere.

The time has arrived for America to meet the war of propaganda, upon the record of Russia's horrible deeds, with a war of truth.

I need hardly remind you again that the latest manifestation of Soviet savagery is merely the continuation of a well-conceived plan to exterminate the identity of every racial group behind the Iron Curtain and thereafter to exterminate democracy everywhere.

Consequently, what I am describing to you is not something remote from our lives, but is the sort of thing that could happen tomorrow to other free people, even to ourselves, as it has already come to pass in many places throughout the world.

It is high time that we recognize that today Soviet Russia is using the fantastic big lie of anti-Semitism as a regular weapon of state policy.

No charges are too preposterous to promote their diabolical aims of world domination.

It is time that we ourselves assume the leadership and proclaim to the world in unmistakable terms the kind of false democracy that Russia is now practicing.

It is a source of real satisfaction to note that the distinguished Committee on Foreign Relations has reported out a resolution embracing my views.

I am indeed happy to have made my contribution to the conception of this splendid resolution now before us for consideration.

I am more than pleased to give my wholehearted support to the committee resolution which includes all minorities under the Kremlin's thumb. I am more than happy to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from New York in his very fine amendment, which, in my opinion, constitutes a real improvement.

I have spoken out for condemnation of Red anti-Semitism, which is having such an immediate effect on world tensions, but the resolution reported by the committee is infinitely wise in including—for all the world to see—how the Senate feels about the Soviet Union's laughable claims of cultural autonomy for all minorities.

Mr. President, I importune my colleagues to vote as one, in the unanimous adoption of this most worthy resolution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a cosponsor with my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] of Senate Resolution 71, which the three of us developed together, I wish to say to the Senate that I join with my colleague in his willingness, just expressed, to merge our resolution with Senate Resolution 84 in order to have a wider

reach for the overall objectives of the resolutions before the committee. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, let me say that we considered the so-called Hendrickson resolution, Senate Resolution 71, in committee and I am glad to go on record with my colleague and with the Senator from Michigan in merging Senate Resolution 71 with Senate Resolution 84. This resolution as it is now before us expresses our profound horror and our outraged feelings against the atrocities committed on peoples behind the Iron Curtain and in other areas of the world who are subject to such terrible and indefensible religious and political persecutions. I am glad to add my word to those of my distinguished colleague and of the Senator from Michigan, and I sincerely hope the resolution will have the unanimous support of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I, too, want to commend the Foreign Affairs Committee for reporting the pending resolution to the Senate, and I hope that it will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3 o'clock this afternoon I may be absent from the Senate for the remainder of the day. I will be most happy to support the resolution reported by the committee, and I commend the committee for having reported it favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on February 16, of this year, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], for himself, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Michigan, the present speaker, submitted a resolution covering in somewhat similar fashion the subject covered by Senate Resolution 84. The number of the resolution submitted by the Senator from New Jersey was Senate Resolution 71. It was our purpose in submitting that resolution to call the attention of the Senate and of the people of the United States to the Soviet Government's inhumanity to man, and its lack of a spiritual outlook toward the peoples of the world.

I am glad to say that I join in supporting the resolution which was reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, because the resolution not only points up the particularly harsh treatment of one nationality group, namely those of the Jewish faith, but it also points up the Soviets' inhumanity to mankind, wherever human beings come in contact with the Soviet power and the totalitarian state.

The Soviet Communists are not only against minorities; they are even against the majority of the people of Russia. When we see that people are compelled to flee Soviet ill treatment, persecutions, and even death, we realize that we must condemn such actions in no uncertain words.

I am particularly glad that certain language has been inserted in the resolution which goes to the crux of the situation, and should receive major consideration. The resolution says that the persecutions "deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom."

That is the thing which the Soviet philosophy lacks. It lacks a belief in the spiritual values, a belief in human progress, in freedom and in the dignity of the human being. The Soviets believe that the state is supreme, and that the human being amounts to nothing at all. In other words, he is to be dealt with by the state as the state deems best.

We must remember the divine rights of the people—not the divine right of the king, who represents the state; not the divine right of the Soviet Union. If the peoples of the world will recognize the divine rights of the people, then there will be safeguarded the spiritual values which are the basis of human progress and human freedom.

I heartily endorse Senate Resolution 84, and I am glad to be able to cast my vote for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Committee on Foreign Relations for bringing Senate Resolution 84 in its present form to the floor of the Senate.

For many years there has been a very sharp contrast between the pretensions of the Russian Soviet Government and the actual performance of that government. The Soviet Government and its agents have tried to represent to the world that Soviet Russia permits the free development of nationalities, and that it has abolished race prejudice. In reality, however, the Soviet power has crushed every nationality which has shown opposition to it, and has tried to crush every religion which has shown independence of it.

This policy began early in the Soviet regime, when, shortly after World War I, Georgia asserted its independence, and the Georgian revolution was put down in blood. Individual Georgians were summarily punished.

In the south of Russia is the country of the Ukraine, in which a large proportion of the people think of themselves not as Russians, but as Ukrainians. Ukrainian nationalism and Ukrainian religion have been persecuted by the Russians for many years, with mass imprisonments and mass deportations.

Up in the Baltic States in 1939 and 1940 there was an infamous division of territory between Russia and Germany, by the treaty between Hitler and Stalin, whereby Russia was allowed to move into the three Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. In order to consolidate her hold upon those states, Russia deported hundreds of thousands of Balts, Estonians, and Lithuanians, and scattered them over Siberia, putting into the Baltic States people upon whom the Soviets felt they could depend. This was genocide upon a large scale. I am very proud of the Government of the United States because it has consistently refused to recognize the Soviet annexation of the three Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Of course, the Russian Government has been hostile to religion throughout—not only hostile to previous abuses of the Greek Orthodox Church, but hostile to the Greek Orthodox Church itself. It has not permitted the Catholic Church to send priests and missionaries into that country, and it has oppressed the small Protestant groups who have lived in south Russia and the Ukraine.

So there has always been a great disparity between Soviet pretensions and Soviet practices. In recent months there has come the shameful drive of the Russians against the Jews. Russia is now practicing and putting into effect a program of anti-Semitism. This started in the satellite states with the trials of Jewish Communist leaders on evidence which was probably largely trumped up. These trials resulted in the execution of a number of Jewish leaders who formerly occupied prominent positions in the Communist Government.

This was followed by the imprisonment of 9 doctors, 7 of them Jews, on the charge that they, in conspiracy with Zionism and the American Foreign Service, had murdered certain leaders of the Communist Party. This is a charge which is transparently false, and which was simply made to stir up anti-Semitism.

Since then we have had the breaking of diplomatic relations between Russia and the new State of Israel. As the result of all these moves, plus the hostility of the Communists in East Germany to the Jews, we have had, as the distinguished Senator from New Jersey stated earlier in the afternoon, mass migrations for the past month out of East Germany into Berlin and West Germany. These migrations sometimes reach 3,000 a day, and have totaled about 30,000 in the past month.

It is now clear that Soviet Russia is actively leading the anti-Semitic movement in the world. The question naturally arises as to why she is doing so. In my judgment there are three reasons:

First, in order to cover up her domestic failures and to make the Jews once again scapegoats for the delinquencies of those in power.

Second, it is an attempt to win over the Arabs of the Near East and Middle East, some of whom are anti-Semitic because of the rise of the State of Israel. The Russians hope that by embracing anti-Semitism they can win over the Arabs of those states, and hence use the Arab States to take the oil of the Near East and the Middle East.

I wish to say that Western Europe at present largely operates upon the oil of the Near and Middle East. If that should be shut off, and if the burden of supplying oil for Western Europe were thrown on the United States, it would mean that virtually every automobile in the United States of America would have to leave the streets almost at once. I hardly need to add that the Communists would also like to foster Arab hostility to other parts of the free world because of the strategic position of the Middle East on vital communication lines.

In the third place the Soviets are, I believe, trying to make an alliance with the former Nazis to reunite Germany. They want a reunited Germany in which Communist East Germany will control West Germany, which will be militarized,

and which will be turned against the West.

Having failed to produce economic benefits for the people of East Germany, and having failed to offer anything positive which is attractive to the people of Western Germany, having in fact only tyranny and terror to offer to them, the Communists are trying to win the Germans over now by arousing anti-Semitism once again. They are trying to unite Germany on the basis of hatred. Soviet Russia has therefore embarked upon one of the most destructive campaigns any nation has ever launched. I am, therefore, delighted that from both sides of the aisle, as a result of the merging of the resolution of the Senator from Montana and that of the Senator from New Jersey, to the full satisfaction of others of us who have joined them, we now have this composite resolution before us, which aligns the United States against this inhuman practice and which urges our Government to raise this issue before the world and before the United Nations.

Mr. President, I hope we will have a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution, and I hope it will be adopted unanimously, as an indication that whatever our domestic differences may be, we are united against Soviet aggression and are united against race prejudice.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Senator from Illinois to say that he hoped there would be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope so, too, and I wish to ask whether there will be a yea-and-nay vote this afternoon on the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, it is our purpose to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution as soon as debate is concluded. Then, immediately following the vote, it will be the purpose of the acting majority leader to ask the Senate to take up the Executive Calendar.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Illinois for yielding for the inquiry. My reason for making it was that I have a good deal of work to do, and I desired to know whether there would be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on the subject now before the Senate. I have already addressed the Senate and have spoken to numerous groups and organizations concerning the brutal and ruthless actions of the Soviets toward those of my own faith, toward those of the Catholic faith, and of the Protestant faith, toward the peoples of the Baltic countries, and those of other countries under Soviet domination and influence.

The position which Russia has assumed in recent months follows a definite pattern, in my opinion—an attempt to divide the free peoples of the world, an attempt to bring pressure on minority groups within the Soviet sphere which will cause them to be more tractable and obedient to Soviet mastery to placate and gain the favor of the Arab States, through their repudiation of the new little Republic of Israel which has shown that it is a real outpost of democracy in the Middle East; and to gain the favor of certain totalitarian-minded forces in Germany, which, although somewhat quiescent, still exist.

I am happy that a resolution similar to that now pending was presented first by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and I am proud to have been one of the cosponsors. I am very glad indeed, however, that the resolution has now been broadened to take in people of other faiths and of other nationalities who have suffered persecution, imprisonment, and harassment at the hands of the Soviets.

I have known what the Soviet attitude has been with regard to the people of the countries which they overran during the Second World War. The question which is now troubling our allies and ourselves in Korea with regard to the forcible repatriation of people to Communist countries is not of recent origin. Russia took exactly the same position in 1944 and 1945 with regard to those who were in the displaced persons camps and in the concentration camps, who had been freed. The Soviets claimed that they had the right to demand the forcible repatriation of those people. That matter has been fought out, of course, in the last 2 years, in the United Nations, but it was fought out in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in 1944 and 1945, and there was exactly the same lineup at that time as there has been since then. Fifty or fifty-two states voted against forcible repatriation. The Soviets and their small bloc of satellites voted for forcible repatriation. That has been their policy and it will continue to be their policy, if we ever weaken in the slightest degree, and I certainly pray to God that we will never weaken, in Korea or anywhere else.

I am very glad indeed that the resolution has been broadened, and I look forward to voting for it with all of my colleagues when the roll is called a little later in the afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment that I may put something in the RECORD?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Declaration of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, adopted at a Ukrainian rally in Detroit on January 25, 1953.

The Ukrainians, as a race and as a people, have been dominated and controlled by the Russians. They, too, have been enslaved by the Russians, and I think it is very appropriate that this declaration go into the RECORD when the Senate is considering the pending resolution in relation to the persecution of all peoples over whom Russia has control.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following is the declaration of Americans of Ukrainian descent, assembled at the Ukrainian rally in the number of 2,000, which was held on January 25, 1953, in Ukrainian National Temple, Detroit, Mich., to commemorate the 35th anniversary of Declaration of Independence of Ukraine and the establishment of the Ukrainian National Republic:

"In Kiev on January 22, 1918, the Ukrainian Central Council (Rada) promulgated the Fourth Universal and thereby brought about the rebirth of Ukrainian independence and established the Ukrainian National Republic.

"The 35th anniversary of this important event in the life of the Ukrainian Nation is being celebrated by Ukrainians throughout the free world.

"Ukraine today is a country occupied by Russian Communist armed forces which installed a puppet government against the will of the Ukrainian people. The Communist system, with its collective economy, has brought about the ruin of Ukrainian peasants, and the bureaucratic character of the Communist production and the unheard-of exploitation of labor has turned Ukrainian workers into slaves of Communist oligarchy.

"The Ukrainian people have been deprived of all the freedoms they enjoyed under their own independent government, have been deprived of those freedoms now enjoyed by the citizens of the free world.

"We Americans of Ukrainian descent, those of us who arrived here many years ago, those of us who were born here, and those who arrived only recently, having fled our native land to escape the terror of Communist domination commemorate this day of Ukrainian independence, this great anniversary of the Ukrainian people.

"We who are of Ukrainian descent and are cognizant of the desires of the Ukrainian people speak today to the honorable representatives of the United States Government and to the freedom-loving people of this country, and do aver that the Ukrainian people are striving for their independence, for their right to freedom, for their right to a democratic Ukrainian Government, for such a government as was established during the revolution by the Act of Ukrainian Independence in 1918.

"We emphasize that the Ukrainian people have been fighting since 1918 for their freedom from Moscow Communist domination. This fight has taken many forms, among them armed resistance, and has not waned until this day.

"We Americans of Ukrainian descent assembled today at the Ukrainian Rally for the commemoration of the 35th anniversary of the Ukrainian Declaration of Independence appeal to the United States Government and to all the free nations of the world assembled in the United Nations to aid the Ukrainian Nation in freeing itself from Communist tyranny and in reestablishing in Ukraine a government by the will of the Ukrainian people."

SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM—NECESSITY FOR REMOVING WANT AND DESPAIR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Chair very much for recognizing me. In raising my children I have tried to teach them the trait of patience by referring them frequently to that good old saying that if not successful the first time, one should try and try again. Since 1 o'clock I have been trying to get the floor, but I have been unsuccessful, even though on several occasions this afternoon I have been on the floor seeking recognition before any other Senator addressed the Chair. On one occasion a Senator was recognized who was not

even standing up addressing the Chair. I point out to the Senate that under the rules of the Senate a Member of the Senate who first addresses the Chair is entitled to recognition.

Mr. President, I want to add my voice to those of other Americans who are standing up before the world and denouncing the most recent savage anti-Semitic attacks of Soviet Russia upon the remaining Jewish people now imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. We should recognize that such anti-Semitism is a direct assault upon human liberty, decency, and freedom. However, before doing so, I want to emphasize again the necessity of having our democracy and all other democracies place their own houses in order.

It is a truism of our democracy that the basis of our achievements today rests squarely upon the economic as well as the political benefits that all freemen enjoy. Today, as we witness the torture and the destruction of these liberties in the slaughterhouse of Soviet despotism, we must ever remember that economic freedom is essential to political freedom.

Only when we eliminate want, and hunger, and despair, do we eradicate the debris upon which the Soviet vultures depend. Human frailties and basic wants are the source of communistic strength.

By the same token, they are also the main source of Soviet weakness, if we place our own house in order. This indicates the necessity of going ahead courageously with the reforms and the human betterments that have characterized the progress of the democracies during the last few generations. We must never cease, until want and hunger and despair are removed from every household in this land, as well as from the homes of our neighbors throughout the world.

Once again the world is experiencing another in a long series of Soviet depradations upon human liberties. Individuals and their liberties are being trampled into dust by the Soviets. The horrendous Soviet octopus seeks to devour everything. The latest victims are the Jewish people who have made one of the finest contributions to our civilization that mankind has ever known.

We had hoped that the persecutions, and the horrors of the Nazi concentration camp and death chambers were just a terrible memory. Now, before a gasping world, they are being revived in all their ugly brutality.

It is apparent that there is great confusion, chaos, and disintegration under the Soviet despotism. Otherwise, it would not be necessary to have public purges regularly, and denounce before the world the Jews of Russia.

A SCAPEGOAT IS NEEDED

The weakness of the Soviet tyranny is now revealed by the fact that these Kremlin monsters must pick upon a helpless people—the Jewish people—whose religious, educational, and cultural racial views have been all but exterminated, for long ago all these racial and cultural traits disintegrated and disappeared within the Soviet Union.

So now, when the Soviet despotism revives, in slightly different form, the age-old, long-discredited forgeries about the Jews, and hails them before the world as plots against the Soviet system, the Soviet system must be in a sad state, indeed.

No strong nation would revive these old scapegoat concepts and court the favor of the erstwhile Nazis and Fascists—who themselves are discredited—unless that government was afraid, or in desperation.

JUSTICE UNDER THE CZARISTS' REGIME

As a lawyer, I am greatly interested in contrasting the kind of justice for the Jews which existed under the Czarists' regime and the kind that prevails under a Soviet regime, so clearly shown in the recent purge trials in Czechoslovakia. The trials in Russia and in the satellite countries have followed a common Soviet pattern. Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to take you back 40 years and describe a famous trial that took place in Czarist Russia, when a Russian Jew was the defendant.

Briefly, the facts were as follows: In 1911, a mutilated body of a 12-year-old boy was found by some children playing near a cavern in the outskirts of Kiev, in the Ukraine. It was apparent that the death was the result of foul play. The officials in the Czar's Department of Justice decided that a certain Jew, Mendel Beiliss, was the culprit. Mr. Beiliss was an ordinary worker in a brick factory. He was arrested for murder.

The unusual thing about the case was that the accusations were directed against him, not as an individual, but as a member of the Jewish race. He was not charged with a criminal act for personal motives. Rather, he, as a Jew, was charged with committing a "ritual" murder. Thus, Beiliss was accused and arrested on the basis of the discredited, absurd, medieval legend that Jews use Christian blood for ritual purposes. That is an old, old legend, Mr. President, that has been used to persecute the Jews in many a country since medieval times.

However, the Czar's bureaucrats overlooked two things. The first was public opinion, and the other was the right of trial by jury. Let us observe what happened at that time, in Czarist Russia, under those two great safeguards. The best Russian lawyers volunteered to defend Beiliss. Both the liberal and the conservative press attacked the Justice Department of the Czar. The presiding judge of the Kiev Circuit Court declined to preside over the case, and was removed to another post. Most important of all, 2 years later, when Beiliss finally was tried by a jury consisting of peasants and petty officials, he was acquitted. This verdict is interesting in view of the pressure and fear under which some of the jurors, particularly those who depended upon the favor of their supervisors, had to act.

JUSTICE IN SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY

Some 40 years have passed since this famous Beiliss trial. It is also about 35 years since the Soviet regime was established in Russia. Therefore, we should now ask ourselves: Is the Russian Jew better off today than he was in the old days of Czarist Russia? This is highly important because of the Soviet claim of impartial justice and the "cultural autonomy" that the Communists have long heralded before the world. How does this work out in the case of one minority, the Jews?

In spite of all its fraudulent claims about affording the greatest of protection to its minority groups, the plain fact of the matter is that Soviet Russia is now formally persecuting the Jews as they never were persecuted before. After previously eliminating all traces of Judaism and its culture, starting with the nefarious campaign in 1947, repeated in 1948, and continued to this hour, we now find the same age-old calumnies, lies, and misrepresentations leveled against this unhappy race. But now they are pursued ruthlessly, as an integral part of state policy.

No class of Jews is exempt. First it was the leaders on top, and now it is the Jewish doctors who are charged with undermining the security of the Communist state. The same is true of Soviet Jewish writers and journalists. These erstwhile Communists are now being branded as homeless "cosmopolitans" who lack Soviet patriotism. Even though all traces of religion have disappeared long ago, the leading Jewish Communists who have renounced all connections with their religion are being accused of Zionist sympathies, and are sent to slave-labor camps, or are hanged in Prague, on orders from Moscow.

The simple fact of the matter is that all of the 2½ million Jews who still reside in the Soviet Union are placed in the category of questionable, second-class citizens. They are denounced as a race, intimidated, molested, persecuted, and are denied the right of going to the Jewish homeland in Israel. Obviously, these people are being held as hostages. The Soviet conspiracy wants to recruit the neo-Nazis and Arabs in the all-out Communist antidemocratic drive.

This afternoon the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] stressed a point which I believe needs reemphasis, namely, the relationship of Arabian oil to Soviet aggression if the Soviet Union of Russia could gain control and possession of Arabian oil. The Senator from Illinois set forth what I understand to be a fact, which I believe the American people should realize when we come to deal, for example, with the problem of conserving the great oil reserves of the United States of America. The fact is that if the Russians gain control of Arabian oil or if it becomes necessary, because of a threat of Russian control of Arabian oil, to take the necessary precautionary steps to see to it that Russia is not able to use that oil, and if Europe then becomes dependent upon American oil, it will be a matter of only a few short weeks before every private automobile on the streets of America will be standing dead still, for want of gasoline. That will be true unless we wish to take the position that we would keep private automobiles in America operating and let the manufacturing plants of Europe close.

Of course, that raises a very direct defense question as regards the relationship existing between the economic productive power of Europe in time of war with Russia and the operation of private transportation vehicles in the United States. As the Senator from Illinois

pointed out this afternoon, and as I understand the facts to be, the great changes in defense weapons and machinery since World War II have been such that the increased consumption of gasoline and oil needed for the technological changes alone in war machinery since World War II would require all the gasoline and oil presently being used for private transportation in the United States, if we should continue to supply to Europe the gasoline and oil which she would then need to keep her plants operating and if the source of oil from the Arabian countries should be closed to us. If that be true, Mr. President, we had better pay very close attention to the designs of Russia and to the relationship between Arabian oil, the offensive power of Russia, and the defenses of the United States.

That the Soviet conspiracy wants to recruit the neo-Nazis and Arabs in the all-out Communist antidemocratic drive is a very significant fact. For it was generally believed that in the old Czarist days, the Jewish people were helpless. However, compared to those today, there is no one left in Soviet Russia today to offer protection to the Jews.

We must all recognize that there are no independent high caliber lawyers alive in the Soviet Union. They are the type of independent, fearless citizens who once came to the rescue of Beiliss, and who could have defended the Jews in the Soviet courts today. But, alas, they are no more.

Likewise a free, independent, and courageous press which could have come to the aid of the Jews against the abuses of their government is no longer existent in the Soviet despotism. Today, trial by jury is a mockery in the land of the Communist dictatorship. Thus, the voice of the Russian people has been finally silenced by the terroristic policies of the Soviet tyranny under the ruthless methods of the secret police.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD TAKE THE LEAD

It thus becomes important for the enlightened conscience of mankind to speak up where the voice of the people has been throttled and stilled. Once more, as free men in a free world, we must denounce the latest Soviet tyranny that is designed to erase freedom from every land if it holds sway. We cannot falter in our paths, for we must recognize that the ultimate aim of this Soviet state anti-Semitic policy is to eliminate the democracies one by one until we are the last victim of their ruthless dictatorship. Let us speak up and protest while, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] said, we still have a chance.

I therefore heartily endorse the composite resolution reported by the committee, because I think it encompasses all nationalities and all religious faiths and is even a better resolution than the Murray resolution in which some of us joined and the Hendrickson resolution, in which other Senators joined. The authors of those two resolutions have indicated this afternoon, that they, too, welcome broadening terms of the committee's resolution, with the very desirable Ives amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the resolution before the Senate, Senate Resolution 84, has caused little dispute. We are being asked to do one thing—to condemn the persecution of minorities by world communism. We are being asked to express our sense of shock and outrage over the reports from behind the Iron Curtain.

As a people devoted to liberty, we can scarcely do less. As a people devoted to God, we cannot fail to assert our deep sympathy with those whom the Soviet atheists are persecuting because they are Catholics, Protestants, Jews, or Moslems.

The record is very clear. It cannot be disputed by reasonable men who have the facts anywhere. For their own political ends, the Communists are determined to crush every faith, every group, which in any way seeks to dispute their claim to world domination.

Since the record is clear, the responsibility must be fixed. The world must be given a clear choice—an opportunity to observe the difference between a totalitarian system erected to glorify the state and a democratic system erected to protect and glorify the individual soul.

Through this resolution, Congress can, and should, speak with a single voice. We would request the President to place our protest before the councils of the world so that all can see where we stand.

This action is in line with our historic policy. I can see no objection to its passage, and I hope its receives a unanimous vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McCarran
Anderson	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Barrett	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Mundt
Bush	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smathers
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Taft
Ellender	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Tobey
Fulbright	Long	Welker
George	Magnuson	Wiley
Gillette	Malone	Williams
Goldwater	Mansfield	Young
Gore	Martin	
Green	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in order to impress upon Soviet Russia the fact that we mean business in what we are doing, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Nebraska, and the Senator from Connecticut would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] are both necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Butler, Md.	Clements
Anderson	Butler, Nebr.	Daniel
Barrett	Byrd	Dirksen
Bennett	Capehart	Douglas
Bridges	Carlson	Duff
Bush	Case	Dworshak

Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Kefauver	Pastore
Ferguson	Kennedy	Payne
Fulbright	Kerr	Potter
George	Kilgore	Robertson
Gillette	Knowland	Russell
Goldwater	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Gore	Langer	Schoeppel
Green	Lehman	Smathers
Hayden	Long	Smith, Maine
Hendrickson	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Hennings	Malone	Stennis
Hickenlooper	Mansfield	Taft
Hill	Martin	Thye
Hoey	Maybank	Tobey
Holland	McCarran	Welker
Humphrey	McCarthy	Wiley
Hunt	Millikin	Williams
Ives	Morse	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Mundt	
Johnson, Tex.	Murray	

NOT VOTING—17

Beall	Frear	Purtell
Bricker	Griswold	Smith, N. C.
Chavez	Jackson	Sparkman
Cooper	Jenner	Symington
Cordon	McClellan	Watkins
Flanders	Monroney	

So the resolution (S. Res. 84), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the vicious and inhuman campaigns conducted by the Soviet Government and its puppet governments in satellite states in Europe and Asia against minority groups such as the persecution of Greek orthodox congregations, the imprisonment of Roman Catholic prelates, the harassment of Protestant denominations, the suppression of Moslem communities, the persecution and scattering of ethnic groups in Poland, in the Ukraine, in the Baltic, and Balkan States and in many other areas under Soviet domination, and most recently the increasing persecution of the people of the Jewish faith, deserve the strongest condemnation by all peoples who believe that spiritual values are the bases of human progress and freedom.

Resolved further, That the President of the United States is hereby urged to take appropriate action to protest, particularly in the General Assembly of the United Nations, against these outrages, in order that the United Nations shall take such action in opposition to them as may be suitable under its charter.

COMPROMISE SETTLEMENTS IN THE ALCOHOL TAX UNIT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have called attention to the manner in which large tax assessments have been compromised by the Income Tax Division of the Treasury Department for a fraction of the proposed assessment.

Today I wish to call attention to the manner in which the Alcohol Tax Unit, another division of the Treasury Department, likewise has been settling proposed tax deficiencies on exceedingly lenient terms.

I am placing in the RECORD specific examples of some of these settlements, showing that in some cases agreements have been made for an insignificant fraction of 1 percent.

Without debating the merits or demerits of the proposed assessments, I do point out that if these were bona fide tax obligations, then the insignificant fractions for which these claims were settled are perfectly ridiculous and unjustifiable.

On the other hand, if these cases were settled on the basis that the Government did not think they could justify claims greater than that for which the cases were settled, then the false claims by the Government constitute nothing short of blackmail.

What possible explanation can be given for settling a $521,000 tax lien for $100? Surely these are not merely "boxcar" figures selected by the Government for bargaining purposes. For the United States Government to file against any taxpayer a claim greater than that which the Treasury Department conscientiously believes the taxpayer owes is just as wrong as it is for a taxpayer to report to the Government less than what he thinks is his actual tax obligation.

I believe that the new administration should establish the policy that in cases where the taxpayer and the Treasury Department have agreed upon X amount as being the obligation any compromise settlement thereafter should automatically be public information.

This publicity would not embarrass those cases in which the Government and the taxpayer are in dispute as to the liability but would apply in cases where compromises are made after an agreement upon the liability has been reached.

The fact that these glaring examples of compromise settlements which I am placing in the RECORD today were in some instances approved by public officials whose own honesty and integrity have been challenged during the recent months does not alleviate our concern over the conditions in the Alcohol Tax Unit.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks several specific examples of compromise settlements in the Alcohol Tax Division of the Treasury Department.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approval date	Name and address	Chief Counsel, Commissioner, Secretary	Years involved	Tax due	Compromise settlement
Oct. 29, 1943	Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co., 235 West Galena St., Milwaukee, Wis.	Wenchel, Kennedy (Acting Deputy Commissioner, Alcohol Tax Unit).	1942-43	$261,189.00	$4,225

Charge: Liability under section 3150 (a), Internal Revenue Code, as amended to deficiency tax in respect to oversize packages of beer removed from brewery premises bearing internal-revenue beer stamps not of the proper denominations required for tax payment in full of the contents, as prescribed in this statute.

Statement of facts: On March 8, 1943, and subsequent dates, inspectors made tests of cooperage at the proponent's premises to determine their volumetric capacities. Their report dated June 24, 1943, copy herewith, and another report of the same date concerning violations of internal-revenue laws and regulations were transmitted to the Bureau for consideration and advice. In letter of August 18, 1943, AT:A:AHN, the district supervisor was advised that the submission of an offer in compromise could be invited in reference to tax liabilities incurred through the use of one-half barrels found to be oversize, computed on the basis of the tax on the actual quantity of beer removed in these packages, giving proper credit for the tolerance.

The inspection report set forth that in reference to oversize half-barrel packages used by this brewer during the period of May 1, 1942, to May 31, 1943, the additional tax liability incurred was computed as being $261,189, under the provisions of section 3150 (a), Internal Revenue Code, as amended, representing the difference in value of the stamps used on the packages and the stamps of the next higher denomination. The report contained also the amount of tax due on the beer removed in the oversize cooperage of the half-barrel size in excess of the rated capacity plus tolerance allowed or $4,223.07. This latter amount was the one considered in determining the amount of the offer under the instructions in the Bureau letter above referred to.

Offer in compromise: An offer in the amount of $4,225 had been submitted by the proponent in compromise of the additional tax liability incurred with respect to beer removed in oversize wood half-barrel packages, imposed by section 3150 (a), Internal Revenue Code.

The recommendations of district supervisor were as follows: "Inasmuch as the amount of the offer in compromise of tax liability is computed in the instant case in conformance with Bureau policy and the exact amount of tax liability owed by the proponent by use of oversize cooperage cannot be determined, it is recommended that the offer in compromise be accepted."

Approval date	Name and address	Chief Counsel, Commissioner, Secretary	Year involved	Tax due	Compromise settlement
Mar. 11, 1942	John L. Boitano, 215 East Washington St., Petaluma, Calif.	Wenchel, Kennedy (acting)	1937	$521,601.40	$100

Criminal phase: On September 13, 1937, John L. Boitano was indicted by the Federal grand jury.

On October 5, 1937, Boitano plead guilty to all counts of the indictment and was sentenced to 2 years in the Federal penitentiary and fined $10,000.

Recommendation of the district supervisor for acceptance of compromise was made on the following basis:

The taxpayer stated that the offer of $100 represented the maximum amount that he was able to offer in settlement of this liability. Because there appeared to be a possibility that the proponent was

liable for only a small part of the total assessment involved in the case and because he did not appear to possess any distrainable assets in excess of the $100 it was recommended that the offer be accepted.

As a result of this violation the following assessment of $521,604.40 was entered against Charles Garroll, Pengrove, Calif., and John L. Boitano, Petaluma, Calif., dated December 1937.

Approval date	Name and address	Chief Counsel, Commissioner, Secretary	Year involved	Tax due	Compromise settlement
Aug. 23, 1943	Alfred J. Aberle (liquor dealer), 207 West 106th St., New York, N. Y.	Leming (acting), Helvering, Sullivan (acting)	1931	$436,830.82	$7,500

This case was included in a list of compromise settlements released July 2, 1952; however, it is included here as an additional example of settlements in the Alcohol Tax Unit.

Approval date	Name and address	Chief Counsel, Commissioner, Secretary	Years involved	Tax due	Compromise settlement
Aug. 7, 1942	The Fidelity and Casualty Co. of New York, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, as surety for the Quinoids Corp. (distilled spirits), 13-15-17 Crosby St., New York, N. Y.	Wenchel, Berkshire	1937-39	$262,305.70	$15,500

Disposition of criminal case: The principal and others were charged with conspiracy to violate the internal revenue laws of the United States through diversion, in fraud of the revenue, for privilege purpose of tax-free, specially denatured alcohol. They were arrested, convicted, and sentenced in connection with such violation.

The Quinoid Corp. had on file with the following bonds executed by the Fidelity & Casualty Co., of New York:

Bond	Effective date	Terminated
$10,000	Nov. 27, 1936	Oct. 19, 1938
$1,000	May 13, 1938	Do.
$12,000	July 1, 1938	

NOTE.—The liability was incurred during the period January 1937 to June 1939.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in the following case an assessment of $678,071.11 was proposed against the La Pompadour, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn.—Samuel S. Kauffman, president; Harry L. Wyman, vice president—for violations during the period of June 10, 1927, to January 1, 1934.

This proposed tax deficiency was assessed against not only the company but also a series of individuals, officers and stockholders.

Between January 1944 and March 1948 these various individuals, named below, each reached an agreement with the Alcohol Tax Unit of the United States Treasury Department settling their joint obligation.

This company was engaged in the manufacture of cosmetics and barber preparations, and the charge was made that they also operated as wholesale bootleggers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the details of these compromise settlements by the different individuals may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the details regarding the compromise settlements of the individuals connected with La Pompadour, Inc., was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approval date	Name and address	Chief Counsel, Commissioner, Secretary	Tax due	Compromise settlement
Jan. 25, 1944	Burton W. Beidelman (alias Bud), 4617 Casco Ave., Minneapolis, Minn.	Wenchel, Hannegan, Kennedy (Acting Deputy Commissioner, Alcohol Tax Unit)	[1] $678,070.11	$1,000
May 18, 1944	Harry L. Wyman (alias Harry L. Weisman or Weisman), Bertha Sharp Wyman, and Sam Sharp, 1779 Irving Ave. South, Minneapolis, Minn.	Wenchel, Nunan, Sullivan, Berkshire	[1] 678,070.11	1,625
	Samuel S. Kauffman, 1620 Penn Ave. North, Minneapolis, Minn.		[1] 678,070.11	1,000
Jan. 22, 1948	Joseph Boucher, Route No. 2, Minneapolis, Minn.	Oliphant, Mealey (Deputy Commissioner, Alcohol Tax Unit)	[1] 678,070.11	1,000
Mar. 18, 1948	Casper F. Scheller, 1415 16th Ave., North, Minneapolis, Minn.	do	[1] 678,070.11	500
June 23, 1947	Ruvin Nevisky (Rueben Nevisky), 226 West 17th St., New York, N. Y.	Wenchel, Mealey (Deputy Commissioner, Alcohol Tax Unit)	[1] 678,070.11	200

[1] Date and place of violation, 1927-36, Minneapolis, Minn.

Approval date	Name and address	Chief Counsel, Commissioner, Secretary	Years involved	Tax due	Compromise settlement
May 2, 1945	The J. R. Watkins Co., Winona, Minn	Wenchel, Nunan, Berkshire, James J. O'Connell (acting)	1928-44	$3,000,000.00	$500,000

The compromise settlement bore the following notations:

"The offer submitted covers the 1934 floor stocks tax and no tax was due for 1938. The company has stipulated that it will withdraw a claim pending in the Bureau in the amount of $17,618.24, and another in the amount of $16,156.73, as well as application for relief under section 722 of the Revenue Act of 1942 in the amount of something over $400,000, all of which are pending in the Income Tax Unit.

"As soon as the offer is accepted, we will then assess floor stocks tax in the amount of $458,789.66, plus 25-percent penalty of $114,987.15, or a total of $473,776.81, which will be promptly paid.

"The Alcohol Tax Unit will, therefore, receive almost $1,000,000 for violations on the part of this company, and in addition thereto the Bureau will benefit to the extent of the amount of the claims pending in the Income Tax Unit.

"Disposition of criminal case: In view of the number of years that have passed since violations can be definitely established, no criminal action has been instituted.

"Financial responsibility: No investigation of the financial responsibility of this proponent has been made.

"Bond history: Due to the fact that copies of bonds prior to July 1, 1940, have been destroyed, this office cannot give a detailed history of the bonds covering the years of the violation. Consents of surety have not been filed with the offer in compromise."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish particularly to call attention to one of the settlements, namely, the last one incorporated in the RECORD, involving the J. R. Watkins Co., of Winona, Minn.

The amazing part about the settlement of the J. R. Watkins Co. is that the criminal phase was completely ignored and the compromise agreement reached by the Treasury Department apparently without any consultation with the Department of Justice.

The following correspondence between Victor R. Anderson, United States attorney of the District of Minnesota, and the Assistant Attorney General, Theron L. Caudle, clearly demonstrates the arbitrary manner in which these cases were handled.

I ask unanimous consent that this correspondence between the United States Attorney and Mr. Caudle, along with the memorandum signed by Mr. Berkshire be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 18, 1945.

The honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Hon. Theron L. Caudle, Assistant Attorney General.)

DEAR MR. CAUDLE: For some time rumors have been reaching this office that the Watkins Co., a large manufacturer of extracts, patent medicines and cosmetics at Winona, Minn., has effected a compromise with the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Internal Revenue whereby there was paid in excess of $1 million for liability growing out of illegal diversion of alcohol, and which we are being told was for both civil and criminal liability.

The Federal judges in this district have indicated quite clearly and rather forcibly that they feel in matters of this nature only civil liability should be settled through administrative channels, and that the criminal liability, whether by payment of fine or other disposition, should be handled through the courts.

Of course, we have no way of knowing what may be involved in the above matter, which presumably never reached your office, but when the facts become known it may subject the administration to rather severe criticism that a large concern like the Watkins Co. can effect a disposition upon the payment of a fine, while smaller concerns for violations of much less magnitude have criminal penalties imposed, and in certain cases prison sentences.

We are also led to believe that the same is true with respect to Walter J. Gaertner, a liquor dealer in St. Paul, who we are told effected a settlement with the collector of internal revenue of $40,000 for income-tax liability. We mention these matters to you so that the Department may know what other governmental agencies are doing which may subject the administration to rather serious adverse criticism and probably reflect on the Department of Justice as well.

Wishing you and your fine staff the compliments of the season, I am,

Yours very truly,

VICTOR E. ANDERSON,
United States Attorney.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1946.

STEWART BERKSHIRE, Esq.,
Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Alcohol Tax Unit, Washington, D. C.

Re Watkins Co., Winona, Minn., and Walter J. Gaertner, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. BERKSHIRE: There is transmitted herewith copy of a letter, dated December 18, 1945, from the United States attorney for the District of Minnesota, in which he refers, for the reasons stated therein, to the alleged acceptance by your Unit of an offer of approximately $1,000,000 in compromise of criminal and civil liability of the Watkins Co., of Winona, Minn., growing out of the alleged diversion of alcohol in the manufacture of patent medicines.

Reference is also made to an alleged settlement with the Collector of Internal Revenue for $40,000 of the income tax liability of Walter J. Gaertner, a liquor dealer in St. Paul, Minn.

This Department has no information concerning these alleged settlements and, in order that we may make proper reply to the United States attorney, we would thank you for such comments and information as you may deem appropriate to submit with respect to the facts and circumstances surrounding the compromise of the above cases.

Respectfully,

THERON L. CAUDLE,
Assistant Attorney General
(For the Attorney General).

JANUARY 14, 1946.

MEMORANDUM FOR DEPUTY COMMISSIONER ALLEN, INCOME TAX UNIT

There are transmitted herewith a copy of a letter from the Department of Justice, dated January 3, 1946, and a copy of a letter addressed to the Attorney General by Victor E. Anderson, United States attorney, relative to the compromise of criminal and civil liabilities by the J. R. Watkins Co., Winona, Minn., growing out of the alleged diversion of alcohol, and the alleged settlement of income tax liabilities of Walter J. Gaertner, St. Paul, Minn.

The Attorney General has requested the Bureau to furnish information relative to the facts and circumstances surrounding the settlement of the cases.

The inquiry concerning the liabilities of the J. R. Watkins Co. is being answered by this Unit. Copies of the letters are being forwarded to you for whatever action you consider necessary concerning the inquiry relative to Walter J. Gaertner.

STEWART BERKSHIRE,
Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Can the Senator tell me under whose administration these tax frauds occurred?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have placed in the RECORD the facts in the cases, which show that the compromises in question were under the old administration. I notice the names of Mr. Wenchel, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Mealey, Mr. Berkshire, Mr. Nunan, and Mr. Oliphant as the officials approving the settlements.

Mr. WELKER. All of these settlements occurred prior to the new administration?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right; they were made in the period 1940–48. These settlements are being published for information of the public in order that we might all know how the past administration enforced the tax laws against this group.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, today we are faced with serious problems in our agricultural economy. For several years we have been in a period of declining farm prices, lowered net farm income, and unmanageable surpluses which have been built up by the preceding administration. These surpluses, which have been inherited as a part of the Truman legacy, are accumulative at a shocking rate. If unchecked, they ultimately will threaten our entire agricultural program.

The new Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, is fully aware of the problems of his Department. In repeated statements he has given evidence that not only is he concerned, but also he is determined to take effective steps to restore again to American agriculture stability, freedom of action, and local control.

All American citizens must be concerned with the condition of our farm economy. Ultimately, the safety, the security, and the well-being of all our people are dependent upon our basic agriculture.

The farmers of my State are vitally concerned with the agricultural problems, but the immediate impact of the present conditions falls most heavily on the farmers and cattle feeders of the great midwestern Corn Belt area. As chairman of the Appropriations Committee, it will soon be my responsibility to make certain recommendations concerning the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. Consequently, I arise today to point out certain basic facts which we must all consider.

In the speech made at Des Moines, Iowa, by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, I was appalled by the statements in which he told the American people that we have in storage corn that is in an extreme state of deterioration and is threatened with total spoilage. He cited one case at Orena, Ill., involving 142 carloads of corn. This corn, when stored was of the highest grade. However, 60 percent of it has now deteriorated to the lowest possible commercial grade. The Secretary warned that if this corn were stored until the spring germination period, it probably would be a total loss. The American taxpayer must pay the bill for this waste.

It is extremely important that in this new administration we realistically appraise the situation and face the facts as they are; not as we would like them to be.

Under the leadership of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been conducting investigations into the present storage program of the six basic commodities, namely, corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco.

On the basis of the information thus far disclosed, it is apparent that the entire price support program has been maladministered, to the detriment of the American farmer and the American consuming public.

The conditions which have been revealed in the corn storage program give all of us cause for alarm, since if these same conditions exist in the storage of the other commodities, the cost to the American taxpayer will run into the billions of dollars. In these perilous times, when our whole national security and the security of the free world depend upon a strong American economy, we can ill afford to allow waste to run rampant in the administration of our farm program.

In the past a great deal of politics has been played with the agricultural program of the United States. Responsible Members on both sides of this aisle must be aware that we cannot afford to tamper with programs which affect the security and welfare of our Nation.

It is a fact that under the leadership of our party, with support from many members of the Democratic Party, in the 80th Congress there was established a realistic, workable price-support farm program. The Agricultural Act of 1948 was the first permanent price-support program ever placed upon the statute books of our Nation. In 1949 there was enacted an amended version of the 1948 Agricultural Act. It was sponsored by the former Secretary of Agriculture, and was known as the Anderson Act. It provided the same basic safeguards for American agriculture that had been established by the previous legislation. If these laws had been properly administered, the condition which faces us today would not exist.

Neither of these two laws was permitted to function as written, within the intent and purpose of the Congress, for reasons which all of us understand.

To cite one example, both of these acts contained a provision for the release of corn under the discretionary powers of the Secretary of Agriculture. When a drought hit the southwest portion of our country corn was not released in adequate quantities to alleviate the condition. When the cattle feeders needed feed in order to hold their cattle, to raise the grade of their beef, and to preserve their breeding herds, sufficient corn was not released, even though it was available for sale in Government storage.

This incident alone demonstrates the poor administration of the program. The law provided specific steps for the orderly disposal of these stocks, which had been accumulated by the Government. The law was never utilized and the steps were never taken.

I know that in a few brief months the Senate Appropriations Committee will be asked to pass upon appropriations for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which handles the storage program under the Agricultural Act of 1949. Obviously we cannot intelligently proceed to appropriate these monies unless we know what the situation is today in regard to accumulated surpluses. We cannot follow the past record of appropriating money "in the dark." Distressing though the facts may be, therefore, it is comforting to know that under the able leadership of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], our Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is proceeding as rapidly as possible to determine the existing condition and to affix the responsibility.

The role of our party, however, has changed considerably since November 1952. As the original authors of a sensible agricultural program which has been maladministered and misadministered by our predecessors, it now becomes our task to redirect this program so that it will conform to the basic purposes for which the legislation originally was placed on the statute books.

I have every confidence in the integrity and the sincerity of purpose of our new Secretary of Agriculture. I know he understands the law as it was originally enacted by the Congress. He has repeatedly said he will administer this law within the intent and purpose of the Congress.

The original purposes of our price guaranty, our forward-pricing program, were twofold: First, it was to insure the farmer against the inherent hazards of his enterprise; second, it was to guarantee an adequate food supply at fair prices to the people of the United States, and, at the same time, return to the farmer a fair share of the rewards of his labor.

Within the existing framework of this legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture is faced with mandatory demands which, if followed, insure the proper and equitable function of this law. Those safeguards were placed there by the Congress. The record that has been exposed to us to date indicates that these provisions were not followed by the preceding administration. We have a responsibility to the people of the United States to see that this condition never occurs again.

There are eight tests which the Secretary of Agriculture is required, under the law, to apply before determining the production needs and setting the price-support levels. These are:

First. The supply and demand for every commodity;

Second. The price levels at which other commodities are being supported and, in the case of grains, their feeding value as measured in terms of corn;

Third. The availability of price-support funds;

Fourth. The perishability of the commodity;

Fifth. The importance of the commodity to agriculture and the rest of the economy;

Sixth. His ability to dispose of stocks, acquired under a price-support level;

Seventh. The need for offsetting export losses; and

Eighth. The ability and willingness of farmers to keep supply and demand in line.

Obviously, if these yardsticks had been applied in determining the production goals for the American farmer during the years of the preceding administration, there would have been no embarrassing or unmanageable accumulations on which today we face spoilage and total loss.

It would be foolhardy for anyone to state that the problems which are before us in agriculture can be quickly and easily solved. This is not an age of miracles. Nevertheless, the problems were made by men, and they can be solved by men.

A majority of this Senate believes that the Agricultural Act now on the books is a valid, workable, realistic approach to the agricultural problems of our Nation. A majority of us still believe that, if properly administered, this law would have prevented the agricultural problems we now face. Furthermore, if properly administered, this law will go far toward the solution of the existing problem and the prevention of similar problems in the future.

There seems to be no need for crippling amendments which will hamstring the present Secretary of Agriculture in the performance of his duty. Although temporarily suspended, discretionary powers provided by the existing legislation enable the Secretary of Agriculture to restore stability and security to our American farm program. It would be a disservice to the people of the country to force upon the Secretary of Agriculture, by means of additional legislation, compulsory price-supports for certain commodities. What he needs now is a demonstration of our confidence in his ability to administer properly the law we have written.

In my previous remarks I have had no intention of implying that the agricultural outlook for 1953 and 1954 is a depressing one. The forces determining the level of prices which farmers will receive for their products, which in turn will reflect itself in prices paid by all consumers, will be determined by the level of domestic demand, the strength of foreign demand, and the volume of farm products offered for sale.

Farm prices for most products for which price supports are in effect are now resting on, or are temporarily sagging below, the support level. The best informed sources indicate that these prices are not likely to drop much lower, even though unusually favorable crop yields are realized.

Our high rate of population growth requires increased farm output each year merely to make it possible to maintain existing levels of per capita consumption for our present high standard of diet. It is the earnest hope of every American that the standard of our diet will be increased, rather than decreased. It is the intention of this administration to see that that comes about.

Our agricultural program is not a program of scarcity. It is a program of abundance which seeks to guarantee to the 156 million Americans the most healthy and nutritious foods that can be provided by a free-enterprise system.

I know that the farm problems of New Hampshire and New England are not identical with those of the great grain, meat, and fiber-producing areas of our country. I do not profess to be an expert on the specific problems of all agriculture. I do take a modest pride in the fact that as far as I know I am the only Member of the United States Senate who, at one time, served as a county agriculture agent, a State agricultural extension specialist, as well as a secretary of a farm organization. What I know about farmers and farm management I learned on a farm.

As I observe the picture, I conclude that the agricultural outlook for 1953 and 1954 is relatively good. There are some readjustments that must be made. I do not stand here and propose that this administration outpromise the New Deal or the Fair Deal. I do say that the accumulation of evidence convinces me that our farm economy is fundamentally strong and that the farmers of America can look ahead to the future with confidence. In the 2 years ahead, therefore, let us move forward calmly and constructively. Let us ignore the cries of alarm which are raised by special pleaders for political purposes and let us again reestablish under the law a sound farm program which is in keeping with a society of free men and free enterprise.

TAXES AND BUDGETS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to discuss for approximately 5 or 10 minutes a subject which I believe is important as we approach the date of March 15.

Mr. President, as we approach the date of March 15, there are two topics that seem to be uppermost in the minds of our citizens, namely, taxes and budgets.

During recent years our tax burden has grown by leaps and bounds. Our Federal budget has and is mushrooming to a figure that is incomprehensible. Ever-increasing Federal taxes and budgets must be stopped.

Early in 1952 the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] drew on his long experience as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to make a much-quoted statement. He said:

> Excessive taxation is not the answer to inflation. The cure lies rather in the adoption of an expenditure program tailored to fit the ability of our people to pay.

The overwhelming truth of this sound viewpoint was emphasized for me when I read a table in a new book, Executive Pay Plans, by J. K. Lasser and William J. Casey, two tax authorities. This table shows that top management, that is, the highest paid 1 percent of employees; the middle management group; and the men in the bottom supervision level, foreman or equivalent, are much worse off today than they were in 1939. I believe this table should be headed Liquidating Our Middle Class.

The table is as follows:

Liquidating our middle class

	Average pay		Increase	1950 pay after taxes and inflation	Real change
	1939	1950			
			Percent		*Percent*
Top management (highest paid 1 percent of total employees)	$43,700	$59,300	35	$18,000	−59
Middle management (next 9 percent)	10,500	15,200	45	6,300	−40
Bottom supervision level (foremen or equivalent)	3,000	5,500	83	2,600	−13
Middle management labor (salaried and hourly employees covered by wage and hour law—includes white collar)	1,650	3,400	106	1,700	3

NOTE.—The above table is reprinted from Executive Pay Plans by J. K. Lasser and William J. Casey. The data was compiled from a survey of 41 leading companies by McKinsey & Co., management firm.

As we study this table it is well to bear in mind that the Senator from Georgia said, in the statement already referred to, about our middle class in America:

> Our middle class is the group in the structure of our Nation which is seldom, if ever, represented by spokesmen before committees of the Congress or by lobbyists. They provide the country with our professional men and women, with the proprietors of our small businesses, with the managers and salesmen for our industrial and commercial enterprises as well as a large segment of our local, State, and Federal officials. They constitute the very backbone of the country and from their savings must come the private investment capital essential for jobs and production. Great Britain is a tragic example of what can happen if the welfare of the middle-class citizen is ignored in a scramble for taxes to support swollen government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to continue, if the Senator will permit, until I conclude my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

It seems to me our greatest responsibility today is to bring our Federal expenditures to a point where the budget is not only balanced, but, in addition, we must have a program of progressive tax reduction. It is my hope that we can bring this tax reduction into effect in 1953.

I believe every Member of Congress must agree with the President's statement that our first obligation is to bring a balanced budget in sight.

With this thought in mind, I requested Mr. Colin F. Stam, of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to furnish me a table giving the actual expenditures, receipts, deficits, or surplus from the year 1946 to 1952. The table prepared by him reads as follows:

[In billions of dollars]

Fiscal year ending June 30	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952
Expenditures	60.7	39.3	33.8	40.1	40.2	44.6	65.1
Receipts	40.0	40.0	42.2	38.2	37.0	48.1	62.1
Deficit	20.7	----	----	1.8	3.1	----	4.0
Surplus	----	.8	8.4	----	----	3.5	----

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and may not subtract to the surplus or deficit.

President Truman, in submitting his budget for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954, submitted an estimate of expenditures in 1953 of $74.6 billion and estimated receipts of $68.7 billion, leaving a deficit of $5.9 billion.

For the year 1954 President Truman estimated expenditures of $78.6 billion with receipts of $68.7 billion and a deficit on June 30, 1954, of $9.9 billion.

Estimate of expenditures and receipts by Mr. Truman for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954

[In billions of dollars]

	1953	1954
Expenditures	74.6	78.6
Receipts	68.7	68.7
Deficit	5.9	9.9

The budget presented in January by the outgoing administration called for expenditures of $74.6 billion in the fiscal year 1953.

In the first 6 months of that fiscal year, July 1 through December 31, 1952, expenditures were made at the annual rate of $73 billion. Expenditures during January 1953 were at an annual rate of $68.8 billion. Thus it would appear that the mere coming into office of the present administration with its known purpose of reducing expenditures has already been felt in the first month of its experience.

It seems to me that the directive issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, with the approval of the President, with a view to making substantial revision in the budget of the former administration, is already bearing fruit.

In this directive to all departments and agency heads in the executive branch, Mr. Dodge stated in part:

> It is clear that the budget will not be brought under control without action to reduce budgetary obligational authority, reduce the level of expenditures, critically examine existing programs, restrain commitments for new programs, and generally drive for greater efficiency and reduced costs.

The sharp reduction in expenditures during January, coupled with the policy outlined in the directive of freezing expenditures and the wholehearted desire of the Congress to eliminate wasteful spending, gives every indication that we will at least be able to hold expenditures down to the 1952 budget expenditure level of $66.1 billion.

It is interesting to note that in the last year of President Truman's administration, or the year 1952, the expenditures were $66.1 billion.

It is also interesting to note the sharp increase in Mr. Truman's estimates for 1953 over the actual expenditures for 1952, namely, an increase of $8.5 billion. The increase for 1954 over 1953 is $4 billion, and the increase in fiscal 1954 over fiscal 1952 is $12.5 billion.

I mention these figures because I think it is important to note that the previous administration had its peak of Federal expenditures in 1952 when the total was $66.1 billion.

Regardless of the swollen budget that the previous administration has attempted for fiscal 1953, we should bring the total spending for the current year to a figure not exceeding $66.1 billion. This calls for readjustments and cutbacks but the people expect it of us. The budget for fiscal 1954 will be entirely in our hands and our goal should be a lower figure than Mr. Truman's biggest year of spending.

Mr. President, we have a mandate to ignore the astronomical estimate of expenditures bequeathed us by the former administration. We can discharge that mandate and start lifting the excessive burden of taxation from the backs of the American people if we have the determination. A spending ceiling for the current year of not more than $66 billion and a budget of something less than that in fiscal 1954 is the answer. The way to put our Federal finances in order is to start now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from Kansas if he realizes that the national debt today is about $267.5 billion?

Mr. CARLSON. I fully realize that if some provision is not made to take care of expenditures contemplated by the present budget, it will be necessary to lift the debt limit above the present $275 billion.

Mr. MORSE. I listened to the Senator's statement about balancing the budget but I did not hear him say what he would propose to do about the national debt. We shall have to do more than balance the budget. We cannot justify increasing the national debt by increasing interest rates on Government bonds.

Mr. CARLSON. I think we shall have to begin afresh, and to do first things first, namely, to balance the budget. I will go along with the junior Senator from Oregon not only in the matter of balancing the budget, but also in taking steps to reduce the national debt.

Mr. MORSE. Do I understand the Senator correctly that not only will it be necessary to start paying on the debt, but that we shall have to do something about the rates of interest now being paid on Government bonds?

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with that idea.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator believe that raising the interest rate on Government bonds, which the administration has already proposed, will add hundreds of millions of dollars to the debt?

Mr. CARLSON. The problems are economic in character, and they affect the general picture of business operations as a whole throughout the country. I believe they will be considered.

Mr. MORSE. If giving the bankers the unjustified profits they want, in order to enable them to invest more freely in Government bonds, is the solution of our economic problems, I will concede that I think the Senator's proposal would work. But to increase the interest rates on Government bonds, in order to get the people to invest, when it ought to be their patriotic duty to invest, is to put a dollar sign on patriotism in the United States. I think the proposal is a reflection on the Republican administration.

Mr. CARLSON. Of course, the junior Senator from Oregon is entitled to his views on the question of financing our public debt, which was inherited by the present administration. I am certain that he is quite familiar with the efforts made to refinance the debt on a short-term basis. The people of the country were offered the bonds, but until recently only a very small percentage of them was bought because, as I am advised, the interest rate was too low. If the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon desires banks and insurance companies of the United States to take the bonds, then the rates must be established on a sound basis.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Kansas, with respect to what he believes the junior Senator from Oregon thinks ought to be done, that several years ago, when the junior Senator from Oregon proposed on the floor of the Senate a series of amendments which would have undertaken to correct the tax inequities in which we find ourselves today he could not get a hearing.

I think the Eisenhower administration stands today in a very poor position when it proposes to increase the national debt and expects the poor people of the country to pay the rising interest rates, in order that bankers may make their economic killing.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Oregon will find that the junior Senator from Kansas will be right here with him, trying to hold down expenditures, so that it will not be necessary to increase the limit on the national debt.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am interested in the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon desires to lay responsibility for the increased interest rates on the Eisenhower administration. Before I left my home town of Custer, S. Dak. to return to the present session of Congress, my country banker called me in and said, "What do you think of the announcement with respect to the offering of Government bonds at an increased rate of interest with the national debt as high as it is?"

The increased rate of interest was not proposed by the Eisenhower administration; the rate was raised by the previous administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the record is clearly against the Senator from South Dakota as to who increased the interest rates. The present Secretary of the Treasury has made a public announcement, stating the Eisenhower administration's proposal for the increased rate of interest, so it appears very plain that it is the new administration which has advocated it.

The new Secretary of the Treasury has made a clear record showing that he is the one who proposed, in his public statement, increasing the interest rates, for which the people of small income in America, will now have to pay millions of dollars in taxes to cover the higher interest rates. The debt which will accrue will descend to American boys and girls a hundred years from now.

Mr. CASE. The record is not against the junior Senator from South Dakota. If the junior Senator from Oregon wishes to see a facsimile of it, I think I can still supply him with the announcement made in December that Government bonds would be sold at an increased interest rate. That announcement was in advance of the taking office by the new administration.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have listened with interest to the able address by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I wish to congratulate him and to concur in what he has said.

I do not make these remarks in critical vein, and I do not wish anyone to think that I am trying to lecture, but the Congress of the United States, and the Congress only, controls the amount of money which is appropriated each and every year. It is not the President of the United States who appropriates the money.

If the national debt is too high, if our expenditures are too high, if our taxes are too high, then that is the responsibility of the Congress of the United States, because Congress, and Congress alone, controls the purse strings. If Congress believes that expenditures ought to be reduced, Congress ought to reduce them. We ought not to blame anyone other than ourselves.

As I said on the floor of the Senate about a year ago, if we are concerned about who is to blame for huge expenditures, then all we have to do when we go home tonight is to take a good look in our mirrors, and we will be looking at those who are responsible for huge expenditures.

I do not know whether Congress can reduce expenditures by five, ten, or fifteen billion dollars, but I know it is our responsibility, and ours alone. We ought to accept that responsibility. If we do not reduce expenditures, then we ought to blame ourselves, and no one else. We, and we alone, have the authority. We have the responsibility. We cannot shift it to the President of the United States or to anyone else. I do not think we can much longer sell the American people on the idea that someone other than ourselves is responsible.

So I will join with the other 95 Senators in reducing expenditures, reducing taxes, and balancing the budget. We ought to accept the responsibility, and we ought to do it in the spirit that it is our responsibility and our authority. We ought not to blame anyone else for what has happened in the past, because we, and we alone, hold the entire responsibility. We are the only body in the whole wide world which has 100-percent control of the amount of money which the President and the Government spend each year.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FINANCES

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, recently I asked for a fiscal preview of the District of Columbia government's position for the next 8 or 10 years and received an enlightening response from Mr. Walter Fowler, District Budget Officer.

Soon the District Committee and the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District will be studying Washington's municipal finances again, and I believe this an opportune time to lay before the Senate Mr. Fowler's brief analysis.

I shall not comment on it myself at this time, but I also wish to present an editorial from the Washington Daily News which bears on Mr. Fowler's comments. I ask unanimous consent at this time that my letter to Mr. Fowler, his reply, and the editorial referred to may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1953.

Mr. WALTER FOWLER,
Budget Officer, District of Columbia, District Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FOWLER: In my position as chairman of the District Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs, I think it would be helpful for me to have a little analysis by you of the District's current fiscal outlook for the next 8 or 10 years.

I would be most grateful if you could supply me with such a statement.

With kind regards, I remain

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
OFFICE OF THE BUDGET,
February 4, 1953.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: This is in reference to your letter of February 3, 1953, in which you requested me to supply you with an analysis of the District's current fiscal outlook for the next 8 or 10 years.

The 1954 budget as transmitted to Congress is a balanced budget. However, with respect to the general fund alone, it contemplates the use of unappropriated surpluses and unexpended balances of prior years amounting to $10,330,968. Over a period of years we have been relying upon surpluses and unexpended balances to make up a considerable part of our revenue availability in the general fund, but we do not believe that we can continue indefinitely to rely upon that source.

Disregarding for the purpose of this report any contemplated long-term public-works program, such as is recommended by the Addison committee, and thinking in terms of normal revenue availability, normal operating and maintenance costs, and normal capital outlay for public works improvements, the picture at this time presents itself as follows:

The three special funds (highway fund, water fund, and motor-vehicle parking fund) can be adjusted to remain within available revenues, providing no large construction program is undertaken.

However, with reference to the general fund, and based upon a normal increase in revenues, an increase of 3 percent each year in operating expenses, and an average expenditure each year of $10 million in capital outlay for public works improvements, it would appear that beginning with the fiscal year 1955 we would be in serious financial difficulties unless new tax legislation is enacted or unless the Federal payment is materially increased. It is estimated that the deficit in the general fund at the end of the fiscal year 1962—under the conditions mentioned above, but without new tax legislation or increased Federal payment—would be over $100 million.

The enactment of pay-increase legislation for policemen, firemen, and, schoolteachers, as is being proposed, would increase this deficit to over $168 million by the end of the fiscal year 1962.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER L. FOWLER,
Budget Officer, District of Columbia.

[From the Washington Daily News of February 16, 1953]

STORM SIGNALS

Free flow of information about District finances long has been inherent in this community. Frankness is essential in a republic. If Washingtonians are not vigilant this precious heritage may be taken from them. The storm signals are up.

For example, the District government is being reorganized (in detail) secretly. Schuyler Lowe, Director of General Administration, says that his staff must reorganize any given bureau in secret so as not to disturb its personnel. He did not comment when it was suggested that mystery may be more disturbing than candor to the persons involved.

One local habit has been for Members of Congress to ask for opinions and data from whomever they please in the public service, and for the person interrogated to tell them the truth without fear of being fired. But a storm arose last week when the new Senate District Committee chairman, Senator CASE (Republican, South Dakota), asked District Budget Officer Walter L. Fowler to brief him on municipal finances. No one is more entitled to such information. He could not have applied to a more reliable source. Mr. Fowler gave it to him.

Thereupon Mr. Lowe and Commissioner Joseph Donohue voiced displeasure. Their implication was that Mr. Fowler should have channeled his communication through them. Why?

Mr. Lowe has, in a way, unhorsed Mr. Fowler, although he has not yet deprived him of the title of budget officer. But he has made the budget office one of his principalities and Mr. Fowler is his suberdinate—on the organization chart.

Mr. Fowler told Senator CASE that, without the $350,000,000 public works proposal, the District will face a possible $100 million deficit in its general fund by the end of fiscal 1962; $134 million if salaries of policemen and firemen are raised; $168 million if schoolteacher pay also is advanced.

One of the bases for criticizing Mr. Fowler was that Mr. Lowe and the Commissioners for days have been in executive session preparing the case they will present to Congress to support the $350 million program. They thought Mr. Fowler's timing was bad. Before answering Senator CASE he should have waited until they had won approval of their expensive scheme.

We, however, think someone should have let the public know that District surpluses have disappeared and that new taxes for routine expenses will have to be imposed before ever former Engineer Commissioner Robinson first revealed his grandiose public-works program last summer.

For whatever it may be worth, we serve notice that we will exhaust our resources in opposition to the muzzling of Mr. Fowler, or any other custodian of our common economic interests; or to moving discussion of District taxes and spending into a star chamber; or letting anyone whomsoever interfere with the informing of the public at any time about its own affairs.

BEEF PRICES

Mr. KERR, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] desires recognition.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point of order. I do not care what the understanding is with respect to the Senator from Texas. If he is not on the floor asking to be recognized, he is not entitled to recognition from the Chair, under the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, last Saturday in Oklahoma about 400 or 500 cattlemen assembled for a meeting to discuss the problems which confront them and their industry, and the means they hoped would be available to them, whereby their problems might more easily or readily be solved, and whereby they might make a contribution toward checking the decline in the price of cattle, and toward restoring the price.

They were in session all day. They discussed almost every phase of the economics and practical operation of the cattle business in Oklahoma. Cattlemen and ranchers who conduct large operations were present. Cattle raisers and feeders who operate on a smaller scale were present; and there were also present those whose operations are very modest.

This meeting adopted a number of resolutions, copies of which I have before me. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

Due to the unusual conditions in which cattle industry of the State of Oklahoma finds itself, the following resolutions are offered for attention by Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association:

1. The present economic condition of the cattle industry calls for all possible use of domestic beef. This fact being true, we ask Congress and the Department of Agriculture to immediately curtail all imports of beef both processed and alive.

2. While commending the steps that the Department of Agriculture has already taken in removing direct controls and abolishing the compulsory grading of beef, we strongly recommend that the Congress and the Department of Agriculture support the banks in an effort to guarantee the loan of responsible cattle raisers so that they may have an opportunity to safely continue this all-important industry.

3. Recognizing the cattle business and agriculture as the greatest industry in Oklahoma, we recommend that the same tax principle apply as to any other industry; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the sales tax on feed, seed, and fertilizer be removed.

4. We wish to strongly commend the efforts of the National Livestock and Meat Board and the American Meat Institute and others in advertising our cattle products and in educating our people as to the value of beef from an economic and health standpoint. We strongly recommend that the Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association put forth every effort to expand this support of an advertising program larger than anything heretofore attempted.

5. That we ask the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of the law now in existence and in the manner now authorized to support beef prices at 90 percent of parity.

Mr. KERR. The fifth resolution, to which I call specific attention, reads as follows:

That we ask the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority of the law now in existence and in the manner now authorized to support beef prices at 90 percent of parity.

It was the sense of that meeting that the price of beef cattle had suffered more than a moderate decline, and that it was at a point where, if stabilized, it would bring widespread bankruptcy to the cattle producers of Oklahoma.

They made it very clear that feeders cannot possibly buy feed produced from grains the prices of which are now supported at 90 percent of parity, and break even in the operation of feeding cattle now in the feed lots.

It was their conviction that the price of beef cattle had already declined to such a level that it would not only bring disaster and bankruptcy to the average producer, but that if the price is permitted to continue at present levels, or to decline further, it would be followed by conditions which would bring about a limited production of cattle in the near future, which would result in fewer supplies and higher prices to the consumers.

They had a feeling that there had not been an equitable and appropriate adjustment of the prices of the products of the beef at the consumer level.

They had a feeling that there had been gross negligence on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, first, in failing to do anything positive in an attempt to bring a halt to the decline in prices; and, second, in indicating his belief that prices had not yet declined to such an extent as to warrant emergency action by the Federal Government.

It was their feeling, Mr. President, that if there were not positive and effective action not only to halt the decline, but to restore the prices of beef cattle to the level of at least 90 percent of parity, serious economic results would occur to our agricultural economy, which would be reflected in the near future in shorter supplies and higher prices to the consumer, and also in adverse conditions in the overall economy of our country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with a news story which came off the ticker a short time ago, which reads as follows:

> Food declined 0.6 percent during the month. This put it 1.7 percent below a year ago, but 12.5 percent above the June 1950, pre-Korean war period.
>
> Another story points out that the Bureau of Labor Statistics said that—
>
> All food prices fell six-tenths of 1 percent. Lower prices for meat, poultry, and fish led the decline. Dairy products dropped 1 percent. Milk and butter prices dropped.
>
> The report did not reflect the gradual dropping of price controls. That will probably be shown in the next report.

Did the Senator see those figures, and is he familiar with them?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I was familiar with the information generally. I had not seen the specific figures referred to by my colleague from Minnesota, but they point up the dramatic fact that, while the price of beef cattle has declined as much as 50 percent in the past 15 months, most of which decline occurred since the November election, the price of food at the retail counter did not decline any appreciable amount before very late in 1952, and has not declined to a point that would be commensurate with the price paid to the producer as much as 3 or 4 months ago.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that I was just checking some of the statistical information, and about a year ago the parity ratio for agricultural commodities stood at 106. In December of this year it stood at 99; it was very close to the full parity base of 100 percent. Now it stands at 95. Those figures represent a drop of 11 points in 1 year to the farmer in the overall parity ratio, but the food prices to the consumers have dropped 1.7 during that period of time.

I am merely making note of the fact that, while some will say that the drop in the price of beef and that the drop in the price of pork and of other products is wonderful for the consumer, that may be true in the long run, but, as one great English economist said, in the long run, we are all dead, but, in the short run, it appears to me that the consumer is not doing so well. He got a drop of 1.7 in the price he paid, while we have seen hundreds of producers, principally in the cattle field, seriously affected by the sharp decline in prices.

If the Senator will permit, I should like to make a few suggestions as to what I think might be appropriate in the present situation. First, I said the other day on the floor of the Senate that it was time the Secretary of Agriculture stopped depressing the market by depressing statements, that this was a time at least to talk in terms of confidence.

First of all, if we start saying that things have to level down, if we start talking about the fact that we should think in terms of the free market, what happens? The consumer says, "Let us wait a little before I buy that half steer and put it in the deep freeze. I may get a lower price."

Secondly, the cattle producer says, "Maybe I had better sell before the price gets too low."

Mr. KERR. And he says, "I am losing the money I am putting in feed."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am talking about the cattle feeder, as well as the range-cattle producer, but particularly the cattle feeder who has to process the beef, and he finds himself on the losing end. So he says, "I am going to get out of this before I am really destroyed."

Then the banker says, "It looks kind of bad for me. I guess I had better begin calling in the loans."

So there is a depression in the making. What can be done about it?

Those in authority can stop frightening the people. Even a smile would help in this situation, having the effect of adding at least an optimistic note.

Next, I am sure the Senator will recall that some years ago, in a similar situation, there were what were called regional agricultural credit corporations, which made emergency loans to those who were in distress. Such an activity at this time would be helpful to the banker as well as to the producer. First, the banker would be able to have his first lien on the cattle, but the regional agricultural credit corporation could make a second loan, which would mean that the banker would not foreclose or call the loan. That would help stabilize the market.

Some of the cattle raisers need long-term credit, but they are not getting it today because the banker is somewhat concerned about the solvency of his institution.

Next, since we are studying practically everything else, we should look into the question of what further extension may be made in the school-lunch program. There is nothing wrong about seeing that a schoolchild gets a good piece of meat once a day. That could be provided for, and it would have a stabilizing effect.

Finally, we could reexamine the allocation of meat products to our own military forces, as well as to those of some nations associated with us in Korea. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] placed evidence in the Record indicating that many South Korean troops were immobilized because of malnutrition. Yet I have heard a speech on the Senate floor today about unmanagable surpluses of agricultural commodities. Yet our most valiant ally, the one nation that has more troops in the line than any other, the Republic of South Korea, today finds part of its manpower immobilized because of lack of food. That does not seem to indicate good planning.

I merely toss out those suggestions to the learned and able Senator from Oklahoma because he is an expert in this field, and I am only offering this evidence and testimony in order to be of assistance to him.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I desire to thank my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota. I say to him that I heard many of those thoughts expressed on the floor of the meeting of cattlemen in Oklahoma last Saturday. They said they had looked to the head of the Department of Agriculture for encouragement and for a word of hope and a sign of understanding and a realization of their problem, but he had returned to them without anything positive or helpful. Instead, he said to them that he was going to help restore free markets to them, and he called upon them, in a very worthy manner, to trust more in the Lord—which certainly is a suggestion of the highest merit and the most exalted character, and one which appeals to men whose economic condition is such that their minds are sufficiently at peace in order to contemplate that desirable picture. Finally the Secretary of Agriculture said to them, "The price of your commodity has not yet declined enough to warrant emergency action."

When he was pressed as to when the taking of emergency action might be warranted, he said he believed there should be disaster insurance. The thought was expressed on that floor last Saturday, Mr. President, that if the Department of Agriculture offers to the American farmer nothing more than the hope that he might receive disaster insurance, then the Department of Agriculture has done that which would insure disaster to the farmers and to their industry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma was on the floor when the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] delivered a statement on agricultural policy.

Mr. KFRR. Is that what he was talking about?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what his address is entitled.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the product on the basis of the title affixed to it.

The Senator from New Hampshire was speaking about "unmanageable surpluses which have been built up by the preceding administrations."

He was also speaking of certain basic farm laws. I have read his address three times, and I listened in part to it. I must say that I have yet really to find out exactly what kind of policy the Senator from New Hampshire was outlining.

For example, he spoke of the 1948 policy, and then spoke in terms of the 1949 program or the "basic" program. He referred to what he alleged to be a fact; namely, that—

> Neither of those two laws was permitted to function as written, within the intent and purpose of the Congress, for reasons which all of us understand.

I assume that thereby he meant reasons which all 96 Senators understand.

I am trying to ascertain whether this is the beginning of the repudiation of a policy statement regarding agricultural price supports, which was made again and again in the recent campaign. In the speech delivered by the Senator from New Hampshire, I do not see a word about 90 percent of parity. I see in his speech reference to the 1952 amendment, but I think it is very important that we learn whether we are being led step by step, inch by inch, in devious paths, to a change of policy, for let me make it quite clear that two policies are embodied in the laws which have been mentioned. The amendments of 1949 include 90 percent mandatory price support in the case of certain basic commodities. The 1948 law, which the Senator from New Hampshire appropriately said is the first "basic" law which we have had in the field of agriculture, provides what we know as the flexible principle. There are advocates of both these principles, but I wish to make it crystal clear that in the campaign nothing was said—and I ask any Republican or Democratic Senator to find that anything of the sort was said in the campaign—to indicate that this administration would take us back to the principle of flexible price supports. Everything said in that campaign—for instance, the statement made before approximately 100,000 farm people, at Kasson, Minn., where the then candidate for President of the United States—as the Governor of Illinois later pointed out—literally walked away with the Democratic farm program, when he said that not only would the farmers receive 90 percent of parity, but that the Republican objective is 100 percent of parity. He bettered us by 10 percent in 10 seconds. [Laughter.]

My point is this: What was the President pro tempore of the Senate, a distinguished leader of the Republican Party, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], alluding to in the statement he made in the Senate today? I ask that question for the reason that anything filled with as much uncertainty as that statement, indicates a new kind of psychological warfare is being waged—not psychological warfare in connection with foreign policy, or as applied to farmers, but psychological warfare against the legislators in Congress.

Let me state clearly for the RECORD, Mr. President, that on Monday of the coming week, I will introduce proposals which to the best of my ability will carry out every pledge the Republicans made to the American farmers, as well as my own program. They convinced me; not only that, but they convinced the overwhelming majority of the people of my State. Mr. President, farmer after farmer said to me, "Senator HUMPHREY, you are 10 percent behind. We are in favor of the Republican proposal. We are in favor of that 90 to 100 percent, and here you come along with a mere 90-percent proposal."

Mr. President, one of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], has brilliantly and vigorously advocated the principle of 100 percent of parity. I think that is where the Republicans got the idea; yes, they were persuaded by listening to the eloquence and logic of the Senator from Oklahoma. Therefore, Mr. President, how unfortunate it was that we could not have the Senator from Oklahoma in our State long enough to make clear to the people of our State that that proposal was his brain child and his well-thought-out logic. In fact, it was literally taken away from a distinguished Oklahoman. I did not know that could be done, Mr. President; but it happened.

Mr. KERR. I thank my friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I wish to say that as I listened to and read the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I perceived what I thought were intended to be two promises. In his closing paragraph the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said:

> As I observe the picture, I conclude that the agricultural outlook for 1953 and 1954 is relatively good.

Mr. President, I did not know whether he meant "relatively" in thinking of what it had been in 1931 and 1932 or whether he was speaking of "relatively" in thinking of 1951 and 1952. I must say that that statement, although it sounds good, does not bear too close inspection.

As a part of the same paragraph, the Senator from New Hampshire said:

> There are some readjustments that must be made. I do not stand here and propose that this administration outpromise the New Deal or the Fair Deal.

I must say I have great respect for the sincerity of the Republican candidate for the Presidency.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do, too.

Mr. KERR. He offered the farmers of the United States not only 90 percent of parity, but 100 percent of parity.

I quote further from the statement made today in the Senate Chamber by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]:

> I do say that the accumulation of evidence convinces me that our farm economy is fundamentally strong and that the farmers of America can look ahead to the future with confidence.

Mr. President, therein, as I see it, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire attempted to make a promise to American agriculture, but that promise is diametrically opposed to a statement he previously made—a statement which every farmer who hears of it or reads it will know is the din of disaster, for the Senator from New Hampshire said:

> As the original authors of a sensible agricultural program which has been maladministered and misadministered by our predecessors, it now becomes our task to redirect this program so that it will conform to the basic purposes for which the legislation originally was placed on the statute books.

Indeed, he had, as I understood, been referring to the Agricultural Act passed in the 80th Congress, known generally as the Aiken bill. Let me say that at this time I see across the aisle my good friend, the Senator from Vermont, who was the author of that bill. For him I have much affection; but with reference to his bill I must remind him that for a while the farmers of America thought the term "Aiken bill" merely identified the author of the bill.

As I understood the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, in his remarks of a little while ago—and he is the President pro tempore of this body, Mr. President—said:

> It now becomes our task to redirect this program so that it will conform to the basic purposes for which the legislation originally was placed on the statute books.

I say that, rather than a promise of help, that is a pronouncement of doom.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from New Hampshire said the farmers of the United States could look with confidence to the future, did he not?

Mr. KERR. That is what he said.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the farmers do that, at 70 percent of parity?

Mr. KERR. I thank my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the farmers do that, at 75 percent of parity?

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi that today the farmers of the United States are trembling in their economic habitations, not only over the condition which prevails wherein many of the commodities they produce are supported at 90 percent of parity, but they are in an environment in which they have been promised the restoration of 70 percent or 65 percent or 60 percent of parity, which to them is not a promise of help, but is a sentence of economic death.

Mr. EASTLAND. To be perfectly frank, is not what the Republicans are proposing a proposal for flexible price supports down to 75 percent of parity?

Mr. KERR. I think it is down to 60 percent of parity.

Mr. EASTLAND. Down to 60 percent of parity?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Very well. That means that whenever the support price is placed lower than 90 percent of parity, farm prices which are supported will fall to that level, does it not?

Mr. KERR. That has been the experience, as demonstrated over and over again.

Mr. EASTLAND. So they are telling the American farmer, "We want a new farm program, and we want to help you. We are going to do that by reducing the prices you receive, and we are going to reduce your standard of living." They take that attitude because, as they say, "at some time in the future a surplus might be built up, and if a surplus is built up, it might reduce your price, and in order to obviate that, we are going to cut that price today, and thus reduce your standard of living now." Is that not what their proposal means?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Mississippi is entirely correct, and in order that there may be no doubt about the reduction in the future, they say today, "We are going to bring about a balance, and, in order to accomplish it, we are going to do that which will result in the inevitable reduction of the price."

Let me say one more word. Our good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], said that our population is increasing, and that agriculture must produce more and more in order to meet the demands; and in the same breath he promises the producers that as they produce more and more, they will have to sell it for less and less. Is that what my good friend is saying?

Mr. EASTLAND. Surely it is. If those in authority are for parity, why do they not say, "We are for parity"? Why do they not say, "Yes, we are for a support price that will give you parity in the markets"? If that is the purpose, why not give it to them?

Mr. KERR. May I answer the question?

Mr. EASTLAND. Why all this talk and equivocation? It is because they want flexible supports, despite the fact that they will reduce the standard of living of all American agriculture, when today it is only half that of the man employed in American industry.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Mississippi, and I will attempt to answer him as to why they do not come out for 100 percent of parity. In the first place, they are basically against it, and in the second place, they do not want to quarrel with their great President in the White House.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I desire to commend the Senator from Oklahoma on his latter statement, that our great President in the White House, I believe in all sincerity and in all honor, did support and does want to see that kind of program placed in effect.

Mr. KERR. He at least promised it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what he promised, and I think a man must be taken at his word. He must be given plenty of time to permit him to deliver on the promise. However, I would point out what his spokesmen say for him. When their statements are looked at, one merely gets the overtones, and sometimes misses the fine print. This is a great deal like an insurance policy—it is necessary to look at the fine print.

I desire to call the Senator's attention to a little of the fine print. This is from the Senator from New Hampshire:

> It is a fact under the leadership of our party—
>
> Referring to the Republican Party—
>
> with support from many members of the Democratic Party, there was established in the 80th Congress a realistic, workable price-support farm program. This Agricultural Act of 1948 was the first permanent price-support program ever placed upon the statute books of our Nation.

I stop there. I want to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the program was realistic, it was workable. Its effects were very real. I do not say it worked for the good of the farmer, but it was workable. I agree with his statement that, "It was realistic and workable."

It was a price support program. I simply do not happen to agree with the results of those low flexible price support policies. There are some aspects of the 1948 act that are highly commendable. I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to the Senator from Vermont for providing compensatory price support payments to the farmers under the 1948 act. In 1949 there was an amended version of the 1948 Agricultural Act, which was sponsored by the former Secretary of Agriculture, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], known as the Anderson Act, which provided the same basic safeguards for American agriculture which had been established by previous legislation.

There is no secret about the fact that some of us, on this side of the aisle, when it comes to price supports, disagree as to the virtue of flexibility as contrasted with mandatory price supports. I think it is fair to say that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was trying to amend the 1948 act by providing what he considered to be a better system of flexible price supports. But it was the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who offered the amendment for 90 percent mandatory price supports, if my memory serves me correctly, with the able assistance and co-authorship of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Yes, and also, I think, with the assistance of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, with the assistance also of the Senator from North Dakota. That is correct. It will be noted that the Senator from New Hampshire does not refer to the Kerr-Russell-Young amendment to the 1949 amendments of the 1948 act. He specifically leaves that out, and says that in 1949 there was an amended version of the 1948 Agricultural Act, which was sponsored by the former Secretary of Agriculture, known as the Anderson Act, which provided the same basic safeguards for American agriculture as those established by previous legislation.

It is perfectly clear as to what the Senator from New Hampshire means. Then he continues with the statement that if these laws had been properly administered the conditions that face us today would not exist. What is the Senator trying to say? He is simply saying this: "Mr. American farmer and Mr. American citizen, you are getting the first full official roundabout, devious, round-tower expression of the return to low, flexible, price supports. That is what you are getting." This is the beginning of the repudiation of a campaign pledge. This is not President Eisenhower speaking. The President still has his pledge, and I accept his pledge in good faith. But I wish to say to our President that he had better do some frank talking with some of his lieutenants, because some of them are beginning to say, "We did not mean it."

I know that in New Hampshire 100 percent or 90 percent of price supports may not be quite so meaningful as in Iowa, or Brookings, S. Dak., or Kasson, Minn., but the Senator from Minnesota knows that two fundamental, basic farm speeches wehe given to the American people, one in Brookings, S. Dak., in October, one in Kasson, Minn., in September, and the only difference between the two speeches was that the October speech went further than the September speech. That is a matter of record.

It is easy for someone on the Republican side of the aisle to say, "Look, we are going to deliver. We are going to give you 100-percent price supports. That is our pledge, and we will keep it."

If it was good enough to give the people such a pledge in September and October, it is good enough to deliver on it sometime in the year 1953. We do not need the legalistic abstractions which we are beginning to hear and which sound well but mean nothing. They try to take our minds off the problem by saying, "Let us investigate Brannan." Apparently we are going to have another investigation. "We are going to investigate Brannan." Listen. The question that needs to be investigated today is, What are we going to do to maintain our agricultural price structure? That is what needs investigating. Mr. Brannan is gone, and I doubt that he will be reappointed. What is more, investigations were conducted here 2 years ago and last year. The American farmers are not going to be able to have money in the bank by having investigations, and the banker is not going to be paid for his loans by having another investigation. What is going to please the farmer is a fair price—not an exorbitant price, merely a fair price, a reasonable price.

Mr. KERR. I thank my friend from Minnesota. My recollection is that an amendment which the Senate adopted in 1949 was sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

With reference to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota about what lieutenants of our distinguished President now declare, let me suggest what I think is the position they are taking. Yes, they are candid in admitting that the President promised the farmers 100 percent of parity, but they are reminding the American farmer that they did not make such a promise, and I think they are trying to persuade their President that he did not mean it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been intrigued by much I have heard here today. I heard the distinguished Senator from Indiana say a while ago, "I do not blame the President for expenditures, for high taxes, or for big deficits. They are the responsibility of the Congress." That is what I thought in 1949, in 1950, in 1951, and in 1952, but I did not hear it then. Mr. President it simply depends upon who is in the driver's seat. So, now, apparently, this is going to be the responsibility exclusively of the Congress, and we are not going to permit the Republican administration to shoulder the responsibility. Oh, how the times have changed.

I want to make but one further comment. The Secretary of Agriculture has heard the voice of the people. I am happy to hear that the Secretary of Agriculture listened to farmers and has wisely issued a price support order continuing 90 percent of parity on butter for 1 year, beginning April 1.

Here is the Secretary of Agriculture doing his duty, and I want publicly to commend him. I say, "Thanks" to the Secretary of Agriculture, in all sincerity.

Mr. KERR. The Senator referred to the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire said that an investigation would be launched. I remind the Senator from Minnesota that that is running true to form. Through long habit the Republicans have learned to appoint committees and commissions and to launch investigations. It is a program to which they are accustomed and to which their habit of the years leads them. They will find that the American farmer is far more interested in solving the problems of today than in their academic curiosity in connection with evils of the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was very happy to hear what the Senator from Minnesota said, because this is the first clear indication that the new Secretary of Agriculture believes in parity. I hope he continues along that way.

The Senator from Oklahoma introduced a bill in the Senate calling for 100-percent parity. I did the same in the House of Representatives. Today I have introduced the same bill, brought up to date, because I believe it is our duty when the President is right to support him to the limit. He believes not only in 90 percent of parity, but he has stated on many occasions that he believes in full parity, which, to me, means 100 percent. That is what the family-type farmer needs if he is to be saved from disaster.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana is eminently correct. As the days unfold and the months go by, it will be demonstrated that the American people are more and more in accord with that view.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as we listen to the many discussions of policy, such as that of the Senator from New Hampshire, it would seem that apparently he had not talked to the Secretary of Agriculture, or he would not have made that speech.

We listened to the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] talking of cutting the budget anywhere from $8 to $9 billion. Then we hear about reducing taxes. It appears to me that this may make a pattern. On the one hand, they speak in terms of production and in terms of price support, and, on the other hand, we hear other announcements saying that we are going to operate more cheaply. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma this question: What does he think when he hears of reducing the budget some 8 or 9 billions of dollars?

Does it mean possibly substantially reducing the appropriations to the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Military Establishment, and possibly appropriations for other established benefits which go to the American people?

We hear 2 speeches in 1 day, one of them saying that we should reexamine the agricultural policy, and the other saying that we should cut the budget from eight to nine billion dollars, and adopt a more vigorous policy abroad. Has the Senator from Oklahoma given some thought to that?

Mr. KERR. I have given much thought to it. No one would say or do more to bring about a reduction in the Federal budget, if that is possible, than would the Senator from Oklahoma. No one contemplates it with any more eager desire than I do. However, I am aware of the fact that the entire cost of the Federal Government, aside from the interest on the national debt—which our friends on the other side of the aisle are in process of increasing approximately one and a quarter billion dollars a year—aside from the cost of veterans' programs, aside from the cost of our cooperation with our allies, and the cost of our own defense program, is less than $11 billion a year. So that when men talk about reducing the budget by $10 billion a year, since they are not going to reduce the interest on the national debt, because they are in the process of raising that item, since they are not going to reduce the cost of our veterans' programs, because even they have not suggested that, it means that they are either going to cut the national defense budget eight or ten billion dollars or entirely eliminate all the costs of Government other than those items. I say to my good friend from Minnesota, that they indulge in a fiction equal in proportion to that which was uttered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire when he said, "Our farm economy is fundamentally strong, and the farmers of America can look ahead to the future with confidence."

I would remind him that whatever strength the farm economy has, has been the result of Democratic farm policies for more than 20 years. But when spokesmen for the majority party make announcements on the floor of the Senate which would be adverse to the farmer, the farmer is not going to be misled and made to feel that he can look to the future with confidence under those circumstances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are some other things which have disturbed me. One day I read in the press that there has been a briefing at the White House, and I see pictures of distinguished colleagues and high officials in the executive branch of the Government coming out of the White House. The newspaper reporters ask them what happened, and the reply is, "The situation is critical. It is not what we thought it was." Of course, they could have ascertained what it was; there has been no secret about it.

The next day we hear the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of the Budget saying they doubt very much whether there will be a balanced budget this year. In fact, they say it cannot be balanced this year. They doubt whether the budget can be substantially reduced. There are indications that the defense budget can be pared down very little without jeopardizing our security.

That is what the President's Cabinet officers say. They want to reduce the budget. They want to see taxes reduced. That is what everyone who is in his right mind wants. They want to see the economy brought into balance, as we all do. But they are finding out now, with the burdens of office upon their shoulders, that the troubles of the world are not going to wither away. They are finding out that Truman was not the problem; the problem is Stalin—the cold war. They are learning that there is some real difficulty in the world.

What I am getting at is this: Who is right? Is the Secretary of Defense right? Is the Bureau of the Budget right? Is the President right? Or are these spokesmen right?

The President says, "Taxes cannot be reduced." Someone else says, "We are going to reduce taxes."

The President says, "We must not jeopardize national security." Someone else says, "We can trim off $9 billion."

It is not going to be possible to trim $9 billion from the Truman budget. Of course, no one wants to pay any attention to the Truman budget, but Mr. Truman suggested a budget of $10,300,000,000 for all civilian aspects of the Government, such as the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Labor, and all the independent offices. His budget called for $10,300,000,000 for all civilian objectives.

Then there is interest of $6,400,000,000 at the Democratic rate of interest. When the new, gilt-edged Republican interest rates go into effect the amount will be up a little bit.

Mr. KERR. It will be about $7,700,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, an increase of about $1,300,000,000.

Mr. KERR. That is interest on the national debt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, that is correct. Six billion four hundred million dollars was provided for in the Truman budget.

The former President suggested a budget of $57,300,000,000 for major national security, including foreign aid, atomic energy, national defense, and aid to our allies.

All I say is that we cannot get a responsible officer of the executive branch of the Government, either by rumor or direct statement, to say that we can remove eight or ten billion dollars from the budget without jeopardizing our national security.

Someone else said that he dismissed a thousand employees from the Mutual Security Agency, but the next evening the Washington Star said that that was because of a Truman order.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say that I resented the Evening Star, great publication that it is, interfering with the rendezvous with a dream which our distinguished friend, the Mutual Security Administrator, had been having. I thought it was unkind and unwarranted. However, if the writer for the Star could have received any pleasure or happiness from a rendezvous with a dream, even by seeking to perpetuate it for the benefit of others, I think this early in the game he should have been permitted to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The magnanimous qualities and the generosity of the Senator from Oklahoma are exceeded only by the economy dreams of the Mutual Security Administrator.

I conclude by asking the Senator from Oklahoma if he has been able to reconcile the $10 billion or the $9 billion budget cut with what he has heard from the executive agencies of the Government. I ask him how we are going to do all this budget cutting, tax reducing, and at the same time have 100 percent parity or 90 percent parity, carry out a more dynamic foreign policy, and increase our military strength, plus bringing the war in Korea to a conclusion.

I want to be around when all this hocus-pocus happens. It will make Houdini look like a bum.

One day we are informed that conditions are grim. The next day we are told that taxes are going to come down. One day we are informed that the budget cannot be reduced. The next day we are told, "Think nothing of it; $10 billion will be taken off just like that."

One day we are told, "Perhaps we ought to go back to the act of 1948." Then we are told, "Do not forget the 90 percent or 100 percent of parity."

That is really playing both sides of the street. I hope somebody gets caught in the middle—but I am afraid it may be the people.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota asks me how these conflicting things can be done. I wish I knew. I must say that if I had known how they could have been done, I would not have waited until this late hour to publish the fact. I await with all curiosity the fulfillment of these conflicting and mutually inclusive predictions and promises.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina rose.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wished to ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether he had heard the Secretary of Agriculture make a statement as to what he was going to do or what law he was going to advocate when the present law goes out of existence at the close of the year 1954.

Mr. KERR. I have not heard the Secretary make any statement on that subject, but I saw him quoted in the press as having said that the only program of support or assistance which he personally advocated was disaster insurance. He did not make clear whether he meant that he was against it or for it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has the Senator from Oklahoma heard anything to the effect that the Secretary of Agriculture might propose a sliding scale, which could permit a sliding down to 75 percent of parity for the farmer?

Mr. KERR. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina, that I did not hear that statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture, but I heard it in a speech made a little while ago on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If I recall his remarks accurately, the Senator from New Hampshire promised to bring about a return or a restoration of a sliding scale of parity which, as I understand, would go much below 75 percent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe it would go down to 60 percent.

Mr. KERR. I believe the Senator from South Carolina is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on page A915 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, there is an article entitled "Speech of Hon. JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, Women's National Press Club, Washington, D. C., February 24, 1953."

Mr. CANNON, who had the article inserted, mentions in the foreword of his remarks that I was present at the meeting. I was present at the meeting of the Women's National Press Club, and I was given 10 minutes to speak on agricultural matters. Mr. WHITTEN was given 5 minutes. I did not think that was fair, so I gave him 2½ minutes of my time. But, to my amazement, I find printed in the RECORD a 30-minute speech which Mr. WHITTEN is supposed to have given. I might have had a little trouble with my hearing, or Mr. WHITTEN might have been able to crowd a 30-minute speech into 5 minutes. As a matter of fact, I do not recall his saying anything that I find in his speech which is printed in the RECORD. From one standpoint, it is a good speech. Certainly the anti-Benson speech-writing staff of the Democratic National Committee could not have written a better speech than Mr. WHITTEN's speech. It is completely full of erroneous statements and shopworn political arguments which were heard last fall and proved ineffective. I do not object to its being in the RECORD, but I do want it in the RECORD for what it is.

I wish to make clear that none of the shots leveled at me in Mr. WHITTEN's printed speech appeared in his oral arguments at the Women's National Press Club meeting.

Now, Mr. President, for the first time in a long while I shall go to bed tonight with a very light heart and without a worry on my mind. I have felt that we had some serious agricultural problems to face. We always have had to face them. I think there probably will be some in the future. Two or three weeks ago I was really concerned about the welfare of livestock producers of this country. However, as I say, I shall go to bed tonight with a very light heart, because the way to salvation has been pointed out to the livestock people of the country. From the resolution adopted by a group of cattlemen in Oklahoma, and which has been inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], it appears that they have at last seen the light which leads to salvation and eternal farm prosperity. I can see them now, on their way to Washington—thousands and thousands of cattle raisers with bowed heads, probably repentant for the things they have said in the past about not wanting support prices, holding out their hats ahead of them as they come up the street, not a homburg in the whole lot; and at the head of the procession I can see marching the distinguished and illustrious Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], with tears of sympathy running down both sides of his chin. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will not be there, however.

I can see the Senator from Oklahoma leading these poor, pathetic cattlemen into Washington, on the way to salvation and eternal prosperity for the livestock grower. I know that they are going to be successful when they arrive here, because Ezra Benson cannot resist an appeal like that. He cannot resist the appeal of extreme poverty. He cannot resist the tears of the Senator from Oklahoma. I do not believe General Ike can resist the senatorial pleadings, and the pathos which will come into the picture. I am perfectly sure that Secretary Humphrey will open the doors of the Treasury and say, "Boys, you have suffered long enough. Come right in with your baskets, and the future will be brighter for you."

So I have no further worries about the cattlemen. I did worry about the livestock producers in 1940, when hogs were 5 cents a pound, until the war came along and bailed them out. Beef was 7 cents a pound, and no one was doing anything about putting an effective support program into operation for them then. I even worried in 1952, when the price of hogs went on the skids and the Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary Brannan, did not do anything about it until the price reached 76 percent of parity.

But I do not worry any more. I can see the farmer of the future, standing in the midst of his wealth. I hope, as he surveys all his possessions, and all the good things which have come to him, that he will see fit to give credit where credit is due—to the test tube and laboratory, to Congress, if he wishes, but above all else, I hope he will not forget to give credit to the windmill and the oil well—the windmill which pumps the water for his private bath and generates electricity which lights the runway for his private plane and also furnishes heat with which to cook his breast of quail.

He must not forget what he owes the oil well, which furnishes kerosene for his tractor, gasoline for his Cadillac, and high octane gasoline for his private plane.

Perhaps, Mr. President, I am seeing a mirage, but tonight, I am going to bed happier than I have been for a long time, because the problems of the farmer seem to have all been solved.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL ON STATUS OF INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, 83d Congress, 1st session, a protocol on the status of International Military Headquarters, set up pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Paris on August 28, 1952, and that the protocol, together with the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. Foley, of the Treaty Division, Department of State, advised that the Department made the instrument public some time ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed, and the protocol, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol on the status of International Military Headquarters set up pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Paris on August 28, 1952. This document is a protocol to the agreement regarding status of forces of parties of the North Atlantic Treaty, and is related to the agreement on the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, both previously transmitted to the Senate in the 2d session of the 82d Congress.

The Status of Forces Agreement of 1951 and the present protocol, as well as the companion agreement relating to the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization itself, are necessary parts of the new machinery we need to carry forward the vital program for the integrated defense forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These are multilateral agreements and thus provide that basis of uniformity in these fields which is essential for NATO and its integrated operations. While these agreements do not in every respect reflect the maximum desires of each country, and to that extent represent certain compromises on the part of all, it is my considered belief that they provide a workable, equitable, and desirable framework for NATO activities and peacetime NATO military operations. The early acceptance of these agreements by the NATO nations is very important to the furtherance of the NATO collective defense effort.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding this protocol.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 27, 1953.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Secretary of State. (2) Certified copy of protocol on the status of International Military Headquarters set up pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

James H. Douglas, Jr., of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force;

Val Peterson, of Nebraska, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator;

Maj. Gen. Joseph Bacon Fraser, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Maj. Gen. Daniel Noce, and sundry other officers for appointment as lieutenant generals in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Paul Kistler, MacDonald, Illinois National Guard, for appointment as brigadier general in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

Col. Jacob Landes Hartman, Veterinary Corps, United States Army, for appointment as brigadier general, Veterinary Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, 62A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe, with rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Bryant Le Maire Boatner, 362A, Regular Air Force, to be the inspector general, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, 90A, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, Alaskan Command, with rank of lieutenant general;

Edward B. Harp, Jr., and John R. Perry, United States Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Staff Corps of the Navy;

Rear Adm. James H. Thach, Jr., and sundry other officers for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral;

Vice Adm. Lawrence T. DuBose, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier, and commander, Atlantic Reserve Fleet;

Vice Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet;

Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Military Sea Transportation Service; and

Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years; and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Personnel).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on request of a Senator who is unable to be present today, I ask that this nomination be passed over. However, it will be definitely disposed of on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of C. Douglas Dillon to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is with genuine pleasure that I rise to pay a brief tribute to C. Douglas Dillon, whose nomination to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France is now before us.

Doug Dillon, as I know him, is a worthy son of New Jersey. He is possessed of those sterling qualities which are a mark of all men of ability. He has a fine mind. He possesses great tolerance. He is always courteous. He is humble in spirit, but not lacking in courage. Above all, he has integrity in high degree. He will be a truly great ambassador.

He is a graduate of Harvard College, class of 1931, magna cum laude. He is an investment banker with real business insight. He is experienced in international affairs, with a weather eye for our responsibilities, always scanning the stormy, international seas.

He enlisted in the Navy in 1941 as an ensign, and left active duty ranks in 1945 as a lieutenant commander.

He is known throughout New Jersey and the Nation as a civic leader, actively engaged in good works of charity.

I commend the President of the United States for this appointment, and I congratulate the American people. When this nomination shall have been confirmed the American people will have an outstanding ambassador to France.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am happy to join my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, in endorsing the nomination of C. Douglas Dillon to be Ambassador to France. As a member of the New Jersey delegation I take pride in having encouraged the building up of a younger generation of businessmen in public affairs. Douglas Dillon has been one of the most active citizens of New Jersey, both in the political field and in the social and philanthropic field and is one of the outstanding representatives of the younger generation of Americans. I have known

him for several years, and hold his abilities in the highest regard.

Mr. Dillon has had a long education and training for the post of Ambassador to France. He is an earnest student of American foreign relations. He speaks French almost as well as English and he has spent much time in France. Thus it is that he will bring to his new position a feeling for and an understanding of France. At the same time his loyalty to the United States is beyond question. Members of the Senate will note from his biography that he joined the United States Navy as an ensign in 1941 and retired to inactive duty with the rank of a lieutenant commander in 1945.

Mr. Dillon's business experience makes him an especially happy choice. Our many financial and economic ties with France make it important that we be represented there by someone who knows the problems that are involved in these relations. I shall not attempt to relate in detail the many important business activities in which Mr. Dillon has engaged, nor shall I attempt a catalog of his business successes—for there are many—which qualify him for dealing with difficult economic problems. Let me simply say that he was a member of the New York Stock Exchange from 1931 to 1936; he has served the United States and Foreign Securities Corporation and the International Securities Corporation since 1937, and has been a director of that organization until January 20 of this year. Most Senators will recognize him as the president of the well-known investment house of Dillon, Read & Co., Inc., a position from which he has also resigned.

Here, then, we have the fine, broad-gaged intelligent businessman. He is modest, industrious, and unassuming. His success in business shows that he possesses initiative, drive, and a deep understanding of human relations, which should stand him in good stead in France. His wide interest in community affairs is shown by his membership on the board of governors of New York Hospital, the board of managers of the State charities aid association, a directorship of the united hospital fund of New York, his trusteeship of the United States council of the International Chamber of Commerce, and a membership on the board of overseers of Harvard University.

I am happy to join in commending the administration for this excellent appointment. Not only Mr. Dillon himself, but his family as well, will be worthy representatives of the United States at one of the important capitals of Europe. I hope his nomination will be promptly confirmed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared, together with a biography of C. Douglas Dillon.

I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Foreign Relations Committee unanimously recommends that the Senate confirm the nomination of C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to France.

Mr. Dillon is a well-known investment banker, and until recently was chairman of the board of Dillon, Read & Co. He has also been actively interested throughout his adult life in foreign relations. He took his honors degree at Harvard in American foreign policy, and he has been an active member of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, and of the Foreign Policy Association. He worked with Mr. Dulles on foreign-policy matters during the 1948 election campaign.

In addition, Mr. Dillon has visited France many times, and traveled extensively throughout the country. He speaks French, and has a wide acquaintanceship among the French people.

Mr. Dillon has resigned his business connections and he assured the committee that he has no financial interests which would be incompatible with his duties as American Ambassador.

The committee heard Mr. Dillon testify in executive session on February 17, and on February 24 voted unanimously to report his nomination to the Senate. Members of the committee were impressed with his knowledge of France, and his practical approach toward the solution of our mutual problems.

I know of no opposition to the nomination, and I hope the Senate will act on it promptly.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF C. DOUGLAS DILLON

Home: Far Hills, N. J.

Office: 46 William Street, New York 5, N. Y.

Born: Geneva, Switzerland, August 21, 1909; son of Clarence and Anne (Douglass) Dillon.

Education: Graduated from Groton School in 1927; graduated from Harvard College, magna cum laude, in 1931, A. B.

Married: Phyllis C. Ellsworth, 1931. Children: Phyllis Ellsworth, Joan Douglas.

Experience: Member of New York Stock Exchange, 1931–36; with United States & Foreign Securities Corp. and United States & International Securities Corp. since 1937; president since 1946, director since 1938; vice president and director, Dillon, Read & Co., Inc., since 1938.

Director: United States & Foreign Securities Corp. and United States & International Securities Corp.; Dillon, Read & Co., Inc.; Amerada Petroleum Corp.

Military: Joined United States Navy as ensign in 1941; retired to inactive duty with rank of lieutenant commander in 1945.

Other: Member of the board of governors of New York Hospital; member of board of managers of State Charities Aid Association; director, United Hospital Fund of New York; trustee, United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Clubs: Racquet and Tennis (New York), Knickerbocker (New York), Links (New York), River (New York), Recess (New York), Metropolitan (Washington).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of C. Douglas Dillon to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France?

The nomination was confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Karl L. Rankin to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, because of my personal experience with him over the period of the past few years, I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Mr. Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, to be Ambassador to China. I particularly wish to refer to my own contacts with him in 1949 and 1951, when I visited the Far East.

I first met Karl Rankin when he was consul—not even with ministerial rank—at Hong Kong, and in charge of our affairs there because of the illness of Mr. Leighton Stewart, who was then our Ambassador.

Mr. Rankin was the source through which I was able to meet various persons in that area and to study the situation in China at that time. Mr. Rankin, although he was critical of some of our policies, was always loyal to the administration he was serving. He made it possible for us to make the contacts we needed in order to conduct our studies.

A little later it was my privilege to have a small part in his appointment as our Minister to Formosa, where the troubles of the Nationalist Government of China centered.

In 1951, after he went to Formosa, I visited him there. In a very short time I found that he had established, not only among the Chinese Nationalist people there, but also among the Formosans themselves, a high degree of confidence in the United States and in its purpose of helping the people in that area. I felt then that he was filling a very important mission, especially as I watched his full cooperation with our ECA, later MSA representatives there, and with our military mission under General Chase.

I was very much impressed with the grasp he had of our American policy in that part of the world, and also with his ability in contacting the various natives and bringing them into satisfactory relationships with our United States commission.

I sincerely rejoice that it has been possible for the administration to appoint Karl Rankin as Ambassador to China, to succeed our last Ambassador, Mr. Leighton Stewart, and to represent us, as I know he will do, with great credit in that important capacity. I sincerely hope that his nomination may be promptly confirmed.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished and able senior Senator from New Jersey for his very kind and generous words concerning a son of Maine.

This is a moment of pride for Maine as one of its illustrious sons has been chosen for the post of Ambassador to Nationalist China. Karl L. Rankin has brought great honor to Maine in his illustrious career in the diplomatic service of his country. I have personally seen him in action and have been proud to say that I come from the same State he does. I saw his excellent work firsthand in Austria.

I am confident that he will do honor to his country and his State in his future service as Ambassador to Nationalist China.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have had prepared a statement in relation to this distinguished citizen, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD, together with a brief biographical sketch. I take pride in asking confirmation of his nomination.

There being no objection, the statement and biography were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Committee on Foreign Relations has considered the nomination of Karl L. Rankin,

of Bridgton, Maine, to be American Ambassador to China, and has voted without objection to recommend that the Senate confirm his nomination without delay.

I submit herewith for the record a biographical sketch which is a mere listing of this gentleman's experience and background.

While we may not be in agreement on every matter pertaining to the Far East, I am sure that we all are agreed that one of the most confused and disturbed areas of the world is the Far East, especially China. What we do or fail to do in the area now may have far-reaching effects in the future, impossible to anticipate. This is one spot above all others where the United States needs to have competent diplomatic representation.

Mr. Rankin is unusually well qualified for the position to which the President has appointed him. He has had extensive experience in the diplomatic service, and much of it in the Far East. Members of the Senate may perhaps recall that he was the American counselor at Athens in charge of our legation during the crucial time when the Communist guerrillas were most active. He rendered exceptionally fine and competent service there, for he cooperated most effectively with Mr. Griswold and General Van Fleet.

More recently, Mr. Rankin has served as chargé d'affaires at Taipei, a position which he held after August 1950. Mr. Rankin understands the Chinese problem. He has been close to the Nationalist Government at its headquarters on Formosa. He knows the very complicated and difficult issues which the United States confronts in China. I think I speak for the committee when I say that the President has selected a very able representative to perform a very difficult mission.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF KARL L. RANKIN

Born: Manitowoc, Wis., September 4, 1898.

Education: Topeka (Kans.) High School graduate; Mercersburg Academy graduate; Fed. Polytech., Zurich, Heidelberg U. 1920–21; Princeton U., A. B. 1922; U.

Experience: Field engineering 1919; relief work in Smyrna, Turkey, 1920; construction superintendent, Near East Relief, Russia, 1922–25; manager of a development company in U. S. 1925–27; appointed assistant trade commissioner at Prague Aug. 1, 1927; cml. attaché at Prague June 27, 1929; at Athens and Tirana Feb. 4, 1932; del., 23d session of Int. Inst. of Statistics, Athens, 1936; cml. attaché at Brussels and Luxemburg June 29 1939; Foreign Service Officer of Class Four July 1, 1939; consul and secretary in the Diplomatic Service Nov. 16, 1939; cml. attaché at Belgrade July 6, 1940; also consul at Belgrade Nov. 1, 1940; at Manila Dec. 8, 1941–Jan. 1, 1942; interned by Japanese Jan. 2, 1942–Oct. 1943; class three Feb. 1, 1942; to the Department Sept. 3, 1943; cml. attaché at Cairo Feb. 5, 1944; counselor of embassy for economic affairs near the Govt. of Greece estab. in Egypt (also with supervision over econ. activities in Albania and Yugoslavia) Oct. 7, 1944; counselor of embassy for econ. affairs at Athens Oct. 21, 1944; class two May 16, 1945; counselor of Legation for economic affairs at Vienna Sept. 13, 1946; Foreign Service Officer of Class two Nov. 13, 1946; class one May 15, 1947; counselor of Embassy at Athens Oct. 16, 1947; class of career minister Oct. 22, 1948; consul general April 7, 1949; consul general at Canton, temp., July 21, 1949; at Hong Kong Aug. 26, 1949; also at Macau Oct. 18, 1949; charge d'affaires ad interim at Taipei in addition to duties as consul general and minister Aug. 8, 1950.

Legal resident: South Bridgton, Maine.

Military: U. S. Navy 1918; lt. cmdr., U. S. Naval Reserve.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in behalf of Karl L. Rankin, whose nomination to be Ambassador to Nationalist China is now before the Senate. I have traveled in countries where he has represented the United States. I have found him to be very cooperative. He has a fine understanding of the conditions which exist in the world at the present time. He also has a clear understanding of the institutions of America. I believe him to be an able diplomat, and I am sure we can place our confidence in him. It is a real privilege to support his nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Karl L. Rankin to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China?

The nomination was confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Clement Dunn to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words with regard to my friend of many years, James Clement Dunn. I knew him some years ago, first in Belgium, as I recall. I have seen him successively advance with growing distinction from one post to another. I think we were all deeply impressed by his brilliant performance in Italy under the most difficult conditions.

Mr. Dunn took on the difficult post in France, in which he also acquitted himself with great distinction. Now he is going to the third important European country, namely, Spain. Mr. Dunn will have had experience as our representative in three important centers; namely, Rome, Paris, and Madrid.

I know of no one in our career service more competent than James Dunn. I rejoice that he is to continue in the diplomatic service in the very important post to which he has been nominated. I know that he will serve us as well in his new position as he has served us in the posts he has previously occupied.

As a personal friend of James Clement Dunn I am glad to pay this tribute, and to express the hope that his nomination will be promptly confirmed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there is very little that I can add to what has been said. It has been my privilege to know this distinguished American, and to know something about the fine service he has rendered abroad. He is truly what is meant by the term "career diplomat," one who makes it a point to understand the obligations of his position. He gets to know the people of the nation in which he is a resident at the time while representing our country, and the people get to know him. The result is there is a mutual respect, which really makes for good international relationship.

Mr. President, I have had a statement prepared, with a biographical sketch of Mr. Dunn, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD following my statement, and I am happy to move that the nomination be confirmed.

There being no objection, the statement and biographical sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I take a great deal of pleasure in asking the Senate to confirm the nomination of Mr. James C. Dunn, of New York, to be Ambassador to Spain.

Mr. Dunn is now Ambassador to France, and before that, he was Ambassador to Italy. He is a career Foreign Service officer who has rendered distinguished service in many extremely important posts over the years. He is personally known to many Senators, and I am sure that all who have met him have been impressed, as I have been, by his ability and his clear understanding of the European scene.

Mr. Dunn has had a steady rise in the Foreign Service since he joined the Department of State as a clerk in 1919. He has been concerned mainly with European affairs and has had previous service in Spain.

The Foreign Relations Committee unanimously ordered Mr. Dunn's nomination favorably reported to the Senate earlier this week. Mr. Dunn is now in Europe, and it was felt unnecessary to call him back for a hearing, because he is a career officer and because he is personally known to many members of the committee. There is no opposition to his appointment, so far as I know.

The importance of the position of Ambassador to Spain is readily apparent and required no additional emphasis. In my opinion, President Eisenhower is to be congratulated for choosing such an outstanding Foreign Service officer to represent our country in this crucial post. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JAMES CLEMENT DUNN

Born: Newark, New Jersey, December 27, 1890.

Education: Studied law and architecture.

Experience: Clerk, Department of State, 1919; App. sec. of emb. or leg. of class four and assigned to the Dept. Sept. 5, 1919; to Madrid Feb. 26, 1920; class three Aug. 24, 1921; assigned to Port-au-Prince Mar. 1, 1922; class two Jan. 23, 1924; to Brussels Mar. 7, 1924; For. Ser. officer of class four and 1st sec. at Brussels July 1, 1924; class three June 2, 1926; to the Dept. Apr. 29, 1927; dir. of ceremonies at the White House Sept. 27, 1927; chief, Div. of Int. Conferences and Protocol, Feb. 4, 1928; class two Oct. 16, 1929; couns. to commn. for study and review of conditions in Haiti, 1930; 1st sec. at London May 17, 1930; resigned Aug. 7, 1930; app. chief, Div. of Int. Conferences, Dept. of State, at $8,000 Sept. 10, 1931; sec. gen. of Am. del. 1st stage, Gen. Disarmament Conf., Geneva, 1932; chief, Div. of Protocol and Confs., June 1, 1933; sec. gen. to Am. del., 7th Int. Conf. of Am. States, Montevideo, 1933; special asst. to the Sec. of State and chief of protocol Feb. 12, 1934; special asst. to the Sec. of State and chief, Div. of Western European Affairs, July 1, 1935; chief, Div. of European Affairs, June 16, 1937; adviser on pol. relations July 17, 1937; at $8,500 July 19, 1937; mem. Civil Affairs Comm., Combined Chiefs of Staff, 1940–45; at $8,750 Oct. 1, 1941; mem., Interdept. Comm. on War Information, 1942; mem., Comm. on Political Planning, Nov. 2, 1942—Jan. 15, 1944 (chm., Nov. 2, 1942—Mar. 1943); adviser, Office of For. Econ. Coordination, June 24–Nov. 6, 1943; mem., Policy Comm. and Coordinating Comm., Comm. for Econ. Policy in Liberated Areas, 1943–; dir. Office of European Affairs, Jan. 15, 1944; also act. dir., Office of Special Pol. Affairs, Jan. 15–May 7, 1944; at $9,000 Apr. 1, 1944; mem. of U. S. group, Dumbarton Oaks Conversations on Int. Org., Washington, 1944; Asst. Sec. of State Dec. 20, 1944; mem. and chm., State War, Navy Coordinating Comm., 1944–46; mem., Secretary's Staff Comm., Dec. 20, 1945;

chm. of U. S. del., Commonwealth Telecommunications Conf., Bermuda, 1945; A. E. and P. to Italy July 25, 1946; also U. S. rep., Advisory Council for Italy, and U. S. pol. adviser to the Supreme Comdr., Mediterranean Theater, Caserta, Italy, July 25, 1946; For. Ser. officer of class of career minister Nov. 14, 1946; A. E. and P. to France, Mar. 13, 1952.

Military: U. S. Navy 1917–19, lt., aide to naval att. at Habana.

Legal residence: New York, New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in the case of the Senators from New Jersey and the Senator from Maine in endorsing the nominees from their States, I am very happy to endorse the nomination of John M. Cabot, a citizen of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. Cabot has served in several trouble spots in the past few years. He was in the Argentine; he was transferred from the Argentine to Shanghai, China; from Shanghai, China, to Belgrade, Yugoslavia; and thence to Finland. So he has served his country in diplomatic posts as a career officer in several important posts. He is now coming back to the United States as an Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, and I am confident he will make good in his new post.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am happy to join my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and to say a word on behalf of the nomination of John Moors Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Latin American Affairs. Mr. Cabot has had a long and distinguished career in the Foreign Service, and is a diplomat of the very finest type.

I should also like to note, Mr. President, that yesterday was the 92d birthday of Mr. Cabot's father, Dr. Godfrey L. Cabot, the active head of Godfrey L. Cabot, Inc., in Boston. Dr. Cabot is an extraordinarily active and energetic man, who learned to fly in the Navy at the age of 58, and who has subsequently been president of the National Aeronautics Association and the Federation Aeronautique Internationale. Dr. Cabot can, therefore, be considered dean of the elder statesmen in aviation in this country.

Both the father and son are among the finest products of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and I am happy to support Mr. Cabot's nomination to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the committee heard Mr. Cabot on February 24. We were impressed with his pleasing personality and with his broad grasp of the main problems which will confront him. I am confident that he will fully justify the President's confidence in him.

I have prepared a statement and a biographical sketch which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and sketch were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

On Tuesday, February 24, the Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously recommended that the nomination of John M. Cabot, as Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, be reported to the Senate for favorable action. I hope the Senate will act promptly so that Mr. Cabot can take his post at once.

In taking a new look at our total foreign policy, I think it is clear that we must do what we can to develop closer working relations with our Latin American neighbors. We must never allow ourselves to become so preoccupied with Europe and Asia that we in any way neglect our good friends south of the Rio Grande.

Mr. Cabot is admirably equipped to handle this challenge in his new post. He graduated from Harvard and Oxford and has been a member of the Foreign Service for 27 years. Many of his assignments, including service in Mexico City, Santo Domingo, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, and Guatemala, have been in the Latin American field. His knowledge of languages—including French, Spanish, and Portuguese—will be extremely helpful to him, as will his wide first-hand experience in the area to which he is to be assigned.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOHN M. CABOT

Born: Cambridge, Mass., December 11, 1901.

Education: Browne and Nichols Sch. grad.; Harvard U., A. B. 1923; Brasenose Coll., Oxford U., B. Litt. 1925.

Experience: App. For. Ser. officer unclass. and V. C. of career Sept. 1, 1926; v. c. at Callao-Lima Feb. 26, 1927; For. Ser. officer at the Legation at Santo Domingo Dec. 29, 1928; sec. in the Diplo. Ser. May 23, 1929; 3d sec. at Santo Domingo June 11, 1929; class eight and cons. Apr. 15, 1930; 3d sec. at Mexico City Dec. 26, 1930; at Rio de Janeiro May 12, 1932; class seven and 2d sec. at Rio de Janeiro Oct. 1, 1935; 2d sec. at The Hague Dec. 13, 1935; at Stockholm, temp., July 23, 1938; class six Aug. 17, 1938; 2d sec. at Guatemala Aug. 24, 1938; class five May 1, 1941; to the Dept. July 3, 1941; act. asst. chief, Div. of the Am. Republics, Sept. 26, 1942; asst. chief Mar. 22, 1943; class four July 16, 1943; asst. chief, Div. of Caribbean and Central Am. Affairs, Jan. 15, 1944; act. chief, temp., May 2, 1944; chief, July 1, 1944; couns. of emb. at Buenos Aires Apr. 19, 1945; class two May 16, 1945; couns. of emb. at Belgrade June 26, 1946; For. Ser. officer of class two Nov. 13, 1946; detailed to Nat. War Coll. Sept. 3–Dec. 20, 1946; class one May 15, 1947; couns. of emb. and cons. at Shanghai Nov. 25, 1947; cons. gen. Feb. 12, 1948; cons. gen. at Shanghai in addition to duties as couns. of emb. Feb. 23, 1948; class of career minister June 19, 1948; A. E. and M. P. to Finland Feb. 2, 1950; recess appointment as A. E. and P. to Pakistan Sept. 17, 1952.

Legal residence: Manchester, Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of appointments and promotions in the armed services totaling 5,741 names, the ranks ranging from second lieutenant and ensign to and including colonels and captains.

I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed en bloc, and the President notified.

By way of explanation, I may say that I make this request because these names have already been printed once in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. To print this large list in the Executive Calendar would seem to be a needless duplication, which would involve a cost of approximately $450.

I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed. They have been submitted by two Presidents, President Truman and President Eisenhower, they have lain on the desks of the Armed Services Committees for a period of several weeks, and there have been no objections to any of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall continue to follow what I believe to be a sound policy for procedure in the Senate. I do not believe nominations should be acted on by the Senate on the same day on which they are presented. No doubt the Senator from Massachusetts is quite correct in stating that in all probability objections to these promotions may not be raised. However, in the last couple of minutes, I have heard whispered comment to the effect that perhaps objection to approving the nominations today would give opportunity to look into some of the nominations. I do not believe it necessarily follows that the names would have to be printed in the Executive Calendar. I should be perfectly willing to have the list remain at the desk over the weekend in charge of the clerk for the inspection of any Senator, but I do not think nominations should be acted on upon the day on which they are presented. Therefore I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the procedure I have suggested has been adopted many times, but I am perfectly willing to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, and I ask unanimous consent that the nominations lie on the desk without being printed, and I will ask that they be taken up on Monday or Wednesday of next week. I repeat, there has been no objection to any of the nominations, and they are all below the rank of a general officer in the Army or a flag officer in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Massachusetts is agreed to; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations of nominations on the Executive Calendar today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

FRIDAY MEETING OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

ELECTRIC POWER: ADVERTISING FANCY AND KILOWATT FACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as my colleagues are advised, it is very important that I do some of my committee work on the floor of the Senate in the name of the Independent Party. I am well aware of the fact that since this is Friday afternoon, a good many of my colleagues are necessarily absent from the floor. I am sure they will appreciate the performance of my committee work on the floor in their absence so that it is available to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in case any of their constituents might later refer to it.

DEDICATING THE REMARKS TO SENATOR NORRIS

As I advised my colleagues when I spoke to this body on February 13, I propose to give a series of speeches in the Senate on the general subject of our natural resources and their development and use. I am dedicating my speeches to one of the great liberals of our history, one of the finest statesmen who ever served in this body, the late distinguished Senator from Nebraska, George Norris. It is hard for us to measure the value of such a statesman as Senator Norris, for without his courage, great learning, and persistence, it is doubtful if we would have as many vital laws on the statute books protecting and developing our great natural resources, as we do have today.

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER POLICY

Permit me to summarize briefly the great achievements America has attained as a result of the electric-power policy that was adopted by our Congress during the last two generations.

My remarks in the Senate—to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 13, 1953, beginning on page 1069—entitled "America's Natural Resources—Electric-Power Policy," summarize the evolution of our national power policy. There have been six main legislative principles enunciated by Congress.

The first is: Federal dams should include facilities for generating electricity. This was enunciated by Congress as early as 1906.

The second great principle is: public works, which develop public property with public funds, should be for the use of the people by granting preference to the same public in the disposition of their power.

The next principle in the evolution of our Federal power policy was the provision for low interest rates. Consequently, under a wise congressional mandate, the Federal Government has used its own lending power in order to make available to public projects the low interest rates which the Government itself enjoys.

The fourth principle announced by Congress in establishing a sound Federal power policy was that such power shall be used for the benefit of domestic and rural consumers.

Logically following this doctrine, Congress provided that power should be sold at the lowest possible reasonable rates. Congress desired to encourage the widest usage of such power and at the same time prevent its monopoly.

Mr. President, at a later date I shall devote an entire speech to the history and importance of the so-called preference-clause principle in connection with the distribution of power generated at publicly built dams. In that speech I shall attempt to sustain the position I have taken heretofore in the Senate in a number of speeches and in keeping with a number of votes I have cast on the question of power development, namely, that preference should be given to public bodies. In the giving of such preference, the equities of private utilities should be taken into account. In light of the facts and circumstances in each individual case, subject to the greater right of the public under the preference clause, private utilities should be given fair contracts for power off of grid-back transmission lines carrying the power to load centers.

In other words, Mr. President, it is my position that the bus-bar principle should not be the policy of the Federal Government in connection with the distribution of power generated at dams built with the taxpayers' money. Having been built with the taxpayers' money, I believe the taxpayers, under the preference clause, are entitled to the preference in the distribution of the power, at least to public bodies.

WHAT REA ACCOMPLISHED

Mr. President, as an example of the importance of protecting the public interest in the distribution of power generated at publicly built dams, I described in my speech of February 13 what one typical agency, namely, the Rural Electrification Administration, has done in the brief span of a little more than 15 years.

We learned that under REA, electric rates were more than halved, and that rural America is living in a daylight world of electricity, instead of in kerosene drabness. The records of REA show that loans of several billions of dollars are being repaid with promptness that is rare, even in private business.

THE PERIL BEFORE US NOW

I warn that these superb national accomplishments—the mighty Federal power projects and the Rural Electrification Administration—are imperiled at this very hour. Truly, this is a challenge that no user of electricity in America—which means all of us—can ignore for the stakes are nothing less than our advanced way of living. I shall try to set forth the main issues as I see them and as I have experienced them down through the years.

SOMETHING MORE THAN PUBLIC POWER

The basic issues involved are national in scope. We might as well look the facts squarely in the face and recognize that either we shall go forward to greater accomplishments by preserving our dwindling national resources as well as our priceless water-power projects for the benefit of all the people, or else we shall give this invaluable national heritage to private-power interests, to permit them to develop only the portion of its potential that will result in their own profit and gain. It is important, therefore, that we see where we came from, in order to visualize where we are going.

Of course, Mr. President, that will necessarily raise, in the course of this series of speeches, a discussion of the points of view already expressed, I admit, in very skeleton form by the new Secretary of the Interior, indicating the policies which should be followed in the case of publicly built dams. He has been reported in the press as having expressed himself in respect to the preference clause and in connection with what he has called an equal rights of the private utilities in the distribution of power from Government-built dams.

If I correctly interpret the remarks of the Secretary of the Interior, and if the newspaper accounts have accurately outlined his views in regard to the policy of the Federal Government in connection with the distribution of power from these dams, I find myself diametrically opposed to the new Secretary of the Interior, so far as his power policies are concerned.

In another of these speeches on the problem of natural resources, I shall devote my attention to the position of the Secretary of the Interior in connection with the power and public domain policies of the United States. However, in fairness to him, I shall wait for a while, until his views are stated in greater detail and until I feel that we have, through him, a clear enunciation of the Eisenhower administration's policy regarding the entire natural resources problem.

THE STRUGGLE FOR PRESERVING OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES

Mr. President, throughout our history there has been a great struggle in connection with preserving our national resources. There have been two schools of thought on the proper use of our national resources and water power. One group feels that our resources and power do not involve any special public interest.

Other public leaders have always held that these natural resources are the heritage of all the American people, since they could not be replaced if once they were deeded away to wasteful exploitation. If we examine the history of Federal flood control, we find a ruthless struggle between these two schools of thought.

OUR NATIONAL POWER POLICY

The reclamation laws; the flood control acts; the Raker Act; the Federal Water Power Act; Boulder Canyon Project Act; the Tennessee Valley Authority Act; the Rural Electrification Act; the Bonneville Project Act; the Fort Peck Act; and in addition the Grand Coulee Dam; the Southwestern and Southeastern Power Administrations, all stand as tributes to the fact that the people, through their Congress, in unmistakable terms have established a national power policy that is designed to preserve our natural resources and water power for the benefit of all the people, and to provide electric service at rates that industries and the people can afford to pay.

Mr. President, there is no question in my mind about what the verdict of the people as a jury on this issue will be, once the record is made clear to them. They will not vote to turn over to a private utility monopoly the power resources of the streams belonging to all the people of the United States. They will insist that the power resources of the streams of America be kept for the people, by the representatives of the people, through appropriate legislation passed by the Congress of the United States. They will so insist for the simple reason that these resources belong to the people of the United States, and should not be turned over to monopolistic enterprise.

There are, however, snowballing attempts to undermine, stop, and reverse this people's program. The preliminary feints and moves are now being made. I issue this warning before the main attack begins, lest public power have its Battle of the Bulge, its Bastogne.

THE ELECTRIC COMPANY ADVERTISING PROGRAM

I should like to consider with you, Mr. President, the amazing advertising program the private utilities have been employing, which has as its apparent purpose the destruction of our existing Federal power policy.

I hold in my hand a 31-page document called the ECAP Story. ECAP stands for "electric companies advertising program." As I turn to the opening page, I find that it was published by the electric companies participating in the electric companies advertising program. As I turn to the appendix, which is found on pages 28 to 31, I see that many of the leading electric light and power companies in the United States are participants in this program.

One of the significant things about the advertising program is that the utility companies are using the dollars that come out of the pockets of the consumers of electricity, in order to mislead the American people about our present Federal power policy. This is a gross misuse of the funds of all of us who, as consumers, pay for electricity.

Utility companies are granted franchises which are, in effect, licenses to conduct a monopoly. This practice is justified, but only if the charges do not exceed the costs of operation, plus a reasonable return on the capital. Legitimate advertising to publicize service certainly is a justified cost element. But advertising for political purposes, for influencing public opinion on governmental policy—can hardly be considered a legitimate operating expense. This is all the more true in the case of a monopoly, where the rate payers have no choice but to use its service.

What is the ECAP Story? Permit me to read from page 12 of this very enlightening document:

OPINION STUDIES ALSO USEFUL AS GUIDEPOSTS

The surveys not only give ECAP indications of changing attitudes, but provide useful guideposts for our strategy. For example:

The 1949 survey made it apparent that the large majority of the public had come to oppose socialism; 69 percent said socialism would be a "bad thing" for the United States. But people did not recognize the socialistic implications of Government in the power business. For when they were asked, "Should the Federal Government produce and sell all electricity in the country?" only 46 percent opposed it. This showed that people were against socialism, but did not oppose nationalization of the electric industry in the same proportion.

And here ECAP found an important guidepost. The opportunity to go over from the purely friend-making phase to a more aggressive phase came sooner than was expected. This was the place. For now, with the probability of friendly support already indicated, ECAP began to point out that nationalization of the electric industry was in effect the first stage of socialism.

The response was tremendous.

This is such an advertising gem that we can look at it carefully again to see exactly what it means. When the people were asked, "Is it all right for the Federal Government to produce and sell all the electricity?" a majority—namely, 56 percent—said this was all right. So what did the private utility lobby do?

In another survey, the American people were asked if they liked socialism. A majority of the American people—namely, 69 percent—said that socialism was a bad thing for the country. So the trick was to tie public power—which people wanted—to socialism—which they deplore—so that the people would condemn the very thing they previously said was satisfactory.

ADVERTISING TAKES OVER

The advertisers took over. Here, on page 13 of this propaganda booklet, is the picture of a little boy sitting at a table. In front of him is a drawing, giving him a Bible, a pencil, and a free ballot. The caption of this power-lobby ad reads: "Will you leave these to your children?" That is like asking a child if he wants a vacation from school, or a farmer whether he wants good weather for his crops.

Notice, however, what appears at the bottom of this ad. Permit me to read it:

But there are people who are trying to give the United States Government more and more control over American life. "Let the Government start," they say, "by taking over certain industries and services—the doctors, the railroads, the electric light and power companies."

Most of these people—like most Americans—don't want a socialistic United States of America. They have other reasons for Government control. But when Government, moving step by step, controls enough things, you have a socialist government, whether you want it or not. You'll be controlled, too. Then what freedoms will you be able to pass on to your children?

We, the business-managed electric companies which publish this advertisement, are battling this move toward a socialistic government. We want to remind everyone how seriously it threatens every business—and everybody's freedom.

AMERICA'S BUSINESS-MANAGED TAX-PAYING ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANIES.[1]

This was published widely throughout the United States. The advertising columns of great newspapers were taken up with it, at a cost of many thousands of dollars.

[1] Names on request from this magazine.

THE PURPOSE AND PRICE OF ECAP

According to its own publication, ECAP has been in operation since 1939. In 1950—the only year for which it states a figure—ECAP had a budget of $1,465,000. This did not include the expenditures of companies which used advertising materials supplied by it.

It claims to represent about 51 percent of the industry's customers. I take that to mean companies which deal with that percentage of consumers. Or perhaps it equates the use of consumers' payments with representation.

In 1776, Mr. President, as I recall, there occurred in America a revolution which rocked the world and which made clear the distinction between a lack of representation and a representation by representatives chosen by a free people.

ECAP literature states that it is designed "to discourage further Government encroachment in the electric business." That is a polite way of saying it is combatting public power.

A large part of its program is apparently devoted to besmirching public power programs as socialistic.

LET'S LOOK AT THE FACTS

Now, do we have socialism or creeping socialism in the electric-power industry in America today? Let us turn to the record and see. First, let us take the amount of electric power that was generated by public and private agencies in 1942, in 1947, and in 1951, the latest figure available.

These are figures as published by the Federal Power Commission and supplied to me by the Library of Congress, as were the bulk of statistics in this presentation.

PERCENT OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC GENERATION OF POWER

In 1942, when a relatively small total was generated, the private utilities supplied 85 percent of the electric power in this country. In 1947, they generated nearly 81½ percent of a much larger amount, and in 1951 the figure was still 81½ percent for a still larger quantity. In other words, Mr. President, although in 1942 the private utilities supplied 85 percent of the electric power generated in the United States, and in 1947 they supplied nearly 81½ percent, they actually supplied more kilowatt-hours in 1947, when they supplied only 81½ percent of the total power, than they did in 1942, when they supplied 85 percent of the total power. This is true because of the great increase in the production of kilowatt-hours during the intervening years.

All the publicly owned systems—this includes municipals, State, and public utility districts, cooperatives, and the Federal Government—generated nearly all of the balance, 15 percent in 1942, 18½ percent in 1947, and the same proportions, 18½ percent, in 1951.

IS THIS SOCIALISM?

Now the question I want to ask you and the private utilities is this:

When they generated 85 percent of a small total amount of power in 1942, and over 81 percent of a larger total amount of power in 1947, and over 81 percent or nearly twice as much power last year, where does Government socialism come in?

If the cities generated less than 4½ percent in 1942, and approximately 5 percent in 1947, and about the same percent last year, where is the "creeping socialism?"

Where the State and power districts generated 1½ percent of the power in 1942, 1.64 percent in 1947, and 1.36 percent—or a drop of 0.28 percent last year—where is the "socialism"?

PRIVATE UTILITIES STILL HAVE LION'S SHARE

In 1942, the private utilities sold 87 percent of the comparatively small total amount of electric power—approximately 165 billion kilowatt-hours—sold in the United States. In 1947, they sold 83 percent of a larger total amount of the electric power—about 224 billion kilowatt-hours—sold in this country and in 1951 they sold 82 percent of a total amount of the country's power—326 billion kilowatt-hours—about double that of 1942.

The private utilities sell power at both wholesale and retail. Many of the cooperative utility districts and municipals purchase power at wholesale from the private utilities and distribute it to ultimate consumers in their respective communities.

The Federal Government, however, is essentially a wholesaler of the power generated at Federal plants. It sells its power, with first preference to other publicly owned agencies.

LARGE INDUSTRIAL USAGE

Industry uses large blocks of power and purchases approximately 90 percent of the Federal power.

Ironically, one might say, the private utilities have been the recipients of almost one-fourth, 22 percent, of this Federal power.

How in the face of these cold, hard facts can the utilities say that America is faced with "creeping socialism" in the electric utility field? The plain fact of the matter is that the utilities have more than held their own. The municipals and the State and power districts have expanded percentagewise only slightly during the last 4 years, and the proportional sale of Federal power has decreased from 1947 to date.

PUBLIC POWER AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE USE

We have just seen the favorable status that the private utilities enjoy alongside the municipals and States and power districts. The most notable exceptions are the power districts and the REA systems which have gone into territories that the private utilities could not or would not serve at a price consumers could afford to pay. Outside of this, the private utilities are pretty much holding their own, if not increasing their proportion of the power market.

Let us once again ask this question: Who obtains most of the power from the public-power projects?

LARGE AMOUNT SOLD TO INDUSTRY

From the start, a large portion of this power was generated and sold to industries and to private utilities. The municipalities are selling one-third of their power to industry and small business, for the factories supplying essential products for cities, the Nation, and the world. Is this socialism? The simple fact of the matter is that public power at low rates has helped to make American industry strong.

It has always been my position, Mr. President, and during the past 8 years I have argued it several times on the floor of the Senate, that we need both private and public utilities operating in the same general region. We certainly cannot tolerate the kind of economic waste that exists when private utilities or public utilities build spite lines, down the same easement or the same highway, and engage in ruinous competition.

We are dealing here, Mr. President, with a kind of service rendered to the people of our country which, as a matter of public policy, we have recognized ought to be regulated because of its monopolistic features. In this field of enterprise we have recognized that such regulation is based on sound public policy, because the industries involved are vested with a public interest, and if they are not subject to reasonable regulations by the Government operating through State utilities commissions, and Federal commissions, the poor consumer is going to be rooked. He will be exploited and charged rates made on the basis of what the traffic will bear. We are dealing here with an economic product, the availability of which is so essential to the maintenance of a high American standard of living and the perpetuation of the private-enterprise system that the Government takes and should take an interest in it, in order to protect the public interest.

It has always been my position, Mr. President, that in the vicinity of great public-built dams it is a good thing that private utilities and public utilities operate in the same general area, free, however, from the kind of spite line work of which in too many instances private utilities have been guilty. Public utilities on occasion have also constructed duplicating lines.

What I want to emphasize today, if I fail in making anything else clear in the RECORD, Mr. President, is that over the years this public policy, this public power program of the Federal Government, under the acts of Congress to which I referred in my speech of May 13, has been one of the great boons to private industry across this land.

Multiple-purpose dams would not have been constructed—not a single one of them—by the private utilities of the Nation. They were built by the taxpayers of America acting through their Congress in the interest of protecting private enterprise and promoting the general welfare. That was the policy behind the program. Yet we see here, Mr. President, a clever but a snide propaganda bulletin seeking to poison the minds of the American people into believing that a continuation of this sound public power program of the Federal Government constitutes a creeping socialism.

Visit my State, Mr. President; go to the area of the Bonneville Dam and contemplate the results of the construction of that dam with tax dollars paid by all American taxpayers, and consider the beneficent effects it has had upon private industry in my State. It has been a great boon to private industry. Private businesses have sprung up locally and others have come into our State, resulting in the production of income which, in turn, has added to the taxes paid into the Treasury of the United States. This great desideratum would never have been enjoyed if we had relied on the private industries of the Pacific Northwest to develop the maximum potential of the power resources of the Columbia River. In fact, Mr. President, what the private utilities really are designing and scheming to do at this time is, so to speak, to skim off the cream of the rivers, so far as their power potential is concerned, taking an amount of power which will guarantee to them the maximum of profit, whereas the interest of the American people demands the development of every last kilowatt of power the Columbia River and the Snake River and their tributaries are capable of developing.

That is why, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon intends in this session of Congress and for his remaining stay in the Senate of the United States to "watchdog" this whole question of public power and continually to raise his voice against the kind of vicious propaganda the private utilities are putting forth, seeking to gut the public-power program belonging to the people of this Nation.

Under the cliché and the name-calling technique of creeping socialism, it is a scheme to gut the program, whereas the program itself has been one of the greatest booms to the strength of private industry. The evidence is clear that private industry has flourished within the economic environment of every great multiple purpose dam the Federal Government has built in conformity with the wise policy of developing the power potential of the streams of America, to which the great Norris, of Nebraska, dedicated himself during his service in the United States Senate.

I close my remarks on this subject by saying that, consequently, when the good people of this country want to discuss the development of power for the benefit of all the people, let us drop these high-pressure, fancy-sounding advertising claims of some power companies and consider these desirable projects solely on their merits—their value for the people.

At each step forward in the march of American democracy and social improvement, the obstructionists have falsely cried "socialism." America has grown strong because she chose to ignore them and dared to be enterprising and free.

I think a fitting close to these particular remarks will be found in an article which appeared on February 12, 1953, in the Oregon Statesman, published in Salem, Oreg. The article was written by one of the most distinguished citizens of my State, a former Republican governor of Oregon, a man who, in my opinion, is a great liberal—Charles A. Sprague. In the editorial, Mr. Sprague discusses in part some of the problems connected with the matter of preserving and protecting the natural resources of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD as the closing paragraph of my speech.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME

(By Charles A. Sprague)

During his interrogation by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Douglas McKay stated his sympathy with the States of Texas and Louisiana which have sought return of control of their offshore oil-bearing lands. At this juncture Chairman BUTLER offered this comment:

"I would like to say here that when the tidelands question is settled—and I hope it will be rather definitely before too far in this session—there are plans for the introduction of a bill that will make the same theory applicable to public lands now held by the Federal Government within the State, and Nevada can really be a State of the Union instead of a part State and part Territory. The same is applicable to other areas.

"This may be very impractical. It is only a thought thrown out to indicate to you one bill that may be facing us a little later in the session."

That comment has touched off a lot of speculation. The Statesman's correspondent, A. Robert Smith, reports that Orme Lewis, the new Assistant Secretary of the Interior, whose division will include Bureau of Land Management, National Parks, Bureau of Indian Affairs, told the Senate Interior Committee that he believes the long-range policy of the Federal Government should be to turn over publicly held lands not to the States, but to private citizens, though he made the reservation that vital watersheds might better remain in Government hands.

What's going on here? Surely the new administration isn't going back to Benjamin Harrison's time and sell off its national forests. Surely it isn't going to turn over the public domain, most of which was so poor it never was homesteaded, to graziers. Surely it isn't going to divest itself of lands in national parks. While the people of the West gripe a good deal over the extent of Federal ownership of lands, I doubt if very many other than those with a selfish interest want the Federal Government to sell out and get out.

Noting that the National Association of Manufacturers was joining the United States Chamber of Commerce in urging scaling down of Federal land ownership, the well-informed and conservative Bend Bulletin makes an analysis of this Federal ownership of 52 percent of land in Oregon. Its comment is pertinent, and I quote from its editorial:

"There are five principal land groups included in the Federal 52 percent. These are the national forests, the Indian reservations, Crater Lake Park, the O. and C. lands, and those included in what was once called the unreserved public domain. The public domain, now under the Bureau of Land Management, comprises the lands left over after everybody had his pick under the homestead laws. The other four groups need no description.

"The NAM should indicate which of these lands it feels should go out of Federal ownership.

"There would be no point certainly in trying to get the public domain on the tax rolls. Those lands would have gone into private ownership years ago had they been worth paying taxes on. Much, indeed, of like lands was homesteaded, patents were secured, and then they went tax delinquent. Now they are held by the counties and are nothing but a bother. They ought to be returned to Federal ownership and managed along with the other lands under the Taylor Grazing Act.

"We do not believe that there is any chance to get Indian reservations on the tax roll nor would any effort to do so be made. If anything turned up on a reservation that the white man wanted, it would probably be taken away just as Ceiilo is being taken in spite of a solemn treaty. No Indian lands would otherwise go on any tax roll.

"We do not believe that the NAM would get anywhere in a program to reduce the area of Crater Lake National Park. We do not believe that there is any chance that the O. and C. lands will be turned over to private ownership. That leaves out of the five groups only the national forests.

"We wonder if the NAM and United States chamber program is to bring about a dispersal of these Federal lands."

I think most of the pressure for disposal of Federal lands emanates from the Rocky Mountain country, Wyoming in particular. The big stockmen there want to get hold of grazing lands. As far as Federal forests are concerned, more lumbermen want the Government to retain ownership than want the lands sold. This way they get a chance to bid on timber without the investment and risks of land ownership.

If the bill Senator BUTLER refers to does come up, it will draw overwhelming opposition from those wanting protection for their water supplies and from powerful and vocal conservation groups (forestry, wildlife, soils, water). From a political standpoint serious consideration of such legislation would react against the Republican Party. Secretary McKay has not advocated any such policy, and he should promptly straighten out his new Assistant Secretary lest he involve the Department in a program of scuttling these great national resources.

Surely we do not have to fight Theodore Roosevelt's great battle over again in this year 1953.

THE BUDGET AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there are some other matters I wish to discuss in connection with my committee work this afternoon.

Earlier this afternoon there was an address made on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], in which he expressed great concern about balancing the budget. As the RECORD will show, I certainly share his concern, and for some years I have been trying to do something to bring about a balanced budget. I raised for the consideration of the Senator from Kansas, as the RECORD will show tomorrow, the question of the relationship of taxes and the national debt to the problem of balancing the budget, and I suggested that we should stop increasing the debt and also start paying it off. That point seemed to have missed the Senator from Kansas, because there was no mention of it in his statement.

I said to him today that paying off on the debt is part of the budget-balancing problem. That was my position in 1947 on the floor of the Senate when I offered a series of amendments to a then pending tax bill—and I reoffered them in 1948 and again in 1949. The amendments, which had been prepared by the Committee for Economic Development, I thought, were pretty good. It seemed to me that at least there ought to have been a hearing on them. But no hearing was held on the amendments, because the position taken at that time was that they were intended for the purpose of revising the tax structure. The bill then pending was concerned with the whole question of tax percentages and tax rates. It was a so-called tax-reduction bill.

I said at that time—and the view I then expressed is as sound today—that when we dabble in tax percentages, we engage in superficiality, so far as the basic problem is concerned. It is more important to pay attention to inequities and to the loopholes in the tax structure, and we should realize that there is no longer any clear-cut line of distinction with respect to tax jurisdiction in this country. The Federal Government imposes taxes for the same purposes for which State governments levy taxes. Moreover, State governments also are double-taxing. I do not use that term in its technical sense, but in the sense that States are levying taxes similar to those levied by counties and municipalities. In some instances, other local governmental units have tax-levying authorities which apply some of the same kinds of taxes as are applied by other units. For several years, I have urged that consideration be given to a remedy for that situation.

I thought that a good start would be to adopt the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development in its 1947 report. As I tried to make clear in my previous speeches, I do not mean to imply that I agree with all the recommendations of that committee, but, at least, I think they are so meritorious that they are deserving of most careful hearings by the Senate, because they deal with tax inequities, and also with the question of making payments on the national debt.

That is what I meant when I said or indicated earlier this afternoon that I thought the Senator from Kansas would have strengthened his argument if he had included a proposal not only to balance the budget, but to do more than that by having a reserve of income in excess of expenditures, to the extent of several billion dollars a year, that could be applied to the national debt.

The national debt now is approximately $267,500,000,000. Perhaps the economics I studied in college and perhaps the laws of finance I have always thought were sound, no longer are sound, but that will have to be proved to me before I will believe it. I still think it an incontrovertible principle that if sound domestic economy is desired in our homes, we had better do a little saving. At least, we had better break even. By breaking even I mean we had better break even after we have paid our debts.

When all is said and done, I think that one of the reasons why we do not have a 100-cent dollar—and there are many reasons—is that we are letting the debt run away with us. Whether we like it or not, economic laws are working against us in respect to the relationship and the influence of that debt upon the value of the American dollar.

As I said this afternoon to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I am still of the opinion that we should not increase the debt by following a course of action which would increase interest rates on Government bonds. I was rather interested in the attempt of Republican speakers in the Senate to show that that is not a Republican policy, but that as recently as December the outgoing Democratic administration of-

fered a plan to increase interest rates on Government bonds.

I do not think that is much of an argument. I have noticed that since the beginning of this Congress, when some of the proposals of the new administration have not clicked quite so well as the administration apparently thought in advance they might click, there has been a tendency to hide behind two alibis. The first is, "Well, the Republicans inherited the situation. It is a problem that was created before the Republican administration took office." Or else it is said, "Well, after all, the Democrats did it."

Mr. President, I think we ought to start doing what we think is right. If the Democrats did something that was wrong, we should not alibi a continuation of it by following suit. I think the argument made here this afternoon, that the interest rate matter—about which I shall have something more to say in a moment—was after all, something the Democrats were talking about in December, is a pretty weak rebuttal to the fact that the Eisenhower program with respect to the interest rate is going to cost the little people of America a good many hundreds of millions of dollars. We are going to leave to American boys and girls who follow us on this scene an increased national debt as a result of the increase in interest rates on Government bonds being put into effect by Eisenhower. I think it is a sad thing. I never will believe that it was necessary. I refuse to believe that we must put a dollar-sign on American patriotism in order to get American investors to be patriotic. I refuse to believe that if the President of the United States and his new Secretary of the Treasury had really appealed to the American people through an educational program setting forth the plight in which the bond market may be, the bonds could have been sold without increasing the interest rate. Eisenhower cannot justify increasing the national debt through increased interest rates. That will be the exact result of the Eisenhower program in this field.

Mr. President, I always like to quote the Wall Street Journal, because I know that when I do so I am not quoting an antiadministration sheet. I notice in the Wall Street Journal for February 25 an interesting story under the title of "Bond markets." The subheading is "long-term Treasury 2½-percent issues fall fourteen thirty-seconds to lowest level ever. Dip seen reflecting belief United States may convert some short-term debt to this type issue."

I shall ask to have the entire article printed in the RECORD in a moment. However, I wish to refer to a couple of paragraphs which bear out the point I made in my discussion with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] earlier this afternoon. They seemed to think I was wrong as to who was responsible for what is happening to the Government bond market. They tried to blame it on the Democrats, because of some Democratic action back in December. Listen to this from the Wall Street Journal:

The recent declines, according to Government bond folk, probably reflect the growing belief that the new Republican administration may some time later in 1953 convert a part of the heavy short-term public debt into long-term securities.

This, it is thought, might be accomplished through a 30-year bond carrying interest at a rate ranging from 3 percent to 3¼ percent. The Victory Loan 2½s, which have a little less than 20 years to run to maturity, as of yesterday were yielding the buyer approximately 2.85 percent.

Commenting on yesterday's market one dealer declared: "It's as thin as a dime. Everybody is keeping on the sidelines to see what the administration will do about a new long-term issue."

Almost nobody saw a connection between the lower Treasury bond prices and the reduction in margin requirements that sent the stock market higher.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG-TERM TREASURY 2½-PERCENT ISSUES FALL 1/32 TO LOWEST LEVEL EVER—DIP SEEN REFLECTING BELIEF UNITED STATES MAY CONVERT SOME SHORT-TERM DEBT TO THIS TYPE ISSUE

NEW YORK.—Long-term issues of the United States Government's 2½ percent bonds retreated further yesterday on small offerings.

Both the bank-eligible 2½s of September 15, 1967–72, and the Victory Loan 2½s of December 15, 1967–72, slipped off 1/32 of a point to 94 17/32 bid, their lowest level since issuance.

The September 2½s were first offered to investors in 1941 and the December 2½s in 1945, the latter bonds coming in the final loan drive of World War II. Aside from their slightly shorter maturity, the Septembers are distinguished from the Decembers by the fact that they are eligible for investment by commercial banks.

Before 1951 neither issue ever sold below cost to the original investor, since it was the official policy to support them whenever the prices threatened to go below par. Beginning in that year the Federal Reserve System moved away from "mothering" the market and now acts only to avoid disorderly conditions, not to peg the bonds at any given prices.

The recent declines according to Government bond folk, probably reflect the growing belief that the new Republican administration may some time later in 1953 convert a part of the heavy short-term public debt into long-term securities.

This, it is thought, might be accomplished through a 30-year bond carrying interest at a rate ranging from 3 percent to 3¼ percent. The Victory Loan 2½s, which have a little less than 20 years to run to maturity, as of yesterday were yielding the buyer approximately 2.85 percent.

Commenting on yesterday's market, one dealer declared: "It's as thin as a dime. Everybody is keeping on the sidelines to see what the administration will do about a new long-term issue."

Almost nobody saw a connection between the lower Treasury bond prices and the reduction in margin requirements that sent the stock market higher. "It was just a further retreat by bonds in the face of the higher interest rates that more orthodox Treasury policies would involve," was the most general comment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to express in the RECORD my judgment as to where the responsibility rests. It rests clearly on the Eisenhower administration. As I stated earlier this afternoon, very early in the life of this administration the Secretary of the Treasury let go the tip as to the policy of the Treasury in regard to Government bonds. Why should not the writer in the Wall Street Journal write exactly as he did on the 25th of February, as to what the effect of that tip was on the bond market? Investors are going to wait and see.

What I deplore is the increase in the national debt which results from the increased interest rates. I think the Eisenhower administration should first have tried some other methods to bring about the necessary purchases of bonds.

What the American people need is an information program, a Voice of America here in America on the facts which confront this country economically; and then a program which relates to the facts, a program which is aimed not at increasing the national debt, but paying it off. I happen to be firmly of the opinion that the sacrificial obligation of our generation in the interest of long-term American history, in the welfare of American boys and girls who are going to walk the stage of America 100 years from now, is to leave them a sound economy. We are not going to do it by following a Government interest policy which increases the debt, and in my judgment serves only to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

I was interested in the comment which came from the other side of the aisle this afternoon. I do not share the views reflected in some of the expressions by Democratic Senators this afternoon in regard to what they think can be done or cannot be done in the field of economy. One of them pointed out, "You do not hear anyone suggest that the defense budget can be cut." My answer to him is that I do. I believe that it can be cut substantially. We can cut it by billions of dollars, by eliminating the waste and extravagance to be found in the defense budget. At the same time we shall have a sounder defense, because we shall have a sounder dollar, a sounder economy. In my judgment, we shall also have stronger installations as defense establishments.

I note the pres nce in the Chamber at this time of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. He has done exceedingly able work as chairman of the Johnson subcommittee, which issued 43 unanimous nonpartisan reports on the military policies of this Government in relation to contracts, expenditures, finance policies, fraud, and corruption which our committee disclosed. It was a great honor for me to serve with him on that subcommittee. Although the Senator from Texas and I have great differences of opinion on some things, I pay him honor again today by saying that I believe his work as chairman of the Johnson subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee saved the American taxpayers several billion dollars. I think a correct computation would put the saving at more than $5 billion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator very much for his generous comments. Moreover, I deeply appreciate the fine contribution which he has made toward that record.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Texas and the others of us who served in a nonpartisan capacity on the Johnson subcommittee know full well that great savings can be made in the Defense Department budget. The Long-Morse report, which was brought to the floor of the Senate, can be substantiated with respect to every statement which is made in that report, if we go behind the scenes into the executive records. Of course, we can save great sums of money. I disagree with the view expressed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, when it was pointed out that no one in the Senate was proposing to cut the defense budget. I am. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is; and the members of the Johnson subcommittee have signed reports which, in effect, amount to proposing the very same thing.

Mr. President, there is little said about making those savings and applying them on the national debt. I, too, want to see the time come, and come quickly, when we can reduce taxes, but I simply do not think we can keep faith with the challenge of our generation if we are not willing to lead the people of the United States into a better understanding of their economic responsibilities to American history. In our generation we had better be thinking in terms of American history, and we had better be thinking in terms of leaving to the Americans who are to follow us the sound economic policy for which I am arguing this afternoon.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF SENATE STAFFS

Mr. President, I have two other little matters I wish to take up, and then my work as a member of the Committee of the Whole for this week will be done.

I notice in the press that a proposal has been made that all the members of the Senate staffs should be investigated. I welcome that, and I wish to cooperate by volunteering this afternoon. I here and now notify the Attorney General that he can start with my staff and with the head of my office, the Senator from Oregon himself. I do not believe in discrimination. We are all in this together. If anyone is disturbed about the fact that members of our staffs have access to highly secret material and security material from time to time, I point out that that goes for Senators also. If it is important that our staffs be investigated, it is important that Senators be investigated. They are merely American citizens, after all. I do not know of anything in connection with our positions that should protect us from investigation.

So I say, "Mr. Attorney General, start with my office and my staff." I hope that other Senators will follow suit and volunteer. I believe it will be a fine example to set for the American people. If there is to be investigation, then let the investigation include every possible organization to which any Member of the Senate or his staff belongs or has belonged which might be subversive, such as the Ku Klux Klan. I think the Ku Klux Klan is highly un-American and is one of the most subversive organizations in America. If any Senator or member of his staff belongs or has belonged to any such subversive organization as a Nazi bund, or a Silver Shirt organization, as well as any Communist or Communist-tinged organization, or any other organization that is un-American and stands as a challenge to our constitutional system, I think he should be investigated.

Following this speech I shall send the Attorney General tomorrow excerpts from it that set forth this offer of mine so that he can start this investigation if there is cause to fear that Senators and their staffs are subversive. The sooner we can get all these investigations out of the way, the better. I am for them, subject, of course, to the rules of procedure which I discussed a week ago today when I did my committee work for that day. I may say to the Attorney General that my offer to investigate my office is not based upon the prior passage of any code of fair procedure. We will take the procedures as they generally apply, and proceed with them because I am satisfied that my office will survive with a clean bill of patriotic health no matter what procedures for the investigation are followed.

AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE

Now, Mr. President, I turn to another matter, and then I shall be through for the day. I wish to give a little advice to Henry Cabot Lodge, the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations.

I share the views expressed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], which I read in the press this morning, that he did not think the conduct of our former colleague was very tactful, and that he did not think he was very diplomatic when he refused to shake hands with Vishinsky. I did not think so either. I believe it would be well if Ambassador Lodge registered for some Emily Post course in diplomacy and ambassadorial courtesy. I dislike Vishinsky as much as he does, but I believe we have to separate our personal feelings from our public responsibilities and diplomatic duties. I am of the opinion that in our actions we should keep in mind the judgment of those countries in the world in which Russia has made greater progress with her vicious propaganda than we would like to admit. Mr. Lodge is reported to have justified his conduct with the question, "Don't you know there is a new administration in Washington?" I do not believe he truly represents the administration in that attitude. I should not like to think so. Good manners should even be expected from a Lodge from Massachusetts. Such pique as he displayed is good ammunition for the vicious Russian propagandists to shoot at us in India and the rest of Asia as well as in other parts of the world where the fight for freedom is taking place.

Mr. President, I wish Mr. Lodge well, but I wish he would be more tactful in his relations with the diplomats from other countries, even though we do not believe they are either tactful or diplomatic. I never knew that even in this kind of a situation two wrongs make a right.

I trust that this little fatherly and brotherly advice of mine may be of some help to the former Senator from Massachusetts, now the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations.

SUBMISSION OF REPORT

With this, Mr. President, I thank those who have been so kind as to listen to my report this afternoon, and I hope they liked it well enough to cause them to be with me again next Friday afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report of the Senator from Oregon will be received and appropriately filed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Livingston T. Merchant, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Anthony Julian, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice George F. Garrity, term expiring.

George E. MacKinnon, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Philip Neville, resigned.

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Myles J. Lane, resigning.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Robert Henry Beaudreau, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts, vice Arthur J. B. Cartier, removed.

Enard Erickson, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota, vice John J. McGowan, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Friday, February 27, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John M. Cabot, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to China.

James Clement Dunn, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1953

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis C. Vaeth, pastor, St. Bernardine's Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

O Divine Legislator, from whom all holy desires, right counsels, and just works do proceed, bless these loyal Senators of the United States with that perfect peace which the world cannot give, neither can it take away—that positive peace perpetuated by a consecrated conscientiousness of loyalty and devotion to God, to our Nation, and to our people and their fellow Senators. Enlighten their minds and strengthen their wills that they may direct their hearts to obey Thy commandments and thus, being freed from the fear of both domestic and foreign enemies, may satisfactorily serve their God, their Nation, and their people in peace, in justice, and in truth. Bless them with the courage of their honest and sincere convictions and convince them of their unselfish courage that they may realize in serving the Nation and its people they are truly serving Thee, the omniscient lawgiver and loving Father of all nations and all men. Reward their self-sacrificing service with that satisfying serenity of soul, promised by Thee to faithful servants—"Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord"—and so poetically paraphrased by Father Abrams Ryan:

"Better than grandeur, better than gold,
Than ranks and titles a thousand fold,
Is a healthy body and a mind at ease
And simple pleasures that always please,
A heart that can feel for another's woes
With sympathy large enough to enfold
All men, as brothers, is better than gold."

May the peace, blessing, strength, and wisdom of God abide with you always. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 27, 1953, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. PASTORE were excused from sessions of the Senate for the next few days, while attending to official committee business in New York City.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., FORMER SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call attention to the unanimous-consent order for today, which reads as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, March 2, 1953, immediately following the approval of the Journal, it be in order for Senators to deliver addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late Honorable Robert M. La Follette, Jr., formerly a Senator from the State of Wisconsin.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Griswold	Monroney
Bricker	Hayden	Morse
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bush	Hennings	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Capehart	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Chavez	Jackson	Saltonstall
Clements	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kefauver	Sparkman
Douglas	Kennedy	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Tobey
Ferguson	Long	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
Fulbright	Mansfield	Wiley
George	Maybank	Young
Gillette	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I rise to express my great distress because of the death of former Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and to say a few words in appreciation of his character and his outstanding public and legislative service.

I first met Bob La Follette when I came to the Senate in 1939. He was then a veteran Senator, having been first elected in 1925, 14 years before that time. He practically lived his entire life as a Senator. Because of a serious illness, he was not able to graduate from the University of Wisconsin, although his outstanding merit was recognized later by the conferring upon him of an honorary degree by that university. Instead of returning to college, he became secretary to his father in Washington and was thoroughly familiar with the practices and procedure of the Senate long before he became a Senator. When his father died he was elected to succeed him, and served continuously for 22 years. Although he was not a lawyer, he had a complete grasp of legal principles, and particularly of parliamentary law, and his outstanding ability enabled him to be as good a legislator as any lawyer could be.

I served with him both on the Finance Committee and on the Education and Labor Committee, and so I came to know him intimately as a person and in connection with many legislative problems. He believed strongly in the principles of his father and adhered to those principles faithfully, with due regard, of course, to changing conditions. He was brought up in a school which believed in greater Government intervention in various matters, with respect to which he went somewhat further than I, but his abiding interest was always the welfare of the people. He was never a demagog. He was always sincere, and the soul of honor itself. He had an able mind and could present the most effective arguments and reasons for his views. The speeches he made had a marked effect on many Senators, although he was not of their party.

When I came here he was one of that group, which I joined, which was fundamentally opposed to our entry into the Second World War until we were actually attacked, and he and I attended many meetings with Senators Johnson, of California, Borah, Vandenberg, and others who were concerned to maintain American neutrality as long as that could be accomplished. He was with the rest of us in the battle against the Lend-Lease Act, which was practically the turning point in the final decision to take part in the war.

I remember well our joint work on the Hill-Burton Act in the Education and Labor Committee, and I knew that he was not an extremist on Federal welfare measures, but was willing to protect the rights of the States and to adjust Federal aid to the necessities of particular communities and particular situations. He was a believer in sound finance, the balancing of the budget, and a stable currency. He was intensely interested in social security, and I worked with him on many amendments to that law.

I remember working with him on a subcommittee on the taxation of cooperative and mutual fire liability insurance companies. He was an ardent believer in the cooperative movement and felt that I did not have sufficient sympathy with it, although I thought I was quite friendly and agreed finally to a settlement of the problem which left the mutual insurance companies in almost too favorable a situation.

Many have referred to the work which he did in connection with the reorganization of the Senate. He knew more about the Senate than any other Senator, and had very definite ideas on how our work could be improved. I do not think he agreed with all the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act, but he certainly is entitled to credit for most of them and for modernization of the Senate organization.

In 1946, Bob La Follette suffered the kind of fate that is likely to meet any of us who depend on elective office, in part at least because he felt and expressed such a strong sense of loyalty to his progressive associates in Wisconsin. He never let his defeat affect his good humor or his interest in public matters. He became interested in other

work, and stayed away from the Senate, largely, I think, because he did not like the idea of any former Senator lobbying, or even being accused of lobbying. During these 6 years I have missed very much the personal association with him. Today I pay tribute to a man of outstanding character, a public servant devoted to his public employers, an outstanding statesman, and one of the greatest of Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as long as our people venerate integrity, statesmanship, and loyalty, the name of the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., will be cherished and honored in these United States.

It was not my privilege to serve with him in the Senate, and I make that statement with a deep sense of regret. But no one who lived and worked in Washington during the years of his service could fail to be aware of the contribution he made to his Nation.

The fighting son of a fighting father, Bob La Follette looked upon his position in the Senate as one which carried many obligations and few privileges. He looked upon public service as a challenge—a challenge to battle for the underprivileged and for the Nation.

He was a man who was never afraid of being in a minority—no matter how unpopular. He was a man who frequently found himself in disagreement with his colleagues, but his integrity was never challenged.

He was also a man of achievement—a man whose deeds still live in the form of laws and acts that touch our lives today. The legislative Reorganization Act is but one of his many accomplishments.

Every chapter must come to an end and Bob La Follette has gone to his eternal reward. Before the bar of history, there can be only one verdict—public servant, statesman, great American.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in paying my respects and tribute to a good man and a former colleague. I worked very closely with Bob La Follette from the time I came to this body in January 1941. He was one of the ablest public servants I have ever known. He was one of the few men, so far as I know, who could change a vote on the floor of the Senate by giving his opinion on pending legislation.

He was particularly watchful of those interests which might seek, through legislation, to obtain unwarranted advantages for themselves at the expense of the public or of their competitors. Although he was always watchful of what have come to be known as vested interests, I never knew him to be unfair toward them. He was always mindful of the needs of the laboring man, or the union man, if one wishes to use that term, but he was never their man, because he would not always do what they wanted him to do. He never hesitated to give the representatives and spokesmen of labor warnings when he thought they were trying to do something that they should not be doing, or tried to obtain what was not properly theirs. Perhaps he thus alienated the support of certain union labor interests in his State, which contributed to his defeat the last time he ran for public office.

He was always considerate of what we call the underprivileged, but I never knew of his trying to capitalize on his sympathy for them in the political field.

His last and perhaps his most important work was done on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. As those of us who were here then will recall, the bill came up late in the session. It was finally enacted during July, just before the primaries in Wisconsin which would determine whether he would be renominated for his office in the Senate.

I had heard disturbing rumors from Wisconsin, and in the early part of July I spoke to Bob and told him that he ought to go home, for his own good, to assure his renomination. He expressed himself as being apprehensive about it and felt that probably he would not be renominated; but he said he could not go home because he had to look after the bill. He felt that it had gone to the point where he could not leave it and go home in behalf of his renomination. Undoubtedly if he had gone home he would have been renominated. Nevertheless, he felt that his duty to the people of the Nation was more important than his renomination. There were those of us who disagreed with him on that point, but nevertheless he did what his conscience told him to do. He was defeated.

After his defeat he took up other lines of work. However, after he lost the nomination so far as I know, he never came back on the Hill, except once. Perhaps it was because some of us did not ask him to come back as we should have done. We get very careless about such things. I feel sometimes that we could have done more than we did to have made his outside work happier for him.

A few nights before Bob La Follette's death I was talking with a South American diplomat, who told me of the respect and esteem in which Bob La Follette was held in his country. Even after he left the Senate, he continued this good work.

Many of us who knew him best will miss him sadly, because we thought of him more often than we saw him. I think that the most we can do for him now and the best way in which we can pay our homage to his memory and to the work he did for his country is to try to do our work here as well as he did his work when he was one of us.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to pay a brief tribute to Robert M. La Follette, Jr. My tribute will be completely unstudied and entirely sincere.

When Bob La Follette first began to serve this body his father was here. I am perhaps the only Member of the Senate who served with Robert M. La Follette, Sr., whom I recall very pleasantly, because shortly after I entered the Senate, he came over to me and talked with me. He knew some people in my State, and felt very close to some of my very warm friends.

Young Bob La Follette was virtually raised in the Senate and around the Capitol. He knew the procedures of the Senate perhaps better than anyone else, because he gave special attention to the work of the Senate, even before he succeeded his father as a Member of this body.

I served for a number of years with Bob La Follette, Jr., as a member of the Committee on Finance and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Bob La Follette became a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations in 1929, as I recall. I had been a member of the committee for perhaps 1 year or more before he entered upon his service on the committee. At that time, as now, distinguished Members of this body served on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Generally speaking, Bob La Follette shared the views of such eminent Senators as William E. Borah, of Idaho; Hiram Johnson, of California; and others, although after Pearl Harbor and after we entered the war, Bob La Follette gave his wholehearted and unstinted support to every effort to win that war.

I knew Bob La Follette perhaps best as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, because I was acting chairman of that committee, and subsequently was chairman of the committee, during a period when he served as a useful member. Bob La Follette always had his own views, in which he earnestly and sincerely believed, on all matters with which that committee had to deal. After he became a member of the committee, it considered not merely matters of taxation, but also matters relating to social security, including the present Social Security System—which was amended in 1950, after he left this body—and practically all veterans' legislation relating to World War I and, subsequently, that relating to World War II.

Bob La Follette had the keenest sympathy for men who labor, for the workers of the country. He had a thorough understanding of their problems. He had deep convictions regarding taxation. He believed profoundly in taxing according to ability to pay. I do not remember reporting a bill to the Senate or studying a bill in the Finance Committeee without having Bob La Follette manifest his willingness to make known his views, and to make them known in the strongest possible terms.

Bob La Follette was a man of strong character, Mr. President. He could differ with his colleagues without ever questioning their honesty or integrity. He was a man of rare qualities with respect to his deep conviction that all members of the Finance Committee and all other Members of the Senate were entitled to hold their convictions; and rarely, if ever, did he question the honesty of purpose of anyone who differed with him on any important matter. Time after time he presented his view that taxes should be levied according to ability to pay. When the committee decided against him, as it generally did on that particular question, he acquiesced in the decision of the committe, but reserved his right to come to this floor and present his views. Many times he expressed his ideas here on taxation matters. He did so with great clarity, much force and vigor, and the utmost sincerity, but always with respect for other members of his own committee, and for other Members of the Senate who differed with him.

With respect to the administrative and technical side of the tax acts which the

committee had to formulate with great rapidity, and with respect to general provisions of taxation in which he had no particular interest, he made his contribution, nevertheless, and stood loyally by the committee in the presentation of so much of the tax or revenue measures as he could conscientiously endorse.

Bob La Follette was a realist in the true sense, and approached all subjects as a realist. Likewise he was a liberal in the true sense.

When we were entering the great depression, indeed, when we had entered it, although many men in public life did not comprehend the severity of that terrific economic storm, which was sweeping not only our own country but also a large part of the civilized world, Bob La Follette came upon this floor and urged the appropriation of a staggeringly large sum of money, for that day and time. I remember how he presented that proposal. I think I was the only conservative in this body who voted with Bob La Follette for an appropriation which would have been adequate, had it been resolutely used and applied in the early days of that depression, to have stemmed the terrific economic tide which carried down so many fortunes in this, our land. We were defeated, but Bob La Follette never forgot my vote on that political measure.

After he was defeated as a Member of this body, he came to my office during the first 2 or 3 weeks of every session of Congress and talked to me at length. I not only respected him, but I learned to love him because of his high sense of honor and because of his indefatigable industry and his great ability as a Member of this body.

He not only labored, of course, to bring about the Reorganization Act, but he understood something of the philosophy which lay back of his labors in trying to reform the procedure in the Senate. Time after time he came to me and talked to me about the articles which were appearing during the Second World War and afterward, from the pens of so many writers—articles which were, in fact bold attacks upon the Senate. Bob La Follette understood very early what they meant. He knew that those attacks were inspired by a desire to cripple representative government in these United States, and, indeed, in the free world. With deep conviction on the subject, he anxiously sought an opportunity to revise the rules and the procedure of the Senate. The Reorganization Act was but a feeble expression of what he wished to do. But being a realist, he knew that he had to take one step at a time; he had to make progress slowly.

On the Finance Committee and on the Foreign Relations Committee one could always count upon the position taken by Bob La Follette in committee to be his position steadfastly to the end. He was not given to compromise, but he knew that many pieces of legislation had to be the result of compromise. Consequently, he was willing to agree with his fellow members on those two important committees.

Having served with him on the Foreign Relations Committee, I know with what deep conviction he opposed our entry into World War II, as his distinguished father before him had opposed our entry into World War I. He opposed every step which he considered to be leading to World War II, which finally engulfed us, of course, following the attack on Pearl Harbor.

It fell to my lot to confer with Secretary Stimson and others who were most interested in what we know as lend-lease legislation. In its formative stage, Bob La Follette often conferred with me regarding that particular piece of legislation. He did not approve it. He regarded it as a certain step toward war. Mr. President, it was as the result of a suggestion made in conference at the State Department with the then Secretary of State, with the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and others, that the lend-lease bill was introduced in both Houses of the Congress by the leaders of the major party. But it fell to my lot on this floor to carry the burden of the fight for lend-lease. Bob La Follette, while strongly and definitely disagreeing with the legislation, nevertheless accorded to me as he always did, complete honesty of purpose in presenting that legislation to this body.

It had seemed to me, Mr. President, for some months that we were becoming involved in the war then going on in Europe, and would ultimately become an active participant in it. But it seeemed to me also that through lend-lease we might possibly avoid the necessity of entering it. We all know, of course, what happened. Hindsight, of course, is always better than foresight, particularly in a period of great crisis; but not once did Bob La Follete question the integrity, the motive, the purpose, and the high honor of anyone who sponsored lend-lease or any other piece of legislation which did not have his approval.

I recall that, shortly after we entered the war, a very serious question arose regarding oil. The late Senator Vandenberg, then a distinguished Senator from Michigan, Senator Bob La Follette, Jr., and two or three other Members of the Foreign Relations Committee were members of a subcommittee to study a very important agreement or treaty with respect to oil. Many matters were brought to us in confidence, and, when certain information reached us which, at that time, we were not free to divulge to the general public, Bob La Follette, who heard the facts, said that, regardless of the facts and regardless of every other consideration, he was willing to go all out to procure and to safeguard the oil which might become so vital to us in that great conflict.

So, Mr. President, I was deeply grieved at the passing of Bob La Follette. I suppose that each of us, at some time in life, passes through our Gethsemane.

Bob La Follette was a man of tireless industry, of unsullied integrity, and of fine purpose in life as a public servant. He loved the Senate. He resented every attack upon it as an attack, not only upon this body but upon representative government, upon free government. He acted always in accordance with his deep conviction that he was striving to better the condition of the common man, to better the condition of his fellow citizens. He knew what criticism was. When he was but a boy he had observed severe criticism aimed at his distinguished father; but he did not carry bitterness as a result of it, he did not harbor any unworthy thoughts. From the first to the last, he was so straightforward in his own thinking, in his own integrity, in his own high purpose as a citizen and as a public servant, that he could not question the position of any man if he believed that the man held his position honestly and sincerely.

To his wife, who was truly his helpmeet, and to his two fine boys, I am sure the Senate wishes to express its deepest sympathy. To the great State of Wisconsin, likewise, I am sure the Senate wishes to express sympathy in connection with the passing of one of her distinguished sons who contributed so greatly to the history of that great State in this body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, when I first entered the Senate I had the privilege of serving with the late Senator La Follette on the Committee on Labor and Education, as it was then called, and, shortly afterward, on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can therefore join with my colleagues who have expressed themselves regarding their association with him in the performance of senatorial duties. Out of my own experience I desire to add a further word of tribute.

Young Bob La Follette commanded the genuine admiration and respect even of those who opposed his views. He was always a courageous, honest, and skillful fighter for the principles in which he believed. He, like his father before him, was a truly devoted public servant.

Bob La Follette, Jr., will chiefly be remembered for his work as chairman of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee. By exposing substandard working and living conditions this committee laid the groundwork for the social reforms which followed during the next 20 years and which have now become accepted parts of our political and economic fabric.

Senator La Follette's skill as a legislator and student of political science was illustrated by his accomplishments in the field of legislative reorganization. The La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act and the great improvements which it brought about in our legislative procedures testify to his energy, persistence, and devotion to the cause of efficient and responsible government.

Young Bob was a radical in a number of respects. With many of his views and ideas some of us could not agree. But he was a man of such great integrity and principle that he inevitably commanded the respect of all those who worked with him. His individual personality, as well as the large part which he played in the development of American political institutions and public policy, will be long and well remembered.

Mr. President, in the shock of his sad passing, I am overcome by the thought that one who worked among us here should have been the victim of a sad and uncontrollable depression. In the crowded hours through which we are all living do we become unaware of the sufferings of our close friends? He was able to sense the sufferings of his fellow human beings and he gave of himself, during

his life with us in the Senate, to alleviate those sufferings. When his hour of suffering came, were we too busy? Did we pass by on the other side? I cannot raise the question without a pang in my heart.

But I can say to his family and those whom he loved that he gave to us all a great something for which we are eternally indebted.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at its meeting on February 25, the Foreign Relations Committee authorized me, as chairman, to send to the widow and family of the former Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., a letter of condolence. I should like to read that letter now, and to incorporate it in the record of today's proceedings:

FEBRUARY 26, 1953.

Mrs. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. LA FOLLETTE: At a meeting on yesterday, February 25, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which Senator La Follette served so long and so ably, authorized and directed me, as chairman, to convey to you the committee's deep sense of grief at the tragic death of your distinguished husband, and to extend to you its heartfelt sympathy in your hour of bereavement.

Those of us who were privileged to serve with Senator La Follette in the Senate and particularly in the closer companionship of the Foreign Relations Committee knew and loved him as a friend and a comrade whose courage, honesty, and integrity were an inspiration to us all. He was a man of high ideals, strong character, and extraordinary devotion to the principles of this Republic.

We were inexpressibly shocked and grieved, and we feel a deep sense of personal loss.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Mr. President, I spoke briefly on the floor of the Senate on February 25 in memory of Bob La Follette, and submitted Senate Resolution 85, which was unanimously agreed to by the Senate as a whole. Mere words, however, are not sufficient to express our sense of sorrow at the passing of this great and good American though I do not think I have ever heard a finer encomium paid anyone than that which was paid this morning by the distinguished Senator from Georgia to my former associate Robert La Follette.

The vitality of Bob La Follette's ideas, his philosophy of living, indeed the strength of his personality make it impossible to think of him as less than alive and serving a cause in which he believed and in which he was deeply interested. It is immeasurably comforting now to know that he has but exchanged the shadow for the substance of existence, and that while he walked with other men, he gave the best of himself for the improvement of others. He had a great heart for humanity, a warmth and compassion for others that will not be forgotten.

One of his unique talents was an ability to translate that feeling for others into positive terms. The thousands of little men who profited from his contribution to a better way of life, to an elevated place in the sun, to an enhanced self-respect, cannot, indeed should never, overlook Bob La Follette's rich understanding of their needs, and, to the best of his ability, the supplying of those needs.

His was a mind not fenced in with dogma and preconceived notions of how to attain a worthy objective. If red-tape and outworn procedures stood in the way of progress, Senator La Follette was the first to find a way around such obstacles. And find a way he did, although he sometimes had to endure criticism and condemnation from those who wanted to stand still. In both word and deed he was a progressive in the true sense of that term.

A tireless and indefatigable worker, he was also selfless in his labor in the Senate. One might say of him that in the interests of increased efficiency in the legislative arm of his Government, he sacrificed his personal interests for the over-riding good; he neglected political considerations for what seemed to him far worthier goals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, there is nothing I can add to the eloquent statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in his tribute to young Bob La Follette, as he was affectionately called. The proudest and greatest privilege I have had in life was to serve in the Senate with such statesmen as George Norris, Hiram Johnson, William Borah, Burton K. Wheeler, and young Bob La Follette. All those men were true liberals in the best sense of that much abused word—they were progressives. Bob La Follette was by no manner of means the least of those men; in my book he did not take second place to any man. His heartbeat in understanding and sympathy for the oppressed; for the farmer; for the "little man"; for the man who could not be here to speak for himself. He was not radical in any sense of that ugly word; he was liberal and progressive in his thoughts about people and political theories. He was sound in his desire for good government. He wanted this Government to be the very best and he wanted it to be sound to the *n*th degree. As the distinguished Senator from Georgia has pointed out, he had a great love and a sincere respect for this body in which we are privileged to serve.

Approximately 3 weeks ago Bob La Follette called at my office and we had another of those delightful visits which I shall always remember. He visited me once or twice every year. We discussed many things. He was as interested as he ever was in what was taking place in the Congress, in the United States, and in the world and he was wide awake and alert as to what was happening. Although he has been in business—big business—for 6 years, none of his political views had undergone any revision.

Mr. President, I shall remember so long as I live the last visit I had with Bob La Follette.

I wish to associate myself with everything the Senator from Georgia had to say this morning with reference to Bob La Follette. I completely concur in his detailed and eloquent statement. I served on the Finance Committee with Senators GEORGE and La Follette and heard the arguments made there, and I know how sound Bob La Follette was on all tax questions.

As the Senator from Georgia put it, Bob La Follette insisted that taxes be levied on the basis of ability to pay. He wanted Government to be based on the principle of justice, equality, and human welfare, and he fought for it along that line without compromise and without surrender. That should give us a true insight into the views of this thoughtful and forceful statesman on all political questions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., whose untimely passing we mourn today, was known as young Bob.

He will always be young Bob, for his spirit and mind were characterized by youthful courage, flexibility, and the quest for truth and facts. It has always been the young who seek new paths, new ways for meeting old problems; who reject the tyranny of labels.

Young Bob successfully carried on the magnificent work of his father, the old but ever new fight of independence in thought and politics.

Both old Bob and young Bob knew no allegiance but their loyalty to their country and to the principles of democracy. They waged courageous battles for freedom as a matter of conscience. They rejected the mere formalism of allegiance to a political party and embraced the more meaningful allegiance to ideas and programs.

As a Senator, young Bob was a Progressive—before that name was sullied by lesser men. He was an independent, and his work is a monument to freemen.

The work of the La Follette committee of the 1930's was one of the great contributions of modern times to the advancement of freedom. With courage and without favor, young Bob uncovered violence and repression and the more subtle interference with the freedom of action and mind which marks free citizens. He did not seek sensational headlines. He sought facts, and he sought realistic solutions which were consistent with democratic principles.

His final work as a Senator was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That great reform, which compelled admiration and respect from both sides of the aisle, was accomplished in large measure by the leadership of young Bob. Disagreements and doubts were resolved by his intervention because of his earned reputation for integrity and devotion to the public good.

I hope I will be excused for making a personal comment. Young Bob was born in Madison, Wis., near my birthplace. Each year at the Dane County Fair I enjoyed a very happy association with the La Follette boys. They raised Shetland ponies, as did I. On most occasions they were successful in defeating me in the show ring. But I had one pony which they could not defeat. I shall never forget the fine lessons of sportsmanship young Bob taught me when I was a boy, because each year when that pony would win the blue ribbon, it would be young Bob who would be first to enter the ring to shake my hand, congratulate me, and say, "I still would like to own that pony."

I have felt a special kinship of spirit to the crusading independence of both the La Follettes, because of the great inspiration which their leadership has

been to me from the time I was a small boy.

Young Bob La Follette made a record of independent judgment and action which we cannot duplicate. But we can seek to follow and emulate the principles which guided the two Senators—which have staked out for them an immortal place in American history—which have contributed to a more vital and more free America.

Young Bob was a lover of the poems of Robert Burns. In my judgment, Burns wrote a great monument to young Bob when he penned these immortal lines:

EPITAPH ON A FRIEND

(By Robert Burns)

An honest man here lies at rest,
As e'er God with His image blest,
The friend of man, the friend of truth,
The friend of age, and guide of youth.

Few hearts like his, with virtue warm'd,
Few heads with knowledge so inform'd.

To Bob La Follette's wife, Rachael, and his two boys, Mrs. Morse and I extend our deep sympathy, and pray for them God's comfort and blessings.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, few Senators throughout our history had such a wide and lasting impact upon America as did Robert M. La Follette, Jr.

Looking back upon the history of the years in which he served in this body, from 1925 to 1946, the imprint of "Young Bob" on the idealism of our democracy is found on the milestones of our progress.

Using different methods, but still aiming at fundamental improvements in democracy which his distinguished father had waged a single-handed fight to achieve, Bob La Follette lived to see many of these reforms become a permanent part of American life.

His success in following through on the paths charted by his father was due primarily to his devotion to his work and to his great appreciation of his responsibility as a Member of the Senate. He always knew and understood every fact of the problem with which he was dealing. He had an unbounded energy to carry through, regardless of the odds. His great skill as a parliamentarian, and the respect all Senators, regardless of political views, entertained for his sincerity and for his knowledge of any subject with which he was concerned, gave him leadership that few other Senators have enjoyed.

His efforts to guarantee to labor fundamental freedom to organize, his zeal for investigation into cases of oppression and violation of civil rights, and his desire to relieve the disaster of unemployment made him a leader in this field of legislation.

But his interest did not stop there. He spoke out strongly for a strong and a sound fiscal policy, and was one of the leaders in establishing a fair base for Federal revenue, one that put in plain focus the part of the load that every taxpayer was expected to carry.

His recognition of the aim of Stalin for world imperialism came early, and his exposure of it, and his constant efforts to safeguard American foreign policy against Communist duplicity, proved his foresight against this danger.

The finest experience of my service in the Congress came through my association with Bob La Follette. I was privileged to serve with him in the efforts to reorganize the Congress, and I well know the scope and breadth of his understanding of our legislative machinery. It was largely his vast knowledge of parliamentary government, its artificial roadblocks, and its deficiencies that led to the acceptance of the report of the Committee on Legislative Reorganization of which he was the chairman.

Hardly was the ink dry on the report when Bob La Follette was busy translating the report into legislation. With enthusiasm and energy, he completed the complicated drafting of the bill and then moved swiftly to secure its passage. I am firmly convinced that it was the personal leadership and recognized ability of Bob La Follette that secured consideration of the bill by the Senate and the House and opened the way for its enactment into law. Day after day, with patience and good humor, he explained the complicated bill and won for it the support that brought about its final passage.

As in most of his other efforts, he completely ignored his own personal political fortunes and stayed on the job to see the legislation through to final enactment, despite the fact that he was facing the most difficult political race of his career. Had he been able to return to his State for the primary campaign, instead of remaining in Washington, his loss of the nomination by 5,000 votes undoubtedly would not have occurred.

Because of his character, his leadership, his determination always to fight hard, but fairly, for the things he believed in, he added stature to the United States Senate. He scorned hypocrisy, demagoguery, and pretense. He had the courage of his convictions to fight alone, if necessary, for the things he believed were good for the country he loved. He had the good humor, the friendship, and the love of his fellow man that helped to carry through to enactment his ideas and ideals of good government.

It is small wonder that the record made by Robert La Follette, Jr., properly won for him national and international recognition.

Mr. President, so many of the great newspapers of our country have written of his contributions to our Government that I ask unanimous consent to have some of them included at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington News of February 25, 1953]

BOB LA FOLLETTE

News of the suicide of former Senator Robert M. La Follette comes as a shock to his thousands of friends and to the multitude of Americans who followed his public career.

Despondency over ill health is the only explanation offered, and indeed the only one that could make sense, for Bob La Follette was a man of tough and logical mind and of stout heart, with a body that long seemed to lack the stamina for the hard endeavor to which he applied himself.

Bob practically was born to public life. He was only five when his father, old Bob, was elected Governor of Wisconsin. After old Bob went to the Senate, and the son reached the age to do the work, Young Bob served as his father's secretary, and upon his father's death, young Bob succeeded to his seat, and was reelected 3 times—serving, in all, 22 years in the Senate.

He grew in stature, usefulness, and influence. Bob never took the Senate floor without first mastering the subject on which he chose to speak—and when he spoke, other Senators listened. He was a progressive of the school founded by his father, among men of the caliber of Burton Wheeler, George Norris, and Bill Borah; men of a time and a philosophy not to be associated with the muddle-headedness which has been passed off as progressivism and liberalism in recent years.

Bob La Follette scorned pretense and hypocrisy and demagogery. He supported all the early reforms of the Roosevelt administration, but he parted company with the New Deal on its fiscal irresponsibility. He believed in pay-as-you-go government.

He opposed hidden taxation, and thought all taxes should be visible, painful, and broadly based, so that the people would be encouraged to police their Government's spending. At one time when the Roosevelt administration shifted its tax policy for punitive and political purposes, Senator La Follette stood up and said something which those who heard him will not forget.

"American business," he said, "can adjust itself to progressive legislation. But American business can never adjust to constant uncertainty."

A list of his accomplishments would fill many pages of this newspaper. We mention only a few:

His 1937 investigation of the "little steel" strike, which threw so much light on the labor-management troubles of that time. His coauthorship of the Congressional Reorganization Act, which won him the 1946 Collier's award as the outstanding Senator. His early understanding of and warnings against the Communist menace. His alertness to the dangers inherent in President Roosevelt's secret dealings with Stalin. His quick recognition that the United Nations would founder on the San Francisco Charter provision of the veto power.

We extend condolences to his family, and we regret to say that since Bob La Follette's defeat in 1946, we have not known his like in the United States Senate.

[From the Washington Post of February 26, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Robert M. La Follette, Jr., was the model of a high-minded and responsible Senator, and he left a lasting imprint on Congress in the Reorganization Act of 1946. He always regarded the modernization of the archaic procedures of Congress, embodied in the La Follette-Monroney Act, as his outstanding achievement, and doubtless it will be so recorded. But his 21 years of legislative service from 1925 to 1946 were filled with achievement. He fought hard for the progressive ideals charter by his father in such varied fields as minimum-wage legislation and the protection of civil liberties. He was a skilled parliamentarian and a clean fighter, and his gifts of persuasion won many to what had been a minority view. Even in his prewar isolationism he had the respect of his opponents for the sincerity of his conviction.

Bob La Follette was in a sense the victim of his own idealism. During the 1946 campaign he was too busy with the Reorganization Act to go back to Wisconsin and campaign. He had taken root in Washington, and he relied on the Progressive tradition in Wisconsin to see him through. He was less fortunate in this respect than Senator Vandenberg in Michigan. The Progressive Party had decayed, and Senator La Follette lost the Republican nomination by a mere 5,000 votes. Ironically it was the groups

he had befriended most—the liberals and particularly the labor unions—that ganged up to defeat him, and put in JOSEPH MCCARTHY.

Mr. La Follette took his defeat stoically and without rancor. He threw himself into the battle for the Marshall plan; he became a member of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; and he went into business as consultant to several large firms having interests in Latin America. His death by his own hand, no doubt occasioned by his persistent ill health, is deplorable.

[From the Madison Capital Times of February 25, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

The tragic gunshot that ended the dramatic life of young Bob La Follette Tuesday took from Wisconsin and the Nation a man whose greatness is denied by none. But it left, in bold relief, the monumental achievements of the 58 years of his life's span.

A great son of a great father, few men in America have packed into so short a time such outstanding achievement, so exciting a career, or so much devoted service to his fellow man.

Bob La Follette, it has been said, was born to serve. As a boy he stood by the side of his great father, striving in the monumental work that made the La Follette name and the name of Wisconsin familiar to the world. As a young man, he was with his father through the storm-tossed years of the fight to translate Wisconsin's achievements to the national scene. He knew what it meant early in life to feel the sting of calumny that so often falls on the head of a public servant devoted only to the welfare of the people. He stood by his father's side on the floor of the Senate of the United States and watched him escape assassination only by the intervention of other Senators with the assailant. As a sensitive young man, he lived through the era when his father was hung in effigy because of his stouthearted battle for what he considered to be the best interests of the people of his country.

Another man, made of weaker stuff, would have emerged from these experiences cynical and embittered. But young Bob came through these experiences to take his own place in the public life of the Nation and carry on the tradition of public service which his father had established.

At the early age of 30 he took his place in the United States Senate to begin a career that was to extend over a period of 2 decades of noble achievement in the service of the people his father served so devotedly. It has been said, even by some of those who fought him hardest, that in those two decades he left a record that accords him the right to be considered among the greatest of the statesmen who have sat in the Senate.

To enumerate his achievements there is to recite a litany of the obvious. Respected, feared, and admired, he was the watchdog of the people's interests. Many of the great achievements of the New Deal era, which bore the name of other Senators, were the fruit of his long struggle alongside other independents such as Norris, of Nebraska; Cutting, of New Mexico, and Borah of Idaho. The Tennessee Valley Authority, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Wagner Act, unemployment relief, bank insurance, farm relief, and the other monuments of progressive government were but a few of the projects he helped to start and saw through to a successful conclusion.

Under his hand the La Follette Liberties Committee in the thirties exposed the conspiracy of force and corruption aimed at denying American workers their right to organize and bargain collectively. His patient work and long years of experience shaped and put through the La Follette reorganization bill in the 79th Congress.

Few men ever came to the Senate with greater responsibility. It was his task to fill the seat of a man whose ability, courage, and incorruptibility had won the admiration of a nation and a large part of the world. With simplicity and deep dedication young Bob went to work at the job of meeting that responsibility.

He suffered the same abuse and vilification his father suffered. He was redbaited from one end of the country to the other. When he acquired a small piece of real estate to develop for a home for his family his enemies, by the use of fraudulent pictures, told the people of Wisconsin that he had purchased a large Virginia estate. He paid the price of devoted service to the people.

And, at last, when he was cut down and his 20 years of service were ended, it is perhaps his greatest tribute that it took a combination of the extremists on the right and on the left to do the job. It was the alliance of the right-wing Republicans and the Communists, then in control of the Wisconsin CIO, which brought his public career to an end.

It was characteristic of Bob La Follette that he could take this ironical twist of the political fates with the same good grace that marked his acceptance of the treatment given his father. He was able to do so because he was born and reared in the tradition of serving the people. He had learned well from his father that, in the cause which he served, the rewards are few and bitter.

But like his father he never lost faith through the long years of service in the ultimate success of the cause. He saw the many things for which his father fought become part of the lives of the people of his State. And after the death of his father he saw them take shape and become a part of the lives of the people of the Nation. And his great reward was to have had a part in shaping them in the United States Senate.

His father, like the great mass of the people of Wisconsin who today lead a better life because he lived, would have been proud of him.

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 25, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

In the 105 years of its statehood, Wisconsin has been represented by 21 men in the United States Senate, and Robert M. La Follette, Jr., served the longest of any of them.

His senatorial career covered 22 years. That record is approached only by his father, with 19, and Timothy Otis Howe, who served 18 years between 1861 and 1879.

Young Bob entered the Senate in 1925 on his father's name. He was the youngest Member of that body since Henry Clay. He was scorned by the then controlling ultra-conservative leadership for his youth and for his allegiance to the midwestern liberal group that was soon to be labeled "the sons of the wild jackass." But when he departed in 1946, he held the highest respect of most Members of the Senate whatever their political leanings.

He earned this respect chiefly by his industry and his skill as a legislative technician. He was not the dramatic figure that his father had been, nor the brilliant orator, nor the stubborn fighter. He carried his points by his hard work in committee and by his mastery of subjects under discussion on the floor. He was the sort of Senator most appreciated by other Senators.

His last, and probably his greatest, contribution to the Congress and to the Nation was the Reorganization Act. In this he made a start on the streamlining of the legislative machinery. He had to overcome tradition and custom. Congress has backtracked on the Reorganization Act since 1946, but it still stands as a monument to La Follette's ability and as a model for future congressional reformers.

The Journal often disagreed with Senator La Follette on issues of the day—particularly his chronic isolationism (like his father's) and what appeared to be opportunistic exploiting of labor issues in the quest for votes.

But this newspaper never doubted his industry, ability, and personal honesty—and his essential desire to be of public service.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 25, 1953]

YOUNG BOB

The tragic death of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., will shock every American who has come to regard the family name he bore as the symbol of a tradition which America cannot do without.

Young Bob not only bore the name. As a United States Senator from Wisconsin for 21 years, he ably carried on the tradition. He may not have had as wide a range as his father, but by and large he stood for the same fearless independence, the same passionate regard for the rights of ordinary men, the same concern for economic justice widely distributed. Among the notable achievements of his career was the committee which investigated strikebreaking and oppressive labor practices in the thirties.

It was always the essence of political irony that when young Bob at length sought to find a home within the Republican Party, he was rejected in the Wisconsin primary and his distinguished senatorial career was ended. Subsequent history has doubled the irony of that 1946 primary which La Follette lost by 5,000 votes, for the man who beat him was JOSEPH P. MCCARTHY, who now swaggers about the United States Senate as the living antithesis to the La Follette tradition.

On whatever evil days that tradition may fall, American politics cannot do without it. And if there are no La Follettes to carry it on, there will be others of other names and from other States. For what old Bob and young Bob stood for is the very essence of American democracy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, other Senators have expressed more ably than I can the views of Bob La Follette on public matters; but I would not want this occasion to pass without paying my very brief and small tribute to him as a man.

He was one of the first who came and shook my hand and offered to help me when I became a Member of this body. I shall never forget his kindness at that time. His friendship and helpfulness always remained available to me, and I took advantage of it.

I believe that the qualities of his which appealed to me most were his friendliness, his fairness, his objective look at questions of public policy, and his jealousy for the prestige of the body in which we sit. One could always approach Bob La Follette and expect a friendly reception and a fair appraisal of the question which one might ask. As the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] so well said, he was always listened to when he debated on the floor of the Senate. When he felt strongly he expressed himself forcefully and well on his side of the subject. Whether one agreed with him or not, he commanded respect.

I had many talks with him concerning the rules of the Senate and what could be done to improve them. He was very jealous of the prestige of the Senate. He was one of the best presiding officers

the Senate ever had. He insisted on order. He insisted on the rules of debate being observed. No matter who might be violating them, he never hesitated to express himself, and to endeavor to bring the Senate back within its rules.

One of the pleasantest afternoons of my life was an occasion when Bob La Follette visited the school in Massachusetts which his son was attending. He asked me to come to the school and take part in a debate in which he was acting as moderator, and in which his son was the leader on one side. We passed a very pleasant afternoon in friendly association with the young friends of his son. I shall always remember that occasion. Afterward we carried on a correspondence on the subject of the debate. Bob La Follette and I did not fully agree on certain points.

We certainly shall miss him as a man. The Senate has missed him as a Member of this body. I never felt that I knew him well enough to be called a really intimate friend. However, I shall always miss him, because of the respect in which he was held, and because of the opportunity which we always felt we had to approach him when we wished to do so. I have the utmost sympathy for the members of his family. I shall never forget my high regard for him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the lives of Robert M. La Follette, Sr., and Robert M. La Follette, Jr., were closely joined. In a sense the son was the continuation of the father. They were both lives in the best American tradition. They were also lives which had in them a certain musical quality beginning with the stormy period of the career of the elder La Follette, and continuing into a period of relative serenity for the son.

The real political lives of the two spanned a period of approximately 60 years. It was in 1895, I believe, that Robert La Follette, Sr., made the fateful decision to challenge the entrenched political forces which were then dominating his State. The struggle was extremely bitter for 5 years, from 1895 to 1900, and Bob La Follette, Sr., was repeatedly defeated.

In 1900 he was elected Governor of Wisconsin, and he became probably one of the three or four great governors in the history of the United States. Reform after reform was put into effect—reforms which at the time were bitterly opposed and bitterly denounced, but which have virtually all proved their worth. I refer to such things as State income taxes, the regulation of the rates of public utilities, protective labor legislation, negotiation between labor and management of rules for the government of labor-management relations, the encouragement of farm cooperatives, and, perhaps most striking of all, the introduction of civil service into Wisconsin, under which there were blanketed into the civil service many of his political opponents who then held office. This demonstration of sincerity in connection with the civil service, even at his own cost, made a profound impression. The principle spread gradually to other States, such as New York and Massachusetts. Wisconsin under Fighting Bob became a synonym for honesty and integrity.

It was a stormy period. In 1904, as I recall, Bob La Follette, Sr., was elected as a United States Senator. When he rose on the floor of the Senate to make his first speech, on the control which he thought big business interests exercised over the Nation, he was met with one of the most bitter slights any man could experience. Virtually the entire membership of the Senate rose and walked out into the cloakrooms, leaving him speaking alone. His reply was, "There will come a time when you will stay and listen."

Bob La Follette, Sr., was a stormy character. He lived in stormy times. He fought for unpopular ideas. People were either for or against him. There were no neutral opinions. He carried on his fight to defend the humble people of his country, whether they were workers, farmers, or consumers, against the great economic and political powers of the Nation. He took an extremely unpopular view at the outbreak of the First World War, a view which, from the standpoint of history, looking back, I now personally believe was mistaken, but a point of view which was honest, and which he followed at great personal cost to himself. At one time it nearly brought him expulsion from the United States Senate and possibly even a jail sentence.

He came through that terrible period with the respect not only of the Senate, but of the country. He was reelected in 1922, and in 1924 he ran for the office of President of the United States. Millions of us loved and respected him, and asked for nothing better than to tie his shoelaces. The campaign in 1924 was bitter and exhausting, and at its conclusion the father died.

As the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said, Bob La Follette, Jr., was secretary to his father during this stormy period. He shared the anguish of his father. He experienced the sense of reflected unpopularity of his father; but it never dimmed his spirit.

He was appointed by the Governor of Wisconsin to succeed his father. So for 40 years there was a Robert M. La Follette representing the State of Wisconsin in the United States Senate. Never was a name better represented.

Bob La Follette, Jr., represented not only the State of Wisconsin, but also the United States of America. He represented wage earners who had little or no protection in the economic or political field. He represented farmers who were weak economically, and at that time weak politically. He represented humble housewives. As the Senator from Georgia has said, he was ever fair to those who held a different point of view; and while he opposed their policies, he loved them as people. The history of the Senate and the history of our Nation are the better for his life. He was a man of honor and integrity. He was a defender of civil liberties, an advocate of social security, and a supporter of decent labor legislation. He was never animated by hate but was always animated by love. He was a skilled parliamentarian. He was one of the noblest of all Americans.

In a sense this is the best of the American tradition. In a sense the La Follettes remind me of one of the great symphonies of Beethoven. They begin with a stormy first and second movement, and then, despite the tragic end, move into the quieter movements. Struggle merges into reconciliation and a measure of serenity.

A noble contribution has been made to American life by the lives of these two great men, father and son. I am sure that not only do we send our love and greetings to Bob's wife, his children, and his family, but we also feel grateful and humble for his life, determined to be in some measure better men because we knew Bob La Follette.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to endorse every word that has been uttered today by my colleagues in tribute to Bob La Follette. If ever a man was motivated by principles it was Bob La Follette. One of the principles by which he lived all his life was the principle first enunciated by Grover Cleveland: A public office is a public trust. Bob La Follette lived out that principle on the floor of the Senate and in his public life. He was a powerful defender of the people. He was their tribune.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my remarks. When the time comes for all of us to meet God, I hope we may be able to say with Bob La Follette, in all good conscience, "I have fought a good fight. I have kept faith. I have not been idle."

I close with the quotation, "Ave atque vale."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] had planned to be present today to pay his tribute to the memory of Bob La Follette. Unfortunately the Senator from New York is ill and cannot be here. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from New York.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

The tragic death of former Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., is a source of sadness not only to those who were his friends and colleagues but to thousands of people who knew him only by name and reputation.

He was a great man and represented one of America's great traditions. He was the son and political heir of a great father—a man who broke ground for liberalism in the United States. Under the leadership of the La Follettes, the State of Wisconsin became one of the Nation's testing grounds for liberal ideas, most of which are now permanently enshrined in the laws of our land. When the La Follettes, father and son, espoused some of these ideas they were denounced as radical and revolutionary. Now they are accepted as part of the American way of life.

The people of New York especially have a deep feeling for the La Follette family and for the tradition which they helped to found and lead. What La Follette, the father, was doing in Wisconsin our own beloved Al Smith was doing in New York. New York and Wisconsin together pioneered in the field of social legislation—in the matter of workmen's compensation, child labor, and

the protection of working women. As Franklin Delano Roosevelt carried on in the State of New York, young Bob La Follette carried on in the State of Wisconsin. The two lines met when in 1936 young Bob La Follette, although by political label a Republican, supported Franklin D. Roosevelt, a Democrat, for reelection to the presidency.

It was my great privilege both as lieutenant governor and as governor of New York to maintain the close association between New York and Wisconsin which had existed under my predecessors. I recall that during the time I was lieutenant governor and our State was held in the grip of terrible unemployment, all of us took heart from the fight led by young Bob La Follette in the United States Senate to provide Federal relief for unemployment, to bring out into the light of day the stark and compelling facts of human misery which the national administration of that day would have preferred not to have acknowledged.

Bob La Follette was never a physically robust man. All his life he fought against poor health. He had great courage, both physically and morally. He was a deeply sincere man and a dedicated man.

I did not always agree with his viewpoint, especially on foreign policy in the years preceding World War II, but I always respected the integrity of his beliefs. Although I believe he erred in some respects, he was deeply and profoundly right in his understanding of the threat of communism. His bold and outspoken condemnation of that threat at a time when others were silent or actually "soft" toward communism, was a contributing factor, I am told, to his political defeat in 1946. It took only a few years to show the deep wisdom that was his. His spirit was crushed by the rejection he suffered at the hands of the voters of his party, and now 7 years later he has left the land of the living.

I did not have the privilege of serving in the Senate with him, but his spirit has been here even in his physical absence from the Senate. The spirit of Bob La Follette will remain here as one of the great traditions of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, last Wednesday, the day after the death of Bob La Follette I sought to pay my tribute to his memory, to his life, and to his services to his country. I shall not today repeat those words, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the fine tributes which have been paid to the memory of Bob La Follette by some of the leading newspapers of the country.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 26, 1953]

SENATOR ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

To those who knew the first Senator La Follette, the son who succeeded him was always affectionately called young Bob. But during his 22 years in the United States Senate the son proved himself time and time again as a mature, brave and skillful fighter for the principles in which he believed. Father and son were devoted public servants all their lives. It was comparatively early in his senatorial career that Robert Marion La Follette, Jr., chaired and directed the Senate Civil Liberties Committee in an exposure of working conditions and living standards that laid the groundwork for the reforms of the last 20 years.

The social legislation under which for the first time workers were protected in their right to organize, the breaking up of company-dominated unions, the development of the Fair Labor Standards Act and of the Social Security Act were made possible because Senator La Follette exposed the abuses of social and economic power which made legislative correction imperative. The modern and model reorganization act designed to streamline legislative procedures in Congress stands as testimony to his legislative skill and understanding. In fact, it is widely believed that his determination to see that piece of work completed, even though it prevented him from returning to Wisconsin to campaign for his reelection to the Senate, permitted MCCARTHY to win. Bob La Follette's great tradition and training in the field of civil liberties must have made him wonder whether the triumph of the reorganization bill's enactment was worth the price—for he had real respect for human beings.

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

It is true that Robert M. La Follette, Jr. got his political start in life because he was the son of his father, but he was much more than that. With none of "Fighting Bob's" flamboyance but with all of his intensity, the younger La Follette made an honored name in his own right and became one of the most esteemed and useful Members of the Senate of the United States.

Succeeding in 1925 to the Senate seat long held by his father, young Bob served the people of Wisconsin and of all the Nation for 21 eventful years. When he went down to defeat in the Republican primary of 1946 at the hands of one JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, he was still a relatively young man with promise of future political activity before him. But he decided otherwise, and it is safe to say that the Nation was the loser. For Bob La Follette had amply demonstrated that he was a public servant of integrity, industry, and ability.

Long before the economic collapse that led to the great depression Senator La Follette had shown his social consciousness by taking an active interest—and attempting to interest others—in the problems of national unemployment. By 1936 he had become chairman of the famous Senate Subcommittee on Civil Liberties, whose exposure of the methods then used to prevent union organization and collective bargaining had a profound effect on public thinking. If he had an inadequate perception of foreign relations, he had a keen understanding of domestic affairs, and he knew that one of the great problems of democratic government was to make its machinery work with a maximum of efficiency. To this end he helped fashion a far-reaching congressional reorganization act during his last term of office.

Insurgent and Independent, Republican, and Progressive—La Follette was in many ways a pioneer; and, as is so often true of pioneers, he made some political enemies as well as many devoted friends. But all of them held him in high respect, and his self-inflicted death brings to a tragic close a career of high distinction and of great service.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 26, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Men in middle life will reflect with a start that to their younger colleagues the death of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., can have no special meaning. Yet for the first 45 years of this century, the La Follette name was one of the mightiest and most attractive in American political life. With Young Bob's defeat in 1946 as Senator from Wisconsin, the La Follettes went out of office, but the former Senator stayed on in Washington, a knowing and friendly man.

The elder La Follette with his famous white mane of hair embodied the best in the tradition of indigenous midwestern American radicalism. Constitutionally suspicious of any power based on money, he looked upon the East and the easterners as almost by definition given to easy political sin. An isolationist in World War I, he had the older dream of an aloof America, a spot of paradise-like calm in an ugly and passion-torn world. He never really yielded that vision.

Young Bob had served as his father's secretary, and it was a natural thing for the Wisconsin electorate to name him Senator in his father's place. Coming to Washington in 1925, the youngest Senator since Henry Clay, the son rose rapidly to a place of real power in the insurgent wing of the Republican Party. The late Senators Norris and Borah were the vocalists of this bloc, in the late twenties and early thirties. "But the politics," wrote Frank R. Kent in the Sun, "the policies, the strategy, the organization and the energy are supplied by 'Little Bob.' He is the dynamo. * * *"

In the Senate the younger La Follette made some injudicious sallies in the direction of his father's isolationism. But special prestige came from his investigations into employer abuses against labor unions in the pre-Wagner Act days. His lasting monument is the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 by which the Congress was adapted for better service in a tumultuous age.

Since he was always not merely a liberal but a stoutly anti-Communist liberal, it was a dark paradox that La Follette was defeated in the end by Senator MCCARTHY. Perhaps the spectacle of a La Follette in private life—and in Washington rather than Wisconsin—seemed to the ex-Senator as incongruous as it seemed to many political observers of his generation. His death will cause a special pang to those who knew him.

[From the Roanoke (Va.) Times of February 26, 1953]

"YOUNG BOB" LA FOLLETTE

Robert M. La Follette, Jr., of Wisconsin, owed much to the magic name of his father, "Fighting Bob," for his rise in politics. But his own abilities and popularity enabled him to build a political career that kept him in the Senate for 21 years.

"Young Bob's" death at his own hand, apparently because of despondency over ill health, removes from the national scene one who was consistently liberal and independent. The pattern of liberalism and progressivism that maintained the La Follettes—father and sons, Robert and Philip—in political power for nearly half a century shifted in 1946 when "Young Bob" lost the Republican senatorial nomination to JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, then a little known circuit court judge. After succeeding his noted father in the Senate in 1925 he was elected to a full term in 1928 and twice was reelected on the Progressive ticket.

Senator La Follette found the atmosphere of Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Dealism congenial, supporting the late President in his first three presidential campaigns. In FDR's campaign for a fourth term he stood aloof. He objected strenuously to Roosevelt's foreign policy before this country entered World War II. Sometimes he was referred to as an isolationist. He opposed lend-lease to Britain, neutrality law revision permitting American ships to carry munitions to belligerent ports, and selective service. But after the war he threw his support behind the Marshall plan for European recovery and the United Nations.

Senator La Follette's political beliefs frequently were at variance with those of his colleagues and he was sometimes out of tune with the voice of the country. But he earned respect, nevertheless. Said Senator WILEY of Wisconsin: "Whether or not we may have always agreed with him, we knew him as a determined fighter for his ideas—just, fair, friendly, industrious. He was a worthy heir of the unforgettable La Follette tradition of public service."

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 26, 1953]

END OF A DYNASTY

The unfortunate death of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., ends a political dynasty that made its influence felt in this country for nearly half a century. Young Bob did not possess the magnetic personality of his famous father, nor his drive, but he carried on the family tradition of political independence and liberalism during his 21 years in the Senate.

Elected in 1925 to fill the seat left vacant by his father's death, he was the youngest Senator to enter Congress since Henry Clay.

In 1928 he was reelected as a Republican, but 6 years later he organized the Progressive Party with his brother, Philip, and was reelected in that year and again in 1940 as a Progressive. In 1946 he announced his return to the Republican fold, but ironically was defeated by a political unknown, JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY. Since then he had been an economic adviser in Washington.

A dynasty has come to an end, but the tradition it symbolized remains.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 25, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

The La Follettes of Wisconsin wrote a chapter in American politics that lives now only as a tradition. Young Bob was a part of that tradition. But in the hour of his tragic death it is not the political tradition but a certain gentleness, gallantry, and humility in his character as a man that is treasured as the personal memory of those who knew him. He fought cleanly and vigorously for what he believed, and defeat never robbed him of grace or dignity.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Madison, Wis., of February 25, 1953]

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.

Beyond the duties of the sociologist and the requirements of the law, it is probably within the province of no man to inquire into the reasons for another's self-destruction.

Yet the act that ended the life of Robert M. La Follette, Jr., was so foreign to the personality that it calls up bewilderment almost to the point of disbelief.

He was always the fighter. Though his once-brilliant and powerful political career may have been done, he was successful by any material standard. He was wealthy. He was important. He was respected. He was too big a man to have let political defeat corrode his soul. He was too responsible a man to have sought anything without reason sufficient unto himself and others.

It is left now, then, only to speculate upon and sympathize with the terrible tortures of ill health he must have suffered, more awful than his closest intimates must have known.

It is left, too, to sorrow and to regret this man's passing.

These words are set down by the Wisconsin State Journal through no mere dictate of taste and tradition of saying only well of the dead.

Through all his political lifetime, this newspaper and young Bob La Follette were political opponents. This newspaper fought him politically with every honorable means at hand. And he never pulled a punch at us, either.

Yet all the time you were fighting him you could like him, admire him, respect him for his fine intellect and his personal integrity.

The man who quarreled with him through the newspaper or on the platform could meet him personally and be greeted with grace and charm and good-hearted manliness. There was nothing petty or mean or vindictive about Bob La Follette. From his boyhood in this, his hometown, he was known as a good fellow.

Even in his political record there was much to praise, much for gratitude from his bitterest enemies. They could and did count him dead wrong in his philosophies, attitudes, and approaches, yet grant him brilliance and courage in the technique of statesmanship. And he gave much of great good to national legislation.

He was blessed with strength and brains and the ambition to use both.

It is doubly tragic that such a man could not have had longer to give more from this great store.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 25, 1953]

BOB LA FOLLETTE

News of the suicide of former Senator Robert M. La Follette comes as a shock to his thousands of friends and the multitude of Americans who followed his public career.

Despondency over ill health is the only explanation offered and indeed the only one that could make sense. For Bob La Follette was a man of tough and logical mind and of stout heart, with a body that long seemed to lack the stamina for the hard endeavor to which he applied himself.

Bob practically was born to public life. He was only 5 when his father, old Bob, was elected Governor of Wisconsin. After old Bob went to the Senate, and the son reached the age to do the work, young Bob served as his father's secretary. And upon his father's death, young Bob succeeded to his seat, and was reelected three times—serving in all 22 years in Senate.

He grew in stature, usefulness and influence. Bob never took the Senate floor without first mastering the subject on which he chose to speak—and when he spoke, other Senators listened.

He was a progressive of the school founded by his father, among men of the caliber of Burton Wheeler, George Norris, and Bill Borah—men of a time and a philosophy not to be associated with the muddle-headedness which has been passed off as progressivism and liberalism in recent years.

Bob La Follette scorned pretense and hypocrisy and demagogery. He supported all the early reforms of the Roosevelt administration, but he parted company with the New Deal on its fiscal irresponsibility. He believed in pay-as-you-go Government.

He opposed hidden taxation, and thought all taxes should be visible, painful and broadly based, so that the people would be encouraged to police their Government's spending. At one time when the Roosevelt administration shifted its tax policy for punitive and political purposes, Senator La Follette stood up and said something which those who heard him will not forget.

"American business," he said, "can adjust itself to progressive legislation. But American business can never adjust itself to constant uncertainty."

A list of his accomplishments would fill many pages of this newspaper. We mention only a few:

His 1937 investigation of the Little Steel strike, which threw so much light on the labor-management troubles of that time. His coauthorship of the Congressional Reorganization Act, which won him the 1946 Collier's award as the outstanding Senator.

His early understanding of and warnings against the Communist menace. His alertness to the dangers inherent in President Roosevelt's secret dealings with Stalin. His quick recognition that the United Nations would flounder on the San Francisco Charter provision of the veto power.

We extend condolences to his family, and we regret to say that since Bob La Follette's defeat in 1946, we have not known his like in the United States Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I never had the privilege of serving in the Senate with Bob La Follette, but during 7½ years he served in the Senate I was honored by being a Member of the House of Representatives, along with the present junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and my colleague, the present junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who were also Members of the House. We were interested, along with Senator La Follette, in legislative reorganization proposals. The resulting legislation became known as the La Follette-Monroney Reorganization Act of 1946. Senator La Follette was not only considerate always of Members of the Senate, but I doubt that any Member of the Senate has spent more time conferring with Members of the House of Representatives than he did. He was always interested in working with the Members of the House in connection with this particular legislation.

I feel we have lost one of the greatest Americans of this time.

I shall not go into detail, but, in my opinion, one of the finest tributes that I have read on what Bob La Follette's life meant to our Nation was written by the thoughtful columnist, Thomas L. Stokes. His tribute was published in the Chattanooga Times of March 1, 1953. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in the remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA FOLLETTES KNEW HONESTY IN DISSENT

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—The death here—tragically by his own hand—of the figure known for so many years as young Bob casts a shadow of sorrow for his host of friends while at the same time it throws a twilight nostalgic glow on a whole era of our history.

Former Senator Robert Marion La Follette, Jr., of Wisconsin, symbolized, as did his father before him, a native American progressivism, an honest and brave dissent, which left a deep and salutary imprint upon our American democracy.

That progressivism carries on today, though more freely, for it is confused and without the magnetic and sure leadership of its heyday. It copes with new and strange problems and issues in a Nation suddenly grown so big in itself and before the world, with its economic life highly organized and consolidated and, in some respects, regimented into giant industry, giant labor, and giant government. A clear path is hard to pick in the morass. The answers no longer are easy, though they never were so really.

But it survives, if we but stop to recognize it, wherever the dignity and independence of the human being shine out today. They do shine brightly, contrasted with the appearance on the scene of the elder Bob La Follette around the turn of the century, when men, women, and children worked at long hours in bleak surroundings for pitiful wages in the era of the exploiters. * * * When our sometimes sainted empire builders, more vulgarly called robber barons by some historians, juggled railroads for stock market plunder and held State governments in their greedy hands, and took their toll from farmers in extortionate freight rates * * * when their compatriots of like instinct ravaged our forests, as they did in Bob La Follette's Wisconsin, with no thought of the future * * * when our farmers had little say about the marketing of their crops and the prices they would get and were victims of economic forces which they could not

understand and about which they could do little.

In changing all of this the American progressive tradition of dissent, in which the La Follettes were forceful leaders, had its influence. So great an influence, indeed, that eventually millions rallied about the La Follettes and those who stood with them, when the father was Governor and Senator, and when the son was a Senator. This became in time so great a multitude that the two great political parties blatantly cribbed from the Progressive philosophy, and inserted it, piece after piece, into the law of the land. What we call the New Deal bore in many of its worthy aspects the imprint of La Follette progresaivism when it ultimately poured in in a flood of legislation from a frantic Congress struggling to stem the tide of depression. It was a fertile yeast.

La Follette history goes way back, back far beyond the first-hand knowledge of this reporter who, however, knew and watched the elder in the sunset of his career, and knew and watched the younger through all his career of 21 years here in the Senate, which ended in 1946 with his defeat in the Republican primary by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY. Flashbacks of remembered scenes tell much of the La Follette story in American politics and American life.

That late afternoon of July 4, 1924, in a dim hall in Cleveland when the 29-year-old young Bob, his round face aglow, accepted for his father, not present, the nomination for President on an independent ticket. The exultant delegates thrilled over the young man's rousing reading of his father's statement. Here it may be interpolated that Senator La Follette the father, bucking Coolidge prosperity, so-called, gave witness by the nearly 5,000,000 votes he polled of the distress and discontent then in the farm belt, for he polled a considerable vote in all the area beyond the Mississippi, running ahead of the Democratic candidate, John W. Davis, in 10 of those States. But the GOP hierarchy was unheeding of the cloud in the West, which broke in political catastrophe over its head 8 years later.

Memory brings back young Bob again, now a Senator in the seat of his father who had died in 1925, as he stood before the 1928 Kansas City Republican convention and offered once again, in vain, as so often before, the "La Follette platform." It was, of course, rejected, though virtually all of it now is law. He was, however, given a great ovation, a sportsmanlike gesture in lieu of votes for his platform—and in lieu of political vision.

Once again, after depression had broken over the land in waves of unemployed, young Bob comes back as he stood in his place in the Senate, day after day, and read in desolate detail, city by city, of what was happening to our people in depression. It was a grim and moving story that finally moved Congress to act.

And again, as he sat at the head of the table in a committee room directing the investigation into the abuse of civil liberties of American workers. That paved the way for reforms in a system of labor relations that still had jungle aspects. These reforms included the outlaw of brutality, with accompanying sawed-off shotguns and tear gas against strikers.

It is a story of political dissent and of economic progress. That would seem to have some meaning in this day when so many would squelch dissent, would suppress traditional native American progressivism, would confuse the issue by name-calling—Socialist, Communist, leftist, and such subterfuges.

Forgetting how we came to be what we are.

The VICE PRESIDENT. With the indulgence of the Senate, the Chair would like to make a brief statement.

Obviously there is little that can be added to the eloquent tributes which have been paid to Robert M. La Follette, Jr., by those who served with him. The present occupant of the chair, like the Senator from Tennessee, did not have that privilege. When I came to Washington in 1947 as a new Member of the House of Representatives I had the privilege of meeting and knowing Bob La Follette through mutual friends. He made a great and lasting impression on me, as he had on the many Members of the Senate who served with him. That impression particularly was that here was a man of great intellectual ability who was not plagued with what often goes by the name of intellectual arrogance or pride. Here was a man of great ability and humility who had respect for the abilities and views of others whom he could consider as not being his intellectual equals.

An indication of the esteem in which Bob La Follette was and is held by his colleagues is, as the Parliamentarian has informed the Chair, that this is the first time in the history of the Senate that a special day has been set aside for memorial services for a man who was not a Member of the Senate at the time of his death.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is investigating waterfront racketeering, be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the remainder of the week. The subcommittee proposes to hold executive hearings in New York during the remainder of this week. The members of the subcommittee are Mr. TOBEY, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. POTTER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. PASTORE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Judgeships of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Foreign Relations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. WILEY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. CAPEHART, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF, EXPENDITURES BY, AND DONATIONS TO THE LIGNITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, GRAND FORKS, N. DAK.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Lignite Research Laboratory, Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the year 1952; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Housing Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal National Mortgage Association, for the year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ON PROGRAM FOR DISPOSAL TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the program for

disposal to private industry of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Resolution 25

"Whereas the State of Illinois has within its boundaries on Lake Michigan 976,640 acres of submerged lands which have been owned and claimed by the State and its grantees for over 100 years, and the State, its political subdivisions and grantees have expended millions of dollars in improvements along the shores of Lake Michigan on lands formerly covered by the waters of Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Illinois Central R. R. Co. v. State of Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), held the Great Lakes to be 'open seas' and that Illinois' ownership of that portion of Lake Michigan within its boundaries rested upon the same rule of law as 'lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea'; and

"Whereas State ownership of lands beneath the waters within the seaward boundaries of the State has been challenged and clouded by Federal officials in recent years, all of which constitutes a threat against the State of Illinois, its political subdivisions, and grantees in connection with its ownership of the above-mentioned lands: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned to enact legislation at the earliest possible date which would confirm and recognize in this State and its political subdivisions, its and their ownership and full rights in all lands beneath navigable waters within its boundaries, subject only to necessary Federal regulations in connection with international relationships, navigation, and defense; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President, the Vice President, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, and to each member of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives of the Congress."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution 35

"Whereas the Federal Government annually takes from Illinois motorists millions of dollars in Federal motor fuel and automotive excise taxes; and

"Whereas the amount of these taxes collected in Illinois greatly exceeds the amount contributed by the Federal Government for the construction and maintenance of Federal highways in Illinois; and

"Whereas the continued policy of draining automotive revenues from Illinois without a commensurate benefit to the people of the State has seriously crippled our highway program; Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we respectfully request the Federal Government to return to the State of Illinois all of the excise taxes collected in Illinois from automotive sources, including motor fuel, and that these excise taxes be used exclusively for the construction and maintenance of Federal highways in Illinois; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each Member of the Congress representing the State of Illinois."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent, that—

"Whereas the State of Idaho produces and ships annually in interstate commerce an average of 50,000 carloads of potatoes classified as to United States grades; and

"Whereas a practice has arisen in marketing centers of repacking Idaho potatoes in inferior packs and without proper designation as to grade or quality; and

"Whereas Idaho potatoes are being repacked and reclassified and improperly displayed as to origin, grade, and quality; and

"Whereas the consuming public is being misled and deceived by the above practices: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 32d session of the Legislature in the State of Idaho (the House concurring), That we hereby urge upon the Congress of the United States to pass an act protecting the consumers of fresh vegetables as to the grades and origin, and that a fine be imposed upon any wholesale or retail dealer repacking under inferior grades or failing to properly advertise the origin of said fresh vegetables, or failing to reinspect such repacked potatoes by Federal inspection to determine the proper grade of such potatoes when displayed for sale or sold under any United States grade; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"Memorializing Congress to deed the title to all of the area of Fort Logan except that area now used as a national cemetery, to the State of Colorado together with all appurtenances thereto

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein):

"SECTION 1. That whereas the State of Colorado is in urgent need of adequate housing facilities for the aged infirm.

"SEC. 2. That the facilities at the Pueblo State Hospital are no longer capable of handling increasing admissions.

"SEC. 3. That the State of Colorado faces financial crisis in apportioning available moneys to cover necessary State service.

"SEC. 4. That the city and county of Denver lacks a proper situs for the care, control, and treatment of alcoholics.

"SEC. 5. That the problem of caring for alcoholics has not been satisfactory and adds to the increasing tax load of Denver taxpayers.

"SEC. 6. That by deed in 1887 the State of Colorado deeded to the United States Government without cost 640 acres of land near Denver for the use of the United States Government as a military post. This was designated as Fort Logan, Colo. This land has been exempted from taxation by the State of Colorado for any purpose since that date.

"SEC. 7. That except for approximately 40 acres set aside as a national cemetery, Fort Logan is no longer a military post.

"SEC. 8. That Fort Logan has adequate brick and stone buildings containing sun porches and wide expanses of lawn ideally suited for the proper housing and recreation of aged people. These buildings can be served from a central heating plant and water supply, and a central facility is available for preparation and distribution of food to the different housing units.

"SEC. 9. That there are available housing facilities for the people employed to care for the aged people residing there.

"SEC. 10. That certain buildings are located on the situs of Fort Logan which would be ideal for the housing, care, and treatment of alcoholics presently crowding the jail facilities in Denver and, whereas, the State of Colorado may contract with the city of Denver that the city of Denver may have the use of property belonging to the State of Colorado for so long as that specified purpose shall continue.

"SEC. 11. That certain facilities are being occupied by veterans as a veterans' housing project on part of the grounds of Fort Logan; that these facilities are not feasible for use for housing of aged people or for treatment of alcoholics; that the State of Colorado can contract with a legal entity set up to manage and operate such veterans' housing project; that the said legal entity shall have authority under such contract to manage and operate such veterans' housing project for so long as the project is operated as a veterans' housing project, and when said veterans' housing project shall no longer be operated as a veterans' housing project then and in that event the entire use, management, and control of said land constituting the area now used as a veterans' housing project shall revert to the State of Colorado absolutely.

"SEC. 12. That there are areas of tillable land in the Fort Logan area which can be well used for rehabilitation of alcoholics; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Whereas building of roads and highways since the inception of our Government has been primarily a State responsibility; and

"Whereas every State of the Union has tremendous problems in maintaining, extending, and building highways and bridges due to the lack of building program during the war-year period; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has always collected much more than they have sent back to the States for road-building purposes; and

"Whereas the costs of building and maintaining roads and highways have increased tremendously; and

"Whereas States have demonstrated they are willing, have, and do cooperate in building the federally designated highways; and

"Whereas the States sensed the responsibility of an integrated highway system as it relates to the national welfare; and

"Whereas the States have demonstrated that they can build adequate highways; and

"Whereas in many instances, many economies can be effected through sole State responsibility of building highways; and

"Whereas because of the foregoing facts and after due consideration, the Council of State Governments in national meeting December 7 in Chicago passed a resolution supporting this proposition, and the Governors' Conference in the national meeting in July 1952 unanimously passed a resolution supporting this proposition: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring

herein), That the 83d session of Congress give serious consideration to the question of eliminating the Federal gasoline tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That attested copies of this memorial be sent to the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress and to each member of the Colorado delegation in Congress, and that copies thereof, showing that said memorial was adopted by the General Assembly of Colorado, be sent to each house of each legislature of each State of the United States."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States bills to grant aid to the Israeli Government; and

"Where it is the purpose of these bills to give financial aid in the form of grants to the Government of the ancient and traditional democracy now known as the Israeli State; and

"Whereas such assistance to the people of Israel in developing their natural resources, expanding their agricultural and industrial economy will mean a great productive capacity and will further the promotion of the security and general welfare of the United States and of Israel and will strengthen the ties of friendship between the people of the United States and of Israel; and

"Whereas such grants would further the basic objectives of the Charter of the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give intensive study and consideration to such bills now pending before the Congress of the United States, and to use its best efforts to have such proposed legislation enacted into law; and be it further.

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolution adopted by the Friendship Townsend Club, No. 1, and Miami Townsend Club No. 22, both of Miami, in the State of Florida, favoring the enactment of legislation to substitute the so-called Townsend old-age pension plan for the present social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, at Denver, Colo., relating to the International Labor Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, at Denver, Colo., relating to international treaties and covenants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal section 1154 of title 18, U. S. C. A., known as the Indian liquor law and all laws and parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas Indians were declared to be citizens of the United States by act of Congress in the year 1924 and have ever since assumed a share and responsibility in our Government not unlike other citizens; and

"Whereas Indians have fought and died for the right of full citizenship in all wars in which our country has been engaged. It is noted that many young Indian men are now lying dead and wounded on the battlefields of Korea; and

"Whereas the existence of the law aforementioned has resulted in unjustified discrimination against Indians; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has failed to enforce this law adequately and there is no prospect of improvement in this regard; and

"Whereas the prohibition in this regard, not unlike that imposed on the whole citizenry of this country before the repeal of the 18th amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, has had the effect of enhancing the value and desirability of obtaining and consuming these alcoholic beverages with disastrous results; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the House of Representatives and the Senate concurring therein, that the existence of this discriminatory law has had the effect of setting the Indian apart from other citizens and by so doing has materially retarded his assimilation into the general population; and

"Whereas the Office of Indian Affairs, numerous veterans organizations, medical groups, and the Indian people and non-Indian people alike, are unanimous in their desire for full repeal of this out-dated law: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to repeal outright section 1154 of title 18, U. S. C. A., known as the Indian liquor law and all laws or parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and of the United States of America; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable E. Y. BERRY and the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the appropriation for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States and the allocation of funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry in the State of South Dakota in order to more adequately prosecute cooperative programs of livestock disease control and eradication

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas the livestock industry of the State of South Dakota has for years past been faced with problems of animal diseases and control and eradication of such diseases; and

"Whereas the livestock sanitary authorities of the State of South Dakota have in the past been granted the thorough and adequate cooperation of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States; and

"Whereas the State of South Dakota has consistently from time to time increased the appropriation and emergency funds necessary for the use of the South Dakota Livestock Sanitary Board; and

"Whereas the present allocation of funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture of South Dakota is inadequate to successfully carry on the routine problems of TB retesting and control and to cope with the increasing problems of Bang's disease control, and problems involving the cooperation of the South Dakota Livestock Sanitary Board in the widespread program of solution of the problems of these and various other livestock diseases: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to materially increase the appropriation for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, and substantially increase the allocation of funds to the Bureau of Animal Industry for use in the State of South Dakota; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable KARL MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE and the Honorable E. Y. BERRY, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress of the United States."

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds in lieu of taxes not received from nontaxable Indian land to the State of South Dakota for the benefit of the counties therein and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction and maintenance, health, and education

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas the Federal Government in times past entered into certain treaties with the Sioux Tribes in the State of South Dakota whereby large tracts of land located within said State were relieved from State taxation; and

"Whereas in recent years the Federal Government appropriation for Indian activities has been inadequate and has been taken up for the most part in administrative expenses including large Federal salaries, necessitating large expenditures by the State of South Dakota for Indian welfare and other activities with no probability of reimbursement therefor; and

"Whereas it is a solemn obligation of the United States Government to take care of all needy Sioux Indians until they become self-supporting and to keep such lands in a nontaxable status: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the use of the State of South Dakota and its counties in lieu of taxes not re-

ceived from nontaxable Indian lands, and thereby relieving counties in this State from the burden imposed by nontaxable Indian land and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction and maintenance, health and education; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Honorable KARL E. MUNDT and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable E. Y. BERRY and the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of Congress of the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

FARM PRICES — LETTER FROM HOLST-COPLEY FARMERS UNION, CLEARWATER COUNTY, BAGLEY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Holst-Copley Farmers Union Local, Clearwater County, Bagley, Minn., concerning the present situation with respect to falling farm prices be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAGLEY, MINN., *February* 23, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: As Secretary of the Holst-Copley Farmers Union Local, Clearwater County, I was instructed by resolution to write to you concerning the present falling farm prices. We, the northern Minnesota farmers, are much disturbed about these conditions and we urge that immediate action be taken to remedy this. We appreciate the splendid efforts you always put forth in the interest of the family farmer and will continue to support you in your efforts.

Sincerely,

ONA SORENSON,
Secretary.

FARM CREDIT—RESOLUTION OF RENVILLE COUNTY FARMERS UNION, RENVILLE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Renville County Farmers Union, Renville, Minn., on February 13, urging immediate and adequate funds for long-term agricultural credit at interest rates not to exceed 3 percent, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON FARM CREDIT BY RENVILLE COUNTY FARMERS UNION, FEBRUARY 13, 1953

Whereas the farmers of Renville County and the State of Minnesota have been hard hit by the drastic drop in prices they receive for their produce; and

Whereas the prices they must pay for the things they buy have not dropped; and

Whereas the farmers need adequate, long-term credit at fair interest rates to tide them over this difficult period; and

Whereas existing credit sources do not in fact provide such credit; and

Whereas failure to act promptly on this credit emergency means disaster for the family-size farm: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we petition our United States Senators and Congressmen and our State legislators to immediately introduce and press passage of legislation providing immediate and adequate funds for long-term agricultural credit at interest rates not to exceed 3 percent.

DALE D. HAEN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF WHISPERING PINES FARMERS UNION, BAGLEY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three resolutions adopted at a recent meeting of the Whispering Pines Farmers Union at Bagley, Minn., be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 1

Whereas the drafting of our farm youth for military service has affected the productive efficiency of thousands of American farms, broken up homes and brought grief to thousands; and

Whereas three cooperative creameries in Minnesota have closed up because of labor shortages in their respective communities caused by the draft: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Whispering Pines Farmers Union Local, urge deferment from military duty of all boys whose knowledge and experience is contributing to the farm and factory production so essential to America's domestic welfare.

RESOLUTION 2

Whereas farm income has already dropped to dangerous levels; and

Whereas the 90 percent of parity price supports on butter will expire as of March 31: Be it

Resolved, That we urge price supports on dairy products of not less than 90 percent of parity be extended to guarantee continued safe farm income and abundant supplies for export to a hungry world which is violently revolting against hunger, poverty, and oppression.

RESOLUTION 3

Whereas President Eisenhower made specific and implied promises during this campaign: Be it

Resolved, That we remind President Eisenhower of those promises for "not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity" farm income; let us remind President Eisenhower, too, of his implied promise to end the Korean war and to provide a domestic "prosperity not based on war."

Respectfully submitted, we urge your official attention to help carry out these ideals.

WHISPERING PINES FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
MARTIN FREDERICKSON, *President.*
MRS. JOHN A. OLSON, *Secretary.*

SALE OF DOMESTIC GOLD IN MARKETS OF WORLD—JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF COLORADO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have before me a joint resolution which was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Colorado. It is entitled "Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation granting domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world—memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell the product of their labors in the markets of the world."

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and thereafter be properly referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 3

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation granting domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world—Memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell the product of their labors in the markets of the world

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation authorizing the sale of gold from domestic mines by the producers thereof on the open markets of the world at prices which prevail on those markets, without further restriction; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to investigate the reasons for present restrictions upon the buying and selling of gold within and without the United States by citizens of the United States, which privilege is denied citizens of this country although extended to citizens of other countries, with no apparent harmful effects upon the economics of the respective countries in which gold is allowed to be bought and sold without government restriction; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States investigate and determine the reasons why the International Monetary Fund has consistently sidetracked the issue involved in raising the price of gold on an international basis to a realistic figure commensurate with the costs of production within gold-producing countries; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to take action now pending: "Recoinage of the $10 gold pieces"; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and Congressmen representing those States in which gold is produced either as a primary product or as a byproduct from the production of other metals, and to the President of the United States, with the additional plea directed to the Chief Executive that immediate steps be taken to bring about the objectives set forth in this joint memorial.

DEFINITION OF CERTAIN GASOLINE AND OTHER PETROLEUM PRODUCTS—LETTER FROM GENERAL COUNSEL, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter from Elbert P. Tuttle, the new General Counsel of the Treasury Department, to Colin Stam, chief of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue and Taxation, with respect to changes in the definition of gasoline and other petroleum products now taxable under the Internal Revenue Code.

It will be noted that Mr. Tuttle's letter makes reference to and indorses in principle a bill I have introduced, S. 218, designed to repeal the tax on certain types of tractor fuel which are now taxable. Although the tax on these fuels is collected, it brings no revenue into the Treasury since it must all be refunded on the basis that it is not used in a highway-using vehicle. My bill is designed to cut out this needless red tape of collecting a tax which is all to be refunded, and, if enacted, my bill should save the Government a great deal of administrative expense.

It will be noted that Mr. Tuttle has asked for legislation to be drafted in general terms correcting this situation and also several similar situations. I have notified him that I intend to cooperate with the Treasury Department fully in this matter, and I have asked that all possible speed be made in drafting such legislation so that it can be acted upon very promptly.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD my bill, S. 218, following Mr. Tuttle's letter.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, together with the bill, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Room 1011, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

FEBRUARY 17, 1953.

DEAR MR. STAM: Further reference is made to your letter of October 7, 1952, requesting the Department's views on a proposal which you have received to amend regulations 44, relating to the tax on gasoline, to redefine the term gasoline so as to exempt commercial solvents and naphthas from the tax on gasoline.

Under existing law the manufacturers' excise tax on gasoline applies to all products commonly or commercially known or sold as gasoline, including casinghead and natural gasoline, and including any petroleum product satisfying the volatility requirements of United States motor gasoline, whether it is ultimately used as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes, or whether it is used for any other purpose. However, commercial solvents and naphthas (as well as certain other similar products) are not taxable as gasoline when they are sold under an exemption certificate, obtained prior to or at the time of sale by the importer or producer, certifying that such products are purchased for use (1) otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats or airplanes, and (2) otherwise than in the manufacture or production of such a fuel. Moreover, if commercial solvents or naphthas are sold tax-paid by the producer or importer to dealers, and such products are ultimately resold for non-motor-fuel uses, the producer or importer may secure a refund or credit where the ultimate user furnishes the required exemption certificate.

Your correspondent recommends that the regulations be amended by redefining gasoline so as to exclude commercial solvents and naphthas, thus eliminating the tax on these products regardless of their end use, and thereby eliminating the need for exemption certificates where these products are sold for non-motor-fuel uses. In support of this recommendation your correspondent argues that practically none of the commercial solvents and industrial naphthas are usable either alone or blended as fuel in engines. For the reasons indicated below the Department would not object to an amendment of the law which exempted commercial solvents and naphthas from the tax on gasoline, but does not feel that it could provide an exemption for these products under existing law by amendment of the regulations.

It is appropriate to note, in the consideration of this proposal, that it has the same basic purpose as one made by Senator HUGH BUTLER of Nebraska in a bill which he introduced in the 81st and 82d Congresses, and which he has again introduced in the present session of Congress, to exempt farm tractor fuel from the tax on gasoline. Senator BUTLER'S bill would accomplish this purpose by amending section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, so as to exclude from the definition of the term gasoline any product 10 per centum of which is recovered at not less than 250 degrees Fahrenheit and not more than 90 per centum of which is recovered at 446 degrees Fahrenheit. When it last reported to the Senate Finance Committee on Senator BUTLER'S proposal (report dated July 7, 1952, on S. 2758, 82d Congress, 2d Session), the Department indicated that it would have no objection to a bill which exempted farm tractor fuel from the tax on gasoline, provided this was done by simply naming farm tractor fuel as a kind of fuel exempt from the tax rather than by providing for an exemption through specifically prescribed distillation tests. In taking this position the Department recognized that there is a relatively limited possibility that farm tractor fuel would be used as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, and that elimination of the need for exemption certificates in the case of farm tractor fuel would have certain advantages both for the taxpayer and for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It would appear that the arguments in favor of exempting farm tractor fuel from the tax on gasoline are equally applicable in the case of commercial solvents and naphthas, and, accordingly, the Department would not object to an amendment of section 3412 of the Internal Revenue Code which exempted these products by name from the tax on gasoline. As in the case of farm tractor fuel, the Department feels that an exemption should not be provided through specifically prescribed distillation tests. If commercial solvents and naphthas were named as products exempt from the tax, the Department would by regulations prescribe the distillation tests which it would be necessary for such products to meet in order to be within the exemption. Such an approach would provide a desirable degree of administrative flexibility so that, as new fuels are developed or new uses found for old fuels, the distillation tests could be changed to meet the new conditions. Moreover, this approach would be consistent with the approach previously used in providing specific exemptions for kerosene, gas oil, and fuel oil.

While the Department would not object to a statutory exemption for commercial solvents and naphthas, it does not feel that it can provide an exemption for these products under existing law by amendment of the regulations. After the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1932, which originally imposed the tax on gasoline, numerous conferences were held with representatives of the Bureau of Standards and members of the petroleum industry in order to determine the dividing line between those products commonly or commercially known as gasoline which are taxable regardless of their classifications or uses and those products which are only taxable when sold as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes. As a result of these conferences the conclusion was reached that in determining the taxability of the various products the Department would be required to rely on their distillation temperatures.

In determining the taxability of the liquids other than gasoline which are specifically named in the law, like naphtha, and of all other liquids which are taxable because they are prepared, advertised, offered for sale, or sold for use as, or used as, motor fuel, the Department has relied on the Standard Method of Tests for Distillation of Gasoline, Naphtha, Kerosene, and Similar Petroleum Products (A. S. T. M. designation; D86) of the American Society for Testing Materials. It has been found since June 21, 1932, the effective date of the statute imposing the tax on gasoline, that most commercial solvents and naphthas meet these specifications. Thus, in order to maintain a consistent policy the Department has held that sales of commercial solvents and naphthas, 10 percent of which has been recovered when the thermometer reads 347 degrees Fahrenheit, or 95 percent of which has been recovered when the thermometer reads 464 degrees Fahrenheit, are subject to tax unless sold under exemption certificates for use otherwise than as a fuel for the propulsion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes.

In view of the fact that naphtha is specifically named in the law as a liquid subject to the gasoline tax except when used for nonmotor fuel purposes, the Department feels that it does not have the authority to exempt naphtha from the tax on gasoline without regard to its end use by amendment of the regulations. In this connection it should be noted that specific exemptions have been provided by the code for certain liquids without regard to their end use, namely, kerosene, gas oil, and fuel oil. Moreover, in view of the specific provisions of the code, the Department is of the opinion that it could not by regulations exempt commercial solvents from the tax without affording a similar exemption to other products having the same or comparable distillation temperatures and sold for nonmotor fuel uses. Under the circumstances it would seem that an exemption from the gasoline tax for commercial solvents and naphthas, or for any other liquids which study may indicate could properly be exempted from the tax without regard to end use, should be accomplished by an amendment of the law.

I have asked the Bureau to undertake a complete study of the base of the gasoline tax and to prepare a draft of legislation which would exclude from the tax base commercial solvents, naphthas, farm tractor fuel, and any other products which the study indicates are not used as fuel for the prolusion of motor vehicles, motorboats, or airplanes.

Very truly yours,

ELBERT P. TUTTLE,
General Counsel.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on gasoline), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or any product 10 percent of which

is recovered at not less than 250 degrees Fahrenheit and not more than 90 percent of which is recovered at 446 degrees Fahrenheit."

LONGSHOREMEN STRIKES — RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii relating to my bill which is designed to protect the people of the Territories against the crippling effects of the periodic strikes among the longshoremen and in the shipping industry, such as they have experienced in the past.

I am afraid most people in the 48 States do not realize how terribly destructive such strikes have been to the economic life and prosperity of the people of Hawaii and Alaska. I am not so much interested in the kind statements about myself contained in this resolution, although they are very flattering, of course. I would like to have this resolution incorporated in the RECORD to demonstrate to the Senate how urgent this problem is and how strongly the people of Hawaii feel about it. I recommend this resolution to the attention of the Senate and House committees which are now studying proposed changes to the Taft-Hartley Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in recent years labor disputes along the waterfront have frequently interrupted ocean transportation service between the mainland of the United States and the Territory of Hawaii; and

Whereas the effect of these waterfront disputes have been to paralyze and severely damage the economy of the Territory; and

Whereas the Honorable HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from the State of Nebraska, has on Janury 7, 1953, introduced a bill, S. 225, in the United States Senate designed to prevent interruptions to ocean transportation service between the United States and its Territories and possessions as a result of labor disputes; and

Whereas Senator BUTLER has, by the introduction of S. 225, further indicated his genuine interest in the welfare and economic well-being of the people of the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That we do by this means express our appreciation to Senator BUTLER for his intense interest in the welfare and economic well-being of the people of the Territory of Hawaii and commend him for his effort to free Hawaii from shipping tieups by the introduction of S. 225; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to Senator BUTLER.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION, SALINA, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, preliminary to the gathering again this year in Washington of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Kansas Society Daughters of the American Revolution assembled in their 55th annual conference, in Salina, Kans., has adopted a number of resolutions, pro-American in character and indicative of the love and loyalty the members of this organization show toward the principles upon which this country was founded.

I ask the unanimous consent for the insertion of these resolutions in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, 55TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE, SALINA, KANS., FEBRUARY 18 THROUGH 21, 1953

I

Resolved, That the 55th State Conference, Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at this session ratify the resolutions still applicable adopted by the 61st Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Washington, D. C., April 14 to 18, 1952; and

Resolved, That we quote for reemphasis a number of the resolutions of our national society by incorporating them, wholly or in part, into our resolutions here.

II. OBSERVANCE OF PATRIOTIC ANNIVERSARIES

American Independence Day

Whereas the character of a nation is judged and its people inspired by its national celebrations; and

Whereas many citizens in the United States seem to forget or disregard the original patriotic and spiritual intent of our national holidays; and

Whereas we sorely need greater devotion to the principles of our Declaration of Independence: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, heartily commend those communities, counties, and cities in Kansas that on the Fourth of July, 1952, made of it a day of fine patriotic celebrations and programs; be it further

Resolved, That we urge all members and chapters to lend every influence and assistance toward making the day one of real patriotism on which the deeds and the principles for which our forefathers gave their talents, fortunes, and lives, be recounted in song and story; and be it further

Resolved, That we make it a duty to see that the Stars and Strips are displayed in all proper public places, and at our own homes.

Constitution Day, September 17

Whereas the Congress of the United States, by resolution which in turn was signed by the President on February 29, 1952, created Citizenship Day, designed to replace Constitution Day: Be it

Resolved, That Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge its members and chapters to continue to observe and preserve the original significance and name of Constitution Day; and be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be encouraged to rescind the action establishing Citizenship Day to replace Constitution Day.

III. THE FLAG

Display of the flag

Whereas the flag of the United States of America is the revered symbol of national sovereignty and represents the unity of our Nation; and

Whereas misguided efforts have been made on United States soil to fly other flags in the position of honor upon certain occasions; and

Whereas our national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, through insistant effort has called such circumstances to the attention of the Congress; and

Whereas by such effort the United States Army chiefs responded in April 1952 by clarifying in the minds of citizens the proper honor to be accorded the Stars and Stripes of our Nation; therefore be it known to all citizens and to the members of Daughters of the American Revolution that no other flag, national nor international, shall be displayed over, or in place of, the flag of the United States of America on United States soil, nor on United States ships at sea: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge through its Senators the immediate action by the Judiciary Committee of the House upon S. 2039, passed by the Senate April 22, 1952, which prohibits the display of any flag in the United States of America in a position of equal or superior prominence to the Stars and Stripes.

Scouts pledge to the flag

Whereas it has been reported that some overenthusiastic or misinformed leaders of some of our Girl and Boy Scout troops in some States have made the error of having the troop under their guidance give a pledge of allegiance or a flag salute to the United Nations flag; and

Whereas we are all very proud of the fine patriotism and splendid training of our 3 million Scouts in America: Be it

Resolved, That we, as members of Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, and as guardians of American girls and boys, the flower and the hope of our Nation, be very alert to any influence of any individual who would regiment these groups toward any loyalties inimical to our Nation's welfare.

The flag at polling places

Whereas Federal law 829, the flag code, requires that the flag be displayed at all polling places on election days: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge members to protest any neglect of such observance in our State and our own voting places.

IV. COVENANT BY TREATIES

Whereas the battle for the freedom and independence of the United States has moved from battlefields to the State Department through negotiations of international conventions and treaties, which become the supreme law of the land as soon as ratified by the Senate; and

Whereas treaties already ratified and others now in the process of negotiation and ratification will destroy our time honored constitutional protections for life, liberty, and property; wipe out the finely balanced constitutional jurisdiction of our individual States; and subject every citizen of the United States to the enforcement of laws enacted by internationalists and an assortment of world parliaments; and

Whereas all these provisions and conventions presented under the plan of the various and numerous divisions of the United Nations are deftly set forth in the folder literature of the named division—as for example, to name but several—the subtle International Labor Organization (the ILO and ITO), the oft-exposed Genocide Convention, and UNESCO's educational program for world citizenship; and

Whereas in the Steel case, three Justices of the Supreme Court expressed the opinion that some of the recently ratified treaties had given the President of the United States authority to seize the property of the steel companies, the Constitution of the United States notwithstanding; and

Whereas State courts have held that these same treaties have suspended the marriage laws and land laws of several States in our Union: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in this 55th State conference, give unqualified support to the passage of Senate bill 1, called the Bricker amendment, which would place all treaties as subservient to the Constitution of the United States and would limit the time, during which treaties might be operative, to the administration under which they were negotiated: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend the position of President Eisenhower that

past secret treaties negotiated by any Government officials be repudiated.

V. UNITED NATIONS

Whereas, since the adoption of the United Nations Charter to promote and maintain peace, the world has continued in a state of turmoil and hostility, with member nations arraigned on opposite sides in this titanic struggle of communism versus freedom; and

Whereas frequently the General Assembly of the United Nations is used as a sounding board for free dissemination of Communist propaganda; and

Whereas the United States Secretariat provides asylum for spies and disloyal citizens: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, deplores this abuse of the privileges of the United Nations and, while the wisdom of remaining a member of this organization has been questioned, commends the McCarran committee in its attempts to eliminate subversive employees from the United Nations Secretariat.

VI. UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas thinking Americans know there is a need for constant vigilance against all subversive forces in our midst: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, expresses thanks to the Congress of the United States for its support of a Committee on Un-American Activities and urges its continued support of this committee.

VII. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in conference assembled, reaffirms its unqualified faith in the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the present Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

VIII. IMMIGRATION

Whereas there has developed a campaign to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act which became a law of the United States on December 24, 1952; and

Whereas this bill was the result of a 4-year careful study and analysis of our immigration practices, which had not had revision in over a century; and

Whereas the act was passed by an overwhelming majority of the House of Representatives and again overwhelmingly carried over President Truman's veto: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Daughters of the American Revolution urges Congress to retain the McCarran-Walter act to ward off attempts to weaken or modify this act; and to continue to screen aliens carefully and keep the present immigration quotas.

IX. OUR AMERICAN YOUTH

Education for Americanism

Resolved, That United States history which is offered in the curriculum of our Kansas schools be emphasized as the core of the social studies, and that it be actually taught rather than neglected and sometimes left out by a busy teacher in favor of some more intriguing portion of the unit; and further

Resolved, That the subject of history of the United States be presented from textbooks and by teachers in such manner as to inspire students with respect, appreciation, and a desire to emulate the Founding Fathers and all of those patriots who have preserved, protected, and maintained our American way of life.

X. UNESCO BOOKLETS

Resolved, That the Kansas Society of Daughters of the American Revolution commends the Los Angeles School Board for banning the booklets of UNESCO from its schools and urges all of its members to work to ban UNESCO teaching from all our schools.

XI. CHILDREN OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Whereas the conflict between the principles of our Republic and the doctrines of totalitarianism is growing in strength and tenacity, thereby with ever increasing insistence, threatening the future of the youth of today; and

Whereas the Society of the Children of the American Revolution is devoted to the instruction of its members in the fundamental principles of our Government, respect for constitutional authority, obedience to law, and devotion to the United States of America and its flag: Be it

Resolved, That the members of the Kansas Society Daughters of the American Revolution continue their interest in the Society of the Children of the American Revolution who are naturally entitled to be cherished as the special charges and dearest wards of the parent society; and further

Resolved, That we express our great pride in the growth and the activities of our Kansas Children of the American Revolution.

XII. NARCOTICS

Whereas chiefs of police throughout America have reported within recent weeks an alarming trend in the increase of drug addiction and the growing narcotic traffic among minors, a most serious menace to the youth of our country in all localities and on all economic levels; and

Whereas adequate laws to punish have not been enacted that are commensurate with the degree of the crime committed by the narcotic peddler; and

Whereas the State of Georgia now gives life imprisonment for the first conviction of selling narcotics to a minor and shows a decrease in the use of narcotics in the State: Be it

Resolved, that the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, requests the passage of laws, similar to Georgia, by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, wherein life imprisonment is the penalty for the first conviction for selling narcotics to a minor.

XIII

Resolved, That the Kansas Society Daughters of the American Revolution reaffirm its opposition to Federal aid to education; to socialized medicine; and to compulsory health insurance; be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its opposition to the adoption of the Covenant on Human Rights and to the Genocide Convention.

XIV. RETURN TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Whereas the Federal Government of the United States now owns 27 percent of the land in the United States, besides controlling vast enterprises for military production and a number of huge authorities over water and power, all operated at costs far above their returns; and

Whereas such deficit operations must be met with taxpayers' money: Be it

Resolved, That Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express its conviction that as rapidly as possible such acquired lands as are capable of agricultural or other private enterprise be opened for resale or allocated to returned soldiers for homemaking, and that all those operations where the Government is a competitor of private business be resold to persons, or companies, capable of operating them at a profit for individuals interested. Thus the taxes upon such individual operation can be used for the support of legitimate government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, heartily endorse the release of controls and that we support all such administrative and congressional measures as shall set the American citizen free to think and act independently, and to live by the sweat of his brow, earning an honest wage for an honest day's work which is the avowed principle of the new administration.

XV. EISENHOWER INAUGURAL PRAYER

Resolved, That the 55th State Conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend the Kansas State Legislature for its timely and appropriate action in having printed and distributed to be read and memorized by the pupils in the public schools of Kansas, the devout inaugural prayer of President Eisenhower.

Committee on Resolutions: Mrs. Bruce Josserand, Chairman; Mrs. Roy V. Shrewder; Mrs. Wm. L. Ainsworth; Mr. J. W. Gowans; Mrs. Frank Davis; Mrs. Jonathan B. Carter; Miss Maude B. Skinner; Mrs. Hugh H. Monahan.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, second session; without amendment;

S. Res. 16. Resolution to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees; with amendments (Rept. No. 50); and

S. Res. 49. Resolution to investigate certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in handling certain mail matter; with amendments (Rept. No. 51).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 81. Resolution relative to the plight of Palestinian Arab refugees; without amendment (Rept. No. 52); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary; without amendment:

S. 56. A bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert (Rept. No. 53);

S. 59. A bill for the relief of Felix Kortschak (Rept. No. 54);

S. 65. A bill for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy (Rept. No. 55);

S. 100. A bill for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. (Rept. No. 56);

S. 152. A bill for the relief of Fred P. Hines (Rept. No. 57);

S. 248. A bill for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb (Rept. No. 58);

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson (Rept. No. 59);

S. 484. A bill for the relief of J. Don. Alexander; (Rept. No. 60);

S. 615. A bill for the relief of Altoon Saprichian (Rept. No. 61); and

S. 837. A bill for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky (Rept. No. 62).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 101. A bill for the relief of Phed Vosniacos (Rept. No. 63);

S. 102. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo (Rept. No. 64);

S. 140. A bill for the relief of John W. McBride (Rept. No. 65);

S. 141. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith (Rept. No. 66);

S. 153. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert (Rept. No. 67);

S. 173. A bill for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro (Rept. No. 68);

S. 255. A bill for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter (Rept. No. 69);

S. 522. A bill for the relief of George F. Ruckman (Rept. No. 70); and

S. 682. A bill for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya) (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 147. A bill for the relief of Sizuko Kato (Rept. No. 72); and

S. 720. A bill for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Connell, United States Naval Reserve (Rept. No. 73).

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. 49)

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit the annual report of that committee covering its work during the second session of the 82d Congress. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who was not a member of the Small Business Committee in the 82d Congress, did not participate in the preparation of the report. The report has the unanimous approval of all of the other members of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. By way of explanation, I may say that, not having participated in the hearings and in the consideration of the subject, I did not join in the report. That does not indicate that I do not agree with the report, nor does it indicate that I disagree with any particular part of it. However, I felt that before one should become a party to a report, he should have first-hand and intimate knowledge of the contents of the report.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is entirely correct. He was not a member of that committee during the past year. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that he not share any of the responsibilities of the annual report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "PUBLIC POLICY AND COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF CERTAIN UNIONS"

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report of the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations of the 82d Congress on public policy and Communist domination of certain unions, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 2, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1146. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1147. A bill for the relief of Karen Ruth Bauman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL (by request):

S. 1148. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1149. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine and render judgment upon the claim of Antoine Gasda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1150. A bill to extend the franking privilege to, and to provide office facilities and secretarial assistance for, former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1151. A bill authorizing the transfer to the State of Tennessee of certain lands in the Veterans' Administration center, Mountain Home, Tenn.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1152. A bill to extend for a period of 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to fur farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. 1153. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1154. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1155. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Bentivegna; and

S. 1156. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jaganath P. Chawla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1157. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to permit the reimportation free of duty of certain articles exported under lease to foreign manufacturers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1158. A bill for the relief of Stayka Petrovich (Stajka Petrovic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1953

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a proposed National Health Act of 1953. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

The bill (S. 1153) to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the bill, among other purposes, will facilitate the broader distribution of health services and increase the quantity and improve the quality of such services and facilities. Identical legislation is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative HALE and Representative JAVITS. If enacted, this bill will be called the National Health Act of 1953 and will provide a voluntary program of health insurance in response to the health needs of the people of the United States.

This is substantially the same bill which we cosponsored and introduced in 1949 in the first session of the 81st Congress. We are reintroducing it in modified form, in the belief that it is designed to provide adequate health care in a manner consistent with our country's traditions of freedom, and that it should be considered along with other proposals having a similar purpose, which may come before the Senate. By such a course of action, the health needs of the Nation can be met realistically within the framework of our free institutions and without resort to Government intervention and control.

The cornerstone of the national health-insurance program advocated in this bill is the local, voluntary, prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Unfortunately, their cost is beyond the means of a large segment of the population. The increasing popularity of these plans, however, demonstrates that the voluntary approach to the exigencies imposed by ill health is the solution desired by the majority of the people—if it is designed in consideration of their financial resources.

The voluntary health and medical service program embodied in this bill basically is financial assistance to voluntary, nonprofit, prepayment, health plans.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services is placed in the States and local communities, with the fullest encouragement to local initiative. The people are thus offered the maximum in assistance with the minimum of governmental interference.

Through this proposed legislation, the health problems of the Nation are met in terms of present available services, while the necessary incentives are provided for additional medical facilities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wondered whether it included domestics and farmers.

Mr. IVES. It includes everyone. It is entirely voluntary. There is nothing at all compulsory about it.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of a résumé of the National Health Act of 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF NATIONAL HEALTH ACT OF 1953

The proposed National Health Act of 1953 would amend the already existing Public Health Service Act by (a) adding a new title VII which provides an immediate health and medical service program; (b) adding a new title VIII which provides for a long-range survey of national health needs; (c) expanding existing provisions for hospital construction and adding new provisions for aid to medical and nursing schools; and (d) adding provisions for local public-health units.

NEW VOLUNTARY HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICE PROGRAM

The purpose of this program is to provide immediate assistance so as (1) to enable voluntary prepayment health service plans to make their services generally available in the communities which they serve at charges based on the income of the subscribers; (2) to encourage the establishment of local administrative facilities embracing functional health service regions and districts in order to facilitate the effectuation of present and future health programs; (3) to enable nonprofit hospitals and medical and nursing schools to maintain and improve their services and facilities; and (4) to assist voluntary prepayment health service plans to construct and equip personal health service centers.

The key to the new health and medical program is the local voluntary prepayment health service plan. Many such plans are in operation today. Both new and existing plans, to qualify for Federal-State aid, would be required to base their rates of payment by subscribers upon a percentage of the subscribers' adjusted gross income (up to $5,000); and under each plan a majority of the Board of Directors must be laymen.

Primary responsibility for the development of adequate health services would be placed in the States and local communities. In order to participate in the program, each State would set up a State health council. This council would divide the State into several regions, a number of which have already been established under the Federal Hospital Construction Act. Each region would be managed by a health region authority, composed of laymen appointed by the governor.

Individuals who obtain medical care for themselves and their families by voluntarily subscribing to a cooperating, voluntary, nonprofit, prepayment health plan. Membership would be in a group plan or on an individual basis—with the Health Region Authority determining the number of nongroup applicants the plans can accept. Further provision would be made regarding the limit on the number of out-of-State beneficiaries a plan might include.

A national yardstick in the form of a comprehensive range of benefits would be established. The cost for this particular coverage would be estimated by the health region authorities for each health region. The subscription charge for this range of benefits could not be less than 3 percent of the subscriber's income under $5,000. Plans could offer more or less comprehensive benefits than those contained in the national yardstick and as the range of benefits offered might vary, so the rates would be required to vary from the 3-percent minimum for national yardstick benefits. The State through the State health council would determine the maximum range of services all the plans in the State might offer. The minimum charge for participation in a plan would be $6 a year.

FEDERAL-STATE AID TO LOCAL PLANS

The States would be able to expend funds, a percentage of which would be reimbursable by the Federal Government, for payments to voluntary plans to meet any deficit between the aggregate of income from subscription charges and the "allowed cost" calculated by each health region authority, as the normal cost of supplying benefits under each approved contract.

The basic formula for Federal aid under this bill would follow the lines of the Hospital Construction Act. Federal aid would be granted a State in inverse proportion to its per capita income. States qualifying for the maximum percentage would receive Federal aid at a ratio of three Federal dollars for every State dollar devoted to the program; those with the highest per capita income, subject to the minimum percentage, would get one Federal dollar for two State dollars. The amount of Federal aid could not exceed $15 a year for each person covered under health plans in the respective States.

A State would begin to receive its Federal contribution as soon as it passed the appropriate legislation and the required machinery was in operation.

When financial help might be needed for the inception of a qualified nonprofit plan, the Federal Government would also help. Provision would be made for State noninterest-bearing loans, reimbursable under the "Federal percentage," to match funds provided for the establishment of a plan from private contributions or non-interest-bearing loans.

LONG-RANGE SURVEY OF NATIONAL HEALTH NEEDS

A bipartisan commission to be known as the "Federal Health Study and Planning Commission" would be created under this act. This commission, to be appointed jointly by the Congress and the President, would direct, supervise, and coordinate continuing health studies with respect to the most pressing problems, such as the financial condition of the country's hospitals, the recruitment and training of health personnel, the provision for care for the chronic diseases (heart disease, cancer, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, poliomyelitis, and other crippling diseases of children, etc.), and provision for dental care. The commission would utilize the research facilities of existing governmental agencies and other organizations as far as practicable.

The commission would be instructed to formulate and submit to the President and to the Congress within a period of 4 years a 20-year national-health program. Provision would be made for interim reports to the President and to the Congress pending submission of its findings and program. In formulating this long-range plan the commission would be required to take into account the recommendations of the cooperating local and national organizations. Thereafter the commission would submit, every 2 years, further plans, on a 20-year basis, designed constantly to improve the Nation's health services.

HOSPITAL-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The present hospital-construction program would be modified to permit State grants and Federal contributions for the construction of diagnostic centers, and personal health-service centers, serving ambulatory patients, as well as hospitals and public-health centers. The appropriation under this program would be increased from $150 million to $175 million per year.

ASSISTANCE TO MEDICAL AND NURSING SCHOOLS

The act would provide assistance in maintaining and increasing the number of individuals trained annually in the fields of medicine and nursing.

Payments to medical schools of $500 for each enrolled student, plus an additional $1,000 for each enrolled student in excess of average past enrollment would be authorized. Comparable provisions would be provided for nursing schools.

The Surgeon General would be authorized to grant up to 50 percent of the costs of construction and equipment of new medical or nursing schools or expansions of existing schools.

LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS

The act would make provision for assistance to States for the development and maintenance of local public health units organized to provide basic full-time public health services in all areas of the Nation and for the training of all types of personnel for public health unit work.

If a State were to provide a plan for extending the coverage and services of local public health units, it would be entitled to receive a percentage of the expenditures under the plan, the percentage varying inversely with the State's per capita income, but not exceeding 66⅔ percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield, provided I have time. If not, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. IVES. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he believes his proposal meets in basic outline or basic purposes the recommendation which was made by the committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Paul Magnuson, recently?

Mr. IVES. As a matter of fact, I may say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota, I have not gone through the whole program, although I have very perfunctorily examined the recommendations. It occurs to me that in large measure those recommendations are met by the ideas and plans embodied in the bill which I have just introduced on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself. So far as I know the bill conforms to the general purpose of the plan and proposal submitted by the Magnuson committee. If such is the case, I am very glad to note that we are in substantial agreement. It is all voluntary; there is nothing compulsory about it, in any way, shape, or form. That is the way it should be in a free society.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator it is my understanding, from having read the report, that his proposal follows the outline of the suggestions made by the Committee on Health Needs.

Mr. IVES. I think their proposals are followed, because this bill was introduced in 1949.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that. I commend the Senator again, and I may say I hope the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will work speedily on his proposal, because it seems to me to make good sense, and it represents a sound middle ground.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] I introduce for appropriate reference another bill, which is a companion to the bill just introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1154) to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. FLANDERS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for not to exceed 3 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1146) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill which seeks to incorporate into legislation some of the legislative recommendations of the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, with respect to the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. The subcommittee directed the staff to conduct an investigation of the reasons for excessive delay in processing cases before the National Labor Relations Board under the Taft-Hartley Act. The factual background for my recommendations may be found in a subcommittee staff report titled "The Problem of Delay in Administering the Labor-Management Relations Act."

What I have tried to do in this bill is to put these recommendations in legislative form. I should add that I do not feel committed to every word in the bill. I offer it in the hope that there may emerge some relief from the intolerable situation in which it takes more than a year to process fully an unfair labor practice case. If we add to this the time taken by enforcement proceedings in a court of appeals, this means another year.

My bill seeks to do the following:

First. To provide a pool of legal assistants to trial examiners. The trial examiners conduct the hearings and write the reports in unfair labor practice cases, on the basis of which the Board issues its decisions. At the time when our investigation was made, it took more than 2 months from the close of the hearing to the issuance of the intermediate report by the trial examiner. The Congress ought to consider whether providing legal research assistants will have the effect of cutting down this time appreciably.

Second. To permit the Board to organize its legal staff in its own way. The effect of the present provision is to establish separate legal staffs of about 15 lawyers each for every Board member. One investigation indicated that the legal staff work could be handled more economically and more efficiently if the Board were permitted to decide, in the light of all of the circumstances, how to organize its legal staff.

Third. To permit, at the Board's discretion, prehearing elections in representation cases. The prehearing election device was developed in the latter days of the Wagner Act period. It is a technique whereby the Board directs an election even though there may be issues in dispute which are unresolved. It was found that many of the unresolved issues were washed out by the results of the election. The Taft-Hartley law eliminated the prehearing election. It is my conviction that the time consumed in processing representation cases can be materially reduced if the prehearing election is reinstated.

Fourth. To permit the Board to use various methods in determining the existence of a majority in a representation case. The Board is now restricted to an election, even though in its judgment a card check may be equally reliable, more economical, and less time-consuming.

Fifth. To permit a regional director of the National Labor Relations Board to exercise final authority on all issues in representation cases, subject to a limited right of appeal to the Board itself. Most of the representation cases are of a routine character and involve no novel issues. One or another party to the proceeding will insist on a Board-directed election, more for reasons of expediency than for reasons concerned with the merits of the issues. My proposal would permit the regional director to make final determinations of all issues in a representation case, subject only to an appeal to the Board if the Board feels that a useful purpose will be served by entertaining an appeal. Otherwise, the Board would have the right to reject an appeal in much the same way that the Supreme Court refuses to grant certiorari.

Sixth. To permit the Board to issue a decision in an unfair labor practice case where the parties waive the right to a hearing and agree to a stipulation of the facts. Here, again, is an economy measure which would speed up Board decisions and would eliminate the expense to the parties and to the Government incidental to the conduct of a hearing.

Seventh. To establish a court of labor appeals with the same jurisdiction as the circuit courts of appeal now exercises in review and enforcement cases. The judges of the court would be designated by the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court from the current roster of judges in the district courts and the circuit courts of appeal. It would function in much the same way that the Emergency Court of Appeals functions with respect to orders of the Office of Price Stabilization. My proposal would provide specialized machinery, without necessarily having specialized judges. Petitions for enforcement or review are now heard in 11 different courts of appeal, each with different rules and procedures. The proposed court of labor appeals could sit at a place most convenient to the parties. The experience of the Emergency Court of Appeals shows that it can process cases more speedily than can the ordinary Federal courts.

My proposals have no partisan purpose. They are designed to achieve two major objectives:

First. To provide timely adjudication of cases arising under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Second. To economize on the expenditure of time and money by the Government and the litigants before the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that these proposals will be given immediate consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They are submitted after careful study and research, and I believe they represent the views of a number of the members of the committee.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF DOCUMENT RELATING TO POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE, 83D CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. CARLSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed additional copies of Senate Document No. 18 of the 83d Congress, first session, entitled "Positions Not Under the Civil Service," as provided for by existing law, for the use of the Senate document room.

REVIEW OF DISABILITY STATUS OF PERSONS DISCHARGED FROM ARMED SERVICES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on February 25, 1953, the bill (S. 1067) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to insure proper review of disability status of persons discharged from the armed services, was introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A reading of the bill convinces me that the subject matter of the bill is under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee rather than the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I therefore ask that the Labor and Public Welfare Committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be referred to the Armed Services Committee.

I may say Mr. President, that I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who has examined the bill, and we are agreed that the reference now suggested by me is the proper disposition of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Address entitled "Young Americans, the Future Belong to You," delivered by Senator Harry P. Cain, of Washington, before the Republican National Convention on July 10, 1952.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Article entitled "Some of America's Chief State School Officers," written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., of Arkansas A. & M. College.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Safeguard," under the general title "Legislation by Treaty," published in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, of February 23, 1953.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Job for an Expert," relating to waste in the defense program, written by Fred Brinkerhoff, editor, published in the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Confused Trade Policy," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of February 28, 1953.

Editorial entitled "To a Bewildered Russian," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report for March 6, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial entitled "Offshore Oil," published in the New York Times of March 2, 1953.

Editorial entitled "A Good Stewardship," published in the Santa Fe New Mexican of January 19, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Letting the Public Know," published in the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer of February 11, 1953.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Article entitled "Crusaders in Washington," written by Holmes Alexander, and published in the Salt Lake Tribune of February 26, 1953.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the reading the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion of the Senator from Ohio is agreed to.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO CIVIL ACTIONS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES IN THE DISTRICT COURTS FOR RECOVERY OF TAXES ERRONEOUSLY OR ILLEGALLY ASSESSED OR COLLECTED

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 6, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 252, permitting all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with the right of trial by jury. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ANTHONY JULIAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Anthony Julian, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice George P. Garrity, term expiring. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ENARD ERICKSON, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Enard Erickson, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota, vice John J. McGowan, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT HENRY BEAUDREAU, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Robert Henry Beaudreau, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts, vice Arthur J. B. Cartier, removed. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF J. EDWARD LUMBARD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Myles J. Lane, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF GEORGE E. MacKINNON, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of George E. MacKinnon, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Philip Neville, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

THE WALTER-McCARRAN IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Port of New York Longshoremen Post, No. 7095, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, signed by John A. Condon, commander, New York County Veterans of Foreign Wars, Americanism chairman, dated February 21, 1953, relative to certain phases of the Walter-McCarran Immigration Act.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT OF NEW YORK
LONGSHOREMEN POST, No. 7095,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN
WARS OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, N. Y., February 21, 1953.

The Honorable Senator McCARRAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This post would like to go on record as unanimously endorsing the section of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act pertaining to the screening of foreign seamen.

We feel we are in better position to judge the merits of this section of the act than the so-called experts that have criticized something they know little about.

If at any time you need assistance in your fight to keep this section of the act from being deleted please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,
JOHN A. CONDON,
Commander, New York County, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Americanism Chairman.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD an article which I have prepared for publication in the magazine U. S. A., the magazine of American affairs, en-

titled "The Background of the McCarran-Walter Act."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BACKGROUND OF THE MCCARRAN-WALTER ACT

(By Senator PAT MCCARRAN)

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, more commonly referred to as the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, went into operation on Christmas Eve, 1952. One would think that opponents of any legislation passed over a Presidential veto, including this act, would allow such legislation a reasonable period in operation before trying to destroy it. But such has not been the case with the McCarran-Walter Act. From the day it was enacted, its enemies have sought ways and means to strike it down. Why this persistent opposition? What kind of a law is it? What does it do? Is it discriminatory? Those are some of the questions to be dealt with in this article.

Recognizing the need for a comprehensive evaluation of our immigration laws, the 80th Congress, in 1947, empowered the Senate Committee on the Judiciary "* * * or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, * * * to make a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system." It was learned during the course of the Senate subcommittee's 4-year investigation that the pattern of our old immigration system had been established not only by 2 comprehensive immigration laws, but by over 200 additional legislative enactments. In addition, there had been a number of treaties, Executive orders, proclamations, rules, regulations, and operating instructions which were in effect. The immigration laws were, moreover, so closely intertwined with the naturalization laws that it was essential for the two sets of laws to be considered together. The subcommittee concluded early in its study that it would be unwise and impracticable to submit the proposed changes in the form of numerous amendments to the patchwork of the old immigration and naturalization laws. It was, therefore, decided to draft one complete omnibus bill which would embody all of the immigration and naturalization laws. The subcommittee undertook a task which had never before been accomplished in the history of this country; namely, the revision and codification of all of our numerous immigration and naturalization laws.

The subcommittee studied not only the history of the immigration policy of the United States, but the immigration policies of other countries. We delved into the history and development of international migrations and the problems of population and natural resources. We studied the characteristics of the population of the United States, insofar as they were related to our immigration and naturalization system. We studied the organization and functions of the agencies of the Government which are concerned with the administration and operation of our immigration and naturalization laws. We studied each of the thousands of provisions of our immigration and naturalization laws with the end in view of appraising their adequacy, force and effect, and in conjunction therewith we studied the judicial and administrative interpretations of those provisions and the rules and regulations implementing them. We learned that at least 60 percent of the total world immigration from early in the nineteenth century to 1930 has come to the United States. Canada, which has ranked next to the United States as a receiving country, has received 11.5 percent of total world immigration, or less than one-fifth as much as the United States. Argentina has received about 10 percent of total immigration, while Brazil has been the place of destination for 7 percent to 8 percent of world immigration. Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa have received most of the remainder. So, it is not an idle boast that we have the most liberal immigration policies in the Western Hemisphere.

In the course of our work, the subcommittee obtained and considered appraisals and suggestions from several hundred officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the visa and passport divisions of the Department of State. In addition, we received and considered appraisals and suggestions from numerous individuals and representatives of various interested nongovernmental organizations.

The study and investigation disclosed many inequities, weaknesses, loopholes, and inconsistencies in the old hodgepodge immigration and naturalization system. The gravity of this situation was not merely academic, nor was it confined to the question of serious inconvenience to those who undertake to administer or understand our laws. Today, as never before, a sound immigration and naturalization system is essential to the preservation of our way of life, because that system is the conduit through which a stream of humanity flows into the fabric of our society. If that stream is healthy, the impact on our society is salutary; but, if that stream is polluted, our institutions and our way of life become infected.

The law as it was finally enacted went through several drafts before it was approved. In that work, we were assisted by not only the staff of the Senate subcommittee, but also by experts from the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Visa and Passport Divisions of the Department of State, and the legislative counsel of the Senate.

After the introduction of the original bill in April of 1950, copies were circulated to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies for study and comment. The Immigration and Naturalization Service assigned two experts who prepared a detailed critique of the bill, and the Department of State set up a special committee within the Department which performed a similar function. In addition, a number of nongovernmental agencies submitted analyses and suggestions. In the course of numerous conferences over a period of several weeks, the various suggestions and analyses were considered and the bill was further refined. Following that, extensive joint public hearings were conducted by subcommittees of the Senate and the House Judiciary Committees on the immigration bills then before the Congress. On April 25, 1952, the House passed the bill by an overwhelming vote of 206 for and 68 against. The Senate followed suit shortly thereafter, and sent the bill to the White House. When President Truman vetoed the bill, it was enacted over his veto.

The cardinal principle which guided us in determining what this act should contain was simply this: The best interests of the United States of America must be served. In the light of that principle, let us examine the chief features of the act.

We have retained the national origins quota system as the basis for our quantitative restriction of immigration to this country. This formula for computing quotas is that the quota for each quota area shall be one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in the continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to such quota area. In addition, several countries which previously had no quotas are allotted minimum quotas of 100. The national origins quota system has been an integral part of our immigration policy since its establishment in 1929, and, while it has been frequently criticized and attacked, no one as yet has come forward with an acceptable substitute. Congress had two purposes in mind when it adopted the national origins formula. The first was to provide a basis for determining quotas for the numerical restriction of the flow of immigrants to this country. The second, and broader purpose, was to preserve the composition of the population of the United States on the basis of the proportionate contribution made by the various nationality groups. The legislative history of the Immigration Act of 1924 shows that Congress never intended the 150,000 quota immigrants allowed to be a minimum limitation, but intended that it should be the maximum number of quota immigrants to be admitted annually. Even those who would whittle away the principle of national origin quotas, by providing for the distribution of unused quota numbers among the low-quota countries, seemingly profess adherence to the principle of national origins for the maintenance of the composition of our population according to the contribution by various nationalities.

How has this formula served us in reality? During the period from 1924 to 1946 immigration from northern and western Europe amounted to 43.1 percent of the total, whereas slightly over 79 percent of our white population, according to the 1920 census, was attributable to that area. During that period, immigration from southern and eastern Europe amounted to 18.9 percent of the total, whereas 15 percent of the white population of 1920 was of southern and eastern European origin. Immigration from the Western Hemisphere countries amounted to 36.2 percent of the total, whereas 5.6 percent of the 1920 white population was attributable to that area.

Although the flow of immigration has not followed the pattern contemplated under the national origins formula, it has provided a fixed and easily determinable method of controlling immigration which is not subject to the whims and caprice of administrative interpretation, and which is automatically resistant to pressures for special treatment. Experience has shown that the national origins formula has been more of a numerically restrictive measure than a means of automatically selecting immigrants from the various nationalities, since the countries of northern and western Europe have used a much smaller percentage of their quotas than the countries of southern and Eastern Europe. The national origins quota formula was and is a rational and logical method of numerically restricting immigration in such a manner as to preserve best the sociological and cultural balance in the population of the United States. It is eminently fair and sound for visas to be allocated in a ratio which will admit a preponderance of immigrants who will be more readily assimilable because of the similarity of their cultural background to that of the principal components of our population.

The act removes from our immigration laws any racial discrimination in a realistic manner. Under its terms, national origin quotas are made available to all countries of the world, and no immigrant is barred solely because of race, nor are aliens barred from naturalization because of race. However, fixed limitations are included to prevent an influx of more orientals than can be assimilated. No one is inadmissible to the United States solely on the basis of race, but all persons indigenous to an area designated as the Asia-Pacific Triangle are assigned to the quotas for that area. By removing the racial bar to immigration and naturalization, about 85,000 orientals in the United States and Hawaii, who have been our friends and neighbors for a quarter of a century, became eligible for citizenship.

Parenthetically, let me say that the Asia-Pacific triangle provision received the endorsement of every major oriental group in the United States as the only fair and reasonable solution to the problem presented. The opponents of the Asia-Pacific triangle provision sponsored legislation which would have swept away all of the control provisions of

the old law without substituting any reasonable limitations in their place. Under their proposals an estimated 600,000 orientals, who are natives of nonquota countries of the Western Hemisphere, would have become immediately eligible for immigration to the United States. Thousands upon thousands of orientals, without statutory limitation, would have become immediately eligible for immigration to this country for permanent residence because of the greatly expanded nonquota categories which would have been established pursuant to the above legislation. This would have been in addition to the quotas which have been assigned to each of about two dozen oriental countries in the Far East. Again, let me repeat that these proposals were so fantastic, so drastic, and so unrealistic that the major oriental groups in this country shied away from them and endorsed the McCarran-Walter version as the only fair and reasonable solution of the problem of racial ineligibles.

It was urged by some that we pool unused quotas and apportion them to low-quota countries. Let me point out, however, that the pooling of unused quotas would be in direct conflict with the national origins quota principle, which is the foundation of our protective immigration system, and which seeks to maintain the relative composition of our population. The effect of pooling unused quotas would be not only to increase substantially the number of aliens coming to the United States for permanent residence but would, in the course of a generation or so, tend to change the ethnic and cultural composition of this Nation. Much has been said about it being the duty of our country to open wider and wider the gates in order to alleviate the surplus population of the overpopulated countries of the world. I insist, however, that an immigration and nationality code is not the proper vehicle for the solution of the surplus population problems of the world. Other means should be utilized, and are being utilized, to find a solution to the problem of overpopulation of Europe. I do not know what the answer to this vital world problem may be, but I do know that the answer will not be found through the destruction of our own immigration system.

Another significant change made by the new act is the removal of discriminations based on sex. Certain of its provisions would permit American women citizens to bring their alien husbands to this country as nonquota immigrants, and enable alien husbands of resident women aliens to come in under a quota in a preferred status. Under the old law men were accorded favored treatment, so that a wife's status could not be used to enhance the husband's chances of keeping the family together. That is no longer the case. For example, under previous law a wife from a low-quota country could accompany her husband from a high-quota country and was chargeable to the high quota. But it did not work the other way around. If the wife were from the high-quota country and the husband from the low-quota country, he could not accompany her on the high quota. The new act changes that, so that the husband from the low-quota country can accompany his wife from the high-quota country. And, under this new act stepchildren are accorded the same treatment as natural children for the first time in the history of our immigration laws.

One of the most significant changes made by the new act is the introduction of a principle of selectivity into our quota system. Under this provision, 50 percent of each quota is allocated to aliens whose services are needed in this country because of their special knowledge or skills.

This new act also revises those provisions of the law relating to the qualitative grounds for exclusion of aliens so that the criminal and immoral classes, the subversives and other undesirables can be excluded from admission into this country. This has been done in a sincere effort to insure that when millions of aliens are storming our gates we shall not be admitting into our society those who would contaminate or subvert it. Likewise, the deportable classes of aliens and the deportation procedures have been strengthened so that subversive and undesirable aliens are not permitted to remain in our midst.

It is charged that the McCarran-Walter Act introduces new racial discriminations into our immigration laws. The truth is that all racial barriers to the naturalization of aliens are removed and that the racial bars to immigration are removed within certain limitations. Under the old law certain Orientals were absolutely excluded from entering the United States as immigrants, but under the McCarran-Walter Act no alien is inadmissible solely because of race, and quotas are available for all the peoples of the world. Some have charged that the quota system militates against Catholics and Jews, but this is not so. Between 1920 and 1950, 5,670,679 immigrants entered the United States. The largest number were from Canada (1,204,760) and Latin America (1,026,797). Many Canadians are Catholic; practically all Latin Americans are Catholic. From European countries the largest immigration was in this order: Germany, Italy, Great Britain, Ireland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Sweden, France. Four of these are Catholic countries, and none of the others is wholly, some not even predominantly, Protestant. Jews immigrated on all quotas, not being classed as a separate nation. In no year were the Jews less than 3.3 percent of all immigrants; and after 1933 they rose from constituting 10.28 percent of all immigrants to 52.3 percent in 1939; 52.20 percent in 1940; 45 percent in 1941; 36 percent in 1942. Half of all the world's Jews now live in the United States and Canada, with the overwhelming majority being in the United States. There is, therefore, not the slightest substance for the charge that the national quota system has had anti-Semitic or anti-Catholic applications.

Never before have our nationality and naturalization laws been integrated with our immigration laws, as is the case in this new act. Race is eliminated as a bar to naturalization. No one who has been lawfully admitted to this country for permanent residence will be denied the privilege of citizenship solely because of his race.

Other significant provisions of the naturalization part of this act broaden and redefine the exceptions to expatriation by residence abroad of a naturalized citizen. These exceptions are designed to meet more realistically the varied problems which arise in connection with those citizens who have bona fide reasons for foreign residence.

It has been suggested that we treat the Communists too harshly in the new Immigration Act. Frankly, they are accorded the type of treatment deserved by traitors to this country, which is what they are. If anyone in this land of ours still doubts that the Communist Party of the United States is part and parcel of the international Communist conspiracy, he has only to read the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Documentary Proof on the subject, and the conclusions of the Subversive Activities Control Board. After 14 months of public hearings, a panel of the Subversive Activities Control Board found that the United States Communist Party was directed, dominated, and controlled by the Soviet Union, and that it should register with the Attorney General under the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. Such registration would force the Communist Party not only to reveal its secret membership lists, but also to open its propaganda and financial activities to Federal scrutiny and control. The panel's decision asserted that the Communist Party lives for the day when it can install a dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States. * * * Nurtured by the Soviet Union, it strives incessantly to make the United States a Soviet America. Does anyone still have doubt? Should they be handled with kid gloves?

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was passed by the Congress on June 27, 1952, over President Truman's veto. On September 4, 1952, 2 months before the general election and more than 3 months before the new act went into effect on December 24, 1952, the President appointed a special Commission on Immigration and Naturalization to study and evaluate the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States. This Commission was to render a final report on the administration and operation of our immigration laws on January 1, 1953, one week after this new law went into effect. This was done despite the fact that it is the duty and prerogative of Congress to determine policy and make the laws, and despite the fact that this new act provides for the creation of a Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy to make a continuing study of our immigration and nationality problems and policies. No measure which has been passed by Congress in recent years has received more attention, more hard work, more thoughtfulness, more study, or has been the concern of more interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies and individuals than this Immigration and Nationality Act. We realized that such an intensive study of so technical a subject comes very seldom—the last one was in 1911—so no avenue was left unexplored, no idea was discarded without serious thought.

I believe that this Nation is the last hope of western civilization and if this oasis of the world shall be overrun, perverted, contaminated or destroyed, then the last flickering light of humanity will be extinguished. I take no issue with those who would praise the contributions which have been made to our society by people of many races, of varied creeds and colors. America is indeed a joining together of many streams which go to form a mighty river which we call the American way. However, we have in the United States today hard core indigestible blocs who have not become integrated into the American way of life but which, on the contrary, are its deadly enemies. Today as never before untold millions are storming our gates for admission and those gates are cracking under the strain. The solution of the problems of Europe and Asia will not come through a transplanting of those problems en masse to the United States. A solution remains possible only if America is maintained strong and free; only if our institutions, our way of life, are preserved by those who are part and parcel of that way of life so that America may lead the world in a way dedicated to the worth and dignity of the human soul. I do not intend to be prophetic, but if the enemies of this legislation succeed in riddling it to pieces, or in amending it beyond recognition, they will have contributed more to promote this Nation's downfall than any other group since we achieved our independence as a nation.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, recently Chairman Paul M. Herzog, of the National Labor Relations Board, appeared before the House Committee on Education and Labor and made a statement which is worthy of thoughtful consideration by all who are interested in labor-management relations. Without at this time going into its substance or even the recommendations it contains, I would call to the attention of the Congress two editorials concerning this statement, which appeared in the February 26 issues of the New York Times

and the Washington Evening Star. At this point in my remarks, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the texts of the New York Times editorial entitled "NLRB's Case" and the Washington Evening Star editorial entitled "Give the States a Chance."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of February 26, 1953]

NLRB'S CASE

The testimony of Paul M. Herzog, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, before the House Committee on Education and Labor was a well-balanced presentation of the Board's administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. It merits the careful consideration of Congress. Particularly is this true because, as Mr. Herzog pointed out, congressional intent is not clear in some of the law's provisions, which can be construed in several ways.

The Board proposes, among other things, that the non-Communist oath for union leaders be discarded and that the problem of communism in unions be turned over to some outside tribunal such as the Subversive Activities Board. But on disputed interpretations of the law itself Congress cannot expect the Board to offer a unanimous remedy, since on these matters the Board would obviously split, as it has, when specific cases involving the selfsame controversial sections have come before it. Clearly the Board needs more guidance from Congress on its intent as to the law's provisions governing union-shop elections, jurisdictional disputes, the obligation to bargain, free speech, and secondary boycotts. These may appear at first thought to be technical matters, but they go to the root of labor-management relations and give rise to controversies which entail strikes, litigation, and loss of time to employers and employees.

Congress should comply with the Board's request to free it from the statutory chains which now make it all but impossible to cede jurisdiction over local controversies to State labor boards. There is no reason why the Board should retain control over local establishments where, even though Federal jurisdiction may attach as a matter of constitutional law, the impact upon interstate commerce is negligible in practice. Indeed, the Board has made some progress in this area, for it has voluntarily abstained from assuming jurisdiction in the New York taxi industry, over which it has been at loggerheads with the New York State Labor Relations Board. This, however, is not enough. Congress should permit the Board to make agreements with State labor boards to cede jurisdiction over cases predominantly local in character.

It is rather refreshing to hear the head of a Federal agency inform Congress, as Chairman Herzog did, that it seeks not more power but less. The Board argues persuasively that its role should not be enlarged "because the freedom of American employers and labor organizations, dealing from approximately equal strength, to make their own collective bargaining with a minimum of Government intervention still seems to us the best road to industrial stability."

The Board's record in speeding up case handling is commendable. In the past long delays have sometimes tended to worsen labor relations.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 26, 1953]

GIVE STATES A CHANCE

In these times of expanding Government it is news when the head of a Federal agency asks Congress to reduce its authority and activities. Chairman Paul M. Herzog, of the National Labor Relations Board has made such a request before the House Labor Committee, which is studying proposed changes in the Taft-Hartley law. Mr. Herzog believes that the Federal Government, through the NLRB, is concerning itself with many labor-management disputes that the States could handle more effectively and more expeditiously.

The NLRB Chairman complained, specifically, about a provision of the present act which has prevented the Federal Board from waiving jurisdiction in favor of State agencies in cases that have little national significance. Section 10 of the law authorizes such waivers, but under conditions which have proved to be a complete block to any cession of cases to State agencies. This section empowers the NLRB to cede to State authorities any local case that can be handled under a State law not "inconsistent" with the Federal law. The trouble with the restriction, Mr. Herzog said, is that no State has a labor law that seems to meet the condition. Consequently, no NLRB cases have been referred to State boards since 1947.

"We believe," Mr. Herzog told the committees, "that the NLRB has more than enough to do, without dissipating its energies upon predominantly local controversies where, even though Federal jurisdiction may attach as a matter of constitutional law, the impact upon interstate commerce is negligible in practice; that the States should not be inhibited from experimenting with labor relations legislation where local enterprises are concerned; and that there should no longer be a no-man's land in those border-line trades where the NLRB, in a spirit of self-abnegation, declines to exercise jurisdiction but where the States do not dare proceed because of the present limitations contained in section 10."

Such a diversion of local disputes to State boards would give the Federal agency more time to devote to major cases touching the national interest. So would the suggested transfer to some other Federal authority of the task of dealing with the threat of communism in labor unions. Mr. Herzog advocated repeal of the anti-Communist oath provision of the act, largely because it has failed of its purpose of eliminating Reds from unions. He recommended several "clarifications" of the present law which would help in enforcing it. As one who has had first-hand experience in administering the act, his suggestions should receive careful consideration.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Harry N. Routzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to make a few remarks in regard to the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Italy.

Mrs. Luce has had a long and varied career in journalism, in the theater, and in politics. She is a former member of the House of Representatives, where she served from 1943 to 1947, and she has written and spoken a great deal on public issues. Her views are well known.

Mrs. Luce appeared at an executive hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee February 17. On February 24, the committee voted unanimcusly to report her nomination favorably to the Senate.

Mrs. Luce is familiar with Italy and she speaks the Italian language. She has in the past made broadcasts for the Voice of America in Italian directed especially to Italian women. She told the committee that, in her opinion, "an American Ambassador abroad is a representative of all the people to all the people of the country to which he goes, regardless of party or class or creed, and so while abroad I think he is both the mirror of the highest aims and aspirations of his country, and a window through which our country may see what the true aims of that country are abroad."

Mr. President, I think there is a great deal to be said for that point of view.

Some question has been raised about Mrs. Luce's nomination on the grounds that it might lead to the appointment of an Ambassador to the Vatican or that Mrs. Luce herself might serve in a dual capacity.

I want to give the Senate categorical assurance that the question of an Ambassador to the Vatican is in no way involved in Mrs. Luce's nomination to be Ambassador to Italy. The corps of diplomats accredited to the Vatican is separate and distinct from the corps accredited to the Italian Government. We have Mrs. Luce's own statement to the committee on this point as well as a strong statement affirming her belief in the deeply rooted American idea of the separation of church and state.

Whether or not the United States should have diplomatic representation at the Vatican is an entirely separate issue which is wholly irrelevant to this nomination as Ambassador to Italy.

I hope that the nomination will be confirmed unanimously.

I attach to my statement a biographical sketch of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MRS. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

Born: New York, N. Y., April 10, 1903.

Family background: Daughter of William F. and Ann (Snyder) Boothe.

Education: St. Mary's, Garden City, Long Island, N. Y., 1915–17; The Castle, Tarrytown, N. Y., 1917–19.

Marital status: Married Henry R. Luce November 23, 1935.

Experience: Associate editor, Vogue, 1930; associate editor, Vanity Fair, 1931–32; managing editor, 1933–34; newspaper columnist, 1934; playwright since 1935; member of 78th and 79th Congresses (1943–47) 4th Connecticut District, Republican.

Other: Author: Stuffed Shirts, 1933; Europe in the Spring, 1940; plays: Abide With Me; The Women, 1937; Kiss the Boys Goodbye, 1938; Margin for Error, 1939. Contributed articles and fiction to magazines.

Home: Ridgefield, Conn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at the last call of the Executive Calendar I objected to considering the nomination of Mrs. Luce at that time. The reason I objected was that I wanted to invite the attention of Members on the other side of the aisle to the serious condition we are facing at the present time in Italy. I was fearful, among other things that a change in the Ambassadorship to Italy prior to the election there might cause some disturbance in our relations which might affect the election in the wrong direction for us. That was the reason I objected at that time. Since then I have talked with some of the Members, and I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin this question: Is it true that Mrs. Luce will not be sworn in until after the election in Italy?

Mr. WILEY. I have heard rumors to that effect. I should like to say, in relation to the fear expressed by the Senator from South Carolina, that, knowing Mrs. Luce as I do, and having known her for quite a number of years—as a girl she used to visit in my own State, and I have met her, of course, on the platform—I think, if her nomination were confirmed at this time, with her wonderful ability to sell a bill of goods for America, she would do a grand job.

I may say, Mr. President, that there was some talk in the committee to the effect—it was very indefinite, and perhaps the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] can enlighten me—that her appointment was to be deferred until May.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was the understanding I received from some Members on the other side of the aisle. I talked with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and he said he thought it was going to be postponed until after the election in Italy.

Mr. WILEY. I have no definite information on the subject.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Would the Senator from Michigan mind passing this nomination over until the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] can return to the floor of the Senate and answer my question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall endeavor to ascertain the facts from the State Department. I have no personal knowledge as to when she will take office. I understand that that is entirely up to the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know that is true. In the latter part of last November I visited Italy and found that the relationship with our diplomats which existed there was a very friendly one, and I do not want anything to happen that may do some injury to the good feeling which now exists there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator ask for postponement of the consideration of the nomination?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] was on the floor a few minutes ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from South Carolina object to considering the nomination at this time?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I realize that it is a matter for the President, but I did want to call the situation very forcefully to his attention, and the only way I could do so was to let it be known how I feel with reference to it.

So, Mr. President, if the nomination can be passed over temporarily, until the Senator from New Jersey can return to the floor, I think he can throw some light on the subject.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to be recognized for a few minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we might take up the supplemental appropriation bill in legislative session.

I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce be placed at the foot of the list of nominations on the Executive Calendar, and that we proceed with the other nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce will be placed at the foot of the list of nominations on the Executive Calendar.

PRICE SUPPORT FOR BUTTER AT 90 PERCENT OF PARITY

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I feel that I should make a few remarks in support of Secretary Benson's announcement that he intends to support dairy products at 90 percent of parity for the next year, following the expiration of the present order, which will expire on April 1.

In order that we may have a complete understanding of the price-support program as it related to dairy products in the past several years, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that a surplus of butter exists all over the Nation; it is not confined to only 1 or 2 or 3 States. As an indication of that I call attention to the fact that in the calendar year 1950 the Commodity Credit Corporation received from the State of Alabama 152,619 pounds of butter.

Georgia delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation 176,753 pounds of butter.

Kentucky delivered to the Commodity Credit Corporation 3,082,520 pounds of butter.

I shall not burden the Senate with reading all the figures, but I ask unanimous consent that the table showing the situation may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Butter under price support for calendar year 1950

	Pounds
Alabama	152,619
Georgia	176,753
Kentucky	3,082,520
Mississippi	1,909,798
Tennessee	5,903,642
Illinois	8,271,158
Indiana	2,831,010
Iowa	1,243,470
Michigan	1,557,125
Ohio	5,095,962
Oklahoma	229,195
Texas	47,613
Kansas	203,729
Missouri	10,746,422
Nebraska	83,684
Minnesota	11,845,535
Wisconsin	55,679,066
New York	35,738
Idaho	105,581
Total	109,210,620

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the calendar year 1950, 19 States delivered butter to the Commodity Credit Corporation in the total amount of 109,210,620 pounds which went to the Corporation. In the year 1952 there were 12 States which disposed of some butter to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I shall not burden the Senate by reading the names of all those States, but I ask unanimous consent that a table entitled "Butter Under Price Support for the Calendar Year 1952" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Butter under price support for calendar year 1952

	Pounds
Illinois	4,514,942
Iowa	1,520,448
Kentucky	137,500
Ohio	480,408
Oklahoma	282,567
Kansas	670,597
Missouri	2,689,198
Nebraska	914,060
Minnesota	3,161,492
North Dakota	813,483
Tennessee	171,736
Wisconsin	708,193
Total	16,064,627

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in the months of January and February of 1953 70 million pounds of butter were purchased under the so-called price-support program. This is under a support of 90 percent, as announced by Mr. Brannan, the previous Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. President, there must be a support program for dairy products or perishable products if there is to be a support program on feed crops, such as corn, feed wheat, and cottonseed meal, a product of high protein, and which the dairy producer must purchase. Cotton itself is under a 90-percent support program. Another item is flaxseed, from which is derived flaxseed meal. All the high-protein feed which goes into the dairy ration used for the production of milk is under a support program.

I believe Secretary of Agriculture Benson was entirely justified in his announced support of 90 percent for dairy products for the year commencing April 1, 1953.

It was expected that reactions to Secretary Benson's announcement of the dairy support level would be varied. As might have been expected, metropolitan newspapers apparently have chosen to take the Secretary to task for deciding that supports for dairy products should be continued for a year at 90 percent of parity. I refer to an article written by Mr. Aubrey Graves, and published in the Washington Post of February 28, 1953. That article was not one which enlightened anybody. It caused a great amount of confusion. I was indeed happy when, as of this date, March 2, 1953, the Post printed an editorial on the same subject that was far more enlightening, and did the consumer, as well as the producer, much good, because it clarified a very highly technical and confused question.

However, attention should be called to the fact that the price-support level will be approximately 2 cents a pound less than it has been during the past year, and that the purchase of butter will be on the basing-point method, using the New York, Chicago, Seattle, and San Francisco terminal markets, with appropriate differentials at other points in the country. Butter has been purchased at a uniform price throughout the country, which in effect meant that the Commodity Credit Corporation paid the freight and certain other costs. This is not to be done in this calendar year.

The position of butterfat prices with relation to the feed costs of dairy farmers should also be noted.

The parity ratio for all farm commodities declined 1 point between January 15 and February 15, 1953, from 95 to 94 percent, while the ratio stood at 100 percent in February 1952. Stated in another way, prices received by farmers declined 9 percent from February 1952 to February 1953, while prices they paid declined much less; in fact, they declined only 2.8 percent.

Mr. President, this is a factor which we must recognize and reckon with. We cannot allow the income of the farmer to decline rapidly, while his operating costs remain on the high level which inflationary conditions in the economy of the Nation have brought about in the past 18 months.

Therefore, if there is to be a stable economy in the United States, it will be necessary to support farm prices and to keep them somewhere in line with the producer's expense and keep the agricultural economy in balance with the national economy; otherwise there will be chaos in the entire economy of the United States. Not only will the earnings of farmers be affected, but a decline in their income will be reflected throughout every category of the economy of the Nation and will ultimately reach consumers, as well as persons employed in factories and the white-collar group employed in offices.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is not that situation analogous to what happened after World War I? At that time the prices of all farm products dropped, but everything which farmers bought remained high, or declined only one index point, with the exception of copper.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from North Dakota has asked a very pertinent question. I wish to read figures showing the percentage of total national income to persons living on farms over a period of years in order to show trends and how the income of farmers in relation to national economy is reflected.

Looking at a tabulation over a period of years, we find that of the total national income, the farmer received, in the calendar year 1912, 13.7 percent. In the calendar year 1917 he received 16.5 percent, and that was at a time when the United States economy was relatively high, not only for the farmer but also for the worker, whether he was a factory worker, a professional man, or a businessman.

In 1922 the percentage dropped to 8 percent. That was the beginning of a recession that affected not only the farmer but affected also the entire economy of the United States.

In 1927 the farmer's income in relation to the total national income was 8.2 percent. In 1932 it dropped to 5.5 percent of the national income. That was the beginning of the depression of the early 1930's.

In 1937 the percentage had risen to 8.8 percent, and in 1942 to 9.1 percent.

In 1947 it had risen to 9 percent, and in 1952 it had dropped to 6.4 percent.

In other words, the recession felt in agricultural areas of the Nation today is reflecting a recession that commenced in the calendar year 1951 and carried itself through 1952. We are now feeling the effects of that recession as of 1953; and unless we can support agricultural prices to maintain a sort of stable price level, there will be a recession which will have its reflex beyond the boundaries of the farm economy. It will reach into the cities and factory centers of the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I yield to the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I want to commend the able Senator from Minnesota on an excellent speech in behalf of 90-percent supports for butterfat. In view of all the facts, I do not think the Secretary of Agriculture could have taken any other course. However, I do take exception to some of his excuses for the 90-percent supports. I do not think any excuses were necessary. For example, he ties his reasons for dairy supports closely to 90-percent supports for basic farm commodities. There is some relation, of course, but not nearly as much as he indicates. For example, there is no price support on pasture, which is a large part of the feed supply for cattle. There is no support on hay or on ensilage. Oat supports are 85 percent of parity. Wheat has been selling at 82 to 85 percent of parity, or from 30 to 40 cents a bushel below 90-percent support, for most of the time during the last 8 months. Even corn is selling far below 90-percent supports. So I think that part of his statement was not quite accurate.

Mr. THYE. May I ask to whom the Senator from North Dakota is referring when he says the statement is not quite accurate?

Mr. YOUNG. I refer to Secretary Benson, not to the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was very careful in developing these figures, and I was ready to defend my figures if necessary.

If agricultural prices are allowed to slide to too low a level, we can rest assured that such prices will ultimately be reflected in the entire national economy. That is as certain as that night follows day.

When we go back over the figures we see that in 1932 the farmers' share of the national income was 5.5 percent. That was the beginning of the depression of the 1930's. In the calendar year 1952 the farmers' share of the national income was only 6.4 percent. That is a danger signal, and we had better recognize it as Members of Congress. Therefore, we had better commend the Secretary of Agriculture for having announced 90 percent support on butter, rather than write articles such as the one to which I referred earlier, in which Mr. Aubrey Graves used such language as this:

> Benson's failure to drop the support level came as a shock following his recent St. Paul speech.

It was that article which led me to do some searching into the facts and figures.

If we permit ourselves to be beclouded in our thinking with regard to the farm-support program, to the point where the Secretary of Agriculture is not supported when he takes a sound stand, some day we shall waken to find a national depression on our hands which will lead to a serious situation, and it will be most difficult to bring the Nation out of it. For that reason, today I am defending the Secretary of Agriculture because, as I stated earlier, butter surpluses come from every section of the United States—not only from Tennessee, but from the New England area. They are not confined to the midwestern section. There are times in the year when butter surpluses necessarily exist if we are to have a sufficient amount of fluid milk to meet the consumers' needs in the summer, when the milk supply is at a low volume and when the consumption is exceedingly high. I refer to the consumption of fluid milk as well as butter fat which goes into ice cream. If we are to have an ample supply of fluid milk for the months of August, September, and October, we shall have butter surpluses throughout the winter months and the early spring months of the year. Such a surplus exists now. Therefore, the Secretary of Agriculture could do nothing other than step in and buy the surplus butter which was being offered. As soon as we have gone through the month

of March, I am confident that we shall see a smaller amount of butter offered to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Once we get past the period involved in the announcement of 90 percent supports a year ago, which period expires on April 1 of this year, we shall find that the amount of butter offered to the Commodity Credit Corporation will be less, because the announced support price, at 90 percent represents a return for butter 2 cents less than the price for the previous calendar year, even though the Secretary announces supports at 90 percent, because the parity ratio will bring 2 cents a pound less for butter under the new executive order than under the Executive order of a year ago.

Prices for butterfat and cream averaged only 66.8 cents a pound in mid-February. This was 1½ cents less than the price a month earlier, and 16.1 cents less than the price a year earlier, or a decrease of 19.4 percent, compared with a decrease of only 6 percent in feed prices.

Secretary Benson followed the only logical course in extending support prices for dairy products at 90 percent of parity for another year. In my opinion, this is not inconsistent with his statement made at St. Paul.

Mr. President, for the RECORD, at this point I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks a two-page release issued by the office of the Secretary of Agriculture on February 27, 1953.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY BENSON ANNOUNCES 1953–54 DAIRY SUPPORT LEVEL

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 27, 1953

Dairy product prices will be supported at 90 percent of parity for another year beginning April 1, according to the announcement made today by Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson.

This decision follows the recommendation of the Dairy Advisory Group, congressional leaders, farm leaders, and others who have been consulted.

"A primary reason for continuing the maximum support allowed by the law," according to Secretary Benson, "was assurance from the dairy advisers that the industry would immediately start work on programs to reduce to a minimum governmental support purchases. The year will give the industry time to demonstrate to what degree it can solve its own problems.

"Here is one of the great agricultural industries," said Benson, "that has told us they want time to get programs into operation. We know the important dairy industry does not want to depend on Government price supports. The farm and dairy leadership now has the opportunity to demonstrate what teamwork will accomplish."

A representative work conference including farmers and leaders of their organizations, processors, distributors, retailers, and consumers will be called together at once. Each segment of the dairy industry will be asked to send representatives prepared to assume definite responsibility for a portion of the solution of the dairy problems. Secretary Benson said, for example, "Dairy farmers can shift more rapidly to fluid milk sales and away from butterfat.

"Milk companies can move more milk from butter-producing areas into regions needing fluid milk.

"Retail dairies, stores, and consumers can more actively promote the sale of milk and milk products.

"There are other adjustments which the industry can make to reduce the accumulation of surplus dairy products.

"The United States Department of Agriculture has offered to help and the assistance of the agricultural colleges, experiment stations, and extension services can be depended upon."

"Dairy farmers and dairy industry leadership has a major challenge," continued Secretary Benson. "We believe they will put the dairy business on a more solid basis—with a minimum dependence on price supports. They have asked for time—we have agreed. Now we will all pitch in to get the job done."

Such price support operations as are needed will be carried out through offers to purchase butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids.

Purchases of butter will be made on a "basing point" method, using the four terminal markets of New York, Chicago, Seattle, and San Francisco, with appropriate differentials at other points in the country. This will be a change from the present policy under which butter has been purchased at a uniform price throughout the country.

The drop in the parity formula will reduce the butter price support about 2 cents per pound.

Program details, which otherwise will be generally comparable with those of present operations, will be announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial which was published in today's issue of the Washington Post. It is an excellent editorial, which greatly clarifies the situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DILEMMA IN DAIRY SUPPORTS

Agriculture Secretary Benson is wise to plan a series of talks over the country to explain his views on farm-price supports. It is apparent that those views have been distorted by persons who see in any suggestion for change in the system of rigid high price supports an attempt to undermine American agriculture. What amounts almost to a campaign of fearmongering has arisen—fear, not of what has happened, but of what might happen. If Mr. Benson can get his essentially moderate position across to responsible farm audiences, we surmise that many of those fears will be quieted.

In this connection Mr. Benson's decision to continue dairy price supports at 90 percent of parity, while disappointing to consumers, ought to reassure farmers that policy changes will not be precipitate. Whether or not to lower dairy supports to 85 or 80 percent would have been a most difficult decision, and Mr. Benson would have invited criticism either way. In view of the huge governmental stocks of butter—89 million pounds—as well as of cheese, his own disposition must have been to drop the support level.

But a drop in the dairy support level, at the same time that supports on feed grains remain pegged by law at 90 percent through 1954, would have put a squeeze on dairy farmers. Incidentally, a major reason for the alarm over falling beef cattle prices is the fact that, whereas cattle prices are not supported, feed prices are pegged. Here is a classic example of the way in which rigid supports upset the economy. Faced with mandatory grain supports, Mr. Benson made a practical compromise. Dairymen are assured 90 percent support for another year, but they have clear warning to adjust themselves to a program requiring less governmental aid.

Mr. Benson spoke euphemistically, however, when he said that the high supports, if continued, will price butter right out of the market. Reports of butter consumption vis a vis that of margarine show that a wholesale change in eating habits has long since occurred. Millions of Americans, whatever their personal tastes, prefer to buy margarine at 30 cents instead of butter at 75.

Dairymen themselves, despite the pressure of their lobbyists, must recognize that there is something criminally wasteful in the governmental purchase of 2 million pounds of butter a day for storage, and perhaps eventual dumping. What is happening is a realignment of values on dairy products. The use of skim milk is on the upswing, and vegetable oils have supplanted higher priced butterfat for many uses. Possibly this means higher ultimate prices for fluid milk and lower prices for butterfat. Lower prices for butterfat might, in turn, restore some of its popularity. Mr. Benson needs to remind the dairy industry continually during the next year that the basic adjustment cannot take place until the price-support system is changed to facilitate production, not for the Government, but for the market.

Mr. THYE. I say further that we, as Members of Congress, must watch the trend, not only of our agricultural economy, but of our entire national economy. If we fail to do so, and if one segment is thrown out of balance with respect to others, it will be a matter of only a short time until there will be chaos, which will be drastically reflected in our entire national economy. I stand in full agreement with the announced support, at 90 percent, for dairy products for the next 12 months, commencing April 1, as contained in the order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture last week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments with regard to a certain nomination on the Executive Calendar. I will be unable to be present when it is taken up for discussion this afternoon.

In order that I may catch a train at 3 o'clock, I ask unanimous consent that I be excused from further attendance upon sessions of the Senate until I return from the trip which I am about to take.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say facetiously and good naturedly that the Republican speakers in support of Secretary Benson ought to get together. Their signals seem to be crossed. I think it would make rather humorous reading to read the speech of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] last week, and then read the comments of the Senator from Minnesota today, and try to follow the time clock of the Department of Agriculture. I think they ought to get together if they are really going to present a united front in the agriculture picture, because if I ever listened to two inconsistent speeches, I have heard them from these two distinguished leaders of the Republican Party.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

NOMINATION OF JAMES H. DOUGLAS, JR., TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the nomination of James H. Douglas, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Air Force, which nomination will be under consideration later this afternoon. At that time I shall not be present to register my vote against his nomination, so I wish to announce at this time that, if present, I would vote against it and to make certain comments as a result of my study of the record of the Armed Service Committee.

Mr. Douglas' nomination was favorably reported last Friday, and is on the calendar for today. He is a Chicago attorney. He has stock holdings which run into hundreds of thousands of dollars. A complete list is available from the Armed Services Committee. The committee requested that Douglas divest himself of 800 shares of Phillips Petroleum stock and 145 shares of Texas Gulf Producing. Douglas agreed to do so.

The transcript shows that Douglas has 400 shares of Seaboard Oil of Delaware. The record shows that members of the committee discussed this subject, and were not sure whether or not the company is a refining company. They did not seem to be able to reach an agreement on that point.

Not being a member of the committee, I must judge from what is in the record. As I gather from the record, some members of the committee felt that if this was a refining company Douglas should get rid of his shares in it. Mr. Douglas was not present at this hearing in order to clear up this matter. So far as the record shows, this discussion was left unresolved. So we still do not know. Even if we wish to accept as sound the criterion of the Armed Services Committee, which I think is a very fallacious criterion, namely, the distinction between a refining company and a producing company, as a basis for determining whether or not a nominee should be required to sell his shares, we cannot tell from the record the breed of his stocks.

Douglas is a cotrustee of several trusts, including that of his father's estate, in which the mother has a life interest. He and his brother will share equally upon her death. It was stated that this trust has diversified stockholdings, but no description was made beyond Douglas' statement that the trust does not hold aircraft or airline shares.

As a lawyer I know it is elementary that when one is trying to find the facts he does not stop with the witness' statement as to what the facts are. In my judgment, if one is carrying out his trust as a member of the committee, he ought to determine exactly what these stocks are. Simply to accept the statement that they are not aircraft or airline shares—which is all the record shows—certainly is not sufficient for me as a lawyer. I still think we ought to know what the facts are, based upon a listing of the shares. That should not be very difficult.

The appointee also has some interests and royalties in oil well enterprises which do not refine petroleum products, but sell to refineries. The discussion in the committee was to the effect that it has adopted the rule that Defense Department appointees should divest themselves of refining company stock, but not producing company stock. The rationale is that the latter would not deal with defense-procurement agencies. I think it is a remarkable rationale, but clearly unsound. In my opinion, there is a very direct relationship between the oil industry as such and the procurement of oil by the Defense Establishment. I believe the kind of interest Mr. Douglas has is one that should have been gone into more carefully than the transcript of the hearings shows was the case.

The record discloses that petroleum procurement for all the military services is handled by the Armed Services Petroleum Purchasing Agency. There is an Air Force representative on the Agency, but he is not within the Office of the Under Secretary. However, he does not work in a vacuum. Nor would the proposed Under Secretary work in a vacuum. They all work together in the Department of the Air Force. To say that because the Under Secretary himself does not sit on the procurement agency, or that the officer who does sit on the procurement agency representing the Air Force does not work within the Office of the Under Secretary, is a great charge on the credulity of the Members of the Senate, if the conclusion the committee thinks we ought to draw is that therefore there could not possibly be any question of influence that would seep through the Air Force Department because of the position of the Under Secretary of the Air Force. They work shoulder to shoulder. They are parties in interest. One would expect that to be the fact in any kind of team work.

At the outset of the hearing Mr. Douglas stated that he would resign all his directorships, including that in the American Air Lines, if his nomination is confirmed. I compliment him on that great concession, but I wish the RECORD to show that if a yea-and-nay vote were held on the nomination—and I do not think one will be held—I would vote against confirmation. I would vote against it because I do not believe that the record shows that Mr. Douglas has been cleared of an affinity of interest any more than Wilson, Kyes, Talbott, or other nominees, whose nominations, in my opinion, for important positions in the Defense Establishment, should never have been confirmed, because they have interests which are in potential conflict with the public interest.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James H. Douglas, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Val Peterson to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

The nomination was confirmed.

ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all the nominations in the armed services listed on the Executive Calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army, National Guard, Air Force, and Navy are confirmed en bloc.

SUNDRY APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations lying on the table, referred to at the bottom of the Executive Calendar, be considered at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I inquire what nominations are now being considered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that nominations of 5,500 junior officers were reported to the Senate on Friday. On objection of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], they were laid over until today.

Mr. STENNIS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the sundry appointments in the Regular Army, sundry appointments and promotions in the Air Force, and sundry appointments in the Navy, which were reported favorably by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services on February 27, 1953, are confirmed en bloc.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to make clear to the Senate that my request on Friday that consideration of the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, be held over until today was not, by any means, motivated by doubt as to the personal integrity and ability of the lady from Connecticut.

Rather, it was the result of a recent visit to Italy where I found that Ambassador Bunker had performed a remarkable service for our country in a difficult political situation. I found that the attention of the Italian Government and people were focused upon our acts here in the United States. They were eagerly

awaiting any move we might make which would reflect our future attitude toward the Italian nation. For this reason, therefore, I felt that a more advised and deliberate approach should be taken to the nomination of a new Ambassador to assume the duties now being performed so ably by Ambassador Bunker.

Let me emphasize that I want the situation in Italy to remain as it is at the present time. I believe that to be the best position to take under all the circumstances. Particularly, we should not indicate that we are in any way interested in the election which is about to take place in Italy.

It was my thought that by avoiding a hasty approach to the nomination, we could best assure the maintenance of the good relations between our two countries and also avoid the charge that the replacement involved political implications in connection with the forthcoming Italian elections.

Mr. President, I shall now withhold any further objection to the nomination.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in behalf of the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, I should like to say that she appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe she demonstrated beyond any doubt that she understands the duties of Ambassador to Italy. She also very clearly distinguishes between the position of Ambassador to the Government of Italy and that of Ambassador to the Vatican State. She also demonstrated that she understands the principle of the separation between church and state in America.

I believe that she will serve in the position of Ambassador to Italy with credit to herself and to our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 44, which is the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering the second supplemental appropriation bill, so-called, which is the first appropriation bill of the 1953 session of Congress.

A great many persons in the United States and a great many Members of the Senate have had considerable to say about economy and about balancing the budget. The first appropriation bill of the 1953 session is now before the Senate, and this is the time for the Senate to proceed to effect economy.

I believe the Appropriations Committee has done a good job on the bill. Let me point out that the appropriation items submitted by the President and the Bureau of the Budget, and considered by the Senate committee, totaled $2,327,521,114. The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee to the Senate calls for appropriations in the amount of $947,325,579, or a decrease of $1,380,195,535 from the estimates and the budget requests.

The bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee differs in only minor respects from the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. Items now included in the bill, as reported, which were not in the bill as passed by the House, are largely ones which were never submitted to the House of Representatives, but came in subsequent budget estimates. For instance, in that connection let me refer to an item of $13 million for claims and judgments. There is nothing the Congress can do about claims, once they have been passed upon by the courts and once the courts have settled their amounts, we can only appropriate the amount.

Various other small items are contained in the bill; but the House of Representatives in considering the bill kept economy in mind, and I believe the Senate committee has held it to the same test. I hope we can proceed to act on the bill without any great delay.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Inasmuch as I have to attend a hearing in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the so-called tidelands-oil legislation, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD some remarks I have prepared in connection with the pending appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY ON APPROPRIATION FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS AND CONFUSED ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THE ADMINISTRATION

I should like to make a few brief comments on the supplemental appropriation for the Council of Economic Advisers.

THREE MEMBERS OF COUNCIL SHOULD BE APPOINTED

First of all, I should like to point out that the $60,000, provided for the Council of Economic Advisers by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, is unique in one respect: It is the only appropriation item for an agency which has no head.

While I support the committee's action in restoring the funds that had been eliminated by the other House, I believe it is essential that appointments be made promptly to fill the three positions on the Council of Economic Advisers as provided for under the Employment Act of 1946.

WIDESPREAD CONFUSION ON ECONOMIC POLICY

At the present moment, we see on all sides a growing confusion in the economic policies of the administration.

In the field of agriculture there seems to be a serious unawareness of the possible dangers confronting the American farmers and of the dangerous impact of declining farm prices on the rest of the economy.

In the field of fiscal policy, we are told, on the one hand, that many billions of dollars of wasteful expenditures can be eliminated and, on the other hand, that very few budget cuts can be expected.

We are told on one day that taxes can be reduced and on another day that they cannot be reduced.

On the one hand—presumably because inflationary pressures have abated—we see price controls abandoned and margin requirements on the stock market reduced.

On the other hand, we are told that higher interest rates are needed to stem inflation.

CONFUSION AND WASTE IN INTEREST RATES

We are told, on the one hand, that more of the public debt should be placed in long-term bonds, but, on the other hand, the Treasury Department replaces almost $9 billion of 11½-month securities with securities maturing in only 12 months.

We are told that a primary purpose of the administration is to reduce costs. Yet in this recent refinancing operation—which is the biggest single action the new administration has taken in the field of economic policy—the Secretary of the Treasury has boosted the rate of interest from 1⅞ percent to 2¼ percent.

This increase of three-eights of 1 percent means an increased cost to the Government—and increased profit to the bankers—of $34 million a year, a figure verified by the Secretary of the Treasury. This sum alone is twice what would be needed to expand and improve our Nation's facilities for training an adequate supply of doctors, dentists, and nurses.

We are told that this costly increase in interest payments is forced upon us by the fact that the market rate has risen as a result of the automatic operation of the law of supply and demand. Yet the financial expert of the New York Times who reported upon the refinancing operation in the New York Times of February 15 said that one consideration in the higher interest rate was—and I quote—"the willingness of the Treasury to pay even more than the market rate."

NEED FOR COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

It was to deal with problems of this type that the Congress provided for the Council of Economic Advisers in the Employment Act of 1946.

The primary purpose of the Council of Economic Advisers is to develop a consistent and integrated economic policy which will promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The members of the Council of Economic Advisers, when appointed, will obviously not find their task an easy one.

Any Council of Economic Advisers, when appointed, will probably find itself faced with the necessity of recommending many changes and improvements in the present

economic policies of the present administration.

Because of the obvious need for such changes and improvements, I sincerely hope that the appointments will be made without further delay.

SIXTY THOUSAND DOLLARS ADEQUATE FOR THIS FISCAL YEAR

As for the specific sum of $60,000 to carry the Council through the remainder of this fiscal year, I am highly gratified with the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee. This decision, if sustained, will reverse the action of the other House which, by deleting funds for the Council of Economic Advisers, would have defeated the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Employment Act of 1946.

The sum of $60,000, I am informed, will be sufficient to allow this important agency to operate during the next few months. I assume this figure will be accepted by the Senate; I hope it will be agreed to by the conferees representing the other House.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amount carried by the appropriation bill we are now considering is almost 60 percent below the total amount requested by the Budget Bureau originally. It is actually 59.3 percent below the estimates. Most of the estimates and requests for appropriations were submitted to the Congress by the previous administration. Congress, however, can take little credit for this tremendous reduction in the appropriations carried by this particular bill, for almost all the savings were voluntarily made by the new administration.

Time after time at the appropriations committee hearings we heard officials of the new administration say, "We can get along without that additional appropriation," or "We shall use the funds we already have." This spirit of economy on the part of the executive branch of the Government is something new to me, and I believe it is the spirit which should be shown by the administration.

I have compiled a brief table showing the reductions in appropriation requests which were voluntarily made by the new administration and also the reductions which were made after the House of Representatives or Senate Appropriations Committee brought the attention of the new administration to this subject. The two types of reduction made by the new administration amount to $1,380,358,500. This total is greater than the amount shown on page 1 of the Senate committee's report as a reduction in the budget estimates, because some of the transfers requested by the new administration are not considered as appropriation estimates or requests. In previous years, however, such transfers were rare, since the emphasis always seemed to be on new and additional appropriations—in other words, on new and additional funds—not on transfers and the use of existing appropriations.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the table of appropriations reductions requested or agreed to by the new administration and also the table of reductions in appropriations requests which were made by the House of Representatives, were accepted by the new administration, and were not appealed to the Senate.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Appropriations reductions requested or agreed to by the new administration

I. INSTANCES AND AMOUNTS OF REDUCTIONS WHERE REQUESTS WERE REDUCED BY NEW ADMINISTRATION BEFORE CONSIDERATION BY CONGRESS

State Department salaries and expenses	$360,000
Justice, fees of witness and support of prisoners	[1] 870,000
Justice, Immigration and Naturalization, salaries and expenses for new law	1,725,000
Commerce, Patent Office, printing expenses	5,000
Post Office, postal operations	[1] 28,000,000
Post Office, claims	[1] 300,000
Department of Labor, Employment Security, salaries and expenses	31,000
Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics	[1] 150,000
National Mediation Board, salaries and expenses	[1] 17,000
Agriculture, REA, for telephones	[1] 15,000,000
President's emergency fund	100,000
Civil Service Commission, for U. N. investigation	[1] 1,000,000
Veterans' Administration, medical and hospital services	3,074,000
VA, readjustment benefits	80,640,000
Defense Department, military pay	145,150,000
Total	276,422,000

[1] By transfer.

II. REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS REQUESTS WHICH WERE MADE BY THE HOUSE, ACCEPTED BY NEW ADMINISTRATION, AND NOT APPEALED TO SENATE

Judiciary, miscellaneous salary and expenses	$36,000
State Department, United States-Mexico International Boundary Commission	[1] 1,000,000
Treasury, Bureau of Public Debt	1,550,000
Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, grants to States	1,190,000
Labor, unemployment compensation for veterans	5,000,000
FSA, Office of Education, salaries and expenses	30,000
FSA, Public Health Service, payment to Hawaii	56,000
VA, readjustment benefits	50,418,000
VA, servicemen's indemnities	500,000
VA, grants to Philippines	432,500
Defense, military pay	[1] 1,043,724,000
Total	1,103,936,500

[1] By transfer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative Branch," on page 1 after line 8, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brien McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Florida, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3 million but less than 5 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of New Jersey, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 5 million but less than 10 million, the population of said State having exceeded 5 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 21, to insert:

Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the compensation of one camera and sound engineer, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of $4,080 per annum, and one shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of $1,500 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to be fixed by the committee, $555.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 8, to insert:

Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, including the objects specified in section 401, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session, $14,000; notwithstanding subsection (j) of section 401, amount to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 16, to insert:

Vice President's automobile: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, $980.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 19, to insert:

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for "Expenses of inquiries and investigations," $500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 4, after line 6, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Clerk: For an additional amount for the "Office of the Clerk," $3,835 to be available for the compensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of $4,020 per

annum, and one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of $2,500 per annum, Joint Recording Facility.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol Buildings" $3,651, of which $2,851 shall be for payment to Skinker & Garrett, contractor, for constructing brick arches under the main entrance portico steps of the Capitol Building to support the 1953 inaugural stands.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 18, to insert:

Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, $1,600, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 6, to insert:

Senate Office Building: For an additional amount for "Senate Office Building," $54,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Judiciary," on page 6, after line 3, to insert:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PREPARATION OF RULES FOR CIVIL PROCEDURE

For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2072, to be expended as the Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed $10 per day, $11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Department of State—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico", on page 7, line 16, after the word "expended", to insert "of which $1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "International information and educational activities", Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 19, to insert:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed $270,000 to the appropriation "Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice", 1953, and not to exceed $600,000 to the appropriation "Support of United States prisoners, Federal Prison System," 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office—Salaries and Expenses", on page 8, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out $100,000" and insert "$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Access Roads (Act of September 7, 1950)", on page 9, line 5, after "(Act of September 7, 1950)", to strike out "for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422), $8,000,000, to remain available until expended," and insert "to remain available until expended, $18,000,000, of which $8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III", on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the postal revenues)

POSTAL OPERATIONS

For an additional amount for "Postal operations", $28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 10, to insert:

CLAIMS

For an additional amount for "Claims", $300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Transportation of mails", fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security", on page 10, after line 7, to insert:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency—Office of Education", on page 11, after line 18, to insert:

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The amount made available under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1953, for necessary expenses of technical services rendered by other agencies, is increased from "$750,000" to "$875,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 11, to insert:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 17, to insert:

ARBITRATION AND EMERGENCY BOARDS

For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards," $10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses," National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 13, to insert:

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The amount made available under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953, exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is decreased from "$216,000" to "$199,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 6, to insert:

CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RURAL ELECTRICAL ADMINISTRATION

Loan authorizations

The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification program is decreased from "$50,000,000" to "$35,000,000," and the basic amount authorized by said act to be borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from "$25,000,000" to "$40,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 17, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "V" and insert "VI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 18, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VI" and insert "VII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President," on page 14, after line 19, to strike out:

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to insert:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $60,000; and said appropriation shall remain available through June 30, 1953.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Emergency fund for the President—national defense", on page 16, line 9, after the word "defense", to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 3, to strike out:

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For an additional amount for "Grants to the Republic of the Philippines', $1 million.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 13, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VII" and insert "VIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 3, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VIII" and insert "IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 21, to insert:

CHAPTER X

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 19, 83d

Congress, $13,230,038, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 16, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "IX" and insert "XI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions", on page 20, line 20, to change the section number from "901" to "1101."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, to change the section number from "902" to "1102."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to state to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from New Hampshire, that I have before me a letter from Mr. Bernard Weitzer, national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States. With the letter he has sent me a copy of a telegram, which I have since submitted to the Senator from New Hampshire. The telegram relates to appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. I am not sure whether the telegram was placed in the record of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that the telegram came in after the hearings were concluded.

Mr. HILL. I assume that the chairman of the committee will have no objection to having the telegram placed at this point in the RECORD; is that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. Then, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the telegram to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, I respectfully urge you support full supplemental appropriation requested in Veterans' Administration approved by Budget Bureau $15,886,000 for administration finance contact service vocational rehabilitation and education loan guarantee program and medical services plus $10 million additional for medical services. Appropriations cuts in past years have already seriously eroded the VA medical services and staff leading to thousands of unusable hospital beds and causing deaths and dangerous hardships to veterans entitled by law to medical treatment. The appropriations suggested above are urgent now and correction in the 1954 budget will not undo the further ruination of the medical services and the contact service which present cuts will inflict. Contact service is the essential means whereby the veteran is aided to get the benefits you have voted for him. The appeals made to you by some Senators on behalf of veterans in their States awaiting medical service can be duplicated in practically every State in the country where more than 21,000 eligible applicant veterans are waiting to get into hospitals and more than 289,000 applications are pending for outpatient dental treatment, more than 2½ times as many as there were last year. Will appreciate your entering this message in your committee hearings record.

BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Director.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have now been agreed to, and the bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, under authorization of the Appropriations Committee, and in conformity with a notice given in proper time for the submission of an amendment, I now send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, in line 18, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that our committee was unanimous in authorizing the Senator from New Hampshire to submit the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The amendment would add nothing to the total amount to be appropriated, but would facilitate greatly the attainment of the objective of giving some help to such areas, regardless of whether the children live in Virginia, the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, or elsewhere. In any event, the purpose is to have them receive the aid Congress intended they should receive.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The amendment is based on the assumption—I may say, in connection with what the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said—that these are Federal funds, and if they are used for school purposes in areas where a great Federal project is in existence, the expenditure of the funds should not be limited by State lines. For example, let us say there is a large plant in Virginia or perhaps in Indiana—I remember one in Indiana—and let us assume that some of the persons working in the plant live in Kentucky—or vice versa. Under the law which has been in effect, they must live within the State where the plant is located in order to obtain benefits. The State boundary is an imaginary line which should not be in effect where Federal funds are to be used. The test should be reasonable commuting distances to the plant, in order that all communities may be treated equally.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I want to call attention to one matter only. This proviso applies not only to this fiscal year but to the succeeding fiscal year. The matter dealt with here will require the passage this year of another school act—an authorization act, as I remember. Consequently, Senators should closely watch to see that that act does not repeal this provision for the succeeding fiscal year. I only want to call attention to the fact that the Senate may later supersede what is being done here for the next fiscal year. I have no objection to including it in this bill, but it should be covered by permanent legislation.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution to the discussion regarding this particular amendment. I should be glad to proceed to explain the amendment at some length, if desired, but I know that all members of the Appropriations Committee understand it. From my talks with most of the other Members of the Senate, I judge that they, too, understand it. It is a fair approach to correct an inequality which prevails at the present time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is it not a fact that a good many States of the Union are affected by this provision?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. About 15 States are affected by it. I have in my hand a list of the States that will be affected. They are Maine, New Hampshire, South Carolina, Georgia, Virginia, Maryland, Iowa, Illinois, Texas, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, South Dakota, and Nebraska. There may be others, but this is the number we have been advised are currently faced with the problem we seek to correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONSTRUCTION

Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of land from appropriations for construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contained in the act of July 9, 1952, Public Law 470, 82d Congress, 2d session, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appropriation not to exceed 1,500 acres of nonreservation lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately 5 acres

of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., for use of the Wapato irrigation project.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment involves no increase in appropriations. Last year in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill there was appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, $17,500,000 for construction of various Indian irrigation projects. There was included in the appropriation bill the customary language, that no part of the sum should be expended for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming, outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, and that no part of the appropriation should be used for the the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

When we made the appropriation we did not have that provision in mind. There was an allocation of $300,000 for the improvement of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project in Arizona. But it cannot be used, because the improvement would result in flooding certain lands, principally desert lands which had been acquired. The same thing is true with respect to a pumping plant to be located on the Yakima Indian Reservation in the State of Washington. It is a small tract, but the title must be passed from the Indians to the United States, for the purpose of building the power-plant. This amendment merely makes it possible to do what the Congress intended should be done at the last session.

For the information of the conferees, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a complete statement regarding this matter, which appears at page 277 of the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Senator HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in the Interior Department appropriation bill last year, under "Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs," there is a provision:

"For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, roads and trails, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; to remain available until expended; $17,500,000 of which $1,380,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority previously granted."

There are two provisos:

"*Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations."

PICACHO RESERVOIR, ARIZ.

Now, this $17,500,000 was left for allocation by the Secretary of the Interior and in the order of priority which he established. $300,000 was allocated for improvement of what is known as the Picacho Reservoir, in connection with flood control and irrigation on the San Carlos project in Arizona.

It now appears that the $300,000 cannot be expended for the acquisition of land which would be flooded by reason of the increase in the size of the reservoir. It also is true that in the State of Washington there is need to acquire a small tract of land inside of an Indian reservation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED

What I desire to do, Mr. Chairman, is to offer a legislative amendment and have it printed in the record at this time which will modify legislative limitations that I have cited. I want to include in the record a statement as to just exactly what was expected to be done in each case, and the justification for the proposed amendment.

Chairman BRIDGES. You may include that in the record.

(The amendment referred to follows:)

"On page 8 after line 4 in H. R. 3053, as reported to the House, insert the following:

" 'BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS CONSTRUCTION

" 'Notwithstanding the prohibition against the purchase of land from appropriations for Construction, Bureau of Indian Affairs, contained in the Act of July 9, 1952, Public Law 470, Eighty-second Congress, Second Session, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to purchase from said appropriation not to exceed fifteen hundred acres of nonreservation lands in Arizona, and necessary rights-of-way and easements required for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir of the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, and approximately five acres of allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Indian Reservation, Washington, for use of the Wapato irrigation project.'

"JUSTIFICATION

"The purchases proposed will be made out of funds appropriated by the said act for the Interior Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. Under the provisions of the act, however, the San Carlos irrigation project cannot use the funds to purchase the lands necessary for the enlargement of the reservoir because of specific limitations contained in the act. It is provided therein that no part of the funds appropriated for the construction of irrigation projects shall be used for the acquisition of lands within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, and that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

"The lands needed for the enlargement of the Picacho Reservoir in Arizona, approximately 1,155 acres, are outside of any Indian reservation. The San Carlos irrigation project was constructed under the act of Congress approved June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 475). The Picacho Reservoir, originally constructed by the water users about 1892, is used to impound floodwaters of the Gila and San Pedro Rivers, and the surrounding areas west of the Picacho Mountains, for irrigation purposes. The reservoir provides storage regulation and water distribution service for the San Carlos project and protects a fertile farm area from possible damages resulting from flood runoff, which, during storm periods in the area, has, at times, exceeded the capacity of the reservoir. As a result of silt deposits, the reservoir capacity has decreased over the years from that of approximately 15,000 acre-feet to a present capacity of about 3,000 acre-feet. The reservoir is extremely important to the operation of the project, the conservation of water, and the protection of the surrounding area from damage in the time of seasonal freshets and storms.

"All of the lands proposed for purchase are above the high-water line of the present reservoir. It is estimated that it will be necessary to purchase 1,154.5 acres at the following estimated costs:

864 acres desert land at $50 per acre	$43,200
290.5 acres cultivated land at $300 per acre	87,150
Total, 1,154.5 acres	130,350

"The allotted Indian lands within the Yakima Reservation, Wash., are required for a pumping-plant site and operator's quarters for the Wapato irrigation project within the Yakima Indian Reservation. The purchase cost is estimated at $500."

Senator HAYDEN. I next insert a statement made by Mr. C. A. Anderson, district engineer of the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District.

(The statement referred to follows:)

"STATEMENT OF C. A. ANDERSON, DISTRICT ENGINEER, SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, COOLIDGE, ARIZ.

"The district I represent is a part of the San Carlos Federal irrigation project which comprises an area of 100,000 acres of irrigated land, located in central Arizona about midway between the cities of Phoenix and Tucson. One-half the area within the project is Indian land, property of the Pima Indians, who were engaged in agriculture there before the white man first came to explore the area some 300 years ago. The remaining half, or 50,000 acres, of the project is owned and operated by white farmers, and this area comprises the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District.

"The works of the project were constructed pursuant to the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 475). These works were placed into operation about the year 1931, and the area has enjoyed the economic benefit and growth resulting from the development since that time.

"A repayment contract between the Secretary and the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District was entered into in June 1931. Under its terms the program of operation and maintenance is defined as are the obligations of the district for the repayment of reimbursable construction costs on an annual basis.

"Because of the extensive Indian interest involved, the San Carlos project was constructed by the Indian Service and the Department, through the Office of Indian Affairs, still retains control and management of the principal project works.

"PICACHO RESERVOIR PROJECT

"Picacho Reservoir is a small storage reservoir located at the eastern edge of the project area and adjacent to the main canal. It serves two important purposes: (1) To capture and store unregulated floodwaters which would otherwise be lost for irrigation use; and (2) to regulate or make uniform the flow in a main canal which conducts water for some 40 miles, feeding project laterals along its course.

"The reservoir has been in operation for some 60 years. It was originally constructed and used by settlers in the valley before the project was built. It was then taken over by the Government as a part of the San Carlos project works. Silt-laden floodwaters impounded there from time to time have caused the storage space to gradually become smaller. At the present time the area is practically

level with the top of the confining embankment. As a consequence the floodwaters which form a part of the common project supply can no longer be impounded or regulated and must run to waste if storage space is not restored. Moreover, the loss of flood storage capacity presents an annual threat of flood damage to areas below the reservoir because, if no detention is provided, such floodwaters will unquestionably run over and past the former storage site and continue without control to cause damage to improved areas below."

Senator HAYDEN. In addition to Mr. Anderson's statement, I desire to have included in the record data that he has submitted, showing who owns the lands that are to be acquired, and the nature of the lands, whether cultivated or desert, together with certain data that he has prepared in connection with it.

(The material referred to follows:)

San Carlos project—Summary of lands or rights-of-way required for reconstruction and enlargement of Picacho Reservoir

[Section numbers referred to in the following tabulation are sections 25 and 36, township 6 south, range 8 east; sections 30 and 31, township 6 south, range 9 east; sections 1 and 2, township 7 south, range 8 east; and sections 6, township 7 south, range 9 east, all G. and S. R. B. and M., Arizona]

Sec. No.	Owner of record	Acres required			Patented or State (unpatented)
		Cultivated	Desert	Total	
25	Leonard Bellows, Waitsburg, Wash	31.1	----------	31.1	Patented.
25	Fred Wuertz, Coolidge, Ariz	67.4	----------	67.4	Do.
36	State of Arizona	27.0	46.6	73.6	State.
30	....do	40.0	240.5	280.5	Do.
31	....do	40.0	100.7	140.7	Do.
2	....do	----------	80.0	80.0	Do.
31	Kitty Hayes, et al., Los Angeles, Calif	----------	140.5	140.5	Patented.
6	A. Avenenti Estate, Tucson, Ariz	----------	148.0	148.0	Do.
1	V. Whitlock, Coolidge, Ariz	[1] 70.5	79.6	150.1	Do.
1	C. Balcom, Coolidge, Ariz	14.5	68.0	82.5	Do.
6	Earl Sheeley, La Marque, Tex	----------	90.1	90.1	Do.
6	C. Balcom, Coolidge, Ariz	----------	50.0	50.0	Do.
	Totals (from preliminary surveys)	[1] 290.5	[2] 1,044.0	1,334.5	

[1] During 1952, following surveys, cultivated area was enlarged somewhat in SE¼ sec. 1. This appears to be about 50 acres additional. Hence total cultivated area is now estimated at total of 340.5 acres.

[2] Actual high-water line of new reservoir is estimated from surveys to cover new desert areas to the extent of approximately 864 acres. It may be necessary to purchase additional fractions to subdivision lines, amounting to about 180 acres. Therefore total estimated desert area is 1,044 (864 plus 180) acres.

NOTES ON TABULATION OF AREAS, PICACHO RESERVOIR

	Acres
Total patented land	759.7
Total unpatented land (State)	574.8
	1,334.5
Estimate of cost of acquiring lands (from Indian Service preliminary report):	
864 acres desert land at $50	$43,200
290.5 acres cultivated land at $300	87,150
Total estimate for purchase of right-of-way	130,350

It is believed that, if found necessary to purchase a total of 340.5 acres of cultivated land and 1,044 acres of desert land as indicated in the tabulation and explained by the notes above, such total areas can be obtained within the $130,350 shown in the above estimate.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. As one who has worked long in this particular vineyard with the Senator from Arizona, I desire to add my word to his with respect to the amendment he has just offered. I think the amendment is in the public interest, and that the particular exception, or the two exceptions from the prohibition, should be made. It will be very helpful to the Indians in question, and it is absolutely necessary if the construction projects are to go forward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in this bill there was one item relating to clerk hire about which there was some question particularly from Senators of States with large populations. Some of the Senators from large States are paying money out of their own pockets for clerical hire in order to carry their official load. This condition should not prevail, and so far as I am concerned, I think the Senate should take steps to remedy it. However, the other day at the committee meetings, in marking up this bill, it was felt that the formula used to attain the desired objective should be given more study. It was suggested that the sponsor or sponsors of such amendment confer with the chairman and members of the legislative subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, to see whether they could agree on a formula for increased clerical staffs prior to the consideration of the next supplemental or regular appropriation bill. Such action will postpone the date of this relief, and it might impose a burden on Senators. I desired to offer that explanation. I see in the Senate Chamber the very able and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who was one of the sponsors of this provision, and I shall defer to him if he cares to add anything to this explanation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I raised the question; indeed, as a matter of fact, it was raised in a number of conferences long before the matter was presented to the Appropriations Committee. Senators from States with large populations, particularly populations that are vocal and are given to writing letters, are in the unhappy position of having put upon them an undue burden. I am frank to confess that I am in that unhappy fix.

The formula by which we operate now is broken up into three categories: First, States with a population of less than 3,000,000 are allotted $39,540 as a base. I confess I have never been able to fathom the intricacies of all the additions to the formula by which that amount is spelled out, because it must take into account nearly every legislative proposal touching the salaries of clerical assistants which at one time or another is enacted.

The next category covers States with populations of from 3 to 5 million; the third, States having populations of from 5 to 10 million; and then those having more than 10 million. I happen to come from a State that has a population of more than 9 million. The population of New Mexico is 1 million; that of New York is in excess of 14 million, or 4 million more than the top figure.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that I find myself in the very unhappy fix of being unable to compete with the House of Representatives when it comes to hiring clerical assistants; nor can I compete with the governmental agencies downtown. Sometimes when a very able person comes forward—a person who might well serve in my office—and I suggest what is the maximum salary I can pay, it is not acceptable, and I discover that I cannot compete with the agencies of the executive branch.

There is one other factor involved, which affects particularly those States that are most remote from the District of Columbia. I refer to the fact that there is no provision today for a transportation allowance for clerks. I think the Members from California would like to give employment to persons from their State, yet we all know that the transportation costs are heavy, indeed, and when the California Members cannot offer enough, it simply means they cannot compete with others who might engage the services of such persons.

Speaking as one whose State is in the category of large States, I simply say to the Senate that I need more help. I cannot go on forever working the life out of my staff. They start early and work until 6 or 7 o'clock at night. They work on Saturdays and Sundays. I bought portable typewriters for some of them so they could work at home, for which they receive no extra compensation. I have procured for them the number of electric typewriters the rule will allow. It becomes a tremendous chore to take care of the mail. It is not so heavy as it was, but in 1951, in a single day, more than 6,000 first-class letters reached my office. They must be answered. The people are entitled to a response from one who represents them in the Senate or in the House of Representatives.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the cost of transportation of an employee is so clearly a serious problem with which many of us are faced that I cannot help but comment on that particular phase of the Senator's statement. The cost of transportation by plane from the city of St. Paul, or the city of Minneapolis, to Washington is approximately $122.02. We cannot recruit workers from such an

area without some kind of travel allowance, because they would expect to go back home at least once a year to see their parents and their friends. In the case of a far western State, such as California or Oregon, to which the fare is in excess of $300, and no allowance is granted for travel expenses, it is impossible to recruit workers from such localities. Most of the time we have to take employees who offer themselves from the District of Columbia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Minnesota has placed his finger on the point. A Senator would like to favor people in his own State. They are familiar with the conditions in the State, whether it be in agriculture or in industry. They know other persons there, and it serves a very useful purpose in a Senator's office to have employees from his own State, if possible. I am in the unhappy position, because of the limitation on clerical allowances, plus the fact that there is no transportation allowance, of having to content myself with employing persons who are residents of Maryland and Virginia. They are fine people; but what kind of an explanation can we make to the voters back home? I am free to admit that a Member of the Congress does wear a political tab, and people want a little favor now and then, and they are rightly entitled to it by every tradition. I have great difficulty because of the straitjacket in which I am compelled to operate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Another grave problem of Senators who come from far-distant States is that from time to time they must return to their respective States and must take some members of their staffs with them in order to conduct their business properly. A year ago I was compelled to take two of the members of my staff and have them establish an office in St. Paul. There are no allowances with which to pay travel expenses of those persons who must return to the States in order to staff the office we establish during the time Congress is in recess.

There is another problem, Mr. President, which apparently no one seems to appreciate or understand, namely, that we must ask some of our staff members to give up their living quarters in the District of Columbia and move out to our own States for a period of 3 or 4 months, and then return to Washington when Congress reconvenes. It involves great expense, and much inconvenience, but conditions are such that it is very difficult to convince persons in the States that they should come to Washington to take positions in the offices of Senators.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota is quite correct.

The formula under which we operate is certainly not scientific. How can we justify a jump from a population of 3 million to 5 million persons, when the next category is over 10 million persons? We are penalized in that respect. I worked out a formula which I thought was infinitely better.

I may say, Mr. President, that I certainly do not like to encumber a supplemental appropriation bill, but I know that if we had to wait until the 30th of June it would not become effective in time to be of any assistance. If we were to move up by successive stages, 1 million at a time, 2 to 3, 3 to 4, 4 to 5, then up to 9, and then to 10, and jump by a stated amount of $3,000 in every category, that would give $3,000 for every additional 1 million persons.

Some States may be able to get by with the amount of clerical help they have at the present time; but I find great difficulty. There is a city in Illinois with a population of more than 3⅓ million persons, but I can take only 1 person in the office for that large population. We are confronted with enough work to make it entirely worthwhile to have 2 or 3 and thus facilitate a great deal of the work at the Nation's Capital, and give more expeditious service. But that cannot be done under the formula which prevails.

I had hoped that my idea would commend itself to the favor and the grace of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I think the committee did look with favor on the objective which he sought. The committee did favor some action along the lines he has indicated. No definite recommendation was made, but it seemed to be the prevailing view that the legislative subcommittee could furnish a formula and then report its findings in connection with the next appropriation bill to come before the Senate.

The difficulty about acting on the floor at the moment is the haste with which we would have to act in perfecting the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I quite agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I know that one cannot discern at a glance all the things that are involved, so I am generally reluctant to advance an amendment under such circumstances. I wish to say to my distinguished chairman that I shall withhold the amendment in the hope that by the time the next supplemental or deficiency appropriation bill is considered, there will have been an opportunity to explore the question.

Mr. President, I am going to hand this proposal in the form of an amendment to my distinguished chairman, knowing full well that it will receive vigorous, careful scrutiny and attention.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator that we should give a great deal of study to this particular matter. Some Senators now on the floor may recall that the matter was before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. That committee, too, did a great deal of investigating. At that time we found that when we jumped these brackets up to 3 million or a little more, in three categories, that was not enough. There ought to be more of a breakdown.

As an illustration, in my own State, the population is 2,200,000. Yet at the present time there are other States having populations of about 250,000 whose Senators draw the same amount received by those of my State. It can readily be seen that that is not a correct allocation. There ought to be a committee giving this matter special attention and careful study. If that is not done, we will have a great many headaches in the future.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, and other Senators who may be interested, that, so far as I am concerned, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, insofar as I have it within my power to do so, I shall see to it that the legislative subcommittee makes a study of the question, and that the full committee acts on it, in connection with the next bill in which it can be appropriately included. I assume there will be another supplemental appropriation bill. The question should be considered by the legislative subcommittee, and something along the suggested lines might be included. I recognize the problem, and I hope we may have the cooperation of the committee and of the interested Senators in solving it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Has the Senator from Illinois concluded his colloquy on the subject he was discussing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, unless the Senator has a question on the point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; my question relates to another point.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, I should like to ask the chairman of the full committee a question with respect to the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, found on page 16, line 12. Approximately $5 million more was asked than was allowed by the House. The Senate committee did not allow it, but referred the matter to the Director of the Budget for an opinion. May I ask the chairman if any reply has been received from the Director of the Budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that the matter was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, as the committee directed, but up to this moment there has been no reply from the Bureau. However, in my judgment, there will be another supplemental appropriation bill, and whether the budget reports favorably on the item or not, the committee will have an opportunity to pass on it when that bill is considered. So the matter can be considered a little later.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the matter was referred to the new Director of the Budget, in order to get an opinion from him, was it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 18 of the bill, line 14, under the items aggregating $1,200,000,000, apparently to be appro-

priated to make up an increase for the military forces, I read the following language:

The foregoing amounts under this heading to be derived by transfer from such appropriations available to the Department of Defense for obligation during the fiscal year 1953 as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

I should like to ascertain from the distinguished chairman of the committee if the breakdown on page 22 of the report means that the action of the Senate in passing this bill today means reducing funds for the maintenance and operation of the Army by $301 million; that we are taking away from the Air Force money for planes in the amount of $295 million; that we are reducing the funds for the Marine Corps by $40 million; the amount for ships and facilities of the Navy by $83 million; the amount for ordnance and facilities by $57 million; the amount for medical care for troops by $5,700,000; together with funds for other matters listed.

In other words, I should like to understand whether the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] today that a saving of more than a billion dollars is shown means that we are to eliminate funds for the acquisition of ships, ordnance, and aircraft, and for medical care, amounts which will not be restored later by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is my understanding that the Department of Defense and its respective divisions have gone over the figures with the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, and also with some members of the committee, and the Department has given assurance that the reductions can be absorbed without the loss of effectiveness of the defense effort, or a reduction of any of the essential aspects of the defense program. In other words, it is the understanding of the committee that the funds will not be replaced, and that the reductions can be absorbed without detrimentally affecting the defense program.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senate committee having cut $295 million from Air Force funds, some $40 million from Marine Corps funds, and some $57 million from ordnance, I am at a loss to understand how we would save money, if when the appropriation bill for the armed services comes before the Senate, the $57 million for ordnance, and the amounts for airplanes and other items, will come back through another door when the time comes to appropriate.

Mr. BRIDGES. No, it is the understanding of the committee that these amounts will not come back through another door, but that they are actual savings. For example, as a result of going into production in the manufacture or purchase of certain ordnance equipment, and therefore getting lower costs, the Department of Defense is able to achieve its objective at an amount lower than was requested in the previous appropriation bill. Therefore, the surplus can be used for this purpose and not detract from the original objective. That is our understanding.

Mr. MONRONEY. In other words, what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is saying is that this is a rescission, and not an actual saving of money?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. Let me read a statement with respect to that question by Mr. Lyle S. Garlock, one of the top officials of the Department of Defense:

With respect to the method of financing proposed by the House, the Department does not object to financing the bill from funds available, but we do want to point out that it is still too early in the year to determine which appropriations can stand these transfers without any substantial interference with the military operations.

So if this committee agrees with the House action, and it is understood we are to take the money from those appropriations which will not cause any interference with the military buildup, we will concur. It is possible, Senator, that we might have to use some procurement money that would have to be replaced in later years.

He leaves an out for the future.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not think he leaves an out; I think he leaves the door wide open, if this matter is to be handed to the Senate and to the country as a billion dollar saving.

I listened intently to the Senator as he read from the report, and I understood the witness to say it was far too early to tell just what portion of these rescissions or transfers or manipulations would be savings which could come back in the form of requests for appropriations in other bills. I am not so familiar with military needs as is the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; but when the armed services appropriation bill comes before the Senate, I should certainly be very much surprised if the Department of Defense did not ask for more money. I find in the report that it is proposed to transfer $57 million for ordnance facilities. Moreover, I certainly doubt that there is $40 million of fat in the Marine Corps appropriation. I doubt very seriously whether there is $83 million for ships that we can automatically wipe out and not have to replace.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, because I know that he wants to be fair, and that he is looking for the facts, that in my judgment there might very well be that amount of fat that can be taken out. It can easily be taken out. The information conveyed to our committee was that on June 30, 1952, there was approximately $7 billion in completely unobligated funds.

I am in favor of adequate national defense, and have always been. Back in the 1930's, when many Members of this body were in favor of cutting down defense appropriations and closing their eyes to what was going on, I fought for appropriations for national defense. I have always been in favor of adequate national defense. However, I think there is a great deal of waste and duplication which could be eliminated, and I think this is one way of doing it.

I cannot say to the Senator absolutely that with respect to these items the Defense Department may not try to slip some items in by the back door again. I would not be foolish enough to say that it will not try to do so. But to the best of my knowledge and belief these savings can be absorbed, and I believe that the method proposed is the best way of policing the situation.

Mr. MONRONEY. The only thing that worries me is what the Senator has just read, to the effect that it is too early in the year to know. Now we are told that we are saving more than $1 billion. As I read the bill we are not saving a thin dime. We are robbing Peter to pay Paul. We are meeting $1,200,000,000 worth of pay due servicemen under increased allowances and pay.

On the other hand, we are proposing to rescind or transfer some $1,043,000,000. However, the chairman of the committee does not say, and I do not believe he can say, whether in this action we are taking away, for example, $28 million of civilian relief in Korea, or taking away from the Army some $301 million. Certainly, if money which has been appropriated for the Army is not used by the end of this fiscal year it will still be available for the Army. So we would not have to appropriate so much money in the next defense bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. That depends on the type of the appropriation; some authorizations lapse in 1 year, some remain available until expended. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that often in the past there has been a rush by the departments to obligate and spend money before the deadline of June 30. I do not say that that has been true in all cases, but I do say that there has been such a general tendency in the Federal Government. If the Congress of the United States, exercising its duties in the field of appropriations, can force a department to use money previously appropriated to carry out an act without detriment to the general program, I think it is sound procedure to do so. Large balances of unobligated funds available to an agency are not conducive to tight economical operations. I do not think the Senator has any cause for worry. I have never heard of damage resulting by reason of a department of the Government voluntarily giving up money.

Mr. MONRONEY. The breakdown, I take it, is that which is recommended by the Department of Defense for ordnance, aircraft, ships, and other things which are not needed, and for which the Department will not need to seek new appropriations.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. The Senator will note items for retired pay, and a number of items for military personnel. The opportunity for savings arises because during the fiscal year there were not the number of men in the services contemplated when the request for appropriations was made last session.

Mr. MONRONEY. We have heard a great deal about ordnance shortages. I should not like to see the Senate take action which would cut $57 million from the item of ordnance, which apparently is in this list.

Mr. BRIDGES. Where does the Senator see the item of ordnance?

Mr. MONRONEY. On page 23 of the committee report. There is an item of $57,288,000 listed under "Ordnance and facilities." I cannot tell whether it is for the Marine Corps or the Navy, or both. In other words, the rescissions

appear to me to come out of fighting funds, funds for military equipment, medical care, and things of that kind, which we have been led to believe are greatly needed, and represent a very important part of our national defense.

With a $40 billion bill coming in later, I do not see how the Congress, and particularly the Senate, can tell whether or not such appropriation bill will carry the $1 billion, which we save on March 2, and which we may find ourselves reappropriating in May, or whenever the bill comes to us.

Mr. BRIDGES. All I can say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is that the committee will do its best to see that these items are not reappropriated for through any back-door operation. We have approached the problem in a sincere effort to attain economy, bearing in mind that no Defense Department official will be absolutely positive. Defense Department officials say "probably," and Congress must make the decision. I think the Defense Department officials went as far as they could in the hearings without the official approval of their superiors. We have had various conferences since. Prior to that time we convinced ourselves that this was an equitable method.

I think we must approach this problem from the standpoint that we must provide adequate national defense; but let us not by any means call national defense a sacred cow and say "hands off," because there is evidence that there is a great deal of waste and duplication in the Defense Department.

I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that we shall do everything we can to see that the defense agencies do not call for reappropriations. I assure the Senator from Oklahoma that to the best of our knowledge and belief, based upon our ability to get the facts, elimination of these funds will not cripple the defense effort. That is all I can say.

Mr. MONRONEY. Can the Senator also assure me that the so-called reductions of $1 billion do not represent reductions in personnel, payroll, and things like that? Are they mostly reductions in money previously appropriated for equipment, planes, ships, or ordnance, representing items which have not yet been expended by the Defense Department?

Mr. BRIDGES. Generally speaking, I believe that is true. They are funds not needed, or not required now, due to changed conditions. There may be some exceptions. But so far as we can tell, this is an equitable procedure. It does not mean cutting corners in any way. We do not expect to have to make appropriations later because of our action in transferring funds today.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, there was testimony by Mr. Lyle S. Garlock, Deputy Comptroller, Office of the Secretary of Defense, to the effect that at least $600 million of this money was not to be used and, if transferred, did not have to be replaced. His explanation was that in many cases estimates were made about a year ago which were somewhat greater than were necessary. In allocating appropriated money to various people, most of them had some left over, which makes up this sum. With respect to the $600 million, I am sure the chairman can give assurance that it will not be necessary to replace that amount.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana himself asked the question, and received the positive answer that $600 million absolutely would not be used.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee and witnesses then proceeded to discuss the remainder of the items. If there is any question whatever, it applies to the remainder of the items and not to the $600 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3053) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE BUDGET OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Congress will consider in the near future the budget for the District of Columbia. In that connection, it will have to deal with a perennial problem—one that confronts every new session of Congress. The problem is this: How much should Congress appropriate as the share of the Federal Government toward the annual operating expenses of the District of Columbia?

Let me say, at the outset, that I am not now a member of the District Committee. I had the privilege of serving on that committee for 8 years. But my assignment to three other committees now precludes my serving on the committee under the able leadership of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. Nevertheless, during my tenure on the District of Columbia Committee I gained a deep concern for the problems of the District of Columbia. I have an abiding love for Washington—our National Capital. Always I shall stand ready to do whatever I can to preserve and develop it as the principal shrine of our people.

With this in mind I am compelled to bring to the attention of the Senate the serious financial condition of the District of Columbia. I have studied the matter carefully. I am convinced that Congress must take action if it is to maintain the financial stability of the municipal government. The demands for the services and facilities of the city government are greater than ever. In recent years—as Senators know—the Federal Government has undergone a tremendous expansion in Washington. The cost of operating the city has spiraled due to inflation.

In 1917 the total cost of running the city of Washington was about $16 million. In 1945 the total cost had increased to $70 million. And for the fiscal year 1952 the costs climbed to $120 million. Despite these increased demands for services, and rising costs, the Federal share of the city's operating expense has dwindled to only a fraction.

The record shows that the Federal payment has shrunk from 50 percent to 40 percent to 30 percent. At the present time it is less than 9 percent. This is the lowest Federal contribution toward the operating costs of the city of Washington in the history of our Nation.

The Federal payment is not a subsidy. It is not a grant-in-aid. Rather, it is a payment that the Federal Government owes to the municipal government for services performed during the year.

If we go into the history of the relations between the National Government and the city of Washington, we will find that the Federal payment has gone through four major phases.

During the first period, between 1790 and 1878, there was no fixed system for Federal payment. In some years there were lump sum payments and in other years there were no payments at all. But the average payment during this early period was about 25 percent of the city budget.

During the second period, from 1879 to 1921, the District of Columbia was on a 50–50 basis with the Federal Government. This fixed ratio payment, established in the Organic Act of 1878, lasted for more than 40 years.

The third period began in 1921 when Congress ignored the organic act and provided for a 40–60 basis of payment. The Federal Government paid 40 percent. The same plan was used in 1922. In 1923 the 40–60 ratio basis of payment was made permanent.

The final period in the history of the Federal payment began in 1925 when Congress adopted the present lump-sum payment system. The first lump-sum payment was for $9 million, or about 30 percent of the city's expenses for that year. But during the period since 1925, and up to the present time, the Federal share has gone down from 30 percent to less than 9 percent.

Mr. President, throughout the years District officials and civic organizations have urged Congress to establish a definite policy of fair and regular Federal payments for the upkeep of our National Capital. But just as soon as Congress adopts a policy, as the record shows, it proceeds to ignore it and appropriates an arbitrary Federal share. This is often done without measuring the services it has obtained, or expects to obtain, from the District Government. The officials and residents of Washington cannot have any assurance, from year to year, as to what percentage of payment the Congress will allow toward the operating costs of the Nation's Capital.

Before I go into the necessity for a fixed policy, though, I think we ought to

look at some of the causes that underlie the District's financial condition.

The first problem is the real estate or land situation in the District of Columbia.

As Senators know, the District of Columbia is an area that is fixed. It cannot expand. It can never reach out and annex new territory. The total land area of Washington, excluding the streets, is about 30,688 acres. But less than 48 percent of the real estate in Washington is taxable. Think of it: The city of Washington is not allowed to tax 52 percent of the land and real estate within its borders.

Moreover, the District is losing more and more land and real estate every year which it could normally tax. But the Federal Government is expanding. And, every time the Federal Government buys property, the tax revenues previously received on such property is lost to the District. I have prepared a chart for the RECORD which illustrates how Federal purchases of real estate are rapidly dereasing District revenues. Quoting from that chart:

(a) The Cosmos Club property was bought by the Government in 1940. The annual revenue lost to the District of Columbia amounts to $22,843. Since 1940 the District has lost in total revenues $273,600 on that one piece of property alone.

(b) The Blair House was purchased by the Government in 1941. The tax revenue lost each year is well over $8,000. This is roughly $88,000 since its purchase.

(c) The Senate Office Building site—by the Senate Office Building—was purchased by the Government in 1949. The District's loss in revenue on that property is more than $10,000 a year.

(d) The General Accounting Office site, purchased by the Government in 1941, causes a loss to the District of more than $14,000 a year. Since its purchase, the District Government has lost $154,000 in revenue.

These illustrations reflect the impact of Federal purchases of real estate on District revenues. These four items alone represent a loss of more than one-half million dollars. Such losses in revenues are permanent and cannot be replaced. In fact, it seems almost a policy of Congress to require and expect the residents of Washington to make up such losses in revenues by increased taxation.

In addition to property federally owned, there is the impact of privately owned, tax-exempt property. Foreign governments own large and valuable holdings here in Washington for embassy and legation purposes. All of them are exempt from the payment of real estate taxes. There are also many large national organizations which, over the years, have secured special acts of Congress exempting them from land and real estate taxes.

More important, the future program already approved by Congress indicates more and more tax exemptions in Washington.

How much do the Federal exemptions on land and real estate cost the District government in terms of revenue?

First. If taxed, Federal real property would produce, each year, $19 million.

Second. If taxed, real estate owned by national organizations, foreign governments, and other private property now exempt from taxation, would produce almost $3½ million.

Mr. President, no other city government in the United States is expected to operate and to take care of its financial needs under such crippling tax exemptions as those imposed by Congress on the District of Columbia.

While we are thinking in terms of real estate, we might also point to the ever-widening park areas in the city of Washington. The National Zoological Park is maintained and operated solely from District funds. Much of Rock Creek Park was acquired with District money; and although the title is in the United States, the job of policing and maintaining these parks is at District expense.

Turning to another major problem underlying the District's financial situation, we ought to look at a few of the services performed by the city for the Federal Government. I shall name just a few:

First. Fire Department services, washing and pumping out flooded Federal buildings, special details, and fire-fighting instruction.

Second. Water furnished Federal agencies—for which Congress pays less than the full cost.

Third. Installing curbs and gutters abutting Federal property, as well as building highways, sidewalks, and alleys.

Fourth. Handling and treating sewage from Federal property.

Fifth. Issuing motor vehicle license plates and special plates.

Sixth. Temporary home for ex-soldiers and ex-sailors.

Seventh. Cleaning streets abutting Federal property, and refuse disposal.

Eighth. Special police details for Federal purposes. And, speaking in terms of police services, let me advise the Senate that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in recently writing an open letter to law-enforcement officers all over the United States, said:

> One factor which contributes to the property of the criminal elements is a police scale too low to maintain law-enforcement forces at full strength. Manpower was spread too thinly, and the criminal element moved in wherever a gap appeared.

The statement by the FBI Director is applicable to conditions in Washington. We do not pay enough to get the numbers of qualified police we need. The police force in Washington is greatly undermanned.

Mr. President, the final major problem underlying the District's growing financial crisis is constituted by the obligations of the municipal government in connection with Federal programs. For instance:

First. The improvement, maintenance, and policing of federally owned parks cost the District government over $2 million dollars a year.

Second. Expenses of National Zoological Park cost $615,000 a year.

Third. Land purchased and to be purchased and titled in the United States under the Capper-Cramton Act is set at $16 million.

Fourth. The District's share of the Hospital Center to be built is $17½ million.

Fifth. The District government's share of the new United States Court Building is about $5 million.

Mr. President, these and many other items make up the services, expenses, and obligations of the city of Washington in its relations to our Federal Government. These demands upon the municipal government are the highest in history. Yet the Federal contribution is near the lowest in history. In my opinion, it means that the Federal Government is exercising little better than squatter's rights in the city of Washington.

Many people will ask, Why do not the people of Washington do more for themselves? Why do they not impose new taxes and higher taxes?

In answer to that question, let me say that while I served on the District Committee I found the residents of Washington always ready and willing to pay their full share for the upkeep and operations of the National Capital. The record speaks for itself.

In 1951 District residents paid an average of $128.61 in city taxes. This was the highest per capita rate recorded in any big American city. The Census Bureau reports that the average person in America's largest cities paid only $61 in municipal taxes last year. But the residents of Washington—our Capital City—paid twice that amount, and have paid it for several years.

District tax collections have jumped more than 210 percent in the last 10 years. We know now that the District of Columbia has tapped its last major reservoir of revenue. I am speaking of the sales tax. We know now that any further increases in taxes, especially in real estate rates, would cause more people and more businesses to move beyond the District borders. We know now that the taxpayers of Washington have all the burdens they can carry.

When we think of the mounting operating costs and the ever higher taxes on the people of Washington, and compare them with the low Federal payment year after year, we can reach only one conclusion: The failure of the Federal Government to make its fair payment has shifted the burden directly to the taxpayers of the District. To the extent that the residents of Washington foot the bill for services to the Federal Government, they are subsidizing the Federal Government. We cannot look on it any other way.

Mr. President, the District of Columbia government cannot properly handle its own financial affairs, and determine how it will support its services, unless it knows what its revenues will be. It cannot know what its revenues will be unless it has some assurance of what it is going to receive from the Federal Government. The best way to provide such assurance, in my opinion, is to establish a certain fixed ratio of expenses between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia.

The Nation, through its Congress, must assume for the future a fixed share of the burden of operating and maintaining

its National Capital. I think we should do this by adopting a fixed ratio of Federal payment of not less than 25 percent of the total expenses of the city of Washington, excluding special funds.

Such a proposal would, in my estimation, solve a number of important problems connected with District appropriations.

First. It would provide Congress with an adequate and permanent basis for determining annually what is a fair payment from the United States Government toward the expenses of the District government.

Second. It would simplify the problems here in Congress by making unnecessary the yearly controversy over the form and amount of Federal payment to the District.

Third. It would simplify the District budgeting problem by settling the role of the Federal Government in financing the District. The fixed ratio of 25 percent would make certain for District officials the extent and character of the Federal payment.

While I am not introducing legislation at this time, I believe that the District Committee should make a serious study of the feasibility of this proposal. I am convinced that this proposal for a 25 percent payment maintains the integrity of the fiscal relationship between the Federal Government and the District of Columbia. It insures that District residents and taxpayers will pay sufficient revenues for normal local operating expenses, as do citizens in comparable cities. It provides, on the other hand, that costs in excess of those normally borne by residents of other large cities shall not be expected of District residents. Such excess costs shall be paid for by the Federal Government as a part of its normal operating expenses. This is only fair and equitable.

Mr. President, Washington is the jewel of American cities—the symbol of freedom for the people of all the world. I hope that this year Congress will begin a new era in our Federal and District relations.

I hope that it will be an era in which the Nation will again recognize its responsibility toward Washington and act to balance government rule with proper financial support.

Mr. President, as I stated, I have felt that, although I am not on the committee, yet I should make this statement. I fear that we neglect our duty to the city of Washington, and have been neglecting it in the past, in failing to appropriate sufficient amounts to pay for the services rendered by the city of Washington, D. C.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 4, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 2, 1953:

Department of Labor

Harry N. Routzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 1953:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

Department of the Air Force

James H. Douglas, Jr., of Illinois, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Federal Civil Defense Administration

Val Peterson, of Nebraska, to be Federal Civil Defense Administrator.

Army of the United States

The following-named officers for appointment to the position indicated and for appointment as lieutenant generals in the Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. Daniel Noce, O5226, United States Army, to be the Inspector General, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Alexander Russel Bolling, O7548, United States Army, to be commanding general, Third Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Benjamin Kean, O12470, United States Army, to be commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer, O12687, United States Army, to be Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research, United States Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. William Kelly Harrison, Jr., O5279, United States Army, to be deputy commanding general, United States Army Forces, Far East, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Paul Wilkins Kendall, O12199, United States Army, to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Reuben Ellis Jenkins, O11658, United States Army, to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Isaac Davis White, O15080, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), to be corps commander, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Withers Alexander Burress, O4812, United States Army, to be commanding general, First Army, and senior United States Army member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Emerson Leroy Cummings, O15500.

Brig. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567.

Brig. Gen. Richard Clare Partridge, O12680.

Brig. Gen. Haydon Lemaire Boatner, O15641.

Brig. Gen. Halley Grey Maddox, O12852.

Brig. Gen. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O8472.

Brig. Gen. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, O15513.

Brig. Gen. Wayne Carleton Smith, O16307.

Brig. Gen. Earle Standlee, O16530.

Brig. Gen. Cornelius Edward Ryan, O7375.

Brig. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219.

Brig. Gen. Francis William Farrell, O12784.

Brig. Gen. Gilman Clifford Mudgett, O14966.

Brig. Gen. Garrison Holt Davidson, O16755.

Brig. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306.

Brig. Gen. Gerald Joseph Higgins, O19530.

Brig. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914.

Brig. Gen. Richard Warburton Stephens, O15569.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479.

(Note.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Regular Army of the United States

Col. Jacob Landes Hartman, O9551, Veterinary Corps, United States Army, for appointment as brigadier general, Veterinary Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

National Guard of the United States

The officer named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States as a Reserve commissioned officer in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.) and sections 38 and 73 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

Brig. Gen. Paul Kistler MacDonald, O296004, to be brigadier general, Illinois National Guard, to date from July 15, 1952.

In the Army

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Joseph Bacon Fraser, O247121.

Maj. Gen. John Calhoun Henagan, O163943.

Maj. Gen. Albert Edward Henderson, O264146.

Maj. Gen. Paul Henry Jordan, O241877.

Maj. Gen. Edward Delvin Sirois, O174246.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Ernest Nicholas Bauman, O262926.

Brig. Gen. George Justus Hearn, O295111.

Brig. Gen. Jesse Scott Lindsay, O237198.

Brig. Gen. Julius Andres Stark, O143760.

Brig. Gen. Charles Frederick White, O285841.

Brig. Gen. Otis Minot Whitney, O279172.

The nominations of John P. Patton et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed this day, were received by the Senate on January 20, 1953, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the Congressional Record for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John P. Patton, appearing on page 457, and ending with the name of Joe L. Youngker, which is shown on page 458.

The nominations of Italo W. Daniele et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 10, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the Congressional Record for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Italo W. Daniele which is shown on page 1011 and ending with the name of Allan J. Francisco, which is shown on the same page.

Regular Air Force

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Maj. Gen. David Myron Schlatter, 62A, lieutenant general, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Allied Air Forces, Southern Europe, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Bryant Le Maire Boatner, 362A, lieutenant general, Regular Air Force, to be

the inspector general, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Hampton Atkinson, 90A, lieutenant general, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, Alaskan Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Wistar L. Graham et al. for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 20, 1953, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Wistar L. Graham, which appears on page 458, and ending with the name of Donald L. Zaworski, which is shown on page 462.

The nominations of Troy William Crawford et al., for promotion in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 9, 1953, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Troy William Crawford, which appears on page 292, and ending with the name of Margaret Louise Rau, which is shown on page 295.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS

Vice Adm. Laurance T. DuBose, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Eastern Sea Frontier, and commander, Atlantic Reserve Fleet.

Vice Adm. William M. Callaghan, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Pacific Fleet.

Vice Adm. Francis C. Denebrink, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

Rear Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years; and to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (personnel).

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

To be rear admirals, line

James H. Thach, Jr. William K. Mendenhall, Jr.
Richard W. Ruble
Stanhope C. Ring Harry D. Felt
Charles F. Coe John M. Will
Thomas B. Williamson Leslie A. Kniskern
Aaron P. Stoors 3d

Rear admirals, Medical Corps

Frederick C. Greaves
John Q. Owsley

To be rear admiral, Supply Corps

Joseph L. Herlihy

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Edward B. Harp, Jr., Chaplain Corps.
John R. Perry, Civil Engineer Corps.

The nominations of Rudolph J. Fabian et al., for permanent appointment in the Navy and the nominations of Spencer M. Adams et al., for promotion in the Navy, both groups of which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on January 29, 1953, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Rudolph J. Fabin, which is shown on page 636, and ending with the last name of the second group, Nicholas Mandzak, which appears on page 642.

The nominations of William A. Alfano et al., which were also confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 6, 1953, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of William A. Alfano, which is shown on page 934, and ending with the name of Samuel F. Leader, shown on page 936.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 2, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we rejoice that Thou art always willing and able to supply each new day with its needed blessings.

We pray that we may be numbered among those whose minds and hearts are rich in the supply of Thy divine spirit of truth and righteousness, of mercy and forgiveness.

Grant that in these days of world tragedy and tribulation we may have the grace to pray even for our enemies who, in their blindness, their hatred, and brutality are filling human life with so much suffering and sorrow.

Inspire us with the dynamic and victorious virtues of goodness and love. Show us how we may lift mankind into that higher spiritual unity where all antipathies and antagonisms are transcended by the spirit of brotherhood and good will.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 26, 1953, was read and approved.

UNITED STATES v. WEINBERG

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: In compliance with House Resolution No. 105, January 22, 1953, I have appeared before the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the matter of *United States of America* v. *Joseph W. Weinberg*, Criminal No. 829–52.

I am attaching herewith, for the information and consideration of the House of Representatives, a copy of the official transcript of a statement made by the court in the above proceedings.

Respectfully yours,
LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CAPITOL PARKING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to make a brief report to the Members on the results of the perplexing parking problem study by the special subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration. This subcommittee, of which I have had the honor to serve as chairman, includes the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, Mr. WILLIAM COLE, and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. CHARLES DEANE.

We have had numerous meetings and have enjoyed the fullest cooperation from Mr. Russel, Sergeant at Arms of the House; Mr. Lynn and his staff, Architect of the Capitol; Captain Broderick of the Capitol Police; officers of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department; and Mr. George Keneipp, Director of Vehicles and Traffic of the city of Washington. We have made a full report to the Committee on House Administration and it has been unanimously accepted.

The plans we propose do not include the building of any new parking facilities, although such facilities are needed now and their need will become increasingly greater as time goes on. The study and proposal of any such plans comes within the proper scope and jurisdiction of another committee of the House.

The approach to the problem by the subcommittee was entirely from the point of view of being of service to two general groups—the public who often drive thousands of miles to see their own United States Capitol and who many times have important problems to discuss with their Representatives and Senators, and the Members of Congress and limited numbers of their office staffs, committee staffs, and service employees, all of whom are vital to the actual work in the Capitol and congressional offices. In order to make the plan work, it is absolutely essential that the full cooperation of everyone involved is assured.

Within the next few days each Member will receive a letter directed to his personal attention. Please read it carefully, follow the instructions fully, and keep it on file for reference. Also in the very near future, the owners of authorized vehicles, other than those of Members, will receive a notice to appear for the Capitol Police to check the car authorization and affix the new and necessary "sticker." Please insist that each of your employees follow these instructions to the letter.

There has been complete cooperation with our colleagues in the Senate to reserve completely the plaza area on the east side of the Capitol.

A very limited number of spaces have been reserved on the plaza for the officers of the House and Senate whose cars must be parked in designated spaces. Another very limited number has been reserved for members of the working press. All remaining spaces are reserved for the exclusive use of the public and parking will be limited to not more than 2 hours enforced by the Capitol Police. This is designed to stop the all-day parking of unauthorized cars and to protect the rights of our Capitol visitors. Your full cooperation and help in this matter will assure success.

The regulations for parking of the automobiles owned by Members is fully explained in the letter each will receive. These regulations may seem very harsh

and restrictive, yet they have been promulgated for only one purpose—to serve the Members in their official duties. Briefly, each Member's car must have the official 83d Congress tag on it. The issuance and use of these tags is fully covered by law. The use of the tags of any prior Congress is unlawful. The use of the various State tags, which indicate the owner is a Member of Congress, will not be sufficient to park in a restricted area around the Capitol and congressional office buildings. No cars, other than those bearing the official tags of the 83d Congress, will be permitted to park in the areas reserved for Members. All these matters are fully covered in the letter each Member will receive.

Finally, I want to urge everyone to cooperate fully with the police officers. They are here to serve all of us and have been issued very strict instructions. Any effort by anyone of us to gain special favor or courtesy will only serve to break down the successful administration of this parking program. Whether it works or not is largely up to each of us.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to my distinguished friend and minority leader, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. May I ask the gentlemen whether or not in this setup there is going to be some parking space set aside for the general public who want to visit the Capitol or want to visit their Representatives here?

Mr. SCHENCK. Yes. I am happy to have the distinguished gentleman ask that question. We have reserved 144 spaces on the east side of the Capitol for use of the public. Those are the spaces to which I referred and they will be limited to 2 hours parking. This parking ban will be enforced by the Capitol police.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to my distinguished friend and majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman and those who have worked with him for the formulation of this program in respect to parking. It has been evident to many of us for a long time that something needed to be done. I trust that when the details of the plan are made available to us all of the Members of the House and all of our employees will study the plan and undertake to abide by it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHENCK. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What happens to the Members who are obliged to use taxicabs? Some of us have no automobiles in Washington.

Mr. SCHENCK. I answer my distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts by asking a question—do you not park your taxicabs in restricted areas?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it would be nice if we could because sometimes we keep a taxicab waiting in order to make a very important engagement with some department. I think something ought to be arranged in that direction.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF WASHINGTON TERRITORY

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1853—100 years ago this very day—the President of the United States, President Fillmore, signed a bill creating Washington Territory.

Today the Legislature of the State of Washington in the capital city of Olympia will observe with appropriate commemorative exercise this 100th anniversary.

I regret Mr. Speaker that I cannot be present at the ceremonies at Olympia and I am sure this disappointment is shared by my colleagues from Washington State.

However, it seems proper and fitting here and now that recognition be given in this House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to this auspicious day, and likewise to record our felicitations and good wishes to the people of the State of Washington on this 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Territory of Washington.

E. ALAN PHILLIPS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening here in Washington I had the great privilege of attending a meeting of the Science Talent Institute. Forty boys and girls selected from 14,260 high-school seniors have come here to compete for the Westinghouse science scholarships at the Twelfth Annual Science Talent Institute being held from February 26 through March 2. I was the guest of Mr. E. Alan Phillips, of Lincoln, Mass., a young constituent of mine. I was very proud that he was one of the 40. He is only 15 years old and the youngest member. He is a genius. He was doing algebra when he was 6 years old. He will graduate in June from Weston High School, Weston, then hopes to attend Massachusetts Institute of Technology to prepare for a career in mathematics. A member of the staff of his school publication, Alan also belongs to mathematics and photography groups and lists radio and astronomy among his hobbies. His science project, titled "The Compression of Liquids and Gases Under Gravitational and Centrifugal Forces," involved mathematical calculations much more complex than are normally expected of high-school students. Alan won a gold medal for the highest score in a State mathematics examination by the University of Massachusetts, and top honors in a similar examination conducted by Tufts College. He is the son of Dr. H. B. Phillips, retired professor of mathematics at MIT, and Mrs. Phillips.

Mr. Speaker, we need scientists desperately today and I hope many more of our youth will go into scientific fields of study and education. Through advancement in science they will accomplish even greater things than they have in the past. Through medical science they will save many lives and they will help to maintain peace in the world.

In the Appendix of the RECORD today you will find a brief résumé of Dr. W. E. Shoupp's speech at the meeting Saturday evening and a memo on the science-talent search. The Westinghouse Electric Corp. deserves a great many congratulations for their foundation research work.

FOREIGN OIL

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to address the House today for 45 minutes, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow and Wednesday, at the conclusion of the legislative programs of those days and following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House today for 90 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

A PAY INCREASE FOR EVERY WORKER IN AMERICA

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has the power to grant a pay increase to every workingman in America. It can be done, and it should be done without the need for a work stoppage, a strike, or a labor dispute. It can be done in either one of two ways: By passing H. R. 1, Congressman REED's tax reduction bill; or by raising the individual income tax exemption from $600 to $700.

Either of these tax reduction programs would give every worker in America more take-home pay to spend upon his family. A tax reduction at this time would also have the tendency to stop the vicious spiral that has been going on during the last decade—namely, first a

pay increase, then a tax increase; another pay increase, then another tax increase, ad infinitum. Every time the worker has succeeded in getting a pay increase to meet the increased cost of living, Uncle Sam has immediately stuck his long arm deeper into the workingman's pay envelope and extracted a larger share of what he found there.

Is it not about time, Mr. Speaker, to reverse this process? The Congress can start the reverse movement by passing H. R. 1, or by raising the $600 individual income tax exemption to $700. Every Member of Congress who during the campaign promised his people tax reduction, expenditure reduction, and a balanced budget should take the floor and place himself on record for action now. This year is the year to keep our campaign promises. Next year will be too late. It can be done if we have the will to do it and the courage to act now.

RUTH J. MOTT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to Ruth J. Mott, sister of Betty C. Ickes, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Betty C. Ickes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege some days ago to address my colleagues of the House on the serious situation that has arisen in the apparently uncontrolled importation of residual fuel oil. That situation has been bad and it is growing worse. For instance, during the month just ended, in February, for the week ending February 7, the average daily importation for residual fuel oil was 425,000 barrels, for the week ending February 14 the average was 437,000 barrels. That is equivalent to better than 104,000 tons of soft coal on the basis that 1 ton of coal is equivalent to 4 and a fraction barrels of residual fuel oil. This situation was aggravated by the recent approval of a change in the reciprocal trade agreements with the Republic of Venezuela in South America by which the import duty on fuel oil was reduced from 21 cents a barrel to 5¼ cents a barrel. They have just discovered a huge oil field in Lake Maracaibo in Venezuela in which the production is approximately a million barrels daily. The United States under the terms of that agreement must prepare to meet the situation of local markets being flooded with that cheap residual fuel oil from Venezuela. Under the favored nations clause in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that affects any other nation importing oil.

A PROMISE TO MY CONSTITUENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, please do not yell at me if the 83d Congress does not cut taxes, balance the budget. I will do my part.

My ears still ring because of the criticism of some commentators, columnists, and editors—1 or 2 in my own district—who jumped all over me when I voted in accord with a practically unanimous 13-year-old policy of the Republican Party and its leaders, which opposed a grant of legislative power to the Chief Executive.

Oh, sure I am accustomed to a lambasting by left-wing "experts," but some of this latest blast came from friends who should know better, but apparently thought a little "taking him down" would be helpful. Maybe so.

It never did seem important to me when eating a breakfast egg or a hen for supper, whether the hen or the egg came first—just something to argue about.

Nor, do I now think it important whether this Congress first balances the budget or first cuts taxes. But, one thing I do know: we promised the people that we would do both, and a Congressman had better keep those promises or have a mighty good alibi ready come November 1954.

November last, sick of the Korean war, disgusted with the mess in Washington, and, because of our promise to cut taxes, balance the budget, the people let Truman go and elected President Eisenhower and a Republican Congress. At least, we are getting some indications of a positive foreign policy. We are on our way to cleaning up the mess in Washington, but I see no indications that we are either to balance the budget or reduce the tax rate. Quite the contrary.

Though Truman was in power, the Republican-controlled 80th Congress reduced taxes and balanced the budget. It can be done again, but only if we cut expenditures, and that we can do by eliminating the waste and extravagance in the Executive and other departments, quit spending so many billions abroad, practice a little economy ourselves.

When someone jumps on me because of some fancied failure to follow the orders of someone without authority to issue the order just take a look at the record. I am only 1 of 435 in the House. It is my purpose to vote not only to balance the budget, but to cut taxes because I believe, as do other Michigan Republican Congressmen, that a campaign promise is something more than political oratory.

If President Eisenhower gets a New Deal Congress of domestic and international spenders in 1955, it will not be because I have not gone along with the party's campaign promises, worked and voted to clean up the "mess" here at home and abroad.

Again, I suggest to my friends, "take a look at the record." And to my colleagues, "let us get the job started."

PREELECTION PROMISES TO REDUCE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, already the spendthrift crowd is planning emergencies to justify higher taxes, greater funds to spend. There is only one thing the Government spenders here and abroad fear and that is the reduction of the flow of revenue from the taxpayer's pocket into the coffer of the Treasury. Was a spendthrift ever known to stop squandering another's funds until the source was cut off? It is such tax victims, as the teacher to whom Mr. Pegler refers, who are bled white by the spendthrift crowd. These spendthrifts are the ones who have taken the purse strings from Congress; they are the ones who are opposed to any tax relief under H. R. 1. The drive is on now in full force to frighten the people with Russian saucers, submarines off our coasts, germ warfare, and atomic bombs. It is the hope of the Treasury raiders to make Republicans and Democrats alike ignore their solemn preelection promises to reduce taxes. H. R. 1 will bring tax relief to over 50,000,000 taxpayers, yet a few men stand ready to repudiate the promises made by which they now hold office.

Abraham Lincoln once said:

> It was in the oath I took that I would, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. I could not take the office without taking the oath. Nor was it my view that I might take an oath to get power, and break the oath in using the power.

Let me paraphrase the words of Abraham Lincoln. It was the preelection promise made by me to the voters that if elected I would reduce taxes. I felt I could not be elected without making the promise to the voters that if elected I would reduce personal income taxes. Nor was it my view that I might make this promise to get power, and then violate my promise to the voters when placed in power.

How many Members of Congress in either party would have been elected in the last election if each candidate had stood before the voters and said: "If you will elect me to Congress I pledge myself to vote against reducing your individual

income taxes, and I will shrink from cutting governmental expenses."

I believe with Professor James, "that every fine impulse, every lofty emotion that we allow to evaporate without action, is just another opportunity lost." The citizens of our Nation expect the Republican Congressmen to display honesty, intelligence, independence, and judgment in the conduct of legislative functions, as pledged to the people during the recent national election.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting as a part of my remarks the article of Westbrook Pegler which appeared in the New York Journal, February 27, 1953, as follows:

INCOME TAX AND A TEACHER'S PITIFUL EXPERIENCE WITH IT

(By Westbrook Pegler)

I present herewith a short and simple annal of a poor, weary, and somewhat brokendown Florida schoolteacher, to make a contrast with the disgraceful waste of tons of money wrung from the likes of her on the wanton frivolities and subsidies of a corrupt government.

Listen:

"May I present a problem? It is entirely true. I still must find some way to raise money for my income taxes for this past year, and I still must keep on trying to find something to do in order to be able to live.

"I was born in Florida and have worked here most of my life. Beginning in June 1914, I taught 35 years in the Florida public schools. In 1949, I reached the age of 60 and, since I had been overloaded in the classrooms for years, I felt that I must retire before my health completely gave way. Indeed, I was unable to work for several months.

"My salary had run from $45 a month for 7 or 8 months a year to $2,500 yearly the last year that I taught. Now my pension under the Florida teachers' pension system is $100 a month and is taxable.

"The 4-year bed illness of a sister, which ended in her death, left me heavily in debt. Therefore, when Internal Revenue notified me in December 1950 that I owed $195 income tax, plus $33.33 interest on my 1947 returns, due to errors in the returns, I was in no position to pay it. They had made no effort to tell me about it before. In other words, they had got around to notifying me 3 years late."

This is a familiar abuse of the citizen. Parasites of civil service loaf on the job, whistle jumping and stalling in the washrooms to the extent of millions of paid hours a year and tot up their rights and benefits at the expense of this wretched woman multiplied by millions.

By inattention and sloth they fall years behind in their work. Meanwhile, compound interest at 6 percent piles up against unsuspecting and morally innocent citizens who pay their salaries.

In the end, the little people, the weak and friendless millions for whom the Roosevelts and Truman and their evil cult expressed such mournful pity while they grabbed every dollar within their greedy reach, always are held to the literal figures rigged against them by expert professional tormenters.

For contrast, the record of the last 2 years of the Truman debauch disclosed hundreds of cases in which actual cheats and thieves were forgiven tax debts of millions on the corrupt proposition that it were better to collect a little money than to jail a rogue with a friend in the White House or a lawyer late of the Treasury staff.

Our schoolteacher's letter continues:

"I explained the circumstances and asked for time to pay it in installments. I was told that this was not Uncle Sam's way. I must send a check immediately for the full amount. That was the first of several such letters.

"In June 1951 while I was still trying to raise the whole amount, the case was placed in the hands of the local (Lakeland) office. After being summoned and having appeared before the local officer for several lengthy sessions, he suggested that I go to the bank and borrow $40, pay 25 cents for a certified check, and offer it in compromise.

"I did. Months later, I was notified that my offer was not accepted. I was then advised to add $10 more and make a second offer of compromise. I did and waited several months more.

"On October 15, 1951, I went to work teaching in Georgia. My salary for the remainder of the school year ending in September 1952 was around $1,500, before taxes. My expenses—board, etc.—were heavy and I was paying on other debts.

"In May 1952 just before school closed, and without notifying me that my $50 offer had been rejected, the Georgia tax office seized $245 of my summer salary, which was most of it.

"Now the old debt was paid but the Internal Revenue still had the $50 I had sent in offer to compromise. Although I wrote them several times asking for it and stressing my real need, they did not get around to sending it until this January 1953. I endorsed it and handed it back to them in the tax office here (Lakeland) and they wanted me to have it cashed and buy another certified check which would have cost around 65 cents.

"But they did finally accept it. But they had kept it over a year, but gave me no interest, although they had charged me more than $50 interest and penalties on the $195 I owed them."

This cruel experience irresistibly reminds me of the braggart announcement of a character known as Leigh Dannenberg, a devotee and personal friend of Eleanor Roosevelt, for many years the publisher of a weekly scandal sheet at Bridgeport, Conn., that he was recently back after 4 months in New Delhi, India, where he set up a New Deal propaganda rag, at the invitation of the discredited Park Avenue political mountebank, Ambassador Chester Bowles.

The purpose was to teach the people of India the Dannenberg version of American ethics, morals, and decency.

This character himself said the budget for this squandering of the taxes of the unfortunate schoolteacher whose letter forms the burden of this essay was $1,000,000 a year. The State Department said it was $300,000.

Dannenberg may have been exaggerating and the State Department trimming, each for obvious reasons. Dannenberg got $35 a day plus travel allowances, paid by the taxes and penalties of this tired old schoolma'am for his expert service in indoctrinating the Indians in the Dannenberg culture, also at her expense.

PREELECTION PROMISES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] have pointed out their Republican concern over the apparent indifference of the Republican Party to campaign promises and platform. This failure is a matter of concern to members of the Democratic Party also. The Republicans did make many promises during the campaign and since the campaign. They remind me more and more of the hunting party that sent a few of its members out before dawn to set out the decoys. The main body, following at dawn, was so eager for the kill that it shot up all of the decoys before it could be stopped. One of the Republican decoys was a balanced budget. That one has been blasted. Another was reduction of military expenditures. The Secretary of Defense has set his sights on that. Mr. REED's tax reduction is under fire from the executive offices and from the majority leader. The Republican Chairman of the House District Committee has splintered one of the most recently placed decoys, additional commissioners for the District of Columbia. Two other decoys, extension of reciprocal trade, and extension of social security are under the guns of the Ways and Means Committee chairman.

The Republicans have had two chances for live game, one in the case of the Reorganization Authority, and another in the educational aid for impacted school districts.

In each case while the Republicans were shooting at the decoys, the Democratic members of the House had to assume responsibility and bring down the live game.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is also another promise that is very important for the national interest of this country, a stronger national defense. We have got to keep that in mind when we hear talk about reduced taxes, reduced budgets; how can that be brought about with a stronger national defense?

Mr. McCARTHY. They are practically shooting decoys out of each other's hands. It begins to look as though they will return from the hunt with their game bags full of chips, and their retrievers' mouths full of splinters.

PREELECTION PROMISES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, the Democratic National Committee withdrew requests for nationwide radio time to broadcast a speech delivered Saturday at Raleigh, N. C., by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and recent candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination.

Evidently someone decided the Democratic National Committee could not afford to sponsor radio time. I do not know whether they could not afford it for financial or for ideological reasons.

There may be a clue to Democratic Chairman Mitchell's decision in the prepared text of the speech.

The Senator, it seems, was guilty of saying, among other things, that—

The American system has always recognized that unusual genius, capacity, and energy is entitled to its reward. Those who possess these traits will accumulate more than those who do not. In this belief is

found the strength and reasons for growth of our economic system.

Perhaps even greater heresy to the tender ears of the radicals who have captured control of the Democratic Party was this warning from the Senator:

There are those who would have us to drink of the fatal potion of national state socialism. We must resolutely reject their enticements.

Apparently even Mr. Mitchell and friends realized that the Senator could not possibly have been referring to Republicans with that remark.

It occurs to me that the Democratic National Committee deserves our sympathy in its present dilemma.

Certainly theirs is a sorry situation: the leftwingers they are willing to sponsor were discredited in the November election. On the other hand, they cannot afford to let a nationwide audience listen to a member of their own party who speaks out for sound American principles.

The Senator also said:

The Democratic Party cannot, and will not, be returned to power if this conspiracy to drive the South out of the party is continued. Those who promote this movement should realize that if any special group of extremists ever succeeds in driving out the old-line Democrats and fashioning the Democratic Party solely to their ideas, they would suffer the most disastrous defeat in American political history. They cannot name three States they would be assured of carrying for their presidential nominee, and the representation of this group in the Congress of the United States would be pathetic to behold.

It is apparent some are already trying to take the Senator and his people out of the party.

PREELECTION PROMISES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, there was a very wise man from the State of the Speaker occupying the Presidency one time, and he was being kidded a great deal as being "Silent Cal" and not talking. He said: "I found out early in life you did not have to explain something you never had said." I trust the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], may take that to his bosom.

I want to say further to him and to his colleagues who believe as he does that they are going to have all they can do, the Republican National Committee and the leadership in the Republican Party, looking after their own business between now and 1954 and from 1954 to 1956, without giving any gratuitous advice to the Democratic Party.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL PARK (TERRITORY OF HAWAII)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1525) authorizing the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I make inquiry of the author of the bill or some member of the committee? I notice that this bill applies to a small piece of ground in the national park in the Territory of Hawaii. However, the Bureau of the Budget advises that in the event of enactment estimates for appropriations for the maintenance of this park should be held in abeyance until such time as conditions warrant consideration of additional expense for items of this character. In view of that statement on the part of the Bureau of the Budget, why should we pass such legislation at this time?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the first eight bills on the Consent Calendar come from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and were before the House last year. They appeared on the Consent Calendar and passed, but were not considered by the other body because of certain difficulties over there in organization. These bills were handled this year by the able subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART]. We again had hearings and these first eight bills came from his subcommittee to the full committee with a unanimous report. I ask the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] if he will answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. D'EWART. The question is, Why should this bill be enacted at this time?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is correct, in view of the statement of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. D'EWART. The bill was brought before the committee at the request of a large group of people who were interested in such matters, including the Advisory Board of the National Parks, established by an Act of Congress, the National Parks Association, the County of Honolulu, and other groups. This monument is a refuge that has been there for a great many years. The exact way it was built is not known. It is thought that we should acquire this property at the present time and set it aside as a national park. It will not deteriorate, I agree, but the opportunity is present to acquire the property for future generations.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. May I inquire of the gentleman if there is any likelihood, in the event that no appropriation will be available for a long period of years, that the situation would be changed at that time so that the law would not be adequate in the event we do enact this bill into law?

Mr. D'EWART. In view of the fact that this is indorsed by such well-known agencies I think we can be sure that this is adequate to reserve the land that is needed for this national park.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in this particular committee report, and also in several of the others, the letter of transmittal from the Department is dated 1952 or in 1951. Consequently, it is obviously out of date. Several of these bills are, may I say rather inconsequential, they are not major legislative proposals. I think we should require hereafter up-to-date letters of transmittal in all of the committee reports before such legislation shall come to the floor and be favorably acted upon. I shall withdraw my reservation in this instance but certainly we cannot in this 1st session of the 83d Congress be acting on legislation with recommendations of prior years. I think that warning should be transmitted to all the committees.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I may say that what the gentleman has said in regard to reports is entirely true, but in these instances we have had a representative of the Bureau before our committee and he has indicated that the previous report is the opinion of the present regime. In view of the change of administration and the difficulties that they are having in the departments, it is impossible to get reports on these and other bills of similar nature that are before our committee. It may be some time before we can get these reports. However, each one of these bills was unanimously passed by our committee. It was debated and passed by the last Congress on the Consent Calendar, and we have cleared, as far as possible, with the Department. In view of that situation we thought it advisable to go ahead with bills of this type, get them out of the way, and get them over to the other House, rather than have them come up later in the session.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when title to such lands located on the island of Hawaii, within the following-described area, as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his judgment and discretion as necessary and suitable for the purpose, shall have been vested in the United States, said lands shall be set apart as the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, for the benefit and inspiration of the people:

PARCEL 1

Being all of R. P. 3306, L. C. Aw. 7219, Apana 2 to Kaliae, all of L. C. Aw. 9470 to Muki, and portions of R. P. 7874, L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi (Ahupuaa of Honaunau), and R. P. 6852, L. C. Aw. 7712 Apana 1 to M. Kekuananoa (Ahupuaa of Keokea).

Beginning at a one and one-half-inch pipe in concrete monument called "Kalani," at the southeast corner of this parcel, the northeast corner of parcel 3, and on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kiilae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Seventy-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred and eighty feet along the land of Kiilae, L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu and passing over a

rock called "Kuwala," marked K+K at six hundred seventy-three and two-tenths feet to high-water mark; thence along high-water mark, along seacoast for the next three courses, the direct azimuths and distances between points at seacoast being:

2. One hundred and thirty-five degrees fifty-one minutes three thousand nine hundred seventy-six and one-tenth feet;

3. One hundred and fifty-two degrees twenty-five minutes one thousand and seventy-eight feet;

4. Two hundred and forty degrees fifty-five minutes one thousand two hundred four and four-tenths feet;

5. Three hundred and fifty-four degrees nine minutes two hundred twenty-four and one-tenth feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi, along stone wall and old trail;

6. Two hundred and sixty degrees fifty-four minutes one hundred seventy-five and nine-tenths feet across old trail along stone wall to a "+" on rock;

7. One hundred and fifty-eight degrees six minutes seventy-two feet along L. C. Aw. 7296 to Puhi, along stone wall;

8. Two hundred and sixty degrees thirty-six minutes ninety and seven-tenths feet along stone wall;

9. One hundred and ninety-four degrees ten minutes sixty-two and nine-tenths feet along stone wall along L. C. Aw. 7295 and 6979–B:2 to Keolewa;

10. One hundred and seventy-five degrees fifty-four minutes twenty-six and nine-tenths feet along stone wall;

11. Two hundred and fifteen degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-seven and four-tenths feet along stone wall along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

12. One hundred and seventy-two degrees twenty-eight minutes forty-eight and one-tenth feet along same;

13. Two hundred and twenty-six degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred twenty-eight and eight-tenths feet along remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the south side of fifty-foot road;

14. Two hundred and sixty-four degrees fifty-one minutes one hundred fifteen and two-tenths feet along the south side of fifty-foot road;

15. Two hundred and fifty-two degrees thirteen minutes two hundred and two-tenths feet along same;

16. Two hundred and eighty-six degrees thirty minutes one hundred seventy and nine-tenths feet along same;

17. Two hundred and thirty-eight degrees twenty-five minutes ninety-two and eight-tenths feet along same;

18. Two hundred and twenty-three degrees one minutes one hundred fourteen and four-tenths feet along same;

19. Three hundred and thirty-eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds four thousand nine hundred eighty and three-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi and L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a one and one-fourth-inch pipe in concrete monument at one thousand four hundred eighty-one and six-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, one hundred sixty-six and ninety one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 2

Being portions of L. C. Aw. 11216 Apana 34 to M. Kekauonohi, R. P. 7874 (Ahupuaa of Honaunau).

Beginning at a pipe in concrete at the northeast corner of this parcel, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being two thousand one hundred thirty-nine feet south and eleven thousand six hundred seventeen and nine-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred fifty-eight degrees twenty-three minutes two hundred sixty and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi;

2. Ninety-three degrees thirty minutes two hundred and sixty-nine feet along same, along stone wall, along lot 2 of the subdivision by B. P. Bishop estate;

3. Eighty-two degrees no minutes three hundred and eighteen feet along same to the east side of fifty-foot road; degrees twenty minutes two hundred ninety-one and five-tenths feet;

5. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes six hundred and twenty feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 11216:34 to M. Kekauonohi to the point of beginning.

Area, three and seventy one-hundredths acres.

Together with an easement 6 feet wide for a pipeline right-of-way extending from the Government road to parcel 1, the south side of said right-of-way being described as follows:

Beginning at the east end of this right-of-way on the common boundary of the lands of Honaunau and Keokea, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being three thousand one hundred ninety and eight-tenths feet south and eleven thousand seventy-eight and eight-tenths feet east, and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Eighty degrees thirty-six minutes five seconds one hundred and seventeen feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekaunaoa, to the Triangulation Station "Ahupuaa" of the B. P. Bishop estate;

2. Eighty-two degrees twenty minutes seven thousand two hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet along same to a 1¼-inch pipe in concrete monument on two hundred eighty-nine and one-tenth feet along same to a 1¼-inch pipe in concrete monument on the east boundary of parcel 1 the coordinates of said point of the end of this six-foot right-of-way referred to Government Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being four thousand one hundred eighty-two and four-tenths feet south and three thousand seven hundred thirty-nine and four-tenths feet east.

Area, one and two one-hundredths acres.

PARCEL 3

Being portion of L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D. Hueu, being portion of the Ahupuaa of Kilíae.

Beginning at a 1½-inch pipe in concrete monument called Kalani at the northeast corner of this parcel, the southeast corner of parcel 1, on the common boundary of the lands of Keokea and Kilíae, the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station "Lae-O-Kanoni" being seven thousand four hundred forty-four and eight-tenths feet south and five thousand three and two-tenths feet east and running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred thirty-eight degrees forty-nine minutes thirty seconds five hundred ninety-five and four-tenths feet along the remainder of L. C. Aw. 8521–B to G. D.

2. Ninety degrees no minutes one thousand ninety-nine and seven-tenths feet along same and along said eight thousand foot south coordinates line and across school grant 7 Apana 6 to high-water mark;

3. Thence along high-water mark, along sea, the direct aximuth and distance being: two hundred six degrees thirty-three minutes thirty seconds four hundred eighty-two and nine-tenths feet;

4. Two hundred fifty-nine degrees thirty-three minutes fifteen seconds six hundred eighty feet along L. C. Aw. 7712:1 to M. Kekuanaoa and passing over a rock called Kuwala, marked K+K at six and eight-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

Area, ten and twenty-five one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. Upon the vesting of title in the United States to such lands as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary and suitable for historical park purposes in accordance with the provisions of section 1 of this act, the City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be established by order of the said Secretary, which shall be published in the Federal Register. Any other lands within the area described above shall become a part of the national historical park upon the vesting of title thereto in the United States and upon publication of an appropriate supplemental order by the said Secretary in the Federal Register.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to procure, by donation or purchase, with any funds that may be available for that purpose, lands and interests in lands which may be needed for the City of Refuge National Historical Park within the area described in section 1 hereof.

SEC. 4. In order to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in consolidating in Federal ownership lands within the area described above, and to facilitate acquisition of the lands needed for the national historical park, the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii is also authorized to acquire lands for said park, at the expense of the Territory of Hawaii by exchange or otherwise, in accordance with procedure prescribed by the act of February 27, 1920 (41 Stat. 452).

SEC. 5. The City of Refuge National Historical Park shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior subject to the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 1–4), as amended and supplemented, and such additional authority compatible therewith as is contained in the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 461–467), with regard to preservation of historic sites and objects of national significance.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, line 21, insert:

"4. Thence along the east side of fifty-foot road, the direct azimuth and distance being: one hundred seventy-one."

Page 7, line 23, insert "Hueu to the eight thousand foot south coordinates line referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Lae-O-Kanoni."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIG BEND NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1527) to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to procure, in such manner as he may consider to be in the public interest, the remaining non-Federal land and interests in land within the boundaries of Big Bend National Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOMATTOX COURTHOUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1528) to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Courthouse National His-

torical Monument, Virginia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire, in such manner as he shall consider to be in the public interest, any land or interests in land, within a distance of 1½ miles from the historic Appomattox Courthouse site, Virginia, which he shall consider to be suitable for addition to the Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Monument. The Secretary is authorized also to dispose of any surplus monument lands in such manner as he shall consider appropriate, or to exchange any monument lands for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value when, in his opinion, such action is in the interest of the United States. Properties acquired pursuant to this act shall become a part of the monument upon acquisition of title thereto by the United States. The total area of this national monument as it may be revised pursuant to this act shall be no greater than its present acreage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO FACILITATE DEVELOPMENT OF BUILDING MATERIALS IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1529) to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of aiding in the development of building materials essential to the growth of Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, for a period of 15 years from the date of approval of this Act, and under such conditions and for such consideration as he may prescribe to permit the removal of deposits of siliceous volcanic ash, commonly known as pumicite, from such areas as he may designate along the shores of Shelik of Strait in Katmai National Monument, Alaska.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "act", strike out "and under such conditions and for such consideration as he may prescribe" and insert "pursuant to the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITION TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1530) to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2029), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I note that the report on this bill states that there is approximately 1 acre involved in the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida, and that this 1 acre is to be purchased at an estimated cost of $30,000. I appreciate Florida is a great State and has valuable ground, but I wonder if we should not have an explanation as to why 1 acre should cost $30,000 for use in a national park.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG], in whose district this monument is located, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PROVIDE FOR ADDITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1532) to provide for the addition of certain Government lands to the Cape Hatteras national seashore recreational area project, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], a member of the Consent Calendar Committee, who was called off the floor, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

RECORDATION OF SCRIP, LIEU SELECTION, AND SIMILAR RIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1813) to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any owner of, and any person claiming rights to, Valentine scrip, issued under the act of April 5, 1872 (17 Stat. 649); Sioux Half-Breed scrip, issued under the act of July 17, 1854 (10 Stat. 304); Supreme Court scrip, issued under the acts of June 22, 1860 (12 Stat. 85), March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 544), and June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. 378); Surveyor-General scrip, issued under the act of June 2, 1858 (11 Stat. 294); a soldier's additional homestead right, granted by sections 2300 and 2307 of the Revised Statutes; a forest lieu selection right, assertable under the act of March 3, 1905 (33 Stat. 1264); a lieu selection right conferred by the act of July 1, 1898 (30 Stat. 597); a bounty land warrant issued under the act of March 3, 1855 (10 Stat. 701); or any lieu selection or scrip right or bounty land warrant, or right in the nature of scrip issued under any act of Congress not enumerated herein (except the indemnity selection rights of any State, or of the Territory of Alaska), shall, within 3 years from the effective date of this act, present his holdings or claim for recordation by the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. In the case of a transfer after the effective date of this act, by assignment, inheritance, operation of law, or otherwise of a holding or claim of any right required by this act to be recorded, the holding or claim of right so acquired shall be presented to the Department of the Interior within 6 months after such transfer, for recordation by it; except that where such transfer occurs within the period of 3 years from the effective date of this act and the prior owner has not complied with provisions of this act, the owner or claimant by transfer shall have the remainder of such period or a period of 6 months, whichever is the longer, within which to present his claims or holdings for recordation.

SEC. 3. There shall be endorsed on the evidence of the right or warrant each recordation thereof.

SEC. 4. Claims or holdings not presented for recordation as prescribed herein shall become null and void and all rights and interests thereunder shall terminate.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 3, strike out section 4 and insert:

"SEC. 4. Claims or holdings not presented for recordation, as prescribed herein, shall not thereafter be accepted by the Secretary of the Interior for recordation or as a basis for the acquisition of lands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPEAL CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO TIMBER AND STONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1816) to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following acts or portions of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Sections 1 to 3, inclusive, of the act of June 3, 1878 (20 Stat. 89), as amended (43 U. S. C., secs. 311, 312, and 313).

(b) Act of June 3, 1878 (20 Stat. 88), as amended (16 U. S. C., secs. 604, 605, and 606).

(c) Section 8 of the act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1095, 1099), as amended and supplemented (16 U. S. C., secs. 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 611a, 612, and 613), except the first sentence of said section 8, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 1166).

(d) Act of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 1015), as amended (16 U. S. C., secs. 614 and 615).

SEC. 2. Rights and liabilities existing under the foregoing statutes on the date of the enactment of this act shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, my purpose being to ask my good friend from Pennsylvania, Judge GRAHAM, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, a few questions on a matter unrelated to this bill.

Last year we passed a bill the sum and substance of which was, as I recall, to enable those in the service during the present emergency to be quickly naturalized under conditions similar to those extended to World War II veterans. Is my recollection correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. The gentleman is absolutely correct in his statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill was reported out of the Committee of the Judiciary and passed the House and went to the Senate. A few days before adjournment the Senate committee reported out the bill with amendments, and it passed the Senate, but went to conference too late for the conferees to have an opportunity to adjust the differences.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. My recollection is that the principal amendment in disagreement was that in the Senate bill there was a provision that those who were temporarily in the United States and who were in our armed services should not be given this opportunity.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without passing upon that question, because I think they should and I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania does, for I do not believe we should draw a distinction between those in the armed services, whether they are here on a permanent or on a temporary visa if they are in the service—it seems to me the question of their willingness to serve our country is the primary question involved—there is another bill now pending before my friend's subcommittee?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill is comprehensive?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I should like to ask my friend this question, without pressing it, for I realize probably the gentleman is awaiting a report from the Department of Justice on it.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the Department of Defense is strongly in favor of the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. All our information is to that effect.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask my friend if he can give an idea as to the chances of early action on the bill. There is a tremendous amount of interest in it. I may say also that interest is increased because there are certain young men, and I am sure, young women, but young men particularly, who are now serving in the armed services and who, in case they serve in Korea and are captured and made prisoner, are likely to be in a very uncomfortable situation in that they are citizens of other countries whose governments are not members of the United Nations, such as Ireland. They also include displaced persons coming from countries behind the Iron Curtain. I know we have those of Irish blood who have volunteered to serve and are serving, and we have those who are displaced persons coming from countries now located behind the so-called Iron Curtain. They are two groups that are in a very uncomfortable situation, a very bad situation, unless this speedy means of naturalization is afforded them. Is my friend acquainted with that situation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, I am.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, my observations in the nature of a question really cover the situation?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is an accurate statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask my friend what his views are on this bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. We plan to take it up as quickly as we can. At the moment the subcommittee I head is engaged in handling the tidelands matter, and we are pressing to get that through as soon as possible. It has been before the Congress a number of times. We are anxious to get it out of the subcommittee. One or two other bills are listed ahead of the bill to which the gentleman refers. As quickly as we can reach it, we will take up the matter of which the gentleman speaks.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because I know there is a tremendous amount of interest in the legislation and I realize the failure to pass it quickly will bring inequities to many who are serving in our Armed Forces at the present time.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. May I point out to the gentleman that in addition to the many reasons why this bill should be passed we have in the armed services at the present time a number of men who are eligible for commission; that is, otherwise they would be eligible, they have all the qualifications, and our armed services feel that they are qualified in every particular, but because they are not citizens they cannot be granted commissions. I join with the gentleman in the thought that this bill should be passed quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for that additional observation, which is very pertinent. I was not aware of it, though I quickly see the significance of it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 3841, REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3062) to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. May I ask that some member of the committee explain just what this bill accomplishes?

Mr. Speaker, if no member is present who can explain what the bill does, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AMENDING ACT OF JULY 12, 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2466) to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, has this bill been on the Consent Calendar long enough so that it may be properly considered at this time?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the bill has been on the calendar for the required time.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 3841, REVISED STATUTES

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of clarification, was the objection raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in reference to an explanation of the bill, H. R. 3062?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to hear the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 10, the bill (H. R. 3062) to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes, for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. Will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill in the first instance is to repeal the present law which requires postmasters throughout the United States to send to the Postmaster General all reports concerning the arrival and departure of the mail. The purpose of this bill is to eliminate the mere formal forwarding to the Postmaster General the time of arrival and departure of each mail that is brought to or taken from each post office. Instead of that, it is believed it would serve a much better purpose if the postmaster, instead of forwarding each arrival and departure, would send to the Postmaster General those that are late on arrival or those that are late on departure. Therefore, in bookkeeping alone it would save a great deal of money and eliminate much red tape.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no intention to follow this up by depriving any of the ports of entry of the continued service of steamship lines, is there?

Mr. BONIN. No, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is there any further explanation my friend wants to make to the House?

Mr. BONIN. In addition to that, there is another section here. In fact, there are two other sections. There is a revised classification which Public Law 204 of the 82d Congress provided. Therein, the classification of "clerk in charge" would actually not be necessary. He is working at the present time, but the classification is still maintained on the statute books. Therefore, this section is merely for the purposes of clarification and to be continued under the new legislation as passed in the 82d Congress. In the third section, this amendment is for the purpose of establishing post roads. At the present time, all post roads and highways, while kept up and maintained, are classified as post roads; but, you must still obtain approval of the Congress in order to establish them. It is merely a clarification of the law in repealing certain sections in consistence with other sections of the law.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the gentleman states that this will bring about not only economy but efficiency, without the impairment of any service?

Mr. BONIN. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I might say that a similar bill was passed by the House in the closing days of the last session. The bill did not reach the other body in time for action there. This bill was originally sent down by former Postmaster General Donaldson. Since it did not pass the other body, the present Postmaster General sent the same bill down this time. This is certainly a good bill which will bring about economy and repeal a lot of useless and obsolete laws that are on the statute books today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements that both gentlemen have made which I think it is good to have for the RECORD, and I might state that the explanation by the gentlemen satisfy me, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3841 of the Revised Statutes (sec. 7, title 39, United States Code) is hereby amended by striking out the clause reading: "and he shall cause to be kept and returned to the Department, at short and regular intervals, registers, showing the exact times of the arrivals and departures of the mail.", and by inserting, in lieu thereof, a clause to read as follows: "and he shall cause to be kept and forwarded to the Department, or designated field offices, such reports as he may consider necessary."

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act to reclassify postmasters and employees of the postal service and readjust their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis," approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1045), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the paragraph reading:

"A clerk in charge is defined as a clerk in charge of a railway post office, terminal railway post office, or transfer office whether he performs service alone or has a crew of clerks under his supervision, or of a tour or a crew within a tour of a terminal railway post office or transfer office."

SEC. 3. Section 3975 of the Revised Statutes (sec. 493, title 39, U. S. C.) is hereby amended by striking out the semicolon and the following: "but where such service is performed over a route not established by law, he shall report the same to Congress at its meeting next thereafter, and such service shall cease at the end of the next session of Congress, unless such route is established a post route by Congress."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE POSTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN SPECIFIED AREAS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, when the bill (H. R. 2466) to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas, was called, Calendar No. 11, I asked that it be passed over without prejudice. I am now fully informed of the purpose of the bill and I now ask unanimous consent to return to its consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am acquainted with what the bill does, but I would like to ask the gentlewoman from New York for a brief explanation.

Mrs. St. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is merely a continuation of the present law which gives free mailing privileges to the troops in Korea or in any war area. But what is does further, and we feel it is a very important addition, is to extend the free-mailing privilege to hospitalized service people outside the continental United States. We are particularly anxious that this privilege should not be curtailed in any way. We have cleared it with the Department of Defense who have given it the fullest consideration and approval. We have also cleared it with the Bureau of the Budget, and they assure us that as the bill is written they would like to see it go through immediately so there will be no interruption or curtailment of this service.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the present law this right of free mailing may be extended within the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is confined now to Korea and Europe.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Yes, or any declared war area, that is, declared by the President or by the Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the bill contains a further provision extending it to hospitalized veterans, as the gentlewoman has said.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That is also provided.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the discretion to extend the privilege is left to the President of the United States, not the Postmaster General.

Mr. McCORMACK. I knew there was delegated authority contained in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That any first-class letter mail matter admissible to the mails as ordinary mail matter which is sent by a member of the Armed Forces of the United States (1) while on active duty or in the active service of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and such other areas as the President of the United States may hereafter designate as combat zones or theaters of military operations; or (2) while hospitalized outside the continental limits of the United States when such hospitalization is a result of service in Korea and such other areas as the President of the United States may hereafter designate as combat zones or theaters of military operations; to any person in the United States, including the Territories and possessions thereof, shall be transmitted in the mails free of postage, subject to such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General may describe. When specified by the sender, letters weighing not to exceed one ounce shall be transmitted to destination by air mail, dependent upon air space availability therefor."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of said act, as amended, is further amended by deleting therefrom "until June 30, 1953", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "until June 30, 1955."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the calendar.

THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement by Dr. R. G. De Voe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of the opportunity to include with my remarks a statement which was furnished me by Dr. R. G. De Voe, manager of the Veterans' Administration hospital in the Bronx, New York City, entitled "The People Behind the Professional Staff." In this statement Dr. De Voe clearly points out that the operation of a hospital is so dependent on excellent teamwork between the various units therein that if one unit should be crippled in any way, it affects the operation of the entire hospital. It is readily appreciated from his statement that a reduction in the nonprofessional staff who service the operation of the hospital itself is bound to affect the professional staff engaged in the care of the patients.

I am convinced that Dr. De Voe and his staff at the veterans' hospita' in the Bronx, New York City, are doing everything they can to cooperate in reducing expenses and have of their own accord

instituted savings where savings could be made without crippling the service. It becomes very necessary for the appropriate committees of Congress to inquire into the actual situation in great detail before authorizing a reduction in appropriations for hospital operation in the Veterans' Administration.

From my study of the situation I believe that something is wrong with the high echelon of the Veterans' Administration when it approves a reduction in the nonprofessional personnel with assurances that it will not affect the care of the patients. Both Congress and our veterans are entitled to better judgment on which they can rely. I hope my colleagues will read Dr. De Voe's excellent statement which follows:

THE PEOPLE BEHIND THE PROFESSIONAL STAFF

For many years hospitals, both private and Government, have been accused of poor management because of their high costs, and more recently VA hospitals have been asked, "Why can't you cut down your staff of nonprofessional personnel without touching the doctors, nurses, dentists, and dietitians and still give the same service both from the standpoint of quantity and quality?" Hospital authorities have answered this question many times and in many ways, but here are a few points concerning VA hospitals which may help to further clear the question.

It is true that since 1945 operating costs of veterans' hospitals have increased considerably in terms of cost per patient-day. This, of course, is due in part to the general rise in costs of everything, but more important, it is the improvement in care of our patients over that in prewar VA. The VA hospital has also taken its place as one of the best hospitals in the community and has assumed its rightful responsibilities to the Nation insofar as training of personnel, professional and nonprofessional, and utilizing its vast resources of patients for research for the benefit of all mankind. This, of course, is expensive but worth while.

Many people not engaged in the day-by-day operation of hospitals are prone to look upon the hospital in the light of a hotel for sick people, or business-type institution. Nothing can be further from the truth. The hospital, to be a good one, must be a dynamic medical workshop with complex organization of services; a social institution serving the needs of sick people and keeping uppermost the fact that the needs of those sick people must come first before any attempts at profit-making or economy in the business sense of the word. The direct furnishing of care to patients by the people they see—doctors, nurses, dentists, and dietitians—is the most expensive phase of the hospital, but let us stop and think. These people could not render their services without a large group of people behind the scenes who provide the materials, supply the food, the records, the telephones, etc., which must be provided for. We agree wholeheartedly that the VA hospital, having a public trust in the expenditure of taxpayers' money, must be as efficient as possible and must be constantly searching for better and more economical means of operation. Here I do not think we have failed.

This hospital, through research and management improvement programs, has voluntarily cut its staff as our personnel have become more experienced, and newer and better ways of doing the hospital work have been found. As a matter of fact, in the last year we have processed 27 employee suggestions resulting in improved service and 84 work simplification studies resulting in economies in either personnel or supplies.

We have been asked, "Why can't you cut your nonprofessional staff. What do they have to do with patient care." Let's go down the nonprofessional activities department by department. One of our largest nonprofessional groups is our engineering department whose task is to maintain without failures a conglomeration of buildings (housing 1,500 patients) some of which were built in 1900 and some in 1940. Aside from keeping the buildings in repair, which is a job in itself where you have provided a half-million patient-days in a year and have taken care of 52,000 veterans as outpatients, our maintenance people have to see that the basic services—heat, steam, electricity, gas—are provided 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, year in and year out, without failures which could make the doctors attempts futile. We have already cut this department down to the point where we honestly feel we are practicing false economy. This same department must be ready to run our ambulances, plow the snow, haul supplies and patients. Our laundry must continue to process 7,000,000 pieces of laundry every year in order to maintain hospital standards which I am sure no one wants to see drop. Our guard force must protect the property and provide fire-fighting services when necessary.

Our supply division is responsible for purchasing, warehousing, and issuing all the supplies and equipment used in a huge hospital of this type. In doing this, they must insure that the doctor will have everything he needs when he needs it and still not overstock and tie up the hospital's money. They must buy all the hospital's food at the best advantage, and this, too, must be available when needed. Warehousing in itself is a big business. The supply division must stock and maintain stock levels on over 2,000 items that are used on a recurring basis in the hospital. This stock replenishment system, as it is called was copied from some of the largest industrial concerns in the country as a means of assuring continuous supply without overtocking. Our supply division consisting of 31 persons has been reduced by 4 persons during the past year alone as a result of improved methods brought about by constant management study.

In our hospital we also have a communications and records department whose main functions are the sorting and delivering of 140,000 pieces of mail per month, coming to us from outside; the maintenance of a messenger system at this hospital where we have no call system, the operation of our telephones, travel, and transportation activities, and one of our biggest headaches, the maintenance of records and files. Administrative records and files are a small problem, but the maintenance of a system of accurate filing of the tens of thousands of patients' records which must be maintained here for a period of 10 years is enormous. It should be pointed out that medical records in a Veterans' Administration hospital serve two purposes: First, as medical and/or research records, and secondly, as very important records concerning the case of a veteran in the adjudication of any claim he may have pending against the Government for compensation or pension. We have reduced this department through our own efforts by four people during 1952.

The registrar division, another nonprofessional service, is responsible for all the administrative aspects pertaining to the admission and disposition of patients and maintenance of their current records, as well as provision for taking care of patients' clothing; responsible for property and equipment on wards and the furnishing of a stenographic service for transcription and typing of patients' clinical records. This division was created to relieve our doctors, nurses, and other professional personnel from purely administrative duties.

Our finance office is responsible for the accurate accounting of all moneys expended at this hospital for any purpose and from any source. Other functions of this division are maintenance of a cost-accounting system which enables us to gage our performance in comparison with other hospitals, Government and otherwise; preparation of payrolls for all employees and distribution of pay checks; operation of patients' funds activities. This interesting activity is somewhat like a small bank in that all patients are encouraged to deposit any money they bring with them to the hospital which can be withdrawn by them at any time. In addition, we have incompetent patients' funds which must be administered by the manager and handled by the finance office. Personnel in this division were also reduced during 1952 by four.

The personnel department handles the hiring and discharging of employees and the operation of a personnel program at the hospital consisting of training and recruitment which we also do for other hospitals. The personnel department is also responsible for staff work in connection with incentives awards and suggestion programs, employee health activities, and advice to the manager regarding personnel administration.

Special services is responsible for recreation, chaplaincy service, library, both professional and patients' library. The activities of this department have been a matter of controversy from time to time, but it has been our experience that the program properly directed for long-term type neuropsychiatric and tuberculous patients is beneficial in aiding our medical staff insofar as dealing with more cooperative patients is concerned.

Housekeeping is a prodigious job in a hospital of this size and type. It goes without saying that every hospital must be immaculate at all times and at all hours. Our hospital, where it is not at all uncommon to have 1,500 visitors to patients at any time, and located in a large population center, presents special problems in housekeeping. If it were not for the afore-mentioned factors, our old buildings with their high ceilings, old-fashioned floors, would be a job in itself. This department, which we have mechanized to the maximum, is another one whose work is often taken for granted, but is constantly a thorn in the side of hospital management.

I have thus far discussed only the purely administrative activities which function as services to the professional and subprofessional staff. In our professional departments we have, of course, many complex activities handled by other than doctors, nurses, or dentists.

Our dietetic department for instance, is responsible for preparing approximately 7,000 meals a day and on time. Our patients and the public often see only the pretty dietitian or the nurse who serves the tray, but in our discussion, we must stop and think what happens and how many people are involved in getting that tray to the patient. We must realize that, after the supply people purchase the food, it must be transported, menus planned, food prepared for cooking, cooked, divided into portions, and transported to the patient to whom it is to be served. Afterwards, the remains of the food that has become garbage must be taken back and disposed of, and the dishes washed. Garbage from 7,000 meals is a formidable thing as is the dishwashing! To get back to preparation of food, most of our food is purchased in bulk. Our beef, for instance, is purchased in carcass lots. It would be prohibitive for us to purchase cuts as the average householder does, so in order for our food to be prepared for cooking, we must maintain a staff of butchers, kitchen helpers, etc. We must prepare vegetables, keep our kitchens and serving areas hospital clean to prevent infection on a 24-hour, 7 day a week basis.

We wonder whether the average lay person takes into consideration the assistance the doctor must have in modern medicine to make an accurate diagnosis and to decide upon courses of treatment. Here again, our

X-ray department, our huge and complex laboratories, all of which must be adequately manned if tragic errors are to be averted, are too often out of the public eye when it comes to judging the hospital. Yes, the character of hospital care has changed radically in the past decade. In an era of ever increasing technical advances in medicine, new testing techniques—electrocardiograph, electroencephalograph, special high-speed X-rays—have added greatly to the overhead cost. Antibiotics, the extensive use of intravenous fluids, including blood, plasma, more laboratory examinations, all of which mean more skilled personnel—these are examples of modern hospital techniques, requiring greater additional cost, but while they have increased the cost of running the hospital, they have lengthened the patient's life, reduced pain, and cut the time of his stay in the hospital. Concentrated treatment is costly, but it pays off economically as well as physically. Excluding our long-term or custodial cases, our patients spend much less time in the hospital than they would have if hospitalized for the same illness 10 years ago.

The points that we have brought out are not peculiar to a Veterans' Administration Hospital but are applicable to any large university-type teaching hospital, organized and operated to take the lead in the medical world toward the goal of not only rendering the highest type of medical treatment but also to discover new methods, train professional staff, and to conduct research in those problems still baffling physicians the world over. The Veterans' Administration has made a notable contribution, and it would indeed be tragic if false economy were to destroy these things now.

SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great pleasure to submit to you a summary report on the activities of the senior Senator from our great State of Michigan during the 82d Congress. Michigan's pride in Senator HOMER FERGUSON has been justified by his two terms of distinguished service to his country and to his State. He has been a dynamic influence in the work of two major Senate committees and his active participation in Senate debate has placed him among the hardest working and most able men in the Senate.

High on the list of outstanding legislative achievements during 1952 is an amendment to the Defense Production Act credited to the efforts of Senator FERGUSON. This amendment terminated the undesirable activities of the International Materials Conference, which had deprived American industries of much-needed raw materials for war production.

Elsewhere in labor and industrial fields our distinguished Senator urged allocation of Government contracts to distressed areas. Furthermore, he vigorously condemned President Truman's unconstitutional seizure of the steel industry. Concurring with the decision of the Supreme Court, Senator FERGUSON called upon the President to halt the steel strike through the use of existing legislation.

One of the chief champions of economy in the 82d and previous Congress, Senator FERGUSON was instrumental in achieving the greatest reduction in Federal expenditures in the Nation's history. On more than 50 occasions during Senate debate, Senator FERGUSON expressed his strong opposition to any increase in Government spending. The Senator is directly responsible for a savings of over $10 million of the total reduction. He waged a victorious fight against waste and inefficiency in the Defense Department which saved millions in Federal expenditures.

As a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Senator FERGUSON took part in the exhaustive investigations of Communist infiltration in IPR. Committee research resulted in the conclusion that the Institute of Pacific Relations was a vehicle used by the Communists to direct American far-eastern policies toward Communist objectives.

On the St. Lawrence seaway issue, Senator FERGUSON in 1952 spearheaded the fight on the side of those who favored the project. The high-water levels which last year caused so much damage to States bordering the Great Lakes, demanded much of Senator FERGUSON's attention. He sponsored legislation for control of the Great Lakes water level and in addition earmarked part of emergency flood relief appropriations for use in Michigan areas.

Senator FERGUSON was responsible for introducing into the 82d Congress bills to provide for servicemen's absentee ballots where State laws do not make adequate provisions. A bill providing for compensation on the same basis for unemployed vets as for unemployed civilians was also introduced and guided into law by our senior Senator.

Senator FERGUSON has always found time in his busy schedule to assist the citizens of Michigan in their relations with the Federal Government and its agencies.

His attendance record, shared by only one other Member of the Senate, is edifying proof of our Senator's conscientious efforts throughout the year. He missed only one of 129 rollcall votes and one of 121 quorum calls for an attendance record of 99.6 percent.

My report does not do justice to the far-reaching accomplishments of Senator FERGUSON. However, on behalf of the people of Michigan I submit this tribute to Michigan's senior Senator, HOMER FERGUSON.

ACCELERATED AMORTIZATION FOR AMERICAN OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the United States has evolved a conscious, if sometimes uncoordinated, policy for redressing the grave economic imbalance between itself and the rest of the free world. Among other things, this policy has included the encouragement of American private investment overseas, although no great progress has been made. With this in mind, I have introduced today a bill, H. R. 3600, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit accelerated amortization on certain facilities constructed, established or acquired in foreign countries by American investors.

One of the basic economic problems faced by our friends abroad is that of production and productivity. Most of these countries are unable to produce enough goods and services at competitive prices to exchange for the goods and services they must import to build stronger economies and support their own defense effort. Their position can be improved only by expanding production and increasing productivity through the investment of more capital, development of managerial skill and encouragement of labor cooperation with a greater share of the profits.

The greatest source today for both capital and technical knowledge is the United States. We all agree that American investment in the form of foreign-aid programs cannot provide a permanent solution. The answer must be increased investment abroad by American private enterprise. Such investment would make available to our allies in some measure the economic benefits of the production, distribution, and management techniques which have contributed so greatly to this country's imposing economic strength.

Since 1947 United States direct foreign investment has been running at something over one billion a year. And it has been very largely special purpose investment heavily concentrated in the Western Hemisphere. This amounts to less than four one-thousandths of national income as contrasted with the approximately one one-hundredth capital movement during the 1930's, almost three times the current rate.

There are many convincing reasons why American private capital is reluctant to seek opportunity abroad. My bill is designed to diminish the importance of two of these factors—the threat of war destruction and expropriation of assets through nationalization schemes. If direct investments could be amortized within a relatively short time, the risk of destruction or expropriation would no longer be prohibitive.

Accelerated amortization is the device which has done so much for domestic investment in defense production for World War II and the Korean war. As Mr. M. C. Conick, executive partner of Maine & Co., Pittsburgh, has pointed out, there is no reason why it cannot do the same thing for overseas investment consistent with our national policy. Amortization takes care of the risk that an investment may be written off on the one hand as useless, on the other as war-damaged or expropriated. It is reasonably estimated that this device could induce the export of American capital at a rate of three or four billion a year and more.

This system of overseas investment and re-investment was the very basis of Great Britain's creditor position in the

19th century, which saw an unprecedented expansion in the development of the world's resources. Both Britain and the rest of the world benefited. Underdeveloped countries expanded their production base and Britain's imports from and exports to them increased. The effect of United States investment in Canada in this century is another example. By importing American capital and skills, Canada has been able to develop its natural resources to such a degree that real national income doubled in one decade.

There are important differences, however, in the two situations. The American investor is discouraged, as his British counterpart of the last century was not, by discriminatory legislation and administrative practices of foreign governments, by double taxation, by unstable and inconvertible currencies, by the shortage of dollar exchange, and, as noted before, by the threat of expropriation and war damage. Investment cannot be justified if there is no assurance that the principal will remain intact and a reasonable return enjoyed. We cannot expect private enterprise to accept unfair risks in the name of national policy. The Government itself must provide the inducements if it desires an increase in overseas investment in the face of what our businessmen regard as an unfavorable investment climate. We expect friendly countries to help develop healthier conditions for the foreign investor, but this will be a slow and tedious process of negotiation and the need for greater investment is immediate.

This investment incentive offers the possibility for real missionary work for the free enterprise economic system. The bill specifically provides that investment programs which are a joint undertaking between American enterprise and investors of the foreign country concerned shall have priority in the issuance of amortization certificates. In this way each country should benefit not only from the capital import but also from experience with American technical skill. Wages are made a factor in awarding amortization certificates in order to prevent the exploitation of local wage standards and consequent cheap labor competition with American domestic industry.

If the people abroad have an opportunity to share in the American system of capital investment, they can take the lead in steps to revitalize their own economy. Corporate investment, symbolizing the individual citizen's share in the ownership of our great business enterprises, is the best possible assurance of broadening the base of a free economy in the non-Communist nations of the world. There is no better way of helping to bring about a better appreciation of the system that has made the United States the envy of the world than to offer the opportunity to citizens of other countries to share in profits of success of the free-enterprise-business development in their own country. The owners and the wage earners in a profitable industrial system are not likely to be easy victims of Communist propaganda.

The question of cost to the American taxpayer under this program is more apparent than real. Taken on the short-term view, the cost would be the loss of the amount rebated to each company in the form of a tax credit for accelerated amortization of the investment abroad. Yet what is lost from Government revenue temporarily would soon be recovered and more by revenue accruing from the taxable earnings on the investment.

But to talk of dollar costs is to tragically ignore the profounder longterm implications of a mass movement of American capital overseas. It is a matter strictly of our self-interest. It has come as a painful discovery to a people who has so long practiced the philosophy of live-and-let-live, but Americans now recognize that the security and economic well-being of our allies is necessary to the security and well-being of themselves.

Here is a way to give the lie to the Marxist dogma that capitalist nations must wage aggressive wars to gain markets for their surplus production. Quite simply put, either the rest of the world rises to our level eventually, or we sink to theirs.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, March 2 is an important date in the history of man's quest for freedom from despotism. It is Texas Independence Day.

Texans are doubly blessed with a heritage of freedom. They are doubly blessed with the honor of two great flags, the Lone Star flag of Texas, and the beautiful flag of our country, both of which today fly over the capitol of our State, and each of them exemplifies the glory of the red, the white, and the blue.

Our pride in being Texans detracts not at all from our devotion to the common goal of the joint enterprise of all of the States. The contribution of our State, its people, its resources, and its industry has in no small measure contributed to the greatness, the progress, and the stability of our country. We love our country no less because we love our State so much. We serve our country no less because of our devotion to the welfare of our State.

The development of Texas parallels the development of the United States, and its resources have consistently increased the sum total of our Nation's wealth.

Petroleum is a resource that is rightfully identified with the progress and development of our State and of the Nation. It is a resource upon which the future of our country may well depend. In this day of labels we are reminded that this is the atomic age. I am not at all certain whether this is a promise or a threat. Of this I am sure. In this atomic age, petroleum is the resource of survival, and surviving, we may be able to determine what, if anything, the atomic age brings except the threat of extinction.

I was greatly impressed by a recent article written by the very able Gen. Carl Spaatz, United States Air Force, retired, as it appeared in the February 9 issue of Newsweek. General Spaatz wrote that—

> The atomic age is upon us but oil remains the strategic material that will decide whether we are to have peace of sorts or another world war. At the moment the bulk of the world's oil resources is under our control and helps keep the peace. But if the oil resources of the Middle East, which lie temptingly close to the Russian sphere, were to come under Russian control, the oil balance would shift to the Soviet side and war in our time would become a virtual certainty.

Such a conclusion nominates our domestic crude supplies as our mightiest weapon of war.

Petroleum is the versatile resource that adapts itself alike to construction and destruction. In a complex economic society it would be foolish to single out a resource or an industry as the indispensable one. Realism demands, however, in the face of Russia's attitude that we think in terms of both peace and war. In times of peace, petroleum and natural gas account for more than half of our energy requirements. In war, petroleum accounts for approximately one-half of our overseas shipments.

A recent report published by the Defense Production Administration evaluates its importance in the following language:

> The machines of peace and war run on petroleum. A program to expand American industry substantially and keep it operating at top capacity requires constantly increasing quantities for fuel, for lubricants, and for the many chemicals that are made from petroleum—everything from toluene for TNT to wax for packaging. Greater industrial activity and peak levels of employment demand more and more gasoline for airplanes, automobiles, trucks, tractors, and buses, and more diesel fuel for locomotives.

Oil is a resource so abundant and so common to Americans we are often unable to appreciate either the product or the daring and adventuresome spirit of the indivdiuals and industry that have made it available, abundant, and useful at prices each of us can afford. It is important that we have more knowledge of both the resource and the industry.

I have some knowledge of the history and operation of the petroleum industry but no interest, direct or indirect, that shades an objective presentation to you of information you will want to have.

Like many successful enterprises, this industry is too often subjected to distorted and unreasonable attacks. Too often it is characterized in relation to some of the buffoons who may have been associated with it. Then again, it is attacked simply because it is big and successful. I assume that this will ever be so, for it seems to be part of our nature that we fear failure, but are afraid of success.

The petroleum industry has dared to succeed. It has dared to challenge the stubbornness of nature, to explore the mysteries of the earth, and to conquer the dangers of the unknown. It has dared to be successful in the face of the scornful, the doubters, and the timid. It is a fabulous and fascinating industry, favored by luck, but solidly built upon good business principles, a national con-

sciousness of responsibility, and respect for the laws of nature. It is a business in which failure, though so frequent as to be usual, is forgotten and wiped out by the rewarding benefits of success. It is tough, hard, and competitive.

The petroleum industry is a national industry and production of oil and gas is not limited to a few States. Actually, petroleum is being produced at this time in 27 States. Leasing and geological and geophysical work is currently being conducted in practically every State in the Union. Almost 14 percent or more of the total land area of the United States, more than 275,000,000 acres, is now under lease for oil and gas. In practical terms, such activity translates into millions of dollars, yes, hundreds of millions of dollars, being paid to hundreds of thousands of families and land-owners each year throughout the United States for such leases and royalty payments.

It employs well over a million people throughout the United States, and I think it may be conservatively said that other millions are indirectly employed by it in related industries. This industry has invested billions of dollars, that annually pay millions in dividends to hundreds of thousands of Americans throughout the 48 States. Since the end of World War II the industry has expanded $7 billion in its development program.

This great industry was not and could not have been developed except in the favorable climate of a free government dedicated to the development of free enterprise. Its success has required the understanding of problems peculiar to such an enterprise, as well as tolerance, patience, and encouragement. The history of the oil industry does not reveal it to be either timid or cautious. Its success has required boldness, daring, and even recklessness at times. It has defied predictions of disaster, laughed at prophesies of failure and in the true American spirit of faith in self it has gone and continues to go forward and to pace the greatness, the development, and the productiveness of our Nation. All predictions to the contrary, the oil industry is today on the threshold of new technical and scientific advances and discoveries which will make its past performances appear amateurish. Though grown, it is in many respects in its infancy.

It is unfortunately true that the oil industry has been harassed by ignorance, by jealousies, and by many who just do not believe in free enterprise, particularly where it is applied to the development of natural resources. Too, it has had to face the opposition of those who either did not know or did not wish it to succeed, individuals both in and out of government. Many had no faith in the industry. Some wanted the Government to control it.

As far back as 1866, the United States Revenue Commission, apparently with little faith in the future of the oil industry, predicted that we would be able to develop synthetics to take its place. In the following 82 years there has been produced in this country more than 37 billion barrels of oil.

In 1885, the United States Geological Survey reported to the Nation that there was little or no chance of the production of oil in the State of California. Fortunately, those engaged in the oil industry did not believe this, for since that time more than 8 billion barrels of oil have been produced in the great State of California.

Again, in 1891, the United States Geological Survey reported that there was little or no chance for production in the States of Kansas and Texas. How very wrong they were. More than 14 billion barrels of oil have been produced in these two States, with known reserves of additional billions.

In 1908, still undaunted, officials of the United States Geological Survey estimated that the future maximum supply of oil in the United States was 22½ billion barrels. Again, the oil industry refused to believe this and has since produced more than 35 billion barrels and has within its grasp proved reserves amounting to more than 30 billion barrels.

In 1914, the United States Bureau of Mines decided to enter into the picture of predictions and estimated that the future production of oil was approximately 6 billion barrels. The industry has since produced 6 times that much.

We have increased our production of oil more than four times since 1920, producing each year since that date in excess of our requirements, all of this in the face of a prediction that year by Geological Survey that we had reached the peak of production and that there was a great need for foreign oil and synthetics.

In 1939, an official of the Interior Department spoke up, saying that the United States oil supply would last only 13 years. New oil deposits discovered in the United States since that time far exceed the then known supplies.

In 1947, the State Department decided to have a hand at predictions and the then chief of the petroleum division of that department stated that sufficient oil could not be found in the United States. What happened? Well, in the following year 1948, and in the face of such a prediction, the oil industry discovered its largest volume of oil in the history of the industry, more than twice our annual consumption, or 4⅓ million barrels.

But not to be dismayed, in 1949, the Secretary of Interior predicted that the end of the United States oil supply was almost in sight. The industry's answer to such a prediction was that the United States can now increase its production by more than a million barrels of oil per day.

You can well see from past performances that the oil industry is not a timid one and apparently it either cannot read the press releases or it pays very little attention to predictions of doom and failure from those who know very little about its great potential.

In 1953, Mr. Russell Brown, an industry spokesman, well qualified, I think, to judge the potential of the industry, said in a speech in Houston, Tex.:

> We have within the confines of the United States petroleum supplies equal to our full national requirements for the foreseeable future.

He continued to state:

> Whatever extent to which this country is now or may become dependent on outside sources for petroleum supplies is a matter of Government policy.

In the matter of Government policy, you and I share a great responsibility. We must be responsible for policies and actions which will create the climate, a favorable climate, for the continued expansion, growth, development and operation, not only of this but other great American industries whose continued success is essential to the continued welfare, prosperity and happiness of our Nation.

Fabulous and fantastic as has been the development of the oil industry in the past, requirements of the present and future demand that it outdo its past performances. Circumstances over which the industry has no control demand performance of which it alone can control.

It is conservatively estimated, I think, that the defense program will this year boost our petroleum needs to 8,200,000 barrels a day. This is an increase of 20 percent over the 6,800,000 barrels per day which we used in 1950. Such an increase in production will, of course, require the drilling of a great deal more wells each year than we have ever drilled yearly in our history. Our refineries must be expanded so that additional millions of barrels of crude petroleum may be manufactured into gasoline, fuel oil, and other finished petroleum products.

Such increases will, of necessity, enlarge our transportation and distribution facilities. The Defense Production Administration has urged that the refining capacity be so expanded as to permit by the end of this year a refining capacity of 125,000,000,000 barrels annually. To handle this increase more pipelines, more tankers, more truck transports, more barges and more railroad facilities are required.

The domestic oil industry cannot expand simply because there is a need for its products; there must also be a market for its products. Too, its expansion will be limited to the expansion of other industries upon whom it must depend for materials. Such an expansion will require tremendous sums of money, money that is becoming more and more difficult to entice into the necessary gambles that are a part of the industry. Such an expansion will require more than 7,000,000 tons of steel and more than 7,000,000 pounds of aluminum. It will require 40,000,000 pounds of copper. It will require lumber, electrical supplies, transports, yes, it will require practically a portion of the entire product of America. It must have additional labor, electrical power, and most of all, it will require a favorable attitude on the part of the Government.

Unquestionably, billions of barrels of oil lie beneath the surface of this great country of ours. To be sure, it is an elusive and well-hidden resource, not only exceedingly difficult to locate but also most difficult to capture. I have observed the development of this industry for many years, yet I have never ceased to marvel at the difficulties that must be overcome to put a gallon of gas

into the automobile I drive. You will better understand the challenge if you can know the problem.

Certainly you who have not had the opportunity to familiarize yourselves with the oil industry will be interested to learn something about the cost of finding and producing oil. Today it costs, as an average, $90,000 to drill a well for oil. Many of the deeper wells drilled today in unproven areas may cost over a million dollars. The machinery used to drill a well today, I am informed, costs from two hundred thousand to a million dollars per drilling unit. This, of course, would not be a great deal of money if we knew exactly where to drill each hole. But nature is tricky, particularly when it comes to hiding its resources, and, in spite of technical and scientific advances, 8 out of every 9 wells drilled today are dry holes, nonproductive, and do not return one penny of the tremendous amount of capital involved in such an undertaking. I am speaking now of what is known to the industry as wildcat wells, or wells drilled in areas under which there is no known production. This may also be true of marginal wells. This being the case, it is, of course, not difficult at all to see that if you have average luck it will cost more than a million dollars to find one oil well. I know of several cases where independent operators have drilled as many as 20 or 30 dry holes without finding one that was productive. If you are fortunate enough to be average, however, and to find 1 oil well in 9 after expending a million dollars or more, it may or may not be a good oil well. It may or may not be of sufficient productive capacity to return the money expended. Past experience has proven that the chances are 16 to 1 against discovering a very small field, a field so small that its production will provide the United States with its oil needs for 4 hours or less. And the odds go up, for they are 53 to 1—and these figures are based on experience—the chances are 53 to 1 of finding a small field which could supply our needs for 2½ days or less. It is even more difficult to find a medium-sized oil field the production of which could supply our needs in the United States for a week or less. The chances are 230 to 1 for finding such a field. It is the dream, I am sure, of every man or woman engaged in the oil industry to find or own a part of a large oil field, and they are being found, but the chances are 991 to 1 against such a discovery.

This will give you, dramatically, I think, a better conception, not only of the faith, courage, and daring that it takes to be a part of this industry, but it will also give you an understanding which you and I must have to encourage the continued expansion and development of a product that we must have.

It becomes increasingly difficult in the face of increasing costs, decreasing returns, tremendous odds, and the scarcity of profitable production to keep lending institutions and individual risk capital flowing freely into the industry's hands; but fortunately, the bold, almost foolhardy spirit which has sparked this industry continues to live in the hearts of individuals engaged in it, and any man who underestimates the potential of this group or their capacity for continued development sells America short.

Gen. Ernest Thompson, a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas, the agency which administers the oil and gas laws of my State, is one of the ablest public officials in America and the man, I think, who knows as much if not more about the oil industry than any man in the world, has some things to say about the future of the industry which I know will be helpful to you. General Thompson suggests that we should drill 55,000 new wells each year to meet our requirements. In 1952, there were only 45,840 wells drilled. The general estimates that we will probably drill in excess of 46,000 this year. There are many factors which would account for failure to drill the required number of wells, not the least of which is the lack of drill stem pipe and casing. I spoke just the other day to one of the officials in the department that allocates pipe and tubing. He estimates that it is possible to fill about 80 percent of the requests received. Equipment has been difficult to get, I am told this almost daily by those engaged in the industry. Particularly this is so for the small independent operator. At the present time there are more than 500 drilling rigs idle. While this country is by no means running out of oil, it is quite certain that we cannot afford the idleness of 500 drilling rigs. Particularly is this true when we realize a jet engine uses approximately 3½ times the amount of petroleum products as a propeller-driven aircraft. Yes; and we cannot afford the idleness of 500 drilling rigs in the United States when we realize the covetous attitude of Russia toward oil in the Middle East.

In 1952, this country produced 2½ billion barrels of oil and natural gas liquids and at the same time increased our known oil reserves by approximately 2 billion barrels. This now gives us a reserve in excess of 34 billion barrels. Compare this to the 5 billion barrels in reserve at the end of World War I and it seems to be entirely adequate. However, in the face of estimates that by the end of 1975 we will need between 12 and 14 million barrels a day, twice that we are now producing, it becomes readily apparent that the oil industry still has a great task ahead of it.

There are, says General Thompson, probably more than 75 billion barrels of oil remaining in the ground in old oilfields, waiting to be recaptured by new production methods. Unquestionably, this will be done.

This industry, since 1859, when the discovery well was drilled, has made great progress. The development of this Nation, its roads, its schools, its transportation facilities, its productive capacity, all are monuments to the oil industry that has dared to be great and successful in the face of many obstacles.

The Congress of the United States has reason to be proud that its good judgment, its faith in private ownership and free enterprise have cleared the road for the advancement and success of this industry. This has not at all times been an easy task for the Congress. Proponents of Federal control of resources, opponents of free enterprise and others through just plain ignorance have subjected this body to much criticism. Some have left the impression that those engaged in the oil industry have robbed nature and their fellow citizens of a great resource and have somehow, through wrongful methods, become gaudily rich at the expense of the consumer. The facts, of course, prove this to be untrue. It is true that fortunes have been predicated upon the production of this great resource. Fortunately, that is no crime. Too, fortunes have been lost by many in the business. It is also true that the wealth that has been produced from this resource and the energy that has resulted from its product have benefited more millions, both directly and indirectly, than any other industry.

This industry has consistently been in the forefront in hourly wages paid. This statement may be easily verified by a look at statistics published by the Department of Labor. It has fought to keep its product within the financial means of all the people. Again, you may see by statistics published by the United States Department of Labor that while, on an average, all products have increased in price by 16 percent since the start of the Korean war, crude petroleum has increased only by eight-tenths of 1 percent.

Taxwise, this industry contributes billions yearly as its share of the cost of local, State, and Federal government.

For example, the petroleum tax bill, for 1950 was over $3½ billion. Concern has been expressed as to the capacity of the petroleum industry to keep pace with the requirements of the future, the requirements of our country in this era of half peace and half war. A glimpse at the past clearly indicates the potential of this industry for the future. It can meet the demands. Current requirements of the Department of Defense and the industrial and domestic trade of the United States are being supplied. Simultaneously, our known reserves are increasing. The industry is capable of expanding production, reserves, refining capacity, and transportation facilities. It can do all of these things, our Government willing.

In 1951, the United States Geological Survey reported:

> In the United States adequate production has been a direct function of economic incentive. Until the unpredictable date at which the incentive fails to provide the needed supplies there will be no convincing evidence that we have reached the limits of our ability to expand the potential ultimately recoverable reserves of petroleum.

It cannot meet its requirements and at the same time battle with bureaus and bureaucracy intent upon its control. The future of the oil industry in relation to the welfare of our country depends upon a national policy understood and agreed to by both industry and the Government and faithfully carried out by all concerned.

Much thought has been given to such a policy and in 1949 the National Petroleum Council, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, outlined the aims of such a policy. It stated:

First. It should result in a maximum contribution by the oil industry to an ex-

panding American economy and to a rising standard of living, including stable employment at fair wages within the industry.

Second. It should maintain conditions most likely to assure adequate supplies of petroleum in both peace and war.

Third. It should maintain conditions, within the free-enterprise system, most likely to assure adequate supplies of essential materials equitably available to all units in the industry in both peace and war.

Fourth. It should contribute to the expansion of trade and of industrial activity at home and abroad by encouraging American nationals in the development of both domestic and foreign oil resources.

Fifth. It should operate to strengthen our free institutions by demonstrating that the issues which periodically arise in an industrial democracy, involving the relations of Government and private industry, of State and individual, can be successfully resolved within our existing institutional framework.

To achieve the aims outlined by the NPC, it is of great importance that the Congress of the United States continue its understanding and its support of a tax policy that will encourage exploration and development of the untapped reservoirs of oil remaining within the borders of this country.

The percentage-depletion law, passed by Congress in 1926 and subsequently maintained, has been a major factor in the development of our oil supplies. This wise and understanding and necessary provision of the tax laws must be continued. The odds against profitable production are increasing daily. Wells are being drilled deeper and deeper and the costs are ever mounting. Each year the gamble becomes more pronounced. To encourage capital, badly needed capital, from lending institutions and individual investors, the oil industry must be assured of a tax structure that will permit exploration in unproven areas with the prospect of a profit commensurate with the risks involved.

Such a policy is wise and tenable because it is based upon the Nation's need for petroleum and not the industry's greed for profit.

Since 1932 the Congress has wisely encouraged the development of the domestic petroleum industry by discouraging the importation of foreign oil. Here again the decision was necessarily made and maintained on the basis of the welfare of our country. Excessive imports of petroleum products are a threat to the Nation's reserves and its capacity to produce in times of war. Our position of strength against our present enemies may well be in ratio to our capacity to explore and to produce within our own borders adequate oil and reserves.

The NPC has put it this way:

The Nation's economic welfare and security require a policy on petroleum imports which will encourage exploration and development efforts in the domestic industry and which will make available a maximum supply of domestic oil to meet the needs of this Nation.

The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent factors, provides the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.

The implementation of an import policy, therefore, should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.

Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oil fields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security.

The importation of foreign oil is a positive threat to the domestic industry. It is not difficult to conceive of a proper policy regarding imports. Only greed on the part of elements of the industry, or ignorance on the part of the Government, will keep us from a quick and successful meeting of the import issue.

A recent editorial in the Oil and Gas Journal very ably analyzed the requirements for success:

If defense is our main job and if oil is vital to defense and if a domestic reserve capacity is essential to the program, then all concerned should help achieve this objective.

One simple fact should be obvious: Somebody has to pay a lot of money to build up and carry reserve oil-producing capacity. Producers are willing to finance the program themselves if they can get enough funds from the sale of oil they do produce to carry their investment in unused facilities.

In addition to an adequate price per barrel, producers need assurance of a large enough market to give them the needed income. This means holding imports to some reasonable proportion of the domestic consumption, say about the same ratio as in recent years.

Other essentials of this program are a fair allocation of steel between domestic and foreign producers, assurance that foreign producers will share in the reserve program by keeping production below capacity and freedom from harassment and prosecution for doing what the defense planners ask.

This is a reasonable program and it doesn't require any worldwide cartel or international control machinery. It can be achieved by a clear understanding of objectives and methods, and genuine cooperation among all elements of the oil industry and the Federal Government.

Domestic production and adequate reserves are much more important than profits from foreign oil imports.

In the passage of the Natural Gas Act in 1938, the Congress specifically denied jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission, an agency created by that act, over production and gathering of natural gas.

Here, again, the administrative agencies have attempted to interfere with congressional intent and have in many instances attempted to exercise controls over the production and gathering of natural gas, which has caused great confusion in this important phase of the oil and gas industry.

The petroleum industry is by no means a sacred cow and those who have played a part in its development are by no means exempt or excused, nor should they be, from the due processes of law, nor from accountability. No industry rightfully hopes to escape necessary supervision and regulation. Wisely, the States have been delegated the right and power of such control and supervision. Particularly is this true in the field of conservation. Such a policy has resulted in our ability to produce adequate supplies. The continuance of such a policy is basic to future success.

Regulation by the Federal Government must be kept at a minimum for over-regulation would stifle it. It is an industry that thrives on freedom. It is an industry that nature regulates and one which competition controls. No trust or monopoly threatens the consumer.

This may well be the atomic age, but it is certain that until it has advanced considerably, petroleum is the one great resource upon which we must depend for progress and development in peace, and for survival and victory in war. The welfare of the industry has merged with the welfare of the Nation.

AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have included at the beginning of my remarks House Joint Resolution 25.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

(House Joint Resolution 25 follows:)

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No treaty or executive agreement shall be made respecting the rights of citizens of the United States protected by this Constitution, or abridging or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"SEC. 2. No treaty or executive agreement shall vest in any international organization or in any foreign power any of the legislative, executive, or judicial powers vested by this Constitution in the Congress, the President, and in the courts of the United States, respectively.

"SEC. 3. No treaty or executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States or the Constitution or laws of the several States unless, and then only to the extent that, Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. Executive agreements shall not be made in lieu of treaties.

"Executive agreements shall, if not sooner terminated, expire automatically 1 year after the end of the term of office for which the President making the agreement shall have been elected, but the Congress may, at the request of any President, extend for the duration of the term of such President the life of any such agreement made or extended during the next preceding Presidential term.

"The President shall publish all executive agreements except that those which in his judgment require secrecy shall be submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress in lieu of publication.

"SEC. 5. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission."

I

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the impact of world affairs on the United States and the impact of the United States on world affairs in the present generation, new and intensified interest is evident in the treaty-making powers delineated in the Constitution of the United States. The entry of the United States into the United Nations organization, also focuses the attention of the American people on this problem. In the last 50 years, the force of events has pushed our country into a new and untried and unusual position with respect to our foreign policy. This requires, once again, that the American people look at the situation closely.

To begin with what are the provisions of the Constitution of the United States with respect to treaty making?

Before going further, let me set forth the existing provisions of the United States Constitution, pertaining to the making of treaties.

BASIC TREATY-MAKING PROVISIONS

Article II, section 2, clause 2:

He—

The President—

shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers, and consuls.

Article I, section 10, clause 1:

No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.

SUPREMACY CLAUSE

Article VI, clause 2:

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

IMPLEMENTING POWERS OF CONGRESS

Article I, section 8, clause 18:

The Congress shall have power * * * to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

There are many who contend there is no necessity for an amendment of the nature I propose. Because they say it is beyond the realm of possibility, or even probability, that the Supreme Court would uphold a treaty provision which contravenes a constitutional prohibition. In support of this contention they say that the Supreme Court has stated in *Geofroy* v. *Riggs* ((1890) 133 U. S. 258) and in *Asakura* v. *Seattle* ((1924) 265 U. S. 332) that a treaty cannot do that which the Constitution forbids.

But the issue is not so simple. I too doubt that our Supreme Court would uphold a treaty provision to override a constitutional prohibition. I feel, however, with thousands of other lawyers that while the treaty-making power might be used not to override a constitutional provision, it might be employed to circumscribe a constitutional right without running afoul of a constitutional prohibition.

The Supreme Court has rendered at least three opinions containing far-reaching implications in this respect. They are, first, *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* ((1936) 299 U. S. 315–318), which stated:

It will contribute to the elucidation of the question if we first consider the differences between the powers of the Federal Government in respect of foreign or external affairs and those in respect of domestic or internal affairs. That there are differences between them, and that these differences are fundamental, may not be doubted.

The two classes of powers are different, both in respect of their origin and their nature. The broad statement that the Federal Government can exercise no powers except those specifically enumerated in the Constitution and such implied powers as are necessary and proper to carry into effect the enumerated powers, is categorically true only in respect of our internal affairs. In that field, the primary purpose of the Constitution was to carve from the general mass of legislative powers then possessed by the States such portions as it was thought desirable to vest in the Federal Government, leaving those not included in the enumeration still in the States. *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238, 294). That this doctrine applies only to powers which the States had, is self evident. And since the States severally never possessed international powers, such powers could not have been carved from the mass of State powers but obviously were transmitted to the United States from some other source. During the colonial period, those powers were possessed exclusively by and were entirely under the control of the Crown. By the Declaration of Independence, "the Representatives of the United States of America" declared the United (not the several) Colonies to be free and independent States, and as such to have "full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do."

As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the Colonies acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown not to the Colonies severally, but to the Colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America. Even before the declaration, the Colonies were a unit in foreign affairs, acting through a common agency—namely the Continental Congress, composed of delegates from the 13 Colonies. That agency exercised the powers of war and peace, raised an army, created a navy, and finally adopted the Declaration of Independence. Rulers come and go; governments end and forms of government change; but sovereignty survives. A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect of the Colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union. See *Penhallow* v. *Doane* (3 Dall. 54, 80–81). That fact was given practical application almost at once. The treaty of peace, made on September 23, 1783, was concluded between his Britannic Majesty and the "United States of America." (8 Stat. European Treaties 80.)

The Union existed before the Constitution, which was ordained and established among other things to form "a more perfect Union." Prior to that event, it is clear that the Union, declared by the Articles of Confederation to be "perpetual," was the sole possessor of external sovereignty and in the Union it remained without change save in so far as the Constitution in express terms qualified its exercise. The Framers' Convention was called and exerted its powers upon the irrefutable postulate that though the States were several their people in respect of foreign affairs were one. Compare *The Chinese Exclusion Case* (130 U. S. 581, 604, 606). In that convention, the entire absence of State power to deal with those affairs was thus forcefully stated by Rufus King:

"The States were not 'sovereigns' in the sense contended for by some. They did not possess the peculiar features of sovereignty—they could not make war, nor peace, nor alliances, nor treaties. Considering them as political beings, they were dumb, for they could not speak to any foreign sovereign whatever. They were deaf, for they could not hear any propositions from such sovereigns. They had not even the organs or faculties of defense or offense, for they could not of themselves raise troops, or equip vessels, for war." (5 Elliott's Debates 212.)

It results that the investment of the Federal Government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution. The powers to declare and wage war, to conclude peace, to make treaties, to maintain diplomatic relations with other sovereignties, if they had never been mentioned in the Constitution, would have vested in the Federal Government as necessary concomitants of nationality. Neither the Constitution nor the laws passed in pursuance of it have any force in foreign territory unless in respect of our own citizens (see *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.*, (213 U. S. 347, 356)); and operations of the nation in such territory must be governed by treaties, international understandings and compacts, and the principles of international law. As a member of the family of nations, the right and power of the United States in that field are equal to the right and power of the other members of the international family. Otherwise, the United States is not completely sovereign. The power to acquire territory by discovery and occupation (*Jones* v. *United States* (137 U. S. 202, 212)), the power to expel undesirable aliens (*Fong Yue Ting* v. *United States* (149 U. S. 698, 705 et seq.)), the power to make such international agreements as do not constitute treaties in the constitutional sense (*Altman & Co.* v. *United States* (224 U. S. 583, 600–601)); Crandall, Treaties, Their Making and Enforcement, 2d ed., p. 102 and note 1), none of which is expressly affirmed by the Constitution, nevertheless exist as inherently inseparable from the conception of nationality. This the court recognized, and in each of the cases cited found the warrant for its conclusions not in the provisions of the Constitution, but in the law of nations.

The third case is *United States* v. *Pink* ((1942) 315 U. S. 203, 232–233), which stated:

We recently stated in *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* (312 U. S. 52, 68), that the field which affects international relations is the one aspect of our Government that from the first has been most generally conceded imperatively to demand broad national authority; and that any State power which may exist is restricted to the narrowest of limits. There, we were dealing with the question as to whether a State statute regulating aliens survived a similar Federal statute. We held that it did not. Here, we are dealing with an exclusive

Federal function. If State laws and policies and not yield before the exercise of external powers of the United States, then our foreign policy might be thwarted. These are delicate matters. If State action could defeat or alter our foreign policy, serious consequences might ensue. The Nation as a whole would be held to answer if, a State created difficulties with a foreign power. Compare *Chy Lung* v. *Freeman* (92 U. S. 279–280). Certainly, the conditions for enduring friendship between the nations, which the policy of recognition in this instance was designed to effectuate, are not likely to flourish where, contrary to national policy, a lingering atmosphere of hostility is created by State action.

The next case to which I call your attention is *United States* v. *Belmont* ((1937) 301 U. S. 324, 331), which stated:

Plainly, the external powers of the United States are to be exercised without regard to State laws or policies. The supremacy of a treaty in this respect has been recognized from the beginning. Mr. Madison, in the Virginia convention, said that if a treaty does not supersede existing State laws, as far as they contravene its operation, the treaty would be ineffective. "To counteract it by the supremacy of the State laws would bring on the Union the just charge of national perfidy, and involve us in war." (3 Elliot's Debates 515.) And see *Ware* v. *Hylton* (3 Dall. 199, 236–237). And while this rule in respect of treaties is established by the express language of cl. 2, art. VI, of the Constitution, the same rule would result in the case of all international compacts and agreements from the very fact that complete power over international affairs is in the National Government and is not and cannot be subject to any curtailment or interference on the part of the several States. Compare *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 316), *et seq.* In respect of all international negotiations and compacts, and in respect of our foreign relations generally, State lines disappear. As to such purposes the State of New York does not exist. Within the field of its powers, whatever the United States rightfully undertakes, it necessarily has warrant to consummate. And when judicial authority is invoked in aid of such consummation, State constitutions, State laws, and State policies are irrelevant to the inquiry and decision. It is inconceivable that any of them can be interposed as an obstacle to the effective operation of a Federal constitutional power. Compare *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416); *Asakura* v. *Seattle* (265 U. S. 332, 341).

Charles Evans Hughes, former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in an address before the American Society of International Law on April 26, 1929, has stated:

If we take the Constitution to mean what it says, it gives in terms to the United States the power to make treaties. It is a power that has no explicit limitation attached to it, and so far there has been no disposition to find in anything relating to the external concerns of the Nation a limitation to be implied.

Now there is, however, a new line of activity which has not been very noticeable in this country, but which may be in the future, and this may give rise to new questions as to the extent of the treaty-making power. I have been careful in what I have said to refer to the external concerns of the Nation. I should not care to voice any opinion as to an implied limitation on the treaty-making power. The Supreme Court has expressed a doubt whether there could be any such. That is, the doubt has been expressed in one of its opinions. But if there is a limitation to be implied, I should say it might be found in the nature of the treaty-making power.

What is the power to make a treaty? What is the object of the power? The normal scope of the power can be found in the appropriate object of the power. The power is to deal with foreign nations with regard to matters of international concern. It is not a power intended to be exercised, it may be assumed, with respect to matters that have no relation to international concerns.

So I come back to the suggestion I made at the start, that this is a sovereign nation; from my point of view, the Nation has the power to make any agreement whatever in a constitutional manner that relates to the conduct of our international relations, unless there can be found some express prohibition in the Constitution, and I am not aware of any which would in any way detract from the power as I have defined it in connection with our relations with other governments. But if we attempted to use the treaty-making power to deal with matters which did not pertain to our external relations but to control matters which normally and appropriately were within the local jurisdictions of the State, then I again say there might be ground for implying a limitation upon the treaty-making power that it is intended for the purpose of having treaties made relating to foreign affairs and not to make laws for the people of the United States in their internal concerns through the exercise of the asserted treaty-making power.

II

The treaty-making provisions of our Constitution were written at a time and in a period of human history when international relations were much simpler than they are now. This is particularly true with reference to our new Nation, founded on a new continent, remote from the European world.

At the time of adoption of the Constitution, there were no means of rapid communication by telegraph, telephone, or radio. The journey across the Atlantic was slow and arduous, made by sailing vessel. There was much less reason for close and strict supervision of international affairs than is true today.

Because of the contemporary situation, a question immediately presents itself for discussion. Does the United States, through the United Nations, or some similar organization, or through a world federation, desire to relinquish its sovereignty as a nation—in whole or in part? To some legal scholars, it appears that such relinquishment could take place through the treaty-making powers outlined above, and take place practically without the knowledge or consent of the people of the United States, through the "back door."

Certainly, most Americans will agree if we are to relinquish a portion of our sovereignty, it should be through the franchise of the people as expressed in their elected representatives and not by a subterfuge apparently made possible by the provisions in the Constitution concerning treaty making.

This is not an unfounded fear. The State Department under President Truman's administration has stated in State Department Publication 3972, Foreign Affairs Policy Series 26, released September 1950, that "there is no longer any real distinction between 'domestic' and 'foreign' affairs."

I feel very strongly that our Constitution, adopted by the sovereign people of this great land of ours, has given the United States a government that has guaranteed human liberties and provided economic comforts and blessings found nowhere else in this world, and therefore should not be changed unless absolutely necessary.

In order that our liberties and blessings shall not be eroded away by a creeping tendency toward centralized world government, every American must be alerted to the dangers that lie in the treaty-making power. Our forefathers, fully aware that changes in the economic situations and the political philosophies of the world might require changes in this great document, provided, with foresight and wisdom, a mode of amendment in article V. This mode of change I propose to invoke. While the idea of raising the level of basic freedoms and rights for all peoples is highly commendable and concurred in by me, I do oppose any course of action through the exercise of the treatymaking power which might effectuate a substantial or even insignificant lowering of our liberties and blessings ostensibly in order to raise those of the peoples of the world. Actually, such a lifting of other peoples must come from within their own borders, and not at the expense of deterioration of our freedoms.

The International Covenant on Human Rights, as revised at the seventh session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, April–May 1951, contains many provisions which might affect certain of our basic rights by imposing obligations and restraints upon the relationships existing between our separate States and their citizens.

The medical profession especially may be confronted with its socialization under article 25, which reads:

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest standard of health obtainable. With a view to implementing and safeguarding this right each State party hereto undertakes to provide legislative measures to promote and protect health and, in particular:

(i) to reduce infant mortality and provide for healthy development of the child;

(ii) to improve nutrition, housing, sanitation, recreation, economic and working conditions, and other aspects of environmental hygiene;

(iii) to control epidemic, endemic, and other diseases;

(iv) to provide conditions which would assure the right of all to medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness.

Our country as a whole may be confronted with socialization under articles 19 through 24, which read:

ARTICLE 19

The States parties to the present covenant—

1. Bearing in mind the link between the rights and liberties recognized and defined above, and the economic, social, and cultural rights proclaimed in the universal declaration of human rights;

2. Resolved to combat the scourges, such as famine, disease, poverty, the feeling of insecurity, and ignorance, which take toll of or degrade men, and prevent the free development of their personality;

3. Resolved to strive to insure that every human being shall obtain the food, clothing,

shelter, essential for his livelihood and well-being, and shall achieve an adequate standard of living and a continuous improvement of his living material and spiritual conditions;

4. Undertake to take steps, individually and through international cooperation, to the maximum of their available resources with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in this part of the present covenant.

ARTICLE 20

Work being the basis of all human endeavor, the States parties to the covenant recognize the right to work, that is to say, the fundamental right of everyone to the opportunity, if he so desires, to gain his living by work which he freely accepts.

ARTICLE 21

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to just and favorable conditions of work, including—

(a) Safe and healthy working conditions;

(b) Minimum remuneration which provides all workers:

(i) With fair wages and equal pay for equal work, and

(ii) A decent living for themselves and their families; and

(c) Reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

ARTICLE 22

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security.

ARTICLE 23

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to adequate housing.

ARTICLE 24

The States parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living and the continuous improvement of living conditions.

The States and local subdivisions may find education transferred to the Federal Government under article 28 which reads:

ARTICLE 28

The States parties to the covenant recognize:

1. The right of everyone to education.

2. That education facilities shall be accessible to all in accordance with the principle of nondiscrimination enunciated in paragraph 1 of article 1 of this covenant.

3. That primary education shall be compulsory and available free to all.

4. That secondary education, in its different forms, including technical and professional secondary education shall be generally available and shall be made progressively free.

5. That higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit and shall be made progressively free.

6. That fundamental education for these persons who have not received or completed the whole period of their primary education shall be encouraged as far as possible.

7. That education shall encourage the full development of the human personality, the strengthening of respect for human rights, and fundamental freedoms and the suppression of all incitement to racial and other hatred. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial, ethnic, or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society.

8. The obligations of States to establish a system of free and compulsory primary education shall not be deemed incompatible with the liberty of parents to choose for their children schools other than those established by the State which conform to minimum standards laid down by the State.

9. In the exercise of any functions which the State assumes in the field of education, it shall have respect for the liberty of parents to insure the religious education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

The legal and all other professions may not be aware of the implications of article VIII, paragraph 2 of Senate Executive Report, 82d Congress, the treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States and Israel which states:

2. Nationals of either party shall not be barred from practicing the professions within the territories of the other party merely by reason of their alienage; but they shall be permitted to engage in professional activities therein upon compliance with the requirements regarding qualifications, residence, and competence that are applicable to nationals of such other party.

Let us consider what this provision can do with respect to State requirements for admission to the bar and practice before local courts of the United States. A cursory examination of the publication of the West Publishing Co. entitled "Rules for Admission to the Bar (1951)" indicates that of 53 jurisdictions, 41 States, 2 Territories, 2 possessions, and the District of Columbia have requirements in one form or another relating to citizenship. Only a prolonged study would demonstrate how many more professions could be invaded through the invocation of this provision.

III

Fully recognizing the arguments that these possibilities may never develop, nevertheless, I feel there is an urgent need for a constitutional amendment to clarify the situation. I, therefore, have introduced House Joint Resolution 25 which, I believe, will resolve doubts covering these problems.

It was introduced the first day of the session of this Congress. That amendment makes provisions as follows:

Section 1 reads:

No treaty or Executive agreement shall be made respecting the rights of citizens of the United States protected by this Constitution, or abridging, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Its broad terms, not only prohibit treaties which conflict with constitutional rights, or treaties which conflict with enumerated constitutional rights, but they also prohibit treaties respecting the rights of the citizens protected by the Constitution or treaties which might abridge or prohibit the free exercise of such rights.

The amendment proposed by House Joint Resolution 25 also provides that any treaty which affects the internal economy and workings of the United States, shall not have the effect of superseding the Constitution of the United States and domestic laws, unless and until such a treaty has been implemented by congressional action.

My amendment, however, does not conflict with the well-established doctrine of the exclusiveness of control of foreign relations by the Federal Government as expressed in article IX of the Articles of Confederation: "The United States in Congress assembled, shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of sending and receiving ambassadors—entering into treaties and alliances," nor as expressed in article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, supra.

It merely prevents the exercise of the treatymaking power in such a manner as to abridge or to defeat those rights emanating from the Constitution of the United States that we Americans have considered for more than 165 years to be inherent, natural, and unchangeable.

Section 2 of my resolution reads:

No treaty or executive agreement shall vest in any international organization or in any foreign power any of the legislative, executive, or judicial powers vested by this Constitution in the Congress, the President, and in the courts of the United States, respectively.

It must seem unnecessary to most people to incorporate into the Constitution a provision of this nature. It must seem inconceivable to most people that there is danger of the President negotiating and the Senate ratifying a treaty which would delegate or transfer these powers to an international or foreign power. That the possibility is not too far-fetched is evident from the testimony before our congressional committees on certain proposals pending in the United Nations. For example, Alfred J. Schweppe, of Seattle, chairman of the American Bar Association committee having the Genocide Convention before it for study, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee that—

The ultimate objective of proponents of the Genocide Convention is to submit American citizens to trial by an international court on account of having, for example, inflicted mental harm on a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.

For another example, George A. Finch, of Washington, member of the committee on peace and law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association and editor in chief of the American Journal of International Law, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee in January 1950 on intent to destroy and mental harm as follows:

Can it be successfully denied that segregation laws are susceptible of being denounced as causing mental harm to all members of a group against which such laws discriminate? Minority groups in this country are vigorously seeking to have such discrimination abolished by Federal legislation. Can there be any reasonable doubt that if Congress fails to enact the civil rights laws now being urged upon it and if this convention is ratified as submitted, members of the affected groups will be in a position to seek legal relief on the ground that this so-called Genocide Convention has superseded all obnoxious State legislation?

Section 3 of my resolution reads:

No treaty or executive agreement shall alter or abridge the laws of the United States or the Constitution or laws of the several States unless, and then only to the extent that, Congress shall so provide by act or joint resolution.

I did not include in this section that additional clause, found in many of the proposed constitutional amendments, which places an additional control on congressional implementing legislation by specifically limiting its exercise to the

constitutionally delegated powers of Congress.

Nowhere in the published debates of the Constitutional Convention do I find any proposal that the treatymaking power of the Federal Government shall be held within the delegated powers of Congress in the domestic field, nor do I find in these debates any suggestion that needed implementing legislation to a treaty should be limited to the orbit of specifically delegated powers. I assume, as it is evident from the debates of the Constitutional Convention that our forefathers assumed, that the Federal Government must possess in the international field as great a right to negotiate and carry out international agreements as is possessed by any other members of the family of nations.

This section would not override the rationale of the opinion in *Missouri* v. *Holland* ((1924) 252 U. S. 416), to the effect that the Congress may enact constitutional legislation on the basis of a treaty which would not be possible were it not for the treaty. I feel that to circumscribe the treatymaking power to the extent that it would interfere unnecessarily with the conduct of our foreign affairs is not proper. I believe that it should be possible to supersede State laws or municipal regulation by a treaty if the following actions pertaining to the treaty have been previously taken: First, negotiation by the President; second, ratification by the Senate; and, third, implementation by the Congress. My proposed amendment prevents treaty provisions from being self-executing in the domestic legislative field, that is, becoming effective as internal law contrary to State constitutional provisions and laws. Under my amendment a treaty will be an international agreement only and will not affect domestic internal laws unless and until Congress has passed implementing legislation. This places us in the same position as that now prevailing in most other countries of the world.

My amendment also limits the authority of the Executive with respect to executive agreements. It does not abolish executive agreements but provides that any executive agreement entered into by a President shall expire 1 year after he leaves office, subject to provision that it can be renewed by his successor in office.

Section 4 of my resolution reads:

> Executive agreements shall not be made in lieu of treaties.
>
> Executive agreements shall, if not sooner terminated, expire automatically 1 year after the end of the term of office for which the President making the agreement shall have been elected, but the Congress may, at the request of any President, extend for the duration of the term of such President the life of any such agreement made or extended during the next preceding President's term.
>
> The President shall publish all executive agreements except that those which in his judgment require secrecy shall be submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress in lieu of publication.

The first paragraph of this section is predicated upon the need to arrest the recently developed practice of bypassing the Senate with the substitution of an executive agreement for a treaty. As indicative of this trend I quote the statement of Mr. Vermont Hatch, New York City, member of the committee on peace and law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association, in the hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate on Senate Joint Resolution 130, 82d Congress, 2d session, 1952:

> The extent to which the scale between the executive agreements and treaties has shifted is mighty interesting. Mr. Borchard's article in 54 Yale Law Journal gives you an account year by year, and Mr. McClure in his book does, too. Mr. McClure points out that during the first 50 years of government under the Constitution the President is known to have entered into some 27 international acts without invoking the consent of the Senate, while 60 became law as treaties. In the second half-century there were 238 executive agreements and 215 treaties. Now it has gone the other way, and for the third similar period there were 917 executive agreements and only 524 treaties, so you can see exactly what has happened (p. 59).

Paragraph 2 of this section would limit, by a constitutional restriction, the effective operation of executive agreements by providing for automatic expiration 1 year after the elective term of the President who made the agreement. It serves notice on foreign nations that executive agreements, which in effect are personal undertakings of the President, will not be binding except for 1 year after his term.

Paragraph 3 of this section makes publication of executive agreements mandatory, except those requiring secrecy, in which instances they would be submitted to appropriate committees of the Congress.

IV

Knowing the extent of the treatymaking power and the limitations which may be imposed by treaties on the internal laws of the United States, I feel it is proper at this time to submit my proposed amendment of the Constitution of the United States to the people of this Nation in whom sovereignty exists.

I do feel it very desirable that the questions raised by this amendment, which are the direct result of the current situation, should be carefully thought out and considered by the American people. This is not a passing phase of human history. The whole world is bound together as never before, and our citizens should focus their attention upon the problems raised by the shrinking world. For a good many generations ahead, there is no likely diminution of these problems. We must face this perplexing and difficult issue, and decide as a people what our course will be.

I have every confidence that Americans, if given the facts, will make the correct and righteous decision.

CAPT. HYMAN GEORGE RICKOVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is recognized for 90 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, there is now pending before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate the question of confirmation of appointments for admiral which were made in accordance with the recommendations of recently convened naval selection boards. The recommendations of one of the selection boards is of particular importance. If those recommended for rear admiral by a naval selection board which met on July 8, 1952, are approved, it will mark the end of the distinguished career of a fine naval officer, Capt. Hyman G. Rickover. Under the law, having served for 30 years and having been passed over by two selection boards, Rickover will be compelled to retire on June 30, 1953, at age 52. With his retirement will come the end, too, of a thrilling saga of a man's dedication and devotion to a dream—a dream of controlling the new force which had devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a dream of harnessing the atom for the United States Navy.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HELLER. I am glad to hear that the able and learned gentleman from Illinois is again addressing the House on the Captain Rickover case. May I at this time record my support of the gentleman's position and commend him for the fight he is making for fair play and justice for Captain Rickover. The good people of Illinois can well be proud of the services being rendered the Nation by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. The dream will not have been fulfilled when he retires, but as a result of his doggedness and determination we stand on the threshold of reality. Today we are building two nuclear-powered submarines, a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier and are contemplating a United States Navy completely atom powered within the next 10 or 15 years. It is to be deplored that Captain Rickover must be compelled to leave the Navy before his work is finished. It would have been infinitely better for the Navy, for the Nation, for all concerned, if he could have been promoted to rear admiral so that he could have completed his task before retiring.

In my speech to the Congress on February 12, I stated that I believed a flagrant injustice had been done to a deserving naval officer. I really believe he was wronged, but if that were all that was involved in the Rickover case, I would not again be taking the floor. But in my opinion, the Rickover case involves much more than that. In addition to the possibility of serious error having been committed by passing him over, there is raised also the question whether his retirement will jeopardize prompt completion of the atomic submarine project, and secondly whether the selection board processes of promotion should be reviewed by the Congress to provide greater assurance of fair treatment to officers facing promotion.

Just how vital to the United States is the atomic submarine project? Is it necessary that Captain Rickover stay on or can any replacement for him in accordance with usual Navy routine carry on the work as well as he has done?

Vice Adm. Charles A. Lockwood thinks the project is quite important. In an article written for the Saturday Evening Post for July 22, 1950, which is entitled

"We're Betting Our Shirts on the Atomic Submarine," he said:

Thank God, we do have the answer to the snorkel submarine, the boat which has transformed submersible concepts and designs, and upon which Russia is relying to build the greatest underwater fleet in the world and thus gain control of the seas.

The answer to the Kremlin threat is the atomic-powered submarine presented so dramatically to Congress by Adm. Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, when he sought the necessary appropriation for its construction. The present cost of a standard fleet-type submarine is $10 million. At a cost of $40 million, which will include the building of the initial atomic pile and the actual construction of the vessel, in 3 years the United States—we hope—will be the first nation to possess the atom submarine, and so lay the foundation for a fleet which will outrun, outfight, and outmaneuver the most advanced snorkel types that Russia is building behind the curtain or is likely to build. * * * I repeat that we have the answer to the Russian snorkel in the atom submarine, and that we shall possess a weapon that might well decide the next war. It certainly will decide any naval war. * * *

The measureless power that was unleashed to devastate Hiroshima and Nagasaki will be harnessed for propulsion purposes and will produce the first true submarine—a vessel of high speed, unlimited range, and operational ability, scorning the present snorkel for air intake, and using the more effective weapons constantly being perfected, the deadliest underwater killer ever conceived.

One gathers the impression that Admiral Lockwood is convinced that the atomic-submarine project is entitled to top priority among all the projects in the Navy, and rightly so. It is an undertaking vital to the safety and welfare of our Nation. The admiral continues:

The pity of it is that we didn't start earlier on the project, so that at the present point in history the Russian challenge would be less overpoweringly urgent. The Navy Department and several able scientists, part of our wartime group of naval assistants, had plans for just such a boat back in 1946, but failed to get the green light from the higher echelons. * * *

Although the efforts of the Navy Department to strengthen our national defense by production of this invincible submarine were retarded for years, the Bureau of Ships, the National Research Council, and the Office of Naval Research were not idle. Plans for this newest power plant were developed, and intensive study was initiated in naval, industrial, and university laboratories to solve the difficult engineering problems presented by this radically new prime mover.

Thus, even though we are years late in realizing the original conception, the project has a good technical head start. For this, the Nation should be deeply grateful to the submariners, engineers, and scientists who never lost hope, but stood by their guns.

It is interesting to note that the name of Captain Rickover is not mentioned as having had any part in the conception and development of the atomic submarine. Admiral Lockwood gives credit to Vice Adm. E. L. Cochrane and to Capt. A. G. Mumma as being the initiators of the project, but not to Rickover. One finds a similar omission in reading the article by Adm. Homer N. Wallin entitled "America's New Dreadful Weapon," which appeared in Collier's for December 20, 1952. Admiral Wallin gives no credit to any single individual, although he must have remembered the citation with which Secretary of the Navy Kimball had bestowed a gold star on Captain Rickover in lieu of a second Legion of Merit a few months before the article was published, which read as follows:

Captain Rickover more than any other individual is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear sub program. He has held tenaciously to a single important goal through discouraging frustration and opposition. His efforts have led to the laying of the keel of the world's first nuclear-powered submarine well in advance of his original schedule.

Secretary Kimball added the statement:

Rickover has accomplished the most important piece of development in the history of the Navy.

One wonders whether the apparent oversight of the admirals in their articles was purposeful. In contrast to their viewpoint is the one appearing in the recently published book by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, entitled "The New Force," which the author describes as a history of atoms and people. On page 145 the author says:

At the time that the switch-over occurred in the power program, I was working for the Research and Development Board in the Pentagon and I took pains to explore the military priority for an atomic submarine. I discovered that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had assigned a priority to the nuclear propulsion of undersea craft but upon further inquiry this turned out to be a desirable military objective rather than an urgent military necessity. The Navy Department, at the time, was not sold upon the atomic submarine and its enthusiasm for the project was largely centered upon a single naval officer, Capt. H. G. Rickover. More than any one person, civilian or military, Captain Rickover was responsible for getting the Navy interested in A-power.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman, of course, knows I have served since its creation on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. In June of last summer I had the privilege of being assigned by the late Senator Brien McMahon, chairman of that committee, to represent the Congress at the laying of the keel of the first atomic submarine, at Groton, Conn. I well recall the high tribute paid by the Secretary of the Navy and by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission to the work and the effort on the part of Captain Rickover in connection with this project.

In line with what the gentleman has been stating in his remarks, may I read just one paragraph of the tribute the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Gordon Dean, paid to Captain Rickover at that time:

There are many people who have played a role in the events which have led to this ceremony, but if one were to be singled out for special notice, such an honor should go to Capt. H. G. Rickover, whose talents we share with the Bureau of Ships, and whose energy, drive, and technical competence have played such a large part in making this project possible.

Those words were in line with the statements of other speakers on that occasion. Every one of them paid tribute to Captain Rickover as a man who babied, fostered, and brought this project along.

May I say that our own Committee on Atomic Energy put much of the drive behind the military to go forward with this project. The gentleman has stated that it was a sort of project the military erdorsed, but did not put any expeditious effort behind. Our committee put much of the effort behind that project, and not until Captain Rickover came into the program were we getting the results that we as a committee desired.

I think the gentleman is doing a great service to the country in bringing the Captain Rickover case to the attention of the people of the country.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. May I say that I think the gentleman deserves great credit for the part he has played as a member not only of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy but of the Committee on Armed Services of the House in making sure that the military might of this Nation would be kept in the forefront of the nations of the world, that it would be modern, streamlined, and prepared for any eventuality. The gentleman is to be commended also for having recognized the talents of Captain Rickover and helped in his drive for the atomic submarine.

In the next chapter the author tells the story of Rickover's drive for the atomic submarine as follows:

The foregoing (material) should suffice to indicate some of the aspects of producing atomic power in a nuclear engine and to point out the unique problems associated with the latter. We are by now equipped with sufficient technical facts about atomic engines to proceed to discuss the propulsion unit which the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy Department are collaborating on and which promises to be the world's first mobile atomic powerplant.

In tracing back through the records, I find that the first clear-cut recognition of the possibility of using atomic power in submarines is contained in a report to President Roosevelt. Dated November 1, 1939, this report states: "If the chain reaction could be controlled so as to proceed gradually, it might conceivably be used as a continuous source of power in submarines, thus avoiding the use of large batteries for underwater power." Although this is the first published record I could find, I know from my work with the Navy that the Naval Research Laboratory had become interested in nuclear power in the spring of 1939 and had undertaken preliminary experiments in the field. Thereafter the Navy was almost completely frozen out of the atomic project so that there was nothing done and no interest was manifest in atomic propulsion until the end of the war.

One might have expected that after V-J Day the Navy would have moved into the atomic power field, for it is probably the world's largest consumer of premium fuels. Furthermore, it has constantly searched for new methods of propelling undersea craft, looking for fuels which would not consume precious oxygen. Moreover, the Navy is mindful of the need to do away with the dead weight of fuel storage which is such a limiting factor in marine design. And, of course, it is always on the lookout for new engines to drive ships through the seas at a faster clip. Despite all of these facts, the Navy in 1945 and for at least 3 years to follow seemed blind to the potentialities of atomic power.

There was one man in the Navy who did see the use for A-power. This was a slightly built but hard-bitten officer named Capt. Hyman G. Rickover. Not only did he see his final objective clearly but he proceeded resolutely toward getting A-power for submarines, possessed of all the zeal and energy of a religious convert. I remember first running across Captain Rickover just after the end of the war when he visited our Chicago laboratory. At that time I had not come into contact with many naval officers but I realized immediately that Rickover was something of a phenomenon. He did not hesitate to speak his mind or to criticize anything—the latter characteristic was scarcely one which later endeared him to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Captain Rickover realized that the postwar era found the Navy in a very confused state of mind and that there was no interest in atomic propulsion. So, very adroitly, he did not immediately attempt to sell the big brass on this new venture; rather he gathered around himself a group of young lieutenants and proceeded to make them sweat it out at Oak Ridge, learning all the wrinkles in this new technology. There were two things which he knew were needed to pry open the door for the Navy; one was technical knowledge about atomic energy and the other was personal acquaintance with atomic scientists. It is not fair to say that Rickover and his cohorts infiltrated into the atomic energy project, for this implies both stealth and a kid-glove approach; it is more appropriate to say that the Navy secured a beachhead in the atomic field.

During the establishment of the beachhead the Atomic Energy Commission took over control of all atomic work. The perilously small naval task force clung to its position, anticipating trouble but none developed. With his landing force secure, Captain Rickover launched the second phase of his campaign. He badgered the Navy to enlist the support of the big guns in Washington, these being the admirals on Constitution Avenue. Before the naval position could be enlarged he realized that strong demands had to be made upon the AEC. In other words the Navy had to apply the pressure to the new agency in order to speed up work on naval reactors. About this time I had moved from Chicago to Washington and was working in the Pentagon as scientific adviser to the War Department and in the course of time I met Captain Rickover frequently.

One meeting I shall never forget. I dropped by Rickover's office across the street from the AEC headquarters. Greeting me with a wry smile the Captain shoved a manila folder across his desk at me. I glanced at the title on the cover, "Quarterly Progress Report on Atomic Propulsion," and flipped it open. Inside there was a single blank piece of paper. "We didn't do a damned thing," he said and added some choice comments about the way in which the project was going. The latter didn't surprise me but I was intrigued with the zero-word report which Rickover had prepared for his superior, Vice Admiral Mills, then chief of the Bureau of Ships. This was but one of the ways in which he persuaded Admiral Mills to do something about getting an atomic submarine for the Navy.

There was another meeting that is equally vivid to me. This one was a much larger and more formal affair—the annual meeting of the Symposium on Undersea Warfare, held in the auditorium of the Interior Department. There were hundreds of officers and civilians present and on the stage were Admiral Mills and an AEC commissioner, Admiral Strauss, who was presiding. Reading a prepared speech, Admiral Mills fired broadside after broadside at the Atomic Energy Commission for its failure to develop atomic power, especially for the Navy. At one point in his speech the towering admiral turned to Admiral Strauss and interpolated: "Mind you, the Navy isn't griping, but we do want atomic power." Admiral Strauss must have wandered back to his AEC office in a daze for he had had no advance warning of the attack.

The Navy had used its big guns for the first time and before the reverberations had ceased it was clear that the second phase of Rickover's campaign was accomplished. Any kid gloves which the captain may have possessed were put aside in favor of a bare-knuckles approach to nuclear propulsion. Even those who held no love for Captain Rickover, and these included many officers, had to admit that he had secured his beachhead and had also succeeded in swinging top strategy around to support a major offensive.

Up to the spring of 1948 Captain Rickover had been practically the only driving force for nuclear propulsion. What he had accomplished in 3 years of dogged persistence he had done almost singlehanded. After Admiral Mills' slam-bang speech the situation changed. The Committee on Undersea Warfare gave support to the atomic propulsion program and the Joint Chiefs of Staff officially endorsed the military objective in developing the new type submarine. Real pressure was now brought to bear upon the AEC. Lacking a real program of its own and being unable to cope with the pressure, the atomic agency formulated the reactor program which was described in the previous chapter.

These facts as I have stated them constitute to the best of my knowledge the real history of how the reactor program in the United States was shaped and how the Navy made its entry into the A-power field. Somewhere within the AEC headquarters there is probably an official history of these same developments and they probably disagree sharply with my account. Too often official histories are tidy and logical accounts of events which are neither logical nor complementary. The facts as I have presented them are those of an eyewitness, not an historian.

This is the story as told by an eyewitness, one who should know what happened. When one considers, too, the statement by Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, Director of Reactor Research for the Atomic Energy Commission:

It is an understatement when I say that more than any other single individual in the entire nuclear submarine program, Captain Rickover is responsible for the present rapid development of the project.

When one remembers the words of the late Senator Brien McMahon, who was chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

In all seriousness, I think the whole country as well as the Navy owes a debt to Rickover—I think he is proving that the impossible in the atomic field cannot only be done but done quickly and by economic means.

When one recalls the tribute paid by Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, at the ceremony at which the keel for the first atomic-powered submarine was laid on June 14, 1952, when he said:

There are many men who have played a role in events which have led to this ceremony but if one were to be singled out for special notice, such an honor should go to Capt. H. G. Rickover whose talents we share with the Bureau of Ships and whose energy, drive and technical competence have played such a large part in making this project possible.

When one is reminded of what Secretary Kimball told the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on September 22, 1951, that—

This Westinghouse bunch is a very capable organization with this very intricate manufacturing thing for this titanium they have to make, and they got this machinery in 12 months; and I said how did they get it in; and they said, "Rickover made us get it in."

When one considers all of these encomiums from people who were intimately associated with the A-sub project, one wonders even more at the admirals' oversight in not having given some acknowledgment to Rickover's accomplishments. One wonders, too, about the nine admirals who sat on the selection board which passed over Rickover for the second time. They knew that their action would compel his retirement from the Navy long before his work on the first naval atomic vessel project was completed.

Why was Rickover persona non grata to the admirals, especially since according to the Bureau of Naval Personnel he had not received an unsatisfactory or unfavorable-fitness report?

Perhaps it is because Rickover is an individualist and the Navy has no use for individualists. The Navy demands organizational achievements and not individual achievements. In the course of the design, development and construction of any naval vessel, the project may have as many as a dozen different directors at various officer echelons. In the past, as many as two or three Chiefs of the Bureau of Ships have been connected with one project. The Navy officer-rotational program is such that after about 3 years in a job a man moves on. Another steps in to fill his shoes, inheriting both the strengths and the frailties of his predecessor. Time goes on. Eventually out of the system comes a finished product. The system gets the credit for the achievement—not the people, for none of them have really been around long enough to make a lasting impression on the developments.

Perhaps this is what motivated the selection board's action, for we can only speculate. Although Rickover had been in his particular assignment for an unusually long time, the selection board may have been convinced that the amazing results that were obtained in so short a period of time came out of the system; that there were people who were put in the job and that the system, independent of the man, produced the results. If this were the case, all that could be said was that Rickover was lucky to be assigned to the spot, and that his mere presence in the job was not and is not sufficient reason or justification to make him an admiral.

But actually that is not what occurred. The facts show that the success story of the atomic project is one almost entirely of individual achievement—the vision and devotion of a single man. The glowing tributes which Rickover has received attest this, and if further verification is desired, it can be obtained from the people who know—the people working in the program. I thought I should talk to some of them and I did. I learned a great deal about Captain Rickover—not everything perhaps, but enough to convince me that he is a most unusual person, operating in a most unusual way, who has achieved fabulous results.

I learned that Rickover undertook almost on his own to achieve atomic propulsion for the Navy; that almost on his own he undertook and set out to get the research, the development and manufacturing facilities, the trained personnel, the appropriations, and interest it needed. In order to place himself in a position to carry on operations effectively, he obtained dual responsibilities in both the AEC and the Navy. He could then represent both organizations, eliminating liaison problems and the accompanying red tape. Not only did he obtain this for himself, but for his entire organization. This unique setup, which he personally masterminded and implemented, is an administrative gem which has saved time and money. It was a major instrument in the effectiveness of his future operations.

This done, Rickover's next step involved people. He knew what the Navy sometimes fails to recognize—that all great things come out of people, not systems. There had to be good people, who were well trained; people who could think clearly, have mature judgment, accept responsibility. His own personnel he carefully screened for these characteristics. He personally urged the companies with which he did business to spend more time on personnel; to hire better people; to continually delve down into their organizations to find younger people who could accept more responsibility; to recognize and allow engineers to operate with fuller authority and consequently more effectiveness. Companies with which he does business will readily admit that it was Rickover's urging and persistence that forced them to equip themselves to do a faster, better, more competent job. He sets a tremendous example of hard work himself—12 to 14 hours a day, 6 or 7 days a week. He asks no loyalty to himself. He demands devotion only to the job.

Rickover is a fanatic on training. He was the major influence in getting the Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology set up. He arranged for a course in nuclear engineering to be set up at MIT to train officers. He sent people away to school for special training over the objections of subordinates who were already strained for personnel. These same objectors now admit that without this training people within their organization could not carry on the job today.

The on-the-job training is continual and incessant. Rickover sets extremely high standards and then trains his people to meet them. His training has paid off. Today, due to his efforts, there are now hundreds who have received training in this work. Typical of Rickover's vision and foresight was the early training of the crew for the first submarine. Long before the design of the engine was completed he made arrangements for the Navy to assign a small group of officers and enlisted men to the project to insure that fully qualified people would be available for the ship.

The depth, the entire scope of the program came out of Rickover. As recently as 1947, atomic science and engineering were mysteries to the industry of this country. Such work was carried on in the national laboratories—Argonne, Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and so forth—in an atmosphere designed to match universities. There existed a belief in both the laboratories and industry that these matters were too esoteric for industry, that the problems of secrecy were too complex for the industrial organization, that the profit motive necessary to lure industry was lacking.

But Rickover believed that nuclear power could not be realized without the help of industry; that the newborn discipline of atomic energy could not be engineered by the scientists who had devised it; that it had to be simplified and streamlined to the point that engineers could understand it and make it work.

He had to sell industry on investing their most talented and most promising people in this new and apparently profitless field. He had to sell scientists on turning over the responsibility for their delicately nurtured brain child to the crude, rough hands of industry. These things he believed and these things he accomplished.

It was Rickover who established the design philosophy for the power plant and then initiated the action to see that it was carried out. It was he who decided the plant would not be built as a laboratory model to prove a principle, but built to go into a ship. It would not be spread out as a test facility but would be built as an engine which could go to war—rugged, reliable, and shock proof, designed to go in a submarine and meet submarine requirements. So the program was established to build the land-based engine into a section of a submarine hull. Rickover insisted that the shipboard problems had to be faced in the present, not the future. This was the hard way but the short way. This was the gamble but it paid off. This was all done over the objections of many leading engineers and scientists in the business. They now all admit that the prospects of a nuclear-powered submarine in 1954 would not even be realized if Rickover had not laid out the way.

Not only did Rickover set the scope, but he set the time scale as well. He wanted a submarine in 1954. The engineers and physicists told him it could not be done. He would not listen. They pointed out all the design, development, research, and manufacturing problems. He would not listen. Laboratories, test facilities—all of these were nonexistent. Rickover said he would get these for them and he did. They soon found out that he was not fooling. He was all business. So they proceeded to do the things they said could not be done and they did it within the time scale he set up. His pushing and unreasonableness were soon felt by every welder, laboratory technician, and engineer. This man could be pleased but never satisfied.

Training, scope of program, time scale—these are functions that could come out of any administration. But people in the program say this was only a small part of Rickover's operations. He traveled frequently, often times spending every day in his office and every night in some plant away from Washington. He was not content with reading reports, or receiving glowing accounts of progress from company officials. He went out into the plants, watched equipment on test, picked out design soft spots and continually brought his naval engineering experience to bear on equipment designs. Where he saw danger in depending on one source of supply, he pushed parallel efforts. He was never satisfied with satisfactory performance. He was always seeking excellence. He would personally check to satisfy himself that the equipment could be maintained by sailors and did not require doctors of philosophy to nurse it. The design and performance standards were Rickover's. His influence was felt right down to the drawing boards where people were working on pumps, boilers, control equipment, and other items too numerous to mention.

When the development of industrial zirconium bogged down, he stepped in and personally took charge. He named himself "Mr. Zirconium" and personally directed the whole zirconium program for over a year. As a result of Rickover's pushing and guidance, zirconium has gone through the same evolution in 3 years that aluminum went through in 50 years. His methods have compressed 20 years of engineering into 5.

Rickover has left his imprint on every engineer scientist and technician in the atomic sub program. Every component has felt the weight of his philosophy and experience.

Are his methods the usual Navy way of doing things? Unquestionably not. Does this mean that his methods are inferior to the usual Navy way? Unquestionably not. What it does mean apparently, is that he cannot continue to do what he has done and stay in the good graces of the Navy.

This is the story in part, of Rickover's accomplishments. The job is not complete and will not be finished in June. What will happen to the project when Rickover leaves?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Some days ago I read a press release about the case of Captain Rickover. In that story I believe it gave his age as 52. Are we to understand that when the Selection Board has passed a man over a second time that they will not again consider his case for promotion, and he might just as well resign and for that reason he is resigning?

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. The retirement age is 62, is it?

Mr. YATES. No. Under the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, it is provided that when an officer is in a promotion zone and is passed over by two succeeding Selection Boards for promotion, that is, he is not selected by the Board for promotion and he has a certain number of years of service—in Rickover's case, being a captain, the number is 30 years—having been passed over twice, with the appropriate number of years in service, the officer is compelled to retire when his term of service is up. I consider the practice to be most wasteful of valuable manpower, and I certainly think that the law should be changed. There is another case I remember very well of a

man who was in the Air Force, and who retired at the age of 47. It was Lieutenant General Quesada, who until his retirement, was the head of the bomber command of the Air Force. I do not know whether the laws pertaining to the Air Force are similar to those of the Navy or whether his retirement was mandatory. I do know that in the case of the Navy, Rickover's retirement is mandatory. He can retire and the Navy can call him back, provided he wants to come back. I discuss later in my address, however, that this will not serve to expedite completion of the atomic vessel project.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for the information and commend him on his efforts in behalf of the captain.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on January 15, 1953, Secretary of the Navy Kimball held a press conference at which the following exchange of questions and answers took place:

The PRESS. You feel the Navy has enough men of Rickover's caliber so they can afford to retire them——

Secretary KIMBALL. You never have enough men of enough caliber, but we have got a lot of very capable people in our technical branches. I think the strength of the Navy—really, the great strength of the Navy—is our special-duty officers. We have them to a greater extent than either of the other services.

The PRESS. You have a man that can take over in Rickover's job, then?

Secretary KIMBALL. Yes.

The PRESS. Who is he?

Secretary KIMBALL. I could name you two or three, but I wouldn't care to start a name-calling thing. I am hoping they will keep Captain Rickover on that job because he has done a fine job on it.

The PRESS. You wanted him promoted to admiral; is that it?

Secretary KIMBALL. Surely, but I was not willing to insist that the board do it.

The Secretary said that he could name two or three people who could take Rickover's place, but it is significant that he wound up by saying that he hoped Captain Rickover would be kept on the job because he has done such a fine job.

Nobody knows what will happen when Rickover leaves. There will be a replacement; there always is. But who it will be is unknown at this time. That is why I believe it is so desperately important that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate find out before it acts on confirmation of those recommended for admirals who will be placed in command of the atomic-vessel project. There is no naval officer in the project itself who could replace Rickover. In the normal course of events the Navy will bring an officer in from another activity who knows nothing about the project, because rotation of duty is the Navy way, even among EDO officers, and the project must inevitably suffer.

The Navy will put another captain on the project, although one would think that with the whole fleet moving onto an atom-powered basis in 10 or 15 years, the activity is important enough to be subject to the command of an admiral. The Air Force project which seeks the application of nuclear power to aircraft is under the command of a general.

While it may not "go to hell in a handbasket" as one reporter stated would happen, we cannot overlook the statement of the Atomic Energy Commission which appeared in the Washington Post on February 18, 1953, that—

If Rickover is forced to resign from the Navy on retirement schedules, these things probably will happen: (a) Morale of the AEC Naval Reactors Branch will be affected; (b) some of Rickover's staff will leave; and, (c) there will be a time lag that usually occurs when there is a change in a key post.

The extent to which these factors occur will determine the promptness and success of completion of the A-sub project. These would not have been sources for concern had Rickover been recommended for promotion.

Amazingly enough, the admirals who decided that Rickover should not be promoted to flag rank status, have recognized how important his services are to the atomic submarine project. They are trying to pull him back into the Navy through the back door. On February 13, 1953, an article appeared in the New York Times which stated that the Navy is "both asking and urging" Capt. Hyman G. Rickover to stay on his job of directing the building of the world's first atomic-powered submarine. Rear Admiral Wallin of the Bureau of Ships, who should know more than anyone else of the importance of Rickover's work, is quoted as saying that the Navy was "asking and urging the scientist to stay on the job. If he agrees," the article goes on, "he presumably would go through the formality of retirement and then be recalled to active duty."

Mr. Speaker, if this matter were not so serious, it would be laughable. To my mind this offer is the usual smoke screen laid down by the admirals as they beat a hasty retreat from an obvious and colossal blunder. In one breath they say that Rickover does not merit promotion and we can get along very well without his services. In the next breath, they say that his talents are so vital to the success of the atomic project that we urge him to retire and come back on active duty.

Let us examine that proposition for a moment. Can Rickover do as good a job as a retired naval captain recalled to active duty as he has done up to now? Can he have any influence, let alone personal pride with his superior officers who until recently were his junior in rank? Will he have the same prestige with junior officers in the Navy or with industry when they know that he has been passed over twice? Will the atomic project receive a greater setback by having a passed-over captain at its head or a new commanding officer who is merely a figurehead? Certainly, a captain who has been retired and recalled does not have the same power to influence decisions as one who still retains the possibility of becoming an admiral.

In his press conference of January 15, Secretary Kimball was asked the question:

With your knowledge of the Navy, what is your opinion of how well a twice passed-over captain can operate in the Navy? How much respect and command do you think they can—

At this point Secretary Kimball broke in with his reply:

In the case of Rickover—in the case of any of them that are passed over twice—we know a lot of people in there who have been passed over twice that are extremely capable people, extremely capable people. I know a dozen of them that I am very fond of and have a very high respect for their technical ability and I have tried and gotten many of them placed in industry.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a significant answer. In effect, Secretary Kimball acknowledges that a passed-over captain does not have the prestige necessary to remain on active duty in the Navy for a job such as running the atomic vessel project. The Secretary infers that moving into private industry is much better. So that when the suggestion is made, Mr. Speaker, that Rickover should return to continue to head up the project as a passed-over captain, much as I respect and admire the captain, I would be hesitant to recommend that he do so, not only for his own personal prestige and profit, but for the benefit of the program, as well.

Mr. Speaker, one very important point has been overlooked in this whole case because primary emphasis has been placed on the military uses of atomic power. We must realize that the Navy's atomic program today represents the only real effort in the Nation to engineer practical atomic power systems. It is the only basis there is of the country's infant atomic industry. Rickover's group has actually two power plants completely designed and construction is now well advanced. These plants are of entirely different types, both from a nuclear standpoint and from a power plant standpoint. Another large power plant, this one capable of propelling an aircraft carrier—or of powering a city, if you will—is now being designed. This represents a third and completely different approach to the use of atomic power. Thus, in a few years, while other reactor programs are still in the early stages of development, there will be operating in different parts of the country, three entirely different land based atomic engines. These plants will be run by engineers and not theoretical scientists. Their components have been produced by industrial concerns—not by atomic laboratories. Operations and maintenance procedures will be based on Navy and industrial practice, for these are not mere laboratory rigs. That is why the Atomic Energy Commission is so vitally interested in the Navy's power plants as central station prototypes. That is why when civilian atomic power comes, it will be a by-product of the Navy's work.

Mr. Speaker, on February 12, I stated to the Congress that we are in a new age—an atomic age and that we should establish atomic age standards, by giving recognition for promotions in the Navy to those officers who are scientists as well as those who are fighting men. I suggested then, Mr. Speaker, that an element of common sense and fairness should be brought to engineering duty officer selection processes and I proposed:

First. That the members of engineering duty officer selection boards which are convened to pass upon the promotion or retention of officers in flag rank shall consist of three line officers, three engineering duty officers, and three

civilians who are selected by the President from among the outstanding scientists and engineers in the country.

Second. The chairman of such a board shall be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy designated for the purpose by the Secretary of the Navy.

Third. There shall be a stenographic record made of the entire proceedings of the board, copies of which shall be forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the President of the United States, and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. In the event that there is disagreement by members of the selection board, such disagreement, with reasons therefor, may be noted and attached to the stenographic report by the minority members.

Fourth. The Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, or the President shall have the right to reject the action of the selection board in whole or in part and to reconvene the board. In the event that there shall be disagreement among the members of the selection board, the Secretaries of the Navy or Defense and the President may substitute the name of an officer not selected by the majority, but approved by at least one member of the board. If either of the Secretaries does so, he shall make an appropriate notation on the report, with his reasons, in forwarding the report to the President for final appointment.

Mr. Speaker, I have today filed a bill incorporating those suggestions.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, is limited to the promotion of officers of flag rank. I have not yet given sufficient study to the possibility of its application to officers in lower ranks, although I believe that congressional review of their situation is warranted. I have recently received a letter from a lieutenant commander, who for obvious reasons refused to sign his name, reading as follows:

DEAR SIR: In connection with your investigation of the passover of Captain Rickover I would like to point out this apparent unequal treatment is now the rule well below the rank of captain.

The action of the selection board last October, for instance, in passing over 10 out of 18 eligible AEDO lieutenant commanders for promotion to commander is a case in point. This is much below the ratio of accepted unrestricted officers in the promotion zone. It is a known fact that some of these AEDO officers have excellent records while some of the unrestricted officers recommended for promotion have at least questionable records.

Many of these "engineering duty" officers who answered the Navy's frantic call for scientific and specialized personnel at the close of the last war now find themselves in the position of not being able to advance in the Navy and not being able to get out and return to their civilian jobs since no resignations from the Regular Navy are being accepted. These officers face a possibility of being kept on active duty up to 18 years in the same rank before the law will permit retirement or release. This is certainly a different picture than was painted for them in 1947–48 when they were induced to accept Regular commissions.

It is my belief that any action taken by Congress to force the promotion of qualified captains but which does not also extend down to the lower ranks will only serve to work further hardship on the lower ranks by serving to limit the number of officers who are allowed to become qualified captains even more severely than at present.

The letter graphically shows a discouragement and deterioration of morale among AEDO officers and EDO officers that is most disturbing and disheartening. These branches of the service used to attract the flower of Naval Academy classes. Today those standing highest in their class seek service in other branches, because the opportunities for promotion are so limited. The length of tenure required in each grade and the attrition in the selection process itself bear abnormally hard upon the naval engineering officers. In 1940 Comdr. H. N. Wallin, of the Construction Corps, who incidentally is now Chief of the Bureau of Ships, and an admiral, wrote a paper in opposition to the proposed merger between the personnel of the Construction Corps and the Bureau of Engineering. It appears in the Army and Navy Register for April 27, 1940, and I believe it is worth quoting in full:

Commander Wallin submitted some ideas on technical and personnel assignments. He said:

"In any discussion of personnel legislation it is essential that we do not lose sight of the tremendous importance of the quality of our technical personnel who are charged with the responsibility of designing and producing the best ships and equipment possible. The importance of this follows from the fact that no matter how efficient or spirited our operating personnel may be, when the real test comes, the fate of the battle will usually depend upon the ability of our ships to fight, and to continue in the fighting in spite of severe blows.

"In other words, material is certainly of no less importance than the personnel who man the ships. Deficiencies in material may well prove fatal to the Navy and to the national defense of the country. This is axiomatic; it is a fact generally recognized and accepted, but material is a prosaic, inanimate thing, and there is a natural tendency to take it for granted and to assume that it will always be adequate for the purpose intended. Most persons not engaged in the actual work of ship construction, and even those operating the ships, seldom have an adequate appreciation of the vast amount of technical talent which must constantly be applied to the design and construction of our ships. Thus, if we are to have the best ships, we must have the best technical personnel—men who are educated and trained in their specialty and encouraged to devote their full talents to the task of striking the best balance possible in the conflicting requirements and complexities of war vessels.

"In order to get the best technical personnel for the work, three things are necessary—first, there must be a real desire on the part of the young officers to apply for assignment for post-graduate instruction and training in the specialty; second, the laws which govern the careers of officers in the specialty must be such as to offer an attractive career; and third, administration must give such recognition to the specialty as to offer encouragement and contentment, a feeling of security, such that the officer specialists can devote themselves wholeheartedly and conscientiously to their task. With respect to the first consideration, it is obvious that young officers will not apply for assignment to technical work unless their prospective career as a full-time specialist outweighs the prospects which exist in the line for the better type of officers, on the average say in the upper one-fourth or one-fifth of the Naval Academy classes. Naturally, there is an urge on the part of most officers to stay in the line in order to command ships and to attain the various flag-rank commands afloat and ashore. The best type of officer will not give up his opportunity in the line without the promise of an attractive career as an officer specialist. Unless the career as a specialist appears attractive, it is needless to expect satisfactory recruitment. As a matter of fact, the applications for transfer to the construction corps have recently reached a lower standard than heretofore, no doubt because of the unsatisfactory and unsettled promotion situation with the corps; further, I understand that applications for transfer to the specialty of aeronautical engineering duty only have been considered below the expected standard. The laws which govern a group of officer specialists and the general administration of the group determine, of course, whether the specialty offers an attractive or unattractive career. There is no unanimity of opinion as to just what legislation or administrative action is necessary to guarantee the best results, but it is a strong feeling on the part of many officers of the construction corps, and possibly in other technical branches, that existing conditions are not conducive to technical excellence in these specialties. Many officers in the construction corps do not feel that H. R. 9450 will in the long run improve the present unsatisfactory situation but seem to feel that the best solution might be found in the present corps system by suitable remedial modification in existing law and in administration."

The reasons sustaining Commander Wallin's argument at that time are as valid today as they were then. The EDO and the AEDO, the scientific branches of the Navy, are not nearly as attractive as the line, and will continue to suffer.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is making a very strong speech. It is obvious the gentleman has given a lot of thought and time to the subject he is discussing and I have been listening with a great deal of interest to what he has to say. In reference to the specialty officers, may I say that I agree with what the gentleman has said. I have been discussing the matter with some officers in the service and the feeling generally is that the combat officer gets the break in so many rules and regulations that seem to balance in favor of the combat officer as against the specialty officer. The technical officer has a reason for being there. He is extremely important. I think he should be treated with fairness in the regulations which the Department promulgates. One regulation of which there was considerable complaint is the matter of awarding housing to the technical officer. The feeling is that there is an unfair arrangement there, especially in the Army. I make this observation because I think it fits into what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I pointed out earlier in my address that whereas the AEDO and the EDO branches of the Navy used to attract the best of the Annapolis graduating classes, they are no longer doing this because there is a feeling among the graduates that they can get further in the Navy, they can achieve higher rank, they can achieve better status as line officers.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. A similar situation prevails in reference to the

Military Academy. At one time the high-ranking graduates sought the Engineers. Now there is not that unanimity of opinion that we had at that time. Many of them are seeking other branches of the service.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

While the law itself may be at fault, this is not the entire reason. Certainly those administering the law on naval selection boards have contributed to the difficult situation through unreasonable and unrealistic performance. When the Officer Personnel Act was passed in 1947, recognition was intended to be given to outstanding officers by providing for their accelerated promotion. John L. Sullivan, Acting Secretary of the Navy, wrote a letter on March 18, 1947, to Hon. Walter G. Andrews, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House, in which he stated:

H. R. 2537 combines a number of unique features calculated to allow accelerated promotion in the case of outstanding officers without the necessity of all those who are passed by their juniors being considered as having failed of selection for promotion, as is the case under existing law. This would be accomplished by the establishment of promotion zones, or the block of officers in each grade who if not promoted would be considered as having failed of selection to the next higher grade. As is now provided, an officer would not be involuntarily separated from the active list unless twice failing of selection in succeeding years. No officer would be considered to have failed of selection unless he was in the promotion zone and was not selected for advancement.

Yet, in spite of this provision of the law, which would permit naval selection boards to dip below the promotion zones for up to 5 percent of their selections, an action which would give hope and encouragement to all officers in the eligible area, an action which would make them believe that they would have a chance for advanced promotion, naval selection boards have not done so. In the EDO branch, all promotions since 1947 have been from officers in the promotion zone, none from the zone below. I should qualify that. If any have been taken at all from below the zone they have been from eligibles on the point of entering the promotion zone. There has never been an allocation of the 5 percent across the entire eligible zone as there should be.

This has been the case as well in the selection of officers from the promotion zone. There have not always been across-the-zone selections as there should be. Selection boards have on occasion selected a disproportionate number of officers from a particular class, rather than making their selections from the several classes within the promotion zone. As a result, the inequity continues until the retirement of those selected out of the particular class. This, too, causes an unfortunate result, inasmuch as the retirements all occur at the same time, rather than being graduated over several years and giving the Navy the benefit of a continuity of experience from its older men.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know all the answers, but I do know that it is essential that the Congress face this problem now. Today there is no protection under the law and regulations for officers who are eligible and have not been promoted. Nobody checks the actions of the selection boards. Nobody knows or apparently cares whether the selection boards have acted wisely. The Rickover case is only one example of flagrant errors that must have happened in many other instances, but nobody knows about it or takes the trouble to investigate. Unless remedial steps are taken, the same procedure will continue on and on. Today only the selection boards review all the officers eligible for promotion. Once they make their selections, there is no hope for those who are passed over. They are discarded and nobody knows anything about them. The President and the Armed Services Committee of the Senate review short biographical sketches only of the officers picked for promotion, and no information is made available respecting the men who have been passed over. Therefore there is no way that either the President or the Senate can compare the officers selected with those who have not been chosen. We have no way of knowing whether the selection boards have promoted the most capable men. It is argued that the members of the selection board know these men and are in the best position to judge whether they should be promoted. I do not believe this is enough. There is too much secrecy surrounding the promotion process. There is an appalling lack of information. I think that not only for the benefit of those who make the service their life career, but for the sake of the country as a whole, there must be some check or balance established to verify that the selection boards have done the best job possible. Perhaps this lies with the Secretary, perhaps it lies with the President—but there must be some check established.

In the 76th Congress the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs was holding hearings on S. 4026 dealing with the reorganization of the Navy Department and the transfer of the Construction Corps to the line. On page 86 the following interchange took place:

Senator DAVIS. Is it possible in the Navy for a man that is incompetent to be labeled as a fitted officer?

Admiral NIMITZ. I hope not.

Senator DAVIS. I am not asking you about what you hope, but I am asking you if that is possible to be done. I am asking you if a man who is incompetent and unable to do his work can be labeled as fitted? That is what I want to know. I do not want any hope about it, I want to get an answer of "yes" or "no" to it.

Admiral NIMITZ. As an individual I cannot answer that. Only the nine officers on the selection board can answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. A man may be competent for 20 years and take to drink and the selection board know he has been drinking, but he has had 20 years and instead of kicking him out without any retirement pay at all, the selection board find him fitted. Is that not right?

Admiral NIMITZ. That is possible; yes. I do not know what goes on in the minds of the nine officers who are designated as a board of selection. They have the officer's record and decide whether he is best fitted, fitted, or not fitted. When they say he is fitted, I cannot ask them why they hold him fitted. Their sessions are closed and they are not required to explain their action. Six out of those nine members determine whether he is fitted, best fitted, or whether he is not fitted.

Senator DAVIS. Then the human element can enter into it with these men that are on the board?

Admiral NIMITZ. Of course, the human element enters into everything that men do.

Senator DAVIS. Certainly. I think we should know if a man is competent or if he is fitted, and we ought not to put men that are incompetent on as fitted officers.

Admiral NIMITZ. I agree with you 100 percent. Every officer on these selection boards takes a solemn oath, having in mind the best interests of the service, that he will do his duty on the selection board as prescribed by law, and I have no reason to believe that they have not done their duty.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is any question but that the officers on the selection boards try to do their duty. It is possible, under the system, for service politics to be played and for personal friendships to be favored, but I do not make this charge. I will accept the fact that the officers engaging in the selection process respect the oaths they have taken and conscientiously do their best to pick the top people. But mistakes do happen. The Rickover case is one instance; there may have been many more. In all fairness to the men in the service, in fairness to the Navy, and to the country, the Congress must establish some means of review to assure equality of consideration not only for the officers picked by the selection boards but for the others with whom they competed for promotion as well. We must find some way, too, of giving recognition to the merit of an outstanding individualist in the face of the Navy's demand for conformity and uniformity. We cannot, we must not continue to indulge in the luxury of wasting men whom we cannot replace.

Mr. Speaker, because I consider the Navy's atom project so vital to the defense and welfare of this Nation, because I consider the promotion to rear admiral of Capt. Hyman G. Rickover as being essential to the prompt and successful completion of the program, I hope the Armed Services Committee of the Senate will find some way to achieve that promotion. I know that some will say that he is the casualty of the attrition inherent in the selection-board process. I am not willing to accept that statement.

To my mind the A-sub projects are of such importance that I would want to know that the admirals who passed over Rickover had in mind a specific replacement for him possessing his demonstrated nuclear talents and capabilities. I do not believe that any and all EDO captains can do the job as well. Unless and until it is shown that such a replacement exists, I would consider the action of the selection board as an abuse of discretion and a blunder which should be corrected and not condoned. The judgment of admirals is not infallible merely because they are admirals.

It is most heartening to know that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate proposes to go into the Rickover case, for the confirmation process is not intended to be a mere formality. It is the only check set out in the law for review of appointments by the Executive, the only means we have to correct the infliction of possible wrongs in the promotion procedure. Captain Rickover, other

officers who have been improperly passed over, have no redress against abuse unless the Senate reviews their cases.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate what I have stated before—that if our military establishment is not to stagnate, we must heed the advice of the great scientist, Dr. Vannevar Bush, as stated in his book Modern Arms and Free Men:

We now need an adequate organization within the National Military Establishment for deliberate military planning in all aspects of modern war, not merely the strictly military part of a generation ago. When the President and Congress have set it up and started it in operation, they should review it constantly, they should review its methods and its personnel, and they must review its decisions, for upon them enormous appropriations will depend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks an article appearing in Look magazine for this month entitled "The Strange Case of the Man Behind the Atomic Sub."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

THE STRANGE CASE OF THE MAN BEHIND THE ATOMIC SUB—THE CITATION SAID HE HAD ACCOMPLISHED THE MOST IMPORTANT PIECE OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE NAVY'S HISTORY, BUT THE NAVY DECLINED TO PROMOTE HIM

(By Ronald Schiller)

Sometime soon in a shipyard near Groton, Conn., the first atomic-powered submarine, *Nautilus*, will slide down the ways and open a new era in the world's history.

"This vessel," said President Truman at the laying of her keel last June, "is the forerunner of atomic-powered merchant ships and airplanes, of atomic power plants producing electricity for factories, farms and homes. * * * The day that the propellers of this new submarine first bite into the water * * * will be the most momentous day in * * * atomic science since that first flash * * * in the desert 7 years ago."

Everybody knew that atomic energy would be harnessed by industry some day, but the job was so immensely complex that most scientists put its realization 50 years into the future. The miracle of *Nautilus* is that, from first plans to completion, she will have been built in about 5 years.

Chief credit for this achievement belongs to a silver-haired Navy captain named Hyman George Rickover, who first dreamed it up, then carried it through against heavy odds. Without his leadership, the atom sub would still be a dream. Captain Rickover's reward for this service to the Nation is to have been passed over twice for promotion. This means that he must retire from the Navy next June, with his work half done, at the age of 53.

The atom submarine developed in Rickover's mind after the first atomic bombs fell on Japan. In 1946, the year after the Hiroshima bomb, he got himself assigned to a course of atom study with the Manhattan project at Oak Ridge. Four of the Navy's bright young officers also were assigned to the course. When they had completed their studies, they went on a tour of all the atomic research installations and came back convinced that an atom-powered craft was feasible. They prepared detailed plans for getting the work started and submitted the plans to the Navy. The report was shelved and Rickover's little group was disbanded.

But "Rick" is a battler who doesn't quit when he knows he's right. After months of getting nowhere, Rickover, together with Adm. Earle Mills, then chief of the Bureau of Ships, persuaded Adm. Chester Nimitz, chief of naval operations, to write a letter stating that "the atomic submarine is militarily desirable." It had the effect of an order to get going.

In Washington, this kind of tactics is strongly disapproved. But Rick didn't care. "That letter was my hunting license," he said. "Without it, *Nautilus* would have been just another of the dozens of worthwhile Navy projects that die of old age trying to get through channels."

RICKOVER'S RECORD

Once he had his license, Rickover got the Atomic Energy Commission—the only agency empowered to build atomic reactors, or furnaces—to say that an atomic-powered engine was feasible. Then he got himself assigned to duty with the AEC and that freed him from a lot of interagency red tape and Navy restrictions. His working habits were just as heretical: Rank means nothing in his outfit; ability alone determines where a man fits. And he has protected his officers from being transferred every three years, as is the Navy custom, so that he would not lose their atomic experience.

"It takes 2 years," Rick said, "to break a youngster of the bad habits he has learned elsewhere in the Navy; to teach him to tackle problems directly instead of by the rules, to get him to stick his neck out and accept responsibility. In battle, the habit of obedience is essential, but it won't work in the technical sphere, not in this atomic age."

In vital matters, the captain has gone over the heads of his superiors, after informing them that he intended to do so. With people who obstruct the program either willfully or foolishly, he is merciless. People have learned not to tangle with him. "I'm too obnoxious," he says.

It took 3 years of research and pressure to wear down the last opposition to the atom sub. In 1949 Congress appropriation $40 million and work was started on the ship that nobody could describe and that many people thought could never be built. When the firm which had been asked to build the sub asked what the job would involve, Rickover answered truthfully: "I have no idea." And when a scientist on Rick's staff heard that Rick had set 5 years for the job, he exploded: "The little dope. He'll never live to see this thing finished."

There was no precedent for the job. Not one component could be ordered from a catalog; each one had first to be imagined, then designed, then turned over to a manufacturer, whose reaction usually was that it couldn't be done. The steam plant alone, said one of America's foremost ship designers, "would ordinarily have taken the Navy 5 years to develop." When the Secretary of the Navy asked how so many radically new jobs had been completed in so short a time, Westinghouse executives told him, "Rickover made us do it."

No man in the Navy was better qualified by training, experience and temperament to undertake this job. The son of an immigrant Jewish tailor in Chicago, Rickover was graduated from the Naval Academy in 1922, then went to Columbia for a degree in electrical engineering. He acquired a reputation as a "loner" who could get things done. Ships on which he served in engineering won the red "E" for excellent performance. As head of the Electrical Section of the Bureau of Ships during the war, he earned the Legion of Merit. "The money he saved the Government," said a General Electric vice president, "ran into hundreds of millions."

Rick received another commendation as industrial manager of the Okinawa repair base and a third from the Army for services at Oak Ridge. The job he did as inspector general of the 19th Fleet after the war was so outstanding that its commander recommended him for flag rank. It was a fine record, but it cost him immense loss in personal popularity.

When a mess developed at the Navy's largest supply depot, in Mechanicsburg, Pa., during the war, "Rick" was asked to clean it up. "It was a job," he said, "that could be done only by a S. O. B., so they called me in."

The captain does himself an injustice. When he's not battling, he is a quiet man of considerable charm and humor. Those who work closely with him say he is sensitive and sympathetic.

When the atom-sub project was begun, "Rick's" first problem was to find competent personnel. In 1947, engineers with nuclear experience were scarce. He was successful in obtaining the services of the four young officers who had served with him at Oak Ridge. Among them was Comdr. Louis Roddis, who had stood number one in his class at the Naval Academy and who had made one of the highest records at the school. Rickover charmed the chemists, physicists, metallurgists, engineers, and production men he needed away from industry, college laboratories and other Navy bureaus, largely by firing their imaginations. One engineer quit a $15,000 a job in industry to work with "Rick" for $7,500. Another said recently, "I was warned to stay away from 'Rick.' People told me he'd work me to death. But after I listened to him, I knew it would be one hell of a fast ride to somewhere."

Everybody who gets a job with "Rick" is put through a grilling in which he snarls idiotic questions at them: If you saw a Wave who was sloppily dressed, what would you tell her? How would you pick the most intelligent person in a roomful of people just by looking at them? "Rick" says he doesn't care what the answers are. "I want to find out whether a man can think straight about a problem he has never considered before, because that's what he's going to have to do every day of his life here. And whether he'll stand up to me when he's convinced I'm wrong. Too much depends on his decisions to have it otherwise."

RACING AGAINST TIME

Some people come out of this third degree shaking. But those who survive make a remarkable team of nuclear-power specialists, and their devotion to Rick is almost fanatic. Their great enemy is time. "The more you sweat in peace the less you bleed in war," Rick quotes. He is pretty sure that the Russians are working on atom-propelled ships and that this is a race we can't afford to lose. He has a knack for getting the last ounce out of his men, but he knows that you can't order a scientist to give you the answer to a brand-new problem by a certain date. All you can do is to get him so enthusiastic that he will surpass himself.

But nobody on the staff works harder than its chief. At the end of a normal working day, he often grabs a plane and transfers his operations to a laboratory, plant, or proving ground in some other city. Once he went 16 days without sleeping twice in the same place. He has called conferences at all hours of the night; he has called heads of corporations out of bed at 2 a. m. to find out why a promised delivery had not been made. None of the people who told me about such incidents had any resentment toward Rick. They admire a man who will go to such lengths to get a job done.

"You prove to him," one engineer said, "that a job can't be done, and he practically calls you a liar. He won't listen to reason and he keeps needling you until you walk away from him in a rage. You know the job can't be done, and then you do it anyway just to spite him."

There was a big metals firm that wanted a year to put a processing plant into operation. Rick gave them 10 weeks and made them stick to it. Another firm wanted 14 months to create a vital component for *Nautilus*. Rick called a night meeting of the company's engineers and got them to deliver the part in 10 months.

The thing engineers admire most about Rickover is his ability to save years by telescoping projects. In the normal way, the atom submarine would have started with the building of an atomic reactor, just to see if it would work. Then, when the experts shook the bugs out of the reactor, they'd redesign it to Navy specifications and try it out on a surface vessel. If that worked, they'd compress it and install it in a submarine, which was the ultimate goal. Each step would have taken years.

Rick was having none of that. He insisted that the reactor go directly into the sub. While the primary research was still going on in the laboratories, he had Westinghouse start building the actual engine. Long before the engine was completed, he was building a full-size submarine out near Arco, Idaho. Before the Arco job was finished, the keel for *Nautilus* was being laid at Groton, Conn. Rick had saved 5 to 15 years. "He stuck his neck out a mile," said an executive of one of the companies involved. "It took more ability and sheer courage than I've ever seen in 37 years in industry or the Navy."

And while the reactor for *Nautilus* was being built by Westinghouse, Rickover started construction of a second atomic engine, the submarine intermediate reactor, at General Electric. *Nautilus* will use water to transmit atomic heat to the steam engine; the new one uses liquid metal and operates on an entirely different principle. Last year, while those two projects were going, Rick undertook to build a third reactor for installation in an aircraft carrier and began a fourth, still secret project.

THE DEADLIEST WEAPON

When the first atom sub is in the water, she will be one of the deadliest weapons ever devised. She will travel under water immensely faster than any previous submarine, and will have practically unlimited range. Given enough food and water, she could stay submerged for phenomenally long periods of time, coming up, as the Navy gag runs, "just long enough for the crew to reenlist." She will be able to cross oceans without revealing herself and launch guided missiles with atomic warheads and supersonic speed against targets far inland. She will be able to track down and kill enemy submarines.

This weapon you can call Rickover's contribution. It scarcely occurred to anyone that his achievement would not be recognized. Yet the selection board that met in July 1951 to consider the promotion of captains to rear admirals passed him over. On July 7, 1952, the day before a second selection board met, Secretary of the Navy Dan Kimball took Rickover into his office and gave him a gold star to add to his Legion of Merit, with a citation that read:

"Captain Rickover more than any other individual is responsible for the rapid development of the nuclear ship program. He has held tenaciously to a single important goal despite discouraging frustration and opposition, and has consistently advanced the submarine thermal reactor well beyond all expectations * * * a contribution of inestimable value to the Nation's security. * * * He has accomplished the most important piece of development in the history of the Navy."

At that same time, Gordon Dean, chairman of the AEC, sent the selection board a letter stating that Rickover's "energy, drive, and technical competence" had made the project possible. Dr. Lawrence Hafstad, Rickover's AEC boss and supervisor of all atomic reactor work in the country, sent a similar letter.

PROMOTION REFUSED

The nine admirals of the board rejected Rickover again, but they raised to flag rank 30 other captains whose services, however meritorious, cannot compare with Rick's.

Admirals with whom I discussed this curious business explained that promotion in the Navy is not given as a reward but to the best fitted, and that perhaps the board felt that Rickover's experience was too specialized for flag rank. Which would seem to mean that the captain's chances for promotion would have been better had he spent his time on routine jobs of diverse nature, as is the usual practice, instead of giving himself completely to one matter of immeasurable importance.

"What it adds up to," said one admiral, "is that he just didn't get enough votes in the board." Another officer working for Rickover said, "I've been warned three times by friends in the service that my continued association with Rickover would jeopardize my career."

Gordon Dean, AEC Chairman, said, "I think I know every topflight atomic engineer in the country and I don't know one, Navy or civilian, who could do the job Rickover is doing." Every knowledgeable person to whom I spoke is convinced that the program he started will be slowed down by years if Rickover is compelled to retire now.

He could continue after June 30 on a year-to-year basis, never to be considered for promotion and subject to retirement at any time at the will of the Navy. He would have little authority in naval matters; his position would be practically untenable. It is possible, however, that he still might get his promotion should the President, as Commander in Chief, set aside the Selection Board's action and promote him anyway. Theodore Roosevelt did that for Adm. William Sims.

About the only person concerned who hasn't opened his mouth is Rickover himself. He has just stepped up the tempo of his work to get as much done as possible in the time left. Lots of people have offered him good jobs at more pay than the Navy gives him.

Hyman George Rickover can afford to retire, but can the country afford to lose him?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to append to my remarks the article appearing in the Washington Post of this morning entitled "Senate Checking Failure to Promote Naval Atom-Sub Expert."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

SENATE CHECKING FAILURE TO PROMOTE NAVAL ATOM-SUB EXPERT

(By John G. Norris)

A Senate investigation which could bring about changes in the method of selecting officers for high military rank is scheduled to open this week.

It stems from the controversy over the Navy's failure to promote its top atomic propulsion expert, Capt. Hyman G. Rickover, to the rank of rear admiral. Having been passed over twice by a Navy selection board, the 52-year-old officer must retire this June while the important job on which he has been engaged is as yet incomplete.

Rickover is widely credited with being chiefly responsible for the extraordinary rapid development of the Navy's atomic-powered submarine—a revolutionary craft due for completion next year. His drive, unorthodox methods and disregard for Navy protocol in pushing the development of atomic power for ships are said to have hastened this great step forward in naval shipbuilding by years.

TOES STEPPED ON

Charges have been made in Congress and the press that Rickover stepped on important toes in his drive toward his goal and that he is being shelved for bucking the system and incurring the dislike of tradition-minded superiors.

His congressional champions—notably Representative SIDNEY R. YATES, Democrat, of Illinois, a wartime naval officer—also charge that Rickover's retirement this June will delay the development of the Navy's two atomic submarines and an aircraft carrier. The Atomic Energy Commission, under which Rickover's nuclear propulsion staff has been working, concedes that some of his key civilian scientists will leave and the morale of the unit will be affected if he is forced out.

The Navy has not yet answered its critics. Top admirals are expected to appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee this week for questioning about the charges.

It seems clear, however, that a major issue which the Senators must weigh is one that has come up many times before in American military history—the fate of the man with a cause.

SPECIALIZATION RISKY

Traditionally, young officers have been taught that the way to an admiral's cocked hat is to diversify your career. Don't become a zealot, they are told. Don't overspecialize and get so hepped on putting over something you believe in that your record isn't well rounded. Above all, don't get so intent on putting over your ideas that you go outside of regular channels, over the heads of superiors who can't see the importance of what you're doing.

This advice undoubtedly is sound. Officers who gain a reputation for handling a variety of jobs well seem to go farther than those known largely as expert in one field. That's true even among officers who, like Rickover, are specialists and not required to qualify for command of warships. One of the explanations given in naval circles for his failure to be selected is that he is overspecialized in his field of engineering.

Navy men say diversification rates higher than accomplishment in a specialty—no matter how important—in the Navy, because admiral's billets largely require broad command or administration ability. As for zealots—those who go to extremes to push new ideas—they are bound to get into trouble in the traditionally conservative military forces.

IN GOOD COMPANY

Yet it is just such unconventional champions of change who have brought about major progress in American arms—usually at the expense of their own careers. Rickover, it would appear, is in good company.

One notable example was Alfred T. Mahan, now in naval history. He retired as a captain in 1897 after pushing with little effect the cause of higher education in strategy and tactics for naval officers. It was only after his writings on the place of seapower in world affairs won recognition abroad and President Theodore Roosevelt's backing that the "practical old salts" at the helm of the Navy put his ideas into effect. He was promoted to admiral on the retired list in 1906.

Adm. William S. Sims was another whose efforts to put over necessary changes got him into trouble. His insistence that naval gunnery practices were faulty nearly caused his court-martial as a commander. President Roosevelt backed him against the admirals, however, and the vital reforms were made. Sims was one of the few who got out of line and won out. He retired as a four-star admiral.

The fight for recognition of aviation also brought its martyrs. General Billy Mitchell was the best known, but there were others who battled the conservative powers-that-be and paid for it. Adm. John H. Towers, leader of naval aviation's struggle over the battleship admirals, kept his fight largely "within the family" and eventually reached high rank. But his infighting resulted in his being passed over once for promotion and kept him from his chief ambition—a top sea command in World War II.

There were similar casualties in other battles for change. The long battle for high-pressure steam propulsion and other technical reforms had their unsung martyrs. Capt. E. M. Zacharias crusaded for his ideas in the field of naval intelligence and psychological warfare and was retired. His promotion to rear admiral on the retired list was the result of a general law advancing officers with wartime combat decorations. Some of those who have got out of line fighting the status quo undoubtedly have been wrong and their superiors right. The question of how far opposition can be permitted without becoming insubordination always is a problem.

PRAISE OF RICKOVER

Of Rickover's ability, even brilliance, there seems no question. His feat in getting the atomic sub, *Nautilus*, so far advanced in less time than was considered possible has won the highest praise. The plaudits come from Chairman Gordon Dean and other top officials of the AEC, from industry—which he made step up schedules and cut corners—from some admirals and from Dan A. Kimball, former Secretary of the Navy.

Kimball is on record as saying that Rickover's was "the most important piece of development in the history of the Navy."

From indications, Navy chiefs are not expected to question Rickover's accomplishments and ability. But they are expected to argue that promotion is not so much a reward for past service as an estimate of an officer's qualification for still greater responsibility in higher-ranking posts.

And further, that the 2 boards of 9 rear admirals which considered his advancement had to pass on his record against those of many other engineering specialists with whom he was in competition. The last board considered Rickover and 27 other engineering capains to fill 2 vacancies in flag rank for officers of their category. They picked Capt. Peter Haas, Jr., commander of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, and Capt. Armand M. Morgan, assigned to the Mare Island, Calif., shipyard.

NO REASONS GIVEN

No one has said why the board felt Haas and Morgan were better fitted for promotion than Rickover and others. The proceedings are secret as are the votes taken by the members.

Some members of the Senate committee want to call members of the board and ask their reasons.

They may well inquire as to why Secretary Kimball—who is on record as saying he wanted Rickover promoted—did not do something about it. For there are numerous instances in the past where Navy Secretaries and the White House have brought weight to bear for the promotion of officers.

Navy admirals try to keep the control of promotions within the uniform selection boards as the fairest system.

But the Secretary does direct the Board on what to do—how many officers to pick, how far down the list to go, etc. Secretaries can and have, also directed the Boards to select officers with certain specified qualifications, which in fact means they have to name a particular man.

They also can, and have, reconvened Boards and handed back promotion lists because the Board chose someone the Secretary believed should not have been promoted or failed to pick someone he felt was neglected. Various Presidents also have taken similar action. Both the Navy and Defense Secretaries sign and forward such lists to the President, as a matter of practice, although this is not required by law. When the President approves, the list is supposed to be final. Promotions, of course, are not complete, until confirmed by the Senate.

Secretaries James Forrestal and Francis Matthews insisted on playing such a part in the promotion system. President Truman intervened on one occasion.

Assuming that Congress should conclude an injustice has been done, what happens then?

PRESIDENT COULD ACT

President Eisenhower could simply nominate Rickover for promotion, and if the Senate agreed, he would be a rear admiral. Promotion laws do not provide for this, but there are ample precedents for such action.

Or Navy Secretary Robert Anderson could convene a new selection Board before June 30 and Rickover could be recommended for advancement, either by free choice of the new Board or by virtual directive from the Secretary.

Congress itself, contend service lawyers, cannot promote him by a special act or other action, without violating the President's appointive powers under the Constitution. There are many precedents for legislative promotions on the retired list, but not to active posts.

However, the Senate, should it decide to do so, can exert pressure on the Navy to advance anyone by refusing to confirm others for like rank. The committee already has held up approval of 30 officers selected for flag rank by the Board which passed over Rickover.

Whatever happens, Congress is expected to take a long, new look at the promotion system, to determine, for one thing, if changes are needed to protect outstanding experts in this age of specialization.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE SPIRIT OF TEXAS

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House that today is a day dear to the hearts of all Texans. It is Texas Independence Day. Today commemorates the day when the spirit of Texas prevailed over the conquering hordes of the tyrant and the independence of Texas was proclaimed. All of us here are familiar with the great natural resources of our fine State of Texas—the oil, the cattle, the wheat, the cotton and the timber, but it seems to me that an even greater thing is the spirit of Texas which was kindled at the Alamo and fanned into a roaring flame by Sam Houston at San Jacinto, a spirit that bows to no tyrant, a spirit that holds that every man is entitled to freedom of body and soul. It seems that on this day which commemorates the anniversary of the independence of Texas, all of us here could do well to rededicate ourselves to the spirit of Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IKARD. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I commend the gentleman from Texas on his timely and most pertinent speech. I think it is well that he has come before the Congress on this day to call attention to the great service rendered to the people of Texas by the great patriots who met the foe and repulsed him. I think this day should also bring to our minds most clearly that we in America, and, of course, in Texas too are today beset by a foe far more sinister than Santa Anna, a foe who is working within our country's borders and a foe that is much more difficult to fight. I think as long as the spirit of the patriots who won independence for Texas prevails we need have no fear of communism in this country. I pledge to the country the continued efforts of all Texans fired by the spirit of our great patriots to continue our fight against communism.

Mr. IKARD. I hope the future days, and I know they will, provide for us and our leadership the intellect of an Austin, the courage of a Bowie, and the leadership of a Houston.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HUNTER.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances and to include two articles.

Mr. Bow in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include an editorial appearing in the February 26 edition of the Smith County News.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include an address by Hon. George F. Kennan, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $200.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. BEAMER in two instances and to include extraneous articles.

Mr. D'EWART in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLE of New York in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and to include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETELLA and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include a speech made on February 28 by Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, at Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include an editorial from the Boston Post.

Mr. PATMAN.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in four instances and to include in one an editorial from the Federation News entitled "The La Follette Error."

Mr. BARTLETT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WALTER and to include an editorial appearing in the current issue of the American Legion magazine.

Mrs. SULLIVAN and to include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. BAILEY and to include two letters.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. HELLER) and to include matter relative to his remarks.

Mr. RHODES in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR) and to include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include an editorial from the Denver Post.

Mr. SAYLOR and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include a speech by Mr. George E. Springfellow.

Mr. PATTERSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances.

Mr. EDMONDSON and to include a copy of a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture with attached charts on the subject of importation of meat into the United States.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. YATES) and to include a newspaper article.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 3 weeks, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly at (2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 3, 1953 at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

496. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 96); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

497. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Housing Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 97); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

498. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal National Mortgage Association for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 98); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

499. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting reports of expenditures made in excess of apportionments approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1953 by the Federal Housing Administration, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

500. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to the development of a program for disposal to private industry of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, pursuant to section 9 (a) of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, and Executive Order 9942 of April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

501. A letter from the Secretary, American Academy of Arts and Letters, transmitting a report of its activities during the year ending December 31, 1952; to the Committee on House Administration.

502. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, National Institute of Arts and Letters, transmitting the official report of the National Institute of Arts and Letters for the year 1952; to the Committee on House Administration.

503. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

504. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1951, Publicly Owned"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

505. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

506. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 152. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $350 funeral expenses to Ruth J. Mott, sister of Betty C. Ickes, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 91). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3575. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State Government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3576. A bill to facilitate the adjustment of cotton production and marketing; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3577. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3578. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 3579. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 3580. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that the tax on the transportation of property shall not apply in the case of certain property exported from the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3581. A bill to further the policy enunciated in the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest by providing for a National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 3582. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3583. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 3584. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3585. A bill to provide for the deduction of subscription charges to certain prepayment health service plans for the purposes of the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3586. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3587. A bill to reclassify the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3588. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 3589. A bill to amend section 1701 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of any opera conducted under municipal auspices or by a nonprofit civic or community membership association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3590. A bill to amend section 1701 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the

case of admissions to a planetarium; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3591. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 3592. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3593. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 3594. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3595. A bill relating to the compensation of certain laundry employees at United States naval hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3596. A bill to provide a cost-of-living pay increase for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3597. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the lower Cumberland Dam and Reservoir on the Cumberland River in Kentucky and Tennessee, for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 3598. A bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3599. A bill to repeal certain laws authorizing the Postmaster General, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to revise parcel-post rates, size limits, zones, and other conditions of mailability; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 3600. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit accelerated amortization with respect to certain facilities constructed or acquired in foreign countries which will help make available to foreign investors and labor the economic benefits of American production, distribution, and management techniques; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3601. A bill to increase the amount of disability pension payable to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 3602. A bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3603. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3604. A bill to protect the public health and welfare by restoring authority for factory inspections under the Federal Food, Drug, Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3605. A bill to provide for two additional district judges for the southern district of California and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3606. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3607. A bill to provide for the design, development, and construction of prototype aircraft suitable to the needs of local-service airlines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 3608. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program and increase the amount of earnings permitted thereunder without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 3609. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain land in Acadia National Park to the towns of Dedham and Otis, and to the city of Ellsworth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 3610. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3611. A bill to provide for an additional Assistant Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3612. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3613. A bill authorizing an appropriation to aid the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College in establishing an experimental farm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3614. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Pecatonica flood area, and to appropriate $25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3615. A bill to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to improve the procedure for the selection for promotion of certain naval officers designated for engineering duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall purchase beef and butter on the open market for distribution to needy persons in other countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. Res. 160. Resolution authorizing payment of official telephone service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. Res. 161. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to favor passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES: Memorial of the House of Representatives, State of Washington, resolving that the lake being formed by the impounding of waters behind McNary Dam on the Columbia River, be given the name "Lake Wallula" to commemorate this historic place which will be inundated; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois requesting that the Congress of the United States enact legislation at the earliest possible date which would confirm and recognize in the State of Illinois and its political subdivisions, its and their ownership and full rights in all lands beneath navigable waters within its boundaries, subject only to necessary Federal regulations in connection with international relationships, navigation, and defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature relating to national cemeteries, and requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature requesting the formulation of a plan for cooperation in the development of ground water supplies on Indian reservations in central and southern Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature relating to Indians and requesting the elimination of existing Federal laws which discriminate against Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to Indians and requesting the elimination of existing Federal laws which discriminate against Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to a request to deed the title to all of the area of Fort Logan except that area now used as a national cemetery, to the State of Colorado together with all appurtenances thereto; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the approval of legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting that there be given serious consideration to the question of eliminating the Federal gasoline tax and leaving that area of taxation entirely to the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President

and the Congress of the United States relative to urging passage of legislation protecting the consumers of fresh vegetables as to the grades and origin, and that a fine be imposed upon any wholesale or retail dealer repacking under inferior grades or failing to properly advertise the origin of fresh vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the increase of appropriations for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States and the allocation of funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry in the State of South Dakota in order to more adequately prosecute cooperative programs on livestock disease control and eradication; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the repeal of section 1154 of title 18, United States Code Annotated, known as the Indian liquor law and all laws and parts of laws in respect thereto which would treat an Indian differently than any other citizen of the State of South Dakota and in the United States of America; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the appropriation of funds in lieu of taxes not received from nontaxable Indian land to the State of South Dakota for the benefit of the counties therein and to direct that such funds be used for welfare, law enforcement, road construction and maintenance, health, and education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the water being impounded behind McNary Dam on the Columbia River, and recommending that it be named "Lake Wallula"; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to transmitting a copy of house memorial No. 5 concerning appointment to the office of Governor of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3616. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta Di Donato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3617. A bill for the relief of Joseph Miele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3618. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the board of foreign missions of the Pentecostal Holiness Church for a mission site and other public purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of Rufin Manikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of Georgia Christos Demareios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 3621. A bill for the relief of M. G. Huff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 3622. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Hadrosek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Willard Chester Cauley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (by request):

H. R. 3624. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Leaming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 3625. A bill for the relief of Luigi Rosella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3626. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3627. A bill for the relief of Biaggio D'Alessandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3628. A bill for the relief of Michael El Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3629. A bill for the relief of Eleanor Bertoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 3630. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Illine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3631. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Sonya Goldschmidt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 3632. A bill for the relief of Milan P. Vojvodic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

74. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of Columbia-Northumberland County convention in annual session at Berwick, Pa., February 23, 1953, in opposition to (1) any change in the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which would weaken our economy and Nation; (2) every proposition providing Federal aid to education where Federal control is involved; and (3) urging that the Voice of America be continued under the supervision of the State Department and its controlling committee be appointed and investigated properly prior to appointment, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. A. Ray Cartlidge, D. D., pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Champaign, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-present Father, as we start this session of duties and opportunities we know our need of strength in body, mind, and spirit. Alone we are not enough. All that we have comes from Thee and all that we shall become and do is governed by Thy grace. Send Thy spirit into us.

May Thy patience shown to mankind through the ages inspire us to a deeper patience toward the thoughtless, the ignorant, and the petty that press upon us.

May wisdom from Thee enable us to sift the truth from falsehood, justice from partisanship, and greatness from smallness; and thus enlightened may we have courage to do the better thing.

Grant unto us each an inner core of faith and trust that after we have done the best we know with these hours we may leave the rest with Thee in peace of heart and mind. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to act as Speaker pro tempore on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

OFFICER PERSONNEL IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the action of the House last Wednesday in passing H. R. 2332, as temporary legislation relating to officer personnel in the Armed Forces, I rise to advise the House that next Thursday the Armed Forces Subcommittee on Personnel, of which I am privileged to be chairman, will begin hearings on this subject.

We intend to make a thorough study of the entire promotion program. We have already asked the respective services to furnish our committee with certain basic information. In order that the House may be advised as to our approach to this problem, that you may have assurances of thoroughness with which we will study this whole matter of promotion of officers, I am including as part of my remarks a statement I released to the press setting forth in detail the type of information we have requested and will review.

Inasmuch as much of the information we will study is of a classified nature, our committee will hold all hearings in executive session until further notice. It is my best estimate that it will take approximately 4 weeks of hearings and concentrated work on the part of the committee to make this study. We will be thorough and wholly objective.

Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, Illinois, chairman of the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee that will investigate the entire promotion program for officers of the Armed Forces, announced today that hearings will begin on Thursday, March 5, 1953.

Mr. ARENDS said that due to the classified nature of much of the information to be submitted to the subcommittee all hearings would be in executive session until further notice.

Representative ARENDS stated that he had asked each service to submit full justification for each job now occupied by a flag or general officer in each of the Armed Forces. He said the services have also been asked to submit the names of all flag and general officers, their ages, rank, permanent grades, and their present temporary grades.

Mr. ARENDS said: "The services will also be asked to submit information concerning the billet justification for all colonels now serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, together with a comparison of the permanent grades of these officers and the temporary grades in which they are now serving."

Other information which will be sought by the subcommittee involves the total number of officers now serving on active duty in each grade, compared with the total number of officers each service feels necessary to man properly the Armed Forces.

Mr. ARENDS revealed the nature of the legislation his subcommittee would possibly consider by explaining that each service has been asked to submit a suggested percentage distribution of officers based on the total number of officers on active duty, graduated downward as the total number of officers on active duty increases. He said that this information would be studied by the subcommittee to determine whether it is possible to place percentage limitations on temporary promotions during periods of emergency such as now exist when the enlisted and officer strengths far exceed the authorized regular strengths.

THREE-CENT BUS FARE FOR SCHOOL CHILDREN

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of the House Committee on the District of Columbia is to pass on legislation for the District.

As chairman of the committee, I was asked to introduce legislation repealing the Capital Transit Co.'s 3-cent fare for school children.

It was explained to me at the time that legislation of this kind was pending in another legislative body, which also deals with District of Columbia legislation.

The 3-cent school children's fare was established by Public Law 733, 71st Congress, February 25, 1931; therefore it takes legislation to repeal it.

I am informed there are 9,000,000 3-cent school fares annually. If this amount were doubled to 6 cents it would mean $270,000 additional revenue annually for the Capital Transit Co. The 1952 earnings failed to meet dividends by $297,000. Rather significant but true.

From the way the Capital Transit Co. is obtaining rate increases and declaring dividends with wartime profits, they apparently now see another opportunity to grab from school children. Three cents today is a cheap price for anything. Regardless, this company under present management is not going to get any help from me and I hope from the District of Columbia Committee in taking one cent from school children under such circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to publicly state that I will not introduce such legislation in this body. If such is introduced, I will oppose it in the subcommittee. I will oppose it in the full committee and on the House floor if it gets that far, which I doubt.

Such is my position on this request and proposal as long as the present ownership of Capital Transit is maintained.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat that I feel the District of Columbia Committee is one of legislation.

I think it past time that someone in proper authority let the Capital Transit Co. know that the District of Columbia, the Congress, and the country are not going to be pushed around any longer by them.

As chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, I can make a start by opposing the legislation just mentioned.

Furthermore, I believe it should be publicly called to attention.

The present ownership may be within the law in buying control of the Capital Transit Co. at $20 per share, only to receive it back in dividends in 4 years.

The North American Co. may have been within their rights, when upon being ordered by the Security and Exchange Commission to divest themselves of their Capital Transit stock, including the several million dollars cash "sleeper" they did so. Then the wolf gang cashed in on it.

The stockholders of the North American Co. could well wonder why they did not participate in dividends rather than their management let the Wolfson group grab the "sleeper." This would be interesting to know from many angles.

If all of this is within the law, then the law should be amended before it is too late. Government workers, Washington business concerns, professions, banks, and the Congress have a vital interest in public transportation in the Nation's Capital.

If new legislation stopping this so-called legalized dissipation of the Capital's transportation system is what will stop it, then I am willing to introduce it. The District of Columbia Committee will seek legal advice of the Corporation Counsel on it. If punitive legislation is needed—and I am willing to call it that in the public interest—I hope the Corporation Counsel, the new Chairman of the Utilities Commission, and the District Commissioners will soon come up with it either to the District of Columbia or the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

They might just as well come now because the battle is on. If the present method of milking the surplus of the Capital Transit Co. and the public is not stopped in the not too distant future, they will, in my opinion, appear, asking for help sooner or later, regardless.

Last year, a distinguished Illinois citizen came up with this old English statement which seems to apply to the Capital Transit Co.:

> The law locks up both man and woman, who steals the goose from the common; but lets the greater felon loose who steals the common from the goose.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone over my remarks with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], who is chairman of the District Subcommittee on Public Utilities, Insurance, and Banking. He has approved what I have said. The press has taken a public interest in the matter. I am trying to make a feeble contribution. I believe if something is not done, and soon, the District and the Congress are going to have something on their hands that will cost them millions.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, approximately what the difference is between the two Houses?

Mr. TABER. It runs to probably $25 million or $30 million.

Mr. CANNON. Is that an increase or decrease with relation to the House figures?

Mr. TABER. Oh, the usual.

Mr. CANNON. Is there a proposal on the part of the other body to decrease any item in the House bill?

Mr. TABER. There was one, an item for the transfer of $1 million out of funds of the so-called Voice of America item.

Mr. CANNON. The proposition of the gentleman is to insist on all other House figures?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, CLEVENGER, BUSBEY, CANNON, ROONEY, and FOGARTY.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the other special orders.

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be

discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3350) for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry, and the bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan, and that these bills be rereferred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I also ask that I may have inserted as part of my remarks a letter from General Gray explaining that the $600,000 was not taken from any hospital beds, but from a fund that the budget had impounded; so it did not mean the taking away of any hospital beds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ALAN PHILLIPS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege and with great pride that I watched Alan Phillips, of Lincoln, Mass., a young constituent of mine, receive the award of a Westinghouse scholarship of $2,800 that will enable him to continue his work in science.

The boy is 15 years old and graduates from high school in June of this year. They told me last night that he has the brain of a very much older individual. Two of the scientists there told me they thought that in later years he would have the finest scientific mind in the country. You can imagine how proud we in the commonwealth of Massachusetts are of that boy. The following is the release given to the press regarding the awards given last evening at the dinner given by the Westinghouse Electric Corp. at the Statler Hotel to the winners in Science Talent Search:

MASSACHUSETTS AND BROOKLYN BOYS WIN TOP HONORS IN SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 2.—A 15-year-old Massachusetts boy and a Brooklyn, N. Y., boy of 16, took top honors here tonight as the most promising of America's young scientists.

E. Alan Phillips, of Mount Tabor Road, Lincoln, Mass. (near Boston), won first award, the $2,800 Westinghouse grand science scholarship, at the awards banquet which concluded the 12th Science Talent Search. Young Phillips is the youngest finalist ever to win the grand science scholarship. The banquet was held in the Presidential ballroom at the Hotel Statler.

Paul H. Monsky, of 925 Prospect Place, Brooklyn, placed second, and won a $2,000 science scholarship.

Alan Phillips will graduate in June from Weston High School, Weston, Mass., then hopes to prepare for a career in mathematics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Paul Monsky, who aspires to be a mathematical physicist, graduated from Brooklyn Technical High School in January this year, ranking first in his class of 468 students. He hopes to enroll at Harvard University or Swarthmore.

AWARD $11,000 IN WESTINGHOUSE SCIENCE SCHOLARSHIPS

A total of $11,000 in Westinghouse science scholarships was awarded at the banquet to the 9 girls and 31 boys from 19 States who were finalists in the competition, attending the 5-day Science Talent Institute. Noted adult scientists, educators, and Government officials saw the scholarships presented by Dr. Harlow Shapley, chairman of the four-man board of judges.

Eight of the 40 young scientists were awarded $400 scholarships. They are:

Virgil E. Barnes, Jr., 17, 207 East 33d Street, Austin, Tex., graduating senior at Austin High School.

Alan T. Moffet, 16, of 1325 8th Street, SW., Rochester, Minn., Rochester Senior High School.

David B. Mumford, 15, of Summerland Key, Fla., a senior at Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H.

Arthur E. Pearlmutter, 16, of 66-09 110th Street, Forest Hills, N. Y., Forest Hills High School.

Joanna R. Russ, 16, of 620 Thwaites Place, New York City, Taft High School.

Martin C. Tangora, 16, of 2047 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill., Evanston High School.

John S. Willis, 18, of 1302 East Villa Street, Pasadena, Calif., Pasadena City College High School.

Jack A. Wolfe, 16, of 4530 Southeast Clinton Street, Portland, Oreg., Franklin High School.

THIRTY OTHERS WIN SCHOLARSHIPS

Thirty of the finalists were awarded $100 Westinghouse science scholarships. Listed by States, they are:

Arizona: Karen M. Spangehl, 16, 2829 North 29th Street, Phoenix, North Phoenix High School.

California: Paul R. Brayton, Jr., 17, 5647 Repetto Street, Los Angeles, Garfield High School; Dennis R. Clark, 18, 1912 Thayer Avenue, Los Angeles, University High School.

Georgia: Nancy Eleanor Wright, 17, 256 Altoona Place, SW., Atlanta, Joseph E. Brown High School; Edward F. Menhinick, 17, Womack Road, Dunwoody, Chamblee High School, Chamblee.

Illinois: John C. Reynolds, 17, 640 Forest Avenue, Glen Ellyn, Glenbard Township High School.

Indiana: Barbara E. G. Hopf, 16, 512 South Swain Street, Bloomington, University High School; David R. Swarner, 15, box 472, route 5, Valparaiso, Valparaiso High School.

Missouri: James D. Larson, 18, 10011 East 35th Terrace, Kansas City, William Christman High School, Independence.

New Jersey: David F. Isles, 17, 10 Arlington Road, Cranford, Cranford High School; David E. Sosin, 17, 12 North 8th Avenue, Highland Park, Highland Park High School.

New York: Merle R. Forman, 16, 10 Argyle Road, Brooklyn, Erasmus Hall High School; Charles G. Gross, 17, 326 East 4th Street, Brooklyn, Erasmus Hall High School; Howard Resnikoff, 15, 3126 Coney Island Avenue, Brooklyn, Abraham Lincoln High School; Robert L. Rubinstein, 15, 1514 West 11th Street, Brooklyn, Lafayette High School; Robert A. Shore, 16, 2624 Avenue L, Brooklyn, Midwood High School; Norman Strax, 17, 10 Somerset Drive, Great Neck, Great Neck High School; Dominick J. Pirone, 16, 108 North Columbus Avenue, Mount Vernon, Archbishop Stepinac High School, White Plains; Emma M. Duchane, 16, 437 East 85th Street, New York City, Hunter College High School; Etsuyo Itokawa, 17, 219 East 40th Street, New York City, Hunter College High School; Harry J. Cassidy, Jr., 18, 148 Steuben Street, Painted Post, Painted Post High School; Kenneth J. Harte, 17, 45 Lawrence Road, Scarsdale, Scarsdale High School; Jonathan D. Lubin, 16, 2 Shirley Avenue, Staten Island, Tottenville High School, Tottenville.

Ohio: Mary E. Kirtley, 17, 602 Crescent Road, Mansfield, Mansfield Senior High School.

Oklahoma: Richard N. Claytor, 18, 1818 West Cameron Street, Tulsa, Central High School.

Pennsylvania: Laurence Schmoyer, 17, 724 North 19th Street, Allentown, Allentown High School; Thayer C. French, 18, 804 Ohio River Boulevard, Sewickley, the Hotchkiss School, Lakeville, Conn.

South Dakota: John M. Winter, Jr., 17, 205 South Pine Street, Vermillion, Vermillion High School.

Virginia: Merle A. Mitchell, 15, 7849 Ogden Street, Norfolk, Booker T. Washington High School.

Wisconsin: Michael P. Grant, 16, 189 Lake Drive, Oshkosh, Oshkosh High School.

WINNING PROJECTS CONCERNED MATHEMATICS, LIGHT BEAMS

Young Phillips' winning science project concerned mathematical calculations normally considered far beyond high school students. It was titled "The Compression of Liquids and Gases Under Gravitational and Centrifugal Forces." His report considers various problems concerning the subject, and includes an estimate of how far the ocean's surface has been lowered by compression. Basically, he reported, his problem was: "If the world were made of water, would it stay together?"

Alan comes by his interest in mathematics naturally, being the son of Dr. H. B. Phillips, retired professor of mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Ranking first in his class at Weston High, Alan is a member of the staff on his school publication, and he also belongs to mathematics and photography groups there. His hobbies include radio and astronomy. He won a gold medal for the highest score in a State mathematics examination conducted by Tufts College. He is a former Boy Scout.

Paul Monsky was curious as to what happens to a beam of light when it passes through a medium consisting of dissimilar elements or ingredients, and he based his science project on such a study. Son of Mr. and Mrs. Morris Monsky, he pursues a number of hobbies including mathematics, chess, handball, and the deciphering of secret cryptograms, codes, and ciphers.

Paul served on the editorial staff of his school publication, held membership in mathematics, science, astronomical, physics, and glee clubs, and was a member of Brooklyn Technical High's mathematics, chess, and physics teams. He has won seven first prizes in mathematics contests, one in a chess competition, one in a physics contest, and one in a history competition.

URGES SKILLFUL USE OF MANPOWER

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, in the principal address at the banquet, warned that there are not enough "intellectually able, physically competent individuals of proper age" to provide the men and women needed to fill this Nation's military, civilian, and foreign aid requirements.

While he urged the use of scientific methods in solving the manpower shortage, Dr. Carmichael insisted that "American citizens shall be treated as free and essentially sacred human individuals and not as pawns in a totalitarian game.

"Never in peacetime, and only to the least possible degree in wartime, must America consider the ordering about of our fellow citizens in an effort to bring about optimal labor utilization.

"Proper manpower utilization alone will allow our Nation to maintain its strength," Dr. Carmichael said. "By such utilization we can become more individually productive and

also have to the greatest degree possible the personal satisfactions that come from performing well the tasks in society which we have selected and for which we are well fitted."

The 40 teen-age scientists who competed here in the finals of the Science Talent Search were chosen from entrants in all 48 States. Selections were based on the students' showing in a tough science aptitude test, their teachers' reports, their grades and their own science projects. About 15,000 top-ranking high-school seniors requested copies of entry materials and entered one or more phases of the competition, and 2,264 of them submitted complete entries.

The scholarships presented tonight may be used at any accredited college, university or technical school. In addition to Dr. Shapley, who announced names of the award winners, judges include two consulting psychologists—Dr. Harold A. Edgerton, vice president of Richardson, Bellows, Henry & Co., New York, and Dr. Steuart H. Britt, vice president and research director of Needham, Louis & Brorby, Inc., Chicago advertising agency—and Dr. Rex A. Buxton, Washington psychiatrist.

The search is conducted by Science Clubs of America through Science Service. The scholarships are awarded by the Westinghouse Educational Foundation, which is supported by the Westinghouse Electric Corp.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 35 minutes on Thursday, March 12, 1953, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

INDIANS AT FORT TOTTEN, N. DAK., NEED THEIR RESERVATION HOSPITAL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there are over 1,300 Indians on the Fort Totten Indian Reservation in North Dakota. The reservation originally comprised a tract of land of 220,834 acres, half of which was good, productive farm land. In 1892 this reservation, against the objection of the more progressive Indians, was opened to white settlement.

The lands were sold to white settlers, and of course the prospective owner examined the land before he accepted it. Naturally, the best farming lands were taken, and out of this reservation of 220,834 acres there remains only 54,026, and only 20 percent of this is fit for farming purposes. The hills covered with scrub oak were left, which are fit for neither farming nor grazing.

The Indians are now in worse social condition than ever before, and only about 2 percent are self-supporting. Many of the remaining Indians are old and health-broken because of malnutrition, and they need care and attention. Now, at a time when they need hospital help, the Commissioner proposes to close the hospital and send the Indians to white hospitals in a country where there are none. Devils Lake is the largest city, with a population of about 7,000, and has two hospitals which are understaffed and barely able to take care of white people.

The Commissioner of Indian Affairs says he has a contract with hospitals to take care of these Indians, and the program to be followed is as follows:

If an Indian is sick or meets with an accident, he must first go to the Agency doctor and get a certificate directing him to a white hospital. It is several miles from Devils Lake, and in the winter months, because of drifted snow, a sick Indian is compelled to rumble along in some conveyance a distance of 13 to 30 miles. When he gets to the already crowded hospital he is more often turned away than received. In one case which was presented to the Indian Commissioner on Wednesday a sick Indian child went to the Devils Lake Hospital, having a fever of alarming temperature. The parents had not obtained a certificate from the Agency doctor because the doctor was away on other business. The child, with almost a fatal fever, was turned away.

If the Commissioner does have contracts with white hospitals, nevertheless, I know as a matter of fact that hospitals object to taking in Indians, especially if they are aged and dirty.

It is perfectly clear that the pauperized conditions of these Indians was brought about by the way the Government has handled them. I grew up close to this reservation, and in the pioneer days there were no needy Indians. Today there is nothing on this reservation to sustain these Indians, either in agriculture or in industrial pursuits, and the Government has made little effort to supply them with something to do. The Commissioner claims there are no nurses to be had, but he does admit that there are plenty of young women on the reservation who are out of work and could be turned into nurses with very little effort. You do not have to have a Shakespeare to read a thermometer or administer to patients what a doctor prescribes for them; and these girls, on the first day of their service, can understand that cleanliness and comfort are, in many cases, superior to medicine in treating sick people.

Since we are responsible for the present condition of these Indians, shall we withdraw medical care from them because it is feared we might spend too much money? We do not bring up this argument when the time comes to make appropriations for the Marshall plan, or NATO, or what-have-you? Nothing is ever said about these appropriations being a poor business deal. When it comes to our own people here in the United States, who need medical attention, and need it more direly than any people on earth, we hesitate and the Commissioner warns us that we will be spending too much money.

If the countries of the world knew how we have treated the American Indians, and how we are still treating them, they would hardly say that our boast of a great, free country obtains here among our own people. We refuse to turn the Indians loose on their own, but have kept them cooped up on reservations, with restricted rights, until the Indian has lost self-respect and has become an absolute dependent upon what dole the Government, his guardian, gives him.

By overwhelming numbers the Indians object to the closing of the Fort Totten Hospital, and the white people in the towns where these Indians would be treated also object to it. Commercial clubs have petitioned members of Congress to prevent the closing of this hospital, and in my opinion it would be nothing less than criminal to allow the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to proceed with his intention to close the hospital. We are the guardians of these Indians by our own choice, and now, in the dark days of their dependent existence, brought about by ourselves, shall we run like cowards from our duty and be permitted to proclaim in defense of our action that it costs too much?

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT POLICY RECKLESS?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one question. I hope that the House in this session will review our retirement policy in the Armed Forces.

It seems, by this policy, that one by one, we are cutting down our best World War II and Korea combat-tested generals and leaders, while the Soviets are not.

By next June, I am told, we are going to retire some 500 combat-experienced colonels.

This Armed Forces retirement law was passed in 1947 when everything seemed economical and rosy, and when our training films fitted Ferdinand the Bull, join the Army and see the world, tactics, but with the increased pressure being applied against the Reds by our State Department, it seems to me we are on the wrong road in knocking down our best combat leaders at this time. Youth thirsts for leadership, as well as opportunity, in combat.

AUTOMOBILE EXCISE TAX TO AID FEDERAL-AID ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to set aside the proceeds of the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles, tires, and tubes, gasoline, and lubricating oil for the purpose of the Federal-Aid Road Act.

Under the present law the tax money collected from these sources goes into the Treasury for general purposes.

There are not enough roads to hold the output of motorized traffic, truck, passenger and bus. In 1941 we began running out of roads when we had 32 million motor vehicles registered. Our main highways were bursting at the seams. To the present time roadbuilding and maintenance have been interrupted and so today with 52 million vehicles using the highways our whole economy has and is being built around motorized transportation of both people and property.

The future demands and the future will bring about an expansion of the use of motor vehicles. Main highways and secondary highways are badly congested, being too narrow, too winding, and antiquated.

Our national defense and safety require a quick and full movement of motorized traffic from one end of the Nation to the other.

It demands a uniform and unified system of four- and six-lane highways.

Why should not the public that pays the tax from motorized traffic then have the full benefit and assistance that that tax can provide. No one can deny that the proper source to look to to solve our muddled traffic problems should be the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobile accessories and the kindred products.

We need a solution to our road problem. We need a unified traffic system throughout the entire country. We must have Federal aid to all the States.

This bill grants the needs supplied by the agencies that require the needs.

Our whole economy and Federal defense must have this aid.

It is the only way we can keep America on the move. Speed up and reduce bottlenecks.

The American Trucking Association, through Walter F. Carey, its president, just the other day publicly expressed the emergency of the situation.

The American Association of State Highway Officials, which is an association made up of 48 State highway departments, the Territorial departments of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Bureau of Public Roads recently decried the urgent need of such a bill as I today present.

NEWSPRINT MILL IN LOUISIANA

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the approval by the Federal Government a few days ago of a tax amortization certificate clears the way for the construction of a $2½ million mill in LaFourche Parish, La., which will manufacture newsprint and pulp from sugarcane bagasse. This plant is the first of its kind in the world.

The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, in the middle of 1950, undertook as part of its monopoly study an investigation and an analysis of the newsprint industry. It quickly learned that constructive efforts to augment the supply of newsprint was indeed necessary in the United States. It particularly took notice that the development of new techniques and the use of new materials as a source of newsprint were absolutely mandatory. In its report of May 1951, the committee formally recommended that steps be taken toward the development of new raw materials and processes and that encouragement be given for the furthering of new enterprises. It specifically recommended the employing of methods for making newsprint from bagasse. As an aid to these new industries, the committee recommended governmental assistance and encouraged the development of new plants in the South and suggested giving them the benefit of accelerated depreciation for tax purposes.

The Committee on the Judiciary then took affirmative steps to implement its recommendations through the cooperation of the United States Department of Commerce. That agency undertook an intensified program whereby the series of pilot plant tests by the Bureau of Standards was undertaken in order to ascertain the feasibility from a financial and commercial viewpoint of making newsprint from sugarcane bagasse. This program also explored the obstacles which had militated against newsprint expansion in the United States, including not only this particular technique involving bagasse, but many other techniques and processes. In the course of its study, the Department of Commerce considered all the aspects involved in the expansion of production such as the financing and the amortization.

This program is continuing at the present moment with a view to develop potentialities of hardwoods and other materials not as yet used in the manufacture of newsprint. It is sincerely hoped that these experiments will prove as successful as the initial one. In the very near future, the Department of Commerce is expected to render a progress report on its activities to the Judiciary Committee of the House. Here is a concrete example whereby an investigation and study by a committee of the Congress and the cooperation of an agency of the Government has opened an entirely new field for private enterprise. It indicates what can be done through the joint cooperative efforts of Government and private industry to expand production without financing by the Government. In the erection of this plant, only private capital will be used.

I am confident that this step will go a long way to alleviate the serious shortage of newsprint in the United States.

RICHMOND NEWS LEADER

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. The Richmond News Leader is one of the outstanding daily newspapers in Virginia and for that matter in the Nation. It has had a splendid editorial staff for many, many years and I desire to publicly commend them for the outstanding contribution the staff has made for better government in this country.

I am in entire accord with their editorial of February 26 and, while I am not a member of the committee of the House of Representatives that will handle this matter to which the editorial refers, I have from time to time made cursory examinations of the problem and find that not only are the facts as set out in the editorial true but it is true to such an extent that the people of other nations have resented the attitude of our representatives in these foreign countries as well as the lavish living that the Federal employees have flaunted before them.

I, therefore, call upon the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives to make a painstaking investigation of these matters so that no longer will the taxpayers of this country have to underwrite the lavish living, the gross extravagance and the utter disregard of the feelings of the native citizens that many of our representatives serving in foreign countries have been responsible for in the past.

The editorial entitled "It Isn't the Personnel, It's the Upkeep" is as follows:

IT ISN'T THE PERSONNEL, IT'S THE UPKEEP

The commendable effort now being made in Washington to reduce personnel in the Foreign Service will accomplish only half its purpose if it is not followed promptly by a reduction in the extravagant services provided for the personnel. Originally these services were furnished at hardship posts only—in those dreary backwashes of civilization where important and necessary relations might have to be maintained, but where United States representatives could not find the most elementary conveniences available locally. For a period after World War II, they were extended to some of the most desirable and civilized diplomatic posts on earth, with the generous and perhaps necessary object of keeping large American missions from eating up or using up the limited resources of war-torn countries.

But however honorable its origin, the provision of goods and services to American military and civilian personnel all over the world has now become a racket. Free services and plentiful tax-free goods enable American representatives abroad to live beyond anything most of them ever dreamed of at home. Three and four servants to the family are not unusual and even the skyscraper bachelor apartments, put up at lavish

expense by a beneficent government, are equipped with maids' rooms. In Britain, dozens of houses in the $50,000 and $75,000 bracket have been purchased for the rent-free accommodation of United States personnel, and in Germany a whole town was built to house the "largest embassy on earth" before the peace treaty was negotiated. Electric kitchens have been installed in Nairobi, clubs and bars set up in Tokyo, and at the Army's big night club in Garmisch, a movable dance floor, the largest of its kind in the world, rolls back to uncover an ice rink.

Germany's transportation system seems to be functioning smoothly and efficiently, but when the new American High Commissioner arrived in Bonn this month, he arrived by special train. It hardly improves matters for the taxpayers that it was probably the same special train that carries Army wives and High Commission clerks on picnics to the Bavarian Alps or shopping expeditions to Hamburg.

For a 3-day NATO conference in Rome, 18 new automobiles were sent from Germany to take our envoys from their hotels to the conference rooms. When Seoul was evacuated in July 1950 the Embassy staff left behind $100,000 worth of American food, $40,000 worth of liquor, and $22,500 worth of gasoline. When a lone point 4 agricultural expert arrived in Iraq last fall, it was said the cost of transporting his goods and chattels would support an Arab village for a year.

Nobody knows what the upkeep of our foreign service really costs the American people; it is buried so deep in the military budget, foreign aid, State Department funds, and other appropriations that the most indefatigable Congressman has never attempted to trace down more than a fraction of it. But if only the more outrageous items were eliminated, the saving would be considerable and the overall efficiency of the service improved.

Nowadays, when much of our business with foreign nations could be handled more expeditiously by transoceanic telephone, a primary object of the foreign service is to keep the United States in touch with what is going on all over the world. This object will be imperfectly attained as long as we have little Americas everywhere in which our personnel is almost as separated from all contact with conditions abroad as if it had stayed at home.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for tomorrow be vacated and that it be set for Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH W. FURSTENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 662) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg, Toms River, N. J., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. Furstenberg against the United States arising out of the loss of a registered letter mailed by the said Mrs. Furstenberg at a United States naval post office in Argentia, Newfoundland, on June 28, 1949. The said Mrs. Furstenberg mailed such letter, which contained $2,000 in cash, in reliance on the assertion of a postal employee in such office that registered mail was the safest way to send such money. Although the declared value of such letter was $2,000, and although the said Mrs. Furstenberg paid a registration surcharge which was based on such declared value, the said Mr. and Mrs. Furstenberg have heretofore been reimbursed only $1,000, which is the maximum amount payable under existing law for the loss of any one piece of registered mail: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MURIEL J. SHINGLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 720) for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery, of 11543 South Paramount Boulevard, Downey, Calif., the sum of $305.15. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Shingler's Hatchery against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of approximately 1,795 baby chicks which were contained in a shipment of 9,000 baby chicks mailed by the said Shingler's Hatchery on November 30, 1950, at Downey, Calif., to Peterson Feed & Supply Co., Tucson, Ariz. Such shipment was not insured by employees of the Post Office Department although such insurance was requested by the said Shingler's Hatchery prior to the time such shipment was made. Such claims are not cognizable under the provisions of title 28 of the United States Code relating to tort claims against the United States by reason of section 2680b of title 28 of the United States Code exempting from such provisions those claims arising out of the loss, miscarriage, and negligent transmission of postal matter. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHESTER H. TUCK AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 724) for the relief of Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Chester H. Tuck, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $10,000; to Mary Elizabeth Fisher, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $10,000; to James Thomas Harper, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $1,000; and to Mrs. T. W. Bennett, of Tullahoma, Tenn., the sum of $10,299.50. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, and James Thomas Harper against the United States for personal injuries sustained, pain and suffering undergone, medical and hospital expenses incurred, and loss of earnings sustained by them as the result of an accident involving an Army truck which occurred at the intersection of South Jackson and Cook Streets, in Tullahoma, Tenn., on March 11, 1944; and in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. T. W. Bennett against the United States for the death of her minor daughter Ruth Cleek, who died as a result of injuries sustained in such accident, and for expenses incurred in connection with the burial of the said Ruth Cleek: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$700."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$10,299.50" and insert "$7,299.50."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. THOMAS J. CAMPION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 726) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Campion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Campion, of Pottsville, Pa., the sum of $8,280, in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of their daughter, Lucy T. Campion, on March 3, 1945, from injuries sustained by her in an accident, involving an Army vehicle, which occurred on the same date on the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Pa.; the driver of the said Army vehicle was not acting within the scope of his employment at the time the said accident occurred: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection

with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER A. SENIBALDI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 739) for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Alexander A. Senibaldi (chief petty officer, U. S. Naval Reserve), Everett, Mass., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $624.27. Such sum represents compensation received by the said Alexander A. Senibaldi as an employee of the United States Post Office, Boston, Mass., during the period beginning July 16, 1946, and ending January 2, 1947, while he was also employed at the Watertown Arsenal and was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Alexander A. Senibaldi an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for such refund.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR J. BOUCHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 834) for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Arthur J. Boucher, for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as an employee of the Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass., in July 1944, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AGNES TURKETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 873) for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Turkett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500 to Mrs. Agnes Turkett, of 50 Lancaster Street, Albany, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of a fall in the post office at Albany, N. Y., on November 27, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEILA PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 883) for the relief of Leila Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leila Park, 1110 South Fifth Street, Waco, Tex., the sum of $858.95. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Leila Park, for reimbursement of expenses caused by the negligence of Sgt. Eldon R. Ernest, AF 28667575, while driving an Air Force truck on or about March 1, 1952. Sergeant Ernest drove the truck into a 1949 Chevrolet club coupe, owned by Leila Park, while the Chevrolet was parked by the curbing on a street in Waco, Tex. Sgt. Eldon R. Ernest was not acting within the scope of his authority at the time of the collision.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$858.95" and insert "$534.95."

At the end of the bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. EDWARD LEVANDOSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 887) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski, Dunkirk, N. Y., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski against the United States arising out of the death of their minor daughter, Jean, which occurred on June 1, 1951, when she fell over a cliff while running along an unprotected and badly eroded path on Coast Guard property adjacent to Point Gratiot Park, a public park and playground in Dunkirk, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 951) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims (a) to hear the claims of the Trust Association of H. Kempner, of Galveston, Tex., against the Government of Germany and nationals of Germany for reimbursement for losses alleged to have been sustained as a result of the sale of certain cotton by such trust association to certain mills in Germany during the years 1923 and 1924, and to determine the amounts of any such losses, and (b) to determine the total of the various amounts wrongfully paid out of the Trust of Germann and Co. while its property was being administered by the Alien Property Custodian.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed (a) to credit the Trust of Germann and Co. with an amount equal to any amounts found by the Court of Claims under clause (b) of the first section of this act to have been wrongfully paid out of such trust, and to charge such sum against the War Claims Fund, created by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, or against any other funds or property of the Government of Germany or of nationals of Germany in the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States or which may hereafter come into the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States, and (b) to pay, to the Trust Association of H. Kempner, out of such War Claims Fund or such other funds, the amounts so credited to the Trust of Germann and Co. and so charged against such War Claims Fund or such other funds, or so much thereof as does not exceed the amount of any losses found by the Court of Claims under clause (a) of the first section of this act to have been sustained by the Trust Association of H. Kempner: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made unless and until such trust association executes and delivers to the said Trust of Germann and Co. a complete assignment of all claims and demands of the said Trust Association of H. Kempner

against the Government of Germany and nationals of Germany arising out of the sale of such cotton during the years 1923 and 1924: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made unless it leaves such War Claims Fund in a position to discharge all payments therefrom authorized and directed to be paid under the War Claims Act of 1948.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS J. MORRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 969) for the relief of Thomas J. Morris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Thomas J. Morris, of Comanche, Okla., the sum of $2,931.50, together with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from January 1, 1923, until paid in satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages sustained by him in May 1922, on account of sweetpotato weevil received from an uninspected interstate shipment of sweetpotato plants.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out "$2,931.50, together with interest thereon at the rate of 6 percent per annum from January 1, 1923, until paid, in satisfaction of his claim", and insert in lieu thereof "$1,500, in full settlement of all claims."

At the end of bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess or 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DASON EQUIPMENT CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1133) for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Dason Equipment Corp., of Brooklyn, N. Y., is relieved of any liability to pay all, or any part of the sum of $7,005.75 claimed by the United States as liquidated damages under contract W 11-183-qm-8160, dated June 23, 1949, since the nonperformance of the contract resulted in an eventual saving to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. C. ISRAEL COMMODITY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1194) for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., the sum of $7,582.57, plus interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period beginning on December 13, 1945, and ending on the date of enactment of this act. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said company against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid (under protest) by such company on December 13, 1945, as damages for alleged violation, in connection with the sale by such company of imported chocolate bars, of price regulations established by the Office of Price Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures strike out the comma and insert a period. Strike out everything in lines 7 and 8, and line 9 down to and including the period.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. KATHERINE L. SEWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1331) for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell the sum of $40,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Government vehicle on Okinawa Island, on April 3, 1949: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$40,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELMUTH WOLF GRUHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1334) for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the managing trustee of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of such trust fund, the sum of $868.53 to Helen Mann Gruhl for the use and benefit of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl. Such sum represents the total of child's insurance benefits that would have been payable under title II of the Social Security Act to Helmuth Wolf Gruhl during the period December 1942 to February 1947, if he had known of the death of his father and had filed timely application for such benefits.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOE BARGAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1452) for the relief of Joe Bargas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to Joe Bargas, of Trinidad, Colo., father of Eddie Bargas, a minor, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Eddie Bargas as a result of injuries sustained on the United States Post Office grounds at Trinidad, Colo., on July 12, 1950; the claim of the said Joe Bargas is not a claim that is cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD JOE DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1460) for the relief of Harold Joe Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold Joe Davis, Tulsa, Okla., the sum of $16,748. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harold Joe Davis against the United States arising out of the permanent injuries he sustained, as a civilian, while serving in line of duty under orders of the United States Navy as fire chief of the United States Naval Air Station, Dutch Harbor, Alaska, during enemy air attacks which occurred on June 3 and 4, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract

to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$16,748" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH McRIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1461) for the relief of Kenneth McRight.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Kenneth McRight, Henryetta, Okla., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Kenneth McRight against the United States arising out of the permanent injuries sustained by him in Dallas, Tex., on April 13, 1950, when he was shot by an insane member of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF RENE WEIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1632) for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Rene Weil, late of New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,927.23, together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent per annum from February 1, 1944. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States for refund of overpayments in Federal estate tax which were made, on July 30, 1943, and February 1, 1944, as a result of the fact that certain Federal and State income tax payments had not been deducted from the value of the gross estate as provided by section 812 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures strike out ", together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent per annum from February 1, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SYLVIA SIMONSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1636) for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Sylvia Simonson, of South 809 Freya Street, Spokane, Wash., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of an accident while directly serving the Armed Forces as an instructor pilot for the training school rendering training instruction to the 319th College Training Detachment, Pullman, Wash., on December 28, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKLIN JIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of Franklin Jim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Phillip Jim and Ella Jim, as legal guardians of the person and estate of Franklin Jim, a minor full-blood Pawnee Indian, the sum of $5,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from injury to his left hand on October 10, 1945, which was caught in the presses of a sorghum mill being used on the grounds of the Pawnee Indian School near Pawnee, Okla., during a period when he was a student at said school, was 13 years of age, and was assigned the task of attending said sorghum mill by the school authorities, who were employees of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of money appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the balance of line 5 and all of line 6 ending with the word "estate" and insert "the legal guardian."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM KIPF AND DAROLD D. SELK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2023) for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to William Kipf, Lincoln, Nebr., a sum (not to exceed $195.96) sufficient to satisfy the judgment and court costs recovered by him against Darold D. Selk, Lincoln, Nebr., on October 24, 1951, in the United States District Court at Lincoln, Nebr., and (2) to the said Darold D. Selk, a sum equal to $195.96 less the amount paid by the Secretary of the Treasury under clause (1), but in no case to exceed the total amount which may have been paid by the said Darold D. Selk in partial or full satisfaction of such judgment and court costs. The payment of the sum specified in clause (1) shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William Kipf against the United States and the said Darold D. Selk arising out of an accident which occurred in Lincoln, Nebr., on January 27, 1950, and which involved a mail truck being operated by the said Darold D. Selk as an employee of the United States postal service. The payment of the sum specified in clause (2) shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Darold D. Selk against the United States for indemnification for losses he suffered by reason of the judgment and court costs recovered against him as a result of such accident. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out the balance of line 5 and all of line 6 ending with the word "estate" and insert "the legal guardian."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA BASIN ORCHARD ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2033) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon all claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp. (all corporations of Washington) against the United States arising out of the flooding, during the period beginning June 1, 1939, and ending April 30, 1940, of certain real property owned by the said Columbia Basin Orchard in Grant County, Wash., insofar as such flooding was the result of certain drilling operations carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation in the course of its investigations preliminary to the construction of a dam and an equalizing reservoir in the Grand Coulee.

SEC. 2. All claims against the United States within the purview of the first section of this act shall be forever barred unless action is begun thereon within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. HARRY F. CUNNINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2158) for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to treat the claim of Col. Harry F. Cunningham against the German Government, which was filed with the office of the Alien Property Custodian on September 26, 1947 (claim No. 16224) under section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 32), as though the architectural services on which such claim is based gave rise to a lien interest in the property in connection with which such services were performed and such interest was the basis for a valid title claim under such section of such act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS A. SCHAFER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2169) for the relief of Louis A. Schafer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 through 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Louis A. Schafer, of La Fayette, Ind.; and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from an injury alleged to have been sustaind by him on or about October 30, 1943, while in the performance of his duties as a blacksmith at the former United States Navy Yard at Pearl Harbor, T. H., shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, United States Department of Labor, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HISAMI YOSHIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 759) for the relief of Hisami Yoshida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Hisami Yoshida, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of M. Sgt. and Mrs. Roy Martin Siegert, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASPASIA VEZERTZI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 886) for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Aspasia Vezertzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Aspasia Vezertzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDITH MARIE PAULSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 861) for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Edith Marie Paulsen, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Robert H. Paulsen, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES H. LIN, ALSO KNOWN AS LIN CHAO HSI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 960) for the relief of Charles H. Lin, also known as Lin Chao Hsi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota from the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET CELIKCAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 973) for the relief of Margaret Celikcan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Margaret Celikcan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Margaret Celikcan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HELGA JOSEFA WILEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1193) for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the 11th category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley, German

wife of Harold Wiley, a United States citizen and member of the United States Armed Forces, with respect to any conviction or admission of the commission of any crime in her case of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge on the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSE MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1362) for the relief of Rose Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Rose Martin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Col. and Mrs. L. A. Burbank, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (a) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rose Martin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Col. and Mrs. L. A. Burbank, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JAMES W. TUTEN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1451) for the relief of Mrs. James W. Tuten, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. James W. Tuten, Jr., may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YEE KEE LAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1794) for the relief of Yee Kee Lam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yee Kee Lam shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK KAMAL SAMHAT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1895) for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Jack Kamal Samhat, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Robert Charles Phillips, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jack Kamal Samhat shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called House Concurrent Resolution 29, favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I will not object, but as chairman of the subcommittee handling immigration and naturalization cases, I desire to make a short statement at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot do that on the Private Calendar; reservations of objection are not permitted.

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement, Mr. Speaker, because this is a matter that will be coming up right along.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would rather conform to the rules governing the Private Calendar. The gentleman can get a minute after call of the calendar is completed.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

FRED B. NISWONGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2366) for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred B. Niswonger, of Weed, Calif., the sum of $966.64. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred B. Niswonger against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of salary which he sustained, for the period beginning February 1, 1946, and ending May 31, 1946, as a result of not being restored to his former position of postal clerk in the United States post office at Weed, Calif., immediately following his honorable discharge from the Army on January 31, 1946. The said Fred B. Niswonger was subsequently restored to such position pursuant to order of the Civil Service Commission: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WINIFRED A. HUNTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2381) for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Winifred A. Hunter, of San Antonio, Tex., the sum of $16,106. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Winifred A. Hunter against the United States for reimbursement for damage to her personal and household effects sometime between December 7, 1946, and March 7, 1947, at Bilbao, Spain. Such damage was incurred when the said Winifred A. Hunter, while employed as a clerk in the Foreign Service of the Department of State, was transferred from the American Embassy at Managua, Nicaragua, to the American Embassy at Madrid, Spain: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$16,106" and insert "$6,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. NEIL ANDREWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2386) for the relief of M. Neil Andrews.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 1204 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, or any other provision of law, there shall be paid out of any appropriation available for payment of salaries of judges of the district courts of the United States, to M. Neil Andrews a sum representing the salary of a judge of a district court of the United States for the period which the said M. Neil Andrews served as district judge for the northern district of Georgia after August 9, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KENNETH CECIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2398) for the relief of Kenneth Cecil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 765–770), the Labor Department (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Kenneth Cecil, of Evansville, Ind., for compensation under such act, within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, on account of personal injuries alleged to have been sustained by him in the month of January 1936, while in the performance of his duty as a census enumerator in Evansville, Ind.; and the Bureau, after such consideration of such claim, shall determine and make findings of fact thereon and make an award for payment of compensation to Kenneth Cecil, provided for in such act of September 7, 1916, as amended: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUTH D. CRUNK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2420) for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth D. Crunk, widow of Tim D. Crunk, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ruth D. Crunk against the United States for the death of her husband on January 22, 1944, as the result of burns sustained in a fire at the Evans Hall housing project, Evansville, Ind., which was under the supervision and management of the National Housing Agency, the United States Court of Claims (congressional No. 17857, decided April 3, 1951, pursuant to S. Res. 268, 81st Cong.) having found that the United States was negligent in failing to enforce its safety regulations, and that such failure was the proximate cause of such fire: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF RAYMOND GIBSON, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2433) for the relief of the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor, of Lakeland, Md., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the personal injuries sustained by the said Raymond Gibson, the pain and suffering undergone by him, the medical and hospital expenses incurred for his treatment, and the damage caused to his bicycle, as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle, which occurred at the intersection of Lakeland Road and 55th Street, in Lakeland, Md., on May 7, 1949; the driver of the said Army vehicle was not acting within the scope of his employment at the time the said accident occurred: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMMET WOOD AND VIOLA WOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2593) for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Emmet Wood and his wife, Viola Wood, jointly, the sum of $3,239.10. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Emmet Wood and Viola Wood against the United States arising out of injuries sustained by them when the vehicle in which they were passengers was struck by a War Department truck at Monterey, Calif., on December 25, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLIFFORD ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2607) for the relief of Clifford Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clifford Robinson, Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $137.71. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Clifford Robinson was held liable on January 24, 1952, in a civil action in the municipal court of Cleveland, as the result of an accident which occurred near the intersection of Chester Avenue and 36th Street in Cleveland on March 19, 1951, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said Clifford Robinson, a letter carrier in the United States Post Office, Cleveland, Ohio. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Clifford Robinson shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIO MERCADO TOLEDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2615) for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,060

to Julio Mercado Toledo, who was injured on March 9, 1944, when struck by a United States Army truck, in Ponce, P. R. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTOS SANABRIA ALVAREZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2618) for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Santos Sanabria Alvarez, who was injured on December 1, 1940, when struck in Aguadilla, P. R., by a United States Army truck. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONALD JAMES DARMODY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2645) for the relief of Donald James Darmody.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donald James Darmody, St. Paul, Minn., the sum of $427.82. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Donald James Darmody against the United States arising out of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on February 1, 1950, when his car, while legally parked near the intersection of East Seventh Street and Maria Avenue in St. Paul, was struck by an Army vehicle being operated by an enlisted man of the Army. The Department of the Army, on August 28, 1950, disallowed such claim on the ground that the operator of the Army vehicle was not acting within the scope of his employment at the time of the accident, and the Under Secretary of the Army, on December 8, 1950, sustained such disallowance on the same ground: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JUAN ANTONIO RIVERA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2660) for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romera, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Col. Juan Antonio Rivera; Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of maj. Raul Valle Antelo; Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Jorge Diaz Romero; Mrs. Otto Resse, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria, of La Paz, Bolivia, widow of Maj. Hugo Soria, are authorized to present their claims against the United States on account of the deaths of Col. Juan Antonio Rivera, Maj. Raul Valle Antelo, Maj. Jorge Diaz Romero, Maj. Otto Resse, and Major Hugo Soria, who were killed as the result of an accident in which a C–54 transport plane of the United States Air Force crashed in the Pacific Ocean approximately 1 mile off the Peruvian coast near the town of San Juan, Peru, on December 19, 1947, under the Foreign Claims Act (55 Stat. 880), as amended, and that for the purpose of such claims the deaths shall be considered as having happened in Bolivia: *Provided*, That no part of any settlement in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such settlement, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 10 and page 2, lines 1 to 10, and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, widow of Col. Juan Antonio Rivera; the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, widow of Maj. Raul Valle Antelo; the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, widow of Maj. Jorge Diaz Romero; the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Otto Resse, widow of Maj. Otto Resse; and the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Hugo Soria, widow of Maj. Hugo Soria, all of La Paz, Bolivia. Such sums are in full settlement of all claims against the United States because of the death of the husbands of these claimants, who were killed as the result of an accident in which a C–54 transport plane of the United States Air Force crashed in the Pacific Ocean approximately 1 mile off the Peruvian coast near the town of San Juan, Peru, on September 19, 1947."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to make an explanation of the purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 29 and similar resolutions which I will periodically offer in the House.

In 1948, the Congress authorized the Attorney General to grant permanent residence in the United States to 15,000 aliens who had entered this country lawfully on a temporary basis if they prove to his satisfaction that they are displaced persons who cannot return to their native countries because of fear of persecution based on their race, religion or political beliefs. Under the same law, the Attorney General had to submit those applicants to a thorough screening and if he found them to be eligible for permanent residence he was directed to submit their names to the Congress for a rescreening and approval of his recommendations.

In Congress, the Committees on the Judiciary of both Houses scrutinize the Attorney General's recommendations and under an arrangement with the Senate, concurrent resolutions approving the Attorney General's rulings originate with the House committee.

In each and every case an FBI and a CIA investigation was conducted and in each and every case approved, a quota number is being deducted for every alien who under such resolution is granted permanent resident status in the United States.

This entire operation is a self-liquidating one. The deadline for filing applications with the Attorney General expired on June 16, 1952, and it is therefore expected that by the end of this Congress all cases deserving of Congressional approval will be taken care of.

I might add that according to what the committee hears from the Immigration and Naturalization Service the congressional allocation of 15,000 quota numbers will not be used. It looks like not over 8,000 aliens falling within this category will be permitted to remain in this country.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 34, Rept. No. 92), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration with a particular view to determining the efficiency of the administration and operation of Veterans' Administration installations.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its inspection, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is

sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

NEWSPRINT INVESTIGATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 126, Rept. No. 93), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation of—

(1) the current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges;

(2) the current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such production and supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternate source materials;

(3) the facilities which are or will be devoted to the production of such papers, and policies relating to the expansion of such facilities;

(4) the exports and imports of such papers, and policies related thereto, including governmental export allocations; and

(5) the availability and adequacy of the supply of such papers to the several consumers, particularly the smaller newspapers, and governmental and other policies relating thereto.

The committee may report to the House from time to time the results of its investigation, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable, and shall, before the expiration of the present Congress, submit to the House a final report. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 127, Rept. No. 94), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1953, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make such investigations and studies as it deems advisable with respect to any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making an announcement. The whip notice indicated that any such resolutions as those just reported by the Committee on Rules would be called this week if they were so reported. I anticipate calling these resolutions on Thursday next.

"MANNIE" CELLER'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY IN CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to one of our distinguished colleagues who, tomorrow, celebrates 30 years of service in the Congress of the United States. On March 4, 1923, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] entered the Halls of Congress. He has spent three momentous decades here, rising to great heights of leadership and statesmanship.

During the past few years he has served with great distinction as chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. He is the dean of the New York Democratic delegation.

The name of EMANUAL CELLER—or "Mannie" as many of us affectionately call him—has become a household byword, particularly in our Borough of Brooklyn where he is universally loved and admired. He has attained a national reputation as a responsible spokesman for New York and a champion of the causes of the underprivileged.

"MANNIE" CELLER is a fighting liberal. He has fought the battle of the working people. He has fought the battle against the power of big-business monopoly. He has fought bravely in the defense of free expression, free press, free assembly, and for all civil liberties which make up our democracy. In recent years he has been one of the stanchest advocates of the United Nations and has espoused the causes of independence for Israel and India.

I recall meeting "Mannie" for the first time in June 1922. He was then a candidate for his first term in Congress; I was a candidate for graduation from the Boys' High School in Brooklyn. He came to speak at the commencement exercises at his alma mater that summer. That was the first time that I had seen him or heard him, and his speech left an indelible impression on my mind. It was natural, therefore, for me to later follow his career with the keenest of interest, not dreaming that some day I would be honored to sit together with him in this House.

In 1925 or 1926 I became active in local politics and I was privileged to meet him at our monthly meetings. I never failed to attend a meeting of the organization at which "MANNIE" CELLER was scheduled to speak. I vividly remember that whenever notices were sent out informing the membership that "Mannie" would address the meeting, the auditorium was invariable filled to capacity. We, his workers, constituents, and followers in those days when he made his first steps in Congress, were certain that "MANNIE" CELLER would some day attain imperishable prominence as a statesman.

For many years I was proud to ring doorbells in his behalf and to persuade constituents, which was not difficult, to vote for him. His personal popularity and appeal were so potent that on election day he would carry with him to victory the rest of the local party ticket. We used to call it the "Celler ticket," and anyone who had the good fortune to be on the Celler ticket was always sure of election.

I remember a very exciting and interesting court case some years later in which I had the honor to represent "MANNIE" CELLER, where an insurgent candidate in our district attempted to get on the ballot for a primary election by using "Mannie's" name on petitions which were circulated among the voters. This insurgent was well aware of the strength, influence, and popularity of CELLER'S name and he tried to attach his own to it without authority, hoping thereby to gain high party position. The case was tried before one of our great and learned jurists, the Honorable Charles J. Lockwood, who is now a referee in the Supreme Court of Kings County. Judge Lockwood, a Republican, saw through the fraud and invalidated the petition. In other words, it is even judicially noted that the name "MANNIE" CELLER is a politically invaluable asset.

In 1942 I had the honor of being a candidate for the State senate, running on the same ticket with "MANNIE" CELLER. He was a candidate for reelection to Congress, and since we covered the same districts, we campaigned together. "Mannie" had practically no opposition. Anyone familiar with the political situation in the district would quote you overwhelming odds that "Mannie" would win by at least 2 to 1. Actually, the vote was 30,000 for CELLER

and a little under 15,000 for his opponent. You would think that under such favorable circumstances "Mannie" would take it easy and not conduct much of a campaign. But he waged a vigorous campaign and I have always had the feeling that he did it just to bring me along on his bandwagon and introduce me to the voters so that I, too, could be elected.

There was one particular incident during that campaign which I shall never forget. It was the night before the election. For weeks prior thereto we had conducted a strenuous campaign and I decided to take a night off to rest for the ordeal of election day. At about 9 p. m., just as I had gotten into bed, the telephone rang. It was "MANNIE" CELLER informing me that he would stop by in a little while and pick me up in his car to go out for another round of speaking engagements. I was ashamed to tell him that I was in bed and anxious for a badly needed rest. I am revealing this to him now for the first time. But I dressed quickly and proceeded with him to some desolated area only to find that there were hardly any people in the streets to greet us. I remarked to "Mannie": "Wry talk here? You haven't even got a corporal's guard to listen to you." His reply was: "As soon as we start to talk, you will find that all my good friends living in these surrounding tenements will open their windows, put their heads out, and listen."

And that is exactly what happened. As soon as he started to speak, I could see along the row of tenement houses windows being opened, heads popping out, and an audience listening attentively. The smile on "Mannie's" face extended from one ear to the other. When the meeting was over, he said to me: "And now we must go to meet the crowd that leaves the theater on Pitkin Avenue, my old stamping grounds."

That campaign taught me something about "Mannie" which all Members of the House who have watched him in action know, that he is never satisfied with a job unless it is well done.

Notwithstanding the fact that "Mannie" is approaching his 65th birthday next May, he can still do more work than men 25 years his junior. On many occasions, when we travel back to New York on the plane, I always marvel at the way he is able to recline in his seat, grab 20 or 30 winks of sleep, and then, fully refreshed, delve immediately into his briefcase for a pile of reading matter.

Besides being known as a hard and diligent worker, "Mannie" is also known and loved for his delightful sense of humor. He is never too busy to tell a humorous story or a good joke in an effort to evoke a laugh from his companions. He has a bag of tricks which, at the drop of a hat, he will display. It is not unusual to see "Mannie" surrounded by a group of colleagues showing them how a silver coin will disappear from the palm of his hand or from between his fingers or how he can shape a puppet out of a handkerchief. All who know him personally will testify to his kindliness, his sense of fair play and his desire to be helpful to his fellow men.

Now, on the occasion of his 30th anniversary as a Member of this House, "MANNIE" CELLER's autobiography, You Never Leave Brooklyn, appears. His story of those 30 years is also the story of America in the last three decades. When he first came here, he was quickly plunged into the fierce controversy then raging over the question of immigration. He is still in the midst of that controversy today—but how the world has changed during those 30 years. In a sense, "MANNIE" CELLER has never left Brooklyn and the millions of people that make up that community—the Jews, the Irish, the Italians, and other nationality groups.

"MANNIE" CELLER's book is the story of a warm and sincere human being, an honest public official, who never hesitates to speak out for unpopular causes, yet one who is modest in his claims of personal triumphs and big enough to admit his mistakes.

On this occasion, I want to offer to "Mannie" my sincerest wishes for his continued good health and to express the hope that he will be with us here for many more years to come, to give us of his rich experience, his wise counsel, and his helpful guidance in the trying days ahead.

Only about 2 weeks ago a very significant remark was made on the floor of this House by the learned and distinguished Congresswoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. In substance she stated that sometimes she has the feeling we, in the Congress, do not show our admiration and our appreciation to our colleagues here for what they do for us and for our country. How very true that is.

I am happy therefore that we are taking time out today to honor "Mannie." This is his day and he richly deserves the high esteem we have for him. On this occasion, there comes to my mind a poem which I think is most appropriate. I do not recall the name of the author, but the poem is as follows:

If with pleasure you are viewing any work a man is doing,
If you like him or you love him, tell him now;
Don't withhold your approbation till the parson makes oration
And he lies with snowy lilies on his brow;
For no matter how you shout it, he won't really care about it;
He won't know how many teardrops you have shed;
If you think some praise is due him now's the time to slip it to him
For he cannot read his tombstone when he's dead.

"Mannie," we love you dearly, and we wish you and your devoted and charming wife, Stella, and your children and grandchildren happiness, good health, and all the blessings which life can bestow upon you.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the gentleman from New York is yielding an hour to me?

Mr. HELLER. Yes; I will be glad to yield 1 hour to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I take the keenest pleasure in participating in this expression of esteem in which my friend and colleague, EMANUEL CELLER, is universally held. Today marks the 30th anniversary of his election to the House of Representatives. Fifteen times has EMANUEL CELLER stood before his constituents, and 15 times have his constituents voted their overwhelming confidence in him. Let it be stated that his is a constituency not easily pleased. It gives as much passion to its politics as it does to its baseball. It is more variable in its mood and more diverse in its activities than any other region I know of.

It has been stated by the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER] that "MANNIE" CELLER has written a book entitled "You Never Leave Brooklyn." I lived in Brooklyn once upon a time. I do not want to negate the title of this book, but I lived in Brooklyn for a few months in 1917 before I joined the Army of the United States. Of course, I should say in passing that those were days when "MANNIE" CELLER was unknown to me; I did not come to know "MANNIE" CELLER until 1923 when he came here as a representative from Brooklyn along with my late chief and predecessor, Mr. Seger, of Passaic, N. J., a beloved Member of this House, whom I served as secretary for some 17 years. I know how Mr. Seger and Mr. CELLER appraised each other; they were bosom friends. Oft have I heard my late chief say to me: "He is a dependable friend," and I have found him to be such in this legislative body.

Now, about this book; I have in my hand at this moment an article appearing in the Washington Star of Sunday, March 1, 1953, a review of this book "You Never Leave Brooklyn" by Mary McGrory. In her review she emphasizes the fairness of the author. She says in part:

EACH CHAPTER AN ENTITY

With undue deference, Mr. CELLER—thinking perhaps some readers might not want to read from cover to cover—has made of each chapter an entity. Thus, the whole question of his concern with the independence of India, the founding of the State of Israeli, monopolies, the Un-American Activities Committee, and so on, are covered in self-contained sections.

The Representative has not so much as indulged himself in the long view or the mellow summary. Pressed for a kind of précis of what 30 years in practical politics has added up to, he said the other day that the rewards of congressional life in terms of human services ultimately outbalanced the frustration, and that a saying of Disraeli has helped him through some of the bad days.

"Ever be armed with the breastplate of good temper."

In all his dealings in this House, our esteemed colleague from Brooklyn has always been temperate. In passing I, too, recall a statement once made by Disraeli as follows: "Life is too short to be little."

"MANNIE" CELLER has never been little.

"MANNIE" CELLER has courage and he has conviction. He has never been afraid to be in the minority, to swim against the tide, if necessary, to vote as his good sense tells him to, without fear and without currying favor.

To me, I must confess, it is the personal flavor of the man that I relish. The public bills which bear his name, such as the foreign trade zone bill, the amendments to the Displaced Persons' Act, the Antimerger Monopoly Act, the act to admit Eastern Hemisphere Indians, the Federal Register Act, and others, give the measure of his legislative achievements. But to me, aside from these, it is the man of generosity of feeling, the marvelous funny stories he tells, the good companion, the friend ready to help, aways, that spell "MANNIE" CELLER as much as his congressional activities.

Those who have listened to "Mannie" on the floor have been struck by one thought—how preeminently fair he has been in debate, even in the very heat of it. Though his own conviction was firm, he respected the opinion of the opposition. I ought to know. I have been in the opposition many times.

Perhaps, I can best sum up both my feeling for and evaluation of EMANUEL CELLER in one word—gentleman. He is firm without obstinacy; kindly without weakness and a defender of rights without pomposity and without self-righteousness. A most valuable public servant.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting indeed today that the House should pause in the midst of its legislative program to acknowledge and commemorate the 30-year service in this great deliberative body of my very dear friend, and our universally esteemed colleague, Congressman "MANNIE" CELLER.

Few among us have enjoyed such long, uninterrupted tenure in the House. Few have been privileged to render such distinguished, valuable service to the House, to his great State of New York, and to the Nation.

Generous of impulse, liberal in thought and action, courageous of heart, sympathetic and kindly by nature, endowed with a brilliant mind, marked by great ability, unyielding in honest convictions, broadminded, tolerant, and helpful toward his fellow man, "MANNIE" CELLER may well be proud of his outstanding and illustrious record as a faithful, devoted public servant and a great patriotic American.

As a friend and admirer as well as a colleague of his, I am very happy and highly privileged to join with so many of our colleagues in expressing to Congressman CELLER my heartiest felicitations upon the completion of his 30 years of meritorious, splendid service and to extend to him and all his family my sincere congratulations.

May "MANNIE" CELLER, friend, humanitarian, and patriot, long continue to enjoy good health and happiness with his family, and may he be spared for many years to come, in wisdom, experience, ability, kindness, and courage faithfully, ably, and conspicuously to serve his district and our country.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting tribute to a deserving Member of this body. I join my colleagues in honoring "MANNIE" CELLER, the gentleman from Brooklyn, on the 30th anniversary of the start of his service in the House of Representatives.

Only six other Members of the House were in this Chamber when EMANUEL CELLER came here to represent New York's 10th District on March 4, 1923. One of these is our friend and colleague from across the river from my own congressional district, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Elsberry, Mo., and to him I also pay tribute upon the observance tomorrow of his 30th anniversary as a Member of Congress.

I am certain each member of Illinois' delegation in Congress joins me in congratulating "MANNIE" CELLER today. We all recognize his great ability, his record of great achievements through his long years of service. More than that, we regard "MANNIE" CELLER as a true friend—one of the most amiable men in the House. He is a staunch supporter of causes he believes upholds the dignity of man. I personally like to think of him in the same category of that great champion of human rights—the late Honorable Adolph Sabath of Illinois.

"MANNIE" CELLER serves his district with honor and the Nation profits by his eternal vigilance in the cause of justice for all. I wish him many more years in the service of his country.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our dear and esteemed friend "MANNIE" CELLER on the occasion of his 30th anniversary in Congress. I did not have the pleasure of knowing him personally until I became a Member of this House and of the Judiciary Committee in January of 1951. His fame and reputation, however, was well known to me long before that.

Every citizen of this country who has interested himself in our progress in the past 30 years knows of his valuable contribution to the enactment of social legislation which has raised the standards of living and defended the human rights of our people.

My brief experience as a member of the committee over which he presided gave me an insight to "MANNIE" CELLER, the man. His fairness, honesty, courtesy and loyalty to his convictions endeared him to me as they did to everyone who had the good fortune to know him.

Not only New York but our entire Nation claims "MANNIE" CELLER as our own and is proud of him. I sincerely hope for him many more fruitful years in his chosen career to serve the public.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my constituents back in Illinois would not forgive me if I remained silent on such an occasion as this. Many of my constituents may never have seen EMANUEL CELLER, may never have had the rich opportunity of closeness to his warm presence, but his name is ever in their minds and is enshrined in their hearts. To them EMANUEL CELLER is the personification of America. His life, his deeds, and his words write for them the story of an America that has come through troubling vicissitudes and baffling misunderstandings to as close an approach as has yet been reached under human government to the brotherhood of man. For 30 years he has served in this Chamber. No American of our times has given of his life thirty more fruitful years. His influence has reached into countless homes in every State of our Union. It has been a mighty force in the strengthening of courage and the rekindling of faith. But for such men as EMANUEL CELLER these United States of America would not be as secure in national character to combat tyranny elsewhere and to lead democracy to yet higher heights. What I have said, Mr. Speaker, is but an inadequate expression of the affectionate sentiment of the people of the district in Illinois that I represent for our distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is now my distinct pleasure and privilege to yield to the distinguished minority whip, our good friend and beloved colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has just made remarks in relation to our dear friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that reflect the views of all of us who have known "MANNIE" CELLER for so many years. To me, "MANNIE" CELLER has always been an inspiration; not only a gentleman, as has my friend from New Jersey so properly said—and how impressive that word is of all of the fine qualities necessary to make up a gentleman—but a man of vision, of unusual capacity, of sincere convictions, and of great courage. To me the two most important elements in public life—in fact, they may apply to any walk of life—are loyalty and courage. Certainly, our friend from New York [Mr. CELLER] is loyal to the people he represents, to his State, and to our Nation, and loyal to those deep convictions and spiritual truths which he entertains and which he symbolizes in such a striking manner. His courage has manifested itself on many occasions. It is one thing to be the advocate of a winning cause; it is another thing to be the advocate and the fighter for what at the time appears to be a losing cause. As my mind goes back through the 25 years that I have been a Member of this body—my friend from New York was here 5 years prior to my arriving—I have recollections of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] taking the well of this floor on many occasions fighting for what at the time appeared to be a losing battle, but convinced that his position was the proper and the sound one for the best interest of our country and of our people. How often have I seen that happen, and the fights he made, losing at the time, but constituting a foundation for future victories and success. On many occasions I have seen the defeats of one day, conditions that "MANNIE" CELLER fought to prevent so loyally and ably, become the victories of a later date, the power of his logic and the effect of his wisdom prevailing upon the minds of his colleagues so that at a later date that which he advocated became en-

acted into law or became operative and effective.

In debate he is always a temperate gentleman, one who respects the views of others in disagreement. To me a very fine practical definition of a gentleman, particularly in public life and holding public office, but a gentleman outside of public life and public office, is one who can disagree without being disagreeable. Certainly our good friend from New York, Congressman CELLER, exemplifies that type of a gentleman to the highest degree humanly possible. It is well and proper that on occasions of this kind, after long periods of service in this body, we pause in relation to any of our colleagues, without regard to party, to pay our respects for the long years of faithful, loyal, and courageous service they have given to our country as a result of their membership in this body. The very fact that any one of us remains in this body for a protracted period of time is powerful evidence that we must have some qualities that are attractive to our people, and the very fact that Congressman CELLER has been a Member of this body for 30 continuous years shows the love and the affection and the respect that the people of his district have for him, not only starting out as a young Congressman 30 years ago, but during the years that have intervened between the first day of his service in this body until today. The people of his district can well feel proud of the service that he has given to them throughout the last 30 years. They can be proud not only in the beneficial results to themselves but the contributions that he has made as their representative in this body to the preservation and the progress of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join with my colleagues in paying this deserving but simple tribute one whom the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] properly terms "a gentleman," but who is also a great American.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I have just shown to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] Mr. CELLER's book You Never Leave Brooklyn. The gentleman from Michigan after reading the foreword now says, "I am sold. I am going to be one of the first purchasers of that new book by our esteemed colleague."

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], such time as he may desire.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, You Never Leave Brooklyn. That is the name and I assume the theme of a book which today is released to the public. I have for several months known of its preparation. Except for the title I have no knowledge of its scope or contents. I do know its author. He was born in Brooklyn and Brooklyn has always been his home. Over the years he has been identified with scores of civic and charitable organizations whose activities were mainly directed from Brooklyn. He is devoted to his home community. He earned and has retained the respect of its citizens.

In 1922 they voted to send him to Washington to represent them in this House. That he has done so to their satisfaction is evident from the fact that he has been reelected for 15 consecutive terms.

Today completes his first 30 years in this body. He has served in the administrations of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and now Eisenhower, and in this House under Speakers Gillette, Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, Rayburn, and Martin. Today there are still serving in the House only four House Members who welcomed him as a freshman Congressman in 1923, and two who were fellow freshmen in his class.

At first I had a notion that You Never Leave Brooklyn was a misleading title and that Washington as well as Brooklyn would no doubt receive honorable mention. I still think the latter is true. Knowing the author, however, as a good lawyer and one who measures well his words, I took the precaution of seeking from the dictionary a definition of the word "leave." It means, "to depart from; to quit; to end one's connection with; to abandon; to desist from; to make an end of; to cease." Then I knew what I should have known from the beginning that the title was right, for "MANNIE" CELLER would never depart from; quit or abandon Brooklyn. He has been merely commuting to Washington these 30 years.

He served 6 years in the House before the opportunity was accorded him to gain a seat on the Committee on the Judiciary for which he was eminently well qualified. For 24 years he has been one of its able, diligent faithful members.

When I first was elected to that Committee in 1937, being not too well acquainted with the holdover members, I sought information from a former distinguished Member of this House, Earl C. Michener, who was one of my senior Republican colleagues on the committee, and who later became its chairman. I well remember what he said. It was as follows:

> "MANNIE" CELLER is chairman of Subcommittee No. 1 on which I serve. He's a Tammany Democrat. He's a good lawyer and he's fair and impartial as a chairman.

Of course Earl was not quite correct. He should have said, "He is a Brooklyn Democrat." At any rate, after Earl Michener had ably served 2 years as our chairman, the people of our Nation became deluded and confused and returned a Democratic majority to the House. The distinguished gentleman from New York—or should I say Brooklyn—became our chairman. It was my first opportunity to observe him as a presiding officer. Earl Michener was right. He was a good chairman. He was fair. He was impartial. He never attempted to curb legitimate discussion and he always recognized any member who wished to express his views. He and I often disagreed on controversial issues. But after all that was not strange. I represented a constituency in Illinois and he represented—Brooklyn; and our respective constituencies did not think alike. He served as our chairman for 4 years and is now ranking minority member.

He has my heartiest congratulations on this, the anniversary of 30 years of unselfish, devoted service to his country, his party and—Brooklyn. I wish him success in his new venture in the literary field and trust that You Never Leave Brooklyn will soon be rated in the bookstores as I rate him, a "best CELLER."

And finally, having in mind the industry, wisdom and conscientious service he has rendered the House and particularly our committee, I shall go as far as consistency will permit me, in trusting fervently that he will retain his present important responsibility as ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary as long as he shall remain in Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege for me to pay tribute to a distinguished colleague upon an occasion like this.

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER was known to me by reputation before I came to Washington to take my place as a Member of the 81st Congress. Beginning with the 82d Congress, I served with him on the Committee on the Judiciary, over which he presided as the chairman.

His record of constructive service as a Congressman during the past 30 years has already been commented upon by my colleagues who preceded me, and I most heartily subscribe to the tributes that have been paid to him on the floor of the House today.

I look upon the career of Congressman CELLER as one of outstanding merit and devotion to duty. I am everlastingly grateful to him for the kind and courteous treatment that he accorded me as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I am also under obligation to him for the timely suggestions that he repeatedly offered me on occasions when his counsel and cooperation was very helpful.

The tribute paid to Congressman CELLER on this, the 30th anniversary as a Member of the House, bespeaks the esteem and respect entertained for him as an outstanding and notable Member of Congress.

I sincerely congratulate him on this occasion that points up to 30 years of useful service in the interest of the public, and I am happy to add this brief contribution to the many well-merited and deserving compliments that have been paid him on the floor of the House by so many of his friends and colleagues associated with him on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] for the opportunity to say a good word for my good friend and also to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER] for the courtesy extended to me. It is necessary for me to return to another scene of action in a few moments

to hold a subcommittee hearing on the so-called tidelands matter, and these two gentlemen have kindly and courteously given me this opportunity.

I came to the Congress 14 years ago. I was assigned to subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, and EMANUEL CELLER was then my ranking officer. Throughout these 14 years we have served together, we have seldom agreed politically, but I will say now, and I am only too glad to say it, that in all those years I never found a more courteous gentleman than he.

No matter how sharply we disagreed, he was always frank, friendly, and always honest. As chairman of our committee he upheld the highest traditions of our great committee.

A few years ago I wrote a history of this committee; and when you stop to think of the great men who have served on this committee, you can see the honor and prominence which came to EMANUEL CELLER, and which he so richly deserves. Three Presidents of the United States have gone forth from that committee; 1 Vice President; 7 Speakers of this House have gone forth. Sixty-five Members have gone into the Senate of the United States. Seventeen Members have served as members of the Cabinet of the United States. On the long list of men who have served you can think of Daniel Webster, Franklin Pierce, William McKinley, Thaddeus Stevens, Stephen A. Douglas—I could go on and name them. I would say that "MANNIE" CELLER's name will rank with the best of those, in the years to come.

I was struck by what our chairman [Mr. REED] said about the difference in our districts. I often wonder if I lived in another district what my views would be. By the same token, if Mr. CELLER lived in my district I wonder what his views would be.

In committee work we come close together. You come to know each other. You get beneath the things that are superficial and on the surface, and you see the sterling character of a man. I have never known a man to conduct more losing fights than this man, but he has never lost his sense of humor. He has always been fair; he has always been temperate; he has always been kindly; he has always been a gentleman.

I am glad to pay this tribute to him.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be privileged to join with my colleagues today in paying this deserving tribute to Congressman EMANUEL CELLER on the occasion of his 30th anniversary of service here in the House of Representatives.

"MANNIE" CELLER, as he is affectionately known to most of us on both sides of the aisle, was born in Brooklyn on May 6, 1888. He was graduated from Boys' High School of Brooklyn in 1906, Columbia College, New York City, in 1910 and the Columbia University Law School in 1912. He was highly successful in the practice of law from the outset of his career and has added great distinction and luster to our great legal profession.

Elected to the 68th Congress on March 4, 1923, he has served with great honor and distinction during some of the most crucial, difficult, and trying times in the history of our country. He has made a lasting and courageous record in carrying out the principles of our democratic form of government and during his 30 years of service has won the acclaim, respect, and warm admiration of the Members of the House of Representatives.

As a close personal friend and colleague, I feel that my life has been richer and fuller because of my friendship with "MANNIE" CELLER. When I first became a Member of this body he was a very busy man with his important work in the House, his duties in the House Judiciary Committee, and his pressing problems as the dean of our Brooklyn delegation but I remember quite vividly his courteous helpfulness and cheerful cooperation whenever I had any perplexing problem which I desired to present to him. Like most freshmen Members, I had many matters which I found somewhat bewildering and shall always be grateful for his sound advice and wise counsel.

While we here in the House get to know each other pretty well and have an opportunity to learn and evaluate the character and accomplishments of our colleagues, I nevertheless feel that in order to have an accurate understanding of the true character of a man we must go amongst the people with whom he has lived and associated himself throughout his lifetime. He grew up in a neighborhood where he intimately knew from early childhood friends and neighbors of many nationalities and in this teeming atmosphere of a big city, he developed his great passion for finding effective means to help improve the living standards and general welfare of the many plain working people and those who came here from foreign shores to take up permanent residence and become citizens of our beloved country. From such surroundings he rose to his present eminent stature as a legislator, an outstanding liberal statesman, and humanitarian. His continuous service in this House over a 30-year span demonstrates that the people whom he represents in the 11th Congressional District of New York have profound faith and confidence in him. They have learned to love and admire him for his unstinted devotion to the betterment of the lot of the working men and women, his sponsorship of beneficial legislation for our immigrants, his devotion to democratic principles and civil liberties.

Today, on the eve of the anniversary of his 30 years of service in the House of Representatives, I congratulate "MANNIE" CELLER and wish him many, many years of good health and happiness, and continuance of rendering in the future the courageous and enlightened service he has rendered to the people of his district, State, and country in the past. His beloved wife, daughters, and grandchildren may well be proud of him.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I know you will indulge me if I call attention to the fact that sitting in the gallery at this time is a former Member of this House, now a specialist in the Library of Congress. He is Meyer Jacobstein, who came to the Congress back in 1923 with "MANNIE" CELLER. I just had a brief talk with Mr. Jacobstein and he told me of his intense admiration for Mr. CELLER. He said also that before he came to Congress he was a professor at the University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y. He continued: "You know, Congressman CANFIELD, your colleague, KEN KEATING, was one of the best students we ever had in that university."

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] such time as he may desire.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this is the day when we do honor to our distinguished friend from Brooklyn exclusively. I am happy to be one to join in this tribute to my beloved friend and able colleague. I have served on the Committee on the Judiciary during my comparatively short tenure in Congress at all times with Mr. CELLER. Except in the 80th Congress, this is the first time I have sat on the majority side of that committee. But when his party was in power our friend from Brooklyn was the chairman of that great committee and I can conscientiously say that during his chairmanship he extended to all of the members of the then minority, and specifically to me, every courtesy which was possible. Politics did not dictate the objects of his generous treatment.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and I have frequently differed, sometimes vehemently, on various issues which have come before us, both in the committee and here on the floor, but never in his mind or heart any more than in mine has there been the slightest degree of rancor or ill feeling. He is one who to my way of thinking is outstanding in the respect that one can differ with him vigorously and debate the issues heatedly, yet walk away shaking hands and as good friends as ever.

I am delighted he has now been officially recognized as an author. His pen has already been used very effectively in the work of our committee and the results appear in the debates on many bills in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

He has a delightful facility of expression which will cause me to read You Never Leave Brooklyn with great pleasure. "MANNIE" CELLER has kept me awake at night many times worrying over how I could meet his keen intellect and penetrating argument in debate the next day on some issue. He will now keep me awake at night in the more enjoyable task of reading this book about his interesting life and distinguished exploits. I hope his book will receive the enthusiastic reception from the reading public which I know it so richly deserves.

Since I am informed it is impossible to elect a Republican from the congressional district represented by my good friend from Brooklyn, I can without restraint of any kind express the hope that he will be serving in this House for many years to come. My wish for him and his family is that they may be vouchsafed all of the good things of life in most abundant measure.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield with great honor to our beloved minority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, this talk about Brooklyn reminds me somewhat of what happened down in Texas, as history tells us. One of the smallest counties in Texas then wanted to secede from Texas. It was not too effective, of course; however the resolution was passed.

I understand there is a movement on that has support in some quarters that they admit the free state of Brooklyn as the 49th or 50th, if Congress passes the Hawaiian statehood bill. If I were to line up on either side, I would line up on the side of Brooklyn.

Brooklyn must be a wonderful place to live and rear families because I have seen some of the finest people I have ever known in all the years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives who came from Brooklyn.

To be a Member of the House of Representatives for 30 years means a great deal. You have got to be accurate, you have got to be fleet-footed, know how to get around and convince people, or fool them, one or the other. To be a Member of the Congress of the United States, which I think is the greatest body on earth, is a great honor. As I have said so often, it has been my life since I was a very young man and, frankly, it is one of my great loves. It is a great honor for any man to be sent to the House of Representatives 1 time by a constituency, but when they renew that commission for 15 times, it becomes really a greater and greater honor.

"MANNIE" CELLER must have been candid and frank with his people. They must think he is honest, they must really feel he is true to the ancient faiths that made this country great and that have kept it great. He made a great chairman of the outstanding Committee on the Judiciary where his name will be remembered as long as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the history of legislation is written and read.

So, today, I congratulate my friend, because throughout all these years we have been close, personal friends. He has a personality that elicits friendships, and that is one of the finest things after all that can come to a man; that he so walks among his fellows that they are delighted to call him "friend," and today to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] I give my heartfelt congratulations and wish him many years of life and enjoyment with his family and friends, and that his service in this House may be extended many years in the future.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I think I should recite very briefly a little incident out of personal experience with "MANNIE" CELLER that confirms all of these compliments that have been said, and yet may not be repetitious. A broadcasting company in New York staged a little radio show quite early in our respective lives between the gentleman from Brooklyn and a neophyte coming out of Westchester, N. Y., for my first time on the radio. We started this show on a heated subject. "Mannie," I thought, kept the microphone and talked an incredibly long time. The moderator did nothing about it. I did not know what to do. In those days there was only one microphone between the parties. After the show "Mannie" came over to me and said, "Well, I thought you knew the rule of this rough game. When you feel you must say something in the debate, you just grab the microphone away from the other fellow and start talking." We have been on the radio since many times, and I think I ought to confess at this time that I have taken advantage of that rule too often and "Mannie" in his anxiety to be fair every time since has given way to see that I had more than a fair break. It simply confirms his everlasting sense of fairness, both as a lawyer and as a Congressman. It shows his capacity for friendship and human feeling of kindliness and for square play which I have always felt in dealing with him and meeting with him. And it is true even when disagreeing violently with him.

Greetings to you, "Mannie."

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said here this afternoon about our good friend from New York [Mr. CELLER] and about Brooklyn. Lest you gain the impression that all of New York is Brooklyn, I must, as a resident of New York but not of Brooklyn, correct that impression. All of Brooklyn is New York but not all of New York is Brooklyn.

We have many famous institutions in the city of New York and some even in Brooklyn. Up to this point Brooklyn's claim to fame has been the Brooklyn Dodgers. Now the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] can take his place alongside the other great monument to Brooklyn.

There are many nice things I should like to have said about and to the gentleman from New York, my really good friend, in the past, but he would not permit me to do so because of his modesty. However, this is probably a good time to say some of them, for he cannot stop me now.

I came here almost 12 years ago. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], whom I did not know at the time except by reputation, was even then a great man, well known in New York. I introduced myself to him on the floor, right in that corner; I remember it well. He invited me downstairs for lunch. His lovely, charming wife, Stella, was there. We three had lunch together, and Mrs. Celler gave me some well-intentioned words of advice, which I have never taken. I am sure she remembers them, and understands. I want to publicly thank you, "Mannie" for the help and support you have given me on many, many occasions when I have come to you for help. We all have problems, and I have always felt I could go to the gentleman from New York for advice. He knew my problems, he knew my district, and he was always happy to take whatever time was necessary to help me, and many other neophytes who appealed to him.

The gentleman from New York has accomplished many constructive and valuable things in the 30 years he has served here, many things of which we in New York are exceedingly proud. I think, however, that probably his greatest monument will be his fight and eternal vigilance on behalf of the millions of unfortunate people who, to escape political and religious persecution abroad, have had to come to these shores for sanctuary, and have pleaded with us to open the doors of this great land of opportunity, so that they might attempt to rebuild their shattered lives.

This country has become great by reason of the immigrants who have come to our shores over the years. The cultures that were brought here from all the countries of the world have helped us in building the greatest and the strongest democracy in the world.

I think the one thing of which the gentleman from New York can be proudest is the fight he has made over the years to see that we have decent, humane, and liberal immigration laws. Here again he is in one of the great fights of his career for the repeal of the McCarran Act, and I know "MANNIE" CELLER will go on to win the fight on this ill-conceived immigration law which is presently on our books and which I believe was a mistake. I sincerely believe we will correct that error. In that fight to correct it, in that fight to create a more humane immigration policy in this country, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] will be the leader in the future, as he has been in the past.

I have been here 12 years, so the gentleman from New York has 18 years on me; and "Mannie," I would like to make a deal with you now. Eighteen years from now, when I will have served 30 years in this House, I hope you will be here to lead the Members in saying about me some of the things we are saying about you, and I hope I will deserve them, as you certainly do.

Even those of us from New York do not always agree, but one thing we do agree upon is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has been a credit not only to Brooklyn or to New York, but to our entire country. I think he ought to change the name of his book—not You Never Leave Brooklyn, but that you Never Leave the U. S. A.—you never leave the greatness that you have earned.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, my tenure in Congress has been very brief, indeed. A little more than 30 days, as compared with Mr. CELLER's 30 years, and yet I believe I have been in this House long enough to come to an appreciation of those qualities which conspicuously distinguish the gentleman from New York.

I am sure that everyone will agree that he is a man of vigorous independence, with a mind of his own and the courage and forthrightness to give it expression as a fighter who does not hesitate to give battle. I submit that the world today

could use many more people who value their independence and are always ready to stand up and fight for it.

But no tribute to Mr. CELLER would be complete if it did not speak of his rare good humor, which seems never to fail him, and which, I suspect, has rescued both him and his adversaries from the perils of stalemate debate on many an occasion.

New Members like myself are grateful to Mr. CELLER and other veterans in this House who are always ready to guide us, and I am particularly happy to join in this tribute, for it affords me an opportunity to acknowledge the helpfulness and kindness of all those in the leadership of this distinguished body who make it possible for newcomers to find their way.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted now to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] for a number of reasons. One of the reasons I am particularly grateful to him points up one of my great difficulties. I have a great deal of trouble remembering funny stories, but I have always found no difficulty whatsoever in getting "Mannie" to repeat over and over and over again the same stories in order to refresh my memory. I am also very frank to say that I am grateful to my friends on the other side of the aisle, the majority side, for their tributes to one of the great statesmen of the State of New York and the city of New York. They have frankly said that they, on occasion, have not been able to agree with the positions that "Mannie" has taken. I want it clearly understood, however, that one of the proudest things in my short record is that I think I can truthfully say now for the past, and I am confident for the future, "'Mannie,' I never disagree with you." I have followed you on many, many issues because I know that the heart that has determined your verdict on the issues stands for the same things that motivate my life. I look forward in the years that lie ahead here in the Congress and, in whatever walk of life to which we may be called, to the opportunity of working with you and of following you. I think that my party, the Democratic Party, is what it is today because of the inspiration and the leadership and the positions you have taken in your 30 years of service to your country. I hope and I pray that our party will continue to follow the precepts which you have laid down and will continue to lay down.

"Mannie," I simply say to you, "lead on, your friends will follow."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] such time as he may require.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have known our colleague, Mr. CELLER, for a lot longer time than I have been in the House of Representatives. I have known him as a friend and as a coworker, and I knew him as a New Yorker long before I came here. It was a great pleasure to be associated with him here in this very distinguished House of Representatives. I have derived particular pleasure from sitting here today and hearing these great tributes paid to Mr. CELLER. The appraisal of a man after 30 years of service from his colleagues who have served with him in a body as searching as this, into character, motives and objectives, I think, is a fair appraisal of the very life of a man. As a friend I join with every one of Mr. CELLER's friends in deriving the greatest pleasure from this appraisal of him as a sterling character and a great public servant, by the most searching jury in the world. It is a wonderful tribute and a great joy.

There is one thing about EMANUEL CELLER which perhaps has not been mentioned, and about which I know a great deal. I hope that, without repeating all the other encomiums which have been so properly heaped upon him, he will forgive me in speaking of this, for in this I share a deep passion with him.

I believe that when a public servant fights for a great issue he fights for it everywhere, not just on the floor of the House but everywhere. In this, Mr. CELLER is an absolute inspiration to me and to countless others. He always, everywhere, fights for what he believes in. After having been chairman of a great committee, in a completely secure district, we see him work even harder than ever, on radio, in public addresses, on television, in meetings; in getting colleagues to act together, as he has on that side of the aisle time and again; working to get so many of our colleagues together behind a particular issue. That is the kind of extracurricular duty which makes of a man a hero. This I know a great deal about. In this I know EMANUEL CELLER has served extremely well.

It is gratifying to join in this tribute. This life is so full of strife, controversy, argument, and discussion that to have the unadulterated privilege for a full 2 hours of saying the good things that are in our hearts about a truly beloved colleague is as much a joy to us as it is to him.

For EMANUEL CELLER, long and continued health and life in this great service which he has "started" so auspiciously. Both to him and to his beloved wife, Stella, every good wish.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my able colleague from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join in this tribute to our very distinguished colleague.

In November 1922, I was participating in my second political campaign but casting my first vote in the adjoining district to that in which "MANNIE" CELLER was running. I remember how people said this young man did not have a chance of winning; it was a losing race. However, he won that fight, and he has won reelection every time since.

It has been my happy privilege to look to him for help and guidance all through the years. He has never been found wanting.

Even though he has on this floor in many a battle wound up in the minority when the vote was counted, he never lost. He never lost respect; he never lost face; he never lost faith.

All of the nice things that have been said about him today can be summed up in a few words: A true statesman; a genuine scholar; a thorough gentleman.

Since rhyming has been a part of the order of the day, I will complete my few remarks with this tribute: "EMANUEL CELLER, a regular feller."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] such time as he may require.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it was Edgar Guest who, in his own inimitable, homespun way, penned the poem, People Liked Him. The poet must have had in mind some noble, kind, gracious, and gentle character who reflected the human touch in all his doings.

For some 4 years now it has been my privilege and my pleasure to know just such a gentleman in the person of the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER.

I have come to admire him as a truly distinguished colleague in this great body of men, and my admiration of him and respect for his human touch, his fairness, and his understanding of people has grown with each passing day. Serving under his chairmanship in the House Judiciary Committee I have also come to look upon him with the fond and warm affection of a friend who has known his kindness and who has sought his counsel.

The gentleman from New York has served our Nation and his district well. His 30 years of devoted service in the House are distinguished with achievements all in the interest of the people of America and in keeping with our time-honored traditions and ideals; and though as "Mannie" says in his autobiography, You Never Leave Brooklyn, that in his 30 years he has seen many causes go a-borning and a-dying, his efforts in their behalf have not been in vain or futile, nor will they be soon fogotten, for his dedication to these causes has been with sincere conviction and great courage.

It is nice to be able to say on this day on which we celebrate the 30th anniversary of his service as a Member of Congress, to "Mannie": May God bless you with many more years of fruitful service, and may you enjoy His bounties of health and happiness in abundance. And as Edgar Guest might say:

People like him, not because
He is rich or known to fame;
He has never won applause
As a star in any game;
His is not a brilliant style,
His is not a forceful way,
But he has a gentle smile
And a kindly word to say.
Never arrogant or proud,
On he goes in manner mild;
Never quarrelsome or loud,
Just as simple as a child;
Honest, patient, brave and true,
Thus he lives from day to day,
Doing what he finds to do
In a cheerful sort of way.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my learned and distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER].

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay honor to my dear friend and colleague, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER. Tomorrow he

completes 30 years of continuous service in the House of Representatives, as a Representative from New York.

No one could be more deserving than he of the words of praise which are spoken of him. He has the respect and high regard of all who know him; his reputation as a man of integrity, a brilliant legislator, and as a man of his word, is widely acknowledged.

Congressman CELLER has ably represented the people of his district through some of the most critical days in our history—the depression years, the dark days of World War II—and now in these difficult times when we are striving for universal peace. In him, the people have a man who deals effectively with our tremendous problems, and who has the courage to fight for the right.

As chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. CELLER distinguished himself as a man of keen intellect. He dealt with the difficult and complicated measures before his committee with competence, good judgment, and fairness.

Those of us who came to Congress more recently have always found him willing to give us the benefit of his years of experience and judgment, and his advice, when it is asked. He has never failed to give me a helping hand when I needed it, and I have found him to be a true friend. I know that many others also value his cooperation and friendship.

Congressman CELLER has given 30 years of splendid service to the people of this Nation. He has given unselfishly of his time, talents, and energy in the interests of good government. He typifies the finest in leadership and his contributions to his community and the Nation are invaluable.

We have always known him to be an able attorney and fine statesman; now we are pleased to learn that he is an author as well. His autobiography is being released at this time, and I am certain that it will be well received and widely read.

We salute our dear colleague, EMANUEL CELLER; we congratulate him upon his outstanding career and his many accomplishments; we are happy that we can continue to have the benefit of his guidance and friendship. We wish for him many more years of happiness, good health, and success, for he deserves the best that life can give.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will ever again be heard the cry in this land of ours of "Comes the revolution" so long as we have men in the Congress who have suffered and fought for freedom, the freedom to be heard, as has our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Europe has known the cry, so has Asia, and in '76, America, too, and the reason generally has been because parliaments of those lands, and governments of the world, have turned the talk of people off, not let them be heard. Grievances mounted. Frustrations boiled. Revolutions followed.

Last spring on Formosa, after I had addressed the Chinese Parliament, that night, just before dinner, Chiang Kai-shek asked me what I thought of their legislative procedure. I said, "General, so long as that red light flashes on the speaker's rostrum, to warn a man his time is running out, you will never have revolution in Formosa. Let your people talk, general, let them talk, do not turn them off."

"MANNIE" CELLER embodies the spirit of letting a man be heard. He fights for that right. Bless him.

Let me recall one incident as a freshman here. After 30 years, the Port of New York Authority was brought to account in Washington. Mr. CELLER might have ruled the hearing out on a technicality; the Port of New York Authority could have gloated over a hollow victory; one Member really did want to throw us out, deny us a committee hearing. However, Mr. CELLER, looking beyond the point of procedure, looking to the spirit of our problem and the frustrations of the people of northern New Jersey in connection with the issue involved, allowed that hearing to go on. No damage was done, frustrations were mollified. Since then, the port of New York has been undergoing a cleaning-up process.

"Mannie" keep going. That is what your spirit means to the people. That is what this Congress means to the people of the world, the right to be heard. We are not fancy-pants legislators hamstrung by semicolons or colons; ours is a spirit of letting the people be heard. Keep doing that for your people, "Mannie," and you will never be responsible for causing the cry, "Comes the revolution."

Your people must indeed be proud of you and themselves on this, your 30th anniversary in the House of Representatives. The very best to you, to Mrs. Celler, and your daughter. They, too, must be intensely proud of you, as are the people of the 13th District, and Hudson County, in New Jersey.

And I thank you, Mr. CANFIELD, Republican though you be, for giving me this time to say these things about my fellow Democrat, Mr. CELLER, of New York. That spirit we commemorate.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON], who for many years has been serving on the Judiciary Committee with Mr. CELLER.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in thus paying tribute to one who has so long and so faithfully served in this body. If the same or similar conditions prevail in New York State as in South Carolina, I can attest that one does not gain a seat in Congress by default. Subsequent elections are far more scrutinizing than the first. It has been my good fortune to be elected eight times and one has to be good for that. To be elected 15 consecutive times as our colleague, EMANUEL CELLER, means he must be very good or else he has his people believing as much.

This very day I sat on the Judiciary Committee, as I have for some years, between a Catholic and a Jew; I, myself being a Protestant, Baptist. In spite of these religious differences, I hold these gentlemen in highest esteem. In this connection, on Sunday morning last, upon going to my accustomed place of worship here in Washington, Calvary Baptist Church, at Eighth and H Streets, I learned that our sanctuary was being repaired and, for the time being, this large Baptist body, upon invitation, was worshiping in the Washington Hebrew Cathedral just across the street, this Jewish body having recently occupied a beautiful new temple elsewhere in the city. At the morning worship service next Sunday, Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld will explain the many impressive and ancient Hebrew symbols adorning the walls of the Jewish temple. This is an interesting, current, personal experience which calls to mind the words of the bard, committed to memory by me some years ago and made a part of my creed:

Shall I ask the brave soldier, who fights by my side
In the cause of mankind, if our creeds agree?
Shall I give up the friend I have valued and tried
If he kneel not before the same altar with me?
From the heretic girl of my soul should I fly,
To seek somewhere else a more orthodox kiss?
No! perish the hearts, and the laws that try
Truth, valor, or love, by a standard like this!

It is comforting to know that there seems to be a trend of greater religious tolerance in our fair land. Those who fight the Christian faiths, called Communists, are solidified and committed to the pagan philosophy of godlessness, denying that there is a future life or a way of salvation.

Although I am often on the other side, from my friend "MANNIE" CELLER, of the many controversial issues confronting us, I have never questioned his sincerity or purpose. He is an indefatigable worker. It is difficult to conceive of him devoting so much time to so many problems both in and out of Congress. It is an honor to extend greetings to him upon the completion of the three hectic decades which he has served.

I am pleased that such occasions as this are marked before our colleagues are summoned to their final reward. Too often we neglect speaking words of appreciation, comfort, and encouragement to those entitled thereto until they have already answered the final roll call.

Some unknown poet has left these significant words which are most applicable on this occasion:

WHY WAIT FOR DEATH?

I would rather have one little rose
From the garden of a friend
Than to have the choicest flowers
When my stay on earth must end.

I would rather have the kindest words
And a smile that I can see
Than flattery when my heart is still
And this life has ceased to be.

I would rather have a loving smile
From friends I know are true
Than tears shed 'round my casket
When this world I bid adieu.

Bring me all the flowers today,
Whether pink or white or red;
I'd rather have one blossom now
Than a truckload when I'm dead.

"Mannie," you have my heartiest congratulations, and I wish for you many more happy, fruitful years of devoted public service.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not know there was going to be this interesting gathering to eulogize one of our great Members until I entered the Chamber, so whatever I have to say today will be an impromptu statement.

Right after I came to Congress, a little over 10 years ago, I met the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and I was impressed by him. The particular thing that impressed me was a trivial one, but it reflected an interest in my congressional district. He told me that he had at one time been a wine salesman who sold wine for some California wineries, and as I represented a district with a great many good wineries I became interested in Mr. CELLER. However, in a short time I learned that he was an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. I used to listen to his debates and to his discussions with interest and profit. I believe I am in a position more than any other person, perhaps, in the Chamber today, to look at his career objectively. It happens that during the last five campaigns I received the nomination of both the Republican and the Democratic Parties. So while I am a Republican and have the endorsement of the Democratic Party, I can look a little more liberally and objectively at the record of a man who is a Democrat. As I look at the title of his book, it impresses me as reflecting something that is not true. Mr. CELLER is known away beyond Brooklyn. He is in demand as a speaker in California, clear across the continent. He is listened to with much respect. He is in demand in other parts of the country to discuss public problems, because people know he has a broad grasp of the problems of the curious world in which we live today. To me he represents what I consider a good Congressman. I do not always agree with him; I think he is too liberal sometimes for me, being a westerner, but he honestly and conscientiously takes his stand on the public questions that come before us, and if every man in this Chamber did likewise, the final composite of what we do would be good, in my opinion. That, to me, is the view that the people in our various areas send us here to reflect, and to represent them as best we can. Some of us are lucky enough to come from constituencies of tolerant people who are willing to accept our judgment as to what is best to do. Mr. CELLER represents his people but has a broader interest, a wider outlook, than most of us because of his work and experience in the House of Representatives for 30 years. His record justifies us to classify him as a statesman. So it is a great pleasure for me to say that I am happy to be here. I wish Mr. CELLER many, many more years of good health and I hope they will all be spent in the House of Representatives so we can have the benefit of his counsel, his wisdom, and his statesmanship.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATTERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege and honor to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a great man, a fine friend, and an outstanding public servant—our respected and esteemed colleague, Congressman EMANUEL CELLER.

"MANNIE" CELLER is a wonderful and fine man. He is a great Congressman and a magnificent public servant. For the past 20 years that I have been in Congress, "MANNIE" CELLER and myself have developed a warm and deep tie of understanding and friendship. He is a man of high integrity. He has a fine legal mind and as a Congressman he has contributed much in the various fields of his activity.

When he was chairman of the powerful House Committee on the Judiciary, he performed his work in a conscientious, competent, and fair manner. As such chairman, he was always gracious, kind, and tolerant to all who had matters before said House Judiciary Committee. To his colleagues in Congress and others he has ever been a considerate gentleman.

During his 30 years in Congress, "MANNIE" CELLER has consistently fought for and supported legislation which would give greater protection and aid to the weak, the unfortunate, and the oft-called forgotten man. He rendered devoted service to the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. He stanchly supported the New Deal policies of President Roosevelt and the Fair Deal policies of President Truman. He is a true liberal in the real sense of the word.

I know him to be a man of conviction and principle. I have found his thinking to be clear, constructive, and fearless. He speaks what he believes. He has always spoken out against the forces of totalitarian brutality. He well knows the menace of the Soviet Union and its satellites to all religions. His recent television speech of February 14, 1953, over the American Broadcasting Co. network, entitled "What's Behind Soviet Anti-Semitism," clearly shows his keen insight of the problem of anti-Semitism behind the Iron Curtain and its threat to world peace and security.

His virtues and accomplishments are held in high regard by the people from his congressional district. For 30 years, his constituents have sent him back to Congress, because they knew that he was a splendid public servant. I am indeed grateful and very happy to have had this opportunity to express my deep sentiments about Congressman CELLER, a great American, our fellow colleague and my good friend.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to join in this tribute to our distinguished colleague, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, the dean of the Brooklyn congressional delegation, who today celebrates 30 years of service in the House. Those 30 years are marked by many accomplishments and achievements of which he may well be proud for his has been an untiring labor in the cause of civil liberty, freedom, and peace. He has given freely of his support and encouragement to the struggling young nation of Israel and has been a stanch champion of the rights of the minorities.

During the 81st and 82d Congresses, Mr. CELLER served with distinction as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. He has earned a reputation as one of the most hard-working Members of the Congress. I am honored to consider the gentleman from New York a personal friend, as well as a colleague in the House—my friendship with him dating long prior to my becoming a Member of the 75th Congress. His sense of humor and command of the English language are well known and have been evidenced many times during his participation in important debates.

The people of his congressional district in Brooklyn are fortunate to have had as their Representative in Congress for the past 30 years such an able, conscientious and devoted public servant as EMANUEL CELLER. As a friend, fellow Brooklynite, and colleague, I join with all of his many friends who salute him today and express the hope that he will enjoy many more years of good health and happiness and that we will be fortunate enough to continue to benefit by his advice and service.

Mr. DINGELL. A rare opportunity has been accorded me this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to pay deserved tribute and to glorify the name of my friend and colleague, EMANUEL CELLER, statesman and patriot, who for lo these 30 fruitful years has served faithfully the people of the 15th District of New York. The people of the Nation and humanity the world over have benefited by his magnanimous works.

EMANUEL CELLER is a personality so rich and genuine in human understanding, affection, and self-discipline that I believe he is possessed of all the cardinal virtues. In seniority he has risen to the point where but few Members outrank him, but his highest rating comes by way of the love and respect which the membership of this House bears him.

I am rich and proud in the thought of being his friend and coworker. Deep and abiding is the love I bear him whom I have known for more than a score of years. From the first day I entered this Chamber he has been an inspiration to me for the straightforward and courageous course he has followed. The printed record of the House is replete with the great contributions made by "MANNIE" CELLER but there are even more of his accomplishments which never have or ever will be recorded. His philosophy of life constitutes a perfect and an ideal pattern which is the link between man and his Creator. I would in preference take the word of EMANUEL CELLER to the gilt or legal bond of almost any other.

I congratulate him on this occasion and prayerfully ask for him health, happiness, and continued tenure for the benefit of the country.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege for me to serve with Mr. CELLER as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for the past 10 years, 4 years of which time my distinguished colleague, Mr. CELLER, was chairman.

Mr. CELLER has always been very courteous to and considerate of his colleagues. He has exhibited very sympathetic understanding of the problems of new Members, and willingly extended a helping hand to any of his colleagues who sought his advice.

The State of New York, and particularly his constituents who have elected him to serve for 16 consecutive terms, can well be proud of the achievements of Congressman CELLER. In the Halls of Congress he has distinguished himself as a gentleman of outstanding ability. He has clung tenaciously to and fought vigorously for the principles he thought were right, whether he was in the minority or majority.

It is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to an able legislator, a good friend.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, long before I was elected to Congress, I knew "MANNIE" CELLER. In some sections of our city, his name seems to be a byword.

Tomorrow, Mr. CELLER celebrates 30 years as a Member of Congress. I have heard from all quarters of our city of the good that he has done, and it really makes one wonder how so very many good deeds could have been packed into 30 years.

"MANNIE" CELLER is an outstanding credit to our home town. He was born and raised in Brooklyn and like so many others here in Congress, his success was not handed to him on a silver platter. At an early age, he learned the value of hard work and by crowding the hours, he managed to attend law school. But a legal career offered only a limited opportunity to help his neighbor. Seeking another outlet, he became a candidate for election to a seat in Congress. A Democrat, running in a solidly Republican district, was doomed for defeat but that Democrat was EMANUEL CELLER and he won. Again and again, at 14 subsequent elections, the people of that district have sent him back to Congress. He serves them well and they know that no one can serve them better. As his colleague from the adjoining district and as the executive member of the 18th assembly district, I pray God will bless him and guide him for years to come.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE].

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply honored for the opportunity to join with the Members of the Congress in paying tribute to a fine American and remarkable and faithful public official.

"Mannie," the best tribute, and without intending a pun, the finest tribute I can pay you, is to tell you that my lovely wife thinks the world of you, and she is pretty good at evaluating goodness in human beings.

Thirty years ago today our illustrious colleague, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, took his oath in this Chamber as a Member of Congress from Brooklyn, N. Y., and every 2 years since has been reelected to the same high office.

Born in Brooklyn, N. Y., May 6, 1888, he attended the city's public schools and was graduated from Boys' High School, New York, in 1906. He continued his studies and was graduated later from Columbia College and Columbia University Law School, my own alma mater, receiving his law degree from the latter in 1912.

Always a fighting liberal during his service in Congress, he has watched our country rise from its policy of isolation to one of world leadership extending a helping hand to all the world.

In 1924, he plunged into the fierce controversy raging over immigration, and has ever since been identified with the subject of immigration and naturalization. An active member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and more recently its chairman, he has had ample opportunity to help the cause of freedom and has fought in said committee, and on the floor of the House, every bill discussed, which he considered discriminatory. In the 81st Congress, he introduced a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act to permit 339,000 displaced persons to enter the United States, instead of 200,000, and over a period of 4 years instead of 2 years. His bill also liberalized many other discriminatory features of that act. In addition, he introduced emergency legislation to permit 300,000 refugees who have been displaced since World War II, including those from Iron Curtain countries who were not covered by the Displaced Persons Act to enter over a period of 3 years. He has been, and is still endeavoring to liberalize the unjust provisions of the McCarran Act of the last Congress.

Congressman CELLER made the most of his opportunity in Brooklyn where he has grown up from childhood with the Irish, the Jews, the Italians, the Greeks, and peoples of all the world. He possessed the courage, will power, and vision to enjoy the opportunities made available to him by this great country of ours.

Out of the swarming streets in which he grew up, he has learned a wholesome respect and zeal for the plain working people and has always been in their corner opposing the power of business monopoly and bravely defending free speech, a free press, free assembly, and all civil liberties. Throughout his public career, he manifested a deep and sincere interest in the welfare of the American people. Everyone knows of his real devotion to the cause of Israel and India and his magnificent advocacy of the United Nations. In his 30 years in public office, he has talked to the great and near great; to the Presidents and the makers of Presidents; to the Churchills and the Nehrus and Orlandos of history. He has earned the love and respect of his colleagues in the House and all the people with whom he has come in contact in officialdom. He is eminently fair and open-minded in matters pertaining to his official duties and courteous and cooperative to anyone who seeks his counsel. He is a progressive, vigorous, and militant Member of the House who has given diligent service to the constituency that he represented so capably in Congress for 30 years.

Today we honor him as a conscientious, faithful, and outstanding public official and communal leader. I am proud to be one of his colleagues in this great House of Representatives, and trust he will be spared to serve with us for many years to come.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] such time as he may require.

"MANNIE" CELLER CELEBRATES 30 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, his autobiography comes out tomorrow.

It is titled "You Never Leave Brooklyn."

By jumping the gun today, fellow Members of the House of Representatives are paying him a personal tribute that might well be called, "May you never leave Washington."

That expresses our sentiment toward a colleague who has given the best years of his life to the service of our Nation.

He is a faithful guide to every bewildered freshman who feels like an orphan when he first comes to this new House, and he is a warm-hearted friend to the veteran Members who have been here so long that they consider this Chamber as their true home.

The fact that "MANNIE" CELLER has been elected for 15 consecutive terms—and from Brooklyn, of all places—is a testimonial in itself. Judging by the lively interest his constituents take in baseball and other activities, I know that they can be satisfied with nothing less than a champion.

And that is what "Mannie" has been—fighting for the little guy all the way, and winning his case for him in this, the biggest of all leagues.

His vast and practical background may be traced to the composition of his teeming district, which includes just about every problem known to man with the exception of agriculture, mining, and Indian affairs, although I am not so sure about the latter, for there may be a few native Americans mixed in with his great cosmopolitan following.

Some Members have a clear line of authority from the districts they represent. Whether farm, labor, "silk stocking," or otherwise, such districts are interested in one particular phase of national legislation above all others. The Member who carries out this mandate has an uncomplicated job. He does not have to be a political genius who can satisfy a swarm of contradictory viewpoints.

So who among us can complain when we look at the little U. N. that "Mannie" has represented for nearly a third of a century without being mowed down in the crossfire. This takes skill of a remarkably high order. Come to think of it, maybe he should be promoted to represent us at the United Nations. I can see the hard-boiled Reds squirm, as he indicts them for their crimes against humanity with a passionate sincerity that comes from the common touch that has always endeared him to the average American.

I count it an honor to have served with him for many constructive years on the Judiciary Committee. As chairman, he was able, diligent, and fair. Living

up to such a high standard of justice in his dealings with all men, he could not fail to inspire us by his example. His accomplishments are reflected in the laws of our Nation, and they stand for honor, mercy, and integrity.

The greatest satisfaction that any man can enjoy in this life is the knowledge that he brought hope and strength and happiness to others.

To the extent that he does this, he becomes a credit to himself and to the creative spirit that is at work in this world, despite the troubles that presently plague us.

When a man has earned our esteem he is entitled to know it.

And so, while he is still with us, and for many more years, we trust, we want to give public notice of our high regard and loyal friendship for "MANNIE" CELLER.

Such men as he are the unsung heroes of America. Day in and day out they work to make representative government serve the people. The good that they do seldom makes the front page, but without it our freedoms might have perished.

To the millions of young people in our schools, from whom the leaders of tomorrow will come, influenced for better or for worse by the actions of their elders, I recommend the living reality of EMANUEL CELLER as a sound pattern for the shaping of their own careers.

The United States will be in good hands if they do.

He comes from a minority group who have been persecuted as no others have by the ignorance and cruelty of their fellow human beings. But they did not succumb to self-pity or arrogance. From tragedy they acquired wisdom and the grace that goes with it. For the greater understanding that is essential to leadership.

Knowledge and character are fused in the personality of "MANNIE" CELLER, bringing to the United States House of Representatives the genuine ability that is needed to solve the urgent and difficult problems that have been thrust upon us.

We are grateful for the intelligence and the trusted advice that he contributes to our deliberations.

And we cherish him with the confidence that we give only to old friends.

Congratulations to you, "Mannie," on your 30th anniversary of distinguished public service.

Brooklyn must be as proud of you as we are.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to endorse, approve, and applaud the fine things that have been said about my distinguished colleague from New York, "MANNIE" CELLER. It has been my pleasure and privilege to associate with Mr. CELLER and to work with him for more than 24 years as a Member of this great body. I know that he is an able, conscientious, honest, and noble statesman. He has done some mighty fine things for our country, and for his district in particular. He has the respect and best wishes of his colleagues. I certainly wish for him in the future the finest and best things in life.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I should like to read the first paragraph of Mr. CELLER's autobiography, You Never Leave Brooklyn. Also the last paragraph in this book.

The first paragraph reads as follows:

You never leave Brooklyn. The life that spills over from Pitkin Avenue follows you to the placid, well-ordered Connecticut Avenue of Washington, D. C. The hoops, the kites, the skates, the sleds, the fights of Brooklyn's children follow you to the streets of official Washington, where no children scamper through the streets or tumble under your feet. The shadows of Brooklyn tenements fall upon the low houses of Washington.

Externally Washington is a lady—proper, hatted, and gloved, as becomes a lady. Brooklyn is a woman, overlarge, aproned for work, with a crisscrossed heart.

The last paragraph in this book:

I cannot thrust myself into the future. Swirling around in my mind are the questions of the atom bomb, the hydrogen bomb, Korea, the use of the veto power in the United Nations, the rearming of Germany, the hungry, distended bellies of children in Asia. Each question is related to the other, and there is no marking off where one begins and the other ends. Perhaps when we understand the relatedness of these problems, not only each to the other, but the relatedness to each of us, individually and personally, will the ragged pieces of the world fall in place. This will be the search. It will be mine, I know.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER] the balance of the time allotted to me.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, lest those who read this RECORD think it is provincial or participation in it limited entirely to those who come from States on the eastern seaboard surrounding the great city of New York, I want it to show that I come from the opposite side of the country to pay my respects to the lovable dean of the New York delegation.

Mr. CELLER to me epitomizes the type of Americanism that we all can well afford to follow; he bases it squarely on the dignity of man; he has recognized this fundamental of Americanism as his guiding light. He has been tolerant, lovable, understanding, and I know from experience how he has helped and does help those of us who come fumbling into the halls of Congress. There has never been a time that I for one have felt that I could not go to "Mannie" with any of the complex problems that beset a new Member of Congress and receive sound solid advice from him. I have not always agreed with him; I have not always voted with him, but his being a liberal like myself I found that our thoughts were generally in consonance; and I am glad, as one who comes from the Pacific Coast, to hail "MANNIE" CELLER.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my word of tribute to those which have been uttered by so many Members of Congress here today. This year, the year 1953, is a great year in the history of the United States of America; it is the 150th anniversary of the purchase of Louisiana from France, and it is also the 30th anniversary of service in the House of Representatives by our colleague and friend, EMANUEL CELLER.

I have sat here almost 2 hours and have listened to one tribute after another paid to this able colleague, EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, and I say this is a great year and a great day in his life; to be the author of a book and the recipient of all these great tributes here at one particular time is really a big order. I do not think I have heard since I have been a Member of the House tributes of the character, type, forcefulness, and extent of those paid here today to our colleague, EMANUEL CELLER. So I join with others who have previously spoken in congratulating our friend and colleague upon the completion of 30 years active able representation in the Congress of the United States. I hope to be able to be here to celebrate the 40th anniversary of his service in the House of Representatives. Congratulations, "Mannie"!

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting and proper that I as a younger Member of this House should rise and pay tribute to our distinguished leader from New York and congratulate him on his 30 years of service and the publication of his book, You Never Leave Brooklyn. As it so happens the fame of "MANNIE" CELLER had traveled to my fair city, the mile-high city and county of Denver, long before I came to Congress. I am informed that his relatives and his uncle were among the founders of an outstanding institution, the National Jewish Consumptive Society in the city and county of Denver. Through that and his legal activities I came to know him before I became a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Since coming to the House of Representatives it has been my pleasure to serve on the Judiciary Committee with him. During that time I have felt that if at any time I wanted a friend and counselor on the many problems that appear to a freshman Congressman I could consult the distinguished gentleman whom we are congratulating on his 30 years in Congress.

I want to join with the balance of our colleagues and say to you, "Mannie": The Nation is proud of the services that you have rendered. We want to congratulate you on the honest efforts that you have through the years given to this Nation. May you have many, many more years of hard work that you are so capable of, as I know we all appreciate you.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I know that we would all be delighted to hear from the distinguished gentleman from New York, Congressman and author [Mr. CELLER], referred to by the esteemed minority leader as

fleet-footed, a gentleman par excellence. I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, and my dear colleagues, I cannot recall many moments in my life equal to this one. I cannot find the words strong enough to convey my feelings. It is more than appreciation. It is more than gratitude. The 30 years have at this moment dropped away from me. I am once again a young man, inexperienced, knowing there was much to learn, yet not knowing how much more. It is no different now. While I have learned much, there is much more to learn. But one of the things I did not know then, which I know now, is that service in the Congress of the United States carries with it a precious gift of friendship from the men and women who serve together. Aside from working in the public interest, as each one of us sees and defines it, there are many occasions of disappointment, frustration and even of failure, but throughout remains the warmth of friendship such as has been expressed here today. I am indeed humble before it.

You, my friends, see the best in me and by that very fact call forth the best in me. Also, I have learned that only through failure can we rise to achieve success. Our greatest glory is not in never falling but in rising every time we fall. Friends like you always help one to rise.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to make a speech. You have heard enough of my speeches in 30 years. I just want to say "thank you."

HON. SAM RAYBURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow, March 4, 1953, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, will have served 40 years in the United States House of Representatives. The Texas Members had planned a program for tomorrow in his honor, but we were surprised to learn a few minutes ago that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the majority leader, consulted with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the minority leader, and they agreed that the House would adjourn over until Thursday, and the unanimous consent was propounded and there was no objection to it. So, the House, when it adjourns today, will adjourn to meet on Thursday next, March 5. The Texas Members cannot go through with their planned program to eulogize Mr. RAYBURN on the 40th anniversary of his coming here. However, the Texas delegation will have a luncheon tomorrow in the Speaker's dining room here in the Capitol and we can still carry out part of our plans.

Mr. RAYBURN came here March 4, 1913. He has been here longer than any other Member of the House. He is not only the dean of the House of Representatives, but he is the dean of the entire Congress of the United States, because he has been here longer than any Member of either body, the House or the Senate. When I first came here as a new Member almost a quarter of a century ago I remember Mr. RAYBURN gave me some advice which I shall never forget and which has been very valuable to me the entire time that I have had the privilege and the opportunity of serving here in this great body. He said that a Member should realize that he is dependent upon two constituencies for success: One constituency, the voters in his district who make it possible for him to be here, who make it possible for him to serve; the other constituency, his colleagues in the House of Representatives who make it possible for him to succeed as a Member of this great body.

Now, Mr. RAYBURN has certainly carried out the advice that he has oftentimes given to new Members in that respect. He has a backlog of strength, of intangible, invisible strength, in his own district, of sufficient support that it has always made it possible for him to be reelected in 20 and more different elections in the district that he has the honor to represent; many opponents of his in the past have learned to their sorrow the strength of this backlog and he has been elected because of that backlog of strength, and that backlog of strength and good will has permitted him to remain here in the United States Congress, and the other backlog of strength and good will here in Congress has made it possible for him to succeed and to become chairman of a great committee, one of the greatest in this House, and to be the author of some of the greatest laws that have ever passed the American Congress and to be minority leader and to be majority leader and to be Speaker of the House of Representatives.

He has not only the honor and the distinction of being the dean of the entire Congress but he has the honor of having served as Speaker of the House longer than any other Speaker of the House of Representatives has ever served.

So today we congratulate Mr. RAYBURN for tomorrow, since he had agreed without our knowledge and consent for the House to go over until Thursday next, overlooking tomorrow, when we expected to have the real ceremony.

The Members of Congress who come here call upon Mr. RAYBURN for advice. He is always kind, he is considerate, he is helpful, and he is constructive.

He has served with more than 3,000 Members of the House of Representatives. I do not believe there is a man in America who stands higher and in greater esteem with every one of those Members today than the Honorable SAM RAYBURN of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Texas. He is entitled to that good name, "Mr. Democrat of the United States."

Few men have served a single constituency for so long in this Chamber. None has served with a deeper devotion to duty or with greater influence for good of his fellowman.

This moment is too brief to recount even the major items of the impressive record our colleague has carved in the service of his country and his countrymen. Even the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the past two decades fails to enumerate highlights of his historic service and achievements.

Permit me, please, Mr. Speaker, to recall that the statutes of this modern day contain important laws conceived and written by SAM RAYBURN; conceived and written and enacted to meet the rapidly changing conditions and needs of the Nation as it shifted, during his service, from a pastoral to a scientific age.

His perception, his vision, his comprehension of the problems of the future and the means to meet them, made it possible for SAM RAYBURN to make immeasurable contributions to the economic growth, security, and well-being of the Nation.

In recognition of his leadership, his knowledge, his courage, his ability, his wisdom and love of justice and fairness, this House elected SAM RAYBURN to serve as its Speaker for a total of 10 years. No such honor has or probably ever will be bestowed upon another Member of this body.

The sense of fairness that SAM RAYBURN has demonstrated not only as Speaker and majority and minority leader of his party is a challenge to all of us who serve in this democratic body.

In this long service of 40 years Mr. RAYBURN has seen this Nation come out of two world wars and three economic depressions and continue to grow in material and spiritual wealth. And he had a hand, a strong hand, in this.

Aside from the honors bestowed upon and the almost fabulous accomplishments of our beloved colleague, SAM RAYBURN is known by innumerable friends in both Democratic and Republican parties for his big, generous, understanding, helpful, and loyal heart.

Loving people, SAM RAYBURN is loved by people, people everywhere.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have often heard the distinguished gentleman from Texas and our former Speaker say, "I love the House of Representatives." We all know that to be true. Mr. RAYBURN has the real affection and the lasting admiration of all of the membership of the House, Republican and Democrat alike. He has written much history in this legislative body, and he will always be remembered as one of our greatest Members, and one of our ablest Speakers.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the time I have asked for today was not for this purpose, but was for the purpose of speaking on another subject which I shall briefly discuss. Since our good Democratic leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] had already agreed to adjourn over until Thursday, I felt that something should be said about the 40th anniversary of his service in the House of Representatives. I will speak to you about the RFC and about how the RFC aids small business, and how it would not be economical to discontinue the RFC. Furthermore, I want to discuss the fact that all agencies of the Government do not save the taxpayers

money. Most agencies of the Government cost the taxpayers money. But the RFC not only saves the taxpayers money, but it makes large contributions over the years of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Treasury of the United States—of dollars which would normally have to be paid by the taxpayers if the RFC did not pay it into the Treasury.

HOW DOES THE RFC AID SMALL BUSINESS?

Small business—small, private, competitive, independent business—is the backbone of a democratic and capitalistic economy. In other words, it is essential to our way of living.

That is an emphatic statement, but I dare say that none here will disagree with it. Even in the current atmosphere, everyone is for small business. At least, they are until it comes to the point of doing something to help it survive and grow. Then some of small business's loudest supporters suddenly have "big business" elsewhere and do not stay to be counted.

EFFECTIVE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

I will cherish your attention for a few moments while I talk briefly about an institution in this country that does help small business and can be, if it is permitted, even more effective in this respect than it is today. I refer to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Surely if it can be demonstrated that the RFC does in fact give assistance to those energetic and able businessmen who happen to be small today, then we have established an invulnerable case for the continuation of that Government agency. It may come as a great surprise to some people, but all of our great industrial giants were small business once, and, incidentally, most of them got Government assistance, too, through tariffs, tax advantages, land grants, and so forth. However, today we are talking about sound, businesslike assistance; for each small-business man who merits it is also required to repay it with interest.

Although the RFC has made a few large loans to both small- and medium-size businesses, it is a fact that over a period of time approximately 90 percent of all of the RFC business loans are for amounts less than $100,000 each.

SHOULD NOT TURN INDEPENDENTS OVER TO LOAN SHARKS

By making credit available through the RFC on sound credit terms, small and independent businessmen have been aided in converting from less essential to urgently needed defense activities. Keep in mind that in each instance ample evidence was assembled prior to making such loans that private funds were not otherwise available on reasonable terms. I will note, however, that the RFC has made funds available to legitimate business which might have been otherwise available from loan sharks and others of that breed. But I, for one, will never come to the point of favoring an action which would push the small-business man into the clutches of the loan shark.

COMPETENT STAFF AVAILABLE

Strategically located throughout the United States, there are trained, honest, experienced staffs of RFC personnel who consult with the small-business man for the purpose of giving him useful advice and suggestions as to how he can put his business on a sounder financial basis. A very substantial amount of these businessmen, who consult with the RFC personnel, do not get loans. In fact, many of them are able then to reset their financial management and put themselves in such condition that they are able to obtain private financing through appropriate private channels. However, whether or not the small-business man ultimately obtains a loan from the RFC, he has obtained a useful service which large businesses can readily afford themselves.

SMALL BANKS NEED RFC

Although I have been speaking of primarily the small manufacturer and the small merchant, I might point out that a good many of the banks in the United States are also small business. Through the method of participation arrangements, the RFC enables many small banks to take as much of the loan as they are able with the RFC taking up only the remainder. I know that some of you come from parts of the country where most of the banking business is not done by institutions which can be called small but there are other energetically growing parts of our country which are indeed short of credit for legitimate business.

It seems to me that the RFC is a Government agency which, without cost to the taxpayer and without attempting to take over anything private business will handle, stands as a sound monument to the farsightedness and thoughtfulness of those who believe that small business is the backbone of our prosperous economy.

IS IT AN ECONOMY TO CLOSE THE RFC?

There seems to be a lot of conversation about economy in government these days—and I happen to be one who favors translating the noise into action. But I mean real economy, not the type of thing which simply makes a showing on the books—and really is something else in disguise. The statements favoring the abolishment of the RFC as an economy measure are the type of something else I am referring to—and the disguise is pretty thin, almost transparent.

The RFC gets no appropriation from the Congress to pay its employees, its rent on its offices, or any other of its operating expenses. In addition, it pays interest on the money it borrows from the Treasury for its loans to private businesses, to municipalities, to disaster victims, and so forth.

In other words—and this is sufficiently rare to be almost startling—the RFC pays its own way and pays a net return back to the United States Treasury. Gentlemen, the RFC is an earner—not just in the sense of public benefit but also in actual dollars and cents to the United States Treasury.

It has been suggested by some with a very short-run viewpoint that if the RFC stopped lending money and just started a quick liquidation of the loans it has made, there would be a bigger dollar return to the Government. That is undoubtedly true in the sense that some money would be coming in and none, other than the liquidation expenses, would be going out. However, the RFC makes loans, not gifts. Keep that in mind. The public's money has been loaned out to borrowers who could not get the funds from private sources. Rapid liquidation of credits which do not have a good private market would have to take place at a substantial discount. As a consequence, there might be a fancy book showing of dollars coming in during a short period of time but only at a big loss of the public's money. These loans are set up to pay out as quickly as the anticipated earnings of the borrowers will allow, and the RFC record on repayment is quite impressive. A speed-up liquidation would ruin some companies, break faith with citizens who contracted with the Government, and lose some of the public's money.

If that is economy, then I have been in favor of something else for these many years—and just called it by the wrong name. However, whatever you call it—it certainly is poor business.

When I said the economy disguise is thin, I meant just that. Why not close the Post Office? It loses money and some of the offices would sell for pretty good figures. The answer is obvious. The service is essential and should be continued whether or not it costs money. Turning again to the RFC—those advocating its closing as an economy measure were just talking popular language—even though misleading. What they actually mean is that they do not like the public service the RFC is performing for those useful citizens who just do not happen to have any other fair and legal way of getting the money they need. They do not like it even if it does make money. But, they do not want to come right out and tell the small-business men, the small banks, the disaster victims that—so they call it an economy measure.

DO ALL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES COST THE TAXPAYER MONEY?

Some of my colleagues, who also are honestly in favor of giving small business a fair financial break, have agreed with me that the RFC performs a very useful role in our country. But, some of them say: "We have to cut expenses. We have to give the taxpayer a break too. So maybe we can't afford the RFC right now."

Well, I was delighted to see a little item in the newspaper the other day—not pleased that it got such a small amount of space—but pleased with the facts in the article. It announced that Harry McDonald, Administrator of the RFC, had handed a check for $28 million to Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey.

Even these days that is not "chicken feed." And, what is so impressive, gentlemen, is the direction the money went. To, not from, the United States Treasury.

By the way, that is not all the money the RFC has paid to the United States Treasury since July 1, 1952, during this fiscal year. Altogether, this agency which gets no money from the taxpayer and pays interest on the money it borrows, turned in to the Treasury $102,784,000 on its activities.

Compare that record with other agencies of the Government and compare the RFC's performance too. And, gentlemen, it looks to me as if we have found

a bright spot, a pretty lonesome one, it is true, but nevertheless a bright star in the overhanging darkness of deficits, high taxes, and heavy spending habits.

The RFC does not have to make money to justify its existence. Just ask the small-business men, the small banks, the thousands of victims of floods, storms, and earthquakes. But, if it can do what it does and still turn money into the Treasury each year, I, for one, certainly will not complain.

IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the Congress H. R. 2947, introduced by me early in this session. This bill seeks to place a limitation of 5 percent of the domestic consumption upon residual fuel oil imported into the United States from foreign countries.

I am very glad to state that other Members of Congress, in their desire to represent their constituents and to protect the best interests of the people as a whole in the United States, have joined in the move to curtail the grossly excessive importation of fuel oil into the United States and quite a few colleagues have introduced like and similar measures.

The coal industry of this country produces one of the basic necessary products that give strength and endurance to our Nation both in times of war and in peace. Anything that strikes at the heart of the coal industry, that weakens and demoralizes the men who work in and around the mines, and that drives many of the coal operators out of business seriously and adversely affects the entire country.

For several years the growing and increasing amount of imported residual fuel oil has inflicted more and more damage to an American industry and has caused and is causing the unemployment of many thousands of working men. You cannot produce steel unless you have bituminous coal. In addition, many of the essential factories and industries in this country must and do depend upon the production of coal to continue in business. Many millions of homes, large and small, depend upon coal for their principal fuel and heating purposes, and in the past it has afforded employment for more than 500,000 of our working men who work in and around the mines, and it has given employment to many more thousands of men engaged in the management of the mines. It has, in the past, afforded reasonable profits to invested capital under our free enterprise system. Yet things are taking place now on an accelerated scale that threatens this industry. It strikes both at this basic business from a standpoint of management and invested capital, as well as at the men themselves who do the work.

As an example of this growing danger to one of the principal and necessary American businesses, I wish to place before the Members of the Congress these facts. Approximately 8 or 9 years ago, the importation of fuel oil into the United States from foreign countries was only a little in excess of 44 million barrels while in 1951 the encroachment upon our business and working men had grown to where there were imported more than 118 million barrels, and last year this increased another 10 million barrels.

To give the Members of Congress a picture of the seriousness of the havoc which is being wrought against our American workingmen and businesses, the permission to import into this country such a large quantity of fuel oil to displace coal and to displace fuel oil produced by domestic oil companies, this imported residual fuel oil has displaced from the market approximately 31 million tons of coal each year. It has lost to American businessmen who have invested their capital in the coal industry revenues of $150 million a year, and it has thrown out of employment and caused the loss of more than 4 million man-working-days in and around the mines.

To approach this condition from another standpoint so that the membership of this House can appreciate this growing danger each year, the miners of the country are now losing each year in excess of $75 million in wages, and this loss of domestic production in America and progressive unemployment is not confined to the mining industry alone. Besides all of this each year, it causes a loss to the railroads of America, which are themselves essential to our well-being and prosperity in times of war and peace, revenues from freight of more than $85 million. Because of the loss of production of coal in our domestic coal mines that is being replaced by fuel oil, it has resulted in the railroads laying off many thousands of railroad employees and throwing them out of employment, and it causes a direct loss of wages to the men who run and operate our railroads of more than $41 million in wages each year.

There are several States in this union the principal production of which is coal. There are several other States that produce coal in such quantities that the coal industry is a major factor in their economic well-being and prosperity. While the country generally, over the past few years, partly because of our armament program, has enjoyed prosperity and a high rate of employment of our people, yet when you take a look at the coal producing areas of the United States, in any one of the many States that produce coal, you will find just the opposite condition.

In these States that produce coal you will find unemployment has been increasing from year to year, and many hundreds of well-managed, strong coal companies have been forced to go out of business. Such a condition as this, in my humble opinion, requires and demands the attention of the legislative body of this Nation. If we survive as a nation in this great struggle that is taking place over the face of the world, we must remain strong ourselves. Our principal advantage over the enemies of this country that would destroy and enslave us is our power to produce here at home. Anything that greatly, permanently, and seriously injures any of our essential producing American industries weakens the whole Nation and places us in more danger should world war III strike us than we would otherwise be.

Another thing that should be considered in addition to driving American businessmen out of business and throwing countless thousands of men out of employment is the fact that if we build up a strong segment of our American economy to be dependent upon the importation of foreign fuel oil and war does come, shipping that oil from foreign countries over the oceans and waterways into America would be in great danger. It could be very seriously reduced or entirely cut off and countless thousands of businesses, homes, and people that are dependent upon the use of foreign fuel oils would be thrown into a state of demoralization and it would seriously handicap the efforts of our country to wage a successful, protective war against foreign enemies.

One of the greatest sources of revenue in my home State of Kentucky comes from the coal industry. In addition, the coal industry in the past has furnished employment to one of the largest groups of working men of any industry that we have in that State. To all of Kentucky, next to farming, the production of coal is the most important. Anything that handicaps and partially destroys the coal industry effects our whole State. The same thing can be said of West Virginia, Tennessee, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and to a lesser degree Ohio, Indiana, Colorado, Alabama, and some other States.

The production of coal in some of the counties in Kentucky in the prosperous year of 1952 fell off as much as 22 percent below the production in 1951. Over the Nation as a whole, besides many thousands of coal companies that have been forced to close, those that are hanging on and continuing to operate are only running part time. Most of them only operate their mines 3 days a week.

We want to maintain friendly and reasonable relations with other foreign countries and we want to trade with them on a fair and equitable basis, but I do not believe that we should go so far in cultivating, sponsoring, and expanding foreign trade so as to destroy ourselves. Whatever reciprocal-trade agreements are entered into by our country with other nations should have fair and reasonable provisions protecting vital and essential industries in America and the men who depend solely upon these American institutions for their livelihood. No reasonable country with whom we have trade agreements would expect us to weaken and destroy our home production.

In the past similar measures were taken by this Government to that proposed in my bill to limit the importation of residual fuel oil to 5 percent of the domestic production. I think that protection which we had along about 1939 was fair and reasonable and I hope and believe that the great Ways and Means Committee of this Congress to which

my bill and other bills have been referred will give us a hearing and that when the seriousness of this situation is brought home to them, that they will report this bill and I hope that it may be passed.

I do not know of any measure that would instill more hope and confidence among such a large group of American people than to give them this just protection.

In Kentucky, coal, we think, is the State's most important asset. This industry is the biggest employer and brings more money into Kentucky than does any other product. We were hard hit last year by the encroachment of residual fuel oil and it is taking the normal market for coal, but we are being harder hit this year. In the first 7 weeks of 1953, the Hazard coal fields in Kentucky was off 31 percent in production as compared to the same period in 1952. The Harlan coal field is off 22 percent, the Big Sandy section is off 24 percent, and the State as a whole is off 17 percent.

This question is important not only to Kentucky but to many producing States and to many factories and industries that depend upon coal for their fuel purposes. Kentucky coal alone is used in 30 States and in most of Europe west of the Iron Curtain. Eastern Kentucky coal is not only the chief source of coke and chemical but is used widely for home heating and a variety of other manufacturing uses.

The great utility plants and many of the Atomic Energy plants of the Nation must depend upon coal for the generation of power, and to sit idly by and permit a great industry to be destroyed and hundreds of thousands of men thrown out of employment by the importation of foreign products which unjustly competes for our domestic market will not only hurt the people directly connected with the coal industry but will permanently damage the defense effort of this great Nation.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 109, Rept. No. 108), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommitee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, mandated islands, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, beginning on line 2, strike the following: "(now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs)."

Page 1, beginning on line 9, strike the following: "mandated islands, and possessions" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "possessions, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

OUR MOST VALUABLE RESOURCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANGELL). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the war that ended in 1945 was called a world war because it spread over most of the inhabited portions of the earth. Several million soldiers were involved, many lives were lost, and numerous cities devastated. The United States and other powerful nations were constantly conducting air raids. It was a big war with a big name.

And, yet, the United States air forces have expended more ammunition in Korea than was used by them during the entire period of World War II, and the Army has fired off more artillery and mortar ammunition than it did in Europe during the Second World War. That little country out there along the far reaches of the Pacific Ocean is not much larger than my native Louisiana, but it has been, and is now, the bloodiest battlefield of all time.

For many months after June 1950 it was difficult for most Americans to comprehend the magnitude of the Korean war. Although it rapidly increased in scope and fury, it was given a rather insignificant name. But it is, in serious reality, a bitter war and a big war. More than a million and a half men are now engaged in that struggle.

Because the United States has in that area such a tremendous investment in manpower and money, a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee was sent there to make a study of conditions and report them as they were found.

As chairman of that subcommittee, I would not want to change a single paragraph of the report we made of our mission to the Far East. But I do want to record certain impressions and observations that are more personal and intimate than would have been appropriate in the official recounting of our findings. Reports of committees are confined rather closely to setting forth facts and figures which do not always reflect the influences of all the human perceptions. A sentient committeeman, such as I am, finds more to report than that which comes in cold figures, although he helps gather, assemble, and logically analyze them.

As a further reference to the report of the subcommittee, it does not seem immodest at this time to express delight over the fact that our recommendations coincide with some of the new policies outlined in the President's state of the Union message to a joint session of the Congress and to the American people on February 2, disclosing the fact that he had ordered a withdrawal of the 7th Fleet from the waters that separate Formosa from the mainland of China, a distance of approximately 100 miles. This Executive order will, in effect, release Chinese Nationalist troops to engage in war against the enemy if their Government and military leaders so desire.

However, many weeks before the President's message was prepared and delivered, the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee reported its conclusions regarding the Chinese Nationalist troops in Formosa. The committee had opportunity to observe a representative regiment of that army and was most favorably impressed. And from what we learned, the economic advantages to be gained by use of these troops are well worth considering. Please note the following excerpts from the report:

A private in the Chinese Nationalist Army receives $2 a month and a major $5 a month.

In connection with the use of oriental troops, it is the committee's view that the attention of the Department of Defense should be directed to the need in Formosa for additional hardware. The actual commitments of the United States in this respect have not been fulfilled and the further training of the Chinese Nationalist troops in the use of modern weapons and equipment has, therefore, been delayed. Even if the troops on Formosa were never, in fact, used as a fighting force in Korea, their training and equipment would be a most important asset to the United States.

It is the committee's recommendation, therefore, that the Department of Defense direct its attention to this matter of supplying the Chinese Nationalist troops in accordance with plans previously made and commitments already entered upon.

None of the preceding discussion * * * is intended * * * to indicate that there should be a precipitate withdrawal of American troops from Korea.

However, I must admit that quite recently and subsequent to the report of the committee, opposition to this proposal has come from unexpected sources. Certain officials of the Korean Government claim that combat between Chinese Nationalist troops from Formosa and Chinese Communist troops would intensify the fighting in Korea. This expressed opposition may be application of that ancient proverb attributed to Confucius:

They sleep in the same bed but they do not dream the same dreams.

Our recommendation that Chinese Nationalist troops be used in Korea is not in conflict with nor does it supplement action that may arise from the President's statement:

I am * * * issuing instructions that the 7th Fleet no longer be employed to shield Communist China.

In fact, lifting the neutrality blockade in Formosa Strait is a step toward fulfillment of the recommendations of our committee. It is also in support of my personal conclusions that all free peoples of the Pacific area should be inspired to utmost effort on their own behalf and encouraged to protect them-

selves against enslavement which Communist aggression always foreshadows.

And this is precisely what the people of Korea want to do. They are telling us Americans that if we will help train their boys of military age and equip them with modern weapons of war, Korea will assume and welcome the obligation of driving Communist hordes from their beloved homeland. Koreans are using a very euphonious slogan in their effort to convince us of their earnestness. Expressed in only seven words, it intones deep sincerity: "Give us guns and save your sons."

This admonition to save our sons is very appealing to American families. That is precisely what they want to hear and want to see accomplished. But let us forget the sentimental approach; let us divest the matter of everything that derives from emotion. Let us consider the subject from a purely cold-blooded economic viewpoint. Let us be realistic about the matter of saving our sons.

If population numbers enter into the estimated offensive or defensive strength of a nation, we are poor, indeed, in comparison with any of the Asiatic countries. Considering population in relation to land area, Korea can be used as an example. That little country is the size of the State of Idaho and with similar topography.

But get this: Idaho's population is slightly more than a half million as compared to Korea's 35 million, both north and south. And to carry the analogy a bit further and reverse the ratio of land area, let us compare China and the United States. China proper, with a land area of about one-third larger than that of the United States, has a population of nearly 500 millions.

To help me make clear my impressions that manpower is cheap and human beings are extremely plentiful in the Far East, let me mention an insignificant but enlightening incident that occurred in Hong Kong. There were six of us committee members in a restaurant, seated at a small table. The moment I sat down I became interested in the array of employees who seemed to be concerned with our welfare. Finally, I wanted to gratify my curiosity, so I counted our waiters. There were 17 of them. And, as you may well imagine, the service was very poor. Haggling over prices was their only evidence of efficiency.

After that incident and on occasions when I ate alone, 4 or 5 people waited on me, regardless of how meager the meal was intended to be.

Comprising the most densely populated area in the world, China and Manchuria are teeming with over 600 million humans, all sensitive to Communist exploitation. For many years they have waged a savage struggle to keep soul and body together in a region where poverty and wretchedness know no limits. In a war to the death, they have but little to lose in the bare chance of gaining bread and shelter. Life to them is a lingering horror at best. What's the difference whether it ends today or tomorrow? There are no odds. One alternative is as good as the other.

This philosophy of fatalism, this grim outlook on life, and this acceptance of the inevitable, have helped make good soldiers of them—a stern fact we will do well to remember.

This philosophy of fatalism in populations that run into the hundreds of millions, offered great opportunity for exploitation. Russia saw there a great wealth of manpower. Hordes of people, desolate human beings that would subscribe to any sort of ideology in order to get, each day, a bowl of rice. It was fiendishly smart of the Kremlin to come up with the plan of arraying them against peoples of the world who desire to remain free.

Perhaps those astronomical population figures explain the disregard of human life that one sees in the Far East. Out there, humans are cheap. The loss of a few hundred soldiers in battle is a matter of little consequence to military and political leaders. There are plenty more where those dead soldiers came from.

No doubt the Kremlin gave much thought to these facts before they began the campaign of fomenting wars in Asia in order to spread their doctrine of communism. Quite likely the Kremlin also took into account the American high appraisal of human life and our grave concern for those who are wounded on the battlefield and for those who die while serving their country.

Aside from the sentiment, this appreciation and high regard of human life is a necessary economic strategy to which the United States must adhere. We must conserve our manpower. We can afford to give guns to Korea, but we cannot afford to sacrifice our sons. They are not expendable. Our young men and women are our greatest resource. They must not be wasted.

For many years I have been vitally interested in the conservation of our natural resources, which include reforestation, the prevention of soil erosion, and which embraces proper land use and a definite plan for water use. I have been interested in the science of chemurgy and in the use of synthetics which have been developed to relieve the strain upon many natural resources. To my great relief, science has always come forward with a substitute when there was threat of complete exhaustion of a raw product. But we have one God-given resource for what science is powerless to create a substitute. It is our most valuable resource. And for this reason, Korea's appeal, "Give us guns and save your sons," must not go unheeded.

However, a realistic analysis must be made of the situation that would arise if the greater part of our troops were brought home or moved to Japan or to Okinawa. We must know the answer to certain important questions. What assurance do we have that well-trained and well-equipped Korean troops can prevent the southward surge of Communist soldiers, and what chance is there to drive the invaders out of the homeland? What sort of soldier does this suffering little country across the Pacific produce?

Gen. James A. Van Fleet has answered that last question in these words:

> South Koreans have all the qualities for making good anti-Red soldiers. They have tasted Communist rule by terror, and despise it. They are loyal, intelligent, and obedient. They have proved they can learn soldiering quickly. * * * They are equal to American soldiers in personal camouflage, digging in, mountain climbing, night patrolling, infiltration, ambuscades, and taking prisoners. For the type of defensive warfare in which we are engaged, the South Korean soldiers are as good, man for man, as United States troops.

This is the statement of our great military commander.

South Korean soldiers are frequently called ROK's and while talking about them, this great Army officer, Gen. James A. Van Fleet, makes this additional comment:

> And you can train, feed, and pay 16 ROK's for the price of 1 American.

When the members of the committee were in Korea, 60 percent of the 155-mile-long battlefront was being held by ROK's. Eleven divisions of Koreans were trained, equipped, and ready for combat, and since that date another division has been added. In addition to these, there were 2,500 native soldiers integrated into each of the United States divisions, comprising almost one-third of the total number.

As a further assurance that the Koreans are not guilty of idle boasting when they say to us, "Give us guns and save your sons," I take the liberty of quoting another paragraph from the report of the committee:

> The committee feels that particular note should be made of the fine work being performed by the Korean Service Corps. Thousands of South Koreans are now performing, even at the frontlines, virtually all of the difficult duties which normally fall to the lot of the fighting men. This includes the carrying of ammunition and supplies up to the frontlines, the digging of gun emplacements and foxholes, as well as many of the other onerous jobs connected with carrying on combat operations.

I shall make no effort to paint for you the horrible picture of misery and desolation that we found in Korea, a little country that has for 2½ years suffered the tortures of a big war. Even so, and regardless of their miseries, they are saying, "Give us guns and save your sons." It seems to me they are offering us a square deal, one that is not purely one-sided. We, as well as they, have a deep interest in this war. They want to drive invaders from their homeland; we want to stop of spread of communism. Koreans are not at one and the same time casting benevolent Uncle Sam in the role of Santa Claus and soldier to play both leading parts in their drama of war and in addition expecting the United States to relieve them of their burden of overpopulation. Please remember that I am expressing my personal thoughts and opinions, although it was while serving as chairman of the committee that I was able to make these observations.

Before the committee's mission was well under way through Korea, Formosa, and Japan, as well as Hawaii, the Philippines, Johnston Island, Okinawa, Hong Kong, and Alaska, we began talking about extending the tasks set for us back in Washington. Members of the committee began asking each other such

questions as "Why not extend our agenda? Why not go further than merely checking on reports that there is a shortage of ammunition, a shortage of weapons, and that much of the mechanism of war is inefficient and obsolete? Why not learn everything possible that might help set up in that area maximum defense of the United States?"

And long before we approached our journey's end, I discovered that I had a very personal interest in our mission. I began trying to find answers to the many questions that fathers and mothers are asking about their sons who have been sent to that faraway land to expose themselves to the dangers of war and the perils of a harsh and brutal ideology that spurns our faith in Almighty God and defies the brotherhood of man. I became seriously concerned about our most precious and most valuable resource that is constantly being impoverished by Asia's manpower, which is her cheapest commodity.

If, by removing the blockade from Formosa Strait, we are releasing Chiang Kai-shek's 550,000 soldiers to fight the Communists anywhere they may be found, we are making steps toward a conclusion of the war. If we train and equip Korean soldiers they will soon be able to hold the entire front line of battle. Then we may safely withdraw our forces, perhaps to the island of Okinawa. And let me say in this connection that Okinawa is our greatest citadel in the western Pacific and we should continue to hold and strengthen it.

Furthermore, in my opinion, there is still another way to bring this war to an end and thereby save our sons. We have long since learned that pussyfoot methods do not get us anywhere with Communists. So why continue using soft gloves and mealy words?

I found nothing in the course of my trip which should deny us the use of atomic energy in Korea. No one in that area asserted any objection to its use. But they would like to know the answer to certain questions:

Will the use of atomic energy break the stalemate? Will the use of atomic energy bring the war to an end and thereby save the lives of United Nation's soldiers?

My answer to both questions is an emphatic "Yes." And be assured that I am fully mindful of the devastating powers of atomic energy. Nevertheless, I urge the use of it in Korea. I do not believe that the use of our latest weapons and energy will extend the war. On the other hand, I am convinced that only the most drastic measures will bring it to a hasty end.

The time is late. Let us not wait too long. The Communists have turned the calendar back to the era of fang and claw. And like animals of the primeval forest, the peoples of the world are now confronted with the primordial law of a survival of the fittest.

The high value that Americans put on human life is disclosed by the way sick and wounded soldiers are treated. It was reassuring to learn that in Korea our military organizations are trained, manned and equipped to handle casualties to a degree that almost is beyond belief. This statement is borne out by statistics.

Of every 1,000 soldiers to reach an American hospital during World War I, 80 of them died. This number of fatalities in World War II was reduced to 45. But in Korea, of every 1,000 wounded soldiers to reach an American mobile army surgical hospital, only 23 have died.

While in Korea, I was privileged to make a closeup and an intimate study of the way we handle war casualties out there. I became a victim of one of the "bug" families that sometimes inhabit the drinking water of that region. I was put on the same sort of litter used for wounded and sick soldiers and carried into an evacuation plane and flown to Tokyo Army Hospital. Please understand that this was not of my own choosing. I had not asked for it. I was not trying to hitchhike back to the United States.

Today I am disposed to boast that I am the only Congressman ever privileged to travel under such circumstances and with such passengers. Although the experience threatened to wreck my emotional structure, I now know that it will never again be my privilege to fraternize with such a courageous group. Those 44 sick and wounded soldiers on the evacuation plane, attended by 3 nurses and 5 corpsmen, convinced me that mortal man is not without nobility of soul. And if God made man in His own image, He must have used for a model His vision of an American military nurse.

At Tokyo Hospital I saw the grim results of war. In my resolve to do everything within the limits of my ability to conserve our most valuable resources, I prepared page after page of notes that would, in years to come, refresh my memory. Like most notes that are hastily jotted down, many of mine are not complete sentences. Even so, in order to present the scene as it unfolded before me there in that hospital, I give you a few of my notes just as they were written:

A crippled soldier walking with two canes, but engaged in the task of pushing a wheelchair in which sits another soldier who has recently lost a leg.

A soldier with no hands turning the pages of a book with his toes. He is very clumsy. He hasn't learned the trick yet. But he finally succeeds. No, he's having hard luck. He dislodges the book and loses his page. He's a little disturbed, agitated. Now he's all right. A one-armed soldier has come to his aid.

A gray lady worker reading aloud to a blind soldier. She's called away. Another patient, swathed in bandages, picks up the book and continues the reading.

A young captain with whom I have talked. Two days ago he was ordered to standby. On a 15-minute notice he may be ordered home. "I'm going home," he has said a thousand times. He waits—not very patiently. He dares not leave the room for fear orders will come while he's out. The order does finally come. "I'm going home," he says to no one. But he's so overjoyed he scarcely knows what he's doing. He picks up a small bag, walks out. Quickly he comes back into the room. Then out again. Three times he comes back for things he's overlooked. He can't think of anything but home. Finally he recovers his poise, looks at me and grins. "Goodby," he says, "I'm going home."

I try to join him in his exultation, but the lump in my throat makes me mistrust my voice. There are so many who are not going home. I can only wave "goodby" to the happy young captain who represents America's most valuable resource.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very fine presentation regarding his trip, and especially the hospitals. May I say that we have on the floor at the present time our former colleague, Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde, who was Minister to Denmark. She tells me that 2 years ago Denmark, little Denmark, gave a hospital ship to the United Nations.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, I know of the hospital ship from Denmark. It is doing fine work there for the wounded United Nations soldiers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has made a very fine report. May I ask him when he was in Korea and how long he was there?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We left about August 1. We were due back about the middle of September. I stayed over 5 weeks longer.

Mr. McCORMACK. At that time we had 11 divisions in South Korea in the line?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Before I left we had 11 divisions in the line. They were actually taking over 60 percent, or I would say 65 percent of the battle line.

Mr. McCORMACK. One other division has gone in since then?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, there are 12 there now unless more have gone in in the last few days.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman give us any information as to the divisions that may be in training now? Are there any other South Korean divisions in training?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes, at that time we were training, which was as early as September, 400,000 South Koreans. Our difficulties at that time were twofold—the training of their officers, because we had to train them for leadership and give them confidence and we had to give them technical information. We brought a good many of the officers to this country to train them in radar and technical things and in artillery. We have done a good job in that respect, but we need to train more of them than we have. We need to give them leadership in this training. But in addition to that we must train, of course, the enlisted men. They make good soldiers when they are properly trained under good leadership.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think that even with a complete buildup, you can withdraw all American troops from South Korea?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Nobody recommends that. In time, it is my hope that we can build up the South Koreans under capable, commissioned, officer personnel to the point that we might be able

to withdraw our troops ultimately, let us say, to Okinawa which is just across the bay, which is our great citadel. But I think no one out there recommends that now our troops be brought home to the U. S. A. which would take them far away from this perilous spot on the globe.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the South Koreans who are in there now, and who will go in, will have been under training for some months?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. For a long time the trouble in Korea has been the delay in getting of equipment. We do not have enough equipment to equip the divisions totaling 400,000 troops. That equipment must be run off the lines, and it must be modern equipment. Then, after it is off the line and available, the Koreans have to be taught to use it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman give us any information as to whether or not any new South Korean divisions have started to be organized, let us say, within the past few months?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I could not say as to the last 2 or 3 months, but I can say this—that there are enough South Koreans over there, in my judgment, to give us the 1,800,000 men in all. We can train them gradually to the point where we will have 1,800,000 South Koreans.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that we will have the facts, and I agree with the idea of building up not only there but in Indochina and elsewhere as quickly as possible, as I say so that we will have the facts, this buildup that has been accomplished to date was done under President Truman; that is correct, is it not? It was done under his administration.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The beginning of the program started a long time ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Actually, of course, this country had been whipped down during World War II, and then after they had an invasion unexpectedly from North Korea, the country was whipped down to a very low point. It was hard to get confidence restored to men, and it was almost impossible for a while to get it restored to the officers in the service. That sort of thing returns slowly to human beings. It is not something that you can give back to them in a day and expect them to take it up as you would eat a bowl of soup. It does not come back that quickly.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. And this slogan of, "Give us guns and save your sons," is very nice too, but it has to be implemented as a practical matter before it can be put into operation; is that not correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Oh, yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. A few weeks ago on a program, I heard the South Korean Ambassador to the United States make that same statement, but he vigorously opposed any Nationalist troops going over to South Korea. It seems to me that is a rather inconsistent position.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course, we here, if I may say so to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, do not realize the animosities that disturb the Far East. We do not realize there is a great feeling of bitterness between Japan and Korea because of the long period of occupation of Korea by Japan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANGELL). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to add one thing. That is that just recently the Danish Government has presented Mrs. Ruth Bryan Rohde the highest decoration of that country. Mrs. Rohde is now with the United Nations.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. And we certainly congratulate her most heartily on that decoration.

Mr. McCORMACK. She richly deserves it. She was one of the outstanding Members of this House when she was in this body, as all who served with her knew.

Coming back to South Korea, "Send us guns and save your sons." It is proposed, as I understand, to build up six or eight more South Korean divisions.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would hope 10 more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, we have to face the fact that it is going to cost us $200 million a year to maintain each division.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It cost $85 million just to equip a division.

Mr. McCORMACK. But to maintain it a year it will cost $200 million for each division?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Every bit of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a problem that can only be carried out successfully by the appropriation of money to do it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is going to take a lot of money. I think the American people should be told that they cannot train more South Koreans, Chiang Kia-shek's 550,000, without putting up the money to equip and train the men.

Mr. McCORMACK. And that is also true of Indochina?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Well, I did not go down there. I am not as familiar with Indochina as I am with these two places.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that we have to face the realities of life. The American people have to be hardened to the necessity of making sacrifices because our national interest is involved in the whole picture. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. I think that is a fair statement. The American people know that war is a grim reality. There is nothing picturesque or alluring about war. You cannot handle a war without equipment or without soldiers. If you are going to win the war, you must have well-trained and well-equipped soldiers. That is going to cost money.

Mr. McCORMACK. And you have to have the appropriations that are necessary.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. You must have the necessary appropriations.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. As one who saw the picture in Korea last spring, I am very glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana make the statement he has made today. It is a very important statement. It is a very timely statement. Only last week I went to Walter Reed Hospital, there to see the first Air Force quadruple amputee in this Korean conflict, a Paterson, N. J., boy, Clarence "Red" Mosley, aged 21. He talked to his Congressman at length about the situation in Korea. I wish he could have been in the gallery today to hear the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana talk very much as this boy feels about ending the war over there.

The gentleman has discussed some deficiencies on Formosa. I recall when our congressional group went to Formosa late last April we noted one particular deficiency; that is, the lack of footgear on the part of the Nationalist Chinese troops. We saw there a crack division, the 67th, training in the hills on maneuvers, wearing tattered and torn sneakers. I wonder if that deficiency has been corrected.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No. It has not. If the gentleman had looked closer he would have found more. Of course, they were running around over those bare rocks with tennis shoes. Tennis shoes would not last our troops 12 hours. Furthermore, they had all types of guns. One gun was an M–1 rfle. We took another from a Chinese soldier, and that was an old Chinese Nationalist rifle. Another was a Japanese rifle. Another was a French rifle. And we even saw a Springfield rifle. You cannot run an army with a dozen different kinds of rifles in one unit and furnish ammunition for them.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know the gentleman must have spoken with General Chase, who heads our commission on Formosa.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. At length.

Mr. CANFIELD. At the particular time we saw him he was heading a mission of 400 American officers commissioned to build up and train this Nationalist Chinese Army. I wonder if he discussed with the gentleman the matter of appropriations—I mean how much it costs to support an American GI in Asia and how much it costs to support a Chinese Nationalist trooper on Formosa?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We went into all of that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We went into all of that. It is a matter which I think should be made abundantly clear to the American people that it is going to cost money; it is going to cost a good

deal of money to equip native soldiers, but considerably less than to maintain American boys over there. The matter of wages is not so great, for the Chinese Nationalist trooper is paid such a poverty wage that it is practically negligible. The cost of salaries and pay is way down. It levels off, of course, in favor of the Chinese Nationalist trooper; his actual maintenance such as the service of supply, medical department, Judge Advocate General's department, all of that is out in the Chinese armies. Generally authorities do not worry with those supporting services as we do and the cost, therefore, is less.

Mr. CANFIELD. The general in talking to us was very frank in the question of cost. He said he felt the United Nations were losing a good bet from the standpoint of cost alone and he pointed out that while it costs some $6,000 or $7,000 a year to sustain an American GI in Korea, it costs only $300 to sustain a Chinese Nationalist soldier on Formosa; and I am quite sure it costs us better than that, that it costs us around $10,000 per year to take care of an American soldier.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It costs us around $10,000 a year; that is the average cost; so there is a big difference in costs. But do not mistake this, to equip those troops and put them in the field is going to cost money, and the American people should be told that it is going to cost money to furnish them with the equipment they are entitled to receive if they are going to do any fighting. You cannot give them second-class stuff if you want them to do first-class fighting.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the men on Formosa are good-looking, they are strong, they are healthy. The gentleman probably saw them doing their gymnastic, their jujitsu. They are very adept, very competent. I am sure the gentleman was impressed by their physical stature, that they looked good physically.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is correct; they looked good physically, but they were thin. I never saw a fat Chinese. They eat a diet of rice and raw fish, and they do not get fat on it. But the equipment that was available to them was archaic. I saw knapsacks on their backs of 1898 vintage. They were supposed to have blankets tied across them. Some had blankets; some had old wornout raincoats they tried to stretch across their backs and disguise them as blankets, and some had on wornout raincoats. They do not have the equipment, that is all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is agreeable to me, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman visited Formosa, did he?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Sure. I visited Formosa and remember it well, because that is where I got the amoeba that later on caused me to spend 5 weeks in our hospital over there in Korea.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are very glad that it was no longer than 5 weeks and that the gentleman is back with us, because he is a valuable Member.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman care to make an observation as to the degree of training there?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Of course, it is always hard to talk about that. I went in there and talked to the Generalissimo—they call him the "Gimo" over there. He had very able officers under him, one in particular, a General Sun, a very able man. If left alone, he can do a very creditable job. But it is hard to know what is in the hearts and minds of men who have been away from their homeland 10 or 12 years as these Chinese have; nobody knows. It is a chance, it is a gamble. Personally I favor equipping them to let them do some fighting. As to what they are going to deliver after we have trained and equipped them with equipment that costs a great deal of money, I do not know. That is a gamble, but I am willing, personally, to take the gamble to see what they can do.

Mr. McCORMACK. The important thing in a fighting man is the will to fight?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct, and the courage behind the will.

Mr. McCORMACK. That all enters into the will. There are certain factors, intangibles, that make up that will, confidence in the leadership, hope for the future; many factors that make up the will to fight or the will not to fight, is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct. Those troops went over there as a beaten, wornout group of men, just able to drag themselves over into Formosa. They left all of their equipment on the mainland. We have to take these same men, although they look to me to be very athletic, and I think they are vigorous, too, but we are going to have to take those men and give them the spirit to fight or the desire to go back and reconquer and take their homeland for the Nationalist Government.

Mr. CANFIELD. I have two questions on the subject of will and leadership. Is it not true that most of those troops on Formosa today have loved ones, relatives, back home on the mainland?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not know. I think they hope they have them back there, but whether they are still alive in Communist China or not I do not know, and I do not believe they know.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is a fair statement. Is it not true that a large percentage of the officers of the Formosan Army are young men, graduates of American universities? Was not the gentleman impressed by what he saw? The Government of Formosa is a progressive government. Governor Wu, of the Formosan Government, is a graduate of Princeton University, in my own State. I believe they have a good government in Formosa today.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. One is bound to be impressed by the number of those people who speak English in contrast with the few of us who know anything about Chinese. Wherever I went, of course, I had an interpreter, and the gentleman probably had to have an interpreter, but a great many of those people do speak English, a great many of them have been educated in English or American schools. In reference to the Government of Formosa, I do not know the answer; we did not study that, and I cannot say. The land did not look good to me. It looks poverty-stricken to me.

Mr. CANFIELD. But in contrast with some other parts of the Orient it is a lush island. They grow many things on Formosa that they do not grow in other parts of the Orient.

THE BOOZ, ALLEN & HAMILTON REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have already received permission to have included with my extension of remarks a letter from General Gray regarding the Booz, Allen & Hamilton survey of the Veterans' Administration. I should like to read a little of this letter into the RECORD at this time and those who want to read the entire letter may find it in the Appendix.

You may remember that when the supplemental appropriation bill was up for consideration a number of Members attacked General Gray for spending money on the Booz, Allen & Hamilton report, saying that that money could have been better used for hospitals. Although General Gray made this explanation to our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I was not able at the time to come in here to say exactly what General Gray had told us.

I will read part of the letter:

> In response to your telephone call concerning the reasons why the Booz, Allen & Hamilton report was made and how it was paid for—the Administrator received a letter from the President of the United States dated September 23, 1950, which directed him to employ a commercial firm to conduct a management survey of the VA. A specification for the job to be done was drawn and an invitation to bid was offered to 16 leading, experienced management-consultant firms * * * The contract was awarded to Booz, Allen & Hamilton at a fixed bid price of $505,000.

On the floor there was bitter debate the other day and it was said that General Gray should use that money for hospitals.

I read again:

> Simultaneously with the request from the President, the question arose in the Administrator's mind as to where the money was to come from to pay for this contract and upon inquiry of the Director, Bureau of the Budget, was advised that it would be taken from the appropriation for administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services for fiscal year 1951, from an unobligated amount in that appropriation which had been impounded by the Director, Bureau of

the Budget and which would not have been available for use after the end of that fiscal year under any circumstances.

In addition, these funds were not available to the medical department for the care of patients.

I think that report did a good deal, because while General Gray carried out some of the recommendations, he, with his own staff, improved the recommendations of the Booz, Allen & Hamilton report, and many of us think and many of the veterans' organizations feel that his reorganization plan is a very fine plan.

Mr. Speaker, I was tremendously interested in the statement by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] regarding the care of the men abroad fighting in Korea. He points out that this care should be continued in the Army and Navy hospitals after the men come back to this country. We must make sure that this care is continued in the veterans' hospitals. Fine medical care is given to our veterans by the Veterans' Administration. Nothing should be done to terminate that care. According to Admiral Boone, who testified before our committee, the Bureau of the Budget has recommended that the care of the veterans be reduced in grade and actually cheapened in veterans' hospitals. I do not believe the people of the country will stand for or permit any such action. This proposed action amounts to nothing more than gambling with the lives of brave Americans who have already made their sacrifices in the cause of freedom. An amendment was introduced to the supplemental appropriation bill for $10 million additional amount for veterans' hospitals. Unfortunately it failed by a few votes. I feel sure that when the Members realize the great need for additional money to run our hospitals, that a supplemental appropriation will be voted, and I am introducing a bill for that purpose. It is impossible to run hospitals without money. It is likewise impossible to provide hospitals in certain areas and increase the number of beds in hospitals in various congressional districts without sufficient funds and adequate financing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GOODWIN in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. WILSON of California and to include an editorial from the San Diego Union.

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MERROW and to include a resolution adopted by the New Hampshire General Court.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include two resolutions.

Mr. HULL (at the request of Mr. WITHROW) in two instances.

Mr. BURDICK in two instances.

Mr. BONIN and to include copy of a resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania district of the Polish Roman Catholic Union.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous material.

Mr. ALBERT and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROBERTS.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances.

Mr. LANHAM and to include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER.

Mr. BUCKLEY (at the request of Mr. DOLLINGER).

Mr. FINE (at the request of Mr. DOLLINGER).

Mr. KLEIN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCKLEY (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. DOYLE and to include a speech delivered by Frank B. Belcher, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mr. BATES and to include an editorial.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. JAVITS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a letter and two resolutions.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. COOLEY in two instances, in one to pay tribute to former Congressman Doughton, and in the other to include an editorial appearing in the magazine Quick.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances and to include in one extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. GWINN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WATTS and to include an editorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, March 5, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

507. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the United States Soldiers' Home for the fiscal year 1952, pursuant to the provisions of the act of Congress, approved March 3, 1883; to the Committee on Armed Services.

508. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a list of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 34. Resolution to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 126. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate actual and contemplated action affecting production or consumption of newsprint; without amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 127. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations and studies with respect to matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 109. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3575. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; with amendments (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 777. A bill for the relief of Richard H. Backus; without amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 778. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 782. A bill for the relief of Kurt J. Hain; with an amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 814. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of Harry Block; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 946. A bill for the relief

of Mrs. Louise Blackstone; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2815. A bill for the relief of Floyd C. Barber; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2817. A bill for the relief of George A. Ferris; with an amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3215. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Clemmer Construction Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3230. A bill for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3231. A bill for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3633. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3634. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for a limited judicial review of decisions of Federal officers under finality clauses in Government contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 3635. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax admissions to athletic games, if the proceeds inure exclusively to the benefit of a junior college; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3636. A bill amending section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 3637. A bill to set aside the proceeds of the manufacturers' excise taxes on automobiles, tires and tubes, gasoline, and lubricating oil for the purposes of the Federal-Aid Road Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 3638. A bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 3639. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3640. A bill to provide that for the purpose of disapproval by the President each provision of an appropriation bill shall be considered a separate bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 3641. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3642. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3643. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3644. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the earning of $1,200 in wages in a year without loss of old-age and survivors' insurance benefits, and to increase from $900 to $1,200 the amount of net earnings from self-employment which may be received in a year without loss of such benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 3645. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3646. A bill to clarify the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the filing of claims for refund; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAUFFER:

H. R. 3647. A bill to provide for the establishment of an addition to the Gettysburg National Cemetery on lands presently located within the Gettysburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 3648. A bill to provide for the construction of a chapel at the Fort Snelling National Cemetery, Minn.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 3649. A bill to provide for two additional district judges for the Southern District of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 3650. A bill to create a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 3651. A bill to aid in controlling inflation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 3652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a construction worker may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation between his home and the site of the construction project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 3653. A bill to grant foster children dependency status for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3654. A bill to establish for Italy an annual immigration quota of 300,000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3655. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3656. A bill to permit the charging of tolls on certain highways constructed with Federal aid; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3657. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3658. A bill to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3659. A bill to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3660. A bill granting increases in the annuities of certain former civilian officials and employees engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 3661. A bill to amend section 2 of the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934, to invalidate Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps in States which prohibit by law the taking of migratory waterfowl by nonresidents thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. J. Res. 204. Joint resolution reimbursing uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. J. Res. 205. Joint resolution to unify severance pay to Federal employees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution providing information for Congress of revisions of the United Nations Charter which the United States intends to propose in the event a general conference to revise such a Charter is held and providing that no revision shall be proposed until and unless approved by the Senate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. Res. 162. Resolution condemning the growing anti-Semitism in Russia and in the Russian satellite countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the appropriation for the use of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture of the United States and the allocation of funds to the United States Bureau of Animal Industry in the State of South Dakota in order to more adequately prosecute cooperative programs on livestock-disease control and eradication; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the recognition and importance of the spruce-timber resources in the State of Idaho, and to initiate an adequate emergency program to control the spruce-bark-beetle epidemic; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of legislation providing for the donation of lands formerly within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation to Missoula County, Mont.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 3662. A bill for the relief of Eva Ruttkay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3663. A bill for the relief of Hajna Sepsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 36664. A bill for the relief of Anis Movafagh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3665. A bill for the relief of Marko Ribic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3666. A bill for the relief of Rev. Petros Constantine Remoundos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 3667. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Girdley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of Samuel Zimmerman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3669. A bill for the relief of Paula Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 3670. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 3671. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Durham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3672. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 3673. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Araxin Jerian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 3674. A bill for the relief of Gerhardt Passl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3675. A bill for the relief of Herre van der Veen, Mrs. Marie van der Veen, Helen Winifred van der Veen, and Jan Herre van der Veen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3676. A bill for the relief of Juanita Kloeden McCormick-Goodhart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 3677. A bill for the relief of Sister Paolina (Angela Di Franco); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3678. A bill for the relief of George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3679. A bill for the relief of Nicola Mastrofilippo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 3680. A bill for the relief of Dora Camalich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 3681. A bill for the relief of Nathan L. Laufman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 3682. A bill for the relief of Tate Gu Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 3683. A bill for the relief of Edmon Burgher; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

75. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Disabled American Veterans, Department of Pennsylvania, approving resolution by the national convention urging the Congress of the United States to grant a sufficient overall annual appropriation so as to guarantee sufficient funds to operate the Veterans' Administration throughout each fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

76. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Miami Townsend Club, No. 22, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, Federal social security for all; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

77. Also, petition of American Medical Association, Washington, D. C., relative to resolutions on international treaties and covenants acted upon by the American Medical Association in session December 1952 at Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

78. Also, petition of the Chairman, the National Assembly, Republic of Korea, relative to a message requesting economic and military aid; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1953

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, resident in the Syracuse area of the Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, for yet another day of life we bless Thy holy name. Without Thy sustaining grace we could not stand; with Thy help we dare confront the massive duties of this day. Give us, we pray, strength equal to our tasks, integrity equal to all testings.

And grant, O God, that our minds may be so open to Thy truth, our wills so gratefully dedicated to the Power that both made and preserved us a nation, that we, servants of Thine and of the people, may be privileged this day to strengthen the forces of righteousness and justice and good will.

Move Thou upon the hearts of leaders of all lands, to the end that men may yet recognize each other, across all frontiers, as members of one great human family destined by their Creator to dwell in peace upon the face of the earth. In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 2, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. CLEVENGER, Mr. BUSBEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. FOGARTY had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg;

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 724. An act for the relief of Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett;

H. R. 726. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Campion;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi;

H. R. 759. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 834. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher;

H. R. 861. An act for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Turkett;

H. R. 883. An act for the relief of Leila Park;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 960. An act for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi);

H. R. 969. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Morris;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Margaret Celikcan;

H. R. 1133. An act for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1194. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell;

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl;

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1452. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of Harold Joe Davis;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H. R. 1525. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1527. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1528. An act to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1529. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1632. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 1636. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson;

H. R. 1794. An act for the relief of Yee Kee Lam;

H. R. 1813. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights;

H. R. 1816. An act to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 2023. An act for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk;

H. R. 2033. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham;

H. R. 2169. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schafer;

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger;

H. R. 2381. An act for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter;

H. R. 2386. An act for the relief of M. Neil Andrews;

H. R. 2398. An act for the relief of Kenneth Cecil;

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk;

H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor;

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas;

H. R. 2593. An act for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of Clifford Robinson;

H. R. 2615. An act for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2645. An act for the relief of Donald James Darmody;

H. R. 2660. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; and

H. R. 3062. An act to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KEFAUVER, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering proposed constitutional amendments was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of sundry aliens whose deportation has been suspended by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization under authority of the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reason for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the United States Soldiers' Home, for the fiscal year 1952, together with a copy of the report of Annual Inspection, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PUBLICATION ENTITLED "STATISTICS OF ELECTRIC UTILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES, 1951, PUBLICLY OWNED"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of the Commission's newly issued publication entitled "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, 1951, Publicly Owned" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"*To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas in Idaho a total of 250 million board feet of Engelmann spruce timber has been infested and killed by a violent outbreak of the Engelmann spruce bark beetle during the summer of 1952: and

"Whereas total spruce stands of 2 billion board feet and having a stumpage value of $15 million and whose manufacture would create labor and lumber values amounting to over $175 million on these 5 national forests and adjacent lands in other ownerships are immediately threatened by this insect outbreak: and

"Whereas in addition there are 3 million board feet of spruce in Idaho which may be killed by this insect outbreak unless it is controlled; and

"Whereas a plan to control the epidemic and salvage the spruce has been developed by a joint Forest Service, Bureau of Entomology, the State of Idaho, and Timber Industry Group; and

"Whereas the carrying out of the program will make possible the protection from bark-beetle attack of intermingled species of timber and salvage of all infested timber; and

"Whereas this plan has the objective in Idaho of removing 205 million board feet of infested and salvage spruce in 1953 and 475 million board feet of such spruce in 1954 which will require the construction of 368 miles of access roads during the 2-year period; and

"Whereas it is necessary to supplement the road construction and logging plans with a chemical treatment program to control the spread of the bark beetles in isolated areas; and

"Whereas time is the essence of the success of this program as timber killed by this insect has little value unless salvaged within 2 years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 32d Legislative Assembly of Idaho of 1953, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring),* Do most earnestly request that the Congress of the United States recognize the importance of the spruce timber resource in Idaho and to immediately initiate an adequate emergency program to control the spruce bark-beetle epidemic; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States, and the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; the Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE; the Honorable DOUGLAS MCKAY, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR; HOWARD I. YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT AGENCY; and J. D. SMALL, CHAIRMAN, MUNITIONS BOARD:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session, duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to-wit:

"Whereas our normal peacetime requirements of primary Antimony are about 15,000 tons and in the event of an all-out war these requirements would be increased to about 45,000 tons; and

"Whereas heavy importation of foreign Antimony at depressed prices during 1951 and 1952 forced the Yellow Pine Mine in Valley County, Idaho, to shut down with the result that our total domestic production, since this shutdown, has been at the rate of less than

100 tons annually, or less than 1 percent of our total domestic requirements; and

"Whereas the said Yellow Pine Mine, for years had been supplying over 90 percent of the entire domestic mine output and has a productive capacity equivalent to over 20 percent of our peacetime requirement and about 10 percent of our wartime needs; and

"Whereas formerly our principal source of supply was from China, which source is no longer available to the free world, and another major source has been Bolivia, which source is undependable because of an unstable government and economic disturbance, and all other sources are either far distant, declining, or undependable; and

"Whereas our Government stockpile has been estimated to contain only 20,000 tons of primary Antimony, or approximately 6 months' supply during a wartime demand period; and

"Whereas our major wartime requirements for Antimony cannot be satisfied by scrap or secondary Antimony, but only by primary Antimony; and

"Whereas since February 1952 the total United States consumption of primary Antimony has exceeded the total available supply, including imports; and

"Whereas the United States industrial stocks of primary Antimony have declined during 1952 to the lowest point in many years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge: that in the interests of national security the new administration carefully examine our Nation's stockpiling program with respect to primary Antimony; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that since we are now in a war emergency and are currently dependent on foreign sources for over 99 percent of our primary Antimony supplies, we believe that our national stockpile of primary Antimony, estimated to contain only enough Antimony to last 6 months during an all-out war, is dangerously inadequate, and we believe that the Antimony stockpile objective should be raised to a more realistic figure; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that consideration be given to encouraging or maintaining some productive capacity in this country. We particularly refer to the closed down Antimony mine and smelter at Stibnite, Idaho, and believe it regrettable that these excellent facilities have not been made use of in building up an adequate stockpile; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson; Douglas McKay, Secretary of Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George W. Malone, chairman, Senate Mines Committee, and Hon. A. L. Miller, chairman of House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas an appointment to fill the office of Governor of the Territory of Alaska under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower is imminent; and

"Whereas the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, has repeatedly stated that he would prefer to appoint an Alaskan to the Office of Governor of the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska are desirous of having an Alaskan appointed Governor of Alaska until such time as enabling legislation is enacted so that they may elect an Alaskan to this office; and

"Whereas there are residents of the Territory of Alaska who are able and fully qualified to fill the office of Governor: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that a bona fide resident and inhabitant of the Territory of Alaska be forthwith appointed to the office of Governor.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, That the text of this memorial be telegraphed to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Honorable Douglas McKay immediately upon its adoption.

"Passed by the house February 16, 1953.

"GEORGE J. MISCOVICH,
"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"MARGARET GRISHAM,
"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Approved by the Governor February 19, 1953.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Cuba Marble & Granite Works, Cuba, Mo., signed by Mr. and Mrs. James I. Dodd, owners, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 622, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make a monetary allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make provision for payment of the exact equivalent of taxes to the States and other lesser political subdivisions whenever the tax base of such taxing units is depleted by withdrawals of lands for the use of Federal agencies

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House concurring therein):

"Whereas the Federal Government and agencies thereof from time to time have withdrawn from the State and its political subdivision areas such as the ammunition depot at Provo; the Angostura irrigation project in Fall River and Custer Counties; the Belle Fourche irrigation project in Butte and Meade Counties; submarginal land utilization areas principally located in Stanley, Lyman, Jones, Jackson, Pennington, and Perkins Counties; airbases at Rapid City and at Sioux Falls, the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation; the Crow Creek Indian Reservation; the Cheyenne Indian Reservation; Rosebud Indian Reservation; the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; the Lower Brule Indian Reservation; the Sisseton Indian Reservation; the Black Hills National Forest; the Harney National Forest; Wind Cave National Park; Jewel Cave National Park; the Bad Lands National Monument; the Rushmore National Monument; the East and West Short Pine National Forests; veterans' facility hospitals at Sioux Falls and at Ft. Meade; the bombing range in Shannon County; the experiment station at Newell; the various Indian schools; the Indian hospital at Rapid City; the Federal sanatorium at Hot Springs, and the other lesser withdrawals; and

"Whereas in the development of the Missouri River project it will be necessary for the Federal Government to acquire extensive areas in South Dakota such as dam sites, areas to be inundated and marginal lands, rights-of-way for canals and ditches, townsites, and areas for administrative facilities; and

"Whereas the State of South Dakota has for a period of 12 years paid on school and endowment lands held in trust by the State, the exact equivalent of school district and county levies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to take steps to provide for the payment of the exact equivalent of taxes which would otherwise be levied on lands in the State and its political subdivisions were such lands not acquired by the Federal Government and its agencies; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the United States Senator KARL MUNDT, United States Senator FRANCIS CASE, Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, and to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorial requesting the formulation of a plan for cooperation in the development of ground-water supplies on Indian reservations in central and southern Arizona

"To the President of the United States, the Department of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indan Affairs:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Of the estimated total of 1,200,000 irrigated acres under cultivation in Arizona in 1952, over 800,000 acres, or almost 70 percent, derive their principal source of water from ground water supplies.

"Of Arizona's 72 million acres only about 2 percent is agricultural land, one-half of which is privately owned. Almost 20 million acres, or 27 percent, are Indian-reservation lands.

"Most of the irrigated lands deriving their principal source of water from ground water supplies are situated in the great central valley of Arizona in Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima Counties.

"A survey made by the Phoenix area office of the Office of Indian Affairs shows a possibility of developing approximately 400,000 acres of Indian reservation lands in the central valley of Arizona through the installation of pumps and the use of ground water supplies. Much of this land is near or adjacent to the presently developed irrigated acreage and in the same geological basin.

"Studies made by the United States Geological Survey and the State of Arizona establish that the water tables in the central

valley of Arizona are lowering and in most instances the declines in the water table are steady and persistent.

"Proposals have been made by the Indian tribes involved and the Phoenix area office of the Office of Indian Affairs to develop considerable additional acreage on the reservations in the central valley of Arizona through the medium of development leases to non-Indian lessees. Additional withdrawls from the ground water basin supplying this area on the scale proposed would constitute a serious threat to the existing agricultural economy of the State, would not be a permanent development of Indian reservation lands, by reason of the resultant competition for existing limited ground water supplies and would not, therefore, add materially to the permanent economic welfare of the Indian nor enable the Indian to immediately farm the land himself. So long as the possibility of this type of development of reservation lands exists, it will be impossible to secure passage of adequate legislation regulating the withdrawal of ground water in the affected areas. It is recognized, however, that the normal development of land by the Indians themselves would not seriously interfere with any policy of water control.

"The State of Arizona has just completed a study of the underground water resources of the State, and legislation designed to control further development in a large part of the central valley will undoubtedly be introduced as soon as a decision by the State Supreme Court in a pending case is announced.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That those agencies of the United States Government directly concerned with this problem recognize its significance by adoption of a statement of policy for the guidance and assistance of the legislature in its future deliberations, and indicate their willingness to cooperate with the State of Arizona in effecting an orderly withdrawal of existing ground-water supplies."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 1

"Memorial relating to Indians and requesting the elimination of existing Federal laws which discriminate against Indians

"*To the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Indians of Arizona are entitled to the benefits of all fundamental American rights enjoyed by their fellow citizens of other races.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress eliminate all existing Federal laws which discriminate against Indians."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RENT CONTROLS—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF MEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Medford, Mass., relating to rent controls.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved, That this council, having decided as a result of a conference of the committee of the whole, under date of February 14, 1953, on the matter of rent control insofar as concerns the city of Medford, that rent controls should be retained; and therefore

Resolved, That the Federal Government at Washington should be memorialized to either extend the Government control of rents or prepare legislation that would pass on to the State governments the power to set up controls in the various States; and further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Legislature be requested to make preparations for rent controls within the State in the event that the Federal Government fails to extend the period of rent control. It being the considered opinion of this council that controls should be statewide rather than individual community control; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted upon passage to the Members of Congress and the State legislature for their consideration and action thereon.

OIL BENEATH COASTAL WATERS—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS, KANABEC COUNTY COOPERATIVE OIL ASSOCIATION, MORA, OGILVIE, ISLE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Kanabec County Cooperative Oil Association, Mora, Ogilvie, Isle, Minn., at its meeting on February 27, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. The resolution urges the retention of the offshore oil deposits under the protection of the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANABEC COUNTY COOPERATIVE OIL ASSOCIATION,
Mora, Minn., February 28, 1953.

Senator H. H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The board of directors of our association in their monthly meeting yesterday, February 27, passed the following resolution which they instructed me to send to you:

"Whereas the vast deposits of oil valued at upwards of $50 billion, which lie far out beneath the coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean, rightfully belong to all of the people of the United States as the Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held; and

"Because it would be unjust to surrender the ownership of these vast natural resources to the States of TEXAS, California, and Louisiana since they lie outside of the recognized tide lands which belong to these States.

"Therefore, you are respectfully urged to use your influence to retain the ownership of these resources under the control of all of the States as they are at present."

We hope that you will give this important matter your careful attention as it is of vital importance to all of the people of the U. S. A. If the oil lobby succeeds in their efforts to take this oil from all of the States in favor of three States, it may someday greatly embarrass our Republican administration.

Respectfully yours,
CARL J. JOHNSON,
Secretary.
JOHN B. VANDERMYES,
Acting Manager.

EXCISE TAXES — RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution unanimously adopted in convention by the Minnesota Telephone Association on February 19, 1953, relating to excise taxes.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the member companies of the Minnesota Telephone Association are vitally concerned with the tax burden on telephone service; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has recognized the special burden created by excise taxes on public utility services generally, by the recent elimination of such tax on electrical energy and reduction of tax on telegraph communications; and

Whereas the excise tax paid by telephone subscribers is rightly considered by the subscribers as an integral part of the cost of telephone service; and

Whereas other comparable public utilities generally are not currently subject to a Federal excise levy of any kind; and

Whereas there has been a widespread reaction against excise taxes on telephone service from both resident and business telephone subscribers; and

Whereas excise taxes on this service have been resorted to in the past only in cases of emergency, and repealed when the emergency was over; and

Whereas with nearly 50 million telephones in use in the United States and more than 160 million local exchange conversations and 7 million long-distance calls every day in the year, it should be obvious to anyone that more people are affected by the taxes on phone calls than could possibly be affected by the taxes on any other thing or service; and

Whereas telephone service is not a luxury but is a business and social necessity and an essential service like water, gas, and electricity, and, in case of illness, fire, accident, or other emergency, far from being a luxury, it is a vital necessity; yet this essential and vital service is nevertheless taxed at rates higher than the tax on jewelry, furs, and admissions to theaters, and is the same as the tax on cabarets and roofgardens; and

Whereas water, gas, electrical energy, and certain short-haul transportation are exempt from excise taxes, and telephone service is the only utility service which is subject to an excise tax, the tax on telephone service is rank discrimination; and

Whereas the elimination of excise taxes on telephone service would assist telephone companies in their program for extending telephone service to rural areas; and

Whereas telephone companies, at substantial expense to themselves, serve as tax collectors for the Federal Government in connection with these taxes, and collection of the tax has been done without compensation or even reimbursement of expenses incurred, thus imposing a genuine hardship upon some of the member companies of this association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this convention assembled, That the Minnesota Telephone Association and its member companies are of the opinion that the present excise tax on communication service makes it impossible to maintain a reasonably priced and nondiscriminatory public communication service, and that, accordingly, the excise tax on communication service should be repealed or greatly reduced; and

Resolved further, That the officers of this association are hereby authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution

to each of the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and said officers are further authorized and directed to urge said Senators and Representatives to support any legislation looking toward a repeal or reduction in the highly discriminatory excise tax now imposed on telephone service.

PARITY PRICES ON DAIRY PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF UNION GROVE FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 282, PAYNESVILLE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Union Grove Farmers Union, Local 282, Paynesville, Minn., regarding parity on dairy products, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The members of Union Grove Farmers Union, Local 282, of Meeker County, State of Minnesota, consisting of 79 paid members, offer the following resolution to you that was drawn up at our last meeting:

"Whereas the support price of dairy products is due to expire March 31 and as the sale of dairy products is the major portion of not only our income, but the entire State of Minnesota, and if not supported of at least 90 percent of parity our income will certainly be lowered to a dangerous level, and any further reduction in farm income will have a strong tendency to upset the economy of the entire United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the signers of the accompanied resolution respectfully request that dairy products be supported at 90 percent of parity."

This resolution was signed by members present at the local meeting, to support dairy products at 90 percent of parity. Dated February 18, 1953.

STABILIZATION OF FARM PRICES—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA STATE SENATE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter signed by five members of the North Dakota State Senate, the 33d legislative assembly, dated February 24, 1953, transmitting resolution 10, adopted by the North Dakota State Senate, memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to stabilize farm prices. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
33D LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
Bismarck, February 24, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Enclosed herewith is a copy of Senate Resolution 10, which has been adopted unanimously by the North Dakota Senate. The undersigned sponsors of the resolution are deeply concerned about the present uncertain status of farm prices and the urgent necessity of immediate corrective measures.

It is our sincere hope that effective steps will be taken at once to stabilize farm prices and that the agricultural economy of North Dakota and the Nation as a whole will be fully protected by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT J. SANDNESS,
ERNEST C. LIVINGSTON,
REINHART KRENZ,
HARRY W. WADESON,
PHILIP J. SAUER,
Senators.

Senate Resolution 10

Resolution memorializing the Secretary of Agriculture to take steps to stabilize farm prices

Whereas the economic welfare of all the people of the State of North Dakota is entirely dependent on a prosperous agricultural economy; and

Whereas after a dozen years of abundant production of farm crops through favorable weather conditions there is evidence of a natural decline in that production cycle; and

Whereas this decline, together with falling agricultural prices, and an increased cost of operation has already resulted in an increase in farm and chattel mortgages, and a general tightening of credits, thus bringing about a decrease in the buying power of our people; and

Whereas the support price and the cash price of grain is far below the 1910 to 1914 parity price; for example, such per bushel parity price on wheat is $2.44, on oats $1.10, on barley $1.71, and on flax $4.66, while cash prices on these products today in Bismarck are as follows: wheat, $2.08, oats $0.56, barley $0.91, and flax $3.52; and

Whereas importation of farm commodities exceeds exportation by over a billion dollars and the continued dumping of the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks would further depress the market; and

Whereas we are unalterably opposed to going back to a program of subsidy payments and Government control of agricultural operations in lieu of fair market prices or a sound price support program; and

Whereas we recognize that "parity" is a price determined by the Government to be fair to producer and consumer alike and present price supports are necessary to provide a fair price for farm products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That we urge the Secretary of Agriculture to take immediate steps to halt the ruinous drop in farm prices, and that a program designed to stabilize all farm commodity prices at full parity be put into effect at the earliest possible moment; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture let it be known in unmistakable terms that this administration is not going to let the farmers be pushed to the edge of disaster before coming vigorously to their aid; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States take action immediately under section 22 of the Agricultural Act to curtail heavy imports of agricultural commodities of which we have abundant supplies and which imports are seriously affecting the operation of our price support program; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Agriculture desist dumping of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks on our markets when prices are below established support levels; be it further

Resolved, That the renewal of the International Wheat Agreement is necessary in order to continue adequate foreign exports; be it further

Resolved, That we commend and support Senator MILTON YOUNG for his untiring efforts to obtain economic equality for Agriculture, and that we endorse his stand on international trade agreements, farm price supports, and fair import and export programs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 873. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 74).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 697. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; with amendments (Rept. No. 75).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for administrative expenses of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control for the period ending April 30, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 79).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 709. A bill to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough; with an amendment (Rept. No. 78); and

H. R. 2332. A bill to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 77).

CONTINUANCE IN EFFECT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably an original bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof, and I submit a report (No. 76) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof, reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF DOCUMENT RELATING TO POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 87, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 87) was read as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed additional copies of Senate Document No. 18 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, entitled "Positions Not Under the Civil Service," as provided for

by existing law, for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the resolution authorizes $1,200 for additional copies of Senate Document 18. The cost of printing these copies under this resolution would be about $500 per thousand, so the resolution will give the Senate two more thousand for distribution. This resolution, however, must be adopted in time to catch the run of this document or it will be of no use. To have to put the document back on the press, once it has been run the first time, will cost about $1,500 for the first thousand copies. Since that figure is in excess of $1,200, the resolution must be agreed to now, or it will come too late to be of any value in increasing the number of these copies to the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I inquire if the resolution is on the calendar?

Mr. JENNER. No; I am reporting the resolution from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 87) submitted by Mr. CARLSON on March 2, 1953, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1159. A bill to provide mandatory price supports through 1957 for dairy products, hogs, cattle, poultry and eggs, oats, soybeans, rye, flaxseed, barley, grain sorghums, and other commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1160. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Tucson, Ariz., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1161. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, by adding a new subsection to section 14 relating to State authority to regulate the right to strike and picket; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 1162. A bill for the relief of Angelo Giuseppe Grassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1163. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1164. A bill to amend section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act so as to permit the coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program of State employees covered under a State retirement system, if the State by which such retirement system was established had in effect on January 1, 1951, a statute providing for making such retirement system supplementary to the old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1165. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Rocke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1166. A bill for the relief of Henry William Brady; and

S. 1167. A bill for the relief of John Nicholas Christodoulias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1168. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1169. A bill for the relief of Tamiko Nagae;

S. 1170. A bill for the relief of Chie Adachi; and

S. 1171. A bill for the relief of Ivo Markulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S. 1172. A bill for the relief of Eugene Ctibor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1173. A bill to facilitate the development, management, and use of public use areas and facilities and improvement of wildlife habitat on the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1174. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Reserve officers formerly in the Regular Army and Navy and who were appointed prior to August 24, 1912, and March 4, 1913, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THYE (for himself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DUFF, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. 1175. A bill to amend and extend until June 30, 1954, the provision of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended, and to prescribe standards for the implementation of such provisions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1176. A bill for the relief of Peter Hoskins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1177. A bill for the relief of David Satoshi Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1178. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1179. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their official duties, suffered losses for personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendation of a Treasury Claim Board;

S. 1180. A bill to further amend the act of May 29, 1945, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service" by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder;

S. 1181. A bill to amend section 3185 of title 18, United States Code;

S. 1182. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

S. 1183. A bill for the relief of John L. DeMontigny;

S. 1184. A bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers from exceptions taken to payments pertaining to terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Department of State;

S. 1185. A bill to amend further the Federal Register Act, as amended; and

S. 1186. A bill to authorize the issuance of 328,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to certain refugees, German expellees, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1187. A bill to provide for the construction and maintenance of a high school for Indian pupils within the exterior boundaries of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1188. A bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Armed Services, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution designating March 3, 1954, as General Pulaski Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRICE SUPPORTS FOR CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide mandatory price supports through 1957 for dairy products, hogs, cattle, poultry and eggs, oats, soybeans, rye, flaxseed, barley, grain sorghums, and other commodities. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1159) to provide mandatory price supports through 1957 for dairy products, hogs, cattle, poultry and eggs, oats, soybeans, rye, flaxseed, barley, grain sorghums, and other commodities, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Confusion and uncertainty over the future agricultural policies of the new administration seriously threatens to undermine the farm economy of our Nation.

Farm prices are already on the skids, at a time when costs of farming are increasing. Farm income is declining dangerously in relation to the income of other segments of our economy.

The current issue of the U. S. News & World Report agrees that farmers are caught in a squeeze—getting less for what they sell and paying almost as much for what they have to buy. It backs up its conclusion that a farm recession is now under way with figures from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics showing that the farm share of national income has fallen below 1932.

In that depressed year, farmers' share of the national income was 7.3 percent. By 1946, that share had risen to 10.8 percent.

For 1953, it is now officially estimated to be only 6.5 percent.

Other economic indicators of the farm situation—the parity position of farmers, the farmers' share of the food dollar, and what farmers keep from gross income—are also all sharply down, according to the U. S. News & World Report.

These are warnings that must be heeded, if we are to avert the kind of collapse that has plunged us into past depressions.

Immediate, positive, constructive action is needed to bolster the economic climate for American agriculture.

Action is needed to clarify the conflicting philosophies now so apparent within the ranks of the administration in regard to agriculture.

Action is needed to make good the repeated assurances of the leaders and platforms of both political parties that economic protection for agriculture would be continued.

Action is needed to establish such economic protection as a basic public policy, fully accepted as in the public's interest, beyond the realm of political controversy.

The bill which I have introduced will accomplish that purpose.

It will assure American farmers fair returns for answering the Nation's call to greater production. It will eliminate the threat of economic penalty for producing in the abundance the Nation now requires to meet fully its domestic and international needs.

I am proposing that the farm price support level be at 90–100 percent of the parity fair return standard for all basic and other designated storable commodities—the parity level pledged to the American farmer by President Eisenhower during the campaign.

I am proposing to make mandatory the support of a number of commodities which are now subject to the discretion—or indiscretion—of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The bill would add flaxseeds, soybeans, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums to the list of commodities supported by mandatory 90–100 percent price supports.

It would also make mandatory the support of dairy products, cattle, hogs, and poultry and eggs at not less than 90 percent of parity.

I am further proposing to extend the period of firm, mandatory farm price supports through 1957, a year after the new administration takes office.

I am asking that the present dual parity formula be continued for that same period, instead of requiring the so-called "new formula" to go into effect at the end of next year.

In the bill, I am purposely not limiting the Secretary of Agriculture to any one method of support for perishables, recommending instead that he consider the use of any or all of several alternative methods.

We must accomplish price support to the farmers without penalizing consumers by withholding such perishable products from useful, human consumption.

American farmers were told by President Eisenhower in a campaign speech at Brookings, S. Dak., on October 4, 1952, that—

"The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent of parity price supports, and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent of parity, with a guaranty in price supports at 90 percent."

Earlier at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, President Eisenhower said:

"I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income * * * and a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity, but full parity."

He aded, and again I quote:

"As provided in the Republican platform, the nonperishable crops so important to the diversified farmer, crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops."

He also said, in the same talk:

"We must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable foods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables, that support our nutritious national diet * * * we can and will find a sound way to do the job."

With those views I most heartily agree.

I have accepted the President's pledge to American farmers in good faith, as I am sure our farmers have done.

I welcomed President Eisenhower's views as consistent with the constructive farm philosophy of the Democratic administrations under which agriculture had been guided out of the depth of depression into its period of greatest progress and prosperity. He seemed to agree with many of us that our farm-price-support laws needed to be strengthened and expanded to cover more commodities and not weakened or scuttled.

As an expression of my agreement, I am placing before the Senate in bill form the means of carrying out President Eisenhower's pledges to American farmers. It is designed to firm up our entire agricultural economy by ending the doubt and uncertainty that now hangs over the head of every farmer risking his investment in the production of food and fiber for the Nation's needs.

There is urgent need for such action without delay.

Day after day farmers in my State of Minnesota and in other States are tumbling to the brink of financial ruin over the "Niagara" of falling farm prices.

I have received letters, telegrams, a memorial from the State Legislature of Minnesota, and other appeals for action from farmers without precedent since the 1920's, when agriculture was permitted to sink into a decline that ended in mass bankruptcy.

We can never permit such a decline again.

On the contrary, we urgently need the utmost strength in our agricultural economy at this very time.

Agriculture's job has not changed overnight. Farmers of this country still have the tremendous responsibility of producing abundantly to meet all the expanding needs of a growing population, and of contributing their utmost to the economic strength of our country at a time when we must be—and remain—economically strong.

Food requirements of the future will be much greater than now, and ways must be found to make further strides in production.

The problems confronting farmers trying to accomplish their job of production haven't changed overnight either. They are still there and must be faced squarely regardless of changes in the country's political leadership.

Foremost among them is the problem of insuring continued food abundance by providing some assurance of reasonable returns for the farmer producing it.

Everyone has a stake in maintaining such abundant production, not just the farmer.

Our population has been increasing at the rate of about 2½ million a year—2½ million more mouths to be fed each year—7,400 a day, 300 an hour, 5 every minute.

In the face of that population trend consumers have a vital stake in maintaining a strong and productive agricultural economy. Abundant agricultural production is the consumer's only safeguard against soaring retail prices now that price controls are being scuttled.

But can farmers be expected to go on producing in abundance if it means they must take less and less? To protect the interests of both farmers and consumers, we must maintain the incentive of fair prices to achieve abundance. We must then find ways to use that abundance wisely without penalizing the producer.

Both presidential candidates recognized and accepted that public policy as in the best interest of the entire Nation.

Unfortunately, farmers are learning that a sharply conflicting philosophy is coming out from hiding from within the ranks high in the councils of the Republican Party.

The discredited starve-out theory of lowering prices to force compulsory adjustments is being brushed off and hauled into public light again.

Farmers have a right to know the real intentions of the Republican administration.

They know what President Eisenhower promised them.

They know what Secretary of Agriculture Benson is saying.

They know the two views are in sharp conflict.

The Secretary of Agriculture is undoubtedly a sincere, earnest, and deeply religious man. Nevertheless, his principles are obviously opposed to the campaign promises of President Eisenhower.

Secretary Benson expounded his farm philosophy in an address at St. Paul, in which he declared that "price supports should provide insurance against disaster." He apparently doesn't believe price supports should be used to provide farmers some insurance of fair prices.

Farmers have every right to be alarmed at what looks like the beginning of a sellout—a repudiation of what had been pledged to them, not once but repeatedly, during the campaign.

They will be even more alarmed if they read the remarks of the President pro tempore of the Senate, Mr. BRIDGES, given in this Chamber Friday, apparently setting the stage for turning back the clock to a survival-of-the-fittest squeeze-out-the-little-fellow farm philosophy.

Such a course would be a direct repudiation of the President's pledge to the farmers of this country and a dangerous tampering with the Nation's future food supply.

It is clear to me, on the basis of Secretary Benson's speech at St. Paul, that if there is to be any action to strengthen farm markets and halt price declines that action must be clearly initiated by the Congress.

And it appears clear to me, on the basis of the Senator from New Hampshire's policy statement on Friday, that if anything is going to be done to make good President Eisenhower's campaign pledges to farmers it will have to be supported from this side of the aisle instead of depending upon the President's own majority party.

That's all I have done in this bill—to ask the Senate to make good on the pledges to American farmers by both political parties.

We cannot leave these vital problems to be solved at the discretion—or indiscretion—of the Secretary of Agriculture. However sincere he may be, his basic philosophy does not agree with the necessity of maintaining high-level farm price supports.

Fortunately, he rose above his own principles long enough to extend at least temporarily the existing 90-percent support for dairy products.

His decision is certainly welcome, but it holds little assurance for the future—for either dairy products or other commodities.

In granting the 90-percent support dairy extension, the Secretary still made clear he was opposed to it in principle. And he certainly gave a gloomy outlook of what his ideas are toward reducing price supports in the future.

Let me quote from a Washington Post article explaining Secretary Benson's position:

"In temporary justification, he (Benson) pointed out, however, that dairymen pay high prices for feed. Corn and wheat, which go into it, will be supported at 90 percent of parity, at least until 1954. It would not be fair to drop dairy prices, he felt, until corn and wheat come down in price."

Could it be any clearer what his intentions are toward support of all basic commodities after 1954?

Can farmers be asked to keep on producing in abundance with such a threat hanging over their heads?

The American farmer needs to be told and wants to be told as quickly as possible where he stands. It is important that the farmer, the agricultural tradesmen, the boards of trade, the mercantile exchanges, and those who deal in farm commodities know and know promptly that the Congress of the United States does not propose to stand by and do nothing while agricultural prices break and drag our whole economy into a sharp recession or a depression.

They need to be assured that the American people want continued abundant production, and that we recognize a public obligation to protect the producers of that abundance.

Both Secretary Benson and Senator BARRETT have recently been making disturbing statements about unmanageable surpluses, indicating they are thinking in terms of scarcity, rather than welcoming abundance and seeking to make good use of it.

What's behind the smokescreen suddenly being created about unmanageable surpluses, at a time when every study shows the world's food production is not even keeping pace with its population growth?

How can there be talk about huge surpluses of corn, when we have been using up more feed grains than we have produced the last few years? We have been drawing upon our reserves until we should be more concerned about maintaining them at safe levels than talking about surplus.

Let's not be hoodwinked into turning backward toward any scarcity philosophy for agriculture. We reject the notion of squeezing the little fellow out of business until production can be so restricted as to demand—and get—artificially high prices from the consumer.

I'm afraid too many spokesmen for the majority party can't get over the habit of looking back 20 years or so. In all sincerity, I ask them to turn around and look ahead, instead. They have a new responsibility and a new obligation to look ahead, and to act constructively for the future.

How much food are we going to need from American farmers? Let me give you some examples:

To supply each person in 1975 with the same standards of diet as we have been getting will require about 5½ billion more pounds of red meat than were produced in 1950.

Such a requirement for meat means that by 1975 we will need annual increases equivalent to the 1950 pig crop of Iowa and Nebraska, plus the 1950 cow numbers of Minnesota, Texas, and Oklahoma, plus the 1950 lamb crops of Montana, Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada.

We will need 10 billion more quarts of milk—equal to the 1950 milk production of Michigan, Wisconsin, and New York.

We will need an additional 1¼ billion dozen eggs—equal to the 1950 egg production of California, Kansas, Missouri, Illinois, and Pennsylvania.

These figures don't allow for better diets. They provide just for holding our own. And yet all of us hope that by 1975 our standard of diet can be improved.

The American farm is the production plant that must meet these growing requirements for American consumers.

Is this any time to start dismantling that plant, cutting down its productive capacity, telling the farmer if he can't cope with the hazards of our complex economy he just better get out of business?

That's just what these folks mean who talk so glibly about natural adjustments, free markets, and less Government interference.

Nobody raised such howls about huge Government outlays to expand our great industrial productive facilities, to make sure we could meet the stepped-up demands of defense production. Nobody said we ought to let free markets take care of such expansion. Nobody said that we let our industry risk its own investment without any assurance of orders and tax benefits from the Government.

Why isn't there just as much a public stake in making sure our agricultural plant can meet its future demands?

I'm proud of the American farmer, and his record of meeting the Nation's needs in the face of a struggle to survive. I think he can meet the huge needs ahead. But I think we all have a vital stake in helping him meet those needs.

It can't be done by limiting our research activities. It can't be done by weakening our conservation efforts. It can't be done by tightening our credit facilities. It can't be done by restricting fertilizer production. And it certainly can't be done by weakening our price-support structure, and thereby telling farmers that if they go ahead on a long-range development program of this nature they do so at their own risk.

Yet all those threats hang over the head of American agriculture today.

Let's remove those threats and give agriculture a green light to go on producing with confidence. As a Nation which requires that production, we are willing to assure farmers fair returns for producing it.

We must prepare for the day when it will be clearly demonstrated for all to see that we in the United States are not an agricultural surplus Nation. We may soon need incentives to increase the production of wheat, flax, corn, sugar beets, and other farm commodities.

My bill would also extend the provision of section 402 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, which would allow a further increase in price-support levels above the mandatory levels if production incentives are needed for the national welfare and national security.

In fact, an intelligent agricultural policy must recognize that there is a great, untapped, potential demand for our agricultural commodities.

All of us want to see food used, not wasted.

Both the Democrat and Republican Parties, during the campaign, promised to find new ways to support perishables. I hope we can do so. My bill would fulfill the Democratic and Republican pledges to extend supports to such perishables, but I'm willing to leave the way open to find a better way to do it.

I don't want to tie the Secretary of Agriculture's hands. I don't want to see any waste of foods when need exists for it in the world.

We know that our loan-and-storage programs that work so well for storable commodities are not practical for perishables without risking huge waste and economic loss. But there certainly are other alternative methods available for supporting such perishables.

Among them, I'd like to suggest further consideration of—

1. The use of compensatory payments, such as previously included in the 1948 Agricultural Act authored by Senator AIKEN, and similar to those still successfully used in the Sugar Act. I understand Secretary Benson has just recently testified in support of continuing the present Sugar Act that includes such payments, so perhaps he may decide they have merit for support of other commodities.

2. Expanding distribution of perishables through our school-lunch programs, charitable institutions and military procurement.

3. New methods of more liberal credit for livestock producers that will encourage and permit more orderly marketing.

4. A domestic food allotment plan similar to that previously proposed by Senator AIKEN for low-income families.

5. Development of international programs for making such food supplies available where they are most needed in the world.

6. Use of our abundant production to fight communism, by improving the diets of South Korean and other allied troops.

Through wise use of such methods, I am sure, the proven benefits of price support can be achieved for producers of these important perishables without penalizing the consumer and risking huge waste and heavy economic loss—a loss that in the past has often been far greater than the costs of these alternative methods would be.

It is to our own interest as a Nation, and it is in the interest of freedom and humanitarianism all over the world, that we begin to raise our sights and use some imagination so that our agricultural products can be effectively utilized, and our agricultural economy protected.

We should enter into international negotiations through the United Nations to extend the principles of the international wheat agreement, not only for wheat, but for other agricultural commodities. Millions in the world are undernourished and underfed, and can use the health-giving strength and life which American farmers produce in their fields.

Furthermore, as the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has urged, we should ship our beef to Korea where South Korean soldiers are suffering from serious malnutrition. Meat, too, can be used as a weapon in the struggle against Communist imperialism. Hunger among South Korean troops is reducing the effectiveness of their combat units.

All of these potential outlets offer new opportunities for agriculture, and new challenges for this administration to serve agriculture—if it will.

But the need for positive action is now. There has been a need for firm action on farm prices for many weeks.

A month ago, Mr. Benson asked for time to study the problem before declaring his position on price supports. Today the problem is no longer one of giving him time to study the problem. The Secretary has announced his policy, and it is a policy which runs counter to the pledges made by President Eisenhower to the farmers of the United States during his campaign.

Today the need is to eliminate confusion and indecision and move on to protect the economic stability of rural America.

The situation in agriculture is too serious to quibble about political credit. The necessity is to get something done.

That is why I have introduced this bill, and why I am sure many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support such an effort to make good on what our farmers have been led to expect—and to thereby serve the best interests of the entire Nation.

INTEGRATION OF WISCONSIN RETIREMENT SYSTEM FUND WITH FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for integration of the Wisconsin retirement system fund with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes in explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

The bill (S. 1164) to amend section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act so as to permit the coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program of State employees covered under a State

retirement system, if the State by which such retirement system was established had in effect on January 1, 1951, a statute providing for making such retirement system supplementary to the old-age and survivors insurance system, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced provides for the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. The bill is identical to legislation I have offered previously in the Congress.

For several years I have been endeavoring to achieve this objective in the interest of some 30,000 workers covered under the Wisconsin system. They are, I feel, entitled to have their modest State pension supplemented by Federal coverage, just as workers in private companies have their industrial pension supplemented by Federal coverage.

The amendment pertains exclusively to the State of Wisconsin, the only State which made provision prior to January 1, 1951, for such integration.

The able past chairman of the Senate Finance Committee [Mr. GEORGE] had kindly assured me last year of his acceptance of this amendment. All that is awaited therefore is the passage of a new social-security bill.

I earnestly hope that this can occur this year rather than wait until next year, as some reports from the House of Representatives have indicated.

I recognize the need for careful study for comprehensive improvement of the social-security system. But I feel that relatively minor and noncontroversial amendments of this nature should not have to wait until, let us say, July 1954—the end of the 2d session of the 83d Congress, but should be enacted promptly. Elderly people on State pensions can barely keep body and soul together on their pittance of pensions in these inflationary times. They are entitled to speedy action.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 218 of the Social Security Act (relating to voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees) is amended by striking out "Exclusion of" in the heading, by inserting "(1)" after "(d)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), an agreement with a State may be made applicable (either in the original agreement or by any modification thereof) to service performed by employees in positions covered by a retirement system (excluding positions specified in paragraph (3)) if there were in effect on January 1, 1951, in a State or local law, provisions relating to the coordination of such retirement system with the insurance system established by this title.

"(3) Nothing in the preceding paragraph of this subsection shall authorize the extension of the insurance system established by this title to service in any of the following positions covered by a retirement system—

"(A) any policeman's or fireman's position or any elementary or secondary school teacher's position; or

"(B) any position covered by a retirement system applicable exclusively to positions in one or more law-enforcement or fire-fighting units, agencies, or departments.

For the purposes of this paragraph, any individual in the educational system of the State or any political subdivision thereof supervising elementary or secondary instruction in such system or in any elementary or secondary school therein shall be deemed to be an elementary or secondary school teacher."

AMENDMENT AND EXTENSION OF TITLE II OF FIRST WAR POWERS ACT OF 1941

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT,] the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend and extend until June 30, 1954, the provision of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended, and to prescribe standards for the implementation of such provisions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1175) to amend and extend until June 30, 1954, the provision of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended, and to prescribe standards for the implementation of such provisions, introduced by Mr. THYE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes in explanation of the bill which I have introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have today introduced a bill to amend and extend the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941 giving authority to the defense agencies to adjust contract prices. Ten of my associates on the Small Business Committee have joined me in sponsoring the bill.

The bill represents the culmination of over a year's study of a problem which has been found to be of serious consequence to numerous small concerns engaged in defense production. In February of last year the Small Business Committee conducted hearings which disclosed that many small companies had suffered or were suffering extreme financial hardship as a result of price increases and material shortages which occurred after the Korean invasion. We were aware of the fact that Public Law 921 of the 81st Congress had amended and extended title II of the First War Powers Act of 1941 to allow the defense agencies to amend contracts to meet such contingencies.

Our study of the legislative history and administration of Public Law 921 indicated that Congress in extending the law expressed a twofold intent; namely, to protect military sources of supply by keeping defense suppliers in business and to afford relief to suppliers suffering heavy losses on fixed-price contracts. We found that the defense agencies were administering the law under regulations which allowed relief only where a contractor was found to be "essential"; that is, a sole source of supply or one of a very few sources of supply, and that those agencies were refusing to afford relief to businesses incurring heavy losses except where they could meet the stringent requirement with regard to "essentiality."

In a report setting forth the results of its study, the Small Business Committee concluded that the effect of the regulations issued by the defense agencies had been to destroy almost entirely both the utility of the law and the intent of Congress in enacting the legislation. It is significant that the Committee on Government Operations, which reported the present legislation on title II powers and which will consider this bill, endorsed the conclusions of the Small Business Committee.

In our judgment the administration of title II powers has been inequitable and has resulted in many small businesses suffering extreme financial hardship. The bill which I have introduced today amends existing law to make it clear that title II powers are to be utilized to afford relief to contractors incurring extreme financial hardship on fixed-price contracts due to factors beyond their anticipation or control without regard to the number of sources that may be available elsewhere to supply defense needs.

The bill contains a provision that companies which have incurred such hardships since June 24, 1950, may be entitled to relief regardless of the fact that final payment on a contract has been received or that relief has been previously denied.

Title II powers are now in effect under Public Law 426 of the 82d Congress, but by the terms of that law the powers are due to expire June 30, 1953. This bill would extend the operation of title II powers, as amended, until June 30, 1954.

In brief, the bill is designed to render practical justice to small business, and the sponsors therefore believe it merits the support of the Senate.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to express my concurrence in the remarks just made by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] with respect to the bill to amend and extend title II of the First War Powers Act.

The members of the Small Business Committee who considered this matter in the previous session of Congress were of the firm belief that a simple amendment of the military regulations on title II powers would achieve the objectives of the bill introduced today. The committee recommended to the military that it amend its regulations but it was not

until the closing days of the 82d Congress that the Department of Defense advised that it was reluctant to do so in the absence of new legislation.

It is encouraging to me to note the support which the members of the present Small Business Committee have given to the bill. I think that support expresses the concern of the members on both sides of the aisle in a matter which is of critical importance to many small businesses.

GENERAL PULASKI DAY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution which would designate March 3 of next year as General Pulaski Day, in memory of the 206th anniversary of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 54) designating March 3, 1954, as General Pulaski Day, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas March 3, 1954, marks the 206th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; and

Whereas it is fitting to recall the contributions and sacrifices which he made that this Nation might be born in freedom; and

Whereas today the country of his birth is enslaved under the hand of a totalitarian dictatorship unequaled in human history; and

Whereas all Americans at this moment in history hold out the hand of friendship to the people of the Polish nation and offer continued hope to them for freedom from the oppression they now live under: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That March 3, 1954, the 206th anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, be observed as General Pulaski Day, and the Congress recommends that encouragement be given to appropriate ceremonies throughout the Nation.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for a study of juvenile delinquency in the United States. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes on the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 88), submitted by Mr. KEFAUVER, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation, special attention shall be given to (1) determining the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (2) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (3) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (4) the extent to which juveniles are violating laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than March 1, 1954.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the very serious problems with which we are faced today is that of juvenile delinquency.

Juvenile delinquency is on the increase. Children in scores of cities are committing more crimes and worse crimes than at any time since World War II, a national survey shows.

While it is important to protect the public from the confirmed criminal, it is even more important to prevent the juvenile delinquent of today from becoming the confirmed criminal of tomorrow.

There is little that can be done to reform a hardened criminal, who has spent a lifetime in crime. If society has the knowledge and the tools, however, there is much that can be done to prevent a youth from turning to crime.

This is a nonpartisan matter. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and I are sponsoring a resolution proposing that the Committee on the Judiciary, or a duly authorized subcommittee of the judiciary, shall conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States.

In the course of this study, we ask for special attention to be given the following matters:

First. Determining the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors;

Second. The adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws;

Third. Sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts; and

Fourth. The extent to which juveniles are violating laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

We hope that this study will give us the knowledge that we need to legislate effectively in those fields of Federal jurisdiction dealing with juvenile delinquency.

We hope that it will lead us to the root causes of crime—the social conditions which breed crime. It is within our power to eradicate many of these conditions.

We need only the knowledge—and the will to do so.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, if there is a single problem which plagues our homefront and which touches many a forgotten family, it is what I choose to call the fifth horseman of doom, the growing problem of crime among our youth.

A recent poll of cities throughout the Nation tells us the grim, dangerous facts.

Juvenile delinquency is at its highest peak since World War II, and the crimes being committed by the young of our Nation are harder, fiercer, more shocking than ever before in our Nation's history.

The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] this morning submitted a resolution identical to the one which I shall shortly submit to the Senate.

It is submitted in the hope that it may afford a solution to this national problem and disgrace.

Either of these resolutions would authorize the Judiciary Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, to examine the nationwide extent and character of juvenile delinquency, its causes and contributing factors.

It calls for a review of present Federal statutes dealing with youthful offenders, correctional action taken with respect to youthful delinquents by Federal courts, and a study of the extent to which juveniles are violating the narcotics laws.

Mr. President, by submitting separate but identical resolutions, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and I are attempting to emphasize in this instance the essential nonpartisanship of our aims and of our objectives.

Our examination of juvenile crime leads us to believe that a comprehensive call should be made to the local levels of law enforcement and the social agencies living with this disaster of the young in body, but the old and warped in spirit.

But it is more than merely a call to the policeman and the social worker. It is a summons to the parents, the very heart of the family, who live with the problem and must in so many instances unwillingly abide by it, but who so frequently do not understand how to combat it.

Federal laws and the Federal courts are involved in addition to the spotlight we hope to throw on the whole, ugly spectacle for the mutual benefit of our social workers and the mothers and fathers of the country.

It is the genius of our people to accept whatever challenge comes along and to find ways to meet it.

Let us do something, I say today, about this problem. Let us find out what is wrong and then correct what is wrong.

I think the time has come to take up this cross, which weighs heavily upon us, in a really comprehensive and diligent manner not only because of the billions of dollars wasted because of the toll crime takes but, more important, because we are engaged in the saving of our children's lives.

I now submit for appropriate reference the resolution to which I have referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 89), submitted by Mr. HENDRICKSON, was received and

referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) determining the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (2) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (3) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (4) the extent to which juveniles are violating laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable, but not later than March 1, 1954.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg;

H. R. 720. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 724. An act for the relief of Chester H. Tuck, Mary Elizabeth Fisher, James Thomas Harper, and Mrs. T. W. Bennett;

H. R. 726. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Campion;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi;

H. R. 759. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 834. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher;

H. R. 861. An act for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen;

H. R. 873. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Turkett;

H. R. 883. An act for the relief of Leila Park;

H. R. 886. An act for the relief of Aspasia Vezertzi;

H. R. 887. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski;

H. R. 961. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 960. An act for the relief of Charles H. Lin (also known as Lin Chao Hsi);

H. R. 969. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Morris;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Margaret Celikcan;

H. R. 1133. An act for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1194. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1331. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katherine L. Sewell;

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin;

H. R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. James M. Tuten, Jr.;

H. R. 1452. An act for the relief of Joe Bargas;

H. R. 1460. An act for the relief of Harold Joe Davis;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Kenneth McRight;

H. R. 1632. An act for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil;

H. R. 1636. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson;

H. R. 1794. An act for the relief of Yee Kee Lam;

H. R. 1883. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor;

H. R. 1895. An act for the relief of Jack Kamal Samhat;

H. R. 2023. An act for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk;

H. R. 2033. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corporation;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of Col. Harry F. Cunningham;

H. R. 2169. An act for the relief of Louis A. Schafer;

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger;

H. R. 2381. An act for the relief of Winifred A. Hunter;

H. R. 2386. An act for the relief of M. Neil Andrews;

H. R. 2398. An act for the relief of Kenneth Cecil;

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk;

H. R. 2433. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Raymond Gibson, a minor;

H. R. 2593. An act for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of Clifford Robinson;

H. R. 2615. An act for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo;

H. R. 2618. An act for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez;

H. R. 2645. An act for the relief of Donald James Darmody; and

H. R. 2660. An act for the relief of Mrs. Juan Antonio Rivera, Mrs. Raul Valle Antelo, Mrs. Jorge Diaz Romero, Mrs. Otto Resse, and Mrs. Hugo Soria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1525. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1527. An act to authorize the acquisition by the United States of the remaining non-Federal lands within Big Bend National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1528. An act to authorize the addition of land to the Appomattox Court House National Historical Monument, Va., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1529. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1813. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights; and

H. R. 1816. An act to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone on the public domain; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; and

H. R. 3062. An act to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Senior day address delivered by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, at Johns Hopkins University, February 27, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Back It Up," published in a recent issue of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel; editorial entitled "Treaties and the Constitution," published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 2, 1953; and editorial entitled "BRICKER's Amendment," published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of February 25, 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Editorial entitled "Truth About Yalta Emerges," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of recent date.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter dated February 26, 1953, addressed to him by Mr. and Mrs. John Lentz, Sauk Centre, Minn.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 27, 1953, commenting on the report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections on proposed amendments to the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

Brief history of the First Baptist Church of Holden, Mo., written by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., in connection with the celebration of the church's 75th anniversary.

Washington's Birthday address, delivered by Col. John Griffin, of St. Louis, Mo., on February 23, 1953.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Harry N. Routzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Richard R. Atkinson, as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Col. Claude Monroe McQuarrie and sundry officers for temporary appointment as brigadier generals in the Army of the United States.

NOTICE OF HEARING—GENERAL VAN FLEET

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that the Senate Committee on Armed Services is going to hear General Van Fleet tomorrow morning in

room 212, Senate Office Building, at 10 o'clock, and that any Senators who wish to be present at the meeting will be welcome to attend and hear what he has to say.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION PERMITTING COMPELLING OF TESTIMONY AND TO GRANT IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 565, permitting compelling of testimony and to grant immunity from prosecution in connection therewith. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION PROVIDING GENERAL RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 12, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 17, providing general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

REMOVAL OF LIMITATIONS ON OFFICIAL LONG-DISTANCE TELEPHONE CALLS AND TELEGRAMS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 2230) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this is a House bill, and covers purely a House matter, and in such matters the Senate never interferes. I ask that its passage be expedited at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 63, which is Calendar No. 45.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 25,000 additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session, of which 20,000 copies shall be for the House document room, 3,000 copies for the Senate document room, 1,000 copies for the Senate Committee on Judiciary, and 1,000 copies for the House Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have a brief explanation?

Mr. JENNER. The resolution would authorize the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the McCarran-Walter Act. The committee's supply of copies is completely exhausted. The demand for copies is great. The cost of the printing is estimated at $2,694.44.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

NOMINATION OF DOUGLAS MacARTHUR II

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the White House sent to the Senate today the nomination of Douglas MacArthur II, of the District of Columbia, to be counselor of the Department of State. Notice is hereby given that the nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, under the rule adopted by the committee at this session.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, so far as I know, the only business before the Senate today is the transaction of routine business in the morning hour. After the morning hour is concluded, and Senators have had an opportunity to make such remarks as they desire to make, I shall propose, for the good of the order, that the Senate adjourn until Friday.

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST INAUGURATION OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than a minute and a half.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent to speak for not more than a minute and a half. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, 20 years ago today, shortly after the hour of noon, the late Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes administered the oath of office to Franklin D. Roosevelt as the 32d President of the United States. A few minutes later, President Roosevelt delivered one of the greatest inaugural addresses in the history of the American presidency, and brought to a distressed and depression-ridden Nation a thrill of hope and confidence unfelt in many previous years.

From that point on, a new era opened for America. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt, revolutionary changes were made in this country which will never be unmade. Under President Roosevelt, America came of age and assumed the leadership of the free world.

I think it well, on this anniversary day to look back upon those 20 years, and to give thanks to the memory of the great man whom New York gave to this country and to the world.

I may say that one of the greatest privileges and one of the greatest honors that has ever come to me—or indeed that will ever come to me—was that while President Roosevelt was Governor of the State of New York, during his two terms in that office, I served under him as his lieutenant governor. I was proud in those days to be called—as he did me the honor to call me—his "right arm." And when he went from Albany to Washington, to serve his country as President and to serve all mankind, I was elected to succeed him as Governor. His removal to Washington did not cut the ties between us. During all his years as President, I was privileged to enjoy his confidence and his friendship. I was proud to yield him my deep loyalty and support.

I do not wish today to comment at any length on the memory of Franklin Roosevelt the man, or of Franklin Roosevelt the leader of this Nation and of the free nations. But I do think it appropriate that we look back upon the era which will, I believe, be known in history as the Rooseveltian era—the era which saw America rescued from economic ruin and grown to the greatest world stature and world responsibility this country or any country has ever known.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following this part of my remarks, a memorandum entitled "Two Decades of Democratic Progress: The GOP Inheritance," which sets forth very clearly the progress that has been made by the United States since 1932, a period of just 20 years.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO DECADES OF DEMOCRATIC PROGRESS—THE GOP INHERITANCE

On March 4, 1933, Franklin D. Roosevelt took office as President of the United States in the midst of a terrible depression. Millions were unemployed. Corporation profits

were nonexistent. Home and farm foreclosures were commonplace.

Twenty years later Dwight D. Eisenhower became President under very different conditions. He took over an economy which was thriving, thanks to 20 years of Democratic policies.

What will Dwight Eisenhower and the Republican Party do with the heritage left them by the Democratic Party? Will they learn the lessons taught by the Democrats and lead us to still greater prosperity? Or will they, now that the campaign is over, forget their promises to support the policies which are vital to our prosperity?

	Then: 1932	Now: 1952	Future: 1954-56
THE WHOLE NATIONAL ECONOMY HAS PROSPERED			
Total national production (billions)	*$122.1	$346.3	(?)
Total personal income after all taxes (billions)	*$97.6	$294.3	(?)
Private investment at home (billions)	*$3	$52.1	(?)
Consumer expenditures for goods and services (billions)	*$100.5	$216.3	(?)
Sales of all retail stores (billions)	$25	$163.8	(?)
Savings of all individuals (billions)	$1.4	$18.0	(?)
New private construction (billions)	*$5.6	$23.5	(?)
Number of new nonfarm houses started (thousands)	134	1,131	(?)
BUSINESS IS GOOD—BETTER THAN EVER			
Corporation profits after taxes (billions)	−$3.4	$17.1	(?)
Plant and equipment expansion (billions)	$2.6	$26.9	(?)
Total business sales (billions)	[1] $129.6	$546.5	(?)
Business failures	31,822	7,723	(?)
Bank failures	1,453	[2] 5	(?)
LIFE IS BETTER AND RICHER			
More jobs—higher real wages—greater security			
Men and women in the civilian labor force (thousands)	51,000	63,000	(?)
Unemployment (thousands)	12,100	1,700	(?)
Percent unemployed	23.6	2.7	(?)
Total wages and salaries (billions)	$30.5	$181.1	(?)
Per capita personal income after all taxes	*$782	$1,496	(?)
Weekly earnings of factory wage workers	*$33.15	$68.18	(?)
Union membership (thousands)	3,226	[3] 16,000	(?)
Workers insured by unemployment compensation (thousands)	None	37,000	(?)
Persons insured by Federal old-age and survivors insurance (000)	None	66,500	(?)
Folks are living better			
Families owning their own homes (thousands)	[3] 14,000	[4] 24,000	(?)
Percent of all homes:			
With toilet and bathing facilities	[5] 61	[4] 70	(?)
With mechanical refrigeration	[5] 44	[4] 80	(?)
With radio or TV	[5] 83	[4] 96	(?)
FARMERS ARE IN BETTER SHAPE—WELL ABOVE PAR			
Crop and livestock production at peak levels			
Crop production per acre of cropland (index: 1923-32 equals 100)	99.9	150	(?)
Wheat production (millions of bushels)	756	1,291	(?)
Corn production (millions of tons)	76	93	(?)
Number of cattle on farms (millions of heads)	66	[6] 94	(?)
Income for farmers kept pace			
Farmers' net income (billions)	*$4.9	$14.3	(?)
Farm prices have strengthened			
Prices received: All commodities (index: 1910-14 equals 100)	65	[7] 267	(?)
Prices paid: All commodities (index: 1910-14 equals 100)	112	[7] 282	(?)
Parity ratio (index: 1910-14 equals 100)	58	[7] 95	(?)
Selected commodity prices:			
Hogs (per hundredweight)	$3.34	[7] $17.80	(?)
Corn (per bushel)	$0.292	[7] $1.48	(?)
Tobacco (per pound)	$0.105	[7] $0.462	(?)
Cotton (per pound)	$0.065	[7] $0.298	(?)
Life on the farm—not so bad			
Percent of all farms electrified	10	[6] 90	(?)
Farm mortgage debt (billions)	$9.1	$6.3	(?)

[1] 1939. [2] 1951. [3] 1930. [4] 1950. [5] 1940. [6] Jan. 1, 1953. [7] Jan. 15, 1953. [8] Jan. 1, 1952.

*Denotes dollar figures adjusted upward to 1952 price levels.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS MASARYK

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for a minute and a half.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and a half. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Iowa is recognized for a minute and a half.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, as the one hundred and third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Masaryk, who was born on March 7, 1850, is almost at hand, I am honored to join in rendering tribute to one of the greatest men of our century, the liberator of the Czech nation, founder of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, and President of his country for 17 fruitful years.

The life of this far-sighted patriot is an inspiration to all men today who yearn for freedom and independence for captive peoples. In the span of his lifetime, Thomas Masaryk conceived and, by both his writings and his works, brought about the liberation of his people. He crowned his success by serving as President of the newly founded Republic with wisdom, patience, and tolerance until age forced his retirement in 1935. His death in 1937 came in time to prevent his seeing the tragedies that overtook his people—the infamy of Munich, the savage onslaught of the Nazi stormtroopers, the hell of wartime occupation, followed by the redoubled tragedy of a liberation betrayed by the Red terror.

Men who love liberty stand in admiration before the magnificent contribution to that timeless cause made by Thomas Masaryk. A people who could produce such a man will surely once again free itself from oppression and rejoin the world of freemen. We pray that this day will come soon, and that the Czech people themselves on March 7 will be able once more to join in public celebration of the birthday of their greatest leader, Thomas Masaryk.

ELBERT D. THOMAS, FORMER SENATOR FROM UTAH

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, unfortunately I was absent when tributes were paid on the floor of the Senate to the late Elbert D. Thomas, who for some time was a colleague of ours in the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to speak for a minute and a half.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed for a minute and a half.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, Elbert Thomas was a colleague of mine, and when he passed away I felt a pang of regret and sorrow, because I had come to have a very high regard for his personality, for his character, and for his fine qualities as a man. I saw him last in Honolulu and Tokyo in 1951, when he was discharging his responsibilities as head of the trusteeship of certain Pacific islands.

Many fine statements have been made in tribute to the distinguished career of Elbert Thomas. I wish to confine my remarks to the man himself as I knew him.

Elbert Thomas and I served together on both the Foreign Relations Committee and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which he was chairman. In addition I was a member of a special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committeee of which he was chairman and which held hearings on various plans and proposals for amending and strengthening the United Nations.

In all my associations with Elbert Thomas I was continually impressed by his deep religious and spiritual faith. This faith formed the basis of his warm humanitarianism. It was the motivating force behind a life dedicated to serving God and his fellow men.

But Elbert Thomas possessed more than a great soul. He also possessed a brilliant and well-disciplined mind. He was a philosopher-statesman in the best sense of the word.

It was perhaps in the field of foreign relations that Senator Thomas and I were closest to one another. Both of us were strong supporters of the League of Nations, the United Nations and various other collective security measures. He was a leader in educating our citizens to their Nation's responsibilities as a great world power. I shall always cherish especially my association with him in that capacity.

Elbert Thomas was a man of faith, a man of learning, and a man of character. He was the type of man all of us, regardless of political viewpoint, were proud

to have in the Senate. He set a high standard for each of us to follow.

CHEST X-RAYS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement.

During the next 2 weeks, March 11 through March 20, there will be an opportunity for all Members of the Senate and their staffs to get a chest X-ray. The X-ray unit will be set up in the Senate Office Building in room 154.

There is no charge for this service, which is being provided by the District Health Department, the District Tuberculosis Association, and the United States Public Health Service as a part of their joint effort to eradicate tuberculosis in the District of Columbia.

It will only take a few minutes for each one of us to get an X-ray, and I urge that we all participate in this effort, and that we encourage all of our personnel to do likewise.

Detailed information regarding this survey should already have been sent to Senators individually. If any Senator has not received such a notice, I ask that he please contact the office of the Secretary of the Senate.

TRIBUTES TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes under the heading suggested by the distinguished majority leader "For the Good of the Order."

Mr. President, it is not generally known that only three Members of this distinguished body were Members of the Senate prior to the 73d Congress. They are "the noblest Roman of them all," the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; the able and beloved Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and the leader of us young Democrats, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. President, today marks the twentieth anniversary of the freshman class of the 73d Congress. Of the Senate Members of that class, only two are still with us—the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

In his memorable address at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument 50 years after the end of the Revolutionary War, Daniel Webster turned first to the veterans in his audience, saying: "Venerable men, you come down to us from a former generation." After describing the outstanding accomplishments of that former generation, Webster referred to the first settlements at Jamestown in 1607 and at Plymouth in 1620, saying:

> We shall not stand unmoved on the shore of Plymouth, while the sea continues to wash it; nor will our brethren in another early and ancient colony forget the place of its first establishment, till their river shall cease to flow by it. No vigor of youth, no maturity of manhood, will lead the Nation to forget the spots where its infancy was cradled and defended.

Even had our generation been inclined to forget those first spots that cradled and defended the infancy of our Republic, the qualities of the men who descended from those colonial ancestors would have kept that memory alive.

Not far from Jamestown, in the county of Westmoreland, which this year will celebrate its 300th anniversary, was born the first President of the United States; and not far from Plymouth was born John Adams, the second President. The third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, was born in Albemarle County, Va., about 125 miles from Jamestown; but the fourth and fifth Presidents, Madison and Monroe, were born in the same county in which Washington was born. In that county likewise were born Light Horse Harry Lee and his famous son, Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Among the early settlers on the James River, near Jamestown, was William Byrd. He was the builder of that lovely James River home, Westover; the founder of Richmond, Virginia's capital city; and one of the ablest businessmen of the early colonial period. He accompanied Gov. Alexander Spotswood on his historic trip across the Blue Ridge Mountains in 1716, when for the first time a white man saw the fertile area now known as the Shenandoah Valley, in which his descendant, HARRY FLOOD BYRD, was born.

Last summer, when BYRD was a candidate in the Democratic primary for reelection to the Senate, I addressed my friends of Staunton and Augusta, on July 8, in behalf of his nomination, saying I could testify "not on the basis of hearsay, but as an eyewitness of the public career of a friend who has become not only a leader in the greatest legislative body in the world but a national figure of whom every Virginian may justly be proud."

I concluded that address by urging "every Virginia Democrat who believes in honesty and integrity of government, in free enterprise and in those principles of constitutional democracy for which Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and Woodrow Wilson stood to rally now to the support of HARRY FLOOD BYRD as their logical champion."

A few days later I renewed that plea over the radio and television, at Norfolk.

While I was not an eyewitness to his birth, as I was born just 13 days before he was, HARRY BYRD and I were born on the same street and in the same town. Our friendship and first public service commenced in January 1916, when we were deskmates in the State senate in Richmond. For 6 years we served together in that body. In 1925, BYRD was elected Governor of Virginia; and during the 4 years of his term as Governor, I served in his cabinet, so to speak, as chairman of the Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries.

In the fall of 1932, I was elected to the House of Representatives; and in the spring of 1933, when Senator Claude A. Swanson resigned to become Secretary of the Navy, BYRD was appointed a Senator from Virginia. On March 4, 1933, we both took the same oath of office as Members of the Congress, he in the Senate and I in the House. In November 1946, I was elected to succeed the late Carter Glass, and again joined HARRY BYRD as a Senate colleague.

During our service of 20 years in the Congress, BYRD has continued to exhibit the qualities of ability and integrity which attracted national attention to him as Governor and made him a serious contender for the Presidency in 1932. On the comparatively few occasions during our congressional service when we have found ourselves on opposite sides of an issue, I have given him the same credit for sincerity of motives which I expected and received from him.

Since the outstanding character of BYRD's record in the Senate is so well known to his Senate colleagues, I shall use this occasion to bear eyewitness, as I said at Staunton, to his contributions to good government in our home State of Virginia.

In 1908, when he was only 21 years of age, but already had demonstrated his business ability, BYRD was elected president of the Valley Turnpike Co., which had built 90 miles of hard-surfaced road from Winchester to Staunton, financing it by the collection of tolls. Consequently, when BYRD entered the State Senate in 1916—a period of transition from "horse-and-buggy days" to motor transport—he not only was aware of the value of improved roads, but also was imbued with an ambition to lift the Virginia farmers out of the mud. In realizing that ambition, future generations can say of him:

> Careless of the monument by the grave, he built in the world a monument by which men might be taught to remember not where he died, but where he lived.

Virginians, I frankly admit, have a weakness for boasting of the glory of their past. I trust, however, that I am indulging in no idle boast when I say that I regard Virginia's highway system as equal to any in the Nation. Certainly future generations will consider that highway system as an enduring monument to where BYRD lived, because under his pay-as-you-go policy we built that highway system without a State debt.

In 1916, State Senator O'Connor Goolrick, of Fredericksburg, Senator BYRD, and I became joint patrons of a resolution to lay out a State highway system. The resolution called for the appointment by the Governor of a commission from the General Assembly, of which Goolrick, BYRD, and I were members, with Goolrick serving as chairman. In January 1918, we submitted our report to Gov. Henry Carter Stuart. At that time I was a first lieutenant, assigned to the 318th Infantry of the 80th Division; but Governor Stuart prevailed upon the Adjutant General of the Army to give me a brief leave of absence so that I could assist in securing the adoption of a bill to create a State highway system.

As soon as that bill had been passed, the issue, of course, arose as to how so ambitious a road program would be financed. Senator BYRD assumed the leadership of those who favored a pay-as-you-go policy; and largely out of his own funds, he financed the campaign which resulted in the defeat of a State bond issue.

It was not surprising, therefore, that in the spring of 1925, Virginians, who favored a pay-as-you-go policy not only

for roads, but in all other governmental actions, regarded BYRD as their logical candidate for the governorship. He was elected in 1925, and assumed office the following January.

During the next 4 years, BYRD gave our State an administration which was outstanding in two respects: It was definitely progressive in its objectives, while conservative in its method of financing those objectives. We embarked upon an ambitious State highway building program, to be financed by a gasoline tax and license fees from motor vehicles, all strictly segregated for highway purposes. Appropriations for public education were increased, while the State land tax was being abolished. Additional State revenue was secured by increasing the franchise tax on railroads and all other public utilities. Meanwhile, economies were brought about by a reorganization and consolidation of State bureaus. In subsequent years more than one State government has studied Byrd's Virginia reorganization plan.

Commencing with World War II in Europe, when we furnished our allies large supplies, and later became an active participant, we have been operating at a relatively high level of prosperity; at times it might properly be called a boom. But during the early 1930's agriculture was never more depressed. Virginia still is to a large extent an agricultural State. During that depression period the State had assumed responsibility only for the roads that were included in the State highway system. All other public roads were called county highways, and each county was responsible for the construction and maintenance of its own county roads. The county road tax was the heaviest tax our farmers had to pay. Realizing that the State, with its better engineering facilities and more adequate supply of heavy road machinery, could build and maintain county roads more efficiently than could the local boards of supervisors, and that assumption by the State of the construction and maintenance of county roads would lift a heavy tax burden from our farmers, BYRD proposed that the State assume responsibility for all public roads. The legislature adopted that suggestion; and, although he was not a member of the legislature at the time, that law is now known in Virginia as the Byrd road law.

Extensions of the State system were delayed temporarily by that program, but immediate progress was noticeable in all the rural areas of Virginia; and before long the increase in the use of motor vehicles and the increase of tourist traffic in Virginia produced sufficient additional revenue from the gasoline tax to finance successfully the enlarged undertaking.

When BYRD was elected to the State senate in 1916 he was a farmer; and he has been a farmer all his life. In fact, solely through his own efforts, not only has he become the largest individual orchardist in Virginia, but with an annual production now of about 1½ million bushels of apples a year, he is no doubt the largest apple producer in the world. But BYRD also was a businessman; and, as such, he fully realized that the average farmer did not enjoy a pro rata share of the national income, and that any State largely dependent for its revenue upon agriculture would fall behind in an industrial age, in which man's productivity could be increased tenfold by power machinery. Therefore, as Governor of Virginia, one of his major undertakings was to bring new industry into Virginia. He accomplished this through giving assurance of a fair and just tax rate and of adequate protection against illegal actions of any kind. The revenue the Federal Government now collects from Virginia is testimony to how well BYRD worked to balance agriculture with industry in Virginia.

Near his home, at Front Royal, is the rayon plant of the American Viscose Co., the largest single plant of its kind in the world. At Newport News we have the largest privately owned shipbuilding and drydock company in the world. At Fredericksburg there is located a cellophane plant which puts out each year enough cellophane to pave a one-lane highway from Fredericksburg to the moon. At Danville we have a cotton mill whose daily capacity of cotton cloth, 1 yard wide, would stretch from Danville to New York, wrap around the Empire State Building, and come back to Philadelphia. At Bassett we have the largest single-unit furniture plant in the world; and at Suffolk, the largest peanut factory in the world. In all types of textiles—woolens, cotton goods, rayon, and nylon—Virginia has become a major producer. The Du Pont Co., for instance, has large textile plants at Ampthill, near Richmond; at Martinsville; and at Waynesboro.

In my opinion, the best test of a man's worth to his day and generation is what endures after he is dead and gone. Future generations will be able to look back upon two enduring monuments to HARRY BYRD'S ability and interest in the development of his native State: A highway system that has greatly promoted the commerce of the State, as well as being a joy and a delight to all tourists; and an industrial empire which has greatly improved the lot of industrial workers, given employment to many submarginal farm operators, and assured the State of dependable revenue for the support of such major undertakings as public schools, colleges, eleemosynary institutions, and the conservation and development of natural resources.

It is no wonder, therefore, that the inefficiency and wastefulness of our Federal Government during recent years have weighed so heavily upon the heart of a man like HARRY BYRD, who would like to see duplicated on a national scale what has been accomplished—if, with all due deference, I may say so—in Virginia.

PATRICK A. M'CARRAN, OF NEVADA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I want to take this occasion to congratulate the senior Senator from my State of Nevada upon his 20 years of service in this body. He is a great American and an eminent citizen of our State of Nevada. Before coming to the Senate he served as chief justice of our State supreme court. Prior to that time he had attained the reputation of being one of the finest criminal lawyers in Nevada or in any other State. He was elected to the Senate by the people of the State of Nevada four times consecutively, covering a total of 24 years. He is a fighter, and on the floor of the Senate he has always stood for what he believed to be right. Mr. President, it is not necessary to agree always with a fighter in order to admire him. I admire the distinguished senior Senator from my State and I wish for him many more years of service to our country and to our State of Nevada.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the eloquent remarks of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

When on August 9, 1951, the senior Senator from Nevada, the Honorable PATRICK A. MCCARRAN, reached his 75th milestone, his colleagues in the Senate paid him well-deserved tributes on his long and useful life of service to his fellow man. Today, we are celebrating another memorable anniversary. On March 4, 1933, this distinguished lawyer, powerful orator, brilliant scholar, resourceful legislator, outstanding statesman, courageous American, and champion of the West took his oath of office as a United States Senator in this Chamber.

He is a member of the bar in Nevada, California, Utah, and Arizona. He has been president of the Bar Association of Nevada and vice president of the American Bar Association. At the age of 41, he became the chief justice of the supreme court of his beloved State.

He is the author of numerous history-making legal opinions on water, mining, corporation, and criminal law. He is the author of many acts, including the all-important Administrative Procedure and the Internal Security Acts.

For many years, Senator MCCARRAN has been the chairman of a conference of Senators known as Senators from the Western States. From time to time, he has suggested that we select someone else as chairman. This, the western Senators will never do. We want PAT.

Whenever trouble arises in the West, the West's great leader, PAT MCCARRAN, calls a conference of western Senators, and he invites officials of the executive departments to meet with us to discuss the particular problem troubling our section of the country. Sometimes the problem is mining; at other times it is livestock, or grazing, reclamation, power development, agriculture, the noxious weed Halogeton, or any other matter of peculiar interest to the West. These conferences are not blocs. Men of all parties attend, primarily to get the cold facts, to guide them in meeting their legislative responsibilities.

Senator MCCARRAN is an indefatigable worker. Prior to the Reorganization Act, he was a member of Committees on Appropriations, District of Columbia, Irrigation and Reclamation, Public Lands and Surveys, Commerce, Special Committees on Conservation and Wild Life Resources, Silver, Committee Investigating the Effects of Centralization of Heavy Industry, and the Committee Investigating Receivership and Bankruptcy Proceedings and Administration of Justice in the United States Courts. Since the advent of the Reorganization Act which has reduced considerably the number of standing committees of the Senate, Senator MCCARRAN retained his

membership on the Appropriations and Judiciary Committees because of their importance to the people of the United States. He was chairman for many years of the Judiciary Committee, having jurisdiction over more bills which were considered and passed by the Senate during the past few years than all of the other standing committees combined.

Indeed, I would be remiss if I should fail to emphasize the deep-rooted convictions of Senator McCARRAN with respect to monetary economics. He is particularly well versed in the monetary theories of hard money and the overwhelming need of commerce for a sound money system. He believes in it with all his heart, just as did Washington, Jefferson, and their contemporaries, who breathed into the Constitution the concept that the best money is that which is coined from gold and silver. It would be unthinkable for this vital subject to be considered in the Senate of the United States without finding PAT McCARRAN in the thick of the fight against a manipulated currency.

Mr. President, during the past 20 years the State of Nevada, yes, our entire country, has been fortunate to have as their outstanding representative in this body this great man from the Far West and HARRY BYRD from the Old Dominion. They came here together and together they have labored for their country. Their leadership and their achievements will be recorded and recited many years after those now within the range of my voice have departed from this world. It is my fervent wish that this Nation may have the services of these patriots for many, many years.

Indeed it is a great privilege to serve in this body with the Senate twins, PAT McCARRAN and HARRY BYRD. These nationally and internationally famous statesmen have much in common. Both are men of unusual moral courage and moral courage above all else is the need of these tragic times. Both are passionately independent. Both are uncompromising on their moral convictions. Neither of them fears to stand alone when they believe they are in the right. Brutal criticism and calumny does not sway either of them one iota from the path of righteousness as they see it. Each of them has but one test for his stand on questions before the Senate: "Is it in the best interest of the people?"

SENATOR M'CARRAN AND SENATOR BYRD

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to join in what has been said about the two distinguished Americans, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. These gentlemen have left their imprint upon American history. They are not Democrats, they are not Republicans—they are both Americans, and, indeed, great Americans, Mr. President.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

The year 1933 was a notable year in American history. The Nation was in the midst of a great depression. The economic and monetary systems were in chaos and the people had changed political administrations as a result of the economic catastrophe which was engulfing the Nation and the world.

The same year was notable likewise for critical developments in other nations—the emergence of personalities and factors that were to lead to the great world catastrophe of 1939 which marked the beginning of World War II. These intervening 20 years from 1933 to 1953 have been among the most historic years of mankind.

The year 1933 was likewise marked by the arrival in the United States Senate of American personalities who were destined to leave their imprint on those historic years. Among those who came to the Senate for the first time that year was the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], fresh from a fine career in the public affairs of his native State, which had seen him as a youth elected to the State legislature, thence speaker of the house of representatives, and on his 30th birthday elected governor of a great State—the youngest man on the political scene in the history of America.

Mr. President, let me say in passing that it has been my observation in the 10 years during which I have been a Member of the Senate that the State of Georgia has been and is one of the best represented States in the American Union.

The administration of Governor RUSSELL was so successful in attuning the State government with the needs of that era through consolidation of bureaus and the streamlining of government that his State offered a pattern to other States of the Union who were encountering great difficulty in making their governmental machinery responsive to the needs of that time. It was only natural that Governor RUSSELL should be sent by the people of Georgia to serve them in the Senate of the United States.

On January 12, 1933, 2 months prior to the inauguration of Franklin Roosevelt, the new Democratic President, Senator RUSSELL was sworn in as a Member of the United States Senate. Since that day, he has been part and parcel of the history of his time. It is not necessary to attempt to enumerate the achievements that have resulted from his vision and humanitarianism. School children all over America are today receiving wolesome, health-building diets through the school-lunch program inaugurated by the junior Senator from Georgia. The farmers of America have always known him as one of their greatest champions. He served on the Committee on Agriculture during the years when the great farm programs were being worked out for the benefit of the American economy and the toiling millions on the farms of the Nation. At the same time he was serving as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, where he continued his service to the American farmers.

On this committee his work has continued on an ever-widening horizon, benefiting the rural life of the Nation. Soil conservation, drainage, flood control, rural electrical power—all have been guided by the hand of Senator RUSSELL, and it can truly be said that the agrarian life of his Nation has been blessed by his services.

When the war clouds hovered during the latter part of the 1930's and the safety of the Nation was menaced by foreign forces, Senator RUSSELL was one of those who sounded the clarion cry and from his position on the Naval Affairs Committee contributed so much to preparing the defenses of the Nation. He was a leader on the Naval Affairs Committee when the fleet was expanded to serve its historic mission in the time of peril. It was this fleet which he helped bring into being that enabled the Nation to fight on two oceans at the same time.

Mr. President, other accomplishments of the Senator from Georgia could be enumerated, including his great parliamentary skill, but I think one of the finest attributes of the man has been his loyalty and devotion to his own section. Although he is in no sense a sectionalist, he, however, has always manifested great pride in his heritage and throughout the country he is honored for it and is known everywhere as one of the best apostles of the South and its institutions. Serving that great area, he has greatly served the interest of his Nation.

No statement concerning Senator RUSSELL would be complete without taking note of the fact that he is only one of a great family. He has 12 brothers and sisters, each of whom has become distinguished in his selected vocation—on the farm, on the judiciary, in the pulpit, and other avenues which opportunity has afforded them. His father was chief justice of the supreme court of his State, and he had the distinction of swearing his son in as Governor of that great Commonwealth. His mother, now 85, must derive great comfort as she looks back over her motherhood knowing that each of her children has served so faithfully and well and that each of them has contributed greatly to the world.

It was no happenstance that in 1952 a large section of the Democratic Party, north, south, east, and west, acclaiming the virtues of this man, tried to place into his hands the banner of the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, history does not pay off on hindsight, but it is easy now for all to see that the debacle of the Democratic Party in 1952 would not have occurred in so great a measure had DICK RUSSELL been the nominee of his party. It does not speak in derogation of others to acclaim the attributes of leadership possessed by Senator RUSSELL which would have characterized him as a candidate and which would further have marked him as a great President. He is still young; the horizon is continuing to unfold before him. His greatest days of service to his State and Nation are still in front of him. I know I bespeak the good will and affection and esteem of the entire Senate when I specifically join other Senators in acclaiming his 20 years of service in this body and wish him Godspeed in the years which lie ahead of him.

SENATOR BYRD AND SENATOR M'CARRAN

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, the year 1933 was a great year for America, especially for the United States Senate.

There is very little, if anything, that I can add to the remarks made by my colleagues about the careers and lives of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD; the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, PAT MCCARRAN; and the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, RICHARD RUSSELL. In particular, I wish to address my few remarks to HARRY FLOOD BYRD and to PAT MCCARRAN.

Addressing myself first to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], let me say that he is truly a statesman in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson. He has been rightly called Virginia's man of the midcentury, and he is today making his greatest contribution to the entire Nation.

HARRY FLOOD BYRD had a humble beginning. At the age of 15 he took over a newspaper that had failed as a result of a depression, and since that time he has known what it means to make a living in the free-enterprise way. He has been skilled in politics, but above all he has been skilled and learned as an American. His record since coming to the United States Senate is one that is consistent with statesmanship, that is primarily interested in the general welfare of the Nation, and rises far above party attitudes.

Senator BYRD has fought consistently for economy in Government. He has warned that the free world cannot remain free if the United States should become insolvent, and if private enterprise should disappear under Government regulation.

Mr. President, I know HARRY FLOOD BYRD personally, and to know him is indeed an honor. That I have his respect and confidence is one of the greatest things I can say about my public life. He is a man of high personal integrity, a personal integrity which has guided him throughout his entire career. He is truly representative of the finest traditions of the great State of Virginia and of the South. Certainly he is one of the stanchest defenders of the free institutions of our Nation.

Mr. President, in going hurriedly over some of Senator BYRD's speeches, I found three quotations which I should like to repeat publicly, so that we may think about them again. I first quote his famous remark when he said:

> I am for peace without appeasement, international machinery to preserve it, and a strong, efficient, and vigilant military establishment at home and abroad to enforce it.
>
> I am for fullest freedom and flexibility in foreign trade and commerce, but I am against subsidizing foreign trade deficits and subsidizing repugnant foreign political ideologies.
>
> I am against international dole, boondoggle and waste, but I have never cast a vote against relief of human suffering in time of distress or emergency.

Next, I like his famous remarks at Chattanooga, Tenn., on January 18, 1952, when he stated:

> When does democracy become insolvent? In a system such as ours, when and how does national insolvency manifest itself?
>
> There probably will be no milestone to mark the crossroad, but it seems to me that a democracy is approaching insolvency when—
>
> (1) We are unable to pay current costs of Government over a prolonged period with taxes short of confiscation and diminishing returns; and
>
> (2) When the constant cheapening of the dollar is a result of those operations.

Then, I like Senator BYRD's words delivered on April 24, 1952, before the American Newspaper Publishers Association in New York City, when he said:

> When I entered the Senate on March 4, 1933, the title of the first bill I was required to vote upon was: "A bill to preserve the credit of the United States Government." The national debt was about $20 billion, and the tax collections $4 billion annually. This legislation was advocated by President Roosevelt, who then indicated great concern for the solvency of our country. It provided for a reduction of 15 percent in the Federal expenditures. Within a few months Mr. Roosevelt's alarm subsided, and the law was repealed. Our Government then began an orgy of Federal spending and waste which was intensified after Mr. Truman came into office. It is a period, I think, that can be properly labeled "20 years of fiscal irresponsibility."

Mr. President, my State of Idaho joins with the other States in congratulating the great State of Virginia on the service of its senior Senator. We wish him many more happy returns of this anniversary, and pray that he may be here to guide and lead us for many years to come.

Mr. President, directing my remarks now to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada, PAT A. MCCARRAN. He was born of Irish immigrant parentage in 1876. He was a poor boy who knew the hardships of the West. PAT MCCARRAN did everything possible to become educated. As a boy, he herded sheep on the deserts and prairies of Nevada, and later rose to become Nevada's greatest statesman, public servant, and judge. I think it is significant that all the great men to whom we are paying tribute today worked their way from the bottom up. PAT MCCARRAN left college in his senior year to operate a stock ranch for the family and he became as skilled in the field of ranching and farming as he was later to become in the field of law.

PAT MCCARRAN started his legislative experience in the State legislature at the age of 26. He was admitted to the practice of law in the year 1905, and early demonstrated his great ability, for which I can vouch, because his name is known all over the West to all young lawyers. He was elected to the Nevada Supreme Court at the age of 36, and from 1917 to 1918 served as Chief Justice thereof.

It is highly interesting to note, and it is a great tribute to my friend from Nevada, as well, that not one of the many judicial decisions which this great man rendered has ever been reversed by a higher court.

PAT MCCARRAN entered the national scene in 1933, when he came to the United States Senate, following a most brilliant campaign. As has been testified here, he is the author of famous pieces of legislation—among others, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Internal Security Act. I should call attention to the fact that he is the father of the Civil Aeronautics Act. He is an eminent jurist, legislator, and statesman.

In going back over his career and reading many of his noteworthy statements, I have found a couple to which I wish to invite special attention.

In a speech on the floor of the Senate on July 10, 1937, the senior Senator from Nevada had this to say:

> I would rather serve one term in the Senate of the United States, have that honor, and go back into the humble walks of private life, where Mr. Farley says he will consign me, than to be here all the remainder of my days and say that I did not exercise my own judgment.

In a letter to a constituent dated March 3, 1941, my distinguished friend had this to say—and I commend it to all Senators, whether they be young or old in point of service:

> I took an oath, when I became a Member of the Senate of the United States, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, either foreign or domestic. I did not take an oath to uphold or defend any man or group of men. My obligation, imposed by the oath, was that I would uphold and defend the organic law of this country. That obligation I will carry out.
>
> The matter of my being reelected is so trivial and inconsequential in the great emergency that prevails here, that it is as nothing compared to the country's welfare. My name may be on, or may pass off, the roll of the Senate, but the Constitution of the United States and the welfare of my country must go on forever."

In offering congratulations to my friend from our neighboring State of Nevada, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks some excerpts from speeches and publications which he has written, to show the world what a great statesman the State of Nevada proudly sent to the halls of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has ably reviewed the career of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], but I should like to conclude my remarks at this time by paying tribute to this great statesman and dynamic spokesman for the people of his State and party. He is known to all of us for his truly impressive ability, for his never-failing courtesy, and for his polished skill as a great orator and master of parliamentary procedure. It is a pleasure to know and work with DICK RUSSELL, of Georgia, and it is always highly worthwhile to hear his views on the legislative problems before the Senate. I wish him many more years of activity in this body, and I am certain they will be as productive and stimulating as have been those he has known thus far.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS AT PHILADELPHIA, PA., MAY 10, 1937

> A government, whatever its form may be, depends primarily and fundamentally upon the confidence given to it by the people who submit to its orderly direction. For this 150 years our growing population has lent the strength of its confidence to the mandate of the courts established by the Constitution of the United States.

That the constitutional court and the courts permitted by the Constitution should be independent of the will or dictate or dominance of any other authority, is the spirit of the organic law. * * *

The law is not the people. The people is not the law. The law is the spirit of justice governing the people, and its application to individuals, to associations, to every form of civil life must be so hedged around with reverence and security that the civil courts established by and with the consent of the Constitution may, in an hour of popular passion, protect all the people from the tyranny of what might be a lawless majority. * * *

If any authority, however much admired, can hold at its beck and call, or effect even to the least jot or tittle, the judgment of that court, then to that extent individual liberty is jeopardized, the spirit of the Constitution is adulterated, and our form of Government is challenged.

SPEECH ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE, JULY 10, 1937

I would rather serve one term in the Senate of the United States, have that honor, and go back into the humble walks of private life, where Mr. Farley says he will consign me, than to be here all the remainder of my days and say that I did not exercise my own judgment.

FROM A LETTER TO HIS OLD GRAMMAR-SCHOOL TEACHER, SEPTEMBER 13, 1937

In this hour when a troubled and torn world is searching about for a safe form of government, it is my view that those of us who love constitutional democracy and who have faith, safety, and security by this form of government, must cling tenaciously to the fundamental principles embraced within our Constitution that have so safely guided us through many troublesome periods. The peoples of the world are looking for a leadership to guide them out of conditions of slaughter and confusion. Our Government, the United States of America, must assume that great leadership and hold on high the torch of individual human liberty.

STATEMENT BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN SUPPORT OF HIS BILL TO PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF SAFETY AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE REGULATION OF CIVIL AVIATION AND AIR TRANSPORT, APRIL 6, 1938

I have this faith: I have said publicly and I say to this committee now that I believe that America can become the mistress of the air, just as Britannia has been the mistress of the seas in centuries past, if we will but look progressively upon this subject, if we will, first of all, give all the encouragement we can to our own domestic lines and every encouragement possible to those lines that fly our flag into foreign countries.

FROM A LETTER TO A CONSTITUENT, MARCH 3, 1941

I took an oath, when I became a Member of the Senate of the United States, to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, either foreign or domestic. I did not take an oath to uphold or defend any man or group of men. My obligation, imposed by the oath, was that I would uphold and defend the organic law of this country. That obligation I will carry out.

The matter of my being reelected is so trivial and inconsequential in the great emergency that prevails here, that it is as nothing compared to the country's welfare. My name may be on, or may pass off, the roll of the Senate, but the Constitution of the United States and the welfare of my country must go on forever.

FROM A LETTER TO A NEWSPAPER EDITOR, AUGUST 12, 1941

The farmers of America deserve, because of conditions through which they have passed in the last 3 years and will pass now, to be seriously considered for an opportunity to get the cost of production—and enough over and above that to retain the interest of the American people in the industry of agriculture.

If we fail in this respect or if we refuse to recognize the rights of the farmers for cost of production plus, we will primarily drive the American out of agriculture, and we will secondarily have in America a great agrarian population breathing discontent and forever rebellious against a Government that fails to render justice to them.

FROM STATEMENT ON SENATE FLOOR, SEPTEMBER 4, 1941, DURING DEBATE ON EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE TO RUSSIA

After all is said and done, it remains a question of whether we shall encourage within this country those who for 23 years have avowedly come here for the purpose of destroying this country or whether we shall stand for this country against that movement. * * *

The leader, the Executive, is now saying that we are going to sponsor Russia—communistic Russia, if you please. Communism * * * was implanted here when we recognized Soviet Russia. * * * It is here, right with us, and we are going now to say that we will give a sponsorship to it by aiding, by lending, by giving. * * *

There are those of us who, until God takes us out of this realm, will go down the line for the Constitution of the United States. * * * But if we espouse the principles of the Constitution of the United States, we will not lend support to those who would destroy this Government and who are now here attempting to destroy it.

I despise Hitler and all he stands for, and equally I despise Stalin and all he stands for. I want those two dogs to come together and destroy each other. It would be well for democracy. But I would not lend a word to either one of them, because neither of them is a friend of this country. If Stalin succeeds, then God help democracy and God help Christianity.

TELEGRAM TO RENO EVENING GAZETTE, DECEMBER 9, 1941

The people of America did not want war. The American people would have gone to any honorable end to avoid war, but while we love and crave peace for ourselves and all the peoples of the world we will not retreat when unprovoked and uninvited attack is forced upon us. The declaration of war made by Congress is our answer to all who would violate honor and decency by bringing war upon a peace-loving people. A united people will teach a lesson to all aggressors everywhere and remind them that decency still prevails among honorable men. Our country is confronted by its greatest trial. It cannot flinch, it must not falter, it will not fail.

FROM SIGNED ARTICLE IN THE EXCHANGITE (OFFICIAL PUBLICATION OF THE NATIONAL EXCHANGE CLUB), AUGUST 1942

Untold possibilities lie undeveloped within the sphere of cargo planes * * * the flying merchantmen, the freight carriers of the air, are possible, are certain, and must receive the encouragement and the support of a progressive people.

FROM A LETTER TO A CONSTITUENT, AUGUST 20, 1942

My observation is that whenever a bureau tackles a difficult problem it branches out with a new bureau; and when that new bureau is faced with another difficult problem, it in turn branches out into another bureau. Hence we have a multiplicity of these so-called bureaus.

Then we have a switching around or two, or a reorganization or two, and a re-coordination or two, and in the interim, there are those in control in the Army and the Navy who refuse to listen to anything that does not come from under a brass hat. Anything worth while originating outside of the sacred precincts does not get far, and no one inside the circle dares do anything on his own initiative.

However, my dear friend, American people and American products and American determination will win the war. * * * I always believe in America, its power, and its possibilities to bring the light into the view of the great masses. America gets results. This is my consolation.

FROM A LETTER TO NEVADA REPORTING SERVICE, AUGUST 27, 1942

To the inquiry, "Why should a man be compelled to pay * * * labor unions in order to be permitted to work at a war production plant * * *?" one answer is this:

All that has ever been accomplished for the toiler, the man who works for a living, has been accomplished by the toiler, the worker himself, in union with his fellow workers. No statute was ever enacted for the welfare, promotion, health, or security of the worker that was not first put forward and demanded by the worker himself, speaking in unison with his fellow workers.

For the last century in this country working people have joined together in what they choose to term unions, and out of these unions has come legislation, rules, and regulations constituting practices for the uplift of the worker. Sanitary surroundings, freedom from danger, safe places in which to work, reasonable living conditions, reasonable pay per year, day, or week, have all been accomplished, and each of these by the demand of united workers.

This activity for the welfare of the toiler in his various pursuits has been crystallized in each instance into statutes, but in every case it has been accomplished by the united effort of the workers themselves. * * *

The reason for charging * * * for a man to belong to the union before he could get employment is because the wage that man would receive in his employment is a wage that was effected and brought about by the action of the union which he is required to join and by the efforts of that union extending over long years of trial. During that time many men lost their lives and many lost their standing in the community in order that the standard of wage for which they were fighting might be accomplished, and in order that the labor conditions surrounding the employment might be bettered and improved. This is the justification for the imposition of the fee.

FROM A SPEECH AT TOLEDO, OHIO, FEBRUARY 21, 1943

Were this war to end tomorrow, the fields of France could not be planted unless the seed came from America; if this war were over tomorrow, even Germany, though enemy she is today, could not progress unless some helping hand from the world that is now her enemy brought her people into a realization that they live for something more than war. If this war were to end tomorrow, the British people, the British Empire, with all of its power, would be calling upon us as she is today, for assistance in time of peace, as we have assisted her in time of war.

How are we going to do it? By maintaining at home a national strength; by doing away with difficulties regarding these new ideologies and isms that are being preached from one end of the land to the other, by those that would say to us, "We will tear down American strength and American in-

tegrity and throw our strength promiscuously throughout the world."

The world will be safer, more secure, and more happy, if we maintain a nation so strong, so secure within itself, so independent, that it can give to a recovering world the things that a recovering world will need when this is over.

FROM A LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, AUGUST 20, 1943

Food may write the peace, but air power will win the war.

One of our most important problems today is what to do with our growing air strength; how to control and direct our military aviation so as to unleash its maximum potential force against the enemy, while at the same time preserving the necessary cooperation between the air arm and our other Armed Forces. This is a problem which, I know, you recognize; one in which you are vitally interested and to which you have given much thought.

In recent months, achievements of our Air Force have been so great that I know it must have been hard for you to continue to deny those forces the autonomy which they seek, and the recognition which they so richly deserve. But you have been hampered by lack of unanimity among your advisers, both as to the end to be achieved and the course to be pursued; and serious questions have been raised as to how far you, as Chief Executive, might go in giving this Nation an independent and autonomous Air Force.

Involved are legal questions, on which I do not presume to advise you. Involved likewise are practical questions concerning aviation and administration, and as to these questions, also, I offer no advice. This is not intended as a letter of advice. It is a call for action.

* * * * *

The petition is this: Take action now which will give us the unified, coordinated, autonomous Air Force that can make most effective use of the air power with which we must win the war.

Take action along the lines recommended by the ablest of your advisers, or by a majority of them; take action to the limit of the powers which your legal advisers tell you you possess; take such action as you can, and if you deem it not enough, ask the Congress to take further action; but take action now.

Every hour we spend winning this war the slow way, when we could be winning it twice as fast, is half an hour of defeat.

FROM COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1943

Public administration is never so difficult, and good public administration is never so important, as in time of war. In wartime it becomes the appropriate function of Congress to vote vast lump-sum appropriations, and to make the broad delegations of power which the Executive needs. But the fact that we are engaged in a war does not mean that we must revise our form of government. We are making war as an organized Nation, and one of the purposes for which we fight is the preservation of our constitutional liberties and our constitutional form of government. We must not let that essential truth escape us.

* * * * *

Nothing could be more violative of the principle of government by consent of the governed than a system under which laws are made by appointive officials, interpreted by the same or other appointive officials, and administered by the same or still other appointive officials. It is no fallacy * * * to say that a large body of our law today is so made, so interpreted, and so administered. * * *

When a man rises to an important position it is customary to suppose that his advancement has been due, at least in part, to some special merit; but this is not always true, even in private business and industry, and certainly it is not always true in government. Still, most people are likely to believe it. Usually, the one who believes it most strongly is the man himself. As a result of this rather common failing, most of the men who write our administrative law, and who interpret it and administer it, have come to regard themselves as rather superior beings. In some cases they are. In many cases they are not. This feeling of superiority is manifested in a great many ways, ranging all the way from the petty dilatory tactics with which sundry petty bureaucrats seek to bolster their own petty egos, to the complete disregard of ordinary civil rights and established democratic processes and procedures which every now and then is evidenced by some new Executive promulgation or administrative interpretation.

* * * * *

Fully centralized control of all governmental functions, in a bureaucracy founded upon administrative law, is the very antithesis of that democracy in which all our rights are rooted; the democracy from which spring all our hopes, not only for a better future, but even for a maintenance of the unnumbered freedoms which we as a nation have enjoyed since the foundation of our Republic.

* * * * *

Dictatorship is not always a creature of war; sometimes it comes tiptoeing stealthily upon an unsuspecting people in time of peace; and sometimes it is builded secretly by the people themselves, unknowing the potentialities of what they create; until like Frankenstein's monster, similarly builded, it is unleashed to accomplish the enslavement or destruction of its creator.

It has been said that true statesmanship must know a higher purpose than vote-getting. We cannot argue with that thesis. But we say to you that if every Member of both Houses of Congress guided his every action by the criterion of whether what he did would win him votes or lose him votes at the next election, the body of law enacted by such a Congress would be vastly preferable to a body of law created by men owing no allegiance to any group of voters, and giving no particular thought or weight to public opinion, either in the country as a whole or within any particular section of it.

* * * * *

Government by administrative law breeds opportunity for personal arrogance, evades the courts, sneers at the rule of stare decisis, affords no precedents, and fortifies itself by pointing ridicule at Congress and other lawmaking bodies of our Nation.

* * * * *

The growth of legislation by administrative directive is the step between democracy, with constitutional guaranties protecting the body of the law in the people, and a Government by men with their back to the wall, hurling defiance at constitutional and substantial changes prompted by progress and founded on the spirit of the law.

FROM OPENING REMARKS AT JOINT MEETING OF MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE, CALLED BY SENATOR MCCARRAN ON OCTOBER 4, 1943, TO DISCUSS INDUSTRIAL DECENTRALIZATION

Early last July, shortly before the summer recess of the Congress, I addressed a letter to a number of my colleagues in the Senate, calling attention to * * * the desirability of decentralizing heavy industry (perhaps I should say recentralizing heavy industry), especially through establishment of new or expanded facilities for production of iron and steel, in areas outside the few acknowledged steel centers of this country.

* * * * *

We must realize that in dedicating ourselves to work for the establishment of facilities for the production of iron and steel, in sections of the country which do not have such facilities, we are charting a course which, if we sail it truly, will mean substantial changes in the economic set-up of this Nation. The importance of these changes will be, perhaps, far beyond our present capacity for visualization. I believe these changes, if made, will greatly benefit the country as a whole, as well as benefiting the individual States which we as Members of Congress represent. I want to see those changes made. But I do not believe we should embark upon the course through which these changes may be produced, without a realization of the broad scope of the results which our actions may have.

We should understand clearly that the course to which we propose to commit ourselves is not one which may be run in a day, or a week, or a month, or a year. There are many things which we can accomplish almost immediately, through concerted action. There are many other things which can be accomplished, if at all, only as a result of long and arduous effort. I believe we should pledge ourselves to continue that effort until our ends have been achieved. And one of those ends should be that, in the final analysis, there shall be no great section of this country which shall not have emerged into economic self-sufficiency.

FROM A LETTER TO A CONSTITUENT, OCTOBER 9, 1943

I fear that this war will not end when the last gun is fired. I can see signs that indicate that this is to be a war with an indefinite ending. No one can say positively that there will be such a thing as a peace term, and no one can conjecture whether or not there will be a peace treaty.

It is admittedly a plan on foot to have international arrangements fixed by international agreements rather than by treaties. This is one of the movements of the times and one of the things that hurl themselves squarely into the face of our Constitution and form of government.

FROM SPEECH AT SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JUNE 9, 1944

In addition to the question of our national security, the question of a better balanced and less centralized economy also demands the development of the West. A larger urban population in the West would open new prospects to the agricultural States of the Middle West, would prove a boon to eastern industries too.

Finally, no other single propect has so much to offer for the solution of the total postwar economic problem. The West offers new prospects and new opportunities to millions of people who have reached the zenith of their hopes and possibilities in the overcrowded and overdeveloped East. A pronounced westward movement of population would set the industries of the East humming by creating a maximum demand for durable goods, producers' goods and consumers' goods.

FROM SPEECH BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA STATE LEGISLATURE IN SPECIAL JOINT SESSION, JUNE 9, 1944

War, even among democratic peoples, is a totalitarian interlude. It is a necessity of limited duration, a hateful but necessary job that demands and justifies the suspension of individual planning, of many individual liberties, and raises maximum individual sacrifice, rather than individual liberty and well-being, to the heights of the greatest social ideal. War has the effect of creating the psychological mood essential for its success—the mood that has for its motive the suspension of all but the military considerations.

This necessary mood, this heroic but collectivist mood, is not the normal mood of

this Nation. It is not the mood in which this Nation has achieved its strength, its greatness, and its wealth. We cannot regard it as more than a necessary interlude.

* * * * *

We must guard against this mood, which will tempt us strongly because the problems of reconversion, of reconstruction, will be so complex and so trying, and we must be on guard against the men who advocate that we turn to the building of the peace in this mood. These men would cost us the peace.

RADIO ADDRESS, AUGUST 17, 1944 (4 DAYS BEFORE THE OPENING OF THE WORLD PEACE CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON)

It is not for this country to attempt to police the world; nor for England to do so, nor any other country. The job must be done cooperatively by all the nations which are fitted by their ideals and principles, and their strength of arms, to join in the effort; just as in the early days of the West, all upright and straight-shooting citizens were expected to join together in a posse to combat some outlaw band. In those early days, whenever it became known that there were more citizens available for the posse than there were outlaws, and that they could ride faster and throw more lead, outlawry died out on the range. That same principle will work out internationally.

FROM RADIO SPEECH, OCTOBER 10, 1944

We face the problem of taking emphatic action, in concert with the other peace-loving nations, to make certain that when this mighty conflict is over, war shall never again be allowed to spread desolation and destruction across the face of the earth.

Twice now in half a century the old world has called upon our people to give their blood, their strength, and their wealth to quench the conflagration of war arising out of old greeds for power.

If this country is thus to be called upon to give its blood to win wars, it should not hesitate to give its brain and courage to prevent war before the flame is lighted.

FROM RADIO SPEECH, NOVEMBER 4, 1944

I am satisfied that this country, along with the other great powers of the world, should bind itself never to commit an act of aggression. I do not believe my country will ever desire to commit an act of aggression. And I believe we can and should agree to do our part in making armed force available to deal swiftly and effectively with any nation which dares to start a war. * * *

We must plan for the prompt use of overwhelming force against any aggressor nation. If we make such force available and bind ourselves to use it, the occasion may never arise when we shall have to do so; but just as surely as we fail to make such force available, sooner or later some outlaw nation will take advantage of that failure to throw the world once more in the hell of war.

FROM HEARINGS, SENATE COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INDUSTRIAL CENTRALIZATION, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1944

It is my conviction that the function of democratic government is not to plan for business but to plan with business; that it is not the function of democratic government to supplant business in any of its vital functions, but to assist business in maintaining its full initiative and the fullest confidence both in itself and the Government.

FROM LETTER TO SECRETARY-TREASURER, NEVADA STATE FARM BUREAU, SEPTEMBER 15, 1945

I am deeply concerned about the philosophy of Government, which apparently still persists in the minds of many here in Washington, that we can continue to spend our way to prosperity.

During the war years this country has produced hugely; but much of what we produced has been or will be destroyed. Therefore, it does not represent permanent wealth. We have not paid our way as we went. If we do not make a serious and effective effort to curtail Government expenditures and to at least move toward a balanced budget, I fear that we may wake up some morning to find that the savings of our people, a substantial portion of which are invested in Government obligations, have depreciated sharply.

FROM TESTIMONY BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE, OCTOBER 9, 1945

Free enterprise has made this country the greatest industrial Nation in the world. But remember, free enterprise does not mean the rule of the jungle, where the lion and the tiger are free to meet the competition of smaller animals by having them for breakfast. Enterprise which is truly free—and I mean enterprise which is free alike from Government control and direction, from artificial economic obstacles, and from the hampering influence of monopoly—is our best bet to solve the problems which lie ahead of us.

FROM A LETTER TO A PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA, NOVEMBER 27, 1945

I have never been able to understand why we should coddle any group or party or foreign government which is dedicated to the overthrow of that democracy which is the foundation of this Nation.

Sometimes I grow discouraged about the situation, for I have found that a man can hew to the line over a period of years, and for part of the time he will be called an isolationist, for part of the time he will be called a warmonger, and for most of the time he will be called a meddler, a crackpot, or worse. However, I shall never change my views on this question, for I feel it too deeply. I shall continue to do my best to combat at all times the forces which I know are this instant undermining the foundations of our national integrity.

FROM A SPEECH ON SENATE FLOOR, NOVEMBER 29, 1945, ON THE OCCASION OF INTRODUCING A BILL TO CREATE A NATIONAL NATURAL RESOURCES POLICY AND PROVIDE FOR A NATURAL RESOURCES INVENTORY

No one really knows how much we have depleted our natural resources in our war efforts.

* * * * *

I do not go as far as others have gone in painting the picture black. I do not agree that we have become a "have not" nation. But we do not know the facts. And we need to know the facts. We need to know what our natural resources are, where they are, and how they may best be used in the national interest.

A nation is a business. The United States is the biggest business in the world. For us to continue in business without knowing our potential assets is insane from an economic standpoint.

FROM AN ARTICLE IN THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 1946

Where law ends, arbitrary power begins. If the laws may be bent to the preferences of any official agent or tribunal, they cease to be laws, and become merely advisory declarations of the legislature. But this Nation was founded upon the premise, enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, that all arbitrary executive power is to be avoided. It is therefore unsound and unwise to divide government into matters of law and matters of discretion, because such a division implies that the one is as proper as the other. Although we may never wholly achieve it in all details, the whole theory and cast of our Government is that it is a government of law, rather than a government of men. Discretion is merely the inescapable or unintentional residue.

FROM STATEMENT TO THE PRESS, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 1947

One of the factors working toward constantly greater and greater centralization of industrial power in the United States is the inability of small businesses to grow in the traditional American fashion.

It is important, in a capitalistic democracy such as ours, to have a constant infusion of new blood at the bottom of the business ladder, in all fields of endeavor; and to give those who start new enterprises every reasonable opportunity and inducement to grow.

FROM SPEECH ON SENATE FLOOR, APRIL 24, 1947

Americans already have come a long way toward looking to their Government instead of to themselves, in small things as well as big. Small business is being liquidated, Big business is being regulated. Agriculture demands Government support. The demands of labor operate on a national scale with legal sanctions. The soul of the individual is being smothered in the struggle of these giants. But these things are well enough known. Indeed, they are so well known that we are in danger of accepting them as commonplace and inevitable. One can hardly speak of them without being viewed as an historical throwback, or as desiring the restoration of days beyond recall. We are in danger of finding that the evil of big government has been converted into a virtue. We are face to face with an era in which men, as persons of human dignity, are paled into insignificance beside the modern state and superstate.

FROM A LETTER TO WALLY BOREN, MAY 4, 1948

Certainly, you are right about the fact that a Senator's mail often includes some letters which are unduly or unfairly critical. However, it has been my experience that usually one of these letters is written simply because the man who wrote it didn't know all the facts. After all, one of the great privileges of being an American is the right to go off half-cocked every now and then, to express an honest opinion even if it is half-baked, and to do a right-about-face without shame when increased knowledge sheds more light on the subject.

A lot of folks who probably never read Emerson's statement that a foolish consistency is the bugaboo of little minds are constantly proving the truth of this statement in their daily lives, and are proving at the same time that by Emerson's standards their own minds are not little.

* * * * *

Your method of putting the good in one pile and the bad in another would be the worst possible way for a Congressman to evaluate his mail. That is too much like trial by compurgation. One letter may be infinitely more important than another, not because of whom it's from, but because of the thought behind it.

* * * * *

Most of the Senators I know—and I know most of them rather intimately—don't want cheers. Their goal is simply to know each night that they are still doing the best job they can of representing the folks who elected them; knowing that, they can sleep with their consciences. Constructive criticism doesn't bother them, because they can do something about it; it helps them do a better job. Captious or irresponsible criticism is sometimes irritating but doesn't get under your skin if you recognize it for what it is, because there's nothing you can do

about it. And most of the Senators I know are pretty good at separating the wheat from the chaff.

FROM A LETTER TO A CONSTITUENT, AUGUST 9, 1948

It has always been my own personal belief that the policy which has made this country great, a policy of producing to the maximum and then finding or developing markets, is the soundest policy for us to pursue. Such a policy shuns artificial controls, permits basic economic laws to operate unhampered, and is bound to result, in my opinion, in the greatest ultimate good for the largest number. There are too many in Washington who are prone to overlook the basic economic truth that our standard of living is measured by what we produce, plus what we import, minus what we export. Perhaps that is oversimplification for it takes no account of the problem of distribution; but if what we face is a distribution problem solely, it hardly seems pertinent to attempt to solve this problem by attempting to control production.

FROM ADDRESS BEFORE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, SEATTLE, WASH., SEPTEMBER 7, 1948

For years the Supreme Court has been holding that, because similar powers have been conferred upon some Federal agency, this or that function of State or local governments has by the very silence of Congress been impliedly rendered null and void. Now that Federal functions have grown with the expanded scope of the commerce clause, blind legislation of that kind must ultimately come close to obliterating effective State or local government. The very fact that in recent years it has become established that almost every serious activity of the people of this land may be the subject of Federal regulation, and that in the same time much has been brought into Federal control that previously had not been, requires two things: First, there is need for us to look back over legislation of this generation and make due provision that it shall not supersede State regulation where the latter does the job. Second, when new or expanded authority is proposed for any Federal agency, Members of Congress should ask themselves: "If this is done, will and should all State and local jurisdiction to the same effect automatically cease to be valid?"

The first of those things has not been done, the second rarely. As a result, our unwritten constitution now in effect provides that every time we add Federal regulatory authority, by the same token and without saying so, we diminish the authority of all the States. In many, perhaps most, such situations that result is unnecessary and may be unwise. In any event, whether or not necessary or wise, that effect comes about silently and thoughtlessly. Thus, moreover, have we blindly ignored Thomas Jefferson's admonition that State governments are the most competent administration for our domestic concerns, and the surest bulwarks against antidemocratic tendencies.

FROM RADIO SPEECH, OCTOBER 4, 1948

Communism is the biggest boobytrap in human history. It is a boobytrap that no sane and clear-thinking man or woman who has ever known the God-given freedom of America would ever walk into with open eyes. But you can drift into it if you refuse to think, if you are too lazy to take action to avoid it, if you shut your eyes to realities, if you give ear to the voices that are constantly trying to create and foster dissatisfaction and prejudice and hatred and unrest and uncertainty.

FROM STATEMENT TO THE PRESS, JANUARY 28, 1949 (IN CONNECTION WITH INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO GIVE AID TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT OF CHINA)

With regard to China, the United States faces a decision which may determine its position in the world of the future. We cannot defer this decision, for to accept delay is to decide against action. It is time to stop drifting on a sea of rhetoric and good intentions and examine the facts.

We must decide anew whether our system of free institutions, free enterprise, and the dignity of the individual human being, is going to accept the challenge of communism in its announced determination to destroy all that we and our forbears have builded. If we reaffirm our decision to accept that challenge, we cannot stand still; we either go forward or we retreat. We must face the issues squarely.

* * * * *

We cannot afford to debate and delay this decision. While we bemoan the failures and shortcomings of our former ally across the Pacific, our enemies are taking over China and laughing at our efforts to straddle the fence. The time is here for us to take our position against communism in Asia, as we have in Europe.

SPEECH ON SENATE FLOOR, FEBRUARY 25, 1949

Events in Asia are daily emphasizing the cold hard truth of the motivating power behind the Chinese Communists. No longer can even the most optimistic believe that the war in China is a mere revolt of an oppressed people. The tenacity with which the Communists hold on to the olive branch they claim to have extended is indicative of Moscow's determination to exercise its complete control over this prostrate nation, not by a peaceful settlement, but by complete surrender of those forces who would, if given the opportunity, oppose the international expansion of communism.

* * * * *

Flushed with recent victories, the real hand behind the Chinese Communists is making itself known in Asia today. Korea is a powder keg, ready to explode in our face if we are pushed out of China as a force in opposition to communism. Reports already indicate the situation approaches outright war between the southern portion, which we recognize, and the northern or Communist portion, which the Soviets recognize.

Make no mistake, if the Communists are not stopped in China, the next step will be Korea and do not forget that in Korea we still maintain occupation troops and if trouble becomes serious in that country our boys must fight or get out and admit to the world that we are losing our battle for the survival of freedom.

FROM AN ARTICLE IN THE GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL, MAY 1950

So long as Government lawyers appear to regard the application of legislation as a sort of chessboard on which they may play games with private interests, the effect of statutes is bound to be at least deferred.

FROM SPEECH IN SENATE, JULY 12, 1950

Mr. President, the Government of the United States should immediately sever diplomatic relations with the Government of Soviet Russia and with the governments of the countries which are satellites of Soviet Russia. May I hasten to add that the severance of diplomatic relations is not a step toward war but is a last hope to marshal the free people of the world in the cause of peace and to quarantine those who are courting war by spreading their tentacles to all corners of the world.

FROM RADIO INTERVIEW ON NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY PROGRAM, THE REVIEWING STAND, WEEK OF DECEMBER 1, 1950

At the start, we must understand that the fight is not against subversive ideas but against subversive acts. Mere advocacy of radical economic and social doctrines, by Communists or anyone else, constitutes no real menace to the United States. Unsound doctrines will not endure when exposed to the light of truth in a free society. Laws suppressing free expression of any economic and social doctrines, no matter who advocates them, would be unwise, and would strike at the roots of our constitutional guaranties of free speech.

The real danger to our freedoms, from the Communists, is not in what they say or think but in what they are trying to do.

The economic and social doctrines of communism are only window dressing behind which a conspiratorial fifth column operates in the United States, under the absolute discipline of the Kremlin. This foreign-controlled conspiracy is working fanatically to undermine or overthrow the Government of the United States by overt acts.

FROM SPEECH IN SENATE, JANUARY 16, 1951

This is a queer kind of war in Korea.

We are trying to fight it without admitting that we are in it. That makes it a tough war to fight and an easy war to lose. In that kind of war, if the enemy loses, we don't win; but if the enemy wins, we lose. So, if we are going to go on fighting this war, we're suckers if we don't use every weapon available to us.

FROM SPEECH IN SENATE, AUGUST 6, 1951, DISCUSSING THE GLOBAL PROPAGANDA WAR

I think we should abandon the superior, almost patronizing tone of a rich and moral uncle addressing poor relatives. No statement by Americans about how well off and free they are will carry weight behind the Iron Curtain. We must learn to look through the eyes of our audience, whether in Odessa or Shanghai or Timbuctoo. Our propaganda must be directed to their interests, their self-esteem, their hopes for the future. They must be made to feel that we need their help, not merely that they need ours. We must flatter, rather than derogate, their national and racial experience.

* * * * *

In a global propaganda war, a miss is as good as a mile. Close doesn't count. Nothing short of an all-out offensive will do the job. We have every moral and political right to use the same weapons of subversion, infiltration, and thought warfare that have been used for 30 years against us. The Soviet rulers have not been seeking just to irritate us—or simply to embarrass us; they have been aiming to destroy us. They have exploited our every weakness and social contradiction. There are no fewer weaknesses and contradictions at their end, for us to exploit.

We need a fighting policy, aiming at the soonest possible collapse of the Red hierarchy, and we need techniques of psychological warfare to match such a policy.

FROM ADDRESS DELIVERED AT ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, MEMORIAL DAY 1934

The array that may threaten the security of our Nation's foundation is not a uniformed army. If it were, we might recognize our foe. The force of reform against our institutions may come from afar and may challenge without a declaration of war. It sends the emissary of propaganda to tell us that the strength of democracy is disintegrating, that the principles for which our patriots struggled and died belong to an age of the past, that the doctrine of popular government fails to meet demands

of the present day, and that the instrument written by Jefferson and Hamilton and expounded by Marshall no longer is possessed of the spirit and the profoundness that caused men to give their lives for its preservation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to add my words to the tributes which have been paid today to our distinguished colleagues on the floor of the Senate, especially the distinguished Senator from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD, and the distinguished Senator from Nevada, PAT MCCARRAN. The senior Senator from Kansas has a high regard and a profound respect for the statesmanlike views, the courage, and the industry of these great Senators. Thousands of Kansans share my view. May their fine abilities and services be available to this body for many years to come.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with those who have preceded me in paying tribute to our distinguished colleagues. I congratulate the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] upon their 20 years of distinguished service in this legislative body. I share the sentiments which have been expressed by other Senators. Their abilities and capacities as statesmen and legislators have long been recognized and acknowledged throughout the Nation.

Aside from their great abilities, they each have one characteristic which most impresses me, and which commands the admiration and esteem of the American people. It is, Mr. President, their frequently demonstrated willingness to rise above merely partisan considerations and place their services upon the basis of the best interests and welfare of this Nation.

While they symbolize to me the true traditions and principles of the Democratic Party as founded by Thomas Jefferson, they rise above and beyond that, in that they further symbolize the true traditions and principles of real Americanism. During my 10 years of service in the Senate I have been privileged and honored to enjoy their personal friendship. I have profound respect for their opinions and judgment. I have often looked to them for counsel and guidance, and have deferred to their wisdom and followed their leadership on many issues associated with legislation over which their respective committees have jurisdiction.

I am happy to join my colleagues in congratulating them, and I wish for each of them many more anniversaries of distinguished and fruitful service in this body.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I desire to take this opportunity to associate myself with the many able, fitting, and well-earned tributes which have been paid today to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

Ever since Senator BYRD entered upon his duties in this Chamber some 20 years ago, I have followed his career with a great deal of interest. I have not only followed it with interest, but I have been thrilled on occasions by his courage and his fine approach to the issues which have confronted our country from time to time. We should all be proud to be in this body with one who possesses the talents and the ability of HARRY FLOOD BYRD, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia.

As to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], it has been my privilege, indeed my high privilege, to serve under his leadership on the vital and important Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate. He, too, on many occasions, has been an inspiration to the junior Senator from New Jersey. He possesses great courage and fine legal ability. He is a great American.

So, Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of happiness and pleasure to associate myself with the deserved tributes we have heard paid to these outstanding Americans.

SENATOR HAYDEN, SENATOR BYRD, SENATOR MCCARRAN, AND SENATOR RUSSELL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, our session today marks an anniversary for three of our most distinguished and able Members.

It was just 26 years ago that the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN, was first sworn in as a Member of the Senate. It was just 20 years ago that the senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, and the senior Senator from Nevada, PAT MCCARRAN, first took the oath.

For two decades and more, these able men have served their States and their Nation. They have risen to positions of national stature through the exercise of ability, loyalty, and devotion to principle.

Like our good friend Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, whose 20th anniversary as a Senator was last January 12, their names are already a part of the history of the Senate.

As have so many others of the junior Members of the Senate, I have learned to lean heavily on the wise counsel and the long experience of these senior statesmen. I have found them to be towers of strength in the days when the road is rough.

I express to them the hope that there are ahead of them many more years of service in which their experience and their ability will play the same vital role in American life that they are now playing and have played in the past.

SAM RAYBURN, OF TEXAS

Mr. President, I wish now to pay tribute to another great American. Texas takes great pride in the fact that the beloved former Speaker of the House of Representatives, SAM RAYBURN, today marks the 40th anniversary of his being sworn in as a Member of that great public body. Mr. President, no man in public life today commands a higher degree of respect, devotion, and affection from those who know him than does SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to another most important anniversary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, today marks one of the great events of American history. It was on March 4—just 20 years ago—that the late Franklin D. Roosevelt took the oath of office as the President of the United States.

In these times, we tend to forget the bleak mood of the country at the time he took office. The United States was clutched tightly in the grip of a terrible depression. Millions were unemployed, and walked the streets in an aimless search for jobs that did not exist. Corporation profits were nonexistent, and the ledgers showed few entries that were not in red ink. On farm after farm, the knock-knock of the sheriff's hammer symbolized the wave of mortgage foreclosures.

Few of us can forget the feeling of confidence that swept the Nation when President Franklin D. Roosevelt took over the reins. He trusted the people, and the people trusted him. Together—acting as Americans in a common enterprise—we proceeded to pull ourselves out of the mire of economic despond.

It has been two decades, Mr. President, since that great day. America has gone far and has lived through some of the most important chapters of history. Together, we have risen to the highest standard of living in history—to the position of the mightiest of the free nations of the world.

We are still close to the administration of our late President. Many of the acts of that administration were and still are controversial, as are all events of the recent past.

But there can be no doubt of the position of Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the hearts of the American people. He will always be the man who appeared in our darkest hour of depression and voiced the true soul of these United States.

The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—

He said on March 4, 1933. Those are the words of hope which carried us through the depression. Those are the words of hope which can carry us through the days ahead.

BEEF AND CATTLE PRICES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to address a few remarks to the Senate on the subject of the gloom which seems to pervade this body, and which has unfortunately spread across the land, concerning the cattle-price situation.

Mr. President, I come from a State relatively small from the standpoint of population, but large from the standpoint of land. Within its borders there are numerous animals classified as cattle, so we are very much interested in this subject.

I have been greatly grieved to hear the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] speak of his concern over the distress which is felt in his State because of declining cattle prices.

I have sat here a long time waiting to hear some Senator from a cattle-producing State express confidence in the men who made this industry great, and express the feeling that the same faith and determination which caused those men to move to the West and to create the great cattle industry might enable them to solve their own problems.

Agriculture and cattle comprise more than one-fourth of the entire economy of my State, so I speak with deep concern on this subject. I had hoped that the light which the cattle and sheep producers of my State of Arizona would cast in this Chamber today might dispel some of the gloom and serve as a second sun to rise on this day and make plain the fact that a State small in population but great in area has a keen determination to solve this problem in the old-fashioned American way.

I wish to read a telegram which I received this morning from the Arizona Wool Growers Association. We have not talked much about sheep, but those little animals also give us concern. The telegram reads as follows:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *February 28, 1953.*

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

In view of the fact that today there is a general public discussion and some criticism of the United States Department of Agriculture in the new administration, we feel that it is time for the sheep-raising industry to restate our long-established belief and announce our whole-hearted support for the principles enunciated by Secretary Ezra Benson calling for less Government support, less Government controls, and more opportunity for the development of agriculture under private enterprise. We believe agriculture can, and we know the wool-growing industry can, develop the production of food and fiber needed for our own uses and the assistance of our allies in today's battle to maintain a free world and we can take our place in a free and strong domestic economy which is required if this Nation is to continue its leadership. We can do this best without Government controls and without cost to the taxpayers. We only ask that we get the right to first place in a free American market, with the American farmer and American worker protected from cheap foreign imports which are destroying the American standard of living and which for several years forced domestic producers to accept more and more Government aid.

ARIZONA WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT W. LOCKETT,
President.
H. B. EMBACH,
Secretary.

To further dispel the note of anxiety which we find in some places throughout the country, I should like to read to the Senate a few excerpts from an article published in the Arizona-Republic of February 28, in reporting the proceedings of the Arizona Cattle Growers Association, held in Bisbee, Ariz. The excerpts show how vitally these people are concerned with governmental support and the extreme importance they place on this subject, which we have heard so ably discussed in this body. The subject has been of paramount concern to the cattle growers of Oklahoma. I know that Oklahoma raises far more cattle than does Arizona. However, Mr. President, I call attention to what Mr. Ralph Cowan, the president of the Arizona Cattle Growers Association, referred to as the first problem confronting the association. It may be hard to believe in this day and age, but that problem is cattle rustling, or the stealing of cattle. It is what we see on the Hopalong Cassidy and other television programs. That was the first problem to which the president of the association referred, not Government support of prices. Then he went on to make an excellent statement, from which I should like to read, and I suggest that Senators from other cattle-producing States could pass this word along. I read from the article:

"We did not expect the abrupt drop without a comparable decline in cattle feed prices," Cowan asserted.

"Our big trouble," he added, "is that we often look at the price received per pound of beef without regard to the cost of producing that pound of beef.

"I would say that one of our aims should be that we take cognizance of the cost of producing this pound of beef in relation to the price we get."

Later in the convention, F. E. Molin, secretary of the American National Cattlemen's Association, asked the delegates to the convention to write to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and to their Representatives in Congress, requesting that support prices not be placed on the cattle industry.

Mr. President, in closing I should like to read a letter which I received this morning from Mr. Carlos Ronstadt, president of the Baboquivari Cattle Co. He writes:

BABOQUIVARI CATTLE CO.,
Amado, Ariz., March 1, 1953.

DEAR BARRY: It was an inspiration to me, as it would have been to you, to attend the Arizona cattle growers' convention in Bisbee this past weekend. The group asked that no controls, no subsidies, no price floor, nor any help other than buy American and long-term loans be given for cattle. They think that old law of supply and demand should be allowed to operate, and that if prices drop that soon other things will come into line, but that we will maintain our freedom and independence. I know that this is what you stand for, and it would have given you confidence in yourself, as it did for the rest of us. There was only one speaker in opposition out of several hundred present. Incidentally, he is not a leader in Arizona of our industry.

Mr. President, I have made these few remarks only to show the American people that in this great land of ours, within the State from which I proudly come and which I call my home, there are those who today are not afraid to stand up on their own feet, as they did in days when they struggled to get the cattle industry to the point where it is today. That was done by strong men who had faith and hope and were willing to fight and suffer for their principles. All they ask for today is to have us in Washington get out of their hair.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I am acquainted with Mr. Carlos Ronstadt, and I derive a great deal of pleasure from the fact that we have the same type of citizen in the State of Nevada, as I am sure other States have. Men of this type have made their investments, and all they ask is that Congress do nothing which will destroy their investments.

I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I should like to ask him what in his opinion will happen to the cattle industry if we continue to import cattle from Mexico and Canada and frozen meat from New Zealand and Australia, as well as canned meat from all areas in which it is available? If we were to continue that policy, what in the opinion of the Senator from Arizona would be the future of the cattle business in this country?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to read a portion of a telegram which I read in full before the Senator from Nevada entered the Chamber. I believe my reading of the excerpt will answer the Senator's question. It not only expresses my feeling but also the feeling of a large segment of the population of my State. It reads:

We only ask that we get the right to first place in a free American market, with the American farmer and the American worker protected from cheap foreign exports, which are destroying the American standard of living and which for several years forced domestic producers to accept more and more Government aid.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think that statement does answer my question. I should like to ask a further question of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say that what the Senator has stated meets with the general approval of the people of my State and the people of many other States. It is the reason why we need the protection of the buy-American policy which was mentioned. A former Representative in Congress at one time proposed a 25-percent leeway in prices. That is to say, the Government in its purchases could favor the domestic producer to the extent of 25 percent in the price paid. Is not the reason why producers need the benefit of the differential because in the other producing countries, such as Mexico, New Zealand, and other areas of the world, the wages are—I was going to say one-third, but actually they are one-tenth of what the wages are in this country?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the problem to which the Senator from Nevada refers is wrapped up in the situation in which we find ourselves in relation to the cattle industry. It is a subject which has been discussed brilliantly on the floor of the Senate. We have a cattle population of approximately 94 million, and we must work off approximately a million of that population before we can expect to find cattle prices solidifying and starting to rise again.

To answer specifically the question of the Senator from Nevada, I would say that naturally when we find ourselves in a condition of overproduction, the introduction of any outside sources of supply tends to keep prices down. The Senator from Nevada comes from a State, as I do also, which produces copper. In the case of copper the situation is such that our country cannot produce sufficient copper for our own domestic needs and therefore we feel it is proper to import foreign copper to supply the demands of our armed services.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question.

Mr. LANGER. Are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). The morning hour has not been concluded.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota permit me to ask one more question of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada is fully aware of the fact that the American wool industry, for example, does not produce as much wool as is used in this country. That is the direct result of the free-trade policy of the executive department. The responsibility of fixing that policy has been placed in the hands of the executive department by the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, by which the constitutional responsibility of Congress was transferred directly to the executive department and allowed to be administered by a State Department which had very little, if any, knowledge of domestic or foreign industry. The supply of wool produced in this country is not adequate for the American market. When wool is allowed to come into this country without the payment of any import fee or duty in the form of a differential, as the Constitution calls for, it means that no investor in the wool business or sheep business in the United States is safe. In other words, no man in his right mind would put any money in the sheep business, because at least one-half of his production could be overwhelmed by foreign importation. Does not the Senator from Arizona agree with that statement?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I addressed my remarks to the cattle situation. We could become involved here in a long discussion of the advisability of free trade, as against tariffs. I would suggest that we might postpone our remarks until that particular subject comes to the floor.

I think the Senator's question is answered amply by the telegram I read.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think that specific question was answered.

In closing, I wish to say that the cattle business, the sheep business, the copper business, the textile business, the crockery business, and practically all other businesses in the United States are seriously affected. Recently three crockery plants in Ohio were closed. Imports are coming from Japan, Germany, England, and elsewhere. The principle or policy involved is clear. A nation which wishes to maintain its high standard of living is faced with two alternatives. It can pay subsidies, and thus can subsidize, for all practical purposes, the output of other nations. In that way prices are held up when the market cannot absorb any more of the particular products, and such products will have the protection of a Buy American program, under which a subsidy of 25 percent, or whatever amount Congress determines, will be provided, in order to afford sufficient leeway to favor American producers. Or Congress can proceed as is provided in the Constitution, namely, by levying duties, imposts, or excises to make up the differential or difference between the standard of living in our country and the standards of living in other countries. When that difference or differential is paid into the United States Treasury a few times, it will not be long before the foreign countries concerned raise their standards of living, so that they will equal ours.

On the other hand, the present policy encourages the maintenance of the very great difference now existing between the standard of living in the United States and the standards of living in other countries.

THE WATCHMAKING INDUSTRY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, there was recently released by the White House a highly significant report concerning the national-defense importance of our domestic jeweled-watch industry. This subject is particularly interesting to me because there has recently been established in my State, at the suggestion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the only existing domestic plant for the manufacture of jewel bearings, which are tiny but indispensable to the operation of timepieces and similar precision instruments that are so vital to our national security program.

Because of both the immediate and the long-range significance of this report, which is entitled "The Watchmaking Industry and National Security", I request the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert in the RECORD the press release issued by the National Security Resources Board summarizing this report, together with certain unclassified excerpts from the report itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the release and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 16, 1953.

Jack Gorrie, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, released today the results of a specialized manpower study important to the security of the Nation.

At the request of the President, the National Security Resources Board chaired a committee composed of representatives from the Department of Defense, Commerce, and Labor. This committe was directed to determine (1) the nature of the skilled manpower requirements which would be placed on the watchmaking industry in the event of full mobilization, and (2) the necessity for and practicability of measures to maintain and develop an adequate supply base of skilled workers in this industry. They embodied their findings in a classified report submitted to the President.

The committee's analysis made it clear that precision jeweled movements are essential to the security of the Nation in wartime. These are produced uniquely by the jeweled watch segment of the watch and clock industry.

The nature of the skills and the long training time required for the development of key skills in manufacturing jeweled watch movements make it necessary to keep workers continuously producing these products. This makes the usual standby facilities approach to the problem of maintaining a mobilization base unsuited to the requirements of this situation.

The committee therefore specified a minimum production range sufficient to maintain the required base of skilled workers for mobilization requirements.

The present annual level of domestic production of jeweled movements is above this minimum and therefore adequate to preserve a sufficient base of skilled workers for mobilization needs. The committee concluded that no Government action is necessary at this time.

The committee recommended, however, that the production levels of this industry be kept under review by the National Security Resources Board and that the Government take action if production falls below the safety level.

The committee further considered the relative merits of seven measures which might be taken if necessary to maintain production at the minimum level. These measures, some of which would require legislation, might be applied singly or in combination:

1. Advanced procurement of watches and chronographs for military use under conditions of full mobilization.
2. Preferential procurement.
3. Increase in the tariff.
4. Import quotas.
5. Direct subsidy.
6. Removal of excise tax on jeweled clocks and watches.
7. Accelerated amortization of capital equipment.

UNCLASSIFIED EXCERPTS FROM MEMORANDUM, JACK GORRIE, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD, TO JOHN R. STEELMAN, THE ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT, JANUARY 12, 1953

Subject: The watchmaking industry and national security.

You will recall that the President, in a letter of September 26, requested me to establish an interdepartmental committee with representation from the Departments of Defense, Labor, and Commerce. This committee was to (1) determine the nature of the skilled manpower requirements which would be placed on the watchmaking industry in the event of full mobilization, and (2) determine the necessity for and practicability of measures to maintain and develop an adequate supply base of skilled workers in this industry.

The committee has completed its report, which was transmitted to the President today. In the course of the development of this report the committee consulted also with the Department of State, the Tariff Commission, and the Treasury Department. Representative firms in the industry participated extensively in preparing the basic data on which some of the major findings rest.

The study makes it clear that precision jeweled movements are essential to the security of the Nation in wartime. It was further determined by the committee that the products of the jeweled watch industry, namely jeweled clocks, jeweled watches, chronographs, and chronometers, have a very high essentiality rating and are uniquely produced by the firms in this branch of the watch and clock industry.

It was also determined that the usual standby-facilities approach to the problem of maintaining mobilization base is unsuited to the requirements of this situation. The nature of the skills and the long training time required for key skills in producing jeweled watch movements make it necessary to keep workers actually producing products directly and continuously using these skills.

It is generally agreed that skills developed in producing precision jeweled movements can be utilized on other products and for other industries. However, it is only after long training periods that workers from other industries become qualified to make jeweled movements.

Dissipation of the skills presently employed either by curtailment below a minimum production level of jeweled movements or by transfer to alternative activity not

requiring the same order of skills clearly would not be in the interest of national security. Such skill attrition, of course, is not a serious problem in the short run when skilled workers are temporarily transferred to less exacting work in the same plant. But, if prolonged, such transfer results in loss of skill, workers leaving the plant, and cessation of training. Therefore, it is not sufficient for national security purposes merely to maintain the facilities on a standby basis. It is the skills that must be maintained. This can only be done by actual put-through of watch and clock movements or the parts of such movements.

The committee therefore concluded that in view of the critical and unique nature of the skills involved, a minimum number of jeweled clocks and watches should be continuously produced by this industry in order to preserve a base of skilled workers upon which expansion could be built in the event of full mobilization. A minimum production range was specified by the committee and is contained in the classified report.

The committee was of the opinion that the present level of production was adequate to preserve this base of skilled workers but suggested that the production levels of this industry be kept under review by the National Security Resources Board and that the Government take specific action if production falls below the safety level.

The committee further considered the relative merits of seven alternate measures which might be taken to maintain production at the minimum level. For some of these measures legislation would be required. The measures are:

1. Advanced procurement of watches and chronographs for military use under conditions of full mobilization.
2. Preferential procurement from the jeweled watch industry for jeweled watch and clock movements.
3. Increase in the tariff.
4. The establishment of import quotas.
5. Direct subsidies.
6. The removal of the excise tax on jeweled clocks and watches.
7. Accelerated amortization of capital equipment.

The advantages and disadvantages of the several alternatives are discussed in the report.

COLLECTION OF LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS FOR ACCUMULATED ANNUAL LEAVE BY EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 4, 1953, I called to the attention of the Senate the highly questionable procedure whereby 49 employees of the Economic Stabilization Agency, Office of Rent Stabilization, had devised a scheme whereby they were collecting lump-sum payments for accumulated annual—terminal—leave.

At that time I pointed out that these lump-sum payments were made on the false assumption that the employees were being separated from the service when actually there was no break in their service record nor any change in their job requirements.

On that same date I incorporated in the RECORD a letter purportedly signed by Mr. William G. Barr defending this transaction on the basis that the 30-day separation notices of May 26, 1950, were given in contemplation of a closing of that agency on June 30, 1950.

The following day, Mr. Barr appeared at my office and repudiated any part in the preparation or signing of this letter attributed to him, and claimed that the letter defending this highly questionable procedure had been prepared in his absence and his name affixed by another official of the agency.

To clarify Mr. Barr's true position on this question, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a portion of a letter dated February 5, 1953, explaining how he had not only refused to defend the transaction but actually condemned the practice when it was authorized. Mr. Barr made this same report to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Government Operations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As you know, the present Office of Rent Stabilization is the successor agency to the Office of the Housing Expediter. I have acted as Deputy to the Housing Expediter and as Deputy Director of Rent Stabilization throughout this period.

In all candor, I must inform you that the device for cash settlement of annual leave credits was conceived without my knowledge. When I was informed of the device I considered it to be clearly unethical and contrary to the responsibility which all Federal employees owe their Government.

In spite of my strenuous objections, the device was carried into effect. However, my views as to the impropriety of the procedure were so strong that I informed all of the employees under my immediate supervision that I would demand the resignation of any of them who took advantage of the device.

Had I been in a position to do so, my views of the ethical standards required of Federal employees would have prompted me to insist, likewise, upon the resignation of the two officials who were responsible for conceiving and executing the device.

On January 30, 1953, I was appointed Acting Director of Rent Stabilization. This appointment will become effective at the opening of business February 9, 1953. Accordingly, I have this day notified the two responsible officials that they will be suspended from employment at the opening of business February 9.

I can well understand that your committee will be interested in the complete details of this matter, and I am most anxious to make these details available to it. Accordingly, I will welcome the opportunity to appear before the committee to explain my position regarding this occurrence.

I am writing a similar letter to Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. BARR,
Acting Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the facts are Congress, on June 23, 1950, extended this agency 1 year, or until June 30, 1951, and the extension law was signed by the President on June 23—3 days prior to the separation payments.

Following this exposure on February 4, 1953, the case was called to the attention of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, for an opinion as to its legality. Under date of February 20, 1953, Mr. Warren submitted his report—a copy of which has been forwarded to the chairmen of the appropriate Senate and House committees.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the conclusions reached by the Comptroller General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Investigation has been made into the circumstances surrounding the action of certain officials of the Economic Stabilization Agency, Office of Rent Stabilization, in "terminating" 49 employees of the Agency from permanent appointments on June 26, 1950, immediately rehiring them under temporary appointments, paying them for accumulated annual (terminal) leave, and transferring them back to permanent status upon the expiration of the period paid for as leave. Further payments were made to them for the leave accrued for the service in the temporary status. Four additional employees were treated in like manner at later dates.

The 53 employees were thus paid a total of $111,421.34 (gross) upon transfer to temporary status and $12,545.17 when transferred back to a permanent status. The reinstatements were dated soon after the expiration of the period for which leave was paid; in other words, as soon as the restoration could technically have been accomplished without creating a requirement for refund of any part of the leave payment received.[1] Forty-seven of the employees in question were on duty in the Washington office. Four were attached to San Francisco and two to the Atlanta office.

BASIS CLAIMED FOR THE ACTION

Responsible officials of the Agency, queried as to the motive behind the action, assert that inasmuch as the life of the Agency was due to expire unless extended by the Congress some means had to be found to carry on the work of the Agency and at the same time provide for liquidation of the enormous liability for accumulated annual leave to the credit of all of the employees of the Agency. It is reported that three plans were discussed—first, to terminate immediately enough of the personnel to allow payment of salary to the balance of the personnel through June 30; second, to request every employee to volunteer to take 1 week of leave without pay; and, third, to solicit the consent of permanent status employees with sizable leave balances to be placed on leave without pay for a sufficient period to save enough of their salaries to cover 1 week of salary needed for the balance of the staff, these particular employees to be terminated in accordance with the terms of reduction-in-force notices issued and receive lump-sum payments (which would be paid from funds made available for terminal leave) then to be rehired on a strictly temporary basis until it was determined which positions could be retained under new staffing patterns. It is reported that plan 3 was first considered the most logical and it was decided upon. However, a few days later the Housing Expediter indicated that this plan (which was proposed by Mr. John J. Madigan, the Deputy Director) seem complicated, that there was insufficient time to explain it, and that it would not be adopted generally. It is further reported that as information concerning this plan had come to the attention of many of the employees of the Office, the

[1] One case was exceptional. C. O. Plummer was returned to permanent duty prior to expiration of the temporary leave date as he expected to be recalled to military service and desired to retain a permanent status when he returned from the service. He refunded $355.12 by check dated August 28, 1950.

director of personnel (Mrs. Linda A. Matteo) inquired of the Housing Expediter whether he objected to use of the plan by any desiring it. Since he had no objection, it was taken advantage of by employees located at the central office and a few from the field who happened to be in Washington on official visits or were told of the plan by telephone upon the occasion of a call from the field.

All employees of the Agency, except a few who were on extended sick leave, took 1 week's leave without pay between June 11 and 24, 1950, though many of them, knowing their services could not be spared, contributed their time without compensation. The 49 employees participating in the plan were continued on limited appointments while all other employees of the Agency continued to receive extensions of their reduction-in-force notices every 30 days. This situation prevailed from June through September of 1950.

The explanations are numerous, conflicting, and only partly related to the known problems and their rational solution. It is true the 1950 salary fund was running short (apart from the balance usable only for terminal leave). But the action then considered and finally taken in the last few days had only a faintly negligible effect on the 1950 salary appropriation. The payment for accumulated leave did not have any effect on the 1950 operating fund for salaries and expenses inasmuch as such payments were charged against the fund earmarked for terminal leave. Also, in view of the fact that the employees were actually never off the payroll there was no saving involved except for the 1 week's leave without pay taken by each employee of the Agency.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

During the fiscal year 1950 the Office of Housing Expediter (Office of Rent Stabilization as of July 31, 1951) was operating under the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 (Public Law 31, 81st Cong.) approved March 30, 1949. The basic legislation covered the period through June 30, 1950. The President recommended in the budget for the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, the sum of $26,750,000 to cover the program during the fiscal year 1950. The budget item was finally approved in the amount of $17,500,000 or $9,250,000 less than estimated requirements. In discussions on the floor of the Senate, when consideration was being given to raising the figure of $17,500,000 it was indicated that consideration might be given a supplemental request in January, when the actual needs would be known. Late in January the President submitted a supplemental estimate of $3,600,000 to enable the Housing Expediter to administer rent control through June 30, 1950.

At that time there was considerable agitation for the termination of rent control on June 30, 1950, and in view thereof there was appropriated in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950, approved March 27, 1950, 64 Stat. 37, the sum of $4,000,000 (an increase of $400,000 over the estimate) "of which $2,600,000 shall be available for the payment of treminal leave only."

Additional funds in the amount of $800,000 were requested for salaries and expenses, but only $600,000 was made available in the Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950, approved June 29, 1950, 64 Stat. 286. As of April 21, 1950, there was an unused balance of $1,358,496 of the amount of $2,600,000 earmarked for terminal leave pay by the act approved March 27, 1950.

As a net result, therefore, there was an appropriation deficiency for the fiscal year 1950, but it is emphasized that this deficiency is not an acceptable explanation for the solution finally arrived at, since the conversions to temporary and payments for leave did not effect any savings to the 1950 salary fund. What was accomplished was the use of some of the 1950 terminal leave fund which otherwise (and unless reappropriated) would have reverted to the Treasury.

By a law approved June 23, 1950, the life of the agency was extended to June 30, 1951 (Housing and Rent Act of 1950, 64 Stat. 255). As of the date (June 26, 1950) when the personnel changes were made to temporary status, the Agency's basic law thus had been extended, but no appropriation for the new fiscal year had been provided. This Agency—in common with most others—operated for several months on the basis of continuing joint resolutions, which permitted salary payments but which did not settle what amount would be available for the entire fiscal year 1951. The status of the appropriation for 1951 thus obviously was uncertain on June 26, 1950, but it is emphasized the uncertainty is not a reason, much less a warrant, for converting permanent employees to temporary, since as temporaries their cost continued as a charge against the expected appropriation.

By Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, approved September 27, 1950, 64 Stat. 1044, there was appropriated for salaries and expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, the sum of $10,615,500 together with not exceeding $1,600,000 of the unobligated balances of funds appropriated for such purpose for the fiscal year of 1950, of which not less than $2 million was available only for payment of terminal leave.

REASON GIVEN FOR FAILURE TO CANCEL THE MOVE FOR PAYMENT OF TERMINAL LEAVE TO 49 EMPLOYEES

In view of the fact that the life of the Agency was extended to June 30, 1951, by the act of June 23, 1950, an explanation was requested from responsible officials of the Agency as to why, immediately after that time, steps were not taken to cancel the plan to make the payment for terminal leave to the 49 employees in question. The only explanation offered was that it was not known how much money the Agency would receive and it was thought advisable to pay for as much of the accumulated leave as the employees had asked for.

NOTICES TO EMPLOYEES

All employees of the Agency were given reduction in force notices on May 26, 1950, effective June 30, 1950. These notices were later amended, changing the date to June 25, 1950, and the 49 employees in question were given temporary appointments effective June 26, 1950. These employees were continued in a temporary status long enough for the leave which they were paid a lump sum for to expire. Shortly thereafter, and usually at the beginning of the next pay period, they were reconverted to a permanent status and again paid a lump sum for leave accrued during their status as temporary employees. (Exception in the case of C. O. Plummer previously explained.)

The separation of the four employees was at a later date and obviously for different reasons. Statements of various employees were to the effect that payments made to two of these employees, namely, John T. O'Brien and Donald K. Martin, were at their oral request and for personal reasons. The files do not contain evidence of such requests. It was further reported that these two payments were made at the direction of William G. Barr (former General Manager of Rent Stabilization) now Acting Director of Rent Stabilization. Form 52, "Request for Personnel Action," was actually signed by Mr. Barr in the case of Mr. O'Brien.

There is attached Mr. Barr's statement to the effect that he disfavored, and regarded as unethical, the payments to the 49 employees. The statement does not advert to his formal request for like action in the O'Brien case.

During hearings before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on February 10, 1953, it was indicated that Mr. Edwin D. Dupree, Jr., General Counsel of the Office of Rent Stabilization, desired to participate in the plan in order to make a down payment on a home. Records of the corporation court of the city of Alexandria, Va., disclose that on October 23, 1950, a deed was recorded showing the purchase by him of a house in Alexandria on which there was recorded a first trust in the amount of $10,600, a second trust of $3,500, and a third trust of $2,717.90. Computation from the amount of revenue stamps on the document discloses that the house cost approximately $20,400, which leaves a balance of $3,512.10, apparently paid in cash. Mr. Dupree received a net payment for accumulated annual leave in July 1950 of $3,654.75.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, particular attention is called to that portion of the report which explains how Mr. Edwin D. Dupree, Jr., the General Counsel of the Office of Rent Stabilization, participated in the plan in order to make a down payment on a home. Records of the corporation court of the city of Alexandria, Va., disclose that on October 23, 1950, a deed was recorded showing the purchase by him of a house in Alexandria on which there was recorded a first trust in the amount of $10,600, a second trust of $3,500, and a third trust of $2,717.90. Computation from the amount of revenue stamps on the document discloses that the house cost approximately $20,400, which leaves a balance of $3,512.10, apparently paid in cash. Mr. Dupree received a net payment for accumulated annual leave, in July 1950, of $3,654.75.

There were four other employees who on a different occasion followed this same practice and brought the total gross payments to $111,421.34. All payments were made by merely transferring the employees from permanent to temporary status without any change being made in their official duties or salaries and without the loss of a day or hour in service.

Mr. Warren also called attention to a fact which makes the whole transaction even more questionable in that when these employees were transferred back to permanent status again, without the formality of being separated for even a day, they received additional lump-sum payments as temporary employees totaling $12,544.17.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a breakdown of these second lump-sum payments.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Office of Rent Stabilization, temporary employees converted to reinstatements (Washington, D. C., unless otherwise noted)

Name	Salary	Hours of leave	Net amount paid
Bloomberg, Florence	$3,725	40	$60.70
Borjes, Harry A.	3,880	84	126.60
Boucher, Mae D.	5,400	60	126.30
Campbell, Kenneth A.[1]	10,750	20	84.79
Clarke, Clarke W.	7,600	80	239.93

[1] Atlanta, Ga.

Office of Rent Stabilization, temporary employees converted to reinstatements (Washington, D. C., unless otherwise noted)—Continued

Name	Salary	Hours of leave	Net amount paid
Comfort, G. William	$9,000	76	270.54
Comrey, Halley S.	3,700	40	60.30
Crilley, Raymond E.	9,000	100	338.53
Davis, Milton B.	9,600	64	242.60
Diggle, Burnham W.	10,750	100	423.94
Donine, Sophie	4,700	40	76.50
Dupree, Edwin D., Jr.	10,750	74	313.72
Edwards, Adolph M., Jr.	9,200	59	213.15
Engel, Anna M.	4,850	80	153.30
Fishbein, David M.	5,350	64	134.78
Goldbaum, William [1]	9,000	60	523.02
Green, Edna S.	3,825	40	69.40
Hale, Golda M.	5,350	100	210.61
Hanback, Hazel S.	6,600	60	156.18
Happ, Howell C.	8,600	100	338.53
Hardiman, Raymond	4,975	81	157.59
Hoffman, Charles W.	7,600	91	272.85
Hoffman, Laura E.	3,355	40	52.97
Hoyle, Earl	6,600	126	350.25
Hurley, James W.	5,600	80	176.40
McCarthy, John T.	10,750	100	423.94
McLeod, John A., Jr.	7,800	71	220.13
Madigan, John J.	10,750	80	339.15
Martin, Donald K.	6,800	80	214.47
Matteo, Linda A.	8,800	80	275.97
Milam, Luther M.	7,800	100	309.30
Mills, Juanita N.	4,725	20	39.00
Mills, Louise W.	7,400	100	306.80
Moore, James R.	8,400	80	266.27
Morrell, R. Coy	7,600	100	99.79
Ninde, Virginia L.	3,355	79	104.69
O'Brien, John T.	10,000	72	515.10
Pierce, Dorothy (nee Kennedy) [1]	6,800	56	150.78
Plummer, Charles O.	3,825	40	73.60
Pohling, Joseph A.	5,400	80	170.08
Propps, Arch L.	8,200	80	257.50
Recknor, Myra L.	3,115	32	41.00
Reimers, Leora	4,200	110	164.50
Siegel, Nathan	8,800	48	164.97
Sparks, Donna [1]	3,355	75	100.05
Taylor, Jessie K.	3,195	60	61.60
Tompkins, Evelyn D.	4,575	54	122.92
Watts, Alexander H.	7,800	80	247.80
Weed, Katherine L.	3,930	64	99.10
Weed, William H.	7,600	78	233.94
Weissenberger, Mary L.	5,600	20	44.80
Wolcott, Wilmo O.	3,475	40	54.00
Workmaster, William E.	6,400	80	201.85

[1] San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated February 9, 1953, signed by Mr. William G. Barr, Acting Director of the Rent Stabilization Office, and addressed to Mr. Norman E. Simpson, of the General Accounting Office, placing the responsibility for this practice upon the top officials who engineered and approved the plan. I commend him for his prompt action in firing the three top officials who, in conjunction with the Housing Administrator, Tighe Woods, authorized this scheme.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1953.

NORMAN E. SIMPSON,
Chief, Washington Field Office, Office of Investigations, General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SIMPSON: You have requested a statement from me, explaining in summary form my position on the lump-sum payments for terminal leave made in 1950, with respect to which you are conducting an examination of the records of this Agency, and its predecessor Agency, the Office of the Housing Expediter.

When these payments were first proposed, I voiced objection to their being made. These objections were not directed toward the legality of the payments, since our General Counsel and our Deputy Director (Administration) who were in a position to ascertain their legality, proposed to accept lump-sum payments. At that time I felt as I still feel, that it was unethical to make such payments.

The determination of questions of ethics with respect to the actions of Government officials in policy-making positions always leaves room for a difference of opinion on specific issues. As to the ethics of the action in question, I concede that an individual may sincerely believe that these payments were ethical as well as legal. However, my own opinion as to the question is so strong that I today suspended John J. Madigan, Deputy Director (Administration), Edwin D. Dupree, Jr., General Counsel, and Linda A. Matteo, Director of Personnel of this Agency. These three persons in 1950 were in positions which should have led them, in my opinion, to register strong objection against these lump-sum payments. They not only failed to object but took such payments themselves. This fact endowed the procedure with such an air of respectability that I am not inclined to blame any of the 50 subordinate employees who applied for payments and, at the present time, no disciplinary action is planned against them.

I shall appreciate being informed by your office of any conclusions of fact or of law which result from your study so that I may adopt an appropriate course of action.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM G. BARR, *Acting Director.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have attempted to find out to what extent this practice has been followed in the past by other Government agencies and to date I have found but one other instance; namely, the case where the Department of the Army in 1947 notified approximately 3,000 civilian employees of the Antilles Command—West Indies—that those who desired to resign voluntarily and receive lump-sum payments for their leave would be immediately thereafter given temporary appointments for not to exceed 1 year, and at the expiration of the lump-sum leave period (after which no refund would be required if reemployed in permanent or indefinite positions) would be given schedule A–1–vii appointments without time limitations.

I find that this case had been called to the attention of the Comptroller General in 1949, and at this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks correspondence dated March 28, 1949, and April 20, 1949, between the Comptroller General, Lindsay C. Warren, and the President of the Civil Service Commission, Harry B. Mitchell.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 28, 1949.

PRESIDENT,
United States Civil Service Commission.

MY DEAR MR. MITCHELL: In the audit of 1947 Individual Earnings Records for the Antilles Department, Civilian Personnel Branch, APO 854, Miami, Fla., a question arises as to the propriety or legality of lump-sum leave payments made to approximately 3,000 employees who, during the latter part of the fiscal year 1947, were requested to resign voluntarily and simultaneously to accept temporary appointments for the purpose of reducing the high liability caused by accumulated and accrued annual leave in view of an anticipated reduction of funds for the fiscal year 1948.

For example, in the case of Albert Laster, Fire Chief, CAF–6, $4,716.75 per annum, including 25 percent overseas differential, Individual Earnings Record 162 indicated "Resignation WOP (VOL)" March 29, 1947, and a lump-sum payment of $1,452.81 for 961 hours annual leave, covering the period March 31, 1947, through 1 hour July 23, 1947. On March 30, 1947, Albert Laster received a temporary appointment at the same grade and rate of pay in the same position. This appointment continued in force through July 23, 1947, covering the same period of time as covered by the above 961 hours of annual leave. On July 24, 1947, Albert Laster's temporary appointment was converted to schedule A–1–7, an appointment without time limitation, and he was paid $58.05 for 30 hours annual leave accrued while a temporary employee from March 30 through July 23, 1947. This last change of status returned the employee to the same type of appointment and the same leave system held prior to his "voluntary" resignation March 29, 1947.

This Office, in letter dated April 21, 1948, requested the administrative office to furnish the authority for the questioned personnel actions, and in reply of May 7, 1948, it was stated that said actions were taken under authority of Radio ANTD 32, dated April 1, 1947, issued by the Commanding General, Antilles Department. A copy of that document is enclosed herewith.

Generally, this Office in auditing payroll accounts does not question the validity of personnel actions such as appointments (see 5 Comp. Dec. 649; 26 id. 804; 17 Comp. Gen. 786) presuming them to have been made in accordance with civil-service rules and regulations. However, the facts as disclosed here of wholesale resignations—approximately 3,000—and of the immediate or simultaneous reappointments under schedule A–1–7 are such as to require inquiry by this Office. Accordingly, it will be appreciated if you will inform this Office as to whether the action of the Department of the Army in making the temporary appointments and subsequent permanent indefinite appointments under schedule A–1–7 in lieu of continuing the same employees in their permanent classified status is, under the circumstances above disclosed, considered to have been in accordance with the civil-service rules and regulations, or otherwise has the approval of your Commission.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1949.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

DEAR MR. WARREN: Reference is made to your letter of March 28, 1949, concerning lump-sum leave payments made to approximately 3,000 employees of the Antilles Department, Department of the Army, during the latter part of the fiscal year 1947. It appears that the Department notified employees that those who desired to resign voluntarily and receive lump-sum payment for their leave would be immediately thereafter given temporary appointments for not to exceed 1 year, and at the expiration of the lump-sum leave period (after which no refund would be required if reemployed in permanent or indefinite positions) would be given scredule A–1–vii appointments without time limitation; and that this procedure was carried out. You ask whether the action is considered to have been in accordance with civil-service rules and regulations, or otherwise has the approval of the Commission.

Paragraph vii of section 1, schedule A of the civil-service rules for a number of years prior to May 1, 1947 (the date the new rules became effective) read:

"Any person employed in a foreign country or in the Virgin Islands, or in Puerto Rico when public exigency warrants, or in any island possession of the United States in the Pacific Ocean (except the Hawaiian Islands), or in the Philippine Islands, when in the opinion of the Commission it is not practicable to treat the position as in the competitive classified service; * * *."

For several years the Commission ruled that because of defense and war needs it was not practicable to treat the position as in the competitive classified service.

Positions listed in schedule A of the civil-service rules are not in the competitive civil service of the United States, and the incumbents of such positions are therefore subject to the administrative direction of the respective departments or agencies. So far as concerns the subject matter of your letter the Commission has no jurisdiction or control over the action taken by the War Department in 1947 and subsequent thereto with respect to the occupants of these excepted positions.

By direction of the Commission.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL, *President.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I made a request to the Comptroller General that he prepare a memorandum on the legality of these transactions. In this recent memorandum, which I shall incorporate in the RECORD, it is found that the Comptroller General in 1949 had decided that "while the payments were irregular no further action would be taken."

Since in 1949 the Comptroller General and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, while not actually ruling the payments illegal, did describe them as highly improper and unethical, I fail to understand why this scheme was not promptly reported to the Congress.

It is noted that in August 1951 the General Accounting auditors had discovered the second case of lump sum separation payments in the Office of Rent Stabilization; however, while at that time the auditors had criticized the transaction, it was decided at a conference that in view of the 1946 and 1949 decisions of the Comptroller General, in reference to the Army payments, no report would be made to the Comptroller General's office. Likewise, again Congress was not notified.

The memorandum dated February 20, 1953, which I am incorporating in the RECORD later, signed by Frank L. Yates, the Acting Comptroller General, has this to say in reference to this decision by their auditors:

With reference to the decision made by the audit personnel not to report the payments made by the Office of Rent Stabilization to the Comptroller General, I can see the reasoning for such a decision but I emphatically disagree with it. This was a matter involving 53 employees receiving payments aggregating in excess of $100,000, and a transaction that was highly questionable both from a legal and moral standpoint. Notwithstanding the action directed in the Army case, which had no general application and was not intended as a precedent, the case of the Office of Rent Stabilization should have been promptly brought to the attention of the Comptroller General.

I now ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point the report to which I have just referred and which embodies the decisions of the Comptroller General regarding the annual leave act.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECISIONS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL INTERPRETING THE ACT

The Comptroller General in decision of April 7, 1945 (24 Comp. Gen. 726), stated that the act of December 21, 1944, providing for lump-sum payments for leave upon transfer of employees between different leave systems did not apply to an employee who transferred from a permanent position to a temporary position even though under the annual and sick leave regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission it was not mandatory that the leave credit be transferred.

In 1946 the question of payment for accrued leave to employees upon transfer from permanent positions to temporary positions was again submitted to the Comptroller General. Several cases were pointed out where employees holding permanent positions with substantial annual leave accumulations had been transferred or reemployed in temporary positions in different agencies and were not given any credit for the annual leave in the new agency. As indicated above, the leave regulations issued by the Civil Service Commission provided that the credit of annual leave to an employee under these circumstances was left to the discretion of the agency to which the employee transferred. As a practical matter, very few agencies ever permitted employees to transfer the annual leave they had earned in permanent positions to their temporary positions because the agency did not want to assume liability for payment of the leave at a later date. As a result the accrued leave merely remained to the credit of the employee in the permanent position he had left to be picked up in the event of subsequent reemployment in another permanent position. In consideration of the matter, question arose as to whether after termination of temporary appointments, some of which were held for periods up to 1 year, lump-sum payments could be made for leave accrued in prior permanent positions or whether the leave was forfeited unless the employee was able to again obtain a permanent position.

In reviewing the matter the provisions of the Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161) were reexamined to ascertain whether the leave provided for in the act for temporary and permanent employees in fact constituted the same leave system. The Comptroller General, in decision of October 24, 1946, 26 Comptroller General 259, concluded that the 1936 act did in fact set up two different systems of leave for temporary and permanent employees in that the annual leave for permanent employees was earned on the basis of 26 days per year, whereas temporary employees earned leave on the basis of 2½ days for each month of service. Another consideration was the different treatment accorded to temporary employees by the leave regulations which, as previously indicated, did not require the transfer of annual leave when an employee transferred from a permanent position to a temporary position. This situation, under certain circumstances, could cause the forfeiture of the annual-leave credit. It was pionted out in the decision that the Congress in enacting the 1944 act apparently intended to authorize a lump-sum leave payment in every situation in which an employee otherwise might be compelled to forfeit the leave which had accrued to his credit.

After decision of October 26, 1946, until the enactment of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679), the departments and agencies were authorized to make lump-sum leave payments to employees without any liability on the part of the employees to refund any portion of the payments upon bona fide transfers between permanent and temporary positions. However, the decision was never intended as authorizing the transfer of an employee from a permanent position to a so-called temporary position for the sole purpose of paying the employee for accrued leave to his credit, or liquidating a liability of the agency.

ACTION OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE IN 1949 WITH RESPECT TO A CASE INVOLVING 3,000 EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The first case of any wholesale transfers of employees from permanent position to temporary positions with a subsequent return to permanent positions for the specific purpose of liquidating the agency's liability for lump-sum payments for accrued annual leave came to the attention of the Comptroller General in 1949. Audit of civilian pay records of employees of the Department of the Army Antilles Command (West Indies), showed that in 1947 approximately 3,000 employees of that command had received lump-sum payments for annual leave under such circumstances. The Audit Division of the General Accounting Office addressed a letter to the Army installation requesting that the authority be furnished for the action taken. The reply stated that such action was taken under authority of a telegram dated April 1, 1947, issued by the commanding general, Antilles Department. That telegram revealed that the primary purpose of the action was to pay off annual-leave liability from excess funds of the 1947 appropriation of that command, it being anticipated that a reduction in funds would be made for the fiscal year 1948. The matter was brought to the attention of the Comptroller General and the information concerning this situation was sent to the Civil Service Commission by letter of the Comptroller General dated March 28, 1949, with the request that advice be furnished as to whether the action of the Department of the Army in converting permanent employees to temporary and then back to permanent was in accordance with the Commissioner's regulations, or otherwise had the approval of the Commission. The Civil Service Commission replied under date of April 20, 1949, and stated that the Commission had no jurisdiction with respect to the positions in question since they were schedule A positions outside of the United States.

Thereafter it was decided that while the payments were irregular no further action would be taken. If collections were required from the employees involved the annual leave represented thereby would have to be recredited to the employees' accounts, and payment again made for the accrued annual leave when the employees were finally separated from the service. It was thought that the Government possibly would have had to pay more for the leave if this action had been insisted upon because of promotions and other pay changes affecting many employees. Further, it was realized that many of the employees, in all probability, had been separated from the service in the 2-year period which had elapsed between 1947 and 1949 because of the reduction of civilian personnel by the Army in 1948. Because of these factors and the cost of examining some 3,000 leave records, attempting to effect collection of the payments, and making adjustments for the recredit of annual leave, the Audit Division was instructed that credit could be allowed for the payment made.

The employees of the General Accounting Office who worked on this case in 1949 do not recall that it was thought a proper case to report to the Congress. They believed the case was an isolated one, no others having come to their attention at that time.

PRIOR ACTION OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE CONCERNING THE PAYMENTS MADE BY THE OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION

In August 1951 General Accounting Office auditors made an on-the-site audit of the payrolls of the Office of Rent Stabilization—then Office of the Housing Expediter. This audit was conducted by Mr. J. E. McManus (not presently employed by the General Accounting Office). During the course of the audit, it was discovered by Mr. McManus that in June 1950 a number of employees of the office who held permanent appointments were terminated and immediately given temporary appointments in the same positions. By reason of the termination of the permanent appointment the employees were paid for all annual leave accrued to their credit as of the date of termination. The employees were allowed to remain as temporary employees until such time as the period covered by the leave payment expired and then were given permanent appointments and paid for all leave accrued to their credit during the period of temporary appointments.

Mr. McManus prepared a memorandum of the facts addressed to Mr. H. H. Sasscer, auditor in charge, dated August 29, 1951. This memorandum was prepared for the signature of Mr. L. C. Tredway, who was the immediate supervisor of Mr. McManus. Mr. Tredway (not presently employed by the General Accounting Office), was interviewed in the past week. He believes, to the best of his knowledge, that the memorandum was taken to the office of Mr. H. H. Sasscer and discussed with him and Mr. Wineberg, zone audit chief, on September 3, 1951. Mr. Tredway believes it was decided at the conference that in view of the 1946 and 1949 decisions of the Comptroller General no report would be made to the Comptroller General's office at that time, but an informal exceptions would issue to see what explanation the administrative office could offer. On September 12, 1951, Mr. McManus issued an informal exception, which is used by the General Accounting Office to raise a question with an agency under audit and request an explanation of a particular payment made. The informal exception was taken against the lump-sum leave payment made to Mr. Edwin Dupree, Jr. Mr. Tredway further stated that before any reply was made the 1951 Annual and Sick Leave Act was approved and since the practice to which exception was taken could no longer occur he advised Miss Sophie Donine, payroll supervisor of the Office of Rent Stabilization, in response to a telephone call from her, that no reply to the informal exception was necessary.

Upon examination of the audit files of this case, since the matter has been reopened, a copy of the memorandum of August 29, 1951, was found. However, neither the original of the memorandum nor the copy of the informal exception dated September 12, 1951, was with the file. A thorough search has been made for these documents without result. In reviewing this matter, I do not believe that the documents were withheld from the files with any improper intent or purpose. Certainly anyone removing a document in an attempt at concealment would not be likely to leave a copy of the document removed, as in the case of the August 29, 1951, memorandum. In any event, in the light of the facts now disclosed, the absence of these documents from the files has had no bearing upon the action taken in the case.

Mr. McManus reviewed the audit files on February 17, 1953, and he has furnished a statement that to the best of his knowledge the files are complete except for the two documents mentioned. A similar statement has been obtained from two employees of the General Accounting Office who reviewed the files in July 1952 in connection with the 1952 payroll audit of the Office of Rent Stabilization.

Neither the Comptroller General nor I take lightly the responsibility for the proper safeguarding of papers. In my experience with the General Accounting Office since creation of the Office in 1921, it has been an extremely rare occasion when official papers could not be located immediately.

With reference to the decision made by the audit personnel not to report the payments made by the Office of Rent Stabilization to the Comptroller General. I can see the reasoning for such a decision but I emphatically disagree with it. This was a matter involving 53 employees receiving payments aggregating in excess of $100,000, and a transaction that was highly questionable both from a legal and moral standpoint. Notwithstanding the action directed in the Army case, which had no general application and was not intended as a precedent, the case of the Office of Rent Stabilization should have been promptly brought to the attention of the Comptroller General.

PRESENT POSITION OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE CONCERNING THE PAYMENTS MADE BY THE OFFICE OF RENT STABILIZATION

Upon review of all of the facts now disclosed in connection with the payments made for accrued leave by the Office of Rent Stabilization, there is no doubt that the shifting of employees from permanent to temporary positions and then back to permanent positions was done for the sole purpose of making payments for accrued annual leave. The appointments were not in fact bona fide. Therefore, the payments made for accrued leave as a result of the transactions were not proper. However, the full monetary result has not been completely developed at this time. If a flat position is taken that all employees should repay the amounts received in lump-sum leave payments there would necessarily have to be recredits to the employees' leave accounts. The Government would make a collection with one hand and assume a liability with the other. In some cases the liability would have to be paid off in the near future. In the case of the Office of Rent Stabilization there is no statutory authority for its continuance beyond April 30, 1953. In some circumstances, it could result in increased cost to the Government to require a collection of the amounts paid in 1950 and 1951 and recredit an employee's leave account and then pay for accrued leave to the employee's credit in 60 days time, consideration being given to the fact that all Federal employees have received a pay increase since 1950. On the other hand, where employees were carrying close to the maximum allowable leave accumulation in 1950, it is possible that an employee would have received or be in a position to receive a larger payment for leave than he would be entitled to if the 1950 device had not been used.

The General Accounting Office is presently reconstructing the leave accounts of each of the 53 employees involved. In any case where the transaction in 1950 or 1951 resulted in an additional cost or liability to the Government, adjustment will be made (1) by collection of overpayments where employees have left the service: (2) by reduction of terminal leave payments upon separation of those employees still employed by the Office of Rent Stabilization; or (3) in cases of employees who have transferred or may transfer to other agencies by notifying the agencies to which transferred to adjust the employee's leave account.

To that end, a letter was addressed to the Acting Director, Office of Rent Stabilization, on February 13, 1953, requesting him to transmit to the General Accounting Office for settlement any proposed lump-sum leave payments to employees of the agency who were involved. By the same letter, the Office of Rent Stabilization was requested to furnish complete leave information with respect to those employees who have been separated from the service, or who have transferred to other agencies. The Acting Director has agreed to this request.

Also, the General Accounting Office will examine into the propriety of the cases mentioned in the report of the Office of Investigations wherein leave payments were made to employees of the Office of Rent Stabilization as far back as 1947, as well as any other cases of a similar nature that come to our attention.

EFFECT OF THE ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF 1951

The Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, which became effective January 6, 1952, eliminated any difference between the earning of leave by temporary and permanent employees. Consequently, the chance of any recurrence of manipulations such as practiced by the Office of Rent Stabilization has been virtually eliminated. However, there is one exception under the 1951 act as construed in the Comptroller General's decision of December 14, 1951 (31 Comp. Gen. 215 at p. 222). The 1951 Leave Act provides for a 90-day period of continuous employment before an employee may earn annual leave and that after the 90-day period is served the employee may then be credited with annual leave for such period. In decision of December 14, 1951, it was held that a break in service of one or more days requires an employee to begin a new qualifying period of 90 days. It was further held that if an employee is separated for one or more days, from a permanent position and receives a lump-sum leave payment for his accrued annual leave and is then reemployed in a temporary position for less than 90 days he is not required to make refund of the lump-sum leave payment.

The reason underlying that conclusion was that employees appointed for less than 90 days, after a break in service, had no annual leave potential and thus were considered to be under no leave system. This was regarded in the same light as a transfer to a different leave system within the meaning of the act of December 21, 1944. If the temporary appointment is extended to 90 days or more or converted to a permanent basis the employee becomes liable under the decision for refund of the lump-sum payment and upon making that refund must be credited with the leave represented thereby. That ruling permits agencies to hire employees for a short period of time, after they have been separated from permanent positions, without the agencies becoming liable for a large accumulation of annual leave which would be transferable or credited in the temporary positions if refund of the lump-sum payment was necessary. However, a request recently has been received from Senator JOHNSTON of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee for a review of the position of the Comptroller General as to that particular phase of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951. The ruling of December 14, 1951, is now being reviewed and I will advise you of the results.

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], in his speech on this subject on February 6, 1953, when discussing my statement of February 4, pointed out how the Civil Service Committee had sponsored legislation, which was adopted by the Congress, correcting this loophole whereby an employee could obtain a lump-sum payment of his annual leave accumulations by merely separating from the Government for 1 or more days. I call attention, however, to the fact that even that former ruling would not be applicable in this instance, in that there was no separation for even

1 day or 1 hour. This was clearly a scheme of a few bureaucrats who felt the Federal Treasury was their private playground.

The Comptroller General is assembling information to determine the actual amount involved in the case of the Antilles Command, where 3,000 employees used this same device in 1947, and a further report with that information along with the names of the responsible officials will be rendered at a later date.

In the meantime I am glad to note that the General Accounting Office is presently reconstructing the leave accounts of each of the 53 employees involved in the Office of Rent Stabilization Agency, and states that in any case where the transaction in 1950 or 1951 resulted in an additional cost or liability to the Government, adjustment will be made, first, by collection of overpayments where employees have left the service; second, by reduction of terminal-leave payments upon separation of those employees still employed by the Office of Rent Stabilization; or, third, in cases of employees who have transferred or may transfer to other agencies by notifying the agencies to which transferred to adjust the employee's leave account.

The Comptroller General has promised to check the other Government agencies to see if this dubious scheme has been adopted elsewhere. If it has, I think it should be immediately stopped.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate adjourn until Friday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, March 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1953:

Department of State

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

Post Office Department

Albert J. Robertson, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Federal Trade Commission

Edward F. Howrey, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years, from September 26, 1952, vice John Carson, term expired.

In the Air Force

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Roger Maxwell Ramey, 91A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Francis Hopkins Griswold, 94A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. George Warren Mundy, 358A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Walter Edwin Todd, 361A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frank Fort Everest, 366A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., 461A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William Fulton McKee, 467A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Emery Scott Wetzel, 464A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edward Wharton Anderson, 514A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert Whitney Burns, 527A (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. John Morris Hargreaves, 233A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, Medical.

Maj. Gen. Lucas Victor Beau, 174A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Byron Elihu Gates, 186A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White, 238A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Colby Maxwell Myers, 246A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Alfred Henry Johnson, 270A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. John Stewart Mills, 357A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Homer LeRoy Sanders, 411A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Benton McDonald, 469A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John Walker Sessums, Jr., 489A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lewis R. Parker, 438A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jarred Vincent Crabb, 535A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Oliver Stanton Picher, 540A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., 552A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. William Dole Eckert, 560A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Edward Julius Timberlake, 603A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Archie Jordan Old, Jr., 605A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Herbert Bishop Thatcher, 634A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Dan Clark Ogle, 602A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, Medical.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Haywood Shepherd Hansell, Jr., AO17468, Regular Air Force, retired, on active duty.

Brig. Gen. Edmund Clarence Langmead, 207A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert Lynn Copsey, AO104024, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO922780, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. John Morris Hargreaves, 233A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White, 238A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Homer LeRoy Sanders, 411A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lewis R. Parker, 438A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Benton McDonald, 469A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Joseph Harold Hicks, 227A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Paul Ernest Ruestow, 548A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. David Hodge Baker, 557A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. David William Hutchison, 601A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John Raymond Gilchrist, 836A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Jarred Vincent Crabb, 535A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Harlan Clyde Parks, 472A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Morris John Lee, 556A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Robert Edward Lee Eaton, 594A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Gabriel Poillon Disosway, 654A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Albert Boyd, 424A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Leigh Wade AO403535, Air Force Reserve.

Brig. Gen. Delmar Taft Spivey, 385A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. John Koehler Gerhart, 525A, Regular Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Elmer Blair Garland, 322A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Charles Raeburne Landon, 712A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Lee Bird Washbourne, 810A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. James McCormack, Jr., 17981A (colonel, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Auby Casey Strickland, 134A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Ray Henry Clark, 212A, Regular Air Force.

Col. John Phillips Kirkendall, 234A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James William Andrew, 269A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph Gerard Hopkins, 339A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edward Harold Porter, 346A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Joseph Arthur Bulger, 379A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Edwin Lee Tucker, 420A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Benjamin Scovill Kelsey, 433A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Raymond Lloyd Winn, 435A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harold Huntley Bassett, 445A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Thomas Jefferson Dubose, 470A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Harold Winfield Grant, 497A, Regular Air Force.

Col. James Leroy Jackson, 503A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Stoyte Ogleby Ross, 531A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Frederick Earl Calhoun, 545A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Royden Eugene Beebe, Jr., 587A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Richard Tide Coiner, Jr., 619A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Edward Willis Suarez, 633A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Sidney Francis Giffin, 649A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, 18819A, Regular Air Force, Dental.
Col. Russell Keillor, 798A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Loyd Engene Griffis, 19047A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
Col. William Jeffers Kennard, 19048A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
Col. Richard Mattern Montgomery, 1025A, Regular Air Force.
Col Richard Elmer Ellsworth, 1115A, Regular Air Force.
Col. James Howard Walsh, 1120A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., 1298A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Augustus Maine Minton, 1301A, Regular Air Force.
Col. William Porter Farnsworth, AO922626 (colonel, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.
Col. Edgar Eugene Glenn, 160A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Herbert Leonard Grills, 432A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Robert Shuter Macrum, 519A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Llewellyn Owen Ryan, 521A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Daniel Webster Jenkins, 528A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Stanley Tanner Wray, 608A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., 644A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Claude Edward Duncan, 686A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Millard Chester Young, 934A, Regular Air Force.
Col. William Sebastian Stone, 1059A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Raymond Judson Reeves, 1082A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., 1129A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Russell Lee Waldron, 1164A, Regular Air Force.
Col. John Dale Ryan, 1418A, Regular Air Force.
Col. William Hugh Blanchard, 1445A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Clifford Harcourt Rees, 630A, Regular Air Force.
Col. William Edward Rentz, 918A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Charles Wesley Schott, 949A, Regular Air Force.
Col. William Monte Canterbury, 1071A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Charles Pratt Brown, 1185A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Major Samuel White, 19056A, Regular Air Force, Medical.
Col. James Oscar Guthrie, 1266A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Henry Russell Spicer, 1487A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, 1613A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Ralph Emanuel Fisher, 240A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Woodbury Megrew Burgess, 323A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Alvord Van Pattern Anderson, Jr., 371A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Glynne Morgan Jones, 398A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Alfred Frederick Kalberer, 607A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Ethelred Lundy Sykes, 914A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Benjamin Jepson Webster, 974A, Regular Air Force.
Col. George Stewart Cassady, 994A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Karl Truesdell, Jr., 1023A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Joseph D. Croft Caldara, 1048A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Albert Theodore Wilson, Jr., 1086A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Ira David Snyder, 854A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., 1211A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Joseph James Nazzaro, 1241A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, 1283A, Regular Air Force.
Col. John Dudley Stevenson, 1320A, Regular Air Force.
Col. Thomas Alan Bennett, 1513A, Regular Air Force.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, AO271855, Air Force Reserve.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Victor Emile Bertrandias, AO267231, Air Force Reserve.
Maj. Gen. Edward Peck Curtis, AO146277, Air Force Reserve.
Maj. Gen. Cyrus Rowlett Smith, AO902787, Air Force Reserve.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Walter Gelvin Bain, AO290604, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. John Marza Bennett, Jr., AO403621, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Donald Campbell, AO900263, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Robert Emmet Condon, AO228877, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Merian Coldwell Cooper, AO163054, Air Force Reserve.
Maj. Gen. Robert Lynn Copsey, AO104024 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Trubee Davison, AO245451, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Lawrence George Fritz, AO191234, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Johnson George, AO284578, Air Force Reserve.
Maj. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham, AO343889 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Pierpont Morgan Hamilton, AO900788, Air Force Reserve.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin, AO170727 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Harold Ross Harris, AO231186, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. John Philip Henebry, AO406548, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Theron Baldwin Herndon, AO238180, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. James Howell Howard, AO511937, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Ray Willis Ireland, AO909835, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Bruce Johnson, AO504391, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Douglas Keeney, AO114136, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Henry Christopher Kristofferson, AO252676, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Walter Barton Leach, AO907234, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Timothy James Manning, AO901542, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Charles Mayion, AO109296, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Chester Earl McCarty, AO235959, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Arthur Lee McCullough, AO257726, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Fenton McManmon, AO919209, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Richard Lewis Meiling, AO370824, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Henry Terry Morrison, AO168027, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Lacey Van Buren Murrow, AO230184, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Will Faust Nicholson, AO426263, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Charles Freeman Nielsen, AO924980, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Russell Isaac Oppenheim, AO300863, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Dick Royal Petty, AO263968, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. William Leroy Plummer, AO114537, Air Force Reserve.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Randal', Rampy, AO927780 (brigadier general, Air Force Reserve), United States Air Force.
Brig. Gen. Franklin Rose, AO166159, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Howard Archibald Rusk, AO166916, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Peter Constant Sandretto, AO908471, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Robert James Smith, AO903591, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Ray James Stecker, AO319899, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Luther Wallace Sweetser, Jr., AO270360, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Lafeton Whitney, AO102007, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Walter Wallace Wood, AO229783, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. Albert McIver Woody, AO176850, Air Force Reserve.
Brig. Gen. William Tandy Young, Jr., AO449164, Air Force Reserve.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force, for service as members of the Air National Guard of the United States, under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Leonard Ewing Thomas, AO179089, California Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joseph Peter Gentile, AO384460, Massachusetts Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.
Col. Rollin Bascom Moore, Jr., AO397579, California Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.
Col. George Robert Stanley, AO289148, Connecticut Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Norgren P. Allen	Ludwig C. Bohler
Richard J. Allen	Arthur H. Bourne
Paul F. Amos	James T. Bowen
Ernest J. Andersen	James M. Bowers
Andrew E. Anderson, Jr.	Daniel Z. Boyd
	Frank M. Boyd
Leo Angros, Jr.	Richard C. Brackett
Donald J. Atha	Dean B. C. Brady
Thomas J. Ayers	John K. Brigden, Jr.
Clarence M. Baker	James J. Briody
Thomas J. Ballew	Thomas D. Brooks
John B. Bany, Jr.	Joseph E. Browne
Peter A. Bauer	Horace W. Burgess
Freddie P. Bayless	William A. Burns
Glen T. Beauchamp	Peter J. Byrnes
Charles D. Beaumont	John J. Cahill
Leslie R. Becker	Thomas L. Cain
William G. Beckham, Jr.	John T. Caldwell
	Irvin D. Califf
Guy W. Belleman	Harold R. Callison
James M. Belling	Donald C. Carroll
Robert P. Beschel	Steve N. Cavros
Joseph P. Billera	James W. Chambers
Daniel S. Bitner	Burr T. Chambless
Ronald J. Boccieri	William M. Champion

Frederick Chase, Jr.
Robert A. Christy
Francis X. Cianci
Bernard E. Clark
Simon L. Coatman
Arthur B. Colbert
Charles W. Colson
Richard J. Conroy
William H. Conway
Gary D. Cooper
Thomas J. Coyle
Duane D. Crews, Jr.
George C. Cusick
Joseph P. Daly III
Donald W. Darby, Jr.
Robert R. Darron
Joseph B. David III
Ed R. Davies
John E. Decoursey
George W. Desmet
Orval E. Donovan
John W. Dresely
Paul E. Dufendach
William B. Duncan
William J. Dunham
Randall W. Duphiney
Hugh C. Durbin
Arthur J. Eagan
Charles H. Egger, Jr.
William R. Eleazer
William D. Elzea
Charles D. Emmons
Louis O. Erwin
John R. Esther
John E. Fant
Philip S. Fenton
Bruce S. Fleming
David W. Florence, Jr.
Benjamin F. Fow, Jr.
James V. Fowler
Quentin I. Franklin
Henry C. Fry
Patrick E. Gallagher
Albert T. Gamon
Kenneth M. Giles
Ronald R. Gilliam
Willis H. Gilmore, Jr.
David L. Giuntoli
Thomas T. Glidden
Robert L. Goodall
James C. Goodin
Bruce E. Graham
Roger W. Greer
John E. Grenier
Sammy L. Grimes
Paul E. Grimm
Edward J. Gulas
John A. Hamilton
Ralph D. Hamilton
Richard T. Hannegan
Richard J. Hanscom
James M. Hart
Harold D. Haviland
Clyde C. Helmer
Meredith Hemphill, Jr.
William R. Henley
Gaylord L. Henry
Gordon L. Hillyard
Michael J. Hiza, Jr.
Eamon P. Holly
Frank K. Hoornbeek
David E. Horlacher
John R. Hosty
William E. House
Stanley S. Houston
Bradley W. Howe
Robert C. Hyland, Jr.
Claude S. Jackson
Thomas Jackson
Erich W. James
Harry E. Jenks II
James T. Jordan
Paul R. Judy
Richard J. Kemper
Thomas D. Kennedy
Thomas L. Kennedy
Erich Kilmer
John P. Kinney
James K. Kneusel, Jr.
Bruce E. Knox
Henry R. Kroeger
Clayton E. Ladd
Daniel H. Laidman
Homer A. Lamotte
James H. Landers, Jr.
Kenneth F. Lange
Robert W. Lee
Tony G. Lee
Harry L. Lefever
Paul A. Lesser, Jr.
Earle D. Litzenberger
Luther A. Lono
Dan W. Lufkin
Thomas A. Lynch
Eldridge J. Macewan
Byron E. Madden
Edward A. Mahlin
Doyle B. Manhart
Austin M. Marts
Donald G. Massen
Gilbert B. Mattson, Jr.
Donald F. Mayer
Jack D. McCreight
Gary A. McDaniel
Arthur T. McDermott
Richard P. McDermott
Daniel V. McDonald
Duard R. McDonald
Thomas D. McDowell
Rolland S. McGinnis
James J. McMonagle
Edward H. Mergens
Allen H. Michelet
Richard C. Mies
Walter L. Molineux, Jr.
Clark S. Morris
Robert F. Morriss
Stephen Mostardi
"J" Robert Mueller
Burt A. Murdock
Albert G. Murphy
Maurice M. Murphy
Robert D. Myers
Ronald E. Nelson
Bernard J. Newton
Jerome L. Norton
Robert D. Nosum
William T. Nyland
William J. O'Connell
James M. Olander
Paul L. Oshirak
John L. O'Toole
William D. Owens
Kenneth P. Palmer
Robert P. Palmer
Robert A. Papetti
Francis M. Parsons
George L. Patrick
Richard E. Patterson
Charles M. Perrott
Robert J. Peters
James S. Phillips
Bert R. Pitcher, Jr.
Walter T. Porter
Sherwood P. Prawel, Jr.
Donald E. Priest
Robert L. Pryatel
Douglas R. Purdy
George J. Radich
William A. Rankin, Jr.
Dale Ratliff
Stephen G. Reich
Harry R. Richards
Jack K. Ringler
Barry H. Rizzo
Gene P. Robinson
Tomas Rocha, Jr.
Donald B. Romans
John C. Rowett
Roy A. Rumbough
Andrew W. Rush II
Philip J. Ryan
Frederick P. Salzman, Jr.
Donald H. Sayce
William M. Scaife
Charles C. Scheirman
Emil R. Schnell
Donald P. Shildneck
Helmuth Siemer, Jr.
Donald R. Simpson
Joseph N. Smith
Thomas P. Stanton
Donald I. Starr
Thomas R. Stringfield
Daly Thompson, Jr.
Robert H. Tomlinson III
Lee H. Toole
Joseph E. Tracey
"J" "B" Troxel
Bruce A. Truesdale
John B. Tuchek
William A. Tyksinski
Thomas B. Urbanske
Roy L. Van Winkle
James H. Walker
John B. Walker, Jr.
Robert P. Walling
Gerard J. Walsh
Joel S. Watkins, Jr.
William W. Wehr
Ullie C. Wells
Lewis E. Westbrooke
Jack L. Williams
Robert G. Williams
Tren A. Williamson
Garrett J. Wimpey
Preston D. Woods
Harold G. Young
Rex J. Young

William L. Jones, Jr. (civilian college graduate), to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps in the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Clyde R. Parks

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

"J" Vernon Scott
"J" Vinton Scott

Charles F. Tedford to be ensign in the Medical Service Corps in the Navy.

The following-named personnel to the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (b), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Allen H. Bloom
William P. Boyle
Billy J. Bradley
Floyd S. Breckenridge, Jr.
Roland F. Cinciarelli
Edward W. Foster, Jr.
Gordon G. Green, Jr.
Donald M. Higbie
Allard H. Lennon
Edward V. Mannix
Will A. Merrill
Ernest L. Moglia
Gerald S. Pate
Harry J. Sievers
William G. Smalley
Charles R. Stiffler
John B. Wolf
Zachary Whaley

The following-named personnel to the grade of second lieutenant in the Regular Marine Corps pursuant to the provisions of title 34, United States Code, section 1020e (b), or title 34 United States Code, section 634, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

George F. Altman
Frankie E. Allgood
Wilburn C. Anderson, Jr.
John W. Andrews
Kermit W. Andrus
Frank A. Applegate
James R. Armentrout
Richard B. Arneson
Glen H. Barlow
William H. Bates
William E. Binnion
James H. Bird, Jr.
Tom R. Birdwell
Stanley G. Borjesson
Clifford J. Brenner
William E. Bucher
Owen J. Butler
Richard A. Cash
Edward J. Chesla, Jr.
James W. Christopherson
William H. Clark III
Daniel C. Coleman
Andrew G. Comer
James F. Conlon
Gerald B. Cornwall
Gregory A. Corliss
John V. Cox
Jack W. Davis
George R. Deaux
Rufino De La Cruz
Louis De Laine, Jr.
Joseph De Prima
Victor R. De Schuytner
Jack F. Dorman
Robert Drovedahl
Daniel M. Duffield, Jr.
Paul J. Ermatinger
Samuel G. Faulk
Louis I. Fein
Edward F. Fernandes
Wells L. Field III
Edward P. Fitzgerald
Charles A. Folsom
James S. Francis
John R. Gale
Luther E. Gartin
James E. Gillis
Theodor M. Glendrange
Marcus J. Gravel
Bernard D. Grooms
Harry H. Grunwald, Jr.
John A. Haley, Jr.
Walter W. Hargadine
John B. Harris
Richard P. Harrison
James G. Higgins
Rollin E. Hippler
Ervin E. Hodges
Robert E. Hofstetter
John P. Holden
John S. Hollis
David W. Howell
Ernest A. Huerlimann
Maurice Hunter
Harold H. Hutter, Jr.
Richard L. Hyland
Harvey G. Ilig
John W. Irion, Jr.
Samuel L. Jenkins
Howell J. Johnson
Peter G. Johnson
Paul M. Johnston
Robert I. Jones
George N. Jorgensen
Floyd A. Karker
William M. Keenan
Louis J. Kelsh
Robert C. Knee, Jr.
William K. Kramer
Richard A. Kuci
Henry J. La Tempa, Jr.
Pierce A. Law
James E. Lebherz
Thomas J. Lee
Jimmie D. Lester
Moritz Lhevinne
William H. Lightfoot, Jr.
Charles H. Lindsley, Jr.
Ronald E. Luley
Barry E. Lynch
Ronald J. Lynch
Joseph A. MacInnis
Mack E. Madzinski
Gerald P. Mahoney, Jr.
John H. Maloney
Paul Massanopoli
William L. McBrayer
Don A. Mickle
Paul A. Monahan
William J. Montgomery
Stuart Moore, Jr.
Thomas R. Morgan
Charles F. Moser
Edward A. Mullin
Monte L. Munn
James D. Munson
John A. O'Brien
William J. O'Brien
Harold F. O'Donnell
James D. O'Neil
Herbert M. Page, Jr.
Horacio E. Perea
Aydlette H. Perry, Jr.
Victor A. Perry
Russell G. Phillips
Bayard S. Pickett
Rollin R. Powell, Jr.
Paul G. Radtke
Lesley L. Ralson
Cleveland N. Reddick, Jr.
Alan R. Rehbock
John H. Ricketson
William E. Rudolph
Anthony S. G. Russo
Constatine Sangalis
Richard E. Schuberg
Joseph Scoppa, Jr.
Bruce J. Shore
Joseph W. Stevens, Jr.
Spencer F. Thomas
Alva F. Thompson, Jr.
James P. Thompson
William M. Toller
Herbert W. Tomlinson
Raymond L. Tryon
Leland W. Tucker
Frank P. Turner
Leonard S. Van Gaasbeek
Solomon L. Van Meter
George F. Vorhauer
Dallas R. Walker
Elwood J. Watts
William Weise
Lawrence Weisser
Michael E. White
John W. Wiita
Milton D. Williford
Donald W. Wilson
Lewis C. Witt
Neal B. Wynn

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Eleanor M. Antoine
Eleanor M. Hahn

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

June MacK. Bartlem

The following-named personnel of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel for limited duty:

Frederick Benton — John C. Johnson

The following-named personnel of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major for limited duty:

Richard Burgess
Frederick M. Steinhauser
John Webber
Lloyd C. Williams
William L. Woodruff

The following-named personnel of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain for limited duty:

Eugene Anderson
Roy H. Bley
Cecil T. Carraway
George R. Eargle
Robert H. Fore
George J. Hanft
Alexis A. Jedenoff
Douglas K. Morton
Stephen K. Pawloski
Albert F. Rinehart
Anthony J. Roscoe
Richard W. Sinclair
Donald L. Shenaut
George W. Torbert
Joseph W. Utz
Russell C. White
Elmer R. Wirta

The following-named personnel of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of first lieutenant for limited duty:

Wilburn C. Allen
Ray H. Bishop
Sidney W. Cooley
Harley L. Grant
Haldon W. Lindfelt
Alfred E. Montrief
Harold G. Schrier
James G. G. Taylor
Robert J. Vroegindewey

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and goodness, may this new day be filled with lofty aspiration for personal and national righteousness.

Grant that we may do our very best to help our confused and troubled world find the way of peace.

May our plans and desires, our deliberations and decisions, always be in harmony and identical with Thy wise and beneficent purposes for all mankind.

Inspire and encourage us with the joyous certainty that our trust in Thee and in the triumph of the kingdom of truth and brotherhood can never be put to shame.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 3, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2230. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams; and

H. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, 82d Congress, 2d session.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

JOHN CARTER VINCENT

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers carry a story that John Carter Vincent is to be retired on a $9,000 pension. The State Department news release, it is claimed, says that Vincent had "failed to meet the standards expected of an experienced Foreign Service officer."

The loyalty review board had found "reasonable doubt" as to Vincent's loyalty and recommended that he be fired outright. The review board correctly stated that Vincent had voiced "steady praise of Chinese Communists and equally studied criticism of the Chiang Kai-shek government" and that he had associated with persons he "had reasons to believe" were Communists or Communist sympathizers.

Over the last several years I have spent many hours studying the record of this man. I find nothing to justify his retention on a pension equal to approximately three-fourths of the salary paid to Members of Congress—and way above the average national individual income.

On the contrary, I have found many things to justify a finding much harsher than the expression of reasonable doubt about his loyalty. And so I ask the committee and the Congress to strike from the appropriation bill for the State Department any provision for the payment of a pension to this man. If necessary, I will sponsor a rider to accomplish that purpose. I can see no sense in paying $9,000 a year to anyone about whom it can be said that "he had failed to meet the standards expected of an experienced Foreign Service officer."

I am glad he is no longer on the active list but I deplore the way it has been done. The price is too high.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which is considering tidelands legislation may sit today during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

BOB BARKER

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement and some letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently a friend of mine of some 30 years who was employed as an investigator by the House Committee on Un-American Activities was dismissed by the chairman, without a hearing, for mistakenly advising the chairman that Mrs. Agnes Meyer, of the Washington Post, was the author of a letter referred to in the Moscow Pravda. This investigator, Bob Barker, has been in Government service for some 25 years, and is well known to many Members of this House on both sides of the aisle, and has worked for several congressional committees in both the Senate and the House.

After his dismissal by the committee, without a hearing, became public he has been attacked by Mr. Alfred Friendly in a story appearing in the Washington Post on Sunday.

Mr. Barker has prepared a statement explaining how the error occurred in erroneously naming Mrs. Meyer as the author of the letter quoted in Pravda, and answering the charges against him by Alfred Friendly in the Post

Since Mr. Barker has no forum before which he could appear and defend himself and get his defense on record, several of his friends have asked me to put his statement, and a copy of the original translation, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with some of the many fine letters of commendation he has received over the years from Members of Congress, and I am glad to do this in simple justice to him.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT B. BARKER RE: MRS. AGNES MEYER, ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON POST BY ALFRED FRIENDLY

I have been dismissed as an investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities for erroneously advising the chairman, Hon. H. H. VELDE, that Mrs. Agnes Meyer, reporter for and part-owner of the Washington Post, was the author of a letter to the journal, Soviet Russia Today, which was quoted in Pravda on April 30, 1947.

None of the nine-member committee, including the chairman, has ever asked me to explain how the error occurred, and, since I was dismissed without a hearing, and have been subsequently smeared and libeled in the Washington Post by one Alfred Friendly, I believe a statement of the facts should be made.

It was a perfectly natural thing for a Russian scholar and translator at the Library of Congress to assume that Agnes Meyer was the Mrs. Meyer who was quoted in Pravda in his oral translation to me, and likewise for me to assume that she wrote the letter when the English translation subsequently received from the Legislative Reference Service gave the name as Mrs. Meyer, not Mayer. This translation was placed in the committee files and reference cards prepared giving the name of Agnes Meyer as the author of the letter. From this, the chairman issued a statement to the press, making the same error that the translator and I had made. It was perfectly natural for all of us to come to this conclusion, in view of the pro-Communist editorial policy of the Washington Post, which carried Mrs. Meyer's picture on page 7M, Sunday, September 3, 1950, as one of the prize-winning Post reporters.

I am at a loss to understand the violent exception taken by Mrs. Meyer over the statement mistakenly attributed to her that she deplored those speaking so disdainfully of the Russians, when her own newspaper, in an editorial on July 21, 1946, congratulated Earl Browder on his trip to Moscow after he was removed as the Russians' No. 1 Communist in the United States, and called Browder a "rugged individualist."

The article in Pravda by N. Rubinstein named as friends of the Soviet Union abroad such well-known Americans as Claude Pepper, Henry Wallace, Elliott Roosevelt, Paul Robeson, Johannes Steel, Ralph Perry, Albert Einstein, Joseph E. Davies.

Surely Mrs. Meyer should not object to being named in company with these well-known apologists for communism, even by mistake. I can't find where her newspaper ever denounced any of them for their pro-Russian views.

The above explanation would not be complete without a few other references to the pages of the Post itself, and we come again to Browder, who has spent most of his adult life betraying his country, and find another editorial in the Post, April 28, 1950, referring to Browder's refusal to name Communists in the State Department when testifying before the Tydings committee, and congratulating him for his "adherence to fundamental American decencies."

It is small wonder that Communists appearing before congressional committees defiantly refuse to answer questions, when they have a ready ally in the Washington Post.

But even worse than this defense and praise of Earl Browder, Mrs. Meyer's Washington Post was forced to admit, on its editorial pages on January 16, 1948, that its city editor, Ben Gilbert, had been a Communist under the name of Ben Goldberg. A rival newspaper had forced the hand of the Post after a delay of 2 days when the question arose during a police trial board hearing.

Following this, it appears that Alfred Friendly's loyalty was questioned by the House Committee on Appropriations during hearings on foreign aid on May 7, 1948, page 797 of hearings, when the chairman (Mr. TABER of New York) asked W. Averell Harriman if he had cleared Friendly with the FBI (for employment by ECA), and, after a long defense of Friendly by Harriman, the chairman, apparently unimpressed, said:

"From what I have heard, I know of nothing that would tend to destroy the confidence of the American people in the program as much as the participation of this gentlemen and others of the same philosophy in it."

Possibly Mr. TABER was thinking of why the Washington Post, Alfred Friendly's employer, had ignored and failed to answer the following charges made against it on March 20, 1948, at page A2068, part 10, volume 94, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The editorial record of Eugene Meyer's Washington Post, a paper which wields great influence because it is owned by one of the pillars of free enterprise, because it is published in the Capital, and because it is a lively journalistic product according to the standards of the day, has long been in need of examination. A scrutiny shows that it has followed in recent years on most major issues the basic pattern of the Communist Party line—not in the outspoken manner of the Moscow Pravda or the New York Daily Worker, but in that very special dialect which Marshall Field's P M and Michael Straight's New Republic have so adroitly introduced into our contemporary language.

"Behind pro forma attacks on communism, occasional sorties against Gromyko and Vishinsky, support of the Marshall plan, aid for Greece, and similar lip service manifestations, the Washington Post has pursued these lines:

"1. Oblique defense of domestic and foreign Communists, Communist organizations, and Communist activities.

"2. Attacks on persons exposing Communist infiltration, on respectable anti-Communist Members of Congress, and on the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"3. Attacks on the President's loyalty program.

"4. Attacks on such legitimate governments as those of Greece and China—of moment to our national defense.

"5. Subversion of confidence in the United States Government through its editorial columns.

"6. A double standard on civil rights."

The Post fell into the hands of a left-wing clique, who managed to put over a watered-down version of the (Communist) party line, disguised and embellished by the pedantic literary style of the intellectual fellow travelers.

Many persons in Washington, including newspapermen and Members of Congress, could not understand why the editor, publisher, and the owners, Eugene and Agnes Meyer, did not answer these charges.

The conviction of Alger Hiss must have been a real shock indeed to the readers of the Washington Post, in view of the manner in which the Post handled the day-by-day account of his second trial, burying it on inside pages and deleting mention entirely of the introduction of certain evidence unfavorable to Hiss.

Now in view of the above tactics of so-called news reporting and editorial comment of Mrs. Meyer's Washington Post, I believe any reasonable person would come to the same conclusion that was reached by the Russian translator and myself on the authorship of the Meyer letter in Pravda. It was certainly an honest mistake.

The Washington Post on March 1, 1953, charged me with giving false information concerning Mrs. Agnes Meyer, its reporter and part owner, and stress that the Post discredited me in 1947 and successfully challenged my veracity, etc.

The article in the Post by this same Alfred Friendly charges that my testimony before the Senate section of the Joint Atomic Committee in 1947 on the nomination of David Eli Lilienthal, regarding a letter written by a TVA Communist named Henry Hart to another Communist named Rob Hall, was false. This is the same charge that Alfred Friendly made against me in 1947.

A complete answer to this charge is that if there had been any evidence of perjury, I would have been prosecuted in the courts, just as numerous other witnesses have been prosecuted for perjury before congressional committees. The reason I was not prosecuted is, of course, obvious. The statements I made before the committee were true, and when they were brought into question, the statements were proven by satisfactory evidence from other witnesses. For instance, my testimony was substantiated by the supporting testimony of the police officer named Lt. Ollie Osborne, of Birmingham, Ala., who under oath told the Senate committee on February 12, 1947, page 395 of the hearing, that he was present with me when the Hart letter was obtained, and that he was present with me when we had a photostat of the letter made.

"Mr. OSBORNE. That was a copy of the original letter seized on April 9, 1940, by Bob Barker and myself while in the Communist headquarters of Robert P. Hall, secretary of district 17, located 235 Clarke Building, Birmingham, Ala."

* * * * *

"So about 10 a. m. on the 10th, Mr. Barker and myself went to the Electric Blue Printing Co., which at that time was located at 108½ North 21st Street, to have the documents that we had photostated."

Then the police officer produced an affidavit from W. Roydon Hulen, secretary-treasurer of the Electric Blue Printing Co., Inc., of Birmingham, Ala., dated February 11, 1947, which appears in the record of the hearings, and states that Lieutenant Osborne and Barker, an investigator for the Dies committee, came to him with some documents which they described as highly confidential, and that he made photostats of them and delivered them to Lieutenant Osborne.

Furthermore, there was submitted to the Senate committee in evidence a news story coming out of Washington, presumably from the Scripps-Howard bureau following a check which Mr. Loy Miller, the editor of the News-Sentinel, had directed be made at the Dies committee to see if the files contained the Hart letter, and this story, which appears in the News-Sentinel on page B-8, Sunday, July 23, 1943, quotes Mr. Robert Stripling, chief of the Dies staff, as verifying that the Hart letter was in the Dies committee files. On the basis of the verification of Mr. Stripling, the Knoxville News-Sentinel, which is a rival of the Knoxville Journal, printed the Hart letter in full. Although this letter was published first in the Knoxville Journal, and again in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on separate occasions, and although Henry Hart was still in the TVA in Knoxville at the time, he made no protest over the publication of the letter to the editor of either paper.

An additional circumstance which may be mentioned is the fact that, after the publication of this letter by both newspapers, the Dies committee received no protest from Henry Hart, or anyone else mentioned in the letter.

Now to show the complete bias of Alfred Friendly toward me, an avowed anti-Communist: he omitted entirely any mention whatever in his story of the above evidence which no reputable newspaperman would do.

The fact that Mr. DIES now states that he cannot recall such a letter, out of the thousands of letters and documents received by the Dies committee in 7 years, does not impeach my veracity.

Alfred Friendly goes on to say that I made another false statement about who gave the Knoxville Journal the Hart letter in the first place. I stated that I did not give the Journal the letter. Friendly says he made an investigation which showed that I did. The only testimony before the Senate committee contrary to mine was the testimony of Alfred Friendly, himself. The man whom Friendly said contradicted me was not called, and I was not recalled from Miami to testify further, although I did request an opportunity to do so, but the hearings were closed, and Lilienthal's nomination was sent to the Senate floor. So, on the basis of Alfred Friendly's hearsay, he says I did not tell the truth.

Friendly, in true "Washington Daily Worker" style of distorted reporting, failed to tell the other facts, and that is when Henry Hart testified before the Senate committee himself in 1947, he denied writing such a letter, but couldn't for the life of him remember any of the Communists in the TVA cell with him except Mabel Abercrombie and David Stone Martin, whereas both William Walter Remington and Harry F. (Chick) Alber, who were in the same TVA Communist cell with Henry Hart, have since been indicted by Federal grand juries for perjury in denying Communist Party membership, and Remington has been convicted the second time while Alber awaits trial at Alexandria, Va.

I have worked for the executive and legislative branches of the Government for some 25 years, and attach photostats of letters received from Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and from Members of Congress who were chairmen or acting chairmen of committees, or members from 1939 to 1953. These letters are from Hon. Martin Dies, Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, Hon. Jerry Voorhis, Hon. Joe Starnes, Hon. Joe Casey, Hon. Clarence Lea, Hon. Frank Fellows, Hon. Percy Priest, Hon. Ed J. Hart, Hon. Louis E. Miller, Hon. Carl Curtis, Hon. Oren Harris, Hon. E. E. Cox, Hon. John S. Wood.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C.

FRIENDS OF THE SOVIET UNION ABROAD

(Excerpts from an article by N. Rubinstein in the Moscow Pravda, April 30, 1947, No. 105, p. 4)

There are many sincere friends of the Soviet Union in the United States who are grouped around the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship. The chairman of this organization is a Protestant minister Melish; its members and active contributors to the journal Soviet Russia Today are the State attorney of California, Kenny; the well-known radio commentator, Johannes Steel; the professor of philosophy, Ralph Perry; the former Ambassador to the U. S. S. R., and author of the book Mission to Moscow, Joseph Davies; Albert Einstein; the famous singer, Paul Robeson; and many others.

The American friends of the U. S. S. R. in their public appearances continually emphasize the fact that to be a supporter of progress and democracy in one's own country means to be a friend of the U. S. S. R. "The struggle for healthy relations with the Soviet Union," writes Melish, "is a struggle

for a healthy, growing, progressive, democratic America."

"It is necessary that at present more than ever sober-minded Americans should come forward openly for an honest collaboration with the U. S. S. R. in order that peace be established," declares Prof. Albert Einstein.

Appeals, articles, letters written to the editor of the journal Soviet Russia Today indicate that men like Melish express the mood of a great number of ordinary Americans. "We feel profound admiration for the people of the Soviet Union," writes Mrs. Meyer in her letter. "It simply makes you sick at heart when you hear many radio commentators speaking so unjustly and disdainfully of the Russians."

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, February 11, 1939.

Hon. MARTIN DIES,
Chairman, House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DIES: Mr. Robert B. Barker informs me he is an applicant for the position of special investigator for the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities.

Mr. Barker was employed by this Administration from July 24, 1922, until June 19, 1937, when he resigned of his own volition. During this period he occupied the positions of assistant chief, contact division, central office, and special contact representative, Nashville regional office.

In those positions Mr. Barker had a wide experience in his contacts with Members of Congress, veterans and their representatives, and the general public in connection with matters coming under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration and in making investigations of complicated cases, some involving the question of violation of Federal penal statutes. From facts obtained in the investigation of individual cases, it is considered Mr. Barker has a natural intuition for investigatory work.

From contacts with and observation of Mr. Barker's services while with this Administration he is considered honest, conscientious, and an indefatigable worker.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1943.

Mr. ROBERT B. BARKER,
Senior Investigator, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BARKER: You have been employed by the special committee since February 16, 1939, as senior investigator and field representative at a salary of $4,200 per annum.

Now that you are leaving the committee to assist Judge COX in the Federal Communications Commission investigation, I want to give you this letter of commendation.

You have made investigations for the special committee in Canada, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Delaware, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, Kentucky, North Carolina, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, and Mexico.

I want to thank you particularly and express the appreciation of myself and the special committee for the excellent work you did in the William Dudley Pelley-Silver Shirt Legion case; the Gilbert-Campbell-McWhirter-Deatherage anti-Semitic case; the German-American Bund investigation in New Jersey; the Kyffhauser Bund in Philadelphia; the Christian Front in Boston; the Kenvil explosion; sabotage in Sun Ship; the Ku Klux Klan; the Bethlehem strike disturbances; Nazi and Communists in Philadelphia Navy Yard; the Communist Party of Pennsylvania; and the American League for Peace and Democracy in Washington and Chicago.

My best wishes go with you for continued success in your new undertaking. You have the ability and experience to do the job.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

MARTIN DIES, *Chairman.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1944.

Mr. ROBERT BARKER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARKER: Now that you are no longer a member of the investigative force of the Special Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities, of which I am a member, I would be remiss if I did not express to you in writing my appreciation for the excellent work which you did for our committee.

You and I were brought together on a number of different occasions, so I had full opportunity to witness your splendid work.

One of the best jobs which you ever did was the investigation of the German-American Bund camp at Nordland, N. J. Likewise your presentation before the subcommittee at Newark of the facts discovered by you at that camp. Your investigation of Nordland probably had more to do with its closing than any other thing; your investigation of the cause of the explosion of the Hercules Powder Co. at Kenvil, N. J., was also very thorough. I was on the scene of that explosion immediately after it took place, and I had occasion to witness the investigations made by the various agencies of the Government, and, frankly, you seemed to get more information than did any of the others.

I could go on and write many other favorable things, but this is just enough to demonstrate the high regard which I have for you personally and for your ability, as both an investigator and counselor.

Hoping that fate will bring us together again some time, and with best wishes for the future, I am, with best personal regards,

Sincerely,

J. PARNELL THOMAS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1943.

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter is written for the purpose of stating that I have been acquainted for the past 5 years with Robert H. Barker and have had the opportunity to observe very intimately his work as an investigator and his character as a man.

I have been a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, by which committee he was employed up until January of 1943.

Mr. Barker is in deadly earnest about his work. He is thorough and efficient, and he has one of the most remarkable memories that I have ever come in contact with. Anyone who has been acquainted with him cannot fail to be impressed also by his deep earnestness, sincere patriotism, and desire to be of maximum possible service to the best interests of his country. He performs his work without fear or favor. He is unprejudiced in his point of view and in his chosen line of work would be invaluable to any agency which might see fit to employ him.

JERRY VOORHIS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1943.

Hon. E. E. COX,
Member of Congress, Chairman, Special Committee Investigating the FCC, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENE: I am informed you are considering the application of Mr. Robert Barker as an investigator for your special committee. Barker has been with the Special Committee Investigating Un-American and Subversive Activities for several years. I find Mr. Barker to be a very able, conscientious, and thorough investigator. He investigated the alleged Klan-German-American Bund alliance in the New Jersey area, the TVA, the Ku Klux Klan, and the Southern Conference on Human Welfare—for the subcommittee of which I acted as chairman. I found his work to be satisfactory and of high order. I have no hesitation in recommending Mr. Barker to you and your committee as an efficient and competent investigator.

Sincerely your friend,

JOE STARNES.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1943.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that for the past several years, as a member of the Dies committee, I have had an opportunity to observe the character and the work of Robert B. Barker, who has been an investigator for that committee.

I found him to be a man of excellent character, entirely trustworthy and reliable, and most energetic in his work.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH E. CASEY.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., January 3, 1945.

Mr. ROBERT B. BARKER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: Now that we have completed our investigation by the Select Committee To Investigate Federal Communications, I desire to express to you my sincere appreciation of the service you did for our committee and the country.

Your work as investigator was thorough, exhaustive, and complete as each matter came within your duties. Your analysis and interpretation of the facts of each matter involved was splendid.

You became our general counsel under circumstances that would have been onerous to any attorney. You showed a very unusual ability to assemble and use facts in their proper order and to present them clearly and effectively. I commend you for a job well done.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

It affords me a great deal of pleasure to advise that I am well acquainted with Mr. Robert B. Baker. I have known him for several years but became much more intimately acquainted with him during the period that he served as attorney for a special Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission. I was a member of that committee during the latter part of its existence and work.

During the time he served as investigator, Mr. Barker obtained a vast amount of valuable and useful information for the committee. At a later date and in a rather critical period of the committee hearings, he assumed the responsibility of chief counsel after a resignation had left that place vacant.

I was greatly impressed by the manner in which Mr. Barker conducted the matters before that committee. He had so fully familiarized himself with even minor details

and handled these so skillfully that there was nothing to be desired. Moreover, I have come to appreciate him as a man of very high principles and ideals.

Sincerely yours,

J. PERCY PRIEST.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to advise that I am acquainted with Mr. Robert B. Barker. Mr. Barker was employed by a Special Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission, which was authorized by the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress.

His work as an investigator was of the highest caliber. He succeeded in obtaining most valuable information for the use of the committee and the thoroughness and competence with which he carried on his work compelled my admiration. At a certain difficult stage in the proceedings of the committee, upon the resignation of the committee's general counsel, Mr. Barker stepped into breach and continued to act as general counsel of the committee until it terminated its activities at the end of that Congress.

He conducted himself in a brilliant manner and his presentation of the case before the committee left little to be desired. His knowledge of all the intricate details involved, his remarkable memory of facts and occurrences, his complete knowledge of the testimony to be presented, all constituted a striking manifestation of his sincere love of his work and genuine ability in its execution. Mr. Barker has a pleasing personality and my experience with him compels me to say that he is thoroughly trustworthy in every respect.

Very sincerely yours,

EDW. J. HART.

LAW OFFICES OF LOUIS E. MILLER,
St. Louis, April 17, 1945.

To Whom It May Concern:

As a former member of the Select Committee of the House To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission, I became acquainted with Mr. Robert B. Barker, and had an opportunity to appraise at first hand his work as an investigator and later as counsel for the committee.

In the 20 years that I have practiced law, I have never observed any investigator with greater devotion to duty or knowledge of the subject of the investigation. Mr. Barker's work was tireless, thorough, and comprehensive. His ability to assimilate facts and recall the manifold details of his work was amazing.

During the course of the hearings, it became necessary for Mr. Barker to assume the duties of the general counsel for the committee, and without a moment's delay he did so, and his work was painstaking and brilliant.

I was particularly impressed by the fairness of Mr. Barker toward the witnesses and the committee. He was solicitous to present only such material as was factual and such findings as were justified by the evidence.

I have been so impressed by his ability and industry, that I would not only employ him in my office, had I the need for another competent investigator and lawyer, but I would consider anyone else exceedingly fortunate who can have the benefit of his services.

You may believe me to be

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS E. MILLER.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
Denver, Colo., August 30, 1946.

ROBERT B. BARKER,
Attorney at Law, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARKER: In connection with your recent request, I have authorized my office in Washington to furnish you with a typewritten copy of my letter in longhand to Senator ELLENDER of the 19th.

I appreciate your industry and loyalty.

Sincerely,

E. C. JOHNSON.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1947.

MR. ROBERT BARKER,
Chief Investigator, Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARKER: May I take this occasion to thank you for your fine help and cooperation in connection with the work of this committee. Our time was short and we faced many handicaps. It is my opinion that you have done a very good job.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

CARL T. CURTIS.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT B. BARKER,
Assistant General Counsel and Chief Investigator of the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: As the Special Committee of the House To Investigate Campaign Expenditures has completed its work and filed the report, I want to take this privilege of expressing our grateful thanks for your untiring work as assistant general counsel and chief investigator of the committee.

I know that your task was very difficult in some instances and required a most careful approach and consideration. You have performed this important work faithfully and well. I have enjoyed working with you in an effort to do a good job for the Congress.

The committee was fortunate in having you as a member of the staff, and we very greatly appreciate the fine work you have done.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1948.

To Whom It May Concern:

This will evidence that the undersigned has known Robert B. Barker, an attorney, of Maryville, Tenn., for many years. He was present when I took the oath of office when I came to the House more than 23 years ago. For much of the time since then I have been closely associated with him. Mr. Barker is a registered Republican and has many friends in both political parties in the House and Senate.

When the Select Committee of the House To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission was set up in February 1943, I, as the chairman of the committee, requested MARTIN DIES, of Texas, who was then chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, to furnish me with the best man in his organization to take over the investigatory work of my committee, and as a result of this he sent me Bob Barker, who did a magnificent job and at the end of the investigation was not only serving as chief investigator, but as counsel for the committee, and it is my information that he prepared the bulk of the final report that the committee made.

If I were called upon to name the most skillful investigator in Washington, I would take Mr. Barker. He is a man of wide experience and has a wealth of information that would make him invaluable to any group undertaking to uncover fraud, or practices which are inimical to the country's good. Since Mr. Barker was with the committee above referred to, he has been counsel and investigator to other committees of the Senate and House, and has been in my office a great part of the time, and I know him to be industrious and completely loyal, and I recommend him without the slightest reservation to any or all needing the services of this kind of a man.

Very respectfully,

E. E. COX.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1951.

ROBERT B. BARKER, ESQ.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROBERT: I have served as a member of a subcommittee to investigate campaign expenditures three times, for three congressional elections. In the 79th Congress, Hon. Percy Priest was chairman; in the 80th, Hon. Ross Rizley was chairman; and in the 81st Congress Hon. Mike Mansfield held that position. I believe that these committees were fortunate in having your service as chief investigator and assistant general counsel in the performance of what has proven to be a most important function, viz: that of ascertaining the facts and reporting the conclusions in cases where violation of the election laws has been alleged in relation to House membership. You have performed your duties I believe honestly and efficiently. Your services should be in demand by committees of Congress. I have convincing proof that you are a Republican.

Sincerely,

FRANK FELLOWS,
Member of Congress,
Third District, Maine.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 15, 1953.

MR. ROBERT BARKER,
Investigator, House Committee on Un-American Activities, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BUCKEYE: In severing my connection with the committee, I want you to know of the very real and deep appreciation I feel for your loyalty to the work of the committee, and the efficient manner in which you have discharged the duties that have devolved upon you, as well as for the many evidences of personal friendship which you have shown to me personally. You boys on the committee have always gone beyond the call of duty to lighten my load and I shall always be grateful.

My earnest wish is that the future may hold in store for you all of the good things which you so richly deserve.

Best wishes.

Your friend,

JOHN S. WOOD.

THE IRANIAN SITUATION

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to read on the news ticker on Tuesday that Premier Mossadegh of Iran had ordered all American nationals to remain off the streets of his country; that diplomats representing the United States had been stoned; that American soldiers had been threatened; that the Premier had called on the tank corps of his nation to defend American citizens.

We have been told we must appropriate large sums for foreign aid grants,

and loans, the repayment of which is doubtful, in order that we can make friends and influence the people of foreign nations.

Is this an example, Mr. Speaker, of the friendship which we have purchased with American taxpayers' dollars? Dollars so badly needed to balance the budget of America's housewives?

Are these the taxes we are told we cannot reduce now?

Mr. Speaker, I have checked on the dollars American thxpayers have sent to Iran, a nation of 15 million people, since 1945. The cost of buying friends who stone our citizens, insult our flag, and threaten American military personnel comes very high.

Here is the price already paid—$74,421,000. How long, Mr. Speaker, until we think of our taxpayers?

Aid to Iran since July 1945

(Department of Commerce report, foreign aid, July 1945 through September 1952)

Grants:	
Mutual Security	$14,036,000
Technical assistance (point 4)	40,000
Lend-lease	750,000
Total grants	14,826,000
Loans:	
Foreign credits utilized	34,185,000
Foreign credits unutilized	25,410,000
Total loans	59,595,000
Total grants and loans	74,421,000

THE SPIRIT OF RESOLUTION 76 BASED ON THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE CAN AID LIBERATION OF SOVIET PEOPLES

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and to include a resolution which I am today introducing regarding the Russian people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, now that Stalin's rule in the Soviet Union is ended, which rule has been a direct threat to the security of the United States, how are we prepared to take advantage of this Soviet crisis to end the power of the Communist conspiracy?

Under our new leadership I am sure we will not merely wait for the dust to settle but that we will seize the initiative and command events instead of letting events command us. It is a grave misfortune that the previous administration did not implement the amendment which I sponsored to the Mutual Security Act passed into law 2 years ago, which provides for the formation of escapees from Iron Curtain countries into national military units and cadres of Russian anti-Communist troops to be attached to NATO. The amendment also provides for the formation of similar Polish, Hungarian, and other satellite national anti-Communist units, with their own uniforms and flags of freedom.

Suppose we had fully utilized this provision of the Mutual Security Act and we today had battalions of Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, and others in being. And suppose we also had effective contact with a bulwark of patriots in the Soviet Union and other captive nations who were ready to spring into action at the opportune time. Would we not then be better able to take advantage of the end of Stalin's rule and be able to do something more than merely express hope for the liberation of the Communist enslaved peoples of the Soviet Union and the captive nations?

At the time of Lenin's death there was a great struggle for power to gain control of the Communist apparatus. Stalin won out and after many bloody purges of thousands of high- and low-ranking Communists he was finally able to consolidate his position of power.

There will no doubt be a similar struggle to determine Stalin's successor. Many of today's top Communists may soon be dead.

After Stalin's death, we should use this interval of internal conflict at the very core and center of the worldwide Communist operation to win the cold war by helping the process of liberation of the enslaved millions who are our greatest potential allies against the Communists.

Today we received news of the Polish jet pilot who flew from Communist Poland to freedom in Denmark with his Russian built MIG airplane. This is just one sample of what could be repeated many times if we wished to encourage it. The armies of the captive nations and the Soviet Army itself, with which the Communists hope to conquer the world, are full of seeds of disaffection and discontent. Could the Communists trust any of their pilots alone in the air or divisions in the field if we made a serious effort to help them surrender without endangering their lives?

The great number of voluntary surrenders in Korea of North Korean and Chinese soldiers who vow they will violently resist, if necessary, any attempt to return them to Communist-dominated areas, also exposes the Achilles heel of communism. We have greatly bungled this great psychological warfare victory in Korea by apologizing for its huge success. Instead we should be strongly announcing to the world how these victims of communism prefer freedom to Communist slavery. We should welcome them to our side.

Let us recall that nearly 5 million Soviet troops, to get away from Communist tyranny, voluntarily surrendered to the Nazis in World War II, before they discovered the Nazis were not their liberators.

I am including in my remarks a resolution which I have introduced in the House today to aid in the early liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union. The text of the resolution is as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 76

Resolution expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Russian people and other peoples within the Soviet Union from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms, and for other purposes

Whereas the Russian people and other peoples of the Soviet Union have been enslaved by the ruthless dictatorship of the Communist conspiracy since 1917, which conspiracy has been headed by J. V. Stalin since 1924, and it now appears that Stalin's dictatorship has ended and the enslaved peoples, in the providence of God, may now have an opportunity to work toward the achievement of their basic human rights and freedoms; and

Whereas the American people have long accepted the basic principles set forth in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776 in the following words: "* * * that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness"; and

Whereas the American people believe these principles are universal and apply to all men, everywhere, at all times and under all forms of government; and

Whereas these principles flow from certain essential truths, among which are—

That the Creator is the author of every human being and the source of his rights and that neither the state nor any other human agency has jurisdiction to exploit any human being or violate his rights;

That the state is a servant to mankind and not its master and may not pervert its administrative and police powers so as to make of them a weapon to violate human rights or to terrorize the people;

That there is a brotherhood of all men but only under the fatherhood of God; and

Whereas communism wears a humanitarian cloak and poses as the Messiah of social justice but in reality has given rise to the most reactionary regime of our time based on barbarism and slavery as a result of its immoral doctrine founded in malice setting man against man, class against class, and all men against God; and

Whereas communism thrusts itself beyond civil government and political philosophy, claiming the whole man, denying all spiritual values, denying his inalienable rights, and seeking to transform all human beings created by God in His image into soulless biological units, to be fitted into a military and economic machine designed for world revolution; and

Whereas communism, although not native to Russia, was adopted by a small, ruthless Bolshevik minority which by treachery, deceit, brutal force, and terror subverted and destroyed the freedom gained by the Russian people and other peoples within the former Russian Empire in their democratic revolution of February 1917; and

Whereas communism after coming to power in Russia succeeded until recently by means of false propaganda, deceit, police-state methods, and hermetically sealed frontiers, in keeping the non-Soviet world largely ignorant of the plight of the peoples within the Soviet Union and, in turn, keeping the peoples within the Soviet Union in ignorance of the true nature of conditions existing outside its borders and particularly of conditions in the democratic world; and

Whereas communism has taken the lives of tens of millions of human beings in the Soviet Union, including a vast number of the members of its own armed forces (other than in the late war), and has enslaved the peoples by robbing peasants of their farms and transforming them into landless agricultural robots; by chaining workers to their factories and transforming them into homeless industrial robots; by depriving intellectuals of freedom of creative work and thought

and transforming them into voiceless ideological robots; by submitting vast numbers from all classes, both men and women, old and young, workers (industrial and white collar), peasants, and intellectuals, to the subhuman conditions of concentration camps in uninhabitable areas and transforming them into a nameless host of more than 15 million state slaves; by the uprooting and dispersal of minority groups; by practicing genocide upon national groups within the Soviet Union; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying the institution of the family in the Soviet Union by an enforced collective way of life, by inordinate control and indoctrination of the children, and by setting members of the same family against one another through fear and terror; and

Whereas communism is in the process of destroying religion in the Soviet Union by fostering atheism, by ridiculing and persecuting the sincere religious expression of the people, by perverting religious instincts in the hearts of the young, by murdering the representatives of religion, by destruction of places of worship and the abolition of religious institutions, by tolerating only religious services subservient to the state, and defying the leader of the Red regime; and

Whereas communism by force and deceit has transformed into a tool of international aggression, the Soviet Army, conscripted of peace-loving peasants, workers, and intellectuals whose true anti-Communist sentiment has been demonstrated by numerous revolts (such as: 1921—the revolt of the Baltic fleet at Kronstadt; 1937—the plan to overthrow the Communist regime led by Marshal Tukhachevsky, head of all the Soviet armed forces, resulting in the purge of 4 of the 5 Soviet army marshals, 399 generals, and over 30,000 other Soviet army officers; 1941–45—the mass surrender of 4,500,000 Soviet troops to the German forces under the mistaken assumption that the German forces were bringing freedom and liberation to their homeland; the formation of an anti-Communist army of liberation of over 800,000 soldiers; when later the true aims of the Nazis were realized by the Soviet people, the same patriotic spirit was manifested in the victorious march from Stalingrad to Berlin in the gallant defense of their homeland); and

Whereas communism by making false and appealing promises, in an atmosphere of ideological black-out in the Soviet Union, perverts the patriotic fervor of a certain number of young idealists, who have a genuine desire to serve their people, and exploit it for an antihuman conspiracy; and

Whereas communism in order to extend still further its tyranny concentrates its efforts on promoting artificial hostile feelings between the friendly and peace-loving peoples within the Soviet Union and the people of the United States and of other free nations whose basic aspirations as human beings are identical, and who have no real conflicting interests; and

Whereas communism, not satisfied with the exploitation of millions of people in the Soviet Union, has already forced Marxist-Stalinist tyranny on the once free and independent nations of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and also parts of Germany and Austria, and initially on Yugoslavia, which still follows the Communist ideology, and in the words of the United States Supreme Court Justice Jackson in the recent case of *American Communication Association* v. *Douds* (339 U. S. at p. 429), "The international police state has crept over Eastern Europe by deception, coercion, coup d'etat, and terrorism and assassination"; and communism has conquered China and is in the process of attempting to subjugate Korea, Tibet, Indochina, and Malaya, and seeks eventually to enslave free men everywhere; and

Whereas agreements made by any one or more of the free nations with the Communist regime that now enslaves the peoples within the Soviet Union strengthen materially and morally the position of said regime, weaken the resistance to Communist tyranny, and dim the hopes of the people for liberation; such agreements with said regime being used by it only to its advantage for the purposes of accumulating additional strength and to the disadvantage of every other country seeking honorably to compose differences with it; it being one of the prime techniques of communism to disregard truth and honor and to ignore agreements whenever opportune; and

Whereas in contrast to the treacherous fifth columns that operate in the free countries of the world to enslave them to international communism, there exists in the Soviet Union a potential force for freedom composed of the great majority of the peoples of the Soviet Union who yearn for liberty, which force, if activated by the encouragement and positive aid of the free peoples of the world, will enable them to liberate themselves and overthrow the Communist tyranny and help place mankind on the path of peace instead of plunging it into the holocaust of a third world war; and

Whereas past tragic mistakes in the policies of certain of the free nations, including that of the United States, toward the Communist regime in the Soviet Union and a failure fully to understand the true nature, extent, and the enormity of its aggressive designs have substantially contributed toward placing said Communist regime in a position where it now is a clear and present danger to world peace and the free progress of mankind compelling the United States and other free nations again to undertake a vast program of armament expenditures; and

Whereas while we rearm with reluctance and would prefer to devote our energies to peace, we are determined to defend our freedom; and

Whereas rearmament alone coupled with an attempt to compose differences with the Communist regime by treaties and agreements leaving undisturbed said regime and its present enormous conquests of aggression will, over a period of years, place a crushing burden of armaments upon the free world that eventually could well, of itself, destroy freedom; and such agreements and treaties would tend to stabilize said regime in its conquests and give a benediction to a way of life that has declared war on all human nature under its control; and

Whereas the world cannot long continue to exist half slave and half free: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States hereby reaffirms the historic friendship of the American people with the Russian people and other peoples of the Soviet Union, between whom and the American people there are innumerable ties of kinship, and concerning whose mutual aspirations for democracy, liberty, and justice there has always been alliance; that the American motives for these aspirations lie deep because the United States of America was founded and has been built largely by the oppressed peoples from all countries.

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States on behalf of the American people hereby expresses the firm conviction that the peoples of the Soviet Union have the right to the basic rights and freedoms for which they have long struggled, and for which in World War II they, together with other people, shed their blood, among which rights and freedoms are:

(a) The right of the people to life, liberty, and private ownership of property; the right of an accused to a speedy and public trial in accordance with principles of law and justice.

(b) The freedom of religion, of speech, of thought, and of the press.

(c) The right of the people to peaceably assemble, to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures.

(d) The freedom of families from undue state interference and control, and the right of parents in the education of their own children.

(e) The freedom of movement within the country and of travel abroad and upon the high seas, together with the freedom to engage in commerce and pursuits of private enterprise and in all peaceful activities.

(f) The right of peasants to their own land, to work it as they see fit and to dispose of the fruits of their labor as they see fit.

(g) The right of the workers to select freely the type and place of their employment, and to obtain equitable wages and decent working hours and conditions through the organization of their own truly independent trade unions.

(h) The right of intellectuals to freedom of scientific and artistic creation, to freedom of cultural intercourse with the whole world, and to establishment of educational, scientific, and cultural institutions independent of state control.

(i) The right of political prisoners of all classes to immediate liberation and aid in rehabilitation.

(j) The freedom of the Russian peoples and the other peoples of the Soviet Union to command their armed forces to defend their legitimate interests, and the freedom of the armed forces from being used by the Communist tyranny as an aggressive force either against its own people or against other nations.

SEC. 3. It is further expressed to be the firm conviction of the American people that the peoples within the Soviet Union have the right of self-determination to be governed by their own consent based on the free expression of popular will including the right of any of the nations within the Soviet Union to choose its own form of government and also the right to form a free federation;

SEC. 4. The Congress of the United States, on behalf of the American people, recognizes the right of the peoples within the Soviet Union to liberate themselves from Communist tyranny and to overthrow and bring to justice their oppressors; but solemnly pledges that the common struggle against imperialist communism in which this Nation, together with other free nations, is now engaged is not directed against those who have been misled by communism through no fault of their own or those who have unwittingly served the small clique in control of the Communist regime, provided they break with communism;

SEC. 5. To assist in bringing about the liberation of the peoples within the Soviet Union at the earliest possible date and in a peaceful manner the Congress of the United States hereby requests the President of the United States—

(a) to continue his efforts to formulate a foreign policy which recognizes the essentially evil nature of the international Communist regime, which is consolidating the military and industrial potential of the Soviet Union and the other areas which it has conquered for the destruction of the United States and all free nations and the usurpation of power to foster communism throughout the entire world, and which policy realizes that no real peace can exist in the world for either the peoples of the Soviet Union or the American people until the power of Communist tyranny in the world is destroyed, and which policy distinguishes between the Communist regime and the people enslaved by them;

(b) to terminate diplomatic relations with and withdraw United States recognition of the present Communist regime of the Soviet Union because of our friendship and regard for the peoples of the Soviet Union and our realization that this Communist regime is not a true government responsible to the

people, and to make no further agreements with or commitments to the present Soviet regime that would tend in any way to maintain, stabilize, or further extend their power over the peoples enslaved by them;

(c) to direct our representatives in the United Nations—

(1) to demand the expulsion of the present Communist regime of the Soviet Union from the United Nations because of its persistent violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations;

(2) to demand that free elections be held in the Soviet Union under the supervision of the United Nations after a preparatory period necessary to eliminate the effects of Communist terror, in order to reestablish peace and justice in the Soviet Union and better secure the international peace and security; and

(d) To carry out plans to provide material aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other Communist-dominated countries, including the following methods:

(1) Aid to and appropriate utilization of escapees and persons liberated from the Soviet Union and other Communist-dominated countries desirous of combating communism, as is authorized under section 101 (a) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, especially by forming those willing into national military units;

(2) Encouragement of effective resistance activities in and defection from the Soviet Union and other Communist-dominated countries;

(3) Cooperation with and encouragement of private individuals and private organizations desirous of combating communism, including nationality organizations and groups whose members have an origin or particular interest in the Soviet Union and other Communist-dominated countries; and

(4) The use of political and psychological methods to expose and combat the world Communist tyranny and to rekindle devotion to the universal principles of freedom, independence, and human dignity which are set forth in the American Declaration of Independence.

SOUTH CAROLINA'S OFFICIAL FLAG

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, at a reception recently given for the President by ladies of the Congressional Club, I was much impressed by the beautiful display of the flag of the United States surrounded by the flags of the States. The many varied colored and designed flags presented a beautiful picture. Next to the flag of our country, the most impressive one was the Palmetto flag of my State. On one side of my desk in the House Office Building stands the red, white, and blue colors of my country, and on the other side stands the flag of blue and white of South Carolina. The history of our country's flag is generally known. The history of the flags of our States, I fear, is not sufficiently known. The following is a brief history of South Carolina's flag:

Long may our palmetto banner of blue
With its white tree and crescent float over our State,
Showing the faith of our patriots true,
Who have left in our hands precious Liberty's fate.

Our flag as well as our State has had a remarkable and glorious history. Both State and flag originated in the struggle for independence from Britain and they have ever since been joined always in the fight for freedom.

It seems to have been in the late summer of 1775 that our flag was born. It was designed in its first form by Gen. William Moultrie, who relates the circumstances himself:

A little time after we were in possession of Fort Johnson (September 1775), it was thought necessary to have a flag for the purpose of signals: (as there was no national or State flag at that time) I was desired by the council of safety to have one made, upon which, as the State troops were clothed in blue, and the fort was garrisoned by the first and second regiments, who wore a silver crescent (sic) on the front of their caps; I had a large blue flag made with a crescent in the dexter corner, to be in uniform with the troops. This was the first American flag which was displayed in South Carolina: On its being first hoisted, it gave some uneasiness to our timid friends, who were looking forward to a reconciliation: They said it had the appearance of a declaration of war; and Captain Thornborough, in the *Tamer*, sloop of war, lying in Rebellion Road, would look upon it as an insult, and a flag of defiance, and he would certainly attack the fort; but he knew his own force, and knew the weight of our metal; he therefore kept his station and contented himself with spying us.

It was this plain blue flag with the white crescent that suffered its baptism of fire June 28, 1776, when a British fleet of 11 armed vessels bombarded the unfinished fort on Sullivan's Island.

It was in that hard-fought battle that a British shot broke the flag staff and the flag fell outside the ramparts. Sgt. William Jasper, Second Regiment of the Regular South Carolina troops, mentioned it to Colonel—later General—William Moultrie: "Colonel, don't let us fight without our color." "How can you help it," replied the colonel, "the staff is gone?" "Then I will replace it," cried Jasper, who leaped over the high wall and rescued the flag. He tied it to a sponge staff and stuck it on the parapet near the enemy. Standing there by the flag he gave three cheers and then went back to work his gun until the battle was over and the broken fleet had retired in dismay. Like one of Sir Walter Scott's heroes, Sergeant Jasper in effect—

Stood for his country's glory fast,
And nailed his colours to the mast!

The chief executive of South Carolina, President John Rutledge, came in person to thank the garrison for its brave defense of Charlestown—now Charleston—in a fort which experts had supposed to be untenable. President Rutledge took his own sword from his side and presented it to Sergeant Jasper to honor him for his brave deed in saving the flag. The fort was named Fort Moultrie in honor of its intrepid commander, and somewhat later a white palmetto tree was placed upright in the center of the flag. This tree was added not only to relieve the unusual plainness of the banner as first hastily raised by General Moultrie, but to give recognition that the palmetto had protected the State in time of extreme danger. Where harder woods would have broken and splintered when struck by cannonballs, the palmetto logs, so unusual for the construction of a fortress, were sufficiently soft and spongy to allow the shot to sink into the wood without much damage to surrounding structures. And so the palmetto, which beautifies our coast in peace and which saved our State in war, was added to our State flag, for which General Moultrie's blue banner with the white crescent in the corner furnished the basic design.

It was adopted in its present form by the general assembly as the national flag of South Carolina in 1861. Some of the suggestions which were discussed in that year by the general assembly or its committees include the following interesting designs:

White, with a green palmetto tree upright thereon; and the union blue, with a white increscent.

Red, with palmetto of natural color, upright in the center—blue union, with white increscent.

Blue, with a golden palmetto upright upon a white oval in the center thereof, and a white increscent in the upper flagstaff corner of the flag.

The plans to put more color in the flag were promoted by the senate, whereas the house preferred to avoid any great change, and saw the advantage of a simple design much like that which had so early endeared itself to South Carolina patriots. This latter counsel prevailed, and the banner well known to us, blue with a white palmetto upright in the center and a white increscent in the upper flagstaff corner, became the emblem of the independent republic of South Carolina.

Upon forming, with other Southern States, the Confederate States of America, this flag remained as the State flag of South Carolina, and was not changed when she was reinstated in the Union. It is still our State symbol of sovereignty and freedom. And there should be no conflict of loyalty or of authority. The one who is disloyal to his State cannot be trusted by his country. He who loves his State will be loyal to the greater Union of which it is a part.

I am glad that the flag has come down to us with so little change from the early days of our American War of Independence. An old flag means more than a new flag; it assumes added significance as our State goes on from glory to glory. The flag is the symbol of the State—and what a wonderful State it is—with its level farms and its granite hills, its forests and plains, its rivers and lakes, its cities thriving with expanding industry.

But the flag represents particularly our cultural heritage—the love of freedom in the hearts of men who prefer peace but are willing to battle and, if necessary, to die to maintain their rights. Our State flag has always stood for local self-government and against the tyranny, potential or real, of distant centralized force. On this issue our embryo flag defeated the British at Fort Moultrie; on this same issue our flag went with Lee to Appomattox, there to lay down its arms but not its principles;

since that day our South Carolina flag has signalized the defeat of Spanish tyranny with Dewey at Manila Bay, has inspired our men to victory over Kaiserism and Hitlerism in two World Wars, and is today waving gloriously in Korea in the struggle of States rights against Stalinism.

But in it all we have learned that the victories of peace are even more to be desired than the winning of wars. And in both war and peace our palmetto flag represents our beloved State. It stands for the sum total of our history, and I should like to mention names of men who have made it what it is and have increased its glory by their loyalty and sacrifice; but the list is too long and selection too difficult.

Our flag brings to us the challenge of the future. The boys and girls growing up in the Palmetto State will determine the honor of our flag in the days to come. To these energetic youth and to every South Carolina patriot I commend these words expressing the spiritual nature of the flag and our relation to it; they are by the late Franklin K. Lane, who was Secretary of the Interior under President Wilson:

I am not the flag; not at all. I am but its shadow. I am whatever you make me, nothing more. I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. * * * I am the day's work of the weakest man, and the largest dream of the most daring. * * * I am the clutch of an idea, and the reasoned purpose of resolution. I am no more than you believe me to be and I am all that you believe I can be. I am whatever you make me, nothing more.

So in the words of our own State song:

Throw thy bold banner to the breeze!
Front with thy ranks the threatening seas,
Like thine own proud armorial trees, Carolina!

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTATIONS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the rapid increase in the importation of residual fuel oil is alarming. This is the oil shipped into this country and dumped on the seaboard after the gasoline has been extracted from the crude oil.

During the month of January 1952, an average of 418,032 barrels were dumped daily as compared with a daily average of 498,200 barrels for January 1953. In February of 1952 the daily average amounted to 382,650 barrels as compared with the February 1953 daily average of 431,245 barrels. These figures were released by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, coming from a coal-mining district and realizing that 4 barrels are equal to a ton of coal, we can readily see the impact that these importations are having on our coal industry and throwing the miners out of employment. Each coal miner in this country averages a little better than 7 tons per day. During the month of January 1952, 105,000 tons of coal per day was displaced as a result of these residual-oil importations, and for the corresponding period in 1953, we lost our market for 125,000 tons of coal.

Recently a change in the reciprocal trades agreement with Venezuela reducing the import tax from 21 cents per barrel to 5¼ cents per barrel stepped up importations considerably.

On June 2, 1950, I appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare protesting against such importations. When we consider the fact that in 1946 only 44,467,000 barrels were imported as compared with 128 million barrels in the year of 1951, we can readily realize the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. Speaker, this is the only basic industry that is being crippled by these importations and we are hopeful that the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee will consider legislation to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil separately from the renewal of the reciprocal trade agreements in general.

I have been advised by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that thoughtful consideration is being given to a proposal to consider such legislation separately on its own merits.

We are hopeful that we will be able to obtain separate hearings before the Ways and Means Committee or a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee at an early date.

TREND OF NEW FARM POLICIES

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House an article by Mr. Alfred D. Stedman in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of March 1, 1953, in which he makes some observations on the trend of new farm policies:

CAN BENSON WIN?

Becoming crystal clear is the downright earnestness in Secretary Ezra T. Benson's purpose to help agriculture back to a free competitive system after 1954 when present Federal price props expire. To him this means a free market for farmers thereafter, with a minimum of permanent reliance on Federal price supports.

Can Benson win that coming struggle? Perhaps, if the main hazard is seen and removed ahead of time. Happily, that hazard seems to have been recognized and tabbed by both Benson and his chief. For Mr. Benson has noted frankly that farmers' chances to discard Government props will depend in part on the willingness of other groups to do the same. And President Eisenhower has taken his stand for extension by this Congress of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for lowering tariffs.

The point is that the present Government price props and economic restraints did not originate on the farm. They were demanded and won in the 1920's and 1930's by an agriculture that balked at going unprotected in a tariff-protected economy. So now a return to free markets and free competition has to be shared by all, including those tariff-protected industries that would get some real competition from abroad. Eisenhower himself has best stated the importance to peace of binding our allies to us with mutual ties of two-way trade.

Some tariffs have been lowered and some remain very high. On Government purchases, the Buy America Act adds 25 percent to the existing tariff wall. With the Government a big buyer of materials for farm improvements and building, that gets to be a substantial cost factor. It comes on top of a 20-percent rate on plywood, 10 percent on lumber, and tariffs on copper, fencing, and other materials. Henry Ford II told how a foreign defense bidder figured to pay a 45-percent import duty, and still compelled two United States firms to cut their bids nearly 50 percent on an Army contract. And this was to get them down inside the 25-percent margin of advantage that's given under the Buy America Act. Figure it out for yourself. Evidently their original bids could have been four times as high and their final bids double the foreign competitor's net bid, after 45 percent export duty.

Fortunately, the issue of tariff subsidies to industry and agriculture comes up in Congress for settlement now, a year ahead of next year's struggle to scale down farm price supports enough so free markets can operate. Thus farm groups will know in advance whether there are to be really free competitive markets all around, or not. If the industrial tariffs are scaled down, Secretary Benson will get a lot of farm support for lowering farm price props. This support will come especially from farm groups having big stakes in export trade, with main farm opposition from dairy and beef men. But if industrial tariff walls are to stay up, Secretary Benson's earnestness and devotion may not be enough in his fight. Not very rosy may be the prospects of winning farmers over to free markets and low price props for themselves alone.

DISCHARGE OF MEMBERS OF THE STAFF OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, several days ago it was stated on the floor of the House as a fact that 15 members of the staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities and two investigators had been discharged because they happened to be Democrats, and were replaced by Republicans.

I made an investigation of the real facts in the matter and I find that one investigator was discharged. He was the man whose incompetency was demonstrated beyond peradventure of doubt; and, incidentally, he was a Republican. Six very minor clerks were discharged, and but two of them were replaced.

I am making this statement so that you will know what the facts are.

MALENKOV AS SUCCESSOR TO STALIN

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, the news from Russia concerning the illness of Josef Stalin is fraught with the gravest consequences to the free world. While Stalin was utterly cruel and ruthless, he was more cautious and conservative than the younger Bolsheviks who surrounded him in the circle of power. He followed the advice of Lenin that the way to conquer the free world was through fifth columns of Communists, fellow-travelers, and suckers. This strategy proved extremely successful. Only our pride and partisanship keeps us from acknowledging that Stalin's ability to outsmart and outgeneral American and British leadership enabled Russia to emerge from a third rate power to the status of a world menace. Through these tactics Stalin was able to weld the manpower and resources of nearly one-half the world into an unprecedented striking force.

More than 10 years ago a former top-ranking Communist official told me that Stalin would be succeeded by Georgi M. Malenkov. He described Malenkov to me as the most sinister and, at the same time, the ablest leader he had ever known. He said that Malenkov's idol and pattern was Genghis Khan, whom he strives to emulate in every way. At the time I was told this, Malenkov was a minor functionary. Since then, I have witnessed his spectacular rise to power. I have read everything about him that is available. It is my belief that if he succeeds Stalin, Communist Russia will enter into the third phase of its program for world conquest, the military invasion and occupation of Europe and Asia.

Mr. Speaker, there is little time left to put our house in order, economically, militarily and spiritually, to survive the storm which will increase in momentum and fury if a second Genghis Khan mounts the throne of the czars.

MIGRATORY WATERFOWL PROTECTION

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 3, I introduced H. R. 3661, which will be of interest to all who are concerned in the conservation of our migratory waterfowl.

Since the 1947 session of their legislature, the State of South Dakota has excluded nonresident hunting of migratory waterfowl within the borders of the State.

The reasons generally given, insofar as I can determine, are that it is a conservation measure calculated to help the State develop certain wildlife areas and to control certain out-of-State sportsmen that had secured monopoly of the better waterfowl passes in their State. Whether the method taken by their legislature or other methods within their control would be the better approach are at least open to debate.

In the 81st Congress, I introduced a bill calculated to impress this situation on the sportsmen of America as well as the State of South Dakota and the Department of the Interior. I was given to understand that this was a temporary device and would soon be repealed. However, in the recently adjourned session of the legislature the repealer was defeated and it may not come up again until 1955.

With a short statement of the facts one can draw their own conclusion as to whether this is a conservation measure or a measure for other purposes.

In 1951, the last fiscal year available, South Dakota sold 59,125 waterfowl stamps, 10,925 more than in 1950, with a population of 652,740 by the census of 1950. Even without any resident hunters this means that 1 out of every 11 residents is a waterfowl hunter, by far the largest per capita in the United States. For the year 1953 their Federal grants-in-aid for the conservation program are $172,598.10.

My measure will not in any way disturb these programs and it will promote conservation without discrimination. Unless some such steps are taken the whole program for international cooperation under the waterfowl treaties are in jeopardy.

The Legislature of Minnesota is now considering retaliatory legislation and a so-called tit-for-tat bill has passed the lower house.

Let us not Balkanize our entire migratory waterfowl program.

IN DEFENSE OF STANDBY PRICE AND WAGE CONTROLS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to give the President standby authorities to freeze prices and wages in times of economic emergency for a period not exceeding 90 days. This authority seems to me to be the very least we can do in the way of economic preparedness to meet the dangers of further Communist aggression. It is not enough to build up our military strength and to expand defense production. We must also guard against the serious weakening of the economy from the inflationary pressures that take place when a crisis develops in foreign affairs.

I am sympathetic with those who fear the expansion of economic controls in ordinary times. I do not wish to rely on direct controls over prices and wages under normal circumstances. But, unfortunately, from the point of view of our national security, conditions are not normal. The international situation is such that we dare not jeopardize the security of the Nation by ignoring the possibility of an emergency suddenly developing in our relations with Russia and her satellites. Our position of world leadership calls for a realistic appraisal of all forseeable contingencies and for a determined effort to keep the United States as the arsenal of democracy. We cannot afford to weaken our democratic allies as well as our own economic system through failure to give the President authority to take prompt action to maintain economic stability when the country is confronted by an emergency situation.

There are those who are opposed to giving the President the limited authority stipulated in my bill, because they fear that we may continue direct controls longer than necessary. Such a timorous attitude at best is a sign of a lack of sense of proportion under the political and economic conditions of 1953 and at worst a manifestation of a mental outlook that chooses to hug illusions rather than face up to the realities of the world as it is. It is not through shortsighted policies based upon fear that we will preserve the free enterprise system. We are likely to be much more successful if we shed such fears and illusions and learned from the experience of the past to take the necessary elementary precautions to protect the American people against the menace of inflation.

One does not have to go back very far to see what happens to the price structure when the economy is confronted by emergency conditions. During the 7 months following the outbreak of the Korean war in June 1950, prices rose rapidly with many dislocations in the productive system. Sensitive spot market prices of 22 basic raw materials rose 52 percent; producers' prices for all commodities traded in wholesale markets advanced 16 percent and consumer prices increased 8 percent. If there was a rush to buy on the part of consumers, a speculative buildup of inventories by business firms, and an acceleration of the wage-price spiral when we were confronted by a limited war in Korea, we can certainly expect more ruinous types of inflationary pressure when we have to shift over to a large-scale war economy.

There can be little doubt that had we not waited 7 months before enacting price control legislation we could have prevented a large part of the inflationary price rises between June 1950 and January 1951. Moreover, once we permit distortions and inequities to develop because of the absence of an across-the-board freeze on all prices, wages, and salaries, then the job of administering a control program becomes most difficult and at the same time hampering and delaying the progress of the defense production effort.

It flies in the face of experience to contend, as some do, that it is unnecessary to have standby authority because the Congress will enact the required legislation immediately upon the development of a crisis. But it is foolish to forget that even after Pearl Harbor it took 4 months before a price control act was passed. It took almost twice as long after Korea. Is it not the better part of wisdom to give the President the power to freeze prices and wages for 3 months so that the consumer and businessman will have the assurance that prices will remain stable while the Congress enacts a controls law that will best meet the

conditions confronting the country as a result of the emergency? It is to the best interest of the country that the Congress act now and not wait only until the crisis is upon us. The leaders in the Kremlin can strike quickly. Let them know that we are prepared to move speedily on the economic as well as on the military front to meet any contingency of that kind.

TEXT OF JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is my pleasure, and I also feel it is perhaps my duty, under the circumstances, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, to call attention to the fact that I am this day inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which you will receive tomorrow morning, a copy of the exact text of many of the jury instructions recently given in what is commonly known as the Los Angeles Communist jury trial in which the distinguished judge, the Honorable William C. Mathes gave said jury instructions. The defendants were found guilty.

As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee again, I was naturally interested, and also, having practiced law actively for about a quarter of a century in my native State of California before I came to the Congress, beginning the 79th Congress, I was sure it would be to my own benefit and education, to make somewhat of a study of the jury instructions given by the Federal judges in the several Federal court jurisdictions, where these Communist jury cases have been tried. But because the Los Angeles case appeared to be the most recent, and, because the instructions there given by the Federal judge, appeared to be substantially the same as those given in the other jurisdictions, for these and other apparent reasons satisfactory to me, I selected the instructions in the comparatively recent Los Angeles case which I felt would be most pertinent for the information and enlightenment of you, my colleagues, in the premises. Nor are the instructions highly techincal either. Read them. Then observe and consider the issues through the instructions that come before an American jury and court, arising out of a criminal indictment against American citizens who are charged with conspiracy to violently overthrow our constitutional form of government.

Another reason, I believe it will be reasonably profitable to ycu one and all to read these instructions, is that I am aware that several of you have come to me as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee and asked me what sort of instructions were given by the judges to the jury in such cases. Also, I am not infrequently asked by Members and others, whether or not it is a fact that there is evidence of real substantial actual conspiracy to use any force or violence. Also, whether or not it is the present Government of the United States or, whether it is some government in the mythical distant future, which the Commies talk about. In light of these and other such questions; in light of the importance of these jury trials in the history of our national security and defense against aggressive and military communism, as well as against subversive communism, I wish to take your time to read one of these recent and significant jury instructions. And, of course, my colleagues, each and everyone of these instructions are given in accordance with the existing law of the land, through the decisions of our highest American courts.

Here, for instance, is No. 12–G given by Federal Judge Mathes in the recent Los Anegeles case; but, before reading it to you, I specifically call your attention to the fact that the judge told the jury in it, that the Government referred to in this Los Angeles case, which the jury had just found the Communist defendants guilty of being in a conspiracy to overthrow and destroy by violence and force, was the present Government of the United States. I read said instruction No. 12–G:

> The burden is upon the prosecution to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendants conspired to advocate the duty and necessity of the overthrow and destruction of the Government by force and violence. The Government referred to is the present Government of the United States, which does afford to the people democratic means for bringing about such changes as they desire. It is not some hypothetical future government which affords no such means.

Need I therefore remind you again that your own House Un-American Activities Committee has a continuing and most definite daily challenge and very strenuous responsibility, to bring to light and uncover and reveal to the light of truth, honesty, patriotism, and honest-to-God American citizenship, the fact that these subversive Communists in the United States of America are, in fact, members of an international conspiracy to actually overthrow and destroy the present Government of the United States?

Mr. Speaker, this is what the jury in Los Angeles and in these other cities had found these conspiratorial, totalitarian, unpatriotic, hypocritical, dangerous, ungrateful citizens to be guilty of. This is the sort of people in our Nation whom I, as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, am primarily interested in uncovering to the light of day with their dastardly conceived plans against our American freedoms. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I will fight with all my vitality for your right to speak your mind about orderly changes in our self-government processes.

It is this very sort of a conspiracy, represented by the present subversive Communists in the United States, which has already claimed the lives of many patriotic and distinguished American lads and which this very day is part and parcel of the aggressive military attack by Soviet and Chinese communism in South Korea. My colleagues, need I say to you that we owe it to those great dead and to the great unborn that we shall do our dead-level best in being eternally vigiliant and vigorous in our respective areas of American citizenship responsibilities, privileges, and duties? We cannot, with any feeling of comfort or of pride within us, live in these days of stress and strain and rivalry between the Communist ideology and our own American way of life, dare be slothful about the destiny of our children and our children's children. Let us, therefore, live vibrantly for our faith in the precepts of this great Nation in the legislative halls of which we have the responsibility of setting an example worthy of the blessings of God and of our fellowmen.

SHIPMENTS OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS TO THE SOVIET BLOC AS PRIOR COMMITMENTS

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, first, continuing my fight to stop shipments of strategic goods from going to the Iron Curtain countries, I would like to point out another important legal leak, that is, the continued fulfillment of prior commitments made before the adoption of the United States embargo policy.

The United States has reluctantly agreed to the shipment of $2,500,000 worth of strategic materials from our allies to Iron Curtain countries as exceptions to the embargo. These exceptions are part of the contracts with the Soviet bloc countries made before passage of the Battle Act—Public Law 213, 82d Congress—which embargoes these particular materials with the penalty of cutting off all United States aid unless the President of the United States decides it is to the security interest of the United States of America to make an exception. These contracts are known as prior commitments.

(a) Still outstanding on the books for future delivery are prior commitments for strategic materials from our allies to the Soviet bloc amounting to over three times the $2.5 million which have already been excepted.

(b) The problem of prior commitments is one of the major problems facing General Eisenhower's administration in stopping strategic shipments to the Communists. It is one of the major headaches Mr. Stassen will have in administering the Battle Act, but it is one that must be successfully met.

Second. On the good side of the ledger is the fact that over 60 countries who are recipients of our aid, and certain other nonrecipient countries have made no shipments to China, Russia, or the satellite countries of items classified as arms, ammunition, implements of war and atomic-energy materials in accordance with the embargo provisions of the Battle Act where no exceptions are permissible under any conditions, subject to the total loss of American aid.

Third. The President of the United States, upon the advice of the Battle Act Administrator, has made six exceptions

on the basis that it was to the security interests of the United States to do so. Reasons given include: The belief that NATO would be undermined by cutting off aid to these countries; the fact that Western European nations are cooperating to a very large degree in denying the Communists strategic materials; the desire to protect the $25 billion investment in western defense made by the United States since World War II; the feeling that cutting off aid might increase the flow of strategic goods to the Soviet bloc; and the allowance for the Nation's determination to keep its contracts which were made in good faith.

(a) An exception was made on the delivery by the Netherlands to Poland of about $240,000 worth of petroleum exploration equipment.

(b) An exception was made on the sale of a $11,000 grinding machine by Italy to Rumania.

(c) An exception was made on a 13,000-ton tanker built by Denmark and delivered to Russia. It should be emphasized that Denmark has recently laid the keel of a second tanker for delivery to Russia in the future, in further fulfillment of a prior commitment which resulted in the delivery of the tanker last summer, for which an exception has already been granted. The Administrator of the Battle Act has placed this type of strategic goods in the category where exceptions are possible if determined to be in the security interests of the United States rather than under the category of war materials for which no exceptions can be made under any circumstances. These tankers can haul jet fuel to kill American boys.

(d) An exception was made to France for $959,245 worth of boring machines, valves, chemical equipment, compressors, electronic equipment, aluminum, and ball bearings which went to Poland and Czechoslovakia.

(e) An exception was made to Italy for $940,000 worth of rolling-mill equipment, ball and roller bearings which went to Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

(f) An exception was made to the United Kingdom for $583,818 worth of forging machines, special metalworking machines, pumps, valves, rolling-mill equipment, balances, locomotives and parts, specialized testing devices, ball and roller bearings, greases and oils, nickel, and one blower which went to Poland, Hungary, Russia, Czechoslovakia, and China.

Poland got approximately half the $2.5 million total, with Czechoslovakia second, Hungary third, and the Soviet Union fourth. All of the shipments went to those four countries with the exception of 50 gallons of lubricating oils and greases for medical apparatus. This shipment, valued at $66, went to China.

Fourth. However, it seems to me that the governments of Western Europe have prior commitments to make their own people secure, to meet their obligations to the United Nations and to help fight for the common cause of the freedom-loving nations of the world which should take precedence over prior commitments to Russia and her satellites. Our allies maintain that these shipments are not very important. However, by the time the round of exceptions is made to countries for shipments of strategic materials, by the time limited shipments of strategic materials from various nations are made according to international agreements, by the time noncooperating countries send their strategic goods to the Communists either directly or through the free ports of continental Europe, by the time illegal trade is consummated—all added to what Russia and her satellites can produce on their own—the build-up of the Communist war machines is assisted substantially from the West.

(a) The problem presented by prior commitments was recognized by the administrator at the time the Battle Act went into effect. The coordinating countries were requested to agree to defer all deliveries of prohibited items against outstanding contracts until an inventory could be taken of such commitments and an evaluation made of their significance. These nations refused to do this, although they have cooperated in submitting a careful inventory of their outstanding prior commitments and have agreed to cancel the delivery of a number of such items which have been contracted for.

(b) It is easy to understand the reluctance of our allies to break contracts previously entered into in good faith. It is difficult to understand their apparent indifference to the benefit derived by the Communist countries from such deliveries while fighting is going on in Korea and while further Russian aggression threatens the Middle East, Indochina, and Europe. Officials of several European governments explained that their governments had a policy and tradition of living up to their contracts, with an implication that the United States perhaps had a different policy and tradition. The United States, however, when it takes emergency action for its defense, makes its commodity allocations, price ceilings and export license limitations without regard to prior commitments. Ordinarily, such regulations go into effect immediately and previous contracts have to be adjusted accordingly.

(c) I believe that the primary explanation of the European attitude on this point is that the Europeans regard the current international situation, including the Korean war, as being less of an emergency than do the people of the United States. They do not have as many boys coming home in caskets. A technical but absurd point is made by them that nobody is at war with Russia or her European satellites so there is no reason to cut off trade with them. Also, they seem to place the economic advantage they gain from such trade above the fact that Russia has voided these doubtful obligations of the free nations to continue fulfillment of these prior commitments by virtual enslavement of millions of people, by her instigating and backing the Communist fight against the United Nations forces in Korea and by her serious threat of further aggression in the Middle East, Indochina, Europe, and elsewhere. They minimize the military gain by the Soviet bloc from such trade. I believe our allies have prior commitments to make their own people secure, to meet their obligations to the United Nations and to help fight for the common cause of the freedom-loving nations of the world which should take precedence over the prior commitments to Russia and her satellites.

HON. SAM RAYBURN AND HON. ROBERT CROSSER

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be privileged to join with my colleagues in paying this deserving tribute to 2 great men who have on yesterday served this august body 40 years. Our beloved ex-Speaker—SAM RAYBURN—and ROBERT "DADDY" CROSSER have had a long and distinguished career in the House of Representatives. They have served with honor and distinction during some of the most crucial and difficult days of our country. They have made a lasting and courageous record in carrying out the principles of our democratic form of government and have won acclaim not only from the Members of the Congress, but of our country.

The continuous service of these 2 great legislators over a period of 40 years proves that the people whom they represent in the great State of Texas and the beautiful State of Ohio have profound faith and confidence in their leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to have served in the House of Representatives and to be associated with Speaker RAYBURN and "DADDY" CROSSER, and to congratulate them on their outstanding character, their fairness, and unstinting devotion to their fellow men and to the service of their country. I know that the world today could use many more such men who have the qualities and the courage to fight for the rights and welfare of this Nation.

As a friend and admirer of our former beloved Speaker, and "DADDY" CROSSER, as he is affectionately known by all of us, I am happy indeed to wish them many years of continued service in the House of Representatives, their district, and their country. My sincere hope is that they will both continue in good health and that they will be spared for many years to come.

HON. ROBERT CROSSER

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as has already been stated, the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, of Cleveland, was first elected to Congress 40 years ago yesterday. His service was not continuous but I think that he has served altogether for 34 years and that he has served continuously for 30 years. I

could consume an hour in talking about this man of many fine qualities. He is highly educated and has been a man of force. Instinctively he has always been a man whose word was good. He was also a very forceful speaker. These characteristics made him a good legislator. When I came to Congress 28 years ago yesterday, I remember meeting the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]. He was then a vigorous, red-headed man of fine physique who looked as if he had come right off the football field. For years he retained his strength but as you have seen him in the last few years you know that he has been seriously handicapped by illness. In spite of his illness he has by reason of his indomitable courage kept on with his work and he has been reelected successively several times. I have always considered BOB CROSSER as a man whose character is above reproach and I am glad to add a word by reason of my personal friendship and high respect for him.

OUR NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the United States owns and controls 179 national parks and monuments. They are visited by more than 40 million people each year. These parks and monuments include the Statue of Liberty, the Petrified Forest, and a volcano in Hawaii. With that thought in mind, I have asked Mr. Conrad L. Wirth, Director of National Park Service, to appear before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Monday morning at 10 o'clock. He is to give us a report on the national park system and the steps that they have taken to carry out the responsibilities which the Congress has placed upon them for the protection, care, and interpretation of the great scenic and historic treasures of the United States. Mr. Wirth has informed me that he will bring with him some of his assistants and a series of colored slides in order better to explain the national park system and the work that the Service is doing. This presentation will take about three-quarters of an hour to an hour at the most. After that time Mr. Wirth and his assistants will be available for any questions by the committee.

I am bringing this to your attention because I feel that our national park system is of tremendous importance to the Nation and in the hope that other Members of Congress might care to sit in and listen to this presentation. I know that Mr. Wirth has shown some slides to the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations headed by the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman BEN JENSEN; however, it would give me a great deal of pleasure if that subcommittee might find time to join us.

I firmly believe that the national parks represent the best the Nation has in scenic and historic treasures. The United States was the first nation in the world to provide for the protection of such things as these for its people. They are an expression of freedom and democracy in that they belong to all of us and are for the use and enjoyment of all of us. I feel also that the national park system is playing an important part in strengthening not only the social well-being of our Nation, but its economic stability as well. Travel to the parks is important in our national economy. I am told that 28 States now maintain that recreational travel in which the national parks play so large a part, is considered as one of their three largest industries.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee handles all the basic legislation for the National Park Service. However, we always welcome suggestions from our colleagues on the other committees in Congress. In order to better understand what the National Park Service is doing and what the national park system stands for, we cordially invite you to this presentation in our hearing room, on the third floor of the new House Office Building.

THE FISHING INDUSTRY NEEDS ASSISTANCE

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, Blaine, Wash., a town of about 1,700 population, after spending $102,000 of its own funds in recent years, has mortgaged its future by appropriating an additional $250,000 for improvements to its small-boat haven. This refuge is used by hundreds of boats of the fishing fleet from the entire Pacific coast of our country during times of rough weather and storms, and as a landing port for its valuable catch.

The fishing industry is of tremendous importance to the economy of our area. It has been made to suffer by competition with foreign products which are produced by low-cost labor. Its natural resource of raw material has been depleted throughout the years by pollution and by the construction of power dams which block the rivers and interfere with the natural spawning practices of the fish.

In recent years the salmon run in the Puget Sound, particularly in the area contingent to Blaine, Wash., has been showing a gradual but important improvement. This is due primarily to the outstanding efforts of those interested, and the result is a great increase in the number of boats desperately needing such a haven as that provided at Blaine. During the last year this haven, which provides normal moorage for about 60 boats, has been used by nearly 1,000; by actual count 380 boats have been squeezed in and tied up at one time, creating a terrific fire hazard with a potential loss of $5 million to boats and gear alone should a blaze start. These boats come from every harbor in the State of Washington and from as far south as San Pedro, Calif.

In view of the willingness of the people of this aggressive community, themselves to provide half of the necessary funds for this drastically needed improvement, I believe that the project as approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors should be authorized for immediate construction by the Congress.

THE BUDGET

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been in session now since early in January. Of course, since November 7 everybody has known who would be in control of the Congress of the United States, including the other body, and we knew who would be President of the United States. Everybody is interested now in knowing when we are going to get the budget of the new administration. All of the committees of the Congress are uncertain as to how to act and how to proceed in their deliberations in order to cooperate with the administration in getting a balanced budget for this country. One of the great programs enunciated last September and October was to balance the budget. It is very easy to balance the budget, provided you do the balancing on the stump, but when it comes to a practical realization of a balanced budget you will find it is a very, very difficult thing to do. I hope the President will soon be able, instead of being so engrossed in firing experts now in the Government, to present a budget to this Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, I agree with the gentleman. It is about time the present administration sent up a budget.

WHO WILL BALANCE THE BUDGET?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I can sympathize with our Democratic friends. They are worried about balancing the budget and a reduction in taxation—they only had about 20 years to do that job themselves. They gave the people an ever-increasing debt; two wars, one still on hand; an ever greater tax load. I remember when Roosevelt was a candidate. He said he was going to cut 25 percent off the expenditures of the executive departments, and he said he was going to balance the budget. He said he was going to stay on the gold standard. Well, he was in office no more than 6 months—hardly 6 months when he repudiated the whole Democratic platform and never since to this day, except in 1947 and 1948 when the Republicans were in control, in spite of

Brother Truman and all of his wasteful bureaucrats down there, in spite of all of them, the Republican Congress balanced the budget and lowered the tax rates. Now, if you fellows will just quit your unsound approach to this situation, we will again balance the budget, lower taxes, and if the internationalists in both parties join the real Republicans, we will get out of this war.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK—COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order that I may ask my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] if he can announce the program for next week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. May I state to the minority whip, and to the House, that at a meeting of the Committee on Rules this afternoon it is hoped that a rule will be granted on the so-called Hawaiian statehood bill. If so, and we will get permission to file a report on the bill, the bill will be brought up for consideration on Monday. That is bill H. R. 3575. Of course, we know not how much time will be granted under the rule for general debate, but it is expected that we will conclude general debate on the bill on Monday, if it is at all possible, and then read the bill for amendment and complete consideration of the bill on Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, we will have general debate, no matter what length of time might be provided under the rule, and then the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule and we will complete the consideration of the bill on Tuesday?

Mr. ARENDS. That is the hope. Of course, it will be controlled by the rule, and we know not what may be provided in the rule.

Mr. McCORMACK. I mean so that Members may be advised as to the situation it is not intended to complete the consideration of the bill on Monday.

Mr. ARENDS. That is right.

Then, on Wednesday, it is hoped that we will take up the bill H. R. 2330, which is a bill from the Committee on Armed Services having to do with dependency allotments.

The program for Thursday and Friday is at this moment undetermined.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has permission been obtained for the Committee on Rules to file reports?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Does the gentleman intend to bring up House Joint Resolution 200, the secret-agreements resolution, next week?

Mr. ARENDS. It is not contemplated to bring that up next week at this time.

RESOLUTION TO REMOVE RINCON ANNEX POST OFFICE MURALS

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution directing the Administrator of General Services to remove certain mural paintings from the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco, Calif.

These murals, supposedly portraying the early history of the State of California, are an insult to the State, an insult to the intelligence of the public, and anti-American in motif.

They cast a most derogatory and improper reflection on the character of the pioneers, are controversial in design, and tend to promote racial hatred and class warfare.

The murals contain subtle ridicule of characters which are supposed to represent the American people. For example, in a panel where a round-table group is shown an unnecessary shading behind the figure representing the United States makes it appear this person has mule-like ears.

In another panel, by chance or design, the American flag is placed in a secondary position to those of other nations illustrated.

In 1941 a competition was held to select an artist to paint the murals for the Rincon annex post office. The entries were supposed to be open for American artists only, but the one chosen to do the work at that time was not an American citizen, but was a native of Moscow.

Public records and files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities contain enough information on this particular artist's connections and activities with subversive groups and publications to fill seven typewritten pages.

For several years numerous civic groups, fraternal and patriotic organizations, labor unions, newspapers, and individuals have filed protests with the Commission on Public Buildings to have the murals removed.

Support has been pledged by many of my colleagues and information has been brought out on this floor from time to time in very recent years as to what extent subversive elements have invaded the field of American art with their insidious propaganda.

I offer this joint resolution not only in the interest of the people of my State but in the public interest as a whole.

Its passage will insure prompt removal of the murals which, as described in the words of the Society of Western Artists, are "artistically bad, historically absurd, and politically corrupt."

INVESTIGATION BY ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 156) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 125, 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, not to exceed $150,000, including expenditures for the employment of special counsel, experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that I have six resolutions for investigations by standing committees of the House. Every one of those investigations has been authorized by resolutions adopted by this House.

I thought I might mention the six resolutions, and, if there is no objection, we can discuss these resolutions and adopt all of them one by one in their order without delay unless some Members desire to offer a few remarks as each resolution is brought for consideration.

The resolution before the House at the moment is for an investigation by the Armed Services Committee. It provides $150,000, the same amount which the committee had in the 82d Congress.

There is a resolution providing for investigation by the Committee on Education and Labor, which provides $50,000 for making such investigation.

Another resolution which I will offer later calls for $75,000 for investigation by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. This is exactly the amount that was authorized for the committee in the 82d Congress, although $54,000 was returned unexpended. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has a splendid record and usually returns a large part of the funds voted for its use.

I might say at this time that all of these resolutions which I shall offer today provide for investigations during the entire period of the 83d Congress. They are not just for 1 year but they are for a 2-year period.

Another resolution will be offered a little later, with an amendment, providing for $110,000 for investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary, which has already set up at least two subcommittees. This is scarcely more than one-third of the amount of money that was expended by that committee in the 82d Congress.

Another resolution which I shall offer provides $50,000 for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. This committee has had $50,000 in the 80th Congress, $50,000 in the 81st Congress, but had no money in the 82d Congress. A considerable number of problems confront this committee, and I think they are modest in asking for only $50,000.

Perhaps as important as any of the resolutions that are about to be brought before the House is one providing for

$100,000 for the continuation of the investigation by the Ways and Means Committee. This is in fact a continuation of an investigation that has been conducted by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. KING]. I think the investigation made by that committee has saved this Government an enormous sum of money in funds that have been collected and passed into the Treasury by reason of the fact that such investigation has been made.

If there are no questions, I will move the previous question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, I have one question with reference to the last committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the investigation to be made. Will the gentleman tell us how many of the people in the Treasury Department were blanketed over from the political end of it into the career end?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I assume the committee will obtain such information. My answer would be "Yes," but I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], who will take charge of this investigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We were bamboozled into taking that reorganization plan. That is all right, but from the information I have, I had heard they had put a lot of politicians over into these career jobs.

Mr. KEAN. I think what the gentleman says is largely true. That is one thing the committee is going to look into. As far as I can find out, just as the gentleman said, what they did was to find additional and permanent jobs and promotions for people whom they wished to favor for political reasons.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But the gentleman does consider that the King committee has done a very good job in finding funds that should be collected.

Mr. KEAN. Very much so. I think the result of the committee's work has been that hundreds of millions of dollars have flowed into the Treasury.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I asked the gentleman that question because I did not think he wanted to leave the impression that the King committee had not done a good job with respect to the collection of taxes due the Federal Government.

Mr. KEAN. I certainly did not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not very easy to sit here and listen to a lot of statements and charges which in my opinion are not supported by the facts but just picked out of thin air that a lot of career positions were just created for politicians. I do not know that anyone is filling any non-civil-service position under the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue outside of the Commissioner and a few who require State confirmation but that he had to be appointed according to the civil-service law; such persons had to have a civil-service status. That is my understanding. If my understanding is incorrect I would like to have it corrected.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey if he cares to reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KEAN. We have not looked carefully into the details of that, but as I understand no examinations were given under the civil-service laws in practically all of the cases.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be so when a person has a civil-service status.

Mr. KEAN. That is correct; but you can have a very low civil-service status and then be promoted through various grades to these important positions without following the normal civil-service course. That is what occurred.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that happened, but in this case I am not in a position to defend it; I want the facts, and I know my friend from New Jersey does and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] also. As I understand the civil-service law you cannot jump an employee more than two grades, and there are certain restrictions. You cannot take a clerk who has a civil-service status and make him assistant commissioner.

Mr. KEAN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are certain specific requirements and standards established for that position. Everyone I know who occupies a position under the new setup in New England is someone who had a civil-service status. They did not have to have an examination because they had the civil-service status, and the Civil Service Commission established standards or requirements for each position. I know of 1 or 2 cases of men who were collectors who could not meet the civil-service requirements for a position I thought them eminently qualified to fill; they could not be appointed to the positions, however, because they did not meet the requirements. But I know of no one occupying a responsible position who has been shot up there from some low position. Take the district commissioners and the 4 or 5 assistant district commissioners, they are all men who have had comparable positions in the Bureau of Internal Revenue prior to their appointment; that is my understanding.

Mr. KEAN. We are looking into that. We have heard a great many rumors, we have had a lot of letters from people complaining about that; we are going to look into the matter and find out if it is true or if it is not true. If what the gentleman from Massachusetts says is true we will let the people know; if not we will also let them know.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is a very fair statement. That is quite different than saying that they have taken people from low positions and put them into places of responsibility with the inference that they are not able to perform the job. I think the course outlined by the gentleman from New Jersey is a very fair and proper one.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I offer an apology. I want, Mr. Speaker, to apologize to the gentleman from Massachusetts because perhaps some of us were maybe—I was—under a misapprehension in all these cases. I remember when the NLRB was sending out examination blanks to fill positions—and I have had blanks similar to the ones in this case—the blanks came out with many questions and among the questions was: "How much have you contributed to the Democratic local committee for campaign purposes over the years?" There were several questions, but they were upon some of the blanks. If that is an examination, I must apologize to the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the House is now considering a request for a sum of money for an investigation by the Armed Services Committee for the moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New Jersey in his temperate way understood the purpose of my few observations and he responded accordingly.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to go back to the question of the Internal Revenue investigations. The gentleman from New Jersey may perhaps be able to help. Having in mind certain information which came to some of us in the last session indicating that recommendations for prosecutions in reference to income-tax violations from various districts, specifically from the Philadelphia area, were not further prosecuted by the Department of Justice, I would like to inquire whether the gentleman's committee intends to look into the recommendations for prosecutions by internal-revenue sources or Treasury agents, and what happened to them when they went to the Justice Department?

Mr. KEAN. When we complete the present phase of the investigation, the next thing we are going to do is to look into the differences between the Internal Revenue Bureau and the Tax Division of the Justice Department and see what the trouble is and why they have not been cooperating as we feel they should.

Mr. SCOTT. Perhaps the gentleman can get some of the dust brushed off of those old prosecutions and get some information.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further, not for the purpose of injecting extraneous matter but to me an important matter and of concern to me, namely, the fact that many taxpayers make honest mistakes. I am very much concerned with the large percentage of taxpayers who are facing indictment and trial on the ground of fraud where in the past those charged with the responsibility in the Bureau or in the Department of Justice would say there is civil liability only rather than fraud, which carries with it a criminal indictment. I do not expect my friend from New Jersey to make any reply. I just make an observation because I notice there are 3 to 5 times as many recommendations for indictment recently as there were a few years ago. I know my friend from New Jersey will conduct this investigation in a manner where men in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Department of Justice will have no fear of assuming their re-

sponsibility in the making of decisions. In other words, they are not being tried on their judgment; they will be inquired into as to improper actions or anything which might constitute a violation of the law on their part.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 66 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 50 of the 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$100,000" and insert: "$110,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 116 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1953, the expenses of the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 115 by the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 145 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 113, 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 148 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 32, 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 123 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 91, 83d Congress, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for the employment beginning on January 4, 1953, of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House I think has taken notice of the fact that all vouchers have to be approved by the Committee on House Administration. This means that before the Disbursing Office pays any of these warrants by check the vouchers have to be signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. Any vouchers that come in that are not regular and in order will be returned by the committee.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 109 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, mandated islands, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "Affairs", strike out the remainder of line 3 and all of lines 4 and 5 down to and including the word "Affairs)" in line 5.

Line 10, after "Territories", strike out "mandated islands, and possessions," and insert "possessions, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, because of an error, and because of the fact that Puerto Rico has been given different status by the Congress, I offer an amendment to the amendment so as to insert the words "Puerto Rico" after the word "possessions" in line 11.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 11, after "possessions", insert the words "Puerto Rico."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply gives to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the authority it needs to have to meet its responsibilities under the Reorganization Act, and to make investigations into matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee. It also gives the same authority and subpena power as were accorded to the committee in the 82d Congress, and permits the committee to sit and hold hearings any place in the

United States or its Territories and possessions. It is the usual resolution.

I have no further requests for time, and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio has explained the purpose of the resolution, and there being no requests for time on this side, I cannot add anything to what has been said. The resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a statement which I made today:

The most powerful and brutal tyrant the world has ever known has passed from the scene of power. As this is being written, there has been no official announcement of Stalin's death, but it is obvious that the Communist ruler has reached the end of his reign. As the symbol of the most powerful wave of reaction against human progress which the modern world has ever known, Joseph Stalin is also perhaps the most hated and feared man in history.

There will be no frenzied rejoicing in the free world at his death, however. A familiar menace is not so frightening to most of us as an unknown menace. It will be this unknown menace in control of Russia in the immediate future, and no man can predict the course of action which will result when the Politburo is dominated by men whose minds have no concept of the basic values which western civilization prizes. In the struggle for power which is now going on behind the scenes, a dominant leader or faction may seek to gain or consolidate control by changing the cold war into a hot one, or again the struggle may bring about a long-term change in Russian policy, a drawing in of the tentacles to concentrate on the internecine warfare in the Kremlin.

We can be sure that there will be a struggle for power, no matter what official reports are made available on this side of the Iron Curtain. In all of history no dictator has peacefully passed on his power to a successor. Stalin himself took control of Russia only after years of savage civil strife following the incapacity of Lenin. No supreme board of directors or other oligarchy in the pattern of the Politburo will be able to assume permanent control of the Communist world. There must be a single tyrant, or eventually there will be none at all.

During this period of transition, the free world, and especially the United States, must not relax its efforts to continue to mobilize to preserve freedom. None of us must yield to the temptation to conclude that dangers have passed. No greater opportunity will ever be presented to us to weaken the Russian hold on satellite powers. Now is the time for our psychological warfare to be put in high gear, to relentlessly take advantage of a turn in the corner of history.

This, as never before, is a time for unity in the free world, and in the United States as the free world's leader. There can be no excuse for partisanship, and men in positions of responsibility should weigh their words and deeds with the knowledge that the future of human freedom may be within their power of decision.

Free men everywhere have a God-given opportunity to turn the tide of history without the catastrophic bloodletting which we all have feared.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR INSPECTION OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 34) to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration with a particular view to determining the efficiency of the administration and operation of Veterans' Administration installations.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its inspection, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is charged with the responsibility of seeing to it that the legislation over which it has jurisdiction, once enacted into law, is properly administered; and to otherwise keep careful check upon the activities of the Veterans' Administration. This is the usual resolution which gives this important committee the authority to conduct proper investigations into the various activities and facilities of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the attention of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, if I may, to inquire whether it is the purpose of this resolution to look into all phases of the Veterans' Administration, or into any particular phase, and particularly whether it is the purpose of the committee to look into and investigate the question of veterans' housing about which so many of us have had so many complaints.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I assure the gentleman that it is. Six subcommittees were appointed. There is one subcommittee which has been established for housing. I think a great deal can be accomplished in that way.

Mr. COLMER. Then it is the purpose to investigate that phase—the housing angle—of the Administration?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; that is the purpose. It is the purpose to investigate all of the six businesses that are under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration. I would like to say to the gentleman that we have a very fine committee. The members are very much interested in these questions, and are very thorough in their work.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentlewoman. I think she will find there is ample room for investigation there.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]. Already, even in advance of this resolution, he is making a careful investigation of the whole housing problem and especially at the present time with respect to the proper interest rate on loans guaranteed under the veterans' legislation. I think this bill will result in millions of dollars of economy and at the same time enable us to give far better service to the veterans themselves. The best example of that is the result of the Teague investigation, which was made during the last Congress and resulted in the Korean GI bill of rights being 100 percent better than the bill which was passed for World War II veterans.

Mr. COLMER. May I ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio, who is a great friend of the veterans themselves if he will be a member of this committee?

Mr. SECREST. I will be a member of the hospital committee and also of the pensions and compensation committee. I am a member of two subcommittees.

Mr. COLMER. I am very anxious for the appropriate subcommittee to look into this question of veterans' housing, construction, and the bypassing, and so on, about which we have received so many complaints.

Mr. SECREST. Under the organization of the Veterans' Committee—and I commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] for appointing these subcommittees instead of trying to keep the whole committee in her own hands—under that there will be no angle of the veterans' program that will not be explored, and explored to the end that the veteran will be served better and the taxpayers' money is not wasted.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BONIN. I happen to be a member of the Subcommittee on Housing. We had a meeting this morning. We are all set to go out into the field already, in order to determine exactly what can be done for the veterans on this question of housing.

Mr. COLMER. I am very glad to have that information.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The past investigations by this committee have re-

sulted in savings of millions and millions of dollars; yet, at the same time, this committee has never used the total funds appropriated to it, and has returned a great portion of such funds to the House. The investigations that have been conducted in the past by this committee have been very economical ones and have paid great results.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from Massachusetts a question, in view of the colloquy that has gone on about the investigations concerning veterans' housing. I think I know the state of mind of those who participated; but, in order that there be no misunderstanding, if my inference is correct, the purpose of the investigation is to bring about conditions that would be for the best interests of the veterans; is that right?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, yes. A great many houses were improperly built, and the veterans were overcharged. I think it will result in very great benefit to the veterans. It has done so already, but there is still much work to be done.

Mr. Speaker, if the House has no objection, I would like to insert as a part of my remarks the personnel of the committees that are handling these investigations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

SUBCOMMITTEES

ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE IN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

E. Ross Adair, Indiana, chairman; Paul A. Fino, New York; Albert W. Cretella, Connecticut; James A. Byrne, Pennsylvania; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Alabama.

COMPENSATION AND PENSION

Edmund P. Radwan, New York, chairman; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; William S. Mailliard, California; W. J. Bryan Dorn, South Carolina; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

William L. Springer, Illinois, chairman; E. Ross Adair, Indiana; Edmund P. Radwan, New York; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Harlan Hagan, California.

HOSPITALS

Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York, chairman; John P. Saylor, Pennsylvania; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; William S. Mailliard, California; Albert W. Cretella, Connecticut; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio; Elizabeth Kee, West Virginia; George S. Long, Louisiana.

HOUSING

William H. Ayres, Ohio, chairman; Winston L. Prouty, Vermont; Edward J. Bonin, Pennsylvania; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Ed Edmondson, Oklahoma.

INSURANCE

Winston L. Prouty, Vermont, chairman; Edward J. Bonin, Pennsylvania; Paul A. Fino, New York; D. R. (Billy) Matthews, Florida; Armistead I. Selden, Jr., Alabama.

SPANISH WAR

Russell V. Mack, Washington, chairman; Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., New Jersey; Paul A. Fino, New York; George S. Long, Louisiana; Brady Gentry, Texas.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Last month this House voted down the Teague amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill, which would have restored $10 million in badly needed funds for VA hospitals. I am sure those Members who voted against that amendment did not realize how seriously lack of funds is affecting our war veterans, who need and deserve adequate hospital care.

I am including with my remarks a letter from Dr. R. G. De Voe, manager of the Bronx Veterans' Hospital in my congressional district. Dr. De Voe points out very clearly and forcefully what reductions in funds have meant at just one hospital.

FEBRUARY 26, 1953.

Hon. SIDNEY A. FINE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FINE: Regarding your inquiry as to the effects of reduction of funds for operation of this hospital, the following is submitted:

Prior to August 1952, the personnel ceiling for this hospital was 2,043, excluding staff for research. In October we were notified by our central office that effective November 4, 1952, our ceiling would be reduced to 1,931. This meant a reduction of 112 positions. This reduction of staff was a result of a cut of some $31,000,000 from the Veterans' Administration medical budget.

As one of the larger VA general, medical, and surgical hospitals, we assumed a share of this cut in funds. Our hospital, operating 1,558 beds, is one of the large teaching centers in the Veterans' Administration. In 1946 a committee, composed of the deans of the six medical schools, was organized to guide the training of resident physicians in all the specialties of medicine and surgery with the exception of obstetrics and pediatrics. A staff of consultants and attendings, unmatched perhaps anywhere in the world, was appointed to supervise the care and treatment of our patients and assist in the educational program. With this wealth of professional talent and because of our location, this hospital was designated as a center for treatment in many of the medical and surgical specialties. Difficult cases are sent to us from all over the United States for diagnosis and specialized treatment. In taking our place alongside other great medical centers in New York City, it was possible for us to gather an outstanding staff, both professional and nonprofessional, interested in the attainment and perpetuation of the Veterans' Administration goal of medical service second to none.

The one factor that has plagued us in continuing our service has been the uncertainty of financial support which has manifested itself in reductions of our staff because of cuts in appropriations. In 1950 we suffered a severe cut and at that time lost many fine people who felt that the high ideals of the VA hospital program were being sacrificed. We managed to weather this storm but again, last November, we were told that we must cut our staff by 112 positions.

During the time between 1950 and 1952 we had voluntarily realined our staff by reducing to a bare minimum the administrative and semiprofessional groups and transferring positions to our nursing and other professional staff. When we were told to reduce our staff again in 1952, we knew that to reduce the nonprofessional staff further would endanger the safety of our patients and personnel alike and might create chaos in our organizational structure. Nothing remained but to reduce our bed capacity and other services to our patients.

My staff and I sincerely believed that it would be tragic to water down the quality of medical care, so we proceeded to reduce the quantity. Since November, with the help of our central office, we have been able to remedy some situations but others remain the same.

One hundred and twenty-five beds remain closed. This constitutes the bed capacity of the plastic surgery ward, the women's ward, including new female tuberculosis section, one closed neuropsychiatric ward, and a new tuberculosis isolation unit.

One operating room suite, representing three-eighths of the operating room space, was closed in order to save five positions. After approximately 1 month, during which time backlog and waiting list cases became overly heavy and pressure increased, we opened the operating rooms at the expense of five personnel drawn from other hospital services which could ill afford to lose them and by use of overtime in our nursing staff. This has resulted in (1) decreased elevator service which is now a source of continuous complaint; (2) decreased messenger service, which makes communication difficult and uncertain; (3) inability on the part of the engineer and laundry to provide certain services previously offered and which now reflect in increased budget costs.

The opening of these operating rooms also served to increase nursing workload on the wards beyond that contemplated at the time that 125 beds were withdrawn. For that reason we now feel that more than this number should have been dropped from the operating bed service in order to provide better nursing coverage for the remaining beds. As a result of the continuous pressure under which our nurses are working, resignations have increased and recruitment has become more difficult. Many committed in recruitment programs have canceled their commitments. They give as their reason rumors of our overworked nursing staff, as well as continuously unsettled VA budgetary conditions which make the headlines every so often. Since a great many institutions in this area are now paying salaries equal to or better than that which the VA now offers, the former attraction on the straight pecuniary basis no longer helps us to recruit. Three of the 13 nurses in the operating room disaffected by present conditions have asked for transfer.

As an indication of the pressure on the surgical service at the present time, the turnover on this service was 108 percent in the month of January. The psychiatric service was forced to reduce its facilities for shock treatment by 33 percent and its bed capacity for the care of new, acutely disturbed mental patients, including Korean battle casualties, by 50 percent, and we have been unable to provide any relief.

Four-hundred-odd paraplegics in the area who depend on this hospital for surgical treatment for recurrent pain, urinary infection, skin ulcer, etc., are all seriously and dangerously affected. Our paraplegic service is so crowded that we have difficulty in finding room for service-connected patients. It is almost impossible to give any service now to non-service-connected cases. Non-service-connected paraplegics do not receive appropriate treatment at any other place in this area, and their condition is a death sentence in the absence of such treatment as only the VA, with the exception of the Rusk Institute of Rehabilitation at its high cost, can give. Due to the terrific pressure and workload on our acute paraplegic ward, we have recently found it necessary once again to request central office to furnish us 7 or 8 additional nursing positions to protect the quality of care, and at the same time prevent utter demoralization of the nursing service which must work under these severe and trying conditions.

A special tuberculosis service, just completed at a cost $100,000, is not in use because of lack of funds and personnel intended for its operation.

We were forced to curtail our follow-up clinic. This clinic, set up to check patients who, although no longer in need of hospital care and occupancy of a bed, required follow-up examinations to prevent recurrence of illness and to gather medical knowledge for the Veterans' Administration and society in general. It is limited now only to those who, in the judgment of our physicians, most drastically need the follow-up service. Borderline cases which may or may not flare up again cannot be checked.

Reductions in force such as these, in addition to their direct result of curtailing services to veterans, have the insidious effect of destroying confidence and esprit de corps of a very fine staff. The situation might have been much worse if it weren't for the loyalty of our remaining staff who have, by their ingenuity and just plain hard work, carried on in the face of this demoralizing cut.

Very truly yours,

R. G. DE VOE, M. D., *Manager*.

The Bronx Veterans' Hospital is one of the oldest and finest in the country, and Dr. De Voe is widely recognized as an outstanding manager. I have received many, many letters from my district commending Dr. De Voe and the entire staff of the hospital for their ability and selfless devotion to duty. I know that they have done the very best job possible under difficult circumstances. Lack of funds has caused a serious reduction in facilities available to veterans in the Bronx, where we are blessed with inspired leadership and outstanding ability; the situation must be a great deal worse at many other veterans' hospitals.

I am sure that every Member of the House agrees that the least we can do for our disabled veterans is to provide them with adequate hospital care. There are many places where economies can be made, but we certainly should not renege on a solemn debt to the men who fought our wars. The cost of adequate medical care for these men is small indeed when compared to the sacrifices they made for their country.

I am confident that the House will vote adequate funds for veterans' hospitals when the Members are aware of the real need that exists. This investigation can perform a valuable service by pointing out that need.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] may extend his remarks on the resolution just passed at that point in the RECORD following my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION AFFECTING PRODUCTION OR CONSUMPTION OF NEWSPRINT BY THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 126 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation of—

(1) the current and prospective consumption of newsprint and other papers used in the printing of newspapers, magazines, or such other publications as are admitted to second-class mailing privileges;

(2) the current and prospective production and supply of such papers, factors affecting such production and supply, and possibilities of additional production through the use of alternate source materials;

(3) the facilities which are or will be devoted to the production of such papers, and policies relating to the expansion of such facilities;

(4) the exports and imports of such papers, and policies related thereto, including governmental export allocations; and

(5) the availability and adequacy of the supply of such papers to the several consumers, particularly the smaller newspapers, and governmental and other policies relating thereto.

The committee may report to the House from time to time the results of its investigation, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable, and shall, before the expiration of the present Congress, submit to the House a final report. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For purposes of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution gives specific authority to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, either by subcommittee or full committee, to conduct an investigation of the supply of newsprint and other paper used in the publication field. This is the same committee which has been in existence for some little time, and has accomplished such great results to the benefit of the publishing industry of the United States. A proper paper supply is a matter that is of great importance, not only to the publishing industry, but also to our entire population.

I might add that in the past this committee through its efforts has already brought about a great increase in paper production here in the United States, especially in the Southland. However there is still a great deal of work for this committee to do. Under the able leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], chairman of this committee, who has had some 10 years of experience with the paper-supply problem, I am sure a great deal more good can be accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, we have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called by the Parliamentarian to an error which appears in the resolution on page 3, line 1, that the word "shall" should be changed to "may."

Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment for this purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Page 3, line 1, strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I support the passage of House Resolution 126, now before the House. The purpose of the resolution is to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study on the whole subject of newsprint, including current and prospective production and consumption, the factors affecting production and supply, the possibilities of additional production through the use of alternate source materials, the expansion of domestic facilities of production, and the formulation of export and import policies, including governmental export allocations. The whole purpose being to insure availability and adequacy of the supply of such paper to all consumers, particularly the smaller newspapers.

This resolution is similar in its authority with respect to newsprint as was contained in the resolutions passed by the House in several previous instances, except that this resolution relates only to newsprint while the others, in addition to newsprint, also covered a study of brand names and material specifications in certain manufactured articles. The necessity for the latter authority has ceased to exist, but the necessity for continued study of the whole subject of newsprint continues to exist.

Newsprint is not specifically designated as one of the subjects coming under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1946, but historically, as evidenced by the several resolutions passed by previous Congresses conferring similar jurisdiction upon the committee, it has been generally recognized as coming within the purview of the jurisdiction of the committee over interstate and foreign commerce in general. In other words, although not enumerated by name in the act of 1946, it requires no strained interpretation of the term "commerce" to include it naturally and properly as within the jurisdiction of the committee. It is identical with the jurisdiction over other commodities entering into interstate commerce. Thus, as I have already said,

it has been historically so considered all through the years, both before as well as after the passage of the Reorganization Act.

The present situation with respect to newsprint requires that the committee shall continue its study. While it is felt that much good has resulted from previous studies made by committee investigations, yet there remains much more to be done. This is particularly true with respect to finding ways and means of providing domestic or other sources of supply that will not leave our consumers dependent upon Canada. Four-fifths of our supply now comes from that one country. It therefore leaves us at the mercy of Canada both as to quantity and price. Under these conditions the price has been steadily rising.

While it is true that there has been considerate attention given to us by Canadian producers, yet the fact remains we should not be left entirely at their mercy in this important matter, nor, continue in a state of helplessness. It is time that our domestic resources should be built up, or at least that some alternate source of supply be found.

Thus, the purpose of this resolution is to continue our studies of all the factors and elements that enter into the production and supply of this important item of real necessity in a democracy such as ours.

This investigation, I assure the House, will not be conducted in an antagonistic manner toward our Canadian friends nor anyone else, but with the single purpose of ascertaining what can and should be done to give our consumers an adequate supply of newsprint at a reasonable and fair price.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 126 was introduced by Mr. WOLVERTON, the chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It provides that our committee be authorized and directed to conduct investigations with reference to the newsprint situation in the United States. I support this resolution. Our committee, composed of 30 Members of this Congress, unanimously supports this resolution.

I want to commend the Rules Committee in reporting the resolution, and I can say to the House that it is a most important program, as the question of newsprint vitally affects the newspaper industry and thus one of our basic principles in America, the freedom of the press.

Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has had the jurisdiction over the question of newsprint under the authority of the Reorganization Act of 1946. It comes under the subject of Interstate and Foreign Commerce generally. However, under the broad general authority of our committee, we have had jurisdiction over this subject matter many years before the Reorganization Act adopted by this Congress in 1946.

The question as to the reasons for this special resolution and why the matter of newsprint does not come under the general resolution: This is primarily because historically the subject matter has come within our committee jurisdiction but is not specifically designated under the act. Because of the continuous concern with the subject, it is necessary to give emphasis to our supply, production and consumption of newsprint, and related problems thereto.

It is amazing that we are virtually at the mercy of the Canadian producers of newsprint. Eighty percent or more of the newsprint used in the United States comes from Canada. As a result of this committee's action, the industry has benefited tremendously. We now have some new mills in this country and particularly in the South and others being considered.

The question of adequate supply immediately and in the future continues to warrant careful consideration. The gravity of this problem makes it imperative that our committee be authorized to continue investigation in the protection of newspapers and the general public as well as the welfare of the country.

I should like also to emphasize the necessity of our committee having authority in connection with this investigation not only within but outside the United States as provided in this resolution. There are many reasons why such jurisdiction should be authorized. Not only is Canada the subject of investigation in this program but it is necessary to go into other countries and particularly where there are related products necessary in the production of newsprint. It is important that we endeavor to interest the development of this program in such a way that the industry will be benefited by it as it has been benefited by the action of this committee over the past several years.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this is not only a problem that needs attention, but one that we must give our careful and continuous study and consideration.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 127 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1953, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may make such investigations and studies as it deems advisable with respect to any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation or study made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report shall be filed with the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, first I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, be permitted to extend his remarks on this resolution, also on House Resolution 126.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the pending resolution and also to extend my remarks on the newsprint resolution immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this resolution simply gives to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the usual authority to conduct investigations in regard to the matters which come under its direct jurisdiction. This is the typical resolution which is necessary to comply with the terms and requirements of the Reorganization Act of 1947.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 127, 83d Congress, gives the committee general authority to conduct investigations into the subject matters which were assigned to it by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and provides that the committee or any subcommittee may sit at any place within or without the United States whether or not the House is in session or has adjourned. It clothes the committee with subpena power.

This resolution merely grants the same authority as has been given the committee in the 81st and 82d Congresses by House Resolution 107, 81st Congress, and House Resolutions 51 and 323, 82d Congress.

The committee's jurisdiction is broad and is outlined by the Reorganization Act of 1946 and covers the following subjects:

First. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

Second. Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Third. Regulation of interstate and foreign communications.

Fourth. Civil aeronautics.

Fifth. Weather Bureau.

Sixth. Interstate oil compacts, and petroleum and natural gas, except on the public lands.

Seventh. Securities and exchanges.

Eighth. Regulation of interstate transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government water-power projects.

Ninth. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

Tenth. Public health and quarantine.

Eleventh. Inland waterways.

Twelfth. Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and the metric system.

Under previous resolutions and the jurisdiction conferred by the Reorganization Act, this committee has conducted a number of highly significant investigations into, and made reports upon, such important subjects, among others, as (a) petroleum, and assurances of supplies from domestic and foreign sources; (b) national transportation policy; (c) civil aviation, United States carriers' overseas' operations, international barriers upon the free flow of commerce, and aviation safety; (d) public health, including medical care systems proposed domestically and operating in foreign nations; (e) continued operation of Inland Waterways; and (f) agencies falling within the legislative jurisdiction of the committee.

Refer pages 2, 3, House Report No. 3251, 81st Congress.

Refer House Report No. 1527, 82d Congress.

There is no diminution in the importance of the subject matter covered by these continuing investigations and several more are of increased magnitude. To the matters of petroleum, aviation, transportation, public health, and foreign commerce, should be added the growing concern over the effects of inflation on railroad retirement benefits, and specifically in comparison with social security benefits. It goes without saying that there is a special need for consideration of the administration which has been given by the agencies falling within the committee's legislative jurisdiction.

House Resolution 127 gives the committee general authority to conduct investigations into the subject matters which fall within its jurisdiction, provides that the committee or any subcommittee may sit at any place within or without the United States, whether or not the House is in session or has adjourned, and clothes the committee with subpena power. This resolution merely grants the identical authority which has been given the committee in recent sessions of the Congress, such as House Resolutions 51 and 323, 82d Congress, and House Resolution 107, 81st Congress, and supplements the authority granted by the Legislative Reorganization Act and the Rules of the House.

The committee ever has been conscious of its duties and responsibilities under the Reorganization Act to maintain a careful watchfulness over the administration of the statutes involving subjects for which the committee has legislative jurisdiction, and has conducted numerous examinations in this field so that it might be kept current.

Just now we are in the process of reviewing with each agency: First, its jurisdiction; second, its organization; third, its administrative policies; and, fourth, such changes as its experience may lead it to believe properly should be made. Subsequently we shall hear from industry on the same policies and operations.

Such review is primarily upon fundamental issues and policies and not upon procedural details. A number of years has passed since most of the legislation was enacted. It seems most appropriate, therefore, now to review them in the light of the accumulated experience of these years, to reexamine the basic purposes underlying the statutes, the reasons prompting their original enactment, their continuing application and desirability, the changes which time may have shown properly should be made or new legislation required, all from the viewpoint of most fully and effectively meeting the public interest.

I should like to proceed for a few moments upon the character of some of the matters which are being developed in this review and upon the nature of some of the problems requiring further investigation and examination. In such way perhaps I may best illustrate the tremendously broad scope of the subjects assigned to the committee by the Reorganization Act, many of which transcend the limits of the continental United States. Under the conditions of today, and the emerging trends of the last decade or so, these are of extreme importance. The enormous expansion of our internal domestic economy naturally accentuates the problems and issues which accompany our commerce among the several States. The substantial growth of international commerce, transportation, and communication, our dependence on foreign supplies for our enlarging economy and national defense, and our augmented obligations in our participation in and leadership of world affairs, enhance the need for constant surveillance in most of the fields, and right now demand the most attentive consideration of many of the fields entrusted to us.

I shall quickly scan some of the major items of moment under the 12 topics assigned to the committee, indicating them, but not herein attempting to express any comment on the nature of any possible solution.

1. INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE GENERALLY

There is a vast variety of subjects under this caption including not only those which are readily apparent, but, even such diverse topics as the numerous claims of our nationals against the funds arising from the operation of the Office of the Alien Property Custodian under the Trading With the Enemy Act; the correct labeling of furs, fabrics, and flammable textiles; advertising generally, and fair competition under laws administered by the Federal Trade Commission; and the activities of the Department of Commerce. The importance of and problems connected not only with our interstate commerce but also with our foreign commerce, cannot and should not be ignored.

Illustrative of the studies which this field entails is that of the matter of newsprint. Today we are dependent upon Canada for nearly four-fifths of our supply and have successively been subjected to increasing prices therefor. The continued availability of adequate supplies to meet our own needs, which are more than half of those of the world, involves Canadian and Scandinavian facilities as well as domestic. The draft on the basic woodpulp source for newsprint furnished includes careful perusal of alternate demands, which largely are asserted as stimulants of the price increases. Specifically, competition from synthetic fibers, such as rayon, has jumped by leaps and bounds, being some fourfold greater in Europe than at the end of the war—chiefly at United States instigation. Alternate or new sources of woodpulp need study, especially in Alaska, where already inroads are being made by cellulose or chemical pulp plants for uses other than newsprint. Consideration of alternate materials to woodpulp comprises materials such as bagasse, on which a plant in Peru is now running, and others in Italy, India, and Egypt are under construction utilizing different processes which may permit use of cornstalks, cotton, and the like, as well.

2. REGULATION OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN TRANSPORTATION, EXCEPT TRANSPORTATION BY WATER NOT SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Though the Interstate Commerce Act was substantially rewritten in 1940, there are many matters of policy and operations significant today: The competition among the various modes of transportation, whether rail, air, motor, water, or pipeline; protection to the shipper or user; protection to the various carriers; preservation of the inherent advantages of each mode of transportation; the equalization of competition, through greater or less regulation, or imposition of user charges for the cost of facilities provided by use of public funds; opportunity for one carrier to operate another form of transportation; measures for increased safety; the adequacy of the national transportation system for defense; the expedition of the operations of the regulatory bodies; and the like.

3. REGULATION OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMUNICATIONS

The statute as it relates to domestic operations, was given intensive study during the last Congress, and amended along procedural lines. Many of the substantive matters, however, continue of vital import, such as: allocation of radio and TV stations, including clear channels; color TV; educational TV; subscription and theater TV; and the divestment of international cable and radio facilities.

Communications are by no means entirely a domestic matter, with the growing television usage resulting in problems with neighboring countries, and radio communications involving the use of the air by all of the world. While we are party to the International Telecommunications Union, and various international conventions, numerous infractions of such agreements continue to occur.

4. CIVIL AERONAUTICS

While the increasing prominence of aviation goes without gainsaying, the problems which concurrently arise are particularly urgent, some of them being: improvements to safety; separation of

air-mail subsidy; treatment of nonscheduled carriers; continuing promotion of aviation, and competition with other forms of transport; airport construction; and hazards of adjacency to airports; condemnation of air space; aircraft liability; and regulation of security issues.

The external issues are likewise momentous, such as: determination of overseas routes; the operation of American carriers overseas, their foreign competition, the restrictions placed on the free flow of commerce by foreign governments, bilateral agreements, and our participation in the International Civil Aeronautics Organization; the increased competition in foreign markets for American aircraft, and the increased competition from foreign production—jet aircraft—there and here; the facilities abroad supplied by our own funds, and charges made for their use by foreign governments; international rates, and separation of air-mail subsidy; and the like.

5. WEATHER BUREAU

Even this seeming more or less routine subject amazingly has become fraught with many problems growing out of recent developments, enhanced by the war; and the interesting experiments in such fields as rainmaking have brought with them challenging issues of the sovereignty over a cloud, or the liability which may attend a man-made rain.

6. INTERSTATE OIL COMPACTS, AND PETROLEUM AND NATURAL GAS, EXCEPT ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Every situation envisaged in the various studies and reports made by the committee in the 80th and ensuing Congresses can but be viewed with greater gravity today, especially in the continued reliance which can be placed upon foreign supplies, and the increased foreign demand which may be made on domestic supplies. The Nation currently is a substantial importer, rather than exporter of petroleum, though there apparently is a reasonable cushion of domestic production which might be brought into play. There is no evidence, however, that this would be adequate for the demands of the Nation under emergency conditions. Diligent restudy is required of: the availability of nearby sources, accessible by land, such as Canada and Mexico; the availability of sources in the Caribbean; the potential effect either of the loss of Middle East supply sources, or of a surplus from such area and the resultant upon domestic exploration and development; the potential expansion of the Far East fields to serve the Far East, and any mitigation of the present heavy depletion of California resources for such market; and the development of synthetic liquid fuel processes.

Nor is petroleum solely worthy of consideration. The natural gas industry has magnified tremendously during the last few years, and now supplies an amount of energy equivalent to half that supplied by petroleum. With such expansion, further problems have arisen, such as: safety of natural gas pipelines; regulation of security issues of natural gas companies; adequacy of reserves available for use; the exercise of the right of eminent domain; the issuance of interim certificates; the expediting of rate cases and other applicants; and administrative policies under the statutes.

7. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGES

There are many matters of great concern in this area, some of them being: adequacy of the current protection to customers of broker-dealers; adequacy of protection to investors in investment companies; effectiveness of the prohibitions on pools, pegging, and manipulation, and the policing of such practices; the expediting of the liquidation of the work under the Public Utility Holding Company Act in integration of utility holding companies; the adequacy of the protection to investors actually afforded by the disclosure provisions of the acts, measured in terms of the purposes intended and the practice in distribution and underwriting; and so on.

A very real situation arises in the relisting of Japanese and German securities, the trading in foreign securities, and the distribution here of new offerings. The entire program of foreign aid, mutual assistance, development of backward areas, and the like has resulted in considerable pressures to encourage private capital to assume part, if not the major part, of the financial burden. Desirable as this may be, it is clear that investments of this character hardly may represent "blue chips," with ensuing complications. The role of the private investor in our foreign program, and the protections which he should be afforded, comprise much more territory than the plain disclosure philosophy of the Securities Act of 1933, and new orientation is needed.

8. REGULATION OF INTERSTATE TRANSMISSION OF POWER

Probably no industry has had greater development the last few years than the electric power industry, and yet the demand for power still exceeds the supply in some areas; shortages continue; the interconnecting grid system necessary for proper national defense is most important.

9. RAILROAD LABOR AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT, EXCEPT REVENUE MEASURES RELATING THERETO

Although the last Congress considered the changing circumstances of the higher levels of pay, the effects of inflation, and the difficulties of meeting living requirements with the benefits afforded under the acts, and did ameliorate the situation with an increase in the benefits, the subject is still one of grave concern to the committee. These problems and the comparison with social security system benefits necessitate further consideration.

10. PUBLIC HEALTH AND QUARANTINE

There hardly is a more significant subject than that of the Nation's health: the provision for medical care, the adequacy of hospitals, the supply of sufficient medical personnel, or the research into sundry diseases.

Proposals for meeting some of these problems along lines similar to those in effect abroad have warranted and continue to merit study as to their applicability or desirability. The rapidity of international air transport has aggravated the problems of efficient and effective quarantine; and there are other obligations in our participation in foreign health programs.

Related to the subject of public health is the problem of protecting consumers against falsely labeled and deleterious foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices. This protection must extend both to foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices produced in the United States, and to such products imported from abroad. However, consideration must also be given to protecting foreign nations which purchase these products from the United States—and also, incidentally, to protecting American citizens when traveling abroad—from physical harm and economic injuries resulting from substandard and dangerous foods, drugs, cosmetics, and devices sold abroad by American manufacturers and exporters.

11. INLAND WATERWAYS

While several attempts have been made to dispose of the governmental barge line in recent years, the entire subject is as yet unresolved.

12. BUREAU OF STANDARDS, STANDARDIZATION OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, AND THE METRIC SYSTEM

While last in the list of subjects assigned to the committee, the matter of our scientific research and study is one of the most pressing which faces the Nation today. Apart from the work of the Bureau, and the dissemination of scientific and technical knowledge undertaken by the Department of Commerce, the stimulation and maintenance of an adequate program of training our future scientists and of sponsoring research in the basic sciences which is being undertaken by the National Science Foundation is of the highest urgency. Under the conditions of these times, indeed, the advancement of research in the basic sciences well may be the most important of all of the subjects for which the committee has responsibility. The problem is far from solved today, as the immediate demands for applied research, and the limitations of trained staff and facilities, seriously affect what we should be doing in the longer term and more far-reaching field. This topic is high on the agenda of the committee for further study.

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed at length the work of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the scope of its jurisdiction, and the problems which confront it. The consideration of this resolution today, has provided me with opportunity to outline for the House something of the vast responsibilities and implications of the committee's work. I have been proud to serve on this committee for many years, and doubly proud presently to be its chairman. It is one of the oldest committees of the House, having existed continuously since its creation in 1795. It has served faithfully, and I believe, well, in the interests of the House, and those of the Nation. It can but be a source of great gratification to the committee, and to me, to have the endorsement of the committee's activities which the passage today of this resolution will indicate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge its adoption.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution providing the general authority for our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct investigations over the subject matters that come under our jurisdiction. It is the same general type of resolution of other committees. I support this resolution as being necessary in the conduct of the committee's work. It has the unanimous support of our committee.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, provides for the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, to carry on the work which is assigned to us under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It is necessary to conduct investigations, hold hearings and make studies of the many problems on which we are called upon to consider legislation. It provides that we may carry on this work which is necessary in the conduct of the committee business within or without the United States and whether or not the House is in session or has adjuorned.

Mr. Speaker, our committee has wide and broad jurisdiction. It covers many highly technical subjects, which in some way or other affect every phase of our activity. Under the Reorganization Act our committee is charged with these subjects, to wit:

First. Interstate and foreign commerce generally.

Second. Regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, except transportation by water not subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Third. Regulation of interstate and foreign communications.

Fourth. Civil Aeronautics.

Fifth. Weather Bureau.

Sixth. Interstate oil compacts, and petroleum and natural gas, except on the public lands.

Seventh. Securities and Exchanges.

Eighth. Regulation of interstate transmission of power, except the installation of connections between Government water-power projects.

Ninth. Railroad labor and railroad retirement and unemployment, except revenue measures relating thereto.

Tenth. Public health and quarantine.

Eleventh. Inland waterways.

Twelfth. Bureau of Standards, standardization of weights and measures, and the metric system.

This House is familiar with the activities of this committee and the work we have done. We have only to refer to the legislation we have brought to this Congress and the many reports we have submitted.

There has been something said about the extent of our investigation outside of the United States. The very first item on which we have jurisdiction, I remind you, is "Interstate and foreign commerce generally." This by its very statement makes our jurisdiction outside of the United States as it covers foreign commerce. The other jurisdictional subject matters as outlined speak for themselves and by their very nature are foreign as well as domestic, as it is with foreign communications, world-wide aviation, and so forth. Therefore, it is highly appropriate that our committee continue the work we are charged with and be not only given the authority but directed to conduct these studies wherever it is necessary.

The magnitude of these questions and the gravity of the problems affecting our very nerve center, such as petroleum, transportation and communication, public health, gives us tremendous responsibilities. Therefore, there is a special need for this resolution and I commend the Rules Committee for its action in reporting this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 9 minutes and ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Committee on Rules will be requested to grant a rule on the very controversial question of statehood for Hawaii. Some of us have very deep convictions about this proposition and I think that the Members of the House might very well, in the interest of the country, take a good look-see at that bill before it passes this Congress.

I have not prepared anything specific here because I had not intended to speak on the subject today; however, I should like in this brief time to present a few facts about the proposition generally in order that you might be thinking about it because I assume the bill will get right-of-way for consideration upon the floor.

Here are 48 contiguous States that comprise and make up the United States of America. Here is a group of islands more than 2,000 miles farflung from the continent of the United States; made up of a conglomeration of races of people whom we propose by one fell swoop to bring into this Union of States of America.

Let us see what the Governor of Hawaii reported to the Secretary of the Interior in 1951 on the question of population and the origin of the people making up that population. Of the total population, there were: Hawaiians, 12,902, or 2.8 percent of the population; part Hawaiians, 78,815, or 16.9 percent of the total; Puerto Ricans, 10,477, or 2.2 percent; Caucasians, 77,000, or 16.5 percent; Japanese, 186,205, or 39.9 percent; Koreans, 7,278, or 1.6 percent; Filipinos, 61,708, or 13.2 percent; all others, 1,790, or 1.4 percent.

Now under this bill it is proposed to bring in two new Members in the other body, the Senate of the United States, and make them equal Senators, representing this small population at this farflung outpost, with the great State of New York, the great State of California, the great State of Illinois, and other States that I might mention that go into the sisterhood of States of this country. Then it is proposed to bring in two additional Representatives in the House of Representatives from those islands. My friends, I do not think that the constitutional fathers who set up this country ever had any such concept that any such thing would ever be done.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Those two extra Congressmen that they are going to bring in, what States do they come out of? Is that an addition, or do two States lose a Congressman?

Mr. COLMER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. We do not want to approach this thing selfishly, but rather objectively. That means, as my distinguished friend just pointed out, that some States of this Union now are going to lose two Representatives in order to give two to Hawaii. That is just one phase of it.

Another phase of the matter that to me is most disturbing is that once we set the precedent here of admitting Hawaii then, of course, comes Alaska. Now, Alaska, in my judgment, can make a much better case for admission into the Union as a State than can Hawaii. Alaska is practically at our door even though it also is at Russia's door just across the Bering Sea. In contrast to Hawaii, it is much more contiguous. Then what happens? Here are the Virgin Islands; here is Puerto Rico; here is Samoa. Where will we stop once we let down the guard? My friends, that all to me simply does not bode well for the welfare of these common United States. I know that this thing is political and we might just as well lay it on the table and be frank about it. I sometimes pride myself, maybe justly, or unjustly, that I am not very partisan; that I try to approach these problems objectively, but we have a political situation here and we might just as well face it. My party, the Democratic Party, has advocated the same thing, let us be frank about it. But, of course, my party has also advocated Alaska. Now the party of my friend from Illinois, the Republican Party, comes in and is going to make fish out of one and fowl out of the other, and is just going to bring in Hawaii. Of course, there is bound to be some reason for this. The implication is there. What is it? You know what it is, and I am not going to spell it out. But I say to you that what might be advantageous to the Republican Party today or what might be advantageous to the Democratic Party tomorrow may not be so in 5 or 10 years from now. Regardless of the partisan political implications, it cannot be for the welfare of the country under any circumstances.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Let me bring the gentleman's attention back for a moment to the population list there. In Hawaii there is a large Chinese population that it is proposed to bring into the Union. I call attention to the fact that if the gentleman would do a little arithmetic on that subject, he would find that 1 Chinaman in Hawaii would have the same power in the election of Senators to the Senate of the United States as 31 American citizens in the great State of New York. In other words, the population of Hawaii is such and the predominance of the Chinese population there is such that 1 Chinaman has the same power in the United States Senate

as 31 American citizens in the State of New York. The same thing applies in proportion to other great States. I have been wondering why any Members from those great States should be willing to diminish and dilute their power in the United States Senate.

Mr. COLMER. Again I am grateful to my always able friend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COLMER was allowed to proceed out of order for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How many native Hawaiians are there in comparison with people of other races who live in Hawaii?

Mr. COLMER. According to this table that was filed by the Governor of Hawaii, Hawaiians constitute 2.1 percent of the population, and part Hawaiians 16.9 percent. The gentleman can make his arithmetical computation from that.

This certainly should not be approached as a partisan matter. I certainly hope that in its consideration it will not be. I know very able and conscientious men on both sides of the aisle who are opposed to what I think is a great tragedy and travesty here.

May I call to the attention of the Members on my left, the majority side, what one of the great leaders of the Republican Party had to say about this proposal as late as 1948. The gentleman to whom I refer is none other than a distinguished former Senator from the great State of Massachusetts, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who is now our representative at the United Nations. This is what Mr. Lodge said in addressing the Honorable HUGH BUTLER, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate in 1948. Mr. Lodge's letter is as follows:

MAY 25, 1948.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is an attempt to put into writing the conversation which we had after the Senate voted against discharging the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the matter of Hawaiian statehood.

Having been in the Hawaiian Islands twice and having the privilege of firsthand knowledge on the performance of the soldiers from Hawaii who fought in Italy, I am sure that no valid argument can be offered against the Americanism of the people of the Hawaiian Islands. The thought of a Senator from the Hawaiian Islands being chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for example, does not bother me in the least. To those considerations, of course, must be added the important material contribution which they make to the United States.

This, however, is not, as I see it, all that is involved.

1. We face the fact that if ever we depart from the practice of confining statehood to areas within the continental limits of the United States we do, in fact, establish a new precedent. If we admit the Hawaiian Islands, it is inevitable that people in Puerto Rico and Alaska will be very much encouraged in their desire to achieve statehood for their respective areas. We know that there is already a movement on foot to submit an application on the part of the British Crown colony of Newfoundland. Some of us have already been approached. In the Italian election which passed on the question of retaining the monarchy there were, to my recollection, several thousand people who voted in favor of having Italy join the United States as a State. All these people, and no doubt many others, will be encouraged if they learn that the Hawaiian Islands have been given statehood.

2. The question of enlarging the number of States is one that does not in any way involve one's opinion of the people who live in any particular area. There are, of course, splendid people in Alaska and Puerto Rico and in all these other places, and nothing contained in these remarks in any way reflects on the people who live in those places.

3. Regard should be had to the changes which have taken place in the organization of nations throughout the world. The idea of forming a regional group or so-called Atlantic community is very much to the fore and has been endorsed in principle by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This would mean that certainly places like Newfoundland could achieve a close relationship with the United States without going the full distance of having Congressmen and Senators.

4. The matter of the size of the United States Senate is something to be seriously considered. As new States join the Union, they do not materially change the size of the House but they do very substantially alter the size of the Senate, in which they, because of our Federal system, hold even representation with the largest States. This means that every time we add more Senators to the Senate, we decrease the relative importance of every existing senatorship. If the Senate gets sufficiently large, it will be necessary to set up the counterpart of the House Rules Committee and have a sort of supercommittee which will act as a graveyard or deep freeze for legislation. Then most Senators will cease to be relatively unfettered representatives of sovereign States. It is not clear to me why the Hawaiian Islands could not become part of California or why Alaska could not become part of the State of Washington. This would give them Congressmen in proportion to population. I have not yet seen it stated why it is utterly essential that so sparsely populated an area as Alaska should have the same number of Senators as the great State of New York, with its teeming millions of people.

In conclusion, let me repeat that all these factors are at stake in the question of Hawaiian statehood and, in my opinion, the Committee on Public Lands cannot completely discharge its responsibility merely by investigating the Hawaiian Islands. They should also go into all these matters which so drastically affect the entire composition of the Senate, the importance of individual Senators, and the future of our Government.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.,
United States Senator.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not trespass further upon the time and patience of my very considerate colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks by including the splendid letter which I have partially read from the former Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, and also to include a very splendid statement filed with the Insular Affairs Committee by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. The thought-provoking statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] is as follows:

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, and other distinguished members of this committee, for the purpose of insuring brevity and accuracy, I respectfully ask permission to read my objections to the bills now under consideration.

At the outset, I would like to state that I am not opposed to statehood for Hawaii. I am only seeking a deferment of admittance until legislation can be approved which would permit entry of Hawaii into the Union on an equitable basis without loss or reduction in the present rights of suffrage of the citizens of the 48 States.

I refer to two concurrent resolutions now before the House, each of which would amend the present constitutional provision providing for two Senators for each State.

The first resolution being House Joint Resolution 17, sponsored by Representative COUDERT, of New York, would amend the 17th amendment of our Constitution by providing that Congress may determine whether any State hereafter admitted shall be entitled to senatorial representation, if any.

The second resolution, introduced yesterday in the House by me, would amend the 17th amendment of our Constitution by providing that any State hereafter admitted shall be entitled to one Senate seat only when it attains a population of one-half of the average population represented by each Senator of all the other States and shall be entitled to two Senators only if it attains a population of one and one-half times the average population represented by each Senator of all the other States.

For example: The average population represented by each Senator according to the 1951 census estimate is 1,589,292. Pursuant to the resolution proposed by me, Hawaii would become entitled to one Senator only upon attaining a population of one-half of the average or 794,646 persons. It would be entitled to 2 Senators only upon attaining a population of 2,383,938 persons or 1½ of the average population represented by each Senator.

Gentlemen, I have no pride of authorship and I believe that the adoption of either resolution would provide a means or an avenue for admitting States upon an equitable basis. Hawaii could be admitted under either resolution without reducing the power and the rights of suffrage for the people of the other States.

My opposition to the bills being considered now before the committee is based primarily upon the grant of disproportionate senatorial representation to Hawaii. Under present law, Hawaii would become entitled to two Senate seats. With its population of 466,329 persons, Hawaii would enjoy representation in the United States Senate of 670 percent of the average senatorial representation possessed by the average person in the other 48 States. Each of its inhabitants will have approximately 25 times the vote of the people of California in the United States Senate and 20 times the vote of the people of Illinois, 10 times the vote of the people of Massachusetts, 35 times the vote of the people of New York, and 22 times the vote of the people of Pennsylvania. The inhabitants of Hawaii will enjoy 6½ times the voting power of the average person in the United States in the choice of Senators.

I would like to point out that this grant of senatorial representation is not a newly created power but is a transfer of power from the people of the other 48 States and is a

corresponding reduction of their present right of suffrage in the election of United States Senators.

The accompanying document, marked "Document No. 1, column 1," indicates the percentage of senatorial representation of each State at present. Column 2 gives the percentage of senatorial representation of each State in the event of Hawaiian statehood. It also indicates the loss of senatorial voting power to each of the peoples of the States in such event.

These are not mere figures that we are discussing but all sovereign rights of the people of this country entrusted to Congress, subject only to the limitations contained in our Constitution.

What are some of these rights of ours?

1. The right to lay and collect taxes without limitation.
2. The right to declare war without limitation or restriction.
3. The right to raise and support arms.
4. The right to provide for the common defense.
5. The right to provide for the general welfare.
6. The right to borrow money without limitation.
7. The right to coin and regulate the value of money.
8. The Senate alone is entrusted with veto power in the making of treaties by our President.

We as trustees of these sovereign powers should examine most carefully our right to surrender any portion of them except upon a proportionate basis.

I would like also to add the thought that the alienation of any powers of our people by reason of this bill is not a temporary transfer. The surrender of these powers is irrevocable and will continue for the life of this Republic.

The theory of equality of representation is based on the premise that we were a federation of sovereign States, and equality by States of senatorial representation was adopted for the purpose of protecting the smaller States against encroachment by the larger States. The election of the House of Representatives was based upon the theory that we were one nation rather than a federation of sovereign States. For this reason, is was provided that the election of Members of the House of Representatives would be upon a proportionate basis and in accordance with the population.

The gentleman who framed our Constitution very wisely attempted to protect the larger States from disproportionate per capita representation in the Senate. Our Constitution provided that the Members of the Senate be selected by the legislatures of their respective States and not by popular suffrage. It was intended that Members of the Senate represent the sovereign States and not the people of the States. It was their duty to prevent the encroachment by the Federal Government upon the sovereign powers of the State. This brake upon the powers of the Senate was destroyed by the 17th amendment of 1913 which provided for popular suffrage in the election of Senators.

With the change in the mode of selection of the United States Senate, our Senate ceased to represent the State governments and to defend the sovereign powers of the States against the encroachment of the Federal Government. The Senate became a second popular house dependent for its election upon popular suffrage. This change in our Constitution destroyed the reason for the rule and the principle that each State should have two Senators and that each State should have an equality of representation. The continuing infringement upon powers reserved to the States is fast bringing about a socialization of almost every governmental service. The larger States are unable to adequately protect their interests due to the lack of representation in our Senate. I respectfully submit that the addition of two Senators from Hawaii is unjust, inequitable, and will weaken the bonds of this Republic.

PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE

It is a common presumption that each of us have an equal voice in the election of our President. This is a fallacy. The accompanying document, marked Document No. 2, indicates the average percentage value of presidential representation of persons in each State.

For example: Six persons living in the State of New York have the same right to suffrage in the election of a President as one person who resides in Nevada. In Pennsylvania and California, approximately five and one-half persons in each of these two States have the same right of suffrage in the election of a President as one person residing in Nevada. The accompanying document in column one lists the percentage value of the presidential vote of residents in the various States at the present time. Column two lists the percentage value of the presidential vote of these same residents in the event of Hawaiian statehood. Column three lists the percentage of loss of suffrage by residents of each State in the election of a President if statehood is granted.

I have, of late, heard a great deal about second class citizenship in connection with civil rights. In my humble estimation, the very foundation of citizenship in a republic is the equal right of suffrage. Yet, in this country, we have 48 classes of citizenship. One for each State with different rights of suffrage for both senatorial and presidential representation. The people of New York State are 48th class citizens, the people of California are 47th class citizens, and the other States rank in the corresponding order of their population.

Now gentlemen, it is not my intention to emphasize the disparity between the rights of suffrage of the peoples of the various States for the purpose of recrimination. All I ask is that you do not worsen our lot by the approval of any one of the bills before us.

POLITICAL CONSIDERATION

It is commonly stated in Republican Party circles that in the event of statehood Hawaii will send two Republican Senators to our United States Senate. It is hoped that these two seats will help maintain Republican Party control of the United States Senate.

It is similarly stated in Democratic Party circles that if Alaska were granted statehood, Alaska would send two Democratic Senators to our United States Senate.

Almost every argument presented by the proponents of statehood for Hawaii applies with equal force in favor of statehood for Alaska. If statehood is granted to Hawaii without granting statehood to Alaska, then the Republican Party is subjecting itself to the charge of executing a political maneuver. If in the event that Hawaii is granted statehood, and due to political pressure Alaska is also granted statehood, or in the event of a compact between leaders of the two parties granting statehood to both of these Territories, then the wrong and the injustice perpetrated upon the 48 States is compounded.

And, gentlemen, this problem is too grave and too solemn for political maneuverings.

ALIEN POPULATION IN HAWAII

According to the publication, Hawaii, U. S. A., and Statehood, Hawaii had (in 1951) a total population of 466,329 of which 402,754 were American citizens and 63,575 persons were aliens.

The alien population constitutes 13.6 percent of the total population of Hawaii. The estimated alien population of the whole United States is 3 million or about 2 percent. This large alien population in Hawaii far exceeds any State in the Union in proportion to the citizen population.

The Constitution in referring to the basis for apportioning representation in the House uses the word "persons." Over the years, there has been agitation and serious argument whether or not aliens should be excluded from the population figures upon which representation is based.

If aliens were excluded either by statute or by constitutional authority from the basis of apportionment, then Hawaii would barely be entitled to one Representative and her two Senators would be more disproportionate to the average representation of the people of the other States in the Senate.

EFFECT OF ADMISSION OF HAWAII UPON APPORTIONMENT OF MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Section 6 of each of the bills, now before this committee, provides that Hawaii shall be entitled to two Representatives until the next reapportionment. These two Representatives will be in addition to the present membership of 435 Members, increasing the membership to 437.

At the reapportionment following the 1960 census the membership will be reduced to the present membership of 435 Members (act of 1911). This will have the effect of replacing two Representatives from other States. The States that will lose the two memberships now temporarily established for Hawaii are the States that show loss or the smallest gain in population between the 1950 and 1960 census.

The annexed document (marked "Doc. No. 3") lists those States that have shown a decrease in population between April 1, 1950 (last census) and July 1, 1951 (latest census estimate). The following seven States fall in this category: Alabama, Kentucky, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and West Virginia. These States have a combined total membership of 32 seats in the House.

If Hawaii is granted statehood and shall be entitled to two Members in the United States House of Representatives following the 1960 census, then, in all probability, the present membership in the House of Representatives of the States of Alabama, Kentucky, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and West Virginia will be reduced by two Members. The loss of two seats by these States to Hawaii cannot be determined with reasonable certainty, but must await the 1960 census.

I am attempting to emphasize that when this Congress grants two seats in the House of Representatives, it is at the same time committing itself to reducing the membership of the other States by two seats. The probability as to which States will lose these seats is dependent upon population growth. As of the presently available information, it would appear that following the 1960 census, the loss of two seats in the House will be divided among the following States: Alabama, Kentucky, Maine, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and West Virginia.

The loss of two seats in the House to Hawaii will be additional to the loss of membership by reason of population apportionment. If the present trend in population growth of the States continues until the next census, then, these seven States may lose from 3 to 6 seats in the House (estimate) under present law. In addition to these losses, they will also lose two additional seats now being proposed to be granted to Hawaii. Thus, these States should now prepare themselves for a loss of between 5 and 8 seats in the House of Representatives

following the 1960 census. The above estimate is subject to application of the equal-proportions rule.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 6 OF BILLS PROPOSING STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Section 6 of each of the bills proposing statehood for Hawaii, provides in part, "The state of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to two Representatives until the taking effect of the next reapportionment."

The United States Constitution, amendment XIV, section 2, provides in part, "Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers."

The total population of the United States including Hawaii but excluding the District of Columbia is 153,038,329. By applying the above-stated provision of the Constitution, and dividing the temporary membership of 437 into the total population, the resulting average population for each congressional district is 350,202 persons. Upon division of this average population for each Representative into the present population of Hawaii of 466,329 persons, we arrive at a figure of 1.33. This figure represents the numerical fractional representation to which Hawaii would today be entitled to under the United States Constitution. This computation gives to Hawaii the benefit of the temporary increase in the House to 437 Members. Hawaiian representation would be decreased from the 1.33 fraction when the House is decreased to 435 Members.

If we are to use the United States census figures (1950) of 150,697,361 as the population of the United States and 499,794 as the population of Hawaii, the fractional representation to which Hawaii would be entitled is the figure 1.44.

It is respectfully submitted that the provision granting Hawaii two Representatives computed according to either the 1950 United States census or the 1951 United States census estimates is contrary to and in violation of the United States Constitution, amendment XIV, section 2.

The present effect of giving Hawaii one seat more than it would be entitled to is to decrease the representation of the combined representation of the other 48 States by one seat.

NOTE.—All of the figures used in this memorandum are United States census estimates as of July 1, 1951, excepting the population of Hawaii for 1951 which is the population figure estimated by the Hawaii Statehood Commission. These are the latest population estimates.

CONCLUSION

Gentlemen, I have tried to present to you the basic, relevant, and material factors involved in this issue.

In my judgment, the magnitude of the issues presented by these bills is exceeded only by, first, our relations with the Soviet and, second, our involvement in the United Nations.

I ask that the members of this committee refrain from acting hastily, to lay aside our personal considerations, and to resolve this problem with all the wisdom bestowed upon each of us. Thank you.

DOCUMENT NO. 1

Average percentage value of senatorial representation of persons in each State based upon the following data:

A. Total population of United States July 1, 1951, excluding District of Columbia and Hawaii: 152,572,000.

B. Average representation by each Senator: 1,509,292.

C. Total population of United States July 1, 1951, including Hawaii but excluding District of Columbia: 153,038,329.

D. Average representation of each Senator with 2 Hawaiian Senators included: 1,561,616.

E. Average percentage value of vote of persons in the United States in senatorial representation equals 100 percent.

F. Column 1 is percentage value of vote of residents of States without Hawaii statehood.

G. Column 2 is percentage value of vote of residents of States if Hawaii is granted statehood.

H. Column 3 is loss of percentage value of vote of residents of States if Hawaii is granted statehood.

[Percent]

State	Column 1 (without Hawaii statehood)	Column 2 (with Hawaii statehood)	Column 3 (percentage loss of suffrage)
Alabama	104	103	−1
Arizona	394	388	−6
Arkansas	166	164	−2
California	29	28	−1
Colorado	231	227	−4
Connecticut	156	153	−3
Delaware	966	949	−17
Florida	107	105	−2
Georgia	91	90	−1
Hawaii		670	
Idaho	539	529	−10
Illinois	36	35	−1
Indiana	79	77	−2
Iowa	121	119	−2
Kansas	163	160	−3
Kentucky	109	107	−2
Louisiana	115	113	−2
Maine	356	350	−6
Maryland	130	128	−2
Massachusetts	67	66	−1
Michigan	49	48	−1
Minnesota	106	104	−2
Mississippi	145	142	−3
Missouri	79	77	−2
Montana	540	530	−10
Nebraska	236	232	−4
Nevada	1,859	1,826	−33
New Hampshire	595	585	−10
New Jersey	64	63	−1
New Mexico	452	444	−8
New York	21	21	0
North Carolina	77	76	−1
North Dakota	525	516	−9
Ohio	39	39	0
Oklahoma	140	138	−2
Oregon	204	200	−4
Pennsylvania	30	30	0
Rhode Island	400	394	−6
South Carolina	150	147	−3
South Dakota	491	483	−8
Tennessee	96	94	−2
Texas	40	39	−1
Utah	448	441	−7
Vermont	852	837	−15
Virginia	94	92	−2
Washington	131	129	−2
West Virginia	159	157	−2
Wisconsin	91	90	−1
Wyoming	1,077	1,059	−18

NOTE.—New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania would also each show a small loss if the figures were carried out to another digit.

DOCUMENT NO. 2

Average percentage value of presidential representation of persons in each State based upon the following data:

A. Total population of United States July 1, 1951, excluding District of Columbia and Hawaii: 152,572,000.

B. Total population of United States July 1, 1951, including Hawaii but excluding District of Columbia: 153,038,329.

C. Average percentage value of vote of persons in the United States in presidential representation equals 100 percent.

D. Column 1 is percentage value of presidential vote of residents without Hawaii statehood.

E. Column 2 is percentage value of presidential vote of residents if Hawaii is granted statehood.

F. Column 3 is loss of percentage value of presidential vote of residents if Hawaii is granted statehood.

[Percent]

State	Column 1 (without Hawaii statehood)	Column 2 (with Hawaii statehood)	Column 3 (percentage loss of suffrage)
Alabama	103.9	103.4	−0.5
Arizona	142.8	142.1	−.7
Arkansas	120.3	119.8	−.5
California	83.4	83.0	−.4
Colorado	125.3	124.7	−.6
Connecticut	112.8	112.3	−.5
Delaware	262.0	260.8	−1.2
Florida	97.0	96.6	−.4
Georgia	88.9	88.5	−.4
Hawaii		245.4	
Idaho	194.8	193.9	−.9
Illinois	88.0	87.6	−.4
Indiana	92.5	92.1	−.4
Iowa	109.5	109.0	−.5
Kansas	117.9	117.4	−.5
Kentucky	98.3	97.9	−.4
Louisiana	104.2	103.8	−.4
Maine	161.1	160.3	−.8
Maryland	105.9	105.5	−.4
Massachusetts	97.2	96.7	−.5
Michigan	87.8	87.4	−.4
Minnesota	105.6	105.1	−.5
Mississippi	104.9	104.4	−.5
Missouri	92.4	92.0	−.4
Montana	195.1	194.3	−.8
Nebraska	127.9	127.3	−.6
Nevada	504.1	501.8	−2.3
New Hampshire	215.2	214.3	−.9
New Jersey	92.4	92.0	−.4
New Mexico	181.6	181.3	−.3
New York	86.0	85.7	−.3
North Carolina	97.3	96.8	−.5
North Dakota	190.0	189.1	−.9
Ohio	89.1	88.7	−.4
Oklahoma	101.4	101.0	−.4
Oregon	110.7	110.2	−.5
Pennsylvania	87.1	86.7	−.4
Rhode Island	144.9	144.3	−.6
South Carolina	108.2	107.7	−.5
South Dakota	177.6	176.8	−.8
Tennessee	95.3	94.8	−.5
Texas	86.3	85.9	−.4
Utah	162.1	161.4	−.7
Vermont	231.1	230.1	−1.0
Virginia	101.9	101.4	−.5
Washington	106.6	106.2	−.4
West Virginia	115.2	114.7	−.5
Wisconsin	99.2	98.8	−.4
Wyoming	292.2	290.9	−1.3

DOCUMENT NO. 3

Census figures of States showing population decreases, from April 1, 1950, to July 1, 1951:

State	Population, Apr. 1, 1951 (census)	Population, July 1, 1951 (census estimate)	Loss	Present membership, House of Representatives
Alabama	3,061,743	3,042,000	−19,743	9
Kentucky	2,944,806	2,922,000	−22,806	8
Maine	915,744	892,000	−21,744	3
Montana	591,024	589,000	−2,024	2
North Dakota	619,636	605,000	−14,636	2
South Dakota	652,740	647,000	−5,740	2
West Virginia	2,005,532	1,995,000	−10,532	6
Combined total				32

NOTE.—The average increase in population from 1940 to 1950 was 13 percent. Any State substantially below the average in 1960, is likely to lose 1 or more seats.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to supplement the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi because in the limited time he had, he was, of

course, not able to go into the particulars of this Hawaiian situation. I just take this time in order to ask those Members of the House who are deeply interested in this matter, as I am, to look at two reports on communism in the Hawaiian Islands made within the last 2 years. One report is the annual report of the Committee on Un-American Activities. It is House Report No. 3249 of the 81st Congress, 2d session, Union Calendar No. 1134. I want to say I have read it, and the statements made in that report concerning communism and its prevalence there, and the power over there of Harry Bridges is not disputed anywhere.

Then, I would also like to have you look at the report of the Senate on a similar subject in the 82d Congress, 1st session, that is the last Congress. It is Calendar No. 296 and it is Senate Report No. 314. If you will get those two reports and read what they say about communism in the Hawaiian Islands, it will be most illuminating, I assure you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES v. SIDNEY BUCHMAN

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the ground of the question of privilege.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on March 9, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the case of United States against Sidney Buchman, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this House.

I send to the desk a subpena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA — UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. SIDNEY BUCHMAN, No. 469–52

To Hon. HAROLD H. VELDE:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington, on the 9th day of March 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman*.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By E. WILLIAM JUREY,
Deputy Clerk.

EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS,
Attorney for the Defendant,
1000 Hill Building,
Washington, D. C.

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 163), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative HAROLD H. VELDE, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 9th of March 1953, in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman*, Criminal Docket No. 469–52; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative HAROLD H. VELDE is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state the question of privilege.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on March 9, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the case of the United States against Sidney Buchman, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

I send to the desk a subpena, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. SIDNEY BUCHANAN, No. 469–52

To Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington on the 9th day of March 1953, at 10 a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman*.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By E. WILLIAM JUREY,
Deputy Clerk.

EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS,
Attorney for Defendant, 1000 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 164) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 9th of March 1953, in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman*, Criminal Docket No. 469–52; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative DONALD L. JACKSON is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on March 9, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the case of United States against Sidney Buchman, which is a congressional contempt proceeding.

Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with the terms of the subpena without the consent of the House, the privilege of the House being involved.

I therefore submit the matter to the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I sent to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. SIDNEY BUCHANAN, No. 469–52

To Hon. CLYDE DOYLE:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington, on the 9th day of March 1953 at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchanan*.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL,
Clerk.
By E. WILLIAM JUREY,
Deputy Clerk.

EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS,
Attorney for Defendant, 1000 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 165) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative CLYDE DOYLE, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 9th day of March 1953, in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman*, Criminal Docket No. 469–52; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative CLYDE DOYLE is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OHIO SESQUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, this year, 1953, is an important and significant milestone in the history of the great State of Ohio. It marks the 150th anniversary of Ohio's statehood.

Ohio was the fourth State admitted to the Union after the original 13 Colonies. Ohio, the 17th State, admitted in March 1803, was preceded into the Union by Vermont, March 4, 1791; Kentucky, June 1, 1792; and Tennessee, June 1, 1796.

One of the historical events just prior to Ohio's admission into the Union as a State was the ride of Thomas Worthington from Chillicothe, Ross County, Ohio, to the city of Washington. On November 29, 1802, the first constitutional convention for the State of Ohio completed its work and appointed Mr. Worthington an agent to bring to the Congress and to the President of the United States copies of the newly adopted Ohio State Constitution.

As a part of the Ohio Sesquicentennial Celebration which began in Chillicothe, Ohio, on March 3 of this year, Mr. George Murphy, accompanied by his escort, Mr. Don Strausbaugh, is reenacting Thomas Worthington's historical ride of over 150 years ago. Mr. Murphy and Mr. Strausbaugh left Chillicothe Tuesday afternoon, March 3, carrying with them letters and official documents from the Ohio General Assembly then in session at Chillicothe, and they are scheduled to arrive in front of the United States Capitol Building here in Washington on next Monday, March 9, at 11 a. m.

The Ohio Constitutional Convention of 1802 used exceedingly good judgment in selecting Thomas Worthington to serve as their agent in furthering the claims for Ohio statehood.

Much of the significance of Thomas Worthington's trip on horseback from Chillicothe to Washington stems from the character, influence, and prestige of this outstanding Virginian who had come to Chillicothe as a surveyor in 1795–96. His father, Robert Worthington, was a friend of George Washington and Thomas Worthington's friendship with President Thomas Jefferson was a vital factor in Ohio's becoming a State.

Thomas Worthington was elected as one of Ohio's first United States Senators and later served as Governor from 1814 to 1818.

Mr. Murphy and Mr. Strausbaugh are traveling the same route from Chillicothe to Washington that Thomas Worthington traveled in 1802.

Scheduled stops are to be made at Lancaster, Zanesville, and Cambridge in Ohio; Wheeling, W. Va.; Washington and Uniontown, Pa.; Cumberland, Md.; Martinsburg, W. Va.; and Leesburg, Va.

Upon their arrival in front of the Capitol here in Washington next Monday, it is the plan of the Ohio society in Washington to give these two messengers from the city of Chillicothe a rousing welcome befitting the importance of their mission in reenacting one of the most important events in Ohio history.

They will bring copies of resolutions from the 100th Ohio General Assembly to the Congress of the United States. And, again, may I say that all Members of the House are cordially invited to be present on the Capitol steps at 11 a. m. on Monday, March 9, to participate in this celebration.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary investigating the Justice Department be permitted to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds the gentleman that there are several special orders pending. If there is no objection, however, the gentleman may proceed for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the legislation which I am introducing today to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The purpose of this legislation is to provide safety in longshore and harbor work through a system of safety rules and regulations, and safety inspection and training. A companion bill is being sponsored jointly in the Senate by the Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH of New Jersey, and the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

Longshore and harbor work is one of the most hazardous occupations in American industry. It is imperative that the Congress of the United States recognize the perils faced by such employees and enact at the earliest opportunity safety legislation for accident prevention.

Latest figures for the work injuries among longshoremen which have been supplied to me by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor are for the year 1951. These figures reveal that the frequency rate of accidents to longshoremen is 76.5 percent for each 1,000,000 employee-hours worked. I invite you to compare this with the figure in all manufacturing industries, which is 15.5 percent for each 1,000,000 employee-hours worked. There are 5 times as many injuries occurring among those who work along the docks as compared with those who work in all the manufacturing industries combined.

The severity rate, which is the measure of the seriousness of injuries in terms of days lost, indicates that for longshoremen the percentage is 12.4 for every thousand employee-hours worked. For all manufacturing industries, this figure drops to 1.3. The material which we have available clearly shows that injuries to dock workers are on the average 10 times as serious as those occurring in all manufacturing industries.

Further, it is my belief that these figures are far lower when they apply to longshoremen than they would be if we had complete reporting. These figures are supplied to the Department of Labor on a voluntary basis, and only a small portion of the industry has furnished reports. Those who have reported are those firms which have the better records. Those with the poorest records are not inclined to furnish figures and there are no regulations which compel them to do so. Thus, when I point out that there are 5 times as many injuries which are 10 times as severe, it must be borne in mind that this can in no sense be termed exaggeration.

The Congress must, through its legislative powers, provide enforceable safety standards for the stevedoring industry which will save lives and prevent the many instances of permanent impairment of employees engaged in such activity. It is essential that we realize the responsibility which we have toward these workers to provide minimums of safety and first aid. The working conditions of the employees of the many stevedoring companies vary greatly and there is an urgent need for standardization of safety programs in the industry. Because of the fact that workers of this type go from one firm to another, they are faced with different standards of safety and accident prevention. In some of the poorer firms, conditions of employment are deplorable. There are either inadequate or no provisions for care of these workers in event of injury. Further, there are no minimum safety requirements for the equipment which must be used by such employees in the performance of the duties assigned to them.

The legislation which I am introducing would impose a duty on employers to furnish safe places of employment, to utilize safe working methods, and to provide safe stevedoring gear. It is appropriate that the Federal Government take every precaution to insure the lives and safety of longshoremen and harbor workers connected with shipside operations.

Voluntary programs for safety in longshore and harbor work have not been successful, and for that reason Federal legislation is required. It is my hope that

I will have the enthusiastic support of the Members of the House for the enactment of this legislation.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THE NEW COMMISSION ROW: ST. LOUIS, MO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe that all too often debates that have occurred in the past are buried and forgotten, particularly if the debate revolved around a bill which was defeated. Sometimes a review of the past is helpful in guiding our future course.

About a year and a half ago we had before the House H. R. 39, a bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 9, pages 12084–12092, and pages 12172–12186. The proponents of the bill urged that it was necessary for the Federal Government to move into this field financially because the marketing facilities in many of our cities were unhealthy and inadequate and that private enterprise presumably could not do the job.

The bill was defeated by those who felt that though marketing facilities might be badly needed, this was not a field for the Federal Government to enter. It was suggested that here specifically was an example of creeping socialism.

I am placing in the RECORD the following statement appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sunday morning, February 22, 1953, hailing the opening of the new $3 million St. Louis produce market:

PRODUCE MARKETING IN ST. LOUIS

(By Virgil G. Baker)

The saga of produce marketing in St. Louis is as colorful as Old Man River.

The story begins with the pioneering days of the Great Gateway to the West, the rugged era of river shipping, the opening of vast frontiers of new land beyond the Mississippi.

The frontiers of new land have long since disappeared. It seems at times there are no new frontiers to conquer and that the spirit of the pioneers lives only in history. But perhaps that spirit only sleeps, awaiting the proper hour of resurgence.

For today, in St. Louis, the spirit of pioneering has arisen again, to write a new chapter in the saga of produce marketing in St. Louis.

The building of the new commission row, now being formally opened after more than 4 years of struggle and strain, is an exemplification of pioneering in new fields for promotion of the general welfare.

Here is a story of men—idealistic, courageous, doggedly determined, pioneering in the field of organization, in financial venturing, in construction planning and practices, in wholesale produce-marketing operations; most of all in striking at basic determinants in the field of public health.

Except for preliminary surveys of the needs of this area in produce marketing by the United States Department of Agriculture, the entire project of the new St. Louis market has been carried out by local men, without subsidy from the Federal Government or any other taxing body. It represents a spirit of cooperative effort probably unparalleled, bringing together many ruggedly individualistic interests for the common good.

Produce marketing in St. Louis and, indeed, probably all over the Nation, has been a lot like Topsy. It "just growed." Never before had there been much planning, certainly no concerted, scientific approach to the industry's many problems, no conception of the basic underlying role which the manner of operation so certainly plays in the health of the people of St. Louis and the surrounding trading area which the market serves.

Where there are no great metropolitan concentrations of population, such terminal facilities as the new St. Louis market still are unnecessary. But in the bigger cities there are few instances in which anything approaching the action that has been taken here has been accomplished.

St. Louis produce-marketing men have blazed and are following a new trail. It bids fair to lead to new ways of life for the men in the business and, it seems, must go far to make St. Louis and the area the market serves a better place in which to live and to do business.

Now the point I want to emphasize is this. Suppose H. R. 39 had become law in 1951? How futile would have seemed the efforts of these new pioneers, with men in other areas holding back waiting for Federal funds getting their lazy wish? How much additional burden would have been placed upon the backs of the Nation's taxpayers to fulfill these lazy men's dreams?

I hope the day of creeping socialism is over. I hope it has been successfully beaten. But let me warn my colleagues, as I did earlier in this session, of the danger of its successor—military socialism. In one sense it is even more dangerous than its predecessor. It turns over, not to civilian government, vast fields of endeavor, but to military government—government outside the safeguards of the Bill of Rights. Here is real occasion for alarm.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I recall very well the excellent contribution made by the gentleman from Missouri to the defeat of the bill, H. R. 39, which provided $25 million to help build markets in various cities of the country, with the Government putting up, as I recall, 85 percent of the money. I again compliment the gentleman for his excellent assistance in joining with others of us to defeat this bill and I also want to congratulate the city of St. Louis for going ahead with the project on its own in the true spirit of initiative and free enterprise.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I think the gentleman from Missouri has done a very wise thing in bringing back to our attention some of these matters which seem dead and buried in the past. The city of St. Louis doing the job is certainly an example of free enterprise. I think the city of St. Louis is to be congratulated, and I think it is interesting to note that this vindicates the judgment of those who believe in free enterprise on the floor of the House and fight against unnecessary burdens on the taxpayers. I hope other cities will follow suit, because marketing facilities do need improving, but the means of improving them lies within the existing framework of our own local government and our own free society.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. So often we have the oratory down here in the well of the House pointing out the conditions that exist, and they are bad, frequently, like lack of marketing facilities, the fact that they are unhealthy, and so on, but all on the assumption that the only way you can solve the problem is through the Federal Government moving into the picture when, indeed, that is not the function of the Government. The real way to proceed in this country is to do it through private enterprise, and instead of government competing with them, let government encourage private enterprise. I think we have a great future ahead of us following such a program.

SIDNEY BUCHMAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his question of privilege.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify on March 9, 1953, at 10 o'clock a. m., in the case of United States against Sidney Buchman, which is a congressional-contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with the subpena without the consent of the House, the privilege of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body and send the subpena to the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read the subpena, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. SIDNEY BUCHANAN, No. 469–52

To Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Third and Constitution Avenue NW., fourth floor, courtroom 8, in the city of Washington on the 9th day of March

1953 at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman*.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*.
By E. WILLIAM JUREY,
Deputy Clerk.

EDWARD BENNETT WILLIAMS,
Attorney for Defendant, 1000 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.
FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 166), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at Washington, D. C., on the 9th day of March 1953, in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman*, Criminal Docket No. 469–52; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *Sidney Buchman* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNCLAIMED DEPOSITS IN NATIONAL BANKS AND OTHER VALUABLE UNKNOWN PROPERTIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss a question that no one particular person in the country is excited about, but millions of people should be concerned about.

A few years ago I introduced a bill to provide for the disposition of unclaimed deposits in national banks. The bill did not go sufficiently far and I have not pursued it in recent years, but it touches on a subject that I think should be explored more fully. In the hope that some Member will be interested enough to explore this subject more fully or that some committee of Congress will take it up and do something about it, I want to give some information concerning the problems involved.

There is at least $100,000,000 in dormant accounts in National and State banks in the United States. We do not know for sure, but last year when I was chairman of a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, composed of both House Members and Senate Members, I asked the Comptroller of the Currency to include in a questionnaire being sent out a question that would embrace this information about unclaimed dormant deposits in national banks.

Most of the national banks answered this questionnaire. Some of them did not answer and some few even refused to answer. However, the answers received indicated that the national banks had over $50,000,000 in dormant, unclaimed accounts belonging to depositors. Many of these depositors have forgotten them, or they are dead and gone, and their loved ones, their heirs, and their legal representatives know nothing about the accounts and have no way in the world to get the information. Since the national banks represent fewer than one-half of the total number of banks of the country, evidently there must be around $100,000,000 in all the banks. That is quite a sizable sum of money. Also, many people have made investments in the building and loan associations or the Federal savings and loan associations and their whereabouts are unknown. Their dependents or their legal representatives have no way of knowing about these investments. It is the same way with credit unions, with postal savings accounts, and with veterans.

TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS ON THE AVERAGE DUE 600,000 VETERANS WHOSE ADDRESSES ARE UNKNOWN

Not so long ago the Veterans' Administration declared dividends on the national service insurance policies held by about 16,000,000 veterans. Today there are about 600,000 of these veterans whose whereabouts are unknown and their checks cannot be delivered. They cannot be located. These 600,000 veterans are entitled to $120,000,000, or about $200 per veteran. This runs into a lot of money.

Not only that, during World War I and World War II, in time of peace, and during this present Korean war veterans were induced to save money and the Government gives them 4 percent on their savings if left on deposit. Many veterans have taken advantage of that. I understand there are enormous amounts there now. And the owners, of course, are unknown. There are dormant accounts, unclaimed accounts, and unknown accounts, I mean unknown to the dependents of the veterans who are gone, who are dead, or who have disappeared for some reason or other.

In addition to that, many veterans, or I will say servicemen, were properly induced to buy savings bonds and war bonds. They did that through the payroll-deduction plan. Many of these servicemen would pay a bond half out or nine-tenths out, and then maybe something would happen to that serviceman. The bond is there right now, and the Government does not know where to send that money and does not know how to locate the person who is entitled to it. It is a violation of the law for anyone connected with the Government or the Veterans' Administration to give any information to anybody to indicate that a veteran is entitled to so much money so that the legal dependents or legal representatives could get that money if they made a claim for it. If a Government employee should do that, he would be violating existing law. Therefore, we can safely say that there are hundreds, multiplied hundreds of millions of dollars in that situation. I think something should be done. I do not like to appear in the attitude of advocating the creation of another Federal agency, and I am not, but I do believe there should be some national clearing agency whether it be sponsored by the Government or endorsed by the Government or affiliated with the Government, it does not make so much difference as it is necessary to have a place where all these dormant accounts and these unclaimed accounts and records could be submitted to this agency or to this department, and where the record could be kept, and where interested citizens could at any time find out the information that would be helpful to them, information which I believe they are rightfully entitled to receive. Such an agency could pay its own way and would not cost the taxpayers anything.

Two other points should be mentioned. Stockholders in corporations in interstate business sometimes are entitled to a great deal of money through these corporations. The corporations cannot locate the people who are entitled to that money, and oftentimes in areas of the United States where there is oil and gas, the oil and gas leases provide that the leases can be continued another year usually by the deposit in a certain bank—the bank is indicated at the time the lease is made—of a certain amount in that bank and the money is placed there to the credit of the person making the lease. A great deal of that money is still there, and the owners are still unknown. So there are hundreds of millions of dollars in the aggregate belonging to people who need it but know no way of getting the correct information concerning it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I think the gentleman has brought to the attention of the House a tremendously important matter with reference to these dormant accounts in veterans' funds and in savings bonds that have been set aside, and in credit unions and in retirement funds. He has indicated that he is against the law forbidding the departments to make known this fact to any heir or beneficiary. Many times veterans are endeavoring to secure information as to their entitlements and the departments will not reveal that information to them. It has occurred to me that the Bureau of Internal Revenue does publish from time to time the refunds on taxes and the overpayments in taxes. Why cannot the other agencies of the Government be placed in the same category so that they, too, can make known overpayments, or dormant accounts, and so forth? Would not that help to solve the situation?

Mr. PATMAN. It would be very helpful, but it would require a change in the law, of course. It would not reach all these other classes of cases that we have discussed. It would just reach those particular cases connected with the Government. To that extent it would be good. It would be fine.

Mr. EVINS. There is then a difference in the policy or the law with respect to various agencies of the government—some agencies are not permitted to disclose information whereas other agencies do publicize certain information.

The Government recognizes that difference does exist?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir; I do.

Not so long ago a constituent gave me the information that her son had deposited $5,000 in a bank in the West, or had made an investment in a Federal savings and loan. His letter did not indicate clearly, and she could not determine exactly where he had made the investment or deposited the money, but he had that much money. She knew that. He had lost his life overseas. She was trying to find some way to locate that money. Of course, there is no way in the world to do it. In this case it was the Pacific Coast area. She would have to inquire at every bank on the Pacific Coast or at every Federal savings and loan, and if an officer of either institution was approached, doubtless he would be indifferent; he would want some evidence of heirship or kinship, or want to know why this person was inquiring. So you would have an endless task before you, which would be absolutely impossible. The result is there is no way today that unclaimed and dormant accounts and investments, running into hundreds of millions of dollars, can be identified and delivered to the people who are legally entitled to receive them.

SAYS $3 BILLION IN IDLE FUNDS THAT SHOULD BE RECOVERED

Some time ago I received a copy of a letter that Lazar Karpess, certified public accountant, Brooklyn, N. Y., had written to Mr. John L. Sullivan, who was then Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, concerning additional revenue and unclaimed deposits. I am inserting herewith a part of the letter:

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN has just introduced a bill whereby unclaimed deposits in the 5,137 national banks in the United States, which are estimated to be as high as $100 million, would be turned over to the United States Treasury. While the importance of this bill cannot be denied, nevertheless, the estimated amount is but 3 percent of more than $3 billion in idle funds which should be recovered by the Federal Government from many thousands of lost legacies, some of which are as follows:

An endowment in Massachusetts for the relief of superannuated wool carders. There have been no wool carders there in the last 150 years, but the fund is still accumulating in the banks.

An endowment providing for the ransom of American seamen held by Barbary pirates on the North African coast.

An endowed lectureship at an American university on the use of coal gas as a cure for malaria fever.

An endowment dated 1683 providing for the "relief of seven aged Protestants in the county of Cork, Ireland." For the last 50 or 60 years the trustees have been unable to find seven Protestants of any kind in all County Cork. The fund now has more than $300,000 in it.

The Bryan Mullauphy Fund, St. Louis, 1851, aids "worthy and distressed travelers passing through St. Louis to take up new land in the West." At last report the fund had more than $1 million surplus and no takers.

The English Parliament nationalized similar wealth more than 100 years ago, when a board of inquiry found 30,000 trust funds, endowments, and foundations for classes of people and charitable causes that had vanished from the earth.

Therefore, I urgently recommend that you consider the advisability of appointing a special commission or inquiry board with powers to make a similar investigaton of trust funds, endowments, and foundations in our country. I am confident the results will enable our Government to recover these enormous idle funds of $3 billion for the common good of our Nation. These suggestions should be included in the proposed bill by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN for the recovery by the Federal Government of unclaimed deposits of $100 million held by the 5,137 national banks.

My intensely patriotic devotion to our democratic way of life has led me to write this letter, with the fervent hope that you will command me to render a service for our country in this crisis before us.

LIARE RENTALS

Lease Rental Service of Tulsa, Okla., had the following to say concerning the unclaimed deposits proposal:

A copy of your bill, H. R. 4886, providing for the disposition of unclaimed deposits in national banks, is before us and is read with much interest. We certainly think you have something here and we would like to help if you can find a use for our information.

Our business, is the collection of unclaimed oil and gas lease rental deposits, and during the 4 months we have been operating we can certainly give you some very interesting angles as to why these deposits have accurred.

This bill H. R. 4886 was pending several years ago. There is no bill pending at this time that would meet this problem.

Advertisements are inserted in some cities covering a small part of these assets but many of the interested people are doubtless out of reach of such publications.

A member of a legislature in one of the eastern-seaboard States had the following to say concerning the unclaimed deposits proposal:

I am very much interestéd in your bill H. R. 4886, and if it isn't taking too much of your time, I would like to know its status in the Congress.

As a member of the escheats committee, board of trustees, I had introduced, in the last legislature of this State, a bill, very similar to your bill, but the bankers defeated us largely for the reason that State legislation would not apply to national banks. We, who are handling this matter at the university, feel that if your bill becomes law that we can hope to get a State law that will give us the dead money in State banks.

Therefore, we are pulling for your bill, and if there is anything that we might be able to do to cause its enactment, it would be a pleasure.

This matter of allowing banks to keep this type of money has been neglected too long in both State and Nation. We succeeded in getting the dead money in dead State banks, approximately $200,000, that, at outside, would not be over 20 percent of the par of the claims, which you see was neglect that reduced a $1,000,000 to $200,000.

The Securities and Exchange Commission brought to the attention of the public interesting information concerning unknown owners of stocks and bonds. A newspaper clipping, which appeared about a year ago, concerning this information is as follows:

TWENTY-FIVE MILLION; WHO OWNS IT?—SEC LISTS REORGANIZED STOCKS, BONDS—WARNS OF DEADLINE DATES

Twenty-five million dollars is waiting for someone, and part of it may belong to you.

The Securities and Exchange Commission this week issued "a special report listing securities and cash available to investors, which may be lost forever unless the investors entitled thereto take prompt action. The funds available amount to $25 million."

These are securities of corporations, mostly utility concerns, which were looted by "holding company magnates," got into financial trouble, and were reorganized as a result of New Deal reforms. Some, however, are nonutility corporations which were reorganized by bankruptcy proceedings. Altogether, these companies had millions of stock and bond holders.

WILL BECOME WORTHLESS

"Publication of the list," the SEC said, "is an attempt to help investors realize every last dollar to which they are entitled in these corporate reorganizations.

"Unfortunately, those investors who can least afford to lose are the ones most likely to have forgotten or neglected their ownership of securities, or to be unaware of the reorganization proceedings."

The report lists about 200 securities which have value now but will become worthless after "deadline" dates.

The commission says it is sending copies of the list to banks and brokers, who can show the list to anyone interested. Copies may also be obtained by writing to the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., and asking for the report on Securities Required to be Exchanged for Cash or New Securities.

A $250,000 POT OF GOLD

The following news article appeared in the Chicago Sunday Tribune, March 28, 1948:

A $250,000 POT OF GOLD AWAITS 121 CHICAGOANS—LOST STOCKHOLDERS OR HEIRS SOUGHT

(By Lloyd Wendt)

Five large midwestern and eastern corporations are seeking information concerning 12 Chicago area residents or former residents who are on their stockholder lists but cannot be located. They are the owners of shares which, with accumulated dividends, are worth almost $250,000. The individual amounts range from $50 to $8,000.

All of the 123 purchased stock in the corporations many years ago. Subsequently they moved from the addresses listed on the corporation books. The company officials have not been able to find them. They are ready to buy the stock and to pay the accumulated dividends either to the forgetful shareholders or their legal heirs. All that is necessary is proof of identity, or, in the event the shareholder no longer is living, proof of heirship.

HERE'S CHANCE TO HELP

The names and last known addresses of the missing persons have been provided to the Tribune by Dan Eisenberg of Skip Tracers Co. in New York, who has specialized in finding missing persons for many years. The individuals named, their legal heirs, or readers having useful information about them can assist in the search for the missing stockholders by sending the facts they possess to Missing Persons, the Chicago Tribune, Chicago. All letters will be forwarded, unopened, to Eisenberg.

During the years he had been in the business of hunting missing persons, Eisenberg has found more than 10,000 individuals who had money coming to them, according to his records. Recently the widow of Frank C. Rhodes, former New York broker, was found by the company in an Eastern State and informed that she can receive $40,000 for 35 shares of stock her husband bought and forgot. The shares now are worth $20,000, while the accumulated dividends total $20,000 more.

Sometimes the stockholder is lost because his name has been misspelled on the com-

pany records, or the address was given incorrectly. More often, however, the investor simply forgot that he owned the stock and failed to leave a forwarding address when he moved. Frequently a few clews, provided by relatives or former friends, make it possible for Skip Tracers 'agents to find him, but occasionally the techniques of a private detective are required. To date, Eisenberg estimates that he has been successful in 85 percent of the cases he has undertaken. In about one-third of the successful cases, heirs of the original stockholders received the money.

"A few years ago, corporations had little interest in finding missing stockholders," Eisenberg said. "Unclaimed accounts were a bookkeeping nuisance, but it was felt that nothing could be done about them. Our company made a survey of 500 corporations and found on their lists 167,000 names of persons who had not received dividends for years. The company didn't know where to send the money.

"PUT HOARD AT THIRTY MILLION

"That's where we came in. We undertook to trace down a list of 12,500 names and have been doing that work ever since. We estimate that there is upwards of $30 million in unclaimed or uncollected dividends and unredeemed stocks and bonds in various vaults about the country. While most of the certificates are owned by small shareholders, some of the amounts total into the thousands."

Usually the missing shareholders are glad to be "found," but occasionally one objects. A few years ago, Skip Tracers was looking for a man who had $400 coming to him. From his relatives they learned that he was fond of a certain science magazine. They checked the subscription list of the publication and found that the man they sought was living in an Ohio city.

WANTED IN JEWEL THEFT

An agent called at the address provided by the magazine list and was ordered off the premises. Suspicious, he went to the local police and told his story. They checked the description he provided and advised that the man sought was wanted for jewel robbery. They seized the elusive stockholder just as he was attempting to leave town.

More often, however, missing stockholders are delighted to discover that a cash windfall is awaiting them. Recently, Skip Tracers found a Florida man who had invested heavily in the market prior to 1929. After the crash he took up life as a beachcomber and papered the walls of his shack with gaudy stock certificates. He learned from Skip Tracers that his wallpaper was worth $34,000.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and insert certain letters and newspaper articles.)

WALSH-HEALEY LOCALITY AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENDER). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein the bill that I introduced, to which an amendment is related.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced an amendment to the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act on a matter of great importance not only to the New England textile industry but also to employers and employees throughout the country. My amendment would strike out the reference to locality in section 1 (d) of the act, the section which provides for the determination by the Secretary of Labor prevailing minimum wages to be paid on Government supply contracts. This deletion would make clear beyond question that minimum wage rates under the act may be determined on a nationwide basis and that the Secretary is not required to fix different wage rates for different areas of the country.

This is in full accord with the intent of Congress. In fact, for many industries, the evils to which the act was directed could not be eliminated in any other way. The primary purpose of the statute, as clearly revealed by its legislative history, was to prevent expenditures by the Federal Government from encouraging and perpetuating substandard labor conditions. Inasmuch as Government contracts are normally awarded to the lowest bidder, the employers paying the lowest wages had a definite advantage in bidding on the billions of dollars of Government contracts. This, of course, worked to the very serious detriment to the working people and also to employers paying decent wages.

In addition to eliminating this inequity, the Walsh-Healey Act was specifically intended to protect legitimate dealers, in bidding on Government contracts, from the competition of unscrupulous bid brokers and vest-pocket dealers.

It is quite apparent that in many industries these purposes of the act could not have been achieved unless there were a single industrywide minimum wage. If a lower minimum had been established for low-paying areas, Government contracts would have continued to flow to those areas. Also, unscrupulous contractors in higher wage areas would have been able, through bid peddling, to have the contract work performed by manufacturers in low-paying areas.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, these results have been avoided, because from the very inception of the act, the Secretary of Labor has fixed a single nationwide minimum wage with respect to many industries. Furthermore, it is clear that Congress has agreed with this setting of nationwide determinations. Year after year the Secretary of Labor has come to Congress for an appropriation for the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act. If Congress considered that he had no authority to determine prevailing minimum wages on a nationwide basis, it is inconceivable that it would have granted these appropriations, as it did, without taking the necessary action to limit his discretion. During these last 16 years, the question of nationwide determinations has been raised many times in committee hearings and floor deliberations, but Congress has never repudiated the Secretary's interpretation. The reason is clear. Determination of minimum wages on a locality basis would foster the very evils which the act was intended to cure.

The most recent attempt to compel the Secretary to make wage determinations on a locality basis occurred during the last session of Congress. The Fulbright amendment to the Defense Production Act, as originally introduced in the Senate, would have required the making of such determinations on the basis of city, town, village, or other civil subdivision. The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency specifically rejected this locality amendment.

Although the locality amendment was rejected, Mr. Speaker, the 82d Congress adopted a very broad procedural amendment to the Walsh-Healey Act. Relying upon this amendment, about 92 firms in the textile industry have brought an action in the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia to prevent the nationwide minimum wage determination of the Secretary of Labor in that industry from taking effect. The court construed the new amendment as permitting any manufacturer to challenge a wage determination, even though the manufacturer does not have a Government contract and has not even bid on one. Many of the 92 firms involved in this action were in that situation. Two weeks ago the court issued a stay order which has prevented the Secretary's minimum wage determination from applying to those firms until the legality of the determination is finally decided. Further, the order of the court allows other textile firms to join in the action and be relieved, at least temporarily, from complying with the wage determination.

In granting this broad stay of the wage determination, the district court did not rule on whether an industry-wide minimum wage determination is legal. That question will be decided later in this litigation. However, Judge Schweinhaut expressed an opinion, in effect, that the textile wage determination was probably illegal because it was established on an industry-wide basis.

If such an opinion is finally adopted and the interpretation accepted during the past 16 years is upset, the effect would be disastrous, particularly for the New England textile industry. This would also be felt throughout the Nation by employees, and by employers with high labor standards. The ultimate result would be tantamount to an actual repeal of the Walsh-Healey Act.

In order to prevent such a possibility, Mr. Speaker, and to affirm the long-established and accepted interpretation, I believe that all reference to locality should be removed from the act. The amendment I have offered would strike out that language, and would thereby make certain that the purposes of the Walsh-Healey Act will not be defeated.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KILBURN in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a speech.

Mr. FARRINGTON in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in three instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in four instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON in three instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KNOX and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCVEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in two instances and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. GRAHAM and to include a short editorial.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in three instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. PERKINS and to include an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include an address by Gen. Omar Bradley.

Mr. WALTER and to include a letter and an editorial which appeared in the World-Telegram.

Mr. WIER and to include an article.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include an editorial from the Denver Post of February 27.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include the opening testimony of Mr. George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, before the Committee on Education and Labor, in regard to the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. BARTLETT and to include an editorial.

Mr. SECREST.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ASPINALL in three instances and to include in each instance extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include an article by the Honorable Barnet Hodes on "The American Heritage."

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include copy of certain jury instructions which were recently given by a distinguished Los Angeles district Federal judge in a criminal case in which the Communists were found guilty of conspiring to overthrow the present United States Government by force and violence, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mr. BATES in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include a resolution commending Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. FEIGHAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include a letter from the Christian Science Monitor and also an article.

Mr. VURSELL and to include a resolution.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. WOLVERTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. KEARNS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. BOGGS in two instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a magazine article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. MCVEY) and include an article by Mr. Isaac Don Levine entitled "Stalin's Death May Help Shorten the Korean War," published in the Washington Daily News of March 3.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCVEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

509. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 101); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

510. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

511. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the Department of the Army relative to the disposal of Army excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Government Operations.

512. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

513. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting the annual report with respect to tort claims paid within the Housing and Home Finance Agency by the office of the Administrator and the constituent agencies, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration for the calendar year 1952, pursuant to section 404, Public Law 601, 79th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

514. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

515. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

516. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a list of cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

517. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

519. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

520. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

521. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475), relating to life preservers for river steamers"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

522. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend section 6 of the act of July 31, 1950, relating to appropriations for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Eklutna project, Alaska"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 156. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 125; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 66. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with an amendment (Rept. No. 111). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 116. Resolution to provide funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 115; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 145. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 113; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 148. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 32, 83d Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 123. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 91; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1524. A bill to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2561. A bill to further amend the act of May 29, 1945, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service" by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder; with an amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2567. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers; with an amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 169. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2330, a bill to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 170. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3575, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2011. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a campsite and other public purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2013. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2019. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to Ted B. Landoe and Roderic S. Carpenter; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 73. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 3684. A bill to increase the personal income exemptions of a taxpayer, including a dependent and the additional exemption for old age or blindness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 3685. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish space and facilities, if available, to State veteran agencies; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 3686. A bill to encourage equity investments through extension of tax incentives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLLING:

H. R. 3687. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 3688. A bill to extend the old-age and survivors insurance system to certain service performed by fishermen, including service performed by them aboard vessels of 10 tons or less; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3689. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to automatic separation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3690. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 3691. A bill to authorize the construction of additional works for the extension of the Contra Costa Canal, a feature of the Central Valley project, California; to the Committeee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3692. A bill to provide for a pay increase for postmasters, officers, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3693. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healey Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3694. A bill to reclassify dictaphones in the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 3695. A bill to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HARDEN:

H. R. 3696. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3697. A bill to aid in controlling inflation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3698. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3699. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3700. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide uniform longevity grades for the postal field service" approved May 3, 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 3701. A bill to provide that certain alien spouses of American servicemen may be admitted to the United States, if they were married with the consent of the appropriate military authority, notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 3702. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire title to real property and to provide for the construction of certain public buildings for housing of Federal agencies or departments, including post offices, by executing purchase contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 3703. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigration inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service," approved March 2, 1931; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 3704. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 3705. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3706. A bill to amend section 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, so as to provide shorter periods of service for certain doctors and dentists who are inducted thereunder after serving on active duty in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 3707. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3708. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide uniform longevity grades for the postal field service" approved May 3, 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3709. A bill to protect the rights of veterans of World War II in the field postal

service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3710. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3711. A bill to promote greater economy in the operations of the Federal Government by providing for a consolidated cash budget, a separation of operating from capital expenditures, long-range budget estimates, the scheduling of legislative action on appropriation measures, yea-and-nay votes on amendments to appropriation measures, and a Presidential item veto; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3712. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Solano project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 3713. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions (including the exemptions for dependents and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) from $600 to $800 for 1953, and to $1,000 for 1954 and succeeding years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 3714. A bill to authorize the improvement of Blaine Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 3715. A bill to amend and extend until June 30, 1954, the provision of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, as amended, and to prescribe standards for the implementation of such provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3716. A bill to regulate subsistence, expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 3717. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1946, in order retroactively to advance in grade, time in grade and compensation certain employees in the postal field service who are veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3718. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3719. A bill to protect the salaries of clerks in Post Offices of the third class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3720. A bill to protect striped bass; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. J. Res. 207. Joint resolution providing for the extension of the period of pensionable service in the case of Navy veterans of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in June of each year as Fathers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution revoking the authorization of the Solano project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution revoking the authorization of the Solano project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. J. Res. 211. Joint resolution directing the Administrator of General Services to remove the mural paintings from the lobby of the Rincon Annex Post Office Building in San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution permitting the entry of 500 children under 6 years of age, adopted by United States citizens who are serving abroad in the Armed Forces of the United States, or who are employed abroad by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution expressing the hopes of the American people for the early liberation of the Russian people and other peoples within the Soviet Union from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 167. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1, a bill to reduce individual income taxes, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 168. Resolution authorizing funds for the inspection of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL: Memorial of the Colorado State Legislature memorializing Congress to authorize funds to be made available for construction of several units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON: Resolution passed by the New Hampshire Legislature requesting that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor-fuel taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona that those agencies of the United States Government directly concerned with water problems recognize its signification by adoption of a statement of policy for the guidance and assistance of the legislature in its future deliberations and indicate their willingness to cooperate with the State of Arizona in effecting an orderly withdrawal of existing ground water supplies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, that the Congress eliminate all existing Federal laws which discriminate against Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing condemnation of Soviet Russia for its brutal and inhumane persecution of Jews living behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize funds to be made available for construction of several units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the amendment of the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the election of a Resident Commissioner for the Territory of Guam in Washington, D. C., and to provide for the appointment of a Representative to present this matter to the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting provision for appointment of residents of Guam to the United States Military and Naval Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Giovanni DeLuca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3722. A bill for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Edward H. Cox; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lynn Nels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. Strong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Thomas Henry Harrison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 3727. A bill for the relief of David Yang and wife, Katherine Louise Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 3728. A bill for the relief of Helen Gertrude Koubek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of Teresa Maria Cipollone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3730. A bill for the relief of James D. Boubaris (Bubaris); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3731. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Micich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 3732. A bill for the relief of Catherine (Catherina) D. Pilgard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 3733. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Holder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3734. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elpiniki Calalidou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3735. A bill for the relief of Maria Ansuini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 3736. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Ruttner and Mrs. Edith Ruttner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3737. A bill for the relief of Maria Quiteoriotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 3738. A bill for the relief of Max Fischer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3739. A bill for the relief of Robert Bertram; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3740. A bill for the relief of Henry William Brady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3741. A bill for the relief of Ludmila Orange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3742. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3743. A bill for the relief of Joseph David Segal, Chaim Szemaja Segal, and Icek Herss Segal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3744. A bill for the relief of the Shea-Matson Trucking Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3745. A bill for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3746. A bill for the relief of Mario Sebac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3747. A bill for the relief of Kalman and Kato Berger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3748. A bill for the relief of David Raskin and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3749. A bill for the relief of Woldemar Jaskowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3750. A bill for the relief of Miss Inge Beckmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3751. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 3752. A bill for the relief of Miss Hatsuko Tsuhamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 3753. A bill for the relief of Cynthia Jacob; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3754. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Spennato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 3755. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Wimer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 3756. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3758. A bill for the relief of Stavrula Perutsea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 3759. A bill for the relief of Babette Mueller Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3760. A bill for the relief of Walter D. Jenckes and Harriet Jenckes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3761. A bill for the relief of Galicano Padem Achacoso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3762. A bill for the relief of Edvardo Romua Arabe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of our life, Fountain of our being: We thank Thee for the light of Thy countenance which illumines our pathway with eternal splendor. Without that light we walk in darkness. Without Thee as guide our boasted progress but leads to the quagmires of futility and oblivion. Without Thee our science but whets the sword to a sharper edge and would destroy us with our own wheels and wings. Without Thee commerce cannot save us, for selfish trade but lifts the hunger of covetousness to a higher pitch. Without Thee even education cannot redeem us, for we know now that the mere sharpening of the intellect, the massing and mastery of facts and figures may but fit men to be tenfold more masterful in the awful art of slaughter. And so, we pray that Thou wilt shatter our delusions, shine through our blindness, shame our pride, that we stray not in folly away from Thee.

As partners in a crusade of decency and honor to make men free, bring us to the common victory for the inalienable rights of all men everywhere. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 4, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is necessary for the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and myself to attend an important meeting on official business, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that we may be excused for such time this afternoon as may be necessary for us to attend the meeting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the leave is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 5210 OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS BY UNITED STATES DISBURSING OFFICERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LIFE PRESERVERS FOR RIVER STEAMERS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4482 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 475) relating to life preservers for river steamers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE EKLUTNA PROJECT, ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6 of the act of July 31, 1950, relating to appropriations for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Eklutna project, Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF POTENTIAL FORT GIBSON PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Interior on a plan for the construction of the potential Fort Gibson project, Oklahoma (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on foreign excess personal property disposal, for the period January 1 to December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of January 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered in cases of temporary admission of certain aliens into the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, granting the applications for permanent residence of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders, granting the applications for permanent residence of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

A letter from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, withdrawing the names of certain aliens from lists of aliens heretofore transmitted to the Senate relating to suspension of deportation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the calendar year 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commissioner of Education on the administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, 81st Congress, 2d session, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF LIST OF POSITIONS NOT UNDER CIVIL SERVICE (PT. 2 OF S. DOC. NO. 18)

A letter from the Executive Director, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 19, agreed to January 9, 1953, a further list of positions not under civil service rules and regulations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed as part 2 of Senate Document No. 18.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, and Representatives WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF, all of Washington, D. C., requesting the enactment of legislation providing for the donation of lands formerly within the Fort Missoula Military Reservation to Missoula County, Mont.

"Whereas the United States of America formerly established a military reservation in Missoula County, Mont., which was legally denominated Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas subsequent to World War II, Fort Missoula was decommissioned as a fort and substantial portions of Fort Missoula were declared to be surplus; and

"Whereas the United States is now making no use of large portions of the area formerly comprising Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas the citizens of Missoula, Mont., through the Missoula Chamber of Commerce, have heretofore donated substantial areas of land to the United States for Fort Missoula; and

"Whereas the county of Missoula is at the present time leasing a portion of the area, but under a lease is unable to adequately preserve and protect the buildings and is unable, under the existing laws of the State of Montana, to purchase the portions of Fort Missoula not now used by the United States and not held for contemplated use by the United States; and

"Whereas the said lands and buildings would be of great value to the public of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States providing for the donation of those portions of Fort Missoula which are not being used by the United States for military service to the county of Missoula; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD and Representatives WESLEY A. D'EWART and LEE METCALF.

"DEAN CHAFFIN,
"Speaker of the House.
"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved February 25, 1953."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States and the State Department to express their condemnation of Soviet Russia for its brutal and inhumane persecution of Jews living behind the Iron Curtain

"Whereas the Communists to advance their antireligious philosophies have embarked on a determined program of enslavement, torture, and extermination of large segments of the population of Europe; and

"Whereas as a result thereof the lives of 2,500,000 persons of the Jewish faith behind the Iron Curtain hang in the balance; and

"Whereas the democratic forces of all right-thinking people of the world must be marshaled to combat this barbaric course of action in order that the fundamental concepts of morality, religion, and freedom can endure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests the President and Congress of the United States, and the State Department to condemn publicly the persecution and brutal treatment of Jews living behind the Iron Curtain, and to combat such uncivilized action by taking whatever steps are possible to curtail further brutality and persecution; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing Congress to authorize funds to be made available for construction of several units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects

"Whereas the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, which include the proposed Florida reservoir, Pine River extension, Navaho reservoir, Hammond, South San Juan and the Shiprock projects, has been approved by the Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

"Whereas the construction of reservoirs and utilization of the Colorado River and its tributaries, as contemplated and reported on, aside from direct and lasting benefit to business and to agriculture, will also be of greatly increased benefit to fish culture and better fishing, and that recreational areas for the use of the public will be created of immeasurable value; and

"Whereas in spite of all organized opposition and reports to the contrary, there will be no assessable damage of any kind or nature to any public use area involved in the construction of said projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to consider a bill which would authorize funds to be made available for the construction of the several units of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, as recommended by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Colorado Water Conservation Board; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial No. 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation granting domestic producers of gold to sell their product in the markets of the world—Memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation authorizing the domestic producers of gold to sell the product of their labors in the markets of the world

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 35th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation authorizing the sale of gold from domestic mines by the producers thereof on the open markets of the world at prices which prevail on those markets, without further restriction; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to investigate the reasons for present restrictions upon the buying and selling of gold within and without the United States by citizens of the United States, which privilege is denied citizens of this country although extended to citizens of other countries, with

no apparent harmful effects upon the economics of the respective countries in which gold is allowed to be bought and sold without Government restriction; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States investigate and determine the reasons why the International Monetary Fund has consistently sidetracked the issue involved in raising the price of gold on an international basis to a realistic figure commensurate with the costs of production within gold-producing countries; be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to take action now pending: 'Recoinage of the $10 gold pieces'; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and Congressmen representing those States in which gold is produced either as a primary product or as a by-product from the production of other metals, and to the President of the United States, with the additional plea directed to the Chief Executive that immediate steps be taken to bring about the objectives set forth in this joint memorial.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Island of Guam; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolution 14

"Resolution relative to memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to provide for appointment of residents of Guam to the United States Military and Naval Academies

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas residents of other Territories of the United States are eligible for appointments as cadets and midshipmen to the Military and Naval Academies; and

"Whereas there are many able and deserving residents of Guam who are not presently eligible under the laws of the United States to receive such appointments: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the legislature does hereby memorialize and request the Congress of the United States to amend the statutes of the United States to provide that an equal number of appointments shall be made from among the residents of the Territory of Guam as are made from among the residents of every other Territory of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved That the executive secretary be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Defense, and the Governor of Guam."

A resolution of the Legislature of the Island of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution 8

"Resolution relative to memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the election of a Resident Commissioner for the Territory of Guam in Washington, D. C., and to provide for the appointment of a representative to present this matter to the Congress of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

"Whereas it is customary for Territories of the United States to be represented in the Congress of the United States by nonvoting Resident Commissioners or Delegates to Congress; and

"Whereas the Territory of Guam has not been accorded the right of such representation, although the people of Guam strongly desire the same; and

"Whereas such representation is necessary to a ready understanding by the Congress of the problems of the people of Guam and to their ultimate solution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to amend the Organic Act of Guam to provide for the election of a Resident Commissioner to represent the Territory of Guam in the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to provide adequate notice to the Guam Legislature prior to considering the matter of providing for a commissioner in order that a qualified representative of the legislature and people of Guam may present necessary information and explain the desirability of such a commissioner to the Members and to the proper committees of the United States Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That the committee on rules be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint one qualified person as representative; and be it further

"Resolved, That the committee on rules be, and is hereby, authorized to pay the necessary travel and other expenses of that representative out of the fund appropriated for contingent expenses of the legislature; and be it further

"Resolved, That the executive secretary be directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Governor of Guam."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaksa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Public Lands, United States House of Representatives; the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas statehood in the American Union on a basis of full equality has long been an aspiration of the people of Alaska, believing in government of, by, and for the people; and

"Whereas the people of Alaska have, for a long time past, demonstrated their ability and fitness to assume the full rights, obligations, and duties of citizens of the United States, and now desire to form themselves into a State, as the people of all other Territories have done before them; and

"Whereas the people of our sister Territory of Hawaii enjoy the prospect of being admitted to statehood at the present session of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the people of the United States, committees of the Congress of the United States, and the national platforms of both our major political parties have called for the early admission of Alaska to statehood.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States, at its present session, adopt adequate enabling legislation providing for the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior of the United States; and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas an appointment to fill the office of Governor of the Territory of Alaska under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower is imminent; and

"Whereas the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, has repeatedly stated that he would prefer to appoint an Alaskan to the office of Governor of the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska are desirous of having an Alaskan appointed Governor of Alaska until such time as enabling legislation is enacted so that they may elect an Alaskan to this office; and

"Whereas there are residents of the Territory of Alaska who are able and fully qualified to fill the office of governor.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that a bona fide resident and inhabitant of the Territory of Alaska be forthwith appointed to the office of governor.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, That the text of this memorial be telegraphed to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower and the Honorable Douglas McKay immediately upon its adoption."

The petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, of Paterson, N. J., praying for leave to deposit with the Sergeant at Arms, for the use of the Senate, 96 copies of a brief relating to his claims against Philip Forman and Guy L. Fake, United States district judges for the district of New Jersey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The petition of H. Joseph Mahoney, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relating to free and independent States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency, and J. D. Small, Chairman Munitions Board:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session, duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to wit:

"Whereas our normal peacetime requirements of primary antimony are about 15,000 tons and in the event of an all-out war these requirements would be increased to about 45,000 tons; and

"Whereas heavy importation of foreign antimony at depressed prices during 1951 and 1952 forced the Yellow Pine mine in Valley County, Idaho, to shut down with the result that our total domestic production, since this shutdown, has been at the rate of less than 100 tons annually, or less than 1 percent of our total domestic requirements; and

"Whereas the said Yellow Pine mine, for years had been supplying over 90 percent of the entire domestic mine output and has a productive capacity equivalent to over 20 percent of our peacetime requirement and about 10 percent of our wartime needs; and

"Whereas formerly our principal source of supply was from China, which source is no longer available to the free world, and another major source has been Bolivia, which source is undependable because of an unstable government and economic disturbance, and all other sources are either far distant, declining or undependable; and

"Whereas our Government stockpile has been estimated to contain only 20,000 tons of primary antimony, or approximately 6 months' supply during a wartime demand period; and

"Whereas our major wartime requirements for antimony cannot be satisfied by scrap or secondary antimony, but only by primary antimony; and

"Whereas since February 1952 the total United States consumption of primary antimony has exceeded the total available supply, including imports; and

"Whereas the United States industrial stocks of primary antimony have declined during 1952 to the lowest point in many years; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge that in the interests of national security the new administration carefully examine our Nation's stockpiling program with respect to primary antimony; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that since we are now in a war emergency and are currently dependent on foreign sources for over 99 percent of our primary antimony supplies, we believe that our national stockpile of primary antimony, estimated to contain only enough antimony to last 6 months during an all-out war, is dangerously inadequate, and we believe that the antimony stockpile objective should be raised to a more realistic figure; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that consideration be given to encouraging or maintaining some productive capacity in this country. We particularly refer to the closed down antimony mine and smelter at Stibnite, Idaho, and believe it regrettable that these excellent facilities have not been made use of in building up an adequate stockpile; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George W. Malone, chairman, Senate Mines Committee, and Hon. A. L. Miller, chairman of House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint memorial to the President, the Congress, and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, relative to certain indemnity lands selected by the State of Idaho in lieu of school sections belonging to the public school endowment

"We, your memorialists, the 32d Legislature of Idaho, respectfully represent and request that:

"Whereas the State of Idaho, acting by and through its duly authorized officers, on April 14, 1913, filed clear lists No. 15, 16, and 21 for indemnity selection of lands in Caribou and Bingham Counties, Idaho, which selection was in lieu of school sections withheld from the lands granted to the State by the Idaho Admission Act; and

"Whereas such clear listed lands amounting to 117,407.07 acres were then subject to a reservation by the United States of the phosphate located thereon which reservation was later withdrawn; and

"Whereas such lands were selected in lieu of lands in which the State of Idaho had title to all mineral rights; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho now has title to said lands and to all other minerals in said land save and except phosphate; and

"Whereas Congress did not include indemnity selections such as those contained in clear lists No. 15, 16, and 21 within the scope of the act of January 25, 1927 (43 U. S. C. A. 870), although it was apparently intended by the Congress that that act should confirm to the State with regard to indemnity lands an interest equivalent to that granted under the act in all school sections known to be mineral on the effective date of that act; and

"Whereas the development of these clear listed lands for phosphate mining has been undertaken under leases issued in good faith by the State of Idaho, and the State has expended money and effort in the development of these areas for phosphate production; and has collected substantial rentals thereon; and

"Whereas the values contained there should, when mined, accrue to the benefit of the public school endowment fund of Idaho as was intended in the grants contained in the admission act; and

"Whereas the United States in 1950 issued leases to mine phosphate in and upon these same lands, and thereby claimed paramount authority to phosphate deposits located in such lands, but lays no other claim to such lands.

"Now, therefore, your memorialists, the 32d Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will confirm to the State of Idaho the title to all phosphate found, or to be found, in the lands covered by clear lists 15, 16, and 21, and will restore these rights to the State; and it is hereby directed that the attorney general of Idaho make representation to the Government of the United States to the end that such legislation be enacted; and that he cause copies of this memorial, duly certified, to be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Representatives of Idaho in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent: that—

"Whereas in Idaho a total of 250 million board feet of Engelmann spruce timber has been infested and killed by a violent outbreak of the Engelmann spruce bark beetle during the summer of 1952; and

"Whereas total spruce stands of 2 billion board feet and having a stumpage value of $15 million and whose manufacture would create labor and lumber values amounting to over $175 million on these five national forests and adjacent lands in other ownerships are immediately threatened by this insect outbreak; and

"Whereas in addition there are 3 billion board feet of spruce in Idaho which may be killed by this insect outbreak unless it is controlled; and

"Whereas a plan to control the epidemic and salvage the spruce has been developed by a joint Forest Service, Bureau of Entomology, the State of Idaho, and Timber Industry Group; and

"Whereas the carrying out of the program will make possible the protection from bark beetle attack of intermingled species of timber and salvage of all infested timber; and

"Whereas this plan has the objective in Idaho of removing 205 million board feet of infested and salvage spruce in 1953 and 475 million board feet of such spruce in 1954 which will require the construction of 368 miles of access roads during the 2-year period; and

"Whereas it is necessary to supplement the road-construction and logging plans with a chemical-treatment program to control the spread of the bark beetles in isolated areas; and

"Whereas time is the essence of the success of this program as timber killed by this insect has little value unless salvaged within 2 years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the 32d Legislative Assembly of Idaho of 1953, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we most earnestly request that the Congress of the United States recognize the importance of the spruce timber resource in Idaho and to immediately initiate an adequate emergency program to control the spruce bark beetle epidemic; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"House Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution memorializing the assumption of governmental authority by a new national administration by the election of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States

"Whereas in accordance with constitutional provisions and procedure a national election was held on November 4, 1952, for the office of President and other National and State offices; and

"Whereas the citizens of this Republic exercising their inalienable right of suffrage have seen fit to entrust the responsibility of Government to a new administration and did elect the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States of America; and

"Whereas this exhibition and bestowal of confidence on the part of the American people is being fulfilled by the expression of these fundamental principles of freedom, justice, and morality upon which this Nation was founded, and from which it derives its great strength and power, as evidenced by the humble prayer to Almighty God, spoken by our new Chief Executive upon his taking the oath of office as President of these United States; and also by his subsequent concise, forthright, and inspiring state of the Union message to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware (the Senate concurring therein), That the 117th General Assembly of the State of Delaware hereby expresses its recognition and appreciation of the assumption of the powers of Government by the new national administration and conveys to the President, the Honorable Dwight

D. Eisenhower, the Vice President, the Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON, and to all others in authority, its hearty felicitations, good wishes, and high hopes that they, with God's help and guidance, will meet the grave problems of the moment, and of the difficult times ahead with foresight, courage, and wisdom; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Delaware congressional delegation."

By Mr. BRICKER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Congressmen from Montana, memorializing the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon a United States Senate joint resolution relative to making treaties and executive agreements

"Whereas the 83d Congress of the United States has introduced a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1953, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we hereby most earnestly request the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon Senate Joint Resolution 1, to wit:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"' "ARTICLE —

"' "SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"' "SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"' "SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"' "SEC. 4. All executive or other agreements between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"' "SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"' "SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; be it further

"'*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States.'"

PERSECUTION OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES—RESOLUTION OF DELEGATE COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY AFFAIRS, JEWISH FEDERATION OF NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Delegate Committee on Community Affairs of the Jewish Federation of New Orleans, La., together with a list of member organizations, which was sent to me by Jules J. Paglin, chairman of that committee, relating to the persecution of minority groups by Russia and her satellites.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with a list of member organizations, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY DELEGATE BODY OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF NEW ORLEANS, FEBRUARY 26, 1953

Every right-thinking and justice-loving person in the United States has been shocked and chagrined to learn of the beastly persecution of Jews and other minority groups in Soviet Russia and the satellite countries. Therefore, all of us present at this gathering desire to protest against these atrocities and to condemn these inhuman practices. We furthermore desire to give expression to the hope that the United States representatives at the United Nations General Assembly will make their voices heard in behalf of democracy and humanity and protest vigorously against the abominable crimes that are being perpetrated by Soviet Russia and her satellites.

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE DELEGATE COMMITTEE OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS OF THE JEWISH FEDERATION OF NEW ORLEANS

Anshe Sfard Congregation, Anshe Sfard Sisterhood, Beth Israel Congregation, Beth Israel Sisterhood, B'nai B'rith Lodge, B'nai B'rith Women's Auxiliary, Business and Professional Women of Hadassah, Chevra Thilim Congregation, Chevra Thilim Sisterhood, Gates of Prayer Congregation, Gates of Prayer Sisterhood, Hadassah, Jewish Federation, Mizrachi Organization, Pioneer Women, Temple Sinai Congregation, Temple Sinai Sisterhood, Touro Synagogue Congregation, Touro Synagogue Sisterhood, Workmen's Circle, Zionist Organization.

INCLUSION OF ATTORNEYS IN SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF WEST VIRGINIA STATE BAR

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution unanimously adopted by the board of governors of the West Virginia state bar, in regard to legislation to permit practicing attorneys to become eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act, and in support of a tax-deferment-pension plan.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEST VIRGINIA STATE BAR

Whereas practicing attorneys were excluded from the retirement and insurance benefits available to those self-employed under the 1950 amendment to the Social Security Act; and

Whereas the various bar associations and integrated bars of the United States have been considering two types of retirement and insurance benefits for practicing attorneys, the first an amendment to the Social Security Act, and the second a combination tax deferment and pension plan, of which the Keogh-Reed bills are a prototype; and

Whereas the board of governors of the West Virginia State Bar in meeting assembled has considered both of the plans suggested and is of opinion that the amendment to the Social Security Act provides only bare subsistence pensions, and that therefore both suggestions should be enacted into law: Therefore be it

Resolved, as follows:

1. That this board favors the amendment of the present Social Security Act so as to permit practicing attorneys to be eligible for the benefits thereunder as self-employed persons, on a voluntary basis if possible, or, if not, on a compulsory basis similar to others so eligible;

2. That this board favors the enactment into law of a tax-deferment pension plan substantially similar to that proposed in the Keogh-Reed bills in the last session of the Congress;

3. That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary to the West Virginia Members of the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to such other persons as the president of the West Virginia State Bar shall direct.

IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL—RESOLUTION OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BLUEFIELD, W. VA.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the importation of residual fuel oil from foreign countries has very seriously affected the economic health of my State of West Virginia. I feel strongly that we are going to have to face up to the need for legislation to relieve this situation. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution on the subject which was adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Bluefield, W. Va., on February 10, 1953.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BLUEFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, BLUEFIELD, W. VA., FEBRUARY 10, 1953

Whereas during the last several years heavy importations of residual fuel oil from foreign countries has adversely and seriously affected the economy of West Virginia and Virginia, especially the bituminous coal industry of southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia. The situation has steadily grown worse and the bituminous coal industry of southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia is now in a critical condition. Coal mining provides employment for thousands of miners and railroaders living in Bluefield, W. Va., and vicinity, and is the

economic lifeblood of southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia. The importation of foreign residual fuel oil has thrown out of employment thousands of coal miners and railroad employees and has adversely and seriously affected many small enterprises wholly dependent for their prosperity upon the production and sale of coal.

A few years ago New England consumed between 17 million and 18 million tons of southern coal annually, mostly low volatile, which is mined in the Bluefield, W. Va., area, but during the last several years the flood of foreign residual fuel oil has replaced nearly two-thirds of the southern coal which was formerly shipped to the New England States, said foreign oil being dumped in New England at prices with which southern coal could not possibly compete. Due to these importations of foreign oil and other economic conditions many mines in southern West Virginia and southwest Virginia have closed down and it is anticipated that during the year 1953 many other mines will close, causing incalculable damage to the coal miners, railroad employees, business enterprises, and the residents of this community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Bluefield Chamber of Commerce—

First. Deplores and condemns the continued importations of foreign residual fuel oil at prices with which the bituminous coal industry of West Virginia and Virginia cannot compete and urges each individual member of this Chamber to exercise his influence in any way possible to relieve this situation.

Second. That a copy of this resolution shall be sent to each member of the West Virginia and Virginia delegations in the United States Congress with the request that proper legislation be enacted to relieve these deplorable conditions; that copies of said resolution shall also be sent to the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and the Tariff Commission of the United States, with the request that steps be taken immediately to remedy the situation and bring an end to the unfair competition brought about by the importation of cheap foreign residual fuel oil.

Third. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the State chamber of commerce and to the various local chambers and boards of trade throughout West Virginia.

INCLUSION OF FARMERS AND CERTAIN SELF-EMPLOYED PERSONS IN SOCIAL-SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF ELKHORN GRANGE 908, NORTH POWDER, OREG.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Elkhorn Grange, No. 908, North Powder, Oreg., be printed in the RECORD. The resolution asks that social security be extended to cover farmers and other self-employed persons.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas social security has been broadened to include self-employed farm labor, etc.; and

Whereas most young farmers have some social security rights before starting to farm which they will lose, and statistics show that the average American farmer or his dependents do not have ample old-age security: Therefore let it be

Resolved, That Elkhorn Grange, No. 908 goes on record favoring the extension of the Social Security Act to include the farmer, as well as the self-employed; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Pomona Grange, State Grange, and our Congressman.

LOWELL CHANDLER,
Master.

LOIS SMITH,
Secretary.

CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Ojibway Tomahawk Band, St. Paul, Minn., and a resolution from that band be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. The matters are of vital concern to the Indians of my State and relate to certain tribal funds.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OJIBWAY TOMAHAWK BAND,
St. Paul, Minn., February 18, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

OUR DEAR SENATOR: From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1953, attached, we noticed you presented a resolution for appropriation of $100,000 for the Tribal Executive Council of the Chippewas of Minnesota, Edward Wilson, president.

For your information, at a special called meeting of the tribal council, July 9, 1953, which Commissioner Myers attended, a resolution—which asked for a general accounting to be completed within 6 months—signed by 200 Indians or more was presented to the council and adopted unanimously.

Enclosed please find a copy of the resolution.

There has been no action as yet. In fact, as you will see by our resolution, there has been no accounting of tribal estate since the adoption of the Wheeler-Howard Act by the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, July 24, 1936.

In view of the request made by the signers, active members of the tribe, and its adoption by the tribal council, we believe your resolution should be withheld until such accounting is completed to the satisfaction of majority of the members of the tribe.

Submitted.

WILLIAM MADISON,
Legislative Chairman.
GERTRUDE LERCH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

The following resolution was presented to the tribal council:

"Whereas, the Wheeler-Howard Act, or Reorganization Act, self-government, was enacted into law June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984); and

"Whereas under said law the Chippewas of Minnesota adopted the same under the name of 'The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe' and their constitution and bylaws were approved by the Secretary of the Interior in Washington, D. C., July 24, 1936; and

"Whereas the said organization has not to this date,—July 1, 1952—given a full and complete statement of accounting of the tribal business to the Chippewas as a whole, or as individuals:

"Now, therefore, we, the undersigned enrolled members of various bands which make up the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, do hereby petition its tribal executive committee to give each enrolled member a report of all business matters, such as money borrowed and moneys accrued from all sources, such as from loans in various projects, both tribal and individual; acres of land bought and sold, and complete mapped areas where tribal lands are located; timber resources, including the mapped areas where the wild rice purchased land are located, including moneys spent for wild rice; its income from said project; it is further

"*Resolved*, That a reasonable time of 6 months be allowed for the completion of said complete general accounting in printed form for the availability of all enrolled members of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

"The petitioners of this resolution have a right, according to law, to know everything concerning the business transactions of the tribe.

"The Wheeler-Howard Act does state in section 10: 'A report shall be made annually to Congress of transactions under this authorization.'

"It is evident, since Congress makes such appropriations out of the General Treasury, it is proper to give an accounting of such transaction. On the other hand, individuals who are enrolled members of the tribe and who do not hold any office in the organization are justified to secure an accounting under the law which is found in the American Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States, which should mean more to the Indian race because of their aboriginal rights.

"The petitioners refer specifically to amendment 5—protection of person and property—American Bill of Rights, last part which states, 'nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation.'

"Therefore, the petitioners are shareholders in all Chippewa estate by treaty rights as well as enactments of laws pertaining to their tribal business. Therefore, we submit the foregoing resolution for its passage."

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN NURSES IN SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION, EAU CLAIRE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution which I have received from Mrs. Ann Wilcox, chairman of the committee on legislation from the Eau Claire District of the Wisconsin State Nurses' Association.

The resolution urges the inclusion of nurses working for State and municipal governments under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system. I heartily endorse the resolution.

It is, of course, consistent with the so-called Wiley amendment which I offered to the omnibus social-security law in the last Congress. Under my amendment, the third-odd-thousand individuals covered under the Wisconsin retirement fund would be blanketed in under the Federal social-security system. Thus, State and municipal workers could receive supplementary Federal coverage in addition to their modest State and local coverage, just as millions of industrial workers throughout the Nation receive Federal pensions in addition to the private pensions provided by their respective companies.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EAU CLAIRE DISTRICT,
WISCONSIN STATE NURSES' ASSOCIATION,
February 12, 1953.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the last meeting of the Eau Claire District of the Wisconsin State Nurses' Association, which was held at Luther Hospital, January 14, 1953, the following resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Eau Claire District of the Wisconsin State Nurses' Association do hereby publicly express a desire to have the laws regarding Federal old-age and survivors insurance changed to include and cover nurses in government employment, such as city or county school nurses, city or county health departments, public institutions, and similar organizations."

Resolution formally moved, seconded, and approved by the group.

Any interest that you can lend to this cause would be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

(MRS.) ANN CAVES WILCOX,
Chairman, Committee on Legislation.

ORGANIZATION OF FEDERAL EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 80)

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I am releasing today a chart and accompanying report setting forth in detail the organization of Federal executive departments and agencies, with the number of paid civilian employees assigned to each major operating unit. This is one of a series of such charts that have been released by the committee covering a period of 6 years, beginning January 1, 1947.

With the chart is included a committee report to the Senate which includes a summary of present Federal employment by departments and agencies, with details regarding reorganization changes that have taken place during the past calendar year. The report and chart reflect a total of 2,564,111 paid civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government, as of January 1, 1953. This exceeds by 301,486 the highest previous postwar total of 2,262,625 on January 1, 1947. Increases of 79,699 were reported during 1952, as compared to an increase of 319,050 reported on the last chart issued covering calendar year 1951.

The report reflects a total of 205,210 employees assigned to overseas posts as of January 1, 1953—181,035 in the departments, and 24,175 in the independent agencies—of whom 89,112 are American citizens and 116,098 are nationals of other countries.

The executive departments reported a total of 2,208,296 civilian employees as of January 1, 1953, of which 181,035 were employed overseas—82,336 citizens and 98,699 foreign nationals. The total represents an increase of 84,138 during 1952, and an overall increase of 418,030 since January 1, 1947. Defense activities account for most of the increases in the departments, with 67,360 additional employees reported in the Department of Defense during 1952, and 337,809 for the 6-year period. The Post Office Department reports increases of 13,608 for the year, and 66,229 since 1947; and the Department of State, 9,691 and 17,181 for the same periods. The Department of Commerce, although reporting a reduction of 4,857 employees in 1952, reflected an overall increase of 13,490 for the 6-year period. The Departments of State and Commerce indicated that the increases were largely due to oversea activities, and to the operations of the National Production Authority, respectively. The Department of the Interior reported increases of 812 during the past year, and 6,083 since 1947. The Department of Justice has 827 less employees than it reported a year ago, but still reported 6,199 more than in 1947, due to expansion of FBI field service in 1950 and 1951. Decreases in employees were reported by the Treasury Department, totaling 1,608 for 1952, and 14,646 since January 1, 1947. The Department of Agriculture, although reflecting an increase of 1,244 in 1952, reported an overall decrease of 12,919 during the 6-year period. The Department of Labor reported a reduction of 1,285 during the past year, and 1,396 since 1947.

The independent agencies reported a total of 354,658 employees as of January 1, 1953, representing a decrease of 4,344 employees during 1952, and 16,674 less employees assigned to these agencies than were employed on January 1, 1947. Of the present total, 24,175 were overseas employees—6,776 citizens, and 17,399 foreign nationals.

The largest decrease among independent agencies during the 6-year period was reported by the Veterans' Administration—50,830, of which 2,251 occurred in 1952. Other agencies reporting decreases were the Panama Canal Company, 8,485, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, 7,258. The Economic Stabilization Agency decreased its employees by 6,343 during the past calendar year, due to its liquidation program. Increases during the past year were reported by the Civil Service Commission, 1,148; the Mutual Security Agency, 1,033; the Atomic Energy Commission, 966; and General Services Administration, 787.

The chart and accompanying report released by the committee have been generally accepted as the official report on organization of the Federal Government. It is the only chart issued which accurately reflects the number of employees assigned to each agency's activity by major operating components. The information on which the chart and report are compiled is certified to the committee by the Secretary or agency head, of each of the departments and agencies. The committee has received many letters of commendation and expressions from officials and others interested in the operations of the Federal Government as to the value of these charts and reports, and has been informed that they are used extensively by educational institutions in their courses in American Government. I believe that Members of Congress will find that the information will be equally beneficial to them in connection with committee studies of Federal operations, proposed reorganizations, appropriations, and expenditures as applied to the various components of the executive branch.

At this time I submit the report of the committee, together with the chart to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report and chart will be received, and the report will be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1190. A bill to amend section 205 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to make the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor ex officio members of the National Labor-Management Panel established by such section; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1191. A bill to authorize the payment of transportation expenses in the case of civilian employees of the American Battle Monuments Commission serving outside the United States when granted leave of absence to visit in the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1192. A bill to provide for the establishment of an addition to the Gettysburg National Cemetery on lands presently located within the Gettysburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WELKER):

S. 1193. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and Public Law 471, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1194. A bill for the relief of Thomas Henry Harrison; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1195. A bill to amend subsection 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, relating to compensation for unused leave of enlisted persons; and

S. 1196. A bill to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to eliminate discrimination against certain personnel of the uniformed services incapacitated prior to physical examination for promotion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. CASE):

S. 1197. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota of certain compacts with respect to the use of waters common to two or more of said States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1198. A bill for the relief of Vera Helene Hamer (Vera Helga Mueller) and Sonja Margret Hamer (Sonja Margot Mueller); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN) (by request):

S. 1199. A bill for the relief of the families of certain merchant seamen who lost their lives in an airplane crash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

S. 1200. A bill to direct the closing of the United States naval installation at Naples,

Italy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1201. A bill for the relief of Martin P. Paviov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1202. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1203. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Rollins S. Emmerich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1204. A bill for the relief of Dr. Yen-Yu Huang and his minor daughters, Lillian and Jean Huang; and

S. 1205. A bill for the relief of Wally Krausnick Paeschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Josephine Lisitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1207. A bill to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1208. A bill for the relief of Andrew D. Sumner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1209. A bill for the relief of Dr. Uheng Khoo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1210. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Lecue; and

S. 1211. A bill for the relief of Martin Madarieta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1212. A bill for the relief of Alice Masaryk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1213. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1214. A bill to provide for uniform relative rank for the persons occupying the positions of leaders or directors of the various Service bands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1215. A bill to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Public Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1216. A bill for the relief of Karl L. von Schlieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1217. A bill for the relief of the alien Col. Panagiotis Christopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1218. A bill for the relief of Winifred Margaret Short; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1219. A bill for the relief of Gertrude M. Baumberger;

S. 1220. A bill for the relief of Heidi H. Baumberger;

S. 1221. A bill for the relief of Fritz Baumberger, Jr.;

S. 1222. A bill for the relief of Emma Baumberger;

S. 1223. A bill for the relief of Fritz Baumberger;

S. 1224. A bill for the relief of Erika Baumberger;

S. 1225. A bill for the relief of Brunhilde Walburga Golomb, Ralph Robert Golomb, and Patricia Ann Golomb; and

S. 1226. A bill for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1227. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Pecatonica flood area, and to appropriate $25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1228. A bill for the relief of Patric Dorian Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1229. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNEQUAL TREATMENT OF ENLISTED MEN IN PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the Committee on Armed Services, a bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, relating to treatment of enlisted men in the payment of accumulated leave.

Simply stated the bill would remedy the unequal treatment accorded enlisted men in the computation of unused leave pay. At the present time such payments to officers include the actual rates of allowances, which have been increased since 1946. But, in the case of enlisted men, payments are based upon the lower 1946 allowances.

There seems to be no valid reason for this discrimination and this bill would accord equal treatment for enlisted men.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, bill (S. 1195) to amend subsection 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, relating to compensation for unused leave of enlisted persons, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Any member of the Armed Forces discharged after August 31, 1946, having unused accrued leave standing to his credit at the time of discharge shall be compensated for such unused leave in cash on the basis of—

"(1) the base and longevity pay, and allowances, applicable to such member on the date of discharge including for enlisted persons the allowances as provided for such enlisted persons in subsection (a) of this section, if his discharge occurred before the effective date of paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

"(2) the basic pay and the basic allowances for quarters and subsistence applicable to such member on the date of discharge, including for enlisted persons discharged during the continuance of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 applicable basic allowances for quarters and subsistence at the rates prescribed by amendments made by that act, as amended, if his discharge occurred on or after the effective date of this paragraph.

No cash settlement shall be made to any member (A) discharged for the purpose of accepting a commission or warrant or entering into an enlistment in his respective branch of the Armed Forces, or (B) electing to carry over such unused leave to a new enlistment in his respective branch of the Armed Forces on the day following date of discharge."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

INEQUITIES IN RETIREMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL WOUNDED IN KOREA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the Committee on Armed Services, a bill to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

Under existing law military personnel are barred from promotion and retirement at a higher rank when wounds interfere with passing the physical examination required for promotion. This works a special hardship on servicemen wounded in Korea. They are forced into retirement by wounds suffered in combat. And the very same disability prevents retirement at a higher rank to which they otherwise would be entitled.

This was not the law prior to the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Apparently this result was not intended. I urge speedy rectification of this inequity.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1196) to amend section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to eliminate discrimination against certain personnel of the uniformed services incapacitated prior to physical examination for promotion, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fifth proviso contained in section 402 (d) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U. S. C. 272 (d)), is amended to read as follows: "*Provided further*, That if the physical disability entitling such member to disability pay is found to exist at any time prior to promotion or advancement in pay grade in the case of a member (1) who is on a recommended list or a promotion list for permanent or temporary promotion, or (2) who is eligible for promotion to higher permanent or temporary commissioned officer, warrant officer, or enlisted rank, grade, or rating, or for assignment to a higher warrant officer pay grade, and whose eligibility for such promotion or assignment is based upon cumulative length of service or length of service in rank, grade, pay grade, or rating, the disability retirement pay of such member shall be based upon the basic pay of the rank, grade, pay grade, or rating to which such member would have been promoted or assigned, but for such disability, if such rank,

grade, pay grade, or rating is higher than any other rank, grade, pay grade, or rating upon which such pay is herein authorized to be computed and which such member would have been entitled to receive if serving on active duty in such rank, grade, pay grade, or rating."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be effective as of October 1, 1949.

PROPOSED CLOSING OF NAVAL INSTALLATION AT NAPLES, ITALY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to require the Secretary of the Navy to close the naval installation at Naples, Italy.

It was my privilege to visit, together with the junior Senator from Oregon, this naval activity during the month of September 1952. After a thorough briefing on the activities of the Navy at Naples, the Senator from Oregon and I were completely convinced that the amount of money the Government of the United States is spending on the Navy's activity at Naples is almost 100 percent wasted. I would not quibble if perhaps our Government might be deriving even two or three thousand dollars of benefit for the $10 million it is spending at Naples, but from point of qualitative consideration, I am convinced that this activity takes the prize for sheer waste without beneficial results.

The naval activity at Naples, with its thousands of naval personnel, is not in anywise used to support our 6th Fleet operating in the Mediterranean. When we visited that activity in September 1952 it was no longer the headquarters of any Mediterranean command activities under our NATO organization. The Italian Government would not permit it to be called even a defense activity. Upon returning to the United States, we severely criticized the naval activity at Naples, and General Bradley told the Armed Services Committee that the Navy had its CINCNELM, meaning Commander in Chief Northeastern Atlantic and Mediterranean, at Naples. He explained to the committee that the activities of CINCNELM no longer included the responsibility for the United States or Allied operations anywhere in the Atlantic or the Mediterranean. Such activities had been taken over under our North Atlantic Treaty Organization activities. CINCNELM, according to General Bradley, had had his activities reduced to the Red Sea and part of the Indian Ocean, where the United States does not pretend to maintain any considerable number of ships or shore activities. Subsequently, the Navy testified that Admiral Wright occupies the position of CINCNELM, and Admiral Wright was still in London and that CINCNELM headquarters had never been established in Naples.

As a former member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a Navy veteran myself, Mr. President, permit me to suggest the nature of the naval activity at Naples. Every indication points to the fact that this wasteful expenditure of more than $10 million a year at Naples is a part of naval officer thinking to the effect that once in a good port, the Navy should never leave, until it is actually forced to depart by its own Government or actually thrown into the sea by the people occupying the land.

I am reminded of one of my experiences in the service during World War II when some of us were so fortunate as to be assigned to operating amphibious craft to unload cargo in Palermo Harbor. One of the officers became so fondly attached to the city of Palermo and its citizens that he found every conceivable excuse to stay at Palermo. On two occasions his ship was ordered to leave, along with other ships. However, in each instance, his ship broke down after leaving the breakwater, and limped back into the harbor under limited operational capabilities. Finally, a third time he was ordered to Bizerte, and the local commander of the Palermo base sent an oceangoing tug behind to tow the amphibious craft to Bizerte in the event that another breakdown should occur.

In this instance, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, hoping that by act of Congress we may be able to tow the Navy out of Naples harbor, where it has no useful purpose to serve. The measure, I believe, will save the taxpayers well in excess of $10 million a year.

The bill (S. 1200) to direct the closing of the United States naval installation at Naples, Italy, introduced by Mr. LONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ALICE MASARYK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a private bill granting the right of permanent residence and asylum in this country to Dr. Alice Masaryk, an accomplished lady in her own right, who is the daughter of that great world statesman and fighter for democracy, the late President Thomas Masaryk, og Czechoslovakia.

It is particularly appropriate that I introduce this bill today because tomorrow is the anniversary of the birth of this lady's great father. The birthday of this man, father and founder of the Czechoslovakian Republic, is celebrated by all Czechoslovaks who love freedom. In Czechoslovakia, before it was ruthlessly seized by the Communists, it was celebrated as a national holiday. Here in America we have regularly taken note of this day. It has been the occasion for a rededication to the cause of freedom for which Masaryk worked during all of his life.

He was a great scholar and writer. His contributions to the writings of our times on the subject of democracy are of lasting significance. His death in 1937, at the age of 87, brought to an end one of the most fruitful lives of our times.

I am happy to be able to introduce the bill in behalf of his daughter who for some time now has been in this country, engaged in social work, and also broadcasting to Czechoslovakia over the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe. This accomplished lady was at one time president of the International Conference on Social Work. During the time that her father was in this country fighting for Czechoslovakian independence, Dr. Masaryk was working with Jane Addams in famous Hull House in Chicago.

Her entire life has been a splendid example of what we consider the most noble of human traits. Not only her own life but the lives of her illustrious parent and her brother, the late Jan Masaryk, have been filled with acts of friendship and cooperation with the United States.

She has lately been served with an order of deportation. It seems incredible that it should require a piece of special legislation for this country to offer permanent haven and asylum to a woman of Dr. Masaryk's stature, not to speak of the contributions of her family to the cause of freedom. I hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will speedily report this bill and that it will be quickly passed in special tribute, not only to this lady and to the name of Masaryk but to the freedom-loving people of Czechoslovakia.

The bill (S. 1212) for the relief of Alice Masaryk, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JUDGMENT UPON CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR BASIC AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation. I had intended to speak in support of the bill, but I do not wish to take up the time of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement by the Senator from West Virginia will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1213) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation, introduced by Mr. KILGORE (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. KILGORE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

I have just introduced a bill to waive the 6-year statute of limitations with respect to certain claims of Government employees for overtime compensation. Practically all of these claims arise under section 23 of the Act of March 28, 1934, which provided a 40-hour week for wage-board employees of the Federal Government, and overtime at the rate of time and one-half for all hours worked in excess of 40 hours a week.

The wage-board employees of the Federal Government are those engaged in the manual trades and occupations, such as carpenters, painters, electricians, and the like, whose pay is fixed by wage boards on the basis of rates prevailing in private industry. They do not include any employees who are under civil service, who are engaged in administrative or policy-making positions, or whose pay is otherwise fixed by statute. To obtain wage-board employees, the Government must compete with private industry, must therefore pay wages which are comparable with those paid in private industry, and must provide similar working conditions.

Throughout private industry, a 40-hour week and time and one-half for overtime have prevailed for many years. Section 23 of the act of March 28, 1934, provided a 40-hour week and time and one-half for comparable wage-board employees of the Federal Government. The great majority of these employees have been paid on that basis ever since.

Unfortunately, a few isolated groups were mistakenly excluded from the benefits of section 23 by rulings of the Comptroller General. Among these were floating equipment employees of the Panama Canal, and employees of the Alaska Railroad. In the *Townsley* case (101 C. Cls. 237; 323 U. S. 557), and the *Hearne* case (107 C. Cls. 335) the Panama workers established their right to the benefits of section 23.

The rights of employees of the Alaska Railroad were presented to the Court of Claims in a test case, *Poggas* v. *U. S.* (118 C. Cls. 385). This case was filed in 1947. The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims is limited to 6 years prior to the date a claim is filed in the court. Therefore the Poggas claim was limited to the period from 1941 to the date it was filed. That meant that, even if they won their cases in the Court of Claims, the employees of the Alaska Railroad would have been deprived of most of the compensation to which they were entitled, that is, compensation for the period from 1934 to 1941. To overcome this injustice, the 81st Congress enacted and the President approved Public Law 440, which waived the statute of limitations with respect to employees of the Alaska Railroad, and authorized the court to render judgment for the entire period back to 1934. On December 5, 1950, the Court of Claims decided that Poggas was entitled to recover, and that therefore all nonoperating employees of the Alaska Railroad were entitled to judgment.

The only other large group of wage-board employees who were deprived of the benefits of section 23 regarding whom we have definite knowledge were the employees of the Alaska Road Commission. These employees are typical wage-board employees, and there was no justification whatever for depriving them of the benefits of section 23 by administrative action. About 4 years ago one of these road commission employees made demand on the Department of the Interior for overtime compensation under section 23, and the Solicitor of the Interior Department ruled that he was entitled to such compensation. Thereafter, several claimants filed claims with the Comptroller General who likewise ruled that they were entitled to the benefits of section 23. These claims were certified to Congress for appropriation. Funds to pay the claims were not appropriated, however, presumably because the House committee misunderstood the situation (see H. Rept. No. 1797, 81st Cong., 2d sess., p. 80). In October 1950, the Alaska Road Commission informed some of these claimants of the action of the Appropriations Committee, and advised them that their only recourse was a suit in the Court of Claims. Several suits were filed by the claimants in January 1951.

These road commission employees, and most other wage-board employees, commenced to receive time and one-half for overtime after 40 hours a week on July 1, 1945. The entire period for which the claims run, therefore, is from March 28, 1934, until July 1, 1945. The individual claims, of course, begin with the first date of employment or March 28, 1934, whichever is later; and terminate on the last date of employment or July 1, 1945, whichever is earlier. The test claimant had last worked for the road commission on March 5, 1945, so that at the time the claim was filed in the Court of Claims on January 24, 1951, all of plaintiff's services had been performed more than 6 years prior to the date of filing, except for the last 40 days before March 5, 1945. The Government therefore made a motion for summary judgment against the plaintiff for the period prior to January 24, 1945. On July 15, 1952, the Court of Claims denied this motion (*Marr* v. *U. S.* (123 C. Cls. 474)). The basis of the court's decision was that the Comptroller General, by certifying the claim, in effect reached an accord which renewed the Government's obligation to pay the compensation.

Manifestly, this decision raises a nice legal question, and it is reported that the Government will seek certiorari. If the Supreme Court should overrule the Court of Claims, the claimant would be entitled to receive overtime compensation for a period of 40 days, but would be deprived of compensation to which he was entitled for a period of many years. If the Supreme Court should affirm the decision of the Court of Claims, the claimant could then recover the full amount found due.

Regardless, however, of the ruling of the Supreme Court, unless action is taken by Congress, most of these faithful Government employees will have been deprived of overtime compensation which Congress had provided for them by law. This will be so because only a small number of claims have been certified by the Comptroller General, and because very few of them have been filed in the Court of Claims.

In 1934 Congress enacted an overtime compensation law for this entire group of Federal employees. From 1934 to 1945 they were wrongfully deprived of this compensation because of erroneous administrative action. If any of them are to recover what should have been paid to them, all of them ought to be permitted to recover. It will be injustice if one or a dozen of them recover all or part of what is due, and the great majority of them are left without remedy. I do not believe that Congress wants to withhold from these people what Congress previously ordained they were entitled to receive and for which they rendered service. Nor do I think that the Government can equitably exploit the statute of limitations to enforce a wrongful act against a group of its own employees. To avoid that the bill I have introduced ought to be enacted promptly.

My bill would not determine the rights of these claimants. It would simply enable them to have their day in court, and have their rights adjudicated by the tribunal Congress has established for that purpose. The court has already held in the Townsley case, the Hearne case, the Poggas case, and the Marr case that these wage-board employees were not culpably dilatory in the assertion of their claims.

Since Congress has already waived the statute with respect to employees of the Alaska Railroad, there is certainly no sound reason why Congress should, by inaction, discriminate against the employees of the Alaska Road Commission. Except for the period within which claims may be filed, my bill, it should be noted, is identical with one introduced by Senator MAGNUSON (S. 751), which was reported out unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee in the last Congress.

TEMPORARY ECONOMIC CONTROLS—AMENDMENT

Mr. FREAR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1081) to provide authority for temporary economic controls, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nominations of Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be Solicitor General of the United States, and William J. Bray, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Postmaster General, which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SYMINGTON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list.

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1, 1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948; and

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, and several other lieutenant generals (major generals, Regular Air Force) to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general.

NOMINATION OF ALBERT M. COLE TO BE HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator. I hope that on Monday the Senate will consider the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the nomination will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the President of the United States sent to the Senate today the nominations of Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, of Nebraska, to be the Representative of the United States on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1955, Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin, a Foreign Service Officer of the Class of Career Minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, and John M. Allison, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service Officer of Class One, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan. The nominations were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Notice is hereby given that the nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired, in accordance with the rule.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

Address entitled "Security and the United Nations," delivered by him at the University of Rhode Island on March 5, 1953.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by him on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the Department of Labor, March 3, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Address delivered by Senator HENNINGS before a statewide Democratic rally at Topeka, Kans., on February 21, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the American Association for the United Nations, at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on March 3, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Disrupting Morale," published in the Washington Post, March 3, 1953, discussing a certain memorandum circulated among employees of the Budget Bureau.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Statement prepared by him in commemoration of anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

Statement by Charles S. Rhyne, on behalf of the United States Chamber of Commerce, before a subcommittee of the Senate Committe on the Judiciary, on March 4, 1953, relating to the so-called Bricker amendment dealing with treaties.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Article entitled "Stevenson and the Big Oil Grab," written by Thomas L. Stokes, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 18, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article by Dr. Charles M. Steese, regarding part played by Gen. Simon Cameron, Ambassador to Russia in the Lincoln administration, on the acquisition of Alaska.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address entitled "The War Against Poverty," delivered by Edward J. Bell, administrator, Oregon Wheat Commission, at Sixth Annual Conference of Oregon High School International Relations League, Eugene, Oreg., February 27, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Offshore Oil," published in the New York Times of March 2, 1953.

By Mr. JENNER:

Statement entitled "Agriculture Is the Nation's Basic Economic Problem," written by Robert M. Harriss.

Statement of policy for inquiry by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee into communism in the educational process.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., regarding the enforcement of the antitrust laws.

Statement by Philip B. Perlman, of Maryland, before subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Senate Joint Resolution 1, regarding treaties and domestic law.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial from Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch with reference to treaties and the basic law.

Editorial from San Francisco Chronicle on the same subject matter.

Editorial from the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., on the same subject matter.

Editorial from San Francisco Examiner of February 25, 1953, on the same subject matter.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Letter addressed to him by the Lions Club of Brillion, Wis., regarding number of persons in that town who voted in the recent election.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, tomorrow, March 7, will mark the 103d anniversary of the birth of the great Czechoslovak patriot and world leader, Thomas G. Masaryk. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following these remarks, the text of a message to the people of Czechoslovakia which I have prepared for this occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE 103D ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK, MARCH 7, 1953

Each year, only a few days after the tragic anniversary of Communist control in Czechoslovakia, the people of that European stronghold of freedom may lift their hearts to celebrate the anniversary of the birth of one of the most courageous men the world has ever known.

Thomas G. Masaryk, Czechoslovakia's great statesman and patriot, was born on March 7, 1850. By his study and ardent labors, a true democracy was realized and established in his homeland. His ideals created one of the first free nations in all of Europe.

On the occasion of his anniversary it is appropriate that we pay homage again to Thomas Masaryk. His leadership, his scholarship, his innate greatness are still an inspiration not only to the people of his native land, but to all people who love freedom. His memory cannot be erased by present tyranny in his homeland. His tremendous strength is a beacon for those who follow him, guiding them forward to the day when freedom is once again established in his beloved nation.

I join my supplications with all others who fervently desire the liberation of Czechoslovakia. On this anniversary, our prayer is brightened and hope kindled by the memory of Thomas Masaryk.

MILITARY POLICY IN KOREA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, we are fortunately free, so far as the present administration is concerned, of supporting and enjoying the contemptible policy of allowing our soldiers and our allies to be shot at on the stationary battlefront in Korea for an indefinite time. What many of us have called a stalemate has been better termed by General Van Fleet as a sitdown. A stalemate is a situation in which the forces are so evenly balanced that neither can get ahead of the other. A sitdown is a situation where one side by deliberate policy refuses to take military advantage when it is plain, clear, and undeniable. Our sitdown has continuously weakened us and continuously strengthened the Communist position.

The question is, what are we to do next now that our minds are clear and we are open to consider a change in policy?

There is one change in policy, Mr. President, which lies on the side of political action, and may be added to our military policy whatever that may turn out to be. The political action will not work against constructive military policy. Both will work to strengthen each other and strengthen the free nations of the world.

What our political action might be, I have set forth in a talk which I gave at a luncheon for the American Association for the United Nations at the Shoreham Hotel on Tuesday, March 3.

The death of Joseph Stalin may well have world-shaking results, but it should have no effect on such diplomatic policies as I am proposing, since these are based on eternal truths and the spiritual laws of the universe. They are not supervened by current events, no matter how portentous these may be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by me on the occasion referred to be printed in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT STEPS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

There has been a tendency in public thinking to write off the United Nations as a failure. The fact that so many constructive proposals have been vetoed by the Soviet Government has led to proposals for a complete reorganization of the whole institution. There is a large body of opinion which feels that our common action, particularly in search of a common defense against aggression, has been stopped by an insurmountable roadblock.

This roadblock indeed does exist so far as certain types of action are concerned. It does not, however, prevent all useful action nor does it place a bar across the road to what may be the most useful and effective types of action open to the United Nations. Our opportunities are ahead of us, not behind us.

The new courses of action will be directed particularly toward measures which have in them a large moral content and which will draw to their support the spiritual forces of the globe and of the universe. Let us look at a few examples of undertakings of this sort.

First it would seem entirely feasible to take our part in the Korean war out of the classification of a contest for power and seek to resolve it on the basis of well-being of people. It would seem that this could easily be done by announcing, unilaterally, terms on which the United Nations would be willing to end the conflict, not by a truce, but by a peace.

A first provision of such terms would be to offer to Communist China a neutral zone along the Yalu whose neutrality would be inspected and administered by a commission composed solely of Asiatic nationals. This would take care of the only interest in the Korean war which Communist China has expressed; viz that she wants assurance that Manchuria will not be invaded from the southeast. That government would, therefore, be furnished with a face-saving proposal and the United States and other western nations would be freed from the accusation that this war is a part of a contest for power between Washington and Moscow. These terms would renounce political power on the part of the so-called "capitalist nations and colonizing powers."

These terms should be broadcast to the soldiers of the Communist armies, over the air and from the air. It is important that they should know that there is nothing for them to fight for except Russian imperialism. Everything else is theirs if they will cease fighting.

If we then made definite the offer to rebuild in usable form the housing, transportation, and industries of northern Korea as

well as southern Korea, the war-torn populations of the north should be anxious for a settlement on this basis.

After rebuilding, the United Nations would offer to carry out its original purpose of holding free elections by means of which the reunited country could select its own form of government.

Every group except professional Communist politicians would derive advantages from the proposed settlement. This would include the Communist government, the Communist soldiers and the harassed citizens of North and South Korea. It could be stopped by a veto from Moscow whose support of the war has been so clearly recorded by Ambassador Lodge. But such a veto would open itself to the clear demonstration that the purposes of Moscow are the accumulation of power and not the well-being of people.

Another line of thought and action that must be pursued is the project for eliminating curtains whether of iron, bamboo, or other materials. These curtains prohibiting intercourse between the peoples of the world is an offense in the sight of God and man. He who has made of one blood all the nations of the earth does not desire that His sons should be separated from each other in groups which have no communication or personal relationships.

The curtains must be attacked. We can draw support for such an attack from nations which are now trying to remain neutral in what appears to them to be a contest for power between Moscow and Washington. These nations can join our side gladly and strongly since this proposal is not one for power but for the dignity, freedom and intercommunication of peoples.

One of the points which should be brought out is that no nation which hides behind the curtain can honorably seek admission to the United Nations. We have seen that the countries behind the curtain which already have been admitted are unable and unwilling to act as members of the family of nations. They have cut themselves off from that role. It is unfortunate that they have gained entrance to the United Nations when they cannot fulfill their responsibilities therein. We must make every effort and offer every proper inducement for them to raise the curtain, but our experience is such that we must oppose the entrance of those countries who thus prevent themselves from carrying out the obligations of membership.

This is a much stronger bar to recognition than is the fact that we detest certain forms of government. Diplomatic history, practice, and precedent do not prohibit the recognition of a detestable de facto administration. But when it comes to granting the privileges of recognition to a nation which hides behind a curtain and so is unwilling to carry out the responsibilities of recognition and membership in the family of nations, that is a new condition, and it must be met with new determination and new precedents. But with this determination goes the responsibility of welcoming and assisting any genuine moves by Communist China to draw the curtain aside.

Of the many opportunities to move into the field of moral issues and spiritual power, there is one which we must continue to present and support. That is universal guaranteed disarmament.

There is no substitute for such thoroughgoing disarmament. There is no substitute for having it guaranteed in the terms of international inspection and administration. When the other nations of the world open themselves to international inventory, inspection, and control of arms and munitions, the nations which refuse obviously refuse for unworthy purposes. This situation must be continuously presented and continuously pressed.

Here again we have a project which is based on the well-being of peoples rather than the aggrandizement of power. To refuse to accept terms of complete inspection is to give plain indication that the nation which refuses to accept such a program is not concerned with the well-being of the peoples of the earth. It is not concerned with the well-being of its own people. It sets power above people. This position is one which should draw condemnation from nations which have tried to stay neutral because they feared being drawn into a power contest. There is no power-seeking left here. There is nothing but concern for the material and spiritual well-being of the citizens of all nations.

While continuously presented in the agenda of the Council and in the forum of the Assembly, continued rejection must lead to other means of presenting the popular cause. It will then become the duty of those responsible for the information programs, beamed to the citizens of the countries behind the curtains, to raise questions in the minds of those citizens as to why they should continue to bear this heavy load of armies, arms, and armament. Questions should be implanted in their minds as to whether their governments really care anything about them as persons or are only concerned with their usefulness in supporting power politics. By continuing such an information campaign simply, strongly, and continuously, forces can be set in motion which will weaken the foundations of totalitarian imperialism and help to bring the world back to peace, prosperity, and spiritual progress.

"People, not power," must be the watchword of the United Nations. Moving in this spirit and with this purpose, a brighter future lies open ahead of us.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNIST DICTATORSHIP IN RUMANIA

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, 8 years ago the Rumanian nation was placed under the slavery of Communist conspiracy. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of these remarks, a statement I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOMER FERGUSON ON THE ANNIVERSARY OF COMMUNIST DOMINATION OF RUMANIA

Today marks the eighth anniversary of the installation of a Soviet Communist dictatorship of Rumania.

The Communist domination of Rumania on March 6, 1945, was in violation of the Yalta agreements and took place almost before the ink was dry on the decisions. Mr. Vishinsky went to Bucharest and ordered the disarming of the Rumanian garrison, took over complete control of the city by means of the Red army, and demanded instant dismissal of the national-union government of General Radescu and the installment of a Communist government.

This date, March 6, is therefore the anniversary of the enslavement of the Rumanian people and the anniversary of one of the early enslavement of peoples.

It is this kind of enslavement that we condemn. We must offer hope and courage to the citizens of Rumania and other imprisoned peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

TREATMENT ACCORDED SICK OR INJURED SEAMEN UNDER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under date of February 6, 1953, Mr. Kosmas Fournarakis, president of the International Society for the Aid of Greek Seamen, Inc., addressed an inquiry to me concerning the treatment being accorded sick or injured seamen under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Following that, I addressed a letter of inquiry to Mr. Argyle R. Mackey, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, asking for clarification of the points raised in the letter from Mr. Fournarakis.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 2, 1953, from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in which he responds to the aforementioned inquiry.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 1953.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: This acknowledges the receipt of your letter of February 16, 1953, with which you enclosed the attached letter dated February 6, 1953, from Mr. Kosmas Fournarakis, president of the International Society for the Aid of Greek Seamen, concerning specific problems which have arisen in the case of Greek seamen.

As you know, section 252 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides that alien crewmen may be issued conditional permits to land temporarily in the United States for (1) the period of time (not exceeding 29 days) during which the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived remains in port, if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart on the vessel or aircraft on which he arrived; or (2) 29 days, if the immigration officer is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart, within the period for which he is permitted to land, on a vessel or aircraft other than the one on which he arrived.

Mr. Fournarakis seems particularly concerned about the treatment accorded to sick or injured seamen. All district directors of the Service have been authorized, in cases where a crewman failed to leave the United States within 29 days, if such failure is due to illness or other reasons beyond his control, to allow him additional and reasonable time to regain his health and depart the United States.

In order further to clarify the procedures, special telegraphic instructions were sent to all District Directors under date of February 18, 1953, covering the following points: The cases of alien crewmen who have been issued conditional landing permits under section 252 (a) (1) of the act (for the time their vessel remains in port), who later request permits under section 252 (a) (2) of the act (29-day permit with permission to pay off and discharge) for the purpose of securing hospital or medical treatment, are to be granted such permits valid for 29 days from their original landing, if their applications are found to be bona fide in every respect. If the physical condition of such seamen prevents their departure within 29 days, they are to be granted a further period of time within which to depart voluntarily from the United States without the institution of deportation proceedings inasmuch as the act has been so construed as to preclude granting formal extensions of temporary stay. A period of voluntary departure without the institution of deportation proceedings is also to be granted to crewmen who were originally issued 29-day landing permits before the need for hospital or medical treatment became known and whose physical condition prevents their departure within 29 days. All landing permits issued under section 252 (a) (2) of the act are to be issued for the full 29 days permitted under the act. Bona fide crewmen who are unable to depart within the period of their admission because of other

reasons beyond their control, such as their vessel's going into drydock, unavailability of shipping, etc., are also to be given a period within which to depart voluntarily without the institution of deportation proceedings.

It is believed that the instructions above referred to will satisfactorily take care of the problems pointed out in the specific cases referred to by Mr. Fournarakis.

Sincerely,

———, *Commissioner.*

FIRST VISA TO JAPANESE NATIONAL UNDER LIBERALIZED UNITED STATES IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a letter dated February 14, 1953, addressed to me from Sozaburo Kujira Oka, of Tokyo, Japan, who was the recipient of the first visa to be handed a Japanese national under the liberalized United States immigration law of 1952.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOKYO, JAPAN, *February 14, 1953.*

The Honorable PAT A. McCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: It is with a great deal of delight and honor to inform you that I have been chosen as the first Japanese citizen in postwar Japan to receive an immigration visa to enter the United States.

This was made possible by the passage of the new American immigration law, which eliminates racial barriers as a basis of exclusion from the United States, and which removes all racial barriers to naturalization as an American citizen.

This event is without a doubt the greatest and happiest moment of my life. Words alone cannot express the thrill which I experienced when His Excellency the United States Ambassador to Japan, Robert D. Murphy, handed me the visa on January 21, 1953, at 11 a. m., at the United States Embassy in Tokyo, Japan.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for giving me this great right to enter the United States of America, and I shall endeavor to make myself worthy of the great honor which has been bestowed upon me.

Please give my best regards and gratitude to all personnel who made efforts for the passage of this new immigration law.

Very truly yours,

SOZABURO KUJIRAOKA.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HAYDEN

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week I joined in the offering of many well-earned tributes to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] on the occasion of the anniversary of their 20 years of service as Senators of the United States.

At that time I did not realize, or, if I did, I forgot, that there was another among us to whom tribute should also be paid for the same long and faithful period of service as a distinguished Member of the Senate.

I take this opportunity to pay my respects to the very able senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], whose long and faithful record in the Congress of the United States is one of brilliance and rich accomplishment. I believe it was in 1912 that Senator HAYDEN first came to the Congress of the United States as a Member of the House of Representatives. For the past 2 years it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration under the able leadership of the Senator from Arizona. From that experience, I am convinced that I shall ever feel the inspiration of the Senator's competence, integrity, and sincere friendship.

I hope and pray that the fine and able mind of the Senator from Arizona, together with his happy and charming personality, will remain with the Members of the Senate for a long time to come.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey. It has been my good fortune to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with the Senator from Arizona, and there is no finer or more able man serving on that committee than Senator HAYDEN.

SHORTAGE OF AMMUNITION IN KOREA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. C. E. Wilson, with respect to the testimony given yesterday by General Van Fleet regarding the shortage of ammunition in Korea. I had taken up this matter with the former Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, on August 13, 1952, and called his attention to complaints that had been made to me alleging this shortage.

In view of the fact that $100 billion has been expended for military purposes since the beginning of the Korean war on June 25, 1950, it is nearly unbelievable that there has been a continuous shortage of ammunition in Korea in the 22 months General Van Fleet has served as commander in the field. It is particularly amazing that there has been a shortage of hand grenades and a necessity for rationing ammunition and other implements of war. When you ration hand grenades and other ammunition to a soldier on the frontline, it is often equivalent to a verdict of death.

I was surprised, too, that General Van Fleet stated the Communists have greater artillery power than we have and did not seem to suffer from any lack of ammunition.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a copy of the letter I wrote on yesterday to Secretary Wilson asking for a full report in the matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 5, 1953.

The Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense.

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: In my 20 years in the Senate I have never been more shocked than I was today when General Van Fleet testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that there has been a shortage of ammunition and hand grenades in Korea for at least 22 months.

General Van Fleet testified this shortage has been continuous since he took command and that almost daily he had reported it officially and through channels. Failure to supply these munitions, according to General Van Fleet, seriously handicapped not only the prosecution of the war against Communist Chinese and North Koreans but also the protection of our own troops.

Shortage of munitions inevitably leads to greater loss of life and prolonged conflict. To me, such a situation as this, extending over 22 months, represents criminal inefficiency, because since the Korean war started, on June 25, 1950, the following appropriations have been made to the armed services: $51 billion in fiscal year 1951, $61 billion in fiscal year 1952, $48 billion in fiscal year 1953; total, $160 billion.

From these appropriations, the following expenditures have been made for military purposes: $20 billion in fiscal year 1951, $39 billion in fiscal year 1952, $44 billion in fiscal year 1953. Included in fiscal 1953 are expenditures to July 1, 1953. Total, $103 billion.

Today the armed services have on hand unexpended balances in appropriations which have been made to them totaling approximately $80 billion, and they estimate that as of next June 30 they will still have some $60 billion of unexpended appropriations, exclusive of whatever may be appropriated in the current session of Congress.

In the face of these facts it is outrageous that we have allowed unnecessary loss of life and the improper prosecution of the Korean war for 22 months by failure to supply necessary munitions.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am asking that you—

1. Make a full investigation as to what officials at the Pentagon received information, so often transmitted by General Van Fleet, that there was a shortage of munitions.

2. What officers at the Pentagon are responsible for the failure of General Van Fleet to receive adequate munitions.

3. What action you will take to punish those officers who have been guilty of such negligence of their official duties.

4. What steps are being taken by the Pentagon to supply adequate munitions in the future.

5. That this and all other information incident to a shortage of munitions in Korea be presented as promptly as possible so that the Armed Services Committee of the Senate can undertake further investigations, should such be desirable.

In closing, let me say that when a charge such as this comes from the commanding general in the field, it is of such importance as to warrant the most exhaustive investigation so as to determine who is at fault, and to punish those who have been derelict in their duties.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Executive Calendar be called.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader as to his plans for next week.

Mr. TAFT. Beyond calling the calendar on Monday, I do not believe there will be any substantial legislation considered next week. I do not know of any important measures except those which are actually on the calendar. I may move to take up any of those measures if they are objected to upon the call of the calendar, though I do not know of any measures on the calendar which are really controversial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the majority leader plan to have the Senate meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday of next week. A number of nominations are expected to be received, and I think the Senate should meet to dispose of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the majority leader indicate whether or not it would be agreeable to him to take up today Senate Resolution 16, Calendar No. 46?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. We intend to take it up today. In addition to Calendar Nos. 46 and 47, being Senate Resolution 16 and Senate Resolution 49, respectively, I believe there is another resolution which has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Executive Calendar be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry N. Routzohn to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if this nomination was reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. TAFT. This nomination was reported unanimously by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I may say, since Mr. Routzohn is a constituent of mine, that he is one of the leading attorneys in the city of Dayton, Ohio. I think he might well have been recommended to be a Federal judge if he had not been beyond the age limit prescribed by the Attorney General's ruling. He has had service on all sides of the labor question. He has represented labor unions and many other clients. For some time he has been the attorney for the International Brotherhood of Carpenters, in the position of general counsel. I do not know of anyone who I think would be more impartial in his action as Solicitor of the Department of Labor. He was a Representative in Congress during the years 1939 and 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Harry N. Routzohn to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor?

The nomination was confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard R. Atkinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LOYALTY CHECKS ON SENATE EMPLOYEES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 16, Calendar No. 46.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The resolution (S. Res. 16) to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "to the", to strike out "Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the"; in line 7, after the word "Investigation", to strike out "and to the Central Intelligence Agency,"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, to the", and in line 7, after the word "Investigation", to strike out the comma and "and to the Central Intelligence Agency", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That hereafter when any person is appointed as an employee of any committee of the Senate, of any Senator, or of any office of the Senate the committee, Senator, or officer having authority to make such appointment shall transmit the name of such person to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of such agency concerning the loyalty of such person, and in any case in which such derogatory information is revealed such committee, Senator, or officer shall make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty of such person.

Every such committee, Senator, and officer shall promptly transmit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation a list of the names of the incumbent employees of such committee, Senator, or officer together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed of any derogatory information contained in the files of such agency concerning the loyalty of such employee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Chair know of any reason why an amendment to Senate Resolution 16 which would require that the resolution cover Senators as well as Senate employees would not be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is subject to amendment in the usual manner. Of course, in the Senate germaneness is not required in the case of amendments.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to announce that at a later hour this afternoon I shall offer the amendment which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the names of each Senator of the United States, incumbent on the date of the adoption of this resolution and hereafter entering upon the office of Senator of the United States, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of each agency (and if such is on file, any rebutting information) concerning the loyalty and the reliability of such Senator for security purposes. In any case in which such derogatory and rebutting information is submitted, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall make or cause to be made such further investigation necessary to resolve the issues raised by such report and to take such further action as it or the Senate shall deem necessary."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my amendment to Senate Resolution 16 would include an investigation of Members of the Senate as well as Senate employees.

As I announced last week, I have already notified the Attorney General that, so far as my office is concerned, this resolution is not needed. We are perfectly willing to have the Department of Justice proceed, on a voluntary basis or a waiver basis, with the investigation of members of my office staff, including the Senator from Oregon himself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am having an amendment to the resolution drafted. As soon as it has been drafted I shall offer it to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY ON SENATE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, while the amendment is being drafted I shall discuss another subject matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration a proposed amendment to Senate Resolution 32, which I submitted on January 13.

The subject of the assignment of Senators was debated at some length on that day. At that time I submitted Senate Resolution 32, to enlarge the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by two members, a member of the majority party and the junior Senator from Oregon.

PURPOSE OF SENATE RESOLUTION 32

That proposal has a twofold purpose: to maintain numerical control of those committees by the majority party and to continue the junior Senator from Oregon on those committees in recognition of his Senate seniority and in conformity with the almost unbroken rule of the Senate that once a Member is assigned to a committee he is not removed from it in violation of his Senate seniority.

INACTION OF RULES COMMITTEE

That resolution has been pending before the Rules Committee since January 13 and so far as I know—and there has been no public announcement to the contrary—absolutely no action has been taken upon it. No hearings have been held, no committee discussion or vote has taken place, no report has been made to the Senate.

I point out that the distinguished minority leader blocked consideration of Senate Resolution 32 on the day that I submitted it—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 337, January 13, 1953. He indicated that he believed the proposal should receive the consideration of the Rules Committee. At that time I was of the opinion that the issues were sufficiently clear to enable any Senator to vote immediately upon my proposal. That was not done.

MANY SENATORS DESIRE OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE

Many Senators stated on that occasion and later that they desired to have the opportunity to vote on Senate Resolution 32. It appears to me that a sufficient amount of time has elapsed since January 13—7½ weeks, to be precise—to enable the Rules Committee to consider Senate Resolution 32 and report it so that the Senate may consider it and vote upon it.

The Senate will recall that on January 13, the membership of standing committees was voted upon. At that time many Senators complained that they were embarrassed by the parliamentary situation in which they found themselves. They were not permitted to vote on Senate Resolution 32.

The distinguished majority leader, with his customary fairness, agreed to a postponement of the assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon to the two committee posts which were left over after the Republican and Democratic caucus slates were drawn.

As I stated at the time, Mr. President, the assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon, if he had been assigned to the two committees to which it was suggested he should be assigned, would have been somewhat in the nature of a garbage-can assignment. Those two assignments being all that were left, the junior Senator from Oregon would have been required to take the leavings. I did not think they would have been even edible crumbs.

The sole reasonable purpose of delay was to permit committee consideration of Senate Resolution 32.

ONLY ONCE HAS A SENATOR BEEN REMOVED FROM A COMMITTEE FOR POLITICAL DIFFERENCE

When the Senate discussed committee assignments on January 13, I presented the complete history of committee assignment in the Senate. It shows that on only one occasion—I repeat, on only one occasion—has the Senate removed a member from a committee because of differences between him and the administration or majority party. One has to go back to 1871, during General Grant's "illustrious" administration, to find that occasion.

Charles Sumner, who at that time had been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations since the Republicans gained control of the Senate and who had served with distinction, opposed Grant's plan for the annexation of Santo Domingo. The Republican caucus in reporting its committee list on March 10, 1871, omitted Sumner as chairman, and in addition, did not include him as a member of the committee.

A vociferous debate ensued and the disciplinary action was denounced by such eminent Senators as Wilson, Schurz, and Trumbull, and described as unjustifiable, impolitic, and unnecessary.

James G. Blaine later observed:

> Never was the power of the caucus more wrongfully applied.[1]

There were several other Senators who opposed their party's nominee or policy. Some were among the most renowned Members of this body: Stephen Douglas, Ladd, and Norris. In not one case did anyone lose a committee post formerly held by him. In some cases, though not all, a Senator has not been continued as a committee chairman, but in none of those instances was he removed from a committee on which he had served.

[1] Haynes, The Senate of the United States, vol. I, pp. 302–303.

Let me describe some of the demotions from chairmanships which took place, not one of which was accompanied by loss of membership on the committees involved.

1859: Stephen A. Douglas, the only Democratic chairman from a non-slaveholding State, was, while absent from the Senate, dropped from the chairmanship of the Committee on Territories, which he had held since his election to the Senate. Senator Pugh laid this punishment to vindictiveness for Douglas' antislavery views.

1867:

> Contrary to precedent, at the beginning of the short session a new election of all the standing committees took place. The list submitted by the majority leader was approved without debate. Apparently the sole object of this election was to discipline the Republican chairmen who had not supported the radicals in the vote to override the President's veto of the civil rights bill.[2]

Three chairmen were demoted.

1923: In my remarks on January 13, I described the removal of Senator Cummins from the chairmanship of a committee he had held for 4 years. Cummins was then 73 years old and held another chairmanship. Two chairmanships were deemed too great a burden for a man of his age. A contributing factor was his unpopularity with certain Senators who opposed the Esch-Cummins Transportation Act of 1920.

1925: On this occasion the dominant Republicans disciplined the supporters of old Bob La Follette's presidential candidacy in the campaign of 1924. Ladd lost a committee chairmanship and the others were reduced in committee seniority. None was removed from a committee on which he had served.

1929: Senator Norris supported Alfred E. Smith and Heflin supported Hoover in the 1928 campaign—each crossing party lines. They both continued in the same committee posts they had held before the election.

This matter has been researched and re-researched—and no example of removal from a committee other than Sumner in 1871 has been unearthed.

Therefore, I wish again to make crystal clear for the RECORD that on January 13, 1953, the Senate followed a course of action which it had not followed since 1871. My colleagues in the Senate can tell their constituents all they want to tell them, as they have in many letters, copies of which I have received from their constituents, to the effect that no disciplinary action was taken against the junior Senator from Oregon, but their constituents are too smart to swallow that alibi or rationalization. Their constituents know full well what happened to the junior Senator from Oregon on January 13, 1953, at the hands of a Senate which apparently felt that the time had come to set an example for all the future which would teach a lesson to insurgents and rebels in the Senate of the United States. It was aimed at reminding insurgents what would happen to them if they refused to accept the dictates of a party caucus. However, the

[2] Haynes, p. 302, footnote 2.

action will not deter true liberals. It will boomerang against the Senators who voted as they did on January 13. I was fair enough to advise both party caucuses, some days prior to the meeting on January 13, that I did not desire to be assigned by a party caucus to a Senate committee, but that I desired to be assigned to committees in accordance with my rights under the Reorganization Act of 1946.

But apparently my colleagues in the Senate either have not read or did not wish to read with the correct interpretation the Reorganization Act of 1946, because after reading it they could not reach any other conclusion than that under that act every Member of this body has a right to be assigned to committees by vote of the Senate, not by action of a political caucus. The junior Senator from Oregon asked to be assigned in accordance with his rights under the Reorganization Act. The Members of this body went back to 1871 for a precedent which was established at the beginning of another military administration, for the action which was taken against the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, my colleagues can continue to tell their constituents that they took no disciplinary action, but I intend to meet them on the platform in their States in 1954, and we will discuss with their constituents the real meaning of their action on January 13, 1953.

Mr. President, I was appalled by the glaring fact that on January 13, the Senate proceeded, in effect, to remove a Senator from committee posts long held without the slightest research of the precedents of the Senate. No Senator of the majority party made any statement which would indicate that he or his party or caucus had considered the history of the Senate before taking the action the caucus had decided upon. The majority leader gave no inkling of having any such information.

With only two exceptions, the Democratic speakers demonstrated the same lack of information, and worse. Both parties appeared indifferent, apathetic, to the possibility that 164 years of precedent might be overturned. To me, that was a shocking course of action.

THE PRINCIPLE OF MINORITY REPRESENTATION IS ROOTED IN DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

Nor was there a shred of evidence that either the Republican Party or the Democratic Party had given the slightest prior thought to the principle of minority representation.

As I stated in my remarks on January 13, the rights of minority parties in the Senate to committee assignments is not a matter of sufferance: It does not depend upon the indulgence of the majority of the moment. It is—or at least it has been—firmly rooted in a tradition of the Senate which has but mirrored a basic premise of our democratic form of government; namely, that the majority shall prevail but with due regard for the preservation of minority representation and the recognition of minority rights. The Constitution is designed to insure and preserve that balance, and it is for that reason that amendments to the Constitution require more than a simple majority.

At any moment a majority of sufficient numbers could override the basic rights of minority groups—whether a political party, a religious group, or dissenters of many persuasions. In such a case the strength of democracy is its accumulated tradition of liberty and the protection of minority rights which has defeated and will defeat attempts at totalitarian control.

The history of progress is the history of minorities fighting for their rights, not humbly petitioning for the indulgence of their betters.

The distinguished minority leader stated on January 13—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 343—that he had no intention of interfering with the selection of the majority caucus because the majority "soon would be picking every member of every committee in the Senate. I can see no more dangerous day that could ever face a minority," said he.

Mr. President, I say that is a counsel of fear. Certainly the minority party should be the first to stand on its hind legs and fight any infringement of the rights of another minority party. I would recall to the Senate that the motto of the Hapsburgs was "divide and conquer." I call the attention of my liberal friends on both sides of the aisle in the Senate to the fact that that is also the old shell game which for decades has been played against liberals in American politics—in short, divide and conquer. The liberals should have known that there was nothing better that the reactionaries would like to do than divide the liberals. Turn the liberals against each other and then pick them off one by one has been reactionary policy for decades. It is a bad thing that my liberal friends in the Senate fell for the tactics.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 32

Let me turn to the arithmetic of the situation and outline what I submit today.

The minority leader, in blocking consideration of Senate Resolution 32, stated that the caucus slates were designed to insure the same percentage of minority party representation in this Congress as obtained in the 82d Congress, 1st session. He pointed out that in 1950 the Republican Party had 47 Members in the Senate and that in this Congress the Democratic Party has 47 Members in the Senate. He is not completely correct in his statement that the percentages are the same, Mr. President; they are only roughly the same.

In the first session of the 82d Congress there were a total of 203 committee posts, of which the then minority party had 94. Under the reorganized committee plan adopted on January 9, 1953, there are now a total of 209 committee posts, of which the Democratic Party presently has 77.

What I propose in my amendment to Senate Resolution 32 is to increase the number of committee posts by two. That would be accomplished by adding 2 members to the Committee on Armed Services and 2 members to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and by reducing the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Public Works by 1 member each. The total change in overall committee posts would be from 209 seats to 211 seats. At present the Committee on the District of Columbia is supposed to have 9 members, and the Committee on Public Works is supposed to have 11 members. Until now, each has operated with one vacancy. It will be recalled that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] explained that it was not found possible to agree upon a plan which would insure a numerical majority of majority party members on all committees. It was decided that the Republican and Democratic strength on those 2 committees should be equal, and that the junior Senator from Oregon should be the ninth member of the Committee on the District of Columbia and the eleventh member of the Committee on Public Works.

They implied that I could conceivably hold the balance of power on these committees. They were not happy about the prospect but apparently felt that this was the best that they could do.

Of course, at no time have they ever contemplated what the RECORD will show, namely, that my votes on the Armed Services Committee and my votes on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, for years and years, have never been based upon any partisan theory of who holds the balance of power, but only on the theory of the merits of the issues before the committee, and on what, in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, was best for the country. The assumption concerning the balance of power on committees which has run through this debate on committee assignments is, of course, clearly based upon what I think is a very undesirable admission that in committee at least some Senators act from a partisanship standpoint rather than from the standpoint of the merits of the issues before the committee. But I said on January 13 that I was perfectly willing to agree with the distinguished majority leader, as I did, that the majority party was entitled to have a majority of one on the committees of the Senate. I did not quarrel with that, but I quarreled with the false assumption of the minority that it had no responsibilities in the fight to protect the interests of a minority or independent party in the Senate. Again today I charge the minority with having, on January 13, walked out on its clear obligations to protect minority rights as a minority party in the Senate of the United States. The minority is going to learn from constituents of theirs across the country that thousands of them agree that there was a failure on the part of the minority party, on January 13, to live up to the professed liberal beliefs of certain Members of the minority, in connection with this committee fight, because they substituted political expediency for political principle, as they well know. In fact, some of them have tended to half confess it in letters to constituents, copies of which have been sent to me.

But what have Members of the minority done since January 13 to correct a wrong, not to the junior Senator from Oregon, but a wrong to the traditions of the United States Senate, a wrong for

which they can find no precedent since 1871. They have done absolutely nothing. They stand convicted before the bar of American public opinion today, in my judgment, as a group of men who walked out on their responsibilities to minority rights in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon, I think, knows that I am a cosponsor of Resolution No. 32. I was very glad indeed to be a cosponsor, because I felt that the proposal which was made took into account the existence of an independent party, and also recognized that a party that had been voted the majority party in the election was entitled to organize the House and the Senate, and to control the committees by majority membership on the committees.

I supported Resolution No. 32 with my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, because I felt that the solution offered by the resolution was a reasonable and a fair one; and I still do, because on two committees, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services, on which the distinguished Senator from Oregon has served with such great distinction for many years, it would have given him continued membership and at the same time would have permitted the majority party to assert its role as a majority party.

While I think that resolution was an entirely fair one, I do not subscribe to the thesis enunciated by my friend from Oregon that the minority party did not recognize its responsibility. Quite the opposite, Mr. President. Many of us in the minority party spoke in favor of Senate Resolution 32 and stated that we would support it, as we would support it today if it should come before the Senate, because we consider it to be a thoroughly fair and equitable resolution which gives recognition both to the right of seniority of the Senator from Oregon and to the right of the majority party to assert its function as the majority party in the Senate.

When that resolution was proffered, as the Senator from Oregon will recall, some of us asked that it be reported promptly by the committee. The answer was that no assurance could be given as to a specific date on which it would be reported. It has certainly been my understanding that it would be brought before the Senate, not necessarily with a favorable report from the committee, but brought to the floor of the Senate so that Members could fight for it.

I can assure the Senator from Oregon that when that happens he will have the support of many members of the minority party, as well as, I believe, the support of many members of the majority party, because it provides a sound way to handle the situation. It would accord recognition of the right of the member or members of an independent party to have proper committee assignments and of the right of a Member who has served on committees for many years to maintain his seniority, and at the same time it would recognize the right and the authority of the majority party to organize and to control, so far as it is able to do so through its own efforts, the proceedings within the committees and within the Senate.

I want the Senator to know that I stand shoulder to shoulder with him in a desire to have the resolution brought before the Senate, and I can assure him that when that happens he will certainly have my support, as he has in the past, and also the support of many other Members of the Senate in both parties.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the remarks of the Senator from New York. I assure him that in my reply I mean no personal reflection upon him. I am talking to the principle which is involved; and I wish to say that the remarks of the Senator from New York are completely unsatisfactory, so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, as to the correct explanation of what happened prior to January 13 and on January 13 as affecting the minority side of the Senate. I do not think the Senator from New York can erase from the RECORD the plain facts. He talks about a group of Senators on the minority side, when the junior Senator from Oregon offered Senate Resolution 32, rising and asking to join in the resolution. That was sort of an afterthought on their part. But the fact should be borne in mind, that the junior Senator from Oregon should never have been placed in such a position that he himself had to offer Senate Resolution 32 in order to do justice on the floor of the Senate to a minority interest. That should have been done by the minority party itself; the resolution should have been offered by the minority party itself. But it was the minority party which blocked the proposal when the majority leader himself made very clear, as the RECORD of January 13 will show, that it would have been acceptable to the majority leader.

The minority party cannot by any stretch of the imagination place upon the majority party the responsibility for what has happened in regard to this committee problem. They say, Mr. President, out of one corner of their mouths, that they recognize that the majority is entitled to a majority on the committee, but out of the other corner of their mouths they say in a letter which I am going to read presently that it was the responsibility of the majority to take care of the junior Senator from Oregon by way of committee assignments. They cannot have their cake and eat it, too; they cannot have the argument both ways; they cannot take the position that the majority is entitled to a majority of one and then take the position that the majority should have destroyed that majority of one on the two committees that I am entitled to serve on. The fact is that the minority party did not want to recognize the fact that there are three parties in the Senate of the United States. They do not want to face the fact that there is an Independent Party in the Senate of the United States. So nothing was done by them on January 13 to protect the rights of the Senator from Oregon. They did not offer any resolution to protect his rights.

The Senator from New York says they rallied to the support of the Senator from Oregon after he offered the resolution. Do Senators think it was pleasant for the junior Senator from Oregon to take the action he did? Do they think it is easy to do that on the floor of the Senate, considering the kind of press we have in America today, which is ever-ready to distort the position taken by nonconformists? I have my feelings, too, Mr. President. It was only because of the important seniority principle which was involved that I made the fight for the protection of my seniority rights. I had gone to the books. I looked upon what I had to do as being a task for a student of government. I believed I ought to do my paper work. Before the meeting on January 13 I had studied the precedents of the Senate of the United States and I knew that the Senate could not justify breaking the precedents of decades if the precedents were pointed out. I pointed them out to the members of the minority in the speech which I made on the subject on January 13. They ignored the precedents.

Where were the voices on the minority side? Only six Members stood up and were counted in support of protecting the precedents and traditions of the Senate of the United States on this issue of my seniority rights.

Mr. President, I make bold to say that the Senator from New York cannot submit an iota of evidence that shows there was any inclination or intention on the part of the minority in its caucus to protect the minority rights of the Senator from Oregon. What ruled in that caucus was politics, not principle—"get every committee assignment we can for Democrats" was the obvious tactic of that Democratic caucus.

"The Senator from Oregon," says one of them in a letter to a constituent, "has made his bed; let him lie in it."

I do not object to my bed, Mr. President. I am proud of the political bed I have made for myself. But I wish to say to Senators on the other side of the aisle that they are going to hear from me in 1954, across the country, on this matter of principle versus political expediency. They will find out in their own bailiwicks what the attitude of their constituents may be on the question of principle versus political expediency.

Let me say further, Mr. President, that it makes nice rationalizing to a constituent to say, "Well, we were in a difficult parliamentary position. The Senator from Oregon was maneuvered into a bad parliamentary position, and there was nothing we could do about that, but the first time we had a chance to help him we rallied to him and indicated that we were going to support his resolution."

That is an interesting alibi, Mr. President, that is what I call working both sides of the street, because the fact is that they were not interested in the position in which the Senator from Oregon found himself until, first, they took care of their own committee assignments. There were some choice ones made, too. Some of my alleged friends on the minority side got some choice committee plums on January 13. They picked

their plums first; then they started talking about protecting the minority rights of the Independent Party in the United States Senate.

Did they vote on committee assignments on January 13? That raises again the old question of form versus substance, because Senate rule XXIV reads as follows:

> In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

Did they vote, Mr. President? Let the record show the form of the ballot they sent to the desk. The form of the ballot sent to the desk was a mimeographed copy of a political caucus list of committee assignments, at the bottom of which each Senator signed his name, and sent it to the desk as his ballot. They can call it a ballot if they wish to, but, in accordance with my sense of values, they sent to the desk an underwriting of a political caucus action, and I refuse to believe that, at least in some cases, it represented the true judgment of the individual Senator as to how he ought to have voted.

Some Senators have been kind enough and fair enough to tell me subsequently that they realized they did not send a ballot to the desk. In some instances they have formally apologized to me. Perhaps I have not been very kind, because I responded to their apologies by saying that I never accept an apology involving a matter of public policy. I accept an apology only in a matter that involves a social error or a personal affront. But an apology never rights a wrong against public policy. The kind of apology tendered was merely conscience salve for the apologizer, and some hard feelings have resulted.

If there is a desire to go into the question of personal relationships that have resulted, I may say that I recognize that this was an unfortunate incident. However, irrespective of the unfortunate personal relations which have resulted, I shall continue to fight on the floor of the Senate for what I think is the protection of a great principle, namely, the seniority rights of a Senator. I shall continue to try to make the record clear for future students of the history of the Senate, by showing that in this session of Congress there was at least one Senator who fought on the floor of the Senate to protect 8 years of seniority rights that were emasculated on January 13, 1953.

I believe that the unfortunate act of the United States Senate on January 13 in violating my seniority rights is going to plague future Senators and future Senates. If it is the attitude of the Members of the United States Senate that by disciplinary action they can inhibit and control insurgents of the future, they are mistaken. Unless I fail entirely to read the handwriting on the wall, I venture the prediction today that the number of independents and insurgents in the United States Senate in the years immediately ahead is going to increase, because increasing millions of American people are becoming sick and tired of the political expediency that has come to dominate both major parties in this country. That is why there is going to be an upsurge from the grassroots of America in opposition to the kind of political expediency that stalked the floor of the United States Senate on January 13, 1953.

So I say, in reply to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], that his explanation is not good enough for me, because the time for the Senator from New York, as a member of a minority party, to have acted was before he ever came to the floor of the Senate on January 13, when he saw that his party was about to follow the course of action which it followed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The place for the Senator from New York to have acted was on the floor of the Senate, before he sent to the desk the mimeographed copy of the Democratic caucus list, to which he signed his name, and which he called a ballot. That was the time for the Senator from New York to have stood up on the floor of the Senate and be counted in defense of minority rights.

When I offered my resolution, and the Senator from New York asked permission to join in offering it, of course I granted him permission, but I would have been much more pleased if the Senator from New York had made the fight for minority rights prior to the time he sent to the desk something which I will never call a ballot under Senate rule XXIV.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the first place, I may say that not being on either the policy committee of the Democratic minority or the steering committee, I had no part in deciding on the minority membership of the committees. I accepted my membership on the committees, as did other Members of the Senate.

I may point out to the Senator from Oregon that it was the junior Senator from New York who strongly urged him to adopt the course of presenting Senate Resolution 32 to this body, rather than a resolution which he presented later on his own initiative, which would have meant bumping off the committees Senators who were selected by the two accredited and recognized committees of the Senate.

Furthermore, the Senator from Oregon may remember that it was at his suggestion and on his insistence that every Member of the Senate was required to vote on the ballot that had been presented, which he referred to as a mimeographed ballot—and it was a mimeographed ballot. So far as I recall this was not done at the insistence of other Members of the Senate, but at the insistence of the Senator from Oregon himself. I think the Senator from Oregon will recall that I strongly urged that the procedure outlined in Senate Resolution 32 was sound and fair, and that it recognized—and I wish to repeat the word "recognized"—three things which I believe are essential in any legislative body in a democracy.

First, it recognized the seniority rights of a Senator who had served for many years on important committees. Second, it recognized certain rights of an Independent Party—and I know the Senator from Oregon represents an Independent Party. The third point is the most important, to my mind, because I believe in majority government. I believe that a party which has been elected by the people of our country to serve as the majority party in a legislative body should be given the means of carrying out its mandate. Resolution 32, of which, as I have said, I was a cosponsor, recognized that viewpoint. It would have recognized that the Republican Party had a mandate to organize the Senate and its committees. It would have maintained the majority position, but, at the same time, it would have given the distinguished Senator from Oregon a place on the two important committees which have been mentioned, which I was very anxious that he have.

I will say to the acting majority leader and the acting minority leader that I think it is perfectly fair to the distinguished Senator from Oregon to criticize the committee, as I am criticizing it, for not having permitted the resolution to come before the Senate long before that, so that we might have had a right to vote in support of the resolution, which I think was fair, wise, judicious, and equitable. The resolution has not come before us.

That is my criticism, I will say to the Senator from Oregon. I join him in that criticism. I join him in saying that that resolution should be brought to the floor of the Senate, so that Members of the Senate may evidence and demonstrate their feelings in regard to its provisions.

In my judgment that is the proper, wise, and fair way to proceed. I must say that when that resolution comes before us—and I hope this debate, acrimonious as it may have been, will serve the purpose of bringing it out on the floor of the Senate—I think we shall have made a great gain in support of the principles of democratic government. I believe that that is the proper way to proceed, rather than, as the Senator from Oregon has done and is doing, in accusing Members of the Senate who, I believe, have just as consistent a record of liberalism as has the junior Senator from Oregon, of surrendering their principles and of being willing to yield to political expediency.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am always glad to have the comments of the Senator from New York on any subject, including this one. Usually, however, I find his comments more satisfactory and logical than I find them today. So I shall reply to the comments which he has just made, because I find them as unsatisfactory as his previous comments.

He has opened up the question as to what happened behind the scenes on January 13. I will tell the Senate some of the things that happened behind the scenes on January 13.

It is true that the Senator from New York suggested that some such resolution as the one submitted by me, Senate Resolution 32, ought to be offered; and some of his colleagues suggested it. But he did not say what my reply was. My reply was: "Why should I be submitting such a resolution? Why should I be placed in the position of having to stand on the floor of the Senate and fight for my minority rights? Why should I be placed in such a position that I have to nominate myself for membership on those two committees? In my opinion, I am entitled to membership on them under the rules of the Senate, as a matter of right. You gentlemen on the other side ought to be protecting my rights."

What was the reply? What was the comment of the Senator from New York and some other Senators on the other side? "You have us in a difficult situation. We have been maneuvered into a bad parliamentary position. We are in the position now where we must either vote for you and against a Democrat, or for a Democrat and against you."

What was my reply? I said, "You are in no such position at all. You are in the position where you must vote either for or against a principle. The principle involved is protecting the seniority rights of a Member of the Senate on the floor of the Senate, in keeping with the spirit and meaning of rule XXIV of the Senate, under which, by ballot, you are to decide who shall go on the committees. What criterion are you going to apply when you come to cast that ballot judgment? How can you escape the criterion of seniority rights?"

The trouble with Senators on the other side is that they did not want to do what they should have done in fairness. They should have recognized—because it was as clear as the noses on their faces—that they ought to have dropped the Member of lowest seniority, of the freshman class, on the two committees with respect to which the Senator from Oregon was entitled to retention of membership. That is how simple it was.

It was not a question of voting for or against a Democrat. It was a question of voting for or against protecting the principle of seniority in the United States Senate; and each and every Member of the minority party who sent the mimeographed caucus list to the clerk's desk failed to protect that principle. They can alibi and rationalize and argue all they wish, as the Senator from New York has done on the floor of the Senate this afternoon; but they cannot escape the pinch in which they are caught. He cannot escape the pinch in which he is caught. He did not vote to protect seniority rights on the floor of the Senate on January 13. He sent a so-called ballot to the desk which did not protect the principle of seniority rights; and he cannot cough that one out of his system; he cannot get it out. It is there for all time, for all to see. The same is true of his colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The minority party did not protect minority rights on January 13.

Let me make a further comment with respect to the remarks of the Senator from New York. Why did he not offer the resolution? Why did not a group of Democratic Senators offer the resolution? I wonder—and I only express wonder—if it was because they knew that their minority leader was against it, and so stated on the floor of the Senate on January 13.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr LEHMAN. I think the Senator's memory is very poor. He may recall—and we can consult the RECORD of January 13—that the first resolution which the Senator from Oregon submitted was Senate Resolution 32, which he submitted very early in the session of that day. My recollection is that the Senator from New York urged its immediate consideration, but the Chair declared that that proposal was out of order, because the resolution had to lie over for a day, which was in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Before he ever came to the floor of the Senate on January 13, what fight did the Senator from New York make within the Democratic Party to protect the rights of the Senator from Oregon? What fight did the Senator from New York ever make in the Democratic caucus, taking the position that the Democrat of lowest seniority ought to give way to the greater seniority rights of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LEHMAN. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that at all times, even though the Senator from New York was not on the policy committee or on the steering committee—and I am not even certain that those committees had been appointed prior to that time—the Senator from New York strongly urged the retention of the Senator from Oregon as a member of those two committees.

Mr. MORSE. Why did not the Senator vote that way?

Mr. LEHMAN. Because I felt, as I have stated, that Senate Resolution 32 was the right way to proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Even when the Senator knew that there was not a chance of getting it through the Senate?

Mr. LEHMAN. Even when I knew that the later method proposed by the Senator from Oregon would have meant the complete negation of the principle to which I am attached, of the right of the majority party to organize and conduct the affairs of the Senate.

I did not expect to say this, until this uncalled-for attack by the Senator from Oregon——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator asked for it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Perhaps I did.

Mr. MORSE. And the Senator's actions justify it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Perhaps I did ask for it. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that he will recall that I volunteered—no; I will not say this. It would not be fair.

Mr. MORSE. Go ahead.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was a statement made in confidence.

Mr. MORSE. So far as I am concerned no such statement need be regarded as having been made in confidence. Let the Senator proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well. I volunteered to withdraw from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in favor of the Senator from Oregon. It is true that that was after the vote was taken.

Mr. MORSE. Two days afterward.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether it was 1 day or 2 days, but it was still an offer made in good faith, and made in a desire, first, to show my confidence in the Senator from Oregon; and in the second place, because I felt that he would be an extremely valuable member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as he had been for many years.

Let me say in all kindness—and I know I am repeating—that although the Senator from Oregon has been in the Senate for many more years than I have, he has not been in public life longer than I have, or longer than some of my colleagues, nor has he served the people of the Nation longer, nor has he served liberal causes longer. I cannot help remark that the Senator from Oregon has no monopoly on liberalism, on liberal leadership, or on liberal action, and that some of the Senators he has attacked, both on the Republican and on the Democratic sides of the aisle, have records on liberalism which I believe would not suffer by comparison with his record, much as I admire and respect him.

He has no monopoly on liberalism, on liberal leadership, or on the support of liberal causes which extend over a great many years. Others too have principles and convictions. I am sorry that I had to engage in this colloquy with my friend from Oregon. It has not been bitter on my side, and certainly I did not want it to be, because in spite of statements and remarks which have been made by him both on the floor of the Senate and on the outside, I still have a great affection and admiration for the junior Senator from Oregon, and I have great confidence in him. He is a real liberal, but I do not think he is the only liberal in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply to the ad hominem argument of the Senator from New York as follows: There is no one in this body who respects the liberalism of the Senator from New York more than does the junior Senator from Oregon. I think he is the giant of us all so far as the record on liberalism is concerned. I have said across the platforms of America on innumerable occasions that I do not think there is a greater liberal in the United States than HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York, and I still think that is true. That is why I am deeply grieved and pained that on this occasion he should walk out on his own principles and liberalism by failing to protect in this instance minority rights, as he has so heroically done in other instances.

The Senator from New York knows full well that he is getting pretty close to the beltline when he tries to imply by innuendo that the junior Senator from Oregon thinks he has a monopoly on liberalism in this country. I make no such profession. I do say, Mr. President, that when it has been pointed out that a principle of liberalism was at stake, I never knowingly walked out on it.

The Senator from New York has referred to a conversation which he had with me some 2 days after January 13.

Well, Mr. President, let us put it in the RECORD. He said he was very much disturbed about the course of action he had followed on January 13. He said he had voted his convictions and he thought he was right, but he was not sure that he was right. He said he thought he was right, but he wanted to talk to me on a proposal which he wanted to make to the Democratic Policy Committee. He wanted to offer to resign from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with the understanding that I be appointed in his place, because he thought I ought to be a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He thought also that I ought to be a member of the Committee on Armed Services, but he did not think he could do anything about that committee. He could do something, however, about the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because he is a member of it.

My reply to him in essence was that I knew he would not mean to insult me, and I asked him what made him think that I would accept through his charity what I was entitled to as a matter of right. I said that I would not think of accepting appointment to any committee through any action of charity of the Senator from New York. I said I held fast to the principle of seniority which had been emasculated by this body on January 13.

I desire to say further to the Senator from New York that he did not have to be a member of the Democratic policy committee, and he did not have to be a member of the Democratic steering committee to make his fight for the protection of minority rights in the Senate on January 13, or prior to January 13, through the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, he rebutted himself when he sent to the desk a ballot which cannot be reconciled with that resolution. He rebutted himself when, after he discovered on January 13 that not even his minority leader would go along with him on the whole question of protecting the seniority rights of a minority, he himself did not make the fight to protect that principle at the time of the balloting.

In my judgment there can be no question about the fact that, confronted with the problem my alleged friends were confronted with, and with the attitude of the minority leader on January 13 on my resolution, that they should have protected the seniority rights of 8 years service in the Senate, instead of giving superior consideration to seniority rights which were just taking root in freshmen Senators who had just recently walked onto the floor of the Senate. That is the major premise of the junior Senator from Oregon, and it is a premise which is consistent with the precedents of the Senate, except for the one of 1871. The Senator from New York has had nothing to say about the precedents of the Senate. He has had nothing to say about the fact that never, except for once in our history, has a Senator received such treatment in the matter of committee assignments as I received on January 13.

Since its formation on January 13, the District of Columbia Committee has held several meetings, has formed several subcommittees and scheduled hearings. The Committee on Public Works also has held several meetings, and has assigned a regular day for its regular meetings. Apparently these committees are discharging their functions without being handicapped by a vacancy on each committee.

I want to set the record absolutely straight by saying that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], came to me and asked me if I should like to have notices of committee meetings sent to me, because they assumed that I would be assigned to those two committees. I told them I appreciated their courtesy very much, but that I would await action of the Senate on my resolution and that I thought, to be very frank about it, I was in a very much better position, parliamentarily speaking, if I did not participate in any committee meetings until I was assigned to the committees by formal action of the Senate. I said I thought it was only fair to await action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on my resolution. However, I feel that I owe these two committee chairmen the courtesy of having the record show that they offered to send me notices of meetings of the Committee on Public Works and of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

It is clear that in the Senate the provision for an odd number of members is designed primarily to insure control by the majority party. Assigning the junior Senator from Oregon to these committees as the ninth or eleventh member would not serve that purpose.

It is not unprecedented to have a committee composed of an even number. I have not conducted an exhaustive research into this matter, inasmuch as time did not permit me to do so. However, I do not think it necessary to do so, for in choosing a back number of the Congressional Directory, I found an instance in the first volume I picked up—that of the 75th Congress, 1st session.

In that Congress—mark you this, Mr. President, it was the 75th Congress, 1st session—no less than 14 committees, including the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Education and Labor, the then Committee on Military Affairs, and the then Committee on Naval Affairs, had even-numbered memberships. It is true that the Democrats had a majority on the committees but the membership of the committees was even numbered.

I might observe that it would be possible to have the same total of committee posts and the same Democratic percentage of seats if the Senate were to reduce the membership of the Committee on Government Operations, as originally proposed. But the Senate has been persuaded that that committee should continue at the same strength as in the last Congress. I agree that such determinations of policy should take precedence over the percentage of committee posts, where the difference comes to less than one-half of a percent, as in this case.

Mr. President, let me reiterate: My proposal is to add one member of the majority party and the junior Senator from Oregon to both the Committee on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, and to contract both the District of Columbia and Public Works Committees from their proposed strength of 9 and 11 seats to 8 and 10 seats, respectively, the number with which they have been operating.

Let me assure the minority leader that the percentage of Democratic seats would remain practically unchanged.

I believe that my proposal also requires that the number of majority members who serve on more than 2 committees be expanded by 2. That number has already been increased and offset by 3 Democrats who can sit on 3 committees. The additional change seems slight. There are several Republican Senators who would be available for the two additional posts.

I close by saying that Senate Resolution 32, with the proposed amendments, offers the Senate an opportunity to reverse what otherwise will stand as a regrettable and dangerous precedent of infringement upon the rule of seniority for committee membership—as opposed to committee chairmanship—which is a salutary rule for the protection of minorities and the orderly selection of committees.

Mr. President, I now submit and send to the desk an amendment to Senate Resolution 32, and I request that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have one other item in regard to this subject matter: I have been receiving a number of copies of letters which some of my Democratic colleagues in the Senate have been sending to constituents, in answer to protests they have received from constituents against the sacrifice of principle which in my judgment occurred on January 13. Those letters are very interesting letters of alibi. Without disclosing the name of the Senator who wrote the particular letter to which I shall now refer, I wish to read what almost takes the form of a form letter, for I understand that this particular Senator has received so many protests that he is replying to all of them, irrespective of who the sender may be, by using the salutation "My dear friend," and his replies appear to be identical.

In his letter of February 21, that Senator said:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 21, 1953.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I have before me now your letter of February 16 asking why the majority of Democratic Senators, including myself, deserted Senator MORSE in his fight for the Senate committee assignments.

I am afraid you and others have drawn erroneous conclusions from organization activities in connection with the establishment of the new Senate. As you may know, when a new Congress convenes, both the majority and the minority parties submit their lists of recommendations for committee assignments. In this Congress, the Senate has a membership of 49 Republicans and 47 Dem-

ocrats. This Republican membership, however, included Senator MORSE, and when the Democrats filed their list of committee membership they naturally did not include Senator MORSE, who is not and never has been a member of our party. When the Republicans filed their list they did not include Senator MORSE, and explained the fact by stating that he had publicly declared that he did not care to be affiliated with the Republican Party.

Let me digress long enough to say that I do not know how one could make it clearer than I did over the weeks, and then in the speech I made on the floor of the Senate, when, well in advance of January 13, I served notice on the Democrats that I was not seeking assignment by a Republican caucus or by any other caucus, but that I was seeking assignment under the Reorganization Act of 1946, by a vote of the Senate, acting as a committee of the whole—which was a sound parliamentary position for me to take.

The Democratic Senator who wrote the letter to which I am referring then stated in the letter:

You can readily see the situation that followed. He did not become a member of our party, and for us to place him on a committee assignment would be to take away an assignment from one of our Democratic members. It was a Republican "baby," and their responsibility, not ours.

Mr. President, where is the Senator from New York? I should like to have him hear it, because that is the alibi, the rationalization, the "out" that a number of Democratic Senators are using in answering complaining mail from their constituents in connection with this matter. Those Senators are saying, "It was a Republican baby."

Mr. President, it was no one's baby, but it was a precious principle of seniority rights on the floor of the Senate that the writer of this letter never so much as mentioned to his constituent, because if that Senator had done so, he could not have justified his vote with the alibi and rationalization he advanced in his letter.

I read further from the letter:

We refused to be placed in a position where we must lower our strength in order to make way for a member of their party—

Of course, he just got through saying I was not a member of their party—

that they had repudiated—

In a minute I shall have something to say about that—

and at a time when membership of the Senate and its control hung in such close balance that Senator MORSE's vote could easily swing control, and he also had publicly announced that on organization matters he would not vote with the Democrats in the Senate.

That is an interesting comment.

The letter concludes as follows:

I hope this gives you a clearer picture of the situation that was presented to us.

Sincerely.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of my remarks at the point following the reading of the letter of Senator X to his constituent, my reply to the constituent, with the names of both the constituent and the Senator deleted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 1953.

DEAR Mr. X: Thanks very much for sending to me Senator X's alibi for substituting political expediency for political principle, as set out in his letter of February 21 to you.

The tragedy of this session of Congress so far has been the sacrifice of principle on the part of Senators who claim to be liberals. Senator X's explanation is completely fallacious, in my judgment. The Reorganization Act of 1946 says that members of committees are to be elected by ballot. It says nothing about members of committees being selected through a political caucus, either Democratic or Republican.

What happened in the Senate on January 13 is that both the Democrats and Republicans placed partisanship above principle, and they have to fall back to 1871 to find a precedent for their course of action.

It was then that Sumner, of Massachusetts, was kicked off his committees because he disagreed with another military President, Ulysses S. Grant.

I am enclosing tearsheets from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing my statements of January 13 and 29 on this committee issue.

It is a matter of great regret to me that colleagues in the Senate would attempt to alibi their unsound position on this issue, as Senator X did to you.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, the Senator who wrote the letter did not get by with it with his constituent, because his constituent saw through it as one sees through glass.

Let me say the Republican Party in the Senate tried to be fair; it never repudiated me. The Republican Party was courteous and kind enough to me to send me official notices to attend the Republican conferences of the organization of the Senate, prior to January 3; and I appreciated it, and I said so to the Republican leadership. But I also made clear that I meant it when I resigned from the Republican Party and stated that I would not be present at any Republican conferences. The Democrats knew that. So the statement of this Democratic Senator that I had been repudiated by the Republican Party was, as he must have known, a misstatement of fact.

No, Mr. President, in his letter he confesses that what the Democrats actually were interested in on January 13, was not in minority rights on the floor of the Senate, but in gaining as many Democratic seats on committees as they could, irrespective of the seniority rights of a Member of the minority. They have convicted themselves.

I have a sense of humor about it, too, Mr. President. I have some friends on the Democratic side who, during the late campaign, introduced me in various States. Oh, if I only had transcriptions of those speeches of introduction, Mr. President, would they show hypocrisy? I hate to think so, but it is impossible to reconcile those speeches of introduction of the junior Senator from Oregon, when I was fighting for what I believed was right in that campaign, with the votes of some of these Senators on January 13, because in those speeches of introduction they were talking about the importance of dissenters in American politics. They were lauding the independence of judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon in that campaign.

I was not entitled to any committee assignment; I would not have taken a committee assignment; in fact, I would have been insulted had a committee assignment been based upon any service I rendered in that campaign, because in the campaign I was simply standing for what I thought was right. But the record speaks for itself as to what that service was, and one will look in vain, Mr. President, for any Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle who fought harder and was in more "tough spots" on campaign platforms in supporting the presidential candidate of the Democratic Party than was the junior Senator from Oregon. Some say all is fair in politics. I presume it is, Mr. President, but it is also an interesting commentary on the kind of loyalty to their professions on the part of some of the Democratic Senators who made speeches of introduction in behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon during the campaign.

Surely, I know this subject is a "hot potato," and I am going to keep it hot until there is recognition on the part of some liberals on the Democratic side of the aisle that they have done a great injustice, not to me but to themselves. They have done an injustice to their own liberal principles. I shall await with interest to learn what steps they propose to take to rectify the injustice. It is not pleasant to be the guinea pig in the situation. I know full well what they have done and I am willing to pay the price. I am aware of the irreparable political damage this alleged group of liberals on the Democratic side of the aisle have done to the junior Senator from Oregon because for weeks there have appeared in newspapers across my State from 3 to 5 vicious editorials a day, inspired by reactionaries in my State who want to destroy me politically because they know they cannot control me. In these editorials there is the constant bombardment to the effect that "not even the Democrats will stand by him; not even the liberal Democrats will stand by him." Today "81 to 7" is the political slogan of Oregon, and has been since January 13 in respect to political attacks upon me.

Some of those on the Democratic side have the audacity to say in some of their letters to some of their constituents "the junior Senator from Oregon is bitter and he is a poor sport." Mr. President, let me tell you that I am not moved by name-calling tactics. If fighting in self-defense is poor sportsmanship, if disclosing to the constituents of these alleged liberal Democrats what they did on January 13 is poor sportsmanship, I accept the charge. If it is bitterness, I accept that, too. But let me tell you further, Mr. President, that this kind of walking out on minority rights in the Senate of the United States is something the junior Senator from Oregon is not going to forget, because he is convinced that he is making a fight to protect the principle that prevailed in this body for decades until January 13, 1953, when, for the first time since 1871 the principle of seniority was destroyed on the floor of the Senate. It was destroyed because an insurgent dared stand

for his convictions and refused to follow the advice of some of the Democrats, not to put them in such a position that they could be criticized if they failed to stand up and be counted under rule XXIV of the Senate and failed to elect to committees a Senator who, in their judgment, ought to serve on them. They voted and said one thing on the floor of the Senate, and within a matter of minutes, in the cloakroom and in the restaurant, some of them told me how much they wished they could have voted to put me on the Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare Committees. I have a phrase for that kind of conduct, Mr. President. It is political hypocrisy.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as I listened to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from New York—and perhaps similar colloquy may have taken place before I came to the floor—there flashed into my mind two brief sentences from Holy Writ, which I am glad to quote. The first is the question of Jeremiah, the prophet:

> Is there no balm in Gilead?

The other is the assurance given us by the writer of the Book of Hebrews:

> Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.

I urge my friends to take some hope and comfort from those verses of scripture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution is open to amendment.

ELEANOR M. HAHN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report the nomination of Eleanor M. Hahn, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps of the Regular Army, I request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this nomination. Lieutenant Hahn is presently serving in the grade of lieutenant of the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve and will be over age in grade for regular appointment under existing law on Saturday. This nomination went forward from the Navy Bureau of Personnel on February 9, but was unavoidably delayed at higher levels because of the backlog of pending business facing officials of the new administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—this is the kind of nomination which I think it is perfectly proper to approve in this manner. My policy of requiring nominations to remain on the table for a day goes only to the nominations of persons who control policymaking.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified.

LOYALTY CHECKS ON SENATE EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 16 to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the pending resolution, Senate Resolution 16, which has been reported from the committee on rules, is intended to provide for loyalty checks on Senate employees. Let me say at the outset that I understand an amendment may be proposed to change the word "loyalty" to "security," so as to make the resolution, in terms, provide for security checks. I should have no objection to such a change.

Mr. President, this is probably the mildest resolution of this nature which could be drafted.

It does not specifically require any form of clearance in advance of employment; nor does it even make such clearance a condition of continued employment. It does not specifically require a full field investigation in any case.

All this resolution does is provide for name checks on employees or prospective employees of the Senate, Senate committees, or individual Senators. In the case of a prospective employee, where the name check shows derogatory information, the resolution provides that the chairman of the committee or other appointing officer is to make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty of such person. The extent of such an investigation is not stipulated, and this is left, therefore, to sound discretion. In the case of an employee already on the payroll, the resolution requires only that a name check be made. The procedure to be followed in the case of a report that derogatory information is contained in the files with respect to some particular person is to be left in each case to the committee or Senator, or other appointing power.

It might be that the Senate would wish to go further than this resolution goes. It would be possible to draft much more stringent provisions. As a matter of fact, I have in the past drafted stronger provisions than this in at least two different alternatives besides the bill which I introduced; and I made those drafts available to the Committee on Rules and Administration, if that committee wanted to use them. The committee chose to report the resolution now pending.

For the information of the Senate, I might say that one of the drafts to which I refer was so drawn as to make the loyalty test a prerequisite to appointment; that is, it would require a name check and a report, and the transmission of the information to the appointing authority, before an appointment could be made. The other draft to which I refer was, like the resolution now before the Senate, concerned with provisions of procedure to be followed after appointment. The difference is that the draft which was not introduced specifically required a further investigation in every case in which a name check should reveal derogatory information, whereas Senate Resolution 16 requires only the name check. Of course, it would be possible to add to the resolution a prohibition against employment, or continued employment, of any person who is a member of a Communist organization. There may be some question whether such a section should be included, since such a section would be, in effect, a limitation on the discretion of a committee, and would also operate to deny to a Communist Member of Congress, if such should be elected, the right to employ Communist assistants. Such limitations might be good; but I did not include them in my resolution, because I was interested in presenting the least controversial provision along this line which could be developed.

Just one further point might be worthy of mention. In preparing the various drafts of which I have spoken, in advance of submission of my resolution, I gave thought to the idea of setting up some sort of legislative loyalty board. This idea I discarded as being undesirable. There are a number of reasons for this, some of them administrative. Another reason for discarding the legislative loyalty board idea is that it might well lead to a sort of central-hiring system, which many Members of Congress would vigorously oppose.

I am very glad the committee has decided to report Senate resolution 16 and I hope some such resolution, either in the form of the pending resolution or in such modified form as the Senate may see fit to adopt, will be approved by the Senate.

The committee has amended the resolution to eliminate the provision for checking with agencies other than the FBI. This is probably a wise amendment, and I would not wish to oppose it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to indicate my support of Senate resolution 16. I should like to point out that for some time the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has voluntarily followed a policy of having all of its professional staff members fully cleared by the security agencies of the Government.

I believe that all employees of the Senate should be cleared. I hope that Senators will give their support to the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have prepared concerning the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER

The resolution contemplates that name checks be authorized with respect to two groups of Senate employees.

The first group consists of those who already are on the payroll of the Senate, whether in the office of a Senator, on the staff of a Senate committee, or in some capacity which serves the Senate.

The second group consists of those who may be employed in the future by a Senator, by a Senate committee, or by the Senate itself.

It should be made clear that the name check to be made initially as to both groups contemplate that the advice of the FBI shall consist merely of the statement—without anything else being added—that there is or is not in the FBI files derogatory information

concerning the employee or prospective employee.

In the case of present employees, if the name check shows derogatory information exists, then more detailed information with respect to that derogatory information shall be furnished in accordance with the terms of the resolution. However, in the case of prospective employees, a name check shall be requested before they are placed on the rolls. If the FBI then finds that derogatory information does exist, then the FBI shall furnish, under this resolution, and to the proper person in the Senate, a statement which says only that such data exists, but without revealing in any fashion the nature of that data.

No general information may be obtained from the FBI which reflects on anyone unless the person investigated is actually on the Senate payrolls.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Nevada that I certainly favor his resolution. I see no reason why Senate employees should receive treatment any different from that accorded other employees of the Government. There can be no question that some Senate employees, because of positions they hold and because they have accessibility to security information, are in a very good position to do damage to the security of the United States, if they are not reliable persons. Therefore, I think that the power to check such employees is a power that we ought to vote for this afternoon.

As a lawyer, I am disturbed about the word "loyalty" which appears on line 11, page 1, and again on line 3 and line 12, page 2.

I wish to make myself very clear about this, because I am sure the Senator from Nevada knows how easy it is to be misunderstood on this matter. I believe that what we are after is to plug any loophole involving a violation of security. I suggest that the amendment I shall offer is even broader, in effect, than the term "loyalty." But as a lawyer it seems to me that it is much more difficult to lay down applicable criteria for testing loyalty than it is to lay down applicable criteria for testing reliability for security purposes.

My suggested amendment is that on page 1, line 11, the word "loyalty" be stricken, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof "liability for security purposes".

A person might be very loyal, but yet might be a very bad risk for security purposes. Let us speak hypothetically for a moment, to illustrate what the junior Senator from Oregon has in mind. Members of the Senate staff might be very loyal so far as our form of Government is concerned, but might be uncontrollable gossips. We might just as well publish the information in a newspaper as to allow such a person to sit in a committee meeting or have access to any of the files of the Senate. We could not get rid of such a person under the terms of the resolution as it stands, on any ground of loyalty. He would be loyal, but he might be so lacking in judgment that he would be a bad security risk.

If a person is disloyal, he is also a bad security risk. I think my phrase is broader than the term "loyalty," with respect to what we are trying to do, and that is to plug the loopholes with respect to security risks.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should look with favor upon the Senator's amendment if the language were "loyalty and reliability for security purposes."

Mr. MORSE. I will accept that.

Mr. McCARRAN. So far as I am personally concerned, I have no objection. However, I am not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to leaving the word "loyalty" in.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my suggestion.

Mr. MORSE. I simply say that whatever agency is to administer this law will have a great deal more difficulty laying down workable criteria for determining loyalty than criteria for determining security.

Mr. McCARRAN. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. So let my amendment be that wherever the word "loyalty" occurs, there shall follow immediately thereafter the words "and reliability for security purposes."

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MORSE. Let me ask the Senator if he has any objection to another amendment which I suggest, namely, in line 10 on page 1, and a corresponding amendment in line 10 on page 2, in the clause beginning "or officer", after the word "derogatory", in line 10 on page 1, and following the same word at the end of line 10 on page 2, to insert the words "and rebutting." If the files contain rebutting information, I think we ought to have the rebutting information. Does the Senator object to adding those words?

Mr. McCARRAN. Personally I have no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendments which I have just discussed, and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, after the word "derogatory", it is proposed to insert the words "and rebutting."

On page 1, line 11, after the word "loyalty", it is proposed to insert the words "and reliability for security purposes."

On page 2, line 3, after the word "loyalty", it is proposed to insert the words "and reliability for security purposes."

On page 2, line 10, after the word "derogatory", it is proposed to insert "and rebutting."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I approve the amendments. However, I am not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I cannot speak for that committee.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, there are 2 or 3 members of the Committee on Rules and Administration present. I do not think there is any objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should not think so.

Mr. MORSE. I think the resolution would be easier to administer if it were amended as suggested. I believe that the words "reliability for security purposes" would afford a much better check than the word "loyalty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section at the end of the resolution, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the names of each Senator of the United States, incumbent on the date of the adoption of this resolution and hereafter entering upon the office of Senator of the United States, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of each agency (and if such is on file, any rebutting information) concerning the loyalty and the reliability of such Senator for security purposes. In any case in which such derogatory and rebutting information is submitted, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall make or cause to be made such further investigation necessary to resolve the issues raised by such report and to take such further action as it or the Senate shall deem necessary.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly on my amendment. I notice some smiles on the faces of other Senators. I think I understand why there should be such smiles, if they do not understand my reason for the amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am very glad to see the bright, genial smile on the face of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am more happy than the Senator from Nevada may sometimes think, I am sure. But even though I may have a smile on my face, I am in dead earnest about this matter.

Speaking hypothetically, if a certain Senator has access to security secrets, and if the FBI knows that in fact he is not a good security risk, even though he may have fooled the people of his State into electing him to the Senate, the interests of the country are greater than any tradition of the Senate.

The times in which we live are so serious that we cannot afford to take risks, even with United States Senators. If any Senator can be shown in fact to be a bad security risk, I believe we ought to apply the rule of the Senate under which we are the judges of the qualifications of our colleagues.

All my amendment does is to seek to give some meaning and effective jurisdiction to the rule. If there is a Senator who, investigation shows, is a bad security risk, then I think he ought to be treated as any other employee of the Government would be treated, and that he should come under the purview of

this resolution. In my opinion, the problem of security knows no person, in the sense that no person in our Government who has access to security files ought to have any immunity or ought to be treated as though the Senate were a sanctuary for his subversive operations. I am opposed to making the Senate a sanctuary for subservise politicians, if there be any.. That is why I have offered my amendment. I should be interested to learn of any argument which can be advanced against it. In effect, we would be volunteering to make ourselves subject to the same kind of investigation as that to which we propose to subject employees of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarran
Anderson	Griswold	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bush	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Capehart	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Clements	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Duff	Kennedy	Stennis
Dworshak	Kerr	Symington
Eastland	Kilgore	Taft
Ellender	Knowland	Thye
Ferguson	Kuchel	Tobey
Flanders	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Lehman	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young
Goldwater	Martin	
Gore	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a large number of Senators have just come to the floor of the Senate, I ask that the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be read again.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the resolution, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit the names of each Senator of the United States, incumbent on the date of the adoption of this resolution and hereafter entering upon the office of Senator of the United States, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration be informed as to any derogatory information in the possession of each agency (and if such is on file, any rebutting information) concerning the loyalty and the reliability of such Senator for security purposes. In any case in which such derogatory and rebutting information is submitted, the Committee on Rules and Administration shall make or cause to be made such further investigation necessary to resolve the issues raised by such report and to take such further action as it or the Senate shall deem necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 16), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That hereafter when any person is appointed as an employee of any committee of the Senate, of any Senator, or of any office of the Senate the committee, Senator, or officer having authority to make such appointment shall transmit the name of such person to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed as to any derogatory and rebutting information in the possession of such agency concerning the loyalty and reliability for security purposes of such person, and in any case in which such derogatory information is revealed such committee, Senator, or officer shall make or cause to be made such further investigation as shall have been considered necessary to determine the loyalty and reliability for security purposes of such person.

Every such committee, Senator, and officer shall promptly transmit to the Federal Bureau of Investigation a list of the names of the incumbent employees of such committee, Senator, or officer together with a request that such committee, Senator, or officer be informed of any derogatory and rebutting information contained in the files of such agency concerning the loyalty and reliability for security purposes of such employee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL RATES AND CHARGES

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 49. This resolution relates to an investigation of certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in the handling of certain mail matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 49), which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments, on page 3, in line 14, after the word "than", to strike out "February 1," and insert "January 31,"; in line 21, after the word "advisable", to strike out "to contract with firms or organizations for personal services,"; in line 23, before the word "services", to insert "reimbursable"; and on page 4, in line 2, after the word "council", to insert "of not more than ten persons," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(1) Postal rates and charges in relation to the reasonable cost of handling the several classes of mail matter and special services, with due allowances in each class for the care required, the degree of preferment, priority in handling, and economic value of the services rendered and the public interest served thereby.

(2) The extent to which expenditures now charged to the Post Office Department for the following items should be excluded in considering costs for the several classes of mail matter and special services:

(A) Expenditures for free postal services;

(B) Expenditures in excess of revenues for international postal services;

(C) Expenditures for subsidies for postal services pursuant to law or legislative policy of Congress;

(D) Expenditures in excess of revenues, pursuant to the act of June 5, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), not enumerated in the preceding subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C);

(E) Expenditures for services of any character not otherwise enumerated herein which may be performed for other departments and agencies of the Government; and

(F) Expenditures which may be justified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function.

(3) Expenditures for the Post Office Department by other Government agencies which should be considered in connection with the cost for the handling of the several classes of mail matter and special services, such as employees' retirement, use of Government buildings, and maintenance services.

(4) The extent, if any, to which Post Office Department expenditures in excess of revenue, for its various services and for the handling of various classes of mail, are justified as being in the public interest.

(5) The costs of handling, transporting, and distributing the several classes of mail, and procedures whereby such costs can be reduced through improvements in methods and equipment.

(6) Other matters relating to the improvement of the postal system.

The committee shall report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, the results of its study and investigation under this resolution together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to

utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

(b) The committee is authorized to appoint an advisory council of not more than 10 persons which may include representatives of the general public, representative users of the mails, members of accounting, management, and engineering firms, postal experts, representatives of postal employee organizations and, with special reference to ratemaking in their fields, representatives of public transportation and distribution organizations. The functions of the council shall be to assist the committee in the studies and investigations authorized by this resolution. The council shall meet at such times and places as may be authorized by the committee.

(c) The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder whether we may have an explanation of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has requested an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this resolution involves nothing more than an appropriation of $100,000 for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Members of that committee appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration and explained the purpose of the proposed investigation. For example, the Post Office Department is running at a deficit which is growing larger each year. Last year it was approximately $500,000,000. This year it is estimated to be $614,000,000. It was the unanimous judgment of the Committee on Rules and Administration that something must be done to reverse this trend. The committee believes that the $100,000 provided by this resolution will prove to be money well spent, if by its expenditure there can be brought about greater efficiency, as well as better service, and deficits can be stopped or substantially reduced.

We understand that the House is also undertaking an investigation of this kind. It was the unanimous opinion of the committee that this involves a big field. I forget how many thousands of employees the Department has, but the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is well acquainted with the procedure he intends to follow, and I am sure he will be able to answer any and all questions concerning this resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator inform us who appeared before his committee in an effort to justify this resolution?

Mr. JENNER. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], presented the budget and an explanation of the proposed appropriation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did he produce any concrete evidence to show the necessity for it?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; he did.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did he produce any evidence which indicated that the Post Office Department is now engaged in doing the very thing that the chairman seeks to accomplish under the authority of this resolution?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; but he made the statement, as I recall, that there was no reason why the legislative branch of the Government should rely exclusively upon the executive branch, when, although the executive branch has had this question under consideration for many, many years, the deficit increases each year. He thought it time that we, as legislators, should look into the subject. The Senator from Kansas is on the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was listening to what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] said with reference to a bill passed last year, and with reference to the investigation of the operating methods of the Post Office Department. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana, does this resolution relate back to the authorization which was then made?

Mr. JENNER. I do not think so. I think what the Senator is referring to is the Purvis investigation of all Government employees, in all the departments of the Government.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will yield, I should like to be permitted to answer the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. It does refer to the resolution approved by the Senate last year, which was also approved by the House and signed by the President of the United States. The resolution was passed so late, however, that no effort was made to obtain funds for the purpose of making a study of the Post Office Department. That is the reason for this resolution, which has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which is coauthoried by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and which, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana said, has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Kansas that I was formerly a member of that committee. I knew that we had been very much interested in this kind of check-up and study of the operating methods of the Post Office Department. I merely wondered whether this particular resolution related to the action which had already been taken. I realize it was late in the session when the bill was signed and became law. Will the Senator point out whether this is over and beyond that, or whether it is in line with that which had already been authorized?

Mr. CARLSON. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota that a similar resolution was submitted in the last session of Congress, upon which no action was taken.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I again take the floor in order to assist my friends across the aisle in carrying out one of the important planks in the Republican platform—the plank having to do with economy. It strikes me that if the Senate is to be in a position to preach economy to other departments, we should practice economy ourselves. It was only last month that the Senate appropriated $500,000 to take care of a deficit which had been created by numerous and sundry investigations that have been ordered by the Senate.

Why do we not give the Eisenhower administration a chance to clean its own house? Why do we not give Mr. Summerfield a chance to make his own investigation as to what should be done in the Post Office Department? I talked to the Postmaster General yesterday, and he said that he had employed the services of accountants and engineers, who are now at work, in order to find ways and means by which the Post Office Department can be put on a more economical and efficient footing, thus saving our taxpayers money. But Mr. Summerfield's study is not enough. What are we being asked to do here today? We are being asked to create a committee, and provide it with $100,000, so it can spend our tax money, calling before it many of the people now employed in the Post Office Department in an effort to find out what improvements can be made. This committee is to employ management engineers and accounting firms, as is now being done by Mr. Summerfield. The approval of this resolution and the creation of a new subcommittee would be rank duplication, nothing else.

As I pointed out last month in the course of debate, the Senate is not leading the way, it is not showing the way, to economy. The expenses incurred by the Senate for investigations has increased tenfold during the past 10 years. In 1940 it was $170,268, and for 1952, it was $1,722,600—merely for investigative purposes. I am not opposed to legitimate investigations; some of them do a great deal of good; but I again ask, why do we not give the Eisenhower administration a chance to do its own investigating? Why do we not give the new administration a chance to clean its own house? If in the course of time they fail to make an improvement, that might be the time for us to offer our assistance.

As I pointed out further, the amount of money that has been appropriated annually to operate the Senate during the course of the past 10 years has increased from $3,936,986, in 1940, to the present figure of $12,850,000, almost 3½ or four times what we spent 10 years ago. Yet we are preaching economy. Why do we not practice it?

As I also pointed out, since 1946 the number of employees of the Senate has increased from 1,369 in 1946 to 1,950 in 1952—an increase of 42.4 percent—yet we are being again asked to add to that number. The total Senate expenditures since 1946 have increased from $5,963,000 to $11,354,000 in 1952, or an increase of 89 percent since 1946. Yet we stand here

and ask other departments to economize. We ought to practice what we preach and not merely give lip service to budget cutting.

I was recently attracted by the eloquent remarks of my good friend the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], who sponsors this resolution. He made a speech on the floor of the Senate on February 27, which appears on page 1479 of the RECORD. At that time he said:

> During recent years our tax burden has grown by leaps and bounds. Our Federal budget has and is mushrooming to a figure that is incomprehensible. Ever-increasing Federal taxes and budgets must be stopped.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas said further:

> It seems to me our greatest responsibility today is to bring our Federal expenditures to a point where the budget is not only balanced but, in addition, we must have a program of progressive tax reduction. It is my hope that we can bring this tax reduction into effect in 1953.
>
> I believe every Member of Congress must agree with the President's statement that our first obligation is to bring a balanced budget in sight.

And he added:

> Regardless of the swollen budget that the previous administration has attempted for fiscal 1953, we should bring the total spending for the current year to a figure not exceeding $66.1 billion. This calls for readjustments and cutbacks, but the people expect it of us. The budget for fiscal 1954 will be entirely in our hands and our goal should be a lower figure than Mr. Truman's biggest year of spending.
>
> Mr. President, we have a mandate to ignore the astronomical estimate of expenditures bequeathed to us by the former administration. We can discharge that mandate and start lifting the excessive burden of taxation from the backs of the American people if we have the determination. A spending ceiling for the current year of not more than $66 billion and a budget of something less than that in fiscal 1954 is the answer. The way to put our Federal finances in order is to start now.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas has struck at the heart of the matter. Now is the time to begin reducing expenses; yet here we are considering an increase in spending at the express request of the distinguished Senator from Kansas. As I pointed out a moment ago, we provided last year almost $1 million in the contingent fund to defray the cost of such things as the investigation which is now being requested.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in a moment. Last Monday we provided for a deficiency of $500,000.

Mr. President, it goes without saying that we cannot balance the budget if we continue to increase our own expenditures. It is my hope that Senators will begin giving more than lip service to economy. We ought to practice it. We have an opportunity of doing so today, and my advice is that we do it.

I now yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I assure him that I share his concern. But there is a responsibility on the part of the Congress of the United States. In the past fiscal year the Post Office Department had a deficit in excess of $500 million. This year it estimated that it will be $640,000,000, and it is estimated that it will be more than $700 million next year. Is it worth while to spend $100,000 of the people's money to determine whether there is some way by which we can stop continuing deficits in that one department?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Post Office Department is now at work in an effort to do that very thing. I have been informed by the Postmaster General that he is employing a firm of consultants—experts on such matters—in order to make such a study.

Mr. President, the Hoover Commission spent thousands of dollars in its survey, and I am informed that the Postmaster General is making every effort to put into operation as much of the Hoover program as may be possible. Why should we not give Mr. Summerfield a chance? If he needs money in order to carry on his study, I should much prefer that it be furnished him rather than for the Senate to appoint a subcommittee, hire additional investigators, and incur other expenses.

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad the Senator has mentioned the fact that the Postmaster General is conducting a survey. I assure the distinguished Senator that our committee, I am sure, will be most pleased to cooperate with the Postmaster General. We state in our report that we expect to cooperate with the Postmaster General and with the Post Office Department in working out a coordinated program. We can work very closely with the present Postmaster General, and we expect to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have heard that before when I have opposed other resolutions. But the Senator has just stated, or perhaps it was some other Senator that not only is the Senate going to undertake an investigation, but that the House will be engaged in a similar investigation.

Mr. CARLSON. The House is going to make an investigation along personnel lines. It is to be hoped, at least, that we may make a study of the distribution of different classifications of mail. There will be no duplication of effort between the Post Office Department, the House of Representatives, and the Senate committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana a series of questions.

Does he agree with me that the first responsibility for bringing about economies in a given department of the Government rests upon the head of that department?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana believe that the Postmaster General, a member of the Cabinet, has adequate money and personnel to make such investigations as may be needed in order to bring about economies and efficiency in his department?

Mr. ELLENDER. If he has not, he should come to Congress and ask for it; and I would be the first to vote for it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator inclined, at least, to have a "hunch," as I have, that considering the tremendous budget the Postmaster General has and the large number of personnel serving under him, if there is the will to bring about greater economies and efficiency in the Department, he is in position to do it?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my position.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that as a matter of policy the Senate of the United States should not initiate investigations into possible economies in various departments of the Government until a given department demonstrates that it cannot be relied upon to put its own house in order and bring about economies which are possible of being brought about?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the position I have been taking all along, I will say to the Senator. Let us give Mr. Summerfield a chance to work out a method by which savings can be accomplished. That is his duty, and I am sure he will fulfill it. He is a man of intelligence. There is no doubt that with the employment of engineers he can do a good job, if left alone. If, in the course of time, it becomes clear that a better job can be done than Mr. Summerfield may accomplish, there will be time enough to start an investigation. But let us give the Postmaster General a chance. That is what I am pleading for. At the same time, we should try to practice what we are preaching to the departments. We should economize at home—in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that the primary purpose of a Senate investigation, and the only legal justification for one, is to seek information and data which may be of assistance to the Senate in passing whatever appropriate legislation may be needed?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct; that is my conception of it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator share my suspicion that in some cases we seem to be moving in the direction of conducting investigations from the motivation of interfering with the administration of a department, and determining the department's administrative policies rather than getting information which will help us as an aid to the passage of needed legislation?

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be leading to that.

Mr. MORSE. My last question, which is really a recapitulation of one of the other questions, is this: The Senator, then, takes the position, does he not, that until the Post Office Department, under Mr. Summerfield, shows that it is not capable of bringing about the economies and the efficiency that may be needed in the Post Office Department, we should not be appropriating money to investigate what amounts to the administrative policies of the department?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly my position.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator, and we should have a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, in a conversation yesterday with Mr. Summerfield, the present Postmaster General, I was provided the information which I have just given the Senate. The investigation has been going on for quite some time; it was ordered by Mr. Summerfield.

Two or three days ago, Mr. A. B. Strom appeared as a witness before the Senate Appropriations Committee. He works under Mr. Summerfield. He indicated to our committee that a thorough investigation is now being made by the Post Office Department in an effort to find out what, if anything is wrong in the way of administrative practices and where savings can be accomplished. These problems are being studied in the light of providing better service to the public. That testimony appears in the record of the hearings which were held recently in reference to the second supplemental appropriation bill.

In addition to all this, Mr. President, the Senate spent $200,000 for an investigation of air mail subsidies during the 81st Congress, through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—under the chairmanship of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The $200,000 was spent under contract with a firm of expert consultants who were hired to investigate the problem at hand. This problem was "a survey of certified interstate, overseas, and foreign carrier operations, with a view to drafting legislation requiring the separation of mail compensation from any Federal subsidy payments." The same thing will have to be done, or is intended to be done, under the resolution now under consideration.

We have all the data. I do not know what has become of the recommendations which may have ben made by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but $200,000 has been spent in order to get the investigation under way, and to make recommendations as to what ought to be done.

Aside from that, hearings were held by the Post Office Committees of the Senate and the House during 1951. Bills for adjustment of postal rates were considered by those committees. There were considered at that time three Senate bills, S. 1046, S. 1335, and S. 1339, and the committee held extensive hearings. The transcripts of the hearings consisted of 918 printed pages, and the cost of printing those hearings alone was almost $11,000.

In 1950 another bill with reference to postal rate increases was considered by both the Senate and the House. More hearings were held, and another volume of printed hearings was issued, consisting of 464 pages. Included in this volume was a vast amount of information, which I know will be duplicated if the pending resolution should be agreed to. The cost of printing that last hearing alone was more than $5,000.

In 1949 three bills were considered; namely, S. 1103, H. R. 2945, and H. R. 2982, all pertaining to the adjustment of postal rates or postal rate revisions.

In all, the first hearing, on S. 1103, consumed 1,139 pages. On H. R. 2945, in two parts, the hearings consumed 1,761 pages. On H. R. 2982 the hearings consumed 776 pages. The total cost of printing those hearings alone was $41,816. Yet we are being asked for another $100,000 in order to make a further investigation of postal rates. Mr. President, to my way of thinking that resolution is not now necessary. Let us give Mr. Summerfield, who has just come into office, a chance to see what he can do. Let us not send investigators to his office taking up his time, and trying to tell him what he ought to do. Let us first give him a chance to act.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to make the point, if the Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, that I am quite familiar with the hearings which were held from 1949 on. Every year the postal deficit has been increasing at a rate of $100 million a year. Does not the distinguished Senator think that not only is it time that we hold hearings but also that we do something about the situation?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall, and perhaps the Senator from Kansas likewise recalls, the postal rate increases were made necessary because of salary raises which were given thousands upon thousands of employees. But the point I wish to make is that the Senate, as a legislative body, should give the executive branch a chance to do its work before stepping into the picture with a crew of hired investigators. I feel sure that within the next 4, 5, or 6 months good results will be obtained from the work now being done by Postmaster General Summerfield. From all the information I have been able to obtain, he is an able, competent man. Aside from those whom he is employing to help do this work, I understand Mr. Summerfield has an excellent staff under him who could assist in carrying on this activity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, may I have this point made clear: Is the Post Office Department presently employing managerial engineers?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has that been begun recently?

Mr. ELLENDER. Since Mr. Summerfield has taken office. I talked to him yesterday.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has a reputable outside firm of management engineers been hired?

Mr. ELLENDER. The firm that has been hired is Heller Associates, the same firm which helped in the work of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in connection with the Veterans' Administration.

The Senator from Louisiana has referred to the growing postal deficit of $100 million a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is more than $600 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But it is growing at the rate of $100 million a year. Does the Senator recall that when we voted for a postal rate increase, we at the same time stepped up the salary scale, and that at that time public notice was given that the increased postal rates would not compensate for the increase in cost?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my recollection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel sure that the Senator from Louisiana also realizes that the Post Office Department has to handle a large amount of the business of the American economy in the form of communications of various kinds, and as that economy steps up its production in the flow of goods, a greater burden is necessarily imposed upon the Post Office Department. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, really when we consider the deficit, without, of course, having intimate knowledge as to the apparatus and operation of the Post Office Department, the deficit is, in fact, composed of two factors: First, an inadequate rate structure; second, the stepped-up nature of the American economy. I suppose that, thirdly, one might say that the apparatus or machinery of the Post Office Department—that is, its distribution machinery, its mechanical equipment, and the other parts of the Department—may not be as up to date as they should be.

Mr. ELLENDER. I might inform the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that Mr. Donaldson, the former Postmaster General, had been at work for many months experimenting with systems of operation to see if money could not be saved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Louisiana recall that during the campaign a pledge was made to restore two deliveries of mail a day?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not recall that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall that such a pledge was made. How can the postal deficit be reduced if there are to be two deliveries of mail a day? It has been ascertained that the cost of an additional delivery would be rather substantial. Mr. Donaldson reduced deliveries in residential areas to one a day as an economy measure.

I think the Senate might want to take note of that, because investigation or no investigation—and I am not passing judgment on that at the moment—I submit that one of the problems is additional revenue. If we are going to fulfill the commitment, or at least the suggested commitment, of greater service, it appears that it will be necessary to have more manpower. If it is necessary to have more manpower, it will be necessary to have greater revenue. If there is to be greater revenue, there must necessarily be higher charges or else there will be an increased deficit. It is just that simple.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to go into that phase of the problem. I repeat that the only thing I am trying to suggest to the Senate is that what should be done now is to give to the executive department, to the brand new Postmaster General—who is starting out afresh, full of vim and vitality—a chance to see what he can do. The Senate should permit him to use to the utmost the fine investigators or engineers whom he has engaged, the Heller Associates.

We should let him try his hand. Then, if within the 6 months or a year he does not succeed, or if he needs more money to carry on the work, I, for one, would be willing to give it to him. But let us see what the new Postmaster General will do before burdening him with a group of Senate investigators, hired at great expense to our taxpayers. Let us not duplicate.

Under this resolution, the committee proposes to employ management engineering and accounting firms at a cost of $40,000. That is not much, as Federal spending goes, but it is still $40,000 in tax money that could otherwise be saved. There are also proposed three staff positions for consultants, technicians, and rate experts, with average salaries amounting to $9,000 each; four stenographers, with average salaries of $4,500. Reporting the proceedings will cost $4,000; travel per diem, $7,000, and telephone, telegraph, and supplies, $4,000.

Mr. President, Mr. Summerfield is the boss of the Post Office Department. He is the one who is in touch with the situation. He is the one who could obtain results by fully investigating the situation, without being bothered by a horde of investigators and being called up to the Hill to testify as to what ought to be done. Let us give the man a chance. He has already begun a study of the department. Thus, at the same time—at least for the moment—we can save $100,000 for the taxpayers.

Providing $100,000 for a duplicating investigation would require the income taxes to be paid by 339 soft-coal miners earning $4,562 a year each; it would require the income-tax payments of 6,666 textile workers receiving an average annual salary of $2,758 each. That is where some of our tax money would go.

If we are to balance the budget, let us start now by practicing economy in the Senate; and if we practice economy in the Senate, we can more consistently preach it.

INTERNATIONAL MUTUAL AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PACTS

Mr. MALONE and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

UNITED STATES ENTIRELY SURROUNDED BY MUTUAL-ASSISTANCE PACTS; UNITED STATES FINANCES BOTH SIDES OF THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I call the attention of this distinguished body to the fact that we are completely surrounded by mutual assistance and economic pacts and treaties.

A few days ago the Russians said that of course they were furnishing Communist China with war matériel under their mutual-assistance pact. Both England and France have mutual-assistance pacts with Russia—and we have the Atlantic pact with 11 of the European nations which includes both England and France—each of the 4 treaties or pacts contains a pledge of mutual economic assistance and all are in full force and effect and are being observed to the letter.

In addition England recognized Communist China. This closes the gap so that we finance our own war in Korea—and our opposition in Korea, China, and in Russia.

In March 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada called to the attention of this body the fact that both England and France had separate mutual economic and assistance pacts with Russia reading startlingly like the Atlantic pact with us.

ENGLAND'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

In the pact between England and Russia, which was signed by Anthony Eden and V. Molotov, and which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in toto in March 1949, article 6 reads as follows:

> The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

This pact has 10 more years to run—and no notice has been given or attempt made to cancel it.

FRANCE'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

In a similar agreement made between France and Russia, and signed by Molotov and Bidault, of France, article 6 reads as follows:

> The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war, with a view of facilitating and accelerating reconstruction of both countries, and in order to contribute to the cause of world prosperity.

This pact also has several years to run and there is no indication that either party wants it canceled.

CHINA'S PACT WITH RUSSIA

A few days ago the press carried the announcement that the Russian representative here had stated that, of course, Russia was sending war material to Communist China under the mutual-assistance pact signed with China, which still has a considerable time to run, and there is no indication that either party wants it canceled.

Article 6 of the alliance between the Russians and the Republic of China says:

> The high contracting parties agree to afford one another all possible economic assistance in the postwar period in order to facilitate and expedite the rehabilitation of both countries and to make their contribution to the prosperity of the world.

UNITED STATES PACT WITH ATLANTIC PACT NATIONS INCLUDING ENGLAND AND FRANCE

On April 4, 1949, or about that date, we approved a treaty called the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 2 says:

> ART. 2. The parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations. * * * They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them . . . to promote conditions of stability and well-being, and to encourage economic collaboration. It should facilitate long-term economic recovery through replacing the sense of insecurity by one of confidence in the future.

UNITED STATES COMPLETELY SURROUNDED WITH MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PACTS

I call attention to the fact that beginning in 1942 with the English pact with Russia and the French pact with Russia, and continuing with Russia's pact with China and our pact with the European nations, we have been completely surrounded with pacts, all agreeing to help one another.

As a result we are financing both sides of our own war.

FURNISHING RUSSIA THE SINEWS OF WAR

Many times since March 1948 the junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate and explained this seeming paradox. At that time he placed in the RECORD 86 trade treaties between Russia and the Iron Curtain countries on the one hand, and 17 Marshall plan countries, several of them made by England and France with Russia, calling for the shipment of everything needed by the Russians to enable them to fight world war III with us.

Later—in 1950—he placed 96 such trade treaties in the RECORD.

The point is that we are completely surrounded by pacts. We agreed to help the European nations. We have built factories there so that they could increase their production from about 96 percent in 1948, when we passed the first Marshall plan, to about 160 percent at this time.

The four mutual-assistance pacts complete the circle—we are at war with ourselves—the cold war, that is. The junior Senator from Nevada called attention at that time to the lack of markets for the goods to be produced by the Marshall plan countries except in Russia and the Iron Curtain countries.

Under the mutual-assistance pacts, the European countries sell goods to Russia and Russia sells the necessary goods to Communist China.

Therefore the taxpayers of America are furnishing about 75 percent of the material used to kill their own boys in Korea.

THE "NEW" PLAN

There are two notable visitors in our midst today, Mr. Butler and Mr. Eden.

Mr. Butler is the author of the slogan "Trade, not aid." There is no secret about the fact that that slogan emanated from the same agency which coined the phrase "reciprocal trade."

Of course, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act is not reciprocal, and was never intended to be. But the slogan "reciprocal trade" sold free trade to the American people under a misleading date line.

THE GREATER OUR DEBT, THE GREATER OUR WEALTH

Their Lord Keynes first sold an ailing president on the theory that the greater our debt, the greater our wealth—we now owe approximately $270 billion.

THE MORE WE DIVIDE OUR MARKETS, THE GREATER OUR WEALTH

They are now selling us the proposition that the more we divide our markets with the nations of the world the greater our income will be. All we have to do is to complete the job of wiping out all protection to our workingmen and investors. We have already transferred the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States to regulate foreign trade through the imposition of duties, imposts, and excises to the executive department through the enactment of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—Reciprocal Trade Act.

The executive department has for 20 long years regulated our foreign trade

with only one idea in view. What is that view, Mr. President? It is to divide the markets of this Nation with the nations of the world, so that we will all live alike, average our standard of living with the sweatshop labor of foreign nations.

ANOTHER $7 BILLION

In the meantime, of course, we are to make up the trade-balance deficits with seven billion or nine billion or ten billion dollars annually, whatever it requires.

Mr. Dulles and Mr. Stassen have just completed a trip to Europe to get information with which to support another $7 billion appropriation.

MR. ANTHONY EDEN (BRITAIN)

Mr. Eden arrived in this country on March 4 and in a New York interview with a New York Times reporter said, among many other things, "We are asking nothing from you."

Mr. President, in that same interview, Mr. R. A. Butler, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the father of the slogan "Trade, not aid"—slogan which further confused our people—voiced the expectation of selling this idea to the American people.

I read from an article published in today's New York Times. The headlines read: "Eden Reveals Aim on Convertibility of the Pound Sterling," meaning that the United States must put up five to ten billion dollars more to maintain the fictitious pound value. "He links progressive freeing of pound to United States guaranty of dollars as protection."

He asks for nothing. Therefore, he asks for everything including our life's blood—our very sources of our income.

FICTITIOUS VALUES SUPPORTED BY DOLLARS

This is the "nothing" he asks for:

The United Kingdom, as banker for the Commonwealth, to undertake a staged and progressive advance to convertibility of sterling into dollars but on a stout leash limiting payments to current trade accounts, as distinguished from accumulated storing debt and to designated dollar commodities.

We will find within a very short time the suggestion being made that $5 billion or $10 billion be granted to them through a new bank or through the World Bank in order to support the fictitious price of the pound, as well as other European currencies.

I read further from the interview as reported in the New York Times.

These are his aims:

The United States Government, or an international agency like the International Monetary Fund, to create a guarantee fund of dollars to underwrite the success of the effort and protect Britain's meager gold-and-dollar reserves.

Mr. President, we have been losing our gold reserves at the rate of about two billion dollars a year. They buy our gold with the money we give them. So here it comes. We are to stabilize the pound at its fictitious value. I quote further:

The exchange rate of the pound sterling in terms of dollars to be unpegged from the current official par value of $2.80 and permitted to fluctuate within a predetermined range below that figure with the objective of enhancing the competitive status of Commonwealth exports in world markets.

MANIPULATION OF MONEY VALUES FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

Mr. President, there is a trick involved in the manipulation of the currency of a nation. It simply means that when a nation wants to export more it merely lowers the price of its money, and when it wishes to import more it merely raises the price of its currency.

We do not manipulate the value of the dollar, we are the victim.

At one time the sterling bloc had as many as 28 different values for its pound. The price of the pound is fixed in each area with respect to whether or not imports are desired.

When a nation within the sterling bloc wants to encourage imports from another country it raises the price of exchange in that nation's money, and when they want to discourage imports from that country it gives less in terms of value of that currency.

CHILE—EIGHT DIFFERENT VALUES FOR ITS MONEY

I recently discussed the question of the import duty on copper on the Senate floor.

At that time I put into the RECORD eight different values of the Chile peso. The peso is used in exactly the same way; to regulate trade. Its value is manipulated with reference to the value of the money of the country from which the imports are to come or are to be prevented from coming.

NO COUNTRY KEEPS TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH US

There is not one foreign country—and I say this without fear of contradiction—which has kept the spirit of its trade treaties with the United States.

THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES WILL NOT TRADE WITH EACH OTHER

Italy cannot even sell an orange in one of the other European countries, and the countries cannot sell their products in Italy. That is just an illustration. They all act alike in preventing trade between themselves. The bars are up between all the countries in Europe; yet the whole area of Europe is less than about half the area of the United States but containing practically twice the population.

WE SUPPORT IT ALL

The trick is that we are supporting all of this subterfuge, and now we are getting ready to step into it again and divide what markets we have left with them. I read further:

The United States to remove or modify existing impediments to international trade of the free world through lower tariff rates, simpler and more expeditious customs procedures, more equal opportunity for British and other foreign shipping to compete for American freights.

Mr. President, let us watch this attempt at customs simplification. I have not read the recently proposed legislation on customs simplification, but when the subject was seriously proposed 2 years ago I did read the proposed legislation very carefully. This was the fishhook in it. They would change to the use of the foreign valuation of the article for fixing the existing tariff or import fees or duties, as the Constitution of the United States calls such regulation, instead of the American value, which would cut in two or reduce to one-third or one-fifth of the amount of the import fee that exists at the present time when fixed on the American dollar value. That is the fishhook.

Mr. President, there are many ways of lowering the tariffs. That is only one way. One other is through trade agreements which are never kept by anyone but this country. Another way is through inflation. It is a well-known fact that the dollar is worth about 33 to 35 percent of what it was worth in 1934; therefore, the effective duty or tariff protection is lowered accordingly.

I quote further:

The United States, by long-term agreements or otherwise, to lead the way toward more stable prices of raw materials, particularly in the sterling area, and thereby reduce or eliminate wide fluctuations in the British balance of payments with the Western Hemisphere.

That means the same thing that was suggested by Mr. Churchill when he arrived in this country a short time ago, namely, that we enter into a cartel agreement and guarantee that certain materials coming from sterling bloc countries would always have a profitable price to the sterling countries.

We are asked to enter into the very thing that we avoid in this country through the Sherman Antitrust Act.

I read further:

The items on the Commonwealth prospectus are there because, in the view in the recent Commonwealth conference, they require some solution before there can be any bridging of the "dollar gap" through "trade, not aid."

Yet, Mr. President, Mr. Eden says he asks for nothing.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the great propaganda splurge made immediately following the election. They started immediately after the election to sell the "trade, not aid" slogan to this administration. Some of the suggestions would do credit to a highwayman.

Mr. President, I have before me an article published in the New York Times of November 30, 1952. The headline reads:

WHAT THE COMMONWEALTH WANTS FROM UNITED STATES

I quote:

For one thing, the United States tariff on dutiable imports has been cut some 60 percent between 1937 and 1951 without any noticeable affect on imports. For another, customs regulations designed to encourage stoppage rather than entry of foreign goods have been vastly more effective than tariff rates in holding down imports.

Mr. President, that is where they intend to switch from the American value to the European value, thereby cutting the tariff down by one-third to one-tenth.

I quote further:

If only for psychological reasons, however, career economists—

Mr. President, note that it refers to career economists—

here assume that the customs simplification law will be passed at the next session of Congress and that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will be extended beyond the June 30 terminal date.

Mr. President, in the same interview, as reported in the New York Times of

March 6, 1953, Mr. Butler is quoted as follows:

> Although it was known in this country as the point 4 program, Mr. BUTLER described as "point 1" among the things he would have this country undertake, "a greater volume of overseas United States investment, private and public, in developing the good things of the earth, especially in underdeveloped countries."

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that when any investor invests money in almost any foreign country, including England, he cannot get his capital investment out of that country; he cannot sell his property and return the capital to the United States from that country.

Therefore, United States investors are not investing in those countries. Of course, Mr. President, if any foreign nation will safeguard the integrity of such investments, there will be no difficulty in getting investors to invest in that country, and there will be no shortage of investments there, if it simply will guarantee not to confiscate the investments, as has become the custom.

I read further from the article in the New York Times, quoting Mr. Butler:

> We want the chance of trading commercially with the dollar with the minimum barriers of tariffs, discrimination in shipping policy, "Buy American" legislation and the like.

In other words, Mr. President, at one time we were smart enough to give our Government officials, when making purchases of materials, 25-percent leeway in connection with the purchase of materials produced in the United States, knowing that in most foreign countries the wages paid are probably one-tenth of those paid in the United States, and certainly never more than one-half, with the exception of Canada. Therefore, there is no chance of competition between goods produced in the United States and goods produced in those foreign countries, unless there is some way or means by which to favor the goods produced in the United States. However, foreign countries now wish to have that United States legislation repealed.

I read further from the New York Times article quoting Mr. Butler:

> I welcome the trends in this direction in recent reports of the Committee for Economic Development and the Advisory Board for the Mutual Security Agency.

Mr. President, if there is anyone who does not know what the Committee for Economic Development is, let me advise him that it was organized about 1938 by Mr. Paul Hoffman, the man who spent the money under the Marshall plan and ECA, and who, in his articles in various magazines, which I have read from time to time here on the floor of the Senate, advocated that we break down all protection to the American workingmen and investors and permit all foreign materials to be imported into the United States, as in the case of butter imported from Denmark and other countries. We did break down the protection to the dairy farmers and now the Government is purchasing the butter that is produced in the United States and storing it in warehouses or caves in the United States—as was done in the case of eggs at one time. I do not know just where all of the butter is stored, but millions and millions of dollars' worth of it has been put in storage, and much of it has become rancid.

Finally, the stored butter is either thrown away or given away, while the American people eat the butter that is imported from abroad or the oleomargarine.

The result is that the United States is stabilizing the world price of butter. That action is similar to the action our Government took in the case of potatoes—until finally the Government had so many potatoes that it gave away tremendous quantities of them and also destroyed and burned quantities of them, and finally there was a shortage of potatoes in our country. Of course, Mr. President, it takes experience to be able to run out of potatoes.

MR. STASSEN, MUTUAL SECURITY DIRECTOR

At this point I wish to call attention to a statement made by Mr. Stassen. Even Mr. Stassen has stated now that our European friends are trading with the enemy. I quote now from an article appearing in the Chicago Tribune of March 2, 1953:

> Harold Stassen, foreign-aid administrator, said today too much British rubber and other strategic materials supplied by nations supposedly friendly to the United States are going to Russia.

Mr. Stassen proceeded to make recommendations to stop those shipments.

Of course, Mr. President, all that is necessary to stop those shipments is to require of those countries, as the price of our cooperation with them, that they stop trading with the enemy; that is all that is needed.

The Wherry-Malone-Kem resolution stopped that trading with the enemy; but thereafter this body decided to supplant that measure with the Battle Act, which permitted the President of the United States to decide how much trading with the enemy would be permitted. The result has been that those countries have continued to engage in that trading, without restraint.

TWO APPROACHES TO DESTROY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, there are two approaches to destroy the United States, the political approach and the economic approach.

COMMUNIST APPROACH

The political approach is called communism. As a matter of fact, socialism may be just as bad; it is simply communism in the infant stages. However, we seem to have caught up with communism. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are handling that phase of the matter. I believe that the matter is in good hands. We will eliminate the third gender in the State Department and many of the individuals who have been working with the enemy, instead of for the United States.

ECONOMIC APPROACH

However, there is another approach to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. It is the economic approach.

We can destroy our country economically, just as well as we can destroy it by any particular "ism" on earth. The political approach in an attempt to destroy the United States is by our potential enemy, Russia; but the economic approach is by our supposed allies, or at least our potential allies. Some of them—the sterling bloc—are represented in the United States today. Supposedly they are, or will be, our allies; but in the meantime they would destroy us by means of a division of our markets—the source of our income.

We are supposed to remove the duties, imposts, and excises—to a point where all the low-wage, sweat-shop countries will be able to export to our shores the products of their sweat-shop labor.

That is proposed to be done by removing all duties, imposts, or excises, which represent the difference between the costs of production in those low-wage, sweat-shop countries and the costs of production in the United States with our higher wage standard of living.

The materials produced in those foreign countries are very often produced by means of materials and machinery we have previously given to them. Yet now they propose that we remove all duties, imposts, and excises, so as to make it possible for them to maintain their sweat-shop, low-wage conditions, and for their manufacturers to keep or pocket the difference between their production costs and what the traffic will bear here. Mr. President, anyone who stops to think can readily understand that such procedure would encourage those countries to continue to hold down the wages paid to their working people.

ENCOURAGE HIGHER FOREIGN STANDARD OF LIVING

However, Mr. President, we should follow the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution charges Congress with the responsibilites for regulating foreign trade. If the duties and imposts were fixed on the basis of fair and reasonable competition, so as to give the foreign countries an equal opportunity to enter our markets, but without giving them any advantage in that respect, and if provision were made for flexibility, so that as the wages paid in those countries went up, the duties here would go down, then those countries soon would see that they would receive no advantage by paying low wages, and thus they would be encouraged to raise their standard of living, so as to move toward a high standard of living.

Mr. President, a tremendous propaganda machine has been working on the American people, since the date of the last election.

So we may know what their real objective is, let me refer to an article in Look magazine on November 18, by Arnold J. Toynbee, who is described as following "the tradition of great historians." In that connection, I now read from a description which appeared in the magazine Look on November 18, 1952:

> Arnold Toynbee * * *, the world's foremost living philosopher-historian.

Mr. President, in that issue of Look magazine, Mr. Toynbee's article is entitled "The Next Step in History." It is a 3-page article, but we have to read only 1 paragraph—which I shall read

into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—in order to know exactly what Mr. Toynbee thinks the next step in history will be. I read now from his article:

THE NEXT STEP IN HISTORY

(By Arnold J. Toynbee)

The steps that are needed are not emergency measures but permanent arrangements for putting and keeping our house in order.

After including in the article a great deal of material to the effect that we are moving toward a one-world government, Mr. Toynbee says:

This, though, would be unlikely to be the end of the process of western constitutional development, for a western electorate would soon begin to ask itself why it should not elect this common western legislature as well as the local national legislatures. If democracy means the control of governments by legislative bodies that are elected and reelected by the people, then democracy would call for the direct election of a common legislative body charged with the supreme responsibility of controlling the western community's common executive services.

There is where we are headed, Mr. President, according to the great historian, Mr. Toynbee; and it is no secret that the entire European setup, led by the sterling bloc, is headed toward that particular objective to bring us into the family of European nations. They would have one legislature for the Atlantic Pact nations, added to from time to time as they see fit to take in new member nations.

Then the Congress of the United States would become a State legislature, and our present State legislatures and State governors would become county commissioners, I suppose. That is about the way such a plan would work. We would be outvoted all of the time.

Mr. President, all this material goes to show us exactly what is the objective of the visit to our country of Mr. Eden and Mr. Butler, who now are in the United States to arrange the next logical step to level our economy with the European nations.

We are to abolish all duties and all other regulations of foreign trade, as the Constitution directed the Congress of the United States to do. The Congress has transferred such control to the Chief Executive, and he now has full control of the regulation of foreign trade; Congress no longer has such control.

So we pay subsidies to American producers, and allow foreign products to enter the United States free of any tariff or duty.

How we can continue to pay subsidies and still reduce taxes is something that no one has yet figured out. I notice that everyone now says we must find out how much money each of the departments want before we can reduce taxes. If one ever gets into a serious conversation with the head of a department, he will be crying with him before the conference is over. It will be found impossible to reduce the appropriation. Not only that, it will probably be found necessary to raise it, and there will therefore be no reduction of taxes.

I like what Mr. REED says: "Let us reduce taxes to what we think the people of the United States can pay, and read the menu backward—then go home, and let them scream." That is the only way we can reduce taxes.

Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention for a moment to an article written by a columnist whom I have quoted several times on this floor. The article is entitled "Forgotten Treaties With Russia," and it is written by Constantine Brown. It was published in the Washington Evening Star on February 16, 1953. People would find it profitable to read. Exactly as the junior Senator from Nevada has already quoted, there is but one objective, and that is to reduce this country's living standard, and when we finally run out of money with which to pay the subsidies, with all of the material coming in from foreign nations, we will then begin to understand what foreign trade on a free basis with the lower living standard of wages of other nations means.

I should like to call attention to Britain's relationship to Japan. I have before me the U. S. News & World Report of December 5, 1952, from which I read:

John Foster Dulles, as Secretary of State, is to find himself in the middle of a trade war between America's principal allies in the Far East and in Europe. Japan and Britain are at each other's throats in a bitter battle for world markets.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada, as Senators may remember, stood here on the Senate floor to suggest that the treaty written by Mr. Dulles and approved by the Senate had then and there lost Japan; it was only a matter of time until they would make a decision.

Anyone who knows, anyone who will study the natural sources of the raw materials available to them and their natural markets, will know that when we lost China to the Communists—and we did it deliberately—we then and there laid the groundwork to lose Japan. Reading from the U. S. News & World Report of December 5, 1952, I continue:

Britain, hard up and alarmed by Japan's recovery, is working desperately to check the flood of Japanese goods into normally British markets. Japan, struggling to rebuild her trade and obliged to restrict dealings with Communist China, is determined to regain markets in southeast Asia and to get more markets in Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America.

In this head-on clash, old antagonisms between these two allies of the United States are coming to the surface. British Commonwealth countries are raising barriers against Japanese goods, British traders are making charges of cutthroat competition.

Their skilled labor is even lower paid than it is in Britain. It was from 7 to 12 cents an hour when I was there in 1948.

I continue:

The British Government is trying to keep Japan from getting most-favored-nation treatment. The Japanese are accusing the British of dirty dealing. Anti-British feeling is rising, fanned by a quarrel over whether Japanese authorities shall have power to punish British and Commonwealth troops for offenses committed in Japan.

* * * * *

Japanese competition already is squeezing the British. The sterling area which Britain looks upon as her market, bought $244 million worth of Japanese goods in 1950 and more than twice as much in 1951.

Mr. President, I read further in the article, the following:

British countermeasures to meet this competition are becoming more drastic and are a matter of growing concern in Japan. British and Commonwealth countries recently have raised new import barriers aimed at Japanese products. The importing of Japanese textiles by Singapore, Hong Kong, west Africa and several other areas has been cut sharply or suspended.

Britain is trying to limit Japan's trade in other areas, also. This is being done by delaying Japan admittance to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Japan outside GATT, is denied the benefits of lower tariffs in effect among the 34 member countries.

Mr. President, there is little point in reading further. It is simply a matter of leaving Japan on our payroll. We are sending money there, spending it for national defense purposes, and when we quit Japan is going to China.

Certainly we cannot continue to allow their imports to come in here free of any duty. Four crockery plants have closed down in Ohio, within the last few weeks. That is only a start.

When we get around to considering the American people, the workers and investors, as a part of our responsibility, then Japan has this choice: Where is she going to go? Can she trade with the Far East, right at her doorstep? No, she cannot, as long as the colonial system exists, and we support it.

She must trade within her natural area, and in order to do that she will have to make a deal—and she will make it with China when the time comes.

MR. FORD—EUROPEAN PLANTS

Now, Mr. President, we have had lately a statement by a great industrialist, Mr. Ford. Mr. Ford says that we should drop all our tariffs and all our duties and have free trade throughout the world, that it would be wonderful.

Mr. Ford has a plant in England where he can produce his Ford automobiles cheaper than he can produce them in the United States after paying standard-of-living wages.

I cannot say that I blame him, except that I think he is shortsighted. In other words, when he builds up competition, as he will, if he gets away with this statement of his—which, of course, I hope he does not—and if the people of the United States wake up in time, he certainly will not get away with it.

But if he did, and he thereby threw these people in the United States out of work in the various areas, from the mining areas to the crockery areas, in the watch manufacturing areas and the textile States, and almost every place else—and as a matter of fact, that is exactly what it would result in—then what happens?

As it is now almost every man in the United States who has a job is a potential buyer of a Ford, or an automobile of some kind. With the kind of wages they have over there, from 40 cents a day up to $2 or $3 a day, not 1 in 100 is a potential buyer of an automobile.

I believe that by ruining the home markets he will ruin himself if he could bring about the change. He possibly thinks he can work the slave labor against the high standard-of-living labor in this country, and profit by it. God help him if he did get away with it; that is all I can say.

The business machines, General Electric and in general big business, will be for this free trade I predict. What is big business? I would describe it for the purpose of this statement as business of such size and such a nature that it can put its plants in the area of low wages, behind the sweatshop labor curtains and import the goods at a lower price than they can produce them here paying our standard-of-living wage.

The little businesses are the ones that cannot do that. They must stay home and take the consequences. I think they will rise up to stop this silly business.

NEVADA, CALIFORNIA, AND FREE TRADE

I have received a telegram which indicates that the legislature of the State of Nevada is passing a resolution memorializing Congress to stop this business of free trade which affects mining, the cattle business, the wool business, the textile business, the crockery business, and practically all small business in this country.

If Congress is going to ignore the production areas that make this country great, and which pays the taxes—I guess they think it time for them to take a hand. I will have the resolutions at the next session of the Senate.

Also, I am advised through Senator Harold J. Powers, President of the California Senate, that they have passed a resolution along the same line in the California legislature, and I hope to have that resolution by the time we return for the next session of the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I think—and this is merely the junior Senator from Nevada speaking—we should have a domestic policy that would safeguard the integrity of our economic system, that would place a floor under the wages and investments in this country, that would preserve our market to the extent of giving foreign nations an equal break in our markets but no advantage.

Let the 1934 Trade Agreements Act expire. The people of the Nation are waking up; they pay the bills to pay for the appropriations which this Congress so blithely makes.

Let the 1934 Trade Agreements Act expire, and it automatically goes back to the Tariff Commission, which is an agency of the Congress whose responsibility it is to fix duties, excises, and imposts, and to regulate foreign trade.

Let the Tariff Commission fix such duties on the basis of fair and reasonable competition.

That is simply commonsense in keeping ourselves in business in this country.

A report recently made by a former chairman of the Budget, Daniel W. Bell, now acting chairman of the Public Advisory Board for Mutual Security, contained 10 recommendations. I ask precedent. There being no objection, the outline will appear in the RECORD at this point.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of March 5, 1953]

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations made in the Bell report are:

1. Basing trade policy on national rather than group interest and adopting measures to help industries affected by the change in policy readjustment by extending unemployment insurance, retraining workers, diversifying production, and converting to other lines.

2. The adoption of a new simplified tariff act providing for a general reduction in duties and the elimination of present uncertainties by consolidating tariff rates into seven basic schedules. The redrafting of the Tariff Act would be done by the President according to standards set up by Congress.

3. Extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without time limit.

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION

4. Customs simplification by the prompt passage of a bill similar to the one passed by the House in 1951, plus the creation of a commission to propose further measures along these lines.

5. Reduction of tariffs and elimination of quotas on agricultural products to allow freer import at world prices of goods not produced in this country, with a repeal of section 104 of the Defense Production Act.

6. Elimination or reduction of tariffs on metals and minerals, of which imports are a major part of United States supplies; in cases where domestic production must be increased for defense purposes, it should be encouraged through special purchases and contracts.

7. Elimination of import excise taxes on petroleum products. If imports should reach a level where they impede domestic exploration and development, other measures to assure a domestic industry adequate to defense needs may be taken.

8. Elimination of the requirement that 50 percent of the cargo on aid and loan shipments is reserved to domestic carriers, except in the case of countries that discriminate against American vessels.

BUY-AMERICAN STUDY

9. Reconsideration of buy-American legislation.

10. The establishment, with United States participation, of an international organization to promote the objectives of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

In its recommendations for a new tariff act, the report suggests that the 7 basic schedules consist of a free list, 4 groupings of commodities bearing duties of 10, 20, 30, and 40 percent ad valorem; a specific list for basic agricultural and mineral raw materials, and an extraordinary list of commodities whose importation should be limited for security reasons.

The first recommendation is enough. It appears we are supposed to take the miners, the people in the sheep business, and the sheep herders and teach them how to make hats, unless the hat business is also destroyed by competition from abroad.

If we placed a tent over the city of Washington, we would have nothing but an international lobby, and Mr. Bell has apparently fallen heir to the common affliction.

I hope that before the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act—comes up for extension that there will be a sufficient number of Senators who will stand on the floor until it dies.

Mr. President, I received a letter from a man in Tonopah, Nev., not long ago. I had asked him if there was anything I could do for him in answer to his first letter. He said a little testily, "Don't do anything for me. Just do not do anything more to me. That is all I would ask."

CHAIRMAN OF THE MINERALS AND FUELS COMMITTEE

I should like to make the further announcement, as chairman of the Minerals and Fuels Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that I am organizing the subcommittee at this time, and I intend to accomplish two things: First, to determine the strategic and critical minerals and materials, including fuels, which are available to us in wartime; and, second, to determine where such materials are available to us in peacetime.

We will have some of the best engineers and advisers in the country to work with the committee. From my experience in engineering over a period of 30 years, I believe the Western Hemisphere can be made practically self-sufficient in the production of strategic and critical minerals and materials, including fuels, this would keep our production so that it could be immediately increased in case of trouble.

Mr. President, let us get ready and get busy, and catch up with our plane manufacture so that neither Russia nor any other nation is ahead of us, and let us also catch up on submarine manufacture, so we need not fear anyone.

Let us reach the point where every nation in the world will know that if they pull the trigger on us, we can defend ourselves

If we do that we would not have a war for 50 years. We are led to believe that in order to get nuclear ores from the Belgian Congo we must protect Belgium. That we have to protect certain nations in the Far East so we can pay through the nose for rubber and tin. If we keep on alienating the Moslem world, 350,000,000 of them, they will not be on our side. They will fight with bare hands, if they do not have anything else. We are even told that we are short of ammunition for the Korean war. Unless we change our methods, we are riding for a fall, and it is brought upon us by those people who are divided in their allegiance. We must let the people know that there is a political approach and an economic approach to destroy this Nation—and that they are equally dangerous.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL RATES AND CHARGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 49) to investigate certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in handling certain mail matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the subject matter of the resolution which is now before the Senate was included last year in a law passed by the House and Senate. The law was passed late in the session, and no appropriation was provided. When Congress passes a law calling for the expenditure of money, the money must be appropriated to carry out the terms of the law. It was simply an enabling

act which was passed last year. We are asking that the Senate make the investigation, instead of it being made by the House and the Senate. We are dealing here in large figures. It takes approximately $2,400,000,000 to operate the Post Office Department.

Something has been said concerning the deficit for the current fiscal year being approximately $640 million. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the reason why there is such a deficit. There has been very little additional personnel in the Post Office Department since the war, but there has been during that time an increase in expenditures of more than $1 billion which was caused by the increased salaries voted to postal employees by the House and the Senate. We cannot blame the Postmaster General and the Post Office Department for that. They cannot eliminate that burden. The blame, if any, is upon the Congress. The Congress must pass the necessary laws to meet the obligations of the Post Office Department.

The resolution will enable us to look into the different classifications, first class, second class, third class, and fourth class, and try to determine how much of the deficit should be allocated to the first, second, third, and fourth classes. That is a big problem. When we considered the situation last year we passed a bill which would have cared for approximately $250,000,000 of the deficit. There was a dispute as to whether it should have been that much in the first place. We want to look into it and try to find a solution, through our experts. The Post Office Department cannot do that. Congress will have to pass a law to wipe out the deficit. The Post Office Department cannot do it. They do not do anything but make recommendations, and their recommendations have been sent to the Senate and the House year after year.

We are asked to help the Department eliminate the deficit by raising rates, but we are not told in what classes the rates should be raised. That point is not touched at all. We are merely told the amount of the deficit, and are then asked to grant more funds for the operation of the Post Office Department. I myself was chairman of the committee previously, and in all fairness to the new chairman, I believe it is absolutely necessary to have the investigation made, in order to ascertain the facts concerning the deficit, and to enable Congress to raise money for the Post Office Department to apply to the proper classes of mail.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has made the point that $200,000 has been appropriated to enable the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to study air-mail rates. I feel sure that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina will agree with me that it is necessary to use the money for that purpose at the present time, because this year there is a deficit of $71 million in the air-mail subsidy. It is necessary to use that money for the purpose for which it was intended, and also to obtain additional funds with which to conduct other necessary studies.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct. It is necessary to make other studies, such as a study of the franking privileges of the Senate and the House, and of penalty mail, which has increased over a period of years, and has helped build up the large deficit that exists at present. Our desire is to wipe out that deficit.

I have voted many times in the past for such investigations as the one now proposed and I intend to vote for them in the future, until I know a little more about conditions by virtue of having had competent persons look into the situation and state in what classes rates should be raised in order to wipe out the deficit. It is not as easy as some might think to get information enabling us to say whether rates should be raised on one class of mail or another. The question is so complicated that even the persons who spend hours, days, and months making investigations disagree as to what should be done.

I am one Senator who believes the money provided by the resolution will be well spent, although the amount requested has been criticized. There would be three staff positions at $9,000 each. That would be the limit. Then four stenographers are provided for, with average salaries of $4,500 each; for reporting proceedings $4,000 is allowed; travel and per diems, incident to the making of the necessary investigation, $7,000; telephone, telegraph, and supplies, $4,000.

Something has been said about the remainder of the appropriation of $100,000, namely, the $40,000 to employ experts in this particular field, to work with the Senate staff in order to reach a proper conclusion. I for one believe that the Post Office Department would welcome such assistance.

I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas, if he has discussed that point with the Department.

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to be able to tell the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that I have asked the Postmaster General about that matter, and he sincerely hopes that we will make a study and cooperate with the Department, as we expect to do, in an effort to help the Department work out a solution to the problem of the deficit of $641,000,000. It is a problem that concerns not only the Post Office Department, but every citizen of the United States as well.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That was my understanding, and it was my reason for asking the question.

It will also be noted that the resolution was unanimousely reported by the committee. It was not a question of Republican or Democratic policy. The entire membership of the committee was present and voted to report the resolution. Not only did the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously favor the resolution, but the Committee on Rules and Administration to which it was referred, also reported it favorably.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield in order to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator from Kansas tell me the number of positions the proposed appropriation would create which are not now held by employees of the Senate?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. Before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asked for any funds, we submitted a budget to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as is required by that committee. There would be created three staff positions with average salaries amounting to $9,000 each, or a total of $27,000; and four stenographers with average salaries of $4,500 each, or a total of $18,000.

Mr. MORSE. That would make seven positions, would it not?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct. That is all the additional help that would be required, in addition to whatever aid might be received from the managerial service.

Mr. MORSE. I merely devised to have the RECORD show that the appropriation would increase Republican appointments by seven new jobs.

I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I merely wished to let it be known that I am very strongly in favor of the resolution.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on a recent day the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] wrote a very sound letter to the Washington Post entitled "More Defense For Less." The editor of the Washington Post saw fit to attach to the letter of Senator LONG an editor's note which reads as follows:

> The Washington Post is a spokesman for no one but itself. Both Senator LONG and Senator MORSE have chosen to overlook the paragraph in our February 18 editorial which asserted that "no doubt some of the objections to duplications, lack of planning, and burdensome construction practices are entirely valid" and commend the point that overseas bases ought to be manned as largely as possible by troops from the country concerned.
>
> Our criticism was focused on two points: First, the Senators' amazing ability to produce detailed comments on individual bases in light of the acknowledgment in their report that their tour covered 60 separate installations and 30,000 miles in a total of 41 days; and, second, their excursions into high strategy despite their assertion that "We have deliberately avoided inquiring into our Nation's war plans."

However, the editor of the Post did not see fit to point out, as the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Oregon had previously pointed out in speeches on the floor of the Senate, that our study was really based on 18 months of analysis of the budgets of the Defense Establishment in relation to the bases before we started our trip. We were thoroughly familiar with the bases before we ever started. We knew their locations, their size, and what was involved in them, but we desired to see for ourselves exactly how the money was being

spent. I may say to the editor of the Washington Post that by reason of our 18 months' work before beginning the trip, it is not at all remarkable we were able to arrive at the conclusions we reached.

Moreover, the comments we made in regard to the policies of the administration had nothing to do with war plans. Our comments were concerned with policies made known to us in our briefings; and I may say that those policies need a thorough overhauling if our country is to have stronger defenses.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the letter written to the Post by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] together with the editor's note with respect thereto.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE DEFENSE FOR LESS

I have read with great interest and, in most respects, with approval, your editorial of February 23 entitled, "More Defense for Less." In the last paragraph thereof you made an unqualified statement to the effect that any efforts to reduce military expenditures have always faced the major obstacle of official resistance.

This statement is particularly intriguing in the light of your editorial of February 18, entitled "Senators Off Base," in which either wittingly or unwittingly you transformed your editorial column into a special pleader for those responsible for these obstacles. You allowed your newspaper to become the mouthpiece and spokesman for the military wastrels you so heartily condemned 5 days later. It would appear that the Washington Post should undertake to provide some form of unification for its editorial page in view of these two occurrences.

It is not necessary for me to belabor your editorial of February 18 with all of its inaccuracies and distortions in view of the fact that Senator MORSE discussed it at length on the floor of the Senate the day it appeared, pointing out among other things that one of the statements in the report which you described as illustrating the "slap dash thinking" contained therein was in fact a statement which the military, while agreeing to the fundamental soundness thereof had asked to be deleted for security purposes.

After their representations to the subcommittee, I would think that the very military people you defended in your editorial were no doubt amused at your juvenile choice of illustrations to prove their case.

You made no reference whatsoever to the only recommendation in the report to the effect that the entire program should be restudied; nor were you interested enough in objectivity to point out that the identical step recommended had actually been taken by the new Secretary of Defense, and that he had frozen construction and is now in the process of causing to be made a complete restudy of the whole problem.

You might well point out to your military cronies that when they describe our thinking as "slap dash," they should append the same label on the Secretary of Defense—and I doubt that he would appreciate such reference to himself from his subordinates.

Perhaps, too, you were not aware—and if you were not, I now state it to you as a fact—that already the director of installations had denied requests for new authorizations during fiscal 1954 approaching $5 billion because his studies had revealed that the services have a total outstanding authorization of $11.7 billions, against which $9.1 billions had been appropriated with only $4.9 billions having been obligated as of January 1, 1953. In other words, the three services combined have asked for and obtained nearly twice as much in appropriations and more than that in authorizations, than they have been able to spend, even in the face of funds wasted in so-called "crash" programs.

You reached the ridiculous on February 22, when one of your feature writers asserted that the difference between perhaps 1,000 men on an overseas base as distinguished from perhaps 10,000 would be the difference between striking a retaliatory blow in 12 hours or striking in 30 days. The truth is that there would not be a difference of 5 minutes. The concept you supported must explain what happens to the tens of thousands of women and children living on those foreign bases which would concededly be atom-bomb targets. The Air Force planning that you supported has the additional burden of supporting an expensive system of parking aprons that makes it simple for an enemy to destroy our planes on the ground.

Actually, the report of the Sarnoff Commission is abundant proof of the validity of the report of the subcommittee I had the honor to head. It failed only in one respect. It did not point out the considerable savings that can be achieved when this excess military personnel is removed from the bases, thereby reducing the required amounts of barracks, messing facilities, recreational facilities, family housing, and expenses incident to maintenance of the families of these excess personnel around the world.

I shall always wonder in the light of your editorial of February 23 how you got booby-trapped on February 18.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
United States Senator.

WASHINGTON.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The Washington Post is a spokesman for no one but itself. Both Senator LONG and Senator MORSE have chosen to overlook the paragraph in our February 18 editorial which asserted that "no doubt some of the objections to duplications, lack of planning, and burdensome construction practices are entirely valid" and commend the point that overseas bases ought to be manned as largely as possible by troops from the country concerned. Our criticism was focused on two points: First, the Senators' amazing ability to produce detailed comments on individual bases in light of the acknowledgment in their report that their tour covered 60 separate installations and 30,000 miles in a total of 41 days; and, second, their excursions into high strategy despite their assertion that "We have deliberately avoided inquiring into our Nation's war plans.")

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, many letters have come to my office protesting a series of indignities which have been suffered in recent days by a number of Norwegian seamen at the hands of American officials. Their treatment is causing us untold damage in Norway and throughout Europe. It is not in keeping with our Nation's traditions and I rise officially to protest the incidents to the Congress and to the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The story first reached the ears of America through the distinguished radio commentator, Mr. Eric Sevareid. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sevareid's broadcast of February 11, 1953, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The new Ambassador to Norway, I'm told, will be Mr. Carin Strong, of Tacoma, Wash.; if and when he replaces Charles Bay, Mr. Truman's unfortunate choice, in Oslo, Strong will confront a problem no other American Ambassador there has had to face in recent memory—a growing anti-Americanism among Norwegians, who have always regarded America almost as their second home.

The reason for this is the McCarran Immigration Act and what it is doing to the Norwegian merchant marine and Norwegian seamen. In Norway the merchant marine directly involves every other family; merchant sailing is an old and honorable way of life; these are proud and respectable men, largely family men, quite unlike the riff-raff found in some of the waterfronts of the world.

Enforcement of the McCarran Act in American ports has resulted in startling experiences for these sailors, the stories of which are now spreading through every farm and hamlet in Norway. The act is designed, of course, to keep subversives and other undesirables out of this country. Under the act, no foreign seaman can remain here more than 29 days.

Consider some of the experiences of the Norwegians alone. Not long ago immigration police tried to search the Norwegian Seamen's Home in Baltimore. There was a strong protest and they left. Last Sunday police stopped and cross-examined the worshipers as they walked out of the Norwegian Seamen's Lutheran Church in Baltimore. If a seaman gets sick and overstays the 29 days, he can be put into Ellis Island to await deportation; among the others, there are about a dozen Norwegian sailors imprisoned on the island now because they were unable to sign on a ship within the time limit. Two young men voluntarily went to the immigration office when 2 of their 29 days still remained. Yet they were immediately taken to Ellis Island. A few weeks ago 11 crewmen asked to sign off the merchant ship *Pleasantville* when it reached Boston. They had been at sea 2 years and were ready to fly home to Norway. The Scandinavian shipping authority sent 11 men to Boston to replace them. These 11 boarded the ship; then immigration officials refused to allow 9 of the original 11 to get off. No reasons were given. The ship is now heading for the Far East, its captain paying for the extra crew and also violating security rules on lifeboat space. Those nine men may not see their families for another 2 years.

Many foreign seamen are not signing off in American ports even when allowed to because they dare not. They have no way of knowing whether they can sign on again in time to avoid imprisonment. Foreign ships can no longer put into American docks for repairs if the repairs take more than 29 days. In order to get out in time, bo'suns have signed on as deckhands, electricians as messboys, losing status and pay.

Interrogations under the new law have not yet discovered one Communist among Norwegian seamen; there may be some Reds among them, but the real Communists, of course, simply deny it. Many American immigration officials detest what they must do under this law as much as do the victims. For example, there are women serving on Norwegian ships as mess stewards or radio operators; this is a familiar and respectable career in Norway. When they reach America, these women are asked if they have ever engaged in prostitution; men are asked when they last visited a brothel, if they intend to commit bigamy in this country, and so on. The complications and humiliations have reached the point where some Scandinavian maritime officials believe that American trade with that part of the world will be seriously affected.

Meanwhile, stories about the humiliations suffered their seamen have spread throughout Norway. It has now become a popular byword with them that life in an American port is like their life under the German occupation of Norway. One Norwegian official put it this way: "You may as well close down your American information services in

Norway; as long as this goes on," he said, "they are fighting a losing battle for the good will of my people."

Mr. HUMPHREY. I draw particular attention to Mr. Sevareid's warning that the McCarran Immigration Act is responsible for a "growing anti-Americanism among Norwegians who have always regarded America as their second home."

I commend the reading of Mr. Sevareid's broadcast to every Member of the Senate. Particularly do I commend it to the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the officials of our Government in the State Department.

Mr. Sevareid's broadcast is consistent with a news story written for the Oslo Daily Arbeiderbladet by its Washington correspondent, Mr. Anders Buraas. This newspaper is the third largest in Norway. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Investigations in Baltimore where the McCarran Act supposedly is being exercised less strictly than in other American ports, bring out the following facts:

To sign off a ship is both a difficult and a dangerous experiment; that the Norwegian Seamen's Home is bound to show a deficit as a result of the decline in the number of reservations; that for a sailor to be left behind when the ship leaves (without regard to the reasons) can lead to his being deported, and also to the captain being fined in case the seaman cannot reach the ship in another American port; that few seamen dare any more to spend his vacation in the United States, and that no seaman can be put ashore in America even if he is not fit for his job.

The law is still not being exercised as it is written, but when that takes place another result will be that seamen who are confined to a hospital for more than 29 days can be deported; that Norwegian ships must avoid repairs in American ports that will take more than 4 weeks to finish if the owner does not want his entire crew to be deported, and that no ship is permitted to sail between American ports for a period of more than 29 days.

Twenty-nine days is the maximum time a seaman who has signed off his ship can stay in the United States. Fearing that he won't be able to find a new job within the time limit, seamen are naturally reluctant to leave their jobs. It has already happened in a number of cases that electricians have signed on as messboys in order to avoid arrest and deportation.

Another reason he is reluctant to sign off is that he reacts very strongly to the questions asked by the immigration authorities. Female crew members have been asked whether they are prostitutes, male members whether they have ever visited brothels. A result is that the pool of seamen so important for Norwegian shipping on the United States have shrunk to a dangerous degree. But even a sailor who has decided to sign off his ship has no guaranty that he will be permitted to do so. Recently five crew members of the motorship *Bykleffjell* wanted to sign off. Four of them were turned down by the immigration authorities. No reasons for this decision were ever given.

A few weeks ago 11 crew members aboard the motorship *Pleasantville* wished to sign off in Boston. The captain cabled the shipping office in New York, asking for 11 new crew members. The 11 men who wanted to sign off in Boston were turned back by the authorities. The 11 new crew members had already entered the ship. The motorship *Pleasantville* left with all of them aboard, but when it called on Baltimore two of those who originally wanted to sign off were permitted to do so. No reason why the other nine had to stay aboard was ever given. Then the ship left for the Far East with too big a crew, causing extra expenses for the owners; with the captain violating security regulations, since the ship did not have enough lifeboats for so big a crew; and with men aboard who had wished to sign off in Boston in order to go back to Norway, but who now instead found themselves on their way to the Pacific.

The same thing happened recently to the motorship *C. J. Hambro*, which left Philadelphia for the Mediterranean with six extra crew members.

In spite of the fact that the Port Authorities in Baltimore have been leaning over backward trying to be helpful, a couple of painful episodes have taken place. After the service in the Norwegian Seamen's Church in Baltimore on February, the congregation found the police waiting for them outside the church, requesting everybody to produce his or her credentials.

Another episode took place a few days ago when the police drove up in front of the Norwegian Seamen's Home in Baltimore and policemen were posted around the block. Three police officers entered the building and demanded to be allowed to inspect the hotel and its guests. Following a rather heated quarrel the manager finally succeeded in getting them to leave.

Norwegians in Baltimore do not deny that the act has its advantages. It has put an end to too frequent shifts in the crew. It has also imposed upon the seamen the necessity of acting like "perfect gentlemen." In both cases it is Norway who profits from this and not the United States.

Item: A Norwegian seaman who was interrogated in New York confessed to having been a member of the Communist Party back in 1938. He explained in detail why he had become a member and also why he had decided to leave the party. He did not want to sign off the ship, but the Immigration Authorities also refused him permission to go ashore.

Item: Two Norwegian seamen who for 27 days without success had been looking for a job, on a Norwegian ship, decided to inform the Immigration Authorities of this, and also of the fact that they did not intend to break the law. In other words, they wanted some extra time to find jobs. In spite of the fact that they had still two more days in which to try their luck, they were immediately arrested and carted off to Ellis Island.

As previously stated a seaman is only allowed a stay of 29 days in the United States, beginning with the arrival of his ship in an American port. If he signs off, let's say 14 days later, he has only 15 more days to go.

If a seaman should wish to leave his ship after a couple of years in order to sign on another one, neither he himself, nor his captain nor the owner of the ship can make this decision, if the ship happens to be in an American port. The American Immigration Authorities have the final say as to how long he should stay aboard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that a responsible Norwegian newspaper carrying an article by a very responsible journalist tells of the indignities which have been suffered by certain citizens of the nation of Norway, and points out some of the very serious problems which will grow between our country and the country of Norway.

NORWEGIANS OFFENDED

On February 20, Senator MCCARRAN, calling Mr. Sevareid's statements "highly inflammatory" and "misleading," placed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Argyle R. Mackey, Commissioner of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, commenting on Mr. Sevareid's broadcast. I wrote to Mr. Sevareid on February 25, bringing these developments to his attention and offering to bring his reply to the attention of the Senate.

I digress to say that I believe that those who are brought under the scrutiny of the Congress, or who are criticized by a Member of the Congress, should have the right and the privilege to have their replies placed in the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my letter to Mr. Sevareid and his letter to me of February 28, together with the transcriptions of his broadcasts of February 26 and 27, which he enclosed, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and transcripts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 25, 1953.

Mr. ERIC SEVAREID,
Columbia Broadcasting System,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SEVAREID: I am enclosing with this letter a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1953. You will find i nthat RECORD on page 1334 a speech on the floor of the Senate by Senator MCCARRAN in which he brings to the attention of the Senate a memorandum from Mr. Argyle Mackey, Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Mr. Mackey's memorandum comments on your broadcast of February 11, 1953, in which you state that the McCarran Immigration Act is responsible for a "growing anti-Americanism among the Norwegians who have always regarded America as their second home."

I would appreciate it very much if you would write me commenting on Senator MCCARRAN'S speech and on Mr. Mackey's memorandum as they affect your broadcast. I think it is important in the interest of accuracy and fair play that your reply be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am prepared to insert your statement in the RECORD.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

CBS RADIO,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have your letter of February 25, pointing out that my broadcast of February 11 on the operations of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as they affect Norwegian seamen and Norwegian public opinion, has been challenged on the Senate floor by Senator MCCARRAN.

You very kindly offer to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any reply of mine. I should like to take advantage of your offer.

As answer to the remarks by Senator MCCARRAN and to the memorandum from Commissioner Mackey that Mr. MCCARRAN also inserted in the RECORD, I have made two short broadcasts over CBS, on Thursday and Friday nights of this week. Copies of these broadcasts I enclose with this letter.

Because of broadcast time limitations, they are not as complete an answer as I should have liked to make, but I believe they do cover the essential points, however briefly, and I believe they constitute a convincing answer to the Senator's statement that my broadcast was "inflammatory and misleading."

In appreciation of your interest in this matter, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ERIC SEVAREID,
Chief Washington Correspondent, CBS.

[Eric Sevareid, CBS Radio News, February 26, 1953]

On February 11 I commented here on the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as to its enforcement on Norwegian seamen in particular. I cited cases of painful hardship and humiliation suffered by Norwegians and said that these events are resulting in anti-American feeling throughout Norway, where almost every family has some connection with the merchant marine.

Representative WALTER telephoned me to say in entirely cordial fashion that he wanted any real defects in the law corrected, but that he thought my broadcast to be in error. On Friday Senator MCCARRAN inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a long letter from Argyle Mackey, Immigration Commissioner, as an answer to my points. Neither Mackey nor MCCARRAN have accused me of any deliberate falsification, but the Senator declared in the RECORD that my statements were highly inflammatory and misleading.

I have always thought it a misuse of the broadcasting privilege for a commentator to engage in personal debates with others—he also runs the risk of boring his audience—but since my veracity has been challenged in this official and public manner, my only recourse is to make answer here.

The more I have checked this problem of the seamen, the more I am inclined to believe I understand the case. Where Mackey is right and I was wrong is on the case of the motorship *Pleasantville*. I had said this vessel was obliged to sail overseas with nine extra men, violating safety regulations. This was based on the report of the ship's master. However, his predicament was relieved when he called at further American ports, because the Barber Line representatives intervened with authorities. Mackey had this information when, later, he wrote his letter for MCCARRAN, though I did not.

I am informed, however, that other ships have been obliged to sail overstaffed, the motorship *Hambro*, for one, and that still other vessels have had to sail understaffed, because of difficulties encountered under the law.

In answer to other points I made, Commissioner Mackey fails to deny that immigration police tried to search the Norwegian seammen's home in Baltimore and encountered a strong protest. Interrogation of individuals there, of course, is routine; a search is not. I said that police on Sunday, February 8, cross-examined worshipers as they came out of the seamen's Lutheran Church in Baltimore. Mackey writes that this, done by city police, had nothing to do with the law in question. This may be true; it did occur, however, and to the seamen, of course, was another example of their new humiliations.

One of the principal aims of the law is to keep Communists away from our shores. Mr. Mackey does not deny my statement that interrogations under the law have failed to uncover a single Communist among Norwegian seamen; the same, incidentally, is true for the Swedes. He does not deny my statement that Norwegian women stewards and radio operators have been asked by immigration investigators if they have engaged in prostitution. He does not deny that rigid enforcement of the shore-leave time limit and consequent fear of Ellis Island have forced seamen to sign on ships at lower ratings, with loss of pay. In fact, I have before me a list of 77 such cases on Norwegian ships alone in the few weeks the law has been in effect. I said that sickness can result in Ellis Island imprisonment because of an overstay. Mr. Mackey in his letter implies that such injustices are avoided. The truth is that this is the No. 1 complaint of the Norwegian seamen's union. He might check as examples the cases of seamen Konnerud, Flathaug, and Larsen, all under doctors' care, but all locked up with dozens of other men, Larsen suffering with a hernia.

I wish to discuss the bigger aspects of this whole problem tomorrow, but perhaps the best answer as to the veracity of the broadcast is that in Baltimore 8 days ago American officials called a meeting with the Norwegians and promised new methods of enforcement. Today the manager of the seamen's home there said, "Your broadcast has improved things already."

[Eric Sevareid, CBS Radio News, February 27, 1953]

This will be the second, and, I hope, final installment of my answer to Senator MCCARRAN about the hardships and humiliations imposed upon Norwegian shipping and seamen, among others, growing out of the McCarran-Walter immigration law. Senator MCCARRAN stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that my original remarks were inflammatory and misleading and he inserted a letter from Immigration Commissioner Argyle Mackey, to support his contention.

I might have added last night that if the Senator would check with the White House, he will find that a foreign seamen's petition has arrived there, asking the President for changes in the law. It says: "Give us the freedom, justice, and equality that America has always promised." According to Chairman Silas Axtell, of the Andrew Furuseth Legislative Association, this petition was signed by several hundred foreign seamen in New York, Norwegians, of course, included.

In his letter, Commissioner Mackey implies that female crew members asked the humiliating question if they have engaged in prostitution, are so asked only in individual cases where there are real grounds for suspicion. This, I think, is not the case. When the Norwegian luxury liner, *Stavangerfjord*, reached New York this month, I am told, virtually every one of the dozens of women employees on board was asked that question.

On Friday, Senator MCCARRAN put in the RECORD an article from the Nordisk Tidende which speaks favorably of the new law. The Senator calls this a Norwegian newspaper, and the implication is that Norwegian opinion is not unfavorable; I had said it was. In the first place, the Tidende is an American newspaper, Norwegian only in language. In the second place, that article was printed when the law had been in effect but 1 week. In the third place, on February 19, the day before the Senator's insertion, the same newspaper carried column after column of itemized cases showing the painful effect of the law's enforcement on Norwegian shipping. If the Senator will check the editorial pages in Norway, he will find that the whole Norwegian press, from right wing to left, has denounced the law and what the Arbeiderbladet calls the insufferable atmosphere it has created. He will find the same reaction in the Swedish press.

Unfortunately for the Senator's belief about Norway's satisfaction with the law, I can reveal now that on the very day the Senator spoke for the record the Norwegian Embassy, on specific orders from Oslo, filed its third protest with the State Department—an 8-page memorandum summarizing the confusions, uncertainties, and hardships resulting from the law and its severe and unpredictable enforcement. It covers many of my points and much more.

Norwegians would not dream of treating our seamen in their ports as we now treat theirs in ours, and of their deep resentment there is no doubt whatsoever. Theirs is one of the biggest and perhaps the most efficiently managed merchant marine in the world. For years, through their consular offices, their seamen's union, and their health and welfare offices, they have exercised careful daily control over each individual Norwegian sailor in our ports. For years they have worked closely and successfully with the FBI to keep out subversives or criminals. They fail to see the need for these new police-state controls and humiliations.

During the big war their fathers and brothers drowned by the hundreds keeping our soldiers supplied; their ships are their biggest contribution to our common defense under the Atlantic Treaty; their sailors are their front-line troops in our mutual struggle with Communist imperialism; their merchant marine is their national pride, and that pride we have injured.

They have not contended—nor have I—that the whole law is bad. They think different enforcement methods would help in some respects. But altogether, as things stand today, they feel certain that something has got to give.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make the same request with respect to portions of a document prepared by the Norwegian Seamen's Union as it relates to our present immigration laws. I ask that the document by the Norwegian Seamen's Union be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. The indignities described by Mr. Sevareid and the Norwegian sources I have cited are unnecessary. They reflect a callousness on the part of the McCarran-Walter Act and on the part of our officials, which is doing us incalculable damage abroad. As a descendant of Norwegians myself, I am terribly aggrieved at the loss of prestige which my country is today suffering in Norway as a result of the McCarran Act. Many other Minnesotans of Norwegian descent share my sentiments.

Representative WALTER placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A638, an article from an American newspaper published in the Norwegian language, indicating a lack of concern on the part of Norwegians with the operation of the McCarran-Walter Act. It is interesting that that article appeared on January 1, 1953, only a few days after the act went into operation.

I ask unanimous consent that the translation of an article appearing in the same newspaper, the Nordisk Tidende, for February 19, 1953, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. The article is further evidence of Mr. Sevareid's thesis.

I make note of the fact that this is the same newspaper which, on January 1, 1953, I believe, according to Representative WALTER, carried an article which did not seem to be too critical of the McCarran Act; but on February 15, 1953, it took an entirely different point of view.

In that connection, too, I bring the attention of the Senate to an editorial which appeared in Colliers magazine last month which can be found in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A966. The editors of Colliers call the section of the McCarran-Walter Act affecting foreign ships and sailors and visitors from other countries "one of the most inept, insulting, militantly chauvinistic and obviously ineffectual items in the whole category of Federal legislation."

Let me make it perfectly clear that I am quoting from the editorial in Colliers.

More than our relations with Norway is at stake, however. I am informed that our State Department has also received official protests from Denmark, Sweden, England, and France.

I want that statement to be a matter of public notice. I have reliable information that our State Department has received official protests on the operation of the McCarran-Walter Act from the Governments of Denmark, Sweden, England, and France.

In that connection I refer to an article appearing in the February 23, 1953, issue of the New Leader, written by the London correspondent of that anti-Communist weekly, Mr. T. R. Fi-vel. He lists the enactment of the McCarran-Walter Act as an event which has "caused renewed flurries of anti-American feeling" in England. No similar action by the United States, he said, "for many a day has received such unanimous criticism in the entire British press."

It is not my purpose to repeat on the Senate floor other complaints registered against the law and its application. They will be found in the RECORD. I do want to take this occasion, however, to say that I am deeply aggrieved at the nature of the debate on the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

SENATE DIGNITY

It has been my objective, as a member of the Senate, to comport myself with a dignity becoming the office and to respect the dignity of my colleagues in this body and in the other Chamber. In spite of that, the authors of the McCarran-Walter Act have seen fit to reflect upon the integrity and the patriotism of those who oppose the legislation.

Recently the senior Senator from Nevada has been distributing through the mails, under his frank, an article which he placed in the body of the RECORD on January 7, 1953—page 178—and which Mr. WALTER, of Pennsylvania, placed in the Appendix of the RECORD—page A13—by a Herbert G. Moore, appearing in a magazine called the National Republic for December 1952. That article attempts to identify me and my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and all of us who opposed the McCarran-Walter Act with the Communist Party. It is an inaccurate and unfair article which plays loosely with the facts and which I consider to be insulting.

In the interest of accuracy and truth, I ask unanimous consent that an article prepared by me on "Who's Fighting the McCarran Act" which appeared in the New Leader for March 2, 1953, be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article may be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. On February 18, 1953—page 1163—the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] again raised the issue of communism in connection with his law by citing a news story from the Chicago Tribune, according to which the blueprint for Communist operations calls for the formation of blocs of legislators in Congress to achieve various legislative purposes. The Senator has the article reprinted in the RECORD and states that one of these Communist-espoused purposes is the repeal of the McCarran Immigration Act.

I consider this statement and innuendo to be another illustration of distorted half-truth and unfair tactics used by the proponents of the McCarran-Walter Act. I comment further by referring Members of the Congress to the newspaper article itself. While it lists the repeal of the McCarran-Walter Act as one of the Communist aims, it also lists repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act as another aim. Examination of the RECORD will reveal that in 1947 the Senator from Nevada voted against the Taft-Hartley Act and to sustain the President's veto. In 1949 he voted with the repeal bloc against the Taft substitute for the bill repealing the Taft-Hartley Act. In this illustration the illogical position of the Senator from Nevada might well be used against him, for in accordance with his terms, he might well be one of those in a formation of blocs of legislators in Congress to achieve various legislative purposes of the Communist Party.

I reject any such notion insofar as Senator MCCARRAN is concerned just as vehemently as I reject the tactics used by Senator MCCARRAN toward my colleagues and myself.

In that connection, Mr. President, I have in my hand an editorial from the New York Journal-American of January 3, 1953, to be found on page 420 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, 1953, which reflects the policy of the Hearst newspapers. I welcome the opposition of the Hearst newspapers to the McCarran Act. More particularly, however, I refer to a sentence in the editorial which states that Senator MCCARRAN was in error in declaring that the opposition to his bill from the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization was a "rehash of the radical left-wing slant."

In saying this, the Hearst newspapers are expressing a thought consistent with an editorial which appeared in the New York Times for January 20, 1953, condemning Senator MCCARRAN for recklessly implying that opponents of his act must be Communists or Communist sympathizers. The editorial says:

Opponents of the McCarran Act include men and women of every religion, of every national strain, including his own; of every political party, of every occupation, and every walk of life. A little more confidence in honesty of motives and a little less suspicion that every opponent is a spy or a traitor would go a long way both on and off the floor of the Congress of the United States.

I refer also to an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post for December 24, 1952, criticizing the article in the National Republic reprinted under Senator MCCARRAN's frank. The editorial calls the article pernicious nonsense. I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of December 24, 1952]

MCCARRAN INAUGURATION

There is a pathetic irony in the fact that the eve of Christmas should have been chosen as the date for putting into effect the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act—an act unparalleled, so far as American legislation is concerned, in its expression of ill will toward men. The McCarran-Walter Act apes the Soviet fear of foreigners and tramples on American traditions. Some of its provisions go so far as to mock the meaning of the Statue of Liberty standing in the harbor of our greatest seaport and beckoning to the persecuted and oppressed of all lands.

Like so much contemporary chauvinism, the McCarran-Walter Act is defended in the name of national security. But the security of the United States does not depend upon degrading naturalization, as this act does, to a conditional, or second-class form of citizenship. The security of the United States does not require this Nation to deal meanly and arbitrarily with aliens who come to its shores. Restrictions and quotas on immigration in the interest of the American economy there must be; but they need not discriminate, as does the present act, against the persecuted and in favor of the persecutors.

The supporters of the McCarran-Walter Act are much given to defending it by attacking the patriotism of its critics. There has come to hand, for example, a reprint from a publication calling itself National Republic—a reprint distributed, incidentally, under Senator MCCARRAN's frank—which quotes the Daily Worker as opposed to the McCarran-Walter Act and then declares blandly: "If we find that Communists and left-wingers are against such a bill, then it is safe to say that loyal Americans should be for it." It is safe to say that this is pernicious nonsense. Loyal Americans do not need to define loyalty in terms of blind anticommunism. Moreover, opposition has come from great numbers of sober, careful, conservative, and indisputably loyal American organizations and individuals.

Among the critics of the McCarran-Walter Act is Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. "Only second-class Americanism tolerates second-class citizenship," he said in a speech on Boston Common, October 21. "It's time to get rid of what remains of both, and that includes rewriting the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act." We believe that in the real interests of American security the job of rewriting cannot begin too soon.

[From the New York Times of Tuesday, January 20, 1953]

REVISION OF MCCARRAN ACT

On this day when General Eisenhower becomes President Eisenhower it is appropriate to remind the new administration and the new majority in Congress than on October 17 in Newark he made the following statement:

"The McCarran immigration law must be rewritten. A better law must be written that will strike an intelligent, unbigoted balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and the oppressed."

Even without regard for the hopes of the unhappy and oppressed, a better law must be written in the exclusive interests of the safety and the welfare of the United States. For the racist and reactionary philosophy of the McCarran-Walter Act not only does nothing to increase the security of our country; it actually lessens that security by undermining the principles of liberty, equality

and justice for which this Republic stands. To the unthinking it gives a false illusion of safety against Communist penetration; to the thinking it gives a distorted picture of the real ideals of democratic America.

The report of President Truman's commission exposing this law for what it is has now been placed in the hands of Congress. The seven-man commission included a former dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School; the secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities; the president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary of St. Paul; the honorary secretary of the American Friends Service Committee; two high Government officials, and a former Solicitor General of the United States.

It should be unnecessary to comment on Mr. McCARRAN'S implication that opponents of the act must be Communists or Communist sympathizers. Opponents of the McCarran Act include men and women of every religion, of every national strain, including his own, of every political party, of every occupation and every walk of life. A little more confidence in honesty of motives and a little less suspicion that every opponent is a spy or a traitor would go a long way both on and off the floor of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not know whether the inclusion of the National Republic article in the RECORD is a violation of rule XIX of the Rules of the Senate. I ask the President of the Senate, the majority leader, and the minority leader to examine the material in the hope that they will have it expunged from the RECORD. I desire to make it crystal clear that I do not intend to have anyone impugn my patriotism or loyalty by associating me with what I consider to be the great international conspiracy of the Communist Party. I find on examining the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it does that. I ask the minority leader and the majority leader to read that article and to determine whether or not it is in conformity with rule XIX of the honored rules of the United States Senate. I make the same request with regard to an article which Representative FORRESTER, of Georgia, placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A68.

M'CARRAN ACT OPPOSITION

I address myself now to some of the opposition to this act. I realize that there are honest differences of opinion, and I am not under any circumstances challenging the motives or objectives of those who were the proponents of the act. They have their political philosophy and political point of view, and I have mine. There is plenty of room for differences in a democracy. It is said that even in heaven there are many mansions, and it seems to me that therefore on earth we have a right to have differences. I am rather proud of the association in which I find myself in opposing the McCarran Act.

There is, I am sure, no need for me to tell the Senate or the American people of the overwhelming responsible opposition to the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act on the part of many millions of Americans. Both General Eisenhower and Governor Stevenson, as our major candidates for President, stated their opposition to the act during the course of the campaign.

On October 17, General Eisenhower in a speech at Newark, N. J., called the McCarran immigration law "another glaring example of failure of our national leadership to live up to high ideals. The McCarran immigration law must be rewritten."—the New York Times, October 18, 1952.

In Bridgeport, he said, according to the New York Times:

We must repeal * * * the unfair provisions of the McCarran Act.

In Boston, he stated:

Only second-class Americanism tolerates second-class citizenship. It is time to get rid of both, and that includes rewriting the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act.

I salute our President for those courageous statements. I want him to know that I will stand with him in every effort he makes to modify, revise, amend, or repeal the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I hope that he will present us with such a program so that we may work on it.

One of the distinguished citizens of my State, Rev. Thaddeus F. Gullixson, president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary of St. Paul and chairman of the Lutheran Resettlement Service, was a member of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization which unanimously condemned the McCarran Act.

The National Lutheran Council, representing 4 million church members of 8 denominations, requested Congress to rewrite the McCarran Act when it met recently at its 35th annual convention at Atlantic City.

The National Council of Catholic Women met recently in Washington. This organization adopted a statement of principles calling for an immediate change in the McCarran Act.

The National Board of Young Women's Christian Association likewise adopted a resolution on February 6, attacking the McCarran-Walter Act as manifestly unfair.

Msgr. John F. O'Grady, a member of the President's Commission and secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, a distinguished friend of many Senators, has been one of the leaders of the move against the McCarran bill. During his recent trip to Rome he stated that by reason of the McCarran Act "Italy could go over to the Communists during the next few months." He said that "there is every evidence that the Communists will make full use of the discrimination against Italians in the act."

Cardinal Mooney, of Detroit, has denounced the law as discriminatory. Archbishop Cushing, of Boston, recently demanded revision of the law to purge it of several un-Christian and un-American provisions; and Bishop McVinney, of Providence, stated that the law reminded him of Hitler's principles. Bruce M. Mohler, director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference Bureau of Immigration, recently reviewed the Catholic Church's long-standing opposition to the national-origins-quota policy as unfair, unscientific, and highly discriminatory.

The American Baptist convention recently passed a resolution urging Congress to revise the McCarran-Walter Act, so that it would be more in keeping with our democratic traditions. The Disciples of Christ approved a more or less similar resolution, as did the triannual general convention of the Episcopal Church, last September.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the opposition to the McCarran-Walter Act is rather respectable. It does not appear to me to be coming from the cesspools of the Kremlin or from the mouthpiece of the Kremlin in America, the Daily Worker. It seems to me it is coming from people who believe in Christian compassion, Christian decency, and democratic honor and integrity.

I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Caspar Nannes, church news editor of the Washington Star, and appearing in that newspaper February 22, 1953, summarizing the position of the various church groups, be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit D.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Republicans, as well as Democrats, have opposed the McCarran-Walter Act—and for good reason. I was delighted to read an Associated Press dispatch in the Washington Post of February 16, 1953, reporting a speech by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, calling for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. He said—and now I shall quote the Governor of Maryland. I have never been quite so vehement as he was in my criticisms, and I wish to make it crystal clear that I am quoting now from the report of the speech made by the Governor of Maryland. He said the act "is the mid-20th century version of the alien and sedition laws of 150 years ago. In time we shall look back on the McCarran law as a great folly and an ignominious chapter in our Nation's legislative history."

He continued, as follows:

Quite apart from its offensiveness to two great groups in America—the Jews and Catholics—its harshness is indictable for two distinct reasons grounded in good ethics and practical political considerations:

The Governor of Maryland continued:

First, it contravenes the spirit that made the United States a refuge for the oppressed who, coming here, helped to make this country great.

Second it undermines our influence as a responsible leader in the community of nations by suggesting that the tarnish of racial hatred and religious bigotry guides our actions.

We must not let this episode discourage us, but work to bring this abomination to an early end.

Mr. President, that statement was made by a distinguished Republican governor. If my memory serves me correctly, he made one of the speeches nominating the gentleman who became the presidential candidate of the Republican Party in the recent election, the gentleman who now is the President of the United States.

I am also gratified at the overwhelming editorial response in favor of our position, and opposed to the McCarran Act. I have in my hands a series of editorials and articles from the Wash-

ington Post, the New York Herald Tribune, the Boston Daily Globe, the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, and the New York Times, opposing the McCarran Act. I ask unanimous consent that these editorials and articles be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 16, 1953]

MCCARRAN ACT REPEAL ADVOCATED BY MCKELDIN

VALLEY FORGE, PA., February 15.—Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, took Maryland's venerable Act of Toleration as his text today in calling for repeal of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

The occasion was Maryland State Sunday at Valley Forge State Park.

Besides explaining the development of and reasons for the old 1649 law on religious freedom, McKeldin dealt particularly with periods when reaction, harsh and oppressive, brushed it aside.

"Examine the meaning of the recessions that occur now and then in the forward march of man," he suggested.

"A similar wind of intolerance is blowing in our time.

"The McCarran-Walter Act is the mid-twentieth century version of the alien and sedition laws of 150 years ago.

"In time we shall look back on the McCarran law as a great folly and an ignominious chapter in our Nation's legislative history.

"Quite apart from its offensiveness to two great groups in America—the Jews and Catholics—its harshness is indictable for two distinct reasons grounded in good ethics and practical political considerations:

"First, it contravenes the spirit that made the United States a refuge for the oppressed, who coming here, helped to make this country great.

"Second, it undermines our influence as a responsible leader in the community of nations by suggesting that the tarnish of racial hatred and religious bigotry guides our actions.

"We must not let this episode discourage us, but work to bring this abomination to an early end."

McKeldin described Maryland as a State of paradoxes, geographically, economically, politically, and philosophically. He cited its contributions to medicine and science, culture, political action, and thought.

Quoting an unnamed source, he said:

"[Maryland] is a place where one cannot always do as he pleases, but where his right to say anything he pleases is respected—even when he speaks foolishness or worse."

[From the Washington Post of January 2, 1953]

IMMIGRATION POLICY

A genuinely illuminating study of the immigration problem has been produced by the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. Appointed in September under the chairmanship of former Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman, the Commission held hearings in 11 widely scattered cities, took testimony from some 600 interested individuals and organizations—many of them expert in the field and representing a great variety of religious, educational, welfare, and labor institutions—and found a consensus among them "to the effect that the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (the McCarran-Walter Act) injures our people at home, causes much resentment against us abroad, and impairs our position among the free nations, great and small, whose friendship and understanding is necessary if we are to meet and overcome the totalitarian menace."

The report of the President's Commission rests, apparently, on a radically different premise from that of the McCarran-Walter Act. In place of the "attitude of hostility toward and distrust of all aliens" which it ascribes to the recently enacted law, the Commission report reflects a firm faith in immigration as a vital source of American strength. It would approach immigration policy with the idea of affirmative selection of recruits for the American society. It would select these newcomers with due regard for the capacity of the American economy to absorb them. It would screen them with the most jealous concern for American security—but without the blind panic and arbitrary procedure of the existing law. It would welcome them, upon proof of their fitness, to full membership in the American society—without making their citizenship conditional and inferior to that of the native-born, as the McCarran-Walter Act does.

The most controversial feature of the Commission report is its flat recommendation that the national-origins-quota system, on which American immigration policy has been based since 1924, should be abolished and that instead there should be a unified quota system—admitting an annual maximum of one-sixth of 1 percent of the population of the United States as determined by the most recent census—with visas allocated in terms of family, economic, and political needs, but without regard to national origin, race, creed, or color. The report proposes creation of a permanent Commission on Immigration and Naturalization to allocate visas and administer immigration and naturalization policy.

"The quota system," as one of the Commission's expert witnesses, Prof. Oscar Handlin, of Harvard, pointed out, "was, in its origins, and remains now, a reflection upon the Americanism of many of our own citizens; it stands in the way of a rational consideration of the present utility of immigration; and it is an unnecessary burden in our dealings with the rest of the world. * * * A moderate flow of newcomers, regulated in terms of our changing needs, would add social and economic strength to our Nation."

The Commission report, in addition, bespeaks a return in dealing with aliens to the ancient American concepts of due process and fair play. It would temper justice with mercy and discretion to take care of hardship cases. It would facilitate the admission of temporary visitors, especially leaders in art, science, business, and the professions; and it would make all those who were honestly naturalized secure in their citizenship. This is an immigration and naturalization program for an adult and secure America, unafraid of strangers, confident as America always has been in the past of her ability to take and use and gain enrichment from the seekers of opportunity and freedom.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 3, 1953]

REPORT ON IMMIGRATION

The seven-man Commission set up by President Truman in September to study and evaluate the immigration and naturalization policies of the United States has now submitted its report. It has conducted 15 days of hearings in 11 cities, has made a comprehensive analysis of the testimony, has arrived at some reasoned conclusions, and has based on them a set of interesting recommendations. The report follows fairly closely the lines of the President's message of June 25, vetoing the McCarran-Walter bill, and constitutes both an attack on certain features of that bill and a prescript to be used in rewriting it.

Instead of the present system, based on national origins, the Commission recommends what it calls a unified quota system. Under it the maximum annual quota would be one-sixth of 1 percent of the total population of the United States—slightly more than 250,000 on the basis of the 1950 census. This quota would be allocated by a proposed Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, whose members would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They would be guided by the following criteria: The right of asylum, the prospect of reuniting families, the needs of the United States, the special needs of the free world and the general desirability of welcoming qualified immigrants. The relative weight to be given to these criteria would be determined from time to time by the Commission. In the upshot, supposedly, the immigration law would provide a means of relieving distress in any part of the world and would be, moreover, a powerful instrument of American foreign policy.

The Commission has made out a strong case against the national origins quotas, but the fact remains that quotas thus established are definite and automatically resist the pressures of special groups, whereas the criteria listed by the Commission are indefinite and automatically invite such pressures. Certainly the law should encourage rather than discourage immigration and should have enough flexibility to permit exceptional treatment of exceptional cases. In particular, as the Commission suggests, the whole subject of denaturalization and deportation needs thorough legislative reexamination. The new administration will find much of value in this painstaking study and will undoubtedly have reason to be grateful for the time and thought that went into its making.

[From the Boston Daily Globe of January 2, 1953]

"WHOM WE SHALL WELCOME"

"The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger, but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation in all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment."

So declared the first President of the United States 170 years ago, setting forth the principle which was to govern our immigration laws and the spirit in which these were to be administered—until enactment of the McCarran-Walter Act last June sought to turn the Nation's back on both.

The distinguished members of President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, whose study of that act is today presented to the public, seek to return our country's immigration policies to the broad highway of our traditions whence the ineffable Senator MCCARRAN's efforts have temporarily detoured them.

It is unlikely their endeavor will fail, though given the complexity of the problem, the task may require considerable time. Meanwhile, it may be noted that seldom in recent political history has there been a more heartening illustration of the functioning of the democratic process for correcting ill-considered legislation than this report and its summons to public opinion.

The strength of the commission's stand and the validity of its plea for complete revision of the law (which became operative less than a fortnight ago) are attested by the fact that spokesmen for every major religious faith in America, together with a host of civic organizations, members of the professions, patriotic societies and outstanding citizens from all walks of life, urged this study to be made. All gave it assistance. The quality of its membership also lends weight to its proposals.

It is not often that a major law, so recent in origin, is subjected to an attack so scathing as this 319-page study. The act, says

the commission, violates American principles, handicaps the economic development of the United States, endangers foreign relations and weakens national security.

It conjures racial discrimination through an archaic quota system and an entirely unscientific assumption of racial differences. It hampers the adjustment of population problems. It thwarts this country's efforts to strengthen the economic and political stability of our allies.

Worse: It blunts one of the most important psychological weapons in the cold war by snatching from the refugees from tyranny the goal of freedom itself. Finally, in numerous administrative provisions, it nullifies ideals as old as the Republic.

The 17 major recommendations put forward by the commission merit careful study from the incoming administration. They are practical, well found in experience, abreast of the times, yet consonant with Washington's advice and the principle he defined.

Abolition of the old national origins quota system and its replacement by a unified quota system which would allocate visas without regard to national origin, race, creed or color is probably the most important of these. The plea for transfer of all immigration and naturalization functions to a new agency also deserves close examination. So do the several suggestions for fairer hearings, a saner deportation policy, the improved security procedures.

President Truman, in the veto message which Congress rejected, pointed out that the McCarran-Walter Act was a step backward. The need for a modernized immigration law was not met by this statute. General Eisenhower also assailed the act during the recent campaign. This useful report provides an ample foundation upon which to build a new structure of law in keeping with traditional principle and contemporary need.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 2, 1953]

MCCARRAN ACT DEFECTS

President-elect Eisenhower expressed the view during the campaign that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which went into effect just before Christmas, must be rewritten. Helpful to that purpose would be the report just issued of a Commission appointed by President Truman. Among the members of this Commission are two Pennsylvanians highly esteemed in this community—Earl G. Harrison, former dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and Clarence E. Pickett.

The Commission holds that the McCarran law should be reconsidered and revised from beginning to end.

A biting comment on the law is that while it was intended to codify and clarify previous laws on the subject, it is even more complex than preceding legislation, and in some respects unworkable.

The law, the report charges, violates American principles, handicaps the economic development of the country, endangers foreign relations and weakens national security. Various provisions are cited as unduly harsh, even cruel, of punitive nature, and in some cases retroactive.

The whole national-origins principle on which our legislation has been based since 1924 is criticised, and a substitute quota system is suggested.

Such a radical change as the Commission suggests may be impossible to get through at this time. But there is wide room for removing obvious crudities and unfair and oppressive provisions of the act, some features of which have already evoked foreign protest. Congress can hardly avoid at least commencing the remodeling of the law.

[From the New York Times of February 14, 1953]

THE MCCARRAN ACT: STILL BAD

Senator MCCARRAN predicted last December that the fight against the new McCarran-Walter Immigration Act would be pushed vigorously after the new Congress convenes by the Communists and those who serve them and others. President Eisenhower, who in his state of the Union message called the act unjust and discriminatory, is of course among the others. So are Senators LEHMAN and HUMPHREY and many members of the President's own party. On the other hand, Senator WATKINS, of Utah, chairman of the subcommittee on immigration, says he knows of no need for changes in the law. Most of the 400 witnesses who testified before Mr. Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization thought otherwise, but it could be that Senator WATKINS did not read or did not believe that testimony.

At any rate, the drive to civilize the act is now getting started again. It would be pleasant to hear that strong bipartisan support was rallying to this drive. Certainly there is nothing on the record or in the facts to justify division along party lines. This is bad, deceptive, and bungling legislation. In theory it would let in close to 155,000 immigrants, the great majority from the British Isles and northern Europe. Since quotas are based on 1920 United States census figures and are not pooled, the quota total is meaningless. In effect, the doors are open to thousands who don't want to come, closed to other thousands who desperately want to come. And this under rules and conditions that treat every intending immigrant or traveler as an evildoer or conspirator until he proves he isn't.

The act and the problem are too complicated to be disposed of in a few days. However, the worst abuses could be removed by amendment and a revised law, wiser and fairer, could be worked out later.

[From the New York Times]

EASE IMMIGRATION, LUTHERANS PLEAD—THEIR NATIONAL COUNCIL ASKS THAT CONGRESS MAKE LAW FAIRER TO DARK PEOPLE

(By George Dugan)

ATLANTIC CITY, February 5.—The National Lutheran Council, at its 35th annual convention here, formally requested Congress today to rewrite the controversial McCarran-Walter immigration law. The council is a cooperative agency representing 4,000,000 churchgoers affiliated with 8 Lutheran denominations.

Noting with "gratification" that President Eisenhower asked Congress in his state of the Union message to review existing legislation on immigration and naturalization, the church body suggested the following changes in the McCarran law:

1. Substitute for the national origins quota system a "just and workable" plan that would avoid racial or religious discrimination. (An estimated 81 percent of the present European quotas are allocated to northern and western countries.)

2. Establish for the next 3 years a "statutory priority" for the admission annually of 100,000 refugees, expellees, escapees, and displaced persons.

3. Amend the present law to give naturalized citizens who have acquired United States citizenship "in good faith" the rights and protection enjoyed by American-born citizens.

PROPOSALS BY DR. T. F. GULLIXSON

The proposals were presented to the council by the Reverend Dr. Thaddeus F. Gullixson, of St. Paul, a member of the Special Commission on Immigration and Naturalization appointed last fall by President Harry S. Truman to study the McCarran law. The law, in effect since last December, represents an extensive codification of earlier legislation. It has been attacked as discriminatory and outdated.

"The discriminations written into the very wording of our immigration laws cannot stand uncontested in the face of the rising tides of racial self-respect among all the darker peoples of the earth," Dr. Gullixson said.

"It is obvious that the collective citizenship of our country has the right to decide who shall be invited to the privilege of citizenship here. It is also obvious that the law by which they come should not carry implications which are at variance with the principles upon which the Nation is founded."

Between 1930 and 1951, Dr. Gullixson declared, only 1.1 percent of our quota immigrants came from Asia, 0.3 percent from Africa, and 0.4 percent from the Pacific islands.

The "real crux" of the problem, he commented, is "our relation to that two-thirds of the human race which is not white."

Dr. Gullixson told the council that proposals were now being considered in both Houses of Congress for emergency legislation to care for the needs in some European countries with refugee and overpopulation problems. He warned, however, that while emergency legislation might be a stopgap it "leaves unanswered an issue which is even more important to the United States in her present attempt to achieve world leadership."

That issue, he said, is the "opportunity to tell the nonwhite two-thirds of the human race that we do not regard them as inferior members."

[From the New York Times of February 6, 1953]

MCCARRAN ACT CRITICIZED—NATIONAL BOARD OF YWCA ASKS DISCRIMINATION BE ENDED

Legislation to remove from the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act all unjust and discriminatory practices was advocated yesterday by the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, 600 Lexington Avenue.

The board adopted a resolution urging laws to assure that our immigration policy was based on a consideration of human welfare as well as on our own special needs and responsibilities. The resolution further advocated immediate legislation to admit to the United States its fair share of refugees and remaining displaced persons.

The board declared that the McCarran-Walter system fixing immigration quotas on the basis of national origins of our population was manifestly unfair because immigrants from Great Britain and Western Europe will still receive preferential treatment.

[From the New York Times of January 25, 1953]

AID TO REDS SEEN IN MCCARRAN ACT—MSGR. JOHN O'GRADY ASSERTS IN ROME LAW MAY TURN MANY ITALIANS TO COMMUNISTS

ROME, January 24.—An American Roman Catholic priest asserted today that complete disillusionment with new United States immigration laws seriously threatened to drive many Italians into Communist ranks.

Msgr. John O'Grady, of Washington, D. C., who served on President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization last year, declared in a prepared speech:

"There is a great danger lest many Italians, on the basis of complete disillusionment in regard to our immigration legislation, may vote for the Communists in the next election. * * * It is conceivable that by reason of our immigration legislation, Italy could go over to the Communists during the next few months."

A general Italian election, the first since 1948, is scheduled this spring. The present pro-Atlantic Pact government faces a bitter ballot-box bid for power from the Communists, who claim 2 million party members in Italy, plus powerful pro-Communist Socialist allies.

Monsignor O'Grady, speaking at a meeting sponsored by the Italian Catholic Migration Committee, said there is every evidence that the Communists will make full use of the discrimination against Italians in the McCarran-Walter Act.

The Washington monsignor said the McCarran Act seemed to belie all the fine things America stood for.

Italy is troubled by unemployment, overpopulation, and has some 700,000 Italians who were forced back to Italy after the war from the colonies and Balkans, and for these reasons emigration is essential, he declared.

He said that the President's Commission found a rising tide of public opinion in the United States that favors a constructive immigration policy. Such a policy is supported by the great majority of church leaders of all denominations, he added.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask that an article by Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich, director of the department of sociology at St. Louis University, on Catholic Views on Our Immigration Law, be printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit E.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the article by Dr. Mihanovich reports a 2-day Institute on Immigration on October 22–24, 1952, "to secure something of a unified opinion" toward the McCarran Act among Catholics. Dr. Mihanovich lists 20 major provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act which the institute unanimously objected to and criticized. He then goes on to list other objections and recommendations for drastic change in the McCarran Act.

The evidence is clear that the religious and democratic conscience of America is against our present immigration laws.

DANGER OF RELIGIOUS BIAS

There is one other item which I now wish to discuss in connection with the McCarran-Walter Act. On February 12, Representative WALTER placed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief excerpt from a story which appeared in the New York Times, reporting an address delivered for me in New York on January 28, on the question of immigration legislation. I fail to see the point of Mr. WALTER'S selectivity in lifting from the news item only one paragraph unless he is, thereby, attempting to demonstrate his often refuted point that his immigration bill is being opposed primarily by those who are concerned with the terrible tragic suffering now being undergone by the Jewish people in Europe. In the interest of accuracy, I think it is important that my whole address—the entire text of the address—be printed. By the way, Mr. President, the address was also recorded, so there can be no doubt or question as to the accuracy of the text. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit F.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Mr. WALTER'S thesis is not accurate. It is also inadvisable and dangerous, in that it may result, knowingly or unknowingly, in religious controversy, division, bias, and misunderstanding. The inaccuracy of the thesis is demonstrated by the evidence presented in these remarks.

M'CARRAN-WALTER ACT NEEDS REVISION

Mr. President, in conclusion I want to express my hope that the Congress will act to carry out the part of President Eisenhower's state of the Union message calling for a drastic revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. I am ready to join in a bipartisan effort to accomplish that objective. I regret that this proposal was not listed among the 11 "must" items, emanating from the recent conference at the White House between the President and the leaders of the majority. The facts are available, the campaign pledges are clear; the time for us to act is now. I urge the majority to expedite the necessary committee and floor action so that we can begin rewriting and improving the McCarran-Walter Act in the next days to come.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding that the Senator from Minnesota has again submitted or is about to resubmit the series of amendments in which I joined him at the last session?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Minnesota about to resubmit them?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that, as in the last session, so in this one, I shall be very happy to join the Senator from Minnesota in those amendments, because I think we have already been proven—so far as the general sentiment in the United States is concerned—to have been correct when we first fought for those amendments. In fact, I believe one of the most interesting things about the last campaign was that in the midst of the campaign the Republicans rather changed their position regarding the entire immigration issue. During the campaign they talked quite differently from the way they talked here on the floor of the Senate when the McCarran bill was pending, and when the debate on that bill was proceeding.

When the Republicans began to discover that large groups of people in the United States were aware of the fact that that bill was in serious need of amendment, the Republicans' campaign speeches began to take on a tone a little different from the one they had used in the early days of the campaign, as the Senator from Minnesota will recall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly do.

Mr. MORSE. The newspapers of the country were writing editorials telling their readers what an acceptable bill the McCarran bill was, at the time when it was before the Senate; but as the campaign progressed, the newspapers began to change their tune, too, because they realized that the bill was a political liability.

In view of the experience the newspapers have had and the barometer readings they have taken, I believe perhaps the Senator from Minnesota is now in a better position to have the amendments adopted; and I wish to say that I am very happy to join him in the amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I recall very well that the Senator from Oregon was one of the stanchest supporters and defenders of those amendments. I wish to say to him that if those amendments had been adopted, much of the indignity we have had to suffer and much of the suffering that has been caused would not have come about at all. I believe that throughout the country there has been a great reawakening, or at least a learning process, on the part of millions of people and many respectable organizations in the United States who now realize that something has to be done quickly.

So far as the investigation of the Voice of America is concerned, inasmuch as I have not had an opportunity to participate in that investigation, I shall not comment on it, except to say that the Voice of America now is being largely nullified by the McCarran-Walter Act. I can say that eminent members of the Norwegian Government and eminent members of the Swedish and Danish Governments have told me that the voice that is being heard in their countries today is the voice of bitterness toward the United States, because of indignities which we have forced upon their people by law and by the actions of our officials.

Of all the countries on the face of this earth none have been more like kinfolk to us, brothers and sisters, than have the Scandinavian countries; and yet, Mr. President, they are angry, righteously angry—and I may say there is nothing more justified than righteous anger—because their own people, people who have been as true and faithful in their love and spirit as any people the world has ever known, are now suffering in American ports under the terms of this law. When we ought to be breeding the spirit of good will toward people who were our friends, what are we doing? By our official acts we are casting doubt on their decency, their honor, their democratic faith. This has happened in port cities not any further away from Washington, D. C., than Baltimore, Md. Mr. Sevareid explains in his broadcast that immigration officials literally met Norwegian seamen coming out of the Norwegian Lutheran Church on Saturday to apprehend them—why? Because of the law.

Mr. President, I desire to make it quite clear that there are a great many people who are anti-Communist. Anticommunism needs to be better outlined and defined by setting forth what one is for. Hitler was anti-Communist—he said so, at least. I think the question is, Is one profreedom? is he proliberty? is he prohuman decency and prodemocracy?

Mr. President, I am not at all interested in seeing laws placed on the books

of the United States Government that are merely designed to be anti-Communist, if they are also insulting to liberty-loving people throughout the world. No amount of money we might appropriate can redeem our good name once we have officially injured the pride, offended the sense of fair play, and reflected upon the good name of people whom we would like to have as our friends.

I shall stand on the floor of the Senate time after time until some definite action is taken about the present immigration law, to remind this august body that while we can spend billions of dollars trying to revamp the Voice of America, or trying to build good will, or mutual security, yet by failing to act on certain humanitarian legislative proposals, or by acting in the way we did in passing the McCarran-Walter Act, we will destroy everything we are trying to build. What the people of the world want today more than anything else is acceptance. They want to be held in a spirit of equality. They want to be respected. They want to be treated as equals. We have set ourselves up as some kind of superpatriots, so to speak, pointing the finger at people from all over the world who have helped make this Nation rich and powerful, and saying to them, "You are not clean."

I conclude by saying that any nation that closes its doors will soon close its mind and close its heart; or perhaps I should turn it around and say that we begin to close our doors, the portals to this great Republic, when we have closed our hearts and closed our minds. It is easy to give away money, but it takes real character to show affection and respect for other people around the world; and that is the job that we must face up to. I submit that unless we do, it will not make any difference what kind of radio transmitters we have. We can hire the finest public-relations experts we can get from the best public-relations firm, and we can spew over far-off areas and coo to them the finest words man can possibly conceive, but I submit that our bad deeds drown out our words, just as our good deeds can drown out any evil propaganda against us.

My comment today is not only in defense in the integrity of those who have opposed the McCarran-Walter Act—that defense was made strictly as a matter of personal privilege—but I also make my comments today in behalf of a more rational and reasonable approach. It may not be as I would want it, but at least there is room for improvement, and I call upon this administration, I call upon anyone, to work with us in modifying what I consider to be some of the most onerous and indefensible portions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Next week I shall offer in this body a resolution calling upon the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to spend its time—a little of its time—looking into the effect of this act upon our foreign policy. I think the effect of this act upon the foreign policy of our country and our relationship with other countries is very important.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator for the announcement he has just made with regard to the resolution he proposes, and, if he does not consider my joining with him in the resolution a liability, I shall be very happy to join in it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I never assume that any association of mine with the Senator from Oregon is a liability.

EXHIBIT A

THE MCCARRAN ACT AND ITS APPLICATION

(By Einar Johansen, Norwegian Seamen's Union)

THE NORWEGIAN MERCHANT MARINE AND NORWEGIAN SEAFARERS

Norway has great traditions as a seafaring nation. For many of you it might seem strange that Norway with its small population should make international shipping the most important part of the country's economic structure. After a closer study of the country itself, you will not only find it less surprising but quite natural. First of all, our shoreline, including fiords and long inlets, is about 12,000 miles, although the general outline of the coast is only about 2,100 miles. It is not very surprising that 3 out of every 4 Norwegians are living within 20 miles of the sea, and that a large part of the population has to go to sea for a living and for transport. About 74 percent of Norway is made up of mountains and moors, glaciers and lakes, which make beautiful sceneries but have very little productive value. Forests cover 23 percent of the country and only about 3 percent, which is less than 3 million acres, is cultivated land. A great part of Norway's population of a little more than 3 million make their living from the sea or industries connected with it, and international shipping offers the only opportunity to cover foreign trade balance. These are a few of the reasons why Norway's merchant marine throughout history and today are the most important factor of the country's economic structure.

Conditions for our seamen on board and ashore are founded upon the principle that any seaman has equal rights with any citizen making a living ashore, and a little more due to conditions around the world and the character of shipping in itself. A Norwegian A. B. is paid more than the average mechanic. When it comes to other conditions, such as unemployment insurance, health and accident insurance, old-age pensions, conditions on board ship, accommodation and food, safety-at-sea regulations, and so on, Norway is second to none. The system covers a seaman his entire lifetime, according to the principle that everyone who all his life has worked for the benefit of society is entitled to economic and social security for himself and his family. A seaman's right to pay off wherever he chooses with notice agreed upon and his right to be paid his due wages are recognized principles. During the last World War the Norwegian seamen were always at the front.

On the afternoon of April 9, 1940, the masters of the oceangoing ships of the Norwegian fleet received radio instructions direct from Oslo: "All Norwegian ships will proceed at once to Norwegian or neutral ports." On the heels of the message from the invading Germans came a second, this time from London: "Norwegian ships will proceed with all possible speed to British or Allied ports." In the China seas, off the Panama Canal, off the French coast, in the Pacific, in the Atlantic, at Antwerp, in the North Sea, Norwegian captains scratched their heads—and made their choice. A thousand masters, all those outside occupied ports, commanding nearly 3,800,000 gross tons of shipping, without exception obeyed the London call. Thus about 80 percent of the Norwegian merchant fleet, the fastest, the most modern, and the fourth largest in the world, was saved from German seizure. It was the biggest prize of the oceans, then or since, and was said to be worth more than a million soldiers.

As explained before, the control of the Norwegian seamen in the United States has been through the consular office, the Norwegian Seamen's Union, later followed up by the Scandinavian Shipping Office, the Norwegian Public Health Service, the Norwegian Seamen's Welfare Office for the Norwegian Seamen. A broad social legislation such as health and accident insurance, together with unemployment insurance are applied to the Norwegian seamen even ashore in the United States, where the Norwegian Seamen's Union is represented. That means that a bona fide Norwegian seaman signed off a Norwegian ship in the United States, at no time can become a public charge to the United States of America, if he follows a few simple rules. When a seaman pays off in the United States or elsewhere he is, according to agreement and Norwegian law, paid 1¾ days' vacation for each month served. After his vacation, he will be covered by the unemployment insurance, which pays him $3.50 a day during the time he is applying for a job. During his service on the ship, his vacation ashore and the time he is applying for a new job, both the seaman himself and his family are covered by same insurances. Such a bona fide seaman can never be a burden to any other country, if he does not wilfully stay ashore in the United States longer than permitted. Further, according to the McCarran Act, the shipowners are responsible up to five years for any alien admitted to the United States. The risk therefore seems to be minimal if bona fide seamen were granted more freedom of movement under the new McCarran Act, those who are counted as security risks exempted.

SCANDINAVIAN SHIPPING OFFICES IN THE UNITED STATES

Since September 1936 the Norwegian Seamen's Union has maintained offices in the port of New York. Later on, offices were opened in Baltimore, New Orleans, San Pedro, and San Francisco. During all the years our union has been represented in the United States, we have cooperated with the American authorities with regard to immigration rules, Coast Guard regulations, and lately the Internal Security Act of 1950. In the abovementioned cities we have also established joint supply offices known as the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., for the purpose of shipping seamen to Scandinavian ships. The Scandinavian Shipping Office in New York was organized and incorporated in June 1938 by the following organizations: Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish shipowners' associations, Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish seamen's organizations. A board of directors was appointed by the above organizations consisting of the consul general of Denmark, consul general of Norway, and consul general of Sweden, one representative each from the shipowners' associations, and one representative each from the seamen's associations.

The purpose of the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., is to facilitate a just and immediate distribution of jobs to be filled from time to time on Scandinavian ships. As soon as the seamen have been signed off in New York, they report to our office in 156 Montague Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., in order to register for reshipment. A card is issued for every seaman and the jobs made available to the seamen according to the length of time they have been registered. At the end of the day, if no suitable jobs have been available, the seaman's shipping card is stamped with a date stamp which signifies that the seaman has been willing and available for any vacancy. A seaman is allowed to refuse three jobs offered to him and receives a specific mark on his card for each refusal. The masters of Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish vessels are instructed by their owners to obtain the seaman needed on board through the Scandinavian Shipping Office's

headquarters, 115 Broad Street, New York City.

We believe that this organization is in this respect rather unique inasmuch as the seamen who really intend to reship are kept under daily and strict control by us. As an example it can be mentioned that during 1950, 2,140 Norwegian seamen signed off in New York and 2,325 Norwegian seamen were signed on different Norwegian ships. According to report from the Royal Norwegian Consulate General in New York, the number of Norwegian and foreign seamen signed off Norwegian ships in New York in 1950 was 3,157. The number of Norwegian and foreign seamen signed on Norwegian ships was 3,929. As can be seen, this is 772 more departures than arrivals. The year 1951 shows that 2,233 Norwegian seamen and 1,222 foreign seamen signed off Norwegian ships in New York, while 2,344 Norwegian and 1,588 foreign seamen signed on. This shows the same picture as in 1950, namely, 447 more departures on Norwegian ships from New York than arrivals. In 1952 records at the Royal Norwegian Consulate in New York show that 2,294 Norwegian and 917 foreigners signed off Norwegian ships in New York. Same year 2,575 Norwegian and 1,421 of other nationalities signed on Norwegian ships. Again this shows 785 more departures than arrivals of alien seamen on Norwegian ships.

It can also be stated that our cooperation with American shipping authorities during war, with regard to exchange of seamen when needed, is well known. Many American ships were able to leave only because our shipping office was able to supply men.

In 1950 when the Internal Security Act was passed our shipping office at once, in order to be helpful in enforcing same, gave the following in writing to the foreign seamen:

"United States security provisions: We point out that crew members of Norwegian vessels entering United States ports are subject to the security provisions laid down in United States Public Law 831, the so-called Internal Security Act 1950, and prevailing Coast Guard regulations relating to the safeguarding of vessels, ports, etc. Under these security provisions, any alien who has been a member of, or affiliated or sympathetically associated with, any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, or combinations which are, or have been designated by the United States Attorney General as being totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or any person who has taken part in un-American and subversive activities, is liable to be refused entry to United States on the vessel's return and may risk being detained and subsequently deported. To avoid any such difficulty you will be required to declare before being hired that you have not taken part in any subversive activity as described above."

It should not be necessary, but for the record I would like to point out that offices of the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., and the Norwegian Seamen's Union at the same time worked in cooperation with other authorities enforcing this law and in full understanding with the American seafarers belonging to the A. F. of L.

Due to the above facts, it is very hard for the Norwegian seamen's union to understand the strict enforcement of the new McCarran Act. As we understand it, same act could be applied more liberally and without hardship to the seamen if the spirit of the law was followed.

THE M'CARRAN ACT USED FOR COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Representing the Norwegian union, I would like to state that we, before and after the Second World War, realized that certain forces were trying to destroy our achievements and the ideals of freedom and liberty which we stand for. We have seen destruction of free unions behind the Iron Curtain, where freedom is nothing more than a memory, and existing conditions impose in our opinion strict duties on all free labor. We must choose between freedom and servitude. We as a union and Norwegian labor as a whole have made that choice. We are in full accord with the responsibilities accepted by the International Transportworkers Federation in regard to the Communist attack on Korea, and safe delivery of arms under the Atlantic Treaty, without delay or sabotage. Delegates to our 11th convention in September 1950 supported ITF's stand on the international platform, all resolutions condemning Communist activities and supporting the United Nations' fight in Korea and the principles the United Nations stand for. At the same time our convention decided that no Communist could hold office in our union.

I would also like to draw attention to two resolutions adopted recently at a meeting of the International Transportworkers Federation (ITF) in London on January 19 this year. Present at this meeting were representatives of officers and seamen's organizations from Belgium, Denmark, Estonia (exile), Finland, France, Germany, Holland, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

RESOLUTION ON M'CARRAN ACT

"The seafarer's sectional committee of the International Transportworkers Federation, meeting in London on January 19 and 20, 1953, after careful study and consideration of the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act relating to seafarers, sympathizes with the general purpose of that law insofar as it is designed to safeguard the democratic way of life.

"The International Transportworkers Federation has ever stood in the forefront of the struggle against totalitarian regimes and fifth-column machinations. Because of their deep conviction and experience that such regimes aim to suppress the freedoms of the workers and tend inevitably toward aggression and war, the seafarers of the International Transportworkers Federation voice the opinion that it is the duty of all freedom-loving people to welcome measures designed to expose those who knowingly or unknowingly have become the tools of dictatorships, be they the people's democracies or any other totalitarian regime. They accordingly declare their willingness to cooperate to the fullest with any government which takes action to meet the challenge and threat of totalitarianism of any kind.

"It must be realized that the ITF is concerned with the welfare and well-being of genuine seafarers. The seafarers' sectional committee therefore urges very strongly that in the application of regulations under the McCarran Act everything possible be done to prevent avoidable hardships to seafarers or irksome restrictions upon their traditional freedom of movement, and requests the secretariat of the ITF make the necessary representations to the United States authorities with a view to simplifying the procedure applied to seafarers under the act.

"ILL-TREATMENT OF SEAFARERS IN COMMUNIST-DOMINATED PORTS

"During the discussion attention was drawn to the treatment afforded to seafarers serving in ships which visit ports in certain parts of the world. The meeting registered a protest against this state of affairs in the following resolution, which was also adopted unanimously:

" 'The seafarers' sectional committee of the ITF, meeting in London on the 19th and 20th of January 1953, deplores the indignities, injustices and acts of violence committed upon seafarers who arrive in Communist-dominated ports. In these ports seafarers are not only denied elementary freedom of movement ashore or even permission to go ashore, but in many cases have been arbitrarily arrested and sometimes sent to concentration camps without any form of trial.

" 'The committee protests most strongly against this treatment which violates all democratic laws and humanitarian principles. It draws the attention of public opinion to the situation and requests all affiliated organizations to intervene with their respective governments with a view to protecting seafarers in the exercise of their calling.' "

In above resolutions, the International Transportworkers Federation are trying to meet and minimize propaganda tactics used by the Communists that are trying to spread bad will against the United States due to the McCarran Act. Seafarers of the free countries are well fitted to be ambassadors of good will, due to the nature of their calling. But on the other hand, every hardship case inflicted upon a non-Communist bona fide seaman can be used for the opposite purpose.

It seems therefore that careful thought should be given to the application of the McCarran Act, as not to give a free hand to communistic agitation against free trade unions and freedom-loving democracies. Following is an example of pamphlets distributed among Greek seamen:

"LET US STOP ARRESTS AND EXPULSIONS

"*To All Greek Officers and Crew Members.*

"Fellow Seamen: The fascistic and anti-foreign McCarran Act has begun to be applied in its sharpest form also against Greek seamen. Up until now over 20 fellow seamen have been arrested. A band of them was on its way to the immigration offices with Fournarakis in order to renew their permits and were locked up on Ellis Island. Others were seized in the offices of the shipowners while going to work.

"These are the first victims of the reactionary McCarran Act, which for seamen means the smashing of our unity, shipping out at low wages, deportation to Greece, and confinement on board for those who have embarked. The law is directed against seamen of all nationalities and its purpose is to serve the war cargoes of warmongers and the shipowners' interests.

"*We must unite*

"The arrests expose Fournarakis and Poulakis, who promised the seamen permits and understanding on the part of the shipowners and their agencies. The arrests dissipate the promises and illusions. The OENO (Federation of Greek Maritime Unions), in the face of the danger which threatens all seamen without exception, is making an appeal to Fournarakis and Poulakis to drop the demagogy and for us all to unite in order to find ways and means to meet this serious situation.

"As a first step the OENO proposes an assembly or conference of all seamen in order to discuss the new situation and adopt decisions. With the interests of the seamen as its only guide the OENO proposes this conference and has not demanded that its representative participate if this means the creation of impediments for the unity of all seamen of all branches.

"However, it notifies Fournarakis and Poulakis that if they refuse to take a stand on this serious issue, then in the face of the danger of having the seamen confined on Ellis Island the OENO will call upon all honorable seamen and the officers of all branches to take the necessary steps. We extend a hand to all who are interested in the welfare of our fellow seamen. Let those who are responsible reflect and not think that the seamen will not criticize them.

"*Measures and decisions*

"The great majority of the American people condemn the McCarran Act. This makes it possible for us to stop the arrests and expulsions.

"From the conference there should be formed a seamen's board to visit: (a) The port authorities and the consulate; (b) the

shipowners whose ships may have trouble; (c) the editors of the newspapers (Atlantis, Kiryx, and Vima); (d) the archdiocese and the presidents of Greek-American organizations—patriotic and trade union; (e) the American organization, (labor) unions in New York, and, above all, the seamen's unions—officers, engineers, radio operators, and crew members.

"Fellow seamen, with a good concerted movement, with the support of the Greek-American patriotic forces, there is every possibility that we may avoid arrests and expulsions. One by one we shall be lost. All together we shall win.

"OENO SECTION OF NEW YORK,
"IR. ARNAOUTIS, *Secretary*."

The above circular letter has already done much harm inasmuch as it can be said that the application of the McCarran Act has brought hardship to anticommunistic bona fide seamen on foreign ships, especially with regard to their traditional freedom of movement, which is so necessary due to their calling as seamen.

PRESENT APPLICATION OF THE M'CARRAN ACT

Although the full effect of this act as yet cannot be determined, it is already clear that a strict enforcement will bring hardship to alien seamen either in American or foreign ships. In Seafarer's Log dated January 9, 1953, we read the following:

"M'CARRAN ACT PROBLEMS

"The much-discussed McCarran Immigration Act went into effect with a big splash 2 weeks ago. Much controversy has been aroused, centering on denial of shore leave to foreign-flag crewmen. Actually the act has weighed heaviest on aliens aboard United States ships, with many of them denied payoffs.

"The McCarran Act is a broad piece of legislation covering much besides seamen's shore leave. Contrary to what has been said in some newspapers, the SIU has not endorsed it. The union hasn't taken any position yet because, like everyone else, it is waiting to see how the act works out.

"What the SIU did endorse months ago was the principle of screening foreign-flag crewmen who enter restricted port areas. At that time an article in the Seafarer's Log exposed the security loophole which permitted Iron Curtain and runaway ships to enter these areas, but required 'American-flag seamen and dock workers to have Coast Guard clearances.

"The McCarran Act goes far beyond that. All alien seamen under all flags are being screened in all ports. For aliens on United States ships it means a double screening. They have already been cleared by the Coast Guard. Now they have to be cleared by Immigration. The difference is that where the Coast Guard is concerned with subversive affiliation, Immigration deals with a broader set of requirements.

"The result has been, for example, that two seafarers who have clearance and have been sailing SIU for years have been denied discharge because they are nationals of countries that were taken over by Russia. Other seafarers have been similarly treated for a variety of other reasons. From reports already received, it appears that the restrictions placed upon aliens sailing American ships will be changed in the new Congress and this hardship removed."

Another article in the same seafarer's Log states that a sizable number of alien crew members have been denied payoff and discharge in the first days of operation of the new act. Later is quoted examples of how an Estonian seaman who suffered back injury was denied discharge, although he was permitted to go ashore under guard for treatment. Other cases quoted seem to prove that a change of the act is necessary also for the smooth running of American ships.

As the act gives full authority to the individual inspector and everything seems to be left to his discretion, it seems that any alien seaman whether still on board his ship, domestic or foreign, and seamen legally entering the United States should be given a smooth and easy way to appeal his case to a local authority or committee, whichever is most convenient. The application of the law on Scandinavian ships shows that different inspectors follow different practices. I would like to give the following examples and reports:

1. Seaman Karl Persson, sailing on the steamship *Olga Torm*, admitted on D2 card in New York January 7, 1953, and registered to reship foreign or depart on any vessel on or prior to January 19, 1953. Granted extension in New York to February 5, 1953, but for this extension he had to pay $10. He shipped on the motor transport *Iselin* from New York January 29, this year.

2. Danish seaman Leif Nielsen signed off the Norwegian ship *Eidanger* in New York January 5, 1953. Given D2, and time for leaving United States January 20, 1953. Later extended to February 3, and for this extension he paid $10. On February 2, he went to the immigration authorities to apply for a longer extension but was asked to come back the day after, on which day his extension expired. Next day he was taken to Ellis Island into custody. If he will be granted conditional parole is not known at the present time.

3. Holger Sjøgren, born in Finland, signed off steamship *Scania* in Philadelphia, January 16. Allowed discharge and departure set to February 14. He was given 29 days at once. This is no grievance but only to show that the law can be applied easier.

4. Norwegian Olaf Olsen reported signed off *Eidanger* on or about January 5. Given D2 card with time limit January 20. On reporting to immigration authorities was requested to come back and pay $10—or else he would be in the United States illegally. Because the seaman did not have $10, he would be deported. His departure not known. All in all this shows that payment of $10 is more important than the spirit of the law, which the above-captioned seaman tried to follow.

5. Case of Norwegian seaman Karl Werner Henriksen, born April 2, 1935. Signed off *Skvauann* as bone fide seamán. D2 card in order, but the 29th day expired on Saturday, January 24, 1953. Did not have $10. All papers in order and registered with the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., where his card was stamped every day. Monday, January 26 at 10 a. m., he got a job on the steamship *Gimle*, which he was to join same night. He was assigned to the ship and his room and board paid for at the Norwegian Seamens' Hotel. Around noon on Monday, January 26, he was picked up and sent to Ellis Island. The Royal Norwegian Consulate General and the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., in New York tried to get him released, but did not succeed until late Tuesday. This seaman intended to depart, had signed on a ship, but due to the fact that it was a Saturday and Sunday and that he was short $10, he was taken into custody. What will happen to him after his trip to Ellis Island is unknown. Will this man on his next arrival in the United States be denied shore leave? Will he later on be denied discharge in the United States for the same reason?

6. Case of Norwegian Seaman Lars Arne Rossevold, born February 2, 1920; from motor transport *Shetland*, a Danish ship. District File E-082-499. Was detained on arrival in New York, January 10, 1953, because his passport was not valid for 6 months. On January 12 he and the wireless operator went ashore to extend passport. He had orders to wait for the wireless operator and return with him. Missed him, and drove around in a taxi to the amount of $7 to $8—most of the night in order to locate his ship. Because he did not master the language and was not well acquainted with New York, he did not reach his ship. He went to the Seamen's Institute and the next morning directly to the agents, Furness, Whitney. The agents gave him plane ticket to Cartagena. About three-quarters of an hour before he was supposed to leave for the plane, he was picked up and sent to Ellis Island. He was to leave about 4 p. m., and was picked up at 3:15 p. m. He remained on Ellis Island until Saturday, January 24, and was then given until February 13 to leave the country. Registered Scandinavian Shipping Office, Monday, January 26. This according to the seaman himself.

7. Another seaman, Gunnar Filland, on the *Elin Hope* trading between Canada and United States, was unlucky enough to be left behind when the ship left. He was picked up and sent to Ellis Island. Deportation proceedings started. Next trip sent back to his ship, but detained on board on later trips. Case in hands of Royal Norwegian Consulate General, and appealed to the Attorney General. No answer yet.

8. Report from the master of the MV *Pleasantville*. The ship arrived in Boston, first port in United States en route from Casablanca. Gave 11 names of the crew wishing to sign off in United States, some with the intention of returning to Norway, others to reship foreign. All with clear papers and with a service from 15 months to 2 years. Four of them were allowed to sign off after the master had informed that they should leave on the *Stavangerfjord* for Norway, departing January 27, 1953. The other seven got shore leave (D1) but no discharge because they were not able to name the ships on which they were to depart. The ship was en route to New York and they were told to apply for discharge to the Immigration Service in New York. On arrival in New York they were not granted discharge because D1 in the first port of arrival could not be changed to D2 in a later port in the United States.

9. Case of the steamship *Emu*. Following service of about 8 months on the above-named ship, Torkel Bjørnevik was given discharge in Philadelphia on January 20, 1953, and given 10 days in which to return to Norway. Five other men were denied payoff for the purpose of reshipping foreign. As told by Mr. Bjørnevik on January 23, 1953, at 1:45 p. m.

10. Oiler Magne Bratholmen, ex *Reinholt*, denied discharge in San Pedro the 6th or 7th of January 1953, together with others of the crew. Given D1. On arrival in New York January 26, 1953, he was given discharge (D2) and allowed to reship foreign. Between Pedro and New York, the ship called at Cristobal.

11. Case of sick seamen, Trygve Konnerud and Skule Stein Flathaug, ex *Wilchief*. This ship arrived in New York from Colombia on the 10th of January 1953. They both felt sick on arrival and had told the master that they would see a doctor. They could not be paid off, but were given D1 cards. They went to the Norwegian Public Health Service and Konnerud was at once declared not fit for duty. Flathaug was sent to a specialist and was declared not fit for duty. They moved their belongings to the Norwegian Seamen's House. The ship's wireless operator reported to the Consulate General that he and Konnerud had been informed by the Barge Office on Saturday that it would be O. K. that Konnerud was ashore for treatment. Konnerud was requested to report when he was fit for duty. (Possibly to be given D2.) Flathaug reported to the barge office Monday, January 12. The ship had departed at the time. He was given same information to report when fit for duty. Konnerud and Flathaug were both under doctor's care from the time they were declared not fit for duty. Flathaug was in the hospital from January 13 to January 16. They were picked up outside the Norwegian Consulate General on January 20 about noon and brought to the Barge Office. Both were still under doctor's care. After about 3 hours'

questioning they were brought to Ellis Island. Hearing on Wednesday and notified that they would be released on Thursday. This following intervention from the Norwegian Consulate General in New York. They were released on Friday, January 23 and given until around February 12 to depart from the United States. Konnerud was sent home on the steamship *Stavangerfjord*. Flathaug, when being declared fit for duty, will reship foreign. Both men told at Ellis Island that they were sick and needed special treatment, but were locked in a cell together with about 30 others.

12. Seaman Karl Lafton arrived January 28 on the *United States* in transit to the motor vessel *Tancred*. Should be picked up by the driver from the Scandinavian Shipping Office, Inc., New York, but driver reported that he was not even allowed to talk to the seaman who, by the way, understood very little English. Lafton was taken to Ellis Island. After intervention from the consulate, he was later released and sent to his ship.

13. Steamship *Solglimt* in New York. Five men did not have their passport in order. Detained. Later O. K. Two others detained. Not Norwegians. Reason unknown. The Norwegian consulate reports that quite a number of Norwegian seamen on different ships are detained for reasons unknown.

Danish seamen, members of Danish Sailors' and Firemen's Union, who have after termination of their allotted stay to remain ashore, in order to reship on a Danish (Swedish-Norwegian) vessel, have been detained, and arrested, by the Immigration authorities, when applying for extension.

14. Gunnar Pedersen, able-bodied seaman, born on August 3, 1925, at Køng, Denmark. Paid off steamship *Aggersborg* (Danish) December 31, 1952. D2 from December 29, 1952. Reported to Immigration on January 26, 1953 (29 days) and was detained. He was released on January 30, 1953, on conditional parole for voluntary departure.

15. Hans Ove Zenius Hansen, able-bodied seaman, born on September 9, 1926, at Roskilde, Denmark. Paid off same ship and all the same conditions and consequences.

16. Erik Nielsen Kjaer, able-bodied seaman, born on February 15, 1926, at Mariager, Denmark. Paid off from steamship *Tessa Dan* (Danish) in Mobile, Ala., and was issued D2 (No. S-606470) on January 6, 1953, and proceeded to New York with permission of the Immigration (stated on the D2 form) and registered here on January 12, 1953, for reshipping. Reported to Immigration on February 3, 1953 (29 days) and was detained. P. t. on Ellis Island.

17. Aage Vestergaard Pedersen, able-bodied seaman, born on March 18, 1929, at Vestervig, Denmark. Paid off same ship, same place (D2 No. 606469) and came also here to New York, but had D2 issued on January 7, 1953, but went with his shipmate up to the Immigration the same day as he (one day earlier than 29 days) but was told to come back next day, on the 29th day, and "he would then be detained," they said. (Immigration.) He is going up there today, the 29th day (February 4, 1953) and expects to be detained.

18. Svend Erik Pedersen, able-bodied seaman, born on November 12, 1929, at Copenhagen, Denmark. Paid off from motorship *Tekla Torm* (Danish) on January 5, 1953 (D2—from January 5, 1953). Registered here for reshipping on January 6, 1953. Went to the Immigration on expiration of his 29th day in anticipation of extension, but was detained (on February 2, 1953). P. t. on Ellis Island.

19. Reports from our offices in San Pedro, San Francisco, and New Orleans indicate that most bona fide seamen are denied discharge as they cannot tell what ship they are going to depart on. Other indications show that another reason for denial of discharge seems to be lack of jobs in the port the seaman applies for such.

20. Representatives of the Swedish Seamen's Union in New York reported January 28, 1953, that the Swedish Consulate General in New York had been informed by telephone from the State Department that no alien seamen will be given extension for shore leave. The time granted in the first place, if 10, 15, or more days would be the deadline for departure. Before the new law went into effect extension for voluntary departure was given without charge even after 29 days, when the seamen had registered to reship foreign. Practice after the new law has been given us to understand, will be that extension will be granted up to 29 days, but after that the seamen will be illegally in the United States and taken into custody.

21. Due to the application of the McCarran Act, several seamen had to take lower ratings than they were qualified for. Especially on Panamanian ships cases have been reported, from the Greek representative in the ITF in New York that denial of discharge has been used by the captain for the purpose of giving lower wages to those seamen so denied. It seems then that a strict enforcement of the McCarran Act can be used by foreign flag ships, not represented by a union, for the purpose of exploitation.

Letter from the Greek representative in New York, giving name of seaman who was forced to take lower wages and other facts, given to the assistant commissioner of immigration in Washington by Willy Dorchain, February 6, 1953.

It must be quite clear that Scandinavian ships and Scandinavian seamen will suffer undue hardship if such rules are to be followed, or extension for the purpose of reshipping foreign will be denied, especially on Norwegian ships, of which about 80 percent seldom or never arrive at a home port and have to rely upon supply of crew in foreign ports replacing those paid off for a rest period before again shipping foreign, or due to seamen's wish to change ship, or due to sickness or accident. Sick or injured seamen seem to be in a spot. A sick seaman will, as the law is applied, not be allowed to sign off the ship. He will, fortunately, be allowed hospitalization; but if the ship leaves without him, he will technically be illegally in the country and, consequently, be deported in due time. As a bona fide seaman, and through no fault of his own, he will later be detained on board any ship on which he arrives in the United States, due to his deportation. It also seems that a seaman during his convalescence after his ship has left will not be allowed to be a free individual but detained on Ellis Island and not be allowed treatment outside the hospitals. If hospitalization is not needed, the application of the law seems to be that he shall be detained on Ellis Island, although he later, through intervention from the consulate, can be given extension for voluntary departure.

Worse yet seems to be that the McCarran Act can be used for pressing wages down on those foreign ships that are not represented by a union. Also, it has been stated in a report from the Royal Norwegian consulate general to their Embassy in Washington that, due to denial of discharge, new men signed on had to join the ship in addition to the crew (case of MT *Carl J. Hambro* in Boston). Consideration should in those cases be given to ship's accommodations for the seamen, lifeboats, and lifesaving equipment.

SUGGESTIONS FOR APPLICATION OF THE ACT

Rules in the McCarran Act re seamen and shipowners' liability seem to be covered by the following sections of the law:

"Section 101 (a) 15D: Classifying a seaman as nonimmigrant, but liable to pay a fee of $10 for any extension granted according to chapter 9, section 281 (5). Bona fide alien seamen should be able to get an extension without pay, similar to other groups as 101 (a) (15) (F), students, etc.

"Section 212 (a): It seems that this section covers all reasons for which a seaman can be excluded from the United States. As mentioned in the ITF resolution in part 4, free trade unions around the world sympathize with the general purpose of the law, insofar as it is designed to safeguard the democratic way of life. As the individual inspector has full authority to make decisions according to his discretion, it seems that any alien seaman should be given a smooth and easy way to appeal his case to a local authority or committee, whichever is most convenient."

Passports have to be valid at least 6 months ((a) (26)). Those seamen with passports not valid are detained. On Norwegian ships new pasaports or extension of old ones can be arranged for Norwegian seamen through consular offices. Several cases of the detention reported due to this paragraph, especially seamen on Norwegian ships of other nationalities whose consular offices do not extend passports or issue new ones. Some arrangements could be made in these cases to allow the seaman to visit his consulate for renewal of passports.

"Section 237: Alien seamen seem to be exempted from this paragraph, but their deportation taken care of in section 252. It is a change from the old law, as this section in the old one covered all aliens.

"Section 241: This section will probably have some effect on a few seamen as one of the deportation reasons for nonimmigrants seems to be that he is not allowed to take any job ashore. This has been strictly enforced as it should be, but even a job as dishwasher for one night for an alien seaman might be followed by deportation proceedings without chance for voluntary departure. Foreign representatives in the United States should strive to make this known, and help the authorities in enforcing it. Union representatives should make this quite clear to the seamen.

"Section 242 (a): This section seems to cover our seamen in such a way that they can be released under bond of not less than $500, or be released on conditional parole. It seems that extension of a seaman's leave cannot be had, but after and when he is taken into custody, conditional parole can be given. This means in effect that the seamen in a certain number of days will be released and allowed to ship out. A few cases of this have already been seen. Conditional parole, not bond, could be applied as a rule for bona fide seamen. This section would then give the seamen a chance without deportation. The big question is, of course, if seamen allowed departure will be detained on ship on next arrival, in line with deported seamen. The case told about the seamen on the *Elin Hope* seems to indicate this.

"Section 243 (c): This section gives the shipowner stricter financial responsibility for a period of 5 years for any alien seaman left behind in the United States. In the same section 243 (g) we find that issuing of immigration visas can be discontinued for countries that will not accept any of their citizens deported from the United States.

"CHAPTER 6, SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO ALIEN CREWMEN

"Section 251: This section compels all ships to give information about alien crew members on arrival and departure. If a seaman has landed illegally, this has to be reported. It seems to be according to the old law except maybe that the Attorney General is authorized to prescribe by regulations when a ship shall be deemed to be arriving or departing from the United States.

"Section 252: This section is an important one for alien seamen. If an inspector finds that the seamen are bona fide and with valid papers, he may in his discretion grant a conditional permit to land—

"(1) for a period of time not exceeding 29 days during the time the vessel is in port, if the inspector is convinced that the seaman intends to depart on the same ship.

"(2) 29 days, if the inspector is satisfied that the crewman intends to depart within this period on any other vessel or aircraft."

This permit can be revoked at any time if an inspector finds that the seaman is not bona fide or intends to stay ashore longer than permitted. If a seaman wilfully remains in the United States in excess of allowed time, he can be fined $500—or imprisoned for not more than 6 months or both.

This section is applied so differently in various ports and by various inspectors that it should be changed, either by regulations from the Attorney General or amendment. Permit to land while on the same ship seems to be the easiest one. If this is denied by the inspector, it seems to be no easy way to appeal for the seaman. This should be corrected as a few seamen are detained only because they are unable to understand the language or answer correctly. Those may be affected that earlier were given conditional parole. The questions asked about the moral attitude have been especially questioned by the stewardesses.

1. It therefore seems that it should be easier rules for shore leave (D1).

2. Discharge seems to be impossible because seamen applying for D2 are seldom given that for various reasons:

(a) If shipping is slow, not allowed to sign off.

(b) D1 (shore leave) cannot be changed to D2 (discharge) in any later port of arrival in the United States.

(c) D2 or discharge denied if the seaman cannot name the other vessel on which he will leave the country.

(d) If given D2 (discharge) the various inspectors give different time ashore. Anything up to 29 days. The seamen having been in service up to 20 months on the same ship can be given 10 days, while another after a short service can be given 29 days right away.

(e) Although we are told by the Swedish consulate general in New York that the State Department claims that no extension can be given for seamen with D2, whatever time ashore they have, seamen given less than 29 days have been given extension in New York, if they pay $10—but not more than 29 days. It seems that after the 29 days have elapsed they will be taken into custody, whereafter they can be released on bond or granted conditional parole. A smooth running of the Norwegian ships will be very hard if the above should be followed, and, of course, it means hardship for our seamen. Application of the law therefore ought to be eased up. We suggest:

(1) Easier applicaton of the law for bona fide seamen for shore leave and discharge.

(2) Twenty-nine days should be given as a rule in all cases where discharge was permitted.

(3) D1 (shore leave) should be allowed changed to D2 (discharge) in all ports.

(4) Extension should be granted even after 29 days if the seaman can prove through his consular office, shipping office or union that he has done everything possible to re-ship, and has been registered for that purpose. No payment for extension should be taken from the seamen.

(5) A bona fide seaman granted conditional parole should not be detained on board on next arrival.

(6) A bona fide seaman detained on ship or taken into custody should be given an easy way to appeal his case in the same port.

(7) It seems to be the application of the law that sick or injured seamen will not be allowed D2 (discharge). We have cases where seamen are taken into custody while under doctor's care. Hospitalization is allowed but not treatment outside the hospital, or convalescence. The only way out of it seems to be that sick or injured seamen on arrival be allowed discharge as before and also if he takes sick or is injured after the first port. His shore leave should of course be 29 days and necessary days to reship after he is fit for duty.

"Section 253: This section covers certain diseases mentioned in 255 and seamen afflicted will be placed in hospital designated by the immigration inspector. Any ship should be allowed to repatriate their seamen even if afflicted with the mentioned diseases.

"Section 254: Seems to be that a ship has duty to detain all seamen until questioned by an inspector and granted shore leave. If not, the ship will be fined.

"Section 255: Covers certain diseases of seamen employed on passenger vessels. Like section 253, they will be hospitalized at the expense of the ship, but the ship can also oe given a fine of $50 under certain circumstances. Ships do not employ seamen with those diseases because we always and for anyone signing on any ship have strict rules for medical examinations. If a seaman should take ill after his payoff, our passenger ships have both hospitals, nurses, and doctors on board, and should be allowed to repatriate those afflicted.

"Section 256: According to this section any ship that signs off a seaman without permission from the immigration, can be fined up to $1,000. This section, therefore, must be seen together with sections 252 and 253. According to application of earlier law, a ship was allowed to sign off seamen without special permit, as long as they notified the immigration on departures. Now permit has to be given before discharge, or the ship will be fined. As the ship in all cases has financial responsibility, it seems that notification on departure would be sufficient.

"Section 257: This is stricter regulations than before. As this covers only intention co break immigration rules, it would be only right to enforce it.

"Section 262: This section seems to cover any alien, including seamen, and compels any seaman ashore 30 days or more to be registered and fingerprinted according to Alien Registration Act of 1940. It seems, therefore, that the law can allow more than 29 days ashore. It would be hard for a seaman to comply, because he would have certain duties to report any change of address and so on. We would like to point out that our seamen were fingerprinted during the war, and would have nothing against such a procedure if extension could be granted for a longer period than 29 days, when necessary for shipping foreign. When fingerprinted it would be necessary to explain his duties according to Alien Registration Act of 1940.

"Section 271: This section gives any owner, master, agent, or office a duty to prevent alien from entering the United States in any other port than designated. If sections 252 and 253 are eased this duty will not be too hard to follow. Also see section 256.

"Section 273: This seemed to cover stowaways more than others and gives the ship financial responsibility.

"Section 281: See explanation under section 101 (a) 15d."

Although we understand that enforcement of the act is very strict when it comes to allowing alien seamen discharge in the United States, we would suggest that this be made easier. If a seaman has been on a ship for a certain period of time or wants to change ship for different reasons, it would be a hardship case if D2 were denied. Further, it would not in our opinion stop illegal entries, as some seamen sooner or later would jump ship, instead of signing off legally. If that happened, he would not register for shipping out again, and could not be controlled as easily as those allowed to sign off legally.

All in all it seems that the general purpose of the act can be complied with without inflicting hardship on alien seamen if applied more liberally, and in a way that would give all seamen their traditional and customary freedom of movement, without being forced out with any ship in safe port against their own will.

EXHIBIT B

[Translation from Norwegian by Library of Congress, Nordisk Tidende, February 19, 1953]

NEW McCARRAN LAW MAY TRANSFORM SICK SEAMEN FROM LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS TO CRIMINALS

(By Odd Halvorsen)

That part of the American McCarran law relating to alien seamen in American ports has proved itself to be impractical and inflexible, it is reported in Norwegian shipping quarters in New York. The law has created "great difficulties for seamen and shipping companies" and, on the whole, has resulted in "very objectionable consequences."

Although, in the beginning, the law was regarded as "literally a threatening collection of earlier regulations in force," and it was believed that in reality a more lenient version would be evolved, the fact is, that despite this belief, some points in the law have been interpreted in a rigorous manner which seems even to "exceed the spirit in which it was framed."

The seamen frankly say that at present when a Norwegian seaman falls ill in New York he is transformed from a "law-abiding citizen to a criminal."

It is further stated, "even when a man has a valid doctor's certificate that he is incapable of working and consequently, for the time being, cannot accept employment, he is hunted as though he were an outlaw by plainclothes American policemen." The police stage raids on seamen at odds with the McCarran law because of sickness or other conditions over which they have no control.

Plainclothes policemen have also posted themselves outside of 115 Broad Street, New York, and have seized seamen who were on their way in or out of the Norwegian general consulate for the purpose of seeking counsel and assistance.

After the arrest the next step is Ellis Island and internment. Here there is little to do but hope for help from outside. The seaman is immediatey isolated in a cell or building.

A number of sick seamen who have been interned on Ellis Island say that the doctor's examination has been superficial and that no consideration is given to sickness or to the care that is required.

The relatively optimistic reception given the McCarran law at the beginning of the year in some Norwegian shipping circles was due to the fact that up to that time only the bare routine part of the law had been enforced. No Norwegian seaman had any difficulty in obtaining permission for shore leave.

The seamen themselves were also optimistic. They believed the law was rather ridiculous but they also said that they could understand why the Americans wished to exercise control.

More recent circumstances, however, have considerably decreased this optimism.

Most of the difficulties have their origin in the sharp difference which exists at present between shore-leave and discharge permits given by the American immigration authorities.

The well-known D1 stamp is a guaranty that the crewman is permitted shore leave up to 29 days while his ship is in port. He is further duty bound to leave port with the same ship.

Crewmen with these regulated shore-leave permits are often in a very difficult position. If they become sick and cannot leave port with the same ship (or, for example, are

hospitalized) they have automatically broken the McCarran law.

The sharp difference between a D1 and a D2—permission to pay off—can create the problems which arise in this case: A ship travels from South America to New Orleans, La., and the crew is provided with D1. It is probable that one or more of them will want to be paid off when the ship arrives in New York. In the meantime, however, in New Orleans they cannot request a D2 and neither can they decline to accept a D1. When they come to New York they cannot, in accordance with present practice, change the shore-leave permit to a discharge permit.

On rare occasions—and, as far as can be determined, quite voluntarily—it has happened that a D1 has been changed to a D2. Technically this is possible and it is difficult to understand why it is refused in so many cases.

Meanwhile the captain of this ship from South America may have signed on new crewmen in New York. But the crewmen with the D1's cannot be paid off and the captain cannot muster those newly hired unless he leaves with an extra crew.

Even if a person is declared a bona fide seaman and all technical details seem to be in order, it does not necessarily follow that he will get a D2 if he desires to be paid off. It seems that the immigration inspectors have supervision over all Norwegian seamen in the country and that they take cognizance of all of them in their treatment of each application for being paid off.

Thus the unhampered mustering process has been considerably restricted as will be apparent from this and earlier cited examples.

With a certain grim humor it has been stated here in New York that as far as we know the best way to get a discharge accepted has been to guarantee a seaman's stay on land and to buy a return ticket home for him. Or a seaman may do it himself, if he is the one who wishes a discharge.

Also, according to the McCarran law a seaman who is granted a discharge permit may count on a stay of 29 days ashore. In practice, however, as a rule, permits for shorter periods are given, usually for 10 days. If the seaman has not been hired in the course of these 10 days, it is possible to request an extension of the permit. For this he must pay a fee of $10. Theoretically he may also be required to pay a fee of $20 during his shore leave.

The 29 days' stay is now much more strictly enforced than previously. A seaman may be discharged the 1st of the month. On the 20th he may hire out again but his ship may not arrive before the 3d of the next month. On the 29th he is taken to Ellis Island and he is not given his freedom until his ship arrives.

Under present conditions there does not seem to be any possibility of escaping internment on Ellis Island after 29 days ashore.

Two internment incidents have created an especially strong resentment among the seamen who are now ashore in New York.

The first concerns two seaman, Trygve Kornerud and Skule Stein Flathaug, both of whom came to New York from Colombia on Saturday, January 10, on the motor transport *Wilchief*. New York was the first American port of entry.

On arrival they both felt ill and wished to see a doctor. Meanwhile there was no possibility of being paid off and the papers of each were stamped "D1."

The same morning Kornerud was declared sick at the Norwegian health office and was given permission to visit a specialist. The same afternoon Flathaug also was sent to a specialist who declared him sick.

Later they presented themselves at one of the immigration offices, Flathaug after his ship had left port—a fact which he also pointed out. Both of them were told to come back again when they had recovered, presumably to obtain a "D2."

After the declaration of sickness both were under a doctor's care. Flathaug, moreover, was in a hospital for several days. Both had been declared sick when they were arrested outside of the general consulate on the 19th or 20th of January. Plainclothes policemen inquired about their papers. They had a "D1" and their ship had left.

They were brought to the immigration office where they were examined. Then they were sent to Ellis Island. Kornerud pointed out that he was under special medical treatment but no attention was paid to this fact and he was placed in a prison cell together with 50 others.

When they were released several days later, it was because the general consulate had taken action. They were notified that they were to leave the country before the middle of February. Kornerud, who had continued to be sick, left January 27 for Norway for further treatment.

The second case concerns Kristian Larsen on the *Taurus*. He was suffering from a rupture and on January 28 was declared sick at the Norwegian doctor's office.

In order to provide himself with a formal statement of his condition he went, together with a representative of the ship's agent, to the immigration office, 70 Columbus Avenue, in Manhattan. He had with him a letter from the agent and in this letter it was clearly stated that Larsen was to return home on the *Stavangerfjord*, February 24 (his first opportunity for departure, since the *Stavangerfjord* had left New York the day before, and the *Oslofjord* was employed for cruises). At that time the *Taurus* was still in port but it was to leave the same day.

Larsen was arrested and sent to Ellis Island.

Three days later he was released after he had signed an order of conditional parole.

A Norwegian shipping official commented on the situation by saying, 'it seems as if the Norwegian representatives—both public and private—here in New York take pride in cooperating with the Americans. Therefore, it is so very difficult to understand the position of the Americans."

The case of Kristian Larsen seems to remove all support for the suggested procedure which the shipping companies' Arbeidsgiverforening (employers' society) sent to ship captains for use in cases of sickness.

According to this plan the captain is required to request shore leave permission for a doctor's visit, or hospital treatment if necessary, on behalf of the sick seaman. The immigration inspector issues a conditional shore leave permit and the seaman receives a copy. This does not give him the right to remain ashore as an ambulatory patient and merely indicates that the immigration inspector has made the inspection.

The captain also is responsible, it is further stated, for providing that the seaman is immediately given a written certification by the ship's agent which states his condition and which he must always carry with him. The declaration is written in triplicate and includes indisputable information that shore leave was requested on the arrival of the ship, and that the decision was made by the inspector. It must also be shown that the seaman is not discharged. When he is well, he must turn to the consulate for further assistance.

Another consequence of the McCarran law is that seamen often take the first job that presents itself, in order to avoid the consequences which are involved in overstaying shore leave.

In the period February 2–10, 15 men took jobs which were below their qualifications: mechanic, cabin boy; seaman, apprentice seaman; oiler, mess boy; boatswain, mess boy; mechanic, mess boy; mechanic, oiler; ordinary seaman, apprentice seaman; carpenter, oiler; mechanic, oiler; ordinary seaman, mess boy; seaman, galley boy; ordinary seaman, mess boy; carpenter, reserve man; first machinist, third machinist; and mechanic, machine boy.

In January there were four more similar cases.

EXHIBIT C

[From the New Leader]

WHO IS FIGHTING THE MCCARRAN ACT?—FOES OF THE IMMIGRATION LAW ARE NOW BEING FALSELY SMEARED AS "PRO-COMMUNIST"

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota)

Political controversy has reached a new low when supporters of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Exclusion Act are content to defend their position merely by stating that Communists oppose the law. Whatever differences—and they have been serious—I have had with Senator MCCARRAN, I have no doubt that he is a sincere anti-Communist as he sees it. But he has done his cause great damage by choosing to pin the Communist label irresponsibly on those who differ with him in vital areas of legislation. Such irresponsibility gravely damages the cause of serious, effective anticommunism.

The Senate passed the McCarran-Walter Act over the President's veto by the narrow margin of two votes. Those of us who opposed the bill debated it extensively and presented detailed analyses of its undesirable provisions. Senator MCCARRAN ignored our arguments, refused to discuss the bill on the merits, and instead was satisfied to show in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Daily Worker and the Communist Party didn't like him or his bill. More recently, he has been distributing under his frank hundreds of thousands of copies of an irresponsible article by Herbert G. Moore in a magazine called the National Republic. This article states that the McCarran Act is a good law because the Communists denounced it and because a substitute measure was prepared by friends of Communists. This logic is strange, indeed; by the same reasoning, Senator MCCARRAN and his friends would have to support germ warfare, Trotskyism, and lynching, which Communists also denounce.

Fixing our national policies by supporting whatever the Daily Worker denounces is a dangerous practice, whether used by liberals or by conservatives. Thus, I recall vividly that many liberals attacked Senator TAFT on the grounds that his votes on foreign affairs matched those of Vito Marcantonio. That, too, was unjust. To attack and defeat communism, we cannot automatically accept everything they happen to oppose, nor can we reject any decent proposals simply because Communists find it tactically wise to support them. To be freemen, we must think for ourselves.

The record shows that the McCarran-Walter Act shuts the doors of America in the faces of thousands of refugees and would-be refugees from communism who, if they were admitted to our land, would prove formidable fighters for democracy. We find that section 212 (a) (10) of that act excludes from our shores any immigrant from a Communist country if the Communist police give him a sufficiently bad police record. In other words, our State and Justice Departments are obligated to follow the decisions of the Communist MVD; a man who is hounded by Communist police becomes a criminal to American immigration authorities. It is therefore quite possible that when the Communists attack the McCarran-Walter Act, they are actually trying to make sure that millions of patriotic Americans will support this act. Certainly, the act is a potent weapon for stirring up anti-American feeling all over the world, wherever the impact of its exclusionist policies is being felt.

In opposing the McCarran Act, Senate liberals offered two substitute measures: the

Lehman-Humphrey bill (known as the short bill) and the Humphrey-Lehman bill (known as the long bill.) Senator McCarran and the National Republic claim the short bill was written by friends of Communists. Now the record shows that this bill consisted of 8 sections, 4 of which were substantially identical with provisions of the McCarran-Walter bill and none of which let down any existing bars against subversives or criminals.

As a matter of fact, Senator McCarran also complained that the draftsmen of the long bill had stolen his ideas. In several instances, the substitute legislation was so clearly a better technical drafting job than the McCarran-Walter bill that, at the end of the debate, Senator McCarran accepted 21 amendments taken from the Humphrey-Lehman drafts.

Insofar as our bill contained provisions not covered by the McCarran-Walter bill, these provisions were strongly anti-Communist. They would have given a preference—within the fixed maximum of our immigration quota, which was not changed—to refugees from Iron Curtain lands, to scientists needed in defense industries, and to relatives of American citizens, regardless of country or origin. Also, the short bill would have curbed the powers of immigration officers by establishing the Attorney General's Board of Immigration Appeals on a statutory basis. Finally, the bill would have given quota-exempt status to foreigners who enlist in the United States Army and to children, orphaned by totalitarian warfare and extermination campaigns, who are adopted by American families. Each of these proposals is diametrically opposed to Communist interests. How they could have helped communism Senator McCarran never tells us. Instead, his act's defenders circulate the charge that alternative bills were drafted by friends of Communists.

What are the facts? The Lehman-Humphrey bill was introduced on October 20, 1951, by a bipartisan group of Senators, comprising Senators Hendrickson, Ives, Langer, Morse, Benton, Douglas, Gillette, Humphrey, Kefauver, Kilgore, Lehman, Magnuson, Moody, Murray, and Pastore. Several of these Senators had taken the lead in exposing Communist agents at home and abroad; others had made fine records in advancing countermeasures against communism in the field of foreign relations. The bill these Senators introduced was drafted by the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the United States Senate, a regular agency of the Federal Government established to give technical assistance to all Senators in drafting legislation.

We also discussed the problem with experts. One of these experts—whom the National Republic tries to smear—is Felix S. Cohen (a frequent New Leader contributor—Editor). One of the country's outstanding experts in legislative drafting, and a former law-school professor on that subject, his services in drafting or interpreting legislation had been commanded by such organizations as the International Rescue Committee, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Board of the YWCA, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Lutheran Council, the Unitarian Service Committee, the American Friends Service Committee, and the Church World Service.

Mr. Cohen's role in the Lehman-Humphrey immigration bill was to give the sort of technical assistance an experienced legislative draftsman can give, after the objectives of a bill have been fixed, to make sure that these objectives are not thwarted by ambiguous wording or by failure to consider all the technicalities of existing law.

Now I would like to discuss, for a moment, Mr. Cohen's record in fighting communism—not because he needs defending, but to show the type of man whom the McCarran-Walter act's defenders are calling names. In recent years, three outstanding steps have been taken against communism: (1) the exposure of covert Communist agents at home, who exercised a great and malevolent influence during the Red decade; (2) the program of economic assistance to anti-Communist peoples abroad, and (3) the Voice of America. In each of these measures, Felix S. Cohen played a large part.

Consider, first, the long fight for adequate measures to expose the agents of communism. In 1940 a group of anti-Communist lawyers, including Mr. Cohen, were deeply concerned at indications of State Department incompetence in handling Communist agents. Congress had passed, in 1938, the Foreign Agent Registration Act, designed to throw the pitiless spotlight of publicity upon secret Communist agents. Enforcement of the act was entrusted to the State Department. How that trust had miscarried was revealed in the report prepared by Felix S. Cohen, released on June 13, 1941, and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 14, 1941, by Congressman Jerry Voorhis of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The following excerpts show the thrust of this report:

"An objective analysis of the operations of the Foreign Agent Registration Act must convince any unprejudiced observer that the act has been rendered a dead letter, of no practical importance in exposing the propaganda activities it was designed to expose. * * * Chief responsibility * * * must be laid at the door of the State Department. * * *

"An examination of the State Department files does not reveal the names of any of the Communist leaders in this country. Yet the Communist Party's organizational manual says: 'The decisions of the executive committee of the Communist International are binding for all parties belonging to the Comintern, and must be promptly carried out.' * * *

"Apparently no efforts have been made by the Department to use the press, radio, and other channels in accordance with the intent of the framers of the act. * * * The regulations issued by the State Department for the enforcement of the act make it inevitable that the information that Congress wanted is not collected. This result is reached by exempting the most dangerous propagandists from the requirements of the act, by omitting from the registration forms all questions relating to details of the agent's propaganda activities, and by inserting a series of loopholes which have the effect of facilitating evasion of the purposes of the act" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, pt. 13, pp. A4417–A4419).

In line with these criticisms, Congress, by the McKellar-Sumners Act of 1942, transferred responsibility for administering the laws relating to registration from the Secretary of State to the Attorney General, and otherwise tightened up most of the loopholes to which Mr. Cohen's study had called attention.

Another step in our resistance to world communism was the Marshall plan. (Let it be recalled at this point that Senator McCarran himself repeatedly voted against appropriations for mutual security, and against military aid to Greece and Turkey.) Felix S. Cohen, then Associate Solicitor of the Interior Department and Chairman of its Board of Appeals, was one of the members of the interdepartmental committee that drafted the original Marhall-plan legislation. He later helped draft legislation sponsored by Senator MUNDT, extending the principles of this plan to India.

Another major step taken by the United States against communism was the organization of a sound campaign of psychological warfare, symbolized by the Voice of America. A report edited by Felix Cohen, Combating Totalitarian Propaganda, sounded what was probably the first call for an effective American propaganda compaign against totalitarianism. This was in June 1941.

In 1943, Mr. Cohen coauthored a more detailed study demonstrating the need for a Voice of America. This study pointed out that vast sums were being spent on Communist propaganda warfare directed against our democracy, operating through a vast solar system of organizations dominated by totalitarian loyalty and discipline, and that the Federal Government was blocked by a series of obsolete statutes from replying.

Five years later, Congress authorized the organization of an effective counterpropaganda campaign against world communism. Senator LEHMAN and I voted with Senator MUNDT to secure adequate appropriations for the Voice of America and other agencies of this anti-Communist campaign; Senator McCARRAN opposed these efforts.

In addition, Felix S. Cohen helped lead the anti-Communist forces in the National Lawyers Guild during the early years of that organization. When the Soviet Union invaded Finland in 1939, he drafted and secured guild adoption of a resolution condemning the Soviet aggression, notwithstanding the opposition of guild leaders Harry Sacher, Louis McCabe, Carol Weiss King, and Mortimer Riemer. A few months later, Mr. Cohen, former Assistant Secretary of State Adolf A. Berle, Jr., and other distinguished officials and judges in the guild challenged candidates for guild office to record their opposition to communism. When this challenge was rejected, they resigned en masse from the guild.

Another fine American whom the National Republic must presumably regard as pro-Communist is Monsignor O'Grady, who was one of the stalwart opponents of the McCarran Act throughout its legislative history. Ordained in Dublin, Monsignor O'Grady came to the United States in 1912 and studied at Catholic University. He has been dean of Catholic University's School of Social Work, the organizer of Catholic Charities in Washington, and general secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities for 31 years. We are proud to have been associated with him in our effort to pass a humane immigration act. I was interested, incidentally, to read excerpts from a recent speech he made in Rome, in which he said that the McCarran Act was driving many Italians into Communist ranks.

Whatever one may think of the merits or demerits of the McCarran-Walter Act—and reasonable men may differ on that—there is no reason to identify opposition to the act as Communist-inspired. Indiscriminate attacks upon men who have been pioneers in the campaign to expose Communist propaganda can only serve to betray America. Those Americans who recklessly cry "Communist" whenever anybody disagrees with them are making it easier than ever for the Communists to isolate America from its friends throughout the world and to paralyze us internally with a network of mutual suspicions.

EXHIBIT D

[From the Washington Star of February 22, 1953]

IMMIGRATION—MANY CHURCH GROUPS ARE SEEKING A LAW MORE LENIENT THAN THE MCCARRAN ACT

(By Caspar Nannes)

The McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, which has stirred up a hornet's nest in many quarters, is facing the stern opposition of some of the Nation's most influential church groups.

Since it took effect last December 24, charges of discrimination, bigotry, and injustice have been leveled against the act. But it has been as vehemently defended.

President Eisenhower has added to the debate by urging Congress to review the legislation and by remarking that it contains injustices and, in fact, discriminates.

There is, among church people, widespread agreement that the present law has improved past legislation in many respects, such as unifying the confused mass of immigration law. They are now, according to Miss Sarah Weadick of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, "for the first time, all in one place."

SOME BARRIERS LOWERED

The act has removed existing racial barriers to admissibility and citizenship, though not as completely as many would like. It has, also for the first time, set up a system of selective immigration whereby 50 percent of all quotas is for qualified immigrants having "higher education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability" whose presence here would benefit the country.

These and other provisions, including removal of sex discriminatory rules, have provided defenders with strong arguments.

The major point of revisionists' objections centers around retention of the quota system, in use since 1924. Quotas are assigned to various countries in proportion to the number of people of that racial stock living here in 1920. As a result two-thirds of all quota numbers are given to Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany, with few using the former two. This lopsided system is further attacked because no provision is made so natives of countries having sharply limited and oversubscribed quotas could fill unused quotas.

At present, under the immigration formula of one-tenth of 1 percent of our country's population, as determined by the most recent census, 154,657 persons may enter the United States. The previous quota ratio was one-sixth of 1 percent, which would admit 251,162 immigrants.

MANY STATEMENTS ISSUED

During the past 6 months various church bodies, at regular meeting, have issued statements on the law. The latest came this month from the 4-million-member National Lutheran Council. This group expressed satisfaction at General Eisenhower's request for a review of existing immigration legislation and called on Congress to adopt a just and workable substitute for the national-origins quota system.

A similar statement was approved by the National Council of Churches last December at Denver, Colo. The American Baptist Convention passed a resolution urging Congress to revise the law so it would be more in keeping with our democratic tradition, providing for a flexibility in making adjustments between national quotas and removing all discriminatory provisions based upon considerations of race, color, or sex.

The Disciples of Christ approved a more or less similar motion. The triennial General Convention of the Episcopal Church last September also called for a review of the policy on immigration.

The Baltimore Annual Conference, the Methodist Church, last June asked for a veto of the law and called on Congress to enact a measure which will uphold the principles and ideals of democracy and Christian citizenship and avoid unfair discrimination.

Bruce M. Mohler, director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference Bureau of Immigration, recently reviewed the Catholic Church's long-standing opposition to the 1920 quota policy as unfair, unscientific, and highly discriminatory.

Jewish religious bodies have practically unanimously urged that the present law be completely rewritten. Six major national Jewish organizations issued a statement to this effect on January 1.

Warnings that the new immigration law imperils previous American standards have come from many Washington church leaders. Methodist Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam charges the good in the McCarran-Walter immigration and nationality law is submerged in bad philosophy, archaic provisions and un-American procedures. It should be repealed and a new law enacted with flexible quota system, without discrimination based upon race, color, or sex, with American procedures for fair hearings and appeals in deportation proceedings.

Dr. Joseph M. Dawson, executive director, Baptist joint committee on public affairs, stated a majority of southern Baptists agree with most other church groups in wishing long-range legislation removing discriminatory provisions.

PRESBYTERIAN OPINION

The Reverend Howard F. Gebhart, chairman of the Social Education and Action Committee, Washington City Presbytery, said, "I'm quite sure that I speak the voice of the Presbytery in holding for a broader immigration program for our Nation than that presently prescribed by law." The Reverend William J. Lineback, general secretary, Capital Area Christian Missionary Society (Disciples of Christ), declared American immigration policy "ought not to be a static thing, nor one characterized as exclusive or unfairly favoring one nation over another," and urged that unused quotas each year be "pooled" among other nations.

A warning that "many Italians, on the basis of complete disillusionment in regard to our immigration legislation may vote for the Communists in the next election" was voiced by Msgr. John O'Grady, general secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, in Rome last month.

On the other hand, the National Association of Evangelicals has asserted "it is generally thought by evangelical circles here that the 3 years' hard work of the House and Senate Immigration Committees, has produced a decidedly improved bill and one that would probably meet the approval of the majority of loyal United States citizens."

Miss Weadick pointed out that while opponents have been protesting the national-origins formula none of them has "ever suggested a substitute. It would seem, therefore, that any wide, open-door policy is not going to get very far unless some definite, spelled-out substitute for the national-origins plan is submitted to the congressional committees."

The Reverend De Loss M. Scott, pastor of the National Tabernacle here, said, "If ever we needed legislation to protect our country from an influx of undesirable aliens who are opposed to our American policy and way of life, it is now. However, it is possible that in barring such we may, at the same time, bar those who are desirable and of inestimable value for our land of America. In the light of this it would seem that a further careful study with possible revisions at certain points, would be of value to all concerned."

It is natural that disagreements will arise on such a sensitive measure as the immigration law. But with general good will on all sides, rather than much of the acerbity that has marked past discussions, a law containing the best American ideals to fit the difficult problem should be achieved.

EXHIBIT E

[From America magazine of February 21, 1953]

CATHOLIC VIEWS ON OUR IMMIGRATION LAW

(By Clement S. Mihanovich)

The McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act, passed by Congress last July over the veto of President Truman, has been subject to close scrutiny and sharp criticism by Catholics in the United States.

In order to promote a deeper understanding of the McCarran-Walter Act, to secure something of a unified opinion toward it among Catholics and to find out what should be recommended to overcome its deficiencies and correct its errors, the writer conducted a 2-day institute on immigration in St. Louis, October 23–24, 1952. The institute, held under the auspices of St. Louis University, was sponsored by Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter, of St. Louis. Msgr. John O'Grady gave me guidance and full support. Over 50 immigration experts, mostly Catholic, were present for the institute. The conclusions of this institute may, in a broad sense, be characterized as typical Catholic views on immigration. However, the writer does not wish to convey the impression that the views he expresses here are necessarily shared by all Catholics. Opinions are bound to vary on such a subject.

The institute objected to and criticized, among others, the following provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act (Public Law 414; S. 2550, H. R. 5678):

1. Assigning 50 percent of the quotas to those of high education, technical training, specialized experiences, etc. (sec. 203 (a) (1)).

2. Eliminating college and university professors from the class of quota-exempt immigrants (sec. 101 (a) (26) (F)).

3. Drastically curtailing the admission of colored persons (sec. 202 (c) (1)).

4. Establishing a special inferior status for persons of Asiatic extraction, including Filipinos (sec. 202 (b)).

5. Requiring American consuls to follow decisions of courts of foreign nations in excluding immigrants from admission to the United States (sec. 212 (a) (10)).

6. Requiring rigid tests for admission of skilled or unskilled workers (sec. 212 (a) (14)).

7. Barring all immigrants who, in the opinion of a consular officer, are "likely at any time to become public charges" (sec. 212 (a) (15)).

8. Allowing immigration by members of totalitarian groups who reformed before entry (sec. 212 (a) (28) (I)), while requiring deportation of those who reform after entry (sec. 241 (a) (6)).

9. Abolishing existing statutes of limitation in deportation cases. Allowing deportation for alleged acts 50 years past (sec. 242).

10. Making all grounds of deportation retroactive (sec. 241 (d)).

11. Authorizing deportation of immigrants who are mistakenly classified as "public charges" (sec. 241 (a) (8)).

12. Requiring deportation of immigrants who become addicted to the use of narcotic drugs after entry (sec. 241 (a) (11)).

13. Practically eliminating judicial review of deportation cases in many instances (sec. 241).

14. Abolishing the confidential character of social-security files (sec. 290 (c)).

15. Subjecting the acquisition of citizenship to a series of new requirements retroactively covering the entire life of the applicant (secs. 313, 316, 318).

16. The interrogation of any citizen if an immigration official believes him to be an alien (sec. 287 (a) (1)).

17. The termination of the right of American citizens to be immune from search or official interrogation without a warrant (sec. 287 (c)).

18. Institutional denaturalization proceedings against any naturalized citizen at the instigation of any private informer who files a proper affidavit, for acts which were not grounds for denaturalization when the naturalized citizen acquired citizenship. (Sec. 340 (a)).

19. The abolition, in certain cases, of the right of an American citizen to court review if his citizenship is challenged by a consul or other officer (sec. 340 (c)).

20. Allowing extremely restricted and minimum quotas for various Asiatic countries while subjecting persons born in the Western Hemisphere to "ancestry" quotas (sec. 202 (b)).

These are only the major objections that we have to the act. As can be readily seen, all these provisions would subject over 10 million foreign-born Americans to special

police controls operating without regard to due process as hitherto defined. Furthermore, naturalized citizens and immigrants will be subject to such subjective and ambiguous standards as "the satisfaction of the Attorney General," "the opinion of the Attorney General," etc., as well as to the arbitrary powers granted to consular and immigration officers.

These objections and many others were studied by our institute on immigration. Upon the completion of the institute a number of recommendations were presented to the attending members, who unanimously agreed on the necessity of revision or eradication of all the above provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

The writer himself believes that there are many provisions in the act that must be removed or changed if we are to keep our constitutional integrity and if we are to convince the peoples of the world that we are a truly democratic nation. Among many changes that the writer recommends are the following:

1. In many of its provisions, as stated above, the McCarran-Walter Act modifies or eliminates existing judicial decisions. This must be corrected to conform to traditional and established practice and to prevent the possibility, which actually exists under the act, of denaturalizing an American citizen upon notice of less than 1 day.

2. When determinations are to be made in regard to the act they should be made on the basis of facts and not upon the opinions of minor officials.

3. The prospective immigrants should not be subjected to the requirement of duplicate examinations by two different agencies. Under the act, the case of a prospective immigrant is examined first by the State Department (consular official) and then again by the Department of Justice (Immigration and Naturalization Service). This duplicate examination is a waste of time and taxpayers' money, in addition to being something of an indignity imposed upon the applicant.

4. A statutory board should be provided to handle appeals from all official decisions on visas, passports, and other immigration matters. There is no adequate appeal under the act from many immigration decisions, such as consular decisions or denials of visas.

5. The Nationality Act of 1940 sharply limits the right of a naturalized citizen to live abroad without loss of American citizenship, although no such limitation was placed upon native-born citizens.

6. The Immigration and Nationality Act continues the provisions of the Internal Security Act (1950) concerning membership in subversive organizations. In these provisions the act again discriminates against naturalized citizens.

7. The basis of immigration in the United States should not be one of racial discrimination. The writer agrees with James Finucane, associate secretary of the National Conference for Prevention of War, that, for the immediate future, at least, we should merge the national-origins quota principle with two other principles—(a) the size of the population of the country from which the intended immigrant comes and (b) its need for immigration. Something of a complicated mathematical formula will result, but justice would be more nearly approached than it is now. In this formula we must not forget the problem of the expellees. Neither must we forget the hundreds of thousands of children fathered by American soldiers in Germany, France, Japan, etc. Our approach to these problems should be a Christian one, based on both justice and charity.

A formula such as the one presented above would go far to erase racial, religious, and ethnic discriminations that now exist in our immigration laws. Any such formula must have as its guiding stars the three following principles: (a) The history of our country; (b) Christian and American concepts of democracy; (c) the role our country plays in the world today.

In summary, it may be stated that the writer, as well as all who attended the St. Louis Institute on Immigration, agreed upon the following:

1. All were for a positive pro-immigrant philosophy and objected to present anti-alien philosophy.

2. All opposed parts of Public Law 414; none completely approved it.

3. All called for definite and drastic changes in Public Law 414.

4. All based their opposition to Public Law 414 on Christian ethics, American foreign policy, good economics, and the Constitution of the United States.

5. All agreed that the present national-origins quota system should be eliminated.

6. All agreed that college and university professors should be admitted on a non-quota basis.

7. All agreed that non-used quotas should be pooled, especially if the national origins quota system could not be eliminated.

8. All opposed the present undue preference given to skilled labor in immigration quotas.

9. All condemned the undue power given to American consular officials abroad.

10. All agreed that quotas should be based on the 1950 census composition of our population instead of the 1920 census used in the act.

11. All agreed that the present deportation provisions should be at least tempered, if not abolished, except for fraud or illegal entry.

12. All agreed that the present distinctions in Public Law 414 between native-born and naturalized citizens should be eliminated.

13. All agreed to advocate the reinstatement of the statutes of limitation.

It would be no exaggeration to state that a liberal and fair immigration law can do more to win for the United States the good will of the peoples of the world than most of our past and present global-aid programs, on which we have spent tens of billions of dollars.

EXHIBIT F

ADDRESS OF SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION BEFORE THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS, BROOKLYN DIVISION, JANUARY 28, 1953

In May of last year, when the United States Senate was debating the McCarran immigration bill, I received an interesting letter from some old Americans who supported my stand against that bill. They wanted me to know that in opposing Senator MCCARRAN's bill they had no personal ax to grind. Here is what my old friends had to say:

"We are not immediately threatened by laws to stop immigration and to deport men and women born abroad," they said.

"Sometimes we wish we had established such a law in 1492."

That letter was signed by five American Indian leaders.

I think that these words can be a good reminder to all of us, whether we trace our ancestry to the *Mayflower*, whether we are Sons or Daughters of the American Revolution, or whether we personally stepped ashore in 1900, in 1925, or in 1945 that, in the historical perspective, we are all new Americans. All of us came here as refugees from the Old World, seeking a new home and new opportunity in America. All of us made our contribution to the development of this country.

But ever since the creation of our Republic there have been some people whose position on immigration has been: "Thank God we are here. Now let's bolt the door."

But that view, ladies and gentlemen, is not the prevailing view in America today. It is not the view of the President's Commission on Immigration which recently reported to the country after an exhaustive study of immigration problems. It is not the view of scores of fraternal nationality, patriotic, and religious organizations in America, and it is not the view of our Jewish synagogues and our Protestant and Catholic churches.

This Sunday I read a report in the New York Times of a speech made in Rome by my friend Msgr. John O'Grady speaking of the McCarran Act. He said:

"There is a great danger lest many Italians on the basis of complete disillusionment in regard to our immigration legislation may vote for the Communists in the next election. * * * It is conceivable that by reason of our immigration legislation Italy could go over to the Communists during the next few months."

Monsignor O'Grady, who was one of the stalwart fighters during the last Congress against the McCarran Act, who served on President Truman's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, and who tirelessly continued his efforts for more humane and decent immigration legislation consistent with American traditions is living proof of my conviction that the spirit of America, the spirit of our people, and the spirit of our religious traditions rejects the notion that there is room for discrimination and bigotry in our immigration laws.

I likewise want to pay my tribute to the American Jewish Congress and its representatives for the leadership they have taken in this vital area of our public life. When the McCarran bill was before the Judiciary Committee the American Jewish Congress authorized Will Maslow, its general counsel, to testify against the bill.

I want to share with you part of his testimony to the committee. In that statement he clarified the real issues in our immigration legislation. He pointed out that the real defect in the McCarran Act and in our immigration laws to date is that they are based on system of selecting immigrants not on the basis of their capacity but on a wholly irrelevant factor—the place of their birth.

One of the Members of Congress questioned Mr. Maslow and asked him whether the nationality quota system which decides that people should enter the United States on the basis of their place of birth was not in fact a good system because it encouraged those to enter the United States who could easily be assimilated into the United States while it discouraged those who found assimilation difficult. Mr. Maslow replied:

"Now that takes us to what is meant by the term 'assimilation' . . . And I think that what we mean by the term 'assimilation' is that people shall come to this country who are in sympathy with its ideals, who believe in the things which make America America. We do not care particularly whether they eat foreign food. In fact, there may be some value to this country if we vary our national diet, if we have spaghetti and smorgasbord, gefilte fish and suki-yaki. We do not think that those factors detract from assimilation, but we want people in this country who believe in democracy, who believe in representative government, who believe that America's contribution has not been the atom bomb or the television screen, but the words of the Declaration of Independence, and who believe that all men are equal, not merely that all Anglo-Saxons are equal. If we judge assimilation on that basis, then we cannot take a concept based upon place of birth."

That is a spirit which I highly commend. It is a statement which I share.

There is one further observation which I would like to make in this connection. I know that in your activities in behalf of more democratic and humane immigration legislation, you are acting selflessly and not thinking primarily of your own, because there are relatively few Jews left in Europe desiring to come to these shores. I am aware of the unfortunate fact that most of the people

to whom you would have wanted to extend a helping hand, people kept out of this country in the thirties by the national origins principle, are now dead, the victims of the most horrible crime against humanity. The whispering campaign of the bigots that the fight against the McCarran Act is a Jewish fight, designed to bring in more Jews, is, therefore, as untrue and unjustified as are all similar campaigns. In fact, even insofar as the displaced persons legislation was concerned, that was not a Jewish fight. Only 18 percent of all the displaced persons who came into the United States were Jewish. Here again it is clear that to raise the Jewish question is untrue and unjustified. I must say that I was very sorry and shocked to see such a campaign reach the floor of the Congress.

Most of the members of the European Jewish community who survived the Hitler era are resettled now, either in Israel or elsewhere. There are still some Jewish displaced persons left in Europe and there are some who, in the thirties, found refuge in the Far East. There is also the ever-present danger to Jewish communities in Arab countries. Yet, as the facts submitted to the Presidential Commission demonstrated, the world population problems are of much more gigantic proportions, involving many other ethnic and religious groups. From those facts I would gather that not more than 3 percent of the people who constituted the major population problems which were listed were of Jewish origin.

Until a few weeks ago, all of us thought that the problem of rescuing and resettling Jewish survivors had been nearly solved. Your participation in the fight for better immigration legislation was thus unquestionably motivated by the broadest altruistic considerations.

What hardly any of us clearly anticipated during the fight against the McCarran bill was the sudden stepping-up of officially-sponsored anti-Semitism in the Soviet sphere. As of today we still don't know how far that ruthless group in the Kremlin intends to go. But we must face the brutal fact that if it will serve their purposes, the men responsible for Katyn will not bat an eyelash at creating another Auschwitz. It is not inconceivable, therefore, that the number of Jews among escapees from behind the Iron Curtain will suddenly increase in the near future.

It is to enable us to cope with sudden emergencies of this nature and to help us make our contribution to the solution of world population problems, that we oppose the rigid, racist national origins principle. We know, of course, that the United States, standing alone, cannot solve all of the world's ills, in the population field or any other field. We know that in order to preserve the stability of our complex economic system, we must limit immigration in accordance with absorptive capacity.

I have heard the senior Senator from Nevada accuse those of us who opposed his bill of trying to raise the floodgates of America. If he had studied our bill, the so-called Humphrey-Lehman bill, he would have found that aside from placing parents of citizens and a few other special groups in the non-quota category, we would have raised quota immigration by the amount of from 150,000 to 250,000 annually. To express it differently, we would increase the immigration ratio from 1 immigrant per year for every 1,000 Americans to 1 immigrant for every 600 Americans. I have great difficulty trying to visualize how 1 alien immigrant can inundate 600 Americans.

I was happy to note that our position was vindicated in the testimony before the President's Commission. Your own organization suggested an increase in quota immigration to 300,000 annually. The Secretary of Labor declared that according to studies undertaken by his Department we can absorb several hundred thousand immigrants every year without placing any burden on our economy. The Secretary of Agriculture, a former acting director of the Bureau of the Census, the late Philip Murray of the CIO, Boris Shishkin of the A. F. of L., and many others took a similar position. And the Commission's recommendation was an increase in quota immigration to 250,000.

You may wonder just how the other side justifies its stand against this weight of authority. The answer can be found in Senate Report 1515 of the 81st Congress, printed back in 1950. That report cites with approval the view that "the economic optimum population of the United States is at least several million less than the present population and may be as low as one hundred million." This philosophy seems to go back 150 years to the teachings of Malthus and Ricardo, to the idea of a fixed number of job opportunities and the suggestion that population must be limited if available economic resources are to satisfy everyone.

Against this pessimism of the neo-Malthusians, we assert our faith in the limitless opportunities of our great democratic society. We do not believe that there are already 60 million too many of us. We believe that with our American spirit of enterprise and through intelligent management of our resources we can attain ever greater heights of economic development for a long time to come.

As you know, since 1924 quota immigration has been limited to 150,000 annually. This number has actually been cut further by the operation of the national-origins principle under which we can expect not more than about 70,000 to enter the country annually. When Senator McCARRAN introduced his first immigration bill, he included a device to make a substantial further cut in immigration. Each quota was to be split into a number of preference categories for people with special skills, parents of citizens, and so forth. Not only could there be no reassignment of numbers from one quota to another, but there wouldn't have been any reassignment from one preference category to another within the same quota. This proposal might have cut immigration to 20,000 or even less.

In view of the sharp criticism directed against this provision, it was finally dropped from the bill.

But one provision to which the Senator and his followers hung on through all the turmoil and trouble was the national-origins principle.

The national origins-quota system was first placed on our statute books in 1924. Its discriminatory background was at that time freely admitted and in the House majority report we find the following frank language:

"With full recognition of the material progress which we owe to the races from southern and eastern Europe, we are conscious that the continued arrival of great numbers tends to upset our balance of population, to depress our standard of living, and to unduly charge our institutions for the care of the socially inadequate.

"If immigration from southern and eastern Europe may enter the United States on a basis of substantial equality with that admitted from the older sources of supply, it is clear that if any appreciable number of immigrants are allowed to land upon our shores the balance or racial preponderance must in time pass to those elements of the population who reproduce more rapidly on a lower standard of living than those possessing other ideals."

One of the Congressmen supported the bill stated this point even more bluntly:

"Were the immigrants now flooding our shores possessed of the same traits, characteristics, and blood of our forefathers, I would have no concern upon the problem confronting us, because, in the main, they belonged to the same branch of the Aryan race."

But the new immigrants, he declared were of a different kind and were essentially unassimilable.

Let me read you the statement of one of the supporters of the McCarran-Walter bill on this subject, a Congressman, since been retired, from Idaho.

"It seems to me that the question of racial origins—though I am not a follower of Hitler—there is something to it. We cannot tie a stone around its neck and drop it into the middle of the Atlantic just because it worked to the contrary in German. * * * I believe that possibly statistics would show that the Western European races have made the best citizens in America and are more easily made into Americans. In a time of trouble and stress, such as we are going through at this time, it seems to me it is a poor time to increase entry into our country of material that is questionable, when we have a very large proportion of people that we have not yet digested, and who have not yet learned the first principles of American citizenship. If there was some law that could take these people that you even wish to bring here and put them out on the prairies of the West, I maintain they would make good American citizens in a considerably shorter time than if you leave them penned up among the people of their own kind in the large eastern cities where they do not learn to talk English readily. They read their own newspapers. It has been my impression from the short space of time spent in those eastern cities that it takes almost three generations to make a good American citizen. * * *

"I am opposed to (quota pooling), because I am of the opinion it will tend to bring in many aliens whose general characteristics seem to show they do not readily make the best American citizens—"

I think there is no need for me to try to demonstrate for you that racist theories are fallacious and devoid of any scientific foundation. But let us stop for a moment to analyze the argument which is currently more favored, the argument that the new immigrants would change our social fabric or alter our cultural heritage.

As I have said before, the proposal embodied in the Humphrey-Lehman bill, which is now also espoused by the President's Commission, is that we permit the entry of 250,000 quota immigrants annually, one for every 600 of our population in 1950. In one generation, 30 years, we will have admitted 30 aliens for every 600 Americans. The 600 native born will, of course, in the meantime grow to 700 or 800. It seems to be the view of these pessimists that our democratic structure and our social fabric are so weak that the 600 to 800 Americans will give way to the 30 immigrants who will trickle in from all parts of the globe over a period of 30 years. I, for one, believe in the strength of our social system, as I believe in the strength of our economic system. I am sorry to find that my faith in the inherent strength of America is not shared by men who always readily designate themselves as patriots.

When Senator LEHMAN, and I, and some of our other colleagues first drafted our own immigration bills, we included a compromise formula which was to be substituted for the national origins principle. I first proposed this plan in a bill I introduced in 1949. Under this formula, known as the quota pooling plan, quota numbers not used in any given year, by the nationality to which they were assigned were to become generally available in the following year.

However, on the basis of the recommendations of the President's Commission, I believe the time will soon come when the evils of the national-origins principle will be abolished altogether.

There is, of course, more to the McCarran Immigration Act than a mere reaffirmation of the national-origins principle. What was originally passed off as a mere codification

of existing law actually involved numerous changes in the provisions regulating exclusion, deportation, naturalization, and denaturalization.

When objections were first raised against these provisions, Senator McCARRAN tried to wave them away lightly. The new law, he claimed, "tightened the security provisions" and prevented the "pollution of the bloodstream of America" with alien criminals.

Now let me say right here that I am just as much opposed to the immigration of subversives and criminals as is Senator McCARRAN. If you put the McCarran Act and the Humphrey-Lehman bill side by side, you will find that when it comes to excluding subversives and criminals the latter does just as much as the former. But our bill was drafted with care, designed to hit only those people against whom it was actually directed. The McCarran-Walter Act, on the other hand, is a blunderbuss, with broad language and loose phrases which hit many innocent people whom we don't really want to hit.

During the debate on the McCarran Act my colleagues and I went through that bill section by section and subsection by subsection and analyzed the most important parts on the floor of the Senate. I don't want to repeat this performance here tonight. But just to give you some of the flavor of what transpired, I'll mention a few examples. What these examples also show is that even though we lost on the final vote, we were able to make some dent in the law and ameliorate some of the harshest provisions.

One of these provisions, which was in the original McCarran bill, would have made it possible for an alien to be deported for a simple traffic violation if the Attorney General declared him undesirable. That language was so strong that Congressman WALTER dropped the clause from the House bill.

Let me give you another example. Under the old law, aliens could be kept out of the United States if they had committed crimes involving moral turpitude. That gave our immigration officers a chance to see whether the alien had committed an act that was a crime by our standards and not by the standards of some foreign dictatorship. But the new law requires exclusion whether or not moral turpitude is involved. We were able to point out that under this new provision a man like Cardinal Mindszenty would be excluded from the United States if he ever were released by the Communists.

Now, I know, of course, that Senator McCARRAN had no intention to keep Cardinal Mindszenty or anyone in a similar position out of this country. Here was just another example of this blunderbuss technique of lawmaking by which innocent persons are hit while the law tries to aim at the guilty.

I might say that once again we didn't get an adequate response from Senator McCARRAN. I am glad to say that the State Department in drafting the regulations under the act, followed the lead of the conference report and corrected the wrong. They took the cases which I described in my speeches, cases of people being convicted in totalitarian countries on trumped-up charges and drafted regulations to take care of the problem.

We had one other incident dealing with regulations of the State Department, which vividly reflected the spirit of the McCarran Act. You may remember that the State Department issued orders to all of its consulates throughout the world requiring that all applicants for visas into the United States list whether they are Jewish or not. Most of the country was shocked by this clear indication that the use of the question on the application form for a visa would mean that it would be easier to keep Jews out of the United States. When I vehemently protested this regulation to the State Department I was told by one of the high officials of the Department that he agreed with me, that he knew the practice was wrong, that he knew it might lead to clear evidences of anti-Semitism, but he said, "We must administer the law. This is the clear intent of the McCarran Act. We don't write the act, we can only carry it out." The large number of protests to the State Department, of course, eliminated that regulation, but the example is a vivid demonstration of what we are opposing.

Let me give you a few more illustrations. One case which has recently come to my attention involves a woman against whom a deportation order has recently been issued. She would have been eligible for suspension of deportation under the old law. She is not eligible now and will have to be sent to Italy. She will be accompanied by her husband, a man 52 years of age, born and bred in the United States, who was never outside this country. So that he can stay with his wife, his life's companion, this man will have to break off all his ties in the country of his birth and start life anew in Italy, figure out a new way of earning a livelihood.

What does the McCarran-Walter Act have to say about this kind of situation? The answer can be found, in cold, heartless language, in the Senate report:

"Hardship or even unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child is not sufficient to justify suspension of deportation."

Let us take a look at another situation. After providing in clear-cut fashion for the exclusion and deportation of subversive aliens, all of which provisions are also included in the Humphrey-Lehman bill, the McCarran Act further allows the deportation of persons who have had a purpose to engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest, and a Government official is given the blanket authority to decide this question.

When the Senate discussion reached this section, the late Brien McMahon, who had risen from his sickbed to come to the Senate Chamber for this debate, rose in disbelief and asked to be shown that section. After he had studied it, he declared:

"It seems almost unbelievable to me that anyone could seriously write such a provision into a bill * * * (it) is contrary to every concept I know of in the common law or in our jurisprudence. I have never heard of such a provision in any statute of the United States."

These words, let us remember, were spoken by a man with broad experience in the field of law enforcement, a man who had been Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Criminal Division.

There is another deportation provision which is almost unbelievable. It is section 241 (c) under which an alien who has obtained a divorce from a citizen can under certain circumstances, be deported if "it appears to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he or she has failed or refused to fulfill his or her marital agreement." It seems to me that this constitutes an unprecedented intrusion by the Government into a field which was heretofore considered a matter of purely private concern.

There is one other provision about which I would like to speak tonight. It deals with professors. Under the old law, professors could enter this country as nonquota immigrants once they had met all the other requirements of the immigration law. This privilege, which has enabled us to bring many great minds to this country, has been abolished by the McCarran Act. No logical reason has ever been stated for this action. The defenders of the act have said that professors can still be brought in under a general preference provision for skilled persons. But instead of the simplified procedure which was in effect previously, let us look what is now required if a university wishes to bring in an outstanding foreign scientist.

First, the university has to file an application with the Immigration Service, attaching to it a clearance order from the United States Employment Service certifying that qualified persons are not available in the United States to perform the work in question. Then it has to file a complete and detailed analysis establishing in what manner the services of the professor will be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States. Next there has to be a complete description of the prospective immigrant's higher education, to which there must be attached diplomas, certificates, and affidavits attesting to the professor's qualifications. The petition will have to be acted on by the Immigration Service district director. The district director may then conduct an investigation and if he approves the petition, the consul's office can then place the professor on the preference portion of the quota list. When the professor's name is reached, and all other investigations have been completed, he will be issued his visa.

Our future experience with this new law will show how many semesters in advance a university will have to plan before it employs a foreign professor.

You know that the fight for better immigration legislation did not end when President Truman's veto of the McCarran Act was overridden. The fight is continuing and I am certain that as time goes by an ever greater portion of the American public will become aware of its dangers and inequities. I am happy to join with you in the necessary program to educate the public.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN POSTAL RATES AND CHARGES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 49) to investigate certain matters respecting postal rates and charges in handling certain mail matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Senate resolution 49, as amended.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McCarran
Anderson	Griswold	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bush	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Capehart	Humphrey	Purtell
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Clements	Jackson	Saltonstall
Cooper	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Duff	Kennedy	Stennis
Dworshak	Kerr	Symington
Eastland	Kilgore	Taft
Ellender	Knowland	Thye
Ferguson	Kuchel	Tobey
Flanders	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Lehman	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Wiley
George	Malone	Williams
Gillette	Mansfield	Young
Goldwater	Martin	
Gore	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(1) Postal rates and charges in relation to the reasonable cost of handling the several classes of mail matter and special services, with due allowances in each class for the care required, the degree of preferment, priority in handling, and economic value of the services rendered and the public interest served thereby.

(2) The extent to which expenditures now charged to the Post Office Department for the following items should be excluded in considering costs for the several classes of mail matter and special services:

(A) Expenditures for free postal services;

(B) Expenditures in excess of revenues for international postal services;

(C) Expenditures for subsidies for postal services pursuant to law or legislative policy of Congress;

(D) Expenditures in excess of revenues, pursuant to the act of June 5, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), not enumerated in the preceding subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C);

(E) Expenditures for services of any character not otherwise enumerated herein which may be performed for other departments and agencies of the Government; and

(F) Expenditures which may be justified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function.

(3) Expenditures for the Post Office Department by other Government agencies which should be considered in connection with the cost for the handling of the several classes of mail matter and special services, such as employees' retirement, use of Government buildings, and maintenance services.

(4) The extent, if any, to which Post Office Department expenditures in excess of revenue, for its various services and for the handling of various classes of mail, are justified as being in the public interest.

(5) The costs of handling, transporting, and distributing the several classes of mail, and procedures whereby such costs can be reduced through improvements in methods and equipment.

(6) Other matters relating to the improvement of the postal system.

The committee shall report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, the results of its study and investigation under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

(b) The committee is authorized to appoint an advisory council of not more than 10 persons which may include representatives of the general public, representative users of the mails, members of accounting, management, and engineering firms, postal experts, representatives of postal employee organizations, and, with special reference to ratemaking in their fields, representatives of public transportation and distribution organizations. The functions of the council shall be to assist the committee in the studies and investigations authorized by this resolution. The council shall meet at such times and places as may be authorized by the committee.

(c) The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, of Nebraska, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1955.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Harry N. Routzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Richard R. Atkinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1953.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, O12830.
Col. William Lenoir Wilson, O16950, Medical Corps.
Col. Emil Lenzner, O15810.
Col. William Joseph Bradley, O15967.
Col. Ralph Morris Osborne, O16399.
Col. Wallace Hayden Barnes, O16426.
Col. George Edward Martin, O16802.
Col. Philip DeWitt Ginder, O16904.
Col. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060.
Col. Edwin Rudolph Petzing, O8463.
Col. Charles Harold Royce, O15769.
Col. Paul Maurice Seleen, O16139.
Col. Ralph Copeland Cooper, O17741.
Col. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662.
Col. Egbert Wesley Van Delden Cowan, O11744, Dental Corps.
Col. Willis Richardson Slaughter, O5296.
Col. William Lawrence Kay, O10349.
Col. Harrison Shaler, O12080.
Col. John Battle Horton, O15150.
Col. Stanhope Brasfield Mason, O17295.
Col. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048.
Col. Derrill McCollough Daniel, O29500.
Col. George Andrew Rehm, O12772.
Col. Louis Holmes Ginn, Jr., O17341.
Col. James Stewart Willis, O15607.
Col. Holger Nelson Toftoy, O16422.
Col. Frank Coffin Holbrook, O16654.
Col. Max Sherred Johnson, O16745.
Col. Robert Highman Booth, O18093.
Col. William White Dick, Jr., O18384.
Col. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715.
Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223.
Col. Louis Watkins Prentiss, O14672.
Col. Francis Elliot Howard, O16776.
Col. George Edward Lynch, O17715.
Col. Theodore William Parker, O18369.
Col. Charles Edward Hoy, O18556.

NOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

Eleanor M. Hahn to be a lieutenant in the Nurse Corps in the Navy.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

William J. Bray, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, from whom all noble desires and all good counsels do proceed, rise mercifully with the morning upon our darkened hearts. In this tragic and tangled world we are conscious of our woeful inadequacy to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice and to respond with equity to the myriad calls of human need. In this forum of a people's hope wilt Thou crown the deliberations with spacious thinking and with sympathy for all mankind, multitudes of whom are bound by the shackles of tyranny. Facing questions which confront us and almost confound us, quicken in us, we beseech Thee, every noble impulse and dedicate to Thy glory and for human good our best endeavors; transform every task into a throne of service, and sanctify this new week of labor in the ministry of public affairs with the benediction of Thy approval. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2230) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams, and it was signed by the Vice President.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in lieu of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has tendered his resignation as a member of the Board.

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 44, extending the authority for the investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs, the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] as a member of that committee.

MEMBER OF FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints J. Mark Trice, Secretary of the Senate, as a member of the Federal Records Council, vice Leslie L. Biffle.

CORRECTION OF COMMITTEE HEARING TRANSCRIPT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a correction be made about two-thirds of the way down page 40 of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Where the transcript of the hearings indicates that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] made a certain statement, the name of the speaker should have been printed as "Senator PAYNE."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have received a letter from the American Council on Human Rights which I should like to read, because that organization likewise desires that a correction be made. The letter reads as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1953.

Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The printed record of the hearings on the nomination of Albert B. Cole contains an error which I herewith call to your attention.

On page 34 at the beginning of my testimony the record states, "We are not here approving him, * * *." I really said, "We are not here opposing him, * * *."

Will you kindly file this letter with the official record in the event any question arises?

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
ELMER W. HENDERSON, *Director.*

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD, and the correction made in the report of the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the correction will be made.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF POTENTIAL BRAZIEL DAM AND RESERVOIR, NEBR.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Interior on a plan for the construction of the potential Braziel Dam and Reservoir, Nebr.—supplemental works for the Fort Laramie division, North Platte project, Wyoming-Nebraska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Chie-Yuan Chen from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1952, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of her immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 15th semiannual report of that bank for the period July–December 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting proposed amendments to the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIFESAVING APPLIANCES FOR CERTAIN MERCHANT VESSELS

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, two copies of part II of the daily issue of the Federal Register dated October 18, 1952, relating to the revision of the rules and regulations governing lifesaving appliances for merchant vessels operating on the oceans, Great Lakes, and bays, sounds, and lakes other than the Great Lakes, as well as for foreign vessels carrying passengers from the United States (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Defense Mobilization, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 601

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to the enactment of Federal laws to insure equal opportunity for employment, security of persons, full and equal participation in the Nation's political life and strengthening of the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights

"Whereas the Democratic Party in its platform, adopted July 24, 1952, promised to continue efforts to eradicate discrimination through Federal as well as State and local action, advocating Federal laws to insure 'equal opportunity for employment,' 'security of persons,' 'full and equal participation in the Nation's political life,' and strengthening of 'the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights'; and

"Whereas the Republican platform, adopted July 10, 1952, declared that while 'primary responsibility' lies with the States, 'the Federal Government should take supplemental action * * * to oppose discrimination against race, religion, or national origin'; and

"Whereas it is evident that neither party should be allowed to forget the importance of its stand on civil rights made at a time when each was endeavoring to obtain the support of the American voter, since both parties have promised to make advances in this vital sphere of domestic action, which has such an important impact on our foreign relations; and

"Whereas it is imperative that pressures never be relaxed to secure these rights of which the Federal Constitution that gave birth to our Nation speaks so movingly; and

"Whereas, although much progress has been made, it is also obvious that much remains to be accomplished; and

"Whereas a group of distinguished Senators headed by Mr. HUMPHREY and including Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE, have caused to be introduced in the Senate of the United States seven bills and a concurrent resolution dealing with various aspects of the civil-rights questions, based upon the famous 1947 report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, which report still stands as the yardstick for legislation on the subject; and

"Whereas these bills according to the statement accompanying them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contain proposals to make lynching a Federal crime, to provide penalties for discrimination in interstate transportation, outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting, to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights, to protect the right to political participation, to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery and involuntary servitude, to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes, and to establish a joint congressional committee on civil rights: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Rhode Island General Assembly, being in full accord with the broad program for civil rights that is the objective of Senate 462, Senate 463, Senate 464, Senate 465, Senate 466, Senate 467, and Senate 468, now pending in Congress and realizing that this program is fully consistent with the traditions of our democracy, respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact said proposed bills; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit duly

certified copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of each body in Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress with special request to the Rhode Island Members that each should work for the passage of the aforementioned bills."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, to eliminate the tax on admissions to grandstands, concessions, and amusements operated by county fairs

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas there are in operation in the United States numerous county fairs, which are essential to community life, particularly beneficial and educational to those engaged in agriculture, and have become a tradition in the life and development of agricultural communities; and

"Whereas such county fairs are so operated and conducted that no part of the net earnings inure to the benefit of any stockholders or members of the associations conducting the same, and proceeds from admissions, or other income of such fairs, are used exclusively for the improvement, maintenance, and operation of such fairs, and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, have been interpreted as providing for the imposition and collection of a tax on all admissions to grandstands, concessions, and amusements used or conducted by county fairs where a charge for admission is made; and

"Whereas, such tax is an additional item of expense to be borne by such county fairs, which seriously affects not only the continuance of such fairs in some instances, but also the ability to improve and maintain such fairs in the manner demanded by the public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the present Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, by exempting from admission taxes the admissions to grandstands, concessions, and other amusements used or conducted by county fairs; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to United States Senators KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE and to Members of Congress HAROLD O. LOVRE and E. Y. BERRY, and to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of Senate.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution N

"Concurrent resolution urging appointment of Hon. Elmer W. Cart as a member of Interstate Commerce Commission

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas it appearing that there are two appointments to be made by the President of the United States to the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

"Whereas it appearing that the Honorable Elmer W. Cart, president of the North Dakota Public Service Commission, is being considered for such appointment; and

"Whereas the said Elmer W. Cart is a North Dakota farm owner, and is a past member of the North Dakota House of Representatives; whereas, he has had over 10 years' experience as a public-service commissioner of this State, over 4 years of experience as a practitioner before the Interstate Commerce Commission in matters involving rates and services of transportation agencies; whereas, he is a member of the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners, a member of the executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, and president of the Midwest Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, he is deemed eminently qualified for appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate of this 33d legislative assembly (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to appoint Hon. Elmer W. Cart as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that the Senate confirm said appointment when and if made; be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to secure said appointment and confirmation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota, and the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 7

"Memorial relating to the Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags was imposed during World War II to restrict consumer purchases and to keep basic raw materials, then in short supply, primarily available for war use.

"Neither reason for continuing this tax exists any longer. None of the materials used in the manufacture of handbags is in short supply.

"Consumer resistance to the tax has resulted in unemployment and business failures of manufacturers and retailers of handbags.

"The tax on handbags is economically and socially unjustifiable. It is a tax on a commodity that is definitely a necessity. It is an inequitable and discriminatory tax in that it falls on women only who pay the tax.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress repeal the excise tax on ladies' handbags."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the Federal Government presently derives over $2 billion annually from automotive excise taxes of which about $800 million is from fuel tax, originally imposed as emergency taxes during the depression period, increasing during World War II and increased again in 1951; and

"Whereas the imposition of these Federal taxes is an infringement on the tax source originally reserved to the States for the development of their highways and is counter to the expressed policy of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the critical inadequacy of important segments of our highways has created a virtual crisis for highway transportation which is as critical as any emergency facing our country today; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho is in need of additional revenues for the construction and maintenance of its highways, but is experiencing extreme difficulty in its efforts to obtain additional revenue needed for this purpose because of the magnitude of the existing overall tax burden now imposed upon the motor-using public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 32d legislative assembly of the State of Idaho most urgently pray that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor fuel taxation and as soon as possible repeal all of the Federal automotive excise taxes; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

"This joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February 1953.

"R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"This joint memorial passed the senate on the 26th day of February 1953.

"EDSON H. DEAL,
"President of the Senate.

"I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial 4 originated in the house of representatives during the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"PAT WELKER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the United States has a sacred trust to defend liberty wherever it can in the world, and, even more important, to preserve and protect it in the United States; and

"Whereas preservation of civil rights under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is of paramount importance; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the terms of any treaty between the United States and any foreign nation shall be the supreme law of the land; and

"Whereas the United States has become involved in many and complex treaties, compacts, and international agreements which could threaten our civil rights and the freedom and liberty guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 32d session of the Legislature in the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we hereby urge upon the Congress of the United States to pass House Joint Resolution 57, introduced in the United States House of Representatives in the 83d Congress, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. Treaties made under the authority of the United States and international agreements entered into by the President or by any other officer or agency of the United States shall be void to the extent that they abridge, abrogate, nullify, subordinate, or interfere with any and all of the rights and freedoms guaranteed to citizens of the United States by the Constitution of the United States.

"'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission'; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"This joint memorial passed the house on the 14th day of February 1953.

"R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"This joint memorial passed the senate on the 23d day of February 1953.

"EDSON H. DEAL,
"President of the Senate.

"I hereby certify that the within House Joint Memorial 2 originated in the house of representatives during the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"PAT WELKER,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress to admit Hawaii as a State

"Whereas the 83d Congress of the United States of America has before it for consideration legislation to enable Hawaii to form a state government and to enter the Union as a new State; and

"Whereas such legislation is the culmination of decades of application by the people of Hawaii for admission as a State, and of increasing progress in achieving this goal; and

"Whereas both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress have separately and jointly held exhaustive hearings on the question of statehood for Hawaii, resulting in favorable reports in every instance; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives passed legislation to make Hawaii a State during the 80th Congress, and again during the 81st Congress, and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported such legislation favorably to the floor of the Senate during the 81st Congress and during the 82d Congress; and

"Whereas both the Republican and Democratic national platforms of 1952 unequivocally supported statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower has stated and reiterated his approval of immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has been an organized territory of the United States of America for more than half a century, and the people of Hawaii are entitled to a decision by the Congress as to their aspirations for statehood :Now, therefore, be it

"Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and petitioned to give immediate consideration to the legislation now pending in the said Congress to enable Hawaii to become a State and to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State without further delay.

"SEC. 2. This legislature does hereby reaffirm, reassert, and restate the desire and demand of the people of the Territory of Hawaii for admission to the Union as a State.

"SEC. 3. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the said Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said House of Representatives, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 6th day of March A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, expressing its recognition and appreciation of the assumption of the powers of Government by the new national administration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR) on March 6, 1953, p. 1668, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Boston, Mass., relating to the granting of citizenship rights to all aliens who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the American Academy of General Practice, Tarrant County Chapter, and the Brazoria County Medical Society, of Alvin, both of the State of Texas, protesting against any extension of the social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the 1952 convention of Tau Beta Pi Association, at Norman, Okla., favoring the proposal that all graduate engineers entering the Armed Forces be employed in a professional engineering capacity commensurate with their training and experience; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution K

"Resolution protesting passage of United States Senate bill 281

"Whereas S. 281 of the 83d Congress introduced January 9, 1953, appears to discriminate against the best interests of the people of North Dakota; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Public Service Commission has previously opposed similar legislation; and

"Whereas the Governor of the State of North Dakota is also opposed to such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein) do hereby protest the passage of United States Senate bill 281, and request the Secretary of the Senate to send a copy of this resolution to the Members of the Senate and House in Washington, D. C.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 8

"Resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to allow shooting hours of one-half hour before sunrise to sunset for migratory waterfowl

"Whereas the State of North Dakota is one of the few States that raises more ducks within its borders than are shot in the State during the hunting season; and

"Whereas migratory waterfowl have been causing excessive damage to the farmers of the State of North Dakota through the destruction of grain after it has been swathed or shocked; and

"Whereas the early onset of cold weather in this State and the resulting southern migration of migratory waterfowl has the practical effect of preventing hunting after the 1st of November, and therefore the hunters of the State of North Dakota do not benefit from the length of the hunting season; and

"Whereas daily bag limits will prevent an undue harvest of migratory waterfowl regardless of the shooting hours set by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is hereby requested to set the daily shooting hours for migratory waterfowl from one-half hour before sunrise to sunset; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and to North Dakota Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG and Representatives USHER L. BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution P

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to eliminate all motor vehicle fuel tax, leaving such field of taxation exclusively for the State, and bringing to an end the matching of Federal funds for highway purposes

"Whereas the Federal Government has for some years last past taxed motor fuel on the theory that the money so raised would be used to match State funds for highway construction, reconstruction and development in the several States; and

"Whereas the several States have taxed motor vehicle fuel for the same purpose, the Federal Government however requiring that all moneys raised thereby in the State should be appropriated and used solely for construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of public highways and payment for the obligations incurred in the construc-

tion, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of public highways; and

"Whereas approximately two-thirds of the moneys raised by the Federal Government in the taxation of motor vehicle fuel has been diverted for other than highway purposes; and

"Whereas the combined Federal and State tax on motor vehicle fuels has reached the point where such fuels cannot stand any more tax burden; and

"Whereas the repeal of all Federal motor vehicle taxes would permit and justify the State in increasing the motor vehicle fuel tax in the amount thus eliminated in Federal taxation, leaving them in a position to spend all motor fuel taxes for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of public highways: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota goes on record as favoring the elimination of all Federal motor vehicle fuel taxes; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this concurrent resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota, to the United States Commissioner of Public Roads, and to the Secretary of the Senate, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of all other States where the legislative assembly is now in session.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of Senate."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution relative to acts of persecution reported to be committed against the members of religious faiths and their institutions in Russia and its satellite countries

"Whereas it is reliably reported that certain inhabitants of Russia and its satellite countries are being persecuted on account of their religious faith and nationality to an extent abhorrent to modern civilized nations; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts affirms its conviction and belief that freedom and equality of mankind, regardless of race, creed, or color, is indispensable to the maintenance of any modern civilization and views with alarm any violation of these sacred principles; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Members thereof representing this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 25, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*

"A true copy.
"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas an excise tax on gasoline, which form of taxation is the rightful prerogative of the several States, is presently being levied by both the United States of America and the several States; and

"Whereas from time to time the United States has changed its rate of taxation on this commodity which action makes it increasingly difficult for the respective States to develop a comprehensive tax program to provide revenues for the improvement and maintenance of their highways: Therefore be it

"Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will—

"(1) Return to each State without restriction all Federal taxes on gasoline collected therein until such time as the individual State is able to enact legislation as may be necessary to permit it to collect such tax;

"(2) Eliminate the tax on gasoline now collected by the United States as soon as the individual States have enacted legislation as may be necessary to permit the State to collect the tax;

"(3) Eliminate Federal aid for highways except in those States where the revenues produced by a tax of 2 cents per gallon of gasoline is less than present Federal aid allocations to such States;

"(4) Change the present functions of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads so that it would become a consultive and advisory engineering agency which would collect, correlate, and disseminate information relative to the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of highways and bridges and the materials used therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be directed to forward copies of this resolution upon its passage to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Chief Clerk of United States House of Representatives, to all Members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, to the Governors of all other States, and to the presiding officers of the legislative bodies of all other States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend proposed tariffs on agricultural lime

"Whereas farmers and all agricultural agencies are actively participating in a long-range farm program for the betterment of the country, of agriculture, and farm people throughout the States; and

"Whereas the use of agricultural lime as a soil conditioner is an important step in the long-range program; and

"Whereas both State and Federal agencies have accelerated the liming program in South Carolina; and

"Whereas, with the accelerated program, South Carolina is using only one-fifth of the tonnage of agricultural lime estimated as annual needs; and

"Whereas producers of ground limestone, marl, etc., known as agricultural lime, state that car shortages and rate increases previously granted carriers have deterred farmers from purchasing lime needs; and

"Whereas present carrier rates are not conducive to the liming program; and

"Whereas unless said program is accelerated, producers in South Carolina declare they will be forced to discontinue mining; and

"Whereas crushed rock, road aggregate, crushed limestone, agricultural limestone, marl, etc., are loaded and unloaded under practically same transportation conditions; and

"Whereas the proposed tariff in SFTB Tariff No. 388H is discriminatory against agricultural lime; and

"Whereas the Commission of Agriculture for South Carolina on December 22, 1952, did file a protest and request suspension; and

"Whereas ICC has ordered I. and S. Docket 6067 to suspend Agent Spaninger's ground limestone tariff ICC 1315 and supplements and unless otherwise ordered to be deferred to and including August 15, 1953; and

"Whereas statement of pleadings must be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in March 1953: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Interstate Commerce Commission be informed that the General Assembly of South Carolina, on behalf of both the State's limestone producers and the soil-reclamation program, protests the discrimination against agricultural lime in the tariff proposals in Agent Spaninger's ground limestone tariff ICC 1315; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the director of agricultural research at Clemson College, the South Carolina Public Service Commission, and the commissioner of agriculture as a request to present such pleadings to the ICC on I. and S. Docket 6067 so as to protect the interest of the limestone producers and farmers in South Carolina; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the two United States Senators and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina."

POWER OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO DISCONTINUE CERTAIN RAILROAD SERVICES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present a certified copy of Senate Resolution 103, adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina, session of 1953, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and then referred to the proper committee for consideration.

The resolution expresses opposition to Senate bill 281, to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce, which is now pending before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,

and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 103

Joint resolution requesting the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States to vote against Senate bill 281, entitled "A bill to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce"

Whereas it is the sense of the General Assembly of North Carolina that the passage of Senate bill 281 will take from the North Carolina Utilities Commission and from the regulatory commission of other States the right to regulate railroad services in intrastate commerce, and will give additional powers to a Federal agency over matters which are purely local being intrastate in character, and therefore unrelated to interstate commerce; and

Whereas the passage of such a bill would impose upon the Interstate Commerce Commission additional work which is now being performed by State regulatory bodies in an efficient, satisfactory manner, and with a knowledge of local conditions that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have and cannot readily obtain: Be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina be and they are hereby memorialized and requested to use their influence against the passage of that bill now pending in the United States Congress known as Senate bill 281, relating to further powers of Interstate Commerce Commission over intrastate commerce.

SEC. 2. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Governor of North Carolina to each Senator and Representative from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 3d day of March 1953.

LUTHER H. HODGES,
President of the Senate.
E. T. BOST, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SUBMERGED OIL LANDS—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Tennessee House of Representatives has adopted a resolution urging Congress not to give away the Nation's resources in the submerged oil lands.

The resolution, adopted by voice vote after an attempt had been made to table it, memorializes Congress to keep these revenues intact for the benefit of education in all the States.

The tabling motion was overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of 70 to 15.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 24

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has judicially determined that the oil off the coast of the coastal States belongs to all the States; and

Whereas there is a plan whereby a part of the revenues derived by the United States Government from such oil would be distributed to each of the several States for educational purposes; and

Whereas there is now pending before Congress proposed legislation which would give such oil to those States adjacent to the coastal area, and thus deprive most of the other States, of which Tennessee is one, of any benefit from the production of such oil, and this deprives the school children of their birthright: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That any such legislation is detrimental to the school children of Tennessee, and should be defeated; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to each Member of the Tennessee delegation in Congress.

GRADUATED TOBACCO TAX—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, LEXINGTON, KY., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the National Affairs Committee of the Lexington (Ky.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to a graduated tobacco tax.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are before the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives, two bills, H. R. 1221 and H. R. 1417, which propose a graduated tobacco tax on cigarettes that would replace the present method of uniform taxes on all cigarettes; and

Whereas the tobacco farmers of Kentucky have large investments in land and equipment and have spent millions of dollars to find better methods for growing better tobacco; and

Whereas the Federal tobacco taxes should be designed to deal fairly with all manufacturers of cigarettes, and tobacco growers. A graduated tobacco tax would not do this. Instead, it would open the way for the collapse of the top quality tobacco markets, because it would put high-grade tobacco growers in the position of competing with the growers of low-grade tobacco in the fringe areas of the tobacco-growing States of the Nation; and

Whereas the high-grade-tobacco growers would be thrown into a state of complete depression, as they were in the 1930's when such a bill was passed and experimented with; and

Whereas such a tax would ruin the economy of the States that depend upon quality tobacco for their major farm income, and since there is no valid reason at this time to create an economic crisis in America's tobacco regions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the National Affairs Commitee of the Lexington (Ky.) Chamber of Commerce, with the interest of tobacco growers of Kentucky in mind, oppose any type of a graduated tobacco tax; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the delegation from Kentucky, Senator ROBERT TAFT, and to all farm organizations and business affected by such a tax.

Submitted and adopted at a meeting held in Lexington, Ky., this 23d day of February 1953.

Arch Mainous, J. A. Fraser, Burton Millward, Malcolm Mason, Ray Wlach, Joseph Mainous, C. W. Gaidry, O. F. Cooke, D. C. Carpenter, Owen Baugh.

DIVISION OF DAIRY HERD IMPROVEMENT INVESTIGATIONS—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS AYRSHIRE BREEDERS ASSOCIATION, INC., MANHATTAN, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kansas Ayrshire Breeders Association, Inc., at their annual meeting in Manhattan, Kans., February 3, relative to the Division of Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Kansas Ayrshire Breeders' Association feels that any curtailment of the program of the Division of Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations, Bureau of Dairy Industry, is harmful to the entire dairy industry; and

Whereas prior reductions in funds have seriously affected the work of the DHIA, we urgently recommend that the Director of the Budget Bureau be supported in his approval of a DHIA budget of $421,300 for this next fiscal year.

Whereas the dairy industry represents the largest single phase of the Nation's agriculture and its well-being affects the entire consuming public, we urge the passage of an adequate budget to insure that the tremendous investment the dairymen are making monthly in the DHIA program will result in improved efficiency of the dairy industry for the welfare of all the public.

PROTEST AGAINST TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Bishop Mark I. Lipa, spiritual head of the Albanian-American Orthodox Episcopacy, of Boston, Mass., and a resolution adopted by American citizens of Albanian descent of the cities of Boston, Quincy, Natick, Southbridge, and Worcester, Mass., relating to Senate Resolution 84, remonstrating against the treatment of minority groups by Russia and her satellites.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the recent adoption of Senate Resolution 84, protesting against the persecution of minority peoples throughout the world,

has given hope to free people everywhere, among them the sorely oppressed Albanian people.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as cosponsor with my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in presenting the letter and resolution for reference and printing in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]? The Chair hears none.

The letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *March 3, 1953.*

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: According to the provisions of Senate Resolution 84, the Congress and the President of the United States have gone on the official record as being in protest against the persecution of all minority peoples throughout the world. This is a stirring action for the Senate and the President of the United States to take at this time. New hope has been given to oppressed peoples all over the world. As the spiritual leader of the Albanian-American Orthodox Episcopacy, I would like to congratulate you for your efforts and sympathies for victimized peoples everywhere.

Albania is often forgotten when resolutions are presented to the Congress and when persecuted minorities are mentioned. At this time I would like to call to your attention a small part of the Communist record for brutality and persecution of the faith in Albania.

The Albanian Orthodox Church has been nationalized and is now under the direct control of the Kremlin. Priests have been tortured, beaten, and imprisoned by their brutal Communist masters. Catholics and members of the Moslem faith have also suffered grievously at the hands of their Russian masters. These facts are not generally known in the Western World as poor communications within Albania and the forcible maintenance of a rigid Iron Curtain around the country has kept press reports scanty.

I am certain that the Albanian Americans would be grateful if you mentioned my thoughts here in the Senate and included our resolution, as enclosed, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours in Christian friendship,
MARK I. LIPA.

Resolved, That the Albanian Americans of the orthodox faith who have relatives, friends, and loved ones behind the Iron Curtain in Albania do hereby congratulate the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the United States Senate for the passage of Senate Resolution 84. The Albanians have suffered grievously under communistic control since 1945 and religion in Albania has undergone particular suppression.

Resolved, that we, American citizens of Albanian descent, are greatly concerned over the systematic extirpation of the orthodox religion, the Moslem religion, and the Roman Catholic religion in Albania. The Communists have used the orthodox church in Albania as an instrument for mobilizing the orthodox population behind Russian policy. Archbishop Kristofor Kisi, the former head of the orthodox church in Albania is now in a Communist jail and a usurper rules in his place. The Communists have virtually wiped out the Catholic church in Albania. The Moslem church in Albania has been shamefully nationalized and is now headed by a Communist stooge, Hafiz Alija.

Resolved, that all Albanian Americans at this meeting and throughout the world who sincerely believe in the principles of the fatherhood of God, do hereby deplore the conspirators in Albania, and the handful of Albanian Americans in this country who follow the dictates of the Communist masters of Albania. The Albanian Americans believe implicitly in the principles of freedom, and religious faith for all men. They deplore the long range aim of Stalinism to extirpate religion. The Albanian Americans hope that Senate Resolution 84, will focus world wide attention upon this antireligious system of Stalinism which perverts mens' souls, robs man of his conscience and enslaves peoples everywhere.

DISTRIBUTION OF DRY GOODS—RESOLUTION OF THE WHOLESALE DRY GOODS INSTITUTE, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, Inc., of New York, N. Y., concerning the work of the Senate and House Select Small Business Committees.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute is the most representative body in wholesale distribution of dry goods; and

Whereas it is instrumental in supplying merchandise to tens of thousands of independent dry goods, department, limited price variety, and general stores throughout the United States; and

Whereas these independent merchants provide an essential link in the chain of distribution between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer in supplying them with many of the basic necessities of life; and

Whereas they personify, in their endeavors, the American way of life which adheres to the principle of free enterprise; and

Whereas we recognize that the perpetuation of our capitalistic system can only be maintained through the sympathetic cooperation of our representatives in Congress; and

Whereas we, the members of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, desire to recognize the excellent work which is being done by the Senate and House Committees on Small Business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, in convention assembled, does hereby express its thanks and grateful appreciation to the aforesaid committees, and to each of their members for their untiring efforts in behalf of small-business enterprises, and particularly of independent merchants throughout the land; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the aforesaid committees.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1230. A bill to provide for the strengthening of the Republic of Korea as an ally against aggression and for the reconstruction of that country from the ravages of war in resisting aggression; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1231. A bill for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son;

S. 1232. A bill to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

S. 1233. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," by removing certain limitations on the nature of personal injury and death claims;

S. 1234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention;

S. 1235. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the provisions of the act of October 31, 1942, as extended, relating to the adjustment of royalties, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter;

S. 1236. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter;

S. 1237. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

S. 1238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 794, 2151, 2153, 2154, and 2388 as extended to continue in effect the provisions thereof;

S. 1239. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

S. 1240. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

S. 1241. A bill to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone; and

S. 1242. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1243. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1244. A bill relating to the renewal of contracts for the carrying of mail on star routes; and

S. 1245. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of agriculture and the farmers of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1246. A bill for the relief of Arshag Haigan Zeiveian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of Doreen McIntyre, Anne McIntyre, David McIntyre and Robert McIntyre; and

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Donald McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1249. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1250. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1251. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relating to veterans' exemptions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. MOUSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1252. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in tidelands and in lands beneath navigable inland waters, and to the recognition of equities in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1253. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1254. A bill to establish effective means to determine Communist domination in unions and to eliminate Communists from positions of influence and control in labor unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1255. A bill to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1169), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 672 (a)), and secs. 5 and 302 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1935 and 1992), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, secs., 672 (a) and 1132); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1256. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1257. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1258. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Kondylis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Else Pope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1261. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SURPLUS FOOD AND CLOTHING FOR KOREA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to provide surplus food and clothing for Korea. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement, and read a one-page letter which I have addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1230) to provide for the strengthening of the Republic of Korea as an ally against aggression and for the reconstruction of that country from the ravages of war in resisting aggression, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have today written a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1953.

The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached you will find a copy of an informal draft of a bill which I propose to introduce in the Senate today which would authorize you to sell the Republic of Korea food and clothing commodities and to receive in payment legal currency of the Republic of Korea. The exact form and details are subject to revision, of course, but I hope that the general proposition will appeal to you and may have your support.

You will note that the bill also directs the Treasury to credit such currency against debentures of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to place it in a Korean Reconstruction Fund and creates a Joint Committee of the Congress to investigate conditions in Korea and recommend a program of reconstruction through the use of the fund so created.

On February 26, the Associated Press reported Korean Defense Minister Shin Tae Young as saying: "The ROK soldier is getting only about one-third the calories he needs from rice and a few side dishes."

Last week, in the Senate Committee on Armed Services we heard Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet say that both the military and civilian populations of South Korea were living on a diet below that which we provide for our prisoners of war under the Geneva convention.

General Van Fleet also testified that fewer South Korean troops would go to the hospital, that more South Korean men could qualify for military service, that efficiency at the front would be improved if they had a better diet. He also said that many of the civilians are wearing the ragged remnants of the clothes they had on their backs when the invasion took place almost 3 years ago.

Eventually, the United States will rehabilitate South Korea. That would be in keeping with our traditions and the spirit of our people toward an ally to say nothing of the destruction occasioned by our own troop movements.

Why not help ourselves by helping the South Koreans now—using some of the fiber and food products which the Commodity Credit Corporation is buying—thereby translating these growing stocks into strength at the front and providing the local currency funds that can be used in Korean rehabilitation later on?

Using food to win the war and build the peace beats putting bluing on potatoes or burning wheat or killing pigs.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator, South Dakota.

I may say that this is in keeping with policies which the United States has followed in connection with the rehabilitation of other allies at present associated with us in war. Whenever foodstocks are approaching the point of deterioration, instead of keeping them on hand, it seems to me that if it is possible we should convert such stocks into food and distribute it to the South Korean soldiers at the front, so as to improve their condition and morale and help to provide more South Korean soldiers for the front. Likewise, the legal currency of Korea should be acquired so that it may be used for the reconstruction of Korea following the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, through the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire domestic supplies of wool, cotton, grains, dairy, poultry and meat products and to sell and deliver such commodities to the Republic of South Korea in an amount not exceeding $500 million under the authority of this act, and to accept legal currency of the Republic of Korea in payment therefor. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, insofar as practicable, utilize stocks of such commodities as may be acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary in carrying out other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive from the Secretary of Agriculture currency of the Republic of Korea acquired pursuant to the authority of section 1 of this act and to credit such receipts in payment for and retirement of debentures or other evidences of indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury and to deposit this currency in a special fund for Korean reconstruction and rehabilitation.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Joint Select Committee on Korean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation to consist of 5 members from the Senate of the United States to be named by the President of the Senate and 5 members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This committee shall investigate the economic and social conditions of South Korea growing out of the resistance of the Republic of Korea to aggression and shall report its findings to the Congress not later than Jan-

uary 15, 1954, together with its recommendations for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of South Korea through the use of the Korean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Fund provided by section 2 of this act. The expenses of such committee shall be provided from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives by appropriate resolution.

DISPOSITION OF MONEYS RECEIVED FROM NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to facilitate the development, management, and use of public recreation areas and facilities, and for the improvement of wildlife habitat in the national forests, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining the bill, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1261) relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests, introduced by Mr. Anderson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the 14th paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by section 212 of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 16, sec. 501) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Ten percent of all moneys received from the national forests during each fiscal year, but not to exceed $5,500,000 in any year, shall be available at the end thereof to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the development, maintenance, and operation within the national forests of facilities and areas for public use; to provide for adequate safety, sanitation and health in connection with uses of the national forests; and to improve and maintain wildlife habitat on the national forests: *Provided*, That no part of such moneys shall be used for the acquisition of land; *and provided further*, That the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress annually, showing the purpose for which the funds are expended."

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

There are at present 4,700 public-recreation areas in the national forests on which the Forest Service has constructed and is maintaining to the extent possible the camp and picnic grounds and winter sports areas, and other improvements for recreational purposes. The increased use of these areas, as shown by the above table, has resulted in overcrowding on weekends and holidays, and consequently the overtaxing of sanitary and water facilities. It is my understanding that the Public Health Service has inspected a number of these areas and recommends improvements in the sanitation facilities and water systems. Most of these facilities and improvements were built by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's. Due mostly to lack of funds for maintenance and upkeep, these facilities, especially sanitary facilities, have deteriorated and require major repairs or replacements. This, together with increasing population and an increase in the number of people visiting the national forests has brought about a critical need for additional facilities, including safe water and sanitary facilities and proper fire protection.

A survey has recently been completed by the Forest Service to determine the amount of funds needed to provide adequate sanitation and care at the 4,700 existing forest recreational areas, the additional capital investment needed to provide for sanitary improvements and other necessary facilities required to accommodate the present recreational use on the national forests in a safe and satisfactory manner, and funds needed annually to operate and maintain all recreational areas after rehabilitation of the existing areas has been completed and additional capital investments made for expansion. A summary of the results of this survey follows:

The recreational use of the national forests has long been recognized as one of the major resources of the forest. The use of the national forest for recreation is increasing year by year, creating the need for additional care, maintenance, and improvement of the recreation areas. The increase of funds allocated by Congress for the care and improvement of these areas has not been in proportion to the increase in their use and need. The table below was compiled by the Forest Service and gives a list of the funds available by year from 1948 to date for recreation and wildlife work, together with the total number of visits per year to these recreation areas.

Funds available for recreation and wildlife work—Funds available for sanitation and care of public-use areas and for wildlife management

Fiscal year:

1948	$1,190,601
1949	1,355,703
1950	1,306,880
1951	1,314,775
1952	1,357,615
1953	1,358,315

Data on sanitation, cleanup, maintenance of improvements, and use at public use areas

	Funds available			Calendar year	Total recreation visits (thousands)
	Sanitation and cleanup	Maintenance of improvements	Total		
1948	$543,986	$515,000	$1,058,986	1948	24,000
1949	681,753	531,000	1,212,753	1949	26,000
1950	630,240	554,000	1,174,240	1950	27,000
1951	627,730	551,000	1,178,730	1951	30,000
1952	652,900	570,000	1,222,900	1952	[1] 31,000
1953	646,100	570,000	1,216,100	------	--------

[1] Estimate.

1. Operation and maintenance of existing recreation facilities:
   (a) Funds needed annually for sanitation, cleanup, garbage disposal, and supervision at the 4,700 existing recreation areas ---------- $1,071,000
   (b) Funds needed annually for maintenance of improvements and facilities at the 4,700 existing recreation areas ---------- 1,197,000

   Total annual needs for the 4,700 existing recreation areas ---------- 2,268,000

2. Additional capital investments needed for recreation improvements:
   (a) Capital investment needed to provide satisfactory facilities for sanitation and public safety and to rehabilitate all essential existing public use areas and facilities in good condition ---------- $7,169,000
   (b) Capital investment needed to expand the capacity of existing areas and to construct new areas necessary to accommodate present use in a safe and satisfactory manner ---- 17,135,000

   Total capital investment ---------- 24,304,000

3. Estimate of funds needed annually to operate and maintain all recreation areas after rehabilitation of existing areas has been completed and additional capital investments made for expansion ---------- 3,200,000

THE WILDLIFE HABITAT MANAGEMENT JOB ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS

In the field of wildlife management, seasons, bag limits, fish and game stocking programs, refuges, and related management tools are all important. However, these are of little value if the environment is unsatisfactory. All fish, game, and nongame animals have certain requirements in terms of food, water, and cover. Moreover these requirements are often different in summer and winter, or even at other seasons. Then, too, animals do best where preferred food, water, and cover are all within their daily travel range. Thus the Forest Service role in wildlife management is a most important one because this Bureau is responsible for the management of large areas of public land. How this land and its cover of trees, shrubs, and grass is managed determines to a large degree how productive the land and waters will be of desirable forms of wildlife.

In the national-forest regions men with specialized training in wildlife management are responsible for leadership in habitat management and cooperative wildlife programs. At present, however, there are only 7 of these technicians for the 10 national-forest regions in the United States and Alaska. As an example of the size of the task involved 1 technician handles the habitat and cooperative program involving 19 million acres of national-forest lands in 11 States.

The habitat management work on the national forests can be roughly placed in two categories: (1) That which is accomplished indirectly through good management of all resources and uses—timber, forage, water, recreation, and fire; and (2) that which can be done directly to develop food, water, or cover.

To meet these basic wildlife management responsibilities would require $500,000 annually. The expenditure during the past fiscal year was $134,000.

At the present time the Forest Service lacks funds to engage in the direct form of habitat management. This is unfortunate as there are many projects which would appear to be in the public interest.

The bill which I have introduced today will provide the necessary funds to rehabilitate and maintain present facilities and allow for the gradual expansion and further improvement of recreation areas that is needed in order to properly accommodate the public and protect their health and safety.

The bill provides that no part of the money can be spent for land purchase, and further that a report shall be made to the Congress each year, showing the purposes for which the funds are expended.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me on the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

For 160 years, the United States has been hampered by an obstacle in the path of democratic selection of the Chief Executives. The system has persisted in spite of oft repeated efforts to substitute more rational and democratic methods. Now, in a time when democracy is enduring its severest trial before the peoples of the world, the United States must perform the duties which it has assumed, and lead the free nations of the world in demonstrating that democracy is the best way.

The fundamental principle on which any democracy is founded is that the people governed shall have a voice, a controlling voice in their government. This means that they shall elect their public servants by popular vote, so that the servants are responsible to the people in the most direct way possible. It is also inherent in any democracy that all citizens shall have an equal voice in choosing their public servants. It is inconsistent with our principles that the votes of some of our citizens are worth twice, five times, or ten times as much as others, merely due to their geographic distribution. It is even more inconsistent that in every presidential election, millions of votes are not counted at all. These inconsistencies are difficult to justify in the eyes of the world. The United States should meet the challenge, and reform its outmoded election system in order that it may better reflect the will of the people.

The electoral college system has many defects. Not only is it possible for a man to be elected President of the United States even though more Americans may have voted for his opponent, but this has happened three times in the short history of our country. In 1824, Andrew Jackson polled 50,000 votes more than his nearest rival, John Quincy Adams, but lacked a majority due to the votes received by two other candidates. The election was thrown to the House of Representatives under the provisions of the Constitution. There, through pressure and influence, Adams was chosen to be President.

Again in 1876, Samuel J. Tilden received almost 265,000 votes more than Rutherford B. Hayes. Hayes won the election, however, through a vote in the Electoral Commission set up to decide the contest.

In 1888, Grover Cleveland received 375,000 votes more than Benjamin Harrison but lost to Harrison through the peculiar distribution of votes in the electoral college.

These three men, Adams, Hayes, and Harrison, were all defeated in the popular election, but nevertheless became President. More voters preferred another candidate in each instance, but due to our election arrangement, the also-ran became the Chief Executive. How can we justly say we believe in majority rule unless we correct the situation which allows this possibility.

There are three factors which contribute to the possibility of a President being chosen without receiving more votes than any other candidate. The first of these factors is that all the electoral votes of a State are cast for the candidate that polls the greatest number of votes in the State. Thus, it make no difference in the result of an election whether a candidate wins a State by a narrow margin or by a sweeping majority. The votes cast for the losing candidates in a State might just as well not have been cast at all. It is as if all the voters who did not vote for the winning candidate had been disfranchised. They might just as well have stayed home. This may well be the cause of much apathy at election time in this country, particularly in the States which consistently vote one ticket year after year. There are an estimated 37 million people in the United States qualified to vote who do not choose to exercise this fundamental prerogative.

There are further statistics to show the unfortunate effects of the "all-or-nothing" rule, not as spectacular as electing the wrong President, but important nonetheless because they show that the electoral vote does not reflect the will of the people. In 1884, Cleveland received 563,084 popular votes in the State of New York and all of its electoral votes. In the same election, Blaine received 562,001 popular votes, only 1,083 fewer than Cleveland, but got none of the State's electoral votes. The electoral vote cast by the State seemed to indicate that New York was 100 percent behind Cleveland when in actuality, the margin between his support and Blaine's amounted to less than a tenth of a percent of the total vote cast.

In 1932, Herbert Hoover had 15,800,000 popular votes and of these, 13,600,000 brought no electoral votes due to their distribution among the States. Of Mr. Hoover's nearly 16 million votes, only 2 million were reflected in the electoral vote. In 1924, John W. Davis polled 6 million votes which were worthless to him for they brought no electoral votes, while 2 million other popular votes brought him 136 electoral votes. These 2 million votes were infinitely more valuable to Davis than the votes of 6 million other people who happened to be living in the wrong States to make their votes effective.

The second factor which contributes to the possibility of an "also-ran" becoming President of the United States is the fact that under the present electoral college system, each State is given a bonus of two electoral votes over the votes it has due to its population. There are 96 of these bonus votes distributed among the 48 States, and they give an unfair advantage to the voters who reside in the smaller States.

In 1950, the census showed the United States population to be 150,697,361. Thirty-eight States contained 70,453,399 people; the remaining 10 States contained 80,243,962 or 9,790,563 more than the 38 smaller States. But the 10 States have 20 automatic electoral votes while the 38 have 76 automatic votes. The 10 large States have over 6 million more people but 56 fewer electoral votes. The voters in the large States are penalized in that their votes don't count as much as those from the smaller States due to the two-vote bonus.

The third factor that contributes to the possibility that a President may be elected without having polled the most votes is the fact that a State casts the same number of electoral votes regardless of the number of people who turn out to vote. In the extreme case, a thousand people in New York could cast 47 electoral votes so long as no one else in the State bothered to vote. We don't have to go to the extreme case, however, to find extraordinary situations which actually existed. In the 1952 election, 1 electoral vote in Mississippi represented less than 36,000 popular votes due to the small election day turnout, while in Minnesota 1 electoral vote represented more than 125,000 popular votes. The voter in Minnesota had less than one-third the importance in the final result as the voter in Mississippi. I am sure we all revere and respect the Mississippi voter, but there are few among us, I think, who will maintain that his judgment concerning who should be President is more than three times as astute as that of the Minnesota or Massachusetts voter.

The following table represents other instances of unequal representation which have actually occurred:

In 1912 Wilson received 1 elector per 14,500 votes; Taft received 1 elector per 435,000 votes.

In 1928 Hoover received 1 elector per 48,180 votes; Smith received 1 elector per 172,602 votes.

In 1932 Hoover received 1 elector per 267,149 votes; Roosevelt received 1 elector per 48,351 votes.

In 1948 Truman received 1 elector per 78,123 votes; Dewey received 1 elector per 113,990 votes.

In 1952 Stevenson received 1 elector per 306,646 votes; Eisenhower received 1 elector per 76,764 votes.

The best way to eliminate the possibility that a man will be elected President in spite of the will of the people is to conduct a general popular election for the position. This does away with all the factors which might contribute to the election of a man who has lost the general election. Under the constitutional amendment which I am introducing today, every voter casts one vote, a whole vote, which is just as good and just as important as the vote cast by any other voter in the country. This is the democratic way. This is what we are trying to convince the people of the world to do. This is, in reality, what is implied in the spirit of our Government. This is the final step in the constitutional evolution which began with the Declaration that all men are created equal, and continued with the assertion that no man or woman may be denied the right to vote for arbitrary reasons. Now we must make the suffrage an equal suffrage, and repudiate arbitrary and discriminatory geographical bases for denying or reducing the importance of the votes of some of our citizens.

The electoral college also permits the majority will within a State to be ignored. The best an individual member of the electoral college can do is perform a function which could more efficiently be performed without him. The worst he can do is to refuse to vote as instructed by the voters of his State and substitute his own will for theirs. In 1948, electors of four States repudiated the Democratic candidate and cast ballots for the States-rights candidate. One elector out of 11 from a fifth State, Tennessee, did the same in spite of an overwhelming victory of the Democratic candidate over the States-right candidate in that State. The electors are not legally bound to follow the dictates of their State's electorate, and are free to exercise their discretion as they see fit.

In 1796 three electors disregarded the mandate of the general election, with the result

that John Adams rather than Thomas Jefferson was elected.

A whole State's citizenry may be disfranchised by the action of a handful of men. The sooner this possibility is removed from our election procedures, the better for the American people.

From the voters' point of view, the electoral college only adds to the confusion of election day. The voter wants to vote for the President and Vice President, not for a list of electors whose names he doesn't recognize. Yet in 10 States, only the names of the electors appear on the ballot. In 16 other States, the ballot includes both the names of the candidates and of the electors.

Another reason for abolishing the electoral college is the possible confusion which would result if an elector is unable to carry out the function for which he was chosen. Suppose he dies, or fails to cast his vote on the proper day and in the proper way. Or suppose the Presidential candidate to whom he is pledged becomes ineligible and the elector is freed from his pledge. All of these circumstances have occurred in our history and all of them could have been avoided if the electoral college had been abolished.

Direct popular election of the President and Vice President are not new concepts in our political philosophy. The father of the Constitution, James Madison, strongly favored direct popular election. The man whose counsel and philosophy guided the creation of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin, also supported this form of election. Andrew Jackson, one of the great Presidents of our history who was more closely in touch with the will of the people than most, emphasized in his first message to Congress the need for direct popular election as a method of democratizing the election process. At best, the electoral college system is the result of a crude compromise, a matter of necessity in order to unite the States at the time of the Constitutional Convention. At worst, it is a device originally created to remove from the hands of the people the selection of the country's Chief Executive. Do we still believe that we must compromise on an issue so basic in a democracy? Do we still believe that the people are not to be trusted in choosing their President?

The answer to both of these questions is clear and it is "No." We have shown countless times that we recognize that the country is strong when the voice of the people is heard. We have removed restrictions on the suffrage three times by constitutional amendment in amendments 14, 15, and 19. In reality, these amendments did not extend the suffrage; they merely recognized contradictions of democracy in our country and removed the contradictions.

We must now continue in the pattern set by our enlightened predecessors, in the tradition of democracy. We must support a direct election of the President and Vice President, recognizing that the present system is defective in guaranteeing the democratic equality of all voters, and that this anachronism must be eliminated.

The process of election as it exists today, promotes an unusual and unfortunate emphasis in presidential campaigning. In the first place, most candidates concentrate on winning majorities in a few large States, realizing that even if these majorities are very slight, they will carry with them all of the electoral votes in the States. These large States contribute a disproportionate number of votes in the electoral college and for this reason the campaigns are disproportionately directed toward these State. The voters in the smaller States are neglected and must choose between the candidates on insufficient evidence. Proof of this campaign emphasis exists in the fact that 17 out of 27 major party candidates for the Presidency since 1900 came from Ohio or New York. In the past 50 years, we have had 3 Presidents from New York and 3 from Ohio. In the past 70 years, only twice has a President been elected without winning a majority in the State of New York.

I don't mean to detract from the caliber of the Presidents and candidates produced by New York and Ohio, and several of the other large States. However, I would venture to say that there have been other possible candidates from smaller States who weren't given the consideration that might have been due them because of their geographic position. On the other hand, citizens of the smaller States who are not the beneficiaries of vigorous campaigning are often apathetic about voting. We have a nonvoting population of 37 million, an extraordinarily large percentage for a free republic.

Another factor in the peculiar emphases of our campaigns is the unusual importance of minority groups in large doubtful States. Often, presidential candidates must give these groups far more consideration than is healthy in a democracy where the majority is supposed to rule. That minorities can exert an important influence is clearly shown in the election of 1948 when the Progressive Party polled enough votes to swing two important States to the Republican candidate. I use this example because it is one of the few cases where the effect of the vote of a political minority group can be accurately shown. It is more difficult to study the voting patterns of other minority groups because under the secret ballot these votes cannot be separated in the final election returns. However, there is no doubt that certain minority groups receive special treatment in presidential campaigns, and we can be sure that this is not without good reason.

A direct presidential election is needed, then, for many reasons, but all of the reasons are derived from the principle that all votes cast should have equal importance in deciding who is to be President. This principle is basic in our democracy as well as in any other democracy. It means not only that all the votes cast will have the same mathematical importance, but that all votes will be the end product of virtually the same opportunity of choice, as far as possible.

It is our duty to the world as well as to our own citizens to perfect our form of democracy until it is beyond the criticism of principle without execution. We must be the example to the free world not only in our words and ideas, but in our actions and our conduct. We must mean what we say when we dedicate ourselves to a government in which its strength, integrity, and sovereignty are those of its people, as expressed in free, untrammeled elections.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY IN TOTALITARIAN COUNTRIES

Mr. KENNEDY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") to be composed of four Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee—

(a) to make a full and complete investigation and study of the facts and circumstances surrounding atrocities and other crimes against humanity (1) which are alleged to have been committed since June 25, 1950, in the course of hostilities in Korea, and (2) which are alleged to have been committed by forces of totalitarian countries in the course of the efforts of such countries to dominate the free world; and

(b) to report, as soon as practicable during the present Congress to the Senate and the House of Representatives (or to the Secretary of the Senate and the clerk of the House of Representatives if the Congress is not in session) the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized (1) to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress, (2) to hold such hearings, and (3) to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpena may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

(b) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION PERMITTING COMPELLING OF TESTIMONY AND GRANTING IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on March 4, 1953, I announced, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, that there was to be a public hearing scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building on S. 565, permitting compelling of testimony and granting immunity from prosecution in connection therewith.

At this time I desire to announce and give notice that the public hearing so referred to has been cancelled without date.

The subcommittee consists of myself, as chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

Address delivered by Lt. Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, before the National Aviation Educational Council at Atlantic City, N. J., February 12, 1953.

By Mr. COOPER:

Address entitled "Lincoln's Path to Greatness," delivered by Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, at the Fayette Lincoln Day banquet, Lexington Ky., February 13, 1953.

By Mr. BYRD:

Statement entitled "Equality of Abstract Individual Rights Under the Constitution" prepared by Charles Hall Davis.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "Four Heroic Army Chaplains Honored," written by Benjamin Prager and published in the Army and Navy Legion of Valor magazine.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "Benson, Farmers Agree," published in the Idaho Daily Statesman of March 2, 1953.

By Mr. LANGER:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. Cora M. Hanssen, of Gebo, Wyo., relative to old age pensions and mineral rights.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Invitation to Anarchy," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of March 9, 1953.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Article entitled "Massachusetts Boy Wins Top Award in Science Search," published in the Washington Star of March 3, 1953, dealing with an award to E. Alan Phillips, of Lincoln, Mass., of the Westinghouse grand science scholarship.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Where Does Mr. Farmer Come In?" written by W. F. Schilling, and published in the Northfield (Minn.) Independent of March 5, 1953.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Editorial from St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 1, 1953, on the establishment of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic.

Editorial comment and newspaper articles relating to observance of 100th anniversary of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

By Mr. TAFT:

Article entitled "New Regime's Record Is One To Be Proud Of," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 7, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorial entitled "Graceful Exit," appearing in the Washington Evening Star of February 27, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

List of organizations represented at meeting on tariffs and trade in Washington, D. C., on March 5, 1953, and a statement of tariff and trade policy by nationwide industrial, agricultural, and labor groups.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Editorial from the Nashville Tennessean with reference to the position of that State on the question of oil from submerged lands.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Articles appearing in the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin on the subject of hydro development in Alaska.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Do Our Schools Fear Freedom?" appearing in the Minneapolis Star.

Article entitled "Let's Respect the Dissenting View," written by Paul G. Hoffman and published in the Minneapolis Star of January 23, 1953.

CATTLE AND BEEF PRICES—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR MURRAY AND THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 6 I wrote the new Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, asking him for the answers to a number of questions in which the farmers of Montana are urgently interested. The length and character of the reply I have received from the Secretary indicates that farmers will have to wait a considerable time for all the answers and that their Government has only vague steps in mind for them.

For example, the Secretary informs me that beef prices should become better because of his assistance in having price ceilings removed from cattle. It is difficult to understand how this assertion can be supported at a time when the price of cattle is well below the price ceiling.

One of the questions I addressed to the Secretary concerned his authority under existing law to support livestock prices.

In view of Friday's announcement that the price of beef has fallen to 89 percent of parity—as contrasted with 130 percent a year ago and 92 percent a month ago—it is particularly interesting to find that Secretary Benson admits that he does possess the power, under existing legislation, to support cattle prices.

He raises the question, however, as to what could be done with the beef that might have to be bought. A partial answer to his question is found, I believe, in the story in today's Washington Post about malnutrition in the South Korean Army. Let me quote from this story:

> The food crisis in the army of the Republic of Korea has grown so grave that Gen. Paik Sun Yup, its chief of staff, yesterday said he would ask the United Nations for help.

Why can we not work out a plan to ship beef to Korea?

Several of the questions I addressed to the Secretary concerned the availability of credit for cattlemen. The Secretary found little or nothing to be concerned about, but I am sure the farmers of Montana could tell him that credit available to them is not adequate to enable them to hold their cattle instead of sending them to market at signs of falling prices.

The Secretary concludes his reply by saying that no legislation is needed with respect to the type of loans the Department is now authorized to make. I think it is becoming more obvious—contrary to the Secretary's opinion—that the credit program of the Department of Agriculture should be enlarged. I am surprised and disappointed at the Secretary's attitude of standing pat in the present situation, and I believe that the United States Congress should examine thoroughly rural credit programs administered by the Department, with a view to expanding them.

Perhaps the legislation now on the books will be found to be adequate, but if so it is my opinion that loan authorizations will have to be increased materially if we are to supply our farmers with sufficient credit to enable them to get their work done and to market their products in an orderly way, instead of having to liquidate their holdings when credit becomes tight.

This can be done at no public cost, because the loan programs of the Department are on a sound basis and the repayment records are excellent. The Department should be authorized to loan all the money that is needed, based on a sound standard of security; and I can think of no better investment than an investment in a healthy agriculture economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the letter from Secretary Benson and his answers, and the story in today's Washington Post, entitled "South Korea To Ask U. N. Help in Food Crisis."

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 6 indicating that the drop in livestock prices has been of serious concern to cattlemen and requesting our views on six questions. Attached are answers to each of these questions. If you require any further information on this problem, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

ANSWER TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

Question 1: "Do you believe that the Government should take any action to deal with the problem of declining livestock prices?"

The Department already has taken a number of steps in connection with declining livestock prices. When we took office a little over 3 weeks ago, a drastic drop in cattle prices was in process. Within 7 days a statement was issued which reviewed the factors responsible for the overall decline in farm prices and pointed out that the Department did not expect any major changes in farm prices in the next several months, particularly in view of the continuing high level of consumer income. On the following day, January 29, a public announcement was made that the Department was doing everything possible to have price controls and compulsory grading of meat removed because these controls were contributing to the decline in cattle prices and their removal would strengthen and stabilize prices. This was followed on February 3 by a call to cattle producers to follow an orderly pattern of marketing and to processors and distributors to develop a greater demand for beef. This statement pointed out that while somewhat lower prices than in 1951 and 1952 were anticipated due to the unusual buildup in numbers, the recent breaks in cattle prices appeared to be temporary. A copy of that statement is enclosed.

It is too early to judge what effect the recent decontrol of cattle and meat prices, abandonment of compulsory meat grading, and orderly marketing suggested will have on cattle and meat prices. We anticipate that recent sharp price reductions in consumer prices will move beef more readily into consumption and stabilize prices.

Nevertheless, we are carefully watching the cattle price situation. Any subsequent action taken on cattle prices will be guided by advice obtained from the best men in the livestock and meat industries. Since

taking office we have followed a policy of consulting advisory groups in connection with our commodity programs so as to obtain the best judgment of farmers, farm organizations, and industries. One of these committees, the cotton committee, has already started its meetings and the special dairy committee will meet in Washington beginning on February 17.

Question 2: "Do you under existing legislation have any authority to support livestock prices? If so, specify."

Support of beef-cattle prices is not mandatory under the Agricultural Act of 1949, the authority under which our CCC price support programs are undertaken. Hence, any price-support program for beef cattle would have to be undertaken under the provisions relating to nonmandatory commodities contained in titles III and IV. These two titles authorize the Secretary to support the price of any nonmandatory commodity at a level not to exceed 90 percent of parity. However, in determining whether to undertake a support program and in deciding on the level of support, the Secretary is required to consider eight factors contained in section 401 (b).

There is considerable question as to whether a price-support program for beef cattle can be justified, after considering the eight factors as required by law. One factor that must be considered is the ability to dispose of stocks acquired. To support prices of beef cattle, we would have to buy beef carcasses or cuts. Beef is perishable and its storage under proper conditions is relatively expensive. If extensive purchases were undertaken, we would be faced with serious disposal problems. We probably would not be able to dispose of any large quantities without incurring tremendous losses. Outlets for which donations are authorized could absorb only limited quantities. As a result, in undertaking any such program we would be faced with a real possibility of spoilage and also great loss in money.

The Department has the authority to undertake surplus removal operations for beef cattle under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. That act authorizes the Secretary to take action to encourage exports, and to encourage domestic consumption of surplus commodities by diverting them from the normal channels of trade. The method usually used is to purchase commodities and then donate them to eligible outlets, such as the nonprofit school-lunch program, and charitable institutions. However, such purchases must be limited to the quantities for which outlets are available. Furthermore, purchases are not made at any specific support level as in price support, and cannot be made at price levels which reflect a price for the agricultural commodity in excess of 90 percent of parity. The latest report of parity prices indicated that cattle prices were 92 percent of parity on January 15, 1953. The quantity of beef that could be moved through available outlets under a section 32 program would be very small relative to the total supply. Hence, any surplus removal operation for beef probably would have little price effect on beef cattle, except perhaps from a psychological standpoint.

Question 3: "What is the outstanding amount of loans made to cattlemen for the purpose of helping them build their herds?"

We have no information as to the total outstanding amount of loans made to cattlemen for the purpose of helping them build their herds.

On the basis of estimates made by the Federal intermediate-credit banks and production-credit corporations, Farm Credit Administration institutions now are financing approximately $240 million of cattle loans, consisting of feed-lot loans of $65 million and range and breeder loans of $175 million. We have no way of determining how much of this amount represents loans made for the purpose of building herds. However, it is our opinion that most of this amount represents loans made to finance regular business operations of livestock growers.

The nature of the production and subsistence loans made by the Farmers Home Administration is such that it is not possible to determine the portions of the loans that are outstanding which were advanced for the purchase of cattle.

Under this program, we have encouraged and financed balanced farming operations with farmers obtaining supervised credit assistance. This has included the development and improvement of grasslands and acquiring beef cattle, dairy cattle, hogs, and other livestock enterprises. In some disaster areas, disaster loans have been made by the Farmers Home Administration to stockmen. Some of these loans included funds to replace cattle losses but not to build up herds.

Question 4: "Is it true that the banks are now calling in a large portion of these loans?"

We have no information concerning the extent to which commercial banks or other institutions not financing through Farm Credit Administration institutions may be calling in their cattle loans. Our information is that the institutions rediscounting with the Federal intermediate credit banks are not forcing liquidation of their cattle loans. Information which has come to us would indicate that commercial banks are becoming somewhat more selective in the extension of credit to farmers and stockmen generally.

Question 5: "Do the farm credit agencies of the Federal Government have sufficient powers and funds to assist the cattlemen and the banks in dealing with this situation?"

The institutions under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration (Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations) have the necessary powers to finance loans to cattlemen who can qualify for credit on a sound basis. Funds for that purpose are derived principally through sales of intermediate credit bank debentures in the investment markets. Such debentures are not guaranteed by the Government. While the supply of funds is not unlimited, these institutions would be able to finance a considerable additional volume of sound loans.

The Federal intermediate credit banks do not at this time have the manpower required to handle a greatly increased volume of loans and discounts, in addition to that expected in their normal operations. Should they be called upon to finance a materially greater proportion of the credit required by the cattle industry, it would be necessary to adjust their administrative expense authorizations, by congressional action, to enable them to employ additional personnel and defray other necessary expenses.

In addition to the seasonal and short-term credit facilities of the Farm Credit system referred to above, the Federal land banks have sufficient powers and funds to assist farmers and stockmen who are eligible and can qualify for mortgage loans under the limitations of the laws governing the land banks. In all probability, there are some cattlemen who have sufficient equities in their real estate to enable them to obtain Federal land bank loans. A Federal land bank loan cannot exceed 65 percent of the normal value of the farm mortgaged and loans to any one borrower cannot exceed $100,000.

Production and subsistence loans made by the Farmers Home Administration are for the purpose of assisting operators of family-type farms who cannot get satisfactory credit elsewhere, to acquire productive livestock farm machinery, and for other operating expenses necessary for successful farming. Such loans are made primarily to acquire the resources necessary for a well-balanced farm business.

Disaster loans made pursuant to Public Law 38 are restricted to those areas designated by the Secretary because of a production disaster which has caused a widespread need among farmers of the area for credit, not otherwise available, to continue their operations. The purpose of this program is to provide a temporary source of credit to help farmers who have suffered production losses to recover from such losses sufficiently to return to their normal sources of credit. These loans are made where farmers have sustained production losses and are not available under the act to farmers whose need for Government credit arises because of an economic condition.

Question 6: "If not, would you favor special legislation to provide emergency loans to help cattlemen carry their herds during the present period?"

No special legislation is needed with respect to the types of credit loans the Department now is authorized to make.

To the extent that cattlemen who need Government loans to continue in operation also have suffered losses of production in feed crops, pastures, ranges, etc., the present facilities of the Farmers Home Administration are adequate.

The Farm Credit Administration does not need any special legislation to enable it to continue to serve farmers who have a sound basis for credit.

Secretary Benson Stresses Orderly Cattle Marketing and Development of Consumer Demand

Calling upon producers to follow an orderly pattern of marketing, and processing and distribution agencies to develop a consumer demand for beef, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today sounded a note of optimism to reassure cattle people disturbed by the decline of fed cattle prices at central markets.

"The United States economy is fundamentally strong," the Secretary pointed out. "Employment and incomes are higher than ever before. This promises more stability in cattle prices, particularly since reductions due this year in the supply of pork will bolster the market for cattle.

"As the Department repeatedly has called to the attention of producers, the rapid buildup in cattle numbers has pointed to a somewhat lower level of prices than in 1951 or 1952. Recent breaks appear to be an unorderly and temporary overadjustment to what should be a natural reaction to this increase in cattle numbers. We feel that a return to orderly marketing will check the price slide."

The Secretary pointed out that prices of fed cattle in central markets have declined sharply in recent weeks. In late January, average prices of Choice slaughter steers at Chicago were down $7 per 100 pounds from late November. Good steers had dropped $6 in the same period. On 1,000-pound steers these declines amount to $60 and $70 per head.

Moreover, the markets have been unsettled, showing much day-to-day change and a wide range of prices paid for cattle nearly alike in quality. Last week individual sales of choice grade steers at Chicago varied from $22.50 to $31.50 per 100 pounds. A year earlier the range had been less than half as wide.

The market for cattle has been under pressure since early fall as receipts have increased. Cattle production in the United States was expanded rapidly during the past 4 years in response to the strong demand for beef. Numbers on farms were built up from 77,000,000 in January 1949, to 88,000,000 in January 1952, and a further rise during 1952 was indicated. Although total numbers for January 1953 will not be known until February 13, the number in feedlots has been reported at a new high, up 16 percent from January 1952.

With dry weather in many areas an added stimulus, marketings of range cattle began to increase last fall, and severe price declines

resulted for this kind of cattle. Now many of those cattle that went into feedlots are moving to slaughter.

As supply conditions have changed over the past year, the tenor of the market has shifted abruptly from the inflationary spirit of a year or two ago to a depressed condition now. Uncertainty on the part of both buyers and sellers has contributed to an unwarranted pessimism. Disturbed by the price trends, many feeders have let their cattle go at half finish. At three Midwest markets in January, more than twice as many fed steers of Commercial grade were received than a year ago, and receipts of Good grade were 60 percent larger. Numbers of Choice and Prime grade were down 26 percent. Meanwhile, consumer demand for the bigger supply of beef, especially of the medium quality, has not yet been fully expressed.

"Complaints have been received," the Secretary pointed out in closing, "that the compulsory grading required by OPS and the retention of price ceilings on beef have contributed to price declines. I have publicly announced my recommendation that these requirements be ended. Leaders in the industry agree that the removal of controls would in itself tend to strengthen cattle prices and stabilize markets."

[From the Washington Post of February 27, 1953]

SOUTH KOREA TO ASK U. N. HELP IN FOOD CRISIS

SEOUL, February 27.—The food crisis in the Army of the Republic of Korea has grown so grave that Gen. Paik Sun Yup, its chief of staff, yesterday said he would ask the United Nations for help. He did not go into detail.

It is a paradox that the South Korean Army is gaining strength in numbers and losing strength at the "chow" line. Defense Minister Shin Tae Yong yesterday said at Pusan that in the miserable food situation the South Korean soldier gets only a third of the calories he needs.

This has sent several thousand Korean draftees to hospitals with tuberculosis, malnutrition, and other dietary diseases. Medical sources would not reveal the figure, but Korean Army officers said 7,000 men—the equivalent of 2 Korean regiments—had been affected.

Communist propaganda has made much of the situation. Peiping broadcasts assert the number of desertions increases daily.

Lt. Col. Kim Dong Ik, commanding officer of the Korean 36th Army Hospital, said the average Korean soldier gets about 2,900 calories a day, although he needs about 4,000 as a minimum.

This does not include the 2,500 Koreans with each United States division, who get the same number of calories as Americans. Independent Korean divisions, however, have been fed by the Korean Government.

Shin said the South Korean Government, deep in its third hard year of war and short of money and resources, is helpless to solve the food situation.

The Korean Military Advisory Group, whose aim is to help the Koreans, says it is doing what it can.

INTEREST ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, only a few months ago the American people were reminded that they "never had it so good before." Of course, that statement has many implications, and many interpretations may be placed upon it.

In this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald appears an article under the heading "Debt Interest in 25 Years Cost United States $60 Billion."

In the fiscal year 1933, which was about the time when the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt took over control of the Federal Government, the total expenditures of the Federal Government for a 12 months' period amounted to $4,622,865,028. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the article to which I have referred, written by Walter Trohan, and published in this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald. The article lists, for a 25-year period from 1929, including 8 months of 1953, the annual interest payments on the Federal debt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT INTEREST IN 25 YEARS COST UNITED STATES $60 BILLION—BUDGET BALANCED ONLY 5 TIMES IN PERIOD

(By Walter Trohan)

Interest on the public debt has cost the American people more than $60 billion in the last 25 years.

A study of Treasury interest payments from July 1, 1928, into 1953 discloses that interest payments on the debt mounted to a total cost of $60,690,411,000.

Federal borrowing was condemned by Thomas Jefferson. In a letter to Eldridge Gerry, Jefferson said:

"I sincerely believe with you that the principle of spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large-scale basis."

FIVE BALANCED BUDGETS

In only 5 of the 25 fiscal years studied was the budget balanced and a surplus accumulated. Four of these years were under Republican rule or a Republican Congress. The years were 1929, 1930, 1947, 1948, and 1950.

Since the end of World War II the interest on the public debt has passed the $4 billion mark. It is now approaching $6 billion a year.

The interest on the public debt is now costing taxpayers more than it cost to run the Government in any year, except for the expenditures of World War I, through the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1933. In that fiscal year, which marked the first months of the New Deal, the total cost of running the Federal Government was $4,611,000,000.

TABLE OF PAYMENTS

Annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal years from 1929 through February 27, 1953, indicated interest payments as follows:

1929	$678,330,000
1930	659,347,000
1931	611,559,000
1932	599,276,000
1933	689,356,000
1934	759,600,000
1935	913,100,000
1936	867,400,000
1937	866,384,000
1938	926,200,000
1939	941,000,000
1940	1,041,000,000
1941	1,110,200,000
1942	1,260,000,000
1943	1,813,000,000
1944	2,610,000,000
1945	3,621,000,000
1946	4,747,500,000
1947	4,958,000,000
1948	5,187,800,000
1949	5,352,300,000
1950	5,496,300,000
1951	5,615,100,000
1952	5,853,000,000
1953 (8 months)	3,512,150,000
Total	60,690,411,000

This compilation does not include $1 billion interest paid on Government guaranteed obligations for the years from 1936 through 1952.

SOUNDED OTHER WARNINGS

Jefferson sounded other warnings against Federal borrowing. In 1791 he wrote James Monroe, saying:

"We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that the more we owe the more prosperous we shall be; that a public debt furnishes the means of enterprise; that if ours be once paid off, we should incur another by any means, however extravagant."

In 1802, as President, he wrote:

"If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to stress the point that in the fiscal year 1952, it required $5,853,000,000 to pay the interest on the Federal debt, which sum is more than $1 billion in excess of the total expenditures of the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1933.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO REPORT NOMINATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to report nominations for the executive calendar, following the close of business today, up to 12 o'clock midnight of Tuesday March 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARE THE CHURCHES FAILING OUR GI'S?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, this morning I should like to call attention to a magazine article in which some of our top military spiritual leaders indicate that at least a part of our churches are failing to play their full role in our mobilization program.

The article, to which I refer, is entitled "Are the Churches Failing Our GI's?" and it appears on newsstands today in the March issue of the American Mercury magazine.

It is not my intention to take personal issue with any creed or denomination, but as chairman of the Veterans Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am particularly interested in this subject. Particularly am I concerned with this report because of the possible effects which inadequate spiritual guidance for our GI's may have on the domestic life of our Nation in future years.

This article, written by Scott Hershey and Harry Tennant, states that Rear Adm. S. W. Salisbury, Chief of Naval Chaplains, retired last month so that he could devote his full time to contacting church leaders. He is sufficiently concerned with the gravity of the situation that he is now trying to develop a program which will make the Nation's churches more effective in preparing our young men and women for their period of military service and to administer to their moral stability while on military duty.

To me the seriousness of this matter is revealed in a statement by the Chairman of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, Maj. Gen. Charles Carpenter. This Defense Department spiritual leader said that the general assembly of the National Council of Churches recently gave only 25 minutes out of a 3-day conference to a discussion of the spiritual problems of men and women in the services.

Admiral Salisbury deplores the attitude of many churchmen, some educators, and various groups of pacifists who put forth the idea that a tour of duty with the military is something to be stoically endured, and that it is simply 2 years out of the life of a young man.

It happens that I am a Presbyterian by faith. I am, therefore particularly concerned that this article points out that, with some exceptions, the Protestants have fallen down on the job. They have failed to indoctrinate their young men on the spiritual problems and responsibilities they will face upon entering the service. They have failed to maintain adequate contact with their members after they have been called to duty. They have sometimes ignored the needs of spiritual and social requirements of their members stationed in nearby military installations. I am told that many denominations have refused to make their best young ministers available for chaplain duty in the Armed Forces.

Perhaps my colleagues may view with alarm this situation, as I do. I am in accord with the view our military spiritual leaders recently took of a Kremlin pronouncement that the danger in Russia today was the association of Russian young people with the church and that the Soviets were taking steps to see that such association ended. General Carpenter has bluntly warned the heads of United States churches that failure to recognize their responsibility to the youth now in service could produce the same result but without the same statement of purpose.

I hope all Members of the Senate will agree with me as to the importance of this subject. Because of its pertinence I ask unanimous consent that the article be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE THE CHURCHES FAILING OUR GI's?

(By Scott Hershey and Harry Tennant)

Each year for the next few years—and as far ahead as we can see—more than a million young men and women will be uprooted from their homes and their communities and drafted or enlisted into the Armed Forces. Another million annually will be mustered back into civilian life as service alumni.

A generation from now these young men and young women will be expected to provide the political, the social, and the economic leadership of the Nation. And the manner in which they fulfill these expectations will depend to a large degree on the imprints left upon their characters by their tenure of service in the Armed Forces.

This very obvious fact is the source of increasing alarm among the chaplains in all echelons of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. They believe that the most important factor in building the character of young men and women—their spiritual life and guidance—is being badly neglected as far as those in the Armed Forces are concerned.

A study of the situation reveals that the Armed Forces themselves, the Congress, and the public must all share some of the blame. But, in the opinion of the chief chaplains of the services, the major responsibility—and the major failure—is that of the churches themselves.

The grave apprehension of the service chaplains is illustrated by the retirement last month of the Chief Chaplain of the United States Navy, Rear Adm. S. W. Salisbury, a vigorous, active, outspoken man. He announced his retirement at the age of 62, so that he can devote his full time to maintaining contacts with church leaders and seminarians throughout the Nation, acquainting them with the seriousness of the situation, and urging them and their churches to develop positive, detailed programs to meet their challenge.

"We are a military state, whether we like it or not—and most of us do not," he said. "Nevertheless, the fact that we have been forced into a military state in time of peace—or semipeace—demands that our churches develop new techniques and new programs, if they are to fulfill their spiritual responsibilities to our young GI men and women."

The Chief Chaplains of the Army and the Air Force, Major Generals Ivan Loveridge Bennett and Charles I. Carpenter, are in full agreement with Admiral Salisbury regarding the gravity of the challenge. And with varying degrees of emphasis they concur in Admiral Salisbury's opinion, that, while most of the churches did an excellent job of meeting the spiritual problems of the GI during the two world wars, they have failed sadly to meet the entirely different, and unprecedented, problem resulting from the mobilization of 3,500,000 men and women in the Armed Forces in time of troubled peace.

The Armed Forces Chaplains Board, of which these three clergymen are members, was created by the Secretary of Defense to advise him on spiritual and moral problems in the services. It is composed of the three Chiefs of Chaplains, Army, Navy, and Air Force, and one additional representative from each service. Its purpose is to make possible a unified approach to the moral and spiritual and other related problems within the services.

"Many denominations have failed miserably to keep pace with the current needs of youth in the service," General Carpenter, who is chairman of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, declared. "Their apathetic attitude is illustrated by a recent meeting of the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, at which I spoke on behalf of the service chaplains.

"Only 25 minutes, of a 3-day conference, was devoted to the discussion of the spiritual problems of the men and women of the Army, Navy, and Air Force."

Admiral Salisbury, who addressed the conference in 1951, noted that "it was not until 2 years ago that the conference even acknowledged that the problem existed."

Curiously enough the three chief chaplains, General Carpenter a Methodist, General Bennett a Southern Baptist, and Admiral Salisbury a Presbyterian, agree that the problem is predominantly a Protestant one. They feel that the Catholic Church and the Jewish faiths are fully aware of the needs of their youth in the service, and have taken adequate steps to meet them.

"The Catholic Church, by its very nature, leaves it up to the individual to maintain contact with the Church—whether in or out of the service," Admiral Salisbury said. "Members of the Jewish faith, individualistic in nature, are drawn together by the tenets of their religion. Consequently, these two faiths are not beset by the same problems which plague the Protestant churches."

Chaplains in all branches of the service report they receive excellent cooperation from the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Jewish Welfare Board.

Many Catholic high schools and universities have established excellent preinduction courses for their students. In these courses, the prospective recruit is advised that military service is a part of life, not a detached period in which the moral standards he adheres to at home can be temporarily suspended. He is counseled to prepare himself mentally, physically, and spiritually for his new experience. He is informed of the various programs in the Armed Forces in which he can participate to the advantage of his chosen career. He is given lectures, illustrated by motion pictures, to guide him in such problems as marriage and his relations with men and women of other races, creeds, and nationalities, of other habits and customs.

Similar programs have been adopted by a few nonsectarian schools, Protestant churches, and isolated communities. But they are all too few.

With a few notable exceptions the Protestant sects have fallen down on the job. They have failed to indoctrinate their young on the spiritual problems and responsibilities they will face on entering the service. They have failed to maintain contact with their members after they have been called to duty. They have ignored the spiritual and social requirements of members of their faiths stationed in nearby Army, Navy, and Air Force installations.

And probably most important of all, many denominations have refused to make their best young ministers available for chaplain duty. Some faiths have even failed to provide enough ministers to fill the modest quotas of chaplains assigned to them, quotas which are based on the number of men and women of their faith in the services.

"Many of the churches are saying that they cannot give us their best men," said General Carpenter. "Most of them are saying that they can't give us more men because the demand for them in civilian life is too great. Church leaders are giving us all kinds of alibis to evade their obligation of providing an adequate number of competent young ministers for chaplain duty."

One of the paradoxes of the problem is that, while the churches are actively fighting communism and are a bulwark against this threat to our liberty and freedom, they are overlooking an opportunity to engage this godless enemy directly by ministering to the spiritual needs of their young men and women on military duty.

"All churches deplore the inroads of communism," General Carpenter said, "yet many of them are shortsighted, failing to realize that, while we are actively fighting communism overseas, they are indifferent to the influence of godlessness at home.

"We have reached the place, as we approach this entire new concept of militarism in American life, where it isn't enough to sit down ond argue about peace and war and what Christ said about military service.

"That isn't our problem. Our problem is, What are we going to do with the kids who are on duty in the service of the kingdom of God today?"

Admiral Salisbury deplored the attitude of many churchmen and educators who put forward the idea that a tour of military duty is something to be stoically endured; that it is simply 2 years out of the life of the young men.

"Nonsense," said Admiral Salisbury. "It is a time of growth and development; during which they need proper guidance. These young men can't develop if they have the attitude that they can drop the church for 2 years and then go back again when they return home; that they can ignore their moral training until their tour of duty is over; or that after a spiritual vacation they will suddenly become men of character in

their own communities, when their military service is ended."

The military spiritual heads were reluctant to discuss recent disclosures of widespread desertions. However, one chaplain remarked that the record showed that many deserters were unable to adjust themselves to a new mode of life, because of a lack of spiritual and moral discipline at home.

For example, General Carpenter said that, at one Air Force indoctrination center, a recent check showed the startling fact that religious illiteracy of young men entering the center ranged between 15 and 28 percent. He explained that these young men had no background of religious training or spiritual guidance to the extent that it had impressed itself upon their characters.

He feels that it is just as important for the churches to develop programs to reach these young men as it is to maintain their contacts with those who are being separated from their regular church for the first time in their lives.

The Chief Chaplain found considerable irony in a recent statement issued by the Kremlin, expressing alarm at the drift of Russian young people toward the church. Steps would be taken, the Soviet leaders warned ominously, to end this dangerous trend.

"We have warned the heads of United States churches," General Carpenter said, "that continued neglect of their responsibility to the youth now in service is producing the same results that the Kremlin seeks, but without such a frank statement of purpose.

"The future of the churches of America is being sabotaged by their own apparent unwillingness to meet the spiritual needs of the men and women who are wearing their country's uniform today."

The chaplains of all ranks and all denominations point out that the problem the Nation faces on the spiritual front today is far different from that in World War II, when a total of 22 million young men and women served varying periods in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine.

"The very existence of war provided a certain spiritual exultation to many young men and women," one young chaplain remarked. "Then, too, the issues were brought into sharper focus, the need for great personal sacrifice more clearly defined. More important, we were a Nation united in a single, recognizable purpose, and nearly everybody played his part—the churches, the communities and the individuals.

"The problems of the peacetime army are far different. There is little if any spiritual uplift felt by the young men and women who are drafted, or reluctantly enlisted into the Armed Forces. Many of them find military life, at its best, an irksome duty; at its worst, an intolerable existence. The issues at stake are no longer so clearly defined. And, most unfortunate, there is division among their elders as to the purpose and need of the sacrifices they are making. Their need for spiritual direction and strength is even greater than the needs of elder brothers and sisters a few years ago, or their fathers during World War I."

Yet it is this greater need that is being so sorely neglected by church and community—both of which responded so splendidly to the lesser challenges of two World Wars—in the opinions of the chaplains. Within a few years more than 10 million young men and women will have spent an average of 2 years in service, and spiritual isolation. When they return to civilian life, as Admiral Salisbury pointed out, "they will bring back with them the imprint of their service life, their observations, and their experiences in countries in which they have served."

General Bennett, who has served 31 years in the Army, and recently completed a 3-year tour of duty as Command Chaplain, Far East Command, put it this way:

"We cannot afford to neglect the problems resulting from the large increase of our military establishment—a situation that has no foreseeable end. It is almost trite, but obviously true, to say that the life of the church of tomorrow depends on the men in the service today."

The same thought was expressed in different words by Capt. E. L. Ackiss, Chief Chaplain, United States Navy, retired:

"Strong measures by your theological seminaries, our churches, and our synagogues, and by our religious communities to meet this continuing emergency in the lives of our young people, are an absolute necessity for the survival both of our religion and of our Nation."

A few of the Protestant sects are taking steps in the right direction. The chief chaplains agree that the Armed Forces Commission of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, is doing an outstanding job. The Southern Baptists recently embarked on a comprehensive program to keep in touch with their young men and women in the Armed Forces. The Presbyterian Church has started a similar program, but on only a limited and experimental basis. The American Bible Society was praised for providing a million and a quarter Bibles to troops in Korea. All these programs are excellent, the chaplains say, but they are too limited in scope, and too few in number.

One particularly vexing problem in maintaining the morale—and the morals—of large Armed Forces in peacetime is that of providing proper recreational facilities and social activities, particularly to troops away from their posts. Military authorities have little trouble with the GI as long as he is within the confines of the military establishment. There, recreational and social opportunities are provided.

Obviously, however, there is a limit to the time that American young men and women outside the combat areas can be restricted to the limits of their military posts, without a serious loss of morale. It is when the young GI, man or woman, is "out on the town" that trouble is usually encouraged.

And here again, the chaplains believe, the churches must accept a full share of the responsibility. For a substantial proportion of the trouble that members of our Armed Forces get into would be avoided if the churches in the communities near military posts would develop recreational and social programs for the service people of their faith.

"The opportunity for young servicemen to join in church-sponsored recreational groups is an integral part of their spiritual training," General Carpenter said. "This is particularly true of Protestant youth which has always looked to the church to provide social activities.

"But in community after community the local churches have ignored the recreational needs of the men and women stationed at nearby military and naval installations."

As a result of this dereliction, hundreds of thousands of unsophisticated young service men and women who might otherwise be attending church socials, are drawn into cheap dance halls, disreputable night clubs, clip joints, and sordid dives. They are subjected to temptations that either did not exist in their own communities, or, if they did exist, they were able to resist because of the strength of their ties with home and church. Deprived of that strength, they often fall easy victim to the hordes of chiselers, sharpers, professional gamblers, and prostitutes who prey on lonely, restless servicemen. The results are frequently a serious undermining of the victim's moral fiber; sometimes sudden tragedy, imprisonment, and even violent death.

Many churches feel they have discharged their obligation to service people when they announce, through the chaplain, the time and place of their services and social functions.

In this attitude the chaplains feel that the church is simply following the pattern of so many communities which regard the serviceman as merely a source of revenue; not as a fellow Christian to be accepted and welcomed into the community's social life. There are relatively few churches, the chaplains say, which have gone directly to the servicemen of their faith, at nearby installations, and invited them to become a part of their congregation, and participate fully in all its activities.

There are some exceptions. Admiral Salisbury noted that pitifully few churches in Washington, D. C., conduct sightseeing tours of the Nation's Capital for servicemen, ending with church or young people's devotions. He mentioned Jacksonville, Fla., as a community which has projects for servicemen and provides them with maps of various churches and other points of interest in the city. The San Diego City Federation of Churches has a friends-finder service, which takes servicemen into church homes in the area and arranges for them to attend services in the local churches with these families.

At the top of the list of communities which have recognized the problem and in which the churches and local businessmen have united to meet it, is Belleville, Ill. Admiral Salisbury said this community, which had one of the worst records about a year ago, is now almost a model of what can be done to provide spiritual and recreational guidance for the servicemen stationed near there.

The Department of Defense feels it has discharged its obligations in the spiritual field by the support it gives through the Corps of Chaplains. The assistance given, however, is in some cases limited. For example, the Navy chaplains last year requested a $900,000 appropriation for their work. By the time the Defense Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress got through with this request it was slashed to less than one-third that amount. There are about 900 Navy chaplains. The funds made available amounted to about $300 per chaplain and this broken down further shows the ridiculously low figure of between 35 and 40 cents per man per year.

The Navy chaplain's office submitted a budget request for $1,026,000 in the current budget now before the Congress. By the time this request went through the Pentagon and the Bureau of the Budget the amount was reduced to $300,000. This amounts to about $333.33 per chaplain, which is an increase of $33.33 per chaplain over the previous year—if the Congress does not further reduce it. Compare this with the $46 billion requested in the new budget for the armed services.

In the matter of the construction of chapels, a benevolent Government is equally remiss. For example: In the Navy the construction of chapels is under the Bureau of Yards and Docks shore development program. Navy chaplains, who serve the Marine Corps, have been trying since 1940 to obtain funds for a suitable and adequate chapel at Quantico Marine Base. Recently the Chief of Chaplains of the Navy was advised that construction of a chapel had finally made the shore development list. He was exuberant. His exuberance chilled somewhat when he was further advised that the chapel was 33d on the list. Thirty-third turned out to be last on the list. What was the 32d project on the list? Construction of stables.

While all three services could use more chaplains, the Navy seems to have less difficulty filling its quota than do the Army and the Air Force. General Bennett said that the Army is presently short about 200 chaplains. The Air Force is having difficulty in filling its quota. The Navy is on the alert for chaplains, but primarily to meet replacement needs.

Admiral Salisbury has pointed out that, while the chaplaincy in the past has been an

emergency service, "from here on out for our generation, the military chaplaincy will rank in the church as a regular form of Christian service for ordained ministers of the Gospel."

"It has become a calling as valid and as important as the foreign missionary, or the home pastorate," Admiral Salisbury said. "It represents a great opportunity and challenge and, by the strong support of her chaplains, the church is ultimately contributing to the enriching and strengthening of her own life."

At a recent Pentagon conference for religious leaders, delegates were told by a Chaplains Corps spokesman that "there isn't a church represented here today that isn't throwing into the mission fields of the world everything it can throw. In many instances you are having to overcome the greatest obstacles to bring the gospel into the hearts of men. Here stands an agency of Government—the Corps of Chaplains—which opens its arms and says please come and hear our words, and the ear of the church is turned against it and the leadership that is needed of the church is absolutely neglected."

Refuting the alibis of many churches for their failure to provide qualified chaplains, military leaders believe, is the current emphasis given by many denominations to placing student pastors in institutions of higher learning. Military men contend that the armed services today have become the greatest educational institution in the country. Yet one denomination had less than 200 chaplains with the military services, and more than 400 student pastors in colleges and universities.

In one branch of the service, strength is about twice what it was a year ago. In order to obtain chaplains, this branch called every reserve chaplain 48 years of age and under, in the grade of major and below. An official charged with this task said, "It was like pulling teeth to get some of the men who held definite reserve commissions." The chief difficulty was not the refusal of the chaplain himself, but that of religious leaders, church officials, and even politicians who wrote letters insisting that these men be deferred to serve in their home communities.

In discussing the church's relationship with the Army, General Bennett explained: "Of course the local communities cannot be drained of spiritual leadership by the services, without a resulting deterioration of morals and moral standards among the civilian population.

"It is necessary to maintain a balance between the men and women on the home front and those in the armed services. It takes all these men and women to make up the Nation and we must keep in mind the welfare of the country as a whole."

Under present procedure the services ask the various churches to provide chaplains, according to the number of men and women under arms. The quotas are allotted among Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions on the basis of the number of men of each faith in the services. In addition to certain physical and mental requirements, the chaplains must meet other standards necessitated by the unusual aspects of their missions in the Armed Forces.

General Bennett pointed out that about 70 percent of the men studying for the ministry or the priesthood today are former servicemen. A large percentage of the chaplains who served in World War II were Reserve officers. Many of these have returned to active-duty status, but many more are unavailable because of age and grade limitations.

The Chaplains Corps does not have the responsibility of providing chaplains. The churches do have this responsibility.

"The churches must face the fact that this mission field is the place in which they need to place men," said General Carpenter, "not because someone wants volumes and numbers but because the souls of men depend upon whether there are enough chaplains to provide adequate spiritual care."

Not too long ago the very existence of the Corps of Chaplains was threatened by persistent attacks from many churches. In the early thirties, when a wave of pacifism was at its height, a leading nondenominational religious weekly advocated discontinuance of ecclesiastical endorsement of chaplains by the general commission or any of its affiliated denominations. Many denominational publications joined in the attack. One group, the Disciples of Christ, voted to send no more chaplains to the Armed Forces, and requested the general commission to sever its connection with the military chaplaincy. In 1934 several Methodist conferences requested their bishops to refrain from sending any of their members to the chaplaincy. In 1936 the Evangelical and Reformed Church refused further participation. The Methodist Episcopal Church requested the federal council to seek a method whereby civilian ministers might render the spiritual ministry to the Armed Forces.

The efforts resulted in an attitude survey by the federal council of the Armed Forces chaplains. They found a strong sense of vocation among the chaplains and learned that uniform and rank were both important factors in their work.

In due time, the tide of pacifism ebbed with the coming of the shadows of World War II, and the prestige of the chaplain rose again in ecclesiastical circles.

Now, the chaplaincy has the finest opportunities for service; the highest standing in the military scheme; and the best possible equipment for professional performance. But many chaplains fear that some of the churches are showing signs of reverting again to the attitude they held toward the Corps of Chaplains back in the 1930's.

Important as the chaplaincy is, however, the chief chaplains agree that without the full support and cooperation of the churches they cannot perform their missions. Admiral Salisbury emphasizes that the churches must bring their influence to bear on their young men and women before they go into the service, while they are in, and when they get home again.

General Carpenter has suggested that, when an inductee leaves to go into the service, some agency of his church should be informed by his pastor. This agency of the church should be responsible for maintaining contact with the GI throughout his entire period in service. General Carpenter further suggested that the churches name a contact pastor from a church of the same denomination located near the Military Establishment where the man is stationed. The contact pastor could then go into the Military Establishment and get acquainted with the youth and take him into the life of the church and the community. There the church could substitute its influence for that of the church at home.

The chaplains agree that the home churches of the men in service, as well as their family and friends, should keep in communication with their servicemen while away. Admiral Salisbury said this touch with home, with associates, and with loved ones, keeps the serviceman conscious of all those good and fine things which make him a man of character and responsibility.

Admiral Salisbury told the second annual governor's conference on children and youth, at Providence, R. I., last fall, that, while it is the responsibility of the military to keep alive those vital connections with the home people, "it is the responsibility of the home folks, in the schools, churches, homes, and communities, to keep in touch with their service people.

"For within a decade, military service of your young people will reach with strong influence into every institution of our national life. You must have men and women of character in your local communities in the days to come. We all need them if our Nation is to survive."

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the morning hour has been concluded, I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called, beginning with Order No. 48.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it it is so ordered.

The Clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar beginning with No. 48.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as first in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I serve as a member of the so-called minority Calendar Committee. I did not hear the announcement of the order number now under consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is about to consider Order No. 48, S. 56, a bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Is the Senate now considering Calendar Nos. 19 and 21? Have they been called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They are not included in the list of orders to be considered on the call of the calendar, at this time. Calendar No. 48 is the first order to be called. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 48?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erich Anton Helfert shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FELIX KORTSCHAK

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschak was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix Kortschak shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which Calendar Nos. 48 and 49, being, respectively, Senate bill 56, for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert, and Senate bill 59, for the relief of Felix Kortschak, were passed, be reconsidered,

and that the bills be passed over without prejudice.

In support of that request I should like to state that since the passage of these bills I have conferred with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has taken a leading part, as Senators are aware, in the entire program of student exchange. He says that he does not believe these bills should pass, that their passage would tend to defeat the purpose of the student exchange program, and would set precedents which would encourage more legislation of this type. Therefore I submit the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have not followed the Senator from Tennessee. Will he tell me what bills he is referring to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the votes by which Calendar Nos. 48 and 49, being, respectively, Senate bills 56 and 59, were passed, be reconsidered, and that the bills be passed over, on the grounds which he has stated.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none; and the votes by which Senate bill 56 and Senate bill 59 were passed are reconsidered, and the bills are passed over.

JOSEPH FLURY PALUY

The bill (S. 65) for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Flury Paluy may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

DETROIT AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS CO.

The bill (S. 100) for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill provides that the petition of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be held and considered to have been received by the Tax Court of the United States within the time allowed by law and regulations for the filing of such a petition.

In this case the taxpayer's application for administrative relief under section 722 was disallowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and notice of such disallowance was mailed to taxpayer on April 4, 1951. The taxpayer then had 90 days, or until July 3, 1951, to file a petition with the Tax Court; such a petition was executed by the taxpayer and mailed by its counsel from Detroit, Mich., to the Tax Court in Washington, D. C., on June 26, 1951, in ample time to arrive at the Tax Court prior to the statutory deadline, but the Tax Court records indicate that the petition was not received at the Tax Court until July 5, 1951, 2 days after the expiration of the statutory 90-day period. Because of this, the Tax Court declined to entertain jurisdiction of the petition.

Considering the undisputed facts in this case which completely negate any negligence on the part of the taxpayer in attempting to file a timely petition with the Tax Court, the committee is moved to permit this taxpayer his day in court, and it is therefore recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

The Department of the Treasury has recommended against enactment of this bill.

The committee went into the subject very carefully. The enactment of the bill would give the Bureau of Internal Revenue an oportunity to consider this case. Therefore the committee unanimously reported the bill to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It gives the Tax Court permission to do what?

Mr. LANGER. The court would have an opportunity to consider the petition, in the same manner in which any other petition for a rebate may be considered.

Mr. MORSE. What it amounts to, then, is a waiver of the time element, but it does not go to the merits of whether the company is entitled to the refund.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore the bill is a procedural bill with regard to the time element, which so operated in this case that the company was not entitled to consideration of the merits of its request for a refund because of the procedural factor involved in the time element. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon to understand that the bill is so worded that its passage in no way whatever indicates to the Tax Court that the Senate, and, if approved by the House, the Congress, feels that the tax refund on the merits should be granted?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. It is merely a waiver.

Mr. MORSE. With that legislative history established, I have no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has very ably and correctly stated the substance of the bill. I believe the procedural difficulty came about because a holiday intervened—as I recall, it was the Fourth of July—and the mail to the Tax Court was not picked up or, if it was picked up, it was not opened and considered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the staff of the committee which has prepared the memorandum I hold in my hand points out that it has been fairly clearly established that the appeal was mailed on June 26.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. It is marked as not having been received until July 5.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. To me, that clearly confirms the position of the Senator from Michigan, and certainly I have no objection to passage of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that there is ample precedent for the procedure here proposed, and a similar bill was passed by the Senate last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 100) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the petition of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be held and considered to have been received by the Tax Court of the United States within the time allowed by law and regulations for the filing of such a petition.

FRED P. HINES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 152) for the relief of Fred P. Hines was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me observe that this bill differs from the bill which has just been passed, for this bill does not waive the statute of limitations, but, instead, confers a gratuity upon an American citizen, even though the Judiciary Committee says it recognizes that the claimant has no legal ground for recovering. The citizen also draws a pension of $90 a month for non-service-incurred disability.

Unless there is some merit which does not appear in the committee report, I shall be compelled to object to this bill as establishing a dangerous precedent for the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the circumstances in this case are very unusual. Mr. Hines is over 80 years of age. He was treated at a veterans' hospital for various ailments. Some years later he returned to the hospital and was again treated. Some 4 or 5 years passed, and again he went to the veterans' hospital; and the physicians there said to him: "Go home and die; you have cancer." So they sent him home, within 24 hours.

Later he went to a private hospital, where he was treated and put in condition for an operation. It took about a month to build him up by proper nourishment to enable him to withstand an operation. He was operated on, has been living ever since, and is still alive. Yet the veterans' hospital doctors said he would die within 24 hours. I can state the exact dates, if the Senator from Tennessee is interested in having that done. It was in 1931, more than 20 years ago, that he was told to go home and die.

This bill provides for the payment of his hospital expenses, which amounted to $778.78. The veterans' hospital absolutely refused to take care of him, as I have stated, and I repeat that he was sent home to die.

Certainly the Judiciary Committee went over this bill very carefully. A similar bill was passed by the Senate a year ago, and was then passed by the House, but was vetoed by President Truman. The veto was overridden by the Senate, but there was insufficient time to have the veto overridden by the House of Representatives.

The Judiciary Committee feels that this bill is a very meritorious one. It will take care of an old, destitute veteran. He is receiving a small pension, but it is very small indeed; and of course he is worried about his hospital debt, which I understand is almost all still owed by him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, undoubtedly this case merits sympathy; but the facts are plain, namely, that the citizen does not have a service-connected disability. Despite that fact, he has received numerous treatments in veterans' hospitals, without charge to him.

It may well be that a medical mistake was made in this case, one which was corrected by a private hospital. However, that set of circumstances would not appear to me to justify a recovery by this gentleman. Indeed, the committee itself says so.

I should like to have an opportunity to go into this matter somewhat further, before objecting to the bill, provided the bill can go over without objection at this time.

So, Mr. President, I ask that the bill now go over.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee request that the bill go over, to be placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be passed over to the foot of the calendar.

MARY BOUESSA DEEB

The bill (S. 248) for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Bouessa Deeb shall be deemed to have been born in Canada.

ALAMBERT E. ROBINSON

The bill (S. 365) for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill is to waive in favor of Alambert E. Robinson, the claimant, sections 15 to 30 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, so that he may present his claim for adjudication.

The sections referred to bar him because of a time limitation. Mr. Robinson's eyes became infected in March of 1940, and he filed his claim.

It was determined, however, that the infection had resulted from trachoma, which had existed for a long time prior to this date, and a claim on that ground was barred.

Inasmuch as trachoma was prevalent among Indians, with whom the claimant had daily contact during his employment in the Department of the Interior, it was felt by the Department that this disease may have been contracted in the course of employment.

The committee is of the opinion that the claim should at least be passed upon; and it is noted particularly that no benefits, if any, are to accrue for any period prior to the enactment of the bill, except for medical and hospital expenses incurred.

The committee recommends this bill to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The procedure in waiving the statute of limitations does not go to the merits of the claim, does it?

Mr. LANGER. Not at all.

Mr. MORSE. Then, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 365) for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 and 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–769), are hereby waived in favor of Alambert E. Robinson for compensation for disability resulting from loss of vision secondary to trachoma contracted prior to March 1940, allegedly by reason of his employment as an employee of the United States Indian Service at the Pima Indian Agency, Sacaton, Ariz., and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment, except in the case of such medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 484) for the relief of J. Don Alexander was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who are not now on the floor, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ALTOON SAPRICHIAN

The bill (S. 615) for the relief of Altoon Saprichian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Altoon Saprichian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EUGENE RIVOCHE AND MARIE BARSKY

The bill (S. 837) for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PHED VOSNIACOS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 24-year-old native and citizen of Greece who last entered the United States on December 1, 1947, to attend Michigan State College. He is presently employed as a reporter for the State Journal, in Lansing, Mich. A bill similar to this passed the Senate in the 82d Congress, second session. However, it was passed too late for action by the House of Representatives prior to the adjournment of the Congress.

Is a further explanation desired?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask one or two questions.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me that this bill calls for the establishment of a policy on the part of the great committee of which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is chairman. There are on the calendar today three bills which would grant permanent residence to exchange students. It is the understanding of the junior Senator from Tennessee that these students came to the United States largely, if not entirely, at the expense of the United States; and that they came here upon the statement that they would not seek citizenship or permanent residence.

It is my understanding that the purpose of the program was to educate in this country certain outstanding foreign students, who would return to their home countries, taking with them an understanding and an appreciation of the United States and its way of life. If we are to continue, as we are doing here today in three instances, to grant citizenship and permanent residence to those exchange students, in violation of their own pledge, we shall be defeating the very purpose of this program. I shall not object to these three bills today, but

hereafter, unless the Judiciary Committee establishes some policy with respect to exchange students, I shall object to the passage on the Consent Calendar of any further bills of this character.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I agree with everything said by the Senator from Tennessee, except the last two sentences. Everything he said, until he got to the last two sentences, raised the whole question of whether we are to establish here today a precedent whereby it will be possible to get around the immigration laws of the United States.

I believe my record is pretty clear as to what I think we ought to do about the immigration laws of the United States. In my opinion we ought to revise them openly and frontally, and not get around them by indirection. I have not had time to study these bills, but when this bill was called—and now the Senator from Tennessee tells me there are on the calendar two more like it—I saw at once that a very basic principle was involved, namely, whether we are to let the exchange-student program be used as a back-door entrance for citizenship in the United States, when such students would not get citizenship or permanent residence in the United States if they had followed the quota system applicable to their respective countries. I assume they would not be eligible. At least, at this time they would not be eligible, and, if not, then they ought to follow the regular course and not attempt to proceed by way of special legislation.

Therefore, Mr. President, until I have had an opportunity to study these bills and give consideration to the immigration-policy principle which I think is involved, I shall object to this bill and to all other similar bills that may be on the calendar.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was about to suggest that this is not the case of an exchange student. As I understand, this bill involves a scholarship bestowed by the Greek Orthodox Church, rather than an exchange procedure. He came to the United States under that scholarship, rather than under the student-exchange system. I wonder whether that would make any difference.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think that involves any matter of substance at all, but only a matter of form. It appears to me that this boy was admitted into the United States for one purpose, and that he now seeks to turn that purpose into something entirely different. I think he ought to take his chances with the consul at Istanbul. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

FRANCESCO CRACCHIOLO—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 102) for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 39-year-old native and citizen of Italy, who last entered the United States as a visitor on September 5, 1950. He resides in Detroit, Mich., with his brother, who is a citizen of the United States and part owner of a restaurant. The brother of the beneficiary of the bill states that his health is poor and that his physician has advised a long period of rest. Because of these circumstances he has trained the beneficiary of the bill to take his place in the restaurant.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to assure my friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that I shall study this bill along with the other bill, but I am going to study these bills in the light of the whole question of our immigration policy. I think we had better face the whole question of the immigration policy, rather than attempt to correct injustices, individual by individual. Therefore, for the present, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN W. McBRIDE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 140) for the relief of John W. McBride, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of John W. McBride for compensation for disability caused by an injury allegedly sustained by him on or about March 13, 1943, while in the performance of his duties as an instructor at the Army Air Forces Technical School, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY RAY SMITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 141) for the relief of Harry Ray Smith, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "period", to insert "less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Harry Ray Smith against the United States for compensation which he would have received as an immigrant inspector, United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, during the period from July 11, 1938, to September 27, 1939, had he not been suspended from the Service during such period, less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period. Suit on such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

SOCORRO GERONA DE CASTRO—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 173) for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 32-year-old native of the Philippine Islands who last arrived in the United States as a visitor on January 17, 1947. She is presently a resident physician in obstetrics and gynecology at Garfield Memorial Hospital in Washington, D. C., where hospital officials speak very highly of her and state that her services are urgently needed at the hospital.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

SISTER ODILIA, ALSO KNOWN AS MARIA HUTTER—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 255) for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. May we have an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 38-year-old native and citizen of Austria, who last arrived in the United States as a visitor on January 27, 1949. She is a nun attached to the Order of the Sisters of the Divine Saviour and presently stationed at the Divine Saviour Hospital in Portage, Wis., where she is engaged in duties as a registered nurse and training as a supervisor and other nursing work.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

GEORGE F. RUCKMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 522) for the relief of George F. Ruckman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the figures "$250", to strike out the comma and "together with interest thereon at the rate of 4 percent per annum from March 22, 1945, to the time of payment", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George F. Ruckman the sum of $250. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said George F. Ruckman against the United States for reimbursement for expenses incurred and paid out of his personal funds in repairing the B–17 bomber under his command which was damaged and forced to be landed in Torum, Poland, on February 3, 1945, following a bombing mission over Germany, and for reimbursement for expenses for quarters and rations for himself and his crew paid for by him during such period required for repairs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE RODNEY GILTNER, FORMERLY JOJI WAKAMIYA

The bill (S. 682) for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya) was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill provides for the admission into the United States of a minor Japanese child presently in the custody of and to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to provide for the admission of this child into the United States and for placing the child in the custody of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Giltner, citizens of the United States. The bill has been amended to bring it in line with appropriate sections of the new law, since the waiver is no longer a necessity. This child, who was born in Japan on February 5, 1948, has been released by the Kamakura Nursery for adoption by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Giltner, who are citizens of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill is in line with the long-established policy of the Congress in connection with the adoption of children. It is in conformity with the well-established policy of our immigration laws, in the cases of a great many soldiers who have adopted babies and children abroad. I think it is sound policy, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 682) for the relief of George Rodney Giltner—formerly Joji Wakamiya— which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Giltner, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIZUKO KATO

The bill (S. 147) for the relief of Sizuko Kato, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill would enable the Japanese fiance and minor child of a United States citizen serviceman to enter the United States so that the fiance may marry her citizen fiance and that thereafter she and the child may reside in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another bill that is consonant with well-established policy in regard to the marriage by American soldiers of women in the countries in which they have served. I think it is sound public policy, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 147) for the relief of Sizuko Kato, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, the fiance and minor child of Cpl. Gust L. Ulrich, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sizuko Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Gust L. Ulrich and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko."

COMDR. JOHN J. O'DONNELL, UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 720) for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Connell, United States Naval Reserve, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the name "John J.", to strike out "O'Connell" and insert "O'Donnell", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $252.67 to Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for pay and allowances for active training duty actually performed by him for the period of June 19 to 29, 1950, inclusive, in compliance with paragraph 1 of appropriate duty orders issued June 7, 1950, by the Commandant, 13th Naval District, Seattle, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve."

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS ACT

The bill (S. 873) to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—this is a rather technical bill, and I wonder if, for the purposes of the RECORD, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] will give us a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, primarily, is to bring the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act in line with the Federal Credit Unions Act. The bill would amend existing law by—

First. Making two corrections of a minor nature, namely, changing the word "company" to read "credit union", and changing the words "payable to" to read "payable by."

Second. Eliminating the present limitation of 200 shares in the account of any 1 member, and permitting a credit-union member to own shares jointly with any person designated by him.

Third. Providing that after a reserve fund equal to 10 percent of the members' shareholdings has been established from the setting aside of 20 percent of the net

earnings of each year, no further transfer of net earnings to such fund will be required. It would also no longer require such reserve fund to be kept liquid and intact, thus permitting a District-chartered credit union to use such reserve fund for loans and other investments.

Hearings were held on Senate bill 873, and there was no opposition. It has the approval of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia Credit Union League, Inc., and the National Association of Credit Unions.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for his explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 873), to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That (a) paragraph 5 of section 7 of the District Columbia Credit Unions Act, as amended (26 D. C. Code, sec. 507), is amended by striking out "company" and inserting in lieu thereof "credit union".

(b) Paragraph 11 of such section is amended by striking out "payable to" and inserting in lieu thereof "payable by".

SEC. 2. Section 9 of the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, as amended (26 D. C. Code, sec. 509), is amended to read as follows:

"MEMBERSHIP

"SEC. 9. Credit-union membership shall consist of the incorporators and such other persons or organizations as may be elected to membership and subscribe to at least one share, pay the initial installment thereon, and the entrance fee, if any; except that credit-union membership shall be limited to groups the members of which are actual residents of or do business or are employed within the District of Columbia, and either have a common bond of occupation, of association, or reside within a well-defined neighborhood or community. Shares may be issued in joint tenancy with right of survivorship with any persons designated by the credit union member, but no joint tenant shall be permitted to vote, obtain loans, or hold office, unless he is within the field of membership and is a qualified member."

SEC. 3. Section 12 of the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, as amended (26 D. C. Code, sec. 512), is amended to read as follows:

"RESERVES

"SEC. 12. All entrance fees and fines provided by the bylaws and 20 percent of the net earnings of each year, before the declaration of any dividends, shall be set aside as a reserve fund against bad loans or other losses, which fund shall not be distributed except in case of liquidation: *Provided, however*, That when the reserve fund thus established shall equal 10 percent of the total amount of members' shareholdings, no further transfer of net earnings to such reserve fund shall be required except that such amounts not in excess of 20 percent of the net earnings as may be needed to maintain this 10 percent ratio shall be transferred. In addition to such regular reserve, special reserves to protect the interests of members shall be established when required (a) by regulation, or (b) in any special case, when found by the Comptroller of the Currency to be necessary for that purpose."

PROPOSED DELEGATE FROM DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 697) to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I request that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

The bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts a question. Does the Senator from Massachusetts feel that this type of bill should be passed on a call of the calendar?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is that I do, because it simply provides an extension of the present act until the Selective Service Act expires, on June 1, 1955. The bill would continue the dependency allowances, which is highly essential to the maintenance of morale in the lower grades of our Armed Forces.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It merely extends an existing function?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It has been the law since June 1, 1950.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 771, 81st Cong.) is amended by deleting the date "April 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1955."

LIMITATION OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, as I stated to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee prior to the session today, I propose to offer an amendment to the pending bill which would correct two injustices against two career naval officers. The amendment is embodied in a bill submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], for himself, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and myself. The bill is Senate bill 1063.

Am I correct in understanding that if the amendment is not offered today the Committee on Armed Services will give a prompt hearing on the bill to which I have just referred?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is correct. I talked it over with him and told him this was a bill for a special purpose, and it was very essential that it be passed promptly. I assure the Senator from Michigan that on the special bill which he has in mind we shall give a hearing within a month.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator. I should like to count on the bill referred to by me being enacted. The Navy has brought about the necessity for this bill by giving inaccurate testimony when the so-called Davis amendment was considered last year.

The bill in which I am interested along with the Senators whom I have named also involves a case where the Department of the Navy has failed to carry out an administrative act when it had the opportunity, and it has opposed the proposed legislation to correct two injustices which it created. I thought the bill was most appropriate at this time, because both bills deal with the action of the Navy Department in giving the Congress inaccurate information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has told me that. The pending bill was introduced as a result of inaccurate information. The committee will certainly give a careful hearing to the bill which the Senator has in mind.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The committee report states that the bill under consideration is of a very temporary nature.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. It is recommended by the committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is chairman, on the ground that a study is being made by the House Committee on Armed Services. I wonder if the Senate Armed Services Committee also is going to give consideration to this problem.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Tennessee that this bill is to prevent the demotion of some 5,400 lieutenants because of a miscalculation, as I have just told the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I have talked with Representative ARENDS, who is the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which is investigating the whole act. I did not think it was wise to have duplication of effort. A House subcommittee is hearing the matter now, and Mr. ARENDS tells me it will be approximately a month before the subcommittee will be ready to report to the full committee.

When the House sends to the Senate such recommendations as it may care to make we shall then be guided by circumstances as to what to do. That, I think, would eliminate any duplication of effort.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is aware, I take it, that in many categories our armed services are topheavy in officers of high grade. It was for the purpose of remedying that situation that the Davis Act, which this bill seems to set aside temporarily, was enacted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. At that time I was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, as also was the distinguished author of the bill. There is a clearly recognized need for remedial action. I had hoped that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services would give assurance that his committee likewise would immediately undertake a study of this matter. Unless such assurance is forthcoming, I shall feel constrained to object to passage of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The only reason why the Senate Committee on Armed Services is not making a study as a committee is that the very same kind of study, for the very purpose which the Senator has recommended, is being made in the House, and I felt that the Senate committee would be in a better position to act when it could consider all the amendments made by the House in connection with this most complicated situation. The whole subject of personnel is very complicated. When the Senate committee can see what the House committee has reported, we can then decide what we should do. But if we should begin a study now, it would be the same study the House is making, and it would be conducted for the same purpose, namely, to prevent overloading at the top, and to make promotions fair.

To conduct a study now would be a complete duplication of the efforts of the House committee. Our heart is in the right place, but we are trying to conserve our efforts, because there is a very considerable amount of work to be done on other subjects.

Mr. GORE. If the House should fail to take action, the Senator from Massachusetts would not consider that such inaction on the part of the House would absolve the Senate from taking action on the problem, would he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not. As has just been pointed out to me, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] last year headed a subcommittee which went into the subject, and the limitations which are now imposed on the number of upper grade officers—officers of general and flag rank—are less than those authorized by statute. In other words, the subcommittee last year, headed by the Senator from Mississippi, which had the responsibility of considering confirmation of such nominations recommended merely by implication, as it were, what it considered were wise reductions in the number of officers of flag and general rank. Therefore, it is not proposed to recommend the confirmation of officers of flag or general rank in the numbers authorized by statute, but rather in the numbers authorized by formal action of our committee. Have I made myself clear?

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Massachusetts always makes himself clear, and is always actuated by the finest motives and purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. GORE. In line with the Senator's traditional reputation of being actuated by higher motives, in the event the House fails to act on this question, will it be the purpose of the Senator's committee to study it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is very decidedly "Yes." However, I know that Members of the House feel very strongly about the subject, too.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when the Unanimous Consent Calendar is before the Senate, I have learned that the best practice is: When in doubt, object. I at least have found this discussion to be so completely lacking in clarity that I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have tried to answer questions. If the Senator from Oregon will give me an opportunity to do so, I shall read an explanation of what the bill proposes to accomplish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to withhold my objection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the Defense Appropriation Act was being debated in the House last year, a floor amendment establishing a percentage limitation on the numbers of officers in various ranks in the several services was adopted. This was known as the Davis amendment.

The intent of the amendment was to put a freeze on promotions to the higher grades—flag and general officers, captains, and colonels, mainly.

There is no doubt that this was a worthy objective. Unfortunately, however, it was not achieved by the language of the Davis amendment. On the contrary, it seems that a substantial number of the younger and more junior officers, particularly those in the Navy, have either been denied promotions to which they are entitled, or actually face a reduction to a lower rank.

The House recognized that the Davis amendment, as adopted, had a completely unintended and unexpected effect. That includes the author of the amendment itself, Mr. Davis.

The pending bill, H. R. 2332, which passed the House a week ago Wednesday by unanimous vote of 370 to 0, seeks to remedy the situation, but on only a stopgap basis. In the meantime, the Arends subcommittee of the House committee is going forward with a complete restudy of the Officer Personnel Act, to bring about a permanent adjustment, and standardization, of existing provisions which control the numbers of officers in the various ranks, and the methods of selection for promotion to higher rank.

I have talked with Representative ARENDS. His subcommittee started hearings last week. They hope to be able to conclude their hearings and report to the full committee by the 1st of April.

The pending bill is of special urgency because of the fact that if remedial action is not taken prior to April 1, a very substantial number of junior officers, particularly in the Navy, will face reduction in rank. I understand that the number of officers involved is approximately 5,400.

Vice Adm. J. L. Holloway, Chief of Naval Personnel, appearing before the committee for the Department of Defense and the Navy, strongly urged the passage of the bill. Representative of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps were also present before the committee and supported the Navy's position. In other words, the bill proposes to take care of the situation up until July 1 of this year.

We are told that if the action proposed by the bill is not taken before April 1, some 5,400 junior officers will face reduction in rank.

Mr. Davis, himself, who was the author of the amendment, agrees to the bill, and was one of the Members who voted in the unanimous vote to pass the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Oregon asked the question. I yield to him first.

Mr. MORSE. To the knowledge of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, how long has this situation existed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It has existed since the adjournment of the last Congress. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that, if my memory is correct, the item was included in the military appropriation bill which was passed in the very last days of the previous session.

Mr. MORSE. The problem has been known for a good many months, has it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should say that the problem has been known for the last 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. The committee still has until April 1 to get through the Senate a stop-gap measure which will really meet the problem basically, has it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Oregon knows, the colleague of the junior Senator from Tennessee, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], was chairman of a subcommittee a few years ago which drew a very comprehensive bill which became the Officer Personnel Act. It was the subject of discussion and consideration for a year or more. Now it appears that some obvious amendments should be made to the act. As I have tried to explain to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Arends subcommittee of the House is now studying the subject. The Senate committee is very cognizant of the situation—so cognizant of it that, led by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] last year, the committee informally cut down the top authorization for officers of general and flag rank.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Oregon has finished.

Mr. GORE. I desired to make a reply to the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. The purpose of my questions to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was not to raise a question in the mind of the Senator from Oregon——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator did not.

Mr. GORE. Or of any other Senator about the advisability of passage of the bill now. My purpose was to elicit from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services an assurance that his committee was, first, cognizant of the problem which the Davis amendment seems to have missed, and, further, that the Senate Committee on Armed Services would give study to it.

I was a participant in the adoption of the Davis amendment in the House. I now feel that the bill presently before the Senate should pass. I wish to make it clear that I have not raised the question in order to keep the bill from passing, but rather to elicit from the Senator from Massachusetts the assurance which he has now given.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand completely the purpose of the Senator from Tennessee in asking his question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—let me say that I think the record is perfectly clear that this problem has been pending before the Armed Services Committee for many months. In my judgment, we ought to be dealing today not with stop-gap legislation but with legislation which would really correct the basic defects. I still think there is ample time between now and April 1 to do it. At least, there will be another call of the calendar between now and April 1 to allow opportunity to pass on this question. Apparently all concerned need an impetus to cause them to undertake to solve the real basic problem. Therefore I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon objects, that is the end of it for the moment; but I have asked the majority leader if he would move the consideration of this measure immediately, because it is the personal concern, the financial concern, and the moral concern of a very substantial number of our officers who are fighting a war today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall use my 5 minutes now.

Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that he is perfectly at liberty, at any time he so desires, to make a motion on the floor of the Senate so as to surmount an objection to unanimous-consent consideration. That is an old, hoary practice on the floor of the Senate.

I also wish to say to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that, in my opinion, we ought to have before the Senate today the basic legislation necessary to solve this problem. The chairman of the committee himself admits that the existence of this problem has been known for many months. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say in reply to the Senator from Oregon that the present Armed Services Committee did not come into existence until January of this year. There was an election last autumn, as a result of which we are very glad to see the present Presiding Officer sitting where he is.

This question cannot be determined in a month or 6 weeks. It will require a substantial amount of time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me reply to the Senator from Massachusetts by saying that so far as I am concerned, his statement is most unacceptable rebuttal. I have seen major legislation go through the Armed Services Committee, with full hearings, in the course of 3 weeks. This is now March 9——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that there have been some remarks which have been slightly out of order from a parliamentary standpoint. The clerk will call the next measure on the calendar.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair advise the junior Senator from Oregon what remarks have been out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been very lenient. The bill had gone over. The Chair had announced that fact. So the proper procedure was to proceed to the consideration of the next measure on the calendar.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

RECOGNITION OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF COL. J. CLAUDE KIMBROUGH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 709) to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "as", to strike out "military", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the outstanding service and contribution made to the science of medicine and surgery by Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired, and to provide that his mature professional judgment and long experience may continue to remain available to the public service, the President is hereby authorized to designate the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, upon his retirement from the active list, as consultant in urology at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C. Such designation shall be subject to the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough's acceptance and shall be terminable at his pleasure, or at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Army. During the time he serves under such designation, the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough shall be entitled to receive, in lieu of his retired pay, the full active-duty pay and allowances to which he was entitled immediately prior to his retirement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF OFFICE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for administrative expenses of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control for the period ending April 30, 1953, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to provide for the necessary administrative expenses of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control of the District of Columbia for the period ending April 30, 1953, as authorized by Public Law 430, 82d Congress, approved June 30, 1952, there is hereby appropriated, out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1953, the additional amount of $17,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the calendar.

LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 72, House bill 2332.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill. Such a motion during the morning hour is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the following three points: In the first place, there is ample time between now and April 1 for the consideration of this bill by the objector to the bill. There is ample time to resolve any differences which may have developed between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon as to the procedure which has been followed in connection with this bill. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill.

I think the statements of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on the floor of the Senate today indicate very clearly the desirability of further time for the consideration of the bill.

Secondly, I point out to the Senator from Ohio that this is early in the session. He may, as majority leader, wish to establish this precedent, but I respectfully advise him that there is a quite a long time between now and the time of adjournment of this session. If he wishes to take the position that a Member of the Senate who desires more time to consider a bill—and I have asked for further time to consider the bill—is to be denied it today, I will accept that as

his idea of the way to proceed parliamentarily when the Unanimous Consent Calendar is before the Senate. If the Senator from Ohio believes that in the long run he will save a great deal of time, as majority leader he may live to learn that this is not a time-saving device at all.

In the third place, I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio again to the fact that once more we are confronted with the problem of what we are going to do about minority rights on the floor of the Senate, and whether or not the Unanimous Consent Calendar is to mean what the term implies, the requirement of unanimous consent to pass bills unless Members who object to bills have had adequate time to study them.

I leave it up to the majority leader. He is writing his record. I will respond to the record he writes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bilil (H. R. 2332) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Anderson	Hennings	McClellan
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bennett	Hoey	Morse
Bush	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Payne
Carlson	Jackson	Potter
Case	Jenner	Purtell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Knowland	Sparkman
Ferguson	Kuchel	Stennis
Frear	Langer	Symington
Fulbright	Lehman	Taft
George	Long	Thye
Gillette	Magnuson	Tobey
Goldwater	Malone	Watkins
Gore	Mansfield	Welker
Green	Martin	Williams
Griswold	Maybank	Young
Hayden	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak for only a few minutes about the present parliamentary situation. I believe the facts to be very clear.

First, during the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] wished to have Calendar No. 72, House bill 2332, considered. I listened to the discussion, and when it was over I stated that I was not at all clear about the subject of the bill. I expressed the view that I believed the Armed Services Committee should have before the Senate proposed legislation which would solve this problem permanently, but I stated that I wanted time to study the matter.

After hearing me say that I was going to object, the Senator from Massachusetts advised me that the majority leader had informed him that if there was objection to the bill, a motion would be made to take up the bill.

That brings up the issue of whether we are going to proceed in conformity with what I believe to be clearly the spirit and intent of the Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure, which requires unanimous consent for the consideration and passage of a bill on the calendar, to the end that any Senator who objects may have time to study the bill. It raises the question of whether in the Senate of the United States the point has been reached where, when one Member of the Senate who is not very popular with some, particularly with a majority of the Members on this side of the aisle, objects, then the whistle of the steamroller will be blown, and the majority will proceed to roll over the objection merely because the Senator who objected wishes to exercise his rights under the Unanimous Consent Calendar rule.

Mr. President, it is up to my colleagues today to decide whether they wish to establish that precedent.

I respectfully say that the Senator from Massachusetts has rebutted himself. In his own discussion of the bill he has pointed out that no great emergency in connection with the bill will arise until April 1. This is March 9. So we shall have at least one calendar call, and possibly more, between now and April 1.

Regardless of the attitude of the Senator from Massachusetts toward me—and I know full well what his attitude is off the floor of the Senate—let me say that under the rules of the Senate he, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, should have the wisdom to follow the long-estabiished practice in connection with Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure, by permitting any Senator, regardless of who he may be—even the junior Senator from Oregon—to have adequate time to study the record involved in any particular bill. That is the position I have taken.

Mr. President, I wish to say that we are going to find out here today whether that kind of courtesy is going to be extended to all 96 Members of the Senate. I will fight to have the same courtesy right extended to any other Member of the Senate, even including the Senator from Massachusetts, because I think we are faced here with a question of great substance. In this particular instance we are faced with the question of whether each Member of the Senate will be protected in what I believe to be an unwritten rule of the Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure. In other words, I believe that each Senator has a right to study a bill before it is steamrollered over his objection, by way of motion to consider the bill. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think he knows me well enough, having served with me for many years on the Armed Services Committee, to realize full well that once I have an opportunity to study a bill and once I find the situation is such that the equities and justice call for immediate passage of the bill, I will give my approval of the bill at the next call of the calendar.

If, on the other hand, I consider there is any basis for a suspicion that the Navy has been at fault in the past in presenting to the Armed Services Committee some unreliable evidence, then I believe the Navy should be brought up to the line and I should furnish clear explanations upon which the committee can rely.

I do not make threats; but as a Member of the Senate, with rights equal to those of any other Member of the Senate, I wish to say that I will find out today, by the action taken in this instance, whether the Senate intends to extend to me the courtesy which I believe is due me under the long-established policies in connection with procedures and practices when the Unanimous Consent Calendar is called. In short, I will learn whether I am going to be given an opportunity, as the Member of the Independent Party on the floor of the Senate, to study calendar bills before they are finally passed, or whether the attitude of other Members will be that they are going to steamroller the bills through the Senate, regardless of my objections.

If that is going to be the view of the Senate, I will do the best I can in the future to try to protect myself by appropriate parliamentary action. But let us have an understanding now about where we stand on the Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I understand that at this time we are operating under rule VIII.

Mr. MORSE. That is not my understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then, Mr. President, if we are operating under rule VIII, all the argument made by the Senator from Oregon is out of order, in my judgment.

Mr. MORSE. Let us discuss that. Today we have had a call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar. We went through

the calendar. After the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar was completed, a motion was made by the majority leader that House bill 2332, Calendar No. 72, be considered. The majority leader did not make his motion under rule VIII, Mr. President. He moved that House bill 2332, Calendar No. 72, be made the business before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is correct in his statement that the motion to consider the bill was made under rule VIII. The call of the calendar had been concluded, and the Senator from Ohio at that time made the motion.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The motion was made immediately following objection to the consideration of the bill in accordance with the rule.

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President; the Senator had finished the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion was made at the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me read rule IX. It is not rule VIII, it is rule IX, which reads as follows:

> Immediately after the consideration of cases not objected to upon the calendar is completed, and not later than 2 o'clock if there shall be no special orders for that time, the Calendar of General Orders shall be taken up and proceeded with in its order, beginning with the first subject on the calendar next after the last subject disposed of in proceeding with the calendar; and in such case the following motions shall be in order at any time as privileged motions, save as against a motion to adjourn, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or questions of privilege, to wit:
>
> First. A motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill.
>
> Second. A motion to proceed to the consideration of any other bill on the calendar, which motion shall not be open to amendment.
>
> Third. A motion to pass over the pending subject, which if carried shall have the effect to leave such subject without prejudice in its place on the calendar.
>
> Fourth. A motion to place such subject at the foot of the calendar.
>
> Each of the foregoing motions shall be decided without debate and shall have precedence in the order above named, and may be submitted as in the nature and with all the rights of questions or order.

So, Mr. President, what has happened is that, proceeding in strict accordance with rules VIII and IX, we are now taking up, on motion, one of the bills which was passed over, as provided for and intended by the Rules of the Senate. When we reach the hour of 2 o'clock, the question will then be whether the Senate desires to make this bill the unfinished business of the Senate. But during the morning hour, the motion was made and is being considered. The effect of the motion is to remove the 5-minute limitation on debate, and the Senator from Oregon can talk until 2 o'clock, at which time the question of making the bill the unfinished business of the Senate may be raised. I think that is a correct statement of the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is properly before the Senate. The Senator from Oregon is in order, and may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to get the parliamentary situation straight. I thought I had it straight. I went to the desk and talked with the Parliamentarian. Apparently I completely misunderstood him. As I understood, his statement was that it would be possible to proceed under rule VIII, but that we were not proceeding under rule VIII; we were proceeding under the motion of the Senator from Ohio to make House bill 2332 the unfinished business of the Senate for the time being, and that the rule governing procedure at the hour of 2 o'clock did not apply. But apparently the Parliamentarian said something to the contrary, and I completely misunderstood him. The purpose of my inquiry of the Parliamentarian, when I went to the desk, was to ascertain exactly the parliamentary situation at that time, and I understood it was his interpretation that we were proceeding with this measure as the unfinished business of the Senate. I asked the Parliamentarian what was pending when the Senate adjourned last Friday. I thought there was some business pending before the Senate, and I asked him what the status of that business was. He said nothing was pending when the Senate adjourned on Friday until today; that today a call of the calendar would be in order; and, when we finished with the calendar, then, I understood the Parliamentarian to say, the Senator from Ohio could, by motion, make this bill the unfinished business of the Senate. If I misunderstood the Parliamentarian, I am sorry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will inform the Senator from Oregon that when a motion is made at the conclusion of the call of the calendar to take up a bill which was on the calendar, then at 2 o'clock, if there is pending business, the particular bill, if its consideration shall not then have been completed, goes back on the calendar. In this instance, no pending business being before the Senate, the precedent has been established that this bill becomes the pending business and will continue, after 2 o'clock, until disposed of. The Senator from Oregon is correct in his understanding of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. At 2 o'clock, I intend to move to proceed with the consideration of the Executive Calendar. What will be the status after the consideration of the Executive Calendar shall have been completed? Will this bill, or will it not, be the unfinished business of the Senate, and how does it get to be so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to consider the Executive Calendar is a privileged motion, and will be considered when it is made, but, according to the precedents, as the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian, when there is no pending business and a motion is made at the conclusion of the calendar, as in this instance to consider a bill which is on the calendar, such bill becomes the pending business.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At the time the objection was made to this bill, on the call of the calendar, would not the Senator from Massachusetts have had the right to move to take up the bill under rule VIII?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the Senator from New Jersey is correct; and had the Senator from Massachusetts done that, the bill could have been taken up in that manner; but it was not handled in that way. As the Senator will recall, the bill went over, and the Senate concluded the calendar. At the conclusion of the calendar, the Senator from Ohio moved to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In light of that situation, Mr. President, I may say that much of the argument made by the Senator from Oregon was not relevant to the issue before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey may say so, but for his benefit I am going to repeat most of that argument. In order to show him that I think it is most relevant to the situation I shall restate it in a little different way, and from a little different angle. He will then, perhaps, see my point a little more clearly.

Mr. President, I have no intention of speaking until 2 o'clock, because I do not propose to use any parliamentary tactic to cause a postponement of the consideration of this issue. We are going to vote on this issue today. We are going to find out today whether we are to follow what the Parliamentarian said. I hope the Parliamentarian will not tell me now that I misunderstood something else he told me at the desk. I asked the Parliamentarian whether the procedure followed by the Senator from Ohio in this matter had been very common in the history of the Senate, and he replied that it has not been a very common one; which brings me right down to the kernel of the situation as I see it. The situation here today was that a Member of the Senate objected to a bill and asked that it go over. In my 8 years in the Senate, I have seen that happen scores of times, Mr. President, and time has been given until the next calendar day, for the objecting Senator to study the bill. Other Senators may say it has not been the common practice, but I have been led to believe that it is, and I think that is a proper description of what the practice has been.

The record is very clear, from the lips of the Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, himself, that there is no essential need for the passage of this bill prior to April 1. That is when the emergency will arise. There will be a call of the consent calendar between now and April 1. I have asked for the right to study this bill until the next calendar day.

Mr. President, I close by leaving it to the Senate as to whether, in effect, the Senate wants to apply another rule of the Senate, and stand on that rule, in order to put a bill through the Senate when Senators know very well that one of their colleagues has asked for time in

which to study the bill. Senators are writing the record, and in the future I shall act upon the basis of the record that is written today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill (H. R. 2332) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert M. Cole, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is a remarkable appointment. Mr. Cole is proposed as Administrator of a program which he has opposed. He has opposed it completely and immoderately.

It has always been my position that a nominee whose confirmation is before the Senate need not be a person with whom I agree. At this time, I will not reiterate the criteria which the Senate has used in passing upon Executive nominations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. MAYBANK. This is a very important nomination, and, without taking the Senator off the floor, I really think we ought to have a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Carolina for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. No. I am interested, I may say to my good friend from South Carolina, only in making my record. I am perfectly aware as of this moment of the attitude that most of the other Members of the Senate have just expressed on the floor of the Senate concerning their opinion of the views of the junior Senator from Oregon. I simply want to advise them that I think they are going to live to learn with surprise that there is much greater interest across the country in the views of the Senator from Oregon than apparently there is on the floor of the Senate. So from this desk today I shall speak to the country about Mr. Cole. The issue must be made clear.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no intention of suggesting that the Senator is not doing that. The only suggestion I had in mind to make was that, on the consideration of the Executive Calendar I think we ought to have a quorum call. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am going to vote to confirm Mr. Cole's nomination.

Mr. MORSE. I am not interested in a quorum call.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. But, certainly, Mr. President, an indispensable condition of confirmation is that the nominee be free of a bias which would interfere with the administration of his office. In this case, the question arises in connection with a comprehensive program for housing established by the Congress. That program is a bipartisan one. We are not considering the administration of an agency for which the executive department has primary responsibility.

The normal presumption in passing upon a nomination submitted by the President is that the President should, in the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary, have the executive officers whom he desires. That presumption is of less force where the program to be administered is one which was established by the Congress. In such a case, the Senate may properly consider whether the appointee can be expected to discharge his duties in a way that fulfills the intent of Congress.

The administration of the Housing Act of 1949 comprises the major portion of the duties of the office to which Cole is nominated. The act established certain housing programs and objectives which are clearly stated. The achievement of them requires administrative discretion—and the act conferred such discretion. For instance, he can determine the interest rates for mortgages under FHA. And in lesser ways the Administrator can forward or defeat the goals of this important legislation. Mr. Cole conceded this during the hearings—page 20:

Senator DOUGLAS. * * * An unsympathetic Administrator can always put roadblocks in the way of specific projects on the grounds that the site is not suitable or that this or that is not suitable.

Mr. COLE. I understand.

Senator DOUGLAS. And therefore, in effect, he can prevent the will of Congress from being carried out.

Mr. COLE. I would agree that it could be done that way.

Cole's opposition to this vital housing program is a matter of record.

He was a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee during his 6 years as a Representative. Normally that would be evidence of excellent qualifying experience for the program which was considered and advocated by that committee in 1949.

But his record was one of total opposition. In his extended speech on the act in 1949—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 6, pages 8150–8152—which was long by House standards—he stated his condemnation of each and every portion of that measure.

His final indictment was that the Housing Act of 1949 had potentialities for strangling America. Even allowing for the extravagance which sometimes unfortunately accompanies debate on a bill, his implacable opposition to and overwhelming lack of sympathy with this program renders him incapable of discharging his duties under it in conformity with congressional policy.

He stated unequivocally during the hearings on the confirmation of his nomination that he had not changed his views—page 16:

Mr. COLE. Perhaps you misunderstood me. I have not changed my opinion. Have I indicated that I changed my opinion? If so, I beg your pardon. I have not changed my personal opinion about it.

And on page 21, he stated:

Mr. COLE. The term "public housing" I still do not like.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, it happens to be in the act.

Mr. COLE. Well, maybe it is. I do not know.

At the outset of the hearings, Cole stated that, despite his personal opposition to the Housing Act, it is the law of the land and he would respect and administer it as such.

Laudable as this sentiment is. I am convinced that his record and his own utterances during the hearing on March 2, demonstrate that he cannot do so. Nor can the Senate gamble on his ability to do so in the face of great odds.

In the course of the hearings, some Senators observed that the congressional policy embodied in the Housing Act may be changed. This is the prerogative of the Congress. Until such change takes place—openly, after investigation and debate—it is the solemn obligation of the Administrator to fulfill the mandate of the legislature.

What is Cole's conception of his functions? The hearings shed light on this. He stated, page 15:

Mr. COLE. Let me say this to you: One directive has been given me by the White House. One directive. That directive is that I conduct a study of the housing program.

In my judgment, that is not the job assigned by Congress. That is not the job inherent in the act.

If the President wishes to consider modification or abolition of this program, he has the means to do so. The study can be undertaken, proposals submitted to Congress, and considered by it. Members of the public have a right to know what the Government is thinking about and be given the opportunity to make their views known.

Congress must require that the Administrator of its program discharge his statutory functions. It seems that the administration did not propose Cole with that intention, if I correctly interpret the innuendoes and implications of Mr. Cole's own testimony.

An administrator can, of course, express his views upon proposed changes and the committees of Congress often solicit such comments. But that is not his primary function.

Is there any indication that Cole safely could be entrusted with this program? He related in his testimony the following incident during consideration of the 1949 Housing Act:

So, when I finally came to the final vote on it, I said to myself, "I am not opposed to housing. My record shows I am not opposed to housing."

He did not say that to the House, nor to anyone else, so far as the record shows. He was very careful in his testimony before the committee to say nothing about public housing.

That is slim evidence, indeed, on which to base a finding that Cole can be sympathetic to any form of public housing.

On the record made before the Banking and Currency Committee it seems clear that Cole cannot be expected to discharge his duties in harmony with the congressional purposes enunciated in the Housing Act of 1949.

Furthermore, the Senate should not invite the emasculation of this program by executive fiat. We want an Administrator, not a one-man law revision commission.

The Housing needs of the country are chronic. The present program is a vital necessity if we are to have any appreciable progress in slum clearance, low-cost housing, some measure of amelioration in the congestion caused by our immense defense program.

This is what Cole has to say about this, page 4:

Mr. COLE. Senator, as conditions warrant it I believe the Government should gradually get out of the housing business. I think government should support housing and not supplant it—support the housing industry; the people who are building houses. They should support it and not supplant it.

That must be music to the ears of the contractors of the country, Mr. President.

I wish to digress from my prepared remarks long enough to say that I shall retain my interest in the people who need housing. I am satisfied that the contractors can take care of themselves, but I know the little people cannot. I know something about the plight of the little people in congested areas of America who need public housing, who need slum clearance. Today I shall not be a party to voting for confirmation of the nomination of a man who has already testified where his interest is—not in the little people, but in those who build houses. The administration proposes to make him the administrator of an act passed by the Congress of the United States which was aimed to help the little people in America who need public housing.

Not only is this nomination shocking, Mr. President, but I shall do my best to help the little people in America remember the blow to their interest which the Eisenhower administration is striking against them today in submitting the nomination.

Of course, the program in part provides assistance to individuals and to the housing industry. It provides also for grants to local public authorities to provide low-rent housing where private groups will not or cannot do so.

The Public Housing Authority has provided for Negroes housing relief which simply has not been otherwise available. It must be continued. The colored population of America knows what it means to be exploited in regard to their housing. One can go within almost a stone's throw of the Capitol Building and see such exploitation and its shocking consequences.

"Leave such housing to those who build houses," says Mr. Cole. The record is clear that if it is left to those who build houses, the result will be exploitation, so far as colored people and many other little people are concerned, once they lose the friendly assistance of such an act as was passed in 1949, and are denied at least an unbiased, impartial administrator of that act.

This nomination is unfortunately similar to the nominations of Wilson, Kyes, Talbott, and Douglas. In each case a man has been proposed whose past activities, associations, or attitudes come into head-on conflict with the program he is supposed to supervise.

Mr. President, I say that such choices as these are dangerous for the little people of America. In my judgment, it is the obligation of the United States Senate today to withhold approval of this nomination. In the interest of the people of America who need public housing, I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of a man whose record shows he is not a friend, so far as the housing issue is concerned, of the little people of America, but who admits he is interested in taking care of builders.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to make crystal clear for the record of the United States Senate what I know about public housing which, to my mind, is simply slum clearance. I was mayor of Charleston, S. C., in 1933, when public housing was first commenced under Secretary of the Interior Ickes. The second public housing project built in the United States was built in my city, the first having been built in Detroit.

Long, long ago, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I supported the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. Likewise, I supported the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. The bill was twice defeated.

I gave to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who sits besides me, a bill to be introduced for the committee, which carried as one of its titles the so-called public housing law.

I believe in the poor people, as does the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I knew Representative Cole when he was a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and I saw him frequently. I knew him to be an honorable man. I knew he was opposed to public housing, but that does not mean that he will not carry out the mandate of Congress.

All I desire to have the RECORD show is that, at the request of my Democratic colleagues I, as ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, questioned Mr. Cole. I wish to read what Representative Cole answered in response to my questions, so that the RECORD may be clear, and there will be no misunderstanding on the part of contractors and housing officials. The advocates of public housing from New York to California know my record. I have been a Member of the Senate for more than 12 years. Prior to that I was Governor of South Carolina, where I sponsored the housing law which was enacted by the legislature of my State. As I have said, I was mayor of Charleston in 1931.

I desire to read into the RECORD the statement and testimony of Mr. Cole, as follows:

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the invitation extended me to appear before this committee in its consideration of my recent nomination as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I am fully cognizant of the great responsibility entailed in the office of Administrator of HHFA.

During the 6 years I was a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I had an opportunity, as many of you have had, to familiarize myself rather thoroughly with the many problems with which the Congress has had to cope in shaping the various Government housing programs.

I have also a deep and sincere respect for the mandates of the Congress. I pledge you my most earnest endeavor to administer fairly and honorably those laws and responsibilities entrusted to my jurisdiction.

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the committee may wish to question me in order to better advise the Senate with respect to my confirmation.

Senator MAYBANK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MAYBANK.

Senator MAYBANK. When the so-called public housing program first came up, it was the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, and then it was the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. Those bills unfortunately did not pass.

Later on, I introduced a bill together with some 20 Senators, I think. You are familiar with that?

Mr. COLE. Yes. The Housing Act of 1949?

Senator MAYBANK. Yes. You opposed that?

Mr. COLE. I voted against it; yes, sir.

Senator MAYBANK. You say:

"I have a deep and sincere respect for the mandates of Congress. I pledge you my most earnest endeavor to administer fairly and honorably those laws and responsibilities entrusted to my jurisdiction."

Now I do not know whether the law might have been good for your district or bad for your district. In South Carolina we had the same situation. It probably was not the best thing for your district, but on the other hand, was good, as a whole, for the United States. When you take office you will of course, look at it from a national standpoint; look at is from the standpoint that the bill is the law of the land?

Mr. COLE. Senator, I definitely and vigorously support that position.

Then I placed in the RECORD the names of those who had voted for the Housing Act of 1949. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read these long hearings. However, when Mr. Cole told me that he respected the laws of this land, that he was going to administer the laws as they were, and that he would not in any wise attempt before any committee

to undo the laws or to seek to have the laws changed, I voted for him, and I intend to vote for the confirmation of his nomination today.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We fought this battle together.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask the Senator from South Carolina if he does not believe, as I do, that it is good, sound policy, when the Congress has spoken on a great national policy such as public housing, to see that those who are friendly to the law are placed in charge of its administration?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who was chairman of the committee in the 80th Congress, and who knows that I voted with him on many issues, that it is not a question of my putting someone in office to administer the law. That is a question for the President, whose duty it is to appoint persons who will carry out his policies. The President could have submitted the name of some other nominee.

Mr. TOBEY. But the Senator and I might become accessories after the fact.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say that I was an accessory before the fact in voting for the Housing Act. My former chairman knows that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the nomination of Albert M. Cole to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I wish to make it abundantly clear at the outset that my opposition is not based merely on a desire to oppose, because it is my strong desire to support the President of the United States whenever I can do so in good conscience. However, I believe this is a most unfortunate nomination.

I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Cole. I understand, however, that he enjoys an excellent reputation as a man and as a former Representative in Congress. My opposition to his nomination is not directed toward his intelligence, his honesty, or his sincerity, all of which have been vouched for by persons whose opinions I respect, including Members of the Senate. I believe, too, that the President should have wide latitude on the selection of his key administrators.

In this case, however, there are compelling reasons why I cannot vote in the affirmative. These reasons are supported by many telegrams and letters received, not only from my own State but from many other States as well.

There are several reasons for my opposition. The first of these is Mr. Cole's record with respect to housing legislation during his service as a Representative in Congress. So far as I can determine, Mr. Cole has consistently, in speech and action, stated and voted his complete opposition to the public housing program.

His dislike and distrust of the public housing program has been reflected not only in his actions on legislative bills, but also on appropriations. In fact, his opposition to public housing has apparently colored his understanding and acceptance of other phases of the Federal housing program which came into being as a result of the Housing Act of 1949. I refer among other things to slum clearance, research, and farm housing.

The best evidence of Mr. Cole's views in regard to public housing and other housing programs are his own statements.

I quote a few excerpts from speeches or statements of Mr. Cole:

For the following reasons I object to the low-rent housing plan:

The first objection is that it is privileged and discriminatory housing.

Secondly, it will not clear the slums.

Third, the poorer folks will not be housed under this program.

Fourth, it builds a tremendous political machine.

Fifth, it violates the rights of minorities.

Sixth, it is excessive in cost and there are no brakes on the excessive cost.

Seventh, it tends to destroy private homes and private business.

And eighth, it tends to destroy our form of government. (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8151.)

There certainly can be no doubt in the mind of anyone regarding his deep-rooted and complete bias against public housing.

I quote Mr. Cole again on public housing legislation:

There is a slender, almost indistinguishable thread running through this entire bill. That thread is government control of the individual family life, the individual home, the individual. Read the bill carefully from the beginning, the declaration of policy, through the slum-clearance proposition, through the low-rent plan, down through the research program, and, finally, to the farm housing, in which the farmers are regimented, and you will then find, Mr. Chairman, that this threat may become so strong as to strangle the people of America. (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8152.)

Certainly these intemperate statements indicate clearly a prejudice against the law which, in spite of the best intentions of the nominee, would prejudice any objective administration of his agency.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York be kind enough to yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York not agree with me that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] went to the very heart of the problem before the Senate when he asked this question a few minutes ago: Do we not have an obligation to confirm as the administrator of a congressional act someone who, on the record, is at least friendly to the act? Does not the Senator agree with me that that goes to the very heart of the problem?

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to make it very clear that my feeling is that it would be unfortunate, unfair, and unwise to appoint anyone to administer an act of Congress who was unfriendly to the act, as this man has clearly indicated he is.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that if we think the act ought to be repealed, modified, or emasculated, we ought to do it ourselves, and not appoint someone who has a record such as the Senator has just indicated, and who obviously is so biased that we could take judicial notice of the fact that he could not possibly administer the act within its spirit and intent?

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree fully, of course, with my distinguished colleague from Oregon. This man has shown by his words and actions that he could not possibly evaluate or appraise this law in any objective manner. Therefore he certainly could not give advice to the Congress which would be of any value, or which could possibly be considered entirely disinterested.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will further yield, let us consider a question or two dealing with the very type of objections and criticisms which Mr. Cole has made with respect to this act.

The Senator from New York, in his many years of distinguished service in public life, particularly during his governorship of the State of New York, had a great deal to do with the problem of better housing for the little people of America. Is it the opinion of the Senator from New York that when we help the so-called little people, the people of small means whose home environments are pitiful, to live in decent homes, we make bad Americans out of them, or good Americans?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, we seek to make good Americans out of them. I think the great test of a man's public service is his effort to raise the standard of living of those citizens who unfortunately have not been privileged to the same degree that many of their fellows have been privileged. There are hundreds of thousands of such people in the State of New York, and I have no doubt that there are many thousands of them in the State so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. This nominee, according to the quotations which the Senator from New York has just read, says in effect that the kind of housing program provided by the law is a threat to Americanism. Is that not the position of the nominee?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly he has taken that position. He goes even further and says with a rhetorical flourish that the public housing program—I am now quoting Mr. Cole—"is a thread which may become so strong as to strangle the people of America."

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York agree with me that undesirable housing conditions, such as the type of housing one observes in certain areas of Washington, D. C., which are inhabited by our Negro population, and some of which are within a few blocks of the Capitol itself—filthy, unsanitary, and inadequate—constitute conditions and environments in which Communists like to work?

Mr. LEHMAN. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is absolutely right. There is no doubt about it at all that such conditions present very fertile

ground for the development of Communists. These conditions constitute some of our most dangerous breeding grounds of communism.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York agree with me that the improvement of such conditions by the Government through a public housing program, with the building done by private contractors, which apparently Mr. Cole is completely overlooking—and they do not lose any money by that kind of construction work—not only makes better Americans out of such people, but helps us to strike an effective body blow at Communist propaganda in the United States? Does the Senator from New York agree with me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the Senator from Oregon. What particulary interested me in the testimony of Mr. Cole before the Committee on Banking and Currency—and I might say that I was prevented by a cold from attending the hearings, but I read the report very carefully—was that he said he was not against some slum clearance. However, he did not explain how one could possibly provide slum clearance without making some reasonable provision for better public housing, in which the people who are removed from the slums could be lodged.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from New York will join with me in trying—and I underline the word trying—to get a yea-and-nay vote on the nomination. I have failed on several occasions to get the Senate on record on other issues. I hope we will be able to have a year-and-nay vote on this nomination.

Mr. LEHMAN. Before I conclude my remarks I will certainly ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the nomination.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Oregon, and to say that I am in complete agreement with him. I am sure we will have a great deal more to say about he issue before the end of the afternoon.

I quote another statement made by Mr. Cole in reference to housing legislation:

> I oppose the bill because I feel it is discriminatory between all types of people * * *. I intend to oppose the bill on that basis.

The source of that quotation is the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 81st Congress, H. R. 4009, April–May 1949.

The second of my reasons for opposing the confirmation of Mr. Cole is the firm belief that no sincere and honest man, and I believe Mr. Cole to be both sincere and honest, can, contrary to his sincere convictions, efficiently carry out and administer a program to which he is unalterably opposed. With the background of his expressed views and his votes, we cannot expect Mr. Cole to seek to justify a substantial program of public housing units for the next year and the years that lie ahead. I ask unanimous consent to print the voting record of Mr. Cole on the issue of low-rent public housing.

There being no objection, the voting record was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Voting record of Hon. Albert M. Cole on issue of low-rent public housing

Issue	Mr. Cole's vote
June 29, 1949: Rees (Republican, Kansas) amendment to strike public housing title from the Housing Act of 1949. (Public housing won, 209 to 204.)	For the amendment; against public housing.
June 29, 1949: Final passage of the Housing Act of 1949. (Passed, 228 to 185.)	Against.
May 4, 1951: Gossett (Democrat, Texas) amendment to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 for fiscal year 1952. (Passed, 181 to 113.)	For the amendment; against public housing.
July 25, 1951: Vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units. (Passed, 188 to 186.)	Recorded as not voting.
Aug. 15, 1951: Second vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units. (Defeated, 206 to 169.)	For recommittal; against public housing.
Mar. 21, 1952: Fisher (Democrat, Texas) amendment to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units for fiscal year 1953. (Passed 192 to 168.)	For the amendment; against public housing.
June 26, 1952: Vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill to conference with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units for fiscal year 1953. (Passed 195 to 181.)	For recommittal; against public housing.
July 2, 1952: Second vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill to conference with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units for fiscal year 1953. (Defeated 193 to 160.)	Recorded as not voting.

Mr. LEHMAN. It will be seen from the voting record that Mr. Cole voted against the appropriation for a substantial number of public housing starts. He voted to cut the public housing program down to 5,000 units, which, of course, was just a way of killing the public housing program altogether.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Cole, but I wonder whether the Senator from New York will agree with me that on the independent offices appropriation bill I had to fight for a long time in order to have justice done to the poor people of our country. That was in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill, however, not in connection with the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senator from New York will agree with that statement, I assume.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I show what the situation was with respect to Mr. Cole's voting record.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I may say that I shall always recall with a great deal of gratitude and appreciation the yeoman service performed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in behalf of the public housing program. The President of the United States had recommended funds for 75,000 public housing units, which was still below the authorized level. The House cut the amount to 5,000 units. The bill came to the Senate and the Senator from South Carolina will recall that I introduced an amendment raising the number to 50,000 units. The Senator from South Carolina went along with the amendment, but he was very frank to say that when the bill got to the House he did not believe the House would sustain the 50,000-unit appropriation.

When the bill was sent to conference, because of the inspired leadership of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina the number of units was set at 35,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Cole sought in every way to cut the number to 5,000 units.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want it understood that it was the Senate of the United States that voted for the 35,000 units. I was chairman of the conference committee, and I went along with what the Senate did.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senate did it, but the Senate certainly was very much inspired by the leadership of the Senator from South Carolina with regard to the public housing program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The legislation to which the Senator from New York is referring was in connection with appropriations before the Committee on Appropriations, not in connection with a bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency, involving authorizations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. In the voting record of Mr. Cole there is included his vote in the House on the bill itself, and also his vote on the appropriation, when there was a move to reduce, to commit, and to recommit the bill. I shall be very glad to read the voting record if there is any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Indiana. I did not wish to take up the time of the Senate to do so.

I wish to say further that in the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Cole made it crystal clear that his views remained unchanged and that his opposition was fundamental and just as strong as it was in 1949.

Of course, he indicated that, as head of the agency, he would seek to carry out the law. However, he also made it very clear, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has pointed out, that his opposition was just as strong as it had been in 1949 and, while he would feel himself bound to carry out the provisions of the law, he would not change his sentiments at all. I maintain that no man can possibly have the sentiments that Mr. Cole has had for several years, and apparently still has—and I base that assertion on the testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency—and handle this complex, important, and intricate question of housing in an objective manner. That, as I have said, is one of the reasons why I certainly feel it my duty to oppose confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. President, with the strong, forceful, and consistent record which Mr. Cole has made in opposition to public housing, can he or any other man having his convictions now say he is in favor of a program which he once said, "may become so strong as to strangle America."

In my opinion he never can and he never will. While I respect him for maintaining his position, I am very fearful that his long-held views and opposition now will lead to deemphasis and curtailment of the public housing program, if not its eventual liquidation.

Mr. President, because I believe that our public-housing program is still vitally needed; because it is essential to many large groups in my State, as well as in many other parts of the Nation, and because I believe the present nominee is barred from effective administration of the public-housing program by sincerely held beliefs and opinions, I must oppose confirmation of this nomination. I could not in good conscience do otherwise.

Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be had on the question of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to make known my opposition to confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Cole as Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

I believe the record has been made abundantly clear, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], as to why confirmation of this nomination should be opposed.

Some time ago, when I was informed that the President was to nominate Mr. Cole to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator, I said it was "like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop." Mr. President, in that parlance I have indicated that to put Mr. Cole in charge of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in view of his record of firm opposition to the objectives and purposes of that Agency, would be to put in charge someone who would see that it is no longer an active agency and function of the Government.

I believe the record is crystal clear that Mr. Cole does not believe in public housing. I believe the record is equally clear that Mr. Cole has advocated the views of those throughout the United States who have been the opponents of Federal assistance for low-rent public housing and slum clearance. I further believe the record is crystal clear that Mr. Cole's nomination is being most vociferously and actively supported by the lending institutions, the private contractors, and the private building industry in the United States who, again, have a record of firm opposition to public housing.

I do not believe it is necessary at this time to debate the merits or demerits of the policy of the United States in reference to the housing program. The national policy is embodied in the Housing Act of 1949. It is a comprehensive, inclusive policy which represents such factors as the Federal Housing Administration, mortgage guaranties to private builders, technical research for the building industry, slum clearance, redevelopment programs, community redevelopment, public housing, and farm housing.

How did Mr. Cole, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, vote on this measure? How did Mr. Cole, the present nominee, the potential, new Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, vote, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, not just on the public housing aspects of the Housing Act, but on the total bill? I have before me the record, and I am informed by the weekly report of the Congressional Quarterly, for the week ending March 6, 1953, on page 297, as follows:

> During consideration in 1949 of the first major postwar public housing and slum-clearance bill, Cole supported an amendment to delete the low-rent public housing provision; voted for recommittal of the bill, and against final passage.

Mr. President, that indicates to me that this gentleman, with all of his many fine attributes and assets—and I am not contesting his sincerity nor his integrity of purpose—is opposed to the basic housing policy of the Nation as adopted by the Congress in 1949.

If Congress wishes to open again the entire matter of that policy, then, indeed, we shall have an opportunity to reexamine the qualifications of Mr. Cole.

But today we have a housing policy and a housing program. The present nominee, whose nomination is before us this afternoon, has been unalterably opposed to every aspect of that program. He voted against final passage of the bill, despite the fact that he had an opportunity to place himself clearly on record when he voted on the public housing aspects of the bill, in a separate amendment submitted in 1949. Furthermore, not only did Mr. Cole take a negative position in 1949, but, as has been revealed by his voting record, which was submitted to us today by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], in every instance, whenever there was an appropriation request for housing, Mr. Cole voted to reduce the amount of the appropriation; he voted, in fact, to emasculate the housing program by withholding the necessary funds.

In fact, again according to the Congressional Quarterly, in 1951 Mr. Cole not only voted to cut down the amount of the appropriation, but voted to take away the right of the Federal Government, in the 1951 Defense Housing Act, to acquire land in isolated areas for developments in connection with defense installations. So even when defense installations were involved, Mr. Cole said, "No"; he said there should be no Federal housing whatsoever even in defense areas where there was a definite need for such activity.

Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate consider this question: What is the housing policy of the new administration?

I ask the new administration whether its housing policy is the policy of the nominee whose nomination has been submitted to us. If it is, then I ask the new administration to have the courage to say that the housing policy, as we know it now, is done.

The only way we can ascertain what is the housing policy of the new administration is by means of the nominations that are submitted to us.

The present nominee has made his position perfectly clear, for he is an honorable man. However, I disagree with him on this issue.

The nominee has said he has an open mind; he has said he would make a study of the situation and of what should be done on the housing issue. However, I understand that there are other views on this matter. For example, I hold in my hand a copy of an Associated Press dispatch which relates to inquiries made of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The inquiries were made on March 2, 1953, I believe. At that time the Senator from Ohio was quoted as follows:

> TAFT said he had recommended to President Eisenhower that an administrator be chosen who had no record on housing issues but was satisfied that Cole would do a good job.
>
> "I suggested to the President that he appoint someone with the understanding he would have 6 months to study the situation and recommend what should be done with the housing agency," TAFT said.
>
> He noted that public housing, finance and loan divisions of the overall agency are self-operating. He said it might be well to transfer some of them under the wing of other departments, adding:
>
> "I don't think we need a Home and Housing Administration at all," TAFT said.
>
> Although TAFT indicated he doesn't believe Cole has been instructed to make such a survey as the Ohioan suggested, the Senator said Eisenhower has reserved to himself and Congress the decision on the future of the organization.

Mr. President, I submit this raises the entire issue as to what the situation is in the case of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Shall it remain as an autonomous agency, an independent agency? Or shall its functions be incorporated in those of other departments or agencies of the Federal Government? What shall be the context of the program?

The program was brilliantly defended in the Senate by Senators on both sides of the aisle. One of the most brilliant defenders of the program, and one who gave the classic rationale in the case of housing, as we have it, was the Senator from Ohio. The entire housing program as it is now developed was an accepted part of the governmental machinery and program for the people of the United States.

Yet I see in this nomination the beginning of a change in the basic housing policy of the Congress and of the Nation, and I submit that in this instance that change is coming in the back door.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there in the record anything to indicate that Mr. Cole would request in good faith, at appropriate times, of the Bureau of the Budget sufficient funds to permit the carrying out of a public-housing program? I believe that question goes to the heart of the discussion here today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Washington for that question. It indeed goes to the heart of the matter. In fact, I was about to address myself

to that very problem. What are the prerogatives, what are the responsibilities, what are the duties, what are the privileges of an administrator of an agency? An unsympathetic administrator can see that an agency dies by lack of economic blood plasma to keep it alive. There are many ways to kill off legislation. It is unnecessary to repeal it. Sometimes it is merely allowed to wither away, and it just dies out. After all, the body politic needs some sustenance, too, and if a housing agency does not get the funds with which to carry on its program it does, and its program dies. The Senator from Washington is eminently correct in the question he asks, which has an automatic answer: Indeed, it is self-answering. The truth is that Mr. Cole has been unsympathetic toward the purposes of this act, and an administrator unsympathetic to the purposes of the act could readily, easily, and effectively choke off the whole program by simply not requesting from the Bureau of the Budget, from the President of the United States, from the committees of the Congress, the funds with which to carry it out. And, Mr. President, "by their fruits ye shall know them." Had the Housing Administration found it necessary to live on the crumbs that were to be dropped into its mouth for sustenance by ex-Representative Cole, it would be a victim of political malnutrition and economic emaciation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I served with Mr. Cole in the House of Representatives, and I have a very high regard for his honesty, integrity, and ability. But I am greatly concerned as to whether he would in good faith request funds with which to carry out the provisions of the law. I understand he has testified that he will live up to the law. Of course, he takes an oath to do that, but I submit to the Senator from Minnesota that that is not sufficient. I think the Senate has a right to know whether he will do so in good faith. It would occur to me that good faith would include a willingness on his part to request funds adequate to carry on a definite public-housing program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may reply to the Senator by quoting from page 20 of the testimony as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, on the nomination of Albert M. Cole. Beginning with the concluding sentence of a question by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I read from page 20:

> An unsympathetic administrator can always put roadblocks in the way of specific projects on the grounds that the site is not suitable or that this or that is not suitable.
>
> Mr. COLE. I understand.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. And therefore, in effect, he can prevent the will of Congress from being carried out.
>
> Mr. COLE. I would agree that it could be done that way.
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. This is really the doubt that has concerned me ever since your name came up: Can an honest man—and you are an honest man—who is sincerely doubtful about or disbelieving in public housing, put aside his honest opposition when these administrative decisions come up?
>
> Mr. COLE. I do not know. How could I know? All I know is what I think. If I say to you I am a sincere man, what does that mean?
>
> Senator DOUGLAS. If you were not a sincere man, it might be easier for you because you might then bend to the storm and approve these projects, even though you did not believe in them. But being a sincere man, and not believing in these projects, can you really facilitate them? It is that which worries me.
>
> Mr. COLE. I think so, but how can I tell you. I do not know. I think I can.

Mr. President, that is about as definite, I may say, as a woman's fancy about next year's fashions. There is simply no definiteness whatever to these answers.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. If Mr. Cole should fail to request funds for new projects, he would not have a housing program to believe in, would he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe he refers to his belief in the law, but I think there at least should be some affirmative statement in the record which would indicate that he is not only willing to carry out the law, but is also willing to act in good faith, and will request appropriate funds from the Bureau of the Budget from time to time as the need arises. I have been unable to find anything in the record which would indicate that he will do that.

I may say that I have supported all of the President's nominees to date. I should like to support this nomination. From the record thus far, I have a serious question in my mind as to whether the nominee can act in good faith and carry out not only the law but the spirit of the law as intended by the Congress of the United States when it was passed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I have acted in the same spirit which the Senator from Washington has announced. As a member of the committees of this Congress, I have supported nominees of the President, many of the nominees holding personal political views with which I might disagree. But they have no congressional voting record. They have made statements, but I have found out in just a short experience in public life that statements are one thing, but the roll-call vote is another. One cannot vote "maybe" around here. He votes either yes or no. And I notice that Mr. Cole did not vote "maybe" either. As a Representative from the State of Kansas, his voting was perfectly clear and forthright. One does not have to have a Phi Beta Kappa key or a master's degree in public housing legislation in order to find out where this gentleman stands. He is opposed to it. I respect his position. I disagree with it, but I respect the integrity of his position. But, Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, this would be like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop. The fox makes no secret as to what his desire is in regard to the chickens. Mr. Cole leaves no doubt at all as to what he believes about the housing program.

I am not influenced at all by the fact that he says he will obey the law. This is like asking a schoolboy, "Won't you attend school?" when there are compulsory attendance laws on the books. Of course, he will attend school; he must. When a man takes an oath of office, saying that he will uphold, support, and defend the Constitution, and the laws of the land—of course he will. But, Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference as to how it is done. It depends upon the vigilance of the administration. It depends upon the enthusiasm, the spirit of the administration. I am fearful that in this instance the flesh is not only weak, but that the spirit is weak also; and therefore I say it would be wrong to confirm this appointment. It would be wrong, if I am to believe what I was told and what the American people were told during the great campaign, that these great social programs were to go on. I say, Mr. President, that today the cities of America are sick—sick with slums, sick with tenements, sick with disease in their underprivileged areas.

I further say, Mr. President, that no program has ever been brought to the Congress that has a better alternative than the one we have for cleaning out the slums and relieving the grief and the suffering of those who live in the tenement and slum districts of American cities—all the talk about privately financed housing, all the talk about free-enterprise housing, still does not give the needy a decent place in which to live. Go over the cities of America and see what has been done in the matter of public housing. Go to the cities where there is no public housing, and see the degradation, the slums, the social cancer that grows in their midst. I do not intend to be a party to repudiating the public housing program by voting to confirm the nomination of someone who is going to see to it that it is not effective. Mr. Cole as an honorable citizen, cannot possibly make it effective, because his whole public life has been dedicated against its effectiveness. He does not believe in it. I respect his belief, but, Mr. President, that is the wrong type of man to have in charge of a program such as this.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to yield to the Senator from Kansas. I believe I should.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator from Minnesota. I believe he made the statement that Mr. Cole was opposed to public housing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. In that connection, I desire to cite page 20 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the nomination of Mr. Cole. I read:

> Senator DOUGLAS. That being so, I do not know what your conclusion is, but my conclusion is that you cannot take care of all of those people under private housing and that you need some public housing to help provide decently for the families and the kids who are ousted in the process of slum clearance.
>
> Mr. COLE. I think it is possible that private enterprise might be able to do the job. It has never been tried. That is No. 1. No. 2

is, again, I am not opposed to public housing, as such, or shall I put it in another way: I am not opposed to the assistance of low-income people to obtain low-rental units. That assistance, if it should come through the Federal Government, that is fine. I would like to localize it as much as possible, however. I think too much of it has been centered in Washington.

Again, I am trying to say it is a question of how we would do it, rather than whether it be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas. But I suggest to him that he read the next page. On the next page there occurred the following colloquy between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and Mr. Cole:

Senator DOUGLAS. Generally, you want someone who is sympathetic with the purpose of a title, to administer that title. That is the point.

Mr. COLE. If I were completely unsympathetic with the need to help low-income people obtain low-rental units, yes. I am saying to you I am not. I am not only not unsympathetic, I am tremendously interested in securing that sort of thing. I am saying that very positively. That I can say, and that I can say in all sincerity.

Senator DOUGLAS. Are you sympathetic to having their needs met, in part at least, through public housing?

Mr. COLE. Through a form of public assistance, yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. And assistance so that they could pay their rents privately?

Mr. COLE. I do not mean to put them in welfare programs. I believe there is a way we can expand the program.

Senator DOUGLAS. Without public housing?

Mr. COLE. The term "public housing" I still do not like.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, it happens to be in the act.

Mr. COLE. Well, maybe it is. I do not know.

Mr. President, let me say that this is not in the realm of theory. We are talking of reality. We have a law which was hotly debated in the 80th Congress, the 81st Congress, and other Congresses. We have had a Federal Housing Act since 1937. It is not new. The law is perfectly clear. It states exactly what the objectives of our Government are to be in the field of housing, both private and public. Mr. Cole is not in support of that law. We can give all the explanations we want to, and I know we try to do so, but sometimes we have to express our philosophy in one word, "Yes" or "No." The "Yes" and "No" votes of Mr. Cole are crystal clear.

In 1949 he supported an amendment to estimate the public-housing provision of the law.

Second, he supported an amendment to send the bill back to committee, which is a gentlemanly way of killing a bill.

Third, he voted against final passage.

Frequently someone votes against certain amendments to make his position perfectly clear, but when it comes to the final vote he has to vote for a housing program or no housing program. What did Mr. Cole do? He voted for no housing program. He cannot erase that from the record. Furthermore, Mr. President, I have not heard him repent for what I consider to be his mistake. From 1949 to 1952 former Representative Cole openly and vigorously opposed Federal assistance in the field of housing or any low-rent, low-income housing. That is his record.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the case of Mr. Cole the record is very clear with regard to his point of view, with regard to his philosophy, and with regard to his policy in connection with the housing bill. His record is so clear that there can be no disagreement with reference to it. I placed in the RECORD, a little while ago, a memorandum showing the votes of Mr. Cole in connection with public housing. The Senator from Minnesota has emphasized that record. Mr. Cole voted five times to cut public housing down to a maximum of 5,000 units. That is merely a token number. It is a fraud on the public, as was stated on the floor of the Senate when the appropriation bill was being considered 2 years ago. It is a complete fraud. We cannot do anything with 5,000 public-housing units. Such a number is almost as valueless as no public housing whatsoever. Yet, Mr. President, that is the extent to which Mr. Cole was willing to go. He talked against a larger number of units. He voted against an appropriation bill provision which allowed a larger number of units when we in the Senate raised the number to 35,000 units. Even that number would be inadequate. Mr. Cole must know that there cannot possibly be slum clearance without public-housing units into which to place the people who have been taken away from the slum areas.

Mr. Cole also spoke on the floor of the House against the research features of the bill, and he was more than lukewarm against the farm housing features of the bill.

There is no reason in the world why we should have any confidence in a man who has taken this position for many years and still maintains it, as can readily be seen in the report of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee.

As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has pointed out, there has been no repentance on his part whatsoever. To place this man in such an important position would be analogous to appointing as Secretary of Defense a man who had declared himself to be hostile to air power and to the Air Forces, in spite of the fact that the Congress of the United States recognizes the importance of air power and the Air Forces.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator's analogy is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York on using the term "slum clearance." In the days when Secretary Ickes had a branch in his office public housing was not then known as public housing, but as slum clearance. The reason for public housing was to clear slums in New York or Minneapolis or wherever they might exist. Slum clearance was the issue in 1933. Last year, in connection with the appropriations for independent offices the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] did not want public housing in Chicago unless it cleared the slums for poor people.

I am glad the Senator from New York brought up the question because, from my knowledge, the purpose of public housing is to clear the slums for persons who could not otherwise afford to get out of slum areas. The purpose was to put the people back near their jobs, near the point at which they worked.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, bad as the term "public housing" may sound to some persons, there is something that is much worse, namely, the filth, the decay, the degradation, the poverty, the social cancer of slums. I have been around the cities of America enough to know the kinds of conditions that exist in some of the older areas of our great metropolitan centers. I can see that city after city is suffering financially, politically, and socially, because there is a blight which sets in and spreads like a vicious circle to consume the city. The facts are crystal clear. We talk about public housing being expensive. Nothing is more expensive than slums. We talk about the hand of the Federal Government on the local community. Let me say that the hand of poverty and misery is much worse than is the hand of the Government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

I am not impressed with all these arguments. What I am impressed with is the need for an effective housing program on the part of our Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know whether there has been discussed in connection with the very important nomination before the Senate another subject which is involved in it, but whether there has been or not, I think the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that there has been a very serious trend in the past 45 or 50 days, on the part of many new administrative officers, to raise interest rates. I read the testimony of Mr. Cole, and although it is somewhat vague as to what he would do about the rate of interest for veterans' housing, which is 4.25 percent——

Mr. LEHMAN. No; it is 4 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Four percent; I thank the Senator. It seems to me from a reading of Mr. Cole's testimony that he would offer no resistance whatsoever to any trend toward increasing interest rates on veterans' loans or FHA loans so they would be anywhere from 4 to 6 percent, the limit which the law provides.

That is a very serious matter to the average person who may be buying a small home. A 1-percent interest rate increase on a $10,000 home would mean $100 a year. A 2-percent raise would mean $200 a year, or between $17.50 and $18 a month. If that is extended to a 20-year payment, it will be found, in some cases, that when the interest rate gets above 5 percent, the person who buys a small home will have paid in interest charges, at the end of the term, more than the amount of principal.

I read Mr. Cole's testimony. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me with respect to it. In answer to the chairman of the committee, Mr. Cole said he might wait for an inquiry on the

part of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, but he did not think he ought to wait more than 30 days.

A very rapid rise in interest rates is indicated, and I think the trend in that direction has been sufficiently shown.

I know Mr. Cole, and I agree with what Senators have said about his frankness, honesty, and integrity. But I am afraid that I shall have to oppose confirmation of his nomination, not so much because of his position in regard to slum clearance, as because of what I think is a very dangerous trend, so far as the average person in America is concerned, namely, the tendency to raise interest rates. I think such a trend would affect the little home buyer more than any other person in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. Cole himself did not limit himself to 30 days. In all fairness, he said, in reference to the matter of interest rates, "Perhaps 30 days is a little bit short"—and possibly it is.

On page 23 of the testimony or report of the hearings, it will be found that Mr. Cole was very cautions with reference to the matter, and suggested that no precipitate action be taken.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make merely one statement, I shall vote for the confirmation of Mr. Cole's nomination. Unless I am wrong—and the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is present on the floor can correct me, if I am—I understood Mr. Cole to state that he would not be in a hurry to take action in the matter of interest rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I just stated.

Mr. MAYBANK. He said that he would report back to the committee before he did anything. If he intends to report back to the committee, I shall be there, together with the chairman of the committee, when he reports back about increased rates of interest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know that the Senator from South Carolina has always been opposed to raising interest rates on Federal housing.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I have. I will go further and pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] who, read into the RECORD this morning the interest rates the Government is paying on the debt. I think it would be a mistake to raise the interest rate on housing loans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From reading the record of Mr. Cole's testimony with respect to increasing the rates of interest, it seems to me that if bankers could prevail upon the administration to have a general increase in Government interest rates as well as other interest rates, Mr. Cole, as Administrator of Federal Housing, would surely offer no opposition to a raise in interest rates on veterans' housing or FHA housing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall let Mr. Cole's record speak for itself. It is a record of opposition to the Housing Act of 1949—a record of obstruction to housing appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the rate is raised for one type of housing, it will have to be raised for all. We cannot have one rate for agriculture, another for the Federal land bank, another for Federal housing, and so forth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My reply to the Senator from Washington is that the record with respect to Mr. Cole speaks for itself. I think that in considering his nomination, it is not necessary to go into the realm of conjecture. It is only necessary to go into the realm of recorded legislative facts.

In the area of interest rates, Mr. Cole was cautious. He said he did not think he could have any answers before 30 days. Moreover, he said he would surely consult with the Committee on Banking and Currency.

However, I should like to point out that, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has just suggested, once a start is made in adjusting interest rates, automatically there is set into effect a chain of events which may necessitate the raising of interest rates in other areas of our economy. This has already started. This is the policy of the new administration.

The President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Cole. I understand that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, by a split vote, has concurred in that nomination. It is my intention to vote against the confirmation of the nomination, primarily because Mr. Cole does not represent, on the basis of his official record and in his statements in connection with matters of policy for which he has stood, the purposes and objectives of the Housing Act of 1949.

I have no personal comments to make about Mr. Cole as an individual. I only say his views are not similar to the housing policies of Congress, which were adopted by an overwhelming majority in 1949.

I think that Mr. Cole's nomination should be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Mr. Cole is an outstanding citizen. Many persons who were Members of the House with him know his ability, his character, and his courage. I am quite certain they have sincere admiration for him, despite the fact that he may be against public housing.

Mr. Cole has been nominated to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is a kind of overriding organization. Originally the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration were separate and independent organizations, having different purposes. They were brought together on the theory that all housing agencies should be consolidated in one organization. Since that time a number of things have happened. It seems to me that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has built up much too large an overhead organization.

In the second place, the Home Loan Bank Board is a routine operation.

Third the Federal Housing Administration has relaxed its standards, until today it is not, in my opinion, at all serving the purposes which it was intended it should serve.

Of course, the matter of the administration of the public housing policy is in dispute, but there is also great criticism of the manner of administration of the Public Housing Administration. It seems to me that the man nominated to the position of Housing and Home Finance Administrator will have the task of going into the whole question of public housing, reporting to the President what should be done.

As I see it, the question, at least for the present is one of administration, including recommendations which may be made to the President and Congress, designed to improve the various organizations involved.

The Public Housing Administration and the Federal Housing Administration are practically autonomous organizations. The head of the Public Housing Administration is, and any person replacing him should be, a public housing man. Whoever may be appointed as head of the FHA probably will be someone from the general mortgage field.

I should perhaps have preferred as Administrator a man who had taken no position on this one controversy in the housing field, but it is very difficult to find such a person. As I understand, there were many candidates from the real-estate field and the building-and-loan field, who were essentially adverse to the whole idea of public housing. On the other hand, to put at the head of the Administration, which supervises the subordinate branches, a man who was an outstanding public housing advocate, certainly would also have been subject to some criticism.

Speaking for myself, as one who favors public housing, I would far rather have as Administrator one who has been a Member of Congress, who has approached the situation from a public standpoint, than one who is a real-estate man or a building-and-loan man, who would be essentially opposed to the whole program by reason of the nature of his business.

I believe that all of use learn to approach problems in a spirit of fairness. I myself talked with Mr. Cole before his nomination was sent to the Senate, and he assured me, as he assured the committee, that he proposes to administer the policy of the administration and the policy of Congress in accordance with the way those policies are developed and the way in which they are written into law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I heartily agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Mr. Cole is a former Member of Congress, one who knows the Congress. He says that he intends to carry out the laws which the Congress of the United States has enacted, and to administer them in keeping with the way they should be administered.

Mr. TAFT. My feeling is that we can count on Mr. Cole carrying out the policy of Congress. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] very fairly stated that the administration must decide what policy is to be recommended. I certainly can assure the distinguished Senator that the appointment

of Mr. Cole is in no way a repudiation of the housing policy. How that policy may develop will certainly be determined in the future. For the present the only question involved is that of carrying out the present policy, the policy now written in the statute books of the United States by the Congress itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I recall the days I served on the Banking and Currency Committee in 1941, 1942, and 1943. The distinguished Senator from Ohio did as much for public housing as did any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

I told Mr. Cole, "Possibly when you have made the complete study, you may have to recommend that your own job be abolished."

Many people feel that the financial end of the job, the FHA and the Home Loan Bank, ought to be in the Treasury, and that the Public Housing Administration ought to be in the Federal Security Administration or whatever other Government department may replace the Federal Security Administration. I myself do not know what I would say. The functions are somewhat different. The suggestion to which I have referred represents a possible approach. Mr. Cole might recommend the strengthening of this particular agency as an independent agency, which it is today.

In any event, I think Mr. Cole is well qualified. He has the highest character and possesses the best sort of record. I can certainly assure the Senate that Mr. Cole will follow the policy of the Congress, so far as there is involved, for example, the question of how many units we may build this year, before the final policy is determined. That particular policy will be determined at the highest level, and Mr. Cole will act in accord with that policy, whatever it may be, as fixed by the President's recommendations to the Congress and the action of the Congress in any law which it may enact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The question was asked a while ago—and I think it was a very pertinent question—as to what Mr. Cole's attitude would be toward requesting funds for the number of units of public housing to be built during the next year. Do I correctly understand from the Senator from Ohio that it will not be Mr. Cole who will be requesting such funds, but that instead, the administration policy will set a certain level, and the request for funds will be contained in the President's budget? As I understand, the Senator from Ohio gives us assurance that Mr. Cole will go along with the program.

Mr. TAFT. Absolutely and completely so. I cannot say what Mr. Cole might argue one way or the other; but this is a matter of such tremendous importance that it will be determined by the President and his advisers—I am sure in cooperation with Mr. Cole—but the decision will be made upon a high level, and Mr. Cole says that he agrees wholeheartedly to go along with whatever may be determined to be the policy. Of course, the ultimate determination will be made by Congress, no matter what the President may determine; but there will be an administration recommendation before Congress acts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will further yield, I should like to ask him 2 or 3 questions.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I voted in the committee for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Cole. I did so primarily upon the assurances which he gave to the committee that he would enforce the law. I know Mr. Cole personally. I served with him in the House of Representatives. I regard him as a man of character, integrity, and ability; and I believe that he will carry out the pledge he made to us.

I had seen in the press reference to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, in line with what he stated here a few minutes ago, namely, to the effect that he had talked with Mr. Cole and had received certain assurances from him.

I believe the Senator from Ohio was quoted also as saying that the subject had been discussed either between him and the President or between the President and Mr. Cole, and that the same assurances had been given in that discussion.

Mr. TAFT. The question was discussed between the President and Mr. Cole.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the same assurances were given?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio if the statement he has made with reference to the breaking down of the Housing and Home Finance Agency represents his clear-cut decision, or if he is merely suggesting that as a possibility?

Mr. TAFT. I think it is a question which ought to be studied. I voted for the Housing and Home Finance Agency on a previous occasion. I would have to change my views to reach the other conclusion. However, the question has been forcefully presented to me as something which should be considered, now that we are trying, in general, to get rid of independent agencies and assign them to the regular departments, so far as possible. For that reason this argument is more plausible than it was before.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it the Senator's understanding that that is one of the things which Mr. Cole is to study if his nomination as Administrator is confirmed?

Mr. TAFT. I think so. It is a question which should be determined in cooperation with the Treasury, the Federal Security Agency, and the President, before any recommendation is made to Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Cole said he had been asked by the President to make a study of the entire program. I gather that he meant the program as it was being carried on.

Mr. TAFT. He meant the study of the agency from an administrative standpoint, to see how the administration could be improved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I recall, in his testimony before the committee Mr. Cole said the President had given him a double directive. One directive, as I recall, was to study the entire program as it was actually being carried out. One reason I mention this at this particular time is that back in the closing days of the last Congress a subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of Representative RAINS, from my State of Alabama, made a study of some of the housing problems, particularly as they related to veterans. By the way, Mr. Cole was a member of that subcommittee. He voiced considerable complaint with reference to certain practices by some of the builders and others engaged in the housing program. I wonder if Mr. Cole intends to carry out the recommendations for such a study which were made by the subcommittee of which he himself was a member.

Mr. TAFT. I did not discuss that question with Mr. Cole; I do not believe I can give the Senator any personal assurances. However, if I once study a matter in committee, certain thoughts remain in my mind, and I must pursue them further. I have no doubt Mr. Cole will do the same.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I asked him about that report in the course of the committee hearings, and he said he agreed with it.

I should like to make one further observation, if the Senator from Ohio will allow me to do so on his time.

Mr. TAFT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While I was not completely pleased with all of the responses which Mr. Cole gave to the committee, I did receive the very definite impression that he was trying to assure us that he would honestly administer the law as Congress enacted it, and that he would not, so to speak, throw any monkey wrenches into the law. My conclusion was that we might expect to see him carry it out.

Mr. TAFT. I am sure the Senator can count on such assurances.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was very happy to hear Mr. Cole say that he was going to follow the directives from the administration and make certain investigations.

The Senator from Ohio knows of the tremendous impact of housing upon the economy of this Nation. We now have in guaranteed FHA and HHFA loans between $10 billion and $12 billion. Something must be done. I hope we may have a special agency for housing. As I told Mr. Cole when he was on the stand, it is the biggest thing in the country. The Army is building housing. The Navy is building housing. The Army engineers are building housing. The Guam Commission is building housing. Housing is being constructed in Alaska, and in many other places. There should be a concentration of effort. In my opinion, there should be a reorganization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Above all things, we could save more money by properly operating the housing agencies of the United States than we could save in any other field except that of national defense. I am glad to hear that Mr. Cole intends to look into the subject. I hope

he will do so. He will find plenty of places where consolidations may be effected, and where money may be saved.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I am glad this afternoon to speak briefly in favor of the nomination which the President has sent to the Senate, that of Albert M. Cole to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator. Mr. Cole is a former Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of my State of Kansas.

Mr. President, I well realize that there is room for honest difference of opinion with reference to qualifications of men who are nominated for key positions in the Government. I am well aware of the fact that not only on the floor of the Senate but in the press on many occasions men are criticized for not being completely expansive and detailed in all their approaches to the problems which they must consider when they administer laws passed by Congress. I know that some Senators have criticized this nomination because they do not know in every particular where Albert Cole stands on all phases of public housing. That, however, is not all of his responsibilities.

Mr. President, from my acquaintance with Albert Cole I know he is not going to hide behind anyone, but that he will always be out in the open. He has told us frankly where he stands and the reason for his stand. While he was much more conservative than the senior Senator from Kansas in his feelings with respect to certain housing bills, I do know where Albert Cole stands. I can say to the Members of this body that Albert Cole is an honest, efficient, forthright man. He understands—and I am sure this is a virtue—that he must administer the laws as they are passed by Congress and that he must look to the legislative branch of the Government for direction as to the laws under which he operates. Congress legislates; he administers.

Albert Cole has stated unequivocally many times in his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency that if he were named Administrator of the agency he would support the position of Congress in administering the laws passed by it.

I need not elaborate, but we have on many occasions passed legislation and then questioned whether the legislation was being properly administered according to the intent of Congress. I stand here to testify in behalf of Albert Cole on many questions that may be raised, but on one particularly, and that is that from my acquaintanceship with him over many years, and as shown by his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am convinced that he will faithfully administer the laws passed by Congress, and will carry out the directives of Congress.

As I said a moment ago, he may not have agreed always with the senior Senator from Kansas in some of his views, but that is an entirely different proposition from how he will administer the law once his nomination is confirmed by the Senate. He has stated candidly to the Committee on Banking and Currency that he will execute the laws passed by Congress. He means that and he should be commended for that position.

Mr. President, I wish to go on record on at least two or three phases of this subject. I am glad that my colleague from Kansas made a correction of the RECORD a short time ago with respect to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] read only a portion of Mr. Cole's statement. I believe the complete answer of Mr. Cole is rather illuminating. It appears on page 4 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I refer to the point where the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] asked a question of Mr. Cole. A part of Mr. Cole's answer was quoted by the Senator from Oregon. I read the remainder of his answer:

> There are times, of course, when the Government wants to do a job in housing as it does in many other segments of our national life and our economy, so I would say "Yes"—

He was referring to the Government's position in the public-housing field—

> I would say "Yes," when conditions warrant it, there should be a gradual decrease of Government activity itself directed toward housing. Do not misunderstand me, sir. I think we have a tremendous possibility in this country to expand housing for the people of this country, and for all classes of people. For low-income people, for middle-income people, and for the other people.
>
> I think we have barely touched the possibilities. As I envisage the housing program, it is one of advancement, one of progression.
>
> I hope, if I am Administrator, I can carry out that particular idea.

Mr. President, does that statement mean that Mr. Cole is opposed to public housing, or that he is opposed to the attitude expressed by Congress when it enacts specific provisions with respect to public housing? It does not. I say he is not against public housing as provided by the Congress. I know Mr. Cole well enough to say that when he stated to the Committee on Banking and Currency that he would carry out that law, that is exactly what he meant and is what he will do.

Mr. President, I have heard on the floor of the Senate criticism directed against men who had been nominated to fill Cabinet posts in the present administration because they would not elaborate on all phases of the question as to how they would administer their responsible positions. I say to my colleagues in the Senate that Albert Cole will administer the law according to the intent of Congress. To do so, might in some respects, be repugnant to what his ideas were when he was representing a congressional district in Kansas, but that is something else. At least he was candid enough to say what his position was at the time.

I appreciate the fact immensely that men who served with Albert Cole in the House of Representatives and who are now Members of this body have stated that he is an honest and forthright man and that they do not question his motives. Probably it is a little too much to assume, if his nomination should be confirmed, that he will carry out every detail in accordance with the views of persons who feel otherwise, or who might feel that more public housing should be provided, but I can say to my colleagues that Albert Cole will do a good job, an honest job, and a forthright job, and that he will not circumvent the will of Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Anderson	Hennings	McClellan
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bennett	Hoey	Morse
Bush	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Symington
Ferguson	Langer	Taft
Frear	Lehman	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Goldwater	Malone	Welker
Gore	Mansfield	Williams
Green	Martin	Young
Griswold	Maybank	
Hayden	McCarran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be the Housing and Home Finance Administrator?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to speak on this nomination.

First, I should like to say that today some Senators have touched upon only a very, very small portion of the duties of the position to which Mr. Cole has been nominated. I hold in my hand a list of only a portion of those duties, and I shall read from the list. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not only Administrator of Federal Housing, but he also has charge of the Public Housing Administration, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the prefabricated housing loan program, the community facilities program, the Alaskan housing program, the slum clearance and urban redevelopment program, the research program, the college housing loan program, the farm labor housing program, the defense housing and defense community program, the management of the housing program for World War veterans, the management of 42 PWA housing projects. I could go on and on in reading the list. I think there are approximately 40 agencies which come under the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator from Indiana think that about half those agencies should be eliminated?

Mr. CAPEHART. In a moment I shall have something to say about that.

Mr. President, Mr. Cole, the nominee, after his nomination is confirmed, will administer, as did Mr. Foley, who preceded him, these many, many agencies I have not named all of them, by any means. Many of them no doubt should be coordinated or entirely eliminated at this time; no one knows exactly what is best to be done in that connection. However, someone should examine the situation. It is the intention of the President of the United States to do so, and to advise Congress of his recommendations.

So when Senators say that Mr. Cole was opposed to public housing, they are mentioning only one small portion of the duties of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. Cole did vote against public housing; he himself admitted that he did. His record is clear. When he came before our committee, he did not hesitate to say that he had voted against public housing. He knew he had, and we knew he had, and he did not attempt to deny doing so.

I wish to call attention to the fact that one of our most able Senators, who is not on the floor at the moment, supported a certain candidate for President of the United States; but when the time came to vote, that Senator decided that he had changed his mind.

Perhaps Mr. Cole may decide to change his mind in respect to public housing; I do not know about that. In any event, there was no testimony before our committee to the effect that Mr. Cole was not able, that he was not honest, that he was not a good administrator, that he had not had experience.

The only adverse testimony was to the effect that, as a Representative, he had voted against public housing, as he had a perfect right to do if that was the way he felt about it. He frankly admitted his opposition. He told us before the committee that he would administer the laws on the statute books as written, and would follow the intent of Congress. He also told us something which I personally like very much; namely, that he would not spend the taxpayers' money on propagandizing either for or against public housing, but would devote himself to being a good administrator, and would not spend his time propagandizing against certain Senators or Representatives, or for or against any proposed legislation.

Mr. President, it is possible a better man might have been found, but we are called upon to vote on the nomination of at least an honest man and an experienced man, who has been appointed to a very important position and who will have administrative control not merely of the one agency which handles public housing, but of many agencies.

Now that all Senators who do not like Mr. Cole's record on public housing have been heard—and I can well understand their position—with the promise we have from Mr. Cole that he will administer the law, and that he is not now against public housing, let us confirm his nomination. He may have made a mistake, just as our able colleague in the Senate made a mistake, in my opinion, in advocating the candidacy of a certain man for President, and then, when the time came for supporting him, he had changed his mind. We all make mistakes. I cannot speak for Mr. Cole, but perhaps when he is placed in charge of public housing and slum clearance he may become a great enthusiast for those causes. I do not know about that; I cannot speak for him. I do feel that he will make a good administrator. There is at least one thing we do know, namely, where he stands. We are not buying a cat in a bag. As a result of what was said in the hearings and what has been said on the floor of the Senate today, I have an idea that Mr. Cole will make a better administrator because of the experience he has had in the past.

I ask each and every Senator to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Cole's nomination. The office to which Mr. Cole has been appointed is an important one, and I urge that we get 100 percent behind the nominee, because I honestly believe he will be called upon to fill the most important position in Washington. He will handle more money and will have more agencies under his control than any other officer of the Government. Furthermore, in my opinion, it is the toughest job in Washington, with the possible exception of that of President. It is a difficult position, and I do not know why anyone would seek to be appointed to it. Personally, I would not want the office, and I imagine that the President of the United States had difficulty in finding a man of experience who would accept the appointment.

So I appeal to Senators, now that we have listened to their objections, to get behind the nomination. All who have spoken have admitted that Mr. Cole is honest, that he is frank, that he would be a good administrator. So I urge my colleagues to eliminate the yea-and-nay vote and confirm the nomination unanimously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Griswold	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bush	Hoey	Potter
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Purtell
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Kuchel	Taft
Dworshak	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Frear	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young
Goldwater	McCarran	
Gore	McCarthy	

NAYS—18

Anderson	Humphrey	Mansfield
Cooper	Jackson	Morse
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Green	Kennedy	Neely
Hennings	Lehman	Symington
Hill	Magnuson	Tobey

NOT VOTING—14

Bricker	Eastland	Pastore
Bridges	Flanders	Russell
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Smathers
Daniel	Kilgore	Wiley
Douglas	Mundt	

So the nomination was confirmed.

THE ARMY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick 08096, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, to be major general (Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1,

1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen Elwood Richard Quesada to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. William Ellsworth Kepner to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

PROBLEM OF OVERLAPPING TAXES AND FUNCTIONS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I have been interested for a number of years in the difficult problem of overlapping taxes and functions among the three levels of Government—Federal, State and local. The latest of several bills I have offered in the Senate to set up a study Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was introduced on January 16, 1953, and is numbered S. 526.

There appears in the Washington Sunday Star of March 8, an article effectively describing the nature of the problem, its complexities and its future outlook. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues as a worthwhile discourse on a long-standing, but outstanding, problem of Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIXING TAX OVERLAP INEFFICIENCIES IS EASIER SAID THAN DONE

(By Earl H. Voss)

Overlapping Federal, State, and local taxes have, over the past 40 years, caused many a frustration for the downtrodden American taxpayer, whose income and purchases sometimes are subject to assessment from 2, 3, or 4 governmental units. Every so often the area of overlap has to be pruned. That time has come around again and politicians on all levels of government are getting set for the assault.

Both the Republican administration and the Democrats on Capitol Hill are aware of the problem. It was studied at some length a year ago. President Eisenhower set up a White House conference recently to study the whole broad field of intergovernmental relationships.

The administration seems agreed that the first step in removing the undesirable overlap is a thorough study of the whole complicated picture. There already is a bill before Congress to set up a study commission. It has been sponsored in the last several Congresses by Senator HENDRICKSON, Republican, of New Jersey. This year 10 other Senators have joined him as cosponsors. Senator HENDRICKSON has been interested in the conflicting government functions and taxing authorities since he was in the State legislature in New Jersey. Another New Jersey official, Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, has been a leader in the movement for better coordination between the various levels of government.

LITTLE OVERLAP UNTIL 1913

Up until 1913 there was comparatively little overlap in the American tax system. The Federal Government got all the revenue it needed from customs—which States were forbidden to levy—and from excises on liquor and tobacco, which the States had not yet begun to tap to any great extent. The States, counties, and cities got theirs from property taxes.

As government costs went up in the tense period before World War I, however, all levels of government started looking around for new revenue sources. By the 16th amendment to the Constitution, the Federal Government started taxing incomes. A very few States followed suit immediately, but most of them met their expenses by levying excise taxes on selected commodities.

It was not until the great depression that the States and cities found themselves hardpressed for revenue. They tried general sales taxes, but still could not bring in enough money to meet their expanding expenses. The Federal Government finally stepped in to provide them direct assistance, in the form of loans or grants-in-aid for relief and work programs during the depression.

Just before World War II there was heavy pressure for doing away with conflicting taxation. But when the war broke out, State and local tax yields increased greatly. Lower levels of government could pay their own way again. The pressure eased until after the war. Meantime, the Federal Government was expanding the range of its taxes. And after the war, the overlap hurt States and cities that much harder.

The following table shows how Federal, State, and local tax-revenue sources overlapped in 1950 (in millions of dollars):

Tax	Federal	State	Local
Individual incomes	$25,885	$754	$64
Corporation incomes	26,230	586	7
Sales	9,764	4,670	484
Property	0	311	7,005
Death and gift	760	171	4
Social insurance	4,900	1,028	3
Licenses, permits, others	145	1,450	353
Total	67,684	8,940	8,002

The sales-tax category in the above table applies to such things as gasoline, tobacco products, stamps, alcoholic beverages, gifts, admissions, and amusements.

States get most of their revenue from sales taxes, while local governments depend mainly on property taxes.

EIGHTY PERCENT TO UNITED STATES

The Federal Government got 80 percent of all the revenue collected in 1950; the States got 11 percent; and local governments, 9 percent.

The search for more revenue by all levels of Government tends to increase the areas of overlapping. In 1951 more than half of the 46 States whose legislatures were in session raised at least one major tax.

EXCLUSIVE AREAS?

Each time the issue of tax overlap has come up there have been some who want to move sharply in the opposite direction. They want to stake out exclusive areas for Federal, State, county, and city governments to levy taxes. This would simplify bookkeeping all around, but it wouldn't be very practical. Some economic areas are strong enough to stand the load of two or three governments' taxes. Other areas cannot produce enough revenue for even one. There just are not enough strong taxable areas to go around.

Separation of sources, as it is called, also would cause an unequal distribution of tax revenues in many areas. The present system tends to protect States with predominantly low-income taxpayers. It gives them services similar to those enjoyed by States with more high-income taxpayers. Separation of the sources of revenue might work hardships on the poorer States.

On the other hand, there are definite abuses in the overlapping-taxation technique. In Alabama, for instance, people are taxed four times on the same item: Federal, State, county, and city governments, all tax gasoline.

Besides being four times as vexatious as any single assessment, such tax overlaps have these disadvantages:

They tend to concentrate taxes unduly on a few economic areas, risking distortion in the national productive pattern.

They raise the cost of administering taxes by adding new corps of administrators to Government payrolls.

They harass taxpayers themselves and consume their time and effort filling out 2 or 3 tax forms on the same item.

They limit local governments' areas of taxation.

If separating tax sources is not the way to avoid the evils of tax overlapping, what is? The Treasury Department had some definite ideas last year.

DEMOCRATIC SUGGESTIONS

Here is a list of the methods the then Democratic Treasury Department outlined:

1. Tax sharing. In general, the Federal Government would collect certain taxes and share the take with States and their subdivisions. This is not possible in some cases. On cigarettes, for instance, State taxes vary from 1 to 8 cents a pack. The Federal Government would have to give all States the same percentage cut of the revenue. Those States which have high cigarette taxes would have to find replacement revenue if their total take were reduced.

2. Deductibility. One jurisdiction often allows deduction of other jurisdictions' taxes. For instance, Federal income taxpayers are allowed to deduct State income taxes from their taxable incomes. Some States allow similar deduction of Federal taxes. This becomes significant only in the higher income brackets.

3. Tax credits. Taxpayers would be allowed to claim taxes paid to States as a partial credit against Federal tax liability. This device has been used in transfer taxes at death, or in unemployment-insurance taxes.

4. Uniformity of tax bases and methods of computing taxes. States are now moving to make their definitions of taxable income coincide with Federal definitions. Some States peg their income taxes to Federal taxes, taking, for example, 10 percent of the Federal levy.

5. Administrative cooperation. All levels of Government exchange audit information, and cooperate in other areas of tax administration. The areas could be expanded, thus reducing the costs of administering the taxes.

SOME NOW IN USE

As will be noted from the above list, many of the methods of reducing the conflict among tax jurisdictions are already being used on a limited scale. These methods have come into use quietly, without fanfare or legislation.

The Treasury Department (then under Democratic leadership) thought last year that this kind of constant chipping away

at the most flagrant overlap abuses—without upsetting the infinitely complex tax system—was the way to handle the problem. Legislation, the Department seemed to think, might not be flexible enough to keep up with the changing economy.

The Republicans are expected to get around to studying the problem soon. They are committed in their platform and by their campaigns to take some of the pain out of taxes. But there is little likelihood that anything definite will be done to relieve tax overlap inefficiencies for a year or two. The issue is too complex.

PATIENCE IS POWER—ARTICLE BY GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, America has been blessed by great leaders throughout its history. To my mind the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, ranks in the forefront of those great men who in our hour of need and peril have given us wise and prudent guidance. His brilliant and heroic leadership during World War II is a glorious chapter in the history of this Nation. In these postwar years he has conducted himself in the same manner and spirit. He is indeed both a soldier and statesman.

In a recent issue of This Week magazine, the editorial page presented a guest article by General Bradley entitled "Patience Is Power." In these few short paragraphs this distinguished soldier-statesman has given to all Americans a philosophy and perspective needed in these trying times. Cutting through the technical, political, and military problems that beset the world, General Bradley has stated simply but profoundly a philosophy that should give us new hope and courage. It is a message of faith, patience, and strength. I commend it to my colleagues, and to the study and attention of free men everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PATIENCE IS POWER"

(By Gen. Omar N. Bradley)

Before my father died, when I was very young, he used to say, "Be patient, son." I guess every father has said that to every son many times. It took me many years to understand it. I first learned what he meant when I tried to fish in a hurry. I found that it doesn't work. For a boy to catch a fish with an angleworm, he has to carefully seek out and find the worms. Then he has to bait the hook and patiently wait for a fish to take the lure. He has to be calm and quiet. Most of all, to fish successfully, he has to keep trying.

An old friend of my father, trying to explain what he meant in later years, used to say that he didn't mean "sittin' patience," he meant "workin' patience." In other words, whatever your goal, don't sit and wait, but keep working at it. As a Nation, we Americans must learn that lesson.

The patience of free men has been sorely tried. Having done what we consider to be honorable and upright, both with our wartime allies and our present friends, we are hurt—and disillusioned—to find that peace is not ours.

By our own human standards, we have given generously. By our most Christian standards, we have acted as well as we knew how. In our faith, we have believed that men are meant to be free. We have pledged every effort toward rebuilding a stable world, aiding both our friends and our former enemies. We have helped to reestablish our former enemies—Japan and Germany—in the ways of democracy. We have searched out the refugees to help them; and we have tried to get along with every race, every creed, every political belief. We have joined the United Nations, sponsored the Marshall plan, and even broken our tradition to join an alliance in peacetime for the defense of Europe—NATO.

We have given our resources, our energies, our ideals, and hopes to the cause of freedom. And yet peace is not abroad in the world. And our sons die on the battlefield again, this time in a far-off, remote corner of the world.

In our hearts, many of us can't help but repeat the anguished cry of Habakkuk, the prophet: "O Lord, how long shall I cry, and Thou wilt not hear? Even cry out unto Thee of violence and Thou wilt not save."

At such a moment, and in such a mood, we need more than ever before the steadying force of patience.

For the second time—this time with the new President—I have visited our soldiers, sailors, and airmen in Korea. They are anxious for an end to the fighting—they are pledged more deeply than any of us to a dedicated peace. But they do not want to quit, nor to appease the Communist transgression.

From them, we can learn the lesson: patience is a commodity as important as power. If we are patient our power won't be misapplied. Also, if we are powerful, we can always afford to be patient.

Patience, in itself, is not a policy. But patient steadfastness, in principle and in action, is an essential ingredient of good leadership.

If our determination for freedom is as great as the Communist desire for tyranny, we will always rally good men to our better cause. Communism as a political system has lasted less than 40 years.

This Nation, founded on the Christian ideal for every man, has lasted almost 200 years.

Christianity itself, with the help of faithful men, has lasted almost 2,000 years.

There is no chance of failure unless it be through haste. Resourceful patience on our part can help the world pluck security and peace out of the present nettlesome danger.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday, March 11, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 11, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9, 1953:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Norma C. Furtos

SUPPLY CORPS

Dorothy M. Quinn.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

John Abbott	Edgar K. Lofton
James J. Ash	Preston Luke-
Kenneth W. Atkinson	Frederick C. Marshall
Keith R. Bare	John E. Marshall
Albert T. Barr	Daniel N. Mealy
Robert E. Bennett	Robert E. Morgan
Joseph Brecka, Jr.	Charles P. Moore
Warran R. Brown	Fred S. Newman
Richard B. Campbell	Robert D. Norman
Charles C. Carter	William R. O'Connell
Thomas M. Castner	Louis C. Page, Jr.
William E. Clark	James H. Pressley, Jr.
James C. Clarke	Harold A. Riedl
Robert J. Duffy	George G. Russell
James R. Edixon	William G. Sizemore
Kenneth E. Enney	Gordon H. Smith
Jack E. Everling	Donald E. Sparks
Harry N. Farnsworth	Robert G. Stammer-
Robert W. Fero, Jr.	john
Arthur S. Fusco	Charles A. L. Swanson
William M. Golding	Benjamin W. Taylor
Jerome E. Hamill	Harold L. Terry
Martin H. Henry	Harry E. Thomas
Robert A. Holden	Richard G. Thomson
John C. Humphrey	William E. Tillerson
Roy T. Hynes	Ralph J. Touch
Robert N. Johnson	Marland W. Townsend
Francis N. Jones	Dennis A. Tuck
Isaac F. Jones	John H. Wachtel
Paul T. Karschnia	Edwin S. Wallace, Jr.
Jack E. Keller	Albert J. Weil
Edward J. Klapka	Henry T. White
Edward V. Laney, Jr.	George H. Willey
Robert L. Leydon	William O. Wirt

NURSE CORPS

Irene N. Dowe	Mary V. Redfern
Dorothy S. Mathewson	Clarissa M. Shaw
Rose M. Miller	

The following-named line ensigns of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Richard J. Biederman	Ward W. DeGroot III
Carl Courtright	Robert L. Jones
Walter E. Davis, Jr.	Warren G. Stevens

The following-named warrant officer of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF CARPENTER

Naaman Dingness

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

William O. Brice

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

William J. Scheyer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Randolph McC. Pate	George F. Good, Jr.
Clayton C. Jerome	Merrill B. Twining
James A. Stuart	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Frank D. Weir	Ion M. Bethel
Alexander W. Kreiser, Jr.	Nels H. Nelson
	David M. Shoup
Wilburt S. Brown	Francis B. Loomis, Jr.
John N. Hart	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9, 1953:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, 18A, major general (Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1, 1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, 50A.
Lt. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards, 11A.
Lt. Gen. William Ellsworth Kepner, 6A.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, who art always placing at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace, may we daily appropriate our blessings with a greater sense of our absolute dependence upon Thee.

Grant that in all our plans and programs for the welfare of our beloved country and the world we may understand more clearly that we can never solve the many problems of humanity on a purely economic basis, for man does not live by bread alone.

We know very well that mankind needs food and clothing, but we penitently confess that we so frequently fail to heed the exhortation of our blessed Lord to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness.

May this be a day when we shall set ourselves anew to the glorious task of bringing to fulfillment the eternal truths of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 5, 1953, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of announcing that the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services will be glad to hear from any Member of the House on either Thursday or Friday of this week. The committee will welcome the testimony of anyone who can be helpful in bringing about economy and efficiency in this field.

It is suggested that anyone desiring to appear before the committee advise the clerk of the committee so that a time may be fixed. The clerk is Mr. Orescan, branch 288 of the Capitol.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I see by the weekend papers that the critics of Messrs. MCCARTHY, JENNER, and VELDE are as active as ever. I specifically refer to Mr. Elmer Davis, wartime head of the Office of War Information here in Washington.

It is obviously a waste of time, as well as being unnecessary, to attempt to answer every leftwing columnist and speaker who attacks congressional methods of investigation and chairmen of such committees. But I think it is proper to make a distinction between a vociferous group of gentlemen of the cloth who, given the benefit of the doubt, may be sincere in their motives but are completely misguided as to their facts. I say it is proper here to make a distinction between such individuals on the one hand and a gentleman such as Mr. Davis on the other. Criticism of congressional investigators of communism may be justified by some, but it comes with singular bad grace on the part of Mr. Davis who was head of a wartime organization notorious for the large numbers of pinks, dupes, and fellow travelers among its personnel. The OWI consistently adopted a pro-Soviet attitude throughout Mr. Davis' incumbency and, unfortunately, when it was absorbed by the State Department, a large part of its un-American element went along with it—into the Voice of America and other international information agencies. Mr. Davis, therefore, should probably be the last person in the world to open his mouth in protest against the methods of congressional committees investigating Communist activities. Can it be he fears possible revelations by such groups?

OHIO'S SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, this year the State of Ohio is observing its sesquicentennial. Although Congress has not yet formally admitted the Buckeye State into the Union, we are acting as if we are full-fledged members of the Nation.

I have been swamped with letters asking that our Federal taxes be refunded on the ground that we are not properly included among the States, and if anything can be done along this line, I could probably be elected president of the first republic of Ohio. Nevertheless, we are anxiously knocking at the door, hoping that Ohio will beat Hawaii into the Union.

SOVIET PREMIER MALENKOV

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is news this morning.

Under a Moscow dateline today there is the following report:

Soviet Premier Georgi M. Malenkov, speaking at the funeral of Josef Stalin, said his new government's policy was peaceful coexistence for capitalism and socialism.

"In the sphere of foreign policy, our main care consists of not permitting a new war and in living in peace with all countries," Malenkov said in his first statement on foreign and domestic policy.

Mr. Speaker, the free world should take Malenkov at his word. Here is an opportunity to make him fish or cut bait. Let us find out if he means what he says.

President Eisenhower should immediately accept this challenge and offer to meet Malenkov and other representatives of the great powers.

There is no time to lose. If the Soviet is sincere, the doorway to peace may be open.

Let us find out.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REDUCTION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the repudiation of a preelection promise made either by a political party or by an individual to obtain public office creates a moral responsibility. The refusal of party candidates once they are elected on a promise made to get elected whether it be a promise to reduce taxes or other relief is a moral obligation to be faithfully discharged.

The great majority of the Members of the House of Representatives who were elected last November promised that if elected they would reduce taxes.

In compliance with that promise I introduced H. R. 1 to provide an 11 percent tax relief by moving up the termination date of the individual income taxes increased for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953. Unless H. R. 1 is enacted into law these increases will not expire until December 31, 1953. H. R. 1 provides that these increases will expire on June 30, 1953. The enactment of H. R. 1 is essen-

tial to the fulfillment of a moral responsibility on the part of the membership of the House of Representatives.

It is not alone the violation of the great moral responsibility to the people but it forecasts something of deep significance to the welfare of our country. This failure to give the people some relief from their individual income taxes is the first step toward ushering in a period of business depression. The danger signals are up. The cyclone cellars are being put in order and unless our economy is given a stimulating influence by tax reduction a depression will follow as surely as it always has when taxes become so high that the people cannot purchase even the necessities of life.

Why violate the advice of the sound economists of this country who urge individual income tax reductions in order to save us from a recession?

I call your attention to an article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Thursday, March 5, 1953, which reads as follows:

BUSINESS BULLETIN—A SPECIAL BACKGROUND REPORT ON TRENDS IN INDUSTRY AND FINANCE

Farm belt is tightening its purse strings in wake of declining commodity prices.

Sellers of everything from tractors to Easter bonnets feel the pinch. In rural Earlville, Ill., Strong & Strong, a farm supply store, reports: "Business has been going down all winter and our sales are at least 10 percent below last year. Even our feed and fertilizer sales are off."

A Chicago mail order house—it does a large business in rural communities—finds its clothing and home furnishing business "weaker than last year." Comments an executive: "Easter outfits for farm wives this year will cost $25-$30—not the $100 or more of last year."

Equipment makers are hit hard. Deere & Co.'s business in the November-January period slumped 23 percent below a year ago, even with a 17 percent jump in defense work. Oliver Corp.'s volume skidded 29 percent, despite increased defense work. Civilian sales of Minneapolis Moline in the same period tobogganed 24 percent below the preceding year.

Earl E. Frame, editor of Earlville's Weekly Leader, capsules farmers' view: "They're worried, but nobody's frightened."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Mr Speaker, together with my colleague from the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland, Mr. FRANK SMALL, I am introducing today a bill "to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C."

It is obvious to everyone that public transportation acn be adequately regulated in the Washington metropolitan area only by a commission which has jurisdiction over the whole area. This bill will in no way conflict with Mr. BROYHILL's bill to provide for a 12-man commission to study the transportation problem in this area. However, action taken in accordance with the recommendation of such a commission cannot possibly be accomplished within 2 years' time. Adequate regulation of public transportation needs immediate attention and an area-wide regulatory utility commission, for this purpose is imperative.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, may I state to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that it is not our purpose to oppose the rule on the Hawaiian statehood bill. But, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his plan to complete only general debate on the bill today?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. I think that was indicated on Thursday. We will complete general debate on the bill and read the first section of the bill, if that is agreeable. Likewise, it is my hope that we can then proceed expeditiously with the consideration of the measure on tomorrow, and finish the bill on tomorrow.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is my hope, too, that we may do that.

OREGON MEMORIAL AGAINST TREATY LAW

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a memorial which was passed by the House of Representatives of the Oregon State Legislature on March 2 and forwarded to the Congress of the United States with respect to the making of treaties. I have only recently, when I was elected as a Member of this Congress, resigned as a member of the Oregon State Senate, and I am therefore particularly interested in commending to the attention of this Congress this resolution of my State legislative assembly. The memorial states that—

Whereas it is essential to protect the rights of American citizens against the dangers of treaty law.

And recommends that our Constitution be amended so that—

A provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

And that—

A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated powers in the absence of such treaty.

I wish to state that I myself support the basic purposes of this memorial, as I believe the question should be settled in clear and unquestionable language, for all time, that treaty power cannot be used for purposes in conflict with our Constitution. I feel that treaties must be prevented from cutting across the rights given our people by the constitutional Bill of Rights. I think we must not allow a loophole to remain in our Constitution which might make possible the change of our form of government by permitting international agreements to come in and change and level out American rights, both State and individual. I do not think we can afford to lower our own standards of human liberty in order to compromise with godless and Socialist members of other nations, but rather we should endeavor to bring them up to our standards.

As we know, much activity is going on today in this direction. In the past year alone, I am advised, the United States has been represented at more than 3,000 international meetings where agreements of all types have been discussed, and in some instances favored, by our own delegates to these meetings. Such international agreements may carry dangers, as they might well authorize what our Constitution forbids, and thus supersede our Constitution. It is my understanding that in no other country do treaties automatically become the supreme law of the land, and I concur with the Oregon State Legislature in the opinion that this Congress should take steps looking toward the amendment of our Constitution to prevent the danger of undermining our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, on the floor of this House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], in speaking against statehood for Hawaii, referred to what would be disproportionate representation in the Senate and gave as an example a comparison between Hawaii and the State of New York. Of course, that same disproportionate representation exists, and has always existed, as between the present 48 States.

But what I take exception to is the gentleman's statement:

One Chinaman in Hawaii would have the same power in the election of Senators to the Senate of the United States as 31 American citizens in the great State of New York.

Mr. Speaker, I have many American citizens of Chinese, Japanese, Philippine, and other ancestries in my district. I am proud to represent them. As far as I am concerned, if they are American

citizens, ancestry, color, or creed makes no difference.

American citizens of all ancestries have laid down their lives for this Republic. In the last war the record of the 442d Nisei Regiment from the Hawaiian Islands was unsurpassed in American history. No race or color has any monopoly on patriotism, loyalty, or good citizenship.

I for one think it is unfortunate that the gentleman from Virginia used the term "Chinaman."

MARINE CORPS

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, during the 82d Congress, Congress enacted Public Law 416 which assured this country of enhanced national security through a strong Marine Corps of three combat divisions and three air wings, and the participation of the commandant in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

At the time that law was passed some apprehensions were voiced to the effect that the Marine Corps could not, with its increased size and responsibilities, continue its traditionally high standards of performance. In the past few days there have been two developments which relate to the Marine Corps standards of military efficiency.

On February 18, the Sarnoff Commission on Military Manpower Utilization released its final report. On the basis of its investigation the Commission recommended manpower reductions for each of the four services, such reductions to total 20 percent for the Nevy, 15 percent for the Army, 12 percent for the Air Force, and 4 percent for the Marine Corps.

Thus, even in the midst of the expansion necessitated by Public Law 416, the Marine Corps continued its high, and particularly at this time, its admirable and deeply appreciated standards of economy in use of personnel.

In the statement of Mr. Robert W. Johnson—of Johnson & Johnson—which was appended to the Commission report, Mr. Johnson, a member of the Commission, reported on the attitude of the four services toward the Sarnoff Commission investigations. The rating of the Air Force was good; the Army, spotty; and the Navy, militantly resistant. The Marine Corps was given the highest standing of all the services, being rated excellent.

A very critical situation in the Armed Forces was reported by John A. Giles in the Washington Sunday Star of February 22, 1953. Mr. Giles reported that in the past 10 months, there has been an 85 percent drop in the Army's reenlistment rate, with the result that at the present time only 2 percent of the Army's inducted enlisted men are staying.

In contrast, the article reports that at the present time the Marine Corps reenlistment rate is about 30 percent. This high reenlistment rate represents a significant saving in both dollars and manpower.

Thus in terms of manpower economy, cooperation with the Sarnoff Commission, and reenlistment rate, the Marine Corps has demonstrated it is adhering to its traditionally high standards of efficiency and economy.

This should be of genuine interest to Congress. It emphasizes the fact that the Marines have justified our faith in them for they are continuing to give now, as in the past, an exact performance of the duties Congress and the President have entrusted to them.

FOOD AND CLOTHING FOR SOUTH KOREANS

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the press reports that we are providing better food and clothing to Red prisoners of war than is available to the civilians of South Korea.

The answer to this is, of course, not to cut down on our care of prisoners because of the danger of reprisals against our own men in Red prison camps, but we should endeavor to improve or increase the food available for South Korean civilians.

Nearly 3 years of war have made a shambles of South Korea. Many civilians are reported still wearing the same clothing they had on when war began in June 1950. Malnutrition has produced disease and suffering unparalleled in modern times. The poor South Korean is indeed the forgotten man of this war. His country has been made a world battleground, and misery, suffering, and hardship will be his lot for years to come.

We are told that we are fighting in Korea today to avoid fighting in our own streets and countryside tomorrow; that intervention in Korea was necessary to stop the spread of communism throughout the east; and that the war is being fought for the ultimate protection of America and the free world.

If all of this is true, and I do not deny it, how can we justify allowing the South Koreans to lose everything they have and live on starvation rations while Government warehouses in this country are filled with surplus food commodities accumulated over the years?

It is reported that we have in storage now 90 million pounds of butter, nearly 450 million bushels of corn, and vast quantities of wheat, peanuts, cheese, dried milk, and other foodstuffs.

It seems to me that of all the people in the world we are helping today, the civilians of South Korea have a stronger claim than any of the others.

I understand from the press that a Member of the other body proposes to discuss with Agriculture Secretary Benson a plan to make some of our surplus food available to the civilians of South Korea. I should like to associate myself with this endeavor and will be glad to support legislation if necessary to accomplish this purpose.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act have resulted in a very unfair and iniquitous situation with respect to those persons who have worked under the railroad retirement system and the social-security system. I recall those amendments were passed on the final day of the session in 1951 as a result of a last-minute compromise, and as is often the case, haste creates errors.

The mistake is a glaring one, and so obvious that any fair-minded person would not hesitate for a moment to agree to its removal. It involves section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act, and I am today introducing a bill to repeal this section of the act.

Under the provision of this section, a person who has qualified for an annuity under both the railroad retirement and social security systems must be penalized by having his railroad retirement annuity decreased by the amount of the annuity he receives from social security. This despite the fact that he earned and bought both annuities by paying the required tax under both systems.

The 1951 railroad retirement amendments provided for a 15-percent increase in annuity benefits. If a person was receiving or entitled to receive benefits under the social-security system, he was denied that increase and had his railroad retirement annuity decreased by the amount he receives or is entitled to receive under the social-security system.

When Congress in 1952 voted a $5 monthly increase in social-security pensions, those persons who receive railroad retirement annuities and social-security annuities were granted this $5 monthly increase, but simultaneously their railroad retirement annuity was decreased by an additional $5, thus nullifying the relief Congress intended to grant when it passed the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COOPER asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on Thursday next on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

TWIN CONSPIRACIES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer two propositions to help defeat the twin conspiracies against the United States in the Pacific:

First, that it be made known to the people of Russia that the free world can help them transform Siberia, a rich and beautiful land, from one of tears, exile, misery, and death into a happy and wealthy country.

Second, that it be made known to the people of the mainland of China that we stand ready to help them avoid destruction from floods, famine, and disease. Dams and power installations can be built. Food can become plentiful and medicines available. Red regimes block both solutions.

For years, it seems, a conspiracy has existed to keep America out of the Pacific. Today, the Reds in the Kremlin deny access to Siberia. The Reds in Peiping deny access to mainland China. Thus, twin conspiracies operate against us in the Pacific.

While our military posture is firming up in the Pacific, one check point must not be overlooked: An appeal over the head of the despots to the people of mainland China and of Russia, assuring non-Communists they will not be chased down a blind alley to their destruction.

In World War II, it was felt that our unconditional surrender terms prolonged the resistance of the people of Germany and Japan against the Allies. Unconditional surrender appeared to work against the basic instincts of self-preservation. Unconditional surrender became a weapon in the hands of the dictators, enabling them to threaten their people with "Fight or die."

At Wonson, above the 38th parallel, in North Korea, when our troops moved in, they found the people had fled to the mountains. After several days, when word reached the civilians that our troops would not cut their ears off, that our troops were men of good will, the Koreans streamed down out of the hills back to their homes. Red propagandists had portrayed us as cruel and vicious. The oriental fears corporal punishment and expects no help from us, if he is now behind the iron curtain under Communist domination.

Thus, it appears to me, in conjunction with our military posture in the Pacific, we must reach over the heads of the Kremlinites and the Reds in China, to the hearts and minds of the people of Russia and mainland China.

We might well let them know specifically what we hope for in addition to becoming free from threats of body harm. We must, it seems to me, for maximum hope and effort, offer them weapons to wave in the face of their Red overlords, demanding specific performance, performance in the name of freedom.

Here, in our recent election, armed with a theme, our people acted. They kept hammering at the casualties in Korea, over 100,000 of them, with no end of the war in sight. The new administration has a mandate to do something positive about Korea.

Armed with a theme like the proposition to help develop the richness of Siberia, and to help eliminate the devastations of mainland China, I believe the people of China and of Russia will be in a better position to help us dissolve the twin conspiracies that militate against the United States in the Pacific today.

Certainly your task in this sense will be made easier.

I suggest that appropriate committees in the Congress, by joint resolution, if need be, affirm specific hope of assistance to the unfortunate people of Russia and of China to the end that they will be freed from tyranny and oppression with benefits on the horizon hitherto denied them, in person and in property.

Voice of America please note, while the Congress deliberates.

INTEREST RATES ON VETERANS' HOME LOANS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest pressure groups in the history of this country is trying to force up interest rates on veterans' home loans and FHA loans. If the interest rate is increased one-half of 1 percent, as an effort is being made to increase it, it will mean $1,000 extra cost to the average buyer of a home, including the veterans—$1,000 extra cost for interest because of one-half of 1 percent increase in interest rates. I respectfully call this to the attention of the administration and express the hope that something be done to stop this increase in interest rates and also to provide a market for these loans.

This increase should be stopped. Before the 1920–21 depression interest rates were greatly increased. Before the 1929–30 panic the same thing happened. The same mistake should not be made the third time.

THE LATE HONORABLE VINCENT L. PALMISANO

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House, the death of a former Member, Vincent L. Palmisano, who represented the Third Congressional District of Maryland, which I now represent.

Mr. Palmisano was born in Italy on June 13, 1883, and came to the United States with his parents when he was 4 years old. They settled in Baltimore and he lived there during his entire life. He began work in a box factory at the age of 11 and when he was 21, he went into the real-estate business. A short time later he studied law and was admitted to the Maryland Bar in 1909.

He served in the Maryland House of Delegates from 1914 to 1915, and in the Baltimore City Council from 1915 to 1923. He was a member of the Democratic State Central Committee from 1923 to 1927, and served as a police examiner for Baltimore from 1925 to 1927, when he was elected to the United States House of Representatives. He served here from March 4, 1927, to January 3, 1939, when he was defeated for reelection. While a Member of the House he was active in District affairs and during his last term, served as chairman of the House District Committee. He was the first American of Italian birth to serve in Congress.

After his defeat, he resumed his law practice in Baltimore and later was appointed to the zoning board of Baltimore, from which he resigned last fall.

Mr. Palmisano had been in ill health since he underwent an emergency operation last summer, and on January 12 he disappeared and friends feared he had fallen into the harbor. Police conducted dragging operations in the river for several days, but were unable to locate the body. Just last Thursday it was discovered and funeral services were held on Saturday morning.

Mr. Palmisano was a leading political figure in the Democratic Party in Maryland for nearly 40 years and during that time he rendered outstanding service to the city of Baltimore and to the State. His loss will be deeply felt in political circles and his many friends mourn his passing. To his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Maryland in his expression of sympathy to the loved ones of our late colleague. Those of us who served with Vincent Palmisano remember him very well as a gentleman, a kind, serious, studious, hard-working Member of the Congress. His passing brought to me a keen regret and again I join in expressing to his loved ones, with my friend from Maryland, my profound sympathy in their breavement.

Mr. GARMATZ. I thank the gentleman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to conduct hearings today during general debate in the House on the Hawaiian statehood bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EDWARD H. COX

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be

discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3723) for the relief of Edward H. Cox, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII INTO THE UNION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 170 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3575) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, you have just heard the provisions of the rule which provide for 4 hours of general debate. This is an open rule and amendments are in order. You have heard the distinguished minority leader say that there will be no fight on this rule. However, I desire to briefly discuss this question of statehood for Hawaii for the information of new Members.

The sole issue here is whether or not Hawaii should become a State. Since 1919 this question has been before the Congress of the United States in a nonpartisan manner. For instance, in the Republican 80th Congress they voted for statehood for Hawaii by the margin of 197 to 133. The following Democratic 81st Congress voted for statehood for Hawaii by a vote of 262 to 110. On both occasions I voted in the affirmative and expect to vote in the affirmative this time.

I say this is a nonpartisan proposition because back in 1935 a nonpartisan subcommittee of the Committee on Insular Affairs went over to Hawaii and made an investigation, and they reported back to the Congress that the Territory of Hawaii was a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type. Back in 1946 another bipartisan congressional group, composed of Democrats and Republicans, went over to Hawaii and made another thorough investigation. They came back and said that the qualifications for statehood were certainly perfect, and they unanimously agreed that Hawaii should be admitted to statehood. What does this resolution before us mean? It means that when these committees made those investigations, and when the House twice voted for statehood for Hawaii, that the majority believed that the people of Hawaii were loyal Americans. I am sure that had these committees felt that the great majority of the people of Hawaii were not good loyal Americans, they would not have made that unanimous report. I am sure that all of you who have gone into the matter, who know the actions and the contributions made by the people of Hawaii in World War II, must agree that they are good and loyal Americans. Another thing that would be, of course, important in regard to the findings of these committees before they made their unanimous report, they must have found that the economic and industrial structure of Hawaii met the requirements for statehood; otherwise I am certain that they would not have made the report that they did make. I know my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has stated publicly that one of his reasons for opposition to Hawaii becoming a State is that it would discriminate against the large States, like New York, for instance, that has, I believe, 15,000,000 people; that Hawaii would get 2 Senators with a population of but 500,000 or 600,000; that consequently New York and all the larger States would be discriminated against because of the great variance of difference in population.

I would say to any of those who hold that way that the issue of representation in the United States Senate was settled back in the framing of the Constitution. You know and I know that the question was fought over then for weeks and weeks. The large States, of course, did not feel that the smaller States should have the same number of Senators as they. In order to meet that issue, it was agreed at that time that each State should have two Senators, and that the representation in the House would be according to population.

I followed the admission of the 35 States that came into the Union after the original 13, and the question never came up about limiting the representation in the United States Senate of the small States or Territories like Nevada.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I was interested in the gentleman's remarks about the Constitutional Convention and representation in the Senate, which I like to characterize as a shotgun marriage, because the small States extorted their representation in the Senate as the price of permitting the Union to be formed.

I wonder if the gentleman's remarks mean that no provision of the Constitution should be reconsidered, that it is all sacrosanct, and that we must not have amendments.

Let me remind the gentleman that we have put 21 amendments on the books modifying in some cases the fundamental structure established by the Founding Fathers.

I submit there is no reason why in a matter of such profound and far-reaching importance as this, the country 170-odd years later, should not reconsider the original method of permitting new States to join the Union as proposed in my amendment, House Joint Resolution 17, a somewhat similar one offered by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. PILLION]. Incidentally, I have also offered an amendment to provide that States should be admitted only in the same manner that the Constitution is amended, to wit, by a two-thirds vote of each House and the vote of three-forths of the State.

There is also no reason why we should not reconsider representation in the Senate, because as it is today the representation in the Senate is grossly distorted, and the admission of new States such as Hawaii and Alaska would, to my mind, strike a body blow at the system of free, representative government, because it strikes a blow at confidence in the apportionment of representation. That is why I say to the gentleman that I hope the bill will not prevail and that is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Although I have not gone into the gentleman's constitutional amendment, that is not the issue before the House today. The issue here is whether or not we should pass this bill, which would permit Hawaii to become a State.

May I also say to my good friend that I believe his statement would mean that if we permit Hawaii to become a State, Puerto Rico and other islands and Territories would be discriminated against. To that I say again, the question here today is whether or not Hawaii should become a State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did I understand my valiant friend to say at the outset of his remarks that this bill comes before the House in a nonpartisan manner?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman heard me correctly. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I wonder if my distinguished chairman is not just a little worried about the danger of the precedent that would be set here by taking in an island or a series of islands as a State of the Union when they are over 2,000 miles from this continent. I wonder if my friend thinks that the Founding Fathers who in their wisdom set up this ideal form of Government ever had any such idea that we would go out and try to make an empire out of this aggregation of sister States here on the main continent.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to my good friend that probably the Founding Fathers had many issues before them then which we do not have today and that we have many problems facing this country today which they probably did not have or did not realize we would have. I have every confidence, I repeat, in the findings of these nonpartisan groups who have continually over a period of 30 or 40 years visited Hawaii and have come back and said that they are

qualified, that they meet the requirements for statehood. That is good enough for me to also deal with this question in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. COLMER. Following the first part of my question, does the gentleman feel that once we let down the bars and take in this most farflung Territory, then Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands and Newfoundland and Samoa and the Canal Zone, and many other far distant territories would also want us to consider this proposition of statehood? I know that our friend is a good American, and I know that he must have some qualms about this matter and realizes the implications and the dangers that it is likely to bring forward.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, that this is more or less of a precedent, but I also say to him that when the time comes and when nonpartisan committees of this House continually year after year go out to these islands and Territories and come back with a unanimous report that these Territories are qualified and meet all the requirements for statehood, and should be admitted, I will probably be for them when the question of statehood comes up for them.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I want to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules that I got here a few minutes late, but did he point out to the House what position the respective parties took in their platforms on the admission of Hawaii? I know my party had a plank in its platform calling for the admission of Hawaii to the Union. What is the status of the platform on the other side of the aisle on that question? I have not had a chance to review it lately.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I will ask my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi, to answer that question. What was the Democratic platform in 1952 regarding statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will answer that question. The Democratic platform was in favor of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In other words, they do not have any objection to the admission of Hawaii?

Mr. McCORMACK. We brought up both matters in the last Congress, did we not? Did not the Democrats bring up both matters in the last Congress?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes and are they both up now?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under the present proposal is there anything to prevent Harry Bridges and his folks from electing the governor?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I imagine they will have a free election over there, but I have my serious doubts as to whether Harry Bridges has any power whatsoever there. I am not worrying about that 1 minute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Two bills were referred to, the Hawaiian statehood bill and the Alaskan statehood bill. They were separate pieces of legislation introduced in the last Congress, if my memory serves me correctly, is that not correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, there is nothing in the world to prevent the Congress from considering an Alaska statehood bill if the Congress decides to do that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. As always, the gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to note that my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] says that this is not to be a partisan issue. I am so glad to hear that because this ought to be an issue of what is for the ultimate welfare of the United States and not what is for the welfare of either the Democratic or the Republican Party. The same is true, in my judgment, as to any effort to bring any other State into this Union. As far as I know, there is no opposition to this rule. There will be no rollcall, as far as I know. But there are some of us on both sides of the House, I hope, who, on principle and very deep principle, and with deep anxiety for the welfare of the future of our Nation, have serious misgivings about this effort to bring Hawaii in as a State of the Union. Those of us who have that feeling feel that this subject has not been given as mature consideration as such an important issue should have before the adoption of this bill. We feel that this matter needs a thorough and deeper study. We feel it needs greater development in the hearings on the questions involved, and therefore we hope that those of us who, like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] feel that this is not a party issue but an issue for the welfare of the Nation, will join with those of us who feel that this bill should be recommitted for further study, and we hope that such motion will be made by the minority.

I want to discuss now, instead of during general debate, some of the issues involved in this matter. According to the report of its governor, Hawaii has a population of 466,000; 63,000 of those are aliens. Therefore, there are about 400,000 American citizens now residing in Hawaii.

Now I am going to touch on a delicate subject, and I am going to touch on it delicately, but I feel I have to do so. I want to say I have no animosity toward anybody in this matter. I do have a deep feeling of apprehension about the future if this bill should pass. So I do not see why anybody should take offense at a Member of Congress when he states facts, however disagreeable they may be. I am just going to state the facts on the population over there.

There are 16½ percent of the Caucasian race. In 1950 there were 17½ percent; in 1951 there were 16½ percent. I do not have the figures for the present. I have no objection to other races, but I do think it is a fact that should be properly brought to the attention of everybody. We have brought other States into the Union. We have admitted people by the millions, by immigration, and that is all right. But we have never brought a State into this Union where the Caucasian race was in the minority, and this minority consists of only 16 percent.

Now, that is offensive to some people, but I seriously ask Members of Congress to think about it.

I noticed today where a liberal Washington newspaper said that I was crude in bringing this to the attention of the Congress. Well, if it is crude to state cold facts, if it is crude to say a word in behalf of American-born citizens, if it is crude to express on the floor of this House your fears for the future of your country, then I am proud to be called crude. In being called crude, I might remind the House that history tells us some other folks in their day were called crude. There was a whole lot of talk about Andrew Jackson being crude when he was President of the United States. There was more talk about Lincoln that he was crude. So if I can get into that kind of company by being a little crude, I have no objection to being berated by the liberal Washington newspapers.

I want to talk a minute about the representation that we will have. I called attention to it the other day. It is proposed to give to Hawaii 2 Members of this House and that ultimately calls for the loss of 2 Members by the States of this Union in the House of Representatives. I do not know whether my State is going to be the victim or your State is going to be the victim, but some 2 States in this Union are going to lose each 1 of their Members in the House of Representatives just as sure as the sun shines, if this bill passes. You might stop to think about that, and those 2 States are going to lose their Members to 2 districts which will be composed of a population of 200,000 instead of 330,000 as the law now is.

Let us see about the United States Senate. I said this the other day, and at the risk of being called crude I am going to have to say it again. In the Senate of the United States, as you know, some of the most important issues that ever arise, often dealing with foreign relations, are settled sometimes by a majority of 1 or 2. Now, you folks in New York, do not forget that if this bill passes each one of those 400,000 American citizens, if you please, of Hawaii is going to have the same power in the United States Senate as 31 persons from your State of New York. Are you going to like that? Are your people going to like that?

All right; let us take the State of Pennsylvania; do you know, you gentlemen from Pennsylvania, that if this bill passes 1 citizen in Hawaii is going to have as much power in the United States Senate as 22½ of your voters in Pennsylvania? Do you think the people of Pennsylvania are going to appreciate that if you tell it to them?

Or let us take the State of California. I know there is a great deal of sentiment in California for this bill, but let me

remind my colleagues from California that if you pass this bill 1 citizen voting in the State of Hawaii will have the same power as 22½ native-born Californians. Do you think your folks are going to like that?

Let us take Ohio: In the case of Ohio, 1 Hawaiian would have the same power in the United States Senate as 17 citizens of that State. I am not going to burden you with a great deal of this but Illinois would have 1 to 18; Michigan 1 to 14; Texas would have 1 to 17. The average all over the United States based upon the present population of Hawaii and the United States would be that every citizen of Hawaii would have 7 times the vote of 1 citizen of the United States in the United States Senate. Do you think the American people are going to like that? Now go back home and tell your folks exactly what you have done to them and see how they like it.

I expect, of course, communism is going to be discussed pretty fully in this debate before we get through—communism in Hawaii. They say that that is cleared up now that there is no more communism in Hawaii. I never have been afraid of American Communists; I am afraid of misguided American citizens who give courage and shirtfront to the Communists; they are the people who have been doing harm. Now, let us see what goes on out in Hawaii. What about the influence of Harry Bridges there? Harry Bridges leading his left-wing union controls the economy of the Hawaiian Islands. That has been true for 15 years to my personal knowledge, and 2 committees, 1 from the Senate and 1 from the House within the last 2 or 3 years have investigated the situation. Minority reports of these committees have warned the American people about the danger of communism in the Hawaiian Islands. But I shall not dwell on that, because I am sure it is going to be covered later on in the discussion. I have now reached what I regard as the vitally important element in this proposal. That is—and please hear me—the danger of this precedent that you propose to establish in going outside of the continental limits of the United States and bringing a State into the Union 2,000 miles from our shores, a State consisting of a number of disconnected islands, bringing in a State that is not contiguous to the American Continent and is not even contiguous to itself. That is the precedent that will be established. It is something that has never been done since the American Republic was founded. It is a subject that needs the most profound consideration, it needs further hearing and unlimited debate to determine whether the American people are ready, whether the American people are willing, to take the chance of spreading themselves away out into the Pacific Ocean and to establish this precedent of bringing an offshore State into the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to be pessimistic, but we have been living under a cloud of threatened war for years now. We know that the world is in grave danger. I hope the time will never come, but the time may come and no one knows when it will come when the last refuge, the last fortification, the last fortress of Christian civilization may be here on the American Continent. When that time comes we must be ready; we must not have bastions scattered out all over the Pacific that we will have to defend them at all cost. When that time comes it is going to be a battle for the preservation of civilization of the world. This must be a tight bastion, a tight fortress, a fortress contained within itself.

I pray to the Members of Congress that you give this matter deep and further and proper consideration before you ever agree to the passage of this bill that will break this precedent established ever since the foundation of our Republic.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has cited some very interesting figures in reference to the distortion in representation in the Senate as it is today. I would like to add one more item of figures to that speech because I think it is well to have all the figures together. These are figures that I happened to have found. Does the gentleman realize that as of today in the United States 19 percent of the population or States representing 19 percent of our population today elect 50 Senators; say if Hawaii becomes a State, 19 percent plus the 600,000 people of Hawaii will elect 50 percent or a working majority of the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to have those figures because I think they are very significant. I do hope that this debate may be serious and thoughtful; I do hope Members will stay here and listen to it; I do hope that they will realize the deep gravity and the vast importance of this precedent that you propose to establish, because once you establish it you cannot deny it certainly to Puerto Rico, to Alaska, and perhaps to other outlying island Territories.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a table showing the predominant power of Hawaiian vote over that of various States in the Union depending on population:

North Carolina, 4,061,929—more than 9 to 1.

California, 10,586,223—more than 22 to 1.

Pennsylvania, 10,498,012—more than 22½ to 1.

New York, 14,830,192—more than 31 to 1.

Ohio, 7,946,627—more than 17 to 1.

Illinois, 8,742,176—more than 18 to 1.

Michigan, 6,371,766—more than 14 to 1.

Texas, 7,711,194—approximately 17 to 1.

Combined average over the entire 48 States—more than 7 to 1.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include an editorial, also to speak out of order.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and they are certainly food for thought and for consideration. However, I am going to support this rule, and the bill, because I believe the fundamental issue that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] brought up, the location of Hawaii, and whether we should go outside of continental United States or not to admit a State, was an issue which was settled at the time Hawaii was made a Territory. I recall, if my memory of our history is correct, that another State of this Union was admitted when it was not continguous to any other State at all, and as far as time is concerned was much further away from the rest of the United States than Hawaii is now. However, I have asked for unanimous consent to speak out of order because I want to bring up another matter at this time, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, usually there is a great deal of pleasure in being able to stand up and say "I told you so," but I receive no pleasure, no thrill, from taking the floor here today and saying to this House, and to the Department of Defense, the words that I have the right to say, "I told you so." Instead, it is something which gives me a great deal of concern.

Mr. Speaker, on June 23 of last year I spoke to this House. At that time I called attention to communications which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] and I had received from American gun and mortar crews in Korea; and to letters I had received from other boys who were on the battlelines in Korea—American boys—telling of the rationing of munitions and the shortage of shells. Of how they were permitted to shoot only so many shells at the enemy and then were compelled to dig in and take the shelling and the shellacking from the enemy without reply.

I then called upon the Committee on Armed Services of this House to investigate the matter; and I called upon the Department of Defense to do something about it. Believe it or not, the only response I got was that my patriotism was seemingly questioned; that this man BROWN, from Ohio, who served in the Congress, did not know whereof he spoke; that he had never been in Korea or on the battle lines; and that those in command of our military forces knew all the answers, and could assure us there was a plentiful supply of munitions. They told us there was not any real rationing of munitions, except in rare instances, and that those American boys, some of whom are new dead, I am fearful, who complained to their Congressmen about the shortage of munitions and shells, were just wanting more than they were entitled to get; that they were complaining unjustly against their superiors. Ah, yes, those boys did not know anything about the war in Korea; nor did any of us in Congress know anything about the war in Korea. Only the polished brass in the Pentagon knew the answers.

But here, last week, a man named Van Fleet, a lieutenant general of the United States Army, a man who not only commanded all American troops but commanded all the United Nations forces in Korea, comes home to report to the President. And this commanding general

tells us there was a shortage, just as I told you nearly a year ago here in this House. Nothing has been done about it, and I am standing here on the floor today saying to you that the time has come that something be done about it.

As to those men who were responsible for this situation, get them in here and see who is responsible for these shortages. America is the greatest industrial nation on the face of the earth, a nation which not only supplied the shells and the munitions during World War II for armies five times as large as we have today, but also supplied them for the armies and the navies of our Allied Nations, too, in such abundance as to leave billions of dollars' worth of surplus munitions abroad when the war ended. And yet we cannot supply our fighting forces in Korea with munitions and the shells; and we continue to ration them to our sons and brothers who are fighting and dying in the cause of freedom. I say such a situation is a national disgrace.

I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, there is something seriously wrong somewhere. Those who are responsible should be exposed. I do not care what their title or rank may be, they should be exposed. American mothers and fathers—yes; and our American fighting men—should know who is responsible for such a tragic situation. Those men responsible should be punished, just as they would punish an enlisted man on the fighting line who might fail to do his duty there; just as many boys in uniform have been punished for their failures of much less tragic consequence.

There is nothing sacred or sacrosanct about those who serve in the Pentagon. If they make mistakes, let them take the responsibility therefor. Yet I see now, nearly a year after these matters were called to the attention of the Pentagon and the Congress, 2 of the great leaders of the other body, 1 from each political party, have come out and demanded that a thorough investigation of these munitions shortages be conducted. At long last perhaps we are going to look into it.

Yet; but how many American boys have paid the supreme sacrifice because of our failure to move promptly; and because of the failure of those responsible in the Pentagon to see to it that plentiful supplies of munitions went forth to Korea as they should have gone.

We had every right to expect that here in the Congress, because we furnished every dollar needed by our military to furnish the munitions, the shells, and the guns, that our men needed over there. We in Congress did not fail. The failure was not here. Let us now place the responsibility where it belongs. Let us see if we can at long last get action, now that the former commanding general has told the world that what the boys in Korea told us a year ago was actually true then, and is still true today. What are we going to do about it? Let us find out.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. At the time the gentleman made these revelations I had just made a trip home. A father came to me and said, "I have a letter here that disturbs me. I don't know what to do about it. I have a letter from my son, who is guarding a munitions dump over there. He is at a danger spot. He said he had no shells for his revolver and could not get any." I told about that letter on the floor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; and the gentleman so stated on the floor at that time, nearly a year ago. The remarks of last June to which I have referred can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 6, pages 7856 and 7857.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of March 8, 1953. I believe it is worth your reading:

THE AMMUNITION SHORTAGE IN KOREA

General Van Fleet, the retired commander of the 8th Army in Korea, has confirmed the charge, repeatedly made and as often denied over many months, that American forces fighting the Communists have been handicapped by a deplorable shortage of ammunition. Van Fleet said that hand grenades, heavily relied on in fighting at close quarters, as frequently is the condition in Korea, had also been in short supply.

This condition obtained from the day that the general first took command 22 months ago, and it has been continuous, despite a relative improvement in recent months.

No wonder Senator BYRD demanded a full investigation and punishment of officials and officers responsible. Congress in the last 3 years has appropriated $160 billion for defense, and in the years between the end of World War II in 1945 and the Truman intervention in Korea in June 1950, the military was given tens of billions of additional funds.

Where did the money go, that American fighting men have been short of munitions to defending their lives? Are the industries of unkempt Russia, of industrially primitive China, of North Korea more efficient than those of the technologically advanced United States when it comes to maintaining armies in the field?

That is unthinkable. The blame lies in the Defense Department under Truman and in the top brass management in the Pentagon.

Certainly no one is going to dispute the accuracy of the facts available to the commander who held responsibility in Korea. Yet a stream of lies has poured out of Washington in the last year, all denying a shortage existed, or, if conceding there was a shortage, tending to minimize it.

Representative BROWN, of Ohio, brought this subject to the attention of Congress last June, when he read a letter from 35 soldiers in Korea attesting the existence of critical shortages in mortar and other ammunition, and asserting that the fighting men were equipped with obsolescent weapons without even an adequate supply of replacement parts.

In the same months Senator KEM, of Missouri, charged that the troops were armed with out-of-date weapons, that ammunition was short, and that every fifth bomb dropped by the Air Force was a dud. Both he and BROWN declared that these conditions were responsible for the unnecessary expenditure of American life.

On July 6, after the Army Chief of Staff, General Collins, had admitted that ammunition was being rationed in Korea, the Army offered the official "explanation" that Collins used the word "rationing" in the military sense—i. e., that ammunition was apportioned among various types of weapons according to scheduled rates of fire. Ammunition for Korea was adequate, the Army said, although it did admit that reserve stocks of certain types of shells in the United States were low and must be replenished from current stocks.

On August 4 the Army admitted that it had been found necessary to ration ammunition in Korea, but attributed "austerity" conditions to the steel strike just ended. In December General Eisenhower, upon completing an inspection trip to Korea, implied that the ammunition shortage there had reached serious proportions. Reports from the field supported this contention, for it was stated that American forces had labored under severe handicaps in the battle for the Kumhwa ridges, where Communist artillery outshot American artillery at the rate of 2½ to 1 until American commanders had to abandon their conservation order and reciprocate at a scale which brought on what was termed the greatest artillery display since World War II.

Despite Eisenhower's prestige, the Assistant Chief of Staff for Logistics, Maj. Gen. William O. Reeder, took issue with his statement. Calling a Pentagon press conference, Reeder said Eisenhower had listened to soldiers "who want all the ammunition they can get" and had received exaggerated ideas about the ammunition supply situation. He threw in the gratuitous observation that if there was any shortage, it was because the American public hadn't given the Army more funds.

We must say that the Americans condemned to Korea have got a bad deal. They weren't allowed to take the measures that could have won the war, and they haven't been given sufficient ammunition to reduce combat risk to a minimum. They are orphans in the sense that the Bataan garrison was in 1942.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the matter we have under consideration is possibly one of the most important we have been called upon to pass judgment on. It is unlike other legislation that comes before us, where if we find that amendment is necessary we have an opportunity to amend it, or if we find the legislation to be unwise we can repeal it. This is permanent legislation. Once we admit Hawaii to the Union as a State, I know of no way, even though we agree that we were in error, that we could change it.

Hawaii claims to have four to five hundred thousand people. I have that many people in my congressional district—a single Member of the Congress. If Hawaii is admitted to the Union, they would be entitled to two Senators and two Members of the House. Thereby eliminating two seats now representing people from various States and giving two more Senators to the other body. Let me call to your attention the extraordinary power that the Senate has in ratifying foreign agreements. The State of Hawaii, if admitted to the Union, can nullify the votes of both the two Members from the State of New York and the two Members from the State of Pennsylvania. Since it takes two-thirds of the membership of that body to ratify a foreign agreement, this new State would have twice as much effect as the Senators from any other State. I say in these times that that is a matter which must be considered.

Let me also call to your attention the fact that this would merely be the beginning of applications for admission to this Union. Others would follow. The test is not the size of area, it is not the wealth of that area nor the number of

people, but merely the ability of that Territory to govern itself. The Virgin Islands has demonstrated its ability to govern itself, and therefore the Virgin Islands with 25,000 people would be entitled to consideration for admission as a State in this Union.

Let me also call to your attention the fact that we need not step into that twilight area of territorial status before making application to become a State. Over 100 years ago, Texas came in as an independent unit, so did California. At the time that Texas in 1846 or thereabouts entered the Union, they reserved to themselves the right to divide into four additional States as they saw fit. So far as I know that compact, that agreement is just as binding today as it was 100 years ago, and upon the election of Texas that State could divide into 4 additional States, giving to that area 10 Senators instead of the 2 that they now have. I say if that happens, other areas will follow.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Apropos of increasing the size of the other body, of course, we all realize that the representation in the House of Representatives is fixed, but as these new offshore islands are brought in we would increase the membership in the other body by two Members each time a new State should be admitted. Having set this precedent, if we keep on, we would soon have the situation where the body of the Congress ratifying the treaties could possibly be largely influenced, if not predominantly influenced, by these new Senators that are brought in. I am just trying to help the gentleman impress upon our colleagues here the vital importance of this situation here and the tragedy in the setup we have as we know it if this precedent is permitted.

Mr. DELANEY. I thank the gentleman for his observations. Let me also say that all citizens of this country are entitled to the same consideration whether they live in the Canal Zone, whether they live in Puerto Rico, or whether they live in the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, or Alaska or any of the islands recently taken over by this country. Whatever consideration we give to Hawaii we must give to these other outlying areas. I say it would be a mistake at this time to admit Hawaii as a State. I say postpone that action; give consideration to the Coudert constitutional amendment. I believe that his proposal is a step in the right direction. Perhaps if we argue out that point, then a majority of the people of this country would feel as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] does, that the statehood for Hawaii should not be considered at this time. I say vote down the rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this is the day the House of Representatives considers statehood for Hawaii.

H. R. 3575 had a 4-day hearing before the subcommittee of which Mr. JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, is chairman. It was fully considered by the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and the committee instructed me as chairman to report the bill to the House for consideration and to take such action as would be necessary to insure its passage. The bill was reported from the full committee with but five dissenting vote.

The Rules Committee, after nearly 90 minutes of hearings, voted the rule which calls for 4 hours of general debate and then reading the bill under the 5-minute rule.

H. R. 3575 has for its purpose enabling the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union in an equal footing with the original States.

In considering the question of statehood for Hawaii, let me point out that since 1935 five congressional committees have investigated the subject of statehood for Hawaii in Hawaii. During this time 31 Members of Congress have visited the islands for these investigations. There were many hearings held in Washington. More than 600 witnesses have been heard, and a record taken comprising nearly 4,000 pages. Of the 600 witnesses appearing, 550 were in favor of immediate statehood for Hawaii.

The record on Hawaii is complete. It is available for examination. Virtually everything there is to be known about Hawaii has been said over and over again in the hearings which have been held. The social, political, cultural, and economic structures have been subjected to an examination that was unheard of with the other 29 Territories when they were candidates for statehood. I understand Hawaii has tried about 17 times since 1903 to be admitted as a State.

Some of the Members of the House are disappointed that Alaska is not considered for statehood at the same time. Let me say to you that hearings have been set on the bills which would permit Alaska to elect its own governor and to have statehood. These hearings will be held on April 14, 15, and 16. I know some of you ask why the late date. The date was set in April because the new legislature in Alaska will appoint a new committee on Alaska statehood. This committee will have the opportunity to consider any change in sentiment and be present at the hearings in April. It does not seem to me it is the measure of responsibility of the opposition to weigh soberly their actions. It is not a time for quibbling over political advantages. It is a time for statesmanship. Surely you who oppose considering Hawaii for statehood at this time because Alaska has not been included should recognize that when Hawaii becomes a State it will be easier to bring Alaska in as one of the States. The vote on considering Hawaii at this time is a test of the party's responsibility.

I would remind you that the Republican and Democratic Parties are committed to immediate statehood for Hawaii. Pledges to that end were incorporated in the 1952 political platforms of both major parties during the political conventions in Chicago. The President in his state of the Union message asked that Hawaii be given statehood.

Hawaii's present population—499,799, United States census 1950—exceeds that of any other Territory at the time of admission as a State, with the single exception of Oklahoma. Its growth has been continuous. The largest group of this population seems to be the Japanese with 183,000. This is followed by the white population of 114,000; Hawaiians, 87,000; Filipinos, 60,000; and Chinese, 33,000.

While it is true the population of the islands is composed of many races and groups, they are trained in the Territory's excellent school system and have been wholly imbued with the principles of Americanism in thought, word, and deed. Of the half million people, 87 percent are native-born and are American citizens. Even more significant for the future of the proposed State is the fact that 99.2 percent of all school children of the Territory are native-born American citizens. The attendance in the schools of Hawaii exceeds the average ratio in the United States.

There are many who have some doubts about admitting Hawaii to statehood because the Territory is not contiguous to the mainland. It also has the varied population which some feel would not have the same ideological thinking as those on the mainland.

Hawaiians pay Federal income taxes amounting to an average of about $138 million a year. They are under social security, unemployment compensation, the minimum wage law, the Taft-Hartley Act. They get Federal loans, their veterans receive benefits, they have farm price supports and sugar quotas, they receive agricultural conservation payments, and their men serve in the military forces.

If Hawaii is admitted as a new State, they will have two Senators and two Representatives. They will then elect their own Governor. They will not be subjected to restraints sometimes imposed on Territories. They will be able to refine their own sugar on the islands. They will not need to come to Congress for approval of legislation. They will automatically qualify for everything that goes to the States.

There are some of my colleagues who hesitate about bringing Hawaii in as a new State because of their fear of subversive activities in Hawaii. To you who doubt, let me call your attention to the constitution which lays down requirements that are more stringent than have ever been prescribed heretofore in enabling legislation.

There is a provision that no person who advocates or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States, shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the State constitution. That should calm any fears that you might have.

The new constitution for Hawaii gives notice to the world, and particularly to the people in the Pacific at this critical

juncture of international affairs, that it is the policy of the United States to promote self-government among all peoples, without political, economic, racial, or other distinction. I hope, my colleagues, that there will be no reference to the racial groups as such which now reside in Hawaii. They are Americans.

The Department of Defense has a real interest in Hawaii. They were able to compose their differences with those of the committee and the people of Hawaii, and the one major amendment being proposed represents a compromise satisfactory to all parties.

The war record of the entire population of Hawaii has been excellent. Not a single case of sabotage by a Hawaiian civilian was reported during the war. The 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii composed of so-called Japanese-Americans, together formed what has been described by Gen. Mark Clark as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States."

The Hawaiian battle casualties in the Korea fighting are more than three times, percentage-wise, those of the rest of the country.

The committee and the Congress has had a greater amount of information regarding Hawaii than has been the case in the admission of any other Territory. The Congress and the committees have gone into all issues thoroughly and have given objective, impartial consideration to all phases. Witnesses have had an opportunity to appear and testify either for or against the measure.

Hawaii understands statehood. In the election of 1952, 87.49 percent of the registered electors voted. This is for the city and county of Honolulu. For the territorial offices, 87.6 percent voted.

Hawaii, with a population of a half million people, contributes more revenue to the Federal Government than any of the 9 States of the Union. It was a free and independent republic before it became an integrated part of the United States by mutual agreement in 1900.

The economic and cultural progress of Hawaii has been distinguished. The University of Hawaii is an educational institution of the highest standards.

Hawaii has adopted in full the recommendations of the American Bar Association with respect to requirements for admission to the bar. The standard is high.

The legislature of Hawaii has consistently enacted progressive, wise law in the American tradition. The proof of the above statement is that although the Congress has the power to veto any law passed by the Territory, such veto power has never been used in the 52 years that Hawaii has been a part of the United States.

While Hawaii is 2,000 miles from the United States, modern-day communications and transportation places it closer to Washington than Washington was to New York when it first became the Capitol. It is noted that 103 years ago Daniel Webster, as a Member of the 31st Congress, found no bar to the admission of California. Now, a century later, there should be no bar to the admission of Hawaii into the United States. The people have developed a typical American society, with American ideals and traditions.

There is no question but what Hawaii will be able to be self-supporting and make great contributions to the Federal Treasury.

First. As a result of the hearings, I am convinced that the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State is in the best interests of the Nation and the Territory.

Second. The Territory meets all the traditional requirements for statehood and as a State would make valuable contributions to the Nation and to the world.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget recommend the passage of this bill and assure the committee it is in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3575) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3575, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MILLER or Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this is the third time that the question of statehood for Hawaii has come to the floor of the House of Representatives. The House in 1947 adopted an enabling act to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State and again in 1950 adopted another bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State. But in the intervening years there has been a considerable change in the membership of this House and many of those who visited Hawaii and studied the subject are absent from the floor for one reason or another; so for the purpose of this debate I feel it is important that I review some of the historical background of Hawaii and some of the fundamental facts that bear upon this issue as it is very evident from what has been said here today that certain facts have been lost sight of by some Members of the House.

Hawaii is American. Hawaii is an American Commonwealth. Hawaii is by tradition and custom American. Hawaii's people are American.

The foundation for Hawaii's development along American lines was laid down by American missionaries who landed in the islands in 1820. By 1840 a system of free public school education and a constitutional government following the traditional American pattern had been established as the result of American influence. The government of Hawaii and the predominance of American influence was recognized as far back as 1854 when President Franklin Pierce authorized negotiations to annex Hawaii to the United States as a State. The treaty proposed that the "Hawaiian Islands shall be incorporated into the American Union as a State, enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States and admitted as such as soon as it can be done in consistency with the principle and requirements of the Federal Constitution to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a State as aforesaid on perfect equality with other States of the Union."

In 1864 President Abraham Lincoln said of Hawaii:

> Its people are free, and its laws, language and religion are largely the fruit of our own teaching and example.

And so has run the history of Hawaii for more than 130 years. The measure of American influence has constantly been increased.

This is no foreign land and no alien people suddenly seeeking to become a State of the American Union. It is a community of American people seeking to achieve full partnership in the American Union as most other Americans that have gone before us have done.

In all major respects excepting one the life of Hawaii and its people is completely integrated with that of the rest of the people of our common country and that exception is in the exercise of their rights as American citizens under our system of government.

The purpose of the legislation to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State is to give the people of Hawaii those rights and the responsibilities that accompany them so that the integration of the life of our people with that of the rest of the country is complete.

Hawaii's people would become full-fledged American citizens under State government.

This has been our ambition for many years.

We are keenly aware of the fact that we are second-class citizens and will continue to be under any other status proposed except that of statehood. Despite this we have carried all the financial responsibilities of the citizens of the States.

We have paid the same Federal taxes as all other Americans.

We have joined in the defense of our country in every crisis. Many of our sons have given their lives to our country on the field of battle. This is a record of which we are very proud.

I believe our record generally as citizens with limited privileges has been a very good one.

The admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State would broaden the privilege of the franchise that has long been exercised by the people of Hawaii in a limited way and secure us in our full rights as American citizens.

For more than 50 years the people of Hawaii have elected the members of their own legislature and the executive and legislative officials of their county governments. They have chosen by popular vote their Delegate to the Congress of the United States.

The Governor of the Territory and the members of the judiciary of the Territory have, however, been chosen by the

President of the United States with the approval of the United States Senate as is the custom under the Territorial system.

The exercise of even these limited rights has, at times in our history, been seriously threatened. They can be removed by act of Congress. Our position with respect to our political rights is very insecure. Our Government as it is now constituted can be abolished by Congress if it so chooses. Experience in the past has indicated that this constitutes a genuine threat.

Under State government we of Hawaii would participate in the election of the President and the Vice President of the United States, elect two Members of the United States Senate and two Members of the House with voting representation, and choose our own executive and judicial officials.

Our position as full-fledged American citizens moreover would be secure.

These constitute the basic reasons that we desire statehood.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. As I understand, there are about 500,000 inhabitants in the islands constituting the Territory of Hawaii; is that correct?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right.

Mr. DONOVAN. Of the 500,000, how many will participate in an election to elect two United States Senators?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think the best answer is that in the last general election there was a total of about 150,000 voters registered.

Mr. DONOVAN. At what age do the voters become eligible to vote in the Territory?

Mr. FARRINGTON. They can vote now when they reach the age of 21. Under the constitution, provision is made that they shall vote at the age of 20, because the organic act provides in other respects that men reach their majority at the age of 20.

I come now to the second aspect of our presentation, which goes right to the heart of this question.

The promise of statehod has been held out to Hawaii's people ever since annexation.

The Republic of Hawaii was annexed by joint resolution of the Congress of the United States in 1898 at the request of the citizens of that Republic. The resolution of annexation incorporated Hawaii into the Union as an integral part thereof. The foregoing phrase has a vital bearing on the consideration of this question. It means that Hawaii became irrevocably a part of the United States.

One of the leaders in the fight for annexation and on the commission which drafted the organic law of 1900 under which Hawaii has been governed was Senator John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama. In talks to the people of Hawaii he held out the hope that if we were to become a part of the United States then someday the citizens of the Republic of Hawaii would enjoy the same privileges as the citizens of the United States.

In Senate Report 227, of the 53d Congress, 2d session, on February 26, 1894, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which that great statesman, Senator John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama, was chairman, is included the following:

> Another principle which does not apply in our dealing with European powers comes into application in this case to influence the rights of Hawaii in her intercourse with the United States.
>
> Hawaii is an American state, and is embraced in the American commercial and military system. This fact has been frequently and firmly stated by our Government, and is the ground on which is rested that peculiar and farreaching declaration so often and so earnestly made, that the United States will not admit the right of any foreign government to acquire any interest or control in the Hawaiian Islands that is in anyway prejudicial or even threatening toward the interests of the United States or her people. This is at least a moral suzerainty over Hawaii.

John Tyler Morgan went to Hawaii in 1897 and persuaded the Hawaiians they should join with Americans in seeking annexation. He held out to them the hope of statehood.

It was John Tyler Morgan who fought Grover Cleveland when he attempted to block annexation of Hawaii.

It was John Tyler Morgan who insisted Hawaii should come into the Union under the territorial form of government with no restrictions on the right of the ballot.

John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama, had the foresight to realize that Hawaii in time would become one of the most vital and important areas under the American flag, and everything possible should be done to bind that area closer to the rest of the country.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a fact, too, is it not, that our former colleague, Henry Larcade, of Louisiana, one of the most respected Members of this House for a number of years, went to Hawaii, held a hearing, and came back and filed a very highly favorable report on statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Yes. If he were in the House today, he would be one of the first to take the floor and fight for the enactment of this legislation, because as a result of his study and examination of that problem he was convinced that the national interest would be served by admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State.

President McKinley, in a message to the Senate on June 16, 1897, stated that "annexation is not a change. It is a consummation."

He recognized that to make Hawaii an integral part of this country was manifest destiny, and used those words.

Today statehood is not a change. It is a consummation, a fulfillment of implied promises repeatedly made.

In his inaugural address on June 14, 1906, the first Governor of the Territory, Sanford Ballard Dole, who was the President of the Republic of Hawaii said:

> Hawaii is forearmed by its past experience for this new essay in government. The honorable competition of sister Territories, the hope of statehood, and the glorious history of America must inspire her.

That was 52 years ago, and we have lived and grown and developed in that hope.

I ask you if at this stage of the development of our country you are going to close the door on us. The Supreme Court of the United States has held time and again that a territory is a State in the making. The dictionary defines a territory as a provisional State. The promise of statehood has been held out repeatedly by leaders in the Congress, and finally the promise that Hawaii would be admitted to statehood immediately has been written into the platforms of both major political parties. Hawaii's people, therefore, have for more than half a century worked, lived and died in the belief that when they met all the requirements of statehood, the Territory would be admitted to the Union on the basis of equality, and that they would become full fledged American citizens.

Hawaii has met all the requirements of statehood. This has been the conclusion of every committee of Congress that has investigated this question. As far back as 1935, a joint committee of the Congress after an exhaustive investigation in the Territory, found Hawaii had met all the requirements theretofore set up for admission of territories to statehood.

The committee found Hawaii to be a modern, American commonwealth with well developed institutions of every character and well qualified by experience and financially able to meet the responsibilities of State government.

There cannot be any question about the capacity of the people of Hawaii financially, politically or otherwise to manage their own affairs. That has been established beyond a question of a doubt.

I want to make this point also, that in seeking admission as a State we are following the traditional American pattern. Out of the original 13 colonies, 4 additional States were carved—Vermont, Maine, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

Two republics came into the Union as States without serving provisionally as territories. They were Texas and California.

Each of the remaining 29 served a period of tutelage as territories to the United States. They were governed by the identical pattern under which Hawaii has been governed since it was made a Territory in 1900. As soon as they qualified to meet the responsibilities of State government they were admitted to the Union and to the privileges of statehood. The last two States to be admitted were Arizona and New Mexico, which became members of the Union in 1912. That left only two incorporated Territories—Alaska and Hawaii. I want to emphasize again, gentlemen, the point that there are only remaining two incorporated territories, and that this does not involve any precedent so far as other areas under the American flag are concerned or any other places are concerned.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the thought was brought out that we might have Samoa and Guam and a lot

of the trust territories brought in. That just is not possible at the present time, is it? They are not incorporated territories. The only other area incorporated is Alaska; is that correct?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is absolutely correct; and anybody who suggests the admission of Guam as a State of the Union indicts himself for his lack of information. Do you know how large Guam is? Guam is only 200 square miles in size, and 100 of those square miles comprise military reservations. There are about 23,000 Guamanians, and I have never even heard a Guamanian suggest that they be admitted to the Union as a State. The gentlemen who talk about admitting Guam and the Virgin Islands to the Union as a State are just talking through their hats; that is all.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. Is it not true that this Congress just in the last session or the session before passed the first law which would provide for the government of Guam?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is right. Prior to that time Guam was governed as a naval reservation.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is right, and the entire island had been a naval reservation up until that point.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Under the Constitution of the United States, the Congress cannot disincorporate Hawaii and Alaska. They cannot give us our independence, and they cannot exempt us from taxes.

Some of the people in Hawaii have been in the past very much fascinated by the possibility of achieving the status of Puerto Rico. We pay into the Federal Treasury each year more than twice as much as we spend for the government of the Territory, and they thought, "Well, if we can get the status of Puerto Rico and be exempted from Federal taxes, what a paradise we would be in." But the Congress of the United States cannot exempt Hawaii from taxes. We have got to pay taxes like everyone else.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. On what theory does the gentleman make the statement that the Congress of the United States cannot change the territorial status of Hawaii? In other words, what was irrevocable about the act of Congress that took place 50 years ago that Congress cannot change?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I did not contend that we could not change the status of the Territory. We can have our territorial government taken away from us. What I did contend is that the Congress cannot exempt us from Federal taxes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Under the commonwealth form of government, similar to that now enjoyed by Puerto Rico, under which the people of Puerto Rico elect their own governor, elect their own legislature, elect and nominate and appoint their own judges, why could not the Congress of the United States exempt the people of Hawaii from Federal taxes in the same way as they exempt the people of Puerto Rico?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The answer to that is, because Hawaii is an incorporated Territory and Puerto Rico is not.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has not the gentleman just said there is nothing irrevocable about the territorial status of Hawaii?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That does not alter the status as far as taxes are concerned.

Mr. DONOVAN. I have asked the gentleman a simple question.

Mr. FARRINGTON. And I have answered it.

Mr. DONOVAN. If the status of Hawaii is revoked, and a commonwealth form of government similar to Puerto Rico set up, what is to prevent Congress from exempting the people of Hawaii from Federal taxes?

Mr. FARRINGTON. The Constitution of the United States. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in 1950 I proposed an amendment to a tax measure under consideration, to exempt Hawaii from the 15-percent transportation tax, as it falls on us very inequitably. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] made a considerable argument along the line that it would be unconstitutional to exempt Hawaii from the tax.

Mr. DONOVAN. That was only one man's opinion.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Well, that opinion prevailed, and I think that is one that is generally held, and constitutional lawyers will uphold it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. May I suggest that I think the gentleman has already given us the answer as to why you cannot exempt Hawaii from Federal taxes, when he pointed out that the annexation resolution provided that Hawaii should be an integral part of the United States.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. I do not believe you can violate a contract entered into by the United States and some foreign nation, and the Republic of Hawaii was a foreign nation at that time. If the United States is to carry out its contract, that is still binding on us; they are still an integral part of the United States, and this Congress cannot change it. Of course, we have to levy the same taxes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. We have to levy the same taxes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. And if Hawaii tried to get out, she would have the same trouble that some of our southern friends had during the so-called War Between the States.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman.

I was very much surprised to hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] tell the Rules Committee the other day that the subject of statehood for Hawaii had not been given adequate consideration.

The question of statehood for Hawaii has been under active consideration in every session of Congress since the conclusion of the war and been the object of extensive inquiry.

At the time the legislation now before the House was under consideration in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the members had available more than 3,600 pages of printed hearings and reports bearing on every aspect of this question. Well in excess of 150 Members of Congress have served on committees that have investigated the question of statehood for Hawaii. Between 30 and 40 of these gentlemen have visited Hawaii, and well in excess of 700 witnesses have been heard.

The volume of testimony bearing on all of the arguments and facts involved in this issue is something tremendous. The subject has been under inquiry by innumerable individuals, private organizations, and publications.

The Governors' Conference has repeatedly supported statehood for Hawaii. More than 40 of the leading national patriotic, religious, civic, professional, labor, and farm organizations have gone on record in favor of statehood for Hawaii. More than 90 percent of the newspapers in all parts of the country have been actively supporting statehood for Hawaii. I doubt if any subject to come before Congress in recent years has been the object of more extensive consideration than has this one.

It is obvious the time is here to reach a decision.

The enabling act now before the House is in the traditional pattern for the admission of new States into the Union.

The measure has undergone some change only because the Territory itself has, since the first enabling act for this purpose was passed, approved a Constitution for the State of Hawaii.

The House of Representatives on June 30, 1947, passed an enabling act to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State by a vote of 197—133.

Almost 3 years later, on March 7, 1950, the House again passed an enabling act to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State by a vote of 262–110.

Both of these measures provided the authority and the funds for the people of the Territory to elect delegates to a convention for purposes of drafting a constitution for the new State and for the submission of that constitution to the people for their approval.

These measures, however, failed of enactment by the Senate, so the Territory itself, following the example of 15 other Territories, proceeded to provide the authority and funds necessary under territorial law to hold a constitutional convention and submit it to the people of the Territory for their approval.

The constitutional convention was assembled on April 4, 1950, and deliberated for 78 days. Shortly thereafter, the legislature of the Territory was called into special session to act on the question of whether the constitution should be submitted to the voters. The legislature approved the constitution unanimously and authorized its submission to the

voters at the regular election on November 7, 1950. The constitution was approved by a 3-to-1 majority with 82 percent of the eligible voters having voted on the question.

Because of this action, the enabling act now before the House has undergone some changes. H. R. 3575 therefore ratifies the act of the Territorial legislature which authorized the holding of the constitutional convention. It sets down, nevertheless, the fundamental conditions that must be met by the constitution. These are set forth in section 2.

The bill then provides in section 3 for the disposition of the public lands of the Territory. It provides, in brief, that the Federal Government shall retain title to those lands at present used for purposes of national defense, and that the State shall have the right to select the 182,000 acres of the public domain as is customary with the admission of new States, and that the disposition of the balance of the public domain shall be determined by a joint committee of the Congress. The latter involves approximately half a million acres.

Section 4 of the bill recognizes the results of the election of November 7, 1950, under which the people of the Territory voted on the constitution for the new State as constituting a ratification of the constitution. It provides that if the President finds that the constitution conforms with the conditions set down in this enabling act, then he shall so certify to the Governor of the Territory, who shall proceed with the steps necessary for the election of State officials. The section also provides that in the event the President finds the constitution does not conform with the standards required by Congress, then the constitutional convention shall be reconvened.

The election of State officials on November 2, 1954, the date of the regular biennial election, is provided for in section 5, that authorizes such other steps as are necessary for the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State.

Section 6 provides that the new State shall be entitled to two Representatives, who shall be added to the present membership of the House until the reapportionment required in 1960. In the event this legislation is enacted into law and Hawaii is admitted to the Union as a State, the membership of the House will be 437 for a period of almost 8 years.

The succeeding five sections are amendments to the United States Code that have been drafted by the judicial conference to cover the changes necessary to the transfer of the function of the courts from a Territorial to a State status.

Provision is made in section 13 for protecting litigation of all kinds during the period of transition.

The next three sections provide that the title of the Federal Government to the Hawaii National Park shall be adequately secured, that there shall be concurrent jurisdiction over military installations as now prevails unless Congress provides otherwise, that the Federal Reserve System should be extended to the State of Hawaii, and that surface transportation between the mainland and the State of Hawaii should continue under the control of the Federal Maritime Board.

It should be said in passing that the section covering enforcement of law in the military installations meets the approval of the Department of National Defense.

The constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii is in itself a great argument for the immediate admission of Hawaii to statehood.

It is compelling evidence of the political maturity of Hawaii's people and their capacity to govern their own affairs.

It has been before Congress officially for almost 2 years. The text of the constitution was incorporated in the report rendered by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in May 1951. The committee's report contains this comment on the constitution:

> The committee finds that the prophecy that the State Constitution of Hawaii would reflect Communist influence has not been even remotely fulfilled. This proposed State constitution was drafted by delegates chosen by the people of Hawaii and who formed an excellent cross-section of them. It was then submitted to the people in the general election of November 1950, and, despite the active opposition of the ILWU, was approved by a vote of more than 3 to 1.
>
> The committee feels that this constitution speaks for itself, and as an example, of the political maturity of the people of Hawaii, it is set forth in full in the appendix to this report (appendix J).

The constitution is unique in that it contains in article XIV, section 3, the following:

> No person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of this State or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

The incorporation of this section in the constitution is evidence of how keenly alert are the people of Hawaii to dealing with the pressing issue of communism.

In an article in the September 1952 issue of the Illinois Bar Journal, Thomas J. Welch, president of the Illinois Bar Association, and who has personally visited Hawaii, had this to say:

> The constitution is to be highly commended for its confinement to fundamental law, its clarity and simplicity of style and minimum statutory provisions.
>
> It is a thoroughly American document, patterned after the Constitution of the United States and State constitutions, and is free from the restrictions and legislative details that have so encumbered most of the State constitutions.

One of the great arguments on statehood for Hawaii is the constitution that was adopted by the people of Hawaii. A minority report of the Senate in 1948 alleged that if we were to hold a constitutional convention that the convention would be controlled by Communist influences. I invite you to read that constitution. I am very happy that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] pointed out the anti-Communist clause, because every time the people of Hawaii have been confronted squarely with the issue of communism, they have met it vigorously, actively, and effectively. We recognize, however, that is a problem that cannot be met in our community alone; it is a national problem, an international problem, and that by strengthening our voice and our vote in the National Government our capacity to control it will be enhanced.

That constitution was opposed when submitted to the people of the Territory by Harry Bridges' union. Examine the record of that constitution and you will be more than reassured that so long as the powers of this country and the responsibility of American citizenship are in the hands of the people of Hawaii they are in safe hands, they are in able hands, they are in patriotic hands.

Hawaii normally pays into the Federal Treasury in Federal taxes more than 9 to 15 States.

In the fiscal year 1952 the total of internal revenue collections in Hawaii was in excess of those from nine States. The per capita collections in Hawaii in the same period were in excess of those in 22 States.

In the last 10 years, Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury $1,200,000,000, an amount exceeding that paid by 10 States.

With regard to total internal revenue collections, Hawaii ranks in 40th place as it did in 1951 with tax collections exceeding those from 9 States.

Per capita internal revenue collections in Hawaii increased from $195.34 in 1951 to $272.80 in 1952. Average collections from the United States as a whole were higher than those from Hawaii, increasing from $332.96 in 1951 to $429.86 in 1952.

The taxes paid the Federal Government reflect a highly developed and prosperous economy.

Hawaii ranks as one of the best customers of the continental United States. In 1951 Hawaii bought from the mainland, food, clothing, shoes, motor cars, household appliances, construction materials, machinery and equipment, fuel, medical supplies, and many other items amounting to $381,912,000.

Since 1933, Hawaii has been seventh and eighth in the rank of continental United States customers, and in 1940, fifth among all the nations of the world, ahead in purchases of such countries as Italy, China, Cuba, the Philippines, Germany.

Gross business in Hawaii reached a volume of $1,429,341,206.

A total of $502,174,589 was paid in salaries and wages.

Retail sales totaled $521,189,496.66.

Assessors' gross valuation of land and improvements in the Territory as of January 1, 1952, was $1,073,952,582.

Territorial residents, in 1952, filed 170,714 Territorial income-tax returns, listing salaries, wages, and dividends totaling $535,178,803.50. Dividends alone amounted to $33,004,214.50.

Total tax collections accruing to the Territory of Hawaii in 1952 totaled $74,862,678.40, up $800,000 from the previous year.

Hawaii's sugar crop was sold for $137,250,000 in 1952, and its pineapple crop for another $100 million.

The tourist trade produced $50 million.

Another $36,700,000 was realized from minor industries.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman made reference a minute ago to what I think is a very vital matter, yet not very understood here, and that is that when Hawaii was announced as forming an integral part of the United States, that Hawaii stays in and stays in either as a subservient territory or as an independent State; there is nothing but that alternative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the Delegate from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii.

Mr. ENGLE. I think the membership would be interested in the conditions of her admission and I would suggest to the Delegate from Hawaii that at an appropriate time he ask permission to make it a part of this RECORD as an extension of his remarks, in order to illustrate to the Members of the House that we have only the alternative between making Hawaii a State or keeping her constantly and forever in this position of tutelage in which she now exists without voting representation in the Congress. I ask the gentleman to do that.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I will be glad to.

The text of the resolution of annexation follows:

Joint Resolution 55 (55th Cong.)

Joint resolution to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Hawaii, having, in due form, signified its consent, in the manner provided by its constitution, to cede absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies, and also to cede and transfer to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, Government, or Crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment, and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the Government of the Hawaiian Islands, together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining: Therefore

Resolved, etc., That said cession is accepted, ratified, and confirmed, and that the said Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies be, and they are hereby, annexed as a part of the territory of the United States and are subject to the sovereign dominion thereof, and that all and singular the property and rights hereinbefore mentioned are vested in the United States of America.

The existing laws of the United States relative to public lands shall not apply to such lands in the Hawaiian Islands; but the Congress of the United States shall enact special laws for their management and disposition: *Provided*, That all revenue from or proceeds of the same, except as regards such part thereof as may be used or occupied for the civil, military, or naval purposes of the United States, or may be assigned for the use of the local government shall be used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for educational and other public purposes.

Until Congress shall provide for the government of such islands, all the civil, judicial, and military powers exercised by the officers of the existing government in said islands shall be vested in such person or persons and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct; and the President shall have the power to remove said officers and fill the vacancies so occasioned.

The existing treaties of the Hawaiian Islands with foreign nations shall forthwith cease and determine, being replaced by such treaties as may exist, or as may be hereafter concluded, between the United States and such foreign nations. The municipal legislation of the Hawaiian Islands, not enacted for the fulfillment of the treaties so extinguished, and not inconsistent with this joint resolution nor contrary to the Constitution of the United States nor to any existing treaty of the United States, shall remain in force until the Congress of the United States shall otherwise determine.

Until legislation shall be enacted extending the United States customs laws and regulations to the Hawaiian Islands the existing customs relations of the Hawaiian Islands with the United States and other countries shall remain unchanged.

The public debt of the Republic of Hawaii, lawfully existing at the date of the passage of this joint resolution, including the amounts due to depositors in the Hawaiian Postal Savings Bank, is hereby assumed by the Government of the United States; but the liability of the United States in this regard shall in no case exceed $4 million. So long, however, as the existing government and the present commercial relations of the Hawaiian Islands are continued as hereinbefore provided said government shall continue to pay the interest on said debt.

There shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands, except upon such conditions as are now or may hereafter be allowed by the laws of the United States; no Chinese, by reason of anything herein contained, shall be allowed to enter the United States from the Hawaiian Islands.

The President shall appoint 5 Commissioners, at least 2 of whom shall be residents of the Hawaiian Islands, who shall, as soon as reasonably practicable, recommend to Congress such legislation concerning the Hawaiian Islands as they shall deem necessary or proper.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners hereinbefore provided for shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEC. 3. That the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to be immediately available, to be expended at the discretion of the President of the United States of America, for the purpose of carrying this joint resolution into effect.

Senate joint resolution adopted July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750).

I will try to conclude in a few minutes, if I may. I want to deal now with the problem of the population of Hawaii. The figures I use are the figures of the Census of 1950. Those are the only figures that should be used in the consideration of this question because that was the last time we had a census enumeration. The other figures are purely estimates and they are just as likely as not to be inaccurate; in fact, they have been shown to be quite inaccurate. I will incorporate in my remarks at this point a tabulation which shows the population of Hawaii broken down by major racial groups as shown by every census since 1900, and also the population broken down by racial groups as shown by the Census of 1950, and I invite you to give it your most careful attention.

A preliminary breakdown by the Bureau of the Census, submitted by Dr. Roy V. Peel, Director, to the committee under date of April 23, 1951, discloses the following racial components:

	Preliminary 1950 population	Percent distribution
Total	490,800	100.0
Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian	87,400	17.5
Caucasian	114,000	22.8
Chinese	33,000	6.6
Filipino	60,000	12.0
Japanese	183,600	36.7
Other races	21,700	4.3

Unofficial reports from the Territory indicate the number of Caucasians may have declined somewhat in the period since the height of the defense construction boom. A far surer guide than the fluctuations from one brief period to another—temporary indices, at best—is the history of the population trend in the islands over the period of the past half century.

In his appearance before the committee last spring to urge speedy enactment of the statehood measures, Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman submitted the following official tabulation:

Population of Hawaii by race, 1896–1940

Race	1896		1900		1910		1920		1930		1940	
	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent	Population	Percent
Hawaiian	31,019	28.5	28,718	18.6	26,041	13.6	23,723	9.3	22,636	6.1	14,375	3.4
Part-Hawaiian	8,485	7.8	9,536	6.2	12,506	6.5	18,027	7.0	28,224	7.6	49,935	11.8
Caucasian	22,438	20.6	26,252	17.1	39,158	20.4	49,140	19.3	73,702	20.0	103,791	24.5
Chinese	21,616	19.8	25,762	16.7	21,674	11.3	23,537	9.2	27,179	7.4	28,774	6.8
Japanese	24,407	22.4	61,115	39.7	79,675	41.5	109,274	42.7	139,631	37.9	157,905	37.3
Korean					4,533	2.4	4,950	1.9	6,461	1.8	6,851	1.6
Filipino					2,361	1.2	21,031	8.2	63,052	17.1	52,509	12.4
Puerto Rican					4,890	2.5	5,602	2.2	6,671	1.8	8,296	2.0
Negro					695	.4	348	.1	563	.2	255	.1
Other	1,055	.9	2,618	1.7	376	.2	310	.1	217	.1	579	.1
Total	109,020	100.0	154,001	100.0	191,909	100.0	255,912	100.0	368,336	100.0	423,330	100.0

Between 1940 and 1950 the total population increased 18.1 percent.

Between 1940 and 1950 there was an increase in those classified as foreign-born from 12 to 15 percent. This was the result of the reclassification of Filipinos who prior to independence were classified as national rather than foreign born.

The removal of racial restrictions from the naturalization laws has resulted in a sharp reduction in the number classified as foreign born, so that today there are probably less than 10 percent of the population who are aliens.

In 1900, 59 percent of the population was alien.

Hawaii's present population—499,794 United States Census, 1950—exceeds that of any other territory at the time of admission as a State with the single exception of Oklahoma.

It exceeds today the population of four of the States, as based on the April 1, 1950, Federal Census:

Nevada	160,083
Wyoming	290,528
Delaware	318,085
Vermont	377,747

It borders the population of several other States, notably Idaho, 588,657; Montana, 591,024; and New Hampshire, 533,242.

Nor is the population of the Territory of Hawaii static. In 1850 Hawaii had a population of 84,165. In 1950, 100 years later, it had increased 6 times as much. Its largest gain, 43.9 percent, came in the decade ending in 1930 when 112,424 persons were added. The 1950 gain is 18.1 percent over that of 1940.

Approximately 87 percent of the population of Hawaii are United States citizens.

The city of Honolulu, with a 1950 census of 248,034, ranks as the 44th city of the United States in size, ahead of such cities as Dayton, Ohio, Oklahoma City, Okla., Richmond, Va., and Syracuse, N. Y.

The population of Hawaii as shown by the 1951 census entitles it to two Representatives in the House.

It is worth noting that at the present time there are now 13 States whose population entitles them to 2 or less Representatives in the House. These include 7 of the 11 Western States—Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and New Mexico; 2 Midwestern States—North Dakota, South Dakota; and 4 Eastern States—Delaware, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire.

From the very beginning of this country the acquisition of new areas of land and the incorporation of those areas into the Union as States has been bitterly resisted.

The opposition to the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State, like the opposition to the annexation of Hawaii in 1898 and its incorporation into the Union as an integral part thereof, is in almost exactly the same pattern.

Thomas Jefferson was bitterly criticized for the Louisiana Purchase.

Admission of Louisiana into the Union was denounced by Representative Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, in these words:

> The bonds of the Union must be dissolved rather than admit these westerners as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for separation; amicably if they can, violently if they must.

The same Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts, in 1819 fought the admission of Alabama into the Union as a State. This is what he said:

> You have no authority to throw the rights and property of the people into the "hotch-potch" with the wild men on the Missouri, nor with the mixed though more responsible race of Anglo-Hispano-Gallo-Americans who bask on the sands in the mouth of the Mississippi. Do you suppose the people of the Northern and Atlantic States will, or ought to, look with patience and see Representatives and Senators from the Red River and the Missouri, pouring themselves upon this and the other floor, managing the concern of a seaboard 1,500 miles, at least, from their residence?

The admission of Texas into the Union was opposed in 1845 by Daniel Webster, who regarded this step with great alarm. He made this statement at that time:

> A very dangerous tendency and of doubtful consequence to enlarge the boundaries of this Government. There must be some limit to the extent of our territory, if we are to make our institutions permanent. The Government is very likely to be endangered, in my opinion, by a further enlargement of its already vast territorial surface.

A filibuster was conducted in the Senate against the admission of California into the Union. In the course of that debate Senator Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois said:

> I have always thought that the boundaries of California were too large. I have laid upon the table an amendment proposing to divide it into three States.

Senator Ewing said:

> With all the extent of California, it will never sustain one-half the population of the small State of Ohio, not one-half. The population will be very small indeed.

Hawaii is today America's frontier in the Pacific.

It stands as an outpost of American military strength and of American political ideals.

It is the meeting ground of east and west.

It is the funnel through which the influences of the west move into the east and the influences of the east move into the west.

It is, in truth, the crossroads of the Pacific.

It is unthinkable that this strategic and vital area should ever pass out of the hands of the American people.

It is vital to our defense and to the welfare of the whole country, and there are no people under the flag who have a keener sense of the importance of this relationship or who have done more to sustain it than the people of Hawaii.

It inevitably follows that any step that binds Hawaii and its people more closely to the rest of the country will add to our common strength. Statehood for Hawaii will give new emphasis to the importance of this outpost in our scheme of national defense and greatly enhance the position of our country in the Pacific area.

In the end the views of those who have expressed such doubts about the expansion of this country and the extension to the people of those areas the privilege of statehood have proved to be without foundation. If the lessons of our history teach us anything at all, it is that as Americans move into new areas and qualify themselves for local self-government they should be accepted into the Union on a basis of equality. The strength of our country has come from following this course.

To follow an alternative course as has been done by some of the powers of Europe and hold some of the people under their jurisdiction in a secondary and an inferior position inevitably sows the seeds of destruction. I say to you, therefore, that when you move to add Hawaii to the Union you move to strengthen the United States of America on this new frontier.

Some question has been raised about the character of our population. The gentleman from Virginia referred to the "Chinaman" who votes in Hawaii having something like 30 times the force of the individual who votes in New York. His statement, I am sure, is the result of misinformation because if he will examine the record and if he will study the facts he will see that none but an American citizen casts a vote in Hawaii. There is, of course, some difference, as many of our people are of far-eastern and Asiatic origin. There is no question about that. But they have been there for many years, many of them are in the third, fourth, and fifth generations, and if there is any question in your mind as to their loyalty as American citizens, I invite you to examine their record during World War II.

I would like the gentleman from Texas to ask members of the 36th Division what they think of the troops from Hawaii, particularly the boys who went in there and saved your Lost Battalion when all the others had failed. I would like to ask you of the Middle West to ask members of the 34th Division what they think of the troops from Hawaii. Ask any man, anyone who led them into battle. Let me tell you what is happening today. The losses among Hawaii's sons in Korea have been at a rate 3 and 4 times that of the rest of the country. The 24th Division is Hawaii's own division, and General Collins' division, the 25th Division, was likewise full of our troops, when these two units bore the brunt of the first Communist attack in Korea. Read the casualty lists before you start raising any doubts about the Americanism or the loyalty of those people who have been raised in Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, you are making a great mistake if by your action on this measure you say to the boys you are putting on the Korean battlefront and who you are taking into the Army that you are not quite as good as the rest of the people of this country.

The final test of this issue is the character of Hawaii's people.

Are they American citizens?

Can they be entrusted with the responsibilities of full-fledged American citizenship?

Is the future of this country being endangered by giving them a vote for President and Vice President and voting representation with all the participation that is involved in the United States

Senate and in the House of Representatives?

Is the fact that many of them are of Oriental origin in itself an argument against entrusting them with this responsibility?

In the final analysis this has been the great question in peoples' minds over a long period of years and no aspect of this issue has received more careful examination than this one.

I think the answer is to be found in the record that was made in World War II and is now being made in the Korean war. I say to you who may have any doubts as to the loyalty of Hawaii's sons to ask the officers and men of the 36th Division of Texas, and of the 34th Division of Iowa and the other Midwestern States who went into battle with them for the answer. I suggest also that you ask the leaders of the 24th Division and the 25th Division upon whom fell the first impact of the Communist invasion of South Korea just what they think of the product of our schools and our systems of training.

There you have the record written in the blood of Hawaii's own people. What more can you ask?

Finally I ask that this issue be settled on its merits. The question is whether or not Hawaii has met the requirements of statehood and should be admitted to the Union. There is no other issue involved at this time and the attempts to interpose other questions only serve to confuse this question.

I trust that common sense and the welfare of our country will dictate, as it should, the adoption of this measure by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to statehood for the Hawaiian Islands or creating any State not contiguous to the United States. It is admitted by all that if the Territory of Hawaii becomes a State it will not improve or strengthen the security of the United States. It is a dangerous precedent to admit any Territory to statehood beyond the continental United States, as in the years to come many more islands all through the Pacific can become States.

In this bill, H. R. 3575, we are called upon to allow the Territory of Hawaii, thousands of miles from the States, to enter the Union on equal footing with the 48 States. No one can deny that the Hawaiian Islands are beautiful and that the men of Hawaii proved themselves loyal, courageous, and great soldiers of the battlefields of Italy. But this alone does not justify the passage of this bill, for many reasons.

Among the most important reasons prompting my objection to immediate statehood for Hawaii is the fact that old-line American stocks are almost completely overshadowed by oriental strains. The percentage of Caucasians in the population of the Territory was only 16.5 of the total as of January 1, 1951. An analysis of the racial picture in Hawaii as of that date is interesting, to say the least. The Japanese constituted 39.9 percent; the Chinese, 6.5; the Hawaiians, 2.8; the part Hawaiians, 16.9; the Puerto Ricans, 2.2; the Koreans, 1.6; the Filipinos, 13.2; and all others, 0.4 percent. And, furthermore, we find that the total population is declining, despite repeated assurances by proponents of statehood that Hawaii's census figure was destined to grow ever larger. The official census count of April 1, 1950, was 499,794, including an undetermined number of Armed Forces personnel. Estimates of the civilian population as of May 1, 1951, placed the figure at 462,776, according to the Governor of Hawaii's own annual report for fiscal 1951. This same report states the civilian figure for January 1, 1951, was 466,329; and for January 1, 1950, the number was given as 478,119. I suggest that these statistics of a declining population are significant.

It would be detrimental to the interests of the United States if political control of the islands were to be administered by groups alien to American political traditions, culture, and way of life.

Another objection is that two Hawaiian Senators would enjoy a disproportionate representation in that body. We are all aware that the framers of the United States Constitution ruled, in adopting the Federal concept, that each State was to be represented by two Senators regardless of population; but I beg to point out that the Senate today, in terms of foreign affairs, plays a far more important role than it did a century and a half ago. Our opponents are prone to counter the argument that gross overrepresentation in the Senate is an inequity with the observation that the larger States have proportionately larger delegation in the House; but they overlook the vital fact that the vote of a single Senator can be decisive in matters pertaining to treaties and other international agreements. At no other time in our history has the wise handling of foreign relation been so imperative. I simply do not believe that an area containing fewer than half a million persons should have the right to be represented by two Senators whose authority is equal to that of the two Senators from other States.

Another reason for my reluctance to support statehood is that the presence of powerful left-wing elements is still very much in evidence. The one big labor union in the islands, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, the leaders of which have frequently boasted that they could tie Hawaii's economy into knots at any time, has been controlled for years by known Communists. Statehood advocates claim that communism could be controlled better by the people of Hawaii after the admission of that Territory into the Union. I believe otherwise. The Communist hold on the ILWU has not yet been broken or even appreciably lessened. Of equal significance is the fact that known Communists are still permitted to hold positions in reputable, social, and charitable organizations. Certainly, until Hawaii puts its own house in order, the plea for full equality with the continental States should remain unheeded.

Another reason for not supporting the bill is that we do not know what the constitution of the State of Hawaii will be as it is not incorporated in this bill. Of course the constitution could not be contradictory to the provisions of the United States Constitution, but the Constitution of the United States does not cover many things and if this bill passes, Congress will never have an opportunity to change or alter the constitution of the State of Hawaii.

Perhaps a better solution would be to accord Hawaii commonwealth status, after the pattern of Puerto Rico. As a semiautonomous territory, Hawaii would enjoy the blessings of liberty, security, and stability. And her people would continue to be citizens of the United States, as they are today.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend my good friend, the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii, for the outstanding speech he has made to this committee and for the great fight he has put up for Hawaiian statehood. May I say, further, that I acknowledge and recognize his deep sincerity in this measure and know that it was not prompted in any degree by political expediency. I have great respect for him and I have great respect for the Hawaiian people. However, I am opposed to this bill and I rise here today to oppose it for reasons which I will undertake to set forth.

In the first instance, I did make a statement to the Rules Committee, as was pointed out by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON], in which I said there had not been enough publicity given to the Hawaiian statehood measure. I did that purposely and the result was what I expected. The members of the Rules Committee smiled as if I did not know what I was talking about. Perhaps I did not. But I do know this: I know that there has been much publicity given to Hawaii's statehood with absolutely no details about the complexities involved and the problems that will arise, and I think that the American people are entitled to a full treatment of the problem before this Congress does something that is going to change the geography of this country, and could well change its basic political philosophy.

I have been disturbed by newspaper reports of late that appear to me to be a negative approach to the problem. They said in numerous editorials that there would be opposition to this bill because Alaska was not included, and that that opposition would come from the Democrats. Well, I want the RECORD to show here and now that I was one of the members of the committee that voted against reporting this bill out. I am registered as a Democrat and I am against the inclusion of Alaska at this time. I am not prompted by any political expediency or by any party affiliation, I am thinking solely of my country as such, and I hope that the newspapers of this country will not continue a negative approach to a problem as important as this.

Now we were told by the chairman during the debate today on the rule, that there had been extensive hearings on this bill at this session of Congress.

Now, I love my chairman; he is a grand fellow, but he and I differ completely on what extensive hearings are. I want to tell you what they were. We met on 4 days in the subcommittee and every witness that appeared before us with the exception of one was a proponent of statehood for Hawaii. The man who appeared against it was a member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to say, as chairman of that subcommittee, that every person who requested the opportunity to appear for or against the bill was given an opportunity to appear, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] was the only person who requested the opportunity to appear. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] submitted a statement, and that statement is in the record. They are the only two persons who appeared in opposition to the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman. I want to make this statement. I am not reflecting on the manner in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] conducted the hearings. He did a wonderful job, and he was just as fair as he could be, and I commend him. But he confirms exactly the point that I am making. There was not any publicity given to this matter, and nobody knew about those hearings. That is what disturbed me in the subcommittee. It is simply this: that when you have a bill as important as this, not only to the Territory of Hawaii but to the United States of America, and no opposition shows up, there is certainly something wrong somewhere.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I did make the statement before the Committee on Rules that they had extensive hearings. Maybe 4 days could not be considered extensive hearings, but I will say that since 1935, 5 committees of the Congress have been in Hawaii; there were more than 4,000 pages of testimony, and nearly 700 witnesses, and out of the 700, 550 were for this bill. Now that included investigations in Hawaii and in this country. There were 5 hearings in Hawaii and a number of them here in Washington, and of the 700 witnesses most of them were for the bill. The opposition had a chance to be heard.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I believe the gentleman said that before, and I do not want him to use up all my time. The point I am making is that there was no publicity at this time, and that was the reason, apparently, that there was no one before that subcommittee to be heard in opposition to this important piece of legislation.

Mr. SAYLOR. May I state that I know of nothing that received any more publicity than President Eisenhower's message to Congress, and I do not think there could be anything more explicit than his statement that the platforms of both political parties promised statehood to Hawaii.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There is no question about publicity being given to that, but that confirms the point I am making. No publicity was given to these hearings and no publicity was given to the detailed information the people of this country should have had.

I want to make these points about this bill. We are playing politics with the destiny of our children, and do not fool yourself on that point. We are moving into a field of politics in which this country has never found itself before. We are moving into a political sea that is completely uncharted insofar as politics is concerned. We are doing it with two major points facing us, although there are many minor ones.

The first is this: This territory is not contiguous to the United States of America as it now exists, and along with that point, there are several islands in the Territory that are separated by the sea. Certainly anyone will admit that that is a move into a new political field.

There is another thing I want to point out, but before I do so let me say this in order to avoid any reflection about racial prejudice. I hope it is not injected into this debate. I am from the South, yes. I have no racial prejudice as such. But when we take Hawaii in as a State, we are taking in a Territory that has a vast majority of its population made up of people of different racial extractions than the people who founded the United States and made it as great as it is today. Maybe that is a good thing. I do not say it is not a good thing, but I do say this, and I want everyone to think about it.

We are in one of the most trying times today that history has ever recorded. We are fighting one of the most sinister forces that free men have ever come up against. Is this the time to explore new political fields? Is this the time for this Congress to get out on a limb, so to speak, and move into a sea of politics that might result and could result in new political philosophies?

We have just finished one of the worst wars ever fought by man. And immediately we got into another. We have a tax burden that is staggering. We have a public debt that our children are going to have to pay if we don't get busy. There are many other dire problems facing the people of the United States today. Are we prepared at this time to move into another field and create more problems and more complexities for our children to deal with? If we are, I think it is high time that this entire question be submitted to the people of the United States, and let them pass upon it, with full knowledge of the facts and the potentialities. Let them pass upon it as a single point. I know it has been said it is in the Republican platform and that it is in the Democratic platform, and that when the people voted for a candidate, they voted for Hawaiian statehood. Now it made no difference which candidate they voted for, it was in both platforms intermingled with issue upon issue.

Now, can you say to yourself that you know that all of the people of the United States or a substantial majority of them want us to take Hawaii in as the 49th State? I have nothing in the world against Hawaii. I have nothing in the world against people of oriental extraction, but I think it is our absolute responsibility to preserve the Union which our forefathers founded for us. I think this is a bad time to be exploring political fields. If we are going to guide the ship of state into these uncharted seas, I think we should at least consult the passengers, and they are the taxpayers who live in this country. I think we are taking a dangerous step when we change the geography and when we change what might be the political philosophy in several instances. I think we are taking a dangerous step insofar as the preservation of this country is concerned.

I want to say one other thing about this bill, which is before you. Do you know that this bill ratifies the Constitution of Hawaii, and that this is the last chance this Congress is going to get to pass upon that constitution? We are doing something in this bill that the Congress of the United States does not have the right to do if we assume our proper responsibilities. We have done it several times. I want to point this out to you—I voted to extend the reorganization powers for President Eisenhower. I did it with the thought in mind that Congress was shirking a responsibility in so doing, but I did it because President Truman had had such powers and because President Roosevelt had had such powers, and I thought that President Eisenhower ought to have the same chance as the men before him to reorganize the Government of this country and to try to get some efficiency in it. But it is wrong from a constitutional standpoint. It is a delegation of power and this Congress should not do it. When you pass this bill, you are ratifying the Constitution of Hawaii, and doing it in advance, a constitution that has never been subjected to hearings before a duly constituted committee of this House; its provisions have never been discussed in detail as they should have been. But, we are being asked to close the door on the Congress insofar as this constitution is concerned.

There is another point about this ratification and that is this: The Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] pointed out that there are certain things that this Congress cannot do, and he used that as a basis for stating why we should grant statehood to Hawaii. If you pass this bill, you are going to fix it so that Congress cannot do anything from now on about Hawaii. That constitution comes back to the President of the United States. The President of the United States passes upon whether or not it conforms to our Constitution, and then if he approves it, that is the end of it, so to speak. Congress never again gets to go over the matter. We were told in committee that that constitution has been running around here for 2 or 3 years and we had had a chance to examine it. That might be right. I do not know whether it is or not.

I do know that the Hawaiian bill has been around for several years and apparently some questionable language in it has not been detected. That is that this bill provides, "that the inhabitants"—not citizens, but—"inhabitants of all that part of the United State now

constituting the Territory of Hawaii shall have the right to make a State." This bill has been through all these hearings, that you were told about, and still the words "inhabitants" is used in it. It further says that the constitution must provide, first, that perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship. Who does inhabitant refer to?

Everyone knows that the Soviet Union has taken our Constitution apart word for word, phrase for phrase, and sentence for sentence and sought to employ its provisions to ultimately destroy us. They have used the words "religion," "freedom of speech," "freedom of the press," and "self-incrimination" in order to get communism infiltrated into this country and to protect their insidious activities. They have done lip service to the Constitution and continuously violated it. Does the word "inhabitant" mean that a man has to be a citizen of the United States, or does it include some of the aliens in the Hawaiian Islands? What will be the result? We had better spell out the true meaning in unequivocal terms. We had better permit this matter to be submitted to the people in the present 48 States, examine closely the many problems and complexities that can flow from this step.

It is the desire of all of us to do what is best for this country. Certainly we owe the responsibility to our forebears and to our children to do nothing that might jeopardize the preservation of our great democracy. I feel very deeply, that although there might be an absence of probability to that end flowing from our actions in passing this type of legislation, the presence of the possibility should force us to weigh carefully the potential consequences and to proceed with due caution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, in engaging in this portion of the debate, I should like to make it clear that I in no way impugn the motives nor question the very deep and sincere convictions of those who are opposing the admission of Hawaii into the sisterhood of States. I have the very highest regard for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], those on both sides of the aisle from New York, from Georgia, and my other colleagues in the House who feel that the admission of Hawaii into the Union at this time would be a grievous error.

There can be no question, Mr. Chairman, but that this problem is a grave and momentous one. I must disagree with those who say that to admit Hawaii would be to establish a precedent of admitting noncontiguous areas into statehood. There were no seas or oceans separating the Colonies from the Territories and States of the West at the time those States and Territories were admitted, but there were vast plains, mountains, and deserts separating the then known from the almost unknown. Today Hawaii is a matter of a few short hours from the continent and travel is rapid as distinguished from the many long weeks of ordeal and hardship necessary before the pioneers could reach the western areas which were being opened to colonization in the early days.

There are several matters of importance, which concern me with respect to the present bill. But the matter of blood strains and the matter of physical features is not one of them. If we will recall the valor of and the oriental cast of features of those who comprised the 442d combat team, we will recall a saga which featured the blood strains of a dozen nations and cultures.

The seawalls of Anzio and the beachheads of Sicily and Italy today bear those blood stains, and it is very difficult to tell whether an American GI from Illinois, New Hampshire, California, or Hawaii shed that blood.

You will recall that when Japanese bombs rained down upon Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, those bombs fell not only upon American service personnel, American citizens from elsewhere, who were then domiciled in Hawaii, but they fell also upon Japanese-Americans, Chinese-Americans, Hawaiian-Americans—men whose common bond was a devotion to human freedom and human dignity. Those American citizens of diverse nationalities picked themselves up off the canvas of near disaster and in anger they bound themselves together to fight back. That meant, Mr. Chairman, in many instances to fight back against the land of their own birth, and in defense of a new concept of dignity. Their resolution meant to take up arms against people in whose veins ran the same blood as in their own; and in that determination and in that anger they did a truly magnificent job. I would remind you that there was not one provable act of sabotage committed by these men and women during the course of hostilities in Hawaii. If Communist aggression broke into full force and fury tomorrow here in the United States could the same thing be said 48 hours from now about many American citizens who are doing the work of the Communist Party?

Yes, the adopted sons and daughters met aggression and they hurled it back. It was my privilege during the war to serve on Hawaii, to serve on the big island, on Maui, and Oahu, and to see American production and strength grow and expand at the hands of Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans and Hawaiians doing the job that had to be done in the Pacific if our forces were to be maintained and if our vital lifelines in the far reaches of the Pacific were to be sustained.

Yes, there are Communists in Hawaii; there are Communists in New York, in Illinois, in California, and in every other State of the Union. Yet the matter of communism is no more serious, it is no less serious in Hawaii than it is anywhere on the face of the earth where the agents of this world aggression are at work.

Yes, the Committee on Un-American Activities of which I am a member issued a report on communism in Hawaii. It also issued a report on communism in Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Detroit. Personally, I would rather see, Mr. Chairman, a Democrat Japanese-American, or a Republican Chinese-American in one of the islands of the Hawaiian group than I would a Communist-American in any one of our great cities.

On the population issue, Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the small population in the Hawaiian Islands and its diversified nature, but, as the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] has said, there are 4 States of this Union today which have smaller population than that of Hawaii. Let us take—and certainly I would not want any onerous connotation to be attached—let us take, for instance, the State of Nevada, with its 158,283 people. If, as the gentleman from New York states, and I am sure it is the case, that to give Hawaii two additional Senators would give an American citizen, on Hawaii, 31 times the power of a voter in New York State—the same argument can be extended to logically point out that a vote of Nevada exercises 93 times the power of a voter in New York State in the matter of the election of a United States Senator. Those same statistics can be carried along to meet all of the other points of contrast so ably posed by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. ENGLE. That illustrates, does it not, that if this system of proportional representation we now have in our Constitution is in error it should be gone into as a separate proposition and not as an argument against the admission of Hawaii as a State.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes; the place to settle that question is certainly not here in connection with a totally unrelated measure before the House at the present time.

Mr. ENGLE. If there are inequities they would apply elsewhere as well as here.

Mr. JACKSON. There are regular processes which should and can meet that situation.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Of course, if there are inequities, to bring Hawaii in under the same circumstances would be adding just one more, is that correct?

Mr. JACKSON. I do not agree with the gentleman at all. I say if there are inequities there are processes within the power of the Congress which can take care of those inequities. Today we are discussing not the inequities of proportional representation but the admission of Hawaii into the Union.

Communist propaganda throughout the world, and particularly in the Orient, has made capital of the allegation that we treat the yellow races, the black races, with contempt, that we do in fact discriminate against them, even to the point where we discriminate against those who are citizens of the United States. In the McCarran-Walter immigration bill that passed this House last year and became law, a step was

taken in the direction of recognizing the potential danger of this Communist claim. For the first time in the history of our immigration policy there was set up what is called an Asiatic-Pacific triangle and there were given to those areas in the Pacific and other areas throughout the Far East, quotas permitting regulated immigration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, here is an opportunity for this Congress to redeem a pledge and a promise of long standing. Here is an opportunity to tell the rest of the world that the Soviet may break its pledges and its promises indiscriminately but that the United States keeps its word.

I, for one, have no doubt, I have no fear as to the character, the ability, the honesty, and the patriotism of the people who will stand behind the 49th star in the flag of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, today, it is said, "Admit Hawaii to statehood. To do so is carrying out the Republican Party platform." The Democratic Party platform goes a step farther and says, "Admit Hawaii and Alaska." If these platforms have irrevocably bound us; if these pronouncements in convention have placed hoops of steel around our consciences; then, there is no need for Congress to assemble, debate, and vote, and a Congress is useless. It would be much simpler for the President, elected on a platform, to draw up a decree, sign it, and it become binding in law. No Congressman is expected to be a robot, on the other hand, he or she must be free to vote on any issue according to his or her conscience. There was an attempt at the Chicago Democratic convention last year to compel we southerners to take an oath binding ourselves to support everything done and said there. We knew then that this was intended only for the South, and was not intended to bind people in other sections who had always voted as they pleased and when they pleased, and voted as they pleased last year. Some of those who attempted to bind us, failed to carry the States they represented. I am a Democrat, a Jeffersonian Democrat. I am a Mason, a Baptist, a Legionnaire, and I am proud that I am. However, I am not a slave to any of those organizations. I have never understood, and I completely deny, that I am bound to support everything called Democratic, Baptist, Masonry, or American Legion. I am devoted to those organizations, and I loyally support those organizations, when I can square that loyalty with my conscience, and that is all any of those organizations can expect.

Few Congressmen had the privilege of participating in the writing of either of the party platforms, but every Member of Congress is confronted with a solemn duty of casting their vote here. By voting according to our consciences, we can do great service to our party and we can make our party better and more receptive to the heartbeats of the people, rather than to well-organized minorities. We might as well admit now, that if Congress had passed everything in party platforms, our way of life would already have been destroyed.

I say, and I believe the majority of the people of the United States say, do not admit Hawaii or Alaska to statehood now. I reject the proposal of the Republican and Democratic Parties' platforms on this issue. Our American interests are greater and more sacred than the proposals of any party. If this bill is passed, it will not be with my vote. I have no ill will toward Hawaii or Alaska, for I have no reason to do so. I simply will not have any part in setting off a chain of reactions that can only harm, and when once started, cannot be stopped.

Hawaii in 1950 had a population of 499,794, which is not as large as the metropolitan area of Atlanta, Ga. In 1950, Alaska had a population of 128,643, a population smaller than the metropolitan area of Columbus, Ga., in the congressional district I have the honor of representing. If Atlanta or Columbus was seeking statehood here, I would oppose them, although I would readily admit that each had a better argument than Hawaii or Alaska, for more reasons than I could attempt to explain now, but neither Atlanta nor Columbus can make out any case for statehood so far as I am concerned.

Let me point out some of the dangers of what we are contemplating doing:

If Hawaii is admitted with 499,794 population, or Alaska is admitted with 128,643 population, what reason can you assign for not admitting Puerto Rico with a population of 2,210,703? Then, what will you do with Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Canal Zone when they knock at your door and ask admittance? Every one of them will surely come with the same arguments you are hearing now.

Already it is being suggested that Hawaii be limited to one Senator. Those advocating this, apparently are willing for Hawaii to have 2 Congressmen based on population, but want to limit Hawaii to 1 Senator, this limitation being based on population. Such an argument can only mean that the mudsill placed in our Constitution, providing for a lower lawmaking body, arrived at by population, and a higher lawmaking body where each State can meet on equal terms, will be discarded. When that day arrives, that will be the last straw. It will mean "goodby agriculture." It will mean complete domination of all the sections of our country by a small portion of our country, although that small portion is at times utterly unacquainted with problems peculiar to other sections. It can only mean the utter destruction of States rights. Under no circumstances can we consider any tampering whatever with that wise constitutional provision giving each State two Senators. Larger populations swing their weight in the House on many issues upon which they are not acquainted to the extent that other sections are, and if the check and balance in the Senate is ever discarded, economic slavery is an inevitable result.

If Hawaii is admitted now, it will mean that some of the 48 States will lose two Congressmen. My State is unwilling to make that concession; consequently, if the other 47 States are unwilling to make that concession, my State understands that unwillingness and joins with them. When Alaska is admitted, when Puerto Rico, and the other Territories hereinbefore named, are admitted, our 48 States lose more Congressmen, in order that these new States shall have their quota. With affection for Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and other Territories, I am unwilling to make this concession now. This is not discrimination. It is simply being realistic. I know, some will say that I am discriminating, but I know I am not. To use the common sense that God has given us, and to appraise the capabilities and limitations of the races, cannot fairly be denominated as discrimination. To hold that the people of our 48 States are more acquainted with our form of government, our philosophies, and our way of life, squares with common sense. This can be disputed, but never successfully disputed.

This does not mean that some day other Territories might not be admitted. We cannot legislate for posterity, for posterity desires to legislate for itself. Our action in this matter simply means that we, in our day and age, are doing the things that the present times and conditions show that we should do. Only for a season, is it given to me to speak for my people and my country, and this is the case with all of you. We simply reflect now the wishes of our people, and the needs of our people, at the present time. I am convinced that our people now feel that we are not in position to make the sacrifices that we must make, if this bill is passed.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at the beginning of my remarks may I state that I regard the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] very highly. I have great respect for him. In many matters his opinions and my own correspond. They do not in this particular instance.

Mr. Chairman, if we compare Hawaii with Territories which have been admitted to statehood in our Union, we find that many striking differences are evident.

All of the Colonies and Territories admitted to statehood have been located on the North American Continent. Each Territory before admission adjoined our country and, when admitted, became a part of the unbroken, contiguous land area which makes up our country.

To begin with, Hawaii is not a part of America, either north or south. If it should be admitted as a State, the term "United States of America" would thereafter be a misnomer.

Hawaii is some 2,100 miles from its nearest point in the United States. It not only is far from the American Continent. It is almost out of the Western Hemisphere.

Hawaii is not itself a contiguous, solid land area. It consists of 20 islands,

8 or 9 of which are inhabited. It has a land area of only 6,400 square miles, and, of course, can be reached only by plane or ship.

Had we aspired to annex islands and make States of them, then we certainly would have turned our attention first to Cuba, which is just 90 miles south of Florida. From a standpoint of desirability, it has much more to offer than Hawaii. Because it is so close to us, an unfriendly power in control could make Cuba a real danger point for us. Cuba has an area of 45,000 square miles, all in one body, as compared with Hawaii's 6,400 square miles contained in a chain of small islands. Cuba has a population of nearly five and a half million as compared with less than half a million in Hawaii. Cuba produces five times as much sugar as Hawaii, and is the largest producer of sugarcane in the world. In the 19th century there were frequent demands for annexation of Cuba to the United States, but our Government always turned a deaf ear to such demands, and, on the contrary, helped the Cuban people obtain their independence. Cuba became a republic in 1902 after the United States withdrew from its affairs.

Certainly if our Government planned to extend statehood to any island areas, Cuba was the place to begin. From every standpoint it was more desirable than Hawaii.

I have read the booklet issued by the Hawaii Statehood Commission to see upon just what is based this claim of the right to statehood in the United States of America.

I see such phrases in this book as "its rightful place as a State of the Union," "inherent right to statehood," "demand for statehood," and so forth.

I do not concede at all that Hawaii, or Alaska, or Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or any other Territory or possession has any inherent right to become a State in this Union or to have a voice in our Government. I do not think any Territory which was ever admitted to our Government had any inherent right to be admitted. They were admitted because they wanted to come in and because our Government was willing. There was no question of an inherent right involved. There is no such question involved in this instance. A claim to an inherent right can be asserted much easier than it can be established. The President of the United States found that out last year when he claimed to have a certain inherent right.

There is a section in this booklet entitled "Why Statehood for Hawaii Will Benefit the Nation." I assume that all the alleged benefits to the United States are set out there. All these alleged benefits are exceedingly inconsequential. They say that statehood for Hawaii would bestow new dignity and prestige to the country's westernmost outpost.

Although I wish Hawaii and its people well, I certainly do not regard that as a substantial reason to admit Hawaii to statehood. If that is a benefit at all, it inures to Hawaii, not to the United States. Another statement is that denial of statehood to Hawaii contributes to the propaganda of those who call the United States imperialistic. That is no reason. The Communists are going to continue their propaganda, and would still call us imperialistic if we grant statehood to Hawaii. Thirdly, it is said statehood would be economical because it would transfer to the State government the present Federal cost of administering the Territory. If any economy resulted from the change, which I doubt, it would not amount to more than a drop in the bucket.

The other alleged benefits refer to matters already in existence, or which would inure to the benefit of Hawaii rather than the United States.

The people of Hawaii now have nearly everything they would have as a State. They have local self-government. They have their own legislature, which they elect themselves, to make their own laws. They participate in our Federal health program, our educational program, our road-building program, our agricultural program, and all the benevolent and beneficent programs which are maintained by the United States Government. In addition to that, all citizens of Hawaii are citizens of the United States. Statehood would add nothing to their citizenship except the right to vote for President, the right to have 2 Senators and 2 Representatives in the United States Congress, and to set up a system of local courts in addition to the system of Federal courts which they now have and would continue to have as a State. They do not have Senators or Representatives in Congress, but they do have the right to send an elected Delegate to the House of Representatives. Statehood would in no sense enlarge the right to local self-government which they now enjoy.

Now on the other side of the ledger there are some substantial disadvantages to us if this bill should pass. You have already heard that it would increase the United States Senate from 96 to 98 Members. Not only that, the sending of 2 Members to the House of Representatives from Hawaii would mean 2 States on the mainland would lose 1 Representative each. That is a pretty high price to pay so Hawaii can have dignity and prestige.

It has been claimed that the Hawaiians have been promised statehood. I disagree with that claim. No one has had authority to promise statehood to them except the Congress of the United States, and no such promise has been made by Congress. I have read the act of 1900 incorporating it as a Territory. It contains no such promise.

Advocates of statehood have compared the size of Hawaii and its population with some of the States of the Union.

It is true that Hawaii with its 6,400 square miles of land area contains in the aggregate more land area than Connecticut, Delaware, or Rhode Island. However, it does not begin to compare with those States in production, or in the payment of taxes. Not only that, it receives back far more in money from the Federal Government, both in dollars and percentagewise, than any of those States. In 1951, Connecticut residents paid $1,099,000,000 Federal income tax; Hawaiian residents paid $135 million. Connecticut received from the Federal Government in that year $33 million, or 3 percent of the amount of income taxes it paid in. Hawaii received from the Federal Government $23 million, or 17 percent of the amount of income taxes which it paid. Delaware paid $769 million income tax, and received back $7,800,000, or one and three-tenths percent of the amount of income tax paid. Rhode Island paid $293 million in Federal income tax, and received back $23 million, or six and nine-tenths percent, as compared with Hawaii's 17 percent of revenue returned.

So far as the size of Hawaii is concerned, its 6,400 square miles of land area compares with 586,000 square miles in Alaska, 263,000 square miles in Texas, 58,000 square miles in Georgia, 97,000 square miles in Wyoming, and so forth.

According to the report of the Governor of Hawaii to the Secretary of the Interior in 1951, there were 63,575 aliens in Hawaii. Thus we see that approximately 15 percent of the total population are aliens, most of these aliens being Japanese and Filipinos.

I have read the constitution which has been adopted by the people in Hawaii. While it has many good features, it has some provisions which are vital, and which offer opportunity for dangerous manipulation. The constitution does not provide that the Governor must receive a majority of the votes cast in the general election in order to be elected. It simply provides that the person receiving the largest number of votes shall be the Governor.

With the genius which Harry Bridges has shown for organizing the people in Hawaii, it needs no strong imagination to see what could be done by Harry Bridges in an election for Governor with 3 or 4 candidates running. Such an election would offer one of the greatest opportunities for the manipulation of bloc voters it is possible to imagine. Yet that provision is a part of the constitution which has already been voted upon, and approved in Hawaii.

This constitution also contains in article 8 provisions under which it will be possible to set up an elaborate cradle-to-the-grave system of public welfare payments and subsidies. It provides among other things:

> The State shall have power to provide assistance for persons unable to maintain a standard of living compatible with decency and health.

That constitutional provision does not refer to aged persons, blind persons, disabled persons, or children. It simply says "persons," and that includes everybody.

It provides that the State shall have power to provide assistance for persons unable to maintain a standard of living compatible with decency and health, whatever that means.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that this provision by which the Governor can nominate not only Supreme Court justices but also circuit court judges would be according to the American Constitution?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Georgia 1 additional minute.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from California.

In Hawaii, with its four-hundred-odd-thousand people, citizens and aliens combined, they not only have self-government and the status of citizens of the United States. They have full control and management of all the property which they own. They have no guardians, supervisors, or agents whatever to hold title to their property or to withhold that property or its income from them, either as individuals or as a class.

There are many thousands of American Indians in this country who are deprived of the substantial rights of full ownership and management of property which rightfully belongs to them, which this Government still assumes to manage and control.

I ask the question why we must find it necessary so hurriedly to break a precedent which has stood throughout the entire history of this country, and take into our Union as a State a string of islands in the Pacific Ocean, almost out of the Western Hemisphere, and say we owe this to them because they have fought in a war and have paid taxes, while at the same time we deny here on the American mainland full citizenship rights to Americans whose ancestors were here even before Columbus came, and who have also fought, paid taxes, and responded to all the calls made upon them?

Is participation in our wars and paying taxes going to be the criterion for statehood hereafter? If so, then we might as well introduce bills now for admission of Puerto Rico. Puerto Ricans at this moment are fighting in Korea. They have paid taxes and have done the other things which Hawaiians have done which are advanced today as reasons for statehood.

The enactment of this bill is not called for or justified by any of these reasons. To enact it would be to set a precedent which in my opinion is unwise. It is an act which we are not called upon to perform; it is unnecessary; it is not to our own best interests; it is contrary to our long-established policy; and if we go through with it, it will rise up to plague us many times in the future.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill providing statehood for Hawaii. I, too, do not wish to impugn the motives of any Member who opposes the granting of statehood for Hawaii; neither do I wish to impugn the motives of any Member who has brought out his or her fear of Communist activities in Hawaii. However, I should like for a few moments to refute the statements that have been made concerning the seriousness of Communist activities in Hawaii. I believe, of course, that the Communist Party is active in Hawaii; in fact, I know that they are. They have been for the past several years.

It was my good fortune to have been a member of the Subcommittee of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House, the only Republican member, that visited Hawaii in April of 1950. There were four Democratic members, and I believe they all agree with me when I say that we did find Communists in Hawaii. As a matter of fact, during the 10 days we spent there we heard some 75 or 80 witnesses, many of whom were noncooperative, many of whom would not give any information concerning the activities of the Communist Party in Hawaii. Later on after we got back to the mainland we came before this body and secured some 57 contempt citations against witnesses who appeared before our committee in Hawaii. These citations were later brought up for indictment in the courts of Hawaii and were all dismissed.

Subsequent to that time seven members of the Communist Party of Hawaii were brought before the bar of justice again under the Smith Act where they are now being prosecuted.

During the visit that we made to Hawaii we consulted with Japanese-Americans, Chinese-Americans, members of the legitimate labor unions there, the American Legion and even the Boy Scouts, and we were all impressed with the keenness, the alertness, that the Hawaiian people had in opposition to Communist activities. As a matter of fact, I am of the personal opinion that the people in Hawaii are more alert to the dangers of communism than some of our good American people are over here. These hearings which we had in Hawaii demonstrated, of course, that the Communist Party of Hawaii was part and parcel of the Communist Party on the mainland, the 13th district, composing the States of California and Nevada.

The activities of the Communist Party in Hawaii are controlled directly from the mainland by the 13th district of the Communist Party, which, of course, is in turn controlled from Moscow, chiefly controlled by the great labor leader for the Communists, Harry Bridges. We found in Hawaii that most of the Communists were strategically located in the NLRU, which is the union controlled by Harry Bridges.

Mr. Chairman, I say it is time that we clean up communism and that we clean up Harry Bridges on the mainland before we start worrying too much about communism in Hawaii. Yes, it is time that we cut off the head of this tentacle which is located on the mainland in California and Nevada instead of worrying about the various tentacles which spread throughout our land. I believe, too, that if we grant statehood to Hawaii the State of Hawaii will be more able to combat this Communist menace than it is at the present time as a Territory. The people will gain a new sense of awareness of the danger of losing their American citizenship if we grant them statehood.

So I say to you in all sincerity, to those who oppose this measure, I know you are sincere in your position, but we who would like to see the great Territory of Hawaii admitted as a State are likewise sincere in wanting to assist this great Nation of ours in the protection of our internal security as well as the security of all citizens of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the arguments that have been advanced in favor of statehood for Hawaii. Let me say at the outset that there is no one in my State who has petitioned me one way or the other concerning this question; in fact, I have not received any letter from any constituent in the State of Texas with regard to statehood for Hawaii. I am only concerned with that which will promote the welfare and the strength of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I do not concede that we have any moral or legal responsibility or duty to admit Hawaii to statehood. The fact that both political parties have advocated it is not persuasive to me. I join in the sentiment expressed by one of my colleagues that if these United States had adopted all of the platforms that have been put forth by the political parties our Republic would have long since dissolved; nor am I concerned about what Franklin Pierce said, or any other political leader. There is but one question involved here, and that is, What has Hawaii to offer to the United States? Are they in a position to bring to this great Republic any stability, any enlightenment, any quality of leadership and citizenship that will strengthen the Republic and enable us to meet the great issues that confront us?

With regard to the population of Hawaii, let me make myself plain. I am not one of those who believe in the superiority of one race over another race. I do not believe in the inferiority of mankind because of racial origin. I recognize that every race has made a great contribution to the civilization of the world. The Greeks gave us sculpture and beauty, the Romans gave us jurisprudence. Oriental races were civilized long before the Anglo-Saxons emerged from the forests. But while each race has been able to contribute something substantial to civilization, it is true that few races have ever been able to contribute to the art of self-government. Only a very few peoples in the history of the world have demonstrated their capability to govern themselves. The fact that the people of Hawaii adopted a liberal constitution is not even evidence of their capacity for self-government. I recall that a long time ago the people of Mexico adopted in toto, by popular vote, the Constitution of the United States, but, not being capable of the responsibilities of self-government, they were unable to maintain their liberties. Now, the fact that there are in Hawaii a vast majority of people of oriental ancestry should not prejudice us. We must concede that they are brave and courageous people, but I am not convinced on the basis of the evidence that has been submitted to this House that those people are capable of bringing to this Republic any great contribution to justify us admitting them into the Union. I do not pose as an authority on Hawaii, but I do know this: That in 1938 one of the principal unions under the control of Moscow was the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union. It was one of

the groups we exposed in 1938, which provoked such an outcry from the so-called liberals in the United States and was greeted with denunciation from the leadership of the CIO. While this organization was permitted to remain in the parent organization for more than 10 years after we exposed it, finally, as a result of public sentiment, the parent organization of the CIO was compelled to expel it, along with the rest of the organizations that our committee had exposed more than a decade ago.

I do know that this organization now has a stranglehold on the economic life of Hawaii. Not only can I testify to the tremendous control that Harry Bridges and Jack Hall and other agents of the Comintern exercised over the International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union when I investigated it, but I can cite more recent testimony. I read you from the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1950, which confirms what I learned many years ago:

> Today, therefore, we find a curious situation where the so-called International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union has within its membership and under the control of the Communist Party, the workers of the basic industries of the Territory of Hawaii; namely, shipping, pineapple, and sugar.
>
> To maintain this economic control of the Territory of Hawaii, the Communist-controlled ILWU has pitted race against race and creed against creed in any issue where it was losing ground with the workers. In this manner, a well-knit minority has been able to maintain rigid control over the rank and file of a powerful union.

It can be appropriately argued that we cannot sit in the scorner's seat in view of the progress communism has made in the United States. It is true that communism did make great strides in our country as the result of the stupidity and the gullibility of many people of this country and the support given to this movement by the Government of the United States. But should we aggravate that condition, should we make it worse by importing another population which, if this finding is true, is now under the strangle-hold and the domination of the agents of the Kremlin?

Is it any justification that because we were a prey to Communist propaganda and Communist tactics which ultimately led to the tragic blunders of Yalta and Potsdam, and many secret conferences which gave Stalin his opportunity to emerge from the status of a third-rate power to the status of a world menace, that we should make the situation worse by admitting Hawaii?

I will not say that the issue should be foreclosed and that for all time to come we will not admit Hawaii. I do not say that in many sections of our United States our people are superior to the Hawaiians. God knows we have faced the problem of non-assimilation of races since the very beginning of this Republic, but it has been a time-honored principle of both parties, written into the immigration laws of our country, that we must not admit people faster than we can assimilate them.

Of course, while the Hawaiians are citizens of the United States and as such are entitled to all the rights of citizenship, when you admit them to the status of statehood you will thereby give the people of Hawaii, the 500,000 people, the power to alter the whole structure of our American Government.

How can any man argue that when you admit Hawaii, you will not admit Alaska? And how can any man contend that having admitted Hawaii and Alaska that you will not in time admit the Virgin Islands and the Island of Guam and finally a minority of people will be in control and domination of one of the great branches of our American representative system of government. I am not prepared to take that step. Before I do so, I want more evidence submitted to me. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon the people of those islands or upon the great Delegate who represents those islands, and who has made a most eloquent plea. I can understand the aspirations and the hopes of these people to be admitted to statehood. But that is not the test. There are literally millions of people all over the earth who tomorrow would like to come into the fold of the Government of the United States. Only a short time ago I read that 300,000 people in Rome, Italy, wanted to be admitted to the United States. I have thought for a long time that if the Chinese wanted to do something very, very destructive to us, they could simply surrender and say, "Here we are—feed us." I am quite sure that people all over the world, if they had the opportunity tomorrow, literally millions upon millions of people, would enter our country. I maintain that no one should be permitted to enter until we can assimilate him. It is not a question of superiority of any race, for we owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the people of all races who have made unique and valuable contributions to America and to America's greatness. It is not a reflection upon any race or the people in any part of the world. It is simply a matter of the protection and preservation of the strength and vigor and vitality of these great United States of America, which face tomorrow the greatest test in our entire history. I maintain that now is not the time to take this important step.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to reply to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was worried about the Communists in the government of Hawaii. Let me point out that the constitution is most stringent upon that question. They have a proviso to the effect that no person who advocates or aids or belong to any party organization or association which advocates the overthrow, by force or violence, of the government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the constitution.

They go much further than this country or any State in the Union goes in relation to Communists.

There is no question of bringing in Guam or the Virgin Islands or the trust islands as a State. There is no provision for it. The only two Territories that are qualified for admission to the Union as States are Hawaii and Alaska, and the gentleman, I am sure, knows that.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my personal conviction that the people of this country, including the district that I have the responsibility and honor to represent, recognize the lack of statehood representation for the 466,000 inhabitants of Hawaii. To me there can be no valid objection to statehood upon a basis that is equitable: First, to the people of this Nation; second, to the people of my district; third, to the inhabitants of Hawaii, Alaska, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

I firmly believe that the citizens of Hawaii are as equally fairminded as the people of the 48 States. In seeking statehood, they must recognize the injustice of asking representation that is many times greater than that of the average citizens of this Nation.

RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE

All sovereign rights of the people of this Nation are entrusted to the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of our Government. These powers are subject only to the limitations and guaranties contained in our Constitution.

How can we as a people participate and share in the exercise of these powers reposed in the Congress and in our President? Our participation in the Federal Government is necessarily limited and condensed in the right to vote for the Members of Congress and our President. This right of suffrage is a priceless heritage and is the only means by which we may protect our liberties and interests.

SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION

My opposition to the bill now being considered is based primarily upon the grant of disproportionate senatorial representation to Hawaii.

Upon the passage of this bill, Hawaii would become entitled to two Members in the United States Senate. Today 152,572,000 people of the 48 States are entitled to the total representation of 96 Senators. The effect of this bill would be to take from these people of the 48 States one forty-ninth of their senatorial representation and transfer this power to the 466,000 inhabitants of Hawaii. This one forty-ninth of the senatorial representation is the representation now possessed by 3,170,000 people of the United States. The 466,000 people in Hawaii would thus enjoy a representation in the United States Senate of 670 percent greater than the representation possessed by the average citizen of the 48 States.

PRESIDENTIAL SUFFRAGE

My second objection to this bill is based upon the grant to Hawaii of a disproportionate right of suffrage in the election of a President.

At the present time the people of the 48 States have a combined total of 531 electoral votes by which the President of this country is elected. The ratio is 1 electoral vote for each 286,000 persons. By this bill Hawaii would become entitled to 2 Representatives and 2 Senators, giving that State a total of 4 electoral votes. The ratio of electoral votes for

Hawaii will be 1 electoral vote for each 116,000 inhabitants, or 2½ times that of the citizens of the 48 States.

Can anyone claim that the people of Hawaii possess 2½ times the political wisdom or 2½ times the loyalty of our other citizens. How can we justify this transfer of 2½ times the right of vote in the election of a President as is now possessed by the average inhabitant of the 48 States?

I cannot in good conscience abridge or expropriate or alienate the sacred right of suffrage of the inhabitants of our 48 States.

REPRESENTATIVES

This bill would assign to Hawaii two seats in the House of Representatives. By the use of the latest census estimates for the year 1951, Hawaii would be entitled to one Representative. This provision for two Representatives for Hawaii is in violation of the intent of the United States Constitution providing for apportionment of Representatives among the several States according to their respective numbers.

REMEDY

The gentleman from New York, Representative COUDERT, has recently introduced a joint resolution which would amend the 17th amendment of our Constitution by providing that Congress may determine the senatorial representation of any State hereafter admitted to statehood.

I am sponsoring a resolution which would also amend our Constitution, by providing that any State hereafter admitted would become entitled to representation in the Senate only upon attaining a population in proportion to that of the other 48 States.

I am not completely satisfied that either proposal is the solution to an equitable representation for newly admitted States. These proposals do, however, furnish a starting point for the consideration of this problem. I have every confidence that the members of the Judiciary Committee and this Congress can formulate a policy and draft an appropriate amendment which would permit the admission of Hawaii and other Territories to statehood upon an equitable basis. We cannot solve this question of fundamental rights by individual consideration for each Territory based upon favor or political advantage. The admission of States must be based upon a policy that is just and is equally applicable to the peoples of all Territories.

The admission of the Territory of Hawaii should be deferred pending the adoption of an appropriate constitutional amendment which would enable Congress to admit States to this Union without the necessity of seriously reducing the rights of suffrage of the peoples of the other 48 States.

LOYALTY

I have read and listened at great length to the claims of loyalty and Americanism made for the people of Hawaii. The implication is that the people of Hawaii are more loyal and more brave than the people of the 48 States. This implication is most unfair to the fellow citizens of the people of Hawaii and to those who served and are now serving in the Armed Forces from the other parts of this country. I would defend the people of any and all segments of this country from any innuendo that the people of Hawaii are more patriotic or that the people of the 48 States are less patriotic than the people of Hawaii.

I know of no process of logical reasoning by which we can draw a valid conclusion proving greater patriotism for the people of any one area as against the patriotism of our people as a whole.

I know of no mathematical formula for computing degrees of loyalty.

I know of no scientific thermometer that can measure the warmth of devotion of any individual for this great country.

POLITICAL CONSIDERATION

If this bill becomes law, the time will come, in the not too distant future, when some of us will seek to advance or to protect the interests of our constituents and of our States. No matter how just our cause may be, if it is in conflict with the interests of the people of Hawaii, the answer of the Representatives and Senators from Hawaii will be, to paraphrase Boss Tweed, "As long as we have the votes, what are you going to do about it?"

I do not mean to reflect upon anyone from Hawaii, but I do cite Boss Tweed's philosophy as a truism of practical politics.

We are, each of us, fully aware of the political significance of this bill. It may appear to offer a temporary political advantage to one party, but the cost to the people of the 48 States would be a prohibitive one.

I would like to quote one sentence from the inaugural address of our distinguished former President, Rutherford B. Hayes: "He serves his party best who serves the country best."

I hope to vote in accordance with that principle.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement supporting H. R. 3575 to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The Northwest Ordinance, passed in 1787 under the Articles of Confederation, established the procedures whereby territories could enter the Union as States. To that end, 29 of our territories became States, including my own home State, Oklahama. There is no better way to demonstrate to the entire world, in front of and behind the Iron Curtain, that the United States, in permitting its territories to enter the scene of our national life on an equal footing with the original States, practices what it preaches with respect to the spread of democracy.

That Hawaii and its people favor admission to the Union has been demonstrated amply and repeatedly since 1903 by the numerous petitions to Congress for statehood and by the great numbers of bills for this purpose introduced into Congress. That Hawaii and its people deserve to be admitted into the Union has been clearly shown by its financial and economic stability; its size—it would be the largest Territory next to Oklahoma to become a State—its population of over a half million; its high percentage of American citizens—87 percent—and its deserved reputation with respect to religious and political tolerance. Despite attempts by opponents of statehood to cover Hawaii with the cloak of a communistic or subversive reputation, Hawaii's war record bespeaks of its patriotism and loyalty to the United States. Not a single case of sabotage by a Hawaiian civilian was reported during World War II. The 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii were described by Gen. Mark Clark as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States." And no one can underestimate or overpraise Hawaii's contribution to our cause in the Korean conflict as very amply demonstrated by the 24th Division and the 25th Division, which were among the first committed in Korea. As a State, Hawaii will continue to be a national outpost in our farflung defense network.

Hawaii represents America to the people of the Pacific and statehood for it would far outcry all the false words that the Communists shout in their plan to destroy the democracies. I, therefore, announce my support of H. R. 3575 and urge this Chamber to join in approving this measure to admit Hawaii as the 49th State of the United States of America.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this is the third time that I have listened to debates here in the House of Representatives on Hawaiian statehood. In my opinion, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] today made the best and most convincing argument that I have ever heard advanced in favor of the proposition.

We have heard a great deal of talk about the fact that if Hawaii is admitted to the Union two Congressmen in this House might be displaced. But that has been true all through our entire history. Every time a new State was admitted into the Union the same situation existed. We cannot settle this important problem, however, on the mere plea that two Congressmen from your State or my State might be displaced here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, as I see the situation, there are three yardsticks by which we might and should determine whether Hawaii is to become a State. First is the matter of population, and that, in my opinion, is a very important one. Any territory that wishes to become a State in these United States should have at least as large a population as the current rule for the House of Representatives, which today is 345,000 people. Hawaii has a population of over 500,000 today, so from that standpoint it seems to me they have every right to ask for and expect admission into the United States. Furthermore, if you will read the history of their efforts to become a State, and how they came into and became an integral part of the United States, you can draw no other conclusion than that they were promised, at least impliedly, that some day the Territory

of Hawaii would have the right to and would become a State of the United States of America.

The question is, Are they today entitled to this privilege?

The second yardstick by which we might determine whether Hawaii is entitled to statehood is their fiscal situation. Here is a Territory that is absolutely sound from a financial standpoint. They have a balanced budget over there, they have the best schools in Hawaii as any to be found in the United States. They have the highest percentage of students to population in Hawaii. From the standpoint of fiscal standing, therefore, it would seem to me that the Territory is eminently fitted to become a State, just like California or any of the other States of our Union.

Now, what is their record, so far as the handling of local problems is concerned? Many of my colleagues have mentioned the fact that the Territory of Hawaii consists of a polyglot of all kinds of races, which is true. But the record of this Territory, so far as the handling of racial problems is concerned, is one of the main reasons why it should be admitted into the United States.

Over there you will find all kinds of people—yellow, black, brown, white people, and so forth—but they have gotten along well in that area without a single race disturbance over many, many years. What other part of the world can equal that record? Successful representative government in such a mixture of races is a real accomplishment. Hawaii deserves great credit for her record in this regard.

I think there is a false assumption that is indulged in by many Members when they come to consider the matter of Hawaiian statehood. They say that because a man's parents migrated to Hawaii, and a son is born of two Chinese people, that he is a Chinaman. But that is not true. He is an American citizen of Chinese birth, and those in Hawaii have acted as real Americans. Do you not realize that right here in the Congress of the United States there are 17 percent of us, and I am one of them, who are the sons of immigrants? I do not want to be called a Scandinavian-American, because I am an American, even though my parents emigrated from across the ocean. Those people over in Hawaii have become thorough Americans, just like you and I, even though they may be of different color. It seems to me the latter record alone would entitle them to statehood.

They have successfully conducted the greatest laboratory in harmonious race relations to be found anywhere in the world or in any time in the world's history.

It may, at some time in the future, be to our advantage to have a strong, solid bastion, a State, out in the far Pacific. The future of the world, in my opinion, is going to revolve around the Pacific Ocean. If the United States of America has a good strong right arm in the form of the State of Hawaii out there in the Pacific, then we are in a very fine position to furnish the able leadership that we will need to solve the complicated problems that will arise in that part of the world.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. This is a categorical question anticipating a positive, unequivocal answer. Does the gentleman stand four-square now, at this minute, in favor of statehood for Alaska?

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not, because it does not have the requisite population to entitle it to statehood.

Mr. DONOVAN. The second question: If the people of Puerto Rico, now having to all intents and purposes practically independent government, come up here tomorrow asking for statehood for their two and one-half million people, with the implication of eight Congressmen, does the gentleman stand squarely for or against statehod for Puerto Rico?

Mr. JOHNSON. Here is the answer: I have not given that matter consideration, and if it comes up here I will give it thorough consideration and give the gentleman my answer then.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentle man from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, it is with the utmost reluctance that I again find myself on the floor of the House speaking in opposition to my very good friend, the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON], and in opposition to the chairman of this committee and the chairman of the subcommittee and the other members who have reported this bill to the floor. I only do so out of a very deep and abiding conviction that the enactment of this measure will strike a real and significant blow at the very foundation of representative government in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I entirely share the conviction of a great statesman and thinker who has passed from the scene, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, who opposed this bill on the further ground that it was unthinkable that we should add States to this Union beyond the compact, natural, and established frontiers of the continental domain of the United States.

Now as to the first point, the very foundation of free government, of representative government, is confidence in the fairness and equity of the representation itself, the apportionment of power. Now we are faced with a situation today, without even considering Hawaii, of a violently distorted representation here in the Congress of the United States. Away back in 1787, when the Constitution was born, there was a great compromise, as you all remember, a compromise that resulted in popular representation, so-called, in the House, and representation of the States in the Senate at two each regardless of population. It was called the Great Compromise. Actually it was nothing more or less than a shotgun marriage, because without it the small States would never have consented to join the Union. Now 165 years have passed since that time. We have completed the occupation and development of our natural domain here on the continent. We have 48 States. We have carried through the original contract, the original Great Compromise. We have completed that operation. There is no reason in the world why we should not at this time reconsider, why we should not reexamine the whole question of admission of new States.

There is no reason why we should go on further distorting representation in the Congress by adding new small States each with two Senators. As I observed earlier in debate on the rule, some 19 percent of the population of the country in 25 States elects 50 Senators, a good working majority, while the remaining 81 percent of us in the remaining States elect only 46 Senators. So if you pass this bill and bring on 2 Senators from Hawaii, you will have 52 Senators elected by still approximately 19 percent of the population, a further distortion of representation in the Senate, to the great detriment of the existing States and particularly of the people of the larger States whose political representation is already so grievously diluted.

Obviously, if you depart from the natural, sound, historic boundaries of continental United States and open the door to Hawaii, you have to go ultimately to Alaska, and tomorrow you will have to accept Puerto Rico, which came into our possession at the same time as Hawaii, 1898, and which is only 600 miles away and has a population of 2 million. Of course, Puerto Rico would be entitled not to 2 Members of this House but to 9 or 10 Members of this House, as well as to 2 Senators. I am no more opposed to Puerto Rico than I am to Hawaii. Without constitutional amendment, I am opposed to both on fundamental, constitutional grounds, that the admission of either of them as a State would further dilute and distort representation in the Congress through the Senate and shake public confidence in our form of free representative self-government.

I have offered a couple of constitutional amendments that I think should be considered before we take an irrevocable step, because adoption of a statehood law is irrevocable. Even the prohibition amendment could be repealed. Any other constitutional amendment can be repealed. Legislation admitting a State is irrevocable, it is final, there is an end to it. You can never again reverse your field. You take it and you are landed with it for the life of the Republic. So let us go a little slowly. Let Hawaii wait a few months longer while this Congress and the people have an opportunity to consider the whole question of admission of new States and how they should be represented in the Senate and the House.

First, House Joint Resolution 17 would authorize Congress to determine how many Senators a new State should have, if any. This would largely take care of the question of disproportionate representation.

I have offered a further constitutional amendment this morning which would be, in effect, a referendum on the admission of new States. Why must Congress alone determine an irrevocable act of this importance? Why not let the people have a crack at it, just as they have on constitutional amendments, to wit, two-thirds of each House, and ratification by three-quarters of the States?

There is another point, Mr. Chairman, that goes to the root of this question.

There are two ways of dealing with empires. One would admit the imperial possessions to the very heart of your own domestic political life. The Roman Empire did that, and senators came in from all over the world, from all sorts of peoples, with all sorts of diversity of interest and background. The French Empire has done that. In the French Assembly all the possessions are represented and participate in the metropolitan government.

Great Britain did the other way. It operated on the assumption that the United Kingdom would retain its own territorial self-government, while allowing the same privilege to the various units of the empire. The result has been the great Commonwealth of British nations, which has been the most effective operating empire of modern times.

For my part, I am opposed to the admission of any new State from noncontiguous and outlying territories under present constitutional provisions. I am opposed in principle to statehood for Hawai, Alaska, or Puerto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will fail. I hope it will go back to the committee on a motion to recommit it and that the whole problem may be reversed in the light of these considerations.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I asked the gentleman to yield to ask if he will permit me to inquire of the delegate from Hawaii in regard to section 6 of the bill. I have heard a number of speakers today refer to the fact that if Hawaii is admitted to statehood, then two States will lose a Member in this House. But upon reading section 6 of the bill, on page 14, I find that we will not lose two Members until after the next census. I want to know of the delegate from Hawaii if my interpretation of that section is correct?

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the interpretation of the gentleman from Iowa is correct. Under the provisions of the bill, the State of Hawaii would have two Representatives in the House until the census of 1960 and then it will take whatever representation it is entitled to under the law governing the apportionment of representation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. By that I understand that upon the adoption of this act, and the admission of Hawaii, until the next census is completed, we would have 437 Members in the House of Representatives instead of 435?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. We have 435 seats now—not by constitutional amendment but by legislative act. Therefore, the Congress has the power to temporarily increase the number to 437?

Mr. FARRINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the reasons why Hawaii should be admitted into the Union as its 49th State, to me, are clear, convincing, and compelling.

The Congress, during many statehood debates, has established a list of traditional qualifications which a Territory should, or ought to have, to be considered eligible for statehood.

Among the qualifications are these: The Territory, first, should possess adequate area; second, it should have sufficient population; third, its economic situation should be such as to permit its people to assume and to carry their proportionate share of the Federal Government's financial responsibilities; fourth, the people of the Territory must have manifest a sincere desire for statehood; and, fifth, finally, and most important, the people of the Territory must believe in the American republican forms of government and be qualified by education and experience for self-government according to American traditions.

All of these five qualifications, I am convinced, the people of Hawaii now abundantly possess.

In area, the Territory of Hawaii covers more than 6,600 miles of land. Hawaii, therefore, is larger in area than Connecticut, Rhode Island, or Delaware. Since these three now are States, an argument cannot effectively be made that Hawaii is too small in area for statehood.

In population, Hawaii now has more than half a million inhabitants. This is more people than any Territory, except Oklahoma, in all the history of the country possessed when it was admitted to statehood. Furthermore, Hawaii's present population is larger than that now possessed by six of our States. Surely Hawaii cannot be denied statehood on the ground she has too few people.

Is the economy of Hawaii such as to permit her to assume her full share of support of the Nation's financial responsibilities? As to that qualification we also must answer in the affirmative. During recent years the people of Hawaii have paid more than $130 million a year in Federal income taxes. There are many present States which do not pay that much. To deny statehood to a people who pay so much toward the support of the Federal Government is to practice what our forefathers denounced, "taxation without representation."

Then there is the question of whether the half million people of Hawaii want statehood. They have said they do again, again, and again. In 1940, in a plebiscite held on the issue of statehood, the people of the Territory voted 2 to 1 for statehood. The Hawaiian Territorial Legislature, composed of duly elected representatives of the Hawaiian people, have petitioned the Congress in the past 48 years almost a score of times for statehood. These representatives, or similarly minded ones, have been elected and reelected time after time indicating they were, in petitioning statehood, expressing the will of the people. The fact that the people of Hawaii year after year have sent to the Congress as their delegate the chief champion in the Congress, and in the islands, of statehood, the Honorable JOSEPH FARRINGTON, further attests to their zeal for statehood.

And, lastly, are the people of Hawaii qualified by training and experience for statehood? Few can doubt that they are. Their educational system is of the best. Their rate of literacy is high. For more than 50 years they have lived under and been faithful to an American system of representative form of government. There also is the further evidence, testified to by the FBI and top military authorities at committee hearings on statehood, that not a single act of sabotage was traced to a Hawaiian during World War II.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he is making. He is giving us some very important facts on this problem. His Republican colleagues from the State of Washington are also vitally interested in Hawaii becoming a State in this Union.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Arguments have been made and probably will be reiterated that Hawaii is not contiguous territory to any of the present States in the Union and that she should be denied statehood on that ground. There is no precedent for denying her statehood on that ground. California was not contiguous to the other States of the Union when she was admitted to statehood in 1850, nor was Oregon when she was admitted to the Union in 1859.

When Oregon and California came into the Union, an easterner had to travel by wagon train, on horseback or afoot 400 miles across the Territory of Nebraska, another 400 miles across the Territory of Wyoming, and across the Territories of Idaho or Nevada before he could reach the borders of either of these then new States of California and Oregon.

The facts are that so great have been the improvements in transportation and communication that Hawaii, today, in fact, is closer to the Nation's Capital here in Washington, D. C., than was New York City to the District of Columbia, 164 years ago, when General Washington was inaugurated the first President of this Republic. It required 8 days for Washington to travel from the District of Columbia to New York City in 1889 when he went to Federal Hall on Wall Street to be inaugurated. General Eisenhower, recently, flew from New York to Honolulu in a single day when he was en route to inspect the fighting front in Korea. In Washington's time and for many years after that it required as long to travel by stage coach from Washington to Baltimore as it now requires to travel from Washington to Honolulu by air coach.

If California and Oregon were admitted to statehood when weeks or months of tedious traveling over large uninhabited territory or by months of sailing around the Horn were required to reach these new States there is no justification, it seems to me, for denying statehood to Hawaii when she is less than an overnight mainland flight from Seattle to Portland, San Francisco, or Los Angeles.

When Hawaii was admitted to the status of a Territory, the United States made her people an implied promise that, someday, when qualified, Hawaii would be admitted to statehood. The

conventions of both political parties in their platforms declared that they favored statehood. We, of both parties, should keep those promises.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs had the floor I asked him to yield, and in his rush under the pressure of time to get all the facts before the House he did not choose in his greater wisdom to do so. Had he done so, I would have propounded to him two categorical or positive questions which I addressed a few minutes ago to the gentleman from California. I should have asked him: "Are you in favor now, at this minute, of statehood for Alaska?" Anticipating an unequivocal answer, I should then have propounded the second question: "Are you in favor of statehood for the teeming two and one-half millions who reside in Puerto Rico?" I should have asked those questions because I like to clear the deck for action. I like to see all the cards on the table.

In these few minutes allotted to me I am not going to discuss the technical merits of this bill, although I cannot help raising a quizzical eyebrow over the provision that will give 2 Congressmen to 120,000 voters in Hawaii, when I can never forget the fact that in the closely populated district up on the East Side of Manhattan, in New York City, which I represent, there are 120,000 voters. Neither can I forget the fact that 150,000 Hawaiians will elect 2 United States Senators, while in the State of New York, out of a population of between 14 and 15 million people, 8 million people every 2 or 4 or 6 years elect only 2 United States Senators. But—brushing all those considerations aside, waving all those facts into the background—let me ask the Members of this House to ponder for a minute the tragic history of the great Roman Republic. Let me, if you will, jog your historical memories and ask you to consider what happened to the pristine virtues of the Roman Republic when it started to take in the senator from Scythia, the senator from Mesopotamia, the senator from Egypt, the senator from Spain, the senators from Gaul; yes, even the senators from England.

What happened to Roman culture? What happened to Roman unity? What happened to all the old-fashioned Roman morals and Roman integrity?

And I should also like to have this House consider the history of modern England; when did a member of Parliament ever get himself elected from India, from Malta, from Canada, from Australia, or New Zealand? On the other hand, I should like to point out, if there be need for further emphasis, the unstable character of modern political France. I have some interesting facts that I would like this House to consider about the French Constituent Assembly and what they now choose to call—not the French Senate—but the French Chamber of Councilors.

There are 622 deputies in the French National Assembly; 30 of them come from Algeria, 10 of them come from what they call the Overseas Department of Guadaloupe-Martinique, Reunion, and French Guiana; 38 members come from what they call the Territories Overseas or the Associated Territories and the Cameroons. Is it any wonder that a Prime Minister of France does not last for more than 60 days?

Consider also the same features of the French Senate: Out of 315 members 200 come from metropolitan France. All the rest come from the far-flung possessions of the French Government all over the world. Those are the things I hope the Members of this House consider before they perform their duty and vote on this bill.

What would I propose by way of substitution? There has been much talk here today pro and con on statehood for Hawaii. There has been a general walking away from statehood for Alaska; and mum seems to be the word on statehood for Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico enjoys at the present time a new form of government under the aegis of the American sovereignty. Its status, if anything, is that of a commonwealth of dominion character. Puerto Rico enjoys a relationship with the government of these United States somewhat similar to the relationship of the Dominion of Canada with the British crown. Puerto Rico has independence for all practical intents and purposes. They elect their own assembly, their own senate; they elect their own governor and their own judges, and they enjoy the very great advantage of no income tax imposed by the United States.

I suggest that this bill be laid over and that serious consideration be given to the question of conferring upon Hawaii the same sort of commonwealth status at least for 10, 15, or 20 years to come.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I will not attempt to reply directly to the gentleman who has just spoken due to the fact I find it a little difficult to understand exactly where his fears lie, because I am not of the opinion that the French split-party system is due to the fact they have delegates from Reunion Island or from Algeria. I was of the impression that that trouble began in the very heart of France and that the splintering of France began in Paris and spread through the nation from causes that have not even the remotest relationship to the question before us, which is whether or not those of us Americans who are enjoying the full privileges of citizenship are going to deny equal citizenship to other Americans who fought along beside our men as comrades in arms in all of our wars, who have been on probation for the privilege of statehood for some 50 years, who have been a free governing unit for 113 years, who comprise 500,000 American citizens. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when the American Marines made all of their landings at Tarawa, Leyte, and the rest of the places to which they went, they had among their numbers representatives, soldiers and marines, from Hawaii. They had them there because of their familiarity with the language which would be involved and expected to be met with on the defensive coast. The loyalty of those men like the loyalty of all other Hawaiian-Americans in the Hawaiian Islands has never at any time been impugned.

We have had no trouble from the Hawaiian Islands. Any trouble we have had from traitors has come from people of so-called native American stock for the most part. I heard some talk about Caucasians. I am of the impression that the most dangerous Caucasian which this country has ever had to meet has just gone to his unlamented end, and that when death came to the archbishop of all Caucasians from the Caucasus, this archbishop of anti-Christ, no one was heard to mourn his passing because he was or was not a Caucasian but because of the evil which he did and the evil which will live after him.

I think we are making a mistake if we concern ourselves as to whether or not any people who seek to be admitted to the privileges of full American citizenship are people of a given ethnic origin or a given color or a given religion. I do not think that the American Legion found any objection on any of those scores in endorsing statehood for Hawaii, nor did the chambers of commerce of the United States, or the Disabled War Veterans or the General Conference of the Methodist Church, for example, all of whom supported this bill.

With further reference to the right of Hawaii to be admitted to statehood, let me point out that it has 500,000 people, approximately, that it is larger than four States, that it proximates in size several other States, that for the last 40 years, at least, it has been an outpost of importance to our national defense and security and from the standpoint of national defense the admission of Hawaii to statehood has been accepted by no less experts on the subject than Douglas MacArthur and Chester Nimitz. I think it is significant, too, that on the floor of this House many of those Members who support statehood for Hawaii themselves served in the Armed Forces of the United States in or near the Hawaiian Islands and they have satisfied themselves of the thorough fitness and qualification of these people to become a State of the American Union.

I submit to you further that had we had a State government in Hawaii at the time of Pearl Harbor, at a time when the civilian population of Pearl Harbor was doing all it could to alert the rest of the country to the dangers of an attack in that area, perhaps a civilian State governor might have been far more alert in calling to the attention of the United States generally the dangers of that attack, whereas a Territorial governor answerable only to the Federal administration then in power had his hands tied and his mouth shut and was not able to make the same representation which the governor of a State of the Union might have made, such a Territorial governor being answerable in some degree to the military, a State governor not being under the same limitations.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I seriously doubt that the American people are fully aware of the momentous decision which this Congress is called upon to make within the next few days. In fact, it appears to me that America stands at the crossroads and those of us chosen to speak for the people of this great Nation must decide whether we shall adhere to the great policy of the past which has built this Union of States or whether we shall change our course of action and expand this Union to the four corners of the earth. This decision must be made during the consideration of H. R. 3575, which has as its purpose the granting of statehood to the Territory of Hawaii.

For approximately a hundred and sixty-five years, we have followed the plan of restricting statehood to those territories which were a part of the mainland, and which were contiguous to each other. This plan has resulted in the development of a unified country with every citizen in all parts of our Nation having pretty generally common views. All citizens are in a position to become familiar with all of our national problems and can consider these problems in the national interest. Our people are bound together here on the mainland by not only great ties of national interest, but inseparately bound together by great and lasting blood and racial ties. These great ties have resulted in a great love and loyalty of country unsurpassed in the annals of history.

Today in considering H. R. 3575, we are called upon to change our former theory of admission to the Union and to go some 2,100 miles off the coast of California and admit to statehood a group of small islands in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. A group of islands which themselves are separated by large bodies of water. A group of islands which are inhabitated by a population of oriental descent, most of whom have never and shall never see the mainland of the United States. This population is composed of a large percentage of people of Japanese descent and includes many Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos and various other oriental races.

We are told that this heterogeneous group of people is now ready to take its place among the great States of the Union and will have that great and necessary American outlook. With this theory I am compelled to disagree. I think it is folly to advocate or to believe that these people some 5,000 miles from Washington and 2,100 miles from the mainland of America can possibly at this time be imbued with the national spirit prevalent on the mainland, or to view the many problems which face us as a Nation in the national spirit which is necessary to their solution. Rather I fear, Mr. Chairman, that should this Territory be admitted to statehood that the people there will look upon all issues solely from the standpoint of what is good for Hawaii. I fear, Mr. Chairman, that when the candidates for President and Vice President are compelled to make the long and tedious trip out to this section of the world in quest of votes in a campaign that they will be forced to make unusual and unreasonable promises for special attention to Hawaii in order to obtain the votes of that State. How can we be naive enough to believe that those people so far removed from the everyday scene of American life can overnight become interested in all of our domestic and foreign problems.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, would admit the Territory of Hawaii into the Union and would automatically give to these people two Members of the United States Senate and, under the terms of the bill, would give that State two Members of the House of Representatives. Thus, we find, Mr. Chairman, according to the Governor's report to the Secretary of the Interior in 1951, that 466,329 people, 63,575 of which are aliens, would have an equal representation in the United States Senate with the great States of New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and others, and would surpass any other State in the Union with reference to representation in the lower body. Thus, we would have, Mr. Chairman, 403,000 Americans having two United States Senators and two Members of the House of Representatives and four electoral votes in the electoral college, which would indeed give to these people an unfair and unprecedented representation in our National Government. According to the Governor's report, the population of Hawaii is declining rapidly, having lost 2½ percent from January 1, 1950, to January 1, 1951, and yet, if this bill is passed, there will be no chance of a revision of their representation in the National Government until 1961.

Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons why this bill should not pass, but time will not permit me to enumerate them all. But, without a doubt, the most serious objection to this bill is the breaking of precedent of not admitting any Territory to statehood which is not on the mainland. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler said that to admit Hawaii to the Union would be a "dreadful mistake" and the United States would "soon be pressed to admit the Philippine Islands, Cuba, and possibly even Australia." He based this objection mainly upon the premises that no Territory which is not contiguous to the mainland should be admitted to the Union. If Hawaii is admitted, the next step will be Alaska, and after these will come Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, Wake Island, and on down the line. Where is the line to be drawn? Where shall we stop? Shall we spread the American States over two or three continents? Have we learned nothing from the lessons of the old Roman Empire? Americans need today, more than any time in our history, to read again the lessons taught in the great works on the decline and fall of the Roman Empire.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should be defeated.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, in my time here I have tried not to make a practice of talking on matters that did not directly concern Alaska. In coming down to the well at this time I do not believe I have violated that self-imposed rule. Although a reading and a rereading of the many words and the many pages of the Hawaii statehood bill will not disclose the word "Alaska" anywhere, yet in invisible ink that word appears on almost every line of that bill, because for better or for worse the fate of Alaska statehood, I believe, is irrevocably linked with that of Hawaii statehood. So, admittedly, I have a personal and a special interest in the Hawaii statehood bill. But I have also a general interest which I hope to demonstrate here today.

It has been suggested a time or two that platforms and planks within platforms of the national parties ought to be no more than guide posts, and yet those of us who are interested in these special propositions look to those platforms as commitments of the great national parties. The platform of the Democratic Party in 1952 called for immediate statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. The platform of the Republican Party called for immediate statehood of Hawaii and statehood for Alaska under an equitable bill. I have never been able to discover to my own satisfaction what the word "equitable" means in that connection. I and all others who stand for Alaska statehood were grievously disappointed when the new administration did not endorse the proposition of statehood for our northwestern Territory. I should have thought that following the platform the administration itself could have suggested a bill which it believed would meet the needs and send it to the Congress for consideration. But I want to say here that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], and similarly the distinguished chairman of the Territories subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], have been altogether cooperative with me in setting up hearings on the Alaska statehood bill. Those hearings are now to be held from April 14 to April 17, inclusive. The chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee would have held those hearings in March if I had so desired, but I referred the matter to the territorial legislature now in session at Juneau.

From my standpoint, a very great calamity occurred in Alaska last fall. The Republicans took over the control of the legislature after 20 years of Democratic domination. It was desired by the people in the legislature and also by the present members of the statehood committee that the hearings here before the committee be deferred until the middle of April, because the legislature is now in the process of passing a new statehood committee bill and the Republicans, as they have every right to do, will have majority representation on that new committee. The legislature will not adjourn until about April 1, and the new members of the statehood committee who will come here as quickly after that as possible need to be in attendance.

There has been considerable comment on this floor today and elsewhere about the fact, or alleged fact—I think there is no doubt that it is a fact—that citizens of one State have a disproportionate weight in the selection of United States

Senators as compared with the citizens of other States. That, as our colleague the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. FARRINGTON] said when he addressed us, was a requirement made by the Founding Fathers. That was one of the great compromises that led to the adoption of our Constitution. In that day the people of Virginia abided by that decision, although it gave the citizen of Delaware about 14½ times the voting strength of the citizen of Virginia.

This system has worked out well. If it had failed, then there would be an absolute requirement upon the people of this Nation to change it and change it right now; but all our history records that it has worked gloriously well. I submit that since that is the case there is no reason whatsoever for changing it now.

But if there were, would it be fair to make the chance in respect to Territories hereafter to be admitted to statehood? If it is bad, it is bad, and there are no qualifications. The only duty then of the American people would be to rectify the wrong and go back into the past and make the chance right across the board. I suggest that no one would propose doing that. I urge likewise that the future States not be discriminated against. The quality of representation in the Congress of the United States has been mentioned. There has not been much said about it, but unvoiced though it be, I seem to sense a feeling that should Hawaii be a State the Japanese-Americans there and the Chinese-Americans might unite, and might elect people of their own racial origins. I suggest if they wanted to get together they would have acted long before if they were going to act differently from ordinary Americans elsewhere. They would not wait for statehood. They would never have elected such outstanding people as Sam King, now Governor of Hawaii, or JOE FARRINGTON. That is the type of people they have chosen in the past and they would choose in the future.

In the past, in the history of the admission of western Territories it was only required that Territories serve a period of tutelage to prove themselves. Once having been incorporated as a Territory, as Alaska is, and Hawaii is, having served that period, they were then to be admitted to the great Union.

I have never been to Hawaii. I have heard many, many witnesses over the years testify concerning statehood. I do not believe anyone could have sat through all these hearings, as I have done, without being convinced the people are entitled to statehood.

A beguiling vista has been held out for commonwealth status or some other status which would be below that of statehood. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] put his finger on that earlier in the day when he said that should such a bill come in here it would be as difficult or more difficult to pass as would statehood itself. Of course, the people of Hawaii and the people of Alaska could have long since urged they be relegated to some other governmental status if their desire was to escape taxation. Through the years they have rejected any such proposal. They consider their true destiny to be as citizens of a State and nothing less. Now, they are taxed without representation. You hear many arguments about statehood. In Alaska it is sometimes said that statehood should not be granted now because a part of the business community is against it. In Hawaii you hear it said that statehood should not be granted because the business community is all for it. One argument has no more merit than the other. I am hopeful that Hawaii will be granted statehood soon. I am hopeful, too, that Alaska will follow. I want to say here that if I were convinced at this moment that Alaska would never attain statehood, or at least never in our time, then notwithstanding I should be for Hawaii statehood and would hope that this House would pass the bill providing statehood for Hawaii because not only are the people of Hawaii abundantly entitled to statehood but such would be to the glory and benefit of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed by some of the provisions of the Hawaiian Constitution. We were given no time in committee to examine the proposed Constitution of the State of Hawaii. I should like first to refer to article 5, section 6 of the Constitution for Hawaii, which we will be approving here. Article 5, section 6 provides:

> The supreme court—
>
> That is, of the State of Hawaii—
>
> shall have power to promulgate rules and regulations in all civil and criminal cases for all courts relating to process, practice, procedure, and appeals which shall have the force and effect of law.

Now, let me read from the Constitution of the State of Iowa. I do not hold it up as perfection, but we Iowans have lived with it for more than 100 years, and it has worked pretty well. Let me read to you from article 5, section 4 of the Constitution of the State of Iowa bearing on this subject. It says:

> The supreme court shall have appellate jurisdiction only in cases in chancery, and shall constitute a court for the correction of errors at law under such restrictions as the general assembly by law may prescribe and shall have power to issue all writs and process necessary to secure justice to parties and to exercise a supervisory control over all inferior judicial tribunals throughout the State.

In section 7 of article 5 of the Iowa Constitution, it is provided further that "judges of the supreme court and districts courts shall be conservators of the peace throughout the State."

I am not an attorney, but I should like to ask someone, perhaps the learned attorney to whom I addressed a question a while ago, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], how far reaching is this provision in this Hawaiian Constitution which provides that the supreme court shall have the power to promulgate rules and regulations in all civil and criminal cases, and for all courts relating to process, practice, and procedure and appeals which shall have the force and effect of law?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would say to the gentleman that putting that into the constitution certainly makes it inflexible, and it goes much further than we go in our own State where all the court rules which are made by the various courts are subject to review by the State legislature.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Again we have in the proposed Constitution for Hawaii, section 3 of article 5 which provides that the Governor shall nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the senate appoint the justices of the supreme court and the justices of the circuit courts.

In the State of Iowa, the judges of the supreme court are elected, and the judges of the district courts, who in this case are called circuit court judges are also elected. We have found that works well, and I say to you that if this power to appoint supreme-court judges and circuit-court judges is put in the hands of the Governor of the proposed State of Hawaii, it would be placing entirely too much power in the hands of the executive.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman also knows that this bill in its present form provides, if it is passed, that only the President of the United States shall have the say whether or not the Constitution of Hawaii as adopted in the last assembly, lives up to the standards of American ideas. Is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is correct.

Mr. DONOVAN. And the Congress of the United States has nothing to say about it at all?

Mr. GROSS. That is right, and I thank the gentleman from New York for making this point.

There is another provision in this proposed constitution, article 2, section 3, I am not sure just what it means, but it reads this way:

> No person shall be deemed to have gained or lost residence simply because of his presence or absence while employed in the service of the United States, or while engaged in navigation or while a student of any institution of learning.

Unlike Hawaii, we have no huge military establishments in the State of Iowa, yet it is provided in the Constitution of the State of Iowa, article 2, section 4, right of suffrage:

> No person in the military, naval, or marine service of the United States shall be considered a resident of this State by being stationed in any garrison, barracks, or military or naval place, or station within this State.

Mr. Chairman, this provision in the Iowa Constitution is a wise one for it makes certain, in the clearest possible language, that transient military personnel cannot be voted in an Iowa election. Contrast this with what I contend is ambiguous language on this subject in the Hawaiian Constitution. In the absence of any definition to the contrary, I can only assume that it would be possible for large numbers of military personnel, in the huge establishments which the United States maintains in Hawaii, to vote in elections if conforming to the 1 year residence and age requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would simply call the gentleman's attention to the fact that section 6 relates to the processes, practices, procedures, and appeals, which will have the force and effect of law. I think that is the usual thing that occurs in any court. That refers only to the making of the rules and processes of the courts.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But there are no restrictions upon what they may do under these items. That is, they do not refer back to the legislature.

Mr. SAYLOR. They do not, and that is the common practice in many States.

Mr. GROSS. It is not the practice in the State of Iowa.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in the position of having supported this proposal in the last Congress, and of really preferring to support statehood now. At least, I feel that I have an open mind about it. During this session of Congress I have served on the committee which has considered this matter. My reservations have grown as I have studied this bill in detail.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has raised one or two questions which I had in mind. In further examination of the constitution, which is part of this bill, I find some evidence that whereas the proponents of the bill argue that the people of Hawaii are ready for democracy, for participation in it at the Federal level, they seem to have some reservations about the extent to which participation in the democratic processes of the State of Hawaii be granted. I should like an answer to one or two questions from members of the committee or others who may be informed.

In section 4 of article 3, for example, I note a provision that the reapportionment of legislative districts for the State legislature of Hawaii is to be made by the Governor every 10 years, on the basis of the number of voters registered at the last preceding general election. It seems to me that this is a departure from the established practice in the United States, where the apportionment is normally based upon population. Here also it is normally done by the legislatures of the States, but in Hawaii the Governor is to do it, not on the basis of population but on the basis of the number of voters registered.

It seems to me that is undemocratic in the ordinary sense. At least, I believe we should have some explanation of it. I am not one of those who believes that the cure for a bad democracy is more democracy, but rather better informed and more responsible citizens. If democracy is to work well, its citizens must be wise, for all are given political power.

I think we should be informed as to why the number of voters registered is to be used in legislative apportionment.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I think that probably is the result of the experience of Hawaii under the territorial form of government. The organic law provides that the reapportionment should be carried out every 10 years on the basis of citizens. An enumeration of citizens has never been provided. The result is that the territorial legislature has not been reapportioned. The members of the Constitutional Convention felt that the most equitable way to carry out reapportionment was to use the number of registered voters rather than total population as a basis. Then the question of aliens and citizens would not enter into the subject of reapportionment.

The fact of the matter is that within another 10 years there probably will be few aliens in Hawaii. Those remaining are now eligible to citizenship and many of them are very old. As a matter of fact, this basis is a better and more modern one for determining representation in the legislature than is total population. The proviso that the Governor should make that reapportionment was put in there so that if the legislature failed to carry it out the reapportionment would be carried out anyway.

Mr. MCCARTHY. In considering this question we should also keep in mind that under this constitution the Governor can be elected by a minority; so the matter of apportionment for representation in the State legislature becomes very important.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. On what basis does the gentleman make the statement that the Governor can be elected by a minority?

Mr. MCCARTHY. The statement was made here a minute ago.

Mr. FARRINGTON. That statement was in error. Under the laws of the Territory the only people who are qualified to run in the general election are those who enter the primary on the Republican or Democratic tickets or else receive at least 10 percent of the votes cast on another or an independent ticket. I doubt anyone has ever qualified as a candidate in this way, that is, outside the two regular parties.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The potential is certainly there in any case.

Mr. FARRINGTON. There are only two parties.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman. I think the constitution does permit election of a governor by a minority.

Now, I would like to raise one other question: We all have difficulty in our own respective States with regard to reapportionment. It seems to me that when making a beginning with a new constitution that at least one could provide one district for each senator or one district for each representative; but as I read this constitution it provides that four or five representatives are to be chosen from some districts, or two or three senators to be chosen in some; whereas other districts are represented by single senators or single representatives. I think we ought to have some explanation of this policy. To me it is an indication of lack of confidence that the democratic processes might be expected to work in Hawaii.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. The question can be answered very easily; it is based on population.

Mr. MCCARTHY. It is based on population; but, if you had a thickly populated area why should it not be broken up into five districts, each electing one representative rather than elect five representatives from one district? Why should not each district elect its own state representative or senator? It is based on population; I understand that, but why should there not be five separate districts with five separate representatives rather than one district with five representatives? To me it looks a little like gerrymandering.

Mr. FARRINGTON. If the gentleman will yield to me I will try to give him a very brief answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The basis for electing a number of members from one district was in the organic act that was adopted by Congress for the government of the Territory. We have gone a long way toward eliminating that in the constitution, but it is not easy to eliminate it entirely.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman explain why it cannot be eliminated? What is the reason?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I suppose in the course of time it may be eliminated, but there are advantages, we have discovered, in electing more than one man from a district; and that is in keeping with the modern practice that they use in many municipalities where they choose their town board of supervisors or councilors at large rather than from wards; so it is a combination of the two systems.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The gentleman knows that this is not a matter of choosing a city council; this is a State election problem.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The same principle applies; and the constitution, I may say, is one of the most modern, if not the most modern in existence. It has won the approval of the National Municipal League. Only a few days ago the president of the Bar Association of Illinois praised it very highly in an article in the association magazine.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I should like to say to the gentleman that our experience in Minnesota is that with regard to those districts where we are now represented by more than one State legislator the general feeling is that representation is not all that it should be. We are inclined to look upon it as a form of gerrymandering.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the State of Minnesota do you not elect your supreme court justices and your circuit or district judges, whatever they may be?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct insofar as Minnesota is concerned.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, may be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Chairman, all during my past 6 years in Congress, I have wished and hoped, as I continue to wish and hope, that the good people of the Territory of Hawaii be admitted into this great Union as one more sovereign member State. This has nothing to do with the particular problems of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico whom I represent. My wishes and hopes derive from my devotion to the principles of freedom and self-determination. Fifty-five years ago Hawaii decided to be admitted into the Union, and the Congress constitutionally incorporated Hawaii as a part of the United States albeit in the category of a Territory.

A Territory is an inchoate State. It has no other way to attain full freedom but by becoming a State of the Union. Statehood is its destiny.

The name of Puerto Rico has been mentioned in the course of the legislative process aimed at Hawaiian statehood. Besides my feelings toward Hawaii, I find it my duty to make these brief remarks with the additional purpose and hope that should there exist any confusion on this matter concerning Puerto Rico, it may be clarified.

In the first place let me recall that the history of Hawaii and the history of Puerto Rico although similar to some extent have great dissimilarities between them.

The colonization of Hawaii started a century and a quarter ago.

The settlers of Hawaii, those who established western civilization in those islands, were former inhabitants of the United States. In more than a century Hawaii has been developed into an outpost of western civilization in the Pacific as established there by pioneers come to the islands from the United States. The Polynesian community was substituted by an American country.

Colonization of Puerto Rico started about four and a half centuries ago. The settlers of Puerto Rico, those who carried western civilization to the island, were former inhabitants of Spain. Puerto Rico became in the Caribbean an outpost of western civilization therein established by former inhabitants of Spain. The Indian community was substituted by a Spanish-American country.

Puerto Rico was definitely admitted by its parent country into the family of Spanish provinces in 1868 as Hawaii is requesting admission now into the family of States which make this Union. To this point a parallel development of the Hawaiian Islands and Puerto Rico may be observed vis-a-vis the spread of western civilization. But from 1898 on, the history of Puerto Rico is not that of settlement, development and maturity within the process of expansion of western civilization started with Columbus and continuing to this day. Severance of the old ties with the country of origin took place in 1898 and integration into American life began, a process which recalls that of the Original Thirteen Colonies in separating from England and later devising a Federal system for mutual security and the enjoyment of freedom.

While in the case of Hawaii incorporation meant the culmination of the process which originated with settlement since 1820, in Puerto Rico during this last 50 years what has taken place is rather a process of adjustment of relations between two peoples of the New World, both of European origin but brought together only half a century ago. Close bonds of union between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States have been built along these years. As a result in 1950 the people of Puerto Rico proposed and Congress approved a law whose terms embodied a compact between the Government of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico so that within the bonds of union eminently symbolized by United States citizenship, Puerto Rico now enjoys in a commonwealth status full local self-government and continues politically and economically united to the United States. It is a new type of relationship which fits the present circumstances of Puerto Rico as was new the type of relationship created for Puerto Rico in 1898 when it was declared to be a Territory subject to the sovereignty of the United States but not a part of the United States. In fact the Commonwealth is an outgrowth of the nonincorporated Territory.

While an incorporated Territory, such as Hawaii, has always been considered an inchoate State, it has developed that a nonincorporated territory may attain self-government in association by mutual consent, by compact, which neither means separation nor incorporation. Such is the meaning of the present Commonwealth status of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, this being the case, I hope that the status of Puerto Rico or the possible further political aspirations of Puerto Rico offer no obstacle whatsoever to the just aspirations of the people of Hawaii. When and if Puerto Rico comes again before this Congress in quest of a modification of or a change in its political status, the question will be necessarily submitted, and I hope considered, on its own merits, regardless of what is now here decided concerning Hawaii.

I hope that Hawaii may now fulfill its legitimate ambition and if admitted, as I hope, let me wish it Godspeed as the 49th State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, in the course of the debate on the entry of the Territory of Hawaii as a full State of our Union, as we promised her many years ago, it has been alleged by some that this would weaken the bonds of this Republic by a shift of the representation now existing among the States.

I was sufficiently disturbed by the implication of this objection, although not by its validity, that I went back to read the notes available on the Constitutional Convention itself, the Federalist Papers, and other related documents dealing with the formation and adoption of our Union. I find that this same argument haunted the now famous Constitution Hall, yet the ghost was laid there to the satisfaction of the framers of our Constitution and to the satisfaction of the original 13 member States of our Union. However, we find it again entering the debate, so perhaps we should return to arguments as old as the fallacy to refute it again.

One important point is this dilution of representation not only can but must occur in the absence of the entry of any or several States. The Constitution plainly states that Representatives "shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers," and by the following provisions dealing with the census to make an accurate determination of the numbers of people. It was clearly recognized by the framers of our Constitution that population shifts would occur and that new States would be carved out of the lands to the west, yet, in spite of motions to insure that the Original Thirteen States should never have less representation in total than any and all new States, the language and determination emerged which was to determine representation in the first House by population alone. In the last census and reapportionment, we saw California increase the number of its Representatives by seven due to the vast increase of its relative population. To apply any dilution theory then to new States is only specious unless the same opposition be raised at each census which reapportions representation as among the several States. We could, of course, increase without limit the number of representatives, but it was long ago determined—and indeed Hamilton so states in the Federalist Papers—that there was some wise limit on the total number which could reasonably act as an effective legislative body. That number has long rested at 435. This is the base number through which population must be run to determine the representation of each State.

It might be noted as an important sidelight to this issue, that the governing reason for this equality of representation—outside of our battle to get representation for taxation alone—was that the national legislative body should sit only as a representative group of the whole number if they could convene in plenary session. We can in no means argue now against this age-old truth. It is the essence of republicanism; that is, representation in equal numbers of the whole.

Thus, simple arithmetic disposes of any dilution of representation argument, for each State is to be represented on the basis of its population in the House and only by gerrymandering one-party districts and other such methods can

any given individual be deemed to have either less or more representation than any other given individual. It might also be noted, as a pragmatic matter, that having a key chairmanship may give more real representation to a given State or area than any loose number of representatives.

There can be no argument then, that the admission of Hawaii could reduce the rights of suffrage of the people of other States for, by whatever arithmetic or array of figures used, the whole can only be divided by its parts and the whole is the area of sovereignty of the national government which is coexistent with the whole of the people speaking through their proportionate representation.

Let us then, turn our attention to the Senate where the argument seems to have more force. How is it that you can dilute the representation of any given citizen by increasing the number of Senators? Does he not still vote for but two Senators? Does his State still not have equal representation with all other States in the Senate? This equality is guaranteed by the Constitution so the dilution argument realizes that it must amend the Constitution if it is to have its way of changing the pattern established by our Founding Fathers for the arrangement of our Government. The simple truth is, as is well recognized by what has become known as the Connecticut Compromise, that without equal power in the Senate the small States would have joined no Federal—as opposed to Confederated—Union, and without direct representation, no large State would have given up its greater power. It was also recognized, as a study of Madison's notes will show, that the Original Thirteen States could hardly expect new States to join the growing union unless they could come in as equals. It was clearly seen that they would, on the contrary, form a union of their own and we might thereby have had not one great Nation but rather many smaller and conflicting nations. By no stretch of argumentation can the exponents of a diminished representation for new States hereafter, demonstrate that any evil has been caused to the Federal Union by the addition, as equals, of the thirty-five States which have been added to our Union. Rather, the records of our history will show that many of our great leaders have come out of the frontier as it shifted westward, just as the money by which the great cities of the East waxed great and populous also came out of the richness of the developing hinterland. To suddenly assume that any more equal partners will "weaken the bonds of our Union" is to make an assumption based on no demonstrable fact from history gone by. It was the frontier, not the conservative East, which pushed the democratization of our Republic suffrage, the vote for women, and the legislation against monopoly in banking, finance and industry generally.

The applicability of the dilution argument as applied to the election of the President, is even more figmentary than as that applied to the Congress. If our wish is to provide a more equitable method of popular election—and I take this as a good move—then we have far better methods of curing the present electoral system than merely seeking to even more disenfranchise American citizens so unfortunate as to live in Hawaii or Alaska or the District of Columbia at presidential election time. We have the choice of direct election or the division of the electoral vote on the basis of the popular vote and this matter need not confuse the issue of statehood for the relationship is indeed strained. We who come from the less populous areas, from the smaller States, are only too aware of the lack of representation in presidential elections as any review of the States who have mothered Presidents will show. If our big-State and big-city brothers wish to raise this argument, let us from the hinterland remind them that to them goes the office of the President with its vast increase of power over the run of our time. Count your blessings and do not forget them when you are arguing on some other point.

Argument is also raised against the passage of the 17th amendment which gave the people the right to select their own Senator rather than have some power play in the State legislatures pick the individual to hold this high office. If any "dilution" specialist wishes to debate this as a separate point, since it has no bearing here, I shall be glad to join issue with him and talk with him about some of the fine Senators this process produced, and produced from his own State.

In truth then, what is the real opposition to entry of additional States to this Union, once we remove the pretty array of figures which give but ghostly cover to it in any event? The opposition stems from the fear that large States in general, and apparently one in particular, will lose some real or potential power in the Halls of Congress. Is this a matter of such great import as to make necessary the revision of our Constitution, hammered out by great minds with just such issues in mind, and used for the entry of 35 States heretofore? I cannot be so persuaded. We have mentioned already the great likelihood that the Executive must be chosen from the large or key States, leaving to all others the power of ratification or rejection alone. We may also mention the great possibility that the Cabinet will be chosen from those same States. We may reject any argument, which must somewhere lie, that large States pay in more than they get, for that tax money must come only from the pocketbooks of the citizens of the areas now "underdeveloped" for we have long seen the parade of money eastward wrung from the soil, the mines and the forests of the wild West which Webster once dismissed as a great and barren desert. We might think of pragmatic things like committee chairmanships, heretofore mentioned, of sectional blocs of concurrent majorities and of bipartisan, bi-State, activity.

I have been impressed by the statement that "in my humble estimation, the very foundation of citizenship in a republic is the equal right of suffrage" for I could not agree with the gentleman more. This is indeed the base of our Republic where the people, not any particular groups, no matter how arranged and classified, are sovereign. Each arm of the Government is, and must be, subservient to their will. To deny to the citizens residing in Hawaii the full prerogatives of the citizens of the other States is to raise injustice and not prevent it. Their rights are fundamentally the same as the rights of any other citizen and any attempt to abridge them, even if it is done in the name of preserving the status quo, is to run in the face of the history and development of this Federal Union going all the way back to the Constitutional Convention itself. This probability was foreseen, debated, and doubted, yet in the end, the Constitution reflected the conviction that equality was an absolute as it applied not to each State but to each citizen. The Connecticut compromise was necessary not because they saw it as the best of Government in any absolute sense but because practical consideration dictated its adoption if there was to be Union. It was assumed, as time has well shown, that the character and dedication of the people alone, and not any form or postulation, could insure and expand democracy within the Republic.

Yet, virtually each time, some Territory or part of a Territory, sought to join the Federal Union, some great argument could be raised against it—its remoteness, its lack of development, its lack of population and concommitant power in the Senate being greater than seemed reasonable, its morals, its lack of resources, or other such grave problems, none of which have ever had any appreciable effect on anything except delay. These arguments against Hawaii are not new. This is not the first time that the dilution of representation argument has reared its head. More advanced calculation may seem to lend it more weight as the figures fall into a prettier pattern, but it is the same problem with which the original convention seethed. The conclusion then, as I have cited, was to write into the Constitution equality of each citizen and each State. I shall uphold that decision in this day for the reasons offered then have changed not one whit through the years and I shall not be misled by any array of numbers nor by any appeal of the preservation of real or imagined power accruing to any State irrespective of size. The Hawaiian citizens have a constitutional guaranty of equal footing with all others, both as individuals and as a community, and I shall support the Constitution.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion has gone on for some time; in fact, it has gone on for some years; and I suspect that there have been more convictions expressed here this afternoon than there have been changes of opinion. But I think even at this late hour it might be worth while to take a few minutes to refer to some of the questions that have been raised and for which, frankly, there has not been given as yet adequate answers.

For instance, one speaker asked this question: What does Hawaiian statehood do for the United States? That is a proper question to ask and one that somebody should say something about. I am not going to try to mention all of the things that Hawaiian statehood does

for the United States. That is set forth rather carefully in a statement filed by the gentleman from Hawaii and appears in the report of our committee. But here is one thing it does: It establishes American unity in the Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, there is no place where we need to reach out our hand and to firm up our friendships any more than in the great Pacific area. That is where a large part of the destiny of our country lies in the future and, if consistent with all of the other principles of our Government, we can reach out and take in these people—if consistent with the principles of statehood in our Nation, we can reach out and take them in as a unified part of the American Union we have done something for ourselves in stepping out into the Pacific area where time and again we have heard the cry: Asia for Asiatics.

It is necessary for us to get our hands and our feet farther out into the Pacific Ocean so that those people will have a better understanding of us and we will have a better understanding of the Pacific area. So, No. 1 is it establishes American unity in the Pacific area.

No. 2: It binds this strategic military base even more closely to the United States. A committee of this Congress made a trip throughout the Pacific area in 1947. We went as far as Japan where we had a conference with General MacArthur. One of the things we went out there to find out about was just what relationship statehood for Hawaii had to the whole concept of Pacific defense.

We were also concerned with those trust islands which are now under our management. But, at that conference I specifically asked General MacArthur whether or not he believed that granting statehood to Hawaii would be beneficial or detrimental to the defense of the United States in the Pacific. He said it would be definitely beneficial to the Pacific defense; that for all practical purposes Hawaii is a part of the Pacific coast; that from the standpoint of national defense, from the standpoint of defending the California coast line and the western coast line of our country, Hawaii had to be considered a part of the Pacific shore line itself, and therefore it was important to lock that area in even closer, if we could, to the American continent, and inasmuch as statehood moved in that direction it was beneficial to us to bring Hawaii into the Union of States.

No. 3: It will relieve the Federal Government of the financial burden involved in supporting a Territorial government. At this time when we are trying to cut Federal expenses, when an area is willing to step out and take care of its own governmental expenses, it would seem to me that we could chop off a little of the amount of money our taxpayers are required to put up by granting these people statehood, if consistently with our principles we can do that, and relieve our people of that obligation.

No. 4—and there are a number of others—but I think this is important: We will be discharging an obligation which we owe to the people of the Territory of Hawaii and we will be acting in support of the fundamental concepts of our Government. When we brought Hawaii into Territorial status we morally committed ourselves to eventual statehood; I do not think that we should welsh on that commitment any more than we should welsh on any other commitment. It was clearly implied in everything that we have done and as has been stated here time and again. Further than that, we fought a Revolutionary War because we objected to the proposition of taxation without representation. For a period of 50 years we have been taxing the people of Hawaii and today they pay more taxes than 10 States in this Union, and today they have no voting representation either in this House or in the United States Senate. Now, I ask you, how long can we sit here and continue to tax people and not give them voting representation when the very basis of the Revolution which we fought for our own independence was predicated precisely upon that one single issue? We certainly do not look very good throughout the world imposing upon these people, whom we have locked into the Territorial system of this country, a tax load which is more than that paid by 10 other States of this Union, and at the same time fail to give them voting representation. So we will not only meet our own moral obligation to the people of Hawaii in granting them voting representation but at the same time we will be acting in accord with the basic principles on which our Nation has always stood.

So much for what granting statehood does for the United States. Some mention has been made here as to the provision for social welfare in the Hawaii constitution. I would like to say this: That it is none of our particular business what those people want to do for themselves, providing it is within the general framework of the constitutional system that we have put into operation. We brought the Puerto Rican Constitution in here last session, you will recall. It has some things in it I would not vote for in the constitution of my State, but that was not the question. The question was whether or not within the framework of their own democracy, and within the framework of the constitutional principles for which we stand, they were entitled to make that kind of a decision; if they wanted to do it that way, that was their business and not our business; and if we believe in democratic principles, we will have to let the people of Hawaii write their own constitution, just the same as the people of Iowa wrote their constitution.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. It is true, is it not, that when the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico came in here last year with a constitution that did not satisfy the solons and the wise men of the House and the Senate, we had no compunction about rewriting their constitution for them.

Mr. ENGLE. As a matter of practical legislative feasibility——

Mr. DONOVAN. That is a simple question; yes or no.

Mr. ENGLE. Yes; and I did not agree for one minute with undertaking to tinker with and rewrite the constitution for the people of Puerto Rico. I would not agree, either, to rewriting the constitution of the people of Hawaii as long as it fell within the general framework of our constitutional system and the general constitutional principles we stand for.

We have talked about setting a precedent for Guam, for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and others. The plain fact is that there are only two areas left that stand in the same legal status now, the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska. They are locked into the territorial system of this country. As has been explained here before, we cannot get them out or give them anything different than they have unless we give them statehood. You cannot very well give them independence. You cannot cut them loose without amending the Constitution. And you cannot give them a different form of government except statehood. The only place they can go is up, and that is toward statehood.

These other areas we have carefully protected against a repetition of that kind of a situation. For instance, when Puerto Rico came in, we made it very plain in the hearings that we were neither committing ourselves to statehood by granting them commonwealth status or committing ourselves against statehood. There is a party in Puerto Rico that wants statehood. There is a party in Puerto Rico that wants complete independence. We said to them, "We are not giving either one of you anything to rely upon by the action we are here taking." We did not prejudice one case or the other. We have held ourselves clear with reference to Puerto Rico.

The Virgin Islands, of course, is hardly ready to do anything. They do not even have a stable government now. Guam is a tiny place. So we cannot be bothered about these other areas now. They are not really a problem in the same sense that these two territorial areas are and which demand some action in real justice on the part of the Congress.

Another matter mentioned time and time again, and I shall cover it in just a sentence or two, is this matter of what we are doing to the House of Representatives. It is said that two States are losing two Representatives. The answer to that is that the population of this country increases about 2½ million every year. In a decade you will have an increased population in this country of 25 million, more or less. What difference does it make whether or not you have 500,000 additional Hawaiians when you have a reapportionment problem involving 25 million people differently distributed than they were 10 years before? You simply make the adjustment under the system, that is all. If the system is bad, let us change the system, but let us not use as a prejudicial argument against Hawaii as an applicant for entrance into the system the fact that we may think that the system is bad. If the system is bad, it deserves to be changed on the merits of that argument alone, and Hawaii should not be precluded from entrance into the system for that reason.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill is given the favorable consideration of this House

which it deserves and which on two previous occasions and under Democratic administrations it has received.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I want to compliment the House for the high level of debate we have heard here this afternoon. It might be of interest to know that 98 minutes have been taken up by those who oppose the bill and 101 minutes, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania uses 15 minutes, will have been taken by those in favor of the bill. So the time has been evenly divided, and the level of debate has been high.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] for his excellent presentation and summary because I believe he has touched on many of the problems and issues that have been raised here today.

I have listened very carefully throughout this debate to every argument that has been made against this bill and against granting statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. I might say to the Members that if they want to review a little history it would do them good to go back and read some of the debates which were held on the admission of some of the States whose Representatives have spoken here today, because these same Halls echoed the same words, except that the words came from other men from other States, giving the same reasons as to why those States should not be admitted to the sisterhood of States, which now comprise the 48 States of the Union. The first argument that has been made is that it is not contiguous to the United States. That same argument was used when California was admitted. People rose in this House and said that it was so far away that they had absolutely nothing in common, and why should it ever be admitted as a State? Yet, in the wisdom of the Members of this House at that time, that argument was brushed aside. I might say that California was further removed at that time from Washington by many weeks than Hawaii now is from the Nation's Capital. The fact is, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] stated, that when the Thirteen Colonies were originally formed to make up these United States it was farther from Washington's home at Mount Vernon to Boston in point of elapsed time than to go from the Nation's Capital to any place on the globe today. So that the argument of whether or not it is contiguous has been made on previous occasions in this House, and former Congresses in their wisdom have seen fit to disregard it. I certainly hope that this House will see fit to disregard that argument today.

The second argument that has been advanced against statehood is do not admit them now. You will notice that those proponents of that argument have not given you any alternative. They are opposed to the admission of Hawaii now or at any time in the future.

This bill has been before the Congress of the United States a number of times. It has received the support of both parties. Somebody suggested that it be brought up as a matter of referendum.

I would like to call your attention to the growing support in the United States for statehood for Hawaii. In 1941, according to the Gallup poll, only 48 percent of the people of the United States were in favor of statehood, 23 percent were opposed, and 29 percent had no opinion. During the past 12 years many of our men and women have had the opportunity to go to the Territory of Hawaii. As a result, not only of military service but of the great tourist trade, many of the people of these United States have become familiar with that great Territory of Hawaii until today the Gallup poll shows that 72 percent of the people of the United States are in favor of statehood for Hawaii, only 14 percent are opposed to it, and 14 percent have no opinion. If you would really like to find out whether the public wants statehood for Hawaii, I think that the Gallup poll indicates that the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States want statehood for Hawaii.

The third argument that has been advanced against statehood is that it would increase the number of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. If that same argument were used we would have not a sisterhood of 48 States but we would have the Thirteen Original Colonies, and that is all. Is this country, because we have grown to 48 States and now have 96 Senators, to cease to grow? Is that the word you want to send out to the four corners of the world, that that is what the House of Representatives has to say, not only to the people of Hawaii, American citizens the same as each and every one of you who occupy a seat here, but to all the people of the world? Do you want to say that this country shall not continue to grow, or do you want to say that these other people who feel as we do, who work with us, can never become a part of the United States?

It is interesting to note that someone has raised the question today of whether or not we ever made any agreements with the people of Hawaii that they would be admitted to statehood. In 1854, when Hawaii was still an independent monarchy, there were negotiations entered into between King Kamehameha III and the United States. The treaty which had been prepared by our Department of State and submitted to the King for his approval provided for the annexation of Hawaii as a State, enjoying the same rights and degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such, and admitted to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of a State, on perfect equality with other States of the Union. Unfortunately, the death of the then monarch, and the failure of his successor to follow it up, caused that treaty not to be effected, or we today would not have the privilege of discussing statehood for Hawaii, it would be an accomplished fact.

We have entered into, and it has been the desire of the people of the United States to have Hawaii admitted as a State since 1853, and I sincerely believe and hope that on this centennial of the beginning of our negotiations for statehood for Hawaii that statehood will be accomplished.

The next argument which has been advanced is that an examination of the constitution which has been approved by the people of the Territory of Hawaii contains provisions that are objectionable. One is that a majority vote is not necessary for the election of a governor. I come from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It may come as a surprise to some of you to know that it is not necessary for the Governor of Pennsylvania to receive a majority vote. The Constitution with regard to the receipt of a majority vote, according to the constitutions of the 48 States, is only required in about 14 States. So the mere fact that they do not include it in the State of Hawaii, I think is of tremendous importance, showing that they are not fearful of the democratic processes working in the State of Hawaii.

Another question was raised that the Governor, by and with the consent and approval of the senate, shall appoint the judges, I might say that I commend the people of Hawaii for having placed that provision in their constitution. Why? Because it shows they are on their toes. The American Bar Association has recommended to the present 48 States that they seriously consider that manner of choosing their judges, because by its use in the long run you get better judges. It is the system that the United States Government uses in choosing judges for our Federal courts, and I believe that it is a good thing. I have noticed that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is seriously considering revising their constitution. One of the things I hope they will do is to provide that our judges in the future shall be selected in just this same manner.

It provides further that the supreme court shall have the right to promulgate rules and regulations for the conduct of the courts. That is the way it should be. The supreme court knows what rules they should have in their own courts, and I sincerely believe that that is a good thing in their constitution. As Thomas J. Walsh, president of the Illinois Bar Association, stated in a recent article in the Illinois Bar Journal:

> The constitution is to be highly commended for its confinement to fundamental law, its clarity and simplicity of style and minimum of statutory provisions.
>
> It is a thoroughly American document, patterned after the Constitution of the United States and State constitutions, and it is free from the restrictions and legislative details that have so encumbered the State constitutions.

In fact, in my opinion, most of the States could well use this constitution as a guide in revising their own constitutions.

Another objection is that we should not admit Hawaii to statehood because it is necessary for us to protect our vitality. I ask you, as Members of this House, How can we better protect our vitality than by actually showing to the world that we are as good as our word? We have taken this Territory in, promising it statehood, and now that it has met all of the requirements that have been laid down for statehood, we should admit it. Hawaii is a young country as

far as its people are concerned. If we had waited for the various States of the Union to prove their vitality before they were admitted as States, we would not have 48 States in our present Union. One of the reasons the States have grown after admission to statehood is that they have the right to determined things for themselves. For that reason I say there is no reason to hold this up; I think, if we really want to protect our vitality, we should admit Hawaii and allow the State of Hawaii to grow under its own jurisdiction.

There have been warnings issued of the fate of the Roman Empire, the Greek Empire, and others and predicting similar fate for us if Hawaii is admitted to statehood; let us get something straight: The United States of America is not, never was, and I pray God never will be an empire. We do not want an empire; the American people do not want an empire; that is why we are 48 States and 2 Territories, and I hope those Territories both will be admitted to statehood. I can say to the Delegate from Alaska that I was proud when I saw him in the well of the House today supporting statehood for Hawaii, and I can promise him that I will be just as vigorous in support of statehood for Alaska as I have been in my efforts to get statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke a moment ago of the selection of judges in the State of Pennsylvania; you elect them, do you not?

Mr. SAYLOR. At the present time we do, and I hope that when we change our constitution we adopt the method provided in this constitution.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am, of course, in hearty accord with the gentleman's statements, and I know that he has been an exponent of statehood for both the Territories. A number of us over here have been also in that category, and we are somewhat bothered at this time by the lack of expression on the part of the leadership on the Republican side as to what they intend to do about the Alaska situation. I appreciate, of course, that the gentleman said he would be vigorous in holding hearings, but that might go on forever, holding hearings. I would like to be for both Hawaii and Alaska, but I do not like to be put in the corner on the Hawaiian deal and then not get a chance to vote for Alaska. I think there are a number on this side who are looking at this thing pretty carefully today.

Mr. SAYLOR. I am happy to say to my friend from California that the reason we have not held hearings or have begun to hold hearing on Alaska is, as the Delegate from Alaska explained. The proponents of Alaskan statehood do not want their hearings until next month. I can say to the gentleman that if I receive from the Members on his side of the aisle the same support in my subcommittee that I had in connection with discussion of the bill for Hawaii, it is my hope that within this session you shall also have the opportunity to vote on statehood for Alaska.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I hope that his hopes and my hopes will materialize.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Does the gentleman also speak for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs?

Mr. SAYLOR. I speak for myself. I do not speak for the chairman or any other member.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We would like to have an expression from the chairman of the committee on that.

Mr. SAYLOR. Not at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we may summarize this debate by saying, first, that the people of Hawaii themselves want statehood, which has been proven by the fact that it went over by a 3-to-1 vote. They have approved their constitution which looks forward to statehood.

Second, I say now that the people of Hawaii deserve statehood. They have been 54 years a Territory. They have served their apprenticeship well and are now entitled to full membership as a State. They have earned statehood by demonstrating their unwavering loyalty to the United States and their complete devotion to the American plan of government, not only by their excellent economy, through the contribution of their people in every walk of life, as has been referred to, and their excellent contribution in the war effort, but they have earned statehood by every standard that has been set up for the admission of every State following the Original Thirteen Colonies.

Third. It will be to our national advantage. General MacArthur has stated that the admission of Hawaii to statehood will establish the fact that the central and western Pacific Ocean areas constitute the defense zone of the United States. It would provide for a better government because, as has been the experience in these United States, governments which are run from Washington as territories do not provide good government for the local people. When the people of Hawaii are able to enact laws without the fear of Congress overriding or vetoing their acts, they will be able to provide better for the wishes of their people than they are able to do at the present time, just as each one of the present States of the Union is now better able to handle their individual problems than having them handled from Washington.

Fourth, and lastly, I say it will discharge a moral obligation of the United States to the Territory of Hawaii and establish as a fact that the United States has not ceased to grow and will say to the Pacific triangle that there is hope in the United States, that there is a free country, and that you, too, can look forward to the great United States continuing to grow and expand.

I could say much more, but let each Member realize that the world is watching what we do to these citizens of the United States who live in Hawaii. The attention of all eyes is on the west and the American attitutde toward the Territory of Hawaii.

Your approval will be a severe setback to the enemies who have been making great propaganda of our continued Territory status of Hawaii, and to the liberty-loving American citizens of Hawaii, admission to statehood in the Union will be a consummation of an effort begun 100 years ago.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, having been in Hawaii several times, the last being in May of 1952, I made some observations which I would like to get into the RECORD.

The strategic, tactical, and economic factors add up to Hawaii being a good deal for coming into statehood of the United States, along with Alaska, of course.

Hawaii is located in the center of the Pacific. It is a hub. More spokes radiate from Hawaii, touching more races, more people, lands and countries, than any other geographic spot on the face of the globe. Hawaii itself has 19 races and as many creeds living in ideal harmony. It is coming into its own.

We have been attacked in the Orient twice in the last 12 years. China is lost; we are trying to get it back. There are more people in the Orient with more potential markets, than elsewhere. If a catalyst is needed between the east and the west, it seems that Hawaii is that catalyst. When we think of Pearl Harbor, we think of the destroyed fleet. We think of it as a strategic location; I hope that in the next few years, the Pacific will mean more than just strategic perimeters, more than islands. I hope we come to think of it in terms of its people and their institutions, democratic institutions.

We brought Anglo-Saxon and European customs and traditions to these shores safely. Hawaii has absorbed our views on government. Its people can do for themselves what we did, and what we hope the people of Japan, and Korea, and Formosa will yet do—govern themselves on a broad base.

Contiguity? Once it mattered in the sense of defense. Today, Korea might just as well be our 49th State. It is not contiguous. Yet our blood fights for a principle there. Tomorrow, if a NATO country is attacked, we are committed to its defense. Contiguity? The world has changed.

We face to the east as well as to Europe. It is what we stand for that will spell survival. The flame of freedom travels eastward. Hawaii merits consideration together with Alaska. It has snatched its share of freedom's flame.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, the foreign policy of any nation must have, as its prime objective, the security of that nation. I believe that such reasoning is fundamental in our foreign-policy objectives. For this reason, I rise in support of the measure before us, admitting Hawaii into the Union. It is a

reason that, standing by itself, overrides any other reasons in opposition.

I must state that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], presented a very good argument against Hawaiian statehood. If I were to vote against this measure, I would have to do so on the basis of his unemotional and clear-cut presentation of the argument of disproportionate representation. I cannot disagree that there will be disproportionate representation but I am bound by internal desire as well as by my oath to support the Constitution of the United States and, as such, I cannot now change it in my mind for the purpose of denying statehood to Hawaii. If the Constitution is wrong, then it should be amended to change the method of giving representation in the Senate. But weaknesses in our Constitution should not be alleged for the sake of serving as an argument in opposition to the measure before us.

I am somewhat surprised that so many stanch defenders of the Constitution seem to forget that Hawaii statehood is being asked for here within the limitations of our Constitution.

I think it is only fair to point out that Hawaii at the present time, as a Territory with a population of one-half million persons, contributes more in taxes to our Federal Government than any of nine States of the Union. Hawaii became a part of the United States by mutual agreement in 1900. It was then a free and independent republic.

In 1854, President Franklin Pierce had authorized negotiations to annex Hawaii to the United States. The proposed treaty of 1854 provided that the Hawaiian Islands should be incorporated into the American Union as a state enjoying the same degree of sovereignty as other States, and admitted as such when it could be in consistency with the principles of our Constitution.

This treaty was not ratified but its discussion and the proposal to make Hawaii a state gave the people of Hawaii cause to believe that statehood would be their ultimate destiny. Later, Hawaii was incorporated into the United States by action of its own legislature and the Congress of the United States.

The issue was not debated in the last election campaign because both political parties pledged immediate statehood for Hawaii.

I am somewhat surprised that our southern friends who, in the past, have had good eyesight where this country's international position is concerned fail to use it at this time. It is disappointing that sectional concern dims such otherwise good vision.

Before Hawaii could ask for statehood, it had to be in a position to comply with the principles of our Constitution and now there are those who would deny it statehood because they want our Constitution different before we admit Hawaii. I cannot reconcile this position.

Our Nation grew in greatness as Territory after Territory came into the Union irrespective of disproportionate representation. So, too, with Hawaii. The advantages to the United States, while apparent already, should further manifest themselves in the not too distant future.

Certainly our position in the Pacific will be strengthened as a result of statehood status—psychologically with the people of Asia, and from a standpoint of security for the people of the 48 States. The passage of this legislation will place the American citizens of Hawaii on the basis of equality with other Americans and will give the United States a stake in the Pacific to act as both a bulwark and a spearhead against subversive ideas. Our action will speak louder than any lies which the Communists can utter, and will contribute to the creation of good will and confidence in the United States among the various peoples of the Pacific area.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD, and that all Members who have spoken may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the inhabitants of all that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, as at present described, are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, with the name "State of Hawaii," which State, when so formed, shall be admitted into the Union, and that the State of Hawaii shall consist of all the territory now included in the said Territory of Hawaii, all as hereinafter provided.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3575, had come to no resolution thereon.

NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 6, Secretary of the Navy Anderson appeared before our committee relative to the Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 at Point Barrow, Alaska. All pertinent information relative to this oil exploration program was discussed, after which Secretary Anderson promptly agreed with the committee that this oil exploration project—Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 at Point Barrow, Alaska—should be and would be suspended at once and the entire operation would be phased-out as quickly as administratively feasible.

There remains an unexpended balance, as of August 31, 1952, of $13,480,026, of which an inventory of Government furnished materials, as of that date, amounts to $6,000,000. Out of which, if the project is suspended immediately, and with what material can be salvaged, reclaiming the unexpended portion of the appropriation and the $10,000,000 requested for 1945–55 and which is at present in the budget, will effect a savings of, I would estimate, between fifteen and twenty million dollars.

In my opinion, Secretary Anderson is to be congratulated for the action he stated he would take. The Members of the Armed Services Committee were greatly impressed with the Secretary's appearance before the committee. His appointment is an excellent one. He is a sound, clear-thinking, practical realist and I feel certain he will turn in a magnificent performance as Secretary of the Navy.

My statement to the committee follows:

Several years ago the Army had the Canol project up in the Canadian wilderness that cost the American taxpayers $138,000,000. And I might say that after this project was completed, there was a dedicatory ceremony and about 10 days later the whole project was discontinued—abandoned—and nature took over. It was finally sold for scrap, written off, a complete loss, with the exception of a few hundred thousand dollars received from the sale of the equipment and refinery.

After the Canol failure by the Department of the Army, the Navy decided to get into an oil exploration program—Petroleum Reserve No. 4 at Point Barrow, Alaska. In a letter from the Department of the Navy under date of January 14, 1953, they state, and I quote: "When the Canol project in Canada was known to be a failure, the War Department was anxious to find a replacement project which could be relied upon to furnish the military with petroleum products in Alaska. Capt. W. C. Latrobe, then in the Bureau of Ships, and Rear Adm. Ben Moreell, Chief, Bureau of Yards and Docks, were persuaded that Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 offered the best chance of finding oil in Alaska. Rear Admiral Stuart (DNPR) concurred in this view, as I believe also did Mr. W. E. Wrather, Director, United States Geological Survey Decision to activate the Reserve seems to have been made by the then Secretary of the Navy (Knox) after discussion with the CNO and with the knowledge and consent of the President."

Now I want to point out to the committee that the accumulative status of costs up to August 31, 1952, from figures submitted to me, is:

1946	$965,000
1947–50	9,600,000
1947–51	14,600,000
1950	3,000,000
1947–52	11,000,000
1947–53	6,100,000
1953–54	7,500,000
Total appropriated to date	52,765,000
Government furnished materials w/o exchange of funds (estimated)	12,000,000
Total funds and materials to date	64,765,000
Unexpended balance, August 31, 1952	13,480,926
Inventory of Government furnished materials, Aug. 31, 1952 (estimated)	6,000,000
Total cost of program to date	45,284,074

Also, it was stated in the Navy Department letter under date of January 14, 1953, and I quote: "Under current plans, and according to the recommendations of the advisory committee, a full program through calendar year 1955, assuming negative results, will be necessary for a reasonable evaluation. The figure of $50 million includes the funds for operation during the calendar year 1953. Thus, estimating $10 million per year for 1954 and 1955 and $5 million for closeout in 1956, gives an estimated minimum future cost of $25 million.

"In June 1951, Arctic Contractors, Inc., estimated that a 16-inch line from Umiat to Valdez could be constructed for $65 million; however, it seems possible that actual costs for such a line might be as much as $100 million."

Now, I want to point out to the committee that an amount approximating $10 million will be requested for fiscal year 1954. A point relating to this which I think will be of interest to you is that, heretofore the appropriation for Petroleum Reserve No. 4 has been carried as a separate item and therefore easily identifiable item. In fiscal year 1954, however, it is planned that the appropriation for this reserve will be carried as part of the general appropriation for all petroleum reserves and may, therefore, be somewhat less easily identified. The designation of the appropriation will be "Naval Petroleum Reserves."

Now, I might say to the committee that the results of this exploration have been virtually nil. It appears that geology of that whole area indicates the possibility of oil in exploitable quantities. Actually, some small amount of oil has been found and some gas wells have been drilled. Naturally, the question arises as to whether, if oil is found, how it can be transported from the area. The Navy has been carrying on experiments as to the feasibility of the construction of a pipeline which, I would gather, could not be less than 500 miles in length and would probably be much longer, depending on the particular route taken. The experiments have indicated that it may be possible to lay the line, at least for a portion of its length, about 3 or 4 feet below the surface of the ground and cover the pipe completely both below and above with tundra, the moss-like vegetation of that part of Alaska. It would not appear, however, that, regardless of the feasibility of the tundra insulation for the northernmost part of the line, there is no tundra as the line progresses southward and some other form of insulation would be necessary for this part of the line. In any event, such a line would, in my opinion, be fabulous in cost since in addition to the consideration of temperature, it would probably be necessary to cross the Yukon River and two mountain ranges.

The report of the Special Subcommittee on Public Works in Alaska (Mr. PORTER HARDY, chairman, August 31 to September 10, 1951) states in part that "It should be mentioned, at this time, that the subcommittee is hard put to understand the need for the tremendous expenditures this project necessarily entails. Here we have a diligent search for petroleum being conducted in one of the most inaccessible areas in the Western Hemisphere. There are no roads, railroads, or transportation available within hundreds of miles. Point Barrow is at the northernmost tip of Alaska on the shores of the Arctic Ocean, with sea lanes open for only 2 months a year, at the most. The only means of access is by air, and this from Fairbanks, 500 miles distant and over some of the roughest and most desolate terrain in the world. Even if vast petroleum deposits are discovered, the problem and expense of transporting the fuel to transportation terminals is one that staggers the imagination. The subcommittee is frank to admit that it has not made an adequate study of the entire problem, but believes that this most certainly must be done by the proper authorities before further appropriations are authorized for this project."

The seventh report of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, following an investigation from August 31 to September 10, 1951, states in part: "During the war the Navy instigated an exploration of this petroleum reserve, using military personnel for the purpose. Since the war it has continued this project under a civilian contract. Approximately $30 million has been expended on this project and it is estimated that an additional $20 million will have been expended by December 31, 1952, when it is planned to complete the exploration work. For the fields to have any commercial significance they must be of vast size because of the difficulty of producing and marketing the oil in this area. It is the Navy's belief that it is entirely feasible to construct a pipeline from this area to the south if the amount of oil discovered is sufficient to make its exploitation commercially attractive."

"The construction of the pipeline in the event a major oil field is discovered will cost several hundreds of thousands of dollars" (however, in my opinion it would cost several million dollars as the Navy's estimate is between $65 and $100 million) "and present major engineering problems. These, however, are deemed to be surmountable.

"The Navy is extremely cautious and conservative in any predications they make concerning the oil potentialities of this area. Prior to the time the subcommittee was in Alaska no significant discoveries had been made. However, we are informed that the Navy had utilized the services of expert geologists and petroleum specialists and they all believed that the signs point to the existence of considerable oil in the area. Two minor oil fields and one gas field had been discovered prior to the subcommittee's visit. The base camp at Point Barrow is heated by natural gas from the field. Shows of oil had been found in every well which had been drilled. However, during the subcommittee's visit, a well of significant size producing 550 barrels per day was brought in at Umiat. We are also informed that another well in the same general area has since been brought in which is producing around 250 barrels per day. These successes have greatly encouraged interest in the project and while there is still no certainty as to the existence of a major oil field, it is the belief of all persons talked to by the subcommittee that the chances are excellent that such a discovery will be made."

Now I might say to the committee that it is my firm conviction that this exploration project should be terminated at once as I understand the harbor at Point Barrow is open but 6 weeks of the year, and it is questionable actually how much oil and gas they have found there. The cost of a pipeline to transport the oil, if oil should be found, would be prohibitive. There is no economic justification to develop the area as there is no ready market for the oil and even if substantial quantities should be found, transportation difficulties enter into it. Even if these difficulties could be worked out, it would be leased to private industry. If private industry is interested, why not let them carry on the exploration rather than carry it on at a tremendous cost to the American taxpayer.

In my opinion the Armed Services Committee should recommend to the Appropriations Committee that they should deny any further appropriations for this project, salvage what material can be salvaged and reclaim the unexpended portion of the appropriation to be used for more important phases of our national defense program.

BAGASSE, A RAW MATERIAL FOR NEWSPRINT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, recent statements in the press and on the floor of the House have called attention to the dramatic events which have been taking place in developing new raw materials for the manufacture of newsprint. I refer in particular to the announcement during this past week that a new plant to make newsprint from sugarcane waste, or bagasse, as it is called, is to be built near Lockport, La., this year.

Mr. Speaker, I am highly gratified that the active interest of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I have the honor to be a member, has been a constructive factor in promoting expansion of the supply of newsprint produced in the United States. Periodic newsprint shortages have plagued our newspaper publishers in Louisiana and elsewhere. I am thinking especially of the dailies and weeklies in our smaller communities. These smaller newspapers necessarily have limited bargaining power in a newsprint market dominated, if not controlled, by a few large producers, chiefly located in Canada. As a result, publishers have frequently found themselves unable to obtain adequate supplies of paper or have been forced to pay unconscionable prices to stay in business.

In the middle of 1950 the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee undertook a detailed investigation of the newsprint situation to determine what factors accounted for the failure of the industry to overcome persistent shortages and what legislative or Executive action was necessary to improve the situation. The published hearings of this investigation consist of more than 1,100 pages of printed testimony, supplemented by a volume of exhibits containing approximately 1,200 pages of documentary material bearing upon the structure and the practices of the industry. Three reports presented at considerable length the subcommittee's findings and recommendations based upon its intensive studies.

In the late spring of 1952, a rise of $10 a ton in the price of newsprint was announced by Canadian producers. It was estimated that this increase, the third successive price rise since the middle of 1950, added another $50 million per year to the sum paid by American newspapers for newsprint. Because of the subcommittee's deep interest in this problem, an executive session was held, at which the situation was reviewed with representatives from the various Government departments intimately connected with the newsprint problem.

Under the aegis of the subcommittee a new program was undertaken by the Department of Commerce on behalf of the executive branch to overcome technological and economic problems holding back newsprint expansion and to

assist in the entry of new productive facilities in the industry, especially those involving new raw materials and processes such as bagasse, hardwoods, and de-inked newsprint.

Mr. Speaker, this program, undertaken by the Department of Commerce at the initiative of the subcommittee reflected a joint determination that something could and would be done concretely to help ease the newsprint shortage and lessen the pressure upon newsprint prices to seek even higher levels. Pursuant to this program, the Department of Commerce has been making a series of most intensive technical and economic studies. The first progress report under this program established definitely the feasibility of making satisfactory newsprint from bagasse based upon a series of trials and tests at the pilot paper mill of the Department's Bureau of Standards. The results of these studies are well summarized in the letter from the Secretary of Commerce to the chairman of our committee accompanying the report:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., October 1, 1952.
The Honorable EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: You will be thrilled as I am by the progress report being made to you by the Department of Commerce as a result of your committee's request on May 27, 1952, that the Department of Commerce undertake to explore the factors impeding the expansion of newsprint production in the United States and the investigation of the possibilities of utilizing new raw materials and technologies in the manufacture of newsprint.

First, may I congratulate you upon taking the initiative in this important matter and then point with pride to the things which have been accomplished by my Department.

It has been clearly demonstrated that we can manufacture from whole bagasse (sugarcane wastes) a paper satisfactory in all important respects and superior in some to newsprint now currently in use. It is also indicated that the total costs of manufacturing newsprint from bagasse are at least as low—and in my opinion probably will eventually be much lower—than production costs of newsprint now used. It is also clear that bagasse could be used economically as a blend with other pulp in the manufacture of standard newsprint and, because of its superior strength and other characteristics, may be suitable for the production of higher grade paper.

The trial tests in this research were conducted by the National Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce. The resultant products were subjected to every known test for comparison with standard newsprint. The tests of the National Bureau of Standards were supplemented by other work. The Government Printing Office made thorough printing tests and ran 100 copies of a sample issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the new paper. A special panel of newsprint executives of leading newspapers gave personal judgments upon the acceptability of the samples. There seems to be no question of the superiority of the new paper.

I do not wish to indicate that the Department of Commerce alone is entitled to credit. Assistance and advice came also from the Department of Agriculture, the Mutual Security Agency, and the Government Printing Office; and officials from the pulp and paper industry serving with the Department's National Production Authority have given us the benefit of their experience.

It is interesting to note that our program of research is not concluded. A Commerce-sponsored mission in Europe has been investigating the use of hardwoods as newsprint raw material and the Department of Commerce is studying developments in the use of deinked waste paper and other fibrous materials. That will be discussed in forthcoming reports.

You are well aware and many members of the public are also well aware of the problems faced by American newspapers in connection with newsprint. A goal of 494,000 tons of additional capacity was set on January 1, 1951. Capacity expansion to date has fallen about one-fourth short of that objective.

We are also faced with continuing shortages of suitable timber. The supply of bagasse is ample to take care of all our increased newsprint needs. Louisiana and Florida are substantial sugarcane producers. Great quantities are available in Hawaii and Puerto Rico and even greater quantities in Cuba and the rest of the Caribbean area. World production of bagasse is about 25,000,000 tons a year, of which the United States and its Territories and Central America account for one-half. If only part of this supply is available for newsprint, potentialities are impressive.

Yours sincerely,
CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

The hearing held by the subcommittee in October 1952 on the occasion of the submission of this first report evoked interest from all over the country and indeed from many of the far corners of the globe. In my own State of Louisiana, which is the leading sugarcane producer in the United States, great interest was demonstrated by cane growers, sugar mills, newspaper publishers, and others.

I am pleased to state that the newsprint investigations and activities of our subcommittee have had unanimous bipartisan support. My esteemed colleague from Illinois, Mr. CHAUNCEY REED, who is now chairman of our Committee on the Judiciary, has given his keenest attention and interest, as well as his wholehearted support to this program, in the preceeding Congress as well as in the present one.

A significant outcome of the work of the Judiciary Committee and the Department of Commerce in this field was reported by Mr. REED to the House on March 3, in his statement that with the approval by the Federal Government of a tax amortization certificate the way had been cleared for the construction of a $2.5 million mill in Lafourche Parish, La., which will manufacture newsprint and pulp from sugarcane bagasse. This plant will be jointly owned and operated by the Valite Corp., an affiliate of Valentine Sugar Mills of Louisiana, and by Brown & Root, Inc., of Texas, one of the largest engineering firms in the South. This enterprise, which will be the first commercial mill in the United States to make newsprint from raw materials other than wood, is being financed entirely with private capital and may well be the forerunner of a great new industry to the South.

Important as it is, the work done to date in this field is only a beginning. Arrangements are being made by the Department of Commerce with a major newsprint mill in the South to make a commercial high-speed run of newsprint manufactured from a combination of bagasse and wood fiber. In addition, a program is now under way to develop the potentialities of hardwoods and other materials not now used in the manufacture of newsprint, as well as the potentialities of the great forest resources of Alaska for newsprint production, and the judiciary committee is awaiting a further progress report from the Department of Commerce on these activities.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the cooperation and active support of other agencies in connection with the utilization of bagasse as a new source of raw material for newsprint and related products.

For instance, the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry is conducting extensive experiments in development of corrugated board and various grades of paper from bagasse. Some of the experiments deal with the production of paper and paper products from whole bagasse, while others are along the line of supplementing bagasse pulp with various quantities of wood pulp, and also supplementing wood pulp with certain percentages of bagasse pulp.

The Sugar Branch of the Department of Agriculture has been very cooperative in furnishing information to the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Standards, and to private industry for use in developing information pertaining to the marketing and economy of producing paper and paper products from bagasse. The Sugar Branch, for some months, has had one of its outstanding economists working in cooperation with officials of the University of Louisiana and the American Sugar Cane League, studying the market potentialities of paper products now being made from bagasse, and investigating the potentialities of paper products not now being made but which may be made in the future from processes now patented and being produced in pilot plants.

The Sugar Branch is interested in trying to tie together the economies of the various processes for producing newsprint and other paper products and to assemble information comparing the cost of production, availability of raw material and whether or not such products can successfully compete with products now being produced in foreign countries and sold in the United States at exorbitant prices.

In his address to the House on March 3, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] placed his finger on the most significant aspect of the work jointly carried on by the Judiciary Committee and the Department of Commerce:

> Here is a concrete example whereby an investigation and study by a committee of the Congress and the cooperation of an agency of the Government has opened an entirely new field for private enterprise. It indicates what can be done through the joint cooperative efforts of Government and private industry to expand production without financing by the Government. In the erection of this plant, only private capital will be used.

Mr. Speaker, if our great free enterprise economy, which has produced so

abundantly for our people, is to continue to grow and to prosper, the way must always be kept open for new ideas, new technologies, new producers, new industries to compete on an equitable basis with established ways of doing things. We must not let the great arteries of American industry and commerce become clogged by the exercise of monopoly power or other unreasonable restraints upon business initiative and innovation. The work of the Judiciary Committee in the field of newsprint is but one aspect of the broader mandate of the committee to assure that our laws and their enforcement permit full opportunity and free competition to American business.

Our distinguished committee chairman the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], stated in an address to the New York State Bar Association on February 19 that a reexamination of our antitrust laws is appropriate at this time and that in view of their fundamental importance in our economy these laws merit continuing legislative study and reexamination. In that address the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] also struck the keynote which will characterize the work of the committee under his chairmanship, when he stated emphatically:

> We must always be sure that any legislative action is based on a careful study of the facts and stems from a desire to improve our economy.

I am pleased to note that in accordance with his emphasis upon the factual approach to reexamination of our antitrust laws the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], on behalf of the committee, has requested the cooperation of the Department of Commerce in developing basic information reviewing and analyzing the major structural changes which have occurred in the location, technology, and concentration of industry as a result of the tremendous expansion of productive capacity of American industry which has accompanied the present mobilization effort. This study is to analyze in detail the operation of incentives to private enterprise to grow and will include an appraisal of such incentive as a means of encouraging the development of new enterprise and new industry in the future. With Mr. REED's permission, I should like to place in the record his exchange of correspondence with the Department of Commerce, which describes more specifically the work to be undertaken by the Department of Commerce on behalf of the committee. These studies will provide reliable up-to-date information concerning the competitive structure of industry with which the committee must be currently familiar if it is to do its job faithfully and efficiently.

NOVEMBER 26, 1952.

Mr. HORACE B. MCCOY,
Director, Office of Industry and Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCOY: This will confirm our conversation this morning with respect to a project to be undertaken under your auspices and presented to the Committee on the Judiciary during the 83d Congress.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of a tentative outline of some of the salient facts which should be covered in your studies. The general subject, The Effect of Mobilization Upon the Competitive Structure of Industry, is a broad one, and I am sure there will occur to you and your staff additional topics to be included. I feel certain, however, that your staff and the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary will be able to reach an agreement as to the ultimate contents of the material presented.

I am fully aware of the fact that this is a formidable project and will require the expenditure of considerable time and effort on your part and on the part of your staff. But it will constitute a valuable contribution not only to the legislative and executive branches of Government but to all of industry as well, and will, like your recent report entitled "Study of Newsprint Expansion," have far-reaching and widespread ramifications.

Let me thank you for your cooperation in preparing this study for the committee and assure you that we will look forward to your progress with interest.

Sincerely yours,

CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
NATIONAL PRODUCTION AUTHORITY,
Washington, December 9, 1952.

The Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: With further reference to the study which you requested on behalf of the Judiciary Committee at our meeting in your office on November 26, and pursuant to the suggestion contained in your letter of the same date, my staff and the staff of the committee have discussed the contents of the material to be presented by the Department of Commerce.

As we understand it, the committee wishes the Department to make an intensive industry-by-industry survey of the large-scale expansion of productive capacity which has accompanied the present mobilization effort, and to present to the committee during the 83d Congress a comprehensive report on this subject. This report is to review and analyze the major structural changes which have occurred in the location, technology, and concentration of industry as a result of such expansion. Among the topics to be covered are: development of new enterprise; changes in scale of production; sources of financing, investment costs, and patterns of concentration and integration; and significant regional and technological shifts. The study is also to analyze in detail, from the standpoint of industry as well as Government, the nature, effect, and significance of accelerated tax amortization and other incentives to private enterprise to expand during the mobilization period. The study will include an appraisal of the desirability and practicability of various proposals for continuing such incentives to encourage sound industrial development and expansion in the future. Among the chief incentives to be studied are depreciation and other business tax policies.

The primary emphasis in the report is to be upon the presentation of facts concerning basic industrial developments, to serve as a guide to the Congress in its legislative considerations. The report, however, is not to be a purely statistical one, but rather to provide the committee with the most professional and objective interpretation possible in order to make the data of maximum usefulness to the committee. It is our understanding that the committee would like to have periodic reports covering various groups of industries as the work progresses, the first such report to be submitted shortly after the new Congress convenes and to cover a number of major industries as agreed upon by our respective staffs.

In line with the tentative time schedule which has been established, I have instructed Mr. Jesse J. Friedman, who will be heading up the staff engaged on this work, to proceed immediately on the basis outlined above.

The Department of Commerce concurs wholeheartedly in your view that the results of these studies should constitute a valuable contribution to industry as well as to the legislative and executive branches of the Government. Please be assured of our willingness at all times to cooperate with your committee in providing such information and assistance as you may require.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. MCCOY,
Deputy Administrator.

LOWELL TEXTILE INSTITUTE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on February 11 we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Lowell Textile Institute at Lowell, Mass. Governor Herter and other distinguished guests spoke on that occasion. I would like to say that it is considered the greatest textile institute in the world. The instruction is of the best. It has gone into paper, books, shoes, leather, plastics, and electronics. It has an excellent library and research foundation and has fine affiliations with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology at Boston only 25 miles away. The institute has a great history, and very soon I think the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the general court, will make it a technological university. We invite the Members of Congress and the constituents of every Member of the Congress to visit that great institution. Many distinguished manufacturers and experts from all of the United States and other countries have studied and graduated from the institute. The following were some of the speeches delivered at the exercises:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, GOVERNOR OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

President Lydon, Mr. Whittemore, distinguished guests, and friends, it is a privilege to join with you here today in observing the 50th anniversary of the location of Lowell Textile Institute on its present site.

I am honored by the part you have given me in helping to lay the cornerstone of the new administration building and auditorium—Alexander Goodlet Cumnock hall, fittingly named after the first president of the board of trustees.

There is scant need of my stressing the importance of extending technological education in the Commonwealth.

In some of our major industries, and especially in textiles, we are in the midst of a period of great change, not only in the products manufactured by the industry, but also in the manufacturing processes.

In view of these great changes, it is important that we in Massachusetts stay ahead of the field in the education of men with the engineering skills to retain our preeminence.

And it is equally important that education and industry work hand in hand so that each may benefit by the other's experience and particular qualifications in the training of young men and women.

In this way, our Government, by providing the training side by side with industry, can

provide the engineers who will be our industrial leaders of tomorrow.

At the same time, we are giving our young men and women an opportunity to obtain this training by higher education which will fit themselves to hold positions of great responsibility in later life.

They do this voluntarily, since higher education is not compulsory.

Thus we find that your State government and industry are willing to invest in these young people by giving them the facilities, the guidance, and the teaching with which to obtain this specialized education.

The students are willing to invest in themselves by their own efforts to prepare themselves for their careers in this field.

Certainly this three-way investment is worthwhile if it will mean that new leadership in forthcoming generations is developed with the abilities and training necessary to keep pace with the ever-changing trends, and even to guide and control these trends.

Our textile industry, which has had many problems in recent years, nevertheless contains many healthy concerns, employing many thousands of our workers.

These companies which have stood the severe tests of recent years, and now remain such a vital part of our economy, must be encouraged in every way possible.

The training of our young people in engineering studies leading to their absorption by the textile industry is one of the major ways in which we can help to preserve this industry on a sound basis in Massachusetts.

We already have the foundation in these companies and in our great textile tradition in Massachusetts.

We should build upon this foundation by providing the leadership the industry needs to remain strong and flexible through the education of potential leaders.

We can give the industry the key personnel who will improve existing procedures and devise new ones, who will know how to develop new products, and how to put these products to the greatest use in the homes of our citizens and in other industries.

Very important to our overall economy is a diversification of our industries, so that while all are interdependent upon each other, still our economy does not rise or fall on the economic level of a very few industries and the major companies in them.

It is fitting, therefore, that in recent years our State technological schools have broadened their fields of industrials training to include studies in such very important industries as leather and paper, with curricula now being established in plastics and electronics.

Along with textiles and the metal-working industries, these are in many respects the basic industries of our Commonwealth, and it is hard to overstate how important it is for us to provide a flow of skilled and trained personnel to take positions of leadership and responsibility in them.

It is to these industries that we are looking for healthy growth in our Commonwealth, so that we may be able to raise our level of economic activity and provide more jobs for industrial workers.

In modern business and industry, the company or the industry which fails to maintain adequate research is the first to fall behind.

New discoveries, inventions, and processes supply the solution to innumerable diverse and complicated problems, and at the same time pose new questions to challenge future generations.

Research is the vital door to progress. Through it, new industrial expansion is made possible, providing an ever higher standard of living for our citizens.

Research gives us diversity and a breadth of interest, to insure a continued progress.

For many years Massachusetts has taken the lead in both public and private industrial research, and our facilities are without parallel in any other State in the Nation.

This leadership should make it possible for us to be pioneers in many of the tremendous new fields that are opening before us.

Our technological schools are well suited to research in the industries they serve, with the Research Foundation here at Lowell Textile Institute taking a progressive role in chemical and engineering lines.

By this means our young citizens are trained and equipped for important research, and at the same time original research is being conducted for the benefit of Massachusetts industry.

In specialized education such as the technological studies we are now discussing, there is one important pitfall we must avoid.

It is one of the fundamental principles of our educational system that we do not seek knowledge merely to obtain power.

The quest for knowledge for the sake of this knowledge is the basic tenet of the liberal education provided in this free country.

Thus, in technological education we must never forget that it is vital to conduct studies for the purpose of improving our culture as well as for the training of skilled engineers.

The courses given in our specialized schools in English literature and in history are just as important as the courses in the various fields of science and applied engineering.

We do not wish to graduate students who are educated only in one certain field of industrial effort and whose background is such that they are unable to absorb the many and varied cultural influences that are so important to them as our prospective industrial leaders of a new generation.

The specialized training of young men and women in preparation for industrial positions is a firmly established part of our educational system.

It is my belief that we should foster and encourage this training, to the end that the State government, cooperating in this type of education as it does in so many other ways with the industries of the Commonwealth, may show the way toward new and important expansion of our economic life.

NEWS RELEASE ON SPEECH DELIVERED BY LAURENCE F. WHITTEMORE, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL

The president of the New England Council in a "will to win" address hitting at pessimism about New England today refuted a British criticism of the region and then challenged that New Englanders can save their textile industry.

Speaking at Lowell Textile Institute's 50th anniversary ceremonies, the NEC's Laurence F. Whittemore, who is also president of the Brown Co., pulp and paper makers of Berlin, N. H., said that—"The facts about New England contradict the London Economist's recent comment that United States Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks of Boston comes from an area full of declining industries." These facts, Mr. Whittemore said, "vigorously and effectively demonstrate just the opposite—the region's amazing capacity for adjustment to constant and accelerating change."

And he disclosed that he has just dispatched a letter to the editor of the Economist righting the record for New England.

On textiles, Mr. Whittemore warned that "the decision as to whether this industry stays in or leaves New England must be made by New Englanders themselves."

"The New England of tomorrow," he said, "will be what we make it. All we need is the will to win."

"There is nothing," he said, "in the recent New England Governors' Committee report on textiles that indicates we must reconcile ourselves to the loss of the textile industry.

"More than one-quarter of a million Yankees still look to the textile industry for their weekly paycheck. And it would cost upward of $3 billion to replace our textile plants with other industrial instrumentalities."

And he called for three-way cooperation between management, communities, and labor to retain the textile industry for New England.

"The challenge, as I see it," he said, "is as old as competitive industry itself. New England can certainly retain its textile industries if all segments of our society are anxious enough to do so."

The Governors' committee report states that the differentials in wage benefits between the North and South are substantial, Mr. Whittemore said. "The committee also finds the workload greater in the South in some instances than in the North.

"If New England labor wishes to join the team to keep the industry here, it can do so by a gradual evening up of these two situations. The report shows that plant- and machinery-wise, New England management and ownership has sometimes been slow to replace old equipment with new. If management and ownership decide to continue in New England, they can surely do the same things in this respect that many of them have already done in the South.

"The report also indicates differences in community attitudes regarding taxation and things of that sort which are more favorable in the South than in the North. Certainly the communities of New Engand, as well as the States, have every reason to go all out to keep an industry which accounts for 1 out of every 5 or 6 industrial jobs, and about 1 in every 11 or 12 jobs of all kinds in New England."

About the unionization of southern textile workers, Mr. Whittemore said that "no section of the country should go out of its way to interfere with the free thinking of people in any other section. That is the American way of life."

And he expressed belief that any suggestion from New England that southern textile labor should become more widely unionized "will probably do more to prevent such unionization than any other single thing."

Mr. Whittemore said he pointed up in his letter to the London Economist that "last year our textile manufacturers were suffering, as were Great Britain's, from an international slump in this particular industry."

The text of Mr. Whittemore's letter to the Economist:

"On the basis of United States census figures, New England had in 1939 about 16,000 manufacturing establishments which employed a little more than 1 million workers. In 1952 New England had 24,000 manufacturing establishments with almost 1,600,000 employees.

"The value of products manufactured in New England in 1939 was about $4 billion. The product value of our industries this last year is estimated at approximately $15 billion.

"Total employment in New England in December 1952 was the highest in the region's 300-year-old history. It stood then at 3,800,000, a gain of one-quarter million jobs since 1947 (which was a good year), and a gain of approximately 1 million jobs since 1939 (also a good year).

"While it is quite true that New England's textile industries have been declining slowly and steadily for more than 40 years, the equally steady growth of our metalworking establishments has more than taken textile losses. New England's metal-using industries employed in 1952 some 645,000 workers, a gain of almost 350,000 over 1939. Textile employment last year averaged about 225,000 workers as against 253,000 in 1939. And, of course, last year our textile manufacturers were suffering, as were Great Britain's, from an international slump in this particular industry."

WELCOME ADDRESS DELIVERED BY PRESIDENT MARTIN J. LYDON

Distinguished guests, reverend clergy, members of the board of trustees, faculty and student body, and friends of the institute, it is a distinct honor and privilege to welcome you to participation in the ceremonies commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Lowell Textile School. Just 50 years ago tomorrow, on February 12, 1903, a distinguished company of leading citizens, educators, and industrialists met in this room to celebrate the opening of classes at this splendid location. During the past half century, the foresight and judgment of these founding fathers have been justified manyfold, and the passage of five decades has seen the work done at Lowell gain international recognition and worldwide acclaim. As the Lowell Textile School grew and developed, it gained in academic stature and in physical facilities. In 1928 the name was changed from Lowell Textile School to Lowell Textile Institute in order to recognize its enhanced professional position, and since that time it has continued to expand its educational programs to include, at the present time, work in many fields related directly or indirectly to the textile industry.

The development of the institute has really only begun. The successes of the past half century have established a firm foundation on which can be built a sound future of service and accomplishment. It is with great pleasure that we welcome you to the observance of our 50 years of progress, and we are glad to have you participate in this program which will mark the beginning of another era of progress and development.

CORNERSTONE CEREMONY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY PRESIDENT MARTIN J. LYDON

Historians tell us that the man recognized as the founder of the Lowell Textile School was Alexander Goodlet Cumnock, the first president of the board of trustees. Mr. Cumnock labored diligently at that time to ensure the establishment and continued functioning of the school and by dint of extraordinary effort, intelligence, and resourcefulness, succeeded in placing this school on the firm foundation upon which others have built a superstructure worthy of his devotion and zeal. Mr. Cumnock's foresight and courage made possible the establishment of the Lowell Textile School at this location in 1903, and it is to recognize his great accomplishments that we take pride in participating in a ceremony today which commemorates all that he meant to the school in its early years. In recognition of his invaluable service in behalf of this institution, the board of trustees voted to name in his honor the new administration-auditorium building, construction of which has already begun.

Today, 50 years after the dedication of the original building, we are holding a cornerstone ceremony for Cumnock Hall. It is our sincere hope and belief that for generations to come this building will be a lasting memorial to the name of the founder of the Lowell Textile Institute—Alexander Goodlet Cumnock. On behalf of the student body of the Lowell Textile Institute, Mr. Robert E. Mulcahy will present a copper box containing memontos and valuable documents which will be encased in the cornerstone of Cumnock Hall. Mr. Samuel Pinanski, chairman of the board of trustees, will accept the box in behalf of the trustees. In turn, Mr. Pinanski will present the box to His Excellency the Governor for encasement in the cornerstone.

TAX ON ADMISSION TO MOVING PICTURE THEATERS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RATE OF INTEREST ON VETERANS' LOANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am receiving protests from all over the country from veterans and other persons regarding the proposed increase from 4 to 4½ percent on veterans' loans. To my mind, it would be a very great tragedy to have the increase made.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is there not a bill pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs making provision for a market for these 4-percent loans now?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, we have such a bill before our committee. We have other bills relating to that.

Mr. PATMAN. May I commend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for her comments about this. I feel that that is a major problem. If you increase that rate from 4 to 4½ percent, that one-half of 1 percent is equal to charging the average veteran $1,000 more for his home.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the general public does not realize that. The gentleman from Texas knows that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, who handles veterans' problems is very greatly opposed to any increase in the interest rate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in three instances: To include in one remarks of American Legion Commander Gough, in one information from General Gray, and in the other extraneous matter.

Mr. KRUEGER and to include a resolution.

Mr. FARRINGTON and Mr. SCOTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEAMER and Mr. YOUNG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in five instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. JACKSON and to include three articles.

Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CANFIELD, and Mr. HILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOPE in two instances and to include extraneous matter in one.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include a resolution adopted by the Virginia State Dairymen's Association at their 46th annual convention at Richmond, Va.

Mr. POFF and to include a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. FENTON and include an editorial on Lithuania.

Mr. FOGARTY and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIES and to include a short radio address by Dr. Dale Crowley.

Mr. FORRESTER and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. KEE and include a statement and resolution.

Mr. REAMS and include an editorial from the Toledo Blade.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and include a resolution.

Mr. COOPER and include a letter from a constituent, with a copy of a letter and statement attached thereto.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HERLONG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include various letters and editorials.

Mr. POLK in two instances, in one to include Ed Sullivan's column in the New York Sunday News of March 8, 1953, on the subject Birthdays, and in the other on the subject of Chillicothe, Ohio's first capital.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a resolution unanimously adopted by people of Lithuanian descent in northern Indiana.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include a statement by Mr. George Meany before the Committee on Education and Labor on the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and in a second extension to include an excerpt from a magazine article dealing with residual oil.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARSHALL and to include a news item appearing in yesterday's Washington Star.

Mr. BYRD and to include a resolution adopted by the Virginia State Federation of Labor.

Mrs. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) in two instances and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

Mr. Moss and to include two editorials.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD and to include an article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Ohio).

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia to revise and extend his remarks on the rule and include some statistical material.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois and include two resolutions from the State Assembly of the State of Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an address delivered by Speaker MARTIN.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD).

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2230. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

523. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the prevention of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of January 1953, pursuant to Public Law 8, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

524. A letter from the Acting Director of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended, for the period ended December 31, 1952; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

525. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the 15th Semiannual Report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, covering the period July to December 1952, pursuant to section 9, of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

526. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Second Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to subsection 7 (c) of Public Law 874 and subsection 208 (c) of Public Law 815, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

527. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a plan for the construction of the potential Brazier Dam and Reservoir, Nebraska, and supplemental works for the Fort Laramie Division, North Platte project, Wyoming-Nebraska, together with related documents and letters of comment on the report. This report was prepared under authority of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

528. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a plan for the construction of the potential Fort Gibson project, Oklahoma, together with related documents and letters of comment, prepared under authority of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

529. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting proposed amendments to title 111, part 11 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

530. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Chie-Yuan Chen (A-7539102) and requesting that the foregoing case be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

531. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a list of orders pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.), where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

532. A letter from the Vice Admiral, United States Coast Guard Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting copies of part II of the daily issue of the Federal Register dated October 18, 1952, volume 17, No. 205, containing the revision of the rules and regulations governing lifesaving appliances for merchant vessels operating on the oceans, Great Lakes, and bays, sounds, and lakes other than the Great Lakes, as well as for foreign vessels carrying passengers from the United States, pursuant to section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (46 U. S. C. 481); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3658. A bill to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3659. A bill to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 663. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala; with an amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 673. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi; with an amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 688. A bill for the relief of Akiko Niina; with an amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 731. A bill for the relief of James Rennick Moffett; with an amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsoviczky; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann); with an amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 884. A bill for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 955. A bill for the relief of Paula Akiyama; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary; with an amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1186. A bill for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1192. A bill for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1704. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2624. A bill for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford; without amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3763. A bill to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 3764. A bill to provide income-tax relief for parents of minor children under the age of 18; to reduce the rate of percentage depletion in the case of sulfur and oil and gas wells; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 3765. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Connecticut River flood-control compact; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 3766. A bill relating to the acquisition of certain land in Pulaski County, Mo.,

adjacent to the Fort Leonard Wood Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3767. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3768. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of certain Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 3769. A bill to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (by request):

H. R. 3770. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 3771. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 3772. A bill to liberalize the marriage requirements for compensation and pension purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3773. A bill to regulate subsistence, expenses, and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3774. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the former owners of mineral interests in certain lands acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3775. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MOSS (by request):

H. R. 3776. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 3777. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3778. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. R. 3779. A bill to amend section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code to remove the requirement contained therein under which certain taxpayers, in computing the deduction for medical expenses, must reduce the amount they actually expended for medical care by an amount equal to 5 percent of their adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3780. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3781. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3782. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3783. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to the estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 3784. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 3785. A bill to increase the personal tax exemptions of a single taxpayer or head of household from $600 to $1,200; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 3786. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Kickapoo flood area, and to appropriate $25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3787. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 3788. A bill to amend section 1 (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to aid in alleviating shortages of railroad freight cars during periods of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3789. A bill to amend paragraphs (6) and (7) (c) of section 20 of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to make applicable to persons furnishing locomotives to railroads certain provisions relating to records and reports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3790. A bill to amend section 20a (12) of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to permit more extensive use of competitive bidding in the marketing of securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3791. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require freight forwarders to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3792. A bill to amend part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend water carrier certificates and permits under certain conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 3793. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, with respect to automotive-equipment maintenance payments to special-delivery messengers in post offices of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 3794. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 3795. A bill to adjust the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3796. A bill relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3797. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to interest upon amounts in the civil-service retirement and disability fund credited to the individual accounts of certain former officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3798. A bill to amend section 27 of the Organic Act of Guam (Public Law 630, 81st Cong.) to provide that articles imported into the United States from Guam and containing foreign materials to the value of more than 20 percent of their total value, shall be dutiable; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 3799. A bill providing for a joint study and investigation of the proposed St. Lawrence seaway project to be conducted by the Chief of Engineers and the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3800. A bill to amend section 4527, Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. J. RES. 213. Joint resolution limiting United States contributions to international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 214. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide that a new State may be admitted only pursuant to the procedure established by the Constitution for amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. J. Res. 215. Joint resolution establishing a commission on utilization of manpower in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 216. Joint resolution providing that the Secretary of Agriculture shall purchase beef and butter on the open market for distribution to needy persons in this and other countries; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POFF:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed one-fifth of the total national income; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution enabling the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for administrative expenses of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control for the period ending April 30, 1953; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution to make a full and complete investigation and study of the facts and circumstances surrounding atrocities and other crimes against humanity; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to inquire into certain operations and conditions in Korea; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. FENTON: Memorial of the Pennsylvania State Legislature memorializing Congress to have gasoline taxes collected by the individual States, and changing present functions of the Federal Bureau of Public

Roads; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly respectfully urging the Congress of the United States to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of Federal laws to insure equal opportunity for employment, security of persons, full and equal participation in the Nation's political life, and strengthening of the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature relative to acts of persecution reported to be committed against the members of religious faiths and their institutions in Russia and its satellite countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to acts of persecution reported to be committed against the members of religious faiths and their institutions in Russia and its satellite countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, that the Congress repeal the excise tax on ladies' handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to get the Federal Government out of private business; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the 68th General Assembly of the State of Illinois petitioning the United States Congress to act immediately to have the production of television programs supervised to the end that such programs will become fit and proper for family home entertainment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to the Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the assumption of governmental authority by a new national administration by the election of the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower as President of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urgently praying that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor fuel taxation and as soon as possible repeal all of the Federal automotive excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting stabilization of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the elimination of all motor vehicle fuel tax, and leaving such field of taxation exclusively for the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of legislation to return to each State without restriction all Federal taxes on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging favorable action on Senate bill 692, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of Federal laws to insure equal opportunity for employment, security of persons, full and equal participation in the Nation's political life and strengthening of the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights; to the Commitee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to determining the causes of the decline in livestock and farm prices and to take steps to stabilize farm income; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the alteration of the current policy of the National Park Service and permit the control of prairie dogs and other small injurious animals within the national parks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the amendment of the Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, to eliminate the tax on admissions to grandstands, concessions and amusements operated by county fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging that a bona fide resident and inhabitant of the Territory of Alaska be forthwith appointed to the office of Governor; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the adoption of adequate enabling legislation providing for the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 3801. A bill for the relief of Maria Fanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3802. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Maria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3803. A bill for the relief of Eugene B. Lowman of Haines, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3804. A bill for the relief of the families of certain merchant seamen who lost their lives in an airplane crash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 3805. A bill for the relief of Elisabetta Marie Cocco, Riccardo Cocco, and Laura Cocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 3806. A bill for the relief of Arvids Bruno Kalnins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3807. A bill for the relief of Domenico Oppedisano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3808. A bill for the relief of Nicolas Schwartz and Vera Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 3809. A bill for the relief of George Galanos, also known as Georgios Galanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3810. A bill for the relief of Salomon Salti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 3811. A bill for the relief of Labrini N. and Efstathios N. Dermatis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3812. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Georgiou Maxis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3813. A bill for the relief of Theodore Psychos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. R. 3814. A bill for the relief of J. A. Sutherland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 3815. A bill for the relief of Dr. Samson Sol Flores and his wife, the former Cecilia T. Tolentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3816. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3817. A bill for the relief of Follett L. Greeno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3818. A bill for the relief of Elias Kulukundis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3819. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Fambrini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3820. A bill for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3821. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Preston, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3822. A bill for the relief of George Milliaresis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H. R. 3823. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3824. A bill for the relief of Giorgio Polifione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 3825. A bill for the relief of Calogero Tocco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 3826. A bill for the relief of George Gargaropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3827. A bill for the relief of William Lawler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3828. A bill for the relief of Antonio Bruno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 3829. A bill for the relief of Ozjasz Rimpler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3830. A bill for the relief of Antoni Zyczynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:
H. R. 3831. A bill for the relief of Panagiotes G. Karras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:
H. R. 3833. A bill for the relief of Miss Renata Cambi of Rome, Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:
H. R. 3834. A bill for the relief of Jerry P. Markantonis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN PELT:
H. R. 3835. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Friday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:
H. R. 3836. A bill for the relief of Petra Fumia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Arthur Northwood, Elizabeth Avenue Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J., offered the following prayer:

God of the ages and of the nations of our own day, look down upon us in mercy and forgiveness. Thou who dost not view us after our sins nor reward us according to our iniquities, renew Thy holy spirit within us.

We would not scorn other nations in a "holier than thou" attitude and yet we give Thee thanks that we have not permitted ourselves to make one group of our people succumb before the selfish avidness of another group or given such power to any one man as ruler that we would be utterly lost when the span of his life had been completed.

Give to us courage to face a world distraught and disillusioned following its own seeking after false gods and walking in the ways of selfishness.

We confess before Thee our own sins of commission and omission and the consciousness of our misuse of power and the placing above all else our own interests and our failure to realize that this is one world belonging to one God. We thank Thee for the privilege of observing last Sunday the "one great hour of sharing" with the offering of our financial gifts as the evidence of a deepening consciousness of our unity with those who are hungry in Korea and India and Europe and the Near East.

Bestow Thy blessing and particularly Thy empowering guidance upon these Congressmen gathered here this morning as the representatives of citizens throughout our beloved country and bearing heavy responsibilities for which they are accountable to Thee as well as to their constituents. Bring their minds and hearts into a glowing compliance with Thy will so that Thy holy purpose may be served by the work and influence of our Nation. In the name of Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2332. An act to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 65. An act for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy;

S. 100. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 140. An act for the relief of John W. McBride;

S. 141. An act for the relief of Harry Ray Smith;

S. 147. An act for the relief of Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko;

S. 248. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb;

S. 365. An act for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson;

S. 522. An act for the relief of George P. Ruckman;

S. 615. An act for the relief of Altoon Saprichian;

S. 682. An act for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya);

S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough;

S. 720. An act for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 837. An act for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky;

S. 873. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act;

S. 1188. An act to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof; and

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for administrative expenses of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control for the period ending April 30, 1953.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Boykin	Hart	Poulson
Brooks, La.	Holifield	Rabaut
Camp	Hope	Rivers
Campbell	Hull	Scudder
Case	Jackson	Shelley
Celler	Lyle	Sikes
Chelf	Machrowicz	Sutton
Crosser	Miller, Calif.	Young
Dondero	Phillips	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and ninety-seven Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ADMISSION OF HAWAII INTO THE UNION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3575) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3575, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments, the Clerk will continue to read.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "inhabitants" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "citizens of the United States who are bona fide inhabitants."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered in keeping with the matter that I pointed out during the general debate on the bill yesterday. I want to read the language to you as it appears in the present bill:

That the inhabitants of all that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, as at present described, are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government—

And so forth. The word that disturbs me is the word "inhabitants."

I have submitted an amendment to change that to "citizens of the United States who are bona fide inhabitants of the Territory of Hawaii," the Territory that wants to become the 49th State of the United States of America.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I see no objection to the amendment. Ninety-nine percent of the children in school are citizens of the United States. The amendment might clarify it. I do not know that it is needed, but on this side we are ready to accept such an amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If the Chair will permit me, I will say this to the Chairman. I just do not want this bill to afford an opportunity to a person like Harry Bridges to start litigation about the matter later on.

SUGAR LOBBY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing about this that disturbs me—and I believe it is something that should cause any good American citizen to stop and think this thing through. I have never known of there being too much sentiment in the United States for statehood for Hawaii. If sentiment back of this bill does not originate in the United States it originates with interested

groups, and I think it will be a sad day in our country when a few people with a lot of money, enormous and unlimited sums of money, can work their way into the good graces of both major political parties in the United States and cultivate and generate enough interest to create a State of the American Union. That is the part that disturbs me. It certainly demonstrates the power and influence of the sugar lobby.

I do not believe that this bill is justified.

I personally do not know of sentiment coming from the American people for the bill; it comes from a great group, the sugar interests, if I understand correctly, with unlimited money, to try to create a State. That is the kind of precedent I do not believe we want established here in these United States.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. Does the gentleman know whether or not any State legislature has at any time by resolution requested the admission of Hawaii as a State in the Union?

Mr. PATMAN. Not to my knowledge, and I really believe if we are going to do this thing we should submit it to the people by joint resolution under article V of the Constitution, submit it to the States, and if 36 States endorse it then it will become a part of the United States Constitution. By that manner the people would be allowed to speak on it. I think it is of sufficient importance to justify that procedure instead of the procedure here attempted.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not know how much faith the gentleman may have in the Gallup Poll, but a recent poll shows that 72 percent of the people of the United States are in favor of statehood for Hawaii, and only 14 percent opposed to it.

Mr. PATMAN. I am like the gentleman, I pay attention to those polls only when they are on my side. They do not amount to a great deal. They have often been repudiated including the Gallup Poll. You never know how many people were interrogated or the circumstances. Percentages are often misleading. During one decade in a certain town the United States Census disclosed that crime among the Chinese had increased 300 percent. There was only one Chinaman in the town and during the past 10 years he had committed three crimes, all three minor traffic offenses.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, if there is no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, I was thinking it probably might be better if we disposed of the amendment before further debate takes place on pro forma amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. With the gentleman's permission, before the gentleman proceeds, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, in 1947 and again in 1950 the Congress was urged by the Truman administration to grant statehood to both Alaska and Hawaii. I opposed the proposal both times because I found after investigation that—

First. The population of Alaska consisted of some 50,000 white people, plus a few thousand Indians and Eskimos.

Second. The population of Hawaii consisted of some 75,000 white people, plus 185,000 Japanese, 62,000 Filipinos, 30,000 Chinese, 100,000 people of mixed blood, and 13,000 Hawaiians—a polyglot population if ever there was one.

Mr. Chairman, under those conditions I could not see any advantage or any sense in giving either Alaska or Hawaii the same voting strength in the United States Senate as Illinois has with its 9 million people.

The chief argument at that time was if Alaska and Hawaii were given statehood status, they would strengthen our national defense line. That argument did not and could not stand up because Alaska and Hawaii are Territories of the United States and as such we now have the right to fortify, to construct air fields, to improve harbors, to whatever extent we may feel necessary.

Mr. Chairman, one of the arguments the proponents of this measure use today is, "It was one of the planks of the Republican platform." If my party chooses to place a plank in its platform that in my judgment is unsound, do my people expect me to support the same regardless of my convictions? I do not believe they do. They expect me to vote my convictions.

Another argument advanced today for a favorable vote upon statehood for Hawaii is, "President Eisenhower wants it." Well, Mr. Chairman, "I like Ike." I respect and admire him very much. Does that mean that I must vote for everything he wants regardless of my own convictions?

I have three children. I am proud of them and have every reason to be. Naturally I think a great deal of them—but I have not always given them what they wanted or asked for.

Mrs. Mason, with her patient, tolerant, and kindly disposition, has put up with me for 50 years. She certainly has earned my respect, my admiration, and my gratitude. Yet I do not always agree with her as to what is best or what we should do.

On the question of statehood for Hawaii, I disagree with President Eisenhower. I do not think it wise or best to grant statehood at this time. That does not mean that I do not respect and admire the President, that I am not loyal to him.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how any Member of this House from New York, from Pennsylvania, from California, from Illinois can justify a favorable vote for statehood for Hawaii. I cannot; therefore I shall vote "no."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, last year this body brought in two bills to admit two Territories to the Union, Hawaii and Alaska. I was the majority leader, and I promised the House that both bills would be brought up—Alaska first and Hawaii second. And I kept my word. There is no violation of any promise now in the fact that the two are not being brought up, or the two not being reported out of the committee; so I do not want anyone to draw any inference that I am making any such charge. However, throughout the years it has been the clear understanding of the parties who have favored statehood for Hawaii and statehood for Alaska that both of them would come up together, or about the same time. Personally, I would prefer a bill reported out of committee providing for the admission of both into the Union. Last year a bill was reported out for Hawaii and one for Alaska, and, as I said, both were programed and both passed the House of Representatives.

There are some of us in this body who favor statehood for both of them, who find ourselves in a very complicated and embarrassing situation. I voted for statehood for Hawaii last year and I voted for statehood for Alaska. I made remarks on the floor of the House indicating clearly the fact that I supported both of them. But I am just as strong for one as I am for the other; and, as a matter of fact, if I were to pick one of the two, which Territory I thought had the best case, I would say that Alaska has the best case on the ground that it is certainly a part of continental North America. However, the fact that Hawaii is not contiguous from the angle of land association with the United States, and while I recognize that as a matter of consideration, that does not impress me as an argument that should cause me to vote against the admission of Hawaii. However, I am very deeply concerned in the fact that we are not going to be given an opportunity at this time to consider the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Now, where does that leave the Members of the House who are situated such as I am? Both of them are identified with each other. For me to separate one from the other would be turning myself upon a fixed state of mind which I entertain, and I find I cannot do it. I find also that a motion to recommit to include Alaska would not be in order, and would be subject to a point of order. This bill admits Hawaii into the Union, and therefore an amendment to admit another Territory into the Union would be subject to a point of order; at least, that is my opinion. The fact that the bill is confined to one Territory means that the one-subject-rule interpretation of the House applies, and that an amendment, while related and germane otherwise, would be subject to a point of order where a bill is confined to one subject, and this bill is confined to one subject, to wit, the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union. If I have an opportunity to vote for both, I shall. If the leader-

ship of the Republican Party wants to put Hawaii first, nobody can object to that. I put Alaska first last year. No one could take objection to that. Personally, I would like to see both of them included in one bill as they were last year, but they were not. If I had known they were going to be reported as separate bills last year, I would have done everything in my power to have one bill reported out including both of them.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I do not think the matter of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii came up last year. I think it came up in 1950.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will accept that correction. It was in a recent Congress.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield, it was in the 81st Congress.

May I ask this question of the gentleman: Does the gentleman consider that a vote for recommittal might also be a vote against the bill, because it is rather doubtful that the committee could bring up the bill again this session.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, I do not think that at all. The only way those of us who believe that statehood for Alaska should be considered can get at it, in my opinion, is to vote for recommittal, and then the committee can report out a bill covering both Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is rather doubtful that the committee would get around to voting out both bills, so there would be no statehood, I presume, for both Territories, if that is the attitude the gentleman is taking.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not think the committee would take that position, because there is too grave a responsibility involved. Further, if I am going to have a chance to vote for Alaska, then I think the chances of that opportunity's being given to me and the other Members of the House would be less if this bill is passed than if the bill is recommitted to the committee. So when I vote for recommittal, as I intend to do, I want the record to show that I am not voting against statehood for Hawaii but I am voting to recommit the bill so that, if recommitted, the committee may bring out a bill covering statehood for not only Hawaii but Alaska. Thereby I and other Members of the House who feel the same way I do will have an opportunity to vote to admit both of the Territories into the Union.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I attempted a while ago to get the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] to yield to me for a question following his discussion of the composition of the population in Hawaii. He stated there were less than 100,000 Caucasians or Anglo-Saxons there and over 400,000 Asiatics.

May I remind the gentleman from Illinois that he has heard, as we all have, that Asiatics are the greatest worshipers of their ancestors of any race in the world. If that is true, and I think we will all concede it is true, is it not very likely that these 400,000 citizens of Hawaii of mixed blood would, in case of controversy between our country and their native countries, side against their own United States? I think that is a historic fact that should be considered by every Member of this Congress and by the people of the United States, that we are taking into statehood as citizens 400,000 people who might easily turn against us.

We have a great country here in the United States, the greatest in the world, because of our Government and our closely knit organization of these 48 United States in the Union. I fear for the future of this country if we start taking in areas far removed from our own shores that we will have to protect with our money, our guns, and our men, instead of staying here and looking after the heritage we were left by George Washington, who told us to beware of any foreign entanglements. I think he had this outpost in the Pacific islands in mind at that time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, am for statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii, but I see a great danger that in this debate something which has happened in the House before could easily happen again today. Two groups combining for completely diverse reasons to defeat a very desirable measure. For this bill to confer statehood on Hawaii represents a historic and timely development in American policy to expand our country beyond the limits of these 48 States.

I have great respect for what our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the very distinguished minority whip, has said. This has happened before in this House to very desirable bills. Strange alinements of voting by groups, one of which wants a measure passed, but wants more than what is offered being joined with a group which is dead set against the particular measure completely by conviction, with the result that by this strange combination of groups with completely diverse views, a very desirable measure is defeated. I think this measure of statehood for Hawaii opens the door to statehood for Alaska and is, indeed, a historic departure for our country. For the first time, we recognize in this modern day that the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans are not moats, and that the people of Hawaii, although they are separated from us by some 1,500 to 1,700 miles of sea, may nevertheless be a part of the United States proper. I respectfully submit that this decision by the House of Representatives today is far superior to the tactical question as to whether or not the committee has committed itself to bringing out a bill providing statehood for Alaska. I believe that the impulse of history is so strong that if we make this historic change today and vote to admit Hawaii to statehood regardless of what the committee may think now, it will bring in a bill providing statehood for Alaska. It cannot resist the march of history. It would be a great mistake, therefore, if we turned this bill down today.

To my friends from the big cities, I want to point out that there is another very important thing here. Hawaii is made up of "minorities." We all know that one of the great points of attack against our position in the world has been the terrible amount of propaganda that the Communists have been able to unleash against us because of actions and views in certain areas and at certain times with respect to minorities. Here we are in a position to admit Hawaii, which is full of minorities, a measure which is supported by the President of the United States, and a policy which has been offered as a plank by both of the major parties. If we turn our backs on this measure, I assure you that millions overseas will not examine into the niceties of the fact that we wanted Alaska included or that the committee said this or that the committee said that. They will see only that we have again turned our backs on an opportunity to treat the minorities in Hawaii as citizens of the same class with the citizens on the mainland—as first-class citizens.

As for the loyalty of Hawaii, I do not think there can be any argument about that. The Hawaiian people generally, regardless of origin, were heroes in the struggle which we had with the Japanese. They have certainly proved their right to statehood. They will not consider the niceties of the fact that many of us—including myself—want statehood for Alaska, too, and, therefore, that some of those—not including myself—may turn them down today.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have an historic opportunity to do a great job for our country and for our position in the world. I do not think we ought to reject this opportunity on the narrow ground of concern about statehood for another area—Alaska—which I am confident the march of history will compel to be brought into statehood. The passage of this bill will have a beneficial effect upon that as well.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York on the very fine statement he has made. Does not the gentleman agree with me that this question on statehood for Hawaii should be voted up or down upon its merits and solely upon its merits, and not on the basis of any other related issue?

Mr. JAVITS. I believe it must be voted up or down upon its merits. I think the merits of this measure are completely in favor of its passage as most of us seem to be agreed. I agree also it must be voted up or down on the basis of the fact it marks a development in history which alone can open the door to statehood for Alaska, too, which is so much to be desired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I understand that the gentleman not only favors the admission of Hawaii but also favors the admission of Alaska?

Mr. JAVITS. I do.

Mr. COLMER. I understand the gentleman bases his decision very largely upon the fact that here is a minority group which we ought to admit and thus show the world—particularly the Communist world—that we are not discriminating against a minority.

Mr. JAVITS. If I may answer the gentleman's question at this time, I do not base my argument upon the fact that we are admitting a minority group. I base my argument on the strategic and practical interests of the United States which now dictate that Hawaii should be admitted. I point out in doing so that we would be serving very well our position in the world by showing that, regardless of race, creed, or color, we admit people to statehood when they are entitled to statehood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Even with the gentleman's last statement, I wonder if the gentleman would not also take the position then that Puerto Rico should be admitted, if they request it?

Mr. JAVITS. I take the position that a Territory of the United States, which is ready for statehood, should be admitted. The people of Puerto Rico, from where I have recently come, are very proud of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and right now show every intention of maintaining their fully independent, self-governing status as the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico within the constitutional framework of the United States. Therefore, to confuse this issue with an argument about Puerto Rico is not at all germane.

Mr. COLMER. But the gentleman would admit that he would have it on that basis; also for the Virgin Islands; also for Newfoundland or Cuba or any other people who qualified according to his idea?

Mr. JAVITS. I say to the gentleman that I agree to nothing of the kind. I stand here today speaking only for statehood for Hawaii and for the way to get statehood for Alaska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, oppose this bill for the admission of Hawaii into statehood, but I do not oppose it for the reasons that have been so often given. Therefore, I asked for this time to state the reasons upon which I shall base my vote.

The consideration of statehood for Hawaii or Alaska or Puerto Rico or any other Territory or country detached from continental United States is one of the most serious problems that has confronted the Congress in our years. It is possibly the most far-reaching of any in the possibilities of its effect on the future of this Nation.

This question, above all matters now before the Congress, should be completely devoid of partisan, political or selfish attitudes. In a stronger sense on this matter than on any other question before this Congress, it should be considered in the light of the effect on the country—not this year, or 10 years or even 20 years hence, but for all time. How will this precedent affect our United States 50 or 100 years from now? That is the attitude which should be kept before each of us as we view this entire question of statehood for Territories not contiguous to the 48 States which now compose these United States.

We dare not approach this problem, and vote on the issues involved in it, on the basis of what is good for one political party or the other. We cannot look at the question of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska and other noncontiguous Territories on the basis of which party will gain Members in the Senate or House should that Territory become a State. We cannot in good conscience oppose or support this question of statehood for these Territories on the basis of the color, race or religion of the people living therein. Surely by this time, history has taught us that there are no permanently inferior races.

We would be shortsighted and forgetful indeed of the judgment of the decades and centuries if we vote for or against this matter on the basis that it will be immediately more profitable or more convenient for the sugar industry or any other business interest or commercial activity of this country or that territory. Those considerations are all changeable and fleeting. In 10 years from now, if these Territories were made into States, the entire political complexion could be changed so that another political party and another ideology of government would determine what party the Senators and Representatives who were sent to Washington would claim. Economic conditions could change so that apparent economic advantages were not real.

The only rule by which we have any right to vote on this issue is: Will this be for the best interests of the people who are citizens of this country in the long years ahead? We of this Congress are merely trustees for those who gave us the Constitution and our basic concepts of government. We cannot change, we must not alter, we dare not diffuse these principles. It is only when our activities are an adaptation to present, true conditions of the same principles they gave us, that we are true to that trust.

The principle of the extension of the Thirteen Colonies westward to the Pacific coast and the dividing of this expanse of land into Territories first, and later into States, was entirely different from the issues now in conflict.

Those issues were first to acquire and colonize contiguous areas to give freedom of expansion and opportunity to our people.

The second principle was to occupy and settle this land in order that we might not have enemies as a constant threat to our peace and welfare.

The third was to build an economic unit with a diversification of natural resources, geographic advantages and climate which would make us a self-sufficient nation.

It was only for the defense and protection of this Nation and from a sense of self-preservation that 50 years ago a great Ohioan President said:

> The manifest destiny of this country is to take over the protection of these island Territories lying outside of the United States.

And President McKinley's promise at that time was not that they should become States of this Union, but that they should be given protection and aid until such time as they would be able to stand on their own feet as free commonwealths.

Likewise Alaska was acquired after the Civil War not with the purpose or thought of its becoming a State but to protect these United States. Secretary of State Seward, in advocating and negotiating the purchase of this great peninsula had definitely in mind the Monroe Doctrine in buying Russia out of this hemisphere. Too little thanks has been given to him for his vision and keen perception in buying Alaska from Russia.

Mr. Chairman, I have no cause or reason to be partisan in this matter. But I must say as I read the RECORD, and hear the discussion of this bill that it is difficult for me to tell how much of this momentum in favor of the move is from genuine and farsighted consideration of what is best for these United States or, the people of Hawaii, and how much is from a short-range view of personal, partisan, and economic advantages.

I am quite sure that the same would be true if we were now considering statehood for Alaska or Puerto Rico.

It is difficult for me to tell whether the motivating forces behind this urgency for statehood for Hawaii is because it is best for our country and the people of Hawaii or, because it would give the great sugar industry a bigger and more unrestricted market.

These and many other phases of the Hawaiian situation have not been carefully considered or certainly have not been discussed openly before the American people.

What I have to say here does not apply only to Hawaii, but to all Territories seeking or desiring admission to the Union. Let us not rush into the proposition of making any Territory a member of the indivisible Union of these United States.

Let us consider carefully what this will do to our United States Senate.

Hawaii has approximately one-half million people. If it became a State it would possibly have 2 Senators. This would mean that the new State of Hawaii would have per capita 16 times the representation in the Senate as do the people of my State of Ohio; 30 times the representation of the people of New York; and 6½ times the per capita representation of the average of the United States today.

The admission of this State would make it necessary to either increase the number of Members of the House or else

cut down the representation in the other States. Let us think through this problem carefully before we are rushed into a vote which cannot be reconsidered or withdrawn.

A resolution which has been introduced for amending the Constitution is to provide that any State admitted to the Union hereafter will have Senators based on population. That would help to correct one of the great reasons for not making States of these Territories. But, I am not sure that this in itself would be adequate to justify a precedent which would mean eventually that widely separated Territories all over the world could have a claim to become one of these United States.

These items must be considered before we set a precedent of admitting even one Territory which is not a contiguous part of continental United States.

We already have several States of the Union with two Senators and a population of less than Hawaii. However, to thereby justify adding to the unbalance of representation on the part of the small States is an unworthy argument for this action we are contemplating.

We can continue to be just to Hawaii as we have through all of these years that it has been under the American flag. We can be fair to all of these other territories upon which we have lavished so much of our economic wealth and our humane care. We do not have to disturb the basic concept of this strong Government and in doing so dilute the great strength of this Union. If we do not maintain a strong, compact, representative United States of America, no Territories will want to be a part of this country. It is because we are strong and cohesive and united that others want to be a part of the United States. We dare not weaken this country in this time of stress.

We have already established a precedent—bought with good American blood—that this Union is indivisible. No one here wants to change that decision. But we must think this and other problems of statehood through carefully before establishing a precedent which can be pointed to by Alaska, and Puerto Rico which are also pressing for statehood.

I shall vote "no" on this bill because I believe it is best for the United States. I also believe that will be best for Hawaii.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to bring up some questions on a point which approaches what I conceive to be one of the strongest if not the strongest arguments as to why this bill should be recommitted for further study.

The bill states in the first section which is now before the Committee that the State of Hawaii shall consist of all the territory now included in the Territory of Hawaii as hereinafter provided. But when you turn to page 9 of the bill and read subparagraph (f) you will see that it provides that the State of Hawaii shall have the same right and interest in the offshore submerged lands that other States have; in other words, that whatever decision is made of the tidelands issue Hawaii will have the same right as other States. I doubt if there is any Member of the House today who can tell anyone what the final decision on tidelands is going to be; so it seems to me that we are here creating a State composed of a group of islands which have more shore line and offshore submerged tidelands than any other State, and we are not telling them what they are going to get; we are just leaving that up in the air. I believe that it ought to be more clearly spelled out. I do not see how you can expect to make the settlement of the tidelands issue now before the Congress any easier by bringing Hawaii in as a State and creating a completely new problem such as bringing in a group of islands will create.

I have been unable to find what constitutes the actual Territorial boundaries of Hawaii except that the bill states that it consists of a land mass. Obviously there is a lot of intervening water between these islands, but there is no language in this bill that states what water is inland water that will belong to the State and what water is open sea, and what water would be subject to a decision affecting offshore or tidelands areas. I I know, of course, that the argument is made that the offshore submerged land off these islands has no value. Of course, some 50, 75, or 100 years ago no one in Congress would have thought that the Continental Shelf off the shores of Texas and Louisiana had any value. Who knows what the future may develop in these waters, what they will have in the way of value?

Somewhere along the line we must make a clear-cut statement on these offshore submerged lands in the case of States already in the Union. It seems to me that we are somewhat derelict in our duties if we propose here today to create a State without settling that issue covering the State; and since the decision has been made in some cases that waters between States or parts of States are inland waters, it seems to me that sort of decision, which I understand has been passed on by the Supreme Court, would give rise to some question as to what happens to the water between Honolulu and San Francisco; since it is water between States, will it be inland waters? I think these questions are serious ones and I think this Congress should be a lot more cautions than it now is in proceeding to take this action which geographically is going to complicate a lot of already complicated problems. I think, therefore, when the motion is made to recommit the bill that the Members of the House should seriously realize that we have a serious offshore tidelands problem that complicates the situation here which needs a great deal of study; that we should go further into this whole matter and bring back here the next time some clear-cut answer to it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the tidelands issue is not before our committee and it should not be injected here.

Mr. STEED. I do not see why you cannot inject it here. You are trying to give Hawaii a place in the Union, and the State has a right to know what its rights are going to be in the waters around its territory. What rights does this House propose giving the new State of Hawaii in these waters?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman feel that the new State, if it does come in, should have the same rights as the other 48 States?

Mr. STEED. Yes, of course; but what are those rights? How can you settle the tidelands issue geographically and make it apply to a group of islands when you have not made any disposition in this bill of the intervening waters in that so-called area?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand that the tidelands bill in the other body does give the lion's share of the revenue to the United States Government.

Mr. STEED. There is nothing in the discussion here as to what the final decision is going to be. It is just an assumption. The best way to find an answer to this is wait until the Congress has worked its will and the problem has been disposed of. We have waited a long time to make Hawaii a State and we should wait until that issue is settled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the last argument that has been made, it seems to me that if any States are going to come into the Union they should be on the same basis as Texas, Oklahoma, Minnesota, and all the others have. That is not discriminating for or against them. It is giving them the same status as other States.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. Can the gentleman tell me what the status of Texas and Louisiana is today?

Mr. JUDD. I do not know what it is or will be, but Hawaii will be in the same position, whatever it is. It should not be any better off or worse off, any more than we should be any different in Minnesota than you are in Texas or Oklahoma or any other State.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. If I have time, I will.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to speak about particularly at this point is the insinuation that has been made several times today, whether intended or not, that those people in Hawaii of alien ancestry who are American citizens, American born, are less loyal to the United States than are some of us who have different colored pigments in our skins. That is something that ought not to be said without evidence, and there is not one shred of evidence to justify any such suggestion. The argument has been made that perhaps people are going to be loyal or not loyal according to their racial or national origin. But who have been traitors to the United States? Why, people whose families have lived here 4, 5, 6, or 7 generations, whose ancestors came here from Europe a long time ago. It is among those that there have been some of the most disloyal. There was not one case of proved disloyalty in Hawaii on the part of

people of non-Caucasian ancestry, as has been implied here. That is a matter of record. It seems a little out of order for any Member from Texas to cast aspersions on the loyalty and the patriotism of those who gave their lives to rescue a battalion of Texas soldiers. You will recall that in the fall of 1944 a battalion of the Remember the Alamo regiment of the 36th Texas Division was cut off and surrounded by Germans in the Vosges Mountains. A good many attempts to rescue them were made over a period of a week. Good loyal, white American troops did not succeed. That is when the American citizens of Japanese ancestry in the 442d Regimental Combat Team volunteered to try it. They made it. They reached the 211 survivors of the lost Texas battalion, but at a cost of more than 2,000 casualties to themselves including almost 200 of their own number killed. In appreciation the gentleman's own State of Texas gave honorary citizenship to every member of the 442d Regimental Combat Team—made up wholly, I repeat, of Japanese-American volunteers, mostly born in Hawaii.

I am compelled to say all this as a matter of plain fairness. The record does not support the slightest reflection on the patriotism and loyalty of persons who were born under the American flag in Hawaii and are citizens in exactly the same way that you and I are.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. I am glad to concede that. I recognize there are many fine patriotic citizens in Hawaii.

Mr. JUDD. Do you know of any who are not?

Mr. REGAN. And I have no greater respect for any man in this Congress than I do the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. That is mutual. But do you know of any in Hawaii who are not loyal?

Mr. REGAN. Yes. It is recognized that there was a certain amount of sabotage at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. JUDD. There was not a single case of sabotage by a person of Japanese ancestry. The FBI, the intelligence agencies of the Navy, and G–2 of the Army all investigated and have denied there was a single case of sabotage by any persons of nonwhite ancestry.

Mr. REGAN. That is not the way I understood it.

Mr. JUDD. May I suggest the gentleman get the evidence. I know his statement was based on the impression that there had been sabotage by Japanese. Rumors to that effect were spread, but investigation proved them completely untrue.

Let me say further that it was we whites in the United States who betrayed our own American principles. After Pearl Harbor we took not only Japanese aliens but tens of thousands of their American-born citizens who have rights under the same basic charter—the Constitution—that gives you and me our rights, and we violated those rights and without evidence or trial we put American citizens in concentration camps. We tore up our own Constitution. I did not think it was right or necessary, but I recognized the pressure and fears under which our officials operated. The thing that is important to the argument today is the way those men behaved who, though born in America, had been treated by their country as if they were traitors. If I had been sitting in one of those concentration camps, I would have been inclined to say to myself and my associates, "What kind of a government is this that will take me, an American-born citizen, and without the slightest evidence treat me as if I were an alien barbarian or a traitor?" I would have been inclined to turn against that country in bitterness. But what did these kids do? They thought about it and talked about it, and then proved themselves better Americans than we who had put them in the concentration camps. They proved that Americanism is not a matter of color or national origin. They proved that they more truly understood the finest things about our country than plenty of us do who proudly trace our ancestors back to the *Mayflower*. They asked only for a chance to join the Armed Forces of the United States—to prove their devotion, their loyalty, their good citizenship—and they came through with a greater number of decorations and citations—and purple hearts—for their outfits in proportion to their numbers and length of service than any other units in the whole United States Armed Forces.

Let us debate this bill on the merits or demerits of granting statehood to Hawaii as we see them. I am wholeheartedly for the bill; I cannot see one good reason against it. For moral reasons, for political reasons, for economic reasons, and for security reasons, I find overwhelming arguments for it. I favor admitting Hawaii as a State, not because they want that but because we want it—and, in my view, we need it. But however we vote, let us not cast aspersions on the patriotism of people who have proved with their blood their loyalty to this Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Sections 2 and 3 of the act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "An act to provide for a constitutional convention, the adoption of a State constitution, and the forwarding of the same to the Congress of the United States, and appropriating money therefor," approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949), which sections provide for the election and organization of a constitutional convention and the forming of a constitution and State government for the proposed State of Hawaii, are hereby ratified, and the convention for which provision is made in said act of the Territorial legislature shall be, and is hereby, recognized as the body authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form, shall make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race or color, shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and shall provide that no person who advocates, or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates, the overthrow by force or violence of the government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the State constitution. Said constitution shall provide:

First. That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State and all debts owed to said Territory of Hawaii shall be collected by said State.

Fourth. That the State and its people cede to the United States, and disclaim title to, the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union as more particularly provided in the next section of this act.

Fifth. That, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian home lands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States, and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said act, may be amended in the constitution, or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund, the Hawaiian home-operating fund, and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired by any such amendment, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian home lands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said act shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian home lands may be made in the constitution, or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from the "available lands," as defined by said act, shall be used only in carrying out the provisions of said act.

Sixth. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

Seventh. That said State and its people do agree and declare that no taxes shall be imposed by said State upon any lands or other property now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States; and that all provisions of this act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property herein made to the said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 2, line 16, strike out the words "shall not be repugnant to" and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "shall conform to and be in complete accord with."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may not be too important, but I do think it is most important to make the corrections as we go along. This is something I think is at least necessary to be done.

The language in the bill is simply "shall not be repugnant to the Constitution." I of course have said before that I do not like to move into any situation blind and I do not like to settle these matters in reverse. I think the language of my amendment is affirmative language and should replace the language that is a backward or reverse approach to the problem. It is simply that the words "shall conform to and be in complete accord with" are substituted for "shall not be repugnant to."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I gladly yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Surely the new State would not be able to adopt something in its constitution that would be at variance with the Constitution of the United States. I do not see just what the gentleman is trying to do by the words he is using. It does perhaps change the approach, and possibly places a little reflection on the new State of Hawaii. I am sure the gentleman does not mean that.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No; I certainly do not want to do that, but the purpose of it is simply this, and I think the gentleman from Nebraska will agree with me, that our Constitution has been attacked so many times from so many different angles that I think certainly if we take a new State into the United States we should have an affirmative approach to the fact that they must conform in their constitution to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Surely the gentleman understands that the bill presently before us does require that they conform to the United States Constitution.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It provides that their constitution "shall not be repugnant to." How the Supreme Court in future years is going to construe that language to be I do not know, in view of some of the past decisions. I am merely trying to lay a predicate of protection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas involves only the question of language and does not change the sense of the bill in any way. This bill was drawn by some of the ablest attorneys in the country, and has been examined time and time again by attorneys in every department of the Government concerned. There was ample opportunity in the committee to make changes such as he proposes. I do not believe there is any sense whatsoever in adopting amendments of this kind. We yielded on the earlier amendment, which changed the word "inhabitants" to "inhabitants who are citizens." There was really no good reason for that change because the only people who participate in drafting of the State constitution, or in its ratification, and in the government are citizens anyway. But, if we are going to vote for a series of amendments of this kind, we are never going to be able to complete consideration of this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. With all due regard for the position taken by the gentleman from Texas, and for him personally and for his ability, and I want to state I have the highest regard for him, it does seem to me that if this bill carries a provision that the Constitution of Hawaii shall not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States, that ought to be sufficient. In other words, there can be nothing in that constitution which would run counter to the provisions of our Constitution, and so far as I have been able to discover, that has always seemd to be satisfactory to anyone considering a matter of this sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I tried to get recognition a while ago so that I might ask our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, a question. I do not see him on the floor at the moment so might I ask the chairman of the committee or the Delegate from Hawaii. The question has to do with communism in Hawaii; and whether or not two men who helped draw up the constitution were later dismissed as Communists from that body.

Mr. FARRINGTON. No; that is not correct. The fact of the situation is this: The convention which was called, or elected to draft a constitution, met just after the House Committee on Un-American Activities began its investigation in the Territory of Hawaii. The Committee on Un-American Activities had as its first witness a fellow named Richard Kageyama who, to the surprise of a great many people, admitted that he was a Communist and became the star witness of the committee in its investigation of communism, and he immediately resigned from the constitutional convention. A second delegate to the convention, and these were 2 of 63, was a man named Frank Silva from the county of Keauhou. He was an organizer for the ILWU. He was called before the committee, and he was 1 of 39 witnesses who refused to testify, and when that was brought to the attention of the constitutional convention, they removed him immediately.

And if you will examine the record of the Territory of Hawaii, you will find that on every occasion when it has been confronted with the question of communism, it has dealt with that problem as it should be dealt with.

Mr. STAGGERS. I ask the question because it has been brought to my attention that these two men were there. I am not doubting the loyalty of the citizens of Hawaii. They are citizens of the United States the same as you and I, and have the same rights to come to this country and enjoy the citizenship of this Nation. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee as to what the Gallup poll, as a survey, shows in relation to statehood for Alaska, if he has those figures. He put in the RECORD the figures as to Hawaii.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think there has been one recently which has been conducted by Mr. Gallup. We did have them in the hearings, or at least we had one for Hawaii, but we do not have one for Alaska. Perhaps someone does have that. I am not sure but what the figures would be very similar to what they were for Hawaii.

Mr. STAGGERS. I see.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is that the same Gallup who made the predictions in 1948?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is what I understand, he is the man who made those predictions so I do not think we can pay too much attention to that. But the thing that does perturb me just a little is that during the time I have been in Congress, the former administrations have brought up the two Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and stated that they wanted statehood for both of them. I was amazed when the President of the United States stood here recently making his address on the state of the Union and stated that he just wanted statehood for Hawaii. I have not heard a leader of this Congress and this administration here say that they are bringing out a bill for Alaska and for Alaskan statehood.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The Chairman indicated a moment ago that it would not come out, because he said if the bill were recommitted they probably would not bring out any bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is my understanding. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his observation.

I believe that statehood for Alaska is far more important to the future of the United States than that of Hawaii could ever be, because the world knows that the power that is opposing this Nation is beyond that Bering Sea, and that in order to attack the United States they must have a land route. The land route is through Alaska. I know the gentlemen will say that we are doing all we can to help Alaska, but there are many things that statehood would do to develop Alaska, and I know the members of the committee will admit that.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I call attention to the fact that it is only 28 miles across that Bering Strait from the tip of Asia to Alaska.

Mr. STAGGERS. Not only that, but it is only 1,855 miles from Fairbanks into Helena, Mont.; and it is 2,400 miles from Fairbanks to Minneapolis, Minn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman spoke about the danger

of being attacked through Alaska. Let me remind the gentleman that when war did start in World War II, it started in Hawaii, by an attack upon Pearl Harbor, and not through Alaska. I think the danger is just as great, or greater, that another war might start in the Pacific.

Mr. STAGGERS. I wanted to bring that out, and would have done so had I had the opportunity. I know that we need to defend Hawaii, for that is where the war started. But the Members know that the danger lies to the northwest today. There is no power which in the next generation could arise to attack us in Hawaii.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are many Members who think there are many danger points in the world, including the Far East as well as the northwest.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all of lines 1, 2, 3 and 4 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances,"

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first I call attention to the fact that this is an enabling act. In this enabling act it says, "said constitution," speaking of the Constitution of Hawaii, shall provide first "that perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of such State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship."

I want to predicate my remarks by saying that I am unequivocally for religious freedom, but I want to call to your attention some things that have happened in this country in the past two decades.

The Soviet Union has taken our Constitution word for word, phrase for phrase, and sentence for sentence. They have taken many of our statutes. They have analyzed them the same way for the single purpose of using those laws as a bulwark behind which they can hide while they spread communism in this country and while they do other damage. They have continuously screamed that we were violating their constitutional rights of freedom of religion, speech, and the press, and their rights under the fifth amendment.

You might say: Well, that may be true, but what evidence do you have of it? I do not have to go very far; you can go to the reports of the Committee on Un-American Activities and find plenty of evidence, all these appealing names, Abraham Lincoln's for one, used as the name of a Communist front organization.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee; did the gentleman submit the amendment to the subcommittee?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No; I did not.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In what way does it improve the amendment already in the bill that provides freedom of religious worship shall be sacred and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship. Just how does the gentleman's amendment improve on what is already in the bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am coming to that if the gentleman will permit me. When I was serving as city attorney in the town of Pampa, Tex., a number of years ago a sect came into that town and undertook to invade the homes of the people and to sell them different articles of literature, and play phonographs. The people complained and the officers went out, arrested these men; and do you know what they claimed in their defense? Their defense was that it was a violation of freedom of religion in the Constitution when we arrested them simply because they all claimed to be preachers and they all claimed to be worshiping God when they walked into the privacy of a man's home.

That is how far some people will try to stretch the provisions of the Constitution.

I want to call this to your attention: Why put this language in the bill and run the possible risk of some construction that we do not presently anticipate when you can put into the enabling act the very same language on the subject that is presently in the constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii, and also the identical language of the Constitution of the United States of America, and extend the freedom to speech, and to the press, and provide for peaceful assembly?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman think that under this section as it now stands they would be able, for instance, to take any action against one of these sects which think it is a religious rite to handle rattlesnakes? Would they be able under this provision of the bill to take any action to stop that?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I can conceive of a situation where the people, where such a case arose, for instance, to come in and say we must construe the Hawaiian constitution in the state court in view of the provisions in the enabling act; therefore you have no right to interfere with us even though we are not citizens of Hawaii, we are aliens, we are inhabitants.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman think also it would be possible under this provision as it now reads for Communists to tie communism with certain acts and call it a religious rite?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. They could come in and say "Our god is Malenkov" or "Our god is Stalin, and we worship by trying to destroy this country; and, therefore, you are violating freedom of religion when you stop us." Do not think they have not thought of it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas who has offered the amendment. I would like to have the amendment read by the Clerk again, if I may, and ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Texas should have offered his amendment in the committee when it was considering this matter. He is apprehensive about what might happen under the language now in the bill which reads as follows:

That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is worried about the Communists, but they have a provision in here that is much stronger than what we have in this country or in the constitutions of the several States. Let me read it to you:

That no person who advocates or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office of trust or profit under the State constitution.

So it seems to me that provision is even stronger than the constitutions of the 48 States. Now we have the bugaboo, Will we have Communists in government in Hawaii?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs appreciates the fact that the language of this amendment is word for word the language of the Constitution of the United States, does he not?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true, but there are other provisions in here that are stronger and go further than the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman is willing then to gild the lily and go further than the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the gentleman's amendment should not be accepted. He has a number of amendments he wants to offer that I think is a method of trying to weaken and trying to change the bill that is now before us. He should have offered those amendments in the subcommittee and in the full committee and have them fully considered. This morning he comes in without any previous notice, which is his privilege, of course, and offers amendments which have no effect on the language of the bill presently be-

fore us. It seems to me the amendment should not be agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I take exception to the remarks of my chairman that I came in here with amendments this morning to try to weaken the bill or to try to slow it down. I want to say to the gentleman that I am sincere in what I am doing, and if this bill is going to pass, the amendments I am offering are intended to strengthen it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not doubting the gentleman's motives, but he should have offered them to the subcommittee or in the full committee, which he did not do.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Was that not the choice of the gentleman who is offering the amendments?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, the gentleman has a right to offer his amendments, but they will not have the opportunity of being as fully discussed on the floor as they would in the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. My amendment is in the language of the Constitution. I am surprised anyone would object to language of the Constitution of the United States being included in this enabling act. That surprises me no end. Certainly that has been considered by every Member of this Congress and by the people of the United States since the Constitution was written.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to find out some more about this language. The proviso at the top of page 3 reads:

> That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured.

There cannot be very much wrong with that.

> And that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

I assume my friend from Texas sees something insidious in the proviso that no inhabitant shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

I wish the gentleman would correct me if I am in error. There has been a disposition on the part of certain Communist groups to use the protection of our Constitution as a method of striking at the democratic institutions of this country. Now the use of the word "inhabitant," for instance, may have significance in that particular, if some alien over there operating under the guise of religious freedom and under the protection of this language in the enabling act would be permitted to do things which he might not otherwise be permitted to do and be subject to the law.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield: Any member, that is right. The word "inhabitant" does disturb me. This enabling act is the last chance that this Congress is going to get at this piece of legislation, and if it takes a week to perfect it, we ought to stay here and perfect it. This is not a bill that we can amend later on. My amendment not only covers freedom of religion but it extends to freedom of speech and freedom of the press in the identical language of the Constitution.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. On that point, why we should not spend a month here to examine the constitution that they propose to ratify in this bill. We had 4 days of hearings on this bill and I dare say, without fear of contradiction, that there are not two members of the committee who know what the provisions of the proposed Constitution of Hawaii as ratified in this bill actually contain. But, there is one thing in there that I would like to point out to the Members of this House.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for a speech; I yielded for a question. I am trying to get some information on the subject.

Mr. DONOVAN. Will the gentleman let me point out, and I will not take any more time, that this proposed constitution provides that the Governor of the proposed State of Hawaii may reapportion the State himself, anyway he wants, without interference by the legislature of the proposed State. If you ever saw provision for perpetuity in office, you will find it right in the center of the proposed constitution of this State which we here ratify if we pas this bill. And, yet, there has not been a word of discussion about it on the floor of this House.

Mr. ENGLE. I want to ask one further question, if I may, and, that is, just where did this language come from? Can the Delegate from Hawaii tell us where this language comes from?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. I would like to get an answer to that question.

Mr. D'EWART. I referred to the section to which the amendment alludes in the State constitution. Then there is a paragraph to which the gentleman from Texas alludes, and to which he objects. But if he will turn to the copy of the Constitution of the State of Hawaii, on page 45 he will find that the very words that he offers in this amendment have been written into the Constitution of the State of Hawaii.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, the effect of the gentleman's argument is to say that he has no protest to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas because it has been effectuated by what has been put in the constitution.

Mr. D'EWART. Yes.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, let us agree to it and let it go at that.

Mr. D'EWART. Turn to page 45 and you will find it in the report of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to have a word to say about the remarks which the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], made a few minutes ago. He read the section of the constitution which says that no person who advocates or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the State or the United States shall be qualified to hold any public office or employment.

Now, the gentleman appears to think that that is a complete protection against any Communist or subversive entering into any position in the government of this proposed State. It seems to me that, although that language is all right, it does not afford the protection the chairman thinks it affords.

One of the men who has caused most trouble in Hawaii and, for that matter, in this country, too, out on the west coast, is a man named Harry Bridges. It is possible, as I see it, under the wording of this provision, for Harry Bridges to become the Governor of Hawaii. We all know that if it suits the purpose of a Communist to deny that he is a Communist, he will deny it. Then where is the protection of your provision? If he also denies that he is a member of any party which advocates the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, then where is your protection? If he gets the votes, where is your protection?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not sure about Bridges, but I think——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am answering the question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Regular order, Mr. Chairman; the gentleman has not addressed the Chair.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman speaks about Harry Bridges. I think the courts have decided that he is a Communist.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him right there, I notice a decision yesterday whereby the Supreme Court of the United States has granted him a rehearing. We do not know yet whether he is a Communist or not. If he says he is not, then under this section of the constitution here the protection sought is dissipated to the four winds of the earth.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the Court is going to try to decide on the issue not of whether he is a Communist but of whether he lied when he appeared before the committee. I have great faith in the good judgment of the people of Hawaii that they would not elect a man of that character as the governor or a senator of that State.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I will say to the gentleman this must go a whole lot further than the faith of the gentleman or of any of us. We ought to have protection here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The charge of perjury grew out of the statement that he lied when he said he was not a Communist. That is what the perjury charge is.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Of course.

This proposed constitution, as has been pointed out in a number of instances, offers many opportunities for manipulation. This is one of them here. This paragraph does not afford protection against subversives or even against Communists if a man denies he is a member of the party.

Another thing which gives me some concern here is that people depend upon the judiciary to protect their rights. If the judiciary is not composed of people to whom they can look for protection of their rights, then we are in a dangerous position. Look at the opportunity which this offers for manipulation insofar as the judiciary is concerned. We have had it pointed out here that these districts can be redistricted by the Governor. Here is another place that the Governor can manipulate. This constitution states that the judges of all these courts shall be named and appointed by the Governor, and confirmed by the senators, who under this provision about redistricting and reapportioning will be certainly influenced by the Governor, who has sole authority to reapportion. This is what it says about the naming of the judges:

> The Governor shall nominate and by and with the advice and consent of the senate appoint the justices of the supreme court, the judges of the circuit court.

They are not demonstrating faith in democratic processes there. In my own home State the justices of the supreme court and the judges of the circuit courts are elected by a vote of the people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] expressed my views with reference to this legislation far better than can I, so I will not repeat his argument. He said that the Washington Post had described him as a crude individual. Now, I have known the gentleman since I came here in 1935, and I know that he has been the author of constructive legislation which has been sustained by the Supreme Court, which, when enforced, resulted in the conviction of Communists and has curbed communism in this country; that his views have been sound heretofore. If I knew of no other reason for opposing this bill, I would go along with him because of the reasons he gave us when he discussed the issue yesterday and as set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, March 9, beginning at page 1761. The gentleman may be crude but he is crude as was Lincoln.

Then, this morning we had a rather emotional plea from our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and without in any way questioning his ability or his patriotism or his sincerity, I want to say I have noted in times gone by that always when he speaks so eloquently that thread of emotionalism runs through his statements and arguments. He is deeply concerned not only about the welfare of our people and the future of our Republic, but he is extremely concerned about the welfare of other people in other parts of the world. That is all right, that is Christianity, and I would like to go along with that, but I do not want to go along so far that in the end I will find that I have done something which in the years to come will impair the welfare of our people or destroy the security of our Nation.

Then another friend of mine, our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, was emotional as well as somewhat excited. My only point in bringing this out is to show how, if you let your emotions get the best of you, you are liable to go astray, say something, do something, that is not based on sound reasoning. The gentleman from Minnesota made an impassioned argument. He is a great crusader. For years he was a missionary, a physician, in China. It may be that in his zeal he overestimates our ability to aid others. He said, and I quote:

> The argument has been made that perhaps people are going to be loyal or not loyal according to their origin. But who have been the traitors in the United States? Why people who have lived here 4, 5, 6, or 7 generations—whose ancestors came here from Europe a long time ago.

I have no statistics as to the accuracy of that statement, but I just doubt it. I just doubt it, and I would like to know something more about it before I accept it.

In the U. S. News & World Report of the 27th of February you will find a little map showing that we have established throughout the world 350 military bases. How many more we intend to establish I do not know.

We are a great Nation. We are a great people. At least so we say, and presumably so we think. But my reading of history tells me that from the very beginning of time right down to the Great Britain of today that the nations that have gone down, that have faded out as world powers, have been the nations that have kept reaching out and reaching out for more territory, and which overextended themselves until they found that they had destroyed their foundation at home. The ambition of the politicians of Rome, Greece, and many others led them to grow too large, take in too many people of different ways and ideas. The result was the loss of their existence as nations. That is what I am afraid we are doing. That is what I am afraid we will do if we establish a precedent here which will be followed when other islands and other territories ask to come into the Union. Following the line of thought expressed by our colleague, the gentleman from New York, and our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, because other people do not have all of the advantages we have and some they do not desire, we ought to take them in. Now there is no limit they say to what we can spend. I think we are at that limit now; that is where we can continue to pour out billions of dollars, men by the thousands, and still retain our strength. Here is a letter which came to me on the 6th day of March of this year from Comptroller General of the United States Lindsay Warren. Do you know what he says? He says that in Hawaii for recreational facilities for 46,000 members of the armed services, we spent annually $2,220,000. Now do you see the end if we keep on—and we are following a similar program whenever we establish a Little America—if we take in Hawaii, and we take in Puerto Rico, and this, that, and every other island or Territory? Do you see what will happen in the end?

What have you left here for the people of the United States of America? Anything except the burden of carrying the rest of the world on our shoulders?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Does the gentleman from Michigan think it is high time the people of the United States stopped treading softly on issues which they think might give Russia some propaganda, and that the United States should stop bending over to certain minorities in order to prevent Russia from becoming offended?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I certainly do. It is long past the time when we should begin to think of our own people, our own country. Like the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], like the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], I want to be kind, I want to be helpful to other groups wherever they may be, whatever their creed or color. But like the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], I want to think and act first for my people and my country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am told that the gentleman has said that I stated there were more traitors among the fifth, sixth, and seventh generations of Americans than among those who are alien born. I do not believe that the RECORD will show that. If it does show that, then I will retract it. What I aimed to say was that those who have been the most dangerous traitors to the United States have by and large been those persons like Mr. Hiss, who because of their Anglo-Saxon tradition, and their training in our finest institutions, were able to get to positions of greater power and influence since nobody suspected them. If I said "more"——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. You did not say "more." I quoted the RECORD correctly. I quoted the RECORD word for word, but at the time I heard the statement and later when I checked the RECORD and found it as I quoted, I was sure the gentleman did not mean it in the way it was said, and I am glad to give him the opportunity to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to impose myself upon the House for the full 5 minutes, but I do feel very strongly about this bill.

The Congress of the United States has called very heavily on the people of this Nation for their money, their resources, as well as the natural resources of this country. We have distributed all this very liberally all over the world. I think this Nation has proven to be bighearted, generous, and fair, probably too bighearted. The American people have gone along with the Congress in its effort to be considerate of all peoples of this earth, but I cannot feel that now the American people are going to appreciate the addition of Hawaii as a State. Somehow, I believe that that area in the corner of the flag where those stars now rest should not be for rent, should not be for sale or used for political advantage. It should not be forced to change its design by virtue of any political pressure from any political party.

I have heard many inferences about politics in this matter. I would be opposed to this bill regardless. I do not think we can, under our concept of a State, make Hawaii one of the 48 or 49 States of this Union. I do not think we should do that. Hawaii is about 3,000 miles from here. I have never been there and probably never will go there. I am not much of a world-government man, and I do not like to see us stepping out in that direction. If there are any politics involved in this, woe be unto the group who thinks it is smart. I understand the political affiliations of the proposed Senators are already known and established. I say to you that I would oppose this bill regardless of the political affiliations of any two Senators that may be coming from Hawaii. I say that even if you selected two southern Democrats, and that would certainly be a test with me.

I just do not see the justice of it. I know there is a lot of money in Hawaii. I know there is a lot of concentration of money in a few hands in Hawaii. I know the lands of Hawaii are held by a small group, but that is all right if it suits them. I want the Hawaiian people to be happy. I want them to enjoy self-government insofar as it is practicable. I want them to have all the privileges they have, and I want them to be able to come over here, and settle down if they want to and be one of us, but I do not believe that the American people expect us to reach 3,000 miles away to take in people and make a State of the Territory they occupy. It just does not make sense to me. I presume they are good, friendly people; I have no criticism to make of them; I simply cannot embrace the policy of stepping out and making it a State of this Union and shoving the stars over to make room on our flag. No, I honestly and sincerely do not believe the American people want us to tinker with their flag. This Territory is disconnected from continental North America. If I am right, then someone will reap a whirlwind as a result of this legislation if it passes. I am perfectly satisfied for the term "United States of America" to stand. I have no ambition to make it any type of world union. We have taxed our people, we have mortgaged the earnings and property of unborn generations; all this they have accepted. But I do not believe they will accept any tinkering with or changing of their flag—let us not do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

I hope my colleagues will understand that from now on I am going to try to keep debate related to amendments that are then before the House. Some excellent statements have been made by the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from North Carolina for or against the bill. When the committee has amendments before them I hope I may have your cooperation that we may deal with the amendment immediately before us and not get off on some general discussion. So I am, with your cooperation, going to press for that objective.

Now there is an amendment before the House that we have lost track of and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all of lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call attention to the fact that on page 45 of the report the exact words the gentleman from Texas wants and are a part of the constitution of Hawaii. He attempts to strike out four lines on page 3 of the bill which read:

First. That perfect freedom of religious worship shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

The words the gentleman has incorporated in his amendment are part of the constitution on page 45 of the report. I do not think that changes anything.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Hawaii is not yet a State and the constitution has not yet been ratified. I want to insure by this amendment that those words stay in that constitution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When it does become a State by action of this Congress and signature of that law by the President, this constitution is part of the Hawaiian statehood.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I want to assure that by this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think it is necessary. I call for a vote on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Texas) there were—ayes 113, noes 94.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I voted for this bill when it came up previously, as well as in favor of statehood for Alaska. I still favor the principle of statehood for these Territories. I oppose this bill, now, however, but I must confess, after listening to the debate earlier this afternoon and yesterday, that I am somewhat alarmed at the company I find myself in—the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], for whom I have a very high regard, to mention at least two. Certainly when they stated their objections to this bill they did not indicate my own views.

Perhaps you may call me a politician. I am. At least I was during the last campaign; now I would call myself a statesman, not a politician. But I am considerably disturbed at what is happening here today.

There is no doubt that the feeling of the Members of this House was, and I believe still is, that both Hawaii and Alaska should be admitted to statehood, yet this administration in a recent public statement—I think the President of the United States himself indicated what he considered to be "must" legislation. He said there were 11 measures which should be passed in this session of Congress. One of them was statehood for Hawaii. Not a word about Alaska. Why the sudden change? What has happened, other than a change in the political complexion of our national administration that has changed the apparent desire to have Alaska admitted to statehood as well? If it is frankly a political stand, and I believe it is, why not say so? We have had that hinted. Nobody has said so, in so many words, but I am going to. The reason this administration wants Hawaii as a State is because they have a majority of Republicans there, and thus will have two additional Republican Senators. If that is the case, why not say so? The reason they do not want Alaska to be a State is because it is Democratic and they do not want the additional Democratic Senators. If that is the reason, let us have it out in the open. That being the reason, I am going to vote to recommit this bill. I am going to vote that way as much as I feel that Alaska and Hawaii both should become States. I believe if we recommit this bill, we will get bills for both Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. I think they are entitled to statehood.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I call attention to the fact that the Legislature of Alaska is now Republican and there will soon be a Republican Governor up there.

Mr. KLEIN. Then somebody should have called that to Mr. Eisenhower's attention when he made the statement that they only wanted Hawaii as a State.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There are some people who make their decisions on other than political considerations. Hawaii is much further along than Alaska from the standpoint of its economic development, its ability to sustain itself, its school system, its proved capacity for self-government. Most of the people in Alaska are still Government employees or working on Government projects of one sort or another. Alaska cannot begin to defend itself or in any way approach the state of development that Hawaii has, although I voted also for admission of Alaska.

Mr. KLEIN. That is what I was going to ask the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I voted for admission of Alaska, but if you compare the two there is a far better case for Hawaii on the merits, in my opinion, than there is for Alaska. It is not because there might be Republican Senators from one and Democrats from the other, as far as I know.

Mr. KLEIN. I think that may be the gentleman's view, but I am afraid many Members of his own party do not feel the same way.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to say that I resent the gentleman's implication in reference to the political motives of the President of the United States. Some of you over there on that side may laugh, but let me say that the people of the country by an overwhelming majority elected him President of the United States because they have confidence in him. And, if the gentleman will permit me to say so, if he will go back home and inquire among his people, Democrats and Republicans, he will find out that by an overwhelming majority they approve of the course he is taking and the leadership he is demonstrating in the affairs of this country.

Mr. KLEIN. It is true, I may say, that the people of this country overwhelmingly elected General Eisenhower, but if you will look at the political complection of this House as well as the Senate, you will see they certainly did not overwhelmingly elect the Republican Party. Certainly they must have had the reservation in their own minds that while they wanted Eisenhower they did not want too many Republicans to tell him to make this a purely political administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to commend the gentleman and point out that in district after district the Republican candidate for Congress ran far behind General Eisenhower, and I would like to further say that I think the people of the country have confidence in his leadership but they do not have too much confidence in the way that the Republican majority of the House and the Senate help him with his leadership. As a matter of fact, the Democrats have had to bail him out when he came up here with certain proposals. They got their signals crossed.

Mr. KLEIN. I think the Democrats will continue to bail him out when he is right.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, do not the very statements just made destroy the gentleman's own suggestion that Eisenhower acted for political reasons. One reason that the people of the country overwhelmingly voted for General Eisenhower is because they know he is not a politician, such as they probably think you are and I am. They had confidence in him.

Mr. KLEIN. Well, he is being advised by these politicians who are interested in the Republican Party and not in General Eisenhower.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Apropos of the gyrations between the executive department and the legislative branch of the Government as now controlled, does not the gentleman think that if General Eisenhower is not a politician he better learn to be one pretty soon?

Mr. KLEIN. I need not even comment on that. The gentleman has said it so much better than I could and it becomes increasingly evident every day.

Mr. JUDD. The answer to the charge of lack of political skill is that we have been trying to work for the country instead of trying first of all to get such a smooth, slick political machine that when the orders come down, the boys march through.

Mr. KLEIN. Perhaps after the next 4 years, the people of the country may feel that they would be a whole lot better off with that so-called slick political machine.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall retain, except as herein provided: (1) all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, and (2) all the lands and other public property which are in the control of the Territory of Hawaii pursuant to the Hawaiian Organic Act and, immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, are in the possession and use of the Territory or its political subdivisions for the purposes of water, sewer, electric, and other public works, penal, charitable, scientific, and educational institutions, cemeteries, hospitals, parks, highways, wharves, landings, harbor improvements, public buildings, and other public purposes; and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall be and become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be.

(b) The United States shall retain title to all the public lands and other public property in Hawaii, title to which is in the United States (except as hereafter provided) for a period of 5 years after the enactment of this act. Such land and public property shall continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided,* That immediately after the enactment of this act an investigation and report shall be made by a joint committee composed of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives upon the subject of the public lands and other public property in Hawaii and the terms and provisions of the cession and transfer thereof by the Republic of Hawaii, and the Congress shall thereafter make a final determination and disposition of the remaining public lands and other public property. In the event the Congress has made no other disposition thereof within said 5-year period, then title to all of the public lands and other public property undisposed of shall thereupon vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely: *Provided, however,* That as to any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by act of Congress or by Executive order or proclamation of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States or the State of Hawaii or, subject to the constitution and laws of said State, such political subdivision, as the case may be, shall retain or become vested with absolute title thereto, or an interest therein conformable to such limitations, as the case may be: *Provided further,* That the provisions of section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 511), which authorize the President to restore to their previous status lands set aside for the use of the United States, shall not terminate upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union but shall continue in effect until the end of said 5-year period.

(c) The State of Hawaii, upon its admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State for 180,000 acres of the lands that were ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii or that have been acquired in exchange for lands so ceded, except (i) lands defined as "available lands" in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and (ii) lands remaining set aside for the use of the United States at the time of the admission of said State and not thereafter restored to their previous status pursuant to section 91 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 511). The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within 5 years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(d) The lands patented to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by such State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the

Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, for the making of public improvements, and for the provision of lands for public use. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands patented under the preceding subsection shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college, or university.

(e) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

(f) The State of Hawaii shall stand on an equal footing with the other States with respect to lands beneath navigable waters or reclaimed therefrom, the beaches and shores of navigable waters, and the natural resources within such lands and waters.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, not being a member of the committee, I am not as conversant with this proposed legislation as I would like to be. I sat listening yesterday and today hoping to have some questions answered. Those that I have heard answered have boiled themselves down, in my humble opinion, to there being two reasons, aside from the political reasons, if there be any, for the Territory of Hawaii to be admitted into this Union.

One of them, as was discussed rather fully yesterday, has to do with the fact that the people of Hawaii fought gallantly in World War II. It was said yesterday, or I was led to believe so, that they were fighting for this Union and this Union only. That left quite a question in my mind. I was under the impression that they were also fighting for their own hides.

The other reason that was given yesterday was that we must be tolerant of other peoples. I wonder sometimes if we have not just about tolerated ourselves out of existence as a Republic already.

I am just asking some questions.

Yesterday in defense of the proposed constitution of the proposed State of Hawaii the gentleman defended it solely on the ground that it was the most modern instrument in that field that had been devised by man. I wonder if that is a complete defense of the proposed constitution. Does just to say that something is modern make it necessarily good? Is your modern literature all good? Look at your newsstands; just look at them. It is modern, but is it good? Is that a complete defense for this proposed legislation?

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to vote for this legislation. I do not believe we should embark on a program which will in a few years, if we follow the precedent we seem to establish here, result in there being recognized here on this floor and in the other body the gentleman from Hawaii, the gentleman from Alaska, the gentleman from Guam, the gentleman from the Virgin Islands, the gentleman from Liberia, the gentleman from Israel, or gentlemen from anywhere or everywhere in the world.

I have grown up thinking that this is the United States of America, not the United States of the entire globe. I just want to get in the RECORD that I do not propose to vote for this legislation, largely because a lot of these questions I have posed have not been answered to my satisfaction.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair how many amendments are on the Clerk's desk relative to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. None at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Are there any that are proposed to be offered? If not, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, why does not the gentleman ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and that it be open to amendment at any point? Then we will get these amendments on the desk.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I make that request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska that the bill be considered as read and that it be open to amendment at any point?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

SEC. 4. The joint resolution of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii entitled "Joint resolution providing for the submission to the people of the Territory of Hawaii of the constitution framed by the convention held pursuant to Act 334 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1949 and in the event of failure of ratification, the framing and submission of a new constitution, and making appropriations therefor," approved October 12, 1950 (J. Res. 1, Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1950), which joint resolution provides for the submission to the people of the Territory of Hawaii, for ratification or rejection, of the proposed constitution framed by the constitutional convention held pursuant to sections 2 and 3 of the Act of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii approved May 20, 1949 (Act 334, Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949) and of any new constitution framed by such convention in consequence of a rejection of the proposed constitution by the people, is hereby ratified; and the election held on November 7, 1950, pursuant to section 1 of said joint resolution, at which election the people of the Territory of Hawaii ratified the proposed constitution by a majority of the votes cast shall be, and hereby is, recognized as constituting due ratification of said constitution by the people of Hawaii.

A certified copy of said constitution shall be submitted by the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the President of the United States. If the proposed constitution is in conformity with all the pertinent provisions of this act, it shall be the duty of the President, on or after June 5, and not later than July 4, 1954, to approve said constitution and to certify such approval to the Governor of said Territory. Thereupon the Governor, on or after July 5, and not later than August 3, 1954, shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, but the officers so to be elected shall in any event include 2 Senators and 2 Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large.

If the President shall disapprove said constitution, such disapproval shall immediately be certified by the President to the Governor of said Territory, with the objections to the proposed constitution; the Governor thereupon by proclamation shall order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than 20 days after receipt of such notification and thereafter a new constitution may be formed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if the proposed constitution had been rejected by the people and as if the new constitution were being originally submitted for approval by the President: *Provided*, That not more than one election shall be held under the authority of this paragraph.

SEC. 5. In case the President approves the constitution duly ratified by the people of said Territory, all as hereinbefore provided, a primary election shall be held on October 2, 1954, and a general election on November 2, 1954, and said primary and general election dates shall be duly named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. At such elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 4, shall be chosen by the people. Such elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by said constitution and the laws of said State for the election of members of the State legislature. The returns thereof shall be made and certified in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may prescribe. When said election of said officers above provided for shall be held and the returns thereof made, and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of the said Territory shall certify the result of said election, as certified as herein provided, to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and, upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States. Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in or under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the Delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor and secretary of said State shall certify the election of the Senators and Representatives in the manner required by law, and the said Senators and Representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 6. The State of Hawaii upon its admission into the Union shall be entitled to two Representatives until the taking effect of the next reapportionment, and such Representatives shall be in addition to the membership of the House of Representatives as now prescribed by law: *Provided*, That such temporary increase in the membership of

the House of Representatives shall not affect the basis of apportionment established by the act of November 15, 1941 (55 Stat. 761; 2 U. S. C., sec. 2a), for the 83d Congress and each Congress thereafter.

SEC. 7. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, established by and existing under title 28 of the United States Code, shall thenceforth be a court of the United States with judicial power derived from article III, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the terms of office of the district judges for the District of Hawaii then in office shall terminate upon the effective date of this section and the President, pursuant to sections 133 and 134 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this act, shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two district judges for the said district who shall hold office during good behavior;

(b) the last paragraph of section 133 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed; and

(c) subsection (a) of section 134 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The district judges, except in Puerto Rico, shall hold office during good behavior. The district judge in Puerto Rico shall hold office for the term of 8 years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified."

SEC. 8. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the second paragraph of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "including the district courts of the United States for the districts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "including the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,".

SEC. 9. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) The last paragraph of section 501 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed;

(b) the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 504 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be 6 years";

(c) the first sentence of subsection (c) of section 451 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out at the end thereof the words ", except in the district of Hawaii, where the term shall be 6 years"; and

(d) subsection (d) of section 541 of title 28, United States Code, is repealed.

SEC. 10. No action, case, proceeding, or matter pending in any court of the Territory of Hawaii, or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution to be thus formed, or shall continue in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all crimin..l offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said State courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses; the admission of said State shall effect no change in the substantive or criminal law governing such causes of action and criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 11. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all orders, judgments, and decrees of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 12. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union—

(a) Title 28, United States Code, section 1252, is amended by striking out ", Hawaii" from the clause relating to courts of record;

(b) title 28, United States Code, section 1293, is amended by striking out the words "First and Ninth Circuits" and by inserting in lieu thereof "First Circuit", and by striking out the words "supreme courts of Puerto Rico and Hawaii, respectively" and inserting in lieu thereof "supreme court of Puerto Rico";

(c) title 28, United States Code, section 1294, is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof and by renumbering paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (5) and (6) respectively;

(d) the first paragraph of section 373 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "United States District Courts for the districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico,"; and by striking out the words "and any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii": *Provided,* That the amendments made by this subsection shall not affect the rights of any judge or justice who may have retired before the effective date of this subsection: *And provided further,* That service as a judge of the District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii or as a justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii or as a judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii shall be included in computing under section 371, 372, or 373 of title 28, United States Code, the aggregate years of judicial service of any person who is in commission as a district judge for the District of Hawaii on the date of enactment of this act;

(e) section 92 of the act of April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 159), as amended, and the act of May 29, 1928 (ch. 904, 45 Stat. 997), are repealed;

(f) section 86 of the act approved April 30, 1900 (ch. 339, 31 Stat. 158), as amended, is repealed;

(g) section 3771 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico"; and

(h) section 3772 of title 18, United States Code, as heretofore amended, is further amended by striking out from the first paragraph of such section the words "Supreme Courts of Hawaii and Puerto Rico" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Supreme Court of Puerto Rico."

SEC. 13. All territorial laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to affect the ownership and control by the United States of any lands or other property within Hawaii National Park which may now belong to, or which may hereafter be acquired by, the United States.

SEC. 15. The first paragraph of section 2 of the Federal Reserve Act (38 Stat. 251) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: "When any State is hereafter admitted to the Union the Federal Reserve districts shall be readjusted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in such manner as to include such State. Every national bank in any State shall, upon commencing business or within 90 days after admission into the Union of the State in which it is located, become a member bank of the Federal Reserve System by subscribing and paying for stock in the Federal Reserve bank of its district in accordance with the provisions of this act and shall thereupon be an insured bank under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and failure to do so shall subject such bank to the penalty provided by the sixth paragraph of this section."

SEC. 16. Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between ports in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, its Territories, or possessions.

SEC. 17. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether

passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 11, line 3, strike out all of the language following the period down to and including the period on line 8, page 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Thereupon the President of the United States shall forthwith submit said constitution to the Congress for its consideration. Should the Congress by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the membership of the House of Representatives and two-thirds of the membership of the Senate approve said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President on or after June 5 and not later than July 4, 1954, to certify such approval to the Governor of the said Territory."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do primarily with the question of whether or not this Congress should ratify in advance the Constitution of Hawaii, and thereby forever cut off any opportunity to go over that constitution and determine for itself as the representatives of the people whether or not that is the type of constitution which we should approve.

I call this to your attention in regard to the amendment. Originally section 4 in the bill H. R. 49 for which the bill H. R. 3575 is a substitute provided for that constitution to be submitted to the Congress through the President, and that Congress should then determine whether or not the constitution should be approved and proceed with the mechanics of making Hawaii a State. I think it is bad business in the first instance for this Congress under any circumstances to be delegating authority. That is exactly what we are doing in the bill as it is presently written in section 4. We are ratifying the joint resolution of the Territorial Legislature of Hawaii, and we are providing in section 4 simply this—that when this bill is passed that constitution comes to the President of the United States and he, as a single individual, passes upon it, and nobody knows for sure who is going to be President of the United States even tomorrow, none of us have a lease on life—but that authority is vested in the one, single individual and if he decides it is all right he sends it back to the Governor of Hawaii, and says, "This constitution is approved." And that is the end of it. Congress has no further say on it. Perhaps the constitution is good—I do not know whether it is or not. I do think this Congress should through one of its duly constituted committees have hearings on the constitution to determine what the provisions of it are and what they mean. You have had some of them pointed to you here on the floor this morning and in general debate yesterday. I have not had a chance to study this constitution. I certainly do not believe in ratifying something in advance when I have not had a full and complete opportunity to examine and understand it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know that I have any particular objection to bringing this constitution back to the Congress, but may I not point out to the gentleman that since the amendment would provide a two-thirds majority, that that might be very difficult to obtain. As a matter of fact I think it would be so difficult that it might be quite interesting to see who stands up for his amendment on his side of the aisle if the amendment should come to a vote with the requirement for a two-thirds majority for certainly to adopt that would in my opinion completely and effectively kill any hope that Hawaii might ever have for the adoption of its constitution by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. May I ask the gentleman does he propose to offer an amendment to this amendment and make it a majority?

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania proposes to do that. Let me ask the gentleman—will he accept a substitute amendment?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I do not know whether I will or not. I have not thought that out. I cannot prevent the gentleman from getting a vote on an amendment to my amendment, but I would prefer to have my amendment voted upon at the present time as it stands unless there is someone who wishes to offer an amendment to it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. If I still retain the floor, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman will not retain the floor.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I do not yield for that purpose, then.

Now, whether it is a majority or two-thirds, I would prefer two-thirds because I think, as I stated yesterday, we are moving the ship of state of these United States into dangerous, uncharted political seas that are pretty rough at this time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS of Texas was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HALE. Can the gentleman give a single instance of a State constitution which has ever been approved by two-thirds of the Congress?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have not gone into that. I will be glad to study the question. I imagine you can find most anything in the United States, but I do not want to move further in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: On page 4, line 3, strike out all of the language following the period down to and including the period on page 11, line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Thereupon, the President of the United States shall forthwith submit said constitution to the Congress for its consideration. Should the Congress, by a majority vote, approve said constitution, it shall be the duty of the President on or after June 5 but not later than July 4, 1954, to certify such approval to the Governor of the said Territory."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment merely allows this constitution to come to Congress for its approval and by a majority vote be approved. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] is agreed to, it would not enable the Territory of Hawaii to be admitted on equal footing with the other States of the Union. There has never been another State admitted to this Union that has required a two-thirds vote for the approval of its constitution. There have been two methods for the approval of State constitutions.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. As deeply as I feel, being from the South, about our loss of the two-thirds rule, I am going to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. When this constitution comes back before Congress, does the Congress have a right to amend the constitution and return it to Hawaii or must it be accepted exactly as is?

Mr. SAYLOR. As it stands right now, we will have the opportunity only to accept it or reject it.

Mr. FARRINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is in error about that. The Congress has a right to require amendments to a State constitution, until it is admitted. So that if there is a feature of the constitution that you dislike, it can be returned to the proposed State, and unless they accept that change, then they are not admitted. That happened in the case of Nebraska, and also in the case of New Mexico.

Mr. ENGLE. I have no objection to this amendment. I think it is all right to bring back the constitution, but is it not true that in the past, approval of constitutions, as falling within the general framework of our republican form of government, has been done in exactly the same manner provided in this measure?

Mr. SAYLOR. The last 6 or 7 States admitted have been admitted in the manner just as is set forth in this bill.

Mr. ENGLE. As it is now?

Mr. SAYLOR. As it is now.

Mr. ENGLE. As respects the gentleman's amendment, I would accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. Is it true that the Constitution of Hawaii as presently adopted by the Constitutional Convention of Hawaii contains a provision that the right to reapportion the legislative and congressional districts shall reside not in the legislature of the proposed new State but in the Governor of the proposed new State?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; that is incorrect; there is a provision in there that states that the authority to reapportion as far as the State legislature is concerned is in the Governor, but not as far as the Congress is concerned.

Mr. DONOVAN. In other words, the Governor, and the Governor alone, of Hawaii can set up the legislative districts of the new State legislature.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is in the constitution.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman know of any State of the Union that has a provision of that kind?

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I hardly think that is in accord with democratic principles, and I think that provision alone would be enough to reject the constitution of the proposed new State.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is only your opinion, and with that, of course, I do not agree.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, with the adoption of the gentleman's amendment the matter of the Constitution of Hawaii and its provisions will be back before the Congress; and at that time after the constitution is submitted, if it is found to be defective in the judgment of the Congress, then the Territory of Hawaii can be required to change the constitution in accord with the mandate of Congress.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Indiana that that is another matter. I say that that is grounds enough for the rejection of the proposed constitution; I did not say anything about the rejection of the Territory as a State.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to have the situation clear so that we will know what we are voting on. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment the substance of which is that the constitution of the new State, if and when admitted, shall be submitted to the Congress for action. Am I correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. It would require a two-thirds vote of both branches of Congress present and voting thereon to approve; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would require approval by merely a majority of those present and voting thereon. Personally, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a sound one; and, with all due respect to my friend from Texas, I shall vote accordingly. Two-thirds would be certainly a radical departure from what has existed heretofore, and while I am going to vote for recommital I want the bill to be in as good form as possible so that should it pass the Congress it would provide for the orderly admission of Hawaii or any other Territory that might come later on as a State of the Union. I understand the gentleman from Texas has accepted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. That means that we have a very fine amendment as I see it providing for congressional approval by a majority present and voting thereon when it comes before this body.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Now, with these two amendments, the amendment and the substitute, we have got down to the issue that some of us raised yesterday, that there are things wrong with this constitution. Hearings were never held in the committee on the constitution, and I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the bill should be sent back to the committee and hearings had upon the constitutional issue rather than this process.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have stated my reasons, which are different from those entertained by others, why I shall vote to recommit; but I think the question before the House is separate and distinct from the matter that my distinguished friend has just referred to. In any event, this amendment will give the opportunity for both branches of the Congress to give consideration to the constitution if this bill becomes law and it does so under the ordinary rules of the House by a majority present and voting thereon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for the very fair statement of his position. In that respect I just wish the gentleman could come out wholeheartedly for the bill for statehood for Hawaii as he did before; in any event, since the constitution that may be finally adopted in Hawaii has to be passed on by the Congress of the United States they certainly will be put on notice that that constitution must not be repugnant to any of the provisions of our Constitution. It will come up before the Congress, and, as I said before, if there is anything the matter with it then it is within the power of the Congress to correct it. I think any true friend of statehood for Hawaii would want that much and no more.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will have the same thing in the future, we had the same thing in the past, and it is only fair that approval of the Hawaiian Constitution should be in accordance with the time-honored tradition and procedure of the Congress.

My friend has been very kind to me and I want naturally to reciprocate because I admire him very, very much. He said he wished I could go a little further. Might I ask my friend if he will guarantee that an Alaska statehood bill will be reported?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows I cannot make any such statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman do everything within his power to that end?

Mr. HALLECK. It has been stated that hearings will be held on the Alaska statehood bill. May I say to the gentleman I hope to have a little something to say on that in just a moment. I do not believe you can defend before the bar of public opinion of this country any sort of an operation that refuses to act upon each one of these proposals on their own merits. I think that is the way the people of the country want us to operate and I think that is the way we should operate.

Mr. McCORMACK. I suggest to the gentleman that he study the Bible a little because there is a very famous saying in the Bible that, "Out of evil sometimes comes good."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The substitute was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 23, line 5, delete the semicolon and insert a period in lieu thereof; delete the balance of line 5 and all of lines 6 through 10.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was trying to get the Chair's attention so that I could offer a committee amendment that goes to this section. May I try to get that permission?

Mr. VINSON. Let me ask the gentleman, Does the committee amendment confer upon the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction or is it concurrent jurisdiction?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The amendment that will be offered is a compromise. We had the military in the office, including the admirals and the generals, and the amendment to be offered by the committee is a compromise.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is not in order until the committee amendment has been acted on.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 3, insert the following:

"(b) Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, authority is reserved in the United States, subject to the proviso hereinafter set forth, for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, of section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as are now owned by the United States and held for military, naval, air force, or coast guard purposes, whether title to such lands was acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and

set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, (i) That the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts of land; (ii) that the reservation of authority in the United States for the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation over the lands aforesaid shall not operate to prevent such lands from being within the Territorial boundaries and a part of the State of Hawaii, and such power of exclusive legislation shall vest and remain in the United States only so long as the land is owned and used for the purposes aforesaid; and (iii) that unless and until the Congress shall have enacted laws preempting or inconsistent therewith, the State shall have concurrent jurisdiction for all purposes over the said lands over which such power of exclusive legislation is hereby reserved to the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON as an amendment to the committee amendment: On page 23, line 5, delete the semicolon and insert a period in lieu thereof; delete the balance of line 5 and all of lines 6 through 10.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offer will delete the third proviso of section 14 (b) on page 23 of the bill. The purpose of my amendment can be simply stated. It has the effect of reserving exclusive legislation over all lands now owned by the United States and held for military, naval, Air Force, or Coast Guard purposes.

I do not have to remind the Members of the strategic importance of the Hawaiian Islands. The Territory of Hawaii stands as a bastion in the Pacific, guarding the defenses of the west coast of the United States and the Panama Canal. Remember that Hawaii is America's Gibraltar. So long as the world is in its troubled state, we must never forget that these islands are one of our first lines of defense in the Pacific. There are many complexities involved in the islands' defense against an aggressor because of the Territory's isolation from the mainland.

At the present time, we have mighty installations located in Hawaii. Let me remind the Members that the total value of the naval installations in Hawaii is $495,189,526. This figure was computed as of July 1, 1952, and includes the value of land, buildings, and equipment necessary to maintain and service our naval forces based in Hawaii. The Army has land, buildings, and equipment valued at $107,376,179, and the value of Air Force installations is $110,000,000. This makes a grand total of approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars, which we have provided for the military services for the defense of our Territory and the United States.

I say that such valuable and necessary segments of our defense should be kept within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States. By striking the third proviso of section 14 (b) of the bill, we could accomplish just that.

When the United States holds exclusive jurisdiction over a military reservation located within a State, the State has no control over it. Its laws are not applicable thereto, and the sovereignty of the general government is complete. The Founding Fathers of our country recognized the importance of such complete control by the United States over its military reservations. They provided in the Constitution a method whereby the United States could exercise exclusive legislation over lands acquired from a State for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings. Later, President James Madison, in commenting upon the purpose of this constitutional provision, spoke of the indispensable necessity of such authority. And now, 150 years later, these words are as true as they were in his day.

Lest there be any misunderstanding concerning the words "exclusive legislation" and "exclusive jurisdiction" I should tell the Members that the words, for the purposes of ceded lands, are synonymous. The Supreme Court of the United States in Mason against Tax Commission, with Chief Justice Hughes speaking for the Court held that the term "exclusive jurisdiction" as used in such statutes, is recognized by the courts as being synonymous with the power to "exercise exclusive legislation" as the latter term is used in the Constitution. To say that the United States has acquired exclusive jurisdiction over lands within a State means that the State relinquishes to the Federal Government all authority to enforce its own laws within such areas.

We must go slow before granting concurrent jurisdiction to the State of Hawaii. This is a new step, for the Congress of the United States, in granting statehood to a territory not contiguous to the lands of the United States proper. Who can predict the stability and effectiveness of this new potential member of the Union? Since the answer to this is unknown, I urge the Congress to proceed with caution. If we go forward in haste and grant concurrent jurisdiction over the lands now owned by the United States and held for military purposes, we must thereafter share jurisdiction with this new State. We will find that the civil and criminal laws of the new State are generally applicable to the military lands and reservations, along with the Federal law. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to determine, at this time, how the laws of the State of Hawaii might affect our military bases. It is possible that such State laws, in times of national emergency, could restrict, yes, even interfere with the national defense. These matters cannot be accurately assessed in advance. I believe all will agree that any sharing of jurisdiction would of necessity give rise to problems of interpretation as to what State laws are applicable. We all know that such problems can only be solved by the courts. Past experience shows us that these matters of interpretation have been a fertile breeding ground for disagreements between Federal and local authorities who share jurisdiction over military reservations. They give rise to many vexing administrative problems for commanding officers. They foster ill will against military communities which resist the efforts of civilian authorities who endeavor to enforce State and local laws which are considered not properly applicable on military reservations. All this, most often, produces much burdensome litigation.

I do not contend that the new State of Hawaii, if granted concurrent jurisdiction, could directly interfere with the use of the reservations for military purposes, but it would have a considerable amount of jurisdiction over the military properties which could cause administrative and legal problems.

If the grave international situation were changed—if this national emergency had not been thrust upon us by Communist aggressors—this problem would not be as serious. But in these crucial hours when we would grant statehood to the Territory of Hawaii, we must be mindful of our responsibilities to all the citizens of the United States, not just to the people of Hawaii. We must do nothing here which might, in any way, interfere with the national defense and security. We want no litigation, during these times, to solve problems of interpretation of what State laws are applicable to our Government lands in Hawaii. We want no additional administrative problems. We want no ill will. All of this can be avoided by retaining exclusive Federal jurisdiction over the lands now held in Hawaii by the Military, Naval, Air Force, and Coast Guard of the United States.

There is no doubt how this may be accomplished. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the Congress, upon granting statehood to a Territory, may except certain lands therein from the jurisdiction of the new State, that is, retain exclusive legislation—or jurisdiction—over such land. Thus, all that the Congress need do to preserve this exclusive jurisdiction is to include in the bill explicit language retaining for the United States exclusive jurisdiction over military lands located within the proposed new State of Hawaii. This is already done in the bill. Note section 14 (b), page 22, of the bill. Note that here exclusive legislation is reserved to the United States over lands now owned and held for the Military, Naval, Air Force, and Coast Guard. The first proviso of this subsection gives the right to the new State to serve civil or criminal process within State tracts or parcels of land. This exception to the retention of exclusive jurisdiction is certainly necessary because if it was not granted to the new State, there is a possibility that the military reservations might become a sanctuary for debtors and criminals.

The second proviso of this subsection merely provides that exclusive legislation shall rest and remain in the United States only so long as the land is owned and used for military purposes.

But now we come to the third proviso which my amendment would delete in its entirety. After granting exclusive legislation in the first and second provisos, the bill would give concurrent jurisdiction over all of these lands. Quite frankly, I do not understand how

the third proviso ties in with the first and second. I am not sure, in my own mind, what was intended to be meant by the third proviso. I can only assume that the intent was to grant concurrent jurisdiction over lands owned by the United States and used for military purposes to the State of Hawaii. If this is the intent, then it is my opinion it should be stricken from the bill and that is just what my amendment would do. Please note that my amendment does not disturb the language in the first part of section 14 (b). For this is the subsection which grants exclusive jurisdiction to the United States. All my amendment would do would be to strike the contradictory language of the third proviso, whereby it seems that there is an intent to grant concurrent jurisdiction to the new State of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, at this grave period of history, it is no time for the Congress to provide for potential mixups and quarrels over jurisdiction on military properties and, consequently, I urge the Members to support by amendment and to keep exclusive Federal jurisdiction over the lands of the United States, used for military purposes, in Hawaii.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with due deference to the gentleman from Georgia, every argument he has given with regard to the committee amendment was presented to our committee by letter of Admiral Nunn.

You will notice that the gentleman who offered the amendment talked about security. There is no Member of this House who is not interested in seeing that security is maintained. But when the Department of Defense came before our committee and we met in conference, they talked about these same cases, whether or not police regulations should be affected on a military reservation, whether or not milk regulations should be affected on the reservations, whether or not building restrictions should be affected on the reservations.

After a long conference, at which representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force were present, we agreed on this amendment. I should like to read you a letter which was received by me from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, signed by Roger Kent, General Counsel:

> Reference is made to the proposed amendment recommended by the Department of Defense to H. R. 49, a bill "to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," designed to reserve exclusive jurisdiction in the United States over those lands now owned by the United States and held for military, naval, air-force, or coast-guard purposes.
>
> The Department of Defense understands that considerable opposition arose in the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the form of the proposed amendment and that a compromise amendment prepared in the office of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs was agreed to by its military departments subject to approval by the Department of Defense.
>
> The compromise amendment has been considered by the Department of Defense and meets with its approval.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman tell the committee whether the Federal Government under this compromise amendment has exclusive jurisdiction or concurrent jurisdiction?

Mr. SAYLOR. They have concurrent jurisdiction.

Mr. VINSON. Exactly.

Mr. SAYLOR. I believe we can justify the concurrent jurisdiction.

I will agree with the gentleman from Georgia that it is a serious matter, but what this amendment provides is that under all circumstances the Territory of Hawaii or the State of Hawaii shall always have the right to serve criminal and civil process on the reservations; that notwithstanding such reservation of the power of exclusive legislation by Congress, these particular lands will remain within the Territorial boundaries and be a part of the State of Hawaii but the reservation of such power of exclusive congressional legislation will cease if and when these lands cease to be used for military purposes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a question?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will not yield further unless I can get more time.

Mr. VINSON. We will ask for more time. This is a very important matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important statement. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have been listening to the gentleman's explanation, especially in reference to the service of criminal process and the handling of criminal cases in the Federal domain and on military property. In what respect will that provision amend the military code of justice where we outline specifically how these matters should be handled? Is there going to be a change by this bill in the manner in which a man is arrested, tried, convicted, or even served?

Mr. SAYLOR. None whatsoever. This will not affect anything in the military code.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We have something in the military code, and I might mention I am chairman of that subcommittee which wrote the code outlining the jurisdiction of the military over crimes committed on a military post. Is it the gentleman's contention that there is nothing here that affects that at all?

Mr. SAYLOR. There is nothing here that affects that at all.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We have something in that code, too, dealing with the rights of civilian authorities with reference to crimes committed on military posts. Is there anything here that will change the rules regarding the rights of the civilian authorities to come on posts?

Mr. SAYLOR. None whatsoever. The important thing and the part which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia wants to strike out, is to say that these military reservations will become little islands in which only the law of the military will apply. Now what the amendment as adopted by the committee will do is just this: That until Congress takes some action any laws which are now in effect in the State of Hawaii, or hereafter enacted, will be in effect on the island.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman just stated that my amendment would have the effect of creating a little, isolated area or island. Let me say this because after all we do want to debate this thing in an intelligent way. This is nothing new for the Federal Government to do. In the naval ordnance plant at Camden, Ark., the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction. In the marine station at Miami and Camp Lejeune, and I have here a long list of them, the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction. My point is that you set out to give the Federal Government exclusive jurisdiction by the first part of your amendment, but you nullify it by including the concurrent jurisdiction. So it conflicts with the first part. No place is more important for the defense of this country than Hawaii. Therefore, no one, not even the State of Hawaii should have anything to do with the defense of this country so far as such laws dealing with the military installations are concerned.

Mr. SAYLOR. What the committee is trying to do is this: Congress has not passed laws covering every phase for every military reservation. For example, take the District of Columbia. Each one of you Members have in your files or in your libraries, two big volumes which are constantly being added to, a full code of laws for the District of Columbia. Such a code does not exist for every military reservation and until such time as Congress passes such a code there shall exist on these reservations concurrent jurisdiction. The reason the military agreed to this amendment as it is to be here, is that unless this amendment is adopted in its present form, you are going to create in the military two classes of persons—those who are able to live on the military reservation and those who are not able to live on the military reservation. They admitted that as extensive as the holdings of the military are in Hawaii, it is impossible for them to go out and provide homes for all of the military, and because of that, those who would live on the reservation will be covered by one set of laws and those who will live off the military reservation will be covered by another set of laws. I do not believe that anyone desires to have that sort of situation exist.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Is it not a fact that a witness from the Department of Defense submitted an amendment to the subcommittee which vested exclusive Federal jurisdiction in these installations?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. And he testified before the subcommittee that the reason they wanted that in this bill was for the security of the United States, and that portion of the bill which the gentleman from Georgia is now attacking is a compromise which was worked out with the Department of Defense, but it is not the original amendment which was offered.

Mr. SAYLOR. It is not the original amendment which was offered.

I would like to call attention to some of the things involved in this bill. This the military were forced to admit, that their position in Hawaii is, as I understand—and it is the same in some of the other military reservations—it is impossible for them to build all of the installations which they would like to have. So what they do is to rent or lease for a long period of time a tract of land within the military reservation. Then they enter into a contract with the contractor to build for them the type of building which they want on the military reservation, and to rent it to the military when it is completed. The amendment which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has offered will mean that when a civilian who goes onto that military reservation is hurt, he will not be entitled to any of the advantages that he would if he had been employed by the contractor off of the military reservation. The Workmen's Compensation Act will not apply. Many of the other acts, as far as building codes are concerned, will not apply. The Department of Defense and those who appeared before us admitted that this compromise would accomplish everything they wanted and everything they needed; and if it ever became necessary for the military to have anything further, they would have the right to come to Congress and have any law passed that would enable them to do anything they wanted to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. SAYLOR was granted 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is my understanding of the gentleman's explanation correct, that if the committee proposal is adopted, and through it concurrent jurisdiction is conveyed upon the new government of the State of Hawaii, that thereafter a future Congress may withdraw from the State of Hawaii concurrent jurisdiction and reacquire exclusive jurisdiction?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. So it is a question of giving full jurisdiction now, with the right to acquire jurisdiction later, or giving it to Hawaii and reacquiring exclusive jurisdiction later?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. And in either event the interest of the Federal Government is protected?

Mr. SAYLOR. In either way the interest of the Federal Government is protected. I believe the general counsel for the Department of Defense has indicated his complete approval of the amendment as it is drawn, and I would ask that the proposed amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 89, noes 122.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 21, line 9, after "14", insert "(a)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Page 11, line 13, strike out the word "two" immediately preceding the word "Representatives" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have a companion amendment that would be in the nature of a perfecting amendment. In the interest of time, I ask unanimous consent that the two may be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Page 14, line 2, strike out the word "two" immediately preceding the word "Representatives" and insert in lieu thereof the word "one."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. On this amendment—I am not going to take the time of the committee because I think you realize that the amendment is one which was discussed in debate yesterday and has been mentioned several times in the debate today. It has to do with the question of whether or not if Hawaii is allowed to enter the Union as a State she shall have two Representatives. The whole thing resolves itself down to this: that according to the figures I have there are possibly 500,000 people in the Hawaiian Islands. I merely call your attention to one fact: There are many Members of this Congress on the floor of this House who are today representing more constituents than that in one district in this country. I think that until a reapportionment is worked out in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and the laws of this land one Representative from the Hawaiian Islands should be sufficient.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see this done in a legal manner. The title of the bill states that Hawaii shall be admitted on an equal footing with the other States. That clearly shows that the gentleman from Texas wants to admit them on the same basis. The States have been admitted with the number of Representatives based on population. According to a letter I received from the Bureau of the Census when the number of Members of the House come to 428 the State of Hawaii is automatically entitled to 2 Representatives. If Hawaii is to be admitted on an equal footing with the other States then they should be entitled to their correct number of Representatives here in this House in accordance with the laws that are now on the statute books.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman think it would be fair to the Sixth District of West Virginia with 456,000 population and but 1 Representative, to have Hawaii admitted with 2 Representatives for approximately the same number of people?

Mr. SAYLOR. I certainly do, because when the great State of West Virginia was admitted to the Union they were admitted in accordance with the same law under which Hawaii will be admitted, and West Virginia got three Representatives.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. It is a fact, of course, that State legislatures do not always apportion according to population, and I personally feel that this argument—although I am not for this bill—is not very sound. They should either come in as other States under the formula established or they should not come in at all.

Mr. SAYLOR. I thank the gentleman; I agree with him heartily.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I had considered offering an amendment similar to that offered by the gentleman from Texas. This provision of the bill has disturbed me somewhat. On the information the gentleman has given us I understand each State is entitled to a representative for each 350,000 people or approximately that and each major fraction thereof. Is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; that is not correct; each State is automatically entitled to one.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right, but the States now are entitled to a Representative for approximately every 350,000 people in the State.

Mr. SAYLOR. As it divides up numerically that is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. All right, and for every major fraction of 350,000 they

would be entitled to another Representative.

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The Hawaiian Islands now have a population, according to the 1950 census, of 499,000 people, in round figures. They would automatically be entitled to one Representative for the first 350,000 people?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is where the error in the gentleman's argument occurs. If they have one citizen in the State they are automatically entitled to one Representative.

Mr. ABERNETHY. But in order to be entitled to two Representatives a State of the Union today must have a total of about 525,000 people; is that correct?

Mr. SAYLOR. To be entitled to two today, I believe that is correct.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then you are giving to the proposed State of Hawaii one Representative more than the States of the Union would have today with a similar population?

Mr. SAYLOR. No; we are not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has just said so.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, if they have 525,000 people they would be entitled to two Representatives.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is right.

Mr. SAYLOR. But I can say that the Bureau of the Census has certified to our committee that they are entitled under the formula under which you and I and every other Member of Congress came here to two Representatives.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hesitate to use a particular State to illustrate my point, but let us take the State of New Hampshire. I was talking to one of the Members from the State of New Hampshire yesterday about this very matter. I understand that the State of New Hampshire barely saved its two Members—by about six or seven thousand people—after the last census. If they had had six or seven thousand people less than the 1950 census gave them the delegation from New Hampshire would have been reduced from two to one; nevertheless, the State of New Hampshire would still have had twenty or twenty-five thousand people more than the islands of Hawaii now have and yet have less representation.

Mr. SAYLOR. That I am not in position to debate with the gentleman. I can tell the gentlemen that the formula has been applied for admission of his State to the Union was this same formula and the people of Hawaii are entitled, according to the Bureau of the Census which used that formula, to two Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment be defeated.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it might be helpful if I just read a letter from the Bureau of the Census which was addressed to the Senate Committee on January 30, 1953, as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In accordance with the request stated in your letter of January 29, 1953, we have calculated the representation to which Hawaii would have been entitled based on the population enumerated as of April 1, 1950.

The population enumerated in Hawaii as of April 1, 1950, was 499,794. By the method of equal proportions, if Hawaii were included among the States, this would have entitled them to two Representatives. The first Representative would have been assigned automatically as the minimum which each State receives. The second Representative would be assigned when the House totaled 428 Members.

A statement, Steps in Computing an Apportionment, showing the details of computation and a section of the priority list, showing when Hawaii would be entitled to the second Representative, are enclosed for your information.

If we can be of further assistance to you, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

ROY V. PEEL,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

Then follows in the record of the committee hearings a complicated set of steps which have been taken under the formula laid down by law to compute the number of Representatives which Hawaii would be entitled to. It is a very complicated process. I am not in position to explain it or to elucidate it for the House. If I went through it I think it probably would be more confusing than helpful. The fact is, however, that we have an official statement from an official source which computes the number of Representatives each State is entitled to, giving Hawaii two, which appears in this bill. Therefore it seems to me to be a fair assumption that the two we designate in the bill for Hawaii is just as correct as the ones designated for our respective States, and which we all accepted.

There is another thing I would like to say: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is adopted, in my opinion that amendment would be unconstitutional. We have some very splendid constitutional lawyers in this body and I would like to hear some of them address themselves to the proposition that you can bring a State into the Union, discriminate against it, and treat it differently than the other States and on an unequal basis.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I ask the gentleman this question? Let us suppose that, according to the last census State A had a population of 499,000 people, how many Representatives would it now have in the House of Representatives?

Mr. ENGLE. Is the gentleman trying to get me to figure this out?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am not trying to trap the gentleman, I am trying to find out whether they are brought in under the same treatment of representation that is now given to the States on the mainland.

Mr. ENGLE. I cannot be trapped because I do not know enough to get into a trap on this subject. What I said was this: We have the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Census who figures the representation for everybody else, and here is what he said: He said the number is 2. As I said, it is a long, complicated formula. I have not gone through it and I have not studied it and I do not know how it would be applied in each particular instance.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. As to the formula under which every State was admitted, Hawaii would be entitled to 2, but under the conditions that we are living under today, with 350,000, Hawaii would not be entitled to 2. Now the question is: Do you want the formula and make that sacred or do you want the actual situation that we face today in some of our States?

Mr. ENGLE. Here is the position we are in. Hawaii, under the formula we all operate under, is entitled to two Representatives. Under the Constitution of the United States Hawaii is entitled to come into this Union on an equal footing or not at all. It would be unconstitutional, in my opinion, to do otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. What it boils down to is this: Under the current law two is the number that Hawaii should have, and under the Constitution two is the number she must have, because she must come in on an equal footing. It would be unconstitutional for us to provide otherwise.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There has been a lot of talk about equal footing in comparison with other States, but I want to call attention to another section of this act, section 16, which says that "Nothing contained in this or any other act shall be construed as depriving the Federal Maritime Board of the exclusive jurisdiction heretofore conferred on it over common carriers engaged in transportation by water between ports in the State of Hawaii and other ports in the United States, its Territories, or possessions."

All the other States are under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Now is that equal footing? Let us look at all of the bill.

Mr. ENGLE. If the gentleman wants to make a point against that section, and I assume he will at an appropriate time, that is perfectly all right. What I am talking about now is these two Representatives. I say it is indisputable they are entitled to two under the existing law, and under the Constitution we must bring them in on an equal footing or not at all.

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, if they are entitled to two under the law, and they should not be entitled to two, then we should change the law of apportionment and not this particular section.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank the gentleman. That is entirely correct.

Mr. FARRINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, under this bill the Representatives from Hawaii would come

in in addition to the present membership of the House, and increase the number to 437. Then in the reapportionment of 1960 presumably we would go back to 435. Of course, if the House in the meantime decides to change that, it can.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something on this amendment. I am supporting it. I have heretofore opposed statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, too, for that matter. In all candidness I am opposed to it now. I think it is dangerous and a mistake to go 2,000 miles beyond the continental limits of the United States to make States with the force and power it would have. But on the question of apportionment; some questions have been raised in my mind that I would like to have cleared up, and I should like to ask members of the committee, who have given much thought and attention to this program.

Do I correctly understand that there is a different method of law of apportionment by which States are brought into the Union than that used in apportioning the Members for each State following the census every 10 years?

Mr. SAYLOR. The answer to that is "No."

Mr. HARRIS. You were talking a moment ago about States brought in years ago under a certain law. A law the same as all States come in under a method entitling the State to a certain number of Members of Congress at the time of admission. May I advise the gentleman that in 1941 when we had the question of method of apportionment up for consideration, the Congress changed the law at that time. Instead of the method of apportionment then used, we adopted what was called the equal proportion method. That became permanent law and is the law of the land today. You are talking about certain States 40 or 50 years ago coming into the Union on the same basis. Of course, the present method was not the law at that time.

As I understand from the debate here, this would increase the number of Members of the House to 437. You are talking about the Bureau of the Census report. What I should like to know, is, if this House is increased to 437 Members, and using the equal proportion method as adopted by the Congress in 1941, the same method used to determine the number of Congressmen from each State, how many Members under that method would Hawaii be entitled to have?

Mr. SAYLOR. Two.

Mr. HARRIS. How can the gentleman say it would be entitled to two when a State existing today with more population would be entitled to only one?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes; if the gentleman can clear up the question I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the theory of this whole apportionment law is that that State should get that number of Representatives which will make the fairest apportionment. May I call to the attention of the gentleman that his State and mine both have 6 Representatives, yet if my State had 7 Representatives our districts would be larger than yours, but if yours had 5 and my State 7, the disproportion would be greater. Does not that explain the situation?

Mr. HARRIS. No, not quite, because you take the technical method of apportionment this Congress has adopted, which I have endeavored to explain very briefly, and that makes an entirely different situation. At the time we had this fight there was a question between Arkansas and Michigan. If we had retained the former method as was the law then, Michigan would have gotten an extra Congressman from the 1940 census, but it was changed to the equal-proportion method, consequently Michigan retained its number at that time and Arkansas retained its number. There is a difference in the method of apportionment. As I understand it, you are taking something here which the Bureau of the Census says has been followed throughout the history of the Nation, and bringing, or propose to bring, into the Union a State and saying that State is entitled to so many Members of Congress. But if you apply the present law then the proposed State would not necessarily be entitled to that number.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Under the formula by which these States have been brought in, Hawaii today coming in as a State would be entitled to two Members. But, under this apportionment method which is the law of the land, and which regulates all States, then if that apportionment method is applied, Hawaii would only be entitled to one Member.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the point. In other words, do I understand the gentleman to say that we are bringing Hawaii in as a State under this bill, and we say by act of Congress they are entitled to two Members, but if next year the census was to be taken, applying the equal-apportionment method the following year, Hawaii would be entitled to only one?

Mr. MASON. That is right. That is absolutely right.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a minute and a half will not give me much time to add to the confusion. I just want to say this to you, that of all the reasons that have been offered for recommittal of this bill to the committee for further study, this demonstrates beyond any question of a doubt it is time for this bill to go back for further consideration. I notice what has been said by the Census Bureau. Well, it happens that the Census Bureau does not write the laws of the land. They are written by the Congress of the United States within the framework of the Constitution, and the Constitution says very little about it, but here is what it does say:

> Representatives shall be apportioned amongst the several States according to their respective numbers—counting the whole number of persons—

And so forth. That is all there is to it. It is very simple. It says according to their respective numbers. We have laid down the formula in the law. It is true that in another clause of the Constitution, it states that each State shall have one Representative, but it does not say each State shall have two Representatives when no other State is entitled to two Representatives. But, I merely rose for the purpose of pointing out to the House again two facts. One is that two States are going to lose Representatives in this Congress. Somebody is going to lose two seats. The other thing is that this demonstrates clearly that this bill should go back to committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take advantage of the time to ask my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, who is one of the finest constitutional lawyers in the House of Representatives, if he does not think that if Hawaii, as has been certified by the Bureau of the Census, is entitled to two Representatives can we, without doing violence to the Constitution, give them any less?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think I answered the gentleman's question. I appreciate the compliment which is entirely undeserved, but I do think I answered the gentleman's question when I said that the Census Bureau does not write the laws of the land, but that Congress does. We have written the law and they are entitled to one Representative for every 350,000 people.

Mr. ENGLE. Well, I do not say that the census people write the law—I say that the census people made the computation under the law and came out with two Representatives.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does not the gentleman know that this Congress can set the number of Members of Congress at any figure it wishes?

Mr. ENGLE. Of course, I know that, but what I am talking about is the law we now have. I say we must abide by the law, and under the Constitution apply it equally.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, all day long today, my phone has sounded and Members of this great legislative body have anxiously asked me whether or not the reported statement over the radio last evening and in the newspapers this day, to the effect that Chairman VELDE, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, of which congressional committee I am again a member, had announced that the committe was to investigate communism in the American clergy, or in religion, was by authority of the committee and by my vote as a member of the committee.

Because of the nature of the work of this important committee and of the individual responsibilities involved in being a member of it in these times of national stresses and strains; when every day calls loudly for a most considered opinion, as well as, for a vigilant and vigorous and tireless fulfillment of our committee duties, I felt impelled, under the circumstances, to make the following explanatory statement to the press today. I therefore submit the same to you, my colleagues, for your information. I hope it will aid you in promptly understanding my individual attitude in the matter involved. The answer to the inquiring press was as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE CLYDE DOYLE, OF CALIFORNIA, MEMBER OF ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE AND HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

The announcement by the Un-American Activities Committee chairman, HAROLD VELDE, Republican, Illinois, in his radio discussion as reported in the Washington newspapers this morning that the committee might investigate the American clergy was not authorized by action of the committee.

In fact, the subject was never discussed, to my knowledge, by the committee before his announcement, but on the contrary, at the very first meeting of the committee this 83d Congress, I proposed to the full committee membership in regular meeting that the committee itself should be the only authorizing authority to determine the areas of investigations to be made by the professional staff of the committee and of the hearings by the committee. This was unanimously agreed to and established, and neither the distinguished committee chairman nor any other member of the committee individually has the right to make any such announcement of what the committee will or will not do as to investigations or hearings.

I am not interested in the committee investigating any American citizen on any basis excepting it first appears pretty clear and certain from the facts in hand that such a person is part of the presently existing subversive Communist conspiracy to overthrow the present form of our great Nation by force and violence. Several American juries have recently held American Communists guilty of such intent and it is this type of subversive activity that I am primarily interested in helping to uncover and expose to public gaze and knowledge. It must never occur that the Un-American Activities Committee shall directly or indirectly subject any citizen to either investigation or hearing for any petty political or or personal reason, or spite, or with any motive of punishment or retribution. However, the activities of all subversive individuals and groups must be exposed at the earliest possible date to public knowledge and spotlight. It is not nonconformity to orthodox thinking which I am willing to interfer with, nor embarrass nor discourage. We need all the sincere and patriotic thinking and worshiping and writing which we can have. We must not become totalitarian. That is what we condemn in Russian Communists and their Government. As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, I always have and always will reserve the right to speak out my individual position and thinking. I regret that our committee chairman made this unauthorized statement. He should have asked for the thinking and the decision of the full committee membership, but he never asked it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the Subcommittee on the Territories Committee of the 79th Congress that visited the Hawaiian Islands and we had an opportunity at that time to make a rather extensive examination of the islands and their peoples.

We held hearings at most of the important places on the islands, and we interviewed many of the citizens—those in prominent positions as well as men and women in all walks of life—and it was the view of the subcommittee that made those examinations that statehood should be granted to the islands.

In view of that, I introduced one of the companion bills in the 80th Congress, seeking the admission of the Hawaiian Islands as a State of the Union on a par with other States. In the 83d Congress on January 3, 1953, I reintroduced H. R. 205 for this same purpose.

The committee found from these examinations and interviews and hearings, that the islands have developed economically to a position which certainly would entitle them to admission as a State of the Union. Their economic development, industries, and agriculture have proceeded certainly to a far greater extent than, I believe, any other of the Territories that have been admitted to this Union.

From the social and cultural standpoint, I believe they have developed to a position which, in my judgment and, I believe, in the subcommittee's judgment, is on a par, if not higher in some respects, than the various States of the continental United States. They have a very healthy view of the political and social demands upon citizens. They take an active part in the political affairs of their islands.

The racial standpoint is another problem that our committee went into quite thoroughly because there have been some charges that the racial issue is such there that it might militate against the admission of the islands to the Union as a State. The committee, after its examination, had an opportunity to discuss the problem with the residents of all racial mixtures and felt that that was not a deterrent. We felt that the islanders have handled the racial question perhaps better than we have in many respects. The various groups of racial origin there in the islands seem to cooperate and get along well socially and politically, and in their business relationships, so that in our judgment that is not a factor that would militate against the admission of the islands as a State.

We found many residents of the islands who were of foreign origin but were exceptionally well educated. They used excellent English and showed themselves to be fully posted on civic, social, political, and public affairs, and were possessed of the faculties, education, and loyalty to exercise full citizenship.

When a Territory has remained in a tutelage status for as long as Hawaii has, with its people required to pay taxes to the Federal Treasury just as mainland citizens do, but denied the right to elect representatives with power to represent effectively, by voting, Hawaii's position on the legislation that sets up the taxing system, then I am of the opinion that such an area should be admitted as a State if that is what its citizens wish and if the area is otherwise qualified.

We know that Hawaiians want statehood. They indicated it in their 1940 plebiscite, and when the House subcommittee, in 1946, held hearings in Hawaii, almost every witness favored statehood. Full opportunity and encouragement was given to the opponents of statehood to come before us with their objections, but only a few appeared and there was no organized opposition. What did appear plainly from the testimony and exhibits filed with the committee was that Hawaii has conducted its affairs in a highly intelligent and efficient manner, that its revenue-producing structure is sound, its businesses diversified, and its electorate politically conscious.

I was particularly impressed by the high percentage of its qualified voters who exercised their franchise and by the excellent representation among the voters of the various racial groups in the Territory. The evidence before us showed that bloc voting, a reference to which so frequently is made in discussions of Hawaii statehood, was not prevalent to anything like the extent one might support, and our subcommittee concluded that while some bloc voting was inevitable, it was not likely to assume serious proportions, since the racial groups are divided within themselves by differences in economic, social, and political outlook which transcend their common racial backgrounds.

Hawaii's Legislature, like its electorate, is composed of members of a great many racial groups and, in no small measure, due to the intelligence and interest of the voters, has consistently enacted legislation which, for progressiveness and social policy, ranks favorably with our leading States. The Territory has adopted many of the uniform laws enacted by our States in such fields as partnerships, sales, negotiable instruments, workmen's compensation, and criminal extradition. It has a Territorial retirement system, comprehensive public-health laws, progressive labor legislation, including a child labor, a workmen's compensation act, and wage-and-hour law, and an unemployment-compensation law which provides more liberal benefits than the laws of any State except New York. Labor organization has penetrated all industries, including sugar and pineapple, and Hawaii has extended collective bargaining to agricultural labor.

The stature of the United States can only be increased by incorporating such a forward-looking community into the Union in the fullest sense.

While the advantages of statehood to Hawaii are great, permitting its people to elect their governor, send voting representatives to the Congress, and vote in presidential elections, the advantages to the United States are no less great, militarily and economically. The strategic importance to the United States of Hawaii's geographic location is surely obvious by now. Hawaii has been called the crossroads of the Pacific, lying, as it does, closer to North America than to any other large land area. America's interest in the Pacific has grown enormously as a result of the war and it would be of distinct advantage to the United States to have, in the Senate and House, Representatives from Hawaii who

know the history and problems of the Pacific area. Its nearness to the Orient, in effect, brings the United States coastline 2,400 miles nearer the oriental markets. Tourists from the mainland, particularly from the western coast States, knew Hawaii well before the war, and now that air transportation is becoming more readily available, through frequency of service and lowered costs, tourists from the Eastern States are brought within reach of Hawaii. It can no longer be argued that distance militates against Hawaiian statehood. The Pacific Northwest area, and Oregon in particular, has close commercial ties with Hawaii and would welcome Hawaii's entry as a State. Over 800 firms in that area are doing business with Hawaii and much of Hawaii's lumber comes from Washington and Oregon, 94 million board feet having been shipped as early as 1940. The potentialities of future expansion of commerce between the two areas, especially if Hawaii should become a State, are great.

Hawaii is a modern American community, maintaining to a high degree of efficiency the same type of educational, health, and welfare facilities to be found in our highly organized State jurisdictions. Hawaii has well-equipped schools for its 81,000 school children, more than 99 percent of whom are American citizens. The schools are better attended than the schools of any State except Maine and Michigan. To an unusual degree, rural schools in Hawaii are on a par with city schools. Teachers are higher paid on an average and have a lighter pupil load than the teachers in mainland schools.

This equality of educational opportunity in Hawaii is maintained because of Hawaii's unique school organization. Although Hawaii's public-school program is controlled in the typical American practice under a lay board of education, the largest city or the smallest village in Hawaii, regardless of the degree of wealth of the area, is provided with comparable school facilities. All schools in Hawaii, both large and small, are comparable in their organization, the 5-year certification requirement for the teaching personnel, the salaries paid, and the education supplies and equipment made available.

Only one State, Delaware, has a comparable centralized school system, although such States as North Carolina and California, in their financing of education, have moved forward in bringing about the type of equalization of education opportunity maintained by Hawaii for nearly 50 years. Under statehood, Hawaii hopes to improve, yet maintain, the centralized feature of its educational system.

Hawaii's educational system was inspired by American missionaries from New England early in the 1820's. One school organized by these Americans in Hawaii celebrated its 100th anniversary in 1940. Californians used to send their children to school in Hawaii because boat travel to the islands was safer than coach travel to New England.

The public schools of Hawaii have been surveyed at least once every decade since 1920. The opening paragraph of the 1946 report on education in the Hawaiian Islands, made by the American Council on Education, states:

> The Territory of Hawaii has convincing evidence in the days which followed December 7, 1941, that its educational program has faced a critical test, and that the objectives and ideals of democratic citizenship had become a part of the lives of a people of many races and backgrounds. Every American citizen owes a debt of gratitude to those people in the Territory who had the vision to plan and develop a democratic school program. Few other communities can boast of having done so much educationally in such a short period of time.

Hawaii's school system is patterned after the best in American tradition. Modern dental hygiene facilities, hearing and vision testing are a part of the regular program. Its nutrition program and its cafeteria service are exemplary.

Health education and service are another well-developed phase of Hawaii's educational system. That is not surprising, for an official board of health in Hawaii preceded that of any State in the Union. King Kamehameha III in 1839 created, by royal proclamation, a board of health. The first State board of health was created by the State of Massachusetts in 1869.

During the fiscal year 1945, 90 percent of all births in Hawaii were attended by physicians.

A bureau of mental hygiene has been in operation since 1939, when it was created by Hawaii's Legislature.

No individual in Hawaii need go without medical care if he is ill. In the rural sections of the Territory, a county health unit is maintained, and a physician paid a salary by the board of health. Funds for certain types of health care of medically indigent persons are also provided through the county governments and the Territory's Department of Public Welfare.

According to statistics published in 1945, no State or State health department, but only the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, exceed Hawaii in per capita expenditures of funds for public health. Two-thirds to three-fourths of the funds for public health spent in Hawaii are appropriated by the Territorial Legislature.

Public health developments in Hawaii include maternal and child-health activities, a program for the aid of crippled children, certain sanitary procedures and efforts to lower venereal diseases. The decline of infant and maternal mortality rates and venereal disease rates has been more propitious in Hawaii than in the continental United States as a whole.

Although Hawaii is world famous as an unusually healthful place in which to live, the Territory's health record has been reached over a period of years not by accident, but by the application of sound principles of public health.

The Territorial department of public welfare has developed a modern program of public assistance. Relief is extended in the fields of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, to dependent children, and general assistance for those needing medical and dental care, hospitalization, and burial services.

A summary made by the United States Social Security Board of the welfare department's personnel requirements and salaries showed Hawaii's standards in this regard are the highest in the United States.

All told, Hawaii has been successful in instilling into her citizens the objectives and ideals of our democracy. By having the American pattern of high standards in public education, health, and welfare as a primary objective during her 50 years of apprenticeship under the American flag, Hawaii has unqualifiedly been fitted for statehood.

Mr. Chairman, support throughout the Nation for State government for Hawaii and Alaska is both widespread and sincere. Our constituents back home give such ample evidence of their grassroots interest in statehood for our two Territories that we should vote favorably on this legislation.

One of the categories of national enthusiasm for the extension of the privileges of full American citizenship to Hawaii, for example, is that of the editors of the press.

A recent survey of 1 year's editorial opinion on statehood for Hawaii covered all 48 States. The survey was compiled from 282 newspapers with a combined daily circulation of 25 million. Of the 733 editorials collated, 691, or 94 percent, favored statehood for Hawaii. Each State had at least one editorial endorsing statehood, and several had many.

Mr. Chairman, I most sincerely hope that this bill granting statehood to Hawaii will be passed by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized.

"COLD SHOULDER" FOR ALASKA?

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, Hawaii should be star No. 49 and Alaska star No. 50, and both should be admitted to the Union at once.

Some political strategists would deny the sovereign rights of both by playing one against the other, or, by naked partisanship, try to put over a split decision that would approve Hawaii's claim while rejecting Alaska's.

This shabby maneuver must fail.

It is unwise and unjust on many counts, but I shall cite only a few.

And, in doing so, I shall not criticize the claims of one Territory in order to build up a case for the other.

Alaska's bid for statehood has so many merits that we can ignore them only at our peril.

Almost one-fifth the size of the United States, it almost touches Communist Siberia, and is, therefore, the base upon which we rely for warning and interception of a major aerial assault before it reaches the key industrial centers of the 48 States.

Furthermore, it is rich in unused resources, all important to the economy of our Nation. Statehood would raise that domain from the backward status of a colony and repudiate the Soviet claim that we are imperialistic. The pride and enterprise that are spurred by recognition of equality would attract capital and settlers to this new land of opportunity.

At a referendum held on October 8, 1946, the residents of our last frontier voted for statehood by an impressive majority.

It is America's back door, and that door reaches up into the skies. If that door does not hold, it will open up the shortest overland route for Russian long-range bombers to reach the target known as US.

The military recognize its importance. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent to strengthen its defenses.

Does Alaska merit statehood?

Put that question to the people who live in Washington, Oregon, and California and they will tell you that without the shock-absorbers of Alaska and Hawaii they would not be too confident of their own safety.

Remember Pearl Harbor and Attu. They took and blunted a two-pronged attack from one enemy. If they should be called upon to protect us again, this time from a much stronger foe, coming at us high, and with the speed of sound, it would seem advisable to have full-fledged partners defending these outposts.

The United States purchased Alaska from Russia in 1867—86 years ago.

That is a long time to wait for equality.

We could lose this key position by default if we continue to neglect the rights of the pioneering Americans who are developing our northern shield.

Alaska has paid back its purchase price a hundred times over.

It supplies us with most of our canned salmon and most of the tin that is produced by the United States. It is rich in many other minerals, and may turn out to be the atomic ore bank that we will have to depend upon in peace or war.

Some of our States had far less people when they were admitted to the Union, and, even today, they cannot compare with our huge Northwest Territory in strategic value, resources, and opportunities for settlement.

It has timber and waterpower in abundance.

In some areas, the unabused land is rich in agricultural yield.

The leading communities, although small, are more modern than some in the United States.

The native minority—early American—is both sturdy and loyal.

Which is more than can be said for some who live in such metropolitan centers as New York City or Washington, D. C.

American public opinion is for the elevation of Alaska to statehood.

The people are watching this Congress and they will not be fooled by any parliamentary juggling that tries to put off recognition until a tomorrow that may never come.

They do not want to see Alaska become Russian America again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not take the minute and a half allowed. I am afraid that in the parliamentary disposition of this bill my true attitude may not be on the RECORD.

I was in favor of Statehood for Hawaii when I first came here. Since listening to the debate and after studying the facts I have changed my mind, and I think it is only fair to the people of my district that they know what my position is and why.

The attitude expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REAMS] most nearly expresses my attitude at this time.

I am not much impressed by the argument that the people of Hawaii will be more subversive than other Americans.

I have not been impressed at all by the argument that there are not enough Caucasians in Hawaii. I do not believe in racial or religious distinctions.

I am not impressed by the argument about what the Communists will say concerning what we do here. I think it would behoove all of us to think more about ourselves and less about how the Communists may misuse what we say here. Let us do what we think is right without regard to how the Communists may distort what is right.

I am opposed to the admission to statehood of Alaska, Hawaii, or any other area, commonwealth, possession, or Territory.

I heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] say that this bill is an expression of the impulse of history. As I read history I receive no such impulse. I shall vote to recommit the bill, in the hope that the committee will give more study to the possibility of extending a commonwealth status to this area of Hawaii. That is the true impulse of history, the development of federation, the cooperation of like, free, and independent people; peoples with a common political basis, organized for peace and decency in the world.

I think anything to the contrary is unwise for us, and I shall vote against the bill.

I believe that the United States should limit its membership to its present status. We are big enough now. Our structure of government is already very large, cumbersome, and unwieldy. We have all we can do within the continental United States without extending statehood particularly to distant islands and Territories.

If we take this step today we cannot turn back. Next will come Alaska, then Puerto Rico, then the Virgin Islands, then the Canal Zone, then Guam, then Samoa—and heavens knows not what. As a matter of fact, Alaska and Puerto Rico have better cases than Hawaii.

As I read history, nations that have extended themselves as is now suggested for us in this way, have sown the seeds of their ultimate weakness and destruction. The United States can best fulfill its great destiny by making itself strong and by cooperation with and through protective help for free people everywhere.

By reaching too far and spreading itself too thin we will not be strong and we cannot help others.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, just to point out that the formula has not been changed. It is the formula handed down by the Census Bureau relative to the apportionment of Members to Hawaii and in the United States.

Also, the argument that some States will lose two Representatives. In the census of 1960 I suppose some States will. There will be 25 million new voters in the United States about that time. Following the last census I understand, the State of California gained seven Members. So there will be some change. Then we go back to 435 and not 437 Representatives in the House. I believe the amendment should be voted down and the committee sustained in asking for two Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, on a division there were—ayes 144, noes 158.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. ROGERS of Texas and Mr. SAYLOR.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 188, noes 134.

So the amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct the second amendment, page 14, line 1, namely that "line 1" be changed to read "line 2."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, in explanation of my vote to recommit this bill, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the minority whip. I do so because I believe it is the only practical way to get any assurance at all that Alaskan statehood will be brought to the floor. I supported a similar move in the committee and there offered a substitute bill embodying statehood for both Territories. Both motions were defeated in committee. If this measure is recommitted, I expect to do my best to secure committee action favorable to statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii, jointly, so there can be no question as to their both receiving fair consideration.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, the Territory of Hawaii is not yet ready for statehood. Contrary to a rather widespread belief, Hawaii has undergone a decline in several important particulars. The statehood advocates proudly point out that in 1952 the islands, in terms of internal revenue taxation, contributed more to the Federal Treasury than did any 1 of 9 States. They neglected to mention that in 1937 the Territory was ahead of 17 States. To me this represents an ominous trend.

We have been reminded frequently that Hawaii has a larger population than any State except Oklahoma had upon its admission into the Union. The statehood people have not been so generous, however, in disclosing that Hawaii's population has undergone a steady decline in the last few years. According to estimates published by Hawaii's own Governor, the civilian population of the Territory on January 1, 1950, was 478,119; on July 1, 1950, it was 467,711; on January 1, 1951, it was 466,329; and by May 1, 1951, it had dropped still further to

462,776. It is strange that such a progressive Territory should be losing its people so progressively.

It is interesting to note that as of January 1, 1951, only 16.5 percent of Hawaii's people were of Caucasian extraction, whereas the Japanese comprised 39.9 percent of the total population. We do not deny that the Japanese-Americans have been splendid fighters and have harmonized with all the other racial strains in the Territory; but we wonder how really Americanized these people have become when we learn that there are still about 50 Buddhist Churches holding services in the islands. I may be old fashioned, but I just cannot recognize anything American in Buddhism, or in any other oriental religion. There has been more than a little evidence that strong secret antistatehood sentiment prevails among the Caucasians, who are aware of the failure of the famed melting pot always to melt; but few of the islanders have dared to be articulate in their opposition out of fear of reprisal.

Proponents of statehood assure us that communism, the most dangerous of all elements of un-Americanism, has been virtually wiped out. They quote J. Edgar Hoover's statement in 1952 that the number of known Communists had declined to the paltry figure of 36. Mr. Hoover knows, and we know, that Communists are no longer in the habit of advertising the fact that they are Communists. To some of us it is significant that even known Communists are still to be found among Hawaii's welfare organizations.

As for the Territory being noncontiguous to any State of the Union, statehood advocates emphasize that science has eliminated the barriers of time and distance. They forget that it is still expensive to travel between the islands and the United States, that relatively few Hawaiians have been able, or ever would be able, to afford to visit the mainland. This factor necessarily has tended to promote an insular outlook on the part of many Hawaiians.

Perhaps it would be best to accord the people of Hawaii the right to select their own Governor and other top administrative officers. Any further changes would appear to be too radical in this critical period.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, 55 years ago a Member of the United States Senate from my State told the people of Hawaii that their road to statehood would not be long. Senator John Tyler Morgan, of Alabama, the man who made this statement, visited Hawaii both before and after the annexation of 1898. He was a member of the commission which drafted the Hawaiian Organic Act in 1900.

The entire history of the negotiations leading up to Hawaii's recognition as a Territory caused the Hawaiian people to believe that they would follow the traditional course from territorial status to statehood. It is shown by the statements of Senator Morgan, who played such an important part in the original negotiations. It is also shown by the fact that at the time of the Organic Act both Houses of Congress specifically rejected amendments providing that the adoption of the law should not be construed as offering Hawaii a promise of statehood.

Mr. Chairman, we should no longer delay our final approval of statehood for Hawaii. Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood which has heretofore been exacted from other Territories. There is a greater amount of information available about Hawaii than has been the case in the admission of any other Territory.

Since 1903 the members of the popularly elected legislature of Hawaii have petitioned the Congress of the United States for statehood on 16 separate occasions. The Hawaiian people themselves have voted overwhelmingly for statehood and more than 2 years ago they ratified their proposed State constitution by a 3-to-1 majority.

Since 1920, the Congress has considered 37 proposals for Hawaiian statehood and, during the past 15 years, congressional committees have held nine separate statehood hearings. Both the Democratic and the Republican Parties last year pledged themselves to immediate statehood for Hawaii. Public opinion surveys and newspaper editorials throughout the United States show almost unanimous support for statehood.

"Taxation without representation" was a major grievance of our forefathers against British misrule. Today the half-million citizens of Hawaii contribute more revenue to the Federal Government than any of nine States. Year after year they pay far more to the United States Treasury than, with the exception of military appropriations, is spent by the United States for Hawaii. Yet, the American citizen in Hawaii has no share in the decisions made by the Congress as to how his tax money is to be spent.

Both the assessed value of real estate and the amount of property held in Hawaii is greater than that of any State at the time of admission to the Union with the exception, in both cases, of Oklahoma. Hawaii's present population exceeds that of four separate States and approximates that of four others.

The Hawaiian people are American. Their social, political, and economic institutions are thoroughly American. During Senator Morgan's initial visit to the islands in 1897 he told the gathering at his first public address:

> Since I have been in Hawaii I have felt as if I were in a part of America to which I have never been before. This is an American country; it is not a European country; and when annexation takes place its own people will merely be coming into their own.

In 1935 the first congressional committee to study the Hawaiian statehood question, after traveling to the islands and making an extensive investigation, reported:

> The Territory of Hawaii is a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type.
>
> Its educational program is an advanced one, with a large proportion of the tax dollar being spent for the training of its youth. Even during the period of the depression this program was neither relaxed nor reduced, and its school facilities compare favorably with those of the most advanced States.
>
> Hawaii's economic standards are high, with an industrial and agricultural development forming a sound basis for the continued growth of the Territory.

Hawaiian loyalty to America can perhaps best be demonstrated by observing the amazing record of her sons during World War II. The 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii, 10,000 of whom saw action in Europe, were described by Gen. Mark Clark as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States."

In 1950 both the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs traveled to Hawaii to study Communist and subversive influences on the islands. Both investigations revealed that the number of Communists in Hawaii was extremely small, that the Territorial legislature and other elected bodies were free of communism, and that the Hawaiian people themselves were generally alert to the importance of guarding against Communist infiltration.

The importance of Hawaii in strengthening our national defenses and fortifying our strategic positions in the Pacific has repeatedly been emphasized. Adm. Chester W. Nimitz in 1947 personally testified for the Hawaiian statehood bill. Former Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug also testified at that time that Gen. Douglas MacArthur favored statehood, not only because of its importance in national defense but also because he believed Hawaiian statehood would aid his efforts in democratizing Japan and other areas of the Orient.

The people of Hawaii have contributed abundantly to the American economy. They have consistently fulfilled their obligations as American citizens in a splendid fashion. They deserve the statehood they have striven for through such a long period. The facts are on their side, and they are on our side too, for Hawaii gives every promise that as the 49th State of the Union its contributions to America will be even greater.

I voted for Hawaiian statehood when this question last came before the House in 1950. I believed then and I believe now that we annexed Hawaii and made her a Territory under circumstances that so strongly held out hope of statehood as to create an implied promise that she would become a State, particularly if no good intervening reason developed to the contrary. Every time I have critically examined Hawaii's claim to the benefits of statehood, I am more thoroughly convinced of the justice of her cause.

Of course, I respect and agree with the viewpoint of my colleagues who feel that the privileges of American statehood should not be lightly bestowed. However, in the case of Hawaii there is a waiting period of 55 years. Her apprenticeship as a Territory has been long.

Some have argued that if we admit Hawaii as a State we must necessarily

admit others of our possessions as States. I do not agree with this position. My thought is that the two Territories of Alaska and Hawaii deserve admission as States and that their admission will make the United States stronger, militarily and economically, than it is today.

I regret that the majority party did not bring both Alaska and Hawaii to be voted upon in the same bill. Failure to do so was a disservice to Alaska, and I hope that our friends of the majority will forthwith bring to the floor of the House a bill providing for the admission of the Territory of Alaska.

I realize that there are those of our friends of the Democratic membership who feel that, although they are otherwise for the admission of Hawaii, they cannot vote for it at this time because Alaska was not included in the bill or because there is no assurance that a bill to admit Alaska will shortly be before the House. I will pass on by saying that this line of reasoning does not carry sufficient weight with me to cause me to abandon what I believe to be Hawaii's just cause.

I will vote for the admission of Hawaii as the 49th State and I hope to have the privilege of voting for Alaska as the 50th State during the present session of the 83d Congress.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to dignify the arguments that Alaska should be included in this legislation to admit Hawaii into the Union by answering them. Our committee has had no opportunity to set up hearings on the question of Alaska statehood. Any action we take today on Hawaii can have no bearing on the question of the admission of Alaska. The bestowing of statehood on a Territory is serious business. The action should be taken only after an exhaustive study. That study has been made in the case of Hawaii. It undoubtedly will be made in the case of Alaska. Perhaps Members of this Congress will have an opportunity to vote on Alaskan statehood. But, statehood is not a type of question that can be decided with package deals such as has been advocated on this floor today. And as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I deeply resent the implication that our committee would take an action as historic and permanent as adding a star to our flag on the basis of politics.

I would also like to say a few words, Mr. Chairman, on the subject of representation in the Senate. My colleagues from the populous Eastern States have had a great deal to say about disproportionate voting power of the small States. I need hardly mention that several of the Eastern States—the so-called large States—would on the basis of area, be tabbed small farms in my country. My State—Utah—gives the Nation nearly one-third of its copper supply. Can it be contended that a State that supplies this much of a nation's major resource is overrepresented because it has the same number of Senators as say, Delaware or New Hampshire or New York? The same arguments of course apply to Hawaii. Our Constitution, divinely inspired, recognized that true representative government must be based upon more than just the number of noses within State borders. Area, resources, regional differences—all these—are included and reflected in the makeup of the Senate.

Much has been made of the distance of Hawaii from the body of the States. This is of course foolish. We all know that distance is measured not in miles but in time. Hawaii is closer to Washington, D. C., than Tennessee was when it was admitted to the Union. Unity is a manner of ideas—not geography. And with modern communications and transportation—Hawaii is an inseparable part of the United States of America.

I have two further observations I would like to make; these from my experience in Utah. As many of you know, Utah became home—and that word is used in its loosest sense—for many of the people of Japanese ancestry during World War II. They were forcibly uprooted from their homes on the west coast and shipped into Utah to wait out the war in barracks located, in many instances, in desert wastelands. The sons of these people fought and died for America during that war. Their record is well known. I venture to say that had any other racial or national group been given the treatment our Nation subjected the Japanese people to in a moment of hysteria, we would have had an armed uprising. Instead, they accepted a harsh fate uncomplainingly. They presented no fertile field for Communist propaganda. They steadily proved that they were, in the highest sense of the word, worthy of citizenship.

Utah spent 46 years as a Territory. My ancestors watched the people of neighboring States achieve full citizenship status in a fraction of that time. Hawaii has waited long enough, and I certainly look forward to casting my vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in listening to this debate, I have not as yet heard a convincing argument against Hawaiian statehood. I regret that the administration did not include Alaska along with its approval for Hawaii.

What was most convincing to me, in my support of statehood for Hawaii, was not what was said by Republican and Democratic Members favoring statehood, but what was said by some of my Democratic colleagues who are in opposition.

In the arguments against statehood I could see the same fear of democracy that keeps home rule from the people of the District of Columbia.

I do not believe in the theory of race superiority. It is un-Christian and un-American if our Constitution and our Bill of Rights have meaning. Our fellow citizens in Hawaii are good Americans who believe in our democracy and our way of life. I believe they have demonstrated their loyalty by the sacrifices they have made for our country.

It is not simply a matter of keeping a promise to Hawaii or of upholding the pledge in our party platforms. It is a matter of doing what is best for America and what will have the best results in winning friends throughout the world for democracy, and for our free way of life.

Arguments for proportionate representation have no place in this discussion. It comes with poor grace in view of the disproportionate representation we find in many States in the selection of representatives to state legislatures and to the Congress of the United States.

It is inconsistent for Republican Members to favor Hawaiian statehood and at the same time sidetrack statehood for Alaska. It seems to me that the cause of statehood is the same in each case.

I believe that the best interest of our Nation would be served by voting statehood to both Hawaii and Alaska without regard for party politics. Both these great outposts and their people would be tied closer to America. We have an opportunity to show the world that our pronouncements for democracy are real and meaningful; that we are not just another breed of totalitarians who discriminate against our fellow men because of accident of birth.

I am going to support this bill and vote against a motion to recommit. I do not believe that we who want to help win statehood for Alaska can do so by voting against Hawaii, and alining ourselves with forces that are opposed to statehood for both of these Territories.

Some Republican votes will be cast for Hawaiian statehood as a matter of political expediency. Some supporters of the bill would welcome defeat that would come in a successful move to recommit. A motion to recommit is unlikely to succeed, but, if it does, it would not help Alaska. More likely, it would hurt the cause of statehood for both. It would put the Democrats on record for responsibility of killing this bill.

I hope, therefore, that Democrats who favor Alaskan statehood will not aline themselves with those who seek to kill statehood for both these two great American Territories.

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, during the last Congress I voted for statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. I did so because I felt these Territories had well earned and were deserving of statehood. I realized the strategic value of having these Territories included as States in the Union. I did so because I sincerely felt that it would be in the best interest of our great country and would recognize these loyal citizens who have certainly served a long apprenticeship. Both Alaska and Hawaii have much to offer toward strengthening our country from many aspects. It would undoubtedly strengthen our position in the Far East when we take in as full citizens the many people who are descendants of people from that area. We cannot deny that it is mighty important to grant statehood to Hawaii to enhance our position in that area when working with the people of southeast Asia. Furthermore, I had an opportunity to spend some time in Hawaii last year and in my humble opinion these people were just as loyal as our people in this country. I do object, however, to the partisan note which is carried with this bill today. It was my understanding that the President, when campaigning last fall, stated that he favored the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii. It was also my understanding that it was included in his party plat-

form. Therefore, I was most disappointed to hear in his state of the Union message that he favored only Hawaii. The statement not only made the people wonder if the President had forgotten his campaign promises but it also entered partisan politics into the issue of admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the admission of the Territories should be considered solely on their merits. I do not believe that partisan politics should be injected into an issue so vital in our field of foreign affairs. Furthermore, I believe Alaska is more important from a strategic point of view. In my mind Alaska is the most important outpost we have today. It is only a few miles across the Bering Strait from Siberia. The Alaskan people are courageous individuals whose loyalty to our country cannot be questioned by anyone. Therefore, I hope we will give them the full status they so richly deserve.

Mr. Chairman, I do not approve the partisan connotation carried with this bill, but I feel so deeply about statehood I am supporting it. Our people want these Territories admitted and I hope that action will be taken at a very early date to have Alaska included.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, no one can be blind to the fact that a life and death struggle is going on in the world today between the only two basic forms of government there have ever been. One form in essence is dictatorship, whether by an individual or by a race or by a party or by a class or by a bloc. And nobody can deny that that form of government is making tremendous strides in the world, encroaching steadily on the other form, which can perhaps best be described by the word federation; federation of classes or of blocs or of races or of peoples or states. Either the democracy or federation principle will extend and grow and expand; or else the totalitarian dictatorship principle will grow and extend and extend and expand. At this particular juncture in the world's history when we witness this struggle all about us, I can think of few things more important than for the United States to demonstrate by action which form it really believes in.

This bill affords us an opportunity to recognize in Hawaii one of the most distinguished achievements of American democracy as contrasted with the other types of government. Nowhere else in the world, including our own 48 States on the mainland, has there been a more successful demonstration of people of different races and different national origins and different tongues and different cultural and social and intellectual backgrounds working together in mutual respect and teamwork for the good of all, as the true way to promote the good of each.

It is no longer just an experiment for us to argue about. It is an accomplished fact.

Granting statehood for the people of Hawaii at this time will be more than just fulfillment of their aspirations as citizens of the United States. It will focus attention throughout the whole vast Pacific Basin on the capacity of our form of government to inspire the loyalty and cooperation of people of many racial and national origins. I am sure that such an example will have an immeasurable value in strengthening our relations with every people of the Pacific Ocean area.

Hawaii's heritage has been very fortunate for the development of an enlightened democracy. Its aboriginal race, the Hawaiians, whose character and culture have left a marked influence on the modern community, were a friendly, tolerant, intelligent, and gracious people.

The early missionaries from New England—and, if I may pause to interject a personal note, having been a medical missionary myself for 10 years in China—I have always been interested in the fact that the first doctor to the Sandwich Islands, as they were called then, was a distant relative of mine, Dr. Garrett Parmalee Judd, who went out in 1828, as I recall, under the same mission board which I was privileged to serve later. He was the first to serve the people of these islands as a physician.

The early missionaries from New England brought with them a strong faith in public education, in the worth of the individual human being, and in the strictest political democracy.

The plantation owners, also, who carried on a strong missionary tradition, were on the whole zealous in the promotion of public health and education without discrimination among the workers of many racial backgrounds who came to the islands. You all know, of course, that the aboriginals in Hawaii are a minority now as compared to the others who have come in from many other areas, Mongolians and Malayans, as well as the white race.

Consequently, Hawaii's standards of rural health and rural education are now an example to the entire country.

We in this country who are struggling with various bills for improving medical and nursing and public health here look to the Hawaiian Islands as the No. 1 example in many respects of the achievements in public health at which we are aiming.

The high moral and physical standards which have resulted from these influences are the foundation of Hawaii's success as a democratic American community.

It is fortunate that this is the case, because, from a mainland point of view, we must place a stronger national reliance upon the people of Hawaii. Their position is one of key importance in the Pacific world. They are on the lifelines of trade and cultural intercourse between all peoples of the area, and the diversity of their own racial background gives them an intense and broad interest in Pacific affairs. Can anyone doubt that representatives in Congress from this thoroughly American mid-Pacific State will broaden our horizons, enrich our congressional debates, and contribute in many ways to the national welfare?

No Americans are more alert to our problems of national defense than those who live on our frontiers, especially those who, in 1941, suffered the severest enemy attack ever launched on our soil and were compelled for many months to toil unceasingly and to remain vigilant in their own and the Nation's defense.

I am sure, therefore, that one of the advantages which we as a united Nation will derive from having the State of Hawaii fully represented in Washington will be an increasing alertness to all problems of national security and an added ability to meet those problems effectively. A loyal island people, firmly united with the rest of the American people, will have a high strategic value for the entire Nation.

Furthermore, I am convinced that our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make with respect to the people of Hawaii, and the other island peoples of the Pacific. We should continue to demonstrate the reality of our belief that every people should have a government of its own choosing. It will be a great advantage to the United States to have one of our great States in the mid-Pacific as a conspicuous example of our American way of life.

In summary, I believe statehood should be granted to the people of Hawaii, first, for reasons of our security.

There is bound to be uncertainty and instability in the Pacific for years. Forces are at work which have destroyed the old patterns and nobody can predict with certainty what the new pattern is to be.

It seems to me incontrovertible that Hawaii would be a much firmer bastion of American security as a full State than it can be with its people increasingly restless, unhappy half-citizens.

Under their present status, they have to make the same contribution to the national welfare as other citizens but without the same rewards, the same standing, as citizens on the mainland have.

The question of physical separation from the mainland seems to me inconsequential because, of course, Hawaii today is so very much nearer the rest of the Nation than the Western States were when they were admitted to statehood.

The second reason is economic. The greatest undeveloped areas of the world are in Asia.

I am willing to hazard the prediction that eventually historians will agree that World War II all along was a war more than anything else to determine who is going to control or guide the development of Asia. Perhaps I should say of the undeveloped areas of the world.

There are three great areas of undeveloped natural resources: Africa, South America, and Asia, but only one has great undeveloped human resources in addition, Asia.

Asia has half the population of the world. Hitler understood its importance. Certainly, the Russians have demonstrated for 30 years that they understand the vital importance of Asia. Just yesterday, the Communist dictator presently enslaving the Chinese, Mao-Tse-tung, said in his tribute to Stalin that Stalin was their best friend because he had said, "Do not forget Asia." The British, the Dutch, the French understand it. The Japanese understood it. That is why they fought so hard to get control of the manpower and the resources and the gigantic potential markets in China.

Only we Americans with Asia in our front door, so to speak, seem seldom to sense the importance to our future of whose system and trade and ideas dominate in the development of Asia.

For both security and economic reasons, we need every possible advantage in the gigantic struggle ahead. I think making Hawaii a State would give us a very great advantage.

The third basic reason is the moral consideration. How can we, with any decency or hope of success, talk about people having the right to governments of their own choosing, for example, in Eastern Europe, unless we show by our deeds that we believe in it in the Pacific as well.

And the fourth reason I would call the ideological consideration which, to my mind, is ultimately synonymous with the security consideration.

Actually our own survival is at stake. Democracy is under attack today. The belief that freemen are capable of self-government for sustained periods is under systematic organized assault in the world as it has not been since the French and the American Revolutions. And it is losing ground. We can see it on every hand.

The people of Asia, up until the middle 1920's or a little later, were definitely moving in the direction of greater freedom and self-government and the democratic pattern. Now they are uncertain. Some are wondering whether they might not have been better off to adopt the racial pattern—which is what Japan tried to force on them—believing there is no hope of decent treatment from white men, that when white men get in a jam they will promise everything to get help until they get out of the jam, but then they forgot the promises.

More are wondering whether they should not adopt totalitarianism of the Communist pattern. That is the one making the greatest advance both in Europe and in Asia and, in my judgment, we cannot successfully combat totalitarianism of the Communist pattern by calling it names and fighting it defensively.

We can overcome evil only with good. We have to have a better ideology and system, and we have to do a better job of selling them to the people of the world.

In most parts of the world today the trend is from the status of citizen to the status of subject. We have to reverse the trend and widen the area where the direction is from subject to citizen.

This is one of the few places I find right now where we have a chance to give new validity and life to our fundamental faith and belief.

I repeat, either democracy will spread or totalitarianism will spread, and I hope very much that this House, and then the Congress, will act favorably upon the bills to give this concrete object lesson, this vivid demonstration before the world of the vitality of our democratic faith, of our federation principle of government, by extending statehood to these people who have proved worthy in every reasonable sense, and have earned the right to become full citizens on the same basis as all of the rest of us.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there has been much in the debate of yesterday and today that I wish might not have been said. I have not liked the aspersions, direct and indirect, on fellow Americans who are not of my racial descent or of my complexion. I trust that they came merely from the heat and passion of debate and were not at heart intended as remarks in disparagement. My faith in the divine purpose of our earthly existence is as nothing if it does not embrace a concept of the brotherhood of man. It is only in the spirit and practice of that brotherhood that we can discharge the responsibilities in world leadership that have come to us. It happens that in the district which I have the honor to represent there are some 7,000 Americans of Japanese descent, I am told more than in any other district in the United States. From my own knowledge I can testify as to the quality of their citizenship and of their personal attributes. Born in this country, reared in the atmosphere of American democracy, educated in American schools and universities, and then undergoing cruel experiences in the hysteria of a war period, then emerged stronger than ever in their devotion to the United States and all that our common country stands for in aims, achievements, and aspirations. They constitute a vibrantly loyal segment of our populace. They are interwoven with all the other segments in the fabric of our society. I know that Japanese-Americans, interwoven with other segments of Hawaii, will make the same large and luminous contribution to the moral, intellectual, spiritual, and patriotic strength of the new 49th State as they have made and are making to the 2d district in Illinois. In the 81st Congress I supported statehood both for Hawaii and for Alaska. The daily newspaper in Honolulu graciously and beyond the merit of the product printed in three installments, with editorial comment, the address which I made on this floor on that occasion. As I then pointed out, in extending the sisterhood of States beyond the contiguous limits of continental United States we are making a new pattern. It is a pattern that was woven on the mills of the destiny of the United States. Today, in passing this bill to admit Hawaii into the Union of States, we are placing upon the date of March 10, 1953, a significance which will be appreciated in the years to come much more than any of us now realize. I am sorry that the administration is not affording me the opportunity also to vote for statehood for Alaska. But this injustice to Alaska on the part of the administration will not cause me in retaliation to do an injustice to Hawaii. I hope, and as a devout American, I pray that the leadership on the other side will forego a temporary political advantage the better to serve justice and to strengthen our Republic by promptly bringing to this floor the bill for statehood for Alaska. If they fail in this, the temporary gain of two seats in the Senate will be a costly price to pay for the contumacy of history. Mr. Chairman, in the 83d Congress I am voting for Hawaii as the 49th State with the certain conviction that in the 84th Congress, under a Democratic leadership, I shall be voting for the 50th State, Alaska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, shortly the House will take action upon H. R. 3575, which has for its purpose enabling the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

I understand a motion will be made to recommit the bill to the committee for further study. I have heard the whip, Mr. MCCORMACK, and others on the Democratic side state they thought the bill needed further hearings. In answer to that argument, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that there have been five congressional committees which investigated the subject of statehood for Hawaii in Hawaii. There have been a number of hearings here in Washington on the same subject. It is my understanding 31 Members of Congress visited the islands of Hawaii for the purpose of making these investigations. More than 600 witnesses have been heard and a record of nearly 4,000 pages of testimony have been taken.

Hawaii, as a Territory, has from a social, political, cultural, and economic position, been subjected to more examinations than have been ever held upon the other 29 territories. I cannot understand just what would be accomplished by referring the bill back to the committee of which I am chairman. This subject has been investigated from A to Z, and there seems to be little new material which the committee could present to the House upon this subject.

I would also call attention to the fact that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am chairman, has more bills referred to it than to any other committee in the House, with the possible exception of the Judiciary Committee. I have examined our calendar carefully. Should it be the decision of this House to refer the bill to the committee, I would hope to make every effort to hold additional hearings to meet the request of the House. I must point out, however, that the schedule of hearings has been completed up to the middle of May. It would take some time to get additional hearings set up and a new bill referred to the House. It seems quite likely that the measure would be lost in the urge to consider appropriation bills and other legislation. It might mean the end of statehood for Hawaii at this session.

ALASKA

There are those who feel the bill should be referred to the committee in order to consider statehood for Alaska. I promised my colleagues that there would be hearings on the bill setting up statehood for Alaska. These hearings could have been held in March. The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] suggested that they be held in April, and they have been arranged for the 14th through the 17th of April. This was done because a new statehood commission for Alaska will be appointed under the new Republican legislature. They will want to be heard on the statehood bill.

This cannot be labeled politics, because the legislature of Alaska is Republican and there will soon be a Republican

governor in Alaska. I feel the bill should have a hearing. But to deny Hawaii statehood at this time because someone feels that Alaska is being slighted is not doing justice to the statesmanship that has always prevailed in the House.

I hope the opposition who desires to refer the bill for further action will not quibble over political advantages. It is a time for statesmanship.

I have been pleased with the high level of debate, the objective, keen, earnest arguments pro and con, which have been made on the subject. I believe the debate reflects credit to the House of Representatives. I have tried to be fair on the allocation of time. When the bill was under debate, there were only 3 minutes difference in the time allocated to those who were for and against the bill. The subject, in my opinion, deserved careful consideration.

Some of you object to the new State because of the large percentage of orientals who make up the population. Let me point out to you that of the nearly half million people in the islands, 87 percent are native-born and are American citizens. Yes; 99.2 percent of all school children of the territory are native-born American citizens. I hope we may have little talk about the pigment in some one's skin. This great country of ours was made up of many, many immigrants coming from foreign countries. We ought not to indulge in the questionable approach of denying statehood to people who are Americans but have a little different pigment in the skin than you and I have who occupy this floor.

REVENUES

There are a few who hesitate to admit the new State, thinking it cannot be self-supporting. To you who have doubts upon this question, let me point out that the Territory of Hawaii has been contributing to the United States Treasury on an average of about $138 million a year in income taxes. This is more than is now contributed by any one of nine States who now belong to the Union.

COMMUNISM

I have heard many times on the floor of the House that the new State might send Communists to sit in the House and Senate. Let me point out to you who have those fears that Hawaii's new constitution lays down requirements that are more stringent than have been prescribed heretofore under any enabling legislation. There is a provision, and let me quote:

> No person who advocates or who aids or belongs to any party, organization, or association which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the State of Hawaii or of the United States, shall be qualified to hold any office of trust or profit under the State constitution.

This should calm any fears that you might have relative to communism in Hawaii.

HAWAII'S WAR RECORD

I am sure, my colleagues are familiar with the splendid record made by the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442d Combat Team from Hawaii. This unit was described by Gen. Mark Clark as "the most decorated unit in the entire military history of the United States."

VOTING RECORD

Hawaii understands statehood. The registered voters voted more than 87 percent in the last election. This is a better record than we have in the States. Hawaii deserves statehood. She has served her apprenticeship with honor and distinction.

If my colleagues vote to send the bill back to the committee, I will, as chairman of the full committee, do the best job I can in getting a compromise and the bill again before this body. I can see little accomplished by referring the bill back to the committee. I hope the motion to recommit will be refused and that the bill will pass this day.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State, California, desire that Hawaii be welcomed into our Union on a basis of equality. It is my pleasure to include, under leave to extend my remarks, California Senate Joint Resolution No. 8 relative to granting the Territory of Hawaii statehood in the United States:

> Senate Joint Resolution No. 8: Relative to granting the Territory of Hawaii statehood in the United States.
>
> Whereas for many years the people and the governments of the State of California and the Territory of Hawaii have enjoyed the most close and friendly business, personal, and cultural relationships; and
>
> Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii, regardless of racial descent, at all times have demonstrated their complete loyalty to the United States and during World War II, particularly, served with great valor and distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States; and
>
> Whereas in April of 1950 a convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by the voters in the 1950 general election and also the Territorial Legislature; and
>
> Whereas it is important for the Territory of Hawaii in its present status to enjoy the sovereignty to which it is entitled and to develop its resources most advantageously: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Congress and the President of the United States be, and they are hereby, urged and memorialized to enact at this session of the Congress such laws as will grant the present Territory of Hawaii the status of statehood in the United States and create the State of Hawaii as the 49th State of our country; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I shall be able to shed any light on this question in the confusion that exists at the moment but certainly I shall not spread any partisan heat. It appears to me that the fair thing to do is to recommit this bill for further study. On account of the amendments that have been adopted here today it would appear that the Members of the House do not know exactly what is in the bill and are willing to vote for amendments with a brief argument and no hearings whatever.

Now, my position is a little peculiar. I am entirely nonpartisan in this matter. Now, you need not laugh. I have been around here a good while. Some new Member might have done that, but not an old Member.

My position is peculiar, and I speak for myself alone and not as a leader or spokesman for my party. If this bill could go back to the committee, and report back both Alaska and Hawaii and give the membership of the House an opportunity to vote on Hawaii and on Alaska, I think it would be the fair thing to do, because I will tell you something, Mr. Delegate from Alaska, if this bill passes the House today, Alaska is as dead as slavery for the rest of this session. I want to make my position entirely clear, and that is that when Alaska and Hawaii are reported to this House I am going to vote against making each of them a State because I do not believe that either Alaska or Hawaii is ready for statehood.

This matter has been passed on twice since I have been a Member of the House. Once I was away; the other time I did not vote because I was occupying the Speaker's chair.

Now I see my friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] taking notes on me. I like the gentleman tremendously personally and politically up to a certain point, but I would warn him this afternoon and from here during the remainder of this session not to get so enthusiastic about trying to make every question a partisan one. We all know that General Eisenhower won the election. He had to have the majority of the votes of the people of the United States in order to do it. We accepted that. And, I want to tell you another thing. I have been here under three Republican Presidents; this is the fourth Republican President. I have never hated either one of them, and I am not going to hate Eisenhower. I wonder if a great many gentlemen on my left can say that about the Democratic Presidents under whom they served? We had an Eisenhower victory, of course, but we did not have a Republican victory. It takes 218 Members to make a majority in the House, and you have 221. It takes 49 to make a majority in the Senate and the Republicans have 48. One time here—and we did not crow and boast about it so much—after a presidential election we had 334 Members of the House, and there were 89 Republicans and 12 others. The usual thing is when a Democrat runs for President and is elected by a million, or two, or three million votes, he carries the House by from 75 to 150 votes. Now, I would not have gotten off on this, but I saw my good friend from Indiana taking notes, and I am sure he is going to get up and say the Democratic Party is throwing Hawaii and Alaska away. Well, I would rather do without 4 Senators and 4 Representatives than to do something I think is fundamentally wrong. I think this thing today is fundamentally wrong, because let me call your attention to one thing: When you start out making States out of Territories not even contiguous to this hemisphere, you are performing a major operation, in my opinion a dangerous one.

Let us send this bill back to the committee for further study and see if we

cannot decide there that we had better let it go on the shelf as some other recommendations of the President in recent days have gone on the shelf for I do not know how long, but maybe for an indefinite period. I think that would be the wise thing for the House to do. I do not think we are prepared to legislate on this thing, and I think it has been demonstrated on this floor today. So I do hope in fairness to Hawaii and to Alaska that there will be enough votes in this House to return this bill to the committee, where I think it should go for further study.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, this debate on the whole has been conducted in good will, and it has been enlightening.

Much as I love and respect my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the ex-Speaker of the House, I cannot, however, go along with him on what I have heard so many times as the half reason for recommitting a bill, that somehow or other the House does not quite understand what it is doing. I am convinced that on this occasion the House understands exactly what it is doing, and I think many of you who have listened to this debate and who have watched the maneuvering know what is going on.

The gentleman from Texas is completely frank and honest about his stand. He wants to recommit this bill because he is against statehood for Hawaii. There are a lot of you who could not rise in your places and say as much. He says that he wants the bill recommitted in order that Hawaii and Alaska may be brought out together, or so that both bills may be brought out, but then he promptly adds that he would vote against both of them. I say that such a position is an honest one. However, I cannot agree with that position as a reason for supporting the motion to recommit. To recommit to get both bills out simply for the purpose of defeating both of them, in my opinion, with all due deference to the great gentleman from Texas, is not a fair reason for voting to recommit. But again, may I say I commend him on his faithfulness to what he believes.

Again, may I say that if there were more on that side who were voting to recommit for the same reason, then I would grant them the same degree of confidence. However, from what I have heard already, and it cannot be denied, many of you are going to vote for the motion to recommit while claiming that you are for statehood for Hawaii. Just let me say this to you, those of you who may feel that way and take that position, as I said earlier in the debate, you cannot escape judgment before the bar of public opinion, because the record will have been written.

Let me say that I have voted twice for statehood for Hawaii. To prove that I am a complete nonpartisan, let me point out that I voted for it once when I was the majority leader in the 80th Congress, and it might interest you to know that it carried on that occasion, 197 to 133. Then, under the leadership of that great Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, in the 81st Democratic Congress, I voted for statehood for Hawaii again. And then it carried, 262 to 210. And both of those occasions were under a Democratic President who had asked for statehood for Hawaii. You see, even if the House is Republican or Democratic, ever since 1947 there have been about 110 to 133 Members of the House against statehood for Hawaii. If there are more votes than that to recommit this bill, or against it on passage, it will be because someone is playing fast and loose with the fundamental question which is involved here and that question is statehood for Hawaii.

Some reference has been made to the platforms of the great parties. We said in the Republican platform that we favor immediate statehood for Hawaii, and for you Members who sit on the other side of the aisle, may I point out that the same position was likewise in the Democratic platform. It has been in our platform ever since 1944. No one has ever taken it out.

It has been said, of course, and I think properly that the platform does not bind anyone to follow it absolutely, but it does in my opinion create a great moral obligation for both of us on either side of the aisle who ran on such a platform and who profess to support it. May I say that party responsibility is involved here, and not alone on my side where we are now in the majority and carry the responsibility of the program, but it is likewise a matter of party responsibility on the Democratic side.

Let me point out another thing. In this message on the state of the Union, the President of the United States said this, speaking of the Department of the Interior:

> Another of its major concerns is our country's island possessions. Here is one matter that deserves attention. The platforms of both political parties promised immediate statehood to Hawaii. The people of that Territory have earned that status. Statehood should be granted promptly with the first election scheduled for 1954.

That is the position stated by the President of the United States as part of his program. Of course, I have never promised to follow blindly any program advocated by any President, even my own President, but I say to you I feel a strong compulsion to back his program on this occasion, a compulsion I am certain is felt by many others.

Many people are worrying about making this Territory a State. Do you know in a very considerable measure, we crossed that bridge back in 1898. There was an amendment when the act was before the Congress to this effect:

> Nothing contained in this act shall be construed, taken or held to imply a pledge or promise that the Territory of Hawaii will at any future time be admitted or charged or attached to any State.

That amendment was defeated. In other words, the clear implication was that as Hawaii came along and demonstrated its right to be a State, its territorial status would indicate that right. There was a commission of five appointed to investigate this matter, to work on the organic act. One member of that commission was the Senator from Alabama, Senator Morgan, and in a speech in Hawaii in 1898, this is what he said:

> The Territory of Hawaii has a great future before it, and with the increase of population and business that must come from annexation and all that is implied by it, the road to statehood cannot be a long one.

In addition to that, the Supreme Court has time and again passed upon the status of Territories. In one case the Supreme Court said that Territorial status is one of pupilage at best. In another case they said that a Territory under the constitutional laws of the United States is an inchoate State. In other words, may I say to the members of the committee, it has been the traditional understanding in the country that when Territorial status is granted such a grant contemplates ultimate statehood, not ultimate statehood for a Territory that cannot prove and establish that it has earned statehood, but for a Territory that has earned statehood. To my mind, therefore, that bridge was crossed way back in 1898.

Now, then, what about Hawaii and the matter of pupilage? Hawaii has been operating as a Territory for about 55 years. In that time they have developed a great system of education. I understand that illiteracy is not found there. They have demonstrated the soundness of their economy. They have demonstrated their patriotism to the United States in time of war. They have demonstrated their power to govern themselves. It seems to me under these circumstances if we find the people of Hawaii, having been annexed by our Government more than 50 years ago, given a Territorial status, having petitioned us for admission to statehood, have learned their lessons well and have established themselves, then there is a great obligation upon us to vote for statehood for Hawaii.

Again, on this motion to recommit: May I say this to my friends on my side of the aisle. Nothing is to be gained by recommitting the bill. If I am right in my approach to the matter of Territorial status and statehood to follow the Territorial status, then I think it inevitably follows that each Territory, as it seeks to be admitted as a State, must make its own case upon its own conduct, upon its own resources, upon its own people, and on its own standing before the people of America. So I say to my friends, what good would it do to vote to recommit? Such a move gains nothing. It solves nothing. We should vote against the motion to recommit. If that motion is defeated, and I trust it will be defeated, I hope you will then see fit to vote for statehood for Hawaii; but, in any event, let us not do a perfectly useless thing and recommit this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3575) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, pursuant to House Resolution 170, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Texas moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 227, answered "present" 4, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 11]

YEAS—182

Abbitt	Cooper	Gordon
Abernethy	Coudert	Granahan
Albert	Davis, Ga.	Grant
Alexander	Davis, Tenn.	Gregory
Andrews	Dawson, Ill.	Gross
Bailey	Delaney	Haley
Barden	Dempsey	Hardy
Barrett	Dies	Harris
Battle	Dingell	Harrison, Va.
Bentsen	Dodd	Hays, Ark.
Blatnik	Dollinger	Heller
Boland	Donohue	Herlong
Bolling	Donovan	Hoffman, Mich.
Bonner	Dorn, S. C.	Holifield
Brooks, La.	Dowdy	Holtzman
Brooks, Tex.	Doyle	Hull
Brown, Ga.	Durham	Ikard
Broyhill	Eberharter	Jonas, N. C.
Bryson	Edmondson	Jones, Ala.
Buchanan	Engle	Jones, Mo.
Buckley	Evins	Jones, N. C.
Burleson	Fallon	Karsten, Mo.
Byrd	Fernandez	Kee
Byrne, Pa.	Fine	Kelley, Pa.
Camp	Fino	Kelly, N. Y.
Cannon	Fisher	Keogh
Carlyle	Fogarty	Kilburn
Carnahan	Forand	Kilday
Chatham	Forrester	Kirwan
Chelf	Fountain	Klein
Chudoff	Frazier	Kluczynski
Cole, N. Y.	Friedel	Landrum
Colmer	Garmatz	Lane
Condon	Gary	Lanham
Cooley	Gathings	Lesinski
Lucas	Patten	Sheppard
McCormack	Perkins	Short
McMillan	Pfost	Shuford
Machrowicz	Philbin	Sieminski
Madden	Pilcher	Smith, Kans.
Mahon	Pillion	Smith, Miss.
Mason	Polk	Smith, Va.
Matthews	Powell	Spence
Metcalf	Preston	Staggers
Miller, Calif.	Price	Steed
Miller, Kans.	Priest	Sullivan
Mills	Rains	Teague
Mollohan	Rayburn	Thomas
Morgan	Reams	Thompson, La.
Morrison	Reed, N. Y.	Thornberry
Moss	Regan	Trimble
Moulder	Richards	Vinson
Multer	Riley	Watts
Murray	Roberts	Wheeler
Nicholson	Robeson, Va.	Whitten
Norrell	Rogers, Fla.	Wickersham
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Tex.	Williams, Miss.
O'Brien, Mich.	Rooney	Wilson, Tex.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Roosevelt	Winstead
O'Neill	Secrest	Withers
Patman	Selden	

NAYS—227

Adair	George	Nelson
Addonizio	Golden	Norblad
Allen, Calif.	Goodwin	Oakman
Allen, Ill.	Graham	O'Hara, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gubser	O'Hara, Minn.
	Gwinn	O'Konski
Andresen, August H.	Hagen, Calif.	Osmers
	Hagen, Minn.	Ostertag
Angell	Hale	Passman
Arends	Halleck	Patterson
Auchincloss	Hand	Pelly
Ayres	Harden	Phillips
Baker	Harrison, Nebr.	Poff
Bates	Harrison, Wyo.	Prouty
Beamer	Harvey	Radwan
Becker	Hays, Ohio	Ray
Belcher	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Fla.	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Hiestand	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bentley	Hill	Rhodes, Pa.
Berry	Hillelson	Riehlman
Betts	Hillings	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Rodino
Boggs	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Bolton, Frances P.	Hoffman, Ill.	Sadlak
	Holmes	St. George
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holt	Saylor
	Horan	Schenck
Bonin	Hosmer	Scherer
Bosch	Howell	Scott
Bow	Hruska	Scrivner
Brambiett	Hunter	Seely-Brown
Bray	Hyde	Shafer
Brown, Ohio	Jackson	Sheehan
Brownson	James	Simpson, Ill.
Budge	Jarman	Simpson, Pa.
Burdick	Javits	Small
Busbey	Jenkins	Smith, Wis.
Bush	Jensen	Springer
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson	Stauffer
Canfield	Jonas, Ill.	Stringfellow
Carrigg	Judd	Taber
Cederberg	Kean	Talle
Chenoweth	Kearney	Taylor
Chiperfield	Keating	Thompson, Mich.
Church	Kersten, Wis.	
Clardy	King, Calif.	Tollefson
Clevenger	King, Pa.	Utt
Cole, Mo.	Knox	Van Pelt
Coon	Krueger	Van Zandt
Corbett	Laird	Velde
Cotton	Lantaff	Vorys
Cretella	Latham	Vursell
Crumpacker	LeCompte	Wainwright
Cunningham	Long	Walter
Curtis, Mass.	Lovre	Wampler
Curtis, Mo.	McConnell	Warburton
Curtis, Nebr.	McCulloch	Weichel
Dague	McDonough	Westland
Davis, Wis.	McGregor	Wharton
Dawson, Utah	McIntire	Widnall
Deane	McVey	Wier
Derounian	Mack, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Devereux	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Magnuson	Willis
Dolliver	Mailliard	Wilson, Calif.
Dorn, N. Y.	Marshall	Wilson, Ind.
Elliott	Martin, Iowa	Withrow
Ellsworth	Meader	Wolcott
Feighan	Merrill	Wolverton
Fenton	Merrow	Yates
Ford	Miller, Md.	Yorty
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Nebr.	Young
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Younger
Gamble	Morano	Zablocki
Gavin	Mumma	
Gentry	Neal	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4

Aspinall	Rogers, Colo.	Thompson, Tex.
Poage		

NOT VOTING—19

Boykin	Hart	Rivers
Campbell	Hope	Scudder
Case	Kearns	Shelley
Celler	Lyle	Sikes
Crosser	McCarthy	Sutton
Dondero	Poulson	
Green	Rabaut	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Campbell for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. McCarthy for, with Mr. Poage against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Rogers of Colorado against.

Mr. Lyle for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Mr. Rivers for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Paulson against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Case against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hope with Mr. Sutton.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. MCCARTHY. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYLE. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Florida, Mr. CAMPBELL. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. PATTEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. LONG changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 274, nays 138, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 12]

YEAS—274

Adair	Bates	Bolton, Frances P.
Addonizio	Beamer	
Allen, Calif.	Becker	Bolton, Oliver P.
Allen, Ill.	Belcher	
Andersen, H. Carl	Bender	Bonin
	Bennett, Fla.	Bosch
Andresen, August H.	Bentley	Bow
	Bentsen	Brambiett
Angell	Berry	Bray
Arends	Betts	Brooks, La.
Aspinall	Bishop	Brown, Ohio
Auchincloss	Blatnik	Brownson
Ayres	Boggs	Buchanan
Baker	Boland	Buckley
Barrett	Bolling	Budge

Burdick	Hinshaw	Osmers
Busbey	Hoeven	Ostertag
Byrd	Hoffman, Ill.	Passman
Byrne, Pa.	Holifield	Patterson
Byrnes, Wis.	Holmes	Pelly
Camp	Holt	Perkins
Canfield	Holtzman	Pfost
Carnahan	Horan	Phillips
Cederberg	Hosmer	Ponge
Chelf	Howell	Poff
Chenoweth	Hruska	Powell
Chiperfield	Hunter	Price
Chudoff	Hyde	Prouty
Church	Jackson	Radwan
Clardy	Jarman	Ray
Cole, Mo.	Javits	Reece, Tenn.
Condon	Jensen	Reed, Ill.
Coon	Johnson	Rees, Kans.
Corbett	Jonas, Ill.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Cretella	Judd	Richlman
Crumpacker	Karsten, Mo.	Robsion, Ky.
Cunningham	Kearney	Rodino
Curtis, Mass.	Keating	Rogers, Colo.
Curtis, Mo.	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis, Nebr.	Kelly, N. Y.	Rooney
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Roosevelt
Dawson, Ill.	King, Calif.	Sadlak
Dawson, Utah	Klein	St. George
Derounian	Kluczynski	Saylor
Devereux	Knox	Schenck
D'Ewart	Krueger	Scherer
Dingell	Laird	Scott
Dollinger	Lane	Scrivner
Dolliver	Lantaff	Secrest
Dorn, N. Y.	Latham	Seely-Brown
Doyle	LeCompte	Sheehan
Edmondson	Lesinski	Sheppard
Elliott	Long	Sieminski
Ellsworth	Lovre	Simpson, Ill.
Engle	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Fallon	McCormack	Smith, Wis.
Feighan	McDonough	Springer
Fenton	McGregor	Staggers
Fine	McIntire	Stringfellow
Fogarty	McMillan	Sullivan
Forand	McVey	Taber
Ford	Machrowicz	Talle
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Ill.	Taylor
Friedel	Mack, Wash.	Thompson, Tex.
Fulton	Madden	Tollefson
Gamble	Magnuson	Utt
Garmatz	Mailliard	Van Pelt
Gavin	Marshall	Van Zandt
Gentry	Martin, Iowa	Velde
George	Meader	Vorys
Golden	Merrill	Vursell
Goodwin	Merrow	Wainwright
Gordon	Metcalf	Walter
Granahan	Miller, Calif.	Wampler
Gubser	Miller, Kans.	Warburton
Gwinn	Miller, Md.	Weichel
Hagen, Calif.	Miller, Nebr.	Westland
Hagen, Minn.	Miller, N. Y.	Wharton
Hale	Mollohan	Widnall
Halleck	Morano	Wier
Harden	Morgan	Wigglesworth
Harrison, Nebr.	Morrison	Williams, N. Y.
Harrison, Wyo.	Moss	Willis
Harvey	Moulder	Wilson, Calif.
Hays, Ark.	Multer	Wilson, Ind.
Hays, Ohio	Nelson	Withrow
Hébert	Norblad	Wolcott
Heller	Oakman	Yates
Heselton	O'Brien, Ill.	Yorty
Hiestand	O'Brien, Mich.	Young
Hill	O'Brien, N. Y.	Younger
Hillelson	O'Hara, Ill.	Zablocki
Hillings	O'Konski	

NAYS—138

Abbitt	Dague	Haley
Abernethy	Davis, Ga.	Hand
Albert	Davis, Tenn.	Hardy
Alexander	Deane	Harris
Andrews	Delaney	Harrison, Va.
Bailey	Dempsey	Herlong
Barden	Dies	Hess
Battle	Dodd	Hoffman, Mich.
Bennett, Mich.	Donohue	Hull
Bonner	Donovan	Ikard
Brooks, Tex.	Dorn, S. C.	James
Brown, Ga.	Dowdy	Jenkins
Broyhill	Durham	Jonas, N. C.
Bryson	Eberharter	Jones, Ala.
Burleson	Evins	Jones, Mo.
Bush	Fernandez	Jones, N. C.
Cannon	Fino	Kean
Carlyle	Fisher	Kee
Carrigg	Forrester	Keogh
Chatham	Fountain	Kilburn
Clevenger	Frazier	Kilday
Cole, N. Y.	Gary	King, Pa.
Colmer	Gathings	Kirwan
Cooley	Graham	Landrum
Cooper	Grant	Lanham
Cotton	Gregory	Lucas
Coudert	Gross	McCulloch
Mahon	Rayburn	Steed
Mason	Reams	Teague
Matthews	Reed, N. Y.	Thomas
Mills	Regan	Thompson, La.
Mumma	Richards	Thompson, Mich.
Murray	Riley	Thornberry
Neal	Roberts	Trimble
Nicholson	Robeson, Va.	Vinson
Norrell	Rogers, Fla.	Watts
O'Hara, Minn.	Rogers, Tex.	Wheeler
O'Neill	Selden	Whitten
Patman	Shafer	Wickersham
Patten	Short	Williams, Miss.
Philbin	Shuford	Wilson, Tex.
Pilcher	Small	Winstead
Pillion	Smith, Kans.	Withers
Polk	Smith, Miss.	Wolverton
Preston	Smith, Va.	
Priest	Spence	
Rains	Stauffer	

NOT VOTING—20

Boykin	Hart	Rhodes, Pa.
Campbell	Hope	Rivers
Case	Kearns	Scudder
Celler	Lyle	Shelley
Crosser	McCarthy	Sikes
Dondero	Poulson	Sutton
Green	Rabaut	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Case for, with Mr. Sutton against.
Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Sikes against.
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Campbell against.
Mr. Scudder for, with Mr. Rivers against.
Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Boykin against.
Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Crosser against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hope with Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. BUCKLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD during the debate immediately preceding the remarks made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore granted.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to make Constitution Day, September 17, a national legal holiday.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that official recognition of September 17, the date of the signing of the Constitution by our Founding Fathers, would be of great benefit to our Republic. Establishment of Constitution Day as a legal holiday would, I believe, serve as a powerful reminder to all the people of this Nation that the Constitution is the foundation of our liberty, and would strengthen their appreciation for the Constitution and their defense of it.

As I introduce this resolution, I want to pay tribute to several outstanding Americans in my district who have played a part in bringing to the attention of the country the desirability of legalizing Constitution Day. Last fall Mayor G. A. Romary and Mrs. Olga Weber, of Louisville, Ohio, with the support of their fellow citizens, put on a Constitution Day program which was one of the finest examples of Americanism I have ever witnessed. It helped to convince me that a national holiday to focus attention on our Constitution would be of great value in strengthening our defense of the Constitution against those who wish to undermine it.

I want also to commend the Keep America Free Council of Canton, Ohio, for the many fine Constitution Day programs it promoted in the Canton area last fall. The council's efforts were so outstanding that on the recent occasion of the birthday of George Washington, the council was awarded a medal in the community programs category by the nationally famous Freedoms Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my resolution will receive the support of every Member of Congress who believes, as I do, that the Constitution, as the fundamental basis of our freedom, is deserving of recognition through the establishment of September 17 as a national legal holiday.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF THIS WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as to the program for tomorrow, if any, and the remainder of the week.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the bill that was on the whip notice, having to do with the extension of dependency benefits, will be called for tomorrow. The bill is from the Committee on Armed Services, and has a unanimous report from that committee. I do not anticipate any controversy about it.

I expect to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the business in order on Calendar Wednesday.

There is nothing on for Thursday. However, we shall be required to meet on Thursday, of course.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

JUST A LITTLE, BUT SOMETHING

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Government Operations is endeavoring by questions submitted to the heads of the executive departments to ascertain just how much, if any, propaganda is being sent out and paid for out of the taxpayers' dollar in violation of the Eighteenth United States Code, section 201, to sell the programs of the departments to the public.

It is matter of common knowledge that individuals entitled under the law to Federal gratuities or, if you prefer, benefit payments are through the expenditure of tax dollars being solicited to "come and get it."

A timely article in Human Events by Junius B. Wood reads as follows:

The elite of the Government's typewriter cowboys have dismounted. The daily torrent of press releases has diminished to a trickle. With public attention focused on a war that is not a war, lagging European allies, taxes, price controls, and other weighty phenomena of the January change in administration, the sudden seclusion of the galloping herd which roamed the range for 20 years has not received the attention it deserves.

Editors and others on the free mailing lists know that missiles from Washington are fewer, and collectors of waste paper carry away lighter loads. One recipient of this Government bounty reported last year that 2,226 postage-free pieces of Government mail were received in 2 days. When this is multiplied by thousands of offices over the country the present letup in Government press releases and propaganda assumes the importance of a national event.

The relief may be as temporary as a summer in Kansas without grasshoppers. Or the former daily deluge of Government press releases may come under the heading, "Time for a change," and never resume. If so, that would be more than various congressional investigations of excessive and expensive Government publicity have accomplished.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, when chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, reported 121 top experts distributing Government information, publicity, and propaganda, but including the assistants listed by the Civil Service Commission, the number is boosted to 4,000. A House committee, of which Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN is now chairman, spread even wider and found 42,000 employees costing the country $74,800,000 a year.

Keeping the public informed on national affairs is a duty of free government. To do that publicity bureaus are necessary. The puzzle which the great brains in and out of Congress have not been able to solve is where to draw a dividing line between such legitimate information and the propaganda for pet projects, plugs for political party programs, or "My Day" trivia about the uneventful doings of an official who rates the services of a public relations expert. The immediate question, however, is whether today's crop failure in press releases is a permanent policy of a new administration or is merely the lull before another deluge.

Government public relations men are not going to prolong their sitdown or the new boss may discover that he gets along quite well without them. They are capable professionals, most of them in the $10,000-a-year level or better. Such jobs are not relinquished without a fight.

The press officer is now sitting tight because he is not sure what information should be made public. Nor is the new Chief too sure. If the latter came from a corporation, he was accustomed to answering the stockholders only at annual meetings. As a Government official, the people ask him questions every day. Worse than that, they talk back. In the corporation, the directors backed him up. In Government, a goodly share of the directors, Congressmen, are waiting to heckle him at the first opportunity.

The new official realizes that a Government job has perquisites. Not the least is a public relations man and a staff for official or personal use. They become his first line of defense. The expert in publicity can write a speech for him, arrange conferences, and turn out a press release every hour on the hour. Releases have a favorite form. The name of the department or agency chief usually is in the first paragraph—what he said, did, announced, or decided that day.

In addition to not knowing their new boss' tastes, the public relations men have their own haunted sepulchers. For years they have sung the praises of a Brannan farm plan, Ewing socialized medicine, RFC, reclamation, public housing, and other plain and fancy projects and "isms." In many cases they did the thinking for their advertised bosses.

The voters repudiated these plans. The public relations man must recant (sounds like Moscow), tell the public that what he was diligently advocating only a few weeks ago is now bad for the country. Small wonder the typewriter cowboys are hiding in the haymow and hoping that lightning will not strike.

The business of this army of public relations men is to inform the public about Government activities. They are the sources to which a newspaper or any citizen can go for information. They fulfill that function cheerfully and well. Instances are rare where a Government information officer misleads or misinforms an inquirer. When he does he probably is obeying orders of his boss.

The abuse of that function comes when the public relations man expands his activities into selling the public a bill of goods. Instead of limiting his efforts to telling the public what the Government is doing under laws enacted by Congress, he is shoved into the more exciting crusade of telling the public what the Government might do for them if Congress would only pass a certain law.

The Government public relations man thus becomes a paid propagandist to sway public opinion—a novel situation where the taxpayer is forced to pay for his own conversion. Lobbying is joined to propaganda, making life unpleasant or impossible for any Congressman who opposes the crusade.

Nor is the day's good deed forgotten. The public must be assured that his boss, a hero with his eyes on a star, is the indispensable man who will lead the Nation into an Eden of ease and prosperity; "remember him at the next election."

Also comes a day, many days, when a pompous official sees a newspaper or magazine story that steps on his bunions. It is lese majesté. If this were an Iron Curtain country, he'd have the reporter shot before sunset. He rings for his public relations chief. That factotum should keep such miscreants in line. He's fallen down on the job, and the big boss takes over. He orders: "Write a stiff letter to that fellow's editor and get him fired. I'll sign it."

The public relations man writes the letter. When the editor receives it he calls for the reporter. "Look at this," he gushes, "on a Government letterhead and signed by a big chief. That story got under the hide of another stuffed shirt. Good work. Take a day off." Officials never learn.

This selling the public a bill of goods went over big for 20 years. Last November, the voters stopped buying. The salesmen and merchants—such typewriter cowboys and rodeo promoters as survive—must get acquainted with a new stock.

Section 201, title 18, of the United States Code, makes it unlawful to use Federal funds to influence legislation before Congress. This is to prevent the executive branch of the Government from dominating the legislative branch. The law might work if a public-relations man started shooting Congressmen who do not support his proposal and putting cash on the barrelhead for those who do support it. Neither method would be exactly popular. As to preventing an agency with a public-relations staff from using Government employees, resources, and materials to influence legislation, the law is little more than a pretty gesture.

Commenting on this, a House committee reported that the administrative agencies of government have the greatest and most effective lobby in the Nation. "We're telling our story to the people," the agencies reply. "The opposition is free to give its side. The public gets a balanced education."

If the other side is big and rich enough, it can get its story to the people. If they are little fellows and unorganized, they can't afford it. The taxpayer foots the bills, coming and going. His taxes pay for Government propaganda and lobbying. The business forced to defend its interests charges off the cost as an operating expense. It gets a tax reduction, and the public pays that much more.

Congressional committees have reported instances where the executive branch of the Government campaigns against a Congressman in his own district. On one issue, department field workers were ordered to call citizens' meetings and line up voters against Congressmen who opposed that department's pet project. This went so far beyond the usual blanketing of a district with propaganda literature that the Attorney General was asked to take action. Nothing was done.

As the legislative branch of the Government and keeper of the purse, Congress is able to defend its rights. The public has difficulty in separating information about what the Government is actually doing from propaganda for a fad or fancy that some official wants the Government to adopt.

One suggestion is that Congress fix a dividing line between information and propaganda. Telling the public what the Government is doing under laws enacted by Congress would be information. Publicizing a proposed program not yet authorized by Congress would be propaganda.

Under this interpretation, if an official travels around the country making speeches or if his public relations bureau grinds out boosts for the proposal, the expenses should not be paid by the Government but by his political party. The discrimination is not as easy as it sounds. The party has endorsed the proposal, the voters have given the party a mandate to carry it out, and its officials are in office. "The executive branch has been elected to do the job; why wait for Congress to act?"

Another suggestion is based on the pleasant fallacy that when an official is elected, he ceases to be a party man and is transformed into a representative of all the people. As

the latter, he should publicize arguments on both sides of a proposal.

Congressional hearings have shown that the administration in office invariably presents only its side of the argument. That often is as highly colored as a recent release solemnly asserting that Grand Coulee Dam won the latest war.

The people have elected a Congress to argue and decide. Having chosen these representatives, at least for 2 years, the taxpayers should not be forced to continue paying for unending arguments. Let Congress hear them and do something.

RETIREMENT ACT IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED BY BRAINERD, MINN., RAILROAD WORKERS

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the railroad workers of Brainerd, Minn., have a great interest in the Railroad Retirement Act and they have submitted a petition to me which includes their recommendations for improving the retirement system.

This is the kind of advice we need and want. The railroad retirement system does not belong to the Federal Government or to the Congress. It belongs to the men who work on the railroads of this country. The Congress is merely a trustee of the fund.

Members of Congress have a serious moral obligation to respect the wishes of the people who actually own the retirement fund. Their own wages are taxed to provide their own retirement system; we have become guardians of the fund in the name of the railroad workers but it does not belong to the Federal Government.

Over 450 railroad workers in the Brainerd area have joined together in proposing some basic changes in the Railroad Retirement Act to make it better serve their particular needs. This was done by the men themselves and represents their own firsthand knowledge of the problems of the retired worker.

In my visits to their shops I have met many of them and know that their recommendations are the result of practical, common-sense thinking; they are not the result of any pressure campaign but of honest and sincere efforts to improve their retirement system.

You will recall that in the last Congress we passed a temporary relief measure to meet the rising cost of living. These so-called Railroad Retirement Act amendments of 1951 provided for, first, a 15 percent increase in benefits of both pensioners and annuitants; second, a 33⅓ percent increase in survivors benefits to bring them up to the level of social security; and third, a spouse's benefit of 50 percent of the retired employee's benefit up to a maximum of $40.

Many of us felt at that time that other improvements should be made and other benefits expanded. Recognizing, however, that we are responsible for the solvency of the retirement fund, we supported Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 to create a special Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement Legislation. You will remember that we instructed the committee to give special consideration to:

First. The character and amount of present benefits and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

Second. The existing relationships between the system established by the Railroad Retirement Act and the old-age and survivors insurance system.

Third. The changes that should be made in the character and amount of benefits to be provided workers subject to the Railroad Retirement Act and the estimated cost of providing such benefits.

The need for this study became clear when the Congress was considering the cost-of-living improvements. Questions constantly arose over the amount of reserve needed in the fund to keep it solvent and to guarantee today's workers that their future benefits would be protected.

The joint committee, under the able leadership of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS as chairman and Congressman Lindley Beckworth as vice chairman, held hearings and sent questionnaires to all of the railway labor organizations. Members questioned the officials of the Railroad Retirement Board on the fund.

A report on the findings is now being prepared and I am advised that it will be completed about April 1. We hope this report will give us sound information upon which we can base legislation to give railroad workers every benefit consistent with the solvency of the retirement fund.

There is an honest difference of opinion among groups and among railroad workers themselves as to how much benefits can be increased without increasing the payroll taxes and without endangering future benefits.

In my talks with railroaders I have been constantly told that their first interest is keeping the retirement fund in a sound condition. They also want to keep payroll taxes within reason since they are already much higher than social-security taxes. We hope, therefore, that the joint committee's report will give us the facts about the fund so that we can make long-needed improvements on a sound basis.

Many active and retired railroad employees believe that benefits can be liberalized without affecting the financial stability of the retirement system. As their representatives and as trustees of the fund, I am convinced that we must give thorough consideration to these amendments and act in the best interests of the men who have built this system.

I submit, therefore, the recommendations of the Brainerd workers and urge that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce give them every consideration in working out a legislative plan to meet their needs. The Brainerd men propose these amendments:

First. Provide that all benefits now payable to the wife of a railroad employee, during the lifetime of the railroad employee, shall be payable directly to the employee rather than to the wife.

Second. Provide that unmarried employees and widowers over 65 years shall receive the same benefits as married employees, for we feel that the present law is unfair because unmarried employees pay the same contribution as married employees but receive no benefits for a wife or dependents.

Third. Provide for an immediate lifetime pension for the wife of a deceased employee regardless of her attained age or the presence or absence of dependent children, until such time as she remarries.

Fourth. Provide that any railroad employee with 35 years of service, or who has attained the age of 60 years, be entitled to the full amount of the pension.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the House that these are the recommendations of active railroad workers who are paying into the retirement fund. They ask that this Congress which has guardianship over their fund give early consideration to their proposals for improving the retirement system.

We all know that rising costs have had a serious impact on the retired worker. A realistic program of security in retirement demands that we constantly reexamine the program to be sure that it provides a decent standard of living for the men who have built and who operate the world's greatest transportation system and a vital source of our national industrial strength.

As trustees of the railroad-retirement system, we should assure all railroad workers, active and retired, that it is our desire to do everything possible to improve benefits paid for the tax burden they carry without threatening the financial health of the fund. I want to give this assurance to the railroadmen of Brainerd, Minn., and I hope this Congress will join in carrying out this obligation.

PROVIDING GRANTS AND SCHOLARSHIPS IN NURSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENDER). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill designed to give financial assistance to students of nursing on the basis of need.

It is being proven more conclusively each day that many young people wanting to make a contribution of themselves to the nursing profession and to the teaching of health methods are unable to do so because they cannot meet the cost of such training. Everywhere the difficulty of staffing our hospitals, of taking care of the sick in their homes, of carrying the public health programs, is growing more and more acute. There can be no solution unless and until there are more students in our nursing schools with an adequate number of teachers to insure a thorough grounding in the basic procedures now exacted in the various gradations of nursing care.

It is becoming more and more a common experience to find whole wards of hospitals closed for lack of trained personnel. The nurse is the key that will unlock those closed doors.

Let me refresh your minds with a few basic figures, and a picture or two of the situation.

We are informed authoritatively that, although more graduate nurses are in active service today than ever before in our history—approximately 320,000—there is an immediate need for at least 65,000 more nurses in the hospital and health services of the United States. At least 16,000 young people over and above those already in nursing schools today must find their way there each year. That, Mr. Speaker, is just in the field of the regular trained nurse who finishes her three or more years of training and successfully passes the licensing requirements of her State.

There is another field also which is of great importance to our national need—the field of the practical nurse. The value of this carefully trained and supervised group is being proven everywhere. The need for them grows in leaps and bounds every day of the world. With the demand for the registered nurse so dramatically unfilled, the women who for one reason or another cannot undertake the 3-years' training, but who can take a year's training, to qualify for becoming a practical nurse, are of ever-increasing importance in the broad picture of giving adequate care to all who need it. This area of sick care in no wise encroaches upon the area of the highly skilled registered nurse, popularly known as the "R. N." Indeed, a truly adequate supply of practical nurses, trained in the simpler needs of the patient, would release the professionally trained R. N. to cover more adequately the field where she is the right-hand of the doctor. The doctor, in turn, is constantly being released by such skilled assistance as the R. N. gives, to cover a larger number of patients and do such research and study as will keep him abreast of medical progress.

Bringing more students into our nursing schools is not a simple matter, Mr. Speaker. So many fields of endeavor are open to young women today that we cannot expect a girl whose economic situation cannot meet the expenses of training—on top of taking time out of her earning years to prepare for a career of nursing—without some inducement.

A nursing career presents to our young women especially an opportunity to give free rein to the deep urge within their hearts to care for the sick, to strengthen the weak, to lift the hearts of the despondent. Nursing gives the knowledge and the techniques for intelligent use of that longing. Nursing makes an appeal no other career can make—unless it be medicine—to the creativeness that so essentially belongs to womanhood.

But desire is not a sufficient inducement in these days of high costs of living, and of training for contributive careers. It is not strong enough to counteract the pull of salaries offered by industry, and the security and drama of a career in uniform with one of our military services.

Unless we find ways in which to make nurse training possible for the many who cannot afford the costs, we shall continue an ever-growing spiral of too few trained personnel to carry our increasing number of sick.

There is an even more fundamental reason behind the problem of securing enough students for our nursing schools. This factor affects all organizations and services wanting young women to train for their specialized purposes. There is an actual decrease in the supply of young woman power resources. Whether we like it or not—whether we want to believe it or not—we are faced with the cold fact that because of the low birthrate in the early thirties, there just is not an unlimited supply of young women. Census figures indicate that the supply will not increase markedly until 1960.

The marriage trend in the last few years, and the extremely high birth rates today in the younger age groups of women, have complicated the picture tremendously. The short supply is really critical. Add to this cold fact the ever-increasing demands for this same young group on the part of industry as well as the present strong effort to increase the number of women in the Armed Services, and you have a very difficult situation indeed.

In asking the Congress to appropriate funds, even the small amounts contained in this bill, to make it possible for more girls and young men to take nursing training—I do not say to you that this will solve the problem of the nurse shortage. I believe merely that it should get us over the biggest road block. I am well aware that nursing could be made more attractive were hospitals to revamp some of their working hours and conditions. I am well aware that when the nursing profession agrees to certain changes in the training programs now being tried out—when the results of certain experiments in content and timing of curricula are available—that a little of the burden will be lifted in many places. I am also certain that doctors too must readjust themselves to new ways of covering the care of their patients who, in their turn, must be ready to do their part too.

There is no longer any question as to the shortage of personnel in the nursing field. If I am to be truly frank with you I must say that I see little hope for betterment unless and until some such action is taken as is contemplated in my bill. I do not propose it to you as a panacea for the nurse shortage problem, nor do I contend it is the only solution. Rather do I bring it to you as one step—and a very decisive, basic step—toward a solution. I believe it to be fundamental to the many other things that need to be done if we are to insure care of our sick and injured, and more and more understanding of the value of health to a civilization facing actual survival.

Measured against the ever-increasing need, the sums included in my bill: $5 million the first year, $10 million the second, and $15 million the third, are very small indeed. If they are used with the same efficiency as those appropriated in 1941 for the purpose of increasing students in nursing schools and later for the Cadet Nurse Corps with its provision for graduate training to secure more teachers—and I have every reason to feel they will be—they will prove once again the wisdom of the Congress in its efforts to further the well-being of the citizens of this great and wonderful country.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that committee consideration of this bill may go forward speedily and that this House may soon act favorably upon it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include herewith a very brief summary of the main points covered by the bill.

The bill would authorize grants of United States funds to the States to assist schools of nursing to meet the increased costs of instruction and to provide scholarships to needy and worthy newly enrolled nursing students. Federal funds would be distributed to the States on the basis of the relationship of the State's newly enrolled trainees to the newly enrolled of the Nation.

To be eligible for aid, States would have to submit a plan to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. Such plan must:

First. Designate the State board of nurse examiners as the administrative agency within the State.

Second. Provide evidence that the above agency would have authority to administer the program.

Third. Set up a State advisory council to consult with and advise the State administering agency.

Fourth. Set forth a program for the expansion and improvement of nursing education.

Fifth. Provide minimum standards—fixed by the State—for schools of nursing.

Sixth. Provide for hearings before the State agency for each school of nursing applying for aid.

Seventh. Provide that the State agency make such reports as may from time to time be required by the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Eighth. Provide that the State agency would review and modify the program from time to time.

Ninth. Agree to secure an inventory of training facilities and nurse training needs within the State.

Direction of the program at the Federal level would be the responsibility of the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, who could stop payment of funds to any State not complying with the law. Before doing so he must give the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard. Advisory councils would be set up at both the State and Federal levels to advise and consult with the State administering agency and the Surgeon General. The act would terminate at the end of 3 years after passage, but allow those who entered their training prior to the cutoff date to finish their courses.

FOUR-PERCENT VETERANS' LOANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith statements and extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words about the 4-percent

loans for veterans. There is an effort being made to increase this rate from 4 percent to 4½ percent. The difference seems very small but that one-half of 1 percent on the average home will mean to the average veteran a difference of $1,000. So if this rate is increased from 4 percent to 4½ percent, it will cost each veteran home owner an average of $1,000. I hope that when the Committee of Veterans' Affairs meets on tomorrow, it will consider the bill now before it for the purpose of making available money to take care of these loans. I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] has such a bill, and that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] also has such a bill. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], chairman of the committee, expressed sympathy for the proposal on the floor of the House here yesterday. In view of that fine support, I hope a bill is favorably reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs tomorrow.

RAINS BILL FOR 4-PERCENT GI LOANS

The gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable ALBERT RAINS, during the 82d Congress, was chairman of a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on housing. He did a wonderful job and made a special study and investigation of veterans' housing. February 16, 1953, he introduced a bill, H. R. 3052, providing for funds to support the VA's direct home-loan program. The release he gave out to the newspapers at that time explains the situation so thoroughly I am inserting it herewith. It is as follows:

DIRECT HOME LOANS FOR VETERANS AT 4 PERCENT

Representative ALBERT RAINS, Democrat, of Alabama, today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill to extend and expand the VA's direct home-loan program. Representative RAINS' bill would extend the direct loan programs for 2 years, until June 30, 1955, and enlarge its authorization by an additional $500 million. The total authorization would become available immediately.

Upon introducing the bill, Representative RAINS stated:

"I have today introduced H. R. 3052, a bill to extend and expand the direct home-loan program for veterans. I am doing this because I believe that only through the enactment of such a bill as mine can Congress hope to prevent a sharp rise in the VA mortgage interest rate. A widespread propaganda campaign against the 4 percent GI rate has been carried on by certain elements of the mortgage-lending industry. They have endeavored to create the fiction that for them to lend to veterans at 4 percent would be an act of pure philanthropy—they have demanded that veterans' interest rates be raised. Unfortunately, there are indications which lead me to fear that the new Republican administration may succumb to this demand. I strongly feel, however, that 4 percent Government-guaranteed mortgages are still a very attractive investment and that the interest rate should not be raised. There is general agreement that an investor purchasing from an originating mortgage company receives a net yield which falls in the neighborhood of 3.2 percent. Now, it is my contention that the only fair basis of comparison in judging the investment attraction of the GI 4 percent loan is to relate its net yield to the yield obtainable on Government bonds. Since the GI loan is guaranteed by the Government for the top 60 percent of the loan, it must be regarded for all practicable purposes as a riskless security, which, like Government bonds, is backed by the full credit and resources of the Government. When compared with Government bonds, the relative investment position of the VA-guaranteed 4 percent loan shows up in a very favorable light. Presently the average yield on long-term Government bonds is approximately 2.70. That figure is a full one-half of 1 percent below the net yield of 3.20 which is typical for those institutional investors which pay a one-half percent servicing fee on VA mortgages. Admittedly, that one-half of 1 percent spread has been narrowed from what it was prior to the upward shift in the structure of money yields which followed upon the monetary actions taken in the spring of 1951. Nonetheless, the differential is there and remains substantial even at the low point currently reached by the Government-bond market.

"I am proud that I introduced one of the first veterans' direct-loan bills in the House on July 13, 1949. This bill eventually became part of the Housing Act of 1950. The original grant of authority expired June 30, 1951, but as a member of the conference committee on the Defense Housing Act of 1951, I assisted in having the authority to make direct loans renewed on a revolving basis. The revolving fund was augmented by Public Law 325, 82d Congress, which authorized the Treasury to advance additional funds up to $125 million in quarterly allotments of $25 million less the proceeds from the sale of direct loans in the preceding quarter.

"The record of the direct-loan program leaves no doubt as to Congress' wisdom in enacting it. It proves that the Veterans' Administration has done an excellent job of administering it. Most of all, however, it is a tribute to the character, energy, and self-reliance of our veterans. As of December 15, 1952, a total of only 16 direct loans had been terminated by foreclosure or voluntary conveyance in lieu of foreclosure, representing only 1 out of every 1,600 completed loans as of the same date. Of the 24,717 direct loans outstanding on December 15, 1952, a total of 684 were in default by one or more installments, with 151, or 0.6 percent, in default by three or more installments.

"In light of these facts, I hope that neither the new administration nor the Republican 83d Congress will break faith with the millions of veterans who have not yet had an opportunity to avail themselves of the GI home-loan program. To raise the interest rates on VA mortgages now would be an act of gross discrimination against the Korean war veterans. I sincerely hope that Congress will take speedy action to extend and expand the direct-loan program. It is the only way we can maintain the 4-percent rates on GI mortgages and thus keep faith with our veterans."

MARSHALL, TEX.: CAPITAL OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago in the Committee on Banking and Currency, there was a discussion about the capital of the great State of Missouri being at one time at Marshall, Tex.

The colloquy at this committee hearing was used as a basis for an interesting article in the Marshall News Messenger, Marshall, Tex., by Millard Cope, the editor, on March 3, 1953, and in connection with the article, there was a picture of the former capitol of Missouri with the following statement under the picture:

It has been razed, but this old house which once stood at South Bolivar and East Crockett was the Civil War capital of Missouri's prosouthern government in exile. While resident here and in another also vanished house across Bolivar to the west, the fugitive Missouri officials employed the great seal of their State to issue their formal papers. Now a Missourian in Congress has offered to trade Stephen F. Austin's body for that great seal. The offer's O. K., except that Austin is buried in Texas, and the great seal has long ago returned to Missouri.

The article is as follows:

MISSOURI SOLON JUST CAN'T HOSS-TRADE TEXAS THIS WAY

(By Millard Cope)

A Missouri Congressman proposes to swap the body of Stephen F. Austin for the great seal of the State of Missouri.

The proposal, to Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, would be perfectly all right, except:

1. The great seal of the State of Missouri is in Missouri, not Texas; and,

2. The body of Stephen F. Austin rests beneath Texas sod, not in Missouri.

The proposal came during a colloquy in the Banking and Currency Committee room, March 3. The committee had under consideration a bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the purchase of Louisiana.

A VERBAL SPAR

"Mr. PATMAN. Since you are familiar with the history of the State of Missouri, I would like to ask you about something that happened many years ago:

"We have a building in Marshall, Tex., part of the district that I have the honor to represent, which says, 'The former capitol of the State of Missouri,' and it even gives the name of the governor and the attorney general and all of them on a plaque in this building.

"Do you know anything about the removal of the capital of the State of Missouri to Texas?

"Mr. SEMSROTT. Only to this extent, sir, and I am not an authority on history of my own State, but I believe that Governor Clayborn of Missouri at that time was believed to have Confederate or southern leanings and apparently his belief was activated by his taking the government of Missouri to Marshall, Tex., where it survived for a period of several months. That is, it was not a legal survival, but nevertheless I believe that that was the incident by which it was alleged that the government of Missouri was removed to the State of Texas."

GOVERNMENT IN EXILE

"Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I understand the entire staff was carried there, and they paid their debts through the use of checks issued.

"Mr. SEMSROTT. Yes.

"Mr. PATMAN. And mailed from Marshall.

"Mr. SEMSROTT. I think that is correct, sir.

"Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, may I comment there?

"I understand you have the great seal of the State of Missouri down there still, and we were trying to arrange a swap for Steven Austin's body which we have in Potosi, Mo., for that great seal.

"Mr. PATMAN. Possibly we can get up a trade."

MISSOURIANS CONFUSED

The gentleman from Missouri, it seems, is confused with the father of Texas' father.

Stephen F. Austin, known as the father of Texas, died while serving as secretary of state of the Republic of Texas, December 27, 1836.

He lies beneath the Texas soil he so loved; appropriately, in the State cemetery, reserved for those who have contributed to the glories of Texas, and, appropriately so, in the State's capital city, Austin, named in his honor.

Moses Austin, father of Stephen F. Austin, received notice in March 1821 that his petition for a colonization grant had been approved. He hastened to organize the vanguard of his colony, but died on June 10, leaving completion of his ambitious undertaking to his son, who was to become known as the father of Texas.

MONUMENT IN TEXAS

It is the elder Austin who is buried in Potosi, Mo., though Texans have erected a monument in his honor and in appreciation of his preliminary efforts destined to be carried to fruition by his son. The monument is in the city hall grounds facing the the entrance to the Spanish Governors' Palace in San Antonio, Texas' most historic city.

Representative PATMAN, of course, is absolutely right about Marshall being the site of the Missouri capitol; but it seems none in Marshall had advised Mr. PATMAN that the frame structure had been razed during the last year. Too, none had advised Mr. PATMAN that the good intentions to erect a monument or place a plaque upon the place had ever been carried out.

The business of the State officers in exile was carried out in Marshall, however.

When Texas seceded in 1861, Marshall, one of the oldest and wealthiest cities in the State, promptly turned to industry to produce saddles, harness, clothing, powder, and ammunition for the Confederate Army.

A PROMINENT CITY

After the fall of Vicksburg, Marshall became the seat of civil authority west of the Mississippi River and, as a fortified city, housed the wartime capital of Missouri, staffed by refugee elected officials of Missouri in exile. Too, Marshall served as headquarters for the Trans-Mississippi Postal Department of the Confederacy.

Marshall contributed 12 companies of soldiers, including high-ranking officers and half a dozen generals, and gave the State two wartime governors, Edward Clark, grandfather of O. H. Clark, president of the First National Bank, and Pendleton Murrah.

Now, about the great seal of the State of Missouri.

If the Missouri Congressman will make a careful search the next time he gets back to the State he represents, the great seal can be found, in storage, in a Jefferson City vault.

If the Missourian will check his State's history he likewise will find it was not "Governor Clayborn" involved in moving the State's capital to Marshall.

It was Claiborne F. Jackson who was Governor. At the same time, Thomas C. Reynolds served as lieutenant governor. Elected on the Democratic ticket in 1860, both remained loyal to the South.

JACKSON A REBEL

Three months after their inauguration a constitutional convention was held. Missouri, it voted, should stay in the Union. Jackson refused to be of aid, however, when Lincoln asked for 50,000 troops.

Refusing the Lincoln request, he issued a call for a like number of State troops to assemble to repel what he termed a Federal invasion of the sovereign State of Missouri and borrowed $50,000 from banks to equip his militia.

When Union forces marched on Missouri's capital at Jefferson City, Jackson, Reynolds, and their staffs fled south. He called a session of the legislature at Neosho, out of which came a proclamation that Missouri had "officially seceded from the Union." The proclamation and all State orders bore the great seal, which Jackson carried with him.

THEM TO ARKANSAS

As Federal troops drew closer, Jackson moved South, establishing an exile government in Arkansas, until his death in an improvised hospital at Little Rock, December 6, 1862.

Reynolds took over; and, moving south again, established the Missouri government in exile—great seal and all—in Marshall. Jackson had hardly fled from Little Rock before it was taken over by Federal forces.

Reynolds originally sought to establish the capital in Shreveport, to be in closer touch with Gen. Kirby Smith, in charge of the Trans-Mississippi forces. Reynolds, a visitor in Marshall a year earlier, for a governor's conference, felt Marshall's climate superior to that of the Red River city—and the capital was established here.

THE SEAL TO MEXICO

The war over, Reynolds—and the great seal—fled again, to Mexico, to be employed in a colonization project by Emperor Maximilian.

The mystery of the missing seal was cleared up in 1869. Reynolds, after a 4-year exile, returned to St. Louis to make his home. From there, on May 26, 1869, he wrote Gov. J. M. McClurg:

"Any hesitation formerly felt, on principles of general public law, or on account of conflicting opinions within the State, to deliver to its existing government the original great seal of the State of Missouri, was removed by the fact that, in November last—for the first time since State officers were chosen, in profound peace, at an election held throughout its territory.

"Therefore, to you as the chief magistrate chosen at that election, it is herewith transmitted. Now of no official value, it is still interesting as a relic of the time when civil war had not yet divided Missourians. May its return be an agency of the speedy oblivian of past strife, and the complete restoration of fraternal feeling among us all."

Mr. Speaker, although I confess, I do not know all the historical facts about my own State of Texas, I did know that Stephen F. Austin was buried at Austin, Tex., and Moses Austin was buried at Potosi, Mo. In the reference by Congressman CURTIS to Stephen F. Austin, I feel sure that he meant Moses Austin. I know that is the way I understood Congressman CURTIS at the time, and replied accordingly.

REGULATING MANUFACTURE OF FLAMMABLE WEARING APPAREL

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill in substitute for H. R. 389 introduced by me on January 3.

As you know, I have taken a deep and active interest in the subject of flammable fabrics in the hope that national legislation might be approved to prohibit the sale and distribution of wearing apparel that is dangerously flammable. We are all concerned over the needless loss of life and maiming of our citizens because some manufacturers have produced materials that are highly dangerous.

This new bill is necessary because on January 30, after several years of study, the Secretary of Commerce promulgated a commercial standard identified as Flammability of Clothing Textiles, Commercial Standard 191–53. My earlier bill referred to the recommended commercial standard. I am happy to report now that this standard has been approved by the various segments of the textile industry.

I am also pleased to report that the bill which I am introducing today has the unqualified support of not only textile producers but the retail industry as well. This bill has been drafted with the assistance of producers and distributors of fabrics used in wearing apparel and it is my sincere hope that with this united support the Congress will see fit to give this bill immediate consideration. This is important for several reasons. First, the adoption of this legislation will prohibit the manufacture and distribution of dangerously flammable wearing apparel. Second, the several States have been waiting patiently for action on the part of the Congress on this subject. If we procrastinate any longer manufacturers and distributors will be faced with the impossible task of trying to comply with a multiplicity of State and local statutes.

I am confident that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will expedite hearings on this legislation. The gentleman from New Jersey, Chairman WOLVERTON and his colleagues, have indicated keen interest, the chairman recently saying legislation of this character is imminent.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the vote on the passage of the Hawaiian statehood bill, I was absent from the Chamber as a result of being called to my office on official business. I voted against the motion to recommit, and had I been present, I would have voted for the passage of the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. OSTERTAG in two instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LATHAM and to include extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the matter will cost $231.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include a set of resolutions by the Wapello County Medical Association of Ottumwa, Iowa.

Mr. MORANO.

Mr. GROSS and to include a letter.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include a speech he recently made.

Mr. RAYBURN in two instances and to include an address by Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, and one by Hon. Robert P. Anderson, Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. ALEXANDER and to include a speech.

Mr. FINE.

Mr. HOLTZMAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI and to include the testimony of Joseph B. Meegan.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in five instances, and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that in one instance the Public Printer estimates the additional cost will amount to $196.

Mr. BOGGS in two instances, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. McCORMACK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. COUDERT.
Mr. FALLON and include extraneous matter.
Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. McVEY and to include an article.
Mr. GAMBLE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. OAKMAN and to include an editorial.
Mr. ANGELL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. YOUNG.
Mr. McDONOUGH and to include a resolution.
Mr. MEADER.
Mr. BENDER in three instances.
Mr. PHILBIN and to include a speech he delivered last Saturday.
Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.
Mr. MACK of Illinois in two instances.
Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include additional information from the Coal Age magazine on the importation of residual oil.
Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances.
Mr. Moss and to include an editorial.
Mr. JUDD in two instances.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 65. An act for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 100. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 140. An act for the relief of John W. McBride; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 141. An act for the relief of Harry Ray Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 147. An act for the relief of Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 248. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 365. An act for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 522. An act for the relief of George P. Ruckman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 615. An act for the relief of Altoon Saprichian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 682. An act for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 709. An act to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 720. An act for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 837. An act for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Baraky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 873. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2332. An act to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 9, 1953, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2230. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 11, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

533. A letter from the Attorney General, relative to the case of Mrs. Eva Yecheved Paneth nee Grunzweig, A-6819100, for adjustment of her immigration status under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

534. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report on the activities to provide war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public for the quarter ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 1211 of Public Law 763, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

535. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

536. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Social Security Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1917. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; with an amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 757. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 837. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth; without amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1514. A bill for the relief of Clint Lewis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1780. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Shea; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1967. A bill to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2667. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3385. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Pio Valensin; without amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3446. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm; with an amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3458. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3557. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3837. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to obstruction of justice) so as to make certain provisions of that chapter apply to the District Court for the District of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3838. A bill to extend the gratuitous insurance benefits granted by subsection 602

(d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased members of the Armed Forces without any requirement as to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3839. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase by one-third the insurance benefits payable thereunder to widows and widowers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 3840. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 3841. A bill to amend section 402 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to provide that citrus fruit to which artificial color is added shall be deemed to be adulterated; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3842. A bill to prohibit members of the Armed Forces from bringing certain firearms into the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Missouri:

H. R. 3843. A bill to provide for payment of indemnity or insurance benefits to dependent beneficiaries of members of the Armed Forces who have been missing in action for over 1 year; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 3844. A bill granting exemption from income tax with respect to $1,500 of the amount paid to any individual by the United States or by any State or political subdivision thereof as a pension, retired or retirement pay, or as a retirement annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 3845. A bill to authorize the issuance of 328,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to certain refugees, German expellees, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3846. A bill to amend section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide increased benefits in cases of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 3847. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, so as to provide a method for the settlement of labor disputes which will eliminate some of the harmful consequences of work stoppages and lockouts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 3848. A bill to aid in controlling inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 3849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to reduce the rates of tax applicable to distilled spirits, wines, and fermented malt liquor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 3850. A bill to provide a program of grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 3851. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 3852. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Ipswich River, Mass., for flood-control purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3853. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution declaring Inauguration Day to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in June of each year as Father's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution making Constitution Day a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 172. Resolution expressing the friendship of the House of Representatives and the people of the United States for the people of Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. Res. 173. Resolution amending rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the conduct of investigations by subcommittees of standing committees; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the 33d session of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to discontinue the practice of letting and awarding contracts by the Government of the United States or any of its departments, agencies, or instrumentalities on a cost-plus, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or negotiated-contract basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the 33d session of the South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent discrimination under law on account of sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY and Mr. FERNANDEZ: Memorial of the 21st Legislature, State of New Mexico, House Joint Memorial No. 8, memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide assistance to the Kingdom of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature, State of New Mexico, to the Congress of the United States of America, requesting an amendment to the Social Security Act to the effect that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled the first $50 of earned income be disregarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the use of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to extend and amend the Statute No. 475 of the 81st Congress, which expires June 30, 1953, by providing for direct loans to veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting a study and to make recommendations necessary to revive the gold mining industry of Montana; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, opposing the repeal of the long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent discrimination under law on account of sex; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to take appropriate action to discontinue the practice of letting and awarding contracts by the Government of the United States or any of its departments, agencies, or instrumentalities, on a cost-plus, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or negotiated-contract basis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting passage of H. R. 1976, 83d Congress, and thereby eliminate an unjust discrimination in the administration of justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting amendment of the Federal Aid to Fish Restoration Act (64 Stat. 430); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the taking of immediate action to transfer control of the fisheries of Alaska to the government of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3854. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Rabbit Creek Community Club of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H. R. 3855. A bill for the relief of Sister Agrippina (Agrippina Palermo), Sister Battistina (Franceschina Serpa), Sister Romana (Angela Iolanda Morelli), Sister Franceschina (Maria Caruso), and Sister Bruna (Giuseppina De Caro); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3856. A bill for the relief of Jaakko Ensio Alho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 3857. A bill to provide for the issuance of a trust patent to the heirs of Lucy Lessert for certain land on the Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3858. A bill for the relief of Nella Norma Giorgi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3859. A bill for the relief of Jose Zavala-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 3860. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Abilene division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Yetta Mae Slayton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3861. A bill for the relief of Fumiko Nakane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 3862. A bill for the relief of Aleksander, Sala, Boris, and Anna Ejdelman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 3863. A bill for the relief of Theodore G. Passails; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3864. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Susie Leider; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3865. A bill for the relief of John George Fient-Geigy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 3866. A bill for the relief of Cosimo Damiano Campanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Mary Thalia Wommack Webb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 3868. A bill for the relief of Selda Bukinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Elkanah Richards, Adelaide Gertrude Richards, and Anthony Gilbert Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 3870. A bill for the relief of Carlo Erbetta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 3871. A bill for the relief of Constantine N. Perkins; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 3872. A bill for the relief of Vera Hsi Yen Wang Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 3873. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3874. A bill for the relief of Roberto Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3875. A bill for the relief of Peter Wei Ting Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Martha Schnauffer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 3877. A bill for the relief of Pu Lun Chien and Helen S. Chien; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

79. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions of the Greater Paterson Chamber of Commerce, Paterson, N. J., that notwithstanding the discontinuance of price controls, there be no increases in the price of its products where possible, and that reductions be made where warranted, and that there be recommended to the major organizations of industry, such as the United States Chamber of Commerce and National Association of Manufacturers, the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and others, a similar declaration of policy and since prices depend upon wages, that similar suggestions be made to the major labor organizations, such as the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

80. By the SPEAKER: Petition of R. G. Roberts, of Seattle, Wash., and others, relative to the present financial and taxation systems of the Government and enclosing a proposed bill entitled "Financial Emancipation Act"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

81. Also, petition of William I. Barnholth, Akron, Ohio, urging official action by Congress, admitting Ohio into the Union as of March 1, 1803; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

82. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtis, Paterson, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Nicholas J. Curtis, Petitioner-Memorialist, vs. Phillip Forman, U. S. district judge of New Jersey, Main Division at Trenton, N. J.; and Guy L. Fake, U. S. district judge of New Jersey (cited as retired), Newark, N. J., under House of Representatives Rules XXII; X: L. R. Act, S. 996. Namely, motion for leave to deposit brief or memorial with the Sergeant-at-Arms or Acting Secretary of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

83. Also, petition of S. Sgt. and Mrs. R. D. Bagaley, Jr., and others, of Braintree, Essex, England, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a bill now pending in Congress to cut subsistence pay of United States servicemen overseas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for blue days and fair, and for eyes to see and for hearts to feel the wonders of this our Father's world. As before our eyes winter graves change to springtime gardens, all nature speaks to us of stirring life and of the barren earth being reborn to haunting loveliness. Already bushes afire with Thee seem to whisper secrets that our dull souls are too dense to comprehend.

Fill us, we pray Thee, with fresh faith, a triumphant confidence in Thy final victory over the hearts of men. May we face these baffling days with the glad assurance that no weapon that has been formed can prevail against Thy eternal purpose. From the selfish schemes of cruel and stubborn men, we turn sure and content to a resistless force that will at last burn away every barrier to brotherhood; and to Thee, our God, who will not fail nor be discouraged until, on a cross deep rooted in Thine own heart, Thou dost lift a willful world to the radiance of Thy love and light. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 9, 1953, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, rule III of the Standing Rules of the Senate reads as follows:

> The Presiding Officer having taken the chair, and a quorum being present, the Journal of the preceding day shall be read, and any mistake made in the entries corrected. The reading of the Journal shall not be suspended unless by unanimous consent; and when any motion shall be made to amend or correct the same, it shall be deemed a privileged question, and proceeded with until disposed of.

Last Friday, when the Unanimous Consent Calendar was before the Senate, I asked for the courtesy of having a bill go over until the next calendar day, so that I could have an opportunity to study the bill. The explanation given with respect to it was bemuddled and befuddled, and when the explanation was finished, I could not make heads or tails out of the bill.

Notice was served on me that if I did not let the bill be passed on the call of the calendar, a motion would be made to consider it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. MORSE. I am reserving the right to object, in order that I may make my explanation with respect to the parliamentary course of action I am taking.

Mr. President, notice was served on me that a motion to consider the bill would be made under the rules of the Senate. I know that traditionally in the Senate, in a situation such as that, courtesy has been extended to Members to have the time necessary in which to study the bill.

If the rules of the Senate are to be applied on a technical basis, as was done on Friday, so far as I am concerned, they will continue to be so applied. I object to the request made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. TAFT. I may say that after the reading and correction of the Journal—if any correction is called for—have been concluded, the only business before the Senate today will be the business of the morning hour followed by Senate bill 697, Calendar No. 70, to provide for a Delegate for the District of Columbia; and then the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Can the distinguished majority leader give us any information as to what he plans to have the Senate consider on Friday?

Mr. TAFT. I think it may be necessary to have the Senate meet tomorrow for a brief period, or as long as the Senate wishes to stay, in order to receive a message with respect to a reorganization plan. There will be nothing more than routine business considered on either Thursday or Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to read the Journal.

The legislative clerk read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 9, 1953.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 10, 1953, the President had approved and signed the act (S. J. Res. 27) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3575) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 9th instant,

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported favorably on March 10, 1953, the following nominations:

Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, of Nebraska, to be representative of the United States on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Livingston T. Merchant, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of State;

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, to be counselor of the Department of State;

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Nepal;

Francis White, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Mexico; and

William McNear Rand, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. RUSSELL was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the next few days.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. CASE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

MRS. EVA YECHEVED PANETH—ADJUSTMENT OF IMMIGRATION STATUS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order entered regarding the application of Mrs. Eva Yecheved Paneth for an adjustment of her immigration status under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF WAR RISK AND CERTAIN MARINE AND LIABILITY INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Social Security Administration, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

OPERATION DURING FLOODS OF UNION ELECTRIC CO. OF MISSOURI BAGNELL PROJECT NO. 459

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of that Commission's letter of March 10, 1953, in reply to a letter dated February 6, 1953, from Cole County Farm Bureau, Inc., of Jefferson City, Mo., concerning the operation during floods of Union Electric Co. of Missouri's Bagnell Project No. 459 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

CONTINUANCE OF OFFICES IN THE PHILIPPINES BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 17

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to determine the causes of the decline in livestock and farm prices and to take steps to stabilize farm income

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas the State of South Dakota is dependent upon agriculture and the livestock industry; and

"Whereas there has been a decline in farm prices and livestock prices without a corresponding decline in consumer prices; and

"Whereas the national economy is jeopardized whenever any area suffers from adverse producing and marketing conditions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to determine the causes of the decline in farm and livestock prices and to take necessary corrective steps to stabilize farm income so that agriculture may obtain its rightful share of the national income; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to United States Senator FRANCIS CASE, to Congressman HAROLD LOVRE, to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 15

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States; His Excellency, the President of the United States; and the Director of the National Park Service to alter a current policy of the National Park Service and permit the control of prairie dogs and other small injurious animals within the national parks

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas the State of South Dakota and particularly the agricultural interests are concerned with the increasing numbers of rodents and other injurious small animals within its borders; and

"Whereas the South Dakota Department of Agriculture at the present time has a program for the eradication and control of such animals; and

"Whereas it is the current policy of the Director of the National Park Service that prairie dogs and other small injurious animals are not to be eradicated or controlled within any national parks; and

"Whereas these animals, protected in the park areas, spread out from these protected areas to vast areas beyond thereby making the present control program extremely difficult to enforce and unavailing in result: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Director of the National Park Service to alter his present policy relative to prairie dogs and other animals of like nature and permit their control and eradication where feasible; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to United States Senator FRANCIS CASE, to Congressman

HAROLD LOVRE, to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prevent discrimination under law on account of sex

"Whereas the rights of the women of America particularly under the laws of many of the States are not equal with the rights of men, and notwithstanding the emancipation of women in many fields of activity there remain in other phases of their lives discriminations against them under the law, their rights are abridged and they are actually restrained in certain endeavors and pursuits by reason only of their sex; and

"Whereas it is the enlightened view, unquestioned now by any thoughtful person, that women should share fully and equally with men the responsibilities and the sacrifices, the rights and the privileges incident to American citizenship, and notwithstanding their sex can and will bear equally with men the full burden of any extremity of physical, mental and spiritual effort necessary to maintain, preserve and protect our great country; and

"Whereas the Republican Party has long advocated the removal of all discrimination against women under law, and this being a propitious time to put into effect this and other principles of government for which this great party has taken a stand: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the 33d session of the South Dakota Legislature (the House of Representatives concurring therein) do urge and memorialize the Congress of the United States to propose the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have the power within the respective jurisdictions, to endorse this article by appropriate legislation. This amendment shall take effect 3 years after the date of ratification'; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, Dwight D. Eisenhower, the President of the United States; to the honorable members of the Cabinet of the United States; to the Honorable Karl Mundt; to the Honorable Francis Case, United States Senators from South Dakota; to the Honorable E. Y. Berry and the Honorable Harold O. Lovre, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota; and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"W. J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 19

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to discontinue the practice of letting and awarding contracts by the Government of the United States or any of its departments, agencies, or instrumentalities, on a cost-plus, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or negotiated-contract basis

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas the letting and awarding of contracts on a cost-plus, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or negotiated basis is not in keeping with our American system of free competitive enterprise, in that it stifles competition in the employment of labor and in the purchase of materials; and

"Whereas it places a premium on inefficient and shoddy practice and operation, and encourages waste, since the greater the cost of the project or undertaking the more profit accrues to the contractor; and

"Whereas in time of shortages of needed and strategic materials for military purposes, it causes thousands of unnecessary casualties in our Armed Forces, because of 'too little, too late'; and

"Whereas in times of shortage of manpower and needed strategic materials, the elimination of the practice of letting Government contracts on a cost-plus, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or negotiated basis would alleviate such shortage; and

"Whereas the practice of letting and awarding such contracts in the manner referred to herein, is demoralizing the morals both of the worker and the taxpayer and discourages prudent management, frugality, and thrift and threatens our economic survival; and

"Whereas such practice is extremely inflationary because of the needed strategic materials, and the waste of manpower in the employment of thousands of unnecessary workers, who on account of idleness cause the cost of completing Government contracts to be extremely high; and

"Whereas, through savings in cost, both in the purchase of materials and in the employment of labor, it would be possible to save more than enough to balance the national budget without additional taxes, and without, in the least, impairing our productive capacity, but rather would increase it; and

"Whereas the United States Government has remedies to recover any excessive profits; first, through renegotiation; second, through excess-profits taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States take immediate steps to stop the practice of letting or awarding contracts by the Government, or any of its departments, agencies, or instrumentalities, on a cost-plus, cost-plus-a-fixed-fee, or negotiated basis, and thereby encouraging the letting and awarding of such contracts by means of the traditional lump-sum advertised-bid contracts basis; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the United States Senator KARL MUNDT, United States Senator FRANCIS CASE, Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, and to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to the use of moneys received from the national forests

"Whereas there are extensive national forests in the State of California, and these forests are attracting growing numbers of people; and

"Whereas the great popularity of these forests has created the need for policing, sanitary, and other services and facilities beyond the ability of local governmental authorities to provide, without great hardship, and it appears just that the Federal Government, which derives revenues from the national forests, should also help pay the cost of services necessary to their use; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has before it for consideration H. R. 1972, which provides that 10 percent of all moneys received from the national forests, but not to exceed $5½ million in any year, shall be made available for development, maintenance and operation of the national forests: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact H. R. 1972; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial to President Dwight Eisenhower and the Congress of the United States of America, Senator James E. Murray and Senator Mike Mansfield, Congressman Wesley D'Ewart and Congressman Lee Metcalf, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs

"Whereas Federal Statute 475 of the 81st Congress, 2d session, and approved April 20, 1950, will expire June 30, 1953; and

"Whereas there are over 76,000 servicemen and former servicemen in Montana with a combined total of several million in the United States and its possessions, who need loans for the purchase or construction of homes for themselves and their families; and

"Whereas the Helena, Mont., veterans' district loan office is of vital importance in the expedient administration of the law and the maintenance of efficiency and service to the Montana veterans; and

"Whereas there are not adequate Federal funds available for direct loans to veterans, and the money market does not absorb the low interest rate loans; and

"Whereas there is now a critical need for loans with over 800 pending applications for loans in Montana, and thousands withholding applications pending approval of extension and modification in the act; and

"Whereas the record of repayment of the Montana loans is exceptionally good: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana of 1953, now in session, in the senate and the house of representatives concurring, do most earnestly request the Honorable Dwight Eisenhower, President, and the Congress of the United States of America and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to extend and amend Statute 475 of the 81st Congress, 2d session, which expires June 30, 1953, by providing for direct loans to veterans; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That interest and service rates on guaranteed loans be modified to make such loans marketable on the money markets; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight Eisenhower, President, and the Congress of the United States of America, Senator James E. Murray, Senator Mike Mansfield, Congressman Wesley D'Ewart, Congressman Lee Metcalf, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Washington, D. C.

"GEORGE M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"DEAN CHAFFIN,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, to United States Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD and Representatives LEE METCALF and WESLEY A. D'EWART, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to make study and make recommendations necessary to revive the gold mining industry of Montana

"Whereas, since October 1942, most of the several hundred gold mines in Montana have been closed with practically no mining operation being done in the State, which has seriously retarded the production of gold, a condition originally brought about by shutdown order L-208 imposed by the United States Government during World War II. When the aforesaid order was rescinded in 1945, most of these mines were unable to reopen and resume mining operations, owing to the greatly increased operating costs and the fixed price of gold, being fixed at $35 per ounce, established and since maintained by the Government of the United States, notwithstanding gold is now selling in a number of foreign countries at the price greatly in excess of that fixed by the United States; and

"Whereas in order that Montana gold-producing mines can be reopened and placed upon a profitable operating basis, it is necessary that existing conditions now retarding the gold-mine industry be materially changed: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That we specifically urge that the Congress of the United States appoint a committee consisting of Members of both Houses of Congres and other persons experienced and qualified to study the appalling situation in the gold-mining industry of the United States and to make such recommendations and to enact such laws in accordance therewith as are necessary to revive the said industry and place it upon a profitable and business-like basis; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state to the State of Montana to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to Senators JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD and Representatives LEE METCALF and WESLEY A. D'EWART.

"GEORGE M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"DEAN CHAFFIN,
"Speaker of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully represents:

"Whereas section 1963 of title 28, United States Code, permits a final judgment for the recovery of money or property entered in any district court of the United States to be registered in any other such district court and therein enforced, without the necessity for filing a suit thereon in such other district court; and

"Whereas the provisions thereof do not apply to the United States District Court for the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas it is necessary to file another suit in any jurisdiction outside the Territory of Alaska to enforce a judgment of the United States District Court for the Territory of Alaska and to file a suit in the Territory to enforce a judgment of a district court of the United States; and

"Whereas such procedure causes unwarranted expense, delay, and obstruction to the administration of justice in Alaska: Now, therefore

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that Congress pass H. R. 1976, 83d Congress, 1st session, introduced by Delegate BARTLETT, and thereby eliminate an unjust discrimination in the administration of justice.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"To the President of the United States; to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States; and to the Department of the Interior:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 21st session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Alaska have, by an overwhelming referendum vote of 20,544 to 3,479, demanded that they be given self-control of the fisheries of the Territory; and

"Whereas repeated legislation has been introduced in the Congress of the United States by Delegates of the Territory of Alaska asking that the people of Alaska have extended to them the same right of control over their major natural resource as is granted the several States; and

"Whereas the Territorial legislature has heretofore created and appropriated moneys to a Territorial Fisheries Department and an Alaskan Fishery Board; and

"Whereas the people of Alaska, by their mandate have shown their displeasure with the present administrative agency and its regulations, and have expressed their confidence and belief in the Alaska Department of Fisheries; and

"Whereas public hearings held for the purpose of formulating policies and regulations pertaining to the control of this major industry should be held at times when fishing conditions may be more readily ascertainable than at the present meetings 6 months prior to the opening of any fishing season, and all such hearings should be held within the Territory of Alaska; and

"Whereas the Alaska Department of Fisheries has been functioning in an orderly and efficient manner for nearly 4 years, and are now in a position to readily expand and assume the duties and responsibilities incident to full control of the fisheries of Alaska with a minimum of delay and inconvenience; and

"Whereas it is an affront to the people of Alaska that their continued pleas for the right to manage and control their major industry and resource have gone unheeded; now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 21st session assembled, respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States, in accordance with the mandate of the people of Alaska, take immediate action to transfer control of the fisheries of Alaska to the Government of the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

"House Joint Memorial 13

"To the President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas sport fishing in the Territory of Alaska for grayling, trout, salmon, and other species of fish constitutes a valuable recreation for the residents of the Territory; and

"Whereas sport fishing is an important recreational attraction for visitors and tourists; and

"Whereas these species of sport fish are already showing signs of depletion in waters adjacent to centers of population and along the main highways; and

"Whereas the 1949 session of the Territorial legislature created an Alaska Fisheries Board and an Alaska Department of Fisheries; and

"Whereas the Alaska Fisheries Board recognized the necessity for restoration and proper management of these depleted waters by setting up within the Alaska Department of Fisheries a sport fish division; and

"Whereas this sport fish division is staffed with well-trained and experienced sport fish biologists, who have been occupied in restoration and related projects for the past 2 years; and

"Whereas, under the present Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act (64 Stat. 430), commonly known as the Dingell-Johnson Act, funds allotted to Alaska are not given to the Territory but to a Federal agency; and

"Whereas in the case of the other Territories and possessions (Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands), these funds are given to the local agencies; Now, therefore:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 21st session assembled, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States amend the Federal Aid to Fish Restoration Act (64 Stat. 430) to authorize the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to cooperate with the Territory of Alaska by allotting Alaska's share of the funds for the conduct of fish restoration to the Alaska Department of Fisheries.

"And your memorialist will every pray."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to modification of the provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act

"Whereas upon December 24, 1952, the new Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 became effective, known as the McCarran Immigration Act; and

"Whereas the plan to codify and consolidate the immigration and naturalization law presented our lawgivers with an excellent opportunity to remove from our law pertaining to this important field various features generally felt to be inconsistent with our democratic tradition and to enact a truly modern imigration and naturalization law; and

"Whereas, unfortunately, this opportunity has been missed and the new law has retained not only most of the objectionable features of the previous law but in many important respects even worsened existing laws; and

"Whereas both the Republican and Democratic Parties, in the election campaign of 1952, felt impelled to call for a revision of the McCarran Immigration Act, since the new enactment has been generally described as a 'racist, discriminatory, and retrogressive

measure,' and there is every evidence of concerted belief that the law should be rewritten and a better law presented to strike an 'intelligent, unbigoted balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and the oppressed'; and

"Whereas while it is necessary and proper that our immigration laws contain provisions to prevent the entry into our country of persons who might engage in espionage and other subversive activity, it has been stated that 'the McCarran Act uses this goal as a device for building an iron curtain around our shores and excluding many people who might well contribute greatly to strengthening our country. In the interests of an illusory security this act sacrifices basic principles of democracy and humanitarianism, unduly and unnecessarily harasses aliens now in our country, or seeking admission to it and makes such aliens and naturalized citizens exercise basic freedoms such as freedom of association, freedom of speech and freedom of press only at the risk of subjecting themselves to loss of citizenship and deportation. In the hands of a strict and unenlightened administration this law can cause untold anguish and hardship to millions of peaceful residents of our country': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now places itself upon record as in favor of modification of the so-called McCarran Immigration Act, respectfully requesting Congress to take prompt action for remedial amendments to said act or complete rewriting of the same for enactment; directing the secretary of state to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of each honorable body of the Congress of the United States of America."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution D-1

"Concurrent resolution opposing the repeal of the long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act

"Whereas there will be proposed and introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation providing for repeal of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; and

"Whereas the repeal of the long- and short-haul clause would permit railroad companies to assess lower rates and charges for long hauls than for shorter hauls over the same route in the same direction; and

"Whereas the charging of a higher rate for a short haul than for a longer haul, the shorter being included within the longer, is now forbidden on North Dakota intrastate traffic in section 49-0409 of the North Dakota Revised Code of 1943; and

"Whereas the passage of such legislation will result in increased freight rates and charges on articles moving in interstate commerce to and from North Dakota, particularly on grain, lignite, and other commodities, to the detriment of producers, shippers and consumers of the State of North Dakota; that it would encourage discriminations in rates against small shippers in favor of large shippers that would be against the public interest; and would, we believe, be in the end detrimental to the best interests of the railroads themselves: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to deny the passage of any legislation providing for the repeal or amendment of the long- and short-haul clause of the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act, when, as, and if presented for its consideration; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the senators and representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to defeat the aforesaid type of legislation upon presentation to the Congress of the United States, and that copies of this memorial be forwarded forthwith to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the senators and representatives of the State of North Dakota.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 208

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will return to the several States amounts collected as unemployment tax by the Federal Government in excess of grants for administration costs of the unemployment insurance and employment service program

"Whereas the several States are responsible by law for administration of the unemployment insurance and employment service program; and

"Whereas the Federal Government levies a payroll tax of three-tenths of 1 percent on employers of eight or more persons to pay the administrative costs of such State programs; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has collected since 1937 from Georgia employers for the administration of such program over $6 million more than has been returned to the State, while the amounts returned to Georgia have been grossly inadequate to provide flexible administration; and

"Whereas each State is limited to the amount allowed it by the Federal Government with the excess of such tax being diverted for purposes other than intended; and

"Whereas an inadequate operating fund restricts service to job seekers in finding work and to employers seeking workers, makes exceedingly difficult prompt detection of fraudulent benefit claims, hinders activities to prevent tax evasions, impairs effectiveness of control over disbursements from the unemployment insurance fund, and circumscribes the fulfillment of the objectives of the entire program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation which will (1) earmark the taxes collected under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act for the purposes of the employment security program in each State; (2) make reasonable provisions assuring all States equitable participation in the allotment of such funds; (3) transfer to the States for use in the employment security program any excess over the amounts allocated by the Federal administrative agencies with full responsibility resting on each State agency for the proper use thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States; the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and each Member of the Congress from the State of Georgia."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 175

"Whereas highways of the country, including the streets and bridges, are by tradition and by law the property and responsibility of the States and the subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas taxation of motor fuel traditionally has been relied upon by the States to produce a major part of the revenue necessary to construct and maintain their State highways and local roads, and the Federal Government, by its continued imposition of this levy, is usurping a tax field which should be reserved to the States; and

"Whereas the Federal Government imposed its automotive excise taxes as temporary emergency measures during the early 1930's, but has continued these taxes in effect ever since at increasing rates; and

"Whereas the motorists of this country are now paying $5 billion a year in State and Federal motor vehicle and gasoline taxes, of which $2 billion is paid out annually for the Federal gasoline and automotive excise taxes; and

"Whereas the invasion of the field of gasoline taxation by the Federal Government has made the total State and Federal tax on a gallon of gasoline equal to 36 percent of the retail price on a national average; and

"Whereas it has been recognized by the Council of State Governments and the Governors' Conference that this burden of Federal gasoline and automotive taxes seriously impairs the ability of the States to carry out their highway programs: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of Georgia urgently requests that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor fuel taxation; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to every member of the Georgia delegation in Congress, to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Finance Committee of the United States Senate, and that the Governor of Georgia is urged to advise all members of the Georgia delegation in Congress of the importance of this matter."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 209

"Resolution commending Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and Senator MILTON R. YOUNG for introducing legislation extending the present farm price support law, and urging all members of the Georgia congressional delegation to aid in the passage of this bill; and for other purposes

"Whereas the present farm price support law is at 90 percent of parity; and

"Whereas said support law gives the farmer a fair return on his crops in relation to his purchasing power, and tends to stabilize prices of farm products; and

"Whereas the present support law expires in December 1954; and

"Whereas the general public is uncertain as to the farm price support policy to be followed by the present Federal administration; and

"Whereas the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, distinguished Senator from Georgia, and Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, distinguished Senator from North Dakota, have introduced legislation extending the present price support law 3 years beyond 1954; and

"Whereas an extension of said parity law is desirable for the farmers of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That all members of the Georgia congressional delegation be urged and requested to exert all efforts possible to effect the passage of the Russell-Young bill; and be it further

"Resolved, That Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and Senator MILTON R. YOUNG be hereby commended for introducing this bill; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to Senator YOUNG and Senator RUSSELL, to each member of the Georgia congressional delegation, and to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to have the Government pay for weed eradication on federally owned land

"Whereas the State of Minnesota has undertaken a program of eradicating noxious weeds for the protection of the public by destroying the weeds and transferring the cost to the owner by an added tax on the property where the owner has failed to eliminate the weeds on his own land;

"Whereas many cases arise involving property owned by the United States or owned by the United States in trust for certain Indians or Indian tribes which, through the neglect of the owner, has necessitated weed eradication on such land by certain political subdivisions of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress be requested to enact legislation which would pay the cost of weed eradication on all lands owned by the United States, or on which the United States holds an easement of any kind or owned by the United States in trust for certain Indians or Indian tribes, and where the growing of such weeds will infest the agricultural lands of this State; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"Approved March 6, 1953.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"Whereas by Public Law 411, chapter 460 of the 2d session of the 82d Congress, the Public Health Service Act was amended by deleting the words 'within the continental United States' in the last sentence thereof, and by adding the following sentence at the end of the section:

"'When so provided in appropriations available for any fiscal year for the maintenance of hospitals of the Service, the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to make payments to the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment in its facilities of persons afflicted with leprosy at a per diem rate, determined from time to time by the Surgeon General, which shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, be approximately equal to the per diem operating cost per patient of such facilities, except that such per diem rate shall not be greater than the comparable per diem operating cost per patient at the National Leprosarium, Carville, La.'; and

"Whereas the per diem rate so determined by the Surgeon General was $9.26, which per diem rate is substantially below that of $11.58 at Carville Leprosarium, Louisiana; and

"Whereas a payment was made in 1952 to the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii covering such per diem rate and it is anticipated that there will be paid by the Veterans' Administration the estimated sum of $31,109.80 during fiscal year 1952–53, the estimated grand total being $531,109.80; and

"Whereas the appropriation of $585,912.74 to cover the amount called for by the said per diem rate for the remainders of the current year has been deleted from the supplemental appropriations bill in the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii is in heartiest sympathy with the efforts of the Congress and the executive branch of the Government of the United States to cease deficit spending and to use every reasonable economy in the conduct of government, but nevertheless feels that the last subject of economy, next to the proper and adequate defense of the United States, should be the care of those stricken with the dreadful disease of leprosy for which care, within the continental United States, the Congress continues to make provision; and

"Whereas to provide for the care of patients afflicted with leprosy within the boundaries of the continental United States without provision for their care in that portion of the United States which lies without the continental boundaries adds an additional wound to the sufferers from leprosy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to include in any supplemental, deficiency, or other appropriation bill a sufficient amount to cover the per diem operating costs per patient of the sufferers from leprosy cared for by the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to the Congress from Hawaii."

By Mr. ANDERSON:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America requesting an amendment to the Social Security Act to the effect that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, the first $50 of earned income be disregarded

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the Social Security Act provides that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for aid to the needy blind, any other income and resources of the individual claiming aid to the blind shall be taken into consideration, except that in making such determination the first $50 per month of earned income shall be disregarded, and the earned income so disregarded shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of any other individual applying for or receiving old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled; and

"Whereas it is deemed desirable that this exemption be granted to all applicants or recipients of any category of public assistance for which provision is made in the Social Security Act: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact an amendment to the Social Security Act that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, any other income and resources of the individual claiming such aid shall be taken into consideration, except that in making such determination the first $50 per month of earned income shall be disregarded, and the earned income so disregarded shall not be taken into consideration in determining the need of any other individual applying for or receiving old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of New Mexico's delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"ALVIN STOCKTON,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"LILLEN C. HOMAN,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
"Approved by me this 27th day of February 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide assistance to the kingdom of the Netherlands

"Whereas the kingdom of the Netherlands was the first European country to inform the United States that economic aid was no longer needed under the economic-aid program of the United States; and

"Whereas the kingdom of the Netherlands has recently suffered a tragic disaster that killed hundreds of its people, that ruined over 40 percent of the farmland of the kingdom, and generally devastated the homes and property of the kingdom; and

"Whereas the people of the United States and of this State sympathize with the people of the Netherlands over their tragic losses and desire to extend material help to alleviate their suffering: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to provide assistance to the kingdom of the Netherlands for the purpose of alleviating the physical and material suffering of its people resulting from the recent tragic disaster; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each of the New Mexico delegation in Congress and to Queen Juliana of the Netherlands."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution 602

"Resolution respectfully urging the Congress of the United States of America to act favorably upon Senate 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry

"Whereas there was introduced into the Senate of the United States of America upon January 29, 1953, Senate bill 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; and

"Whereas this bill was introduced under the nonpartisan cosponsorship of the following distinguished Senators: Mr. IVES and Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. MORSE; and

"Whereas, according to the statement accompanying its introduction by its sponsors, elimination of discrimination in employment is the very heart of the civil-rights program; and

"Whereas such discrimination denies equality of opportunity and constitutes an outright violation of our American creed; and

"Whereas this legislation furnishes the most practical and effective medium by which to guarantee to everyone equal opportunity to earn a living according to his ability, regardless of parentage, or religious faith; and

"Whereas the Rhode Island General Assembly, having witnessed the constructive accomplishments in this field by the operation of our own State law, realizes the need for a similar act at the Federal level for employment in interstate commerce; and

"Whereas we are in agreement with the sponsors that the passage of this bill would provide a process that will assist in making our American creed a living reality and in establishing at home the observance of the ideals and principles for which we profess to stand among the nations of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon Senate bill 692 and requests the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island in said Congress to use their good offices to secure the prompt passage of this measure; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America."

By Mr. WELKER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the Federal Government presently derives over $2 billion annually from automotive excise taxes of which about $600 million is from fuel tax, orginally imposed as emergency taxes during the depression period, increased during World War II and increased again in 1951; and

"Whereas the imposition of these Federal taxes is an infringement on the tax source originally reserved to the States for the development of their highways and is counter to the expressed policy of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the critical inadequacy of important segments of our highways has created a virtual crisis for highway transportation which is as critical as any emergency facing our country today and

"Whereas the State of Idaho is in need of additional revenues for the construction and maintenance of its highways, but is experiencing extreme difficulty in its efforts to obtain additional revenue needed for this purpose because of the magnitude of the existing overall tax burden now imposed upon the motor-using public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 32d Legislative Assembly of the State of Idaho most urgently pray that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor fuel taxation and as soon as possible repeal all of the Federal automotive excise taxes; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State."

STABILIZATION OF MARKET FOR METALS—JOINT RESOLUTION OF IDAHO LEGISLATURE

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there has been widespread disruption in the domestic-mining industry as a result of the dumping of foreign metals in this country. The Idaho Legislature recently took cognizance of this desperate situation by the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution No. 7, supporting the proposed stabilization import tax on lead and zinc. I ask unanimous consent to have the joint memorial printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 7

To the Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, President of the United States; the Honorable CHARLES E. WILSON, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable DOUGLAS MCKAY, Secretary of the Interior; HOWARD I. YOUNG, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials; J. D. SMALL, Chairman, Munitions Board:

We, your memorialists, the senate and house of representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to wit:

Whereas the base metal-mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries creating an unemployment situation for a large number of the American metal miners; and

Whereas the domestic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

Whereas Idaho as well as many other sections of the United States is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Idaho but not produced in Idaho; and

Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much-needed tax income; and

Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it jointly

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the 32d Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the Governor of the State of Idaho concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson; Douglas McKay, Secretary of Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge, and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George M. Malone, Chairman Senate Mines Committee, and Hon. A. L. Miller, Chairman of House Internal and Insular Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

OFFSHORE OIL RESOURCES—RESOLUTION OF MEMBERS OF MIDLAND COOPERATIVE WHOLESALE, CAMBRIDGE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the Midland district VI wholesale meeting of cooperatives held at Cambridge, Minn., on February 25, 1953, relating to offshore oil resources.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Great petroleum reserves lie off the coast of the United States which should be developed for the benefit of all of the States. The United States Supreme Court has heard the whole case for and against title of coastal States to these resources and has ruled three times that oil beyond the tidelands belongs to all the 48 States.

Now an effort is being made to take that oil for the benefit of only a few of the States: Be it

Resolved, That members of Midland Cooperative Wholesale comprising district VI (including over 35 cooperative organizations

in east central Minnesota) hereby express their desire that their representatives in Congress work and vote to retain Federal rights in offshore oil which the United States Supreme Court says are properly Federal rights.

This meeting of district VI members calls upon all not present and upon fellow cooperators in the Midland region to join them in writing Members of Congress to express their concern for protecting the petroleum resources which belong to all of us.

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—PETITION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present a petition signed by citizens of Rehoboth Beach, Del., in support of legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio, and television, and in magazines and newspapers, which I ask be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to protect us in our rights as parents and as purchasers by passing legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio, and television, and in our magazines and newspapers. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless to us by alcoholic-beverage advertising, and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by means of such advertising.

McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement and a resolution which were introduced in both houses of the New York State legislature memorializing Congress to revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act. The resolution was sponsored in the New York State senate by Senator Alfred E. Santangelo, in cooperation with Senators Joseph R. Marro, and Arthur Wachtel. It was introduced in the assembly by Assemblyman Philip V. Baczkowski, in cooperation with Assemblyman Louis A. Cioffi.

It has had the support of Senator Francis J. Mahoney, minority leader of the senate, and Assemblyman Eugene F. Banningan, minority leader of the assembly.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MAHONEY, MINORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE, AND ASSEMBLYMAN EUGENE F. BANNIGAN, MINORITY LEADER OF THE ASSEMBLY, NEW YORK

Senator Francis J. Mahoney and Assemblyman Eugene F. Bannigan, Democratic legislative leaders, announced today that the party in the State will launch a vigorous drive for complete revision of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act.

The first step in this drive will be introduction of a resolution into the State legislature that will memorialize Congress for a new immigration act with the obnoxious national origin quota feature of the present act eliminated. Senator Alfred E. Santangelo, in cooperation with Senators Joseph R. Marro and Arthur Wachtel, will sponsor the resolution in the senate. Assemblyman Philip V. Baczkowski, in cooperation with Assemblyman Louis A. Cioffi, will be its sponsors in the assembly.

"The McCarran-Walter Act is an affront to all freedom-loving people of the world," said Senator Mahoney and Assemblyman Bannigan in a joint statement. "It was conceived in fear and is based on the assumption that some races are superior to others. This is contradictory to American ideals and beliefs. President Truman vetoed this act originally. President Eisenhower, on October 17, said: 'The McCarran immigration law must be rewritten. A better law must be written that will strike an intelligent, unbigoted balance between the immigration welfare of America and the prayerful hopes of the unhappy and the oppressed.'

"We of New York must do all in our power to take the leadership in the struggle to revise this law. The resolution to be offered the legislature tonight follows:

"'Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact amendments to the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the McCarran Act

"'Whereas widespread criticism and protests have been leveled against the 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the McCarran Act; and

"'Whereas the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization has emphasized the urgency of revision of the McCarran Act from beginning to end; and

"'Whereas this law has become a sore spot in our relations with nations that have been, are, and must continue to be our loyal friends, if our country is to thrive and the free world is to survive; and

"'Whereas this law was enacted in the last stage of the previous Congress and debated in an atmosphere of rancorous partisanship and petty factionalism; and

"'Whereas President Eisenhower himself has given more than one clear-cut indication that he finds provisions of the McCarran law obnoxious in their effect and iniquitous in their content; and

"'Whereas the McCarran Act reveals a backwardness and shortsightedness that can lead any nation only into a blind alley of frustration and folly; and

"'Whereas the McCarran Act retains origin quotas which hinder the further growth of our Nation; and

"'Whereas the McCarran Act discriminates against the Italians, who have repulsed the spread of communism in Europe; against the Greeks who are struggling to assist the helpless victims of a Communist civil war; the Turks who are warriors of freedom; and

"'Whereas the McCarran Act perpetuates all the injustices included in the Quota Act of 1924, and the National Origins Act formerly adopted in 1929 which was designed to bar people born in southern and eastern Europe; and

"'Whereas the McCarran Act perpetuates the doctrine of nordic superiority which we fought so bitterly in World War II; and

"'Whereas the McCarran Act dims the luster of the torch of liberty, the symbol of hope and freedom; and

"'Whereas the McCarran Act renders naturalized citizens as second class citizens without the full privileges of American citizenship; and

"'Whereas those countries which we have befriended and aided financially and otherwise, regard this law as controverting our avowed good neighbor policy and as an unfriendly act, and are contemplating reprisals against us; and

"'Whereas we must demonstrate that our country believes in the principles of the United Nations which respects the dignity of human beings and the equality of man, and recognizes the commonwealth of nations: Now, therefore, be it

"'*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized speedily to amend the McCarran Act so as to revise the present inequitable quota system contained therein; and be it further

"'*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That the Congress be further memorialized to eliminate those provisions of the McCarran Act which make naturalized citizens of the United States second class citizens by preventing them from enjoying the full privileges of citizenship; and be it further

"'*Resolved* (*if the senate concur*), That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress duly elected from the State of New York.'"

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 2466. A bill to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; without amendment (Rept. No. 81).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Stefanos A. Spilios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1263. A bill to limit the water level of the reservoir to be formed by Garrison Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1264. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, so as to clarify the authority of the States and Territories with respect to certain cases within the purview of such act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1265. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1266. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romola Nijinsky;

S. 1267. A bill for the relief of Irene Kramer and Otto Kramer; and

S. 1268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna L. DeAngelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1269. A bill for the relief of Elias Kulukundis;

S. 1270. A bill for the relief of Irene Montoya;

S. 1271. A bill for the relief of Spyrodon Vlassopoulos and his wife, Theresa; and

S. 1272. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Garris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1273. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American University," approved February 24, 1893, so as to vest supervision of the American University in the board of education of the Methodist Church, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1274. A bill to provide for the repair, restoration, and preservation of the U. S. S. *Hartford*, flagship of Admiral Farragut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1275. A bill for the relief of Ruth Rumiko Fukano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1276. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in order to increase the interest rate on loans made under title I of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1277. A bill to increase the authorization for appropriations for the International Peace Garden, North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1278. A bill to quitclaim certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Ohio under restrictions limiting its use to the training of juvenile delinquents and certain other persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 1279. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Jay Gilbert Lockridge;

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Aristides Nicoloudis;

S. 1282. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Termini and his wife, Giuseppa Termini;

S. 1283. A bill for the relief of Georgette A. Sbarounis, and John A. Sbarounis, and Anthony Athanse Sbarounis;

S. 1284. A bill for the relief of Ivan Bozovic; and

S. 1285. A bill for the relief of Paul Henry Grabowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 1286. A bill to authorize the extension of the levee on the American River near Sacramento, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1287. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1288. A bill to provide for the release of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property heretofore conditionally granted to Converse County, and to Converse County School District No. 17, and Converse County High School, State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1289. A bill for the relief of Soly S. Bencuya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to provide for the creation of an International Food Reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT WITH RESPECT TO CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF STATES AND TERRITORIES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to clarify the authority of the States and Territories with respect to the question of jurisdiction under the Taft-Hartley Act.

The bill was prepared by my staff in collaboration with the New York State Labor Relations Board and I believe, if enacted, it will clear up largely the confusion and difficulties with which the Federal Government and the States have been confronted in their effort properly and adequately to resolve the question of jurisdiction over cases which can come within the purview of the functions of either one of them.

In this connection and at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a memorandum on this subject, which was prepared by the New York State Labor Relations Board in support of the bill I have just introduced, and the text of the bill itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1264) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, so as to clarify the authority of the States and Territories with respect to certain cases within the purview of such act, introduced by Mr. IVES, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the section number and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) (1) The Board, in its discretion, may decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute where, in the opinion of the Board, the effect on commerce is not sufficiently substantial to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction.

"(2) Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to prevent or bar any agency, or the courts, of any State or Territory, from assuming and asserting jurisdiction over labor disputes over which the Board declines, pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, to assert jurisdiction.

"(3) The Board, in its discretion, may, by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory, cede to such agency jurisdiction over labor disputes involving (A) unfair labor practices or (B) controversies concerning representation, in any industry or portion thereof, even though such labor disputes may substantially affect commerce."

SEC. 2. The proviso in section 10 (a) of such act is hereby repealed.

The memorandum presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED BY THE NEW YORK STATE LABOR RELATIONS BOARD IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT

We wish to submit, for your consideration, a proposed amendment to the Labor Management Relations Act. It is proposed, in substance, that the act be amended so as to vest in the National Labor Relations Board broad discretionary power to decline jurisdiction, to permit State action where the National Board has declined to assert jurisdiction, and to empower the National Board to enter into agreements with appropriate State or Territorial agencies for the allocation of cases between them.

THE PROBLEM

There can be no doubt that labor disputes which substantially affect interstate commerce are a proper matter of national concern and a lawful subject for Federal legislation. At the same time it must also be recognized that while labor disputes may affect interstate commerce, they invariably have an immediate and direct impact upon the local community in which they occur. A strike, or lockout, or a picket line in front of a place of business, obviously is a matter within the legitimate concern of the State.

During the past few years the always vexatious problem of defining and reconciling the respective interests of the national and State governments has become particularly acute in the field of labor relations. The National Board's decisional extension of its jurisdiction,[1] together with recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court,[2] have substantially restricted the operation of the police power of the States in this field, and, indeed, have raised serious questions as to the power of the States to act even in cases involving essentially local matters. This has come about even though the Supreme Court has acknowledged that the field of labor relations is not inherently national in nature,[3] and that the distinction between national and local matters "is vital to the maintenance of our Federal system."[4]

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE NATIONAL AND STATE BOARDS, 1937–47

A brief summary of the past relationship between the National and New York Labor Relations Boards will serve to highlight the unfortunate and confused situation which exists at present.

Shortly after the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, a number of States adopted similar legislation.[5] In its annual report for 1937, the National Board stated that it looked with favor on the adoption of State labor relations acts. The following year it reported that its hope of effecting cooperative arrangements with State boards had been completely fulfilled and that satisfactory working arrangements had been achieved with all the State boards.[6]

The New York board, established in 1937, was one of the first to arrive at a working arrangement with the National Board. In 1937, the two boards reached an understanding as to the practical allocation of matters between them.[7] By that agreement the

[1] See report of House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 80th Cong., 2d sess., Rept. No. 2050.

[2] *Bethlehem Steel Co.* v. *N. Y. S. L. R. B.* (330 U. S. 767), and *LaCrosse Telephone Co.* v. *W. E. R. B.* (336 U. S. 18). *Electric Ry. Employees* v. *Wisc. E. R. B.* (340 U. S 383); *Plankington Packing Co.* v. *Wisc. E. R. B.* (338 U. S. 953); *U. A. W.* v. *O'Brien* (339 U. S. 454); *Bus Employees* v. *Wisc. E. R. B.* (340 U. S. 383).

[3] *Bethlehem Steel Co.* v. *N. Y. S. L. R. B.* (330 U. S. at 772), 91 L. Ed. at 1245.

[4] *N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.* (303 U. S. 1, at 30).

[5] New York, 1937; Pennsylvania, 1937; Utah, 1937; Massachusetts, 1938; Michigan, 1939; Minnesota, 1939; Wisconsin, 1939; Rhode Island, 1941; Connecticut, 1945.

[6] See third annual report of the National Labor Relations Board, p. 3.

[7] For full text of agreement, see appendix to opinion of Justice Frankfurter in *Bethlehem Steel Co.* v. *N. Y. S. L. R. B.* (330 U. S. at 784, et seq., 91 L. Ed. at 1251, et seq.).

boards, in substance, divided the field so as to leave to the National Board the interstate industries, while leaving predominantly local and borderline situations to the State board. In general, the New York board handled: (1) Retail stores; (2) small industries which receive all or practically all raw materials from within the State of New York, and do not ship any material proportion of their product outside the State; (3) service trades; (4) office and residential buildings; (5) small and clearly local public utilities; (6) storage warehouses; (7) construction operations; (8) other obviously local businesses.

The national and New York boards continued to operate under this agreement for almost 10 years. That entire period was characterized by harmonious relations and complete cooperation. Doubtful cases were cleared between the two boards and, where the occasion required, parties were referred by one board to the other. In 1946, for example, the National Board, for budgetary and other administrative reasons, referred all cases involving New York brokerage houses to the New York board.[8]

DECISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

In 1947, the United States Supreme Court issued its decision in *Bethlehem Steel Co.* v. *N. Y. S. L. R. B.*[9] That case arose out of the New York board's assertion of jurisdiction over a representation proceeding involving foremen. At the time the New York board first assumed jurisdiction of the case, the National Board held units of supervisory employees inappropriate for purposes of collective bargaining and declined to entertain petitions by foremen.[10]

Although the National Board subsequently reversed its policy concerning foremen,[11] the Supreme Court held that the State board had acted without jurisdiction, apparently grounding its decision principally on the fact that the National Board customarily asserted jurisdiction over the steel industry and had previously exercised jurisdiction over the particular employer. As the case was not one covered by the working arrangement between the two boards, the Supreme Court did not pass upon the validity of the working agreement between them or upon the effect of a declination of jurisdiction by the national board.[12] Nevertheless, both the majority and minority opinions commended the efforts of the boards to reconcile the national and State interests in the field.[13]

In *LaCrosse Telephone Co.* v. *Wisc. E. R. B.*,[14] the Supreme Court apparently enlarged the scope of its decision in the *Bethlehem* case so as to prohibit State action in an industry in which the National Board had customarily asserted jurisdiction, even though the National Board had never asserted jurisdiction over the particular employer and employees concerned. Again, the Court did not pass upon the power of the National Board to "cede" jurisdiction to a State agency.[15]

THE EFFECT OF SECTION 10 (A)

In June 1947 the National Labor Relations Act was amended by the National Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.[16] Section 10 (a) of the National Act, now provides:

"The Board is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unfair labor practice (listed in section 8) affecting commerce. This power shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, law or otherwise: *Provided*, That the Board is empowered by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases in any industry (other than mining, manufacturing, communications, and transportation except where predominantly local in character) even though such cases may involve labor disputes affecting commerce, unless the provision of the State or Territorial statute applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith."

It appears that the proviso in section 10 (a) was inserted to eliminate any doubts, arising out of the Bethlehem decision, as to the power of the National Board to enter into working arrangements with State agencies.[17] Unfortunately, however, section 10 (a) has operated to preclude any possibility of collaboration and cooperation between the National and State boards. That has resulted from the rigid and inflexible statutory requirement of consistency, which, by depriving the National Board of discretion, has made it impossible for the National Board to continue or enter into new agreements with any State agency.

This situation was remarked upon by the Chairman of the National Board in June 1948, when he appeared before the Joint Congressional Committee on Labor-Management Relations. On that occasion, he suggested that "Congress may also desire to reappraise the language of section 10 (a) of the present act, which bars the National Board from ceding jurisdiction over relatively local controversies to State boards unless they are enforcing legislation substantially identical with the Federal statutes." He further pointed out that as a result, "There is considerable danger of creating a no man's land, especially if the National Labor Relations Board decides to refrain from exercising its own jurisdicton to the hilt."[18] Perhaps it was partly because of that danger that the National Board asserted its jurisdiction "to the hilt." Thus, the National Board has asserted jurisdiction over retail stores,[19] loft buildings,[20] local bus lines,[21] exterminators,[22] laundries,[23] small manufacturing establishments,[24] service trades,[25] and other types of essentially local enterprises.[26]

The National Board's projection of its jurisdiction to such far reaches was criticized by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.[27] Since that report, the National Board has declined to exercise jurisdiction in a number of cases.[28]

In each case, however, the declination was placed, not on the ground of lack of jurisdiction, but on the ground that assertion of jurisdiction over the particular case "would not effectuate the purposes of the act."

Subsequently, in October 1950, the National Board announced the establishment of standards which would govern its exercise of jurisdiction thereafter. The standards "reflect in large measure, the results reached in the [National] Board's past decisions disposing of similar jurisdictional issues," including the prior policy that the National Board would not "exercise its jurisdiction to the fullest extent possible under the authority delegated to it by Congress, but [would] limit that exercise to enterprises whose operations have or at which labor disputes would have, a pronounced impact upon the flow of interstate commerce."[29]

Under its statement of October 1950, the National Board will assert jurisdiction in the following situations:

"1. Instrumentalities and channels of interstate and foreign commerce (for example, radio systems).

"2. Public utility and transit systems.

"3. Establishments which operate as integral parts of a multistate enterprise (for example, chain stores, and branch divisions of national or interstate organizations).

"4. Enterprises which produce or handle goods destined for out-of-state shipment, or performing services outside a State, if the goods or services are valued at $25,000 a year.

---

[8] See minutes of national board, August 16, 1946, printed in 330 U. S. at p. 796, 91 L. Ed. at p. 1257.

[9] 330 U. S. 767, 91 L. Ed. 1234.

[10] *Matter of Maryland Drydock Co.* (49 N. L. R. B. 733 (1943)).

[11] *Matter of Packard Motor Car Co.* (61 N. L. R. B. 4, enforced, 157 F. (2d) 80, aff'd, 330 U. S. 485, 91 L. Ed. 1040 (1947)).

[12] 330 U. S. at 776, 91 L. Ed. at 1247.

[13] 330 U. S. at 776, and 782, 784, 91 L. Ed. at 1247 and 1250, 1251.

[14] 336 U. S. 18.

[15] 336 U. S. at 26, 27: "The result we have reached is not changed by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, 61 Stat. 136, 29 U. S. C. Supp. I, secs. 141 et seq. That act grants the national board authority under specified conditions to cede its jurisdiction to a State agency. But it does not appear that there has been any cession of jurisdiction to Wisconsin by the national board in representation proceedings."

[16] 29 U. S. C. A. 141, et seq.

[17] S. Rept. No. 105, 80th Cong.: Pt. I, p. 26; pt. II, p. 38.

[18] 22 L. R. R. M. 119.

[19] *Park-Belk Co.* (77 N. L. R. B. No. 71, 22 L. R. R. M. 1036); *Electrical Equipment Co.* (76 N. L. R. B. No. 155, 21 L. R. R. M. 1285); *Sam's Inc.* (78 N. L. R. B. No. 104, 22 L. R. R. M. 1271.)

[20] *Lowell Industrial Develop. Co.* (80 N. L. R. B. No. 251, 23 L. R. R. M. 1278).

[21] *Amarillo Bus Co.* (78 N. L. R. B. No. 158, 22 L. R. R. M. 1327); *Lynchburg Transit Co.* (79 N. L. R. B. No. 72, 22 L. R. R. M. 1419); *Des Moines S. & S. Route* (78 N. L. R. B. No. 170, 22 L. R. R. M. 1324)

[22] *Orkin Termite Co.* (79 N. L. R. B. No. 113, 22 L. R. R. M. 1460).

[23] *N. Y. Steam Laundry* (80 N. L. R. B. No. 242, 23 L. R. R. M. 1286).

[24] *Unique Ventilation Co.* (75 N. L. R. B. No. 41, 21 L. R. R. M. 1029); *Pacific Moulded Products Co.* (76 N. L. R. B. 164, 21 L. R. R. M. 1328); *Binns Passaic Iron & Brass Foundry* (77 N. L. R. B. No. 60, 22 L. R. R. M. 1016); *Atlanta Brick & Tile Co.* (79 N. L. R. B. No. 104, 22 L. R. R. M. 1444).

[25] *Vogue Wright Studios* (76 N L. R. B. No. 111, 21 L. R. R. M. 1246).

[26] *Liddon White Truck Co.* (76 N. L. R. B. No. 165, 21 L. R. R. M. 1290; *Puritan Chevrolet Co.* (76 N. L. R. B. No. 180, 21 L. R. R. M. 1309); *Herboth Tractor Co.* (79 N. L. R. B. No. 58, 22 L. R. R. M. 1392; *Adams Motors* (80 N. L. R. B. No. 236, 23 L. R. R. M. 1272).

[27] Twelfth Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, 80th Cong, 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 2050. See also critical report of the joint committee, 23 L. R. R. 132.

[28] See, e. g., *Red Star Industrial Service* (80 N. L. R. B. No. 135, 23 L. R. R. M. 1159); *Nat'l. Tool Co.* (78 N. L. R. B. No. —, 22 L. R. R. M. 1234); *J. E. Stone Co.* (78 N. L. R. B. No. 73, 22 L. R. R. M. 1254); *Sta-Kleen Bakery* (78 N. L. R. B. No. 94, 22 L. R. R. M. 1257); *Fehr Baking Co.* (79 N. L. R. B. No. 60, 22 L. R. R. M. 1398); *Detroit Canvas Mfgrs. Assn.* (80 N. L. R. B. No 54, 23 L. R. R. M. 1062); *Screw Machine Prod. Co.* (79 N. L. R. B. No. 120, 22 L. R. R. M. 1459); *Tampa Sand & Material Co.* (78 N. L. R. B. No. 74, 22 L. R. R. M. 1253); *Midland Bldg. Co.* (78 N. L. R. B. No 171, 22 L. R. R. M. 1316).

[29] National Board press release, dated October 6, 1950. This policy of limiting its assertion of jurisdiction is based upon the discretionary power of the National Board, upheld by the Federal courts, to assert or withhold jurisdiction. *Denver Building & Construction Trades Council* (341 U. S. 675, 684); *Halston Drug Stores, Inc.* v. *N. L. R. B.* (187 F. (2d) 418, rev. den. 324 U. S. 815). Cf. *Joliet Contractors* v. *N. L. R. B.* (193 F. (2d) 833).

"5. Enterprises which furnish services or materials necessary to the operation of enterprises falling into categories 1, 2 and 4 above, provided such goods or services are valued at $50,000 a year.

"6. Any other enterprise which has (a) a direct inflow of material valued at $500,000 a year; or (b) an indirect inflow of material valued at $1 million a year; or (c) a combination inflow or outflow of goods which add up to at least a total of '100 percent' of the amounts required in items 4, 5, 6 (a) and (b) above.

"7. Establishments substantially affecting national defense."

The promulgation of this jurisdictional formula, however, still leaves unresolved, and indeed emphasizes the importance of, the question whether the States may act in labor disputes over which the National Board has, but declines to assert, jurisdiction. Whether the States may act under such circumstances is a question on which there is disagreement.[30] Yet unless the States may act in such cases, the labor disputes will be entirely unregulated.

The Taft-Hartley Act not only complicated but increased the importance of this problem. Prior to 1947 the national act dealt only with representation proceedings and employer unfair labor practices; and the States, even after the Bethlehem and La Crosse decisions, were free to act in the broad fields not covered by Federal regulation.[31] The 1947 amendments, however, comprehensively regulated practically the entire field of labor relations. The field preempted by Congress was expanded to cover subjects which traditionally had been regulated by State equity courts and by State legislation.[32] As Federal preemption of the field is applicable whether State regulation is sought to be accomplished through administrative action,[33] court decree,[34] or legislative enactment,[35] the importance of the problem, arising out of the combination of Federal preemption and discretionary refusal to assert Federal power, is readily apparent. It affects not only the relatively few States which have labor-relations boards, but the courts of all 48 States.

Declination of jurisdiction by the National Board of borderline cases thus provides no answer to the problem. Agreements permitting State agencies to handle primarily local matters are barred by the inflexibility of section 10 (a). And under the decisions of the Supreme Court there is a serious question whether the States, in the absence of cession, may act in any industry to which the national act can be made to reach, even though the National Board has never exercised, and declines to exercise, jurisdiction over the particular employer and employees.

Thus, there is real danger of leaving labor disputes in a no-man's land in which the Federal power is not applied, and the local community, which bears the direct and immediate impact, is barred from effective action, not by Federal action, but by Federal inaction.

Even when the States attempt to act in purely local cases they are met by attacks on their jurisdiction. For example, the jurisdiction of the New York board has been contested in cases involving a parking lot,[36] a cleaning and dyeing business,[37] small retail stores,[38] and local restaurants.[39] Even if a State board ultimately is successful in establishing its jurisdiction, the processing of such cases can be inordinately delayed by attacks in the State or Federal courts.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The foregoing discussion has shown that, under present law, the National Board is unable to cede jurisdiction to State or territorial agencies and that the right of States to act, where the National Board declines to assert jurisdiction, has been questioned. The result has been to establish a "no-man's land" in which labor disputes are, or may be, wholly unregulated. The situation manifestly is one which calls for congressional action.

The amendment, it is submitted, should be framed with three basic objectives in mind.

1. The discretionary power of the National Board to decline to assert jurisdiction presently exists by virtue of administrative and judicial interpretation of the national act. The right to decline jurisdiction should be expressly set forth in the act, so that there may be no question as to the propriety of such action by the National Board.

2. In order to avoid a "no-man's land," the States must be free to act in labor disputes over which the National Board might assert jurisdiction but declines to do so. State action should be permitted, without the necessity of formal cession of jurisdiction, in all cases which do not come within the National Board's jurisdictional formula, and in individual cases in which the National Board has declined to assert jurisdiction.

3. The National Board should be empowered, in its discretion, to cede jurisdiction over cases, or categories of cases, which it might otherwise process, to appropriate State or territorial agencies. The amendment should substitute broad discretionary powers, vested in the National Board, for the present rigid and inflexible requirement of consistency contained in the present section 10 (a).

It is suggested, therefore, that the proviso contained in section 10 (a) of the national act be repealed. That section 6 be renumbered section "6 (a)," and that the following subdivisions be added to section 6:

"(b) (1) The Board, in its discretion, may decline to assert jurisdiction over any labor dispute where, in the opinion of the Board, the effect on commerce is not sufficiently substantial to warrant the exercise of its jurisdiction.

"(2) Nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to prevent or bar any agency, or the courts, of any State or Territory, from assuming and asserting jurisdiction over labor disputes over which the Board declines, pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, to assert jurisdiction.

"(3) The Board, in its discretion, may, by agreement with any agency of any State or Territory, cede to such agency jurisdiction over labor disputes involving (A) unfair labor practices or (B) controversies concerning representation, in any industry or portion thereof even though such labor disputes may substantially affect commerce."

The foregoing proposal would not impair the supremacy of Federal law, for the power to decline jurisdiction and to execute agreements with State boards would rest with the national board. Moreover, it would make it possible for the National Board to distinguish betwen industries, cases or classes of cases, according to whether they substantially affect interstate commerce or are more essentially local in nature, and to take into consideration the availability of State agencies. The proposal accords with the Supreme Court's statement that, in determining whether a labor dispute substantially affects interstate commerce, consideration should be given "to the bearing and effect of any protective action to the same end already taken under State authority. The justification for the exercise of Federal power should clearly appear." [40]

It is submitted that the proposed amendment would—

1. Eliminate any doubt as to the authority of the National Board to decline to assert jurisdiction and to enter into working agreements with the various State boards;

2. Eliminate the present inflexibility of section 10 (a);

3. Permit the National Board to devote its time and energies to labor disputes which really are matters of national concern, unhindered by the necessity of processing primarily local matters which can be handled by available State agencies;

4. Eliminate the danger of a no-man's land in which labor disputes are subject to neither Federal nor State regulation;

5. Permit appropriate State agencies to process local and borderline cases free from jurisdictional attack;

6. Permit a return to the cooperation between the National and State boards which previously existed.

Respectfully submitted

NEW YORK STATE LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
MEYER GOLDBERG, *Member.*
FRANK D. MAURIN, *Member.*
PHILIP FELDBLUM,
General Counsel.

QUITCLAIM OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN OHIO

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to quitclaim certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Ohio under restrictions limiting its use to the training of juvenile delinquents and certain other persons. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1278) to quitclaim certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Ohio under restrictions limiting its use to the training of juvenile delinquents and certain other persons, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Security Administrator is authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed or other appropriate means, to the State of Ohio, all of the right, title, and interest remaining in the United States in and to that property located in Marion County, Ohio, which is held by such State under an amended deed executed

---

[30] Cf. 61 Harvard Law Review at 844 and Feldblum: Jurisdictional Tidelands in Labor Relations, 38 Virginia Law Review 187. See also *Montgomery B. and C. Trades Council* v. *Ledbetter Erection Co.* (argued before U. S. Supreme Court on November 13, 1952, 31 L. R. R. 31, cert. dismissed as improvidently granted, December 8, 1952, 31 L. R. R. M. 2130, 97 L. Ed. (Ad. Op.) 127).

[31] *W. E. R. B.* v. *Allen-Bradley Local 1111* (5 Labor Cases, par. 51,135, 315 U. S. 740 (1942)).

[32] See, for example, sec. 8 (b).

[33] *W. E. R. B.* v. *Plankington Packing Company* (17 Labor Cases, par. 65,595, 338 U. S. 953 (1950)).

[34] *Costaro* v. *Simons* (19 Labor Cases, par. 66,295, 302 N. Y. 318).

[35] *United Automobile Workers* v. *O'Brien* (339 U. S. 454).

[36] *Matter of Hippodrome Parking Space* (11 N. Y. S. L. R. B. 207).

[37] *Matter of Roxy Cleaners & Dyers* (11 N. Y. S. L. R. B. 209).

[38] *Matter of Stone's Clothes Shop* (11 N. Y. S. L. R. B. 413).

[39] *Matter of Lottie's Dogwood Room* (11 N. Y. S. L. R. B. 632; *Matter of Daniel the Caterer* (11 N. Y. S. L. R. B. 297).

[40] *Consolidated Edison Co.* v. *N. L. R. B.*, 305 U. S. 197, 223.

by the Federal Security Administrator on March 30, 1950, conveying such property to the State of Ohio on the condition that it be used for the training of juvenile delinquents and certain other persons.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The bill is designed to speed up a slow-motion transfer of lands from the Federal Government to the State of Ohio. The lands involved are part of the site of the former Scioto Ordnance Plant near Marion, Ohio.

The Department of Welfare of Ohio is now using the lands as the site of a training school for juvenile delinquents. Its authority to do so arises from a 1950 deed from the Federal Government. The deed recites a purchase price of some $746,000 to be paid in 25 years, but it stipulates that for any year in which the lands are used as the site of a training school for juvenile delinquents, the yearly installment on the purchase price is to be waived. The net effect is that Ohio gets the lands free in 25 years if it uses the lands exactly as specified in the deed.

The needs of the penal program in Ohio now require that reformatory-type prisoners, as well as juvenile delinquents, be housed at the Marion site. To use the site in this fashion would breach the restriction in the Federal Government's deed and void Ohio's right to use the site.

The bill I have introduced would not only speed up the transfer of the lands to Ohio but would also remove all restrictions on use, so that Ohio, rather than the Federal Government, would judge the best use of the lands. My bill calls for a quitclaim of the Federal Government's interest in the site. A similar bill is being introduced in the House by Congressman JACKSON BETTS, in whose district the site lies.

CONTROL OF CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES IN CERTAIN CLUBS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me relative to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1279) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. NEELY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The statement presented by Mr. CASE is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CASE

On April 4, 1951, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and myself cosponsored in the Senate S. 1264, to license and regulate those breeding grounds of Washington crime, the so-called bottle clubs. We acted following a fatal shooting in one of them, the Gold Key Club.

That club is as good an example as any of why these after-hours drinking spots must be eliminated from the Nation's Capital, and why new legislation is needed to bring this about. For not long after that fatal shooting, the club was reopened in the same location and under the same guiding sponsorship as before but with a new name, the Downtown Club. Recently this club, in turn, was raided and closed for illegal sales. And tomorrow, it will open for the third time, I am informed, as the 606 Club, still with the same guiding spirit behind a new set of directors.

Today the Senator from West Virginia and myself are offering a new bill to license and regulate bottle clubs. It embodies suggestions made in recent hearings before the House District Committee on a similar measure by Representative KEARNS, with whom I have consulted. We are anxious to cooperate with him in seeking speedy enactment of the bill.

The purpose of this legislation is to license and regulate the so-called after-hours or bottle clubs by creating a new type of license under the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, approved January 24, 1934, as amended, by placing such establishments under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Board.

The proposed bill gives the Commissioners authority to prescribe the hours during which alcoholic beverages may be consumed on such premises and to forbid the consumption thereof on Sundays. Also the Commissioners would be authorized to prescribe rules and regulations not inconsistent with this act to properly and adequately control the consumption of alcoholic beverages on premises licensed under the bill.

The bill also makes it unlawful for any person operating any premises where food, nonalcoholic beverages, or entertainment are sold or provided for compensation, and where facilities are especially provided and service is rendered for the consumption of alcoholic beverages, who does not possess a license under this act, to permit the consumption of such alcoholic beverages on such premises.

The bill provides for a consumption license for a club and sets the annual license fee at $100. It prohibits issuance of a club license in a residential zone. It authorizes issuance of search warrants on premises where this act is violated and provides for seizure of alcoholic beverages found thereon. It provides for enjoining and abating a nuisance in violation of the act.

PLEBISCITE FOR SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTE BETWEEN ITALY AND YUGOSLAVIA CONCERNING TRIESTE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution calling for a plebiscite to be held in the free area of Trieste. For more than 5 years the problem of Trieste has plagued relations between Italy and Yugoslavia and has been a sore spot in international relations. The international Communist threat to this area makes it most desirable that there be friendly cooperation between Yugoslavia and Italy. Direct negotiations between the two powers have not been successful; nor has success followed the attempts of the United States and Great Britain to exert diplomatic influence to bring about an understanding. A plebiscite is a democratic and just method, and if it is held under the auspices of the United Nations I believe it will provide a just solution to this knotty problem.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), submitted by Mr. KENNEDY, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress—

(1) That, since the existing situation in the Free Territory of Trieste creates unnecessary friction between Italy and Yugoslavia, it is highly desirable that the dispute be resolved in an amicable fashion, on a basis of democratic principles, with the protection of the rights and interests of all concerned, by a plebiscite within a reasonable time in the Free Territory of Trieste, under proper supervision of the United Nations;

(2) That the ultimate disposition of this area be in accordance with the wishes of its population as expressed through the medium of such plebiscite.

The statement by Mr. KENNEDY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY

Italy today occupies a position of maximum strategic importance. Its security is essential to the defense of all Western Europe and to the maintenance of our position in the Mediterranean. Yet Italy's defenses on its northeastern frontiers are imperiled by the strained relations which exist between Italy and Yugoslavia. This region, in the area of the Lubiana Gap, has been since the ancient days of Rome, the highways through which successive waves of invaders have poured into northern Italy. For once the gap has been secured the broad plains of northeast Italy lie open to foreign armies. The Lubiana Gap therefore must be held if northeast Italy is to be held.

Yet most of the natural defense lines in this area run through Yugoslavian territory and because of the bitterness of feeling between Yugoslavia and Italy, there is little evidence of cooperation for the common defense in this area. The border instead was marked, when I was there last December, by barbed wire and armed Yugoslavian guards. The bitterness between Italy and Yugoslavia arises out of the dispute over Trieste and it is therefore of maximum importance to the United States and the whole free world that a solution be reached between these two countries, a solution which will take into account the wishes of the majority of the population of the territory. It is for that reason that I am today introducing legislation which will indicate that the United States Congress looks with favor upon a plebiscite of the people in the Territory of Trieste.

For more than 5 years the problem of Trieste has plagued relations between Italy and Yugoslavia and has been a source of friction for the great powers. Time and again efforts have been made to heal this sore spot in international relations but to no avail. Yet, unsolved, the Trieste question is fraught with dangers that should not go unheeded. The fate of the Free Territory of Trieste is of deep concern to the Italians and Yugoslavs in both of whom it arouses intense nationalistic sentiment. These sentiments are often expressed in dramatic ways that clearly indicate their inner passionate force. As long as the question of Trieste remains unsolved, it will exacerbate relations between Italy and Yugoslavia and be a source of

dangerous tension in the eastern Mediterranean area.

The international Communist threat to this area makes it most desirable that there be friendly cooperation between Yugoslavia and Italy. At the present time Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia are on the verge of signing a friendship agreement and reaching a military understanding whereby they will coordinate their defenses against possible Communist aggression. Logically, Italy should be a participant in this strategic arrangement. But because of the bad relations between Rome and Belgrade, poisoned as they are by the Trieste question, it has not been possible thus far to bring Italy into the arrangement. This is one vital strategic reason why a prompt answer should be found to the Trieste problem.

Many attempts have been made to find a key to the Trieste riddle but without success. Under the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty, which came into force in September 1947, the city of Trieste and its environs (a total area of about 285 square miles) was to become a free territory under a governor appointed by the United Nations. Because of disagreements between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union a governor was never appointed and the administration envisaged in the peace treaty never came into effect. Trieste has remained divided into two zones—Zone A (including the city of Trieste proper) under Anglo-American military occupation, and zone B under Yugoslav military occupation. At the present time, there is no prospect that the plan in the peace treaty for the establishment of a government for the free territory will be carried out. Other approaches have been attempted, but those too have not proved fruitful. One of the methods tried has been direct negotiation between Italy and Yugoslavia. For the past several years it has been the consistent policy of the United States and Great Britain to urge that the Trieste question be solved by direct negotiations between the two principal disputants. On many occasions Italian and Yugoslav leaders have proposed direct negotiations between their two countries but the terms have always been such that they have been unacceptable to one side or the other. Meetings between Italian and Yugoslav representatives on the Trieste issue have never gotten very far.

Not only have direct negotiations been unproductive as a means of solving the Trieste question, but other approaches have failed too. The United States and Great Britain have tried to exert their diplomatic influence to bring about an understanding, but their overtures have been in vain. Likewise, failure has been the fate of the Italian proposal that the case of Trieste be referred to the International Court of Justice.

All these methods have failed, the peace treaty project, direct negotiations, diplomacy, and international adjudication. All these methods have been tried, but Trieste still remains a painful thorn in the side of the international body politic. Yet there is still one approach which, although it has been suggested before as a way of solving the Trieste problem, has apparently never received from all concerned the kind of consideration it deserves. And that is, a plebiscite.

A plebiscite has many advantageous features which qualify it as an efficacious means of putting an end to the Trieste trouble. A plebiscite is, above all, democratic and just. It gives the people themselves the opportunity to decide their own fate. It recognizes the principle of popular sovereignty which is so basic in the western political tradition. It honors the principle of self-determination, which has so prominent a role in the history of American foreign policy. In short, it is a singularly appropriate device for settling the Trieste dispute, not only from the viewpoint of its own intrinsic merits but also from the viewpoint of its consistency with American tradition.

Experience has proved that plebiscites are satisfactory measures for settling disputes of the Trieste type, that is, disputes over border areas where the resident population is made up of intermingled nationalities. Examples of some controversies that have been settled by plebiscite include: (a) the dispute of Denmark and Germany over North Schleswig (1920); (b) the disposition of a portion of East Prussia as between Germany and Poland (1920); and (c) the division of Upper Silesia between Germany and Poland (1921). The successful use of plebiscites in these and many other instances indicates that this method of achieving a satisfactory outcome for territorial disputes involving nationalities is sound and accords with the best international practice. For these reasons a plebiscite should be appropriate in Trieste, an area where many conditions are similar to those in regions where the plebiscite has already been applied with good effect.

There is one further condition, however, that must be met. The plebiscite must be supervised by an international umpire whose integrity, impartiality, justice, and competence are above question. Otherwise, the best results might not be obtained. The United Nations, as an international organization that represents nearly all of the governments of the world, is eminently qualified to supply the proper supervisory agents. These might very well be selected from countries that have no partisan interest in the Trieste problem. They could then be relied upon to exercise their functions neutrally and efficiently. Certain countries in Asia or Latin America could certainly meet these requirements.

The Trieste question is a serious one. Because it is so inflammable, it should be resolved promptly. It is undoubtedly in the best moral, political, and strategic interests of the United States that the status of Trieste be fairly determined in the very near future. A plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations is the best means at the disposal of the United States, now that so many other means have failed, for effecting a quick and just solution to this knotty problem.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFECTS OF IMMIGRATION LAWS ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling upon the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to conduct a full study and investigation of the effects of the present immigration laws of the United States on its foreign policy and its relations with other nations.

The evidence is unmistakable that since the enactment of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, many misunderstandings between our Government and other governments have arisen. These have been serious in the case of Norway, as I pointed out on the floor of the Senate last Friday. The degree of seriousness varies from country to country, but there is no question that the Communist Party has capitalized on the humiliation which many Europeans have suffered since the passage of the act.

Immigration legislation has a very direct effect on our Government's relations with other nations. It is a definite part of our foreign policy. I realize full well that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary has legislative jurisdiction over the details of our immigration laws, but the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has a definite responsibility to look at those laws as they affect the foreign policy of our Government.

It is in that spirit that I submit this resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 90), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full study and investigation of the effects of the present immigration laws of the United States on its foreign policy and its relations with other nations. The committee shall report the results of such study and investigation to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with its recommendations for such legislation or other action as it deems necessary.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3575) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BASIC AND UNIFORM RULES FOR THE CONDUCT OF SENATE COMMITTEE HEARINGS—COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has informed me that he wishes to be a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 83, to promote the effectiveness of investigations by committees of the Senate to establish uniform rules for the conduct of Senate committee hearings and to insure orderly and fair procedure and the protection of individuals which I submitted on February 20, 1953. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from New York be added as a cosponsor of the resolution, and that a star print of the resolution be made showing the name of the distinguished Senator from New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS SERVING IN ARMED FORCES — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has informed me that he has been very much interested in introducing proposed legislation along the lines of my bill, S. 704, which provides for the expeditious naturalization of persons who have served or are serving in the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict. The Senator from Massachusetts has now expressed a desire to cosponsor my bill. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent record be changed to show that he is a cosponsor of the bill, and in the event additional printings of the bill are made, his name be included as one of the sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address entitled "What Is Ahead in the Next 4 Years?" delivered by Senator BRIDGES before the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association on February 24, 1953, together with introductory remarks by Senator MARTIN.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement by him on the 103d anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him before the leadership conference for State of Israel bonds held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on Saturday, March 7, 1953.

Address entitled "Time for Teachers To Get Angry," delivered by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO, and president, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, at the charter day observances of Howard University, Washington, D. C., on March 2, 1953.

Joint statement issued by State Senator Francis J. Mahoney and Assemblyman Eugene F. Dannigan, Democratic leaders of the New York State Legislature, on the subject of submerged lands legislation.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Address delivered on Wednesday, March 11, 1953, by Representative DON MAGNUSON, of Washington, in support of the development of a high dam in Hells Canyon of the Snake River.

By Mr. HOEY:

Statement entitled "A Comprehensive Plan for Better Medical Care and Better Distribution of Physicians, With Special Emphasis on the Rural Sections," by Dr. W. C. Bostic, of Forest City, N. C.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement entitled "Good Posture, Good Health," prepared by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D. C., director of public relations, National Chiropractic Association.

By Mr. MORSE:

Editorial entitled "Penalty for Working," published in a recent issue of the Portland Oregonian.

Editorial entitled "Cheap Politics Indeed," published in the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee of February 28, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Need of New Amendment," published in the Tablet, of Brooklyn, N. Y., on February 28, 1953.

Editorial entitled "She Pleads for More Noise," published in the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind., on March 7, 1953.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "Harry's Team Got Its Severance Pay," written by Marshall McNeil, and published in the Washington Daily News of March 11, 1953.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Trojan Horse Returns," published in the March 9, 1953, issue of the New Leader.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

NORTH DAKOTA POLL ON CURRENT NATIONAL ISSUES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the results of a poll which I recently conducted in the State of North Dakota. I may say that the poll was directed to 2,300 Republican precinct committeemen and also to all lawyers, all doctors, all grain elevator operators, and a large group of others in the State, including many thousands of farmers.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An honorable solution to the Korean war is still the most important national issue, according to incomplete returns from 14,000 questionnaires sent to North Dakota people. Falling farm prices, together with Secretary of Agriculture Benson's views on farm-price supports, is running a close second. The questionnaires were addressed individually to 2,300 Republican precinct committeemen, farmers, and to thousands of individuals representing nearly all other occupations in North Dakota.

Comments range from, "Secretary Benson is a good man. Give him a chance" to "I have always voted Republican. * * * I went to St. Paul to hear and see him (Benson) and got the biggest disappointment since the grasshoppers cleaned up my crop in 1938."

* * * * *

1. Do you favor President Eisenhower's recent action removing the United States 7th Fleet from patrol duty around Formosa, thus opening the way for Chinese Nationalists to raid the Chinese mainland held by the Reds? Yes, 2,860; no, 343.

2. Do you favor the proposed naval blockade of the Chinese Communist coast line? Yes, 2,084; no, 607.

3. Do you approve of the appointment of Ezra Taft Benson as Secretary of Agriculture? Farmers: Yes, 483; no, 1,787. Other groups: Yes, 361; no, 328. Total: Yes, 844; no, 2,115.

4. Do you favor the so-called flexible price supports for agricultural commodities (75 to 90 percent of parity)? Farmers: Yes, 270; no, 2,296. Other groups: Yes, 235; no, 342. Total: Yes, 505; no, 2,638.

5. Do you favor an extension of 90 percent supports for basic farm commodities, as provided in the Young-Russell-Cooley Act? Farmers: Yes, 2,070; no, 338. Other groups: Yes, 230; no, 144. Total: Yes, 2,500; no, 482.

6. Do you favor 100 percent price supports? Farmers: Yes, 1,899; no, 453. Other groups: Yes, 348; no, 319. Total: Yes, 2,247; no, 772.

7. Opponents of high-level price supports claim that such support levels usually lead to acreage limitations. Do you object to such acreage allotments if they are necessary to a 90 percent price support program? Farmers: Yes, 600; no, 1,890. Other groups: Yes, 235; no, 404. Total: Yes, 835; no, 2,294.

8. Do you favor continuance of the Federal crop insurance program? Yes, 2,278; no, 640.

9. Do you favor continuance of other farm programs—REA, RTA, Soil Conservation? Yes, 3,029; no, 172.

10. Do you favor an immediate tax reduction of from 5 to 11 percent, even though it may mean an unbalanced budget? Yes, 654; no, 2,550.

11. It has always been my strict policy to answer all mail promptly and completely. (a) Have you heard of any instances where my reply wasn't prompt? Yes, 24; no, 3,213.

(b) If you personally wrote me previously, was your reply: (1) Prompt, 903; (2) delayed, 9; (3) complete, 430; (4) incomplete, 10.

12. What, in your opinion, is the most important issue facing Congress and the Nation today? (1) Korea, 1,731; (2) farm prices, 1,143; (3) balanced budget, 346; (4) communism, 217; (5) waste, 162.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD MARKET

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], my colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution, to provide for the creation of an international food reserve.

Mr. President, this is a very important joint resolution, and I wish to have an opportunity to address the Senate in explanation of the joint resolution at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 56) to provide for the creation of an international food reserve, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED ELECTION OF DELEGATE FROM DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 697, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives. It is order No. 70 on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 697) to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this is a bill to establish for the District of Columbia a voice in the Congress of the United States, by providing for the election of a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, whose status would be comparable to that of a Delegate from a Territory.

Mr. President, I observe the distinguished Senator from Montana on his feet. Does he wish me to defer my remarks?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few moments ago I introduced a joint resolution, requested its appropriate reference, and asked that I be given an opportunity to explain it at the conclusion of the morning hour. Have we concluded the morning hour, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour has been concluded.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator from South Dakota is not going to take too much time, I would prefer to wait until he concludes.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to state rather briefly the outline of the pending bill, after which I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. It will take me some little time to present the subject matter of the joint resolution. If the Senator from South Dakota is not going to take too much time, I suggest that he proceed.

Mr. CASE. So far as I know, there is no particular opposition to the pending bill. I think it can be disposed of rather promptly.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I was the Senator who, on Monday, objected to a consideration of this bill on the call of the Consent Calendar. It was my thought that a bill of this nature, and of this importance, should not be so summarily considered by the Senate in the 5 minutes of debate which is permissible under the Consent Calendar. That was my reason for objecting to its consideration at that time, and it was my only reason. Personally, I think I shall vote for the bill. Nevertheless, I should like to have the bill explained. I think the Senate is entitled to an explanation of it rather than having the bill passed by the Senate, without debate, on 5 minutes notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may say to the Senator from South Dakota that the Chair had assured the Senator from Montana that he would be recognized at the conclusion of the morning hour. The Chair failed to do so.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota will be glad to yield to the Senator from Montana, with the understanding that he does not lose his right to the floor following the presentation by the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, and with that understanding, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD RESERVE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and a large bipartisan group of other Senators, I have introduced today a joint resolution which aims at the creation of an international food reserve under the auspices of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

This resolution is not a new idea. It is the product of long years of study by farmers, economists, Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and leaders in international affairs. The general idea of an international food reserve first came to public attention back in 1946 when Sir John Boyd Orr, the head of the FAO, proposed a World Food Board. It came to public attention again in 1949, when a committee of distinguished economists from various countries, including the United States, proposed the creation of an International Commodity Clearing House.

Mr. President, the international food reserve resolution will be of direct interest to every farmer in America and to every processor and distributor of farm commodities, because it will encourage abundant production of food and fibers and provide a constructive method of preventing market surpluses.

It will be of direct concern to all the consumers of farm products because it will protect against shortages and the consumer price increases which accompany shortages.

It will be of tremendous interest to the other nations of the world which produce or import agricultural commodities, and to all those throughout the world who recognize the fundamental fact that food and clothing are our two most vital weapons in mankind's struggle for a happier and more peaceful world.

The passage of this joint resolution by the Congress of the United States and signature by the President will be a milestone in the history of international relations in the modern world.

Its enactment, which I hope will be soon, will provide a strong foundation for the prompt creation of an international food reserve.

Mr. President, I am well aware that this has not been the customary procedure in the handling of international negotiations.

All Members of the Senate know that the customary procedure is for congressional consideration of international matters to occur only after the end of long and intensive international negotiations. All the Members of the Senate know that this has at times meant insufficient congressional participation in the conduct of foreign economic affairs. It has created a barrier between those handling weighty international affairs and the duly elected representatives of the American people. As a result, international negotiations have often been unrealistic. To my mind, one of the major factors underlying this lack of realism and this waste of effort is the fact that none of the participants in such international negotiations has had prior opportunity to gage congressional thinking on the matters under discussion.

Mr. President, the sponsors of this resolution believe that there are some occasions when the most appropriate procedure involves the full expression of policy by the Congress as a prelude to international negotiations. This is one of those cases.

The sponsors of this resolution believe that only through congressional initiative and through a congressional mandate can a proper start be made toward the development of a more adequate international machinery for handling some of our pressing agricultural problems.

Mr. President, this is not a partisan measure. It is supported by Republicans as well as Democrats.

While initiated by Members of Congress, it appears to be supported in principle by many officials of the executive branch. We hope it will be supported by President Eisenhower, by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson.

WHAT THE INTERNATIONAL FOOD RESERVE PROVIDES

This is an extremely simple resolution. It contains only four sections and is only four pages long.

The first section makes certain findings which indicate why an international food reserve is needed. These findings deal with declining farm prices, farm incomes, and farm exports.

The agricultural problems of other countries are also recognized, particularly the need for more food and fibers and the ever-present threat of famine and starvation.

The section then points out the positive value of food reserves as a protection against shortages.

The second section spells out the following five purposes that will be served by an international food reserve:

(a) It would provide for the appropriate storage, in the United States and in other countries, of raw or processed agricultural commodities.

(b) It would be developed in a manner that will help to prevent extreme price fluctuations in the international market for agricultural products and keep production expanding to meet the world's pressing need for more food and clothing.

(c) It would be used to prevent famine and starvation.

(d) It would absorb temporary market surpluses of agricultural products.

(e) It would provide for the use of the national currencies paid to the International Food Reserve by purchasers of agricultural products for the purchase in the same countries of other raw materials needed by food-exporting countries and, through cooperation with the appropriate international lending, economic development, and technical assistance agencies, for use in approved economic development programs.

The third section authorizes and directs the United States representatives in the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization to "enter promptly into international negotiations for the purpose of preparing a specific plan and a proposed international agreement on the creation of an international food reserve."

The fourth section provides that "The plan and agreement developed in accordance with section 3 hereof, together with full supporting material and information on operating methods, shall be presented to the Congress of the United States for approval."

This resolution does not appropriate any funds.

This resolution does not provide for any new controls of agricultural commodities.

Above all, this resolution does not commit the United States Congress to any specific plan for an international food reserve. The specific plan and agreement which would be developed under it would subsequently be presented to the Congress for approval.

AN INTELLIGENT RESERVE PROGRAM WILL HELP INSURE ADEQUATE SUPPLIES AND CONTINUED PROSPERITY

History as far back as Biblical times teaches us that if the world is to have a reasonably adequate supply of food at all times, there must, at times, be supplies in excess of current needs. Following the example of Joseph in Biblical times, wise people consider these temporary surpluses a blessing and build reserves during years of plenty to draw upon during the lean years, which inevitably will come. National and world reserves of food and fiber will not merely be economic relief measures for the benefit of agricultural producers, but such reserves are undoubtedly of even greater importance to all consumers in this and other countries, as insurance against famine, inflation, and political unrest.

Tens of billions of dollars are being spent annually for military defense purposes, yet everyone must realize that no defense program can be effective unless supported by adequate supplies of food and fiber for not only the military, but also the civilian economy. Recent history contains numerous instances when the progress of communism has been turned back by food rather than bullets.

The ever-increasing population of this country and of the world makes it imperative that we continue an all-out agricultural production policy both in the United States and elsewhere. We cannot afford to let temporary surpluses frighten us into a scarcity policy. Neither can we afford to let temporary surpluses cripple the productive capacity of agriculture for future years.

It is estimated that in the United States alone our population will reach 190 million by 1975. To maintain present diet levels, this will necessitate an expansion of about 25 percent in agricultural output. Low-income farmers, financially unable to take care of their land and make maximum technological and scientific advancement, cannot meet this challenge of the future.

Temporary surpluses are a blessing in the world of today. A plan which converts them into a properly managed reserve will make this a reality.

SUPPLIES ARE AVAILABLE TO START A RESERVE

The spring of 1953 is a particularly appropriate period for the Senate to take action that, hopefully, will lead to the establishment of an international food reserve. By and large, nature smiled on farm production last year here at home and over the rest of the world. Farm production in the United States in 1952 set a new high record. Food and fiber producers in other lands also had a good year.

Larger production abroad coupled with the efforts by some countries to conserve dollar exchange caused the foreign demand for United States farm products to drop sharply in the first half of the 1952–53 marketing year.

The reduction in foreign demand and the record high farm production in the United States were the major factors responsible for the more than 10-percent drop in average prices received by farmers which took place from August 7, last year, to February 15, this year. That is a drop of 2 percent a month that took place in spite of rising consumer incomes and purchasing power in the United States.

FARM PRICES AND INCOMES ARE SLIPPING

Prices of farm commodities as a whole have fallen 16 percent from their all-time high in February of 1951.

In the past year, farm prices have fallen 9 percent, having fallen each month for the past 6 months.

Cattle prices fell last year from $27.60 a hundred pounds to $18.80, as of February 15. Farmers averaged 89 percent of parity during the month ending February 15, but the price dropped to nearly 80 percent of parity in some localities during the same period.

Corn fell during the past 12 months from $1.65 a bushel to $1.43.

Oats fell during the same period from about 89 cents a bushel to 77 cents.

Cotton fell from 37 cents a pound to 30 cents—down to 89 percent of parity—in the past year.

Sheep declined from $13.30 a year ago to $8.55 a hundred pounds.

Milk has dropped from $5.11 to $4.66 a hundred pounds since February a year ago.

These are only a few of the price drops farmers have taken. Of course, the prices of not all farm commodities have fallen during the past year; some have gone up, contrary to the general trend.

While the prices received by farmers have been dropping, the prices farmers have to pay have been rising. We are dealing here with a fundamental, long-term problem. Since 1947, the purchasing power of farm families—their real income in constant dollars—has dropped by more than one-fourth.

(b) Farm income for 1952 is estimated to have barely held even with the previous year, on a net basis, and is 15 percent below the record high of 1947. This is a drop of $2½ billion.

Cash receipts are increasing, but production costs are rising as fast—and a little faster. Present forecasts for 1953 indicate that farm families will receive a lower percentage of the national income than in any year in the history of the Nation, except one—1932.

The relationship of prices received by farmers to those paid by farmers for production and living necessities fell from 100 a year ago to 94 this month. This is the so-called parity ratio.

In addition to adequate carry-over stocks of most commodities, there are actually burdensome surpluses of some, partly because of their relatively perishable nature.

Secretary Benson referred recently to the very serious development in the large Government inventory of milk products which have been purchased to support the market price. As of February 13, the Government had on hand: 70 million pounds of butter; 17 million pounds of cheese; 101 million pounds of dried milk.

Storable commodities in inventory are not necessarily surplus but some, such as wheat, could be disposed of without jeopardizing the national reserve. In fact, the surplus of wheat is depressing the market considerably and will continue to do so for several years if negotiations to extend the international wheat agreement should fail.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS ARE DECLINING

The volume of exports of farm commodities has fallen 27 percent from the peak reached just after hostilities in Korea broke out, until it stands at the lowest point since Korea.

The outlook for the current year pointed to a record world output of bread grains, rice, and fats and oils and to a near-record world output of cotton and corn, according to the Department of Agriculture.

Much of our favorable export position of recent years has been accounted for directly by our foreign-aid programs. In the fiscal year 1948–49 about two-thirds of our agricultural exports was financed by various foreign economic-aid funds, but these sources are shrinking. By fiscal year 1951–52 only about one-fifth was so financed. This means, of course, that United States exports must compete more and more sharply in price with other producing areas of the world.

Here is how exports of the three largest commodities have dropped from the third quarter of 1951 to the same quarter of 1952: Cotton, down 36 percent; wheat, down one-third; tobacco, down one-third.

The lack of stability in the United States export market has historically plagued American farmers with alternate shortages and surplus, with alternate ups and downs in prices.

The all-time high in exports of agricultural products was 1919, when the value reached $4,093,000,000. The low point was reached in 1940, with a value of only $517 million. The value in 1951 was nearly up to the peak again, but the years between the peaks make a grossly jagged line on the chart of the agricultural economy.

The fluctuations of specific commodities from year to year is even sharper—and often more disastrous to individual farmers. For example, United States exports of corn were only 300,000 bushels in 1935, jumped to 147,700,000 in 1938, fell off sharply to 32,400,000 in the very next year, bounced back after the war to 127,900,000 by 1947, and fell to 23,800,000 in the next year.

Leveling off the peaks and valleys would be a great contribution to American farmers in the form of stable prices and a confident outlook.

The following table shows the ups and downs of wheat and cotton exports compared with relatively stable and, in the case of cotton, increasing domestic consumption.

I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wheat

[Millions of bushels]

Marketing year	Net exports	Domestic consumption
1927–28	191	680
1932–33	28	725
1938–39	167	716
1946–47	397	771
1947–48	486	761
1948–49	502	682
1949–50	297	683
1950–51	374	694
1951–52	443	678
1952–53	295	692

Cotton (American type)

[Millions of bales]

Marketing year	Exports	Domestic consumption
1927–28	7.5	6.5
1938–39	3.3	6.7
1948–49	4.7	7.6
1949–50	5.8	8.7
1950–51	4.1	10.5
1951–52	5.5	9.0
1952–53	4.0	9.6

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the relative importance of agricultural exports to total United States exports has tended to decline over the past several decades. However, American agriculture has been geared in recent years to a foreign market for substantial quantities of wheat, cotton, tobacco, and oils. Short foreign supplies of most food and agricultural products resulted in an upsurge in United States agricultural exports following World War II.

During fiscal 1951–52, exports of farm products were valued at a near-record $4 billion, up nearly one-fifth from a year earlier in both quantity and dollar volume. Exports of food grains—wheat and rice—in 1951–52 represented over 50 percent of total output, cotton exports nearly 40 percent, and flue-cured tobacco exports about one-third of total production. A number of special circumstances limited available foreign supplies of some major foods and agricultural products and resulted in a strong export demand for United States agricultural products in the 1951–52 marketing year.

Foreign demand for United States farm products dropped sharply in the first half of the 1952–53 marketing year, reflecting efforts by some countries to conserve dollar exchange as well as larger foreign supplies of competitive farm products. Total agricultural exports in the last half of 1952 apparently were down around 30 percent from a year earlier. Cotton exports in this period were estimated at about one-half those of a year earlier. Exports of wheat were about 30 percent smaller and flue-cured tobacco exports were down more than a third from a year earlier. Food-fat exports were also smaller than the unusually large movement in the last half of 1951.

UNMET NEEDS FOR FOOD IN OTHER COUNTRIES

These recent and dramatic drops in the export of United States farm commodities is far removed from being a reflection that the rest of the world's people have now become well clothed and well fed. Quite the contrary is the case.

A world food survey made by FAO covering 78 countries and 90 percent of the world's population showed that in the period just before the war over half the world's people, on the average, had just about enough food for minimum subsistence—barely enough, that is, to prevent serious undernutrition, but not enough for health by any decent standard.

Most of the underfed millions are in the Far East, the Near East, and parts of Africa and Latin America.

Populations in the Far East, the Near East, and Northern Africa, in Southern and Eastern Europe, and in Germany and Austria have increased faster than food production. Thus, on the average, there is now less food per person in these areas than the low prewar levels.

Only about a third of the world population has enough food of the right kind to be well nourished by good standards.

The contrast can be vividly illustrated by comparing the daily food consumption of an average native of India and an average American. These are the figures, calculated from those for annual food consumption in the FAO survey:

The average Indian has 1½ pounds of food a day. Half of this, or three-fourths of a pound, is a starchy food—mainly rice or wheat. The other three-quarters of a pound includes everything else—less than a third of a pound of food of animal origin—milk, eggs, fish, meat; less than half a pound altogether of fruits, vegetables, sugar. The amount of fat the average Indian gets is negligible—about half a pound a month.

On the other hand, the average American consumes about 4¾ pounds of food a day. He eats about the same quantity of starchy foods, such as bread, potatoes, and so forth, as the Indian—three-fourths of a pound a day. But the American consumes 4 pounds a day of other foods. These include 2⅓ pounds of foods of animal origin, such as milk, eggs, fish, and meat—3 times as much as the amount of starchy foods. It also includes more than a pound of fruits and vegetables a day and nearly 3½ pounds of fats a month, as against the Indian's one-half pound.

But these figures in pounds do not tell the whole story because a pound of grain, which contains little water, cannot well be compared with a pound of vegetables or fruits, which may be largely water.

In terms of energy the food supply of the Indian gives him 1,700 calories a day. Three-fourths, 76 percent, of this comes from starchy foods, chiefly grain. The average American gets 3,130 calories a day, of which only 43 percent comes from these foods.

A diet made up too largely of starchy foods is low in health-giving proteins, vitamins, and minerals. A diet with a large proportion of meat, milk, fish, eggs, vegetables, and fruits is rich in these elements. The amount of protein, particularly animal protein, is generally considered the best single indicator of the nutritional quality of a diet. The average American gets 90 grams of protein a day, of which 60 grams come from animal sources. The average Indian gets 44 grams of protein a day, of which only 6 grams come from animal sources. So the American's diet not only furnishes almost twice as much energy as the Indian's; it also includes far more of the foods that mean good health, normal growth, long life, including 10 times as much animal protein.

Actually, the average Indian's food consumption is probably a little lower than 1,700 calories a day, since this is the figure at the retail level. It does not include waste, which in many cases may amount to about 15 percent.

The minimum subsistence level needed to escape very serious undernutrition has been estimated at 1,500 to 1,600 calories a day of actual food consumption for populations living in the warmer climates and 1,900 calories for populations in the Temperate Zone. These levels are not considered safe over a long period of time.

But a large part of the world's people always subsist near these levels. I submit for the RECORD figures for calories per person per day from the FAO survey. They include only countries for which recent data could be obtained.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under 2,200 calories:	
Indochina	1,560
India	1,700
Iran	1,820
Indonesia	1,880
French North Africa	1,920
Peru	1,920
Belgian Congo	1,930
Iraq	1,930
Philippines	1,960
Ceylon	1,970
Syria	2,000
Pakistan	2,020
China	2,030
Mexico	2,050
French West Africa	2,070
Japan	2,100
Venezuela	2,160
2,200–2,700 calories:	
Mauritius	2,230
Madagascar	2,250
Colombia	2,280
Egypt	2,290
Southern Rhodesia	2,300
Brazil	2,340
Italy	2,340
Chile	2,360
Eastern Germany	2,460
Cyprus	2,470
Turkey	2,480
Greece	2,510
Union of South Africa	2,520
Uruguay	2,580
Austria	2,620
Israel	2,630
Western Germany	2,640
Paraguay	2,670
Over 2,700 calories:	
Cuba	2,740
Belgium-Luxembourg	2,770
France	2,770
Netherlands	2,960
U. S. S. R.	3,020
Canada	3,060
United Kingdom	3,100
Sweden	3,120
United States of America	3,130
Norway	3,140
Switzerland	3,150
Australia	3,160
Denmark	3,160
Argentina	3,190
New Zealand	3,250
Ireland	3,340

Mr. MURRAY. I point out in passing that Ireland is the greatest consuming country in the world. The Irish are good eaters.

The results of low food consumption and poor diets are clear in the vital statistics. The average Indian, for example, will die before the age of 27. The average American will live to be 65 or older. In India, 123 infants die in their first year for every 1,000 live births. In the United States, the infant mortality rate is only 29 for every thousand. In Iraq and Egypt, only 600 of each 1,000 babies that are born live to be 5 years old.

In countries where food supplies are always close to the hunger line, a drought or a flood results in famine because there are no food reserves to provide a margin of safety. Then hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of human beings die of starvation.

Norris E. Dodd, director-general of FAO, said in a recent speech:

Believe me, it's a dangerous business. Hungry people are likely to follow any leader who comes along and promises more to eat and a little better conditions of living. It used to be that people just lay down and starved to death dumbly as I have seen cattle freeze to death huddled together against a drift fence when one cow could have led them through. People won't do that any more. They figure they might better be slaves to a dictator than die of starvation.

WE MUST BE PREPARED TO DEAL WITH FAMINES

The terrible and widespread famines in China and India in the past are too well known to need comment here.

But famine is not a phenomenon of historical interest only. We have famine conditions now in the 20th century, in spite of all our progress in agricultural production and the processing and distribution of foods.

Pending the time when such things can be prevented by adequate production and trade, it is a black mark on our civilization if we do not take all possible steps to forestall and relieve famine conditions.

THIS IS ANOTHER OF THE MANY REASONS WHY AN INTERNATIONAL FOOD RESERVE IS NEEDED

Here are cases of famine today:

Last year Yugoslavia was hard hit by drought, frost, and hail. Perhaps 40 percent of total crop production was wiped out. Most of the population suffered from famine conditions. Corn exports from Yugoslavia in 1951–52 amounted to $67 million. In 1952–53, they were zero. Agricultural and industrial development programs were materially slowed down by the shortage of food.

In India, 3 million people died in the great Bengal famine of 1947. Famine conditions are again rife in India, particularly in Madras and neighboring provinces. In India and Pakistan, the annual monsoon rains, source of water for crops, have failed for the past 2 years. If they fail again this year, the situation will be terribly serious. Last year the United States made a large contribution of wheat for famine relief in India. The U. S. S. R. contributed some wheat, and China sent in rice.

Famine in Pakistan now covers some of Punjab and Sind areas in the north. The whole upper part of west Pakistan is short of water, and since this is an irrigated area, it is worse off than if it had been growing wheat under dryland conditions, when at least a partial crop might be harvested in spite of drought. Normally, the area is not only self-dependent; it produces wheat for export. In 1953, it may have to import as much as 120 million bushels of wheat or other grains.

In Holland, Belgium, and the United Kingdom, the recent storms and floods that brought widespread devastation have disrupted transportation and created serious food shortages. There are bills pending in the United States Congress to appropriate funds for shipping food and feed grains to those countries.

In Brazil there are serious food shortages which have not reached famine conditions.

FIBER CONSUMPTION ALSO LOW IN MOST COUNTRIES

If most of the world's people are ill-fed, so are most of them, also, ill-clothed. In general, people who do not have enough food do not have enough clothing or household textiles. Figures for the consumption of textiles (cotton, wool, rayon) per person per year in 1948–50 show enormous differences among countries, as indicated in a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Pounds
Indonesia	1.54
Pakistan	1.98
Thailand	1.98
Ceylon	3.52
Japan	3.52
India	4.62
Iraq	6.60
Egypt	7.04
Yugoslavia	7.26
Brazil	8.80
Cuba	9.68
Denmark	16.94
United Kingdom	25.08
Australia	25.52
Canada	27.50
United States of America	38.06

Mr. MURRAY. Climate accounts for some of the differences in the quantity of textiles used for clothing, but income and standards of living are more important. The average Cuban, living in a tropical area, uses 9.68 pounds of textiles a year and has a diet that provides 2,740 calories a day. The average Indonesian, also living in a tropical area, uses 1.54 pounds of textiles a year and has a diet that provides 1,880 calories a day. The ratio of land area to population in the two countries is almost identical—about 5 acres per person.

An earlier study by FAO covering some three-fourths of the world's population—World Fiber Survey, 1947—showed that about half of this number used less than 4½ pounds of textiles a year; about 17 percent used between 4½ and 8½ pounds; about 13 percent, between 8½ and 14 pounds; and only about 18 percent used more than 14 pounds. To have brought the whole world population up to a standard of textile consumption per person per year equal to half that of the United States during the 1934–38 period would have required a world production increase of 84 percent.

As in the case of food, the fiber consumption situation has deteriorated in large parts of the world since the war. In the case of cotton, in 1950 the populations of Canada and the United States were using 26.18 pounds per person per year; the populations of Europe were using 8.8 pounds; and the populations of Oceania, 8.14. Consumption in Central and South America was 6.16 pounds per person per year; and in Asia it was only 2.86 pounds. In Africa the figure was still lower—only 2.42 pounds.

HOW THE INTERNATIONAL FOOD RESERVE WOULD OPERATE

Take wheat as an example.

Under United States law the Secretary of Agriculture each year makes an estimate of need for wheat and the five other basic crops. The goal provides for estimated home consumption plus estimated exports plus a reserve as insurance against low yields and crop failure. For wheat and some other crops the reserve percentage in present law may be too low. But let us suppose that growing conditions this year are good enough so that total production exceeds the goal by 20 percent, or 10 percent, or some other figure.

At present, two things might be done to take care of the excess.

(a) It might be dumped on the foreign market at cut rates. But this would injure growers in other producing countries. A main objective of the International Wheat Agreement is to prevent this kind of dumping.

(b) The Government might cut back production next year enough to balance the excess this year. But such a cut would mean less income for wheat farmers than would be earned from more abundant production, if a profitable outlet could be obtained; it would also bring corresponding reductions in the income of the railroads and steamship lines that haul wheat, the grain elevators, the farm-equipment manufacturers, and dealers—in fact, everyone who sells to the wheat farmers—and to the railroad and steamship and elevator and factory and office employees whose livelihood depends at least in part on the wheat farmers.

An international food reserve, on the other hand, could be operated so as to make it unnecessary to resort to either of these alternatives.

The 20-percent surplus could be turned over to the IFR, to be held in strategically located storehouses abroad or stored in the United States against IFR claims.

The wheat held in the international reserve would be sold and merchandized through regular channels of international trade, and the quantities distributed would be in addition to the normal demand so that present distribution patterns would not be disturbed or threatened.

Suppose country X has a contract negotiated in accordance with Wheat Council procedures to buy 20 million bushels of wheat from the United States this year. It would like to get 30 million bushels but lacks dollars to pay for the

extra 10 million. It could pay in national currency, but the national currency is currently not acceptable in the United States. Moreover, the other government is already straining its resources to carry out an economic development program, including costly dams, irrigation works, and so on.

In such a case, country X could apply to the IFR for 10 million bushels of wheat from the United States, and at the same time for a loan in its national currency equal to the market price of the wheat.

The wheat would be paid for in the national currency, which could then be loaned to the importing country on a long-term basis—20, 25, 30 years—to be applied to the cost of a specific approved project of a type likely to be self-liquidating within the period of the loan.

Most countries with large populations in need of food and clothing are underdeveloped countries to which such arrangements would be most acceptable. By proper selection of the development projects and programs, the transactions could be made to pay their own way on a long-term basis.

Surpluses from other wheat-producing member countries besides the United States could be handled through IFR in the same way.

In some instances the receiving countries might pay for the surplus wheat in commodities which the United States was stockpiling. Care would have to be taken, however, to make sure that these transactions also were over and above the quantities the United States would have purchased in any case. It would not be to the advantage of country Y to sell tin to the United States for surplus wheat which it could have sold for badly needed dollars. However, it is becoming abundantly clear that the United States and other advanced nations will find it increasingly necessary to vastly increase their imports of important raw materials required for industrial production. National prudence dictates a safety reserve stockpile of much greater magnitude than currently planned.

The wheat deposited with the IFR might also be used to prevent famine and for emergency relief in great disasters such as floods, tornadoes, tidal waves, and earthquakes. In these cases the contributing countries might under suitable circumstances either contribute the wheat outright or make it available at special prices, charging the cost to famine relief appropriations.

DIFFERENCE FROM INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

The proposed international food reserve would not interfere in any way with trade under the International Wheat Agreement, or any other commodity agreement of a similar nature.

In fact, IFR would admirably supplement that agreement by expanding the total world wheat trade beyond what the agreement could accomplish. Wheat could be purchased from IFR only in excess of the amounts contracted for under the wheat agreement.

The international food reserve would not be confined to wheat. It would take in other foodstuffs and fibers that might be subject to temporary surpluses—not only grain and other staples but such fats and perishables—meat, poultry, dairy products, fruits, vegetables—as could be processed for storage or otherwise handled in international trade, as well as textile fibers. The number and kinds of products suitable for inclusion in the international food reserve would need careful investigation.

ADVANTAGES OF INTERNATIONAL FOOD RESERVE PLAN

An operation of the type outlined would have several major advantages.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list of advantages be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(1) The IFR would help to stabilize prices and maintain agricultural production in the United States, with all this means not only to farmers but to industry and trade. The fact is that 25 million people—more than 40 percent of all United States workers—are directly or indirectly dependent on agriculture for their jobs. Of the 25 million, only 10 million are farmers. The other 15 million are producing for and servicing farmers, or processing and distributing farm products. A depression in agriculture, therefore, affects business and industry outside of agriculture as much as it affects the farmers themselves.

(2) The IFR would tend to protect consumers from shortages (and the abnormally high prices that accompany shortages) by maintaining reserves which would help to stabilize supplies of important products at safe levels.

(3) The IFR would help to encourage the expanding food production necessary to meet the future needs of the expanding United States population. It has been estimated that by 1975 there will be 35 million more people in the United States than there were in 1950. This will require a 25 percent increase in food production—even without taking account of possible improvements in standards of living. The United States cannot afford the letdown in agriculture that will inevitably occur if we allow temporary surpluses to exert ruinous effects on farm prices and farm family income and destroy the value of needed investments in soil conservation, land improvement, better machines and power equipment.

(4) The IFR would enable countries in need to use for economic development some of the internal resources that would otherwise have to be used for buying food.

(5) The IFR would help to feed many people better than they could otherwise be fed during the early stages of economic development when a country must devote a large part of its financial resources to capital investment.

(6) The facilities of the IFR might be used, if governments so desired, as a mechanism for maintaining food reserves to be distributed in areas threatened by famine, or for international disaster relief.

(7) The IFR would be a practical means of encouraging widespread economic development, expanded trade, and better living standards; and by strengthening friendly relations among the participating countries it would contribute to peace.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in closing I wish to say that there is no better way by which we can make a major contribution toward the attainment of a permanent peace and increased world stability than by initiating a series of actions that will result in establishing the machinery for a great international food reserve that will match up hungry and ill-clad people with a permanently and abundantly productive agriculture.

The rewards of success are so great, the challenge of attainment so stimulating that I commend this proposal to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee and hope that it will be favorably reported in the near future and be promptly approved by the Senate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota wishes to follow my remarks with his own on this subject.

EMPTY STOMACHS AND FULL CARTRIDGE BELTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first I wish to pay a very high and deserved tribute to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], for the very splendid presentation he has made in support of the joint resolution to provide for the creation of the international food reserve.

The Senator from Montana has brought to the attention of the Senate some very interesting comments and challenging facts with respect to the food situation in the world, not only as it relates to our own agricultural economy, but also as it relates to very practical and human problems which are confronting millions of people in the world, particularly in Asia, the Far East, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America.

I wish further to compliment the Senator from Montana for a proposal which challenges our imagination. If ever there was a time for the American people and the Government of the United States to present humanitarian, constructive, and practical programs to build for freedom and for peace in the world, that time is at hand.

We have just witnessed and experienced a very emotional period in world history. The death of the dictator of the Soviet Union has aroused many thoughts and considerations in the minds of thoughtful people throughout the world. We are asking ourselves: What next? What will be the policy of the Kremlin? What will and should be our policy?

The Senator from Montana has again stepped to the forefront and has outlined a program which makes good sense to a world that is looking for good will and understanding and leadership.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am proud to join the distinguished Senator from Montana as cosponsor of a joint resolution to provide for the creation of an international food reserve.

The joint resolution would instruct the United States representatives to the United Nations and its Food and Agriculture Organization to initiate negotiations toward establishing the international food reserve within the existing facilities of those international agencies.

The purpose would be to provide a means of absorbing temporary market surpluses of agricultural products and to make them available wherever they are most needed in the world to prevent famine and starvation.

I sincerely hope that every Member of the Senate will give this far-reaching proposal the serious consideration it so justly deserves. I am convinced that it offers a tremendous new opportunity for strengthening the entire free world in its struggle against communistic imperialism, while at the same time providing practical domestic benefits that would

considerably strengthen the agricultural foundation of our economy.

Mr. President, it is seldom we find that two worthy objectives can be fulfilled by means of one proposal. Such is the case, however, with respect to the proposal which has been presented to the Senate today.

By such a course, our Nation would be instilling a positive, humanitarian force into the world's ideological struggle.

Mr. President, let me digress long enough to say that I recall that several years ago the late and beloved Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, addressed the Senate on his proposal to devote some of the great resources of our country to the constructive paths of peace. At this time we have before us another proposal coming from a great liberal in American politics—in this case, a proposal to give new thought and new application to important procedures in international relations.

This proposal, if adopted, would enable us to seize the initiative in foreign policy, at a time when the whole world is tensely waiting to see who shall make the next move in the grim conflict between freedom and communism.

It would serve notice to the whole world that the United States is concerned with empty stomachs, not just with full cartridge belts.

Communism progresses on empty stomachs and frustrated spirits. Democracy marches forward on full stomachs and abiding faith, on hope and on opportunity.

The hope of communism consists of arousing starving people against their present misery; but the hope of democracy should be to offer such people a better alternative for eliminating such misery—a better future, where hunger and mass starvation need not exist.

In such a struggle, a million dollars for food might equal $10 million for ammunition.

Mr. President, let me say here that I notice that we in the Congress readily appropriate millions and billions of dollars for ammunition and other defense materiél which we need; but how difficult it is to get the Congress of the United States to use for purposes of peace what we have in abundance, which comes naturally from the American spirit and the American soil, namely, the food and the fiber which are ours. Here is a great stockpile, a great storehouse in our arsenal of democracy; and yet we hesitate to use it. The Senator from Montana has called upon the United States to dip into that arsenal and see to it that this precious ingredient, food, is used effectively in the struggle for freedom and for the benefit of people who today are being enticed and in many cases driven into the terrible trap of Communist enslavement.

Mr. President, I have just said that in such a struggle as the one in which we are now engaged, a million dollars for food might equal $10 million for ammunition.

So long as there are millions of empty stomachs in the world, we shall have to keep our cartridge belts full.

But full stomachs, we pray, can in time replace the full cartridge belts as our greatest defenders of democracy.

The proposal for creating an international food reserve offers us an opportunity to provide constructive leadership in that direction. Mr. President, I repeat that this is the hour, this is the time, for such a sound, practical, and dramatic proposal. Here is an opportunity for a freedom-loving America to extend the warm hand of humanitarian compassion, filled with the abundance of American production, to a suffering world.

The Senator from Montana has explained in detail the international food reserve proposal, and he has very capably outlined the domestic and international circumstances supporting such a course at this time.

Therefore, I wish to review only briefly its purposes, and to emphasize the significant contributions which I believe it can make, both as a forward-looking, positive, and humanitarian addition to our foreign policy, and as a logical and practical supplement to our domestic agricultural policy.

The joint resolution does not commit the Congress to any specific plan for an international food reserve, but it opens the door toward such a program by directing the United States representatives in the United Nations to initiate negotiations for such action through existing facilities of the United Nations and the Food and Agriculture Organization.

The specific plan and agreement which would be developed under the joint resolution would subsequently be presented to the Congress for approval.

But the joint resolution sets forth certain principles as guideposts for the negotiation of such an international agreement.

It recognizes that economic isolationism is as outmoded as political isolationism in the world of today. It provides for the creation and storage of international food reserves in a manner that will help to prevent extreme price fluctuations in the international market for agricultural products, thereby providing an incentive to keep production expanding to meet the world's pressing need for more food and clothing.

This proposal recognizes the tragic weaknesses of either international or domestic policies that permit accumulation and even destruction of unwanted food surpluses in one part of the world, while millions suffer the degradation of hunger and want elsewhere on earth.

Mr. President, I say that no Congress, no parliament of any free government in this kind of a world, dares destroy food which is needed by other people throughout the world, without suffering a great defeat psychologically, politically, socially, and morally. So it behooves our Nation, with its tremendous reserves of food, to see to it that they are used here at home and abroad. It is downright immoral to destroy the abundance which God has given us, while there is misery and starvation among millions of God's children throughout the earth.

The proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Montana which I am proud to cosponsor, provides that the international food reserve shall absorb temporary market surpluses of agricultural products, and use them where and when needed to prevent famine and starvation.

It recognizes the dollar shortage in many areas of the world as responsible for drastically restricted foreign markets for American farm products. This handicaps our farmers, as well as the consumers in other lands who want and need to share in our farm abundance. This proposal provides for the use of national currencies for the purchase of agricultural products from the international food reserve. These funds, though cooperation with the appropriate international lending, economic development, and technical assistance agencies, are then to be used for financing approved self-liquidating economic development programs within the country from which the funds originated.

I say again, Mr. President, that this is not a novel idea. The so-called counterpart funds under the program known as the Marshall plan, or the Economic Cooperation Administration, taught us valuable lessons in the use of national currencies for self-liquidating projects in the countries that were receiving assistance and help.

Increased amounts of national currencies would be channeled into such necessary economic development projects through food purchases, thus lessening the drain upon American dollars for the same purpose.

American food and fiber would be replacing American dollars as part of our contribution toward economic strength in the free world.

Such a policy makes good sense to most Americans, and, I am sure, to the American farmers; and it makes good sense for our friends and allies in other lands.

Within recent weeks I have several times called the attention of this body to the increasingly serious economic recession confronting American agriculture. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has further documented the downward slide of American farm prices and farm income, at a time when farm costs are remaining high, and the other segments of our economy are relatively prosperous. I noted, Mr. President, in a recent issue of the U. S. News & World Report an especially featured article on American agriculture which disclosed that the percentage of income for the American farmers in 1953 is estimated to be less than it was in 1932. I am not talking in terms of dollars; I am talking in terms of the percentage of the total national income. Years ago it used to be said that farmers did not live on income; they lived on lack of expense, on lack of overhead; but that is far from true today.

During 1951 farm-production expenses amounted to $92½ billion. That is almost three and a half times the total farm gross income of 1932. It is more than the total farm gross income in any year prior to 1943.

Fifty years ago, a farmer could operate for a long time at a loss if he had to. He could liquidate some capital investment to cover expenses for several years. But that is not possible for very many farmers today. Expenses are too high and too rigid. Falling farm-price levels

can quickly wreck a farmer today because of his fixed expenses for equipment, fertilizer, gasoline, insurance, and the like.

Because the farmer is more dependent on cash income today to meet his production costs his purchasing power has greater effect on the rest of the economy. If it is allowed to dwindle, it will all the more quickly drag the rest of the Nation into a depression. I call the especial attention to the statement that the farmer of today is a cash-income farmer, and when his cash income dwindles, it has an immediate—not a delayed but an immediate—effect upon the entire economy.

Perhaps not enough people realize the importance of the farm market for the products of city industry. Perhaps not even my fellow Senators realize that farmers use more steel in a year than goes into a year's output of passenger cars; that farmers use more petroleum than is used by any other industry; that they use enough raw rubber to put tires on 6,000,000 cars; and that they use enough electrical power to supply the great cities of Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston.

That is a brief picture of the stake the whole Nation has in a dependable price level for the products of American agriculture.

That is why many of us are so concerned, and are insisting that something constructive be done to strengthen farm prices and to insure agriculture of greater stability in the future. It is for this reason that I recently submitted a series of amendments to the basic Agricultural Act of 1949, to strengthen and expand our price-support program for both so-called storable and perishable commodities.

But we are met by negative complaints about "surpluses," implying farmers must turn off their spigots of production, their only means of making a livelihood. Let me say, Mr. President, that the farmer is a born producer, a natural producer. He likes to produce, and it appears to me that in this kind of world production is needed.

I have said before, and I repeat, that there can be no surplus of food or fiber so long as there are hungry and inadequately clothed people in the world.

Our job is to put our ability to produce to work for the good of all mankind, not hamstring it with new restrictions aimed at scarcity rather than abundance.

For the sake of our own economy and for the sake of a politically stable world, we must make our abundance available to those who need it, wherever they may be. That is what our proposal for an international food reserve would do; and it would do it on an economically sound and constructive basis. Our proposal is not filled merely with the spirit of charity; it is not merely the expression of a pious hope; it is not offered merely in the spirit of doing good, or of performing good deeds. It is backed up and supported by sound economic principles and premises. It would bridge the gap between our producers and the world's potential consumers now lacking buying power in American dollars. Mr. President, we know that that potential market exists. The Senator from Montana outlined that market in great detail.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in its 1952 edition of the State of Food and Agriculture: Review and Outlook, says that in terms of food supply "the world's need for more food has not yet begun to be met."

In the least developed and most heavily populated regions of the world where the mass of the world's population lives—

The FAO reports—

per capita food consumption levels are still substantially below already inadequate prewar averages. This situation is most acute in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I may say that the threat of international Communist aggression is most acute in southeast Asia. There is a strange but apparent corollary here. Wherever misery is found, wherever hunger, sickness, and malnutrition exist, communism will be found on the march. We ought to be able to catch on pretty soon and realize that something more has to be done about that situation than merely to wish them well and talk about democracy. They want food and fiber, they want opportunity to work.

Yet in the face of that need for food, United States agricultural exports dropped 15 percent on a dollar-value basis in the calendar year of 1952, according to a report issued this week by the Department of Agriculture's Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations.

Lack of American dollars, not lack of need or desire for our products, is mostly responsible for that sharp decline.

That is why an International Food Reserve is needed as a supplemental outlet for American farm products, permitting other nations to buy with their own currencies beyond what they can now buy with American dollars.

A week ago I introduced a bill to strengthen our farm price-support legislation, with particular emphasis upon greater protection for producers of perishable commodities. At that time I offered a number of suggestions for seeking new outlets for commodities such as dairy products now in temporary oversupply. I have been reading the articles and looking at the cartoons about the oversupply of butter. I submit there is no oversupply of butter; we have failed in the matter of distribution, that is all. There are millions and millions of people who are anxious for butter, and who are anxious to pay for butter, and our job is to see that it is distributed.

I mention also the development of international programs for making such food supplies available where they are most needed in the world.

If I may be pardoned for repeating, I said at that time:

It is to our own interest as a Nation, and it is in the interest of freedom and humanitarianism all over the world, that we begin to raise our sights and use some imagination so that our agricultural products can be effectively utilized, and our agricultural economy protected.

We should enter into international negotiations through the United Nations to extend the principles of the international wheat agreement, not only for wheat, but for other agricultural commodities. Millions in the world are undernourished and underfed, and can use the health-giving strength and life which American farmers produce in their fields.

The international food reserve proposed under this resolution would serve just such a purpose.

It would be the means of developing entirely new outlets for American farm products, in areas where those products are urgently needed.

Let us take dairy products, for an example. The Department of Agriculture's report indicates the most quantitatively significant reduction in farm exports in 1952 occurred in dairy products. As the exports went down, farm income went down; and as farm income goes down in a highly sensitive and expensive business such as dairy farming, farmers start to go broke. It is just that simple. One does not need to hold a college degree in economics in order to figure that out. He needs but two good eyes, and reasonable horse sense.

Lack of adequate refrigeration and distribution facilities deprives great masses of the world's people of the essential health-giving qualities of milk.

Yet progress of our food preservation industry in recent years has made possible the retention of all those same health qualities in dried whole milk, for which no refrigeration or distribution problems need exist.

While the market for dried whole milk is understandably limited in this country because of our high consumption of fresh fluid milk, there should be a tremendous potential market elsewhere in the world if we provide the means of making such supplies available.

Already, popular acceptance and use of our dried whole milk is greatly on the increase in Venezuela and other Latin American countries. There is no reason why a similar market for dried whole milk cannot be developed in many other countries of the world now lacking in adequate dairy supplies, or in facilities for distribution of such supplies in fresh form.

It should be obvious to see that, entirely aside from its beneficial impact on international good will, the international food reserve proposal makes good sense for American agriculture. And it makes good sense for farmers in other lands, too.

In our own country, we have learned the advantages of maintaining adequate reserves of storable products. We have learned that sound storage programs can narrow the speculative risk in agriculture, and increase stability of farm prices. We have learned further that adequate reserves accumulated in time of plenty add to our Nation's security by being available whenever crop failures or other emergencies might develop.

As a country we benefited greatly by having such reserves at the outbreak of World War II, and again at the start of the Korean conflict. They were our safeguard against shortages in a critical time of stepped-up demand. They have been the means of making our price-support programs effective for storable commodities.

Other countries, too, have recognized the importance of assuring farmers fair returns by adopting price-support devices of one type or another.

The one gap remaining in farm price-support programs here and elsewhere has been the relation of domestic policies to international trade.

The international food reserve offers a means of bridging that gap, and of strengthening our entire price-support program.

Just as storage of reserves on a national basis has increased stability of domestic farm prices, so can international reserves contribute to greater stability in the international market. And as long as world need remains ahead of world production, such international storage never needs to accumulate beyond a sound amount of safe reserves, such as sometimes threatens domestic storage programs having a more restricted potential outlet.

Therefore, my reasons for cosponsoring this resolution, however, go far beyond the tremendous benefits I feel it offers to American agriculture.

Among the masses of underprivileged people in many parts of the world who may eventually sway the balance between freedom and communism, a single, positive act of leadership toward a world of plenty will win more friends for democracy than all the armed might we could assemble.

I submit, Mr. President, that there are millions of persons in the poverty-stricken areas of the world who are fearful of our armed might. The Communist propaganda has portrayed America as being a nation of military power, of military aggression. Even though we know that to be false, they have so portrayed us. So I say, again, that a single positive act of leadership toward the world will win more friends for democracy than will all the armed might we can possibly assemble.

That is especially true today in the critical areas of southeast Asia.

If our foreign policy is ever to be successful in meeting the great challenge of our time, we must better understand the mind and heart of the Asia we hope to preserve among the world's free peoples.

India's great poet, Tagore, expressed most vividly the secret of winning the minds of Asians when he wrote—listen to these prophetic words:

> You do not open a lock with a hammer; you open it with a key devised for the lock.

Food, not force, is the key that fits Asia.

America, with its ability to produce food in abundance, can provide that key.

That is why, Mr. President, I am so vigorously supporting this joint resolution, and why I so quickly grasped at the opportunity to be a cosponsor of it with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and other Senators. It offers us a way to make a positive contribution toward permanent peace, while, at the same time, protecting the interests of American agriculture.

I commend this resolution to the attention of the Secretary of State, who says that our foreign policy must take on a new creative imagination. I also commend to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture this great international food reserve proposal.

America's heart is big. No nation has ever shown a more Christian approach of forgiveness to its former enemies. No nation has ever shown a more humanitarian spirit of responding to great disasters and emergencies among people of other lands. No nation was ever more desirous of having peace and prosperity shared throughout the world.

Yet the instincts of self-preservation warn us we must not ignore the welfare of our own people in the process of helping the world.

We should welcome, therefore, such an opportunity as this resolution offers to move forward toward the twin objectives of protecting our own economic security while making a new contribution toward a world of plenty.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I have listened with profound interest and complete approval to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and it is with great enthusiasm that I associate myself with those Senators and with other Senators on both sides of the aisle in introducing the joint resolution relating to the international food reserve.

The objectives of this proposal are of the highest order. The goal of eliminating the peaks and valleys from both the marketing and the consumption of agricultural products can be shared by people everywhere—American farmers, American families, farmers abroad, and families abroad.

Farmers do not like to produce crops that cannot be consumed or that will actually be wasted. They like to produce for useful purposes, and they like to produce abundantly. That is their very nature.

However, there is probably no one in the economic picture who has less control over his production than a farmer does. He does not know what price he will get for his commodity when he prepares the ground for it, when he buys the seed for it, when he plants or cultivates, when he harvests, when he loads his truck for market, or, frequently, even when he drives down the road to that market.

We, who are cosponsoring the joint resolution, have set our sights on a mutual system which would go far toward taking the wild uncertainties out of the volume of farm production, though, of course, many economic hazards will remain for farmers.

At the same time, we offer some assurance that the volume of food will never fall so low that famine will stalk the world, including, incidentally, our own part of the world. This, alone, would be one of the greatest contributions that could be made to the preservation of freedom in the United States and to the extension of freedom to other parts of the world. It would be one of the most effective notices that could be served on dictators and incipient dictators that they who would ride roughshod over large groups of people will not be able to use mass hunger as part of their evil machinations.

Mr. President, the measure introduced today is of great interest to the farmers of my State, both as responsible citizens of this Nation and as producers of crops which might be exported for purposes of an international food reserve. The people who live on the 230,000 farms in Missouri make up more than one-fifth, or 21.8 percent, of our State's population.

In recent years, these farmers have been producing an average of about 400,000 bales of cotton and 25 million bushels of wheat—to mention only two very important export crops.

Missouri farmers, like farmers everywhere, are interested in stabilizing their production and stabilizing their prices. And they are vitally interested in an economy of abundance—they want to keep on producing at high levels.

But aside from the personal economics of our farmers, they are also interested in the altrusim of an international food reserve. They will gladly strike a blow against the disaster of famine, though that disaster threaten half way around the world. They will gladly join in a conscientious effort to improve the diets of people everywhere and to supply a standard of clothing for warmth and protection which goes along with personal dignity of human beings, and should go along with the abundance with which this world of ours is endowed.

I sincerely hope that the administration will approach this age-old problem in the same spirit in which this joint resolution has been sponsored today, and that negotiations may be entered into very soon to meet the challenge of scarcity and abundance existing side by side in the world.

PROPOSED ELECTION OF A DELEGATE FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 697) to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Senate bill 697, to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives, comes before the Senate today with the unanimous support of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill was presented to the public in hearings which were conducted in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building on the night of Friday, February 27, 1953, the night hearing having been a rather unusual procedure. Some 200 people from the District of Columbia were present. Thirty of them made statements, and letters received from others were filed for the record. I recall only two persons who spoke in opposition to the bill. In both cases they said they really wanted the bill to go further, and it was because they felt passage of the bill might interfere with going further that they spoke as they did. In general, the sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of taking at least this one step toward giving the people who live in the District of Columbia some voice in the legislation which controls the government under which they live.

This bill has been introduced by myself and by the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY],

who was formerly chairman of the Committe on the District of Columbia, and is in keeping with a bill which we introduced in the 82d Congress and also with a portion of the so-called home-rule bill which was passed by the Senate in the 82d Congress.

The bill which has been introduced in this Congress providing for a locally elected council for the District of Columbia, and on which hearings have not been held, also includes a proposal for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who was here a few moments ago, and was temporarily called from the floor, but who I hope will be able to return soon, asked me to make clear, if he had not returned when I began my statement on the bill, that he is wholeheartedly in support of the bill. He feels it is a necessary first step toward giving the people of the District of Columbia an effective voice in their government.

The persons who appeared at the hearing in support of the bill included all three of the present Commissioners of the District of Columbia, namely, the Honorable F. Joseph Donohue, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners; the Honorable Renah F. Camalier; and Brig. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss, the Engineer Commissioner for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Vernon West, Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia, made suggestions dealing with technical portions of the bill, and practically all of his suggestions were incorporated in an amendment which will be offered when the time comes for consideration of amendments to the bill.

Among others who spoke in behalf of the bill were Mr. Carl Shipley, president of the Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia, and Mr. Sturgis Warner, who I might say has been very active in support of proposed home-rule legislation. He expressed his views with respect to this bill, and said that while he also feared the bill might interfere with consideration of a larger home-rule bill, nevertheless, if this was one step that could be taken toward home rule, he felt it should be taken.

The following persons were also in attendance at the hearing:

Mr. Gilbert Hahn, Jr., chairman of the political planning committee, Young Republican Club of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Peter Beter, president of the Southwest Citizens Association.

Mr. Joseph A. Kaufmann, president of the Federation of Citizens' Associations.

Mr. Austin L. Fickling, chairman of the suffrage committee, Federation of Civic Associations.

Mr. Herbert P. Leeman, president of the Central Suffrage Conference.

Mr. President, I wish to digress for a moment to say that the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia has returned to the Chamber. I hope he will speak for himself in a few moments, but I wished to call attention to the fact that he is interested in the bill, and is now on the floor.

Other persons in attendance at the hearing were Miss Cornelia Hill, chairman of national representations, Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. Glenn Watts, president of the CIO Industrial Council of the District of Columbia.

Mr. William Smull, representing Americans for Democratic Action.

Mrs. George Malloy, cochairman of the home rule subcommittee, League of Women Voters, of the District of Columbia.

Miss Gertrude Longden, representing the American Association of University Women.

Mr. Rufus Lusk, president of the Taxpayers' Association.

Mr. Culver B. Chamberlain, representing the Central Democratic Committee of the District of Columbia.

Mrs. Jack Gottsegen, legislative chairman, Washington section, National Council of Jewish Women.

Bernard Tassler, representing the Citizens Nationwide Committee for the District of Columbia.

Paul Silvestre, representing the American Veterans Committee.

Mrs. Christopher T. Bever, second vice president, Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice.

Two others who appeared voiced the feeling that the bill should go further than it does, and asked for complete home rule for the District. They did not want to accept this single step. I refer to Mr. Stanley G. Karson, president of the Young Democratic Club of the District of Columbia, and Mr. Joel D. Blackwell, representing the Washington Bar Association. Mr. Blackwell said that his position was that he thought the bill ought not to be passed, because it might interfere with the consideration of a larger bill.

The provisions of the bill contemplate the election of a Delegate who would be comparable in all respects to a Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii or the Territory of Alaska. He would have the privilege of speaking on the floor of the House of Representatives, of serving on its committees, and of appearing before its committees. He would have the privilege of offering amendments to bills as they might come up in the House of Representatives.

Question was raised during the hearings on the bill as to whether or not he would have any privileges on the floor of the Senate. Under the custom of the Senate he would be entitled to visit the floor of the Senate and to confer with Members of the Senate, as do Delegates from the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska. Of course, he would not be permitted to speak on the floor of the Senate, not being a Member of or accredited to the Senate.

He would be elected for a term comparable in all respects with those of Members of the House of Representatives, and would receive the same salary and have the same perquisites as a Member of the House of Representatives.

In order that the Delegate might be elected, the bill provides for the creation of a Board of Elections, to consist of three members, who would be designated by the President of the United States. They would be appointed for terms of 3 years, except for that provision of the bill which provides for staggering the terms.

The Board would establish and maintain a permanent registry, conduct registrations and elections, print, distribute, and count ballots, and also divide the District into appropriate voting precincts, each of which would contain at least 350 registered persons.

The Board would operate the polling places, certify nominees and the results of elections, and perform such other duties as might be imposed upon it by the act. The Board would be an independent agency, and should not be subject to the direction of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

There is a provision that the person elected should receive a majority of the votes cast, and in case he did not receive such majority, there is provision for a runoff election. In the case of a contest or a recount, appeal could be taken to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to review an election. The decision of that court would be final and not appealable, under an amendment which was proposed during the hearing, and which it is proposed to offer.

I think that completes the statement on the bill. I am glad to yield the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the District Committee for this bill, because, in my opinion, it constitutes a very important forward step toward bringing to an end what I think we must recognize as a form of second-class citizenship which exists in the District of Columbia.

I have always felt that it was a matter of great national regret that fellow Americans living in the District of Columbia were not entitled to full voting citizenship.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was about to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon whether or not he proposed to offer certain amendments. Did I correctly understand him to say that he intended to offer some amendments?

Mr. MORSE. No; I did not say that. I intend to offer one amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the amendment printed?

Mr. MORSE. It is at the desk. It has not been printed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator mind having the clerk read the amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I will tell the Senator what it is. I propose to discuss it at some length, though not at too great length. I shall explain the amendment. It provides that the number of petitioners required for a nomination be 500 instead of 1,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, coming back to my comment on the bill, I think it is a matter of great national regret

that fellow Americans residing in the District of Columbia have not been entitled to full voting citizenship. However, as a realist, I recognize that we are dealing here with a problem which cannot be solved all at once. I believe we are making progress toward its solution.

I repeat that, in my judgment, the District Committee is to be highly commended for this bill. I hope it will pass. In any event, I believe that its very consideration is an important medium for spreading the information throughout America that fellow Americans here in the District of Columbia are discriminated against.

I fully understand the historical cause for the discrimination, but I never have been able to accept any justification for it. I believe we ought to pass this kind of legislation, but we should not stop with it.

I do not share the views of those to whom the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia referred, who appeared at the hearings and stated that they felt that this bill might serve as a handicap to the passage of a broader bill for home rule. To the contrary, I think every step we make in the direction of home rule is all to the good; and I believe that the education of public opinion which will result from the passage of this bill, if we succeed in passing it through the Congress and obtain executive approval of the bill, will have a very beneficial effect.

I have two comments to make on the bill, though not by way of criticism. I make the comments by way of constructive suggestion; at least, that is my motivation. On page 9 of the bill, lines 17 and 18, in the committee amendment, I believe that the words "one thousand" should be stricken and the words "five hundred" should be substituted. I have such an amendment at the desk and in due course will offer it. However, I thought we might proceed with the committee amendments first, and that I could offer my amendment when we reach the particular committee amendment to which my amendment applies.

As the representative of the Independent Party in the Senate, I was elated when I read what I consider to be the exceedingly fair and nonpartisan procedure for nominating candidates for delegate from the District of Columbia. I thought for a moment that I was back home. I come from a State which, in my judgment—if I may be permitted a modest expression of pride in my State—has the soundest election laws of any State in the Union when it comes to nominating candidates for the Congress of the United States. In my State the people, not the political machines, do the nominating. In my State the people, not the political parties, make the choice in the first instance as to who is to run for the House and for the Senate. In my State the nominations are open to all. Anyone may present a program to the people of the State of Oregon and on the basis of that program announce his candidacy. I am not so unrealistic to be unaware of the fact that political forces in the form of political parties play their part in my State, but the people have reserved to themselves a very sound check upon political forces and political parties. In my State, Mr. President, an independent can run for the United States Senate if 250 of his fellow citizens in convention assembled endorse him by petition.

Therefore, being firmly convinced that such a kind of freedom for the electors is good for democracy, it is not surprising that I suggest on the floor of the Senate today that the nominating procedure proposed in the bill be modified with respect to the number required to nominate, by requiring 500 petitioners instead of 1,000 petitioners. If in my State in a race for the United States Senate it is good procedure, as I insist it is, to make it possible for 250 persons to nominate an independent as a candidate for the United States Senate, I think it is reasonable to suggest that in the pending bill we provide for 500 instead of 1,000 petitioners.

Yes, Mr. President, I believe it ought to be made easy for free Americans to run for office, and that it is wise to have election procedures which encourage men to be free when they run for office. I recognize that there ought to be some check, in the nature of a so-called seconding of the motion, if you will, Mr. President, to provide assurance that irresponsible people will not run for office.

We all know that in America we must be on guard against so-called irresponsibility. However, I submit that when 500 residents of the District—it is only 250 in my State—second the motion, so to speak, of the candidacy of an individual, he ought to have the right to make the race. I want to be reasonable. It seems to me that a requirement of 500 petitioners would not be unreasonable. I believe that 1,000 is too large a number to require. A man without any political experience at all and without widespread contacts in the District, but a fine and able man nevertheless, might find it difficult at first to get 1,000 people to petition that he be allowed to run for the office, but not nearly so difficult to get 500. Once such a person becomes known and once the program for which he stands becomes understood and appreciated, he would of course have little difficulty in getting a much larger number of people to sign a petition for his nomination.

The point I am making is that we should have a check, of course, against irresponsibility, but that we should not place the number required for the filing of a petition so high that it would make it difficult for a man not well known, but nevertheless highly qualified, to make the race.

With respect to the nominating procedure, I wish to say that the committee is also to be highly commended for the nonpartisanship of the procedure itself. Party politics are not read into the language of this bill, and it is very gratifying to have a bill, dealing with a problem so difficult as this one is anyway, so completely stripped of partisanship. I compliment the committee for what I consider to be a very fine job.

Mr. President, with respect to another point, I do not yet have an amendment prepared on it, and I may wish to give it further thought after I have listened to the chairman of the committee. I may offer the amendment later. I know that a procedural rule exists in some States in regard to requiring a runoff when one receives only a plurality. I believe it is an unwise rule, Mr. President, although I would not vote against the bill with the provision retained, because I recognize there is another side to it. However, in my judgment, the merits of the argument are on the side of a procedure that does not require the plurality rule. I think it would be a stronger bill if it were to provide that the individual receiving the highest vote in the election shall be declared the delegate.

Runoffs are costly and wasteful, and they are subject to an abuse that we need to be on guard against in American elections. Runoffs encourage alinements and backstage deals, and political combinations, and logrolling tactics which do not always lend themselves to purity of politics. Let the voters decide in one election, and let the decision be based upon the principle that the man receiving the largest number of votes is elected the delegate, rather than putting the District through a so-called second or runoff election which might be subject—the procedure, at least, would be subject—to political manipulations which I believe justify my saying that the merits of the argument are in favor of one election, with a high man winning.

I have not researched the problem sufficiently to give to the Senate this afternoon the actual statistics on the subject. I am aware of the fact that the election laws of some States require a runoff. It is my guess that in most States in elections to the Senate and to the House runoffs are not required. However, even if I were wrong statistically I would be moved to say that I believe the better procedure would be to have only one election.

In a nonpartisan election, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents will not necessarily run on a party ticket under this bill. Of course I can understand that when dealing with a party primary, a stronger argument for majority rule might be made; but even in that case I believe the plurality rule is the better one.

In inaugurating this procedure, I believe it would be much better to permit of a plurality, rather than a majority. Yet I say quite frankly, Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to maintain an open mind on this plan until I hear from the authors of the bill, because probably there have been brought out in the committee hearings a great deal of information and much evidence which buttress the committee's recommendations; and I favor raising as little controversy as possible over this bill, for I believe it to be highly desirable that the objective of the bill be enacted into law as quickly as possible.

Mr. President, I close by expressing the hope that after the passage of this bill, in the not-too-distant future, the Committee on the District of Columbia will see fit to call for hearings on Senate bill 534, which I believe is the appropriate next step toward the elimination of second-class citizenship in the District of Columbia—namely, my bill which

seeks to outlaw any discrimination because of race, color, or creed in any public places in the District of Columbia.

That is all I wish to say about the bill at the present time, Mr. President, other than to express again to the chairman of the committee and to the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] my highest commendation for what I believe is a notable piece of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee to Senate bill 697.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia was, on page 2, in line 19, after the word "old", to strike out "and"; and in line 20, after the word "public" to strike out "office" and insert "office, and (5) is domiciled in the District for 3 years next before the day of his taking office."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at this point for a question? It may have been answered in the previous debate.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Delegate to be assigned to committees in the House of Representatives under the same process by means of which the Delegates from Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska are presently assigned to House committees?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the bill contain any provision as to which party shall assign to committees the nonpartisan Delegate?

Mr. CASE. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was prompted to ask that question because of seeing on the floor at this time my friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. I think the Delegate will be an Independent. [Laughter].

Mr. CASE. I believe the procedure in the House of Representatives would be to permit the Delegate to select the committees on which he wished to serve. That has been the custom in the House of Representatives. The committee felt that we should not try to write such a provision for the House of Representatives. So we believe we should permit the House to proceed in its own way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is true that that has been the custom in the House of Representatives. However, suppose one of the House committees decided to turn down the Delegate's request to serve on it?

Mr. CASE. It is true that the Delegate would not vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That situation might cause some trouble in connection with the assignment to committees.

Mr. CASE. Conceivably it could. However, it was our feeling that, after all, that is an internal matter of the House of Representatives, and that since the Senate is passing the bill first, we should permit the House of Representatives to determine that point for itself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, it is understood that the new Delegate's committee responsibilities will be similar and parallel to those of the Delegates from Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico; is that correct?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 4, in line 15, after the word "he", to strike out "is a qualified elector" and insert "can qualify as an elector."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, with respect to the committee amendment, as printed on page 4, in line 15, of the bill, I wish to suggest that instead of having the amendment at that point read "can qualify as an elector", it should read "qualifies as an elector." If there is no objection, I should like to have the amendment submitted in that form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as proposed to be modified will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 4, in line 15, it is proposed to strike out "can qualify as an elector" and to insert "qualifies as an elector."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed modification of the committee amendment will be made.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 4, in line 21, after the word "be", to strike out "registered."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 15, after the word "Board", to insert "as are available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 3, after the word "Columbia" and the period, to insert "The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 17, after the word "than", to strike out "one hundred" and insert "one thousand."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have submitted an amendment to this committee amendment, and I ask that my amendment to it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 9, beginning in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "one thousand" and insert "five hundred."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have consulted with two or three other members of the committee, and I believe there is no objection to accepting the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

In explanation, I may state that at the hearing there was some thought that the number 100, as originally provided by the bill, was too small, and would create a number of more or less "nuisance candidates" or candidates who had no substantial backing. We thought the number provided in the bill should be greater than 100. Someone suggested that the proper number would be 1,000. However, I do not think the exact number is a material matter. Five hundred is better than one hundred, and the committee is willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 12, after the word "prescribed" and the period, to insert "The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 16, after the word "is", to strike out "one year" and insert "six months."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would appreciate it very much if the chairman of the committee would give us the benefit of the discussion which occurred in the committee in regard to the plurality question in connection with run-off elections. I have already expressed my views about that matter, but I may be wrong about it. So I should like to hear from the committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, my personal belief is that the point the junior Senator from Oregon has raised is a good one. In other words, the question is whether the District of Columbia should be put to the expense of having a runoff election in case no candidate receives a majority.

There was a discussion of that question among some of us, informally, if not at some length, at the hearings. Personally, speaking wholly from my own standpoint, I would be satisfied if the bill provided that if the candidate who received the greatest number of votes received at least 40 percent of the votes cast, he would be the Delegate; and if no candidate received at least 40 percent of the votes, there would be a runoff election.

However, in discussing that matter, I did not receive very much support from other members of the committee. So, rather than try to carry through that point alone and make a fight for it alone, I accepted the language which now is in the bill.

If the Senator from Oregon feels particularly strongly about the matter, in view of my personal feelings about it, I would not have much objection to the adoption of his suggestion, provided the

result would not be to create a situation in which there would be a number of so-called splinter-party candidates, bringing about the consequence that the Delegate for the District of Columbia would be someone who would not represent a substantial group of persons in the District of Columbia.

In the committee as a whole there was a feeling that we should begin by requiring for election a majority of the votes cast. So I would not feel authorized to accept at this time, in the name of the committee, any amendment.

Of course, this matter might be further discussed here and then discussed with the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives after the bill passes the House of Representatives.

Mr. MORSE. The bill has not yet passed the House of Representatives, has it?

Mr. CASE. No.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the fact that the bill has yet to pass the House of Representatives, and in view of the fact that we have made our legislative record on this question, and because my greatest desire is to see the principle of this bill enacted into law, I shall not submit an amendment on this point. I would much prefer to have the bill embody the suggestion which has been made by the Senator from South Dakota about the 40-percent rule. I believe the Senator from South Dakota is quite correct in saying that certainly we desire to have elected from the District of Columbia a Delegate who represents a substantial body of the District of Columbia electorate, and certainly we wish to avoid what the Senator from South Dakota describes as splinter-party candidates.

On the other hand, if we find that my fears materialize with experience under this election procedure, we can always make a change in the future. So I shall not offer an amendment.

I hope the suggestion which has been made will receive consideration in the House of Representatives and that it may be worked out satisfactorily in conference.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I assure the Senator from Oregon that, personally, I shall see to it that this discussion is brought to the attention of the House committee, and I shall present to it my personal views with regard to the 40-percent proposal

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 697) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. NEELY obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to be sure. Did I catch the ruling of the Chair, that the bill is passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The bill had been read the third time. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, as a drowning man would desperately grasp a straw so I shall vote for the pending bill to provide for the election of a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives. But let us not delude ourselves into believing that this measure is even a shadow of a substitute for home rule for the voiceless, voteless, disfavored people of the District of Columbia, or that it is a satisfactory substitute for full representation for the District in the Congress of the United States. The bill has my support on the theory that it is better for one to have even a small part of a loaf than to be utterly destitute of bread.

The herculean task of obtaining either home rule or congressional representation for the people of Washington, unhappily, constitutes no exception to the rule that—

Heaven is not reached at a single bound;
But we build the ladder by which we rise
From the lowly earth to the vaulted skies,
And we mount to its summit round by round.

To pass the pending bill will be to take the first round of the ladder on which we shall ultimately rise to the lofty consummation of enfranchising the men and women of the District of Columbia. We shall thus demonstrate to the world that the unjust, un-American practice of depriving the residents of the Nation's Capital of the right to vote, govern themselves, and enjoy the democratic blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness has been abandoned forever. The bill, if passed, would undoubtedly facilitate the achievement of full congressional representation. Manifestly, a competent Delegate, with the privilege of speaking in the House, would be able to arouse the Nation to demand with the voice of the archangel that a million praiseworthy patriots of the District be delivered from the infamy of taxation without representation—the identical infamy which impelled our ancestors to fight and win the Revolutionary War.

Our ascension to the first governmental round on the ladder that leads to democracy for the District will provide the Voice of America a new weapon with which to combat Communistic propaganda against us. It will enable us to refute the devastating charge that the United States, while spending countless billions in money and sacrificing countless thousands of American lives to procure or preserve representative government for Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea, infamously imposes upon the residents of its own Capital a hundred-million-dollar-a-year burden of taxation without representation and cruelly deprives them not only of self-government but also of the elementary democratic right to vote.

The passage of the bill by the unanimous vote of the Senate will clearly indicate that we no longer justify the taunting interrogatory—

What boots it at one gate to make defense
And at another to let in the foe?

Such unanimous action would conclusively demonstrate that liberty and justice for all the American people are at last marching to victory on Capitol Hill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of Senate bill 697, as amended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I dislike to take the time to do what I am about to suggest, but I think it wise to do so. I do not believe the Senate ought to pass this bill with so few Senators on the Senate floor as are here now, because the country ought to know that this bill really had the backing of the Senate. I should not like to afford to some newspaper commentator the opportunity to write a column to the effect that only about 10 or 20 Senators were on the floor when a bill so important as this one was before the Senate for a vote. I think it would strengthen the acceptance of this bill, even if it is passed on a voice vote, to have a larger attendance than is now on the floor. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McCarthy
Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Barrett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Beall	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Bush	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kuchel	Stennis
Eastland	Langer	Symington
Ferguson	Lehman	Taft
Flanders	Long	Thye
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Malone	Welker
George	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	Young
Gore	Maybank	
Green	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 697) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "qualified elector" means a citizen of the United States (A) who has been domiciled in the District continuously

since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day of the next election or, if such period has not begun, is domiciled in the District; (B) who is, or will be on the day of the next election, 21 years old; (C) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned; and (D) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(3) The term "Delegate" means the Delegate from the District of Columbia provided for by section 2.

(4) The term "Board" means the Board of Elections for the District of Columbia provided for by section 3.

DELEGATE

SEC. 2. (a) The people of the District shall be represented in the House of Representatives of the United States by a Delegate, to be known as the Delegate from the District of Columbia, who shall be elected as provided in this act. The Delegate shall have a seat in the House of Representatives, with the right of debate, but not of voting.

(b) No person shall hold the office of Delegate unless he (1) is a qualified elector, (2) resides in the District, (3) is at least 25 years old, (4) holds no other public office, and (5) is domiciled in the District for 3 years next before the day of his taking office. The term of office of Delegate shall be 2 years beginning at noon on January 3 of each odd-numbered year after 1963.

(c) (1) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 601 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby amended by striking out "from the Territories."

(2) Paragraph (10) of section 3A of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 693–1), is hereby amended by striking out "from a Territory."

(3) The second paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives" in the act of July 16, 1914 (2 U. S. C., sec. 37), is hereby amended by striking out "from Territories."

(4) Paragraph (i) of section 302 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended (2 U. S. C., sec. 241), is hereby amended by inserting after "United States" the following: "and the District of Columbia."

(5) Section 591 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting "and the District of Columbia" before the period at the end thereof. Section 594 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "Territories and Possessions" the following: "or the District of Columbia". The first paragraph of section 595 of such title is hereby amended by inserting after "from any Territory or Possession" the following: "or the District of Columbia."

CREATION OF BOARD OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Board of Elections for the District of Columbia, to be composed of three members appointed by the President of the United States. The first terms of offices on the Board shall expire, as designated by the President, one at the close of December 31 of each of the first 3 years which begin after the date this act is enacted. Subsequent terms of each such office shall be 3 years beginning January 1 following the expiration of the preceding term of such office. Any person appointed to fill a vacant office shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such office. Until his successor is appointed and has qualified, a member may continue to serve even though the term of the office to which he was appointed has expired.

QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 4. (a) No person shall be a member of the Board unless he qualifies as an elector and resides in the District. No person may be appointed to the Board unless he has been domiciled in the District continuously since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day he is appointed. Members of the Board shall hold no other office or employment in the District government. Not more than two members shall be members of the same political party.

(b) Each member of the Board shall be paid compensation at the rate of $15 per day while performing duties under this act. Except as provided in subsection (a) no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the Board because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source. The right to another office or position or to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be abridged by the fact of his service or receipt of compensation as a member of the Board, if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in such other office or position.

FUNCTIONS OF BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall—

(1) maintain a permanent registry, keeping it accurate and current;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) print, distribute, and count ballots, or provide and operate suitable voting machines;

(4) divide the District into appropriate voting precincts, each of which shall contain at least 350 registered persons;

(5) operate polling places;

(6) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(7) perform such other duties as are imposed upon it by this act.

(b) The Board, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 8 and 9. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(c) The Board may prescribe such regulations as it considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(d) The Board may employ necessary personnel.

BOARD TO BE INDEPENDENT AGENCY

SEC. 6. (a) In the performance of its duties, the Board shall not be subject to the direction of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(b) The officers and agencies of the District government shall furnish to the Board, upon request of the Board, as are available such space and facilities in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable the Board properly to perform its functions.

DELEGATE AND RUNOFF ELECTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) A delegate election shall be held in each even-numbered year to fill the office of Delegate for the term beginning on the following January 3. If any candidate receives a majority of the votes cast in a delegate election, he shall fill the office of Delegate. If no candidate receives a majority of the votes so cast, a runoff election shall be held in which the candidates shall be the two candidates who received the most votes so cast. The candidate who receives a majority of the votes cast in a runoff election shall fill the office of Delegate.

(b) Runoff elections shall be held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November. Delegate elections shall be held in October on the fourth Tuesday before the Tuesday in November prescribed for runoff elections.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 8. (a) No person shall vote in any election in the District unless he is a qualified elector and, except as provided in subsection (e), is registered in the District.

(b) No person shall be registered unless—

(1) he is a qualified elector;

(2) he has been domiciled in the District continuously since the beginning of the 9-month period ending on the day he offers to register;

(3) except as prevented by physical disability, he can read and write the English language, as shown by his ability to read and complete the affidavit prescribed by paragraph (4); and

(4) he executes a registration affidavit, completed in his own handwriting (unless prevented by physical disability) and on the form prescribed by the Board pursuant to subsection (c), showing that he meets each of the requirements specified in section 1 (2) for a qualified elector and that he meets the requirement of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(c) In administering the provisions of subsection (b) (4), the Board shall prepare and use a registration affidavit form in which each request for information is readily understandable and can be satisfied by a concise answer or mark. With respect to each requirement named in or imposed by such subsection, the Board may make such requests for specific information as in its judgment may be necessary or appropriate to show whether a person seeking to register meets such requirement.

(d) The registry shall be kept open except during the 60-day period ending on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of each even-numbered year, and except as provided by the Board in the case of a special election. While the registry is open, any person may apply for registration or change his registration.

(e) If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board, but not later than 3 days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged elector is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied, the appellant may, within 3 days after such denial, appeal to the municipal court for the District of Columbia. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged elector may cast a ballot marked "challenged," as provided in section 11 (e).

NOMINATIONS

SEC. 9. (a) The candidates at a delegate election shall be the persons registered under section 8 who have been nominated by a petition—

(1) prepared and presented to the Board in accordance with rules prescribed by the Board, but not later than 60 days before the date of the election;

(2) signed by not less than 500 persons registered under section 8; and

(3) accompanied by a filing fee of $125 and an affidavit executed by the person proposed to be nominated stating that he resides and is domiciled in the District.

(b) All filing fees shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District.

EXEMPTION FROM HATCH ACT

SEC. 10. The last sentence of section 9 (a) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 118i), is amended to read as follows: "The provisions of the second sentence of this subsection shall not apply (1) to the employees of the Alaska Railroad, residing in municipalities on the line of the railroad, in respect to activities involving the muncipality in which they reside, or (2) to any qualified elector of the District of Columbia, in respect to taking an active part in the nomination or election of a candidate for the office of Delegate

from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives."

METHOD OF VOTING

SEC. 11. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret. Voting may be by paper ballot or voting machine.

(b) The ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(c) There shall be no absentee voting.

(d) Each qualified candidate may have a watcher at each polling place, provided the watcher presents proper credentials signed by the candidate. No one shall interfere with the opportunity of a watcher to observe the conduct of the election at that polling place and the counting of votes. Watchers may challenge prospective voters who are believed to be unqualified to vote.

(e) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any such challenge or acting on his own initiative with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is unqualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged". Ballots so cast shall be segregated, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (f).

(f) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenged ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board within 3 days after election day. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(g) If a voter is physically unable to mark his ballot or operate the voting machine, the official in charge of the voting place may enter the voting booth with him and vote as directed. Upon the request of any such voter, a second election official may enter the voting booth to assist in the voting. The officials shall tell no one how the voter voted. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(h) No person shall vote more than once in any election.

(i) Copies of the regulations of the Board with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

RECOUNTS AND CONTESTS

SEC. 12. (a) If, within 7 days after the Board certifies the results of an election, any qualified candidate at such election petitions the Board to have the votes cast at such election recounted in one or more voting precincts, the Board shall order such recount. In each such case, the petitioner shall deposit a fee of $5 for each precinct petition to be recounted. If the cost of the recount is less than $5 per precinct, the difference shall be refunded. If the result of the election is changed as a result of the recount, the entire amount deposited by the petitioner shall be refunded. Such recounts shall be conducted in the manner prescribed by the Board by regulation.

(b) After the Board certifies the results of an election, any person who voted in the election may petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to review such election. In response to such a petition, the court may set aside the results so certified and declare the true results of the election, or void the election. To determine the true results of an election the court may order a recount or take other appropriate action, whether or not a recount has been conducted or requested pursuant to subsection (a). The court shall void an election only for fraud, mistake, or other defect, serious enough to vitiate the election as a fair expression of the will of the registered qualified electors voting therein. If the court voids an election it may order a special election, which shall be conducted in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for regular elections), and at such time, as the Board shall prescribe. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable.

SPECIAL ELECTIONS

SEC. 13. (a) If the office of Delegate becomes vacant at a time when the unexpired term of such office is 6 months or more, a special election and, if necessary, a runoff election shall be held, at such time as the President shall direct, and in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for elections held under section 7) as the Board of Elections shall prescribe.

(b) If a court orders a special election under section 12, it shall be conducted in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for the election which was voided), and at such time, as the Board shall prescribe.

INTERFERENCE WITH REGISTRATION OR VOTING

SEC. 14. (a) No one shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law. No person performing such a duty shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person because of his race, color, sex, or religious belief, or his want of property or income.

(b) No registered voter shall be required to perform a military duty on election day which would prevent him from voting, except in time of war or public danger or unless he is away from the District in military service. No registered voter may be arrested while voting or going to vote except for a breach of the peace then committed or for treason or felony.

VIOLATIONS

SEC. 15. Whoever willfully violates any provision of this act, or of any regulation prescribed and published by the Board under authority of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both.

COTTON PRODUCTION IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I have a committee meeting to attend, I should like at this time to make a brief statement. This morning, my colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and I sent to the office of each of the Senators a sample of cotton produced within the State of California. I am sure that, were it not for the fact that my distinguished colleague is now presiding over the Senate of the United States, he would want to join in a few remarks dealing with this subject.

The record of cotton production in California over the past three decades shows a rapid and steady growth. As a result the cotton industry in California has become increasingly important in the economy of California and also of the Nation. Most of the linf cotton produced in California is shipped out of the State to foreign countries and to our domestic mills located, for the most part, in the eastern part of the United States. The cottonseed produced in California furnishes raw materials for the upholstery, beddings, chemical, and edible vegetable oil industries of the United States.

In 1920, California produced 67,000 bales of cotton—500-pound bales. By 1930, California cotton production had increased to 264,000 bales and in 1952 it is estimated at 1,825,000 bales. This remarkable growth has lifted California from the 13th ranking cotton producing State in 1920 to the second largest in 1951. Only Texas produced more cotton than California in 1951. In 1920, California's production was only 0.5 percent of the Nation's cotton crop, but in 1951 California is estimated to have produced 12 percent of the United States crop.

In 1920, cotton and cottonseed production in California was valued at $5.1 million; in 1930 the value was $15.3 million; $37.5 million in 1940; and $400.6 million in 1951. In about three decades the value of the California cotton crop increased to 78 times its 1920 value.

This tremendous increase has meant more money for California consumers and industry. It also means that cotton production has become an important source of the State's farm income. In 1930, the value of the cotton crop was 2 percent of California's farm income, but in 1951 it had increased to 15 percent.

In 1952, cotton was grown on 1,407,000 California acres. This was the largest cotton acreage in California on record, 9 times the acreage in 1920; 5 times the 1930 acreage and 4 times the acreage in 1940. These figures indicate that acreage in California has not increased as much as cotton production.

The figures on the output per acre also have been rising steadily over the past three decades. The yield per harvested acre has tripled, increasing from 212 pounds in 1920 to 640 pounds in 1951. By contrast, the United States average yield per acre increased only 45 percent over the same period from 187 to 272 pounds. For the 29 crops since 1923, California has shown either the highest or second highest average yield per acre of any cotton producing State. Although Arizona had the highest average yield for the past 5 crops, California has ranked highest for 21 of the 29 crops.

These figures indicate that the growth in California's cotton production reflects an efficient utilization of resources. This efficiency of the California cotton producer indicates that California will continue to be one of the country's most important cotton-producing States for many years to come.

Credit for this great progress in California's cotton production goes to all those cooperators in the breeding of cotton, the distribution and sale of uniform seed to maintain the entire State as a one-variety community, the production of cotton on increased acreage with modern methods of cultivation and harvesting, the ginning of cotton with the most improved types of ginning equipment, the crushing of seed for the production of food for man and feed for livestock, and the merchandizing of the finished products here at home and abroad.

Through advanced breeding programs implemented by effective planting seed the quality of the cotton has been raised to recognized superiority in fiber and high yield. Good reserves of seed are maintained at all times for uniformity of production results. California engineers and producers of cotton have gone farther than those in any other State in mechanizing the harvesting of cotton. About two-thirds of the California crop is now harvested mechanically. In this, the State leads all others.

I believe that California also has probably made greater advancement than most other States in the modernization of ginning equipment. Many new modern gins have been installed to facilitate the ginning of the crop as rapidly as it is mechanically harvested.

Crushing plants are most efficient. Long trains carry the cotton for the manufacture of quality textiles in the Carolinas and New England. Large ships carry the cotton for export from Pacific ports to Europe and Asia.

Men speak of the discovery of gold in California. There is another type of gold that has been discovered here in the production of agricultural commodities—and notably in recent years in the production of cotton. Some people assert that the State's agricultural wealth which is produced year after year with no evidence of cessation may exceed all of the discoveries of gold. I am told that in recent years the farm income from cotton alone has exceeded that of any other crop produced in the State.

In reviewing the production of cotton by counties in 1951, I was pleased to learn that of the first 5 cotton-producing counties in the United States, California occupied 3 of the 5 places. The counties were: Kern, Calif., 497,000 bales; Fresno, Calif., 487,150 bales; Maricopa, Ariz., 335,250 bales; Pinal, Ariz., 316,940 bales; Tulare, Calif., 309,150 bales. Cotton truly has moved west.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, at this point in the RECORD, a National Salute to King Cotton From California, being a statement by Bobette Bentley, California maid of cotton, 1953.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SALUTE TO KING COTTON FROM CALIFORNIA

(By Bobette Bentley, California maid of cotton, 1953)

The robes of the kings who ruled thousands of years before Christ were made of cotton. Today cotton provides royal raiments for everyone.

Tonight, at the National Salute to King Cotton, in Bakersfield, Calif., we salute those in the industry in all the States of the Nation who are working to provide better cotton for its myriad of uses. We salute those who are striving for more efficient and economical production. We salute those who are searching for new markets and increased uses.

We especially salute those in our own State of California, many of whom came to us from the Old South, who are part of our great cotton industry.

Cotton is the No. 1 cash farm crop in California. California is the second largest cotton-producing State in the Nation.

California farmers, processors, and handlers have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in cotton farms and equipment and facilities.

The income of millions of people in California is affected directly or indirectly by the cotton crop.

On behalf of those millions in California who are tied to cotton, we salute our cotton industry.

And for the whole Nation whose people use cotton products so extensively and whose economy is dependent upon cotton income so heavily, we salute King Cotton—may he meet the challenge of the future as he has met the tests of the past.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General; and

Albert J. Robertson, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

By Mr. IVES, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn to be Representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY], and speaking for the committee, I desire to make a brief statement on the nomination of Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn to be United States Representative on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

On two previous occasions during this legislative session the names of outstanding American women have been presented to the Senate for confirmation for important diplomatic assignments—Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York; and Mrs. Clare Booth Luce, of Connecticut. I am particularly pleased today to submit the nomination of Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn as United States Representative on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. I do so with a sense of deep pride in the women of this Nation who are taking an increasingly prominent part in the affairs of today's world, and who are discharging their role in an enviable manner.

Mr. President, Mrs. Hahn is admirably qualified for this key post, and she brings to it not only a sympathetic appreciation for the particular problems of women everywhere in the economic and social field, but a record of achievement in contributing to the solution of those problems. As national president of the American Legion Auxiliary, she had an intimate knowledge of the attitude of the women of the United States toward war and its aftermath, and also of the problems of the men who served so valiantly in the war.

Later, as chairman of the Nebraska Board of Control, charged with jurisdiction over the penal and other State institutions, including the welfare department, Mrs. Hahn had ample opportunity to acquire firsthand experience in the administration of activities designed to promote the welfare and progress of individuals throughout her State.

In 1947 she was appointed Director of Women's Activities for American Military Government in Germany under General Clay, and this involved close cooperation between American, British, French, and German authorities.

Mrs. Hahn appeared yesterday before the Foreign Relations Committee and discussed with the members the various aspects of her new job. Her personal charm and her intellectual ability made a real impression on the committee. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] also appeared and spoke in her behalf. If there is no objection, I wish to attach to my statement a short biographical sketch of Mrs. Hahn. It is my hope that this nomination will be confirmed unanimously.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MRS. LORENA B. HAHN (MRS. OSCAR W. HAHN)

Born: Ravenna, Nebr., December 31, 1896.

Education: Graduated from Ravenna (Nebr.) High School. Studied under private tutor, took State examination and was given a bachelor's degree.

Experience: 1929–30, State president of the American Legion Auxiliary. 1936, national president of American Legion Auxiliary. 1943–47, member of State board of control and later chairman of the board of Nebraska (deals with penal institutions); also in charge of the welfare department. 1947–48, director of women's activities for American Military Government in Germany, under General Clay.

Marital status: Married May 23, 1920, in Omaha; one son, William, who lives at 517 Northeast Fourth Avenue, Camas, Wash.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations?

The nomination was confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant to be Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I present to the Senate for confirmation the name of Livingston T. Merchant to be an Assistant Secretary of State. I am pleased to be able to

do this because I know Mr. Merchant personally, and I am confident that he possesses those qualities that will enable him to fill his new post with ability and distinction.

It is my understanding that Mr. Merchant will be the Assistant Secretary in charge of European affairs. Mr. Merchant's experience during the past 10 years admirably fits him for this position. In 1942 he entered upon his diplomatic career when he was appointed Assistant Chief of the Division of Defense Materials in the Department of State. Then followed a succession of positions in connection with our war effort which gave him valuable experience in both the political and economic fields.

Since the war Mr. Merchant has served as our economic counselor at Paris with the personal rank of Minister, 1945; counselor of Embassy at Nanking, 1947; and Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, 1949, to mention only a few of his posts. During the past year he has served as deputy to the United States special representative in Europe with the personal rank of Ambassador; also as United States Alternate Permanent Representative to the NATO organization in Paris.

In my judgment, Mr. President, Mr. Merchant is one of the very able members of our Foreign Service. He has a sound, practical approach toward world affairs which enables him to go to the heart of a problem in a direct way and come up with a sensible solution. Moreover, he has a pleasing personality and gets along very well with other people—an exceedingly helpful trait for any diplomat to possess.

Finally, I should not lose this opportunity, as one long affiliated with Princeton University, to remind the Senate that Mr. Merchant graduated from that great institution—the intellectual hub of the universe.

I hope the Senate will speedily approve this nomination. I am confident that Mr. Merchant will serve his country well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant to be Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand, the confirmation of the nomination does not necessarily carry with it the endorsement by the Senate of the university to which the Senator from New Jersey has referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is understood that it does not constitute official notice on the part of the Senate that Princeton University is the intellectual hub of the universe.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I assume that the statement of the Senator from New Jersey with respect to Princeton University is in the form of dictum.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to make it in the form of dictum, obiter dictum, or in any other form.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a short biographical sketch of Mr. Merchant.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVINGSTON TALLMADGE MERCHANT

Born: New York, N. Y., November 23, 1903.

Education: Hotchkiss School graduate; Princeton University, A. B., 1926.

Experience: Assistant in investment company 1926–30, partner, 1930–42; appointed Assistant Chief, Division of Defense Materials, Department of State, March 30, 1942; Chief, Blockade and Supply Division, August 27, 1943; adviser, Office of the Special Adviser on the Eastern Hemisphere, December 1, 1943; adviser, Eastern Hemisphere Division, January 15, 1944; Chief, Eastern Hemisphere Division, March 27, 1944, War Areas Economic Division, October 16, 1944; accompanied Judge Rosenman to Europe to examine civilian supply needs, 1945; special assistant to Assistant Secretary of State, July 9, 1945; United States representative and chairman of technical command, Central Rhine Commission, Strasbourg, France, 1945; economic counselor with personal rank of Minister at Paris, October 4, 1945; United States Council Member of European Central Inland Transportation Organization, 1946; Chief, Aviation Division, Department of State, November 12, 1946; Foreign Service officer of class two, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service, February 18, 1947; alternate member, United States delegation, First Assembly of ICAO, Montreal, 1947; to the Department August 6, 1947; United States delegate, Commission on Multilateral Agreement, ICAO, Geneva, 1947; Acting Deputy Director, Office of Transport and Communications, October 20, 1947; counselor of Embassy at Nanking, December 15, 1947 (to proceed later); Deputy Director, Office of Transport and Communications, January 11, 1948; Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, September 29, 1949; to the Department October 12, 1949; class 1 May 23, 1950; Deputy to the United States Special Representative in Europe with personal rank of Ambassador, March 24, 1952, also United States Alternate Permanent Representative on NATO, April 8, 1952.

Status: Married.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Livingston T. Merchant to be Assistant Secretary of State?

The nomination was confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Douglas MacArthur 2d to be Counselor of the Department of State.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I recommend to the Senate the nomination of Douglas MacArthur 2d to be Counselor of the Department of State.

Mr. MacArthur, who is the nephew of the famous general, is a career Foreign Service officer with 17 years of experience, mainly concerned with Western Europe. He was born in Bryn Mawr, Pa., in 1909, graduated from Yale in 1932, served 2 years in the Officers Reserve Corps as a first lieutenant, and entered the Foreign Service in 1935. He has been assigned to Vancouver, Naples, Paris, Vichy, Lisbon, London, and Brussels in positions of steadily increasing importance and responsibility. He has also served in Washington as chief of the Division of Western European Affairs and deputy director of the Office of European Regional Affairs. For a time during the war he was on the staff of General Eisenhower's political adviser.

As Counselor of the Department, Mr. MacArthur will hold a rank equivalent to that of an Assistant Secretary and will serve as senior adviser and consultant to the Secretary and other senior officials on diplomatic and foreign affairs problems. He will assist in the handling of complex international negotiations and consultations and will act as the Department's National Security Council consultant.

As I have already pointed out, Mr. MacArthur has had a wealth of experience which admirably equips him to take over the post of Counselor. His last assignment was in Paris where he served as Counselor of Embassy, and in that capacity he became intimately aware of the many important issues in that area.

Mr. MacArthur is personally well known to several members of the Foreign Relations Committee who have had an opportunity to observe his work both in Washington and in Europe and who have been favorably impressed with his ability. He has always been very cooperative and very helpful. I do not hesitate to add my personal endorsement to that of the committee. I consider him one of the ablest and best of our younger Foreign Service officers. In my judgment he will make an excellent addition to the top command in the Department of State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a short biographical sketch of Mr. MacArthur.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF DOUGLAS MACARTHUR 2D

Born: Bryn Mawr, Pa., July 5, 1909.

Education: Milton Academy graduate; Yale University, bachelor of arts, 1932.

Experience: Appointed Foreign Service officer unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service, October 1, 1935; vice consul at Vancouver, October 3, 1935; Foreign Service School, December 5, 1936; vice consul at Naples, April 7, 1937; vice consul and third secretary at Paris, December 17, 1937; third secretary at Vichy, June 10, 1940–November 8, 1942; vice consul at Lisbon, July 19–October 17, 1940; class 8, May 1, 1941; class 7, July 16, 1943; to the Department, February 18, 1944; secretary of mission, staff of United States political adviser, supreme headquarters, AEF, at London, temporary, August 17, 1944; secretary and vice consul at Paris, Septmeber 8, 1944 (canceled); at Paris, October 2, 1944; second secretary at Paris in addition to duties as vice consul, May 10, 1945; class 6, May 16, 1945; class 5, August 13, 1945; consul, November 12, 1946; consul at Paris in addition to duties as second secretray, November 12, 1946; Foreign Service officer of class 4, November 13, 1946; class 3, May 15, 1947; first secretary at Paris in addition to duties as consul, July 16, 1947; at Brussels, July 12, 1948; to the Department, March 31, 1949; Chief, Division of Western European Affairs, May 16, 1949; Deputy Director, Office of European Regional Affairs, October 3, 1949; class 2, May 23, 1950; counselor of Embassy, Paris, February 16, 1951; Foreign Service officer of class 1, February 21, 1952; to the Department, October 15, 1952.

Military: Officers Reserve Corps, 1933–35, first lieutenant.

Status: Married.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and

consent to the nomination of Douglas MacArthur 2d to be Counselor the Department of State?

The nomination was confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George V. Allen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, again speaking for the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and for the committee itself, I desire to make a brief statement in regard to Mr. George V. Allen. I wish to make the statement particularly because of my observation of his distinguished work in previous posts, such as in Iran and Yugoslavia.

Mr. George V. Allen, who has been United States Ambassador to Yugoslavia for the past 3 years, has been nominated by the President to be our Ambassador to India where he will succeed Ambassador Chester Bowles. He will also serve as our Ambassador to Nepal.

The Committee on Foreign Relations considered Ambassador Allen's nomination on March 10, 1953, and recommends that the Senate confirm his nomination.

Mr. Allen, who was not able to be present before the Committee because of his absence from the United States, is well known to a number of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He has appeared before the committee in the past in connection with his service as Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and when he was nominated to be Ambassador to Yugoslavia.

Mr. Allen has been in the Foreign Service since 1930, having served in posts throughout the world. His foreign duty has been interrupted from time to time for service in the Department of State in the division of near eastern affairs and as Assistant Secretary of State. Much of his service has been in the Middle East. He served the United States as Ambassador to Iran from 1946 until 1948 when relations between Iran and the U. S. S. R. were most critical.

Mr. President, I have had occasion to work closely with Mr. Allen on a number of problems since the war. I have high regard for his ability and his integrity.

It is encouraging to see the President appoint able career officers to such important posts as this one in India. With his fine background and experience, I am sure that Mr. Allen will fully justify the confidence the President has placed in him.

I submit for the record a short biographical sketch of Mr. Allen, and I hope the Senate will act without delay on his confirmation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a short biographical sketch of Mr. Allen.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF GEORGE V. ALLEN

Born: Durham, N. C., November 3, 1903.

Education: Durham High School graduate; Duke University, bachelor of arts, 1924; Harvard University, master of arts, 1929.

Experience: Teacher in high school, 1924–26; newspaper reporter, 1926, 1927, 1928; editorial clerk, Census Bureau, 1929; appointed Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the diplomatic service, April 15, 1930; vice consul at Kingston, Jamaica, April 29, 1930; Foreign Service School, July 16, 1930; vice consul at Shanghai, November 8, 1930; at Patras, August 15, 1934; at Athens, temporary, January 17, 1936; at Patras, February 10, 1936; vice consul and third secretary at Cairo, July 21, 1936; class 8, April 1, 1937; consul, April 23, 1937; consul at Cairo in addition to duties as third secretary, April 26, 1937; to the Department October 1, 1938; class 7 April 1, 1939; class 6, June 1, 1942; divisional assistant at $5,600, August 1, 1942; Assistant Chief, Division of Near Eastern Affairs, July 1, 1943; at $6,500, September 16, 1943; Chief, Division of Middle Eastern Affairs, January 15, 1944; at $8,000 (P–8), July 1, 1944; also executive officer, Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, October 16, 1944; Deputy Director, Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, April 19, 1945; Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran April 23, 1946; Foreign Service officer of class of career minister November 14, 1946; Assistant Secretary of State, February 26, 1948; to the Department, March 30, 1948; a representative of the United States to the third session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, to be held from October 18 to November 10, 1948, June 24, 1948; a representative of the United States to the fourth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, September 21, 1949; Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia October 27, 1949.

Status: Married.

Legal residence: North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India?

The nomination was confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis White, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, again reporting for the Foreign Relations Committee, and in the absence of the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I desire to make the following statement:

The President has sent to the Senate the nomination of Francis White, of Baltimore, Md., to be United States Ambassador to Mexico. On Tuesday, March 10, the Committee on Foreign Relations heard Mr. White in executive session, and voted without dissent to recommend that the Senate advise and consent to the President's nomination.

A brief biographical sketch is available for the RECORD. It shows that Mr. White was educated at Yale and did postgraduate work at Grenoble, Paris, and Madrid. He entered the diplomatic service of the United States in 1915, and in the course of his duties served in many posts abroad, the majority of them in Latin America. In 1926 Mr. White became Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs; and in July 1933 he was assigned as the American Minister to Czechoslovakia. Shortly thereafter he resigned, as he explained to the committee, because of financial considerations. He has, therefore, been out of the diplomatic service for the last 19 years.

Immediately upon his resignation, Mr. White became the executive vice president of the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council. Ultimately he became the president of the council. This organization was created in 1933, at the request of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, as a nonprofit organization to negotiate with foreign governments that had publicly issued bonds in the United States. It had as its purpose to negotiate in behalf of American bondholders who needed a central organization. During the time when Mr. White was connected with it, he negotiated about $2 billion worth of defaulted bonds.

In Maryland and wherever else he has worked, Mr. White has an excellent reputation. He has always been respected for his integrity and ability. He speaks French and Spanish, and has had a distinguished career in the Foreign Service of the United States. These are some of the considerations that are responsible for recommendation by the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senate give its advice and consent to the nomination of Mr. Francis White, to be American Ambassador to Mexico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief biographical sketch of Mr. White.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRANCIS WHITE

Born: Baltimore, Md., March 4, 1892.

Family background: Son of Miles, Jr., and Virginia Purviance (Bonsal) White.

Education: Sheffield Scientific School, Yale, 1913; postgraduate work, universities of Grenoble and Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques, Paris, France, and University of Madrid and Real Academia, Madrid.

Marital status: Married Nancy Brewster, June 28, 1920.

Experience: Entered diplomatic service as secretary July 28, 1915, and assigned to Peking, China; transferred to Teheran, Persia, 1918; Habana, Cuba, 1919; Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1920; acting during various periods as chargé d'affaires; transferred to Department of State, March 1922; in charge, Division of Latin American Affairs, 1922–26; counselor of Embassy, Madrid, Spain, 1926–27; Assistant Secretary of State, 1927–33; Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Czechoslovakia, July–December 1933; executive vice president, then president, Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, 1934–42.

Other: Trustee, Johns Hopkins University.

Clubs: Maryland (Baltimore), Metropolitan, Chevy Chase (Washington), Brook, Piping Rock (New York).

Home: 4603 Kerneway, Baltimore, Md.

Office: 25 South Calvert Street, Baltimore, Md.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Francis White, to be United

States Ambassador to Mexico. However, I desire to have the RECORD reflect certain views which I believe the people of Texas hold regarding this matter. For that reason, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL ON NOMINATION OF FRANCIS WHITE AS AMBASSADOR TO MEXICO

The nomination and confirmation of an Ambassador to Mexico is a matter of considerable interest to the people of Texas.

There are bonds of history—and ties of common interest—between the State of Texas and the Republic of Mexico which are older by centuries than our present Union of States.

Furthermore, on a contemporary plane, no State enjoys a closer relationship with Mexico than does Texas.

Today more than 1,500,000 Texas residents are of Latin-American descent. This number has grown rapidly during the past 20 years and continues to grow.

It is estimated that each year more Texans visit Mexico—on both business and pleasure—than the total of residents from all other States combined.

In 1952, exports from this country to Mexico through Texas ports—Port Arthur, Galveston, Laredo, and El Paso—totaled more than $400 million.

Our State government in Texas maintains a full-time, fully-staffed agency—the Good Neighbor Commission—dedicated solely to the fostering of good relations and mutual understanding between the residents of Texas and Mexico.

In virtually all of the institutions of higher learning in our State, there are numerous students from Mexico. The language of Mexico is taught in our public schools and it is the most widely studied of all foreign languages by the youth of Texas.

Such a recitation of this evidence of common interests between Texas and Mexico could continue at great length. The purpose in citing such instances to the Senate, however, is to emphasize that in these times there exists a mature spirit of cooperative, constructive, friendly neighborliness between Texas and Mexico.

The Rio Grande is a boundary, not a barrier, between Texas and Mexico. On both sides of that boundary, there is a mutual desire to work together, to stand together, and to live together in peace and harmony.

For that reason, the Texas Legislature and many citizens of our State strongly urged the appointment of one of several of our citizens who were eminently qualified to serve as Ambassador to our neighbor on the south, the Republic of Mexico. That we are disappointed is no reflection upon Mr. White, whose capacity, experience, and ability are unquestioned.

Our only hope is that the administration has not passed over citizens of Texas because of an old and outmoded tradition that a Texan is disqualified to hold this position because he is a Texan.

This tradition is founded on the false premise that because Texas once was a part of Mexico, and that Texas won her independence from Mexico on the battlefields, that ill-feeling still exists between Texas and Mexico. That is just not so.

To give credence to this tradition is an injustice to the efforts of Texas citizens and citizens of Mexico to obliterate the differences which once existed, but which no longer exist. It is especially unfair and unfortunate for Texans, in their relations with Mexico, to be harassed by a belief or tradition which has existed only in the National Capital. Washington should not hold open a breech which the people directly concerned long ago closed of their own accord. I know reliably that a Texan, if appointed, would be welcome as this country's Ambassador to Mexico.

I do not say that this tradition influenced the present administration in its consideration of Texans suggested for this appointment. I only hope it did not, and have tried to point out why it should not now or in the future.

As part of this statement, I should like to include a list showing those who have served as representatives of this Government to Mexico; a list showing Texans who have served as Ambassadors to other foreign countries; and the text of a resolution adopted by the Texas State Senate regarding this matter.

LIST OF DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES TO MEXICO (FROM REGISTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE)

ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY

Joel R. Poinsett, South Carolina, March 8, 1825.

CHARGÉS D'AFFAIRES

Anthony Butler, Mississippi, October 12, 1829.

Powhatan Ellis, Mississippi, January 5, 1836.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY

Powhatan Ellis, Mississippi, February 15, 1839.

Waddy Thompson, South Carolina, February 10, 1842.

Wilson Shannon, Ohio, April 9, 1844.

John Slidell, Louisiana, November 10, 1845.

Nathan Clifford, Maine, July 28, 1848.

Robert P. Letcher, Kentucky, August 9, 1849.

Alfred Conkling, New York, August 6, 1852.

James Gadsden, South Carolina, May 24, 1853.

John Forsyth, Alabama, July 21, 1856.

Robert M. McLane, Maryland, March 7, 1859.

John B. Weller, California, November 17, 1860.

Thomas Corwin, Ohio, March 22, 1861.

Lewis D. Campbell, Ohio, May 4, 1866.

Marcus Otterbourg, Wisconsin, July 1, 1867.

William S. Rosecrans, Ohio, July 27, 1868.

Thomas H. Nelson, Indiana, April 16, 1869.

John W. Foster, Indiana, March 17, 1873.

Philip H. Morgan, Louisiana, January 26, 1880.

Henry R. Jackson, Georgia, March 23, 1885.

Thomas C. Manning, Louisiana, August 30, 1886.

Edward S. Bragg, Wisconsin, January 16, 1888.

Thomas Ryan, Kansas, March 30, 1889.

Isaac P. Gray, Indiana, March 20, 1893.

Matt W. Ransom, North Carolina, August 24, 1895.

Powell Clayton, Arkansas, March 22, 1897.

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Powell Clayton, Arkansas, December 8, 1898.

Edwin H. Conger, Iowa, March 8, 1905.

David E. Thompson, Nebraska, January 24, 1906.

Henry Lane Wilson, Washington, December 21, 1909.

Henry P. Fletcher, Pennsylvania, February 25, 1916.

Charles Beecher Warren, Michigan, February 29, 1924.

James Rockwell Sheffield, New York, September 9, 1924.

Dwight W. Morrow, New Jersey, September 21, 1927.

J. Reuben Clark, Jr., Utah, October 3, 1930.

Josephus Daniels, North Carolina, March 17, 1933.

George S. Messersmith, Delaware, December 4, 1941.

Walter Thurston, Arizona, May 4, 1946.

William O'Dwyer, New York, September 20, 1950.

TEXANS WHO HAVE SERVED SINCE 1845 AS AMBASSADORS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES, OR AS MINISTERS

Robert Granville Caldwell, Portugal, June 13, 1933; Bolivia, May 4, 1937.

John Cardwell, Egypt, October 2, 1885.

William E. DeCourcy, Haiti, June 18, 1948.

Hampson Gary, Egypt, October 2, 1917; Switzerland, April 7, 1920.

Richard B. Hubbard, Japan, April 2, 1885.

Edwin Jackson Kyle, Guatemala, February 9, 1945.

Mirabeau B. Lamar, Costa Rica, January 20, 1858; Nicaragua, January 20, 1858.

Raphael O'Hara Lanier, Liberia, February 13, 1937.

Alvin Mansfield Owsley, Rumania, June 13, 1933; Ireland, May 15, 1935; Denmark, May 28, 1937.

Charles N. Riotte, Costa Rica, June 6, 1861; Nicaragua, April 21, 1869.

Hal H. Sevier, Chile, August 19, 1933.

George P. Shaw, Nicaragua, May 22, 1948; El Salvador, June 24, 1949; Paraguay, April 27, 1952.

Frederick A. Sterling, Ireland, February 19, 1927; Latvia, August 9, 1937; Estonia, August 9, 1937; Bulgaria, September 1, 1933; Sweden, June 16, 1938.

Alexander W. Terrell, Turkey, April 15, 1893.

Edwin H. Terrell, Belgium, April 1, 1889.

Thaddeus Austin Thomson, Columbia, June 10, 1913.

Fletcher Warren, Nicaragua, April 6, 1945; Paraguay, April 10, 1947; Venezuela, October 9, 1951.

George C. McGhee, Turkey, December 20, 1951.

Senate Resolution 24

Whereas the State of Texas through geographic position, historic tradition, and through social, cultural, and economic ties, is closely linked with the neighboring Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas the Republic of Mexico stands today as one of the great nations of Latin America and the world, an outstanding example of democracy, and an ally of our Nation in the world struggle against Communist aggression; and

Whereas it is vital to the interests of the United States and Texas that an able and qualified person be chosen to represent this Nation as Ambassador to the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas relations between Texas and Mexico are of the most cordial and friendly, with frequent interchange between our State government officials, businessmen, students, teachers, and tourists; and

Whereas during the more than 106 years of Texas statehood, no Texan has ever represented the United States as Ambassador to Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas:

SECTION 1. It is the considered opinion of the government and people of Texas that the time has come for a Texan to be named to this important post to represent our Nation before the government and people of Mexico, and that the naming of such an Ambassador would be warmly welcomed by our neighboring Republic, and he could effectively carry out his duties in a manner which would strengthen even more the ties of mutual esteem, respect, and friendship now uniting our two nations.

SEC. 2. The secretary of the senate is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to President Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles; and to the two Senators from Texas.

the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson and the Honorable Price Daniel.

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on January 26, 1953.

LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Francis White, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico?

The nomination was confirmed.

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William McNear Rand, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, again speaking in behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, and for the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I desire to make the following statement with regard to Mr. Rand:

Mr. President, the nomination of William McNear Rand, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security was approved by the Foreign Relations Committee without objection, after hearing Mr. Rand in executive session. The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] also appeared before the committee, and gave Mr. Rand his enthusiastic and unqualified endorsement.

Mr. Rand is 66 years old. Before his retirement in 1951, he was president of the Monsanto Chemical Co. He is still a member of the board of directors of that company, but he told the committee he would resign if his nomination is confirmed. He has disposed of his other stockholdings in companies which do an international business and which might conceivably be incompatible with his new duties in the Government. Although the Monsanto company has a plant in England, its business is very largely domestic. Mr. Rand discussed frankly with the committee all of his holdings, and the committee is convinced that no incompatibility is involved.

Upon his graduation from Harvard, in 1909, Mr. Rand went to work for the Mutual National Bank of Boston, as a messenger. He was later treasurer of the City Fuel Co., of Boston. He entered the chemical business in 1919, with the Merrimac Chemical Co., which was merged with the Monsanto company in 1929. He is, or has been, a director of a number of other companies, and has been active in civic, business, and other organizations.

Mr. Rand's many years of experience in the management of large enterprises has equipped him to perform a valuable public service, through applying his considerable talents to the Mutual Security Agency.

Mr. President, on yesterday Mr. Rand appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, and made a very favorable impression. It is my belief that he will make an excellent teammate for Harold Stassen, Director of the Mutual Security Agency.

So, Mr. President, I urge that the nomination be confirmed.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a biographical sketch of Mr. Rand.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

William McNear Rand, of Lincoln, Mass., to be appointed Deputy Director of Mutual Security (Presidential appointment subject to confirmation by the Senate).

Recently retired as president of the Monsanto Chemical Co., Bachelor of Arts, Harvard, 1909. Began career as bank messenger at the Mutual National Bank of Boston.

Served as treasurer, City Fuel Co., Boston, 1913–19. With Merrimac Chemical Co., Everett, Mass., beginning 1919. President, Merrimac Chemical Co., beginning 1935. President, Monsanto Chemical Co., 1945–52.

Served as lieutenant, United States Navy, 1917–19. Member of the board of overseers, Harvard College. Trustee, Governmental Research Institute. President and director, Greater St. Louis Community Chest, 1950. Member, Manufacturing Chemists' Association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of William McNear Rand, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed today by the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, at this time I wish to say that it is proposed to have the Senate take a recess from today until tomorrow merely for the purpose of having the Senate receive from the President of the United States a message relating to reorganization. Of course, at that session any other formal business may be presented, but there will be no regular business of any kind, or even a morning hour.

On tomorrow we shall take an adjournment until Friday for the usual Friday session; but at that session also, I know of no legislative business of importance.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BRYSON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 174), which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 11, 1953.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 91) was read, and the Senate proceeded to its consideration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief résumé, which came over the news ticker this afternoon, regarding the deceased Representative.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON, 60, of South Carolina, died last night of a cerebral hemorrhage.

The Democratic veteran of 14 years in Congress was stricken just after he had said grace at a dinner of the Cotton Textile Manufacturers Association. He was taken to Bethesda Naval Hospital, where he died at 11:15 p. m.

He had been in apparent good health and had put in a busy day, attending two committee meetings and the debate in the House on statehood for Hawaii.

Born January 18, 1893, in Brevard, N. C., he was taken at the age of 7 to Greenville, S. C. There he went to work at 10 and continued working in textile mills for 15 years while attending public schools and obtaining a bachelor's degree from Furman University.

He served in the Army during World War I and afterward won a law degree from the University of South Carolina.

BRYSON served in both Houses of the South Carolina Legislature before coming to Congress in 1939. He was reelected continuously since then.

Survivors include his widow and five children, Dr. Joseph Robert Bryson, a physician in Greenville; William J. Bryson, an attorney there; Mrs. Carl R. Thackston, Arlington, Va.; David F. Bryson, a student at Furman University; and Judy Bryson, a student at Anderson (S. C.) College.

Funeral arrangements had not been completed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me add that JOE BRYSON served long and

faithfully his State and his Nation. The people of South Carolina were distressed to learn this morning of Mr. BRYSON's untimely death.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 11, 1953:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Frederick Billings Lee, of Vermont, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, vice Charles Horne, resigned.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Harmar D. Denny, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1953, vice Donald W. Nyrop, resigned.

GOVERNOR OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Edward W. Scruggs, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona, vice Frank E. Flynn, resigned.

John B. Stoddart, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois, vice Howard L. Doyle, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William J. Littell, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois, vice Robert Grant, removed.

Robert W. Ware, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California, vice James J. Boyle, term expired.

IN THE ARMY

The officer named herein for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.).

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, 0199581.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 11, 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, of Nebraska, to be a representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1955.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Livingston T. Merchant, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

Douglas MacArthur 2d, of the District of Columbia, to be Counselor of the Department of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George V. Allen, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal.

Francis White, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mexico.

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY

William McNear Rand, of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 11, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, inspire us now with a more eager response to the call and command of Thy divine voice, lest we walk in darkness and despair.

Grant that we may always be conscious of Thy presence girding us with wisdom and power to meet worthily and courageously all of life's stern duties and demands.

May we never be guilty of any selfish ambition to seek merely our own personal welfare but may we labor for the promotion and preservation of the common good.

We thank Thee for the noble life and character of Thy servant who now dwells with Thee in eternal blessedness. May the members of his bereaved family be comforted and sustained by the consolations of grace.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRUSSIAN-TYPE MILITARY PLAN FOR AMERICA

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pose some questions which should no longer remain unasked or unanswered.

I shall state the questions bluntly.

The issues at stake are too grave for either delicacy or doubletalk. It is perhaps too much to hope that answers will be in kind, that they will be equally forthright.

What is going on in the Department of Defense?

Is a certain powerful element in the Pentagon directing the stratagem of encirclement against the new Secretary of Defense?

Is the recently designated seven-man committee to recommend changes in the Defense Department—a new committee dominated by completely old hands—the first major move in that strategy?

Is this stratagem designed to render the Secretary of Defense captive to the Army's persistent dream of a Prussian-type supreme general staff for America?

These questions are prompted not only by the appointment of this Defense Department committee some weeks ago but by happenings for many weeks prior to creation of this committee.

They are questions which Congress has not alone a right but an absolute obligation to raise and to pursue relentlessly.

The organization of our Department of Defense is a matter which involves not only our national security but also directly affects our national economy and our form of government.

National defense accounts for about 70 percent of our national budget; thus it directly and critically affects our tax burden and hence our entire economy. The social and economic power and influence of the military extends, through military manpower, education, and industrial requirements, to the very heart of our national life.

Because the defense effort, and in consequence the Military Establishment, exerts such a powerful influence on our security, economy, and form of government, it is imperative that the defense structure be militarily efficient and reliable, economical, and consistent with our form of government. In achieving its fundamental goals, the military must ever remain subordinate to civilian authority, both in statute and in fact.

Constant congressional interest in the Defense Department is necessary if strength, economy, and American philosophy are to prevail in our efforts to protect our Nation.

This is altogether a proper area of congressional interest, for our constitutional obligation of providing for the Armed Forces was not limited merely to giving the military a blank check to spend as the military might deem fit. In a real sense the Constitution charges Congress with a stewardship over the military. It provides specifically that "the Congress shall have power * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces." It is proper that such is the case, for if history teaches any lesson it is that representative government dies when parliamentary authority over the military is surrendered or even relaxed.

It is always commendable, of course, to seek greater military efficiency and economy. But there is much in connection with the appointment of the seven-man committee to recommend changes in the Defense Department, and in connection with its membership and the timing of the appointment which justifies suspicion and closest scrutiny.

First, there is the matter of its membership, which consists of Nelson A. Rockefeller, chairman; Arthur S. Flemming; Milton S. Eisenhower; former Defense Secretary Robert A. Lovett; Dr. Vannevar Bush; Gen. Omar Bradley; and David Sarnoff.

I impugn the motives of none of these men. Individually, each is an able person. However, the broad collective qualifications of the committee to deal adequately with the problem is subject to question.

A prime requisite for any such committee is objectivity. Its membership must provide representation for all major views on the problem.

That it lacks such capability is apparent. With all due respect to the other members of the committee, the key members are Mr. Lovett, Dr. Bush, and General Bradley. The committee report will not be in basic conflict with their views.

That leads us to the question: What are their views? The opinions of each of these three members with respect to the Defense Department are a matter of public record. Dr. Bush has been speaking and writing on the subject since last fall. While professing to seek greater military efficiency he has been advocating separation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from their status as service commanders. This is simply the old and disastrous device of separating authority from responsibility, something that this country and the British have always rejected.

Separation of authority and responsibility is a fallacious device in any line of endeavor. In military matters it leads to confusion, defeat, and disaster. Such a method encourages theory and discourages realism. It relieves those who plan from taking responsibility for the result of their plans. A key feature of the Prussian-German supreme general staff concept was authority without responsibility.

In contrast, our Joint Chiefs of Staff system—like the closely similar British procedure—is based upon the marriage of authority and responsibility, because those Joint Chiefs of Staff members who do the top level planning are also chiefs of their respective services and in that capacity are responsible for executing their plans. This war-proven principle would be discarded by Dr. Bush. In its place he would substitute the authority without responsibility system.

Speaking at the Mayo Clinic, September 26 of last year, Dr. Bush said, relative to the separation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff members from status as service chiefs:

> Its sole duty—
>
> Joint Chiefs of Staff—
>
> as a body, should be to advise the Secretary of Defense and to recommend action to be taken by him or by the President. Joint Chiefs of Staff should not itself exercise command directly or indirectly. The law should spell this out so positively that it cannot possibly be misunderstood.

For good and obvious reasons such a proposal was emphatically rejected by the Hoover Commission Subcommittee on National Security. Why it was rejected is clear: the Germans lost two wars with it. In sharp contrast our Joint Chiefs of Staff system, combining authority and responsibility, was an instrument of victory.

In fact, the Hoover Commission Task Force report on National Security Organization says explicitly:

> The appointment of a single military chief of staff as commander of our three military services might lead to a military "party line" with static concepts and enforced "mental unification." The dangers of one-man military control of the armed forces of a nation are illustrated by history. The case of the Third Reich is a recent example of the hazards of unilateral strategy. When military differences completely disappear military progress will cease. (Appendix G, January 1949, pp. 53–54.)

Dr. Bush also advocates a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with authority to resolve service disagreements. Twice in his address at Tufts College last October 11, Dr. Bush said, in speaking of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

> If there is disagreement the chairman should have authority to resolve it.

Regardless of what he is called, a chairman with such authority possesses power of decision. Thus, while professing to seek greater civilian control, Dr. Bush proposes a single chief of staff, which has always resulted in reduction of civilian control of the military as well as eventual military defeat.

This proposal likewise was flatly rejected by the Hoover Commission Task Force which said:

> The committee does not believe that a chief of staff—a commander over all the armed services—is needed. The Secretary of Defense, and constitutionally, the President, occupy this role. This tremendous authority should not be transferred from civilian to military hands, with consequent danger to our democratic institutions. There has been much loose criticism of the war efforts of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as constituting "command by committee"; yet there can be no doubt whatsoever that in the broad field of grand strategy a meeting of several minds is far safer—and in the end more sound—than the dictates of one. The responsibilities for strategic planning and the conduct of war are soundly placed by the National Security Act upon the shoulders of the Joint Chiefs of Staff who, in turn, are under the authority, and subject to the control of, the President and the Secretary of Defense. There should be no change in this concept. (Task Force Report on National Security Organization (appendix G) January 1949, pp. 57–58.)

Upon analysis, I believe it is clear that these, and other of Dr. Bush's proposals would establish a Prussian type of supreme general staff over our Armed Forces.

Mr. Lovett's views, as expressed in his farewell letter to the President, differ in detail and timing but not in final result from Dr. Bush's plan. Those who doubt this statement should read Mr. Lovett's letter in which he criticizes the provision of the National Security Act that prohibits the Secretary of Defense from having a military staff. That provision of the law was not an accident or legislative caprice. It was deliberate; it was for one purpose and that purpose was to prevent development of a supreme general staff. If Mr. Lovett wants to remove that prohibition it follows that he would establish what the law prohibits—a supreme general staff.

Let me read two or three paragraphs from Mr. Lovett's letter to the President of November 18, 1952:

> Under the present act, and in the event of war, I believe that the present system of controls provided in the legislation for the exercise of authority by the Secretary of Defense, in some areas, will prove to be inadequate.
>
> Strangely enough, the fact that the Secretary of Defense is prohibited from having a staff is not generally realized. * * * In consequence, the Secretary of Defense has no alternative but to flood the Joint Chiefs of Staff with all sorts of papers originating in the three departments.

In Mr. Lovett's alternate I plan he recommends:

> The balance of military staff functions should be transferred to the Office of the Secretary of Defense to provide him with a combined military-civilian staff. This staff would be responsible only to the Secretary of Defense.

I bow to no man in my admiration of General Bradley's many achievements. It is a source of personal satisfaction to me that I introduced the bill which authorized General Bradley's promotion to five-star rank. Yet, I believe General Bradley would be the last to contend he is infallible. I believe he was wrong in his sympathy for a single Chief of Staff, as expressed in his 1949 testimony before the House Armed Services Committee. In the light of congressional attitude to the present moment he is wrong, for Congress has always sensed the military and political dangers of a single Chief of Staff, which is the key feature of the Prussian-German type of supreme general staff.

Here is what General Bradley told the House Armed Services Committee, July 9, 1949:

> With reference to this arriving eventually at a Chief of Staff, I have said at various times that I believe you will demand a single Chief of Staff some day. It may be 20 years from now. But it will come—not necessarily from the military but from you people who are interested in economy and efficiency. I think it will never come until you do want it. It can't come until you do want it. There are a lot of arguments for it. (From p. 2918 of House Armed Services Committee hearings (No. 95) on S. 1843, 81st Cong., July 9, 1949.)

Add it up and the answer is simple. The key members of the committee have publicly endorsed the essentials of a supreme general staff.

The committee report will not find Mr. Lovett, Dr. Bush, and General Bradley in the minority. As things now stand, it seems inevitable that some form of supreme general staff or major steps toward it will be recommended.

Putting it bluntly, this committee is "stacked." It is stacked against the historic position of Congress and the Armed Services Committees which have always rejected the Prussian supreme staff system as dangerous to our national security and alien to our form of government. It is stacked in favor of that relatively small military group which long sought the adoption of the Prussian-German system in this country. I refer to the Army General Staff Corps. It was the Army General Staff Corps that openly advocated the supreme general staff in

the 1946 unification proposal, popularly known as the Collins plan after its architect, then Lt. Gen. J. Lawton Collins, of the Army General Staff, and now Army Chief of Staff.

It was the same Army General Staff which printed and distributed to its officers, under a classified stamp and with implied blessing—the views of the Nazi General Guderian in support of the supreme general staff concept.

I am convinced that the Army General Staff Corps still believes essentially in the system advocated by the defeated German General Guderian.

This newly appointed committee is heavily weighted toward one view, that of the Army General Staff Corps. Thus, another question: Since any recommended changes will affect all services, why was not broader representation sought by including, in addition to Army General Bradley, a Navy, an Air Force, and a Marine Corps officer? This is a situation belatedly acknowledged but not corrected by appointment of Air Force and naval advisers.

Could it be that such well-rounded representation would deflect the General Staff steamroller from its course? Such might well be the reason.

The naval position as to a supreme general staff has always been clear-cut opposition based on the realization that a German-type supreme staff would mean misuse of our sea power.

Apprehensions being voiced in the Air Force are certainly understandable. The Army General Staff sponsored unification, realizing it was a foundation on which to erect a supreme general staff. Air Force support was encouraged by making Air Force autonomy a feature of unification.

This emancipation of the Air Force from Army command was not an act of charity on the part of the Army General Staff. Air Force officers are well aware of the maneuver. The Army General Staff freed the Air Force in 1947 in return for Air Force support of unification, knowing that eventual establishment of a supreme general staff under Army domination would be the means by which the Army General Staff would regain operational control of the Air Force while permitting the legal fiction of a separate Air Force to continue. I do not believe that anyone is so naive as to think that the Air Force will control a United States supreme general staff, for ground power—Army—will, by sheer weight of numbers, dominate any such staff organization. The Army General Staff's operation, "Recapture of the Air Force," is now under way. This is just another reason why any recommendation for full or partial adoption of a supreme general staff will undermine our national security. Our national security demands actual as well as legal autonomy for our Air Force.

The next point involves the fact that the committee was directed to submit its recommendations by April 30, 1953—slightly over 60 days after its creation. It is, on the face of it, ridiculous to believe that such a short period is adequate for a thorough investigation of the vast Defense Department. Contrast this with the fact the National Security Subcommittee of the Hoover Commission, performing almost exactly the same mission as has been assigned the committee in question, required 7 months to complete its investigation and submit its report. In that time it took testimony of 245 witnesses.

Remember, too, that the Hoover Commission Subcommittee on National Security consisted of 14 members, headed by the Chairman, Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, and assisted by a military advisory committee of 9 distinguished retired senior officers representing land, sea, and air power; a total of 9 nationally prominent citizens serving as consultants to the subcommittee; a professional staff of 22, and a secretarial staff of 9, headed by Dr. Edward F. Wellett. Compare such well-planned, sound, deliberate, and business-like organization with the composition, sketchy organization, and early deadline of the new committee composed of only 7 members and 3 advisers. Such comparison does not serve to create confidence in this new committee.

Incidentally, the three advisers appear to have been named as an afterthought and presumably as a sop to the Navy and Air Force. These advisers are Generals Marshall and Spaatz and Admiral Nimitz, who were designated just last week. As I will have occasion to note a little later, inclusion of General Marshall as one of these so-called advisers offers no reassurance so far as the matter of Prussianized general staff is concerned, in view of his admitted philosophy on this matter.

Does this commitee intend to do in 60 days what the Hoover Commission subcommittee required 7 months to accomplish?

Does this committee in its 60 days of life expect to be as thorough as the Hoover experts who heard the views of 245 witnesses over a period of 7 months?

The answers are obviously "No."

Yet, when considering the 60 days given the committee to perform its mission we might well ask "Why so long?" If Pentagon reports are correct, all the committee has to do is hold one meeting to adopt the report based upon the already recorded position of Lovett, Bush, and Bradley.

Another question: Why is it necessary to have this committee duplicate—on a rush basis—what the Hoover Commission did so thoroughly?

I believe the answer to this question is to be found in the report of the Hoover Commission Subcommittee on National Security itself. As I have already indicated, that report pointedly endorsed the present Joint Chiefs of Staff system and rejected the supreme general staff concept together with its single chief of staff. Furthermore, the Hoover experts explain why such proposals would weaken our national security. In fact, that Hoover subcommittee report, submitted in 1949, now constitutes a point-by-point rejection of the principal proposals of Dr. Bush and Mr. Lovett, as well as the single chief of staff which General Bradley admires.

This leads to a disturbing realization: The Hoover Commission subcommittee's report on national security stands as an insurmountable barrier to those who would junk our war-proven Joint Chiefs of Staff system and substitute the discredited system of the defeated Germans. Consequently, the Army General Staff hopes to have its road toward a supreme general staff smoothed by this new committee which is expected to be sympathetic to the German system, and, of course, as soon as this new committee submits its report the Hoover Commission's position will be labeled as "out of date" and "old-fashioned." Naturally, the ones who do that labeling will make no reference to the thoroughness and impartiality of the Hoover subcommittee or to the loaded membership and rush-job character of this new committee.

While speaking of membership of this committee, there is something involved here that is real cause of further concern and misgiving. Take a look at the committee names again: Rockefeller, Flemming, Milton Eisenhower, Lovett, Bush, Bradley, and Sarnoff. Every one held prominent appointive positions in the Democratic administration. If the Defense Establishment is to be investigated and cleaned up, why can't the Republican Party furnish enough brains and integrity and freshness of approach to do this job? Why do we have to turn to participants in the repudiated regime for advice on how to improve the Defense Department, the largest single segment of the executive branch of the Government?

The answer is obvious: There is no need or excuse for doing so.

As I have already indicated, there is another aspect of this reorganization committee that is deeply distressing. I am disturbed because a sincere, capable man, still uninitiated to Washington political maneuvering, is being victimized. I refer to Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, my fellow Michigander. Secretary Wilson is being made the victim of the shrewdest General Staff maneuver I have observed in my 17 years in Congress. It is obvious to me that this committee membership originated either in the Army General Staff or with someone who supported the General Staff objective and knew the views of Mr. Lovett, General Bradley, and Dr. Bush. The names of committee members were, I gather from press reports, submitted to Mr. Wilson, who officially appointed this Rockefeller committee. Thus, it is now Mr. Wilson's creation.

When, as expected, the committee recommends a supreme general staff, or a move toward it, Mr. Wilson will be under heavy obligation to press for legislative approval of such recommendations. Yet, if he does not approve the committee report and withholds it, he will be condemned as a foe of progress, economy, and efficiency. Never forget the propaganda power of the Army General Staff. All who have defied it have felt its sting.

For testimony on this score I can do no better than quote comments of former War Production Administrator, Donald Nelson, as recorded in his book, Arsenal of Democracy:

But that barrage of scare publicity, guaranteed to appeal to the fears and to the patriotism of readers in every section of the

country, was the sort of thing the Army could and did turn on whenever it wished to do so. I had a great deal of experience with it during the war—and I can assure you that when the Army turns loose a blast against you it is deadly (p. 361).

All that resulted through this Army process of publicity manipulation was the production of a good deal of needless irritation, and a needless amount of public confusion (p. 362).

In any case, a violent attack suddenly broke out against me in the press. It was inspired by the Army (p. 364).

There is nothing new, of course, about this trend of the military. The late Speaker Champ Clark in 1920 expressed the exasperated opinion that the regular Army General Staff and officers constituted a lobby "second in strength only to the Anti-Saloon League." And Speaker Clark charged that these officers had "powerful influence here and an undue influence."

On the other hand, if, when the committee finishes its assignment, Mr. Wilson submits committee plans for all or portions of a German-type staff system to Congress, such proposals will then be Mr. Wilson's. On the basis of past congressional understanding and rejection of the Prussian system I foresee a major congressional fight to prevent the Army General Staff from achieving its long sought and alien objectives.

Thus, Mr. Wilson will be the target for press, radio, and public reaction against any move to give the military greater power. If the issue goes sour, and if the proposal is then rejected, as it should be, everyone connected with the creation of the committee and selection of its members, except Mr. Wilson, will be in the clear—even the Army General Staff, which, ostensibly, will be on the sidelines.

Never, in my recollection, has a man been boxed in as neatly as Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson will be expendable, and the Army General Staff can make another try later.

But I do not believe Congress and the people will let this General Staff power play succeed. Already thoughtful press reaction is appearing in various parts of the country warning against moves toward a German-type supreme staff in this country.

Thus, the Nashville Banner of January 10 comments editorially:

The Secretary [Lovett] is right in observing that war danger hasn't subsided. * * * It isn't a danger to be made less so by experimenting with a Prussian-type military setup which—if we read our history aright—always has lost more wars than it won.

The Christian Science Monitor, January 19, 1953, points out editorially that the Hoover Commission Task Force Report "considered the General Staff idea and rejected it," and also rejected the concept of a single military Chief of Staff. The editorial adds:

If the germ of such unwanted institutions could lie hidden in their plans [the plans of Mr. Lovett and Dr. Bush], it would be well to let the critics as well as the advocates have their day.

The Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram of January 19, 1953, warns that "the system which Dr. Bush visualizes contains the seeds for the very kind of military system he appears to deplore"—namely, the German general staff system. The editorial warns that "any proposals for changes in the JCS should be entertained only with great caution."

It is noteworthy that all three of these editorial warnings were delivered prior to the appointment of the new Defense Department committee.

Finally, Hanson W. Baldwin, writing in the February 8 New York Times, describes the "super-Chiefs" proposal as "academically appealing," but warns that "it defies the fundamental law of any sound organization—the marriage of authority and responsibility." Mr. Baldwin likewise notes rejection of this proposal by the Hoover Commission.

With the Korean war and the draft requiring sacrifices by our Nation, let us not be bemused that proposals for a supreme general staff can be quietly handled. With our citizens so sensitive to military requirements, this particularly is no time for the Army General Staff to make another play for power. It is no time to force Congress to devote its efforts to repel another attempt to enhance the power of the military at the cost of reducing civilian authority.

This matter of protecting civilian authority over the military is not an imaginary issue. We must never forget that the late James Forrestal said that General Marshall told him that the intent of the Collins plan was the isolation of civilian authority.

Secretary Forrestal's statement was contained in a confidential Chief of Naval Operations letter of February 19, 1947, which was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Congressman Werdel, of California, April 3, 1951:

That's the background of what has always seemed to me to be two violently opposed sets of thinking about the military organization. It was expressed in the Collins plan which, as you know, did have a single civilian Secretary, had a Chief of Staff, and in my opinion would result in the isolation of the civilian charged with the responsibility for the running of the organization, which I also think was the Army's intent—in fact, Marshall quite frankly said so. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 3, p. 3232.)

Remember, too, that the adoption of the Bush-Lovett-Bradley views would mean a Prussian-type supreme general staff for this country—the key feature of the rejected Collins plan. Does it not logically follow that if we now accept a camouflaged Collins plan we will emasculate civilian control of the military just as surely as if we had adopted the original Collins plan in 1946?

I readily admit to deep concern over this Defense Department reorganization committee and circumstances surrounding it. There is too much reason for suspicion and question: The one-sided viewpoint of its collective membership, the lack of expert spokesmen on the committee to present the anti-supreme staff opposition, the inadequate time allowed, the questionable necessity to cover the same ground—to duplicate—the relatively recent and very thorough work of the Hoover Commission, and the committee's membership composed of those who held important positions in the recently repudiated regime.

In particular I resent the maneuver which puts Mr. Wilson in the role of the sacrificial goat in the probable event this General Staff power play fails. Also, I question the reasons for needlessly forcing Congress to devote its efforts, at this critical time, to engage in a struggle to protect our national security and form of government.

Let me make myself clear on this point. I do not contend that the Defense Establishment is running perfectly. I believe it can be improved. But there are ways to achieve improvement other than by a loaded committee and a General Staff maneuver that confronts an able Secretary of Defense with a Hobson's choice. Instead, I believe the Hoover report was and is sound. I believe it is within the competence of the House and Senate Armed Services Committees and the Congress to find areas of constructive change. I believe that the interests of national security, Congress, and the people would be well served by reconsideration of the membership of this Rockefeller committee, the questionable circumstances surrounding it, and particularly the need for it existing at all.

So much about it is irregular that Congress and the people are entitled to ask, "Just what is going on?" and, even more important, are entitled to a clear and forthright answer.

THE 49-STAR FLAG

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as the House has voted to admit the Territory of Hawaii to the Union, I am introducing a concurrent resolution to set up a joint congressional committee to work out the problem of deciding on a design for a 49-star flag and submitting the same to the Congress for action.

The membership will recall that in 1912, when New Mexico was admitted and Arizona was in the process of being admitted, a Flag Board was created, headed by Adm. George Dewey, as senior member. This Board submitted a report establishing the pattern of the present 48-star flag.

It appears that no method has been set up to solve the rather difficult problem of introducing a 49th star into the now equally balanced design. The resolution which I have prepared is to establish a joint congressional committee to decide upon and recommend to the Congress an appropriate design of the flag to be adopted when and if the 49th State is admitted to the Union.

This joint committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate appointed by the President of that body, and three Members of the House appointed by the Speaker. A chairman to be elected by the committee. It would submit a report to the Senate and House at the earliest practicable date.

COST OF BRITISH CORONATION

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, while reading the papers this morning, I came across a very interesting article captioned, "Coronation to Cost Britain Almost $4,500,000."

This article went on to say that Prime Minister Churchill's government expects to spend this amount of money for the preparation and carrying out of the Westminster Abbey ceremony and royal procession on June 2, and for the entertainment of visiting royalty and other distinguished guests. This article has a particular significance. Recently we went through a presidential inauguration here in this country without the cost of one cent to the people of the United States. I would like to know how much of the bill for the coronation in Britain is to be footed by American taxpayers, and if Anthony Eden's visit to this country is purely coincidental.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MORANO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances, and in each case to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. CHATHAM) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota).

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2332. An act to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. NEAL, for 1 day, on account of district meeting requiring his presence.

THE LATE JOSEPH R. BRYSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House the passing of our beloved and honored colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, who has represented ably and faithfully the 4th District of the State of South Carolina for 14 years.

He passed away last evening shortly after 11 o'clock. There was no advance warning that the grim reaper was standing by. I had just gone with him to the Mayflower Hotel to attend a small dinner of the Cotton Manufacturers' Association and, at the request of the host, Joe had just offered a prayer of blessing. He sat down, complained of dizziness, and slumped from his chair. He was immediately carried to the hospital but there was nothing that human hands and expert medical care could do.

While none of us can solve the mysteries of the unknown or the ways of divine providence, I think it is fair to say that his death was due to the accumulated tensions, strains and exactions that fall to the lot of a Member of Congress who is devoted to his duty to his district, his State, and his country.

There are many here today who will testify that Joe's service here has been able and distinguished. We all know that he was an indefatigable worker. He was moderate in his personal habits but exacting in his demands upon himself when it came to the calls of his constituency, committee work and his attendance upon the floor here. Joe was a Christian in every sense of the word. He was a devoted member and leader of the Baptist Church, and his church was the center of his religious life whether he was performing his duties here or back home in Greenville, S. C. He was probably best known here in Congress as a cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night in his leadership in the cause of temperance, particularly in the use of alcoholic beverages.

So, a real friend and champion of the cause of the common man has gone. Coming from a fine family who had little worldly goods, he was determined to get an education and as a youth worked in the cotton mills of our State for 14 years to obtain that objective. In the climb up the ladder, he was elected to both the senate and the lower house of the General Assembly of South Carolina before coming to Congress, and he has grown in stature continually since he first came to the halls of Congress.

Joe was my friend and your friend. He was devoted to his work here. But most of all, I should say, he was devoted to his wife and five children and several grandchildren. All of these returned that devotion in full measure. Now, in their sorrow and loss, may the hand of the Omnipotent Ruler of the universe be placed lightly upon their shoulders and dry away their tears, for Joe is home at last.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I was shocked at the sudden passing of my friend and fellow South Carolinian, the distinguished and very able gentleman who represented the Fourth Congressional District of my State. I was with JOE BRYSON on the floor of the House during most of the afternoon yesterday. We walked from the Capitol to our offices together. Later he and I attended a dinner party in honor of some outstanding visitors from our State. He was apparently in good health and certainly was in excellent spirits so that his passing was a shock which scarcely seems a reality.

I did not know JOE BRYSON until I came to Congress 8 years ago, but I learned to love and respect him because of his many fine qualities. He was never too busy to help me as a freshman Congressman. He was patient and understanding and wise in his counsel. He was a distinguished and patriotic South Carolinian. My State has lost one of its outstanding public servants.

JOE BRYSON was born just over the hill from South Carolina in Brevard, N. C., but at an early age he came to Greenville, S. C., and there began his distinguished and fruitful career. He worked in the mills of that great textile center to obtain the means with which to educate himself. He was graduated from Furman University and from the Law School of the University of South Carolina, returning to his native city of Greenville to practice his profession. He served both in the State house of representatives in South Carolina and as a State senator from Greenville County before being elected to Congress in 1939. For 14 years he has served his district in a most statesmanlike manner. His attendance record both in the committee and on the floor of this House has been surpassed by few Members. Seldom has he been absent from either the committee or from a session of this House and always he has voted, both on the record and off, on the side he considered in the best interest of the greatest number of citizens. He showed no partiality for any particular group.

My colleague was ever a seeker after knowledge. He was a collector of rare books, being especially interested in those which dealt with religion and philosophy. He had more than 300 Bibles in his collection.

He was deeply religious and practiced his religion by effective work both in the church and among his fellow men. He was temperate in all things. All of his life he has espoused the cause of temperance, and he practiced his philosophy in this respect diligently.

He reared a fine family of 3 sons and 2 daughters. It was a happy family because he was devoted to his wife and children. He has given to each of his children a splendid education, wise counsel, and wonderful companionship.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to find appropriate words to express myself about one so beloved and respected, so devoted to the performance of his official duties, and so filled with love for his country and his fellow man. We can ill afford to lose men of his caliber, but God, in His infinite wisdom, knows best, and we must strive to meet the problems of life from this time on without him.

I know of no more fitting tribute than one which my colleague liked to quote himself from the lines of the poet:

So live, that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan, which moves
To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave,
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not sufficient words to express my feelings over the shocking news of the passing of my personal friend, JOE BRYSON. I cannot pass up this opportunity to express my feelings and the high esteem I held for my friend and colleague. Just 10 minutes before he suffered the stroke that proved to be fatal, we had a picture taken of the South Carolina delegation in Congress, and JOE BRYSON seemed to be in excellent spirits at that time.

I was privileged to have JOE BRYSON's acquaintance since we attended the University of South Carolina, as I was a freshman in the university when JOE BRYSON was a senior. He was highly respected by every student at the university and all the professors.

JOE BRYSON and I were elected to serve in the United States Congress on the same date, September 13, 1938. He has served his constituents well and has given his entire time, energy, and his all in an effort to properly represent the people of South Carolina here in the United States House of Representatives.

I have always believed that loyalty is the primary human virtue. Loyalty was certainly a virtue of JOE BRYSON—loyalty to his Nation, to his State, and to his friends. He possessed many great traits of character, utterly unselfish; his loyalty to the ones he trusted and loved was whole and complete.

He was a devoted husband and father. I have never known any man that enjoyed home life and being with his family more than JOE BRYSON.

In his political life, he possessed extraordinary courage, and was never afraid to speak his convictions. He was a great believer in the Constitution of the United States, and there is no power on earth that could have caused him to deviate from the course which he believed was charted by the Constitution of the United States. He was a great student of history, and spent a number of hours each day reading the life's history of our former great statesmen and heroes.

I have never known JOE BRYSON to say an unkind word about anyone, and he was always eager and willing to lend a helping hand to any person who wished his counsel.

I shall personally miss JOE BRYSON, as a friend, and his advice. My life has certainly been enriched by our association and our understanding. I shall always remember him as a great statesman and a real friend. My deepest sympathy goes out to his lovely wife and fine children.

I have known his children since they were small. They have all turned out to be great young men and women. The youngest child is in college today. One of his sons is one of the finest physicians we have in the State of South Carolina, and another is one of the finest lawyers in our State.

The English language does not provide me with sufficient words to say what I would like to say about my friend, JOE BRYSON.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, JOE BRYSON was a great South Carolinian. He was a great American. You knew him. You know of his career and character. There is nothing I can add here this morning since all of you knew JOE BRYSON and know of his distinguished service in this body. I first came in contact with JOE BRYSON as a boy attending the political campaign meetings in South Carolina. In South Carolina we have a unique system of appearing on the same platform with our opponents, and there I saw for the first time JOE BRYSON in his campaign for the lieutenant governorship of South Carolina. Later on I saw him in his campaign for the United States Senate. There is one thing I remember about him at that time—he always ran a clean campaign, free of any derogatory remarks about any of his opponents, and that was true right on through his entire life. He served in this great body for over 14 years with courage, ability, integrity, and with an understanding heart.

Representative BRYSON's life was a saga in the progress of America. He was born in North Carolina in the great Anglo-Saxon region that has produced so many great Americans, and where we are told today that the purest strain of the Anglo-Saxon race is to be found—the great Smoky Mountains of North Carolina. He came from there into our State and went to work at the age of 10 in the textile plants and worked his way for 15 years through the public schools and the great Furman University, the Baptist college in Greenville, and then to the University of South Carolina where he received his law degree. Soon after graduation he went to the statehouse and then to the State senate and later to the Congress of the United States—one of the highest offices in the gift of the American people.

One thing I like to remember about the life of this great American is that he always advocated moral principles both as an individual and in his public life. I think that is one of the finest things that can be said about anyone, that a person's moral and ethical standards were the highest. He knew no North or South or East or West. He spoke all over this great country for those principles and ideals that he believed in. "Greater love hath no man than this—that he lay down his life for his friends." JOE BRYSON died in the saddle, in the service of his country, and he gave his life to his friends, the people of the United States of America. Yes, "they pass on, but their good works follow them," and the good works of JOE BRYSON will follow him in the fine family of five children that he reared—each of them knowing the difference between right and wrong because their father trained them and had left them this Christian heritage.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal regret that I have to appear in the well of the House today. My district joins JOE BRYSON's for over 100 miles. I have appeared on many platforms with him. I remember my mother and father, when I was a Representative-elect, going to a Baptist all-day meeting in an adjoining county where JOE BRYSON was the speaker. My mother and father spoke to him about their son coming to the Congress, new and young, and asked him to advise me, which he subsequently did. I greatly appreciated his advice and counsel. I can hardly find words to express my sympathy to his splendid wife and his noble five children. The American people have lost a great man, one who came up in the traditions of Lincoln and John C. Calhoun in that he did not have the opportunity that many of the rest of our American citizens have.

JOE BRYSON's last public utterance was a beautiful prayer while standing at the dinner table a few seconds before he suffered the fatal stroke—symbolic of the life that he lived. My deepest sympathy always to his beloved wife and children.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult at a time like this to express our feelings. As I think of JOE BRYSON I am reminded of the words of a docker in one of the great ports of Britain. He said:

When you begin with the sins of others you are only guessing.
When you start with yourself you know where you are.

There was no finger-pointing by JOE BRYSON. He began with himself. He followed and lived out those moral standards which are alone going to be the answer to the friction and division and the crucial issues facing our country and the world.

I think the outstanding characteristic of our beloved friend was his tolerance. Joe stood where I am standing on March 3 and set forth this tolerance so characteristic of his life. On that date we were honoring the 30th anniversary of the services of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Let me share with you as my words the words that Joe expressed on that occasion. He said:

This very day I sat on the Judiciary Committee as I have for some years between a Catholic and a Jew, I, myself, being a Protestant and a Baptist.

Joe then mentioned that on the previous Sunday, as was his custom, he was attending church. That because of the renovations being made in his Washington church, the Calvary Baptist Church, he worshiped in the Washington Hebrew Cathedral, the church of Mr. CELLER, that had been placed at the use of his church.

Joe continued:

Shall I ask the brave soldier who fights by my side
In the cause of mankind, if our creeds agree?
Shall I give up the friend I have valued and tried
If he kneel not before the same altar with me?

Joe next made this observation:

It is comforting to know that there seems to be a trend of greater religious tolerance in our fair land.

Then he goes on to refer to his colleague [Mr. CELLER]:

Although I am often on the other side from my friend in the many controversial issues confronting us, I have never questioned his sincerity or purpose.

That was the spirit of our colleague whose passing we mourn at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the terrific pressure that Members of the House must face. The folks back home do not always fully understand the burdens we bear. Night after night our dear friends from home come and expect a pleasant visit in Washington, and they want us to join with them and it is hard to say "No." Joe was one of those fellows for whom it was difficult to say "No."

Joe was alert to the needs of his colleagues and the people he served. It is singular, I feel, that Joe only so recently spelled out his own philosophy of life. From this March 3 address our late colleague continued:

I am pleased that such occasions as this are marked before our colleagues are summoned to their final reward. Too often we neglect speaking words of appreciation, comfort, and encouragement to those entitled thereto until they have already answered the final rollcall.

Some unknown poet has left these significant words which are most applicable on this occasion:

"WHY WAIT FOR DEATH?

"I would rather have one little rose
From the garden of a friend
Than to have the choicest flowers
When my stay on earth must end.

"I would rather have the kindest words
And a smile that I can see
Than flattery when my heart is still
And this life has ceased to be.

"I would rather have a loving smile
From friends I know are true
Than tears shed 'round my casket
When this world I bid adieu.

"Bring me all the flowers today,
Whether pink or white or red;
I'd rather have one blossom now
Than a truckload when I'm dead."

My wife and I would sincerely share with Mrs. Bryson and members of this devoted family in their great loss.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, sadness has descended upon us; our Joe has left the scene.

No man was more gentle or benign; his kindliness and good humor were infectious; tolerance and respect for the individual ever guided his word and action. We never found him ill-tempered; he was always armed with the breastplate of good humor. He had a great religiosity and a firm sense of righteousness. It was never in Joe to harm anyone.

Death is always untimely. We never considered Joe ill or weak in mind, or heart, or body; his going from us, therefore, is as sad as it is stunning to us. He was ever firm in his convictions and his friendships. Storms broke over his head because of his views, but he clung steadfastly to them because he always kept faith with his conscience. So it was with his allegiance to his fellows; he bound himself to friends with hoops firm and unseverable.

He was my friend; and, as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, our beloved colleague [Mr. DEANE], just said at this lectern, only a day or so ago he expressed heartfelt feelings for our relationship here. To me his words uttered then will remain unforgettable. I am indeed distressed by his passing. Death found him a shining mark. It will be difficult to contemplate life in the Judiciary Committee without him; his quaint sayings and wise homilies always spread enlightenment upon the darkness engendered by intense controversy. His seat is vacant; it is draped with our sorrow.

We ask ourselves: Why? Why? Why is he struck down at the height of the fullness of his years when the wisdom that years and experience had brought enriched our proceedings here and the country out there? Our lips are muted in silence; it is God's inscrutable will. We bow in reverence to the inevitable.

We intensely admired Joe in life; now we shall love and respect his memory. We usually love all the more because we know the object of our affection cannot endure forever. We need not wear black for Joe, because he is now the guest of God.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and unforeseen death of JOE BRYSON is a distinct shock. Seemingly in the best of health and as cheerful as usual, he was summoned to the great beyond. Joe was an able and conscientious legislator. He was a friend who always greeted you with a smile. His little quips of humor had the effect of making contagious his good nature and amiable disposition. He served many years on the Committee on the Judiciary. He was alert, industrious, courageous, and keen of mind. In the most controversial matters wherein he had definite convictions, I never saw an indication of loss of temper or a disinclination to consider with fairness the arguments of those with whose views he differed. His was a judicial mind. He desired to know the facts, and, if convinced that he was in error, had the courage to acknowledge it. His opinions were highly regarded by the members of our committee. We deeply deplore his death. God in His infinite wisdom determined that JOE BRYSON had completed the labors that were his to perform on this earth and welcomed him to "that house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the 81st Congress I received a warm, friendly hand from JOE BRYSON. As we became better acquainted I learned to look to him as a kindly, gentle, Christian friend, a man of integrity, high ideals, common sense, and great ability.

He represented the huge textile area of his State and was familiar with all those problems that we have known in that industry. He had a clear understanding of the responsibilities of management and labor, he knew from his own experience that the growth of his area depended upon hard work and mutual understanding between all his constituents. He was wise enough to recognize that in his heart there were no class distinctions.

He leaves to his family and friends a splendid heritage—one that will remain green in their memory for all time.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, on the 3d day of January 1939, among the four hundred-and-some-odd Members of this House who stood here to take the oath there were 114 Members who entered for the first time. I was one of those and the Honorable JOE BRYSON was another. Of that 114, 90 have now departed from these halls. Only 24 are left. Thirty-two have passed on to be with their God.

In the Committee on the Judiciary where I have served ever since I entered Congress only four men are now left, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, the Honorable FRANCIS WALTER on the Democratic side, and the Honorable CHAUNCEY REED and myself on the Republican side.

At the beginning of the 79th Congress JOSEPH BRYSON became a member of that committee. I remember well his first day. We all shook hands and became acquainted. He turned to me and said: "You know, I have not had much experience in Federal work and I will be leaning on you pretty heavily." I said, "You can lean on me as long as you want and as hard as you want."

That was the beginning of a firm and lasting friendship. His virtues have been told here and there is nothing that can be added. As I think of him, I think first of a gentle, Christian spirit. It is hard to believe that any man in these troublesome days of tension and sharp discords could maintain the sweetness that this man carried through his life. He knew no racial bounds, he knew no political bounds. To him all men were brothers. His favorite salutation to me was, "How are you, Brother GRAHAM?" and I knew that in his sincerity of heart he meant that. His many quips of humor have been alluded to, and rich they were, and often they broke the tension of sharp debate and bitter, acrimonious legal struggles. Throughout all he maintained his sweetness, his gentleness, and his firmness. He never compromised, and I always admired him for the strength of his character and his willingness to go more than a mile to meet the opposition. It has been said that we shall miss him. We will miss him far more than we can ever say by mere words. Many years ago the patriarch Job said, "If a man

die, shall he live again?" Later on he said, "I know that my Redeemer liveth" and JOE BRYSON today is with his Redeemer and his life will live on for years and years to come.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, because our comprehension is fixed by the finite limitation of our minds, we cannot understand why JOE BRYSON, who yesterday, with so much vigor, participated in the affairs of this forum, is not with us today. But that is a reality that I learned with such a feeling of shocking loneliness while having my breakfast this morning.

Many years ago I came to the conclusion that when I shall come to the end of what we call the journey of life, and I look back on those things that I cherish most, they will be the warm, personal friendships that I made while traveling along this journey of life. That was the kind of friend I had in JOE BRYSON. He stands very high on my roster of very warm, personal friendships. His was a warm friendship because it emanated from a warm heart, from an understanding mind, from a charitable soul. When I first came here in the 77th Congress, he was one of the first men with whom I became rather intimately acquainted. That acquaintanceship and association has become enriched through the years since that time. Other colleagues of ours and his have already paid tribute to the alertness and discipline of his mind, to his quiet, keen wit and sense of humor, and to his strong moral convictions. There was never any venomous sting in any of the wit or humor that came from JOE BRYSON. He was tolerant, and that is a quality of character which already has been mentioned by nearly every colleague who has taken the well of the House to pay tribute to his memory. I think perhaps as much or more than any person I have ever known, JOE BRYSON found in his deep religious faith, in those deep wells of faith inside himself, great resources of inner strength and calm courage. It was with a great sense of loneliness and loss that I learned of his death this morning. I think, perhaps, as he progressed day after day, developing the great qualities of character that mark him in our own minds and in our memory, he probably came as near practicing the philosophy of those closing lines of one of our great poets, Oliver Wendell Holmes, in The Chambered Nautilus, as any man I have ever known:

Build thee more stately mansions, O my soul,
As the swift seasons roll!
Leave thy low-vaulted past!
Let each new temple, nobler than the last,
Shut thee from heaven with a dome more
vast,
Till thou at length art free,
Leaving thine outgrown shell by life's unresting sea!

I join with all of you in extending deep and sincere sympathy to his family in this hour of grief and sorrow.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON].

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly grieved and shocked to learn this morning of the passing of our dear colleague Congressman BRYSON. Congressman BRYSON and I have been on the same committee since I came to Congress, and no later than yesterday he was one of us in a committee meeting.

I shall always very vividly remember Mr. BRYSON. About a year ago he and I, with two members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, were sent to California to make an investigation. During that long flight, to that far-off State and back, we spent many hours together talking about various things. Congressman BRYSON explained to me what he considered to be the proper ethics of the Members of the House and I am sure I shall profit by his good advice. Congressman BRYSON told me most interestingly his whole life's history. He talked to me about his family and how much they meant to him.

Mr. BRYSON was a man of fine Christian character; he was a great statesman and a loyal friend. I have since come to know his wife and their family. My heart goes out to them today in this their great hour of sorrow.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, like all the other Members who have spoken here, I too, was greatly shocked this morning when I heard of the passing of my dear friend and brother, JOE BRYSON. Joe, or Brother Joe, as we called him, was an outstanding legislator. We are going to miss his accomplishments as a legislator but I think even more than that we are going to miss the kindly twinkle in his eye as he came up with some philosophical gem. He was really a friend to the Members of Congress.

There is nothing I can add to what has been said about the character of this good and great man. His character, too, spoke for itself. There exuded from the great heart of JOE BRYSON a great outpouring of love for his fellow man. Because he loved us so much, he strengthened our love for him. I loved JOE BRYSON, and I am sure everybody that knew him loved him. My family and I join with you all in extending to his fine family our deepest sympathy in their and our country's great loss.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the death of no Member of the House could have stunned or grieved me more than that of JOE BRYSON. He was kind, thoughtful, tolerant, and always a true friend. One of the most entertaining and enriching experiences of my congressional life was when I was fortunate enough to be on a trip with JOE BRYSON and our former colleague, beloved by all of us, Frank Fellows, of Maine. Only those who have been privileged to know well both of those men, so different in many of their interests yet so alike in capacity for friendliness and infectious sense of humor, could appreciate the significance of this experience. JOE BRYSON always illumined and enlivened any group with which he was associated. He was withal a man of sterling character. Many of us are better men because we knew JOE BRYSON. He has given of himself to our lives and personalities.

In addition, in our work on the Committee on the Judiciary, his contributions were outstanding. He was always ready to sit down and discuss the details of a measure to try to work out something which would be acceptable to the differing viewpoints. No man I have known exhibited a more tolerant attitude toward those with whom he differed. However, if it became a matter of compromise with a principle, that was where JOE BRYSON drew the line. He had fixed ideas of right and wrong. He never swerved from the path he believed was right. He served as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of which I now have the honor to be chairman. I shall miss him and his sound counsel more than I am able to express. To his fine wife and wonderful family, I want to join in expressing my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], who knew and loved JOE BRYSON as I did, may have permission to extend his remarks at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAHAM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the news of JOE BRYSON's death came as a great shock to me. It came at a time when Mrs. Riehlman and I were discussing the day's activities and she was planning to spend part of that day with Mrs. Bryson. Although I was not one of his intimate friends, I had learned to admire and respect him for his outstanding Christian character. Whenever honesty and integrity were involved, there was never a doubt in the mind of any Member of the House where JOE BRYSON stood. He was one who actually put into practice his religious beliefs and convictions. His great spirit and friendliness will be deeply missed by his colleagues in the House of Representatives. To his bereaved family I extend my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with other colleagues in expressing brief but very sincere tribute to the life and character and public service of our dear friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOE BRYSON, of South Carolina. He and I had offices next door to each other for a number of years, and I enjoyed a warm friendship with him during that period. It truly can be said that he was a man who professed the very highest attributes of Christian character and all of the sterling characters of manhood—a man of recognized ability and demonstrated devotion to the public service. I join with other colleagues in conveying to his family and loved ones our deepest sympathy and assure them that we share the great loss they have sustained.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, shortly after coming to Washington, it

was my good fortune to meet and to know the Honorable JOSEPH BRYSON at a little breakfast group that I attended and which he had attended for many years before. I grew to respect him and, I think, to know him, not quite as well perhaps as many of his older friends who have spoken so well and so eloquently of him today. He was a man. A gentle soul, and yet one with the very firmest and strongest convictions. He was a good man in the truest and the best sense of that word. For these reasons, he was always able to express himself moderately and with tolerance. He was sure of his faith. He was sure of his principles. He did not have to, therefore, indulge in histrionics or emotion. I believe that all of us who knew him are the better for that friendship and for that knowledge. For that reason, we can certainly sympathize most deeply with his family and with his widow, but we know and they know that he has now gone ahead and will go on from strength to strength in that greater and larger life where some day we all hope to join him.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with great sorrow of the death of my friend and colleague, Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of South Carolina. I join with my colleagues in mourning his passing and pause to pay a final tribute to a great South Carolinian and a great American. It has been my privilege and pleasure to know Mr. BRYSON personally for a number of years, and I count it an honor to have served with him in Congress. I served with him as a member of the House Judiciary Committee, and was privileged to serve as a member of his subcommittee during the last session of Congress. Throughout this association, I have come to know Mr. BRYSON well and have learned to respect him as a man of great ability, and strong convictions as well as a man of strong character and integrity. We shall miss him here in the Halls of Congress, and we shall particularly miss him in the House Judiciary Committee.

Mr. BRYSON was born in the mountains of western North Carolina, where he developed the strong characteristics of our mountain people. These characteristics remained with him throughout his life. Early in life he moved to Greenville, S. C., and climbed the ladder of success which ultimately led to his election to Congress. He has served his district, his State, and his Nation well. The people of his district have lost a great Congressman, his State has lost a great advocate, and the Nation has lost a great statesman. I express my deep sympathy to the members of his family upon their great loss.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the passing of anyone in the House could have shocked me more than the passing of JOE BRYSON. He looked a perfect picture of health on yesterday when he spent practically all of the session on the floor of the House.

JOE BRYSON lived the life that he said he believed in. His was a good soul. His character was above reproach. Out there somewhere, where good spirits dwell, when the spirit of JOE BRYSON approached he was received as an equal to the finest spirits there. He typified morals. He typified the Christian gentleman. He practiced what he preached. He was a good Christian and a great American.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I, with others, was deeply shocked to learn of the passing of Judge BRYSON. He served on three committees with me in his early days in Congress. I never knew him to be anything but fine and helpful. I feel as if I knew his constituents somewhat also, because when he was entertaining them at luncheon with his wife, he often called me to the table and I had an opportunity to see the love and respect in which he was held.

I sympathize deeply with his wife and children. My constituents in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts also mourn his passing. I remember the time of the celebration of the 175th anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. Judge BRYSON, out of his subcommittee of the Judiciary, secured the passage of a bill which provided for a commission of Members of Congress to participate in the celebration. It came out of the main committee and passed the House almost immediately. His helpfulness knew no party lines. We are grateful to him. We are grateful for his love of history and love of his country. He took particular interest in all the battles of our country, the military history of our country, and he valued the strength and the fineness of the people of our country. He was always such a Christian, such a gentleman in the debates and arguments on the floor and in the committees when I fear some of us are not too gentle, not too courteous, not too considerate of one another.

I understand that he was taken very ill just after the blessing which he invoked before a dinner of a group of textile men. He went very quickly, but it is terribly hard for his relatives and friends.

I like to look back on the history of his early life, his going to work at the age of ten in the textile mills at Greenville, S. C.; and I like to remember the tireless war he put up for the textile industry of his part of the country even though sometimes it was, we thought, against us in New England. He was always fighting, always battling for his own people and his own State. I enjoyed his humor, too. The last words he ever spoke to me were a few days ago when Congressman LANE and I passed him while he was sitting over there near the door. We went by and he hailed us and said with a smile on his lips and a twinkle in his eye: "You know, I have plans for the textile industry in the South"—said in kindliness, yet the everlasting looking after the interests of his own people. And he loved us all, too, in his great way. We shall miss him; we shall miss his spirit, and we shall miss his inspiration. His courage, ability, and valiant spirit will live on with us.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege during the 82d Congress to serve on the subcommitte of the Judiciary Committee which was chairmaned by JOSEPH R. BRYSON. During this time I grew to know him very well, and I soon learned to value his friendship and his counsel. His unfailing patience and good humor helped to smooth the work of the committee which involved long and oftentimes bitter hearings and discussions on various matters that were pending. Last summer it was also my privilege to go with him to Geneva, Switzerland, where we were members of the United States delegation to the International Copyright Convention. During that trip I grew to know him even better, as I was with him almost continuously; and I learned to respect him the more the better I grew to know him.

In my opinion there have been few Members of the House of Representatives who had a more even temperament or who so completely lacked bitterness. He never engaged in recrimination, and he had great tolerance for his fellow man and their opinions.

My sympathies are extended to his very fine family. He will be missed—very greatly missed—in this House and in the committee which he served so long and faithfully.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, JOE BRYSON was truly and genuinely a man from the people and of the people, a man who had deep love and affection in his heart. I know of no Member in this body on either side of the aisle who did not hold him in the highest esteem or who did not reciprocate the affection he had for each of us. We shall miss him greatly.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I did not read the newspaper this morning nor did I listen to the radio. As a result I learned of the death of our colleague, JOE BRYSON, only as I entered the portals of this Chamber. Of course, it was a shock. It was the type of shock that I have not received. It is difficult, therefore, to express through language my sympathy. However, I will do my best.

Man proposes; but God disposes. Surely this is the case in reference to the life of JOE BRYSON. Yesterday morning I began the day by taking breakfast with him. I saw him numerous times in the course of the day and had opportunities of talking to him. At breakfast yesterday morning he was jovial, yet serious. He told us stories that went back to his early youth when he first worked in the textile industry in South Carolina. Some of these stories were witty, some were serious. He told us then, casually it is true, about some of

his plans in reference to the textile industry, plans that would help lift the standard of living of the textile work in South Carolina and in the deep South. He had many plans and much work to do.

He was sincerely interested in the plight of the average man in his section of the United States and in this country generally.

Mr. Speaker, a poet has well said: "Where, oh where, are the snows of yesteryear?"

They are, of course, in the streams, in the rivers, and in the seas; they are in the grasses, the leaves, the trees, and the flowers.

So it was with JOE BRYSON. He lives on with us in spirt, in his personality, in his influence, and in his achievements in the great work he tried to do in the Congress of the United States for his people, the average man, and especially the people in the textile industry in the United States. So, as I said, his spirit lives with us today and he will be with us in the time that lies ahead.

Mr. Speaker, our hearts go out to his devoted widow and the family he leaves behind. We extend to them our deepest sympathies.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, when a friend whom we have been permitted to know more intimately than usual is suddenly called from our midst, the shock is a little greater and the grief runs a little deeper. Only a few hours ago Mrs. Goodwin and I were talking with JOE BRYSON and his lovely and devoted wife in the same sort of happy conversation which had come to be the repetition of so many more that have gone before. It is hard for me to realize that his cheerful voice is stilled.

Every social contact with him outside the halls of legislation has always been a stimulating experience. He was a delightful conversationalist and his ready wit and unfailing good humor so often used to punctuate even recital of the humdrum experiences of everyday life make me realize in this hour of sorrowful retrospect that JOE BRYSON had evolved a very splendid philosophy of the joy of living.

I shall always remember my service with him on the Committee on the Judiciary, and particularly my service under him as a subcommittee chairman. I have never known a more conscientious legislator. His district and his State and Nation have lost a Congressman who adequately met the measure of a public servant always earnest in a desire to make the best use of his ability, industry, and talents to the end that Government should reflect the highest ideals of citizenship.

To Mrs. Bryson and to that splendid family of which Joe so often spoke with such becoming pride, I extend my sincerest sympathy.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, had I not known before I came to this Chamber this morning of JOE BRYSON's passing I would have known that something like that had happened because of the quietness and the hushed voices that I observed when I entered. That in itself is a tribute to JOE BRYSON, because we all recognize that death is close to us all when someone to whom we are so devoted like JOE BRYSON has passed from our midst. Really, however, it is rather out of character for us to be funereal about JOE BRYSON's death; it is a little bit selfish, I think. We are being selfish that we have lost Joe, and that is understandable. Joe himself, however, would not want us to be sad or anything other than cheery and jovial, for Joe was always happy. He was, indeed, the very personification of happiness, a contagious happiness he imparted to all who associated with him.

There are two things about Joe that I want to say which I have not heard said here today. One is in connection with his work in the church, for he practiced his religion both in his district and here, too. A year ago the city of Washington was the scene of a great religious revival. Dr. Billy Graham came to Washington for a revival out at the Armory, which brought the light of salvation to hundreds, and increased the joys of many of us in the living of God's holy word. JOE BRYSON was one of the most diligent in attending this revival and in assisting in its success. Another thing: You know, it is very difficult for a Member of Congress to get another Member of Congress to go into his district or go somewhere and make a speech. We are reluctant to speak outside of our own districts. A month or more ago my preacher out in my Methodist Church in Arlington, Va., asked me if it would be possible for me to get a speaker to come out and speak at one of our lenten services. I asked him what kind of a speaker he wanted, and his description exactly fitted JOE BRYSON. So I went to Joe and told him what I wanted, and Joe, without a moment of hesitation, said, "Certainly, I will be glad to go." I regret very much that I did not have the privilege of introducing Joe, because he passed away before he was able to fill that engagement.

There is little we can say which will be consoling to JOE BRYSON's family. But I hope that some measure of consolation is given to them in knowing that all his friends here share their sorrow.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this hour to pass without expressing publicly the deep sense of loss I feel in the passing of a great statesman from my neighbor State of South Carolina.

Although JOE BRYSON represented a South Carolina district here, we in North Carolina felt that he belonged to us also. He was born in our State, and we North Carolinians have watched with pride as he climbed the ladder of success in our sister State and in the Halls of Congress.

I shall never forget that soon after I came here in January he sought me out and, although we sit on opposite sides of this center aisle, he extended to me the right hand of fellowship and friendship, and volunteered to help me in every way possible in learning the ropes here.

I join my colleagues from South Carolina and elsewhere in expressing my deep sense of the loss not only to South Carolina but to the Nation in the passing of this fine citizen and this great Representative of the people.

My deepest sympathy goes out today to his family. May God be with them in this hour of trial. I am sure of only one thing, and that is that only faith will carry them through their ordeal courageously and victoriously.

When I think of the sudden passing of a statesman at the height of his power and influence, I recall these lines written by one of the world's greatest thinkers:

> Our little systems have their day.
> They have their day and cease to be.
> They are but broken lights of thee
> But, Thou, O Lord, art more than they.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues the grief and sorrow they have expressed here in the passing of our mutual friend, JOE BRYSON.

I think the greatest tribute that could be paid to JOE BRYSON is that he was a Christian gentleman. I think that Joe was a living example of the Golden Rule. He had a golden heart, he had a brilliant mind, and he had the courage of his convictions. He possessed all the qualities that go to make up a good Christian gentleman.

I think of a little verse I learned long ago that I think might be applicable to Joe. It read like this:

> Dare to be a Daniel,
> Dare to stand alone.
> Dare to have a purpose and
> Dare to make it known.

He possessed that kind of character. We have lost a valuable Member and the State of South Carolina has lost a great public servant. In this hour may the good Lord bless, sustain, and keep the members of his family.

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, when Mrs. O'Hara and I sat down to breakfast this morning, upon opening the morning paper we read that my dear and much loved friend, JOE BRYSON, had passed away. I do not know when I have received a greater shock. When I first came to the Congress in 1941, I had the privilege of being assigned to serve on the great Committee on the Judiciary. There I first became acquainted with JOE BRYSON. I feel often times we can become best acquainted with our colleagues in the course of our committee work. I have known many beautiful characters in my lifetime who have left upon me a very deep impression, but I do not know of any one who left a greater impression on me than did JOE BRYSON. All of the beautiful things that have heretofore been so eloquently said about him are true. He was born in modest circumstances. He obtained his education in the face of adversity as a poor boy. I think that helped to make him the great

and understanding soul that he was. I have never heard him say one unkind thing or make an intolerant statement against any person or any viewpoint. He had the gift of believing strongly but dispassionately in his own principles but recognized the logic or reasoning behind the position of someone who might differ with him. I think the tributes which have been paid to JOE BRYSON today are as deep and sincere as I have ever heard in the Halls of Congress. Every one is appropriate. The only thing that has not been mentioned is that JOE BRYSON was a great scholar. I believe the private library that he had is one of the largest of any Member of the Congress. He was a great scholar and student.

To his lovely wife and family, I want to join with my colleagues in extending the sympathy which we do fully share and to wish for them the strength and guidance which somehow I feel he has imparted to them to carry them through these dark hours.

My sympathy goes to the great State of South Carolina and to the people that JOE BRYSON so devotedly and so loyally served. May I say to you that this country has not only lost a great public servant, but a great American.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE].

Mr. CARLYLE. Mr. Speaker, my conscience would reprove me at this time should I fail to add my words of commendation and deep appreciation for the splendid life and works of the distinguished Congressman from Greenville, S. C., Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON.

I am far from sure as to how great a loss I have sustained at this time, because each opportunity that I had to be in his presence brought new enrichment into my life. Congressman BRYSON was a superb man, and those who knew him best appreciate the true significance of this statement. He was possessed of a fertile brain, a kind heart, and a real determination to be at all times helpful. His many fine attributes caused one to know that he was a good man and one in whom confidence could be safety placed. It had not been my privilege to know him before I came to Congress, but a short acquaintance with him caused me to know that he was always sincere, forthright, and highly dependable, and a true friendship was formed.

He sponsored much wholesome and beneficial legislation, and when legislation came before the House which had for its purpose to be of real and permanent benefit to the people of this country, JOE BRYSON'S support was assured. When I consider the many splendid qualities possessed by this true statesman and the nature of the legislation which claimed his attention, I cannot believe that he has completely departed, because his life and his works have been indelibly impressed upon the Members of this House and the people of this country, and they will continue to bless mankind for many years to come.

He was a family man and was a devoted husband and father. He loved his church, and with all of his energies he supported its many activities. He fervently believed in the cause of education and never failed to lend his aid to educational institutions. Only yesterday I talked with him, and every appearance indicated that he would have many more years of fruitful service to his district, his State, and this country. However, it has been well said: "That life is long which answers life's great end."

To his devoted wife and children I humbly extend my deepest sympathy in this period of their irreparable loss. In future years I shall have many occasions to think of Congressman JOE BRYSON, and I am now more firmly convinced than ever that the poet was using inspired words when it was written:

There is no death, I am sure of that,
The thing that seems to be
Is but a touch of winter
That lays bare the spreading tree.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, unlike many of those who have spoken here today, I was not an intimate friend of JOE BRYSON'S. I never served on the same committee with him. We were never closely associated in the work of this body, but I certainly knew him well enough and saw enough of him to realize that there was a man of rare quality, of great integrity, great gentleness, and great devotion, both as a legislator and a servant of his people and of all the people of this country.

It chanced that exactly 48 hours ago JOE BRYSON and I were seated side by side in the chamber of the United States Supreme Court whither each of us had gone to move the admission of a member of the bar. I had some casual conversation, trifling and unsuspecting, with my colleague on that occasion. Certainly there was nothing in his mind or in mine, or in that of anyone present, to suggest that my service in this body would be extended beyond his. I am aghast at the inscrutable decision which gives me the privilege of standing here and praising my lost colleague instead of his being here speaking kindly, as I hope he would have, of me. It makes one feel very poignantly how unworthy we are to carry on the work, from which so many and such noble spirits are taken away. I can only hope that in JOE BRYSON'S case, his leaving means only that he has been called earlier to a far greater reward.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it came to me this morning as a sudden shock and with deep regret when I learned of the untimely death of my distinguished friend and colleague, JOE BRYSON. It has been my pleasure during the past 10 years to serve on the same committee as Brother Joe; it has been my pleasure also to sit next to him for many years. We all knew Joe as a man with a keen intellect, a keen perception about any problem he studied and about many that he had not even studied. He had ability to express himself, he had a melodious voice, he was a prodigious worker, he was an avid reader and a very able scholar. He was to many of us a gentle spirit, a wonderful raconteur of exceptional ability, we enjoyed his company and profited by it when he was working and helping us to solve our problems. I like to remember him as the epitome of a true Christian gentleman. There was a gentleness about his spirit and a height and depth in his soul that made one realize that JOE BRYSON was a walking example of what we as Christians strive to be.

I think the Lord was most kind to Joe when he called him suddenly, because Joe's life was one in which he was always prepared to meet his Maker and to enter into his eternal reward.

Joe was very devoted to his family, and they likewise were extremely devoted to him. They were devoted to him because to them he exhibited in a family way the same qualities he exhibited to everyone with whom he came in contact. It is indeed a terrific blow to his family, but I certainly feel that they will take consolation in the fact that Joe did not leave this earth after a struggle with illness but went hurriedly to his richly deserved divine reward.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, every one of us has heard the remark that there is nothing as certain as death, and nothing as uncertain as the time of death. We were forcibly reminded of that this morning when we read the sad news of the death of JOE BRYSON.

It was my privilege and pleasure to have known JOE BRYSON for 10 years. To me he was the perfect example of a true southern Christian gentleman, and I say "southern" because the average southerner possesses a certain graciousness that is usually lacking in those who come from other parts of the country.

Mr. BRYSON was an able legislator, he was an outstanding individual, and he had a keen sense of humor. I happen to be one of those who believes that an individual does not have to die in order to enjoy the blessings of heaven. JOE BRYSON was one of those men who thoroughly enjoyed being here on earth. His life was one of which it could be said he had a part of heaven during his earthly life.

He was a tolerant man, he was friendly, kind, able and, as I stated, he had a keen sense of humor. I will be pardoned, I know, if I relate the following incident, which illustrates his sort of playful humor. When I told Mr. BRYSON that my daughter had married a South Carolinian, he told me then, and repeated the statement many times, that "she was a mighty lucky girl." Of course, I also share that view. When my grandson was born and I told him about it, he said, "That boy's success is assured."

Anyone who knew JOE BRYSON will always remember him for his pleasing personality, his thoughtfulness, his kindness, and his wholesome humor. He was not a weakling in any sense of that word. He possessed a strong character, he was an intelligent legislator, he was a great pleader for the right as he saw it, and one who stood firmly behind his convictions.

Mr. Speaker, it seems sad sometimes that a man of his caliber and usefulness

should pass from us so suddenly. However, may I reiterate what has been previously stated here today, that all of us who think of our departed friend will have the fondest and most pleasant recollections of him. His lovely family, I know, will find great consolation in the fact that their husband and father was a Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. That thought will help them carry the burden which is theirs today.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, may I join the other Members of this House today in their hour of grief at the sudden passing of our beloved colleague, JOE BRYSON. We all realize that the life of JOE BRYSON was typical of true Americanism.

As has been stated by many of our colleagues today, Mr. BRYSON started a humble life and fought a valiant battle and made a true and honest American. As we look over his accomplishments, we appreciate that he has contributed much to our Nation.

It was my good fortunte more than 2 years ago to first meet JOE BRYSON. I had the opportunity to serve on a subcommittee of which he was chairman. It was there that I learned of the man who had a sterling character, the Christian man who was ready and able to accept responsibility. It was there that all of us who knew him learned to love him. We learned to love him because of the attributes he typified. We knew that when his word was given we could depend on it, we knew that his sincere efforts and his interest in the welfare of his constituents, the Nation, and his friends, was something which was not unusual in a man of this character. It is with a deep sense of regret that I learned of his sudden passing this morning. We who have served with him extend our sympathy to his widow and his children. America has lost a great man.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a just and devoted man has been called to his richly deserved reward. I wish to express my gratitude for his life and extend to his family and loved ones my sincere sympathy.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the hand of the Almighty, the God in whom we believe, has reached down again on this House. JOE BRYSON has gone from us. His memory will ever live within the walls of this Chamber.

We are reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the promise that we knoweth not the day or the hour when that summons shall come, but it will surely come. This morning, just after breakfast, my wife and I were reading the paper when she saw the article announcing the unfortunate and sudden passing of JOE BRYSON. I, like many of you who have joined in this beautiful and fine tribute to his life, was deeply shocked. Mrs. Harris and I were both grieved because we had known the Bryson family for a good many years and we knew the type of life that he lived and the service he has rendered.

It was a little more than 12 years ago that I first met Joe. I came here in the 77th Congress. Of course, I remember meeting him here in the Halls of Congress, but not nearly as vividly as is the memory of my meeting him at Calvary Baptist Church. It was soon after we arrived in Washington that January 1941, in the Vaughan Bible class, one of the largest and finest organized Bible classes in the United States, that I was introduced to him. JOE BRYSON took an active part in the class and the church. I knew him there as here in the Congress during these 12 years that I have been in the Congress, and also his wife and children.

JOE BRYSON was a man of deep philosophy.

His philosophy was truly American. He had the same kind of philosophy as the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and above all, the Bible.

JOE BRYSON was a man of deep conviction. We have seen his performance here in the House. This House instructed our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make investigation with reference to the type of programs over radio and television going into the homes throughout the United States, where they especially affected children. JOE BRYSON came to our committee. He sat there and talked to us in his humble way, tolerant, patient, but yet expressing a firm conviction for the future welfare of this country, because he believed that it is in the homes that the strength of this great Nation lies.

JOE BRYSON was a man of deep religious faith. We know that from his life as we have observed it. Every Sunday morning whenever it was possible and he was in Washington you would find him sitting on the front seat just beneath the pulpit at Calvary Baptist Church, listening to Dr. Cranford or a visiting minister. He was a man that not only believed it, he lived it.

JOE BRYSON was a man of deep family ties. He believed that the only way his children could have opportunities in life was to have the environment of the church and the type of home life he wanted to provide for them. Such a man has gone from us, Mr. Speaker.

Only the night before last my wife and I and other Members of this Congress and their wives were together at a little party downtown at which JOE BRYSON and his wife attended. He was the same, usual JOE BRYSON that we have known day by day here. Only yesterday in the Halls of this Congress was he performing his usual duties, assuming the responsibilities which his constituents had reposed in him. Today Joe is resting with his Master, in whom he believed.

I join my other colleagues in expressing our deep sorrow to the members of the South Carolina delegation and to his constituents. You have lost a great colleague and a great American and we have, too. The Nation has lost a great man and a great legislator.

To his fine wife and family, I join in extending, too, deep regrets at his passing, and for myself and my wife, our deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, a most lovable, Christian gentleman—a dedicated American—that is the JOE BRYSON I have been privileged to know in the House of Representatives.

I cannot say how saddened I have been to learn of Joe's sudden passing. I can say this. I have heard many eulogies expressed in the well of the House, but none more deeply sincere than those of this hour.

Just a few weeks ago in a group of 20 Members of this body, 10 from each side of the aisle, Joe and I were privileged to be the luncheon guests of President Eisenhower at the White House. That was an historic day because that was the day the distinguished former Governor of Illinois, Adlai E. Stevenson, also was a luncheon guest at the White House. I recall so well that Joe sparkled with wit on that occasion, and he was very serious too.

Immediately after the luncheon, we Members of the Congress saw the President and his vanquished foe of the last campaign walk out into the East Room arm-in-arm, there to stand alone for several minutes, smilingly chatting together. I recall that JOE BRYSON took me by the arm to make a statement which I have repeated many times since. That statement was this: "Brother CANFIELD, look! Where but in America could you ever see a picture like that?"

It was only a week ago that JOE BRYSON stood in the well of this House eulogizing the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] upon the completion of 30 years of service in this body. He had the most friendly things to say about MANNIE CELLER'S autobiography captioned "You Never Leave Brooklyn." That was JOE BRYSON. His passing has hurt me terribly. It has been a blow to me mentally and physically. Most certainly my heart goes out to the beloved members of his family, to his distinguished colleagues of the South Carolina delegation, and to his faithful constituency at home.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to join those colleagues who have spoken so sincerely and so earnestly from their hearts about the fine qualities of JOE BRYSON. This Congress will not be the same for me now that he is gone. I have had the privilege of associating with him in almost every place I have been here, and in almost every phase of my activities in Washington.

Like the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], I was with him on Monday of this week in the Supreme Court where the three of us had some of our constituents to present to that Court. I had the privilege of walking back from the Supreme Court Building to the House at that time with him. Like the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], it was my privilege and pleasure to have breakfast with him in the House Office Building cafeteria

just yesterday morning. It is difficult for me to believe now that he has gone, and that we will never see him here in these accustomed haunts again.

Our colleagues have spoken truly about his many good qualities. There are some of our friends about whom we sometimes exaggerate when we speak of them, but I feel that you could not exaggerate when you speak about the good qualities of JOE BRYSON. He never was ostentatious. He never undertook to present himself as his friends now present his good qualities. He was a gentle soul, and yet, with all that, he was a man of courage. He was a modest man, and yet he was a man whom all the forces that could be mustered against him could not move from his position once he had reached a conclusion as to what was right.

My limited vocabulary does not permit me to express the admiration which I had for him, the friendship which I feel for him. I join with those colleagues who have already spoken in extending for myself and my wife to his family our deepest and most sincere sympathy. I extend also to his colleagues and to his constituency in the great congressional district which he has so faithfully represented my sincere feelings of sympathy. It is with a feeling of distinct personal loss that I pay this tribute to this great American, my friend JOE BRYSON.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since reading in the morning paper of the passing of JOE BRYSON, my heart has been heavy. Joe, the gentleman always; Joe, once a friend, always a friend; Joe, the Christian, sincere, hard-working legislator. The Congress and the country can ill afford to lose men like JOE BRYSON. Personally I shall miss Joe and his kindness at all times. My sincere and heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet recovered from the shock over the passing of the gentleman from South Carolina. Somehow I never associated death with JOE BRYSON. He was so full of life, so vibrant, and certainly as much in love with life as any man I ever knew. I do not believe I ever saw a man who was happier with the family that was his. I am sure I never knew a man who loved every Member of this House more than he did. It was a benediction to me to see the affection that JOE BRYSON held for his constituents. He probably had as many visit him as any Member of this body. But the sweetest thing and the finest thing between them was the great love and affection those constituents had for Joe, and the complete confidence they had in each other.

I like to remember Joe as I saw him here on this floor yesterday afternoon; I saw him rise to his feet and, with every gentlemanly instinct which was his, fight earnestly, but as usual always temperately, on a great issue, a most serious issue. Joe's position did not win, but over the years history will determine which one was right. I heartily suspect Joe was.

There were few men here who were more constructive than JOE BRYSON; I know there was none here who was more loved. Joe had the happy faculty, when sometimes during long hours of debate, we under tension allowed our tempers to become frayed, of bringing us back down to earth with a humorous anecdote with a whole lot of common sense.

JOE BRYSON was a scholar in every sense of the word, but there is another thing that I want to point out about JOE BRYSON: JOE BRYSON's life was a living lie to the foolishness we so often hear in this country, which is that if a man is not accorded every chance on earth that human mind can conceive, you will make him a bad citizen or that he will become a Communist. Of course I had known there was nothing to that foolishness all the time but JOE BRYSON as fully as any man I ever knew proves that all that an honest government can do is to say to any young man: "Son, you can go just as far in America as your will to work, as your ability, and your friends will permit you to do." And that was utterly sufficient for Joe, and he thought that extremely fair and American.

JOE BRYSON worked in the cotton mills; JOE BRYSON knew what it was like to be without sufficient clothes at times; JOE BRYSON knew what it was to be hungry; but JOE BRYSON, instead of condemning his Government, thought that he had a wonderful Government, and he loved it like a mother does her first-born child. I say that when anyone advocates that foolishness, we have the complete answer by saying, "Wait a minute! Wait a minute! Have you considered our friend JOE BRYSON?"

You know, in thinking about his passing I would be compelled to say that nature itself was prodigal, wasteful, were it not for the fact that I realize, as you do, that even heaven is going to be a little brighter, a little happier, because of Joe. Lots of my friends have passed on to the other side, so many that heaven is not near as far away to me as it was in my youth. I have a lot of people up there myself, and you know I hope that they have already met Joe. I want them to know Joe, and I know that they will be happier because of having met him.

To his fine wife, to his splendid family, to his district, to his State, and to his Nation, I extend my sincere sympathy, my greatest affection, and my deep sense of personal loss at his passing.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have not been a Member of this body long enough to know many of my colleagues well, but I did know JOE BRYSON extremely well, particularly because of our joint work on the Committee on the Judiciary. I can say with all sincerity that if I am in this House for 20 more years I shall never forget him.

Concerning my work with him in this House and on our committee, may I say that he manifested at all times what you might call intellectual honesty and a strong spirit of morality. It was just a little over a year ago that I, with JOE BRYSON and others, represented this body at a funeral in Albany, N. Y., of one of our distinguished Members, William Byrne. When we left Albany I traveled to Buffalo, N. Y., with JOE BRYSON on the airplane because Buffalo is near my home and at that time JOE BRYSON had a daughter living there. All during that trip I spoke with JOE BRYSON. When we departed and I went to my home all I could think of was that in the entire scope of my acquaintances I had known no one who impressed me as being such a clean thinker, such a fine thinker, such a splendid person as JOE BRYSON.

May I say upon this sad occasion that because of his character, his integrity, and because of the life he lived, certainly he is in a place far more peaceful, he is far happier than he would have been on this earth. To the members of his family, to the members of the South Carolina delegation, I extend my deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on learning of the passing of Hon. JOE BRYSON this morning a deep gloom fell over our household. It was only night before last that my wife and I attended a dinner with Mr. and Mrs. Bryson. We always enjoyed being in their company. Mrs. Bryson was a loving, gracious, and devoted helpmate and companion. She contributed in no small measure to his greatness and success.

JOE BRYSON and I came to this body at the same time on January 3, 1939, at the beginning of the 76th Congress. I was associated with him very closely since that time. He was never too busy to leave his office to visit a Government department to intercede for a friend. I accompanied him on many such occasions. He was equal to any situation with which he was confronted. He possessed a pleasing, sincere manner; had an abundance of tact and diplomacy. We always asked Joe to do the talking at these conferences. None could have done better at the assignment that was his.

He was a true and loyal friend. I recall once that he read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article that had been written regarding my activities.

If good deeds were flowers, he would sleep tonight in a bed of roses. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that JOSEPH R. BRYSON was a Christian gentleman without hypocrisy. I am a better representative of my people because of having known and worked with him these years. The House of Representatives is a better legislative body due to his service here.

He was a clean man—clean in mind and spirit. He was an immaculate dresser, who looked and acted the part of a true statesman.

I would like to quote a portion of a poem by Josiah Gilbert Holland that I read a few years ago which I believe is most fitting:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie.

JOE BRYSON was such a man. "He fought the good fight; he kept the faith; a crown of righteousness awaits him."

I shall miss his counsel, his pleasing, ever-ready smile, and his warm friendship. My heart goes out to his widow, his children, and his grandchildren in the loss of a great man and a good man.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, a kindly, humble man who walked with us yesterday today walks with God. JOE BRYSON sprang from the people. He knew the ills that beset them, their wants, their fears, and their sorrows; he was the better man for it. He masked a keen sense of humor behind a serious mien. He was friendly, courteous and sincere. He was a man of great principle, unbending in those things that he felt to be right but not intolerant of others. He was ever willing to accept counsel and hear the story of all who came to him. He reserved his judgment of men and issues until he could reconcile it with his conscience. JOE BRYSON was my friend, and I know that men who come to the House will miss a kindly soul who was ready to encourage and guide them. We all suffer a sense of personal loss in the passing of this truly Christian man who fulfilled all the precepts of his faith and loved his fellow man because of his great love of God.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to a most loyal and lovable Member of this House. JOE BRYSON was a man that I like to think about, like the story I heard of a little crippled boy whose mother told him that God would take care of him. One day this man went to carry this little boy to a hospital, and on his way to the hospital this little boy looked up into this man's face and asked him, "Are you God?" Well, the man was dumfounded; he did not say anything. In a moment the little boy said, "Well, mister, you work for God, do you not?" He said, "Well, son, I suppose I do." I think that JOE BRYSON worked for his God, he worked for his State, and he worked for his country. I think that it can be truly said that a giant oak in the forest has fallen.

As many of the speakers have said here this afternoon, JOE BRYSON came up the hard way. Joe was a graduate of Furman University, a Baptist institution in Greenville, S. C. Some years ago he was instrumental in having Bob Jones University established in Greenville, and he was a trustee of that great interdenominational school. He gave much of his time, his thoughts, his efforts, and his talents in making that one of the greatest interdenominational schools of this Nation and of this world. I think that the establishment of that Bob Jones University in Greenville, S. C., to which our colleague JOE BRYSON contributed so much, will forever stand as a monument to his help.

I like to think of JOE BRYSON as a man like Enoch of old, who truly walked with his God.

I know that each and every Member of this House joins in extending our sympathy to his devoted family, to his widow, and to his children.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there are times when no words we can utter express our feelings and that is my position now. It was with the deepest and most sincere sorrow that I learned this morning of the passing of our colleague, the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina. He was beloved and admired by all who knew him, and in his passing we have lost a colleague whose record of service to his district, his State and his Nation is worthy of emulation.

The esteem in which he was held by his constituents is attested by his uninterrupted service over the years in this body. His charming manner and friendliness that won him the loyalties of his friends at home he brought with him to the Congress, where he continued to make countless friends among his associates. He was an able, courageous and kindly man, always ready to help those who needed assistance and tireless in doing good. He spent himself and sacrificed his life for others. No finer character from the standpoint of ability, clear-thinking, integrity of mind and heart has held public office. His acts were always controlled by diligent solemn judgment and honesty of purpose.

Congressman BRYSON was a tireless worker, a trustworthy and devoted public servant, a lovable and kindly soul. This Nation has lost a sincere and able statesman.

For a number of years it has been my pleasure and my honor to occupy a seat next to our devoted colleague on the House Committee on the Judiciary. He was conscientious and faithful in his attendance and work on the committee and to the business on the floor of the House. I have had many pleasant conversations with him over the years, and I had every opportunity to judge the worth of our colleague.

Only yesterday as we sat together on the floor of this Chamber he remarked to me that he and I had many things in common. He made mention of the fact that he represented a great textile industry in the South, and I had the honor to represent a similar district in the North. That his people in his district and his area were similar in so many respects to my constituents, made up of hardworking, sincere and conscientious mill workers.

His achievements would not have been possible without the inspiration, understanding and help of his faithful and loving wife. The life and character of JOE BRYSON will remain always as an inspiration to all who knew him, to all who were associated with him and to all who come after him.

I shall miss him as a friend; his district and the Nation will miss him as an able legislator and one who rendered his country a great service in one of the most critical periods of our history.

May I express to his wife and to his family my sincere and deepest sympathy, knowing that the Almighty will shower down upon him eternal happiness.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing I can add to what has been said in deserved tribute to our departed colleague, but I would not feel right in my heart if I did not add my word of respect and affection for him and express my personal sorrow and sense of loss at his sudden and untimely passing.

The great playwright once had Mark Anthony say over the body of Caesar, "The evil men do lives after them; the good is oft interred with their bones." Perhaps he said that because he knew that most of us, no matter how high and noble our aspirations, have plenty of evil which we hope will not live after us, and we hope that what good we have done will not be interred with our bones. But no evil will live after JOE BRYSON, because he had done none. If he had any weakness, it was completely unknown to anyone who ever knew him.

We, who lived and worked with him for many years, sometimes under trying circumstances and in situations which expose defects in men's character, never found any chink in his armor.

Whenever we lose a friend or colleague, we naturally say the best possible things about him, but here was a man about whom everything good that has been said today was completely deserved and words are inadequate to tell half of the whole. Joe was a man who was unswerving in his own convictions, a man who understood that this Nation was founded on the principles that came into the world with the Judeo-Christian body of ethics, and who never deviated in his devotion to those principles, a man who never hid his own candle under a bushel, but who never tried to impose his views on anyone else. He was a man who knew that the effective way to influence people is by the irresistible attraction of a righteous and godly and charitable and kindly example and not by coercion. He was a man who enriched the life of every person who was privileged to know him.

I first became somewhat intimate with JOE BRYSON during the war when a person who was very dear to him was afflicted with a very troublesome illness. The outcome was unpredictable at that time. He talked to me about it on several occasions for he was borne down with it. Sometimes a physician has a better opportunity to see what is in a man than almost anybody else except perhaps his pastor or his priest. For if a man ordinarily wears a mask, the mask is off when he is dealing with ultimate realities—with life and death, with health and disease, with pain and relief from suffering or anxiety. It was under such circumstances that I first came to see and admire the sterling qualities of this man's character and his beautiful spirit. We, too, have been made better men for having known him. The world is a better place because of him. I join with all his many, many friends in extending to

his beloved family, and all those who were so close to him, our affection and our sympathy.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the deserved and splendid tributes paid by so many Members today to the life and memory of our dear friend JOE BRYSON is the best evidence of the type and character of man that he was in life and of our deep respect and affection for him. The Members of this body are elected from different parts of our great country, and we come here at the outset not knowing each other, or as a new Member knowing very few, usually confined to those who come from our own State or section of the country. We meet and we talk. We are members of committees. We come to know one another. Friendships develop. Feelings of respect and confidence develop, and we come to know what each individual Member symbolizes—the spirit of a Member.

Everything said about JOE BRYSON today is a deserving tribute to a truly great man. He made his contributions as a Member of this body, quietly but effectively. He was a man of profound thought and logic, a man with a penetrating mind, but in a sweet manner, and all the more effective because of his sweetness of thought, sweetness of mind, sweetness of character. I can see him now on the various occasions when he took the floor. While there are many Members I like to listen to, he was one I always liked to listen to. I told that to him personally, in life; not only the thought and logic that he expressed impressed me but the musical tone of his voice. He is probably one of two or three men I have met in my lifetime that I could see the musical notes flowing out of his mouth, a gift; a rare gift.

JOE BRYSON was one of the few I met in life who had a melodious speaking voice, one of the most melodious I have ever heard, and that great possession made him all the more powerful and all the more influential.

So I join with all my colleagues who have spoken today, and those who have not spoken but who join with us, in paying tribute to a human being who has made the journey on earth and has come across our pathway of life and has made us all a little better because we have known him, a true gentleman, an understanding mind, a philosopher, one always searching for the truth and living up to it as he found it; a man who lifted himself above human impulses and reactions as far as anyone humanly could.

I wish I had ability great enough to express the thoughts I have about this fine, quiet, but effective gentleman, legislator and American who during his journey through life made his contributions to a better country; and, over and above that, to a better world.

To the delegation from South Carolina I extend my profound sympathy in the loss the delegation has sustained; to the people of his district I extend my deep sympathy, but in particular to his loved ones Mrs. McCormack and I extend our profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of our late colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely death of JOE BRYSON has cast a pall over the entire Capitol. He was one of the most popular Members of this House. He was one of the finest men that I have ever known. His outstanding ability, his sterling Christian character, his kindly disposition, and his keen sense of humor endeared him to the hearts of all of his colleagues. He was the type of public official that we can ill afford to lose at this time. His passing is a loss to the Nation.

I join the Members of this body in paying a well-deserved tribute to his memory and in expressing deepest sympathy to his family. There is little that we can say to assuage their grief, but I trust that it will be some measure of comfort to them to know that his many friends share their sorrow.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay my tribute to the memory of the Honorable JOSEPH BRYSON, Representative from the 4th Congressional District of South Carolina.

We here in the House of Representatives were greatly shocked to learn of the death of our colleague. It is hard for us to realize that he will no longer be with us.

JOE BRYSON was born in Transylvania County, N. C., a county in my district. He comes from a distinguished family of that section, a family that has had much to do with the growth and progress of our State.

I have only known JOE BRYSON since I became a Member of the 83d Congress, but in that short period of time I learned to respect and admire him. He was truly a big man. He early extended to me encouragement and counsel. Knowing him for this brief period of time has meant much to me, and I shall always cherish his friendship.

Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of this body in expressing to the family of JOE BRYSON my sincere sympathy in his death.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I learned today of the passing of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

It has been my great honor and privilege to serve with JOE BRYSON on the Committee on the Judiciary. He was one of its most outstanding members, and his influential leadership had much to do with the legislation which that committee recommended to the House.

In addition, his quiet, philosophical humor endeared him to all of us on both sides of the committee aisle. His fine sense of humor did much to ease tensions during moments of vigorous and heated debate. All of us who served with JOE BRYSON on the Judiciary Committee and, indeed, all of us who have served with him in the Congress came to know him as a great statesman and as a man of highest ideals who set an example for all of us to follow.

We shall miss JOE BRYSON, but we are better off for having known him and for having served with him.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the sudden and untimely passing of our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, JOSEPH R. BRYSON, leaves us with a great sense of loss—both personally and as a Member of this body in which he served long and faithfully.

JOE BRYSON typified the greatness and strength of our Nation. He was, by his own proud acknowledgment, a wage earner at the age of 10, and yet withal the necessity to make his own way, he attained the highest degree of education possible—a background which enhanced his worth and value to his constituency and to his State and Nation. He lived a full and useful life—serving his country during World War I, and also in the realm of local and State endeavors.

Deepest sympathy is extended to his bereft loved ones, who may take the deepest pride in his country to his fellowman and his country.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of JOE BRYSON was a great shock. I have never known a Member of Congress to be more highly regarded by his colleagues. JOE BRYSON was a genuine man, always endeavoring to be of the greatest constructive and helpful service to his fine family, the people of his district, his colleagues, and the people of the entire Nation. The wonderful Christian life that he lived is inspiring to all who had the privilege of knowing him. His family and other loved ones have my sympathy in their sorrow.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, my feelings have been so deeply affected by the passing of the gentleman from South Carolina that I am unable to speak in adequate terms of my regard and affection for him. He was one of the first to greet me when I became a Member of the House 10 years ago and we soon became intimate friends. We participated in many activities together, and our families worshiped in the same church. From this close association came my deep appreciation of the man and the Christian.

His was a remarkable career. His formal education exceeded that enjoyed by most men, and yet to achieve the degrees he held he had to surmount unusual obstacles. Only a man of great perseverance could have overcome them. But education is like an iceberg. There is the visible portion which represents, I believe, about one-ninth the total mass. Underneath the surface and invisible to the observer is the process of self-education, which, in the case of JOE BRYSON, was impressive. His was a disciplined life. It was based upon a magnificent faith. It exuded good will and human kindness. His gentle ways made friends of those in all avenues of life who enjoyed a contact with him.

He and his devoted wife provided those powerful influences which dedicated parents find available, and they transmitted to a splendid family the faith which undergirded them. I am sure that every

Member of this House extends deepest sympathy to them in this period of grief.

To all eternity he binds us,
He links the planet and the star;
He goes ahead, the trail he finds us,
And where he is and where we are,
Will never seem again so far.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last week Mrs. Willis and I had a delightful visit with Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON and his lovely wife in the House restaurant. I was with Joe all day yesterday and up until the adjournment bells rang at 5:04 p. m. last evening. Imagine our shock when we heard the news of his untimely death over television this morning.

I became acquainted with JOE BRYSON upon my election to Congress some 4½ years ago. During all that time it was my good fortune to serve on the House Committee on the Judiciary with him, and for some 2 years I was on a subcommittee which he headed as chairman. I, therefore, had the rare privilege of becoming closely associated with JOE BRYSON and of knowing him intimately and well.

JOE BRYSON was a kind, tolerant, and Christian gentleman. He was a loyal and devoted friend. He had a keen mind and a refreshing sense of humor. He loved the arts. He loved history. He loved literature. He loved life.

Joe was deeply religious in the finest sense of the word. He was ever loyal to the precepts of his church, but always respectful of the other man's point of view. For example, a short time ago, he called me to his office and presented me with a book dealing with the point of view of my own faith. You see, I am a Catholic and he was a Baptist.

The death of Representative JOSEPH R. BRYSON leaves a great void not only in the Halls of this body, but in the hearts of his friends, both in and out of Congress. I am going to miss him—we all will, and to his aggrieved widow and family I extend my most sincere sympathies.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, like all Members of this body, I was greatly shocked to hear of the passing of our beloved colleague, JOE BRYSON.

No man in the House was more esteemed by those of us who have had the privilege of serving with him.

It was my privilege to serve with him on the Judiciary Committee. He was an exceptionally able legislator and a wise counselor, faithful always to those principles in which he believed.

He particularly endeared himself to the members of this committee by his keen sense of humor and his brilliant wit. I have never known a man with a finer personality.

We have all lost a loyal and devoted friend, for I believe he was the friend of all who were privileged to know him.

South Carolina and the Nation have lost a great Representative. I wish to join in extending to his beloved wife and family my deepest sympathy.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, last week here on this floor in extolling his good friend, Congressman CELLER, our departed colleague, JOSEPH BRYSON, used these words in quoting from a verse of an unknown poet entitled "Why Wait for Death":

I would rather have a loving smile
From friends I know are true,
Than tears shed round my casket
When this world I bid adieu.

Bring me all the flowers today
Whether pink or white or red;
I'd rather have a blossom now
Than a truckload when I'm dead.

I am sorry that JOE BRYSON will never pass this way again to hear the remarks of his colleagues and friends who are saddened by his death. But I know that his kind and simple ways, his modest nature, his great morality of character and his noble heart endeared him to many—and made him rich, with friends.

A fine gentleman, a great American has left forever this mortal scene, but we shall always remember his pleasant mien. And, I pray that—taking a page from JOE BRYSON'S life—we go on, those of us who remain behind, affectionately passing out smiles and flowers in abundance.

To his family I extend my sincere sympathy in this dark hour of their great loss.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was terribly shocked this morning to learn of the sudden and unexpected passing last night of our beloved colleague, Hon. JOSEPH RALEIGH BRYSON, of South Carolina.

I had the privilege of knowing Joe quite well and always had a warm affection for him. He was a typical southern gentleman of the old school, and I always found him to be kind and considerate of those with whom he came in contact. He was blessed with an attractive personality and a disposition which endeared him to his colleagues and friends. He possessed a ready wit and the ability to narrate southern stories in a most interesting and fascinating manner.

He served in the House continuously since he was first elected to the 76th Congress on November 8, 1938. During the years he rendered most capable and conscientious service to his constituents and his beloved country. I know that he will be sorely missed by his constituents in the Fourth Congressional District of South Carolina, his colleagues in the South Carolina delegation, and his many friends here in the House.

I have lost a good friend. His devoted wife and children have my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. ROBESON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I find it difficult to adequately express in words my thoughts when I realize that JOE BRYSON died last night. When I came to breakfast this morning, another friend, Congressman CHARLES BENNETT, told me of his death. It is difficult to realize that my close association with him, which began on my first day as a Member of Congress, will of necessity be a fond memory instead of reality. On that first day when I became a Member of the House, Congressman BRYSON came to me and said, "I am JOE BRYSON, of Greenville, S. C. Dr. B. E. Geer and other mutual friends told me about you. Let me know when I can be helpful to you."

I shall always remember JOE BRYSON as a Christian gentleman in every sense of the word, filled with the milk of human kindness. Although he was a scholar, a man of considerable attainment and exceptional ability, he was kindly and considerate toward others. He was firm in his own convictions but tolerant of another's views. He had an unusual degree of both wisdom and humor. He went about doing good and being helpful. We will miss the fine association with him and we will feel the lack of his influence. Undoubtedly we have all been helped and our lives have been enriched by his presence among us.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened, as you are saddened. The grim reaper has removed from our midst our beloved friend and distinguished Member of this House, JOE BRYSON. To know JOE BRYSON was to love him. JOE BRYSON was kind. He was considerate; he was generous; he was loyal; he was deeply religious; he was devoted to his duty and to his country; he was devoted to his family and to his God; he was cheerful; he was sincere. There was no rancor in his soul. He was tolerant of others and their views. He had a deep sense of justice. He had those fine qualities that go to make up a truly Christian gentleman of the finest order.

This House—yes; this country—is better and finer because JOE BRYSON has lived and walked among us. To the members of his family we extend our deepest sympathy.

I will not say, I cannot say, that he is dead,
He is just away.
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand,
He has wandered into an unknown land,
And left us to dream how very fair it needs must be
Since he lingers there.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am moved by the tragic death of our beloved colleague JOSEPH BRYSON to set down my sense of irreparable loss in the passing of one who will ever remain in my memory as one of God's noblemen and also one whose life gave substance to the appellation "Christian gentleman."

The constant evidence of JOE BRYSON'S subtle but gentle humor made association with him a continuing pleasure. His stories, which were unending, were of the type that served to portray the philosophy of his beloved South and won for him and those he so ably served the sympathy of all who heard him.

It is significant, I think, to point out that our good friend had just finished the invocation of Divine blessing when he was stricken. It has been my great privilege to have been associated with him in the meetings of our House devotional group and knowing JOE as I do I feel that he would have wanted nothing more than to be called to his reward with the name of his Maker on his lips.

Our hearts go out to his bereaved family and we pray that their grief will be tempered by a solemn pride in the life of their beloved husband and father, which was lived to the fullest in the service of our Nation.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the sincere expressions of sadness and loss which have been made in the House on the occasion of the passing of our respected friend and colleague the Honorable JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON was a fine Christian gentleman. Were he still with us, however, he would have demurred to that simple tribute, for he was an humble man. His way was to serve his God and his country to the best of his ability, and he provided us with an outstanding example of selfless devotion to this course.

Our colleague worked earnestly and effectively for his South Carolina constituents during his 14 years in the House. He viewed his home interests as inevitably linked, however, to the interests of the Nation as a whole. In committee and on the floor of the House, he strove for the enactment of reasonable and sound legislation. His counsel was sought and valued by his colleagues, and they will be poorer for the loss of this wise advice.

In the performance of his public duties Mr. BRYSON had gone to a dinner of an important trade association. He had just asked God's blessings on the meal when the call came, and a true Christian spirit was taken to its reward.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that it is impossible for me to give adequate homage to my deceased friend, JOE BRYSON, I feel impelled to pay him all the tribute that my abilities may allow. He was my friend. He was the friend of all who knew him, for his heart had the ready love, the deep love, of a practicing Christian. I have said he was my friend. Is there a more beautiful word than "friend"? I think not as I use it to describe our departed colleague. He was a gentleman and a devoted husband and father. He had a humor about him that was of this earth and yet sprang from an abiding good will that must have pleased the angels. In all reverence, I say that I am sure that the angels smile today, not only for Joe's good works which he continues among them but for the very joy of the happy soul of their dear friend, JOE BRYSON.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the shocking news of the untimely passing of our dear friend and esteemed colleague, JOE BRYSON, came as a stunning blow to me and all the Members of the House.

Only yesterday we shared his gracious presence on this floor; today we join in mourning his great and irreparable loss. His sudden, unexpected demise leaves us humbled before the inscrutable will of the good Lord who giveth life and taketh it away.

JOE BRYSON was a many-sided personality and a many-sided character. Of great mental attainments and scholarship, of great ability, of superb qualities as a statesman, of ready wit and delightful humor, JOE BRYSON was distinguished most of all for his deep and profoundly moving spiritual purpose, which seemed to permeate his very being.

Often the center of fierce and contentious legislative controversy, an able and forceful exponent of any cause he espoused, Congressman BRYSON never allowed his intense personal convictions to lead him into bitterness and acrimony toward his opponents. He had the gift of separating his viewpoints on legislation from his personal relationships and some of his warmest friends in this body were his most vigorous adversaries on public questions.

Gentility and humility of spirit and conduct were among the choicest personal qualities that marked his sincerity of purpose and endeared him to his colleagues and his friends.

Who could excel him in humor and the more delightful arts of conversation? I have seldom, if ever, met anyone who could spin a yarn or tell a funny story with greater effect. His sense of humor, good nature, and friendly human disposition were certainly qualities so well developed in him that they challenged comparison.

JOE BRYSON was a lovable, kindly, sympathetic man who loved all his fellow men. He was a distinguished, most able, and effective Representative of his people—a great, sincere soul devoted to his district and his country. We shall all miss him in this House and he will be missed and mourned in many places and by many people of every race, class, and creed.

In expressing my own deep sorrow for JOE BRYSON'S irreparable loss, I would like to join the Members of the House and his other many friends in extending my profound and heartfelt sympathy to his grief-stricken family.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened to learn of the passing of our colleague, JOE BRYSON. Only a few days ago, he sat in front of me when we were honoring "MANNIE" CELLER, on the completion of 30 years in this House. More recently, he spoke on the floor of the House on the important issue of the statehood of Hawaii, and he appeared to be in good health and spirits. And now he is gone.

As one of my colleagues on the Committee on the Judiciary, I learned to know and respect Mr. BRYSON. I valued the friendship he offered more and more as I learned to know him better. The oustanding value of his service in the Congress is too familiar to you who know him to require enumeration at this time, but it occurs to me as altogether appropriate on this solemn occasion to utter a few remarks which show my esteem for him as friend and colleague. I am sure that what I have to say will echo the sentiments which pervade the hearts of all of us who join together to pay honor to his memory. It was a privilege to have been associated with him. It is said that the greatest charm of fellowship is the thought that we live in the memory of our friends. So indeed, will our friend and colleague, JOE BRYSON, ever live.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1939, it was my very good fortune to meet the late Honorable JOE BRYSON, of South Carolina. We joined in taking the oath as new Members of Congress. From that time on, Joe was one of my closest friends serving in the House of Representatives.

I know that Joe has been praised much and often; however, I cannot forego the privilege of adding to the sentiments already expressed by my fellow colleagues. I, too, should like to endorse his splendid spirit of service and his faithfulness of effort so characteristic of his work and his life. Knowing Joe was loving him for his personality, his principles and his true Christian attitude toward people. Because he was a man of moral soundness, I had the utmost confidence and faith in him and the greatest admiration for his courage, resourcefulness, and enthusiasm.

The House of Representatives has lost a great legislator, a Representative who fought for issues he believed would not only benefit his district, but would also benefit his beloved State of South Carolina and the Nation. He was a man of strong convictions and tireless in the execution of his interests. He was consistently "reaching forth unto those things which were before, and pressing toward the mark for the goal of the high calling of God." I know that Joe has reached his goal.

Joe's participation in community activities, both civic and religious, always endeared him to his associates. Washington, as well as South Carolina, mourns, the passing of a real friend.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express to Mrs. Bryson and to her fine children my sincere sympathy in the loss of their loved one.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 174

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of 10 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF FUNERAL COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee: Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DORN of South Carolina, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FORRESTER, Mr. JONAS of North Carolina.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect, this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 12, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

537. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending December 31, 1952, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

538. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report on the contributions program for the quarter ending December 31, 1952, pursuant to subsection 201 (i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

539. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood or urine of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

540. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Power Commission, transmitting letter of reply to Cole County Farm Bureau, Inc., of Jefferson City, Mo., concerning the operation during floods of Union Electric Co. of Missouri's Bagnell project No. 459; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2936. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10-A District Agricultural Association, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 3878. A bill to quitclaim certain real property heretofore conveyed to the State of Ohio under restrictions limiting its use to the training of juvenile delinquents and certain other persons; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3879. A bill to provide for a Federal lottery to raise funds for Federal hospitals, the blind, recipients of old-age assistance, and disabled veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3880. A bill to increase by $30 per month the retired pay and disability retirement pay of enlisted persons of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3881. A bill to amend the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 3882. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $900; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 3883. A bill to amend title II of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 3884. A bill to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to establish and continue offices in the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3885. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3886. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 3887. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3888. A bill to protect the right to political participation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3889. A bill to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3890. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3891. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently handicapped; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3892. A bill to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 3893. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 3894. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the definition of dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 3895. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and Public Law 471, 81st Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 3896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit farmers using the accrual method of accounting to use the cash receipts and disbursements methods in respect of livestock held for draft, breeding, or dairy purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3897. A bill to provide that percentage depletion in the case of gypsum rock mines or deposits shall be allowed at the 15 percent rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3898. A bill to amend section 202 (e) of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over persons and facilities engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy to foreign countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint congressional committee to decide upon and recommend an appropriate design for the flag of the United States to be adopted if and when the 49th State is admitted to the Union; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 175. Resolution calling for the removal of Representative HAROLD H. VELDE from the position of chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the South Dakota Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States, His Excellency, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to determine the causes of the decline in livestock and farm prices and to take steps to stabilize farm income; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the South Dakota Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States, His Excellency, the President of the United States, and the Director of the National Park Service to alter a current policy of the National Park Service and permit the control of prairie dogs and other small injurious animals within the national parks; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, to eliminate the tax on admissions to grandstands, concessions, and amusements operated by county fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Sate of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to renew the present International Wheat Agreement which expires July 31, 1953, and renegotiate said world agreement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to cooperate with the States in the examining and auditing of State departments, institutions, and political subdivisions of the State which are allocated Federal funds either by direct grant-in-aid or on a matching basis; and authorizing the filing of the audit report of Federal examiners with the State auditor and State comptroller or corresponding departments of State government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to provide assistance to the Kingdom of the Netherlands; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting an amendment to the Social Security Act to the effect that in determining the need of applicants or recipients for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, the first $50 of earned income be disregarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to have the Government pay for weed eradication on federally owned land; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to include in any supplemental, deficiency, or other appropriation bill a sufficient amount to cover the per diem operating costs per patient of the sufferers from leprosy cared for by the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 3899. A bill for the relief of Hugo V. Kern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 3900. A bill for the relief of D. Lynn Hockenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3901. A bill for the relief of Washington Earnest and Mrs. Steelman R. Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3902. A bill for the relief of Fatulla, Agha Bibi, Albert, and David Amini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 3903. A bill for the relief of Sister Iolanda Sita, Sister Guerrina Brioli, Sister Pasqualina Coppari, Sister Anna Urbinati, Sister Ida Baschi, and Sister Elvira P. Mencarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Jack Maurice Lamont; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3905. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anatoly Batenko and Vladimir Batenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 3906. A bill for the relief of John H. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3907. A bill for the relief of Jean Sutherland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 3908. A bill for the relief of David Arthur deWolff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

84. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Minnie Newhart and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1953

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 11, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the stillness of this moment of prayer we would make our souls the sanctuary of Thy spirit. Be Thou our chart and compass in all the complex problems of state. Endue with understanding and sympathy, as well as with a sense of stern justice, those who, as Thy ministers and as the champions of liberty in this free land and in the great capitals of the world, are planning peace and plenty for lands torn and uprooted by the ghastly horrors of war and by those who plot against the peace of the world. As workers together with Thee, teach our hearts and our hands to build that city where Thou shalt dwell with man and where darkness and sorrow and want shall be no more. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Col. Paul D. Berrigan, CE, Corps of Engineers, to serve as president and senior member of the California Debris Commission, vice Col. Donald S. Burns, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Albert J. Robertson, of Iowa, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Bush	Hendrickson	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Ives	Morse
Capehart	Jackson	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Purtell
Dworshak	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Ferguson	Langer	Smith, Maine
Frear	Lehman	Taft
George	Martin	Thye
Gillette	Maybank	Young

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] are unavoidably detained on official committee business.

The junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] is absent on official business at the White House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS and Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senators from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are unavoidably detained on official committee business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to have permission to make an insertion in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a quorum not being present, nothing is in order except a motion to adjourn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is correct. A quorum not being present, no business is in order.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate in executive session, adjourned until Friday, March 13, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of March 11), 1953:

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Paul D. Berrigan, Corps of Engineers, to serve as president and senior member of the California Debris Commission provided for by the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893, entitled "An act to create the California Debris Commission and regulate hydraulic mining in the State of California," vice Col. Donald S. Burns, to be relieved.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of March 11), 1953:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Albert J. Robertson, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, wilt Thou kindle within our souls Thy divine light and may its luster and radiancy never grow dim or be eclipsed and extinguished as we daily continue our earthly pilgrimage.

We humbly confess that there is so much in life that appears dark unto us and that we do not understand. Again and again our finite minds are sorely perplexed with questions we cannot answer and with problems which human ingenuity and wisdom cannot solve.

Grant that we may never lose heart or hope but go right onward in one undeviating course, following the leading of Thy spirit and that light that shall never fail.

Show us how we may conquer our fears and doubts. Help us to cleave with increasing tenacity to Thy love which will never let us go. May we place our trembling hands in Thine and heed Thy voice as Thou dost say, "This is the way, walk ye therein."

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord in whom we find that perfect love which casts out all fear. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House, by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 11, 1953:

H. R. 1979. An act to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time before April 1, 1955.

On February 14, 1953:

H. R. 568. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1954, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper.

On March 10, 1953:

H. R. 2230. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 697. An act to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 91):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, late a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution, Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina were appointed on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, be appointed a member of the Federal Records Council, vice Leslie L. Biffle.

EXTENDING FOR AN ADDITIONAL 2 YEARS THE EXISTING PRIVILEGE OF FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3658) to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of December 5, 1942, entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad," as amended (U. S. C., title 50, App., sec. 847), is hereby amended by striking out "July 1, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1955."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 3658, which was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, is to continue for an additional 2 years the existing law which allows for the entry of so much of any shipment of bona fide gifts as does not exceed $50 in value without the payment of customs duties, charges, or exactions, or internal revenue taxes when such gifts are sent by members of the Armed Forces on duty abroad.

Existing law expires July 1, 1953.

The act of December 5, 1942 (Public Law 790, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 1041), allowed, until the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities as determined by proclamation of the President, the entry, free of customs duties or internal revenue import taxes, of so much of any shipment as did not exceed $50 in value if there were filed in connection with the entry satisfactory evidence that the articles were bona fide gifts from a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty outside the continental limits of the United States. Public Law 384 of the 80th Congress extended the period for free entry through June 30, 1949, and also amended the law by restricting the privileges so as to deny free entry on or after September 1, 1947, unless the article is purchased "in or through authorized agencies of the Armed Forces of the United States or in accordance with regulations prescribed by the major geographical commands of the United States Armed Forces."

This law was extended without interruption by the 81st and 82d Congresses.

The Bureau of Customs has advised your committee that it has encountered no serious administrative difficulties in administering this law, and it was explained to your committee that this legislation is safeguarded from abuse not only by the restrictions imposed by Public Law 384 of the 80th Congress, but also by appropriate Treasury Department regulations and instructions from the armed services.

Your committee believes that this limited free importation privilege is a definite moral factor for our servicemen overseas, and since substantial numbers are now stationed in all parts of the world, a 2-year extension is warranted.

The Department of Defense has requested that this legislation be made permanent. Your committee believes that a 2-year extension will accomplish the desired result and that at the end of that period the Congress can determine if an additional extension is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means and we strongly support its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING UNTIL JULY 1, 1955, THE PERIOD DURING WHICH PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES UNDER GOVERNMENT ORDERS SHALL BE EXEMPT FROM DUTY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3659) to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 2 of the act of June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders" (U. S. C., title 50 App., sec. 802), is hereby amended to read as follows: "This act shall be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after December 8, 1941, and before July 1, 1955."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (18) of subsection (a) of the first section of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82 Cong.) is hereby repealed.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 3659, which was unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, is to continue to July 1, 1955, the existing law which allows the exemption from duty of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

The existing law expires April 1, 1953. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that this bill be sent to the other body without delay. If the present law is permitted to lapse, it will cause serious inconvenience and hardship on those persons in the service of the United States stationed overseas and who are ordered back to this country.

The act of June 27, 1942—Public Law 633, 77th Congress; Fifty-sixth Statutes, page 461—allowed, until the day following the proclamation of peace by the President, the free entry of personal and household effects of any person evacuated into the United States under Government orders.

Public Law 450 of the 82d Congress, extending the period of free entry, will expire April 1, 1953. The proposed legislation will continue this free-entry privilege to July 1, 1955.

This authority applies to the personal and household effects of any person in the service of the United States, or of his family, which are forwarded to the United States by reason of Government instructions regarding the movement of the owner of the article, whether or not the owner returns to this country.

The international obligations and commitments of the United States continue to require the presence of substantial numbers of persons in the service of the United States in many parts of the world. Termination of this free-entry authority would impose an inequitable administrative burden upon persons evacuated to the United States and would remove an important morale factor and inducement to overseas service.

Your committee is advised by the Bureau of the Customs that no serious administrative difficulty has been encountered under the law. The exercise of the free-entry privilege is safeguarded from abuse by appropriate regulations of the Department of the Treasury, as required by the act.

The Department of Defense has requested that this legislation be made permanent. Your committee believes that an extension to July 1, 1955, will accomplish the desired result, and the Congress can at that time determine if an additional extension is desirable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was also reported by unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means, and we strongly urge its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 3053 may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I shall not object, the intention is then to file tonight in order to permit us to take it up and dispose of it tomorrow?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, if we have a session tomorrow, we will try to dispose of it, but I do not understand they will have a session tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that arrangements have been made to adjourn over and not have a session tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. But this will permit us to take it up on Monday just as soon as the House meets.

As far as I am concerned, I would be glad to take it up tomorrow, but as I understand, the House has not planned to meet tomorrow, and for that reason it would not be possible to take it up until Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume it will be Monday. Of course, Tuesday is St. Patrick's Day, and some of us are interested in the celebration of that great event. I assume there will be no roll call, as far as the gentleman knows. Of course, he cannot control that.

Mr. TABER. I would not want to say that there would not be any, because I do not know in what shape things might develop, but I would hope that there would be none. If it is desired, I would not mind holding it a day or two afterward. I would not want to embarrass those who were paying their respects to St. Patrick by forcing a roll call on that day.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the intention of the gentleman himself, in all probability, to ask for a roll call?

Mr. TABER. No; I would not expect to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, 1953—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

In my message of February 2, 1953, I stated that I would send to the Congress a reorganization plan defining a new administrative status for Federal activities in health, education, and social security. This plan carries out that intention by creating a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as one of the executive departments of the Government and by transferring to it the various units of the Federal Security Agency. The Department will be headed by a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who will be assisted by an Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries.

The purpose of this plan is to improve the administration of the vital health, education, and social security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental rank. Such action is demanded by the importance and magnitude of these functions, which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens. The programs carried on by the Public Health Service include, for example, the conduct and promotion of research into the prevention and cure of such dangerous ailments as cancer and heart disease. The Public Health Service also administers payments to the States for the support of their health services and for urgently needed hospital construction. The Office of Education collects, analyzes and distributes to school administrators throughout the country information relating to the organization and management of educational systems. Among its other functions is the provision of financial help to school districts burdened by activities of the United States Government. State assistance to the aged, the blind, the totally disabled, and dependent children is heavily supported by grants-in-aid administered through the Social Security Administration. The old-age and survivors insurance system

and child development and welfare programs are additional responsibilities of that administration. Other offices of the Federal Security Agency are responsible for the conduct of Federal vocational rehabilitation programs and for the enforcement of food and drug laws.

There should be an unremitting effort to improve those health, education, and social security programs which have proved their value. I have already recommended the expansion of the social security system to cover persons not now protected, the continuation of assistance to school districts whose population has been greatly increased by the expansion of defense activities, and the strengthening of our food and drug laws.

But good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their success upon efficient, responsible administration. I have recently taken action to assure that the Federal Security Administrator's views are given proper consideration in executive councils by inviting her to attend meetings of the Cabinet. Now the establishment of the new Department provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 will give the needed additional assurance that these matters will receive the full consideration they deserve in the whole operation of the Government.

This need has long been recognized. In 1923, President Harding proposed a Department of Education and Welfare, which was also to include health functions. In 1924, the Joint Committee on Reorganization recommended a new department similar to that suggested by President Harding. In 1932, one of President Hoover's reorganization proposals called for the concentration of health, education, and recreational activities in a single executive department. The President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937 recommended the placing of health, education, and social security functions in a Department of Social Welfare. This recommendation was partially implemented in 1939 by the creation of the Federal Security Agency—by which action the Congress indicated its approval of the grouping of these functions in a single agency. A new department could not be proposed at that time because the Reorganization Act of 1939 prohibited the creation of additional executive departments. In 1949, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government proposed the creation of a department for social security and education.

The present plan will make it possible to give the officials directing the Department titles indicative of their responsibilities and salaries comparable to those received by their counterparts in other executive departments. As the under secretary of an executive department, the Secretary's principal assistant will be better equipped to give leadership in the Department's organization and management activities, for which he will be primarily responsible. The plan opens the way to further administrative improvement by authorizing the Secretary to centralize services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department. It also establishes a uniform method of appointment for the heads of the three major constituent agencies. At present, the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, while the Commissioner for Social Security is appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. Hereafter, all three will be Presidential appointees subject to Senate confirmation.

I believe, and this plan reflects my conviction, that these several fields of Federal activity should continue within the framework of a single department. The plan at the same time assures that the Office of Education and the Public Health Service retain the professional and substantive responsibilities vested by law in those agencies or in their heads. The Surgeon General, the Commissioner of Education, and the Commissioner of Social Security will all have direct access to the Secretary.

There should be in the Department an Advisory Committee on Education, made up of persons chosen by the Secretary from outside the Federal Government, which would advise the Secretary with respect to the educational programs of the Department. I recommend the enactment of legislation authorizing the defrayal of the expenses of this committee. The creation of such a committee as an advisory body to the Secretary will help ensure the maintenance of responsibility for the public educational system in State and local governments while preserving the national interest in education through appropriate Federal action.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations, it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provisions for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the reorganization plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

Although the effecting of the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not in itself result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of necessary services at greater savings than present operations would permit. An itemization of these savings in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 12, 1953.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, March 12, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SECTION 1. Creation of Department; Secretary: There is hereby established an executive department, which shall be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter in this reorganization plan referred to as the Department). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereafter in this reorganization plan referred to as the Secretary), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary.

SEC. 2. Under Secretary and Assistant Secretaries: There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and two Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries, respectively, of executive departments. The Under Secretary (or, during the absence or disability of the Under Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Under Secretary, an Assistant Secretary determined according to such order as the Secretary shall prescribe) shall act as Secretary during the absence or disability of the Secretary or in the event of a vacancy in the office of Secretary.

SEC. 3. Special Assistant: There shall be in the Department a Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs) who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience, shall review the health and medical programs of the Department and advise the Secretary with respect to the improvement of such programs and with respect to necessary legislation in the health and medical fields, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for assistant secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 4. Commissioner of Social Security: There shall be in the Department a Commissioner of Social Security who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall perform such functions concerning social security and public welfare as the Secretary may prescribe, and shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter fixed by law for grade GS–18 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 5. Transfers to the Department: All functions of the Federal Security Administrator are hereby transferred to the Secretary. All agencies of the Federal Security Agency, together with their respective functions, personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available), and all other functions, personnel, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds (available or to be made available) of the Federal Security Agency are hereby transferred to the Department.

SEC. 6. Performance of functions of the Secretary: The Secretary may from time to time make such provisions as the Secretary deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Secretary by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department.

SEC. 7. Administrative services: In the interest of economy and efficiency the Secretary may from time to time establish central administrative services in the fields of procurement, budgeting, accounting, personnel, library, legal, and other services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department; and the Secretary may effect such transfers within the Department of the personnel employed, the property and

records used or held, and the funds available for use in connection with such administrative service activities as the Secretary may deem necessary for the conduct of any services so established: *Provided*, That no professional or substantive function vested by law in any officer shall be removed from the jurisdiction of such officer under this section.

SEC. 8. Abolitions: The Federal Security Agency (exclusive of the agencies thereof transferred by section 5 of this reorganization plan), the officers of Federal Security Administrator and Assistant Federal Security Administrator created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 (53 Stat. 1423), the two offices of assistant heads of the Federal Security Agency created by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946 (60 Stat. 1095), and the office of Commissioner for Social Security created by section 701 of the Social Security Act, as amended (64 Stat. 558), are hereby abolished. The Secretary shall make such provisions as may be necessary in order to wind up any outstanding affairs of the Agency and offices abolished by this section which are not otherwise provided for in this reorganization plan.

SEC. 9. Interim provisions: The President may authorize the persons who immediately prior to the time this reorganization plan takes effect occupy the offices of Federal Security Administrator, Assistant Federal Security Administrator, assistant heads of the Federal Security Agency, and Commissioner for Social Security to act as Secretary, Under Secretary, and Assistant Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare and as Commissioner of Social Security, respectively, until those offices are filled by appointment in the manner provided by sections 1, 2, and 4 of this reorganization plan, but not for a period of more than 60 days. While so acting, such persons shall receive compensation at the rates provided by this reorganization plan for the offices the functions of which they perform.

UNLESS CONGRESS REPEALS THE RESTRICTIONS AGAINST EARNED DUAL BENEFITS UNDER THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND SOCIAL SECURITY ACTS IT IS GUILTY OF BREAKING FAITH WITH THOUSANDS OF RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ABUSE OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed about the $709,538 received by the members of President Truman's Cabinet, and other high-ranking officials of the Truman administration, for accumulated leave.

I am not as much concerned whether these former public servants were technically entitled to this money or not. Morally, they were not entitled to it. By taking it they are confessing that they have been faithless in carrying out good employment practices in their administrations. The Congress adopted the Thomas amendment the last Congress in order to stop the abuse going on in the departments in regard to accumulated leave.

Leave was established so that employees would take vacations so that they would be refreshed and so able to do their jobs better over a period of time. Good employment practices require that employees do take vacations and that those in charge of the employees see that vacations are taken.

Now we find that the men who were in charge of employment practices in the Federal departments obviously were encouraging the practice of subverting the theory behind taking vacations. They were, by example, encouraging the practice of converting good health into cash, and undermining the efficiency of their employees.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER FOLLOWS DEMOCRATIC POLICY

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I compliment President Eisenhower for sending up the reorganization plan, which he has, for making a department of the Federal Security Agency. It is a very good Democratic policy, which shows that our Republican friends recognize the soundness and the logic of the principles of the Democratic Party, and that they are in the best interests of the people of our country. I am a member of the committee, and I shall support the recommendation, and again as in the case of the extension of the reorganization plan giving the President real, substantial legislation providing for a constitutional majority to reject a presidential reorganization plan, the Democratic Party in this case will be leading the way.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the very kindly statement made by my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], which indicates his wholehearted support of the reorganization plan which has just been submitted by the President. This is not a partisan plan or program. It is one that has been sponsored by two, and the only two, living ex-Presidents. I recall President Truman had a plan something along this line which was submitted to the Congress, but the original idea came from the Hoover Commission, which was headed by a Republican ex-President, Herbert Hoover.

That Commission, of course, recommended creating the Federal Security Agency into a department with Cabinet status. Therefore it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that with both Republican and Democratic support, this reorganization plan should be made effective as quickly as possible, and I am hoping that in the next few days it may be possible for this House to adopt the joint resolution, which I understand has been introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], to make this plan effective immediately upon the adoption of the resolution and the signature thereof by the President.

EFFICIENT POSTAL SERVICE—THE NEW YORK OFFICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, one of the big jobs of the new administration now placed in the capable hands of Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield is the restoration of our postal services to a state of efficiency. The New York Post Office is the biggest in the country and what will happen there under the new administration is likely to be the standard by which the whole postal system will be judged. I take the liberty of suggesting that in the appointment of the Postmaster in New York City it be recognized as a trouble shooting job of the first rank requiring great administrative ability as well as experience and prestige. The personnel management problem alone is enormous with 34,000 postal workers employed in the district comprising Manhattan, the Bronx, and Pelham and a heavy proportion of the first class mail in the country handled in this district alone. The loyal and dedicated postal workers have been in the forefront of those seeking better postal services and have been the most hurt by the postal services curtailment directive. Ever since the postal curtailment order of April, 1950, cutting home deliveries to one a day and reducing other services, the people of New York City have been suffering serious efficiencies in mail services. I hope very much the opportunity to start on the road back to proper postal service will now be utilized.

KING COTTON IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body yesterday and today have found on their desks a miniature bale of cotton. Attached to the little bale is a picture of California's lovely maid of cotton, who ruled last Friday at Bakersfield, Calif., on the occasion of the national salute to King Cotton from California.

These bales are a memento of the great part California is playing in the cotton production of the Nation. Already cotton is the No. 1 cash crop in California, and in 1951 California was the second largest cotton-producing State in the Nation.

California is justly proud of her fine long-staple cotton, of her high production per acre, and of the fact that three of her counties ranked among the first five in cotton production in 1951. In that year Kern County produced 497,000 bales to lead the Nation as the largest cotton-producing county in the United States. Closely following Kern was my own county of Fresno, which produced 487,150 bales, and the two sister counties are expected to show production of over a million bales for 1952. Although Arizona's Maricopa and Pinal Counties ranked third and fourth, in fifth place is California's Tulare County, which produced 309,150 bales.

It is with great pride that I call the attention of my colleagues on this occasion to the magnificent contribution of the State of California to the cotton industry of the United States.

Following is a national salute to King Cotton from California by Bobette Bentley, California maid of cotton, 1953, given last Friday:

The robes of the kings who ruled thousands of years before Christ were made of cotton. Today cotton provides royal raiments for everyone.

Tonight, at the national salute to King Cotton in Bakersfield, Calif., we salute those in the industry in all the States of the Nation who are working to provide better cotton for its myriad of uses. We salute those who are striving for more efficient and economical production. We salute those who are searching for new markets and increased uses.

We especially salute those in our own State of California, many of whom came to us from the old South, who are part of our great cotton industry.

Cotton is the No. 1 cash farm crop in California. California is the second largest cotton-producing State in the Nation.

California farmers, processors, and handlers have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in cotton farms and equipment and facilities.

The income of millions of people in California is affected directly or indirectly by the cotton crop.

On behalf of those millions in California who are tied to cotton, we salute our cotton industry.

And for the whole Nation whose people use cotton products so extensively and whose economy is dependent upon cotton income so heavily, we salute King Cotton—may he meet the challenge of the future as he has met the tests of the past.

THE PASSING OF BIG JIM

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, last week the town of Burbank, Calif., lost its most famous citizen. Last week American manhood lost one of its idols of rugged athletic prowess and good sportsmanship. Last week marked the passing of Big Jim, for many years the world's heavyweight champion, James J. Jeffries.

Big Jim was more than a great boxer, more than a great fighter. He was great and he was an idol because of his ideals of fair play and good sportsmanship. Throughout his career he was never knocked out. Few big men have ever equaled his speed and his skill as a boxer, and none has ever equaled his ruggedness.

Born in Ohio, April 15, 1882, he moved to Burbank in 1912, over 40 years ago. He was the champion of all champions from 1899 to 1905, when he retired undefeated. In 1910 he was coaxed out of retirement and lost on a technical knockout in the 15th round, at age 35.

For many years he made a career of the teaching of the manly art of self-defense and of good sportsmanship in the famous Jeffries Barn in Burbank. For many years prior to his death his birthday, April 15, each year caused a large gathering of his friends and admirers. Big Jim was an inspiration to many men, not the least of whom was Joe Griffin, who is responsible for the following poem which I quote from the Burbank Review, which excellent paper printed it on two different occasions:

THE KID SPEAKS

Oh, a swing is a swing and a hook is a hook,
And you look 'fore you swing and you swing where you look,
And you'll fight by the rules that are there in the book—
(Those are things that I learned from Old Jim.)

Oh, the truth is the truth and a lie is a lie,
But a lie doesn't last, nor the truth ever die,
So you'll throw no foul punches—square fighters aim high—
(Those are things that I learned from Old Jim.)

Oh, a man is a man and a friend is a friend,
And there's no finer gift the Almighty can send
Than the fellow who sticks with you clean to the end—
(Those are things that I learned from Old Jim.)

Oh, a life is a life and a name is a name,
And you're bound to meet strife in the battle for fame,
But victory depends on how you played the game—
(Those are things that I learned from Old Jim.)

(Oh, a church is a church and a creed is a creed,
Au revoir, old companion. You've got all that you need
To enter the Gates—the Almighty will heed
The prayers for the soul of Old Jim.)

—*Joe Griffin.*

CHEST X-RAYS FOR MEMBERS AND HOUSE PERSONNEL

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, during this week and next—March 9 through March 20—there will be an opportunity for all of us to get a chest X-ray. The X-ray unit will be set up in the first-aid room of the old House Office Building.

There is no charge for this service, which is being provided by the District Health Department, the District Tuberculosis Association and the United States Public Health Service, as a part of their joint effort to eradicate tuberculosis in the District of Columbia.

It will only take a few minutes for each one of us to get an X-ray and I urge that we all participate in this effort, and that we encourage all of our personnel to do likewise.

Detailed information regarding this survey should already have been sent to you individually. If you have not received such a notice, please contact the office of the Clerk of the House.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF MARCH 16

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order that I may ask the gentleman from Illinois what we may expect in the way of legislation next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. The program, let me say to the minority leader, is as follows:

Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar to be followed by consideration of conference report on the bill H. R. 3053, the second supplemental appropriation bill.

Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called.

Wednesday we plan to call up for consideration the reorganization plan which was submitted today to create a new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Conference reports will be in order at any time.

Should there be any additional legislative matters to be called up for consideration—and I know of none at this moment—I will notify the Members in ample time.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR COMMITTEES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to amend the House rules to set up rules and procedures of practice for the committees of the House, particularly those which are investigating different subjects. In the last few weeks, I am sure you must have been alarmed at some of the activities and statements made by some of these committees, or at least members thereof. These actions reflect on the entire membership of the House and of the Congress. It seems to me it would help all of us to get at the facts, and regain the respect of the people of the country which, I fear, has been forfeited by unfair methods. Incidentally, it would help the committees themselves obtain information they were formed to get, by following orderly procedures.

The change in rules would permit representation of witnesses by counsel, permit people whose names have been mentioned to appear before these committees and clear themselves of charges made against them, permit cross-examination of witnesses, and things of that kind. I hope the resolution will have the support of the membership. It will help us to maintain the dignity we must have. It will help the committees themselves in working out their problems and help them regain some of the respect they seem to have lost throughout the country due to some activities of one or two of these committees.

The bill is similar to the one that was introduced in the other body by Senator WAYNE MORSE.

THE PINK BOLLWORM THREAT TO COTTON

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to refer to the cotton situation in parts of the South. I just heard my colleague from California refer in glowing terms to what is being done in California in reference to growing cotton. In my section of the South, we are greatly disturbed by the invasion of the pink bollworm. It came from the west, from Texas, but originally from Mexico. I think all Members who are interested in the planting of cotton will be concerned with some sort of help to curb this pest, this parasite. I do not mean financial help, except in one small respect. I want to call the attention of the members of the Appropriations Committee to the fact that we need more money—it will not take a great deal—allotted for the purpose of further experimentation in the control of the pink bollworm. Just a small amount of money in the use of methods of control to curb the spread of this destructive pest will do a great deal for the economy of the whole country, the West and East and especially the South.

I hope that other Members who, like I am, are concerned in the protection of cotton farming will join me in suggesting to members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that we make suitable allowance for the continuation of the work of trying to curb this pest.

SEGREGATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last year a majority of the American people, completely dissatisfied with the New Deal way of running the Government, voted for a change. They wanted reductions in spending and taxes, something done about the Korean war, and a return to sanity in Government.

The radicals and leftwingers such as the Americans for Democratic Action, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and similar groups, did not want a change, and did not vote for a change. They wanted a continuation of the petty politics and socialistic program of the New Deal element.

It begins to look now as if those who want the new administration to get to work to pull the country out of the hole, reduce spending and reduce taxes, will have to be content with second place. Position No. 1 has been allocated to a program of appeasement of radicals and minority pressure blocs for political purposes.

Tuesday there was a newspaper story under the headline "Ike Asks Court End District of Columbia Segregation," telling that the Attorney General of the United States filed a brief in the Supreme Court asking that segregation be abolished.

Now this brief is filed by the Attorney General in the name of the United States of America. The United States of America is not a party to the suit. It is not entitled to file a brief as a party to the suit. He pushes himself into the case under the guise of "A friend of the court." It is undoubtedly done at the direction of the President. He and the Attorney General bring themselves into this case to palm off their personal views as the position of the United States of America. Undobutedly it is done as a political gesture, in the hope that these radical groups can be enticed away from the New Dealers and attached to the Republican Party. This brief is an effort to use the Supreme Court as a monkey to pull political chestnuts out of the fire for them.

It is an unauthorized action on the part of these officials. Neither of them is authorized to allege in a brief or otherwise that the United States of America advocates the abolition of segregation in the restaurants and cafes in Washington, D. C.

I had expected that President Eisenhower would apply his talents, and those of his associates, to some of the many pressing problems which need immediate attention. But this action seems to indicate that we may look for the new administration to carry on the New Deal practice of appeasing radicals to get votes, and that the major objective will be to do it more effectively, and to outdeal the New Deal.

THE NEXT STEP TOWARD A VICTORY IN KOREA

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn a while ago about the Communists shooting down another Allied plane, this time a British plane involving the loss of several lives. I am very hopeful that this will cause the British and the rest of our allies, all of us, to work together more effectively to stop the shipment of strategic goods that is still going behind the Iron Curtain and which in effect helps build up this Communist war machine.

First, England's announcement about further restricting trade with China is really good news. I would like to take this opportunity to commend those who have worked so hard for so long on both sides of the ocean to bring this development about. It should inspire NATO and the United Nations to more effective action in preventing the buildup of the Communist war machine. However, we should not be complacent about this progress because it is just a drop in the bucket compared to what needs to be done to help our boys in Korea.

(a) As I pointed out in my speech to the House of Representatives on February 12, 1953, our allies have chartered as many as 100 ships to Russia at one time. Such ships fly western flags and are largely beyond the control of their owners for the time chartered. Important shipping countries such as Panama, the United Kingdom, Greece, and Denmark let Russia have ships under this agreement. Now England plans to restrict the use of her ships but we need similar agreements from other naval powers of the world which still let the Soviet bloc have the benefit of their ships.

(b) Over $8 million worth of strategic goods as prior commitments are still to be shipped from our allies to the Soviet bloc, much of it to come from England. It seems that these nations would have prior commitments to their own people for their security which would take precedence over prior commitments to Russia and her satellites. An indeterminable amount of strategic materials is still permitted to go behind the Iron Curtain from noncooperating nations or in

the form of falsely documented shipments. Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Copenhagen and Hamburg are examples. Continued trade by neutrals such as Switzerland and Sweden is also a stumbling block to international agreements to stop the buildup of our common enemy. Ship repairs, services, and facilities furnished by our allies do not break the letter of the law but certainly violate the spirit of it. Shipments of materials not classified as strategic such as rubber to Russia from England continue. England refuses to ship rubber to China but she ships it to Russia. What is the difference? All these represent legal leaks in addition to the ship chartering problem which is still to be solved with other maritime powers. In addition, there are so-called nonstrategic shipments like cotton, medicine, and food that go to China and the Iron Curtain countries as legal trade. England now plans to stop some of her trade with China but she will continue to send the same materials to Russia and the rest of the Soviet bloc. What about the other shipments to China and what about the other countries in the United Nations? Eighty percent of the so-called nonstrategic materials shipped by sea to China come from the free countries. The U. N. has been supplying China with one hand and fighting her with the other. General Van Fleet recently said that our enemy in Korea does not worry too much about getting thousands of Chinese killed at a time because life is cheap and plentiful over there but action that stops their supplies is fatal to their sustained drives of aggression. Of course in addition there is the continuous smuggling going on in many countries which is very bad but less damaging than all of these legal leaks.

Second. The United Nations voted to take military action in Korea but the United Nations has not supported the war in Korea militarily or economically in a manner necessary to win.

(a) Our boys in Korea would be helped immeasurably by a peaceful all-out economic boycott of the Communist bloc but the free nations of the U. N. are not willing to make the joint economic sacrifice necessary for such a program.

(b) Although they are members of the United Nations, our European allies do not feel that Korea is their responsibility to the extent of taking effective action to win the war. Of course they make concesssions here and there to the United States for our aid. Then, too, they wish us well because if we lose in Europe and Asia, they might become slaves. Europe feels that Korea is an American war by and large and stopping Russian aggression is primarily the responsibility of the United States.

(c) If the hearts of the free nations were in the right places, their trade would be in the right places. As it now stands, shortsighted neutrals and other free countries have too much of the attitude of seeing how much trade with the Soviets they can get by with instead of how little trade they can get by with.

Third. The only way the free nations of the U. N. will get their hearts in Korea is to furnish some fighting men for Korea. This should be the next step and it should be taken immediately.

(a) I would be the last to minimize the value of the efforts other nations are contributing to Korea. Yet the fact remains that only 25 of the other 59 nations of the U. N. are making any direct contribution at all and that is rather infinitesimal compared with what is needed to win. Excluding South Koreans, 88 percent of the troops are supplied by the United States and only 12 percent by all other countries. Only the United States and Canada embargo all trade with China.

(b) Hard economic decisions must be made, but they are not as hard as burying your sons or waiting forever for your buddies to come back from a one-way trip. Sharing the orphans, widows, broken homes, and disrupted communities because their boys went to Korea, too, would bring a different attitude toward trading with the enemy; also, it would help weld the free world into an unbeatable and unstoppable force.

(c) Yes; England must have her timber and grain, Denmark must have her coal, but where there is a will there is a way to get necessary materials without building up the Communist war machines in China, Russia, and the satellite countries. France has shown her independence or contempt even when she did not need to trade with the Soviet bloc. Stereotyped negative excuses for not getting new sources of supply must be replaced with a positive attitude of accomplishment in the freedom-loving nations of the world. There are enough laws and international agreements now to stop the flow of strategic goods from going behind the Iron Curtain, but the flow continues.

(d) Korea has taxed the United States with over 130,000 casualties not to mention the strain of material assistance all over the world, so we have reached the point where we can no longer continue normal diplomatic niceties but decisive action is a necessity.

(e) Getting a decent contribution of fighting men from our Allies for Korea will strengthen our joint military effort considerably. Also, it would immeasurably strengthen the will of these United Nations countries to stop trade that builds up the war machines of our common enemy. It is a shame this has not already been accomplished. This is a fight that I will continue with all my strength.

Fourth. In this shrinking world when the Atlantic Ocean can be crossed twice in one day, the fate of all free peoples is tied together closer than ever before in history. England is a valiant ally and much more has been accomplished by this great country and other members of the U. N. than we may realize but supplying our enemies with one hand and fighting them with the other just does not make sense. For a time England led the way in restricting trade to the Communist countries after realizing the sad mistake of shipping jet engines to the Kremlin. She is still ahead of most countries in this respect. For instance, the in-transit trade that goes behind the Iron Curtain through the free ports of continental Europe gets no such assistance in English ports. Now comes England's announcement about restricting the use of ships flying her flags that carry supplies to China. I hope this British move will be an inspiration to all free members of the U. N. to really go forward in putting on a complete boycott to aid our boys on the fighting front.

REFUGEES, THEY LOOK TO US AND THE FREE WORLD

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, reams and reams have been covered with explanations and expositions of the immigration policies of the United States. There have been lengthy defenses of existing law and equally lengthy criticisms. Throughout all these discussions, whether in the Halls of Congress or in the columns of newspapers and periodicals, there runs at least one consistent thread. Throughout all the fabric of these discussions of our present policies on the admission of aliens to our country, there is a consistent pattern.

Whether we agree wholeheartedly with the law now on the statute books of our land, or vehemently criticize its exclusionary provisions—all agree that in the lands beyond the seas there are many thousands suffering grave hardships solely because of their belief in fundamental liberties. Try as we might to shield our minds from the facts we are forced to acknowledge that these countless thousands are inspired with a will to live until tomorrow and the next tomorrow because of the great faith they have in the ideals which are represented in that great monument which stands on Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor.

Liberty is more than a monument. It is a way of life. I respectfully urge my colleagues to give serious thought to the plight of these thousands of homeless families. I hope that we can do something to prevent their becoming, in fact, lost souls.

I do not contend that the problem is one which should concern us alone. It is one which should worry all the freedom-loving nations of the world. I hope that this great Nation which has provided a haven for so many of the peoples of the world who loved freedom and liberty more than life itself—that we could, without extending ourselves beyond the limit of our resources, provide a shining example to all the world by charting a course.

Going very briefly down the list of countries with refugee and surplus population problems, we find: In Western Germany we have the expellees. These are people of German blood, whose ancestors, prior to World War II, had lived beyond the borders of the Reich. Following V–E Day these people were torn from their homes and driven into a Germany, the war-shattered economy of which was barely able to sustain those already resident therein.

In Austria, and countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, particularly, France, Turkey, Norway, and Denmark, as well as in Western Germany also, we find refugees who have fled

hither from Communist tyranny. Here again, these folk are in the main unable to find productive work and live in enforced idleness.

Italy, due in a large extent to an influx of nationals expelled from former overseas colonies, as well as from Adriatic territories lost to Yugoslavia, is sadly over populated, with resulting unemployment and that drift toward communism which has alarmed the world since the end of the war.

Greece, devastated by her civil war, finds herself with more people than her rather barren resources will support.

In Holland, there is a problem of a population having expanded beyond that small country's productive capacity. It is quite possible that the recent storm damage, which is said to have rendered useless thousands of acres of hitherto fertile land, may accentuate Holland's difficulties.

All of you will recall that former President Truman, on March 24, 1952, in a special message to the Congress, called attention to the plight of these unfortunates. You will recall also that nothing has been done about it. The trickle of immigration permitted under the present quota system would afford only token relief even if it could operate at the full, but we find that the quotas of countries under the greatest pressure are mortgaged for years to come to compensate for those who did come in under the Displaced Persons Act.

For the purpose of rendering some tangible assistance on this problem I have introduced a bill H. R. 3845 which would admit 328,000 persons over a 3-year period beginning July 1, 1953. The classification according to groups is as follows:

First. One hundred thousand immigrants from Italy and Trieste.

Second. One hundred thousand German expellees.

Third. Twenty-two thousand Greeks.

Fourth. Twenty-two thousand Dutch.

Fifth. Sixty-four thousand refugees now sheltered in Western Germany and Austria.

Sixth. Twenty thousand refugees now sheltered in other countries of Western Europe, among which being France, Turkey, Norway, and Denmark.

While in the very nature of things figures such as given above must be somewhat arbitrary, they are not capricious. They were arrived at after consultation with authorities on the subject, on the basis of the estimated capacity of the United States, plus the endeavor to provide equitably for those countries having the greatest problem.

The administration of this bill would be entrusted to the State and Justice Departments, which would be instructed to enlist the cooperation of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration. By using these existing agencies it is hoped that the cost to the American taxpayers could be substantially minimized.

The problem presented by European refugees and surplus populations is a serious one. Something has to be done for these people. Idle workmen and overloaded national economies are productive of bankruptcy and communism, as we should well know. This problem is one for the entire free world. The United States should not be expected to solve it singlehanded. But, indeed, this has not been demanded, for there are other countries which are doing all they can by way of absorbing immigrants from overseas. We must be sure that in truth we are really doing our share. It is past time that we pick up again where we left off when the Displaced Persons Act expired. It is my hope that under the provisions of this bill, or similar legislation, the United States, in cooperation with other nations of the free world, may bring this problem to a solution, or at least so near to a solution, that only minor difficulties will remain.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House and offer a resolution (H. Res. 176).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Joint Resolution 52, making an appropriation out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said joint resolution be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Senate Joint Resolution 52 was passed on Monday, providing an appropriation out of the general fund of the District of Columbia. It was not referred, as the rules require, to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, but was passed direct. This infringes the privileges of the House as set forth in section 7 of article I of the Constitution which gives the House of Representatives the privilege of initiating all appropriation bills.

This question was thoroughly discussed by the Honorable John Sharp Williams when he was a Member of the Senate back in 1912. He analyzed the authorities on that subject. The article was printed as a Senate document on July 15, 1919. The article discusses the situation in great detail, and there is no question about it. I hope that the resolution will be promptly adopted. Pursuant to the consent granted me, I submit herewith certain parts of Senator Williams' treatise:

Mr. President, if the Senate can constitutionally originate general appropriation bills when money is in the Treasury, then it can do the same thing when there is no money in the Treasury; and thus this body, representing the States and not the people, representing chiefly the smaller States, could force either Federal insolvency, not to be thought of, or else could force the House to levy new or additional taxes; thus force the House to originate tax bills. The two things hang together. If this Senate could originate general supply bills, then it could commit the Government to a course of expenditure that would coerce the House not only into originating but into passing tax bills.

As Seward well says, speaking of the long practice under which the House always insisted upon and the Senate always conceded, the right of the House to originate general appropriation bills:

"This [practice] could not have been accidental; it was therefore designed. The design and purpose were those of the contemporaries of the Constitution itself. It evinces their understanding of the subject, which was that bills of a general nature for appropriating the public money or for laying of taxes or burdens on the people, direct or indirect in their operation, belonged to the province of the House of Representatives." (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 16, pt. 2, p. 959.)

He added:

"If this power be confined to the one and not to the other, that is, to the levying of taxes to get money, but not to its expenditure, then the right is useless, because we change revenue laws so seldom."

This criticism of Seward's is correct, although it was made in view of what occurred later and not of what was in the minds of the framers of the Constitution. I believe it is not too much to say that, in the minds of the framers of the Constitution, a bill to raise revenue was a budget; that is, a bill levying taxes and at the same time appropriating the proceeds of the levy, because such was the contemporaneous practice.

Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, said that he regarded the Senate origination of general appropriation bills as "a departure from the spirit of the Constitution" (ibid.).

Mr. Hinds, in his incomparable work, in a note at the bottom of page 973, volume 2, concerning the question of the right of the House to originate general appropriation or supply bills, says: "But while there has been a dispute as to the theory, there has been no deviation from the practice that the general appropriation bills originate in the House of Representatives." He expresaly uses this this phrase as contradistinguished from special bills appropriating for single, specific purposes.

It is well to remember in this connection the Hurd resolution of January 13, 1885, which was laid on the table in the House. The fact that it was laid upon the table has been quoted very frequently, but the resolution was directed at Senate bill 398 (the Blair educational bill). It was not a supply bill, but a bill of specific appropriation; not a bill for carrying on the Government any more than a bill making appropriation for a public building would be a bill for carrying on the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this is not an inconsequential matter. It is fundamental in the practice of the House and is supported by the strongest rule known in parliamentary procedure, the rule of immemorial usage. A great many precedents could be recited, but the whole matter is summed up in a comment by the former Parliamentarian of the House, Asher Hinds, who knew more about procedure and had more to do with establishing the orderly procedures of the House than any man in American history with the single exception of Vice President Jefferson. He was Parliamentarian in those critical days when the rules were in process of flux and readjustment under the Speakership of Speaker Reed and Speaker Cannon, when the deadwood was being cut out, and the approved practice of the House was being redrafted and reemphasized.

In summing up the whole question Asher Hinds said:

There has been some debate about the theory of restricting the origin of appropriation bills to the House but there has been no deviation in the practice.

As Mr. Hinds pointed out, this rule is one of the rules which came down to us from the English Parliament. In the

earliest days, when the House of Commons was being established, the King permitted them to meet only when he was present. On the rare occasions when the House of Commons met the King was always on hand looking around to see if anybody wanted to start anything, and if anything started the King finished it. But eventually, as the sessions and business of the House of Commons increased and the diversions of the court as well as the official duties of the crown, and the red deer in the royal forests monopolized the interest and attention of the King, the dry debate in the House of Commons became so irksome that the King adopted the practice of sending down his sword or his mace which were carried to the floor with pomp and ceremony and symbolized the presence of the monarch and his consent to the convocation of the House. With the exception of the days of the Roundheads when Cromwell disdainfully discarded the "bauble." The practice has continued and neither the British House of Commons nor the American House of Representatives meets without ceremonial reminder of the ancient custom.

The King, however, retained and maintained his surveillance of the Commons and their proceedings through the Speaker. The Speaker was not a member of the House and served as the King's stoolpigeon and reported faithfully to the King the nature of the debate and the names of the firebrands and troublemakers in the membership of the House. Thereupon the House resorting to subterfuge to circumvent the King's espionage, devised the Committee of the Whole under which they dismissed the Speaker and supplanted him with a Chairman of the Committee of the Whole chosen from their own number.

At the same time the Commons through the years began to assert and eventually maintained through debate and by the sword the primacy of the House in the origin of money bills, the levying of taxes, and the appropriation and expenditure of revenues.

Whenever the Commons became too insistent on the redress of grievances and began to protest too vigorously the chronic denial of justice, the King would prorogue Parliament and send them home. But inevitably the forced loans, the sale of privileges, and the money borrowed at usurious rates of interest dwindled and as a last resort the King would be compelled to convene Parliament. In that day, as now, the control of the purse strings was the only recourse of the people. It was and is the primary prerogative of democracy and the one effective weapon in defense of rights and liberties of a free nation.

I think all will agree that every possible precaution should be thrown around the appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury. Even at best, such appropriations of money are too easily made, and too often abused. Certainly it should be the exclusive privilege of the House of Representatives composed of Members who every 2 years must go back to the people for reelection, and can thus be called to account for any unwise or improper expenditure of public funds. As Parliamentarian Hinds says while the theory has been debated, the House of Representatives in practice has never deviated, and the other House has invariably conceded the point when raised.

Of course, it must be remembered that in those early days when a bill was introduced in the House making an appropriation, in the same bill provision was made to raise the revenue to pay that appropriation. Now, that is not a bad idea. Sometimes I think today we would give a little more consideration to the appropriation of money, if in the same bill in which we appropriate the money we had to provide for the raising of that money. In that way the right of the House to originate both revenue and appropriation bills was early acknowledged and established.

There was one notable exception to this rule brought about by exceptional circumstances. In 1856 when the Congress could not elect a Speaker, when for days no candidate could command a majority of the House. Adjournment was taken from day to day without a Speaker—without organization. At the beginning of each term, there are certain financial obligations which must be met. That is why we always elect the Committee on Accounts and the Committee on Appropriations in advance of the other committees. In this dire situation the leaders got together and they agreed, as a compromise, that the Senate for that one time should originate needed appropriation bills. But that was an exceptional case, and it was so understood at the time and accepted as such, and the situation has never been duplicated. So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a matter to which the House should give the greatest, the most earnest consideration. The Representatives in the House, elected by the people every 2 years, should have exclusive rights in the origination of appropriation bills. I hope the resolution of the gentleman from New York will be agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure when my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] agree that the House of Representatives must, indeed, have a sound case. But will the gentleman, for the record, state just what part of this resolution, which has come from the other body, violates the long standing custom and usage and practice of the Congress?

Mr. TABER. This resolution, Mr. Speaker, in its entirety, violates the practice. There is no part of it which could be construed as covering anything else or any other subject matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's statement satisfies me.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a portion of Mr. Williams' article.)

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING THE TERMINATION DATE OF THE DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2330) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 169 makes in order for immediate consideration to the bill H. R. 2330, to extend the termination date of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950. The rule provided by this resolution is an open one, which calls for 1 hour general debate, after which the bill is to be considered in Committee of the Whole, and amendments may be offered under the 5-minute rule.

For the information of the House, the Dependents Assistance Act was enacted originally in 1950, to continue until April 30 of this year. It was enacted for the purpose of giving assistance to the families and dependents of those men in the armed services during the Korean conflict. Owing to the prolongation of the war in Korea, it is necessary to extend the termination date of the act. The Committee on Armed Services has unanimously reported this bill and recommends that the present law be extended to July 1, 1955, to provide for additional allowances to be paid to the families of men in the armed services, after such men have first contributed as much as they can out of their service pay to the support of their children and wives or their parents or other dependents.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this rule was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules. I do not know

of any opposition either to the rule or to the bill. I have no requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Have there been any hearings held on this bill?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes. The Armed Services Committee reported it unanimously.

Mr. WIER. And there are no changes at all in the allotments?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No change, except the extension of the date.

Mr. WIER. Just an extension of the act?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, because the Senate has already passed Senate 1188, a bill identical with H. R. 2330, I ask unanimous consent that we may now consider Senate 1188 in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are copies of the Senate bill available? Or will the Clerk read the bill so we may know just what it is?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri said the bill was identical with the House bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 771, 81st Cong.) is amended by deleting the date "April 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1955."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we are again faced with the necessity of acting quickly on a very urgent piece of legislation. The bill H. R. 2330, or S. 1188, would extend the Dependents Assistance Act from April 30, 1953, to July 1, 1955. If we do not move quickly on this measure many hundreds of thousands of enlisted personnel, in fact over a million of them, will be affected and their dependents will suffer hardships.

I think you are all familiar with the Dependents Assistance Act. I am sure all of you know that under this law enlisted personnel with wives, children, or dependent parents can, by contributing a portion of their pay, obtain additional allowances for these dependents. Under the law the Government contributes amounts varying from $51.30 for a man with one dependent, to $96.90 for a man with three dependents. To this the enlisted man must contribute amounts ranging from $40 to $80 per month, depending upon his grade. Let me explain that in a little more detail.

The lowest three pay grades, that is the recruit, private, and private first class, by contributing $40 a month from their own pay can obtain an additional $51.30 a month from the Government for a total allotment of $91.30 if they have one dependent. If they have two dependents, the allotment is increased to $117.10 a month, of which the man contributes $40, and the Government $77.10. If the man has three dependents, the Government contributes $96.90, and the man $40, for a total contribution of $136.90.

Now, the corporals and sergeants must contribute more money on the theory that they are receiving more and thus should be required to contribute a greater amount to their dependents. Thus, a corporal or a sergeant must contribute $60 a month and the Government will contribute $77.10 for a total allotment of $137.10 a month if the corporal or sergeant has 1 or 2 dependents. If they have more than two dependents, the Government contributes $96.90 and the corporal or sergeant contributes $60 for a total allotment of $156.90. Sergeants first class and master sergeants with 1 or 2 dependents are required to contribute $80, and the Government contributes $77.10 per month, for a total of $157.10. The sergeant first class or master sergeant who has more than two dependents must still contribute $80 but in that case the Government contributes $96.90, for a total of $176.90 per month.

Now, this is not an inexpensive program. In fact, the estimated cost of fiscal year 1954 is $538,537,000, and if the Armed Forces cannot obtain the necessary funds from savings or transfers for the months of May and June of this year, they will require an additional $86,212,000 to complete this fiscal year. But even though this is a large amount of money, I would like to call your attention to the fact that during World War II the old Family Allowance Act cost the taxpayers approximately $10 billion. The reason for this tremendous cost during World War II was due to the fact that many persons who were not really dependent upon a serviceman were paid these allowances. That was a disgraceful practice. Under the present law, only wives and children, and parents who are dependent upon the enlisted man for over one-half of their support are entitled to these benefits. But, at the same time, I also want to say that we have considerably increased the benefits for the dependents under this law. That is, the Government's contribution to the wife under present law is $51.30, compared to the $28 she received in World War II. An the Government's contribution for a man with two dependents is $77.10, compared to the $58 received during World War II. The Government's contribution for an enlisted member with three dependents is $96.90 today, compared to the $78 these dependents received during World War II.

Now the present cost up to and including April 30, 1953, under the Dependents Assistance Act, will amount to $1,880,000,000. As I have indicated, it will cost approximately $538 million next year to pay the benefits authorized by the extension of this act. Thus, while we are giving greater benefits to the true dependents of our enlisted personnel, nevertheless in proportion to our total forces today, the total cost is less than it would have been had we merely extended the old family allowance law.

The theory of this law is sound. Greater benefits for those who deserve them and the elimination of benefits for those who are not truly dependent upon the serviceman.

The bill extends the present law to July 1, 1955, the date when the authority to induct men into the Armed Forces expires. I sincerely hope this bill will receive the unanimous support of the membership of the House. It was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VINSON. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today is probably one of the most necessary items of legislation that will be considered by this Congress. It is a bill to extend the law under which the enlisted members of our Armed Forces may provide benefits for their dependents. The present law expires on April 30 of this year.

Depending upon the final action taken with regard to the second supplemental appropriation bill, I think I can say that if the necessary funds can be obtained from savings or transfers, the extension of this law will require no new expenditures for the remainder of this fiscal year.

However, if it should develop that transfers cannot be made or savings effected to pay the costs for the remainder of this fiscal year, that is for the months of May and June, then it will be necessary for the Congress to appropriate the amount of $86,212,000.

The estimated cost for fiscal 1954 is $538,537,000.

Bear in mind that every penny of this money goes to the dependents of our enlisted personnel.

Now I would like to explain just what this law provides and just how it operates.

Let us start with the enlisted man who enters the Armed Forces and has only a wife to support. I will use the Army grade structure to explain the various pay grades.

A recruit, private, or a private first class, with only a wife to support, may provide an allotment for his wife of $91.30 each month. The enlisted man contributes $40 a month from his own pay and the Government contributes $51.30. Now, if that same man has a wife and 1 child, he can provide an allotment of $117.10 a month, of which he will contribute $40 and the Government will contribute $77.10. If an enlisted man of the grade of recruit, private, or private, first class, has a wife and 2 children, his wife will receive an allotment of $136.90 a month, of which the enlisted man will contribute $40 and the Government $96.90.

Now, if a man is a corporal, or a sergeant, he must contribute $60 a month from his own pay, and if he has a wife or a wife and one child the allotment will amount to $137.10 a month, of which $77.10 will be the Government's contribution. If an enlisted man of either of

those pay grades has more than two dependents, his dependents will receive an allotment of $156.90 per month, of which $96.90 will be the Government's contribution. A sergeant first class, or a master sergeant, must allot $80 per month from his own pay to initiate an allotment. And if he has one or two dependents, he can provide a total allotment of $157.10 per month, of which amount the enlisted man will contribute $80 and the Government will contribute $77.10 per month. If the sergeant first class or master sergeant has more than two dependents, the allotment will be $176.90 per month, of which amount the man will contribute $80 and the Government $96.90.

The reason that there is no difference between one or two dependents for an enlisted man who is a corporal or above is due to the fact that we have always given enlisted men of the higher pay grades a quarters allowance, and when we wrote the Dependents Assistance Act we could not give those people an amount less than that to which they were already entitled.

Now, I have talked about an enlisted man with a wife and children. I have also mentioned dependents. The dependents can only be wives, children, or parents. Under the Dependents Assistance Act an enlisted man can claim a mother or a father, or both, as dependents, if the mother or father, or both, are dependent upon the enlisted man for over one-half of their support.

You will note that we do not provide benefits for more than three dependents. There is a very good reason for that. In the first place, we are not drafting men with three dependents if they are truly dependent on the man and, generally speaking, we have limited the recall of reservists to those with not more than three dependents.

Now, I think the House should again be reminded, as it was in 1950 when we first passed the Dependents Assistance Act, that the present law is considerably different from the law which was in effect during World War II. We don't provide benefits for brothers and sisters, or grandfathers and grandmothers, as we did during World War II. And, as I have indicated previously, the benefits are limited to not more than three dependents. During World War II, we had some enlisted men drawing more total pay than their battalion commanders. But under the Dependents Assistance Act, we do provide more money for the wife and child and more money for the truly dependent parent than we did under the old family allowance law. For example, during World War II, a wife of an enlisted man received an allowance of $50 a month. Of this amount, the man contributed $22 and the Government $28. Today that wife receives $91.30 a month, of which the Government contributes $51.30, and the man $40. Under the family allowance law of World War II, a wife with one child received an allowance of $80 a month, of which the man contributed $22 and the Government $68. Under the Dependents Assistance Act, the man contributes $40 and the Government $77.10; and during World War II, a wife with two children received $100 a month of which the man contributed $22, and the Government $78. Today the wife of an enlisted man in the first three pay grades receives $136.90 of which the man contributes $40 and the Government $96.90.

Insofar as parents are concerned, under the old family allowance law a man with a dependent mother contributed $22, and the Government $28. Under present law, the man contributes $40 and the Government $51.30.

During World War II, if a mother and father were dependent upon an enlisted man for their support they received a total of $68 from the Government, of which the man contributed $22 and the Government $46. Today, that enlisted man contributes $40 and the Government $77.10.

Now, let us analyze for a moment what happens to a young man who is inducted into the Armed Forces. Let us assume that he has a wife and wants to establish a class Q allotment in the amount of $91.30 a month for his wife. The first thing he does is to file a dependency certificate with his personnel officer, and at the same time, execute an allotment authorization. No proof of marriage is required, so there is no delay in initiating the allotment. Then the certificate and the allotment authorization are forwarded to the local disbursing officer who enters a credit for the basic allowances for quarters in the soldier's military pay record. The disbursing officer then forwards the original certificate and allotment authorization to the Army Finance Center at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. About 13 days elapse from the time the soldier's application and the receipt of the application at the Army Finance Center. Authorization for the current month received at the Finance Center will be processed and checks will be mailed to the dependent on the second day of the succeeding month. Any retroactive claims submitted by the soldier will be paid within 9 days after they are received at the Finance Center.

Now, this same procedure would be true for those who have a wife and one child. In other words, only a certificate of dependency is required.

Now, supposing a man is drafted who has a dependent mother. Here we run into a little different situation. First, the man files the dependency certificate through his personnel officer and executes an allotment authorization, both of which go to the local disbursing officer. Then the local disbursing officer notes on the man's military pay records that the forms have been submitted and he forwards them to the Army Finance Center. Now, when the forms are received in the Finance Center they mail to the mother an affidavit form which she must fill out. She must swear to certain financial facts that prove her dependency. Now, I want to emphasize this: The soldier's allotment, that is the amount of money that he allots to his mother, will be processed in the normal channels. So the soldier's contribution for the current month in which the allotment is initiated will be paid to the mother on the second day of the succeeding month. But it depends upon when the affidavit from his mother is returned to the Finance Center as to when the payment to her of the Government's contribution will be made. That is, if she delays in returning the affidavit, she will delay just that much time the payment to her of the allotment insofar as the Government's contribution is concerned. She will not lose any money by the delay because she eventually will be paid retroactively to the date it was filed, if it is approved, but she will delay the receipt of the total amount by holding up the return of the affidavit which she must fill out.

Now, let us take one more situation. Supposing a soldier has initiated an allotment for his wife, and the Government has made its contribution. Then the wife obtains a divorce, which is final in every sense of the word, and the soldier puts in a stop-allotment order. In other words, supposing the soldier tells his personnel officer to stop the allotment to his divorced wife, but the checks continue to be delivered to the divorced wife, through no fault of the soldier, what happens then?

Well, first, collection action is taken against the wife. This is done by letter by the Army. If collection cannot be effected from the divorced wife, then an attempt is made to collect from the enlisted man, unless the Army is at fault. If the Army is not at fault, an attempt is made to collect from the man. Now, at that point, the soldier can apply for a waiver of collection against him. And if he does so, the case is adjudicated individually, taking into consideration his good faith, the absence of fraud, and whether or not the collection would be against equity. During World War II, we discovered that many of these waivers were granted on the flimsiest type of evidence. Thousands and thousands of waivers were granted. Under the present law, only 973 waivers have been granted to date. I think the reason is obvious. We have confined the law to true dependents and have not opened the door to unjustified claims of dependency that were possible under the old family-allowance law.

I have taken this time to explain how the new law operates because I know that many Members of this House are very much interested in this act. I think it is a good law, and one which deserves the full support of this House. I hope that the House will pass it without delay.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a few moments to express my views on the bill H. R. 2330, which would extend the Dependents Assistance Act.

I had the honor of being chairman of the subcommittee that wrote this legislation back in the summer of 1950. And, in that connection, I might say that we wrote a brand new bill which became the present law. It bore very little resemblance to the measure that was submitted to us by the Department of Defense which would have merely reenacted the whole family allowance law. I had excellent assistance from one of our staff members, Mr. Ruso Blanfort.

I think that the Dependents Assistance Act has been a good law. Persons who are truly dependent upon service personnel that is the wives, children, and

parents, all receive greater benefits under this law than they would have received under the old family allowance law. On the other hand, we eliminated many persons who drew allowances during World War II who were not truly dependent upon the serviceman. Thus, while we have reduced the overall expenditure for the legislation compared to what it would have cost had we reenacted the old family allowance law, nevertheless we have provided greater benefits for those deserving of them.

And, I am quite confident that the administration of this act is considerably less expensive than it would have been had we reenacted the old Family Allowance Act.

I want to emphasize something that has not yet been mentioned. This law is designed to prevent hardship among the dependents of our service personnel. It obviously cannot attempt to maintain the standard of living to which all of these dependents have been accustomed prior to the entry of their breadwinner into the Armed Forces. I do not know how we could write such a law because of the various income scales of those who become members of the Armed Forces. But the amounts furnished by the enlisted man are greater, and the contributions of the Government are greater than those that existed during World War II. And thus, I hope that in most cases, we have prevented real hardship. Now, I might mention that one of the reasons the enlisted man is required to contribute more than he did in World War II is because we have greatly increased his basic pay. In fact the pay of a private has increased almost 400 percent since 1940.

I do not want to have anyone infer from my remarks that this law is generous. It is not. But at the same time it is substantial compared with the old benefits. It is accomplishing its purpose and even though I participated in its creation, I cannot refrain from saying that it is serving its purpose well. I personally am interested in a thorough review of this legislation. Complaints have come to me of the inadequacies of these allotments. I know they are not overly generous in amounts but we must be fair with our Nation's defenders and we must not treat them shabbily.

I therefore hope, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will pass unanimously and that after that our committee will investigate the question of the adequacy of these payments.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

H. R. 2330 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE PEHR G. HOLMES

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of announcing to the House the passing, on December 19, 1952, of a distinguished former colleague, the Honorable Pehr G. Holmes.

For 16 years, from 1931 to 1947, Pehr Holmes ably and devotedly represented the people of the Fourth Massachusetts Congressional District in this Chamber.

The story of his life, from immigrant boy to high public office, is an inspiring revelation of the opportunities available in this American democracy to those possessing character, industry, ambition, perseverance, and the Christian desire to serve their fellow men and country.

Former Congressman Holmes was born in Sweden and emigrated to the United States with his parents at the age of 5. His family settled in Worcester, Mass., where he attended our public schools. While still a youth he started a small manufacturing business and soon became the owner of the enterprising Holmes Electrotype Foundry. He was also associated with others in the banking and insurance business.

However, for most of the 71 years of his good life Pehr Holmes made government his chief concern. Although Republican in politics throughout his long public career he had as many ardent Democrat supporters as he had in his own party.

A résumé reveals his elections to the following public offices: Member of the Worcester Common Council from 1908 to 1911; member of the board of aldermen from 1913 to 1916, serving as president during the latter 2 years; mayor of Worcester, 3 terms, 1917, 1918, 1919; member of the Governor's Council, 7th Massachusetts district, 1925 to 1928; elected to the 72d and to the 7 succeeding Congresses, serving in this House from March 4, 1931, to January 3, 1947.

From this brief biography, it is readily observed that Pehr Holmes brought a wealth of fundamental political knowledge and understanding to his service in this House. There are many Members here today who have told me of the innumerable times his wise counsel and friendly guidance steered them in the right path on many troublesome occasions.

While a Congressman, Pehr Holmes was a member of the House Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Public Buildings and Grounds, and the District of Columbia. His associates on those committees bear witness that his contributions to the accomplishment of committee objectives were repeatedly commended as patriotic examples of bipartisan cooperation. Many a tense committee moment was peacefully resolved by gentle interjection of the characteristic tolerant humor of Pehr Holmes.

The discipline of commonsense marking his whole life inspired his conviction that a prime necessity for a sound legislator is a balanced mind and body. He was a great lover of the outdoors, spending most of his leisure time on his small farm where he personally devolped an enviable orchard and garden which were a neighborhood pride. He was an experienced horseman, an ardent hunter, and skillful fisherman. He found the time to qualify as an expert in carrier pigeons and their breeding. A number of his birds were used with great value in the First World War. He had about 200 birds of pedigreed stock on his farm which was considered one of the largest pigeon cotes in the eastern section of the country.

A self-educated man, he was an avid, constant reader. His library contained more than 5,000 volumes, many of which were valuable first editions. Needless to say, Pehr Holmes was also active in civic, charitable, and religious circles of Worcester and our State giving unreservedly of his time, his energy, and his money. His beloved wife, Mrs. Freda C. Johnson Holmes, deceased October 23, 1936, was also known for her civic and charitable interests as well as intense devotion to her family.

Pehr Holmes has now gone to join his life partner under the heavenly roof of our eternal Father. He was essentially a man of sturdy integrity, quiet industry, modest manner, and genuine sincerity. He avoided extravagant honors and words. I am sure he would not want them now. His daily acts, throughout his life, of Christian virtue and patriotic service are his own monument. He was a kind, tolerant, understanding Christian gentleman who did his best each hour of every day. He was possessed of a gentle friendly humor, which has often seemed to me to be God's greatest blessing, especially to those in public life. It is perhaps worthy of philosophic reflection that a man like Pehr Holmes is more keenly missed in our society than the overawing genius whose parade of brilliance is too often more blinding than enlightening, more envied than loved.

I knew Pehr Holmes most of my mature life and was privileged to be among his multitudinous friends. I can pay him no more respect than to say that, as his successor in representing my district and the Nation here, I can only pray and work to meet the high standards of patriotic service he established for us who follow in his steps.

In extending my heartfelt sympathy in their great loss to his two fine sons, his sister, and brother I know full well I am speaking the united sentiment of all the Members who were privileged to serve with the late Hon. Pehr G. Holmes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] has well covered the life and history of our dear and beloved late friend, Pehr Holmes. Like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] and others of us who served with our late friend, I was deeply grieved when I read of his recent passing.

The story of Pehr Holmes' life will always stand as a shining example of the opportunities which America offers to everyone, and particularly to the foreign born who have faith in our democratic way of life. Pehr Holmes was imbued with that faith and in turn justified and repaid his adopted land for the privileges of citizenship bestowed upon him.

In addition to what my friend from Massachusetts has so well said, our late, beloved friend, Pehr Holmes, after he retired from politics, continued his interest in public affairs and his contributions to the best interests of our country

never ceased until he died. He also took time during his busy life to return for a visit to the land of his birth.

Those of us who served with Pehr Holmes will always remember him not only as a colleague, but as a friend and as a gentleman and as a human being who gave not only to this country but to his fellow men the best that was in him. I valued his friendship deeply. We came to be very close to one another as a result of our service in this body. His passing is a personal loss to me. To his sons, to his sister, and brother who survive him, I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, as the older Members of the House know, Pehr Holmes was one of my closest and most intimate friends when we served together for 16 years in this House before he left this body. It has been my high privilege and immense pleasure to have spent many happy and enjoyable hours with Pehr Holmes, many of them alone, just the two of us, as we traveled together in this country and in his native land of Sweden. On different occasions I have driven from Washington to Worcester, Mass., as the gentleman knows, and have spoken on different occasions for Pehr Holmes. I have been in his home. I know of the beautiful family life that was his. I know of his fidelity and devotion, the tender care he accorded to his dear wife. I know the high pride and great interest that he took in his two fine sons. The last good visit I had with Pehr was a little over a year ago, when he drove Mrs. Short and me, with two of his sisters-in-law, all over the southern part of Florida. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], who has well and faithfully represented his district following Mr. Holmes, as the minority whip, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], said, well covered the wide and varied career of this good man. I would only want to emphasize one thing, and that is that sometimes I think people who are born abroad and who have come to this land of ours perhaps have a keener appreciation for many of its liberties and benefits and opportunities than those native sons, those of us who were here and often are inclined to take things for granted. Pehr Holmes loved the United States of America. He loved our Constitution and tried to follow it unerringly. He had little sympathy for some world uplifters or self-appointed do-gooders who would dissipate all of our strength as a nation and who would try to make America over. Pehr Holmes came up the hard way. He was truly a self-made man, but because of his rugged honesty, his untiring industry; because of his love for this America of ours and his love for his fellow man; because Pehr Holmes would always go out of his way to accommodate the lowliest constituent, he was a true friend. I shall sorely miss him.

To those of his kin who survive I pray that the blessings of Almighty God shall rest upon them and sustain them even unto the perfect day.

Mr. DONOHUE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend and revise their remarks in tribute to the memory of Congressman Pehr G. Holmes for 5 legislative days.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Pehr Holmes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PEHR G. HOLMES: SAGA OF A SELF-MADE AMERICAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Pehr G. Holmes died last year after a long life that was devoted to the highest traditions of public service.

Pehr G. Holmes was born in Sweden.

He was educated in the public schools of Worcester, Mass.

He became a sucessful manufacturer. Some men would be content with that, unwilling to accept other responsibilities. But he was a man of broad vision who knew that the precious moments of life are loaned to us for a purpose higher than the claims of self. There is work to be done for family, friends, neighbors, and the community.

Successively, he became alderman of Worcester, mayor of that thriving industrial city, member of the Governor's Council of Massachusetts; and Congressman representing the Fourth District of the State where our Nation was conceived.

As an immigrant who made good, as a husband and a father; as a man of intelligence and character who had a deep and abiding faith in the liberties and the duties that go hand in hand with American citizenship, he was well qualified to be a servant of the people in this House of Congress.

He gave 16 years of his life—the ripe years of wisdom—to national service in this Legislature. Conscientious, thorough, all his thoughts and actions were guided by his personal integrity.

His epitaph is short, simple, and illuminating. It reads: "He lived a life of honor."

Although it is customary to speak well of the dead, and especially of those whose lives were a part of ours because we worked side by side with them, there are times when we fully recognize the merits of a man only after he has gone. And then, trying to bridge the barrier between life and death, we speak the words that should have been spoken before.

We do so now, belatedly, but they are not lost.

Somewhere, somehow the good that men do lives after them, touching others with a memory that, thinking of, inspires us the living—to do better. And so we say: "Thanks to Pehr G. Holmes for the gifts he brought to life and left with us."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, during all the years that he served as a Member of this House Pehr Holmes was a close personal friend of mine. I had for him both high regard and real affection.

Coming to this country at the age of 5 he was destined to serve for 8 years as a member of the city council in Worcester, Mass., for 1 year as its president of the board of aldermen, for 2 years as its mayor, for 3 years as a member of the Governor's Council for the State of Massachusetts and for 14 years as a Member of the Congress.

He made a fine contribution to his city, to his State, and to the Nation.

He will be greatly missed by his wide circle of friends and by all those who served with him here.

I know that his record of service will always be a source of pride and satisfaction to the members of his family and all others close to him.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] in the tribute he has paid to our former colleague, Pehr G. Holmes, who served the Fourth District of Massachusetts in this body for 16 years.

The service of Pehr Holmes in this House was characterized by a high degree of usefulness to the constituency he represented. Furthermore, his service to the country was of outstanding value. He brought to his service in the Congress and to the committee of which he was a member a wisdom that was based on an experience gained by him as businessman engaged in many different activities. His judgment at all times was sound and dependable. He was always practical in his approach to the solution of the problems that came before us either on the floor of the House or in the work of the committee.

It was my pleasure and privilege to be closely associated with Pehr Holmes as a result of our membership on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The intimacy that thus existed between us enabled me to know how sincere he was in all matters and in the views he expressed in the conduct of his public duties. He was a man of strong convictions. While ever willing to hear all sides of a question, yet, once he had formed his opinion he would not deviate from what he believed to be right.

Equally observable, as his allegiance to principle, was his allegiance to friends, and they were many. I have known no one in all my experience who knew so many of the Members of the House by their first names. His friendly attitude to others created similar feelings by others toward him. His cheerful disposition, his kind manner, his friendly attitude made for him a host of friends.

We felt a distinct loss as he passed from us. His memory will linger always with those who knew him. I extend to the fine family that he left my deep and sincere sympathy in the loss they have sustained. To them, however, it should be a source of satisfaction to realize that the fine service he rendered in every public office he ever filled is recognized the high regard in which he

was held by all who knew him, and that his memory lives on and will be an inspiration to all who had the good fortune to know him.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my former colleague and late friend Mr. Pehr G. Holmes, of Worcester, Mass. When I came to Congress in 1943 Pehr Holmes was one of my first acquaintances. During the time I served in the House with him we became fast friends. He was always kindly and most considerate. As a new member, I valued his advice and relied upon his counsel. He was exceedingly helpful and never failed to be of assistance whenever possible. I count it an honor and a privilege to have known him and to have had his warm friendship.

Congressman Pehr Holmes devoted many years of untiring effort to public life. From his youth he was constantly interested in public service. Prior to his election to Congress he served as one of the youngest mayors in his home city. Later he was a member of the Governor's Council in Massachusetts.

Not only was Pehr Holmes a most successful businessman, but he participated in a multitude of civic interests. He played a vital role in many civic and fraternal organizations. At all times he was ready to be of help to his fellow men.

He was an ardent sportsman and had a summer camp in my district in the town of Sandown, N. H., where he spent much time during the summer months. He led a most active life, devoting his many talents to a variety of subjects.

Pehr Holmes had a distinguished career in this House, extending from 1930 to 1946. He was a member of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He was active in the formulation of legislation and devoted his time and effort unsparingly to his work. His contributions to the formation of public policy will stand as an enduring monument to his achievements. He established an enviable record of public service.

Pehr Holmes was an able, conscientious, and hard-working Member of Congress. I deem it a privilege to have served with him in this House, and I am happy that I had an opportunity to know him as a constant friend. He will long be remembered by the many who knew him throughout the country.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve for several years with Pehr G. Holmes on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was an experience which I shall treasure always in my memory.

All of us will agree I am sure that we learn more about our colleagues in that intimate association on standing committees than in any other way.

Pehr Holmes was a hard worker on his committee. He was a close student of legislation and had to an unusual degree the ability to translate legalistic language into practical phraseology, and to appraise properly the effect of a legislative proposal on the Nation's people and economy.

He made friends and kept them, because he knew how to be a friend, and because he was in every sense a gentleman.

I learned of his passing in December with deep regret and with a sense of personal loss. My sympathy and good wishes are extended to his family and his friends.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I was indeed saddened to learn today that a former colleague, Pehr G. Holmes, who served commencing with the 72d Congress and continuously thereafter until the 79th Congress, for a total service to his district and his country of 16 years, as Representative from the 4th District of Massachusetts.

I sincerely join my colleagues in the tribute paid to him.

Mr. Holmes was born in Sweden and was educated in the public schools of Worcester. He served on the board of aldermen, as mayor of Worcester, and as a member of the Governor's Council of the 7th Massachusetts District. His background was that of a manufacturer and businessman and with his political experience in his home city and in his State he brought to the Congress a wealth of experience, common sense, and good judgment that made his record in Congress outstanding.

I became acquainted with Mr. Holmes when I was first elected to Congress and subsequently had the great privilege of serving with him on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He was a delightful friend and a wise counselor and was ever an advocate of the free-enterprise system of our Government. While ever tolerant of the viewpoints of others, he was strong in his convictions of principle and never deviated from what he thought was right.

Personally I shall always remember Pehr Holmes for the friendship he extended to me and the wealth of his contributions which he made during his service in Congress. In his passing I feel a distinct loss, and I extend to his family my deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very real personal privilege for me to have this opportunity of paying tribute to my good friend and former colleague, the late Pehr G. Holmes. When I first came to Congress I found in Pehr Holmes not only a fellow Republican Congressman from a district adjoining my district, but a man who became a valued friend. He was always glad to give me the advice I sought of him frequently.

I am certain that all who knew Pehr had the same respect that I had for his fine abilities, for his devotion to his responsibilities, and for his complete integrity. His record of public service as a member of the Governor's council, as the mayor of Worcester for three terms, and as a Member of Congress from 1931 to 1947 was a splendid one. It has been said of him that "he was anxious to be right on all public questions." I am certain that Pehr never reached any decision during his public life without believing deeply that it was the right decision.

An editorial appearing in the Worcester Telegram after Pehr's death was concluded as follows:

He was a man without pretense or show. He made no claim to brilliance. He never sought to electrify Washington. His ambition was to serve his country and people steadily and in good conscience. It is high tribute to him to say that he succeeded.

Since 1947 Pehr always came to the floor of this House when he was in Washington to visit with his former colleagues. It was always a real pleasure for us to see him, and we shall all miss greatly our association with him. I join in extending my deepest sympathy to his two sons, his sister, and his brother in their great loss.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, with great sorrow I learned of the death of our former colleague, Hon. Pehr G. Holmes, who represented the Fourth Massachusetts Congressional District in this body for so many years.

When a Member comes to the National House of Representatives as a freshman, he naturally relies upon those of his colleagues who have had experience for a great deal of information, assistance, and advice in order to help him get under way in his service to his constituents. When I came to Washington to begin my first term in this House, I was naturally hungry for such assistance, counsel, and advice, and no Member was more helpful in affording desired information and valuable counsel than was Pehr Holmes. He repeatedly went out of his way to aid me in making a good start, and I have never ceased to remember with a grateful heart his generous assistance and wise counsel.

His home city of Worcester is often referred to throughout Massachusetts as the heart of the Commonwealth, and the people of his city and his congressional district, of which Worcester is the center, had in their Representative in Congress a man who was always a valiant champion of all the people.

Pehr Holmes was one of those fortunate Congressmen whose friends and neighbors back home had permitted him to serve an apprenticeship in government before sending him to Washington. For him the approach to many a problem of Federal Government was made easy by his former experience in municipal government, both legislative and executive, and by his service to the Commonwealth in the Governor's council.

The career of Pehr G. Holmes both in business and in government will long serve as an inspiration to many a youth as an example of what an immigrant boy can accomplish in our America by honesty and industry and a faithful adherence to the principles of good citizenship and Christian living.

I extend my profound sympathy to his two sons, his sister, and brother.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, like all who enjoyed the rich experience of his friendship, I was deeply saddened by the death of our former colleague, Pehr G. Holmes, of Worcester, Mass.

Pehr Holmes ably and diligently served in this House for 16 years, from 1931 to 1947. In those years, a friendship which had begun earlier in his political career ripened into one of my closest associations in Congress. Following his retirement from office, he often returned to visit with us, as he loved the House and the friendships he had made here. It was always a happy occasion when Pehr

called to have a little chat about the affairs of the Nation, in which he retained a deep interest after his services here ended.

The story of Pehr Holmes and his success is typical of the American tradition which he cherished so deeply. Born in Sweden, Pehr came to this land of freedom and opportunity with his parents at the age of 5. With the venturesome spirit of youth and in the faith that America offered rich rewards to those who were willing to work, Pehr Holmes established his own manufacturing business while still a very young man. His confidence in the future of America paid off in the success of his business. His enterprise also extended to the banking and insurance fields.

While successful in business, his real devotion was to the public service. His public career started with his election to the Worcester Common Council. He then moved to the board of aldermen, which he later served as president. His service to the city government of Worcester resulted in his promotion to the office of mayor, to which he was elected for three terms. After serving for a time as a member of the governor's council, he was elected to represent his district in Congress for eight terms.

Those who had the pleasure of serving with him admired his fine capacity and understanding. They respected his sterling character, his unfailing integrity, his rugged Americanism.

Here was an immigrant boy who appreciated the opportunities he found in this favored land. He made the most of those opportunities and became another American success story.

To his fine sons and his family I extend my heartfelt sympathy. I know they are consoled by the knowledge that Pehr Holmes will live always in the memories of all who had the privilege of working with him.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Pehr Holmes was one of the great and lovable personalities it has been my high privilege to know intimately and serve with in this body. His untimely passing came as a shock and brought me and all those who knew him very deepest grief.

Pehr Holmes was a true son of the people. Of proud, but humble Swedish stock, reared in the best traditions of the great Swedish people, imbued with the profound spiritual qualities and faith of his indomitable forebears, he rose up through the ranks to high station in the service of city, State, and Nation, and an exalted place in the hearts of his fellow citizens.

Possessed of great ability, highest character and resolution, and a burning love of American principles and institutions as well as an absorbing aspiration to serve his fellow man, Congressman Holmes in his life, his career, and immeasurable contributions exemplified always the loftiest and finest attributes of a true American statesman.

He was indeed a warmhearted and devoted friend, a loving husband and father, a loyal effective public servant, and a distinguished and great American.

His illustrious career will long remain as a spur and inspiration to young men of this and succeeding generations who will inevitably be impressed and stimulated, not only by the high standards he maintained, but by his invincible, determined spirit and his successful struggle in the battle of life.

He served the people with conspicuous distinction and unflagging zeal. Sincere and wholesome, loyal and devoted to duty, dedicated to earnest service, firm in his principles, true to his many friends, kindly and generous toward all, Pehr Holmes lived and worked in accordance with the finest traditions of America. He will long be remembered for his nobility of character, sincerity of purpose, and many contributions to the welfare of the American people.

I join in mourning his truly irreparable loss and again extend my deep and heartfelt sympathy to his family and friends. May he rest in peace.

As part of my remarks, I desire to include the following splendid editorial tribute from the pages of the Worcester Telegram, celebrated publication of Congressman Holmes' home city of Worcester, Mass.:

[From the Worcester Telegram of December 20, 1952]

PEHR G. HOLMES

In the years between his political retirement in 1947 and his death yesterday in Florida, former Congressman and former Mayor Pehr G. Holmes had kept aloof from the public scene. But his career, in many ways a remarkable one, is still fresh in the memory of most people in this part of Massachusetts.

Pehr Holmes was a man of business, who made a success of the shop he started in a small way in his early years. He was a man of varied interest, who found the time and the means for the enjoyment of many things from reading in his extensive library to gardening and pigeon fancying.

He was quiet and unobtrusive always, but could be a most genial companion and pleasant host with ready stories of his experiences and activities.

But for most of his 71 years, Pehr Holmes made politics and government his major concern, to the extent that he seemed often to regard his business chiefly as a means of subsistence to enable him to seek and occupy public office.

He was a good man in public life, and useful. His service has nothing of the sensational in it, but it was a model of diligence. He was anxious to be right on all public questions, and he sought to inform himself thoroughly on every issue, national or local. At the same time he was eager to meet his responsibilities, to the smallest detail, and no request from a constituent was too trivial for his personal attention.

His was, in short, a public career that lived up to a standard he set for it. He seemed to set that standard early, for he had not yet reached voting age when he was interested in political matters, and he celebrated his 21st year by becoming a member of the Republican city committee. Thenceforth, whether as a three-time mayor, governor's councilor, or eight-term Member of Congress from the Fourth District, Pehr Holmes looked upon politics as a field for public service rather than personal advantage.

He was a man without pretense or show. He made no claim to brilliance. He never sought to electrify Washington. His ambition was to serve his country and people steadily and in good conscience.

It is high tribute to him to say that he succeeded.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I was not on the floor the other day when several Members paid tribute to our former colleague, Pehr G. Holmes, of Worcester, Mass., who for 16 years—from 1931–47—represented in this body the Fourth Massachusetts Congressional District. For most of this period of service, he was a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I have had the honor to be a member for the last 6 years. Mr. Holmes was a devoted and industrious member of the committee and always visited it when he returned to Washington after his retirement.

Other Members have already spoken of the biographical facts of Pehr Holmes' life. I wish simply to testify to his qualities as a legislator and as a friend. He was an unassuming man but, for that very reason, was the more beloved by those who knew him and worked with him. I regretted very much when his term of service here came to an end and I mourn the fact that his longer and larger term of service to his fellow man had to come to an end last December. Pehr Holmes had lived out his 3 score and 10 but he was yet far too young and far too useful to be spared. I join my colleagues in extending sympathy to his two sons, and to his brother and sister.

TAX REDUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as I look about the House I want to pay my respects and express my gratitude that so many Members have waited this long and seem to be waiting to listen to what I shall have to say.

Naturally, I have been keenly disturbed and shocked after many years of service in the House to find myself in the position I do in reference to legislation which I have introduced for the benefit of the people of this country. I know from discussion with Members on the floor of the House that they are keenly anxious to have the bill which I have introduced to reduce taxes for the benefit of practically 50 million sovereign citizens of this country passed, for they have expressed a desire to be given the opportunity to vote for the bill and have told me they would support it. It is a rather strange position to be in.

I have made requests on the Rules Committee; those requests have been friendly and dignified, and for some time I received no response at all to the requests, but the second letter did bring a reply and I assume most of the Members have read it.

I have had the privilege of serving on the Ways and Means Committee for 20 years; I had the high honor of serving under one of the most distinguished, able, and true Americans as chairman that has served in this Congress; I refer to Robert Doughton, a great man, a great American. We differed very little on much legislation; in fact, I have many letters from him thanking me for my assistance on legislation which he brought to the floor.

I am going to read most of my speech, but I want to explain one thing: Many Members on both sides of the House ask:

Why are you in such a hurry to bring H. R. 1 to the floor? I have tried to explain it; I have explained it to the press; I have explained it on television, and it is so obvious: There are 30 million taxpayers in this country who come under the withholding tax. They are the people who are in need at this time of take-home pay. The tremendous correspondence which I have received indicates that they need that take-home pay, and they are almost desperate because taxes today are the highest not only in the history of this country but in the world. All around us they are reducing taxes; Canada has done what I know H. R. 1 will do, it has released the people from the shackles of high taxation and given them an incentive to produce more. As I pointed out yesterday in an extension of remarks, in France we are building a seaway with our counterpart funds, money out of the pockets of the taxpayers of America. I went down to see three of the completed dams costing $568,000,000. But there are 22 dams to be built and 46 power stations. France is not putting in a nickel. All you have to do is figure up, and if we finish that job with our money we will have poured into that seaway the total sum of $13,000,000,000. They say we cannot reduce foreign aid. Maybe that is one of the reasons, I do not know. We put $2,000,000,000 into Italy and she has just reduced her taxes so she can get more revenue. That seems to be a paradox some people cannot understand. France reduced her taxes and she said, not only to bring tax relief and get more revenues but to create honesty among her people. In this morning's or yesterday's press we see that little Israel has reduced her taxes. So, throughout the world if they want to produce they have to reduce their taxes and they know it.

Mr. Speaker, if any Member in this Congress, even when the House is filled with the membership, which it is not now, can name one single instance where I have sacrificed principle to politics in any vote I have cast, where I once voted against the interests of my grand and glorious country, let him stand and I will send my resignation as a Member to the Speaker. Do you think I would be here with this bill if I did not think it was sound and good for the country? We have arrived at the time of diminishing returns in revenue.

I want to give you another example. While many of you have not seen the results of the work that is going on in the Ways and Means Committee, spade work is being done with the assistance of the finest trained minds in this country in the field of taxation, and they are volunteering their services; services that we could not buy for several million dollars. They are serving with all the enthusiasm of true patriots, bringing to us the benefit of their knowledge of taxation in the particular area which they serve or from which they come. That work is going on and has been going on day after day since the Congress opened.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say another thing. The Ways and Means Committee is composed of men who are experts in their field, and, without the slightest reflection upon the membership of any other committee in the House, I say that you cannot find a more devoted and a group of higher talent and faithfulness than you find on the Ways and Means. The membership of the Ways and Means Committee that reported out H. R. 1 represents over 7 million people. The members of that committee in the first instance and down to the present time have been selected after their delegations said that they were the outstanding men to go on the Ways and Means Committee. Some of them are outstanding experts, and that applies to Members on both sides of the aisle.

The bill which I am going to present here as soon as I can get it on the floor—and I realize I have almost insurmountable difficulties to overcome—is a sound bill and was reported out by 21 members of the committee out of a total membership of 25, representing, as I said 7 million people and all the affairs of those people in taxation. Both sides voted this bill out. The leadership of this House knew that I was introducing this bill. Every person on the floor knows that the candidates who went out to be elected promised tax reduction or a reduction of Government expenditures. In most instances they promised both, and the men that are here today are here because of that great issue. You are all getting letters from your district, and in my office they are running 50 to 1 in favor of this bill. I am sure you are all getting telegrams and telephone calls from all over the country. They say, "Why is it that you cannot bring this bill to the floor?" That is a hard question to answer. I am casting no reflections, but I sometimes wonder what have I done during the last 34 years that I should be subjected to this treatment here. It is not only because I happen, through seniority, that I have become chairman of this powerful committee. I have looked forward to doing one of the finest jobs that can be done for the American people if I and the other members of the committee are not hamstrung. It is their bill just as much as mine. There is no pride of authorship in this bill so far as I am concerned. It is the people's bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will proceed to prove it to you.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The ides of March, that is, the American ides of March, come on Monday, and because of that I have been receiving telegrams, telephone calls, and mail urging immediate passage of this bill. The arguments used in those messages can be boiled down to this one: If you will cut taxes and live within the income, which is the second step in my opinion, this country will be better off and it can expand and expand. I think it is a shame that we cannot do that and do it immediately.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Now then, I wish to try and spell out this bill and the economics of it so that you each will have it and the country can have it.

I wish to explain just what H. R. 1 does.

Under the Revenue Act of 1951, individual income taxes were increased for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953. These increases expire as of December 31, 1953.

My bill provides that these increases will expire on June 30, 1953, instead of December 31, 1953. Thus my bill gives tax relief to individuals in 1953 instead of causing them to wait until 1954. By moving this date back to July 1, 1953, individuals will, in computing their tax for 1953, receive approximately one-half as large a reduction of their individual income tax as they will receive under existing law for 1954. For example, a single individual earning $3,000 in calendar 1953 will under existing law pay a tax of $468.60. Under H. R. 1 he will pay a tax of $445.30. This reduction amounts to $23.30 or 5 percent of what he would otherwise pay in calendar 1953. In the calendar year 1954 he will pay a tax of $426.60 because he will receive an additional reduction of $23.30. His total reduction therefore is $46.60 or approximately 10 percent of what he is now paying.

Right at this point I want to make this clear. I said there were 30 million people operating under the withholding tax, that they were the ones that need the take-home pay. Under my bill they would get the 11 percent reduction on July 1 of this year. They would get that benefit.

Why am I in a hurry to get H. R. 1, the tax reduction, through? Because the mechanics back of this bill require sending out withholding tables and the instructions for the employers of 30 million people, 16 pages in each booklet, going out to 30 million people. It takes 60 days. Of course, this bill can be checked and killed certainly as far as 30 million people are concerned, and they will be deprived and cheated out of the gain they would get on July 1, 1953.

It does not make any difference to me personally whether this bill is passed now or later, except to keep faith with the people, those on both sides of the aisle who want reduction of taxes and the cutting of expenditures. That does not mean anything to me personally, but it means everything to the people of this country, as I will show. But I cannot believe that the Members of this House are going to sit idly by and let 30 million people lose their 11 percent on July 1 because we cannot get the bill to the House on time, and April 1 is almost the deadline. So I want to see you people, at least those of you who have made your promises, taken off the hook on both sides of the aisle. It is the only honest thing to do.

Since my bill also makes the reduction in withholding fully effective as of July 1, 1953, taxpayers subject to withholding will have the full 10-percent reduction reflected in their take-home pay commencing July 1, 1953.

The fear has been expressed that a heavy cut in Government spending might have an adverse effect on the economy. In order to offset this, the suggestion has been made that tax reduction should match Government spending. In this connection the following is quoted from the article by Sumner H. Slichter appearing in the

February 1953 issue of Harper's magazine:

(7) Cut taxes: If individuals and business concerns raise their spending for goods as fast as the Government cuts its defense spending, the total demand for goods will not drop, and there will be no recession. The Government can help individuals and business concerns to spend more by taking less from them in the form of taxes. Hence it is important that cuts in defense spending be promptly matched by cuts in taxes.

That is from one of the leading economists in this country, the advisor of some of the largest concerns in this country, a man who often appears before the Committee on Ways and Means, to our advantage.

Of course, if tax reductions are to match reductions in spending, it is important that the tax-cutting law should be enacted as promptly as possible, so that taxpayers may anticipate the amount of their increased spending occasioned by the tax reduction.

I call your attention, while you are talking about recessions, to an item in the Wall Street Journal showing how sales are dropping off in the Illinois district. You will see from the article that the danger signals are up right now.

A distinguished student of taxation once said:

It seems difficult for some to understand that high rates of taxation do not necessarily mean large revenue to the Government and that more revenue may often be obtained by lower rates.

There are those who have been spending the taxpayers' money without let or hindrance for the past 20 years who oppose any tax relief but who do support and applaud every emergency that affords an opportunity to spend. These are the spending addicts. They cry out with pain when the words "Economy in Government" are uttered. Woe be unto him who advocates tax relief for the people.

The taxpayers are fed up with a boondoggling Congress. They have seen the national debt under a boondoggling regime climb from $49 billion at the end of fiscal year 1941 to $259.1 billion at the end of fiscal 1952—an increase of $210.1 billion.

Public debt outstanding

At end of fiscal 1941	$49,000,000,000
At end of fiscal 1952	259,100,000,000
Increase	210,100,000,000

And yet the cry for more boondoggling and no tax cut is still heard. The cry echoes through every bureau of the Government.

One of the great economists of this country wrote to me as follows:

We must, of course, reduce expenditures, balance the budget, reduce the Nation of debt, and take other steps to preserve our great Nation, but I am convinced from many years of study in the field of private and public finance covering the country and many other countries, that the absolute first step must be to make a beginning in the reduction of the tax burden. With the tax burden reduced, the average taxpayer will have at least a little something left with which to buy needed goods and services, and this alone will stimulate the economic life of the Nation and in turn result in an increase in ordinary revenue even though the rates are lower. And the individual will have a little something left for investment, or in making of improvements, or to begin or increase the nest egg which is so vital an element in human life.

Continuing, this distinguished economist closed his letter by stating:

I hope that you will keep up this magnificent battle in the firm belief that first things must come first notwithstanding attractive slogans or political planning. I am saying it as an economist and one most concerned with the national prosperity and general welfare.

I have been amazed at the statements appearing in the press and elsewhere to the effect that it will be necessary to postpone and delay the enactment of H. R. 1 providing individual income tax relief for the year 1953. In the campaign the Republican Party pledged itself to reduce expenditures and cut taxes. I for one feel that I am committed to carry out wholeheartedly and without reservation this pledge to the people.

What did we mean in our campaign pledge when we told the country we were going to reduce expenditures? We made a record in the campaign on the basis that we would reduce the enormous and wasteful expenditures of the Truman administration and the people relying upon our promise gave us control of the Government for the first time in 20 years. Unless we take steps to reduce expenditures substantially below those of Mr. Truman, we will be guilty of the same charge of reckless spending which we hurled against the former President.

What are the Truman expenditures? Looking at the budget submitted by Mr. Truman for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, I find a table on page 1138 giving the actual expenditures for the full fiscal years during which Mr. Truman was in office. These years are the fiscal years 1946 to 1952, inclusive. Here is the record of expenditures for those years:

1946	$60,700,000,000
1947	39,300,000,000
1948	33,800,000,000
1949	40,100,000,000
1950	40,200,000,000
1951	44,600,000,000
1952	66,100,000,000

The fiscal year 1953 does not end until June 30, 1953. Accordingly, we have no record of what the actual expenditures for that year will be. While Government spending in the last quarter of the calendar year 1952, when the prior administration was in control of the Government, was running at the rate of $74.7 billion—as compared with the Truman budget estimate of $74.6 billion for the entire fiscal year 1953—the rate of spending dropped in January to $68.8 billion and in February to $67.1 billion. This sharp reduction in expenditures, coupled with the announced policy of the present administration to freeze expenditures, and the earnest desire of the Congress to eliminate waste and extravagance indicates that even for the fiscal year 1953—although we have been in control of the Government for less than 6 months of that year—there will be sizable reduction in actual expenditures over the estimate in Mr. Truman's budget.

But H. R. 1 affects only the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. For that year we have only Mr. Truman's "guesstimate" of expenditures of $78.6 billion, which is $12½ billion greater than the actual expenditures for any complete fiscal year during which Mr. Truman was in office. Since the Republican Party will have full control of the Government during the entire fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the people will expect that expenditures for that year will be held down at least to the highest full year of Mr. Truman's administration.

These "guesstimates" in past years have invariably exceeded actual expenditures by wide margins. Do not let us be misled by "guesstimates." What we must reduce is actual expenditures.

What kind of cuts are we going to make in the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954? Are we going to be satisfied with a budget which is higher than the highest full year of actual expenditures under Mr. Truman? I believe we are not. Unless we want to be charged as reckless spenders ourselves, we must cut spending below the spending of Mr. Truman.

In addition to cutting expenditures we are also pledged to reduce taxes. In accordance with this last pledge, I introduced H. R. 1 on the very first day of this Republican Congress.

Let us see what effect H. R. 1. will have upon the budget. I hear the cry repeatedly that we cannot reduce taxes until we reduce expenditures and this is accompanied by the complaint that a reduction in taxes at this time might prevent the budget from being balanced.

But certainly if we are to reduce expenditures we can accomplish no substantial reductions unless in a year during which we have been in complete control of the Government we reduce them below the last highest year of actual expenditures during which the Truman administration was in complete control of the Government. Do not let us be misled by a strawman. The "guesstimate" presented in the budget of Mr. Truman for 1954 should not govern the measure of reduction we ought to make. The reductions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, should be below the actual expenditures for the highest year during which Mr. Truman was in complete control of the Government.

Do my colleagues realize that we can still pass H. R. 1 giving individual income taxpayers much needed relief for the calendar year 1953 and have a balanced budget if expenditures do not rise more than $1.1 billion above the highest year of actual expenditures during which Mr. Truman was in control of the Government for the entire year? I am convinced that many of you do not realize this, but here are the facts in connection with H. R. 1.

First, H. R. 1 will have no effect at all on the budget for the fiscal year 1953. Receipts for that year will remain the same regardless of whether or not H. R. 1 is enacted. However, even though H. R. 1 will not effect the 1953 budget, I am hopeful that that year will be reexamined by the Congress and that expenditures can be substantially cut below Mr. Truman's estimates.

H. R. 1 will affect the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and

that year only. In his message of January 9, 1953, transmitting the budget, former President Truman has already taken into account, in estimating the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the effect on that budget of the scheduled termination under existing law of the excess-profits tax as of July 1, 1953, the decreases in the individual income tax as of January 1, 1954, and certain excises.

With these scheduled terminations taken into account he estimates that the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, will be $68.7 billion.

Even if the receipts for the fiscal year 1954 are as low as former President Truman has estimated, H. R. 1, even under the most pessimistic assumptions, will only reduce the revenues for the fiscal year 1954 by $1.5 billion. This means that even under the most pessimistic assumption the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, will amount to $67.2 billion—if H. R. 1 is adopted—instead of $68.7 billion.

I can hardly visualize, in the absence of an all-out war, that the Congress will permit expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to rise above $67.2 billion. We are pledged to cut expenditures and to cut them substantially. In the period from 1946 to 1952, the budget expenditures for any year have not gone above $66,145,000,000, and that amount was reached in only one of those years, namely, the fiscal year 1952. This was the last year during which the Truman administration was in complete control of the Government from beginning to end.

If we do not let budget expenditures rise above $67.2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and adopt H. R. 1, we will have no deficit. Moreover, there is every indication that receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, may be higher than the estimate given in former President Truman's budget of January 9, 1953.

At this point let me reiterate for the sake of emphasis just what H. R. 1 does. Under the Revenue Act of 1951 individual income taxes were increased for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953. These increases expire as of December 31, 1953. My bill provides that these increases will expire on June 30, 1953, instead of December 31, 1953. Thus my bill gives tax relief to individuals in 1953 instead of causing them to wait until 1954.

By moving this date back to July 1, 1953, individuals will, in computing their tax for 1953, receive approximately one-half as large a reduction of their individual income tax as they will receive under existing law for 1954. For example, a single individual earning $3,000 in calendar year 1953 will under existing law pay a tax of $468.60. Under H. R. 1 he will pay a tax of $445.30.

This reduction amounts to $23.30 or 5 percent of what he would otherwise pay in calendar 1953. In the calendar year 1954 he will pay a tax of $426.60 because he will receive an additional reduction of $23.30. His total reduction therefore is $46.60 or approximately 10 percent of what he is now paying. Since my bill also makes the reduction in withholding fully effective as of July 1, 1953, taxpayers subject to withholding will have the full 10 percent reduction reflected in their take-home pay commencing July 1, 1953.

Our individual income taxpayers are entitled to the relief which H. R. 1 gives them for the year 1953. Let us grant them this relief and grant it to them now so that they can plan ahead. As already shown, we can grant this relief and have a balanced budget even though the expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, rise more than 1 billion 100 million above the highest year of actual spending by Mr. Truman.

I feel that we can and will reduce expenditures for the fiscal year 1954 considerably below 67.2 billion but even if we hold expenditures to that level we can still have a surplus for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, of 1 billion 100 million in addition to granting individual income taxpayers the relief provided in H. R. 1.

With the expiration of the excess-profits tax, the decrease in individual income taxes under H. R. 1, and the scheduled termination of the increases in other taxes provided for under the Revenue Act of 1951, there is every indication that our economy will be in a position to move forward with greater rapidity than has been possible in the past because of the existing severe tax rates.

I have pointed out on many occasions that tax rates do not of themselves make revenue. If the rates are too high they will result in actually reducing revenue by retarding incentive, growth, expansion and the development of initiative and by encouraging inefficiency, waste, and extravagance. With the stimulation afforded by H. R. 1, and the scheduled termination of the excess-profits tax and other tax increases, I believe everyone will be encouraged to produce more and earn more.

Both payrolls and profits should increase. Greater income necessarily means greater Federal receipts. In my opinion greater revenue receipts can be secured if we have the foresight to remove the tax shackles that are retarding growth, expansion and initiative in our economy. H. R. 1 is the first step toward accomplishing that great objective.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman a couple of brief questions. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman's viewpoint, but I am wondering if it is his present intention to ask for a renewal of the excess-profits tax?

Mr. REED of New York. It is not.

Mr. PERKINS. It seems to me that some relief through higher exemptions should be forthcoming out of justice to the low-income groups so that they can afford at least adequate food, shelter, and other necessities of life such as educating their children before being unreasonably taxed; and, inasmuch as there are several bills pending before the gentleman's committee to raise the individual income exemptions, I am wondering whether we will be able to get hearings before the gentleman's bill is passed by this Chamber.

Mr. REED of New York. No, you will not; and I will tell you why. I have answered this question several times; I answered it early this week when I pointed out what happened under exemptions. Each $100 of the exemption that is raised means a loss of revenue of $2 billion. Among the bills introduced is one providing for a $1,000 exemption. Under this you would lose over $10 billion a year. What we want to do is to make a start and gain experience as we go along and benefit from it. They are going to get the benefit of it. I will tell you right now that the members of the Ways and Means Committee, and I think there are members of it on the gentleman's side of the House who will bear witness to this, are trying to do a real job for our country. There is no use muddying the waters. I know what appeal these exemptions have and I am heartily in favor of them, just as much so as the gentleman is. But I lived in a period when the exemptions were $3,500 for a married couple. I would like to see that day arrive again. But on matter of debt and all those things, we have to start reducing the debt and taxes gradually just as fast as we safely can, yet keep the country economically sound. With these high taxes you cannot preserve the integrity of our economy. As I say, I am just as favorable to tax reduction as the gentleman is. I know everyone in the House would like to go home and say, "I have been in Congress and I have reduced them down to 1 percent." We would all like that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. REED of New York was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. I doubt seriously whether the question I propounded was a political question. In fact, I do not think it was. There was a question of equity involved.

Mr. REED of New York. Now, wait a minute. The gentleman wants me to yield for a speech. I want to give the other Members a chance, and I will be very glad to do so. The gentleman asked some questions and I answered them. I am willing to yield for a short question.

Mr. PERKINS. The bill you introduced only moves forward the expiration date of the current law from December 31, 1953, to January 30, 1953?

Mr. REED of New York. It does. Do you want to cheat the people out of $1,500,000,000?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not intend to cheat the people out of anything.

Mr. REED of New York. It will if you let this expire automatically. That is exactly what it will do.

Mr. PERKINS. It is my contention that we should also approach this problem with the view of raising individual income exemptions.

Mr. REED of New York. I told you why and you would not care what happened so long as you got the votes.

Mr. PERKINS. I would care what happened.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. As a man who has been interested in general tax matters for

over 40 years and who has been a student of taxation in the universities for that long, I want to correct one statement that the gentleman has made as to the amount this bill will give relief to the individual who earns $3,000. Your figures are practically correct so far as direct taxation is concerned, it will give that amount of relief, but so far as indirect taxation is concerned, when that is taken into consideration and the relief that will come through that, it will be just about double the figures that the gentleman has used.

Mr. REED of New York. If the excess profits tax provision dies, you will have an expansion by business in this country that will sweep the country. If it is not repealed, you will choke every small enterprise in this country. Do you propose to extend the excess profits tax and say to the people: We will tax you $1,500,000,000 more?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 60 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to speak to the House of Representatives today on a subject that is not only important to the area where I live; it is of very great importance to the entire Nation. I am asking your indulgence to speak to you on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which, because of the far-reaching consequences of its program to the welfare of our country and the happiness of our people, should challenge our most thoughtful attention and interest.

The Legislature of Tennessee at its present session unanimously adopted a resolution on the subject of the TVA and forwarded a copy to each Member of the Tennessee delegation in Congress. My colleague from the Fourth District [Mr. EVINS] has already submitted a copy of this resolution for the record. It sets forth in parliamentary fashion the warm approval the people of my State are always eager to express for TVA, and protests against reported efforts to dismember or injure this Federal enterprise by putting some of its vital facilities up on the auction block.

To the people in my State who have been disturbed by casual after-luncheon speeches threatening the future of the TVA, I have given reassurance. I have told them that no Congress will fail to recognize the national importance of this great regional agency, and that no Congress would be so ill disposed toward the region served by TVA as deliberately to thwart its full development. Today, on this floor I should like to give my reasons for that faith, to speak about the TVA without the haste and the excitement of debate on a particular item. I should like to give a little background, if I may, to the Members of this House who have not lived with the subject through the years. There are only a few of us here now who were here when the act creating TVA was adopted almost 20 years ago.

At that time, after more than a decade of debate, the Government properties at Muscle Shoals, a legacy from World War I then idle and unproductive, were turned over to TVA to be utilized for the public benefit. Along with possession of Wilson Dam, a nearby steam-power plant of 60,000 kilowatts and the chemical plants, went a mandate from the Congress outlining a program for the development of all the natural resources of the valley. TVA was directed to make the river navigable from Knoxville to the Ohio, to control its floods, to develop power from the force of its water, to produce fertilizers in peace and munitions in time of war. It was required to make the benefits of its developments available to all the people and to report the result of its work regularly and fully to the Congress and the people.

In these 20 years those of us who live in the region have seen sandbars and shallows disappear and the Tennessee become a chain of lovely lakes, useful for navigation, a delight for recreation, at the same time providing great reservoirs for the storage of water for the purposes of flood control and power production. The waterway created by the construction of the majestic multipurpose dams built by TVA is being utilized by the people for whom it was created. It is being used as rivers have been used since trade between peoples began, to promote commerce in the products of private business between regions of the Nation. Particularly, it has developed markets in this area for the products of the Southwest and the Middle West. In 1933, the year this program of resource development was undertaken, the river carried only 33 million ton-miles of freight, and that consisted mostly in short hauls of low-value commodities. In 1952, by contrast, 825 million ton-miles of freight—steel, automobiles, grain, oil, coal, and chemicals—high value products—moved up the river and through the locks to reach their inland markets by way of the river towns of Alabama and of Tennessee, which are thriving ports of entry to the valley, or started down the river with the valley's products for delivery to older river ports on the Ohio and the Mississippi. Last year, in 1952, river traffic in ton-miles represented a 42-percent increase over the traffic of 1951. The growth is steady. This Government expenditure for navigation improvement is reaching its objective. Shippers realize savings, manufacturers find new markets. Jobs and opportunities are created. A Federal program is paying off in benefits to its citizens.

The Tennessee is a year-round river now. It used to be practically dry in the autumn, and in the spring we had floods. The danger of floods is almost removed in the Tennessee Valley today. Local protective works are required at a few points, notably Chattanooga, for complete security. But the annual fear is gone, and the job remaining to be done is relatively small. And the task of controlling floods on the lower Ohio and the Mississippi is easier because the Tennessee is harnessed. Its waters no longer pour in when the crest of a flood reaches its peak at Cairo. Kentucky Dam holds the river back until its flow can safely be released to join the downstream current to the Gulf.

The power provided by the multipurpose dams which create the navigation channel and control the floods is the foundation upon which the TVA power system was based, a system now the largest in the United States. Twenty years ago all the generating facilities in TVA's present power-service area produced 1½ billion kilowatt-hours for the people's use. This year TVA will supply 28 billion kilowatt-hours to meet the energy requirements of the same region. The farms, the homes, and business enterprises of the Tennessee Valley are using more electric energy every year. Expanding power use is a symbol of our national prosperity. It means greater comfort in our homes, higher productivity and a better life on our farms, a more abundant output in industry. Power use is growing over the whole country, and the TVA area is setting the pace for the Nation. In 1933 the average use of electricity by the domestic consumer of power in the TVA area stood at about the national average of 600 kilowatt-hours. But with a swifter rate of increase, residential consumers in the TVA area have pulled away ahead of the national average. Today over the country as a whole the average domestic consumer's annual use is 2,100 kilowatt-hours, 3 times his use in 1933, while in the Tennessee Valley the average has risen more than sixfold to reach 4,000 kilowatt-hours in 1952.

In 1933 the Tennessee Valley lagged far behind the Nation in the use of electricity on the farms. The private utilities then serving the area contended that it was not financially feasible to extend lines to our farm families. Only 3 percent of the farms in that area had electric service in 1933 although 11 percent of the farms in the Nation were already connected with electric systems. Today the national average of farm electrification has reached 90 percent and for the first time the TVA area, starting way below the average in 1933, has caught up to the average of the Nation.

Navigation, flood control, power production, and fertilizer development—these were the major programs entrusted to this Federal agency in 1933. Today in 36 States TVA fertilizer is being sold for use in experimental programs recommended by the State agricultural agencies, while new types of fertilizer and new processes are being developed in the plants at Muscle Shoals for future utilization on the land.

To summarize accomplishments in these major programs is not to give the whole story of TVA. That would need a longer time than I am disposed to use today. It would tell a story which is, I think, unrivaled in the annals of Federal administration—a story of cooperation with States and local governments, with public and private organizations, and with private business enterprises, in programs relating to agriculture, to forestry,

in public health, in recreation, and in minerals research. It would, if we had time to analyze the record, give considerable encouragement to those of us who believe that the Federal Government must find ways to decentralize its administration and to so discharge its functions that State and local governments are made more strong and have a larger share of responsibility in joint programs of resource development. Such an analysis of TVA's activities must be postponed to a later time. I shall limit the remainder of my remarks to a summary of what I regard as the national significance of the results achieved in this region in the last 20 years, and with particular reference to the power system which has had such spectacular growth, and has commanded so much public attention.

I believe, for example, that the success of the TVA power system has been just as important to the Nation as a whole as to the region of its operations. It is true that consumers of electricity in the Tennessee Valley have had the direct benefits of the low-cost power which TVA produced from the fall of the Tennessee River. They are the ones whose use of electricity has increased sixfold in their homes as the cost has dropped from 5.7 cents per kilowatt-hour in 1933 to 1.33 cents in 1952. But I think the demonstration of the financial feasibility of the low-cost-high-use electricity pricing policy introduced on an area-wide basis by TVA for the first time in 1933 has been of as much importance to consumers in the rest of the Nation as to those who live in the region itself. Consumers of electricity from neighboring systems are getting cheaper power from their suppliers because of TVA. The area of its influence is wide.

Rural use of electricity over the whole country has been stimulated by the TVA. To demonstrate beyond a doubt that, when lines are extended to farmers and when rates are low enough for them to use all the power the lines can bring, the revenues resulting will soon pay all the costs of operation and leave a margin for profit, is to provide the basis for progress in rural electrification everywhere. One of the first rural electricity cooperatives in the United States was organized in the Tennessee Valley, the first, I believe, on a countrywide basis, and out of that experience came the REA, a program of unchallenged national benefit. I say that while we can estimate in actual figures the savings to electricity consumers in the Tennessee Valley resulting from the substitution of TVA rates for the rates charged by private utilities in the same area in 1933, or in neighboring areas now, still greater savings are being realized and will continue to be realized over the whole country because of this great demonstration.

Associations of private utilities over the country have been reminding the people in very costly advertisements that electricity is the only commodity available today at prewar or near prewar prices. If that is generally true, and I understand it is, the utilities are rightly proud of the record. No one can convince me that the stability of TVA rates in this postwar period has not helped maintain the level everywhere. All the world can see that low rates do result in greater demand for power and therefore permit more effective use of capital investment. You, as consumers of electricity all over the country, are getting this benefit from the TVA power system. The private utility that serves you has benefited by the demonstration, too. The earnings of the industry are excellent. In general, private utilities in this country are able to give more satisfactory service and at lower rates than they used to charge. TVA and the region which gave the Nation the demonstration deserve a share of your appreciation.

The TVA power system is a national asset in another particular which is important to this dollar-conscious Congress. The largest single purchaser of power from TVA is the Federal Government itself. The Tennessee Valley has long been identified as an area, because of its strategic location, of special importance to the national defense. It is fairly remote from the coast, circled by mountains, convenient to major centers of production and shipping. It is considered an area of relative security by the experts. That is why the nitrate plants were built at Muscle Shoals in World War I, and Wilson Dam to provide the power for their operations. The Oak Ridge Atomic Energy Plant was located in the valley early in the Second World War and today a huge new atomic plant is being rushed to completion near Paducah, Ky., close to the point where the Tennessee River discharges into the Ohio. A rocket research center is maintained at Huntsville, Ala., and a great center for aeronautical research has been located at Tullahoma, Tenn. At Muscle Shoals the Army has established a huge classified project to utilize the research and production experience of the men who run TVA's chemical plants.

All these Government-owned facilities are vitally needed for defense. The Government would pay their power bills no matter who supplied them or how much the power cost, and the use of power at the atomic energy plants alone is stupendous. The fact that TVA provides these plants with power at rates which, although they cover all TVA's cost of providing service and earn in addition a return on the money invested, are lower than the industrial rates of private power suppliers, means an annual saving of many millions to the taxpayers in the costs of national defense. The Nation benefits not only because bombs and weapons will be produced in the quantity required for its defense, the taxpayer benefits because they will be produced at the lowest possible power cost. Here, too, as in the case of power provided to the farms and households of the valley, there will be large secondary savings. The demonstration of service to these defense installations has had results in indirect savings which will equal or even exceed the direct savings realized by the defense plants located in TVA's service area.

Private enterprise is supplying power for atomic energy installations, too. A little over one-third of the requirements of the AEC plant at Paducah will come from a plant built by a combination of private companies known as Electric Energy, Inc. That initial enterprise has been followed by the organization of the Ohio Valley Electric Corp., another group of private power companies combined to build two huge plants to provide power to AEC's facilities at Portsmouth, Ohio. Sales from these newly developed corporations to AEC are at prices very much lower than the regular industrial rates at which these or other utilities sell power to their other customers. I understand that rates have been negotiated which in general are not much higher than the rates at which TVA will sell power to the Paducah and Oak Ridge operations of AEC from the stream plants now under construction by TVA. It is pure speculation, of course, to figure what AEC power costs for these large installations might have been if AEC's contract with TVA had not been a yardstick for the new suppliers, and for AEC to use in arriving at an agreement. It would be naive, I think, to estimate the savings under many millions of dollars a year when you consider that in the total volume of energy purchased by AEC a difference of one mill in the cost per kilowatt-hour would mean a difference of some $50 million every year.

All over the country power supply is tight and utility systems are adding capacity at an unprecedented rate to keep up with the demand. A recent issue of the Electrical World—January 26, 1953—reported that private power companies spent about $2½ billion for new construction in 1952 and are expected to spend almost $3 billion in 1953. If these companies carry out their plans the private utility industry will have increased its capacity by 45 percent in the 4 years 1952 through 1955. We are told that by about 1960 the utility industry will have tripled its capacity since the end of the war. The growth of the industrial capacity of this whole Nation is reflected in the prosperity of the utility industry and the fact that its foreseeable earnings permit it to make a capital investment of several billion dollars a year. Power is the lifeblood of modern industry. The burden of increasing power supply is heavy, but power supply must be expanded or there will be a ceiling on our national strength.

TVA like every other power system is expanding. The capacity of the area TVA now serves rose from a meager 800,000 kilowatts in 1933 to 4½ million kilowatts in 1952, more than a fivefold gain. From 1952 to 1955, when the plants already under construction are completed, the capacity will have doubled. That is an even swifter rate of increase than that reported by private utilities generally, due in part to the location in the area of heavy power-using defense production, in part to the fact that the industrial development of this area, held back prior to TVA, is now under way. As the managements of private utilities issue stocks or bonds to provide the capital required in this heavy building period, TVA comes annually to Congress for the appropriations which are its only source of capital beyond the power earnings plowed back into the system. We will vote on such an appropriation later in this session. This year TVA is requesting funds to continue the great construction program under way, filling

the empty stalls in the hydro plants, rushing seven giant steam plants to completion. In addition funds to start a new steam plant in the western part of the system, not far from the growing city of Memphis, are requested. The extraordinary demands of defense production superimposed on the increasing requirements of the farms and homes, the private business establishments and expanding manufacturing enterprises of the region have far outrun the power resources of a mighty river. By the end of 1955, when the steam plants under construction are completed and in service, TVA will be selling the Atomic Energy Commission alone more kilowatt hours than could be produced by all the dams in the TVA system, including the output of the dams owned by the Aluminum Co. of America, which are operated as a part of the TVA system, and those in the Cumberland Valley built by the Corps of Engineers.

This, the only such publicly owned area-wide power system in the United States, is a system to be proud of. There are other federally owned power projects, of course, and local power systems owned by local public agencies, but in no other region has the Federal Government accepted the responsibilities which must be accepted by any utility having a franchise to supply all the power requirements of a given area—the responsibility to keep ahead of the demand and to provide the power at the lowest possible cost to the consumer. In no other area do municipalities and cooperatives form a solid network of distribution and provide the only means through which power from Federal generating projects reaches the normal area-wide market.

TVA is discharging its obligations to the region and to the Nation. The team of distinguished engineers and experienced construction forces which built those famous dams with a remarkable record of keeping costs down, living up to estimates, and meeting tough schedules has been transferred to the new tasks of designing and constructing steam-power facilities. Their superb performance will be repeated. The units TVA is installing now are the largest steam-generating units in the world. Great economies result. I was impressed to discover just the other day how substantial the savings in power costs are likely to be because the size of the TVA system permits such units to be installed and has prompted improvements in steam-plant design. TVA began construction of its first steam plant in 1940 at Watts Bar. There was steam on the TVA system from the beginning, of course. Steam facilities at Muscle Shoals were turned over to TVA in 1933. Steam capacity was purchased in 1939. But those plants were old and none too efficient, admittedly high cost power sources according to modern standards. When Watts Bar began operation in 1942 it was a modern, up-to-date plant, one of the largest in the South. Yet I am told that, if the Watts Bar plant were to be duplicated at today's prices, its cost would be between $10 and $20 more per kilowatt of capacity than the costs will be at TVA's Johnsonville plant, where the units are nearly twice as large as those of Watts Bar.

The operating costs at Johnsonville will be lower, too. With nearly three times the capacity of Watts Bar, the number of men required for operation will be only half again as large as the number required at Watts Bar. The higher steam pressures and temperatures at the great new plants mean a more efficient use of coal. At the Watts Bar plant about ninety-two one-hundredths of a pound of coal is burned to produce a single kilowatt-hour of energy. At Johnsonville this figure is eighty-four one-hundredths of a pound, a reduction of about 10 percent. Savings are small on every kilowatt-hour but turn them into tons and then to dollars. With full output of power at Johnsonville, the bill for coal consumed will be a million dollars less a year than it would be if each kilowatt-hour required the same amount of coal as at Watts Bar. Coal is a natural resource, too. The people of the United States have a concern that it should not be wasted, but fully utilized and thus conserved. The people have a right to know just how the most efficient operation can be achieved in coal-burning power plants.

I have great hopes that TVA power-system operations will have a wholesome impact on coal-mining operations. By 1956 TVA steam plants will be using between 18 and 20 million tons a year. The huge bulk purchases with delivery to a few locations will be economical for the Government. The coal industry should benefit, too. Such a stable market will permit steadier mine operations in Illinois, in Indiana and Kentucky, the major sources of supply, and in Tennessee, in Alabama and Virginia. Such a steady market ought to justify more mine mechanization, better safety provisions, more modern operation throughout. The railroads and barge lines will also benefit by the stability of these large-scale coal movements.

This public-power system is leading the way in progressive utility construction and operation, in efficient utilization of energy, whether it comes from water or from coal. It should do that, of course. This Congress should be content with nothing less than first-rate performance. The Federal Government should set the pace for the whole industry, and as new sources of energy are developed from nuclear fuels this public-power system should pioneer again in demonstration of its effective use.

This asset is not one to be auctioned off. On the contrary, this program must grow so that the region and the Nation can grow. I am not fearful. I do not think this Government will stand before the world as so extravagant as to jeopardize admitted savings for defense, or so capricious, so disrespectful of democratic processes as to disregard the will of the people throughout the TVA area.

After-dinner speakers should be cautioned to remember that although it was by act of Congress that this Federal agency took on the sole responsibility for regional power supply when the purchase of existing power facilities was authorized in 1939, Congress did not act until the people of the area, in their village councils and town meetings, by ballots cast in referenda in the cities, by the legislative action of their representatives, had exercised their free choice and selected TVA as their power supplier, rejecting the offers of the private power companies to continue to provide their energy. One by one communities determined their course of action, until today a total of 148 municipalities and rural cooperatives own their electric distribution systems. They purchase power at wholesale from TVA, for resale to their customers, who number over a million and a quarter. The total investment of these power distributors is nearly $400 million and the investment is growing by millions of dollars every month. They have bonds outstanding to be paid from earnings, and their earnings, by the way, are excellent. Last year, after paying all the expenses of their operations, including depreciation, the average return on the investment in distribution facilities was 8 percent. These municipal and cooperative distributors have in turn made contracts with thousands of private business owners, who have built the plants which use the power they sell. Those private businesses cannot produce their goods without power, they cannot guarantee employment, they cannot meet their commitments unless their supply of power is assured. Increased production rests on an expanding power supply in the Tennessee Valley and everywhere in this Nation.

The solvency of these municipal and cooperative power systems, the prosperity of these private business operations, the whole economic future of the region rests in the hands of this Congress. I have no fear of the decision when the facts are known. When we understand that, under the law, TVA must out of power earnings return to the Treasury every dollar invested in power projects within 40 years from the time a plant goes in service, our concern about the wisdom of such appropriations should vanish. When we realize the savings to consumers everywhere resulting from this demonstration we will not halt this pilot plant for progressive power system management. When we consider the actual savings accruing to the Government itself as a purchaser of power, and when we measure this region's increasing contribution to our national strength, this Congress will not engage in the reckless destruction of a going and growing concern.

I believe that, in the future as in the past, TVA will stand as a symbol of government integrity and competence in the United States. We need those symbols here, and men in every land, who know that they will be more free as they become more strong, need TVA as a beacon to their hope that what has happened in one underdeveloped area in this great country can happen elsewhere in the world.

RENT CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to discuss for a few minutes today the facts and the essentials of one of

the most important problems before the Congress. It is a problem which is critical to thousands of families in my district, as well as being of critical importance to the Nation's defense.

As matters now stand, Federal rent controls expire on midnight of April 30. The President of the United States has recommended the continuation of rent controls where serious housing shortages exist, but I hear that certain Members of this House plan to make the extension so limited that the bulk of the families now living in controlled units will be denied the security of fair rents and protection from arbitrary and unjust eviction. The device to be used, I understand, is the restriction of rent controls to the so-called critical areas.

Let us call a spade a spade. What are these so-called critical areas? Are they the areas of the greatest housing shortage? Are they the areas of greatest importance to the defense? Do they include such great defense centers as the Pittsburgh area?

Let us stop playing with words, Mr. Speaker. Let us stop trying to hide behind a technical and misleading terminology. The critical defense housing area as set up in the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is strictly a technical phrase to define a group of areas, which, though they are important to the defense effort, are not the most important. Under this definition, an area could be vital to defense and the defense work of the community be severely hampered by a shortage of housing, but unless that community employed a substantial number of persons from outside the area it could not qualify as critical. A simple illustration, and one close to home, will prove my point. In spite of the fact that the Pittsburgh area is one of the great industrial areas of the Nation; in spite of the fact that the Pittsburgh area suffers from a cruelly acute shortage of housing; in spite of the fact that the city councils of Pittsburgh, McKeesport, Duquesne, and the governing bodies of 24 other communities in my congressional district, recognized the extent of the housing shortage by asking for a continuation of rent control on September 30, 1952; in spite of all these facts, not one of these localities can qualify as critical under the technicalities of the rent-control law.

To say that these communities are not critical to the Nation's defense effort is equal to saying that steel is not a critical war material. We are not merely fighting a cold war, Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a production war. That war is a hot war made up of steel furnaces, assembly lines, and an enormous output for the protection of our men on the frozen and dismal battlefronts of Korea. To end Federal rent control in these communities means the demoralization, on the economic front, of tens of thousands of families whose men are forging the steel and other sinews of armed might.

I know what it is to be a housewife. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House realize what it means when suddenly, because of the end of a law, a housewife has to cut the family budget on food and warmth and other needs to make up for a rise in rents—a rise in rents occasioned not by the normal operation of the law of supply and demand, but by the unreasonable, unconscionable, unjustifiable operation of a supply and demand distorted by an acute defense housing shortage. Add to this, Mr. Speaker, the time lost, the production lost, the man-hours wasted through needless moving and reshuffling and the doubling up of families who are seeking and searching for decent housing within their ability to pay.

Let us stop playing with the word "critical" and let us stop toying with the idea of throwing economic stumbling blocks in the way of the defense of our Nation. Let us extend rent controls—and let us extend rent controls in such a way as to aid defense, including both our boys in the armed services and the vital defense activities of our Nation's great production centers.

DAN CASEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, time takes its toll. It matters not whether it be the elusive ether of outer space, the light from distant stars, or the solid granite that forms the crust of the earth. All must change with the passing of time. Yet there is one thing that does not, that cannot change. The record that each of us makes during the short time which, by chance, we as individuals have here, will never change.

Though the sea be dried up, though the mountains dissolve into dust, though "the heavens be rolled away as a scroll," that record will remain unchanged.

My colleagues, yesterday we paid our tribute of respect to a fellow Member of this body whose record, whose unchangeable record was made up. And we agreed that Congressman Joseph R. Bryson, of South Carolina, had made a good record, one such as we, ourselves, might well be proud to emulate.

Today, my colleagues, I wish to call to your attention the record of a distinguished citizen of Kansas who finished his course upon this earth on the 7th day of March 1953. This gentleman was the son of Gen. Jack and Mrs. Olivia Thornburgh Casement. He came into their home in Painesville, Ohio, July 13, 1868, and they named him Daniel. Whether or not it was for the courageous Biblical character, I know not; but this I do know, he developed in early manhood and exhibited throughout his lifetime, the fearlessness that characterized that illustrious Old Testament hero.

Like Daniel of old, Dan Casement, for by that name he was known, was always concerned about the welfare of his fellow man. No question arose in community, in State, or in Nation, in which he did not take a part. He never straddled an issue. Was the question the tariff, sound money, the triple A, or Tuttle Creek Dam, he made it known where he stood. Personally, in former years, I differed from him on many questions, but always I admired his courage.

In more recent years, we had much in common. The mellowing process of the time may have had something to do with it. The fact that we were both tillers of the soil likely had much more to do with it. It was not a coincidence that we both became ardent advocates of soil conservation and flood prevention. It is more likely that, being subject to the same influence, and cognizant of the same dangers to our country, we responded in a similar manner. I feel honored in the fact that I can regard myself as trailing along behind an older, a more experienced, and dare say, a more courageous man than I believe myself to be.

Nature was kind to Dan Casement. She gave him a strong body that endured, almost unimpaired, for more than 80 years. She endowed him with a keen mind, able to discern between the true and the false. She gave him a sense of humor that made his presence desirable in any company of men. But those other qualities, that good sense, that determination to stick to his purpose, that courage to follow his convictions regardless of friend or foe, these were qualities of his own making. These are the qualities that take the measure of men, and by that standard Dan Casement measures up to the highest standard of American citizenship.

For more than 35 years Dan Casement lived and labored among his neighbors in Riley County, Kans. In that time they came to love, to respect, and to admire him. And when at last Father Time decreed "ashes to ashes; dust to dust," he left behind a record, indestructible as time itself, a record of unstinted service to his fellow men. To the surviving members of his family I extend my greatest sympathy.

LOUISVILLE, KANS., *February 9, 1953.*

HON. HOWARD S. MILLER,
Congressman, First District of Kansas.

DEAR SIR: Am writing you a few lines in regard to my opposition to the building of Tuttle Creek Dam. I happened to be in Manhattan at the time of the 1951 flood, and want to say that at the Manhattan Laundry and Cleaners, Inc., where I work, the water was 7 feet 4 inches deep in the laundry part and this water all came from the Kansas River to the south of town, and flowed north up the old Blue River channel until it backed the Blue River north about 7 miles or about to Rocky Ford.

The Kansas River backed the Blue River north then it came back across Highways 24-40 for about 3 miles east of Manhattan.

I have worked at the Manhattan laundry for about 6 years and there have been several times in the meantime that the 2 highways—24-40—were blocked from traffic at different times. All because the Kansas River was backing the Blue River up until it could not get away.

For my part, I cannot see any reasonable excuse for so much squandering of the taxpayers' money. Am sending you three clippings from the Manhattan Mercury-Chronicle newspaper which I hope will be of some benefit to you in this Congress.

This is wasting lots of money besides ruining so many nice farm homes and the wonderful fertile valley it contains.

Here's hoping you Congressmen kill the fatted calf at this next Congress.

Sincerely,

JAMES W. BARCLAY.

MANHATTAN, KANS., *February 8, 1953.*
Representative HOWARD S. MILLER,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MILLER: Since the first of December 1952, we have had several printings of these Let's Stop Big Dam Foolishness stickers—a total of 50,000. Over 30,000 have been sold to date so they have a pretty wide circulation by now.

I want to commend you for your fine work in Washington in behalf of the Blue Valley and in the interest of better flood-control planning. We hope that you will receive support for your bill to deauthorize Tuttle Creek. You are certainly doing everything in your power to carry out the wishes of the people as indicated by the November election in the first district. There has been much favorable comment about your news reports to the people of this district. Thank you for keeping us informed about your activities there.

We are heartened by recent press releases from Representative HOPE in which he states that in his opinion, Tuttle Creek Dam is a "dead duck." We hope that more good news will be forthcoming regarding the doom of the Tuttle Creek project. I think that it is your election that accounts for this turn of events. Meanwhile we aren't relaxing any efforts until we actually see the engineers move out of the Blue Valley.

Would it be possible for you to put my name on a mailing list to receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or has your quota already been filled? I could share the copies with other members of our Blue Valley publicity committee when items of interest to our group have been discussed in Congress.

Within the past few days several persons in the valley have observed the activities of a photographer who is driving a United States Government car, so they presume he is employed by the Army engineers. In Randolph, he took pictures of a garage which was destroyed by fire about a year ago and also two ramshackle houses. Of course you know that Randolph has a residential area of modest but very well kept and comfortable homes. Those which he photographed are certainly not typical and are about the only ones that have the appearance of belonging to the slums.

Perhaps the engineers realize that their Tuttle Creek project faces a severe test on the basis of economic justification. Do they desire to minimize the wealth and productivity of the valley they would destroy?

To identify myself, I am a teacher in the Manhattan city schools but my home is in the Blue Valley near Cleburne. I met you when you spoke at a meeting in the courthouse here prior to the election and also at the victory dinner held at the Wareham Hotel the evening when you announced your telegram to President Truman requesting that construction work on the dam be halted.

My best wishes to you and the best of success in your work in Washington.

Sincerely,

(Miss) LEONA VELEN.

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter and a newspaper article.)

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS TRAINING CENTER

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a proposal has been advanced whereby the Women's Army Corps Training Center at Fort Lee, Va., is to be moved to Fort McClellan, Ala. I have today dispatched the following telegram to Secretary of Defense Wilson:

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.:

I herewith call to your attention the costly proposal of transferring the Women's Army Corps Training Center from Fort Lee, Va., to Fort McClellan, Ala. This project will cost millions of dollars and in my opinion is not in keeping with the program for economy which this administration has promised our people. Fort Lee offers every facility for the training of the Wacs and under the present program has ample quarters. I suggest that the Defense Department resurvey this project immediately before the construction goes any further. My information is that Fort Lee has all necessary facilities needed by the WAC in the foreseeable future, which facilities would not be presently used if abandoned by the WAC. If the Wacs are moved as proposed it will be necessary to construct all new facilities to take care of them at an estimated cost of $11 million for construction alone which means that it will actually cost approximately twice this amount plus many millions more for furnishings.

I can readily understand that the officers in the WAC desire separate, permanent, and independent facilities but in this time of national emergency every effort should be made to use existing facilities even though they are temporary facilities, and I desire to reiterate that the facilities at Fort Lee are adequate.

W. M. ABBITT,
Member of Congress,
Fourth Virginia District.

I can readily understand why the officers in the Women's Army Corps would be anxious to have their corps transferred to permanent quarters at a place where they would be separate and apart from other Army units. We are told, however, that an all-out effort is being made to bring economy to the Defense Department, to balance the budget, and if possible to reduce taxes.

I tell you that in my opinion Fort Lee has adequate facilities for the WAC's even though they are of a temporary nature. These facilities will last for many years, certainly for the foreseeable future.

To me, it is a gross waste of the taxpayers' money at this time, when construction costs are higher than ever before known in the history of this country, to undertake the construction of permanent quarters simply to satisfy the whims and fancies of those in the top echelons of the Women's Army Corps, and I call upon the Secretary of Defense as well as the Secretary of the Army to give this matter a most thorough and painstaking study because if we are to balance the budget, if we are to bring order out of chaos, if we are to bring economy, if you please, to the Armed Forces, it is necessary to economize on the lower levels when we are dealing with millions of dollars as well as when we have big projects involving billions of dollars; and I for one do not expect to take this lying down.

In my opinion, it will not be necessary to expend huge sums to rehabilitate the facilities at Lee. This has been done; they are adequate now and will continue to be adequate for a long time to come.

RENT STABILIZATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, my remarks today are directed to a national problem—rent stabilization. With the expiration date of the present rent law, April 30, just around the corner, so to speak, I believe some plain talk about rent control is certainly timely.

Rent control has just one reason for existence—the still acute housing shortage which exists today in all too many localities. That housing shortage is not in existence through any fault of local people or through lack of willingness on the part of local builders or local governments to see that housing shortage ended. The housing shortage which is in existence today exists in spite of the best efforts of both Government and private enterprise to lick the problem. Primarily, our housing shortage today is an aftermath of the diversion of men and material from civilian housing to war-production purposes during World War II. That shortage has been accentuated by exigencies of mobilization for the Korean campaign. During this period from 1940 on there have been tremendous population shifts as well as population increases.

The housing industry has made tremendous efforts, has shown tremendous results. Since the end of World War II the industry has built an average of over 1,000,000 new housing units per year.

In spite of this record, there still exists in many communities such a shortage of housing as to make rent control a necessity. I firmly believe that providing for rent control in these areas where the supply and demand for housing has been distorted by Federal action, as a result of defending the Nation, is a Federal responsibility.

The Congress has recognized the responsibility of the National Government for the housing shortages that exist today and its responsibility for rent control. This responsibility has been recognized by the housing bills passed by both Republican- and Democratic-controlled Congresses. This responsibility has been recognized by our passage of rent-control legislation by both Republican and Democratic Congresses. The responsibility was recognized by the President in his state of the Union message.

My own city of Boston is still suffering from a severe housing shortage and I am certain that any fair-minded person who examines the statistics on housing in Boston will recognize this. This fact was recognized by the Boston City council when it became one of the first major cities of the United States to ask for extension of Federal rent controls in the city beyond September 20, 1952. How many of you gentlemen realize that Bos-

ton had a for-rent vacancy ratio of only seven-tenths percent according to the 1950 Census and that there are 13,940 married couples and families living in the city of Boston who do not have homes of their own but are living with friends and relatives. Make no mistake about it, continuation of Federal rent control is needed in Boston today if the multitudinous defense activities of this great port and industrial center are not to be severely hampered.

But the city of Boston is not alone in needing the benefits of Federal rent stabilization to prevent the law of jungle from setting in on the rental market. Neither is the city of Boston alone in recognizing the need for continued Federal rent controls. Last fall when communities were asked to express themselves through their local governing bodies or through popular referendum, more than 1,450 communities expressed themselves in favor of continuation of Federal rent controls. The vast majority of these communities are still under control today in spite of the fact that the present law provides them ample opportunity to take decontrol action on their own initiative. Federal rent controls operate today in 121 defense rental areas which contain some 4,285,000 rental units and the 134 critical defense housing areas containing some 1,300,000 rental units. In critical areas there is a total population of more than 12 million while some 34 million persons live in the regular defense rental areas. Federal rent controls operate today in 46 States and Alaska and Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, with such vast number of housing units involved, with so many people involved and with the defense mobilization of our Nation involved, this cannot be merely a local problem to be solved by local means. Rent control is more than a national problem, rent control is a national necessity for effective mobilization.

I should like to point out another facet of the demonstrated need for adequate rent control legislation. There is not a single community in the United States today which is under Federal rent stabilization which has not rendered either affirmative or tacit approval for the continued need of rent control. There is not a single community in the United States today which could not remove itself from the list of controlled communities through action of its local governing body on the basis of facts which need satisfy only that local governing body. In the face of this—do we have the moral right to refuse the benefits of Federal rent control to communities which have indicated their need of it? I do not believe we have the moral right to withhold this aid in the face of the fact that the shortages necessitating rent control were brought about in carrying out national defense policy. As the people's representatives at the Federal level, we must take the responsibility for alleviating a situation which is the aftermath of war and a result of mobilization. We have undertaken that responsibility for the farmer and for the veteran. We have a responsibility to make it possible for the community and for the tenant to protect themselves against unbalanced and unfair supply and demand situations—situations in which the cards are stacked against the tenant and supply is out of balance because of national emergencies.

Rent control or rent stabilization is a prime weapon in the arsenal of democracy. We are not in such a position that we can afford to discard it. Do not take my word for it. I urge you to find out for yourself. Ask employee relation and personnel people in aircraft factories and other vital defense installations if you do not believe it. They know that the availability of adequate housing and housing at reasonable rentals for defense workers and their families cuts down on the quit rate or the necessity for expensive and repeated training programs and makes for more efficient utilization of manpower. Translated into production that more efficient utilization of manpower means additional sabre jets, modern tanks, and all the other materials and weapons needed for democracy's battles. Our experience in two great wars has taught us the importance of achieving victory on the production front as a means of achieving victory on the battlefront. Rent control helps win the battle on the production front.

The chaplains at our farflung military bases in the United States and Alaska and on the fighting front in Korea, too, for that matter know the value of rent stabilization. The man who is fighting our battles in Korea does not like to feel that his Government is abandoning his family at home to the mercies of the drastically distorted supply-and-demand situation in communities still suffering from a housing shortage. Also, I would advocate careful reading of the reports of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Forces Committee made during the last Congress, and find out what happens around many military establishments when adequate Federal rent-control protection is not available. Is it sensible to provide for the finest training and the finest weapons for members of our Armed Forces and then undermine this by leaving their families to live in substandard inadequate housing, thus leaving them broken in pocket and in spirit?

I think that protecting these men is a national responsibility. Both the defense worker and the military personnel are working in the national interest. The serviceman has little or no choice as to where he is sent. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to see that he is not victimized simply because he is doing his duty as a citizen. This is not a matter which can be left entirely to State or local action. It is a well-known fact that the laws of the various States many times do not give the locality the legal right to take the action which is necessary to establish rent stabilization. In other States the situation is such that the actual facts are against the State government taking requisite action even though individual communities in the State recognize the need for rent control. The only safe way and the only sure way to make certain that the opportunity is available to a community to obtain rent-control protection is through a Federal law.

Opponents of rent control have made much of the fact that there has been no rioting in the streets following some actions taken by local communities to decontrol rentals which have seemingly been premature. They point out that citizens have taken many drastic rent increases without outward protest. I hope these gentlemen are not taking advantage of the fact that the average American and the average American tenant is a law-abiding citizen. But to me the quiet suffering and the mental anguish that takes place when rents have been decontrolled prematurely is more poignant and more expressive than the most dramatic and overt act. Suffering in side-street homes is not necessarily visible on Main Street. The mother of the low-income family who has to face hungry children because the money to pay the increased rent had to come from the money for food—she suffers by the ending of rent control. The children who are forced to attend new and strange schools because their families cannot pay the new higher rent—these children suffer. The wife of the serviceman who has to leave her child and take a job to meet the higher rent because the dependency allotments will not cover the increase—I think she suffers and I think her child suffers. There are others that suffer, too, from premature decontrol. There is the large family that is forced into smaller quarters or the young marrieds whose marriage is wrecked or distorted through being forced to live with in-laws not through choice but through necessity.

In connection with the increase in rents after decontrol, bad as the situation has been in some places I do not believe it to be half as bad as what will happen if a large portion of the cities remaining under control are suddenly denied the protection of Federal rent control. Remember, the cities which have thus far been decontrolled have done so either through action on the part of the rent agency or by using the local-option provisions of the present law. In either case some authority with access to facts has felt that the housing shortage has eased enough to make decontrol of rents feasible. There probably have been some bad guesses, but, on the whole rent controls have been lifted in the places where the housing shortages were the least severe. Conversely, by and large the communities remaining under control are those with the most desperate housing situations—situations which the communities themselves realize—and abrupt decontrol of these communities could well have effects far more drastic than any that have so far occurred.

In considering rent-control legislation there are some pitfalls. One of these is the use and misunderstanding of the term "critical defense-housing area." It is a highly technical term used to describe certain areas which meet certain

restrictive definitions provided in the 1951 amendments to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. While these areas that are so designated are critical to the defense program they are not necessarily the most critical either from the standpoint of the extent of housing shortage or from the standpoint of their importance to defense mobilization. One example will point up what I mean. Pittsburgh—that great steel center—cannot under the technical definition provided by Congress qualify as critical in spite of the fact that Pittsburgh has tremendous and vital defense production contracts and in spite of the fact that Pittsburgh has an acute housing shortage. You may well ask why such an important defense production center as Pittsburgh technically cannot qualify as critical under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. The reason lies in an extraneous proviso in the law which says in effect that regardless of the extent of defense activity or of the housing shortage a community cannot be declared critical unless it has a substantial immigration of defense workers or military personnel. That looks to me like discrimination against local citizens in favor of outsiders.

The President recognized the need for rent control when he called for its extension in his state of the Union message. I think he recognized that for most commodities there is a substitute but that there is no substitute for a roof over the head of your family. You can eat cheaper cuts of meat, or buy beans but shelter is a necessity.

I feel that we will be derelict in our duty if we do not pass an adequate rent-control bill. We, Democrats, have accepted the responsibility to see that the President receives the tools he needs to help win the worldwide struggle against godless communism, and those who feel as I do are waiting to cooperate.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a recent statement by Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, in the Senate with reference to a speech I made before the Women's National Press Club when he, too, was on the program.

The Senator pointed out the short time for our opening talks. He overlooked the 45 minutes he and I discussed the farm issue, in which I orally presented every argument appearing, and in the exact words so far as possible, in the printed copy placed in the RECORD of February 25, 1953, by the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON. Printed copies were also distributed around the table at the luncheon before the speaking began.

The Senator says he does not remember that I said what is in the speech. Of course, each argument was presented by me in his presence. However, the fact that he did not listen closely is not surprising, nor is it too unusual. I could not get many Republican leaders to listen in the 80th Congress when I tried to keep them from writing the sliding support provisions for basic agriculture in Public Law 897, which gave help when you didn't need it and much less support when you did. They did not stay in the majority long that time. I made no charges against the Senator either place. He deserves none.

Senator AIKEN is a fine man, a good Senator, and a friend of agriculture. I know that as do others. I certainly made no charges against him. I do differ radically with the sliding support provisions of Public Law 897, passed in the 80th Congress. I have been doing my best to stop, before it starts, any effort to reenact it. The first place I believe that any such move could be stopped is with the Senator, for he is the Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate.

I know that most Republican farm leaders, except those in the House of Representatives, were for that law when it passed. I know that to have firm price supports there must be some limitation on the crop produced or upon the quantity supported. With regard to nonstorables or perishables, that is doubly true.

Recent action supporting butter at 90 percent of parity for a year with no controls nor limitations could result in another potato debacle, which neither the Democrats nor Republicans stopped for several years, notwithstanding constant urgings by our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations to change it. Some folks believe this action on butter was taken, knowing there would be great losses and such losses would serve to discredit the whole price-support program for storable commodities. As to that I do not know.

It was my motion in the 80th Congress which started the use of section 32 funds—30 percent of customs receipts—for the support of perishables, with such foods so purchased diverted to school lunches and other excellent uses.

Last year, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I wrote the report directing that further efforts be made along that line.

Mr. Speaker, that is the proper approach. With regard to perishables price supports must be limited to a given amount of money and the needs for good use. With regard to storables, there must be controls or limitations, either of acreage or as to the quantity produced. We all know that and when such fact is ignored as in the butter order, by those making recommendations who are opposed to firm supports anyhow, it makes us wonder.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Senator made some comment last Sunday on television with regard to the restriction I put on the foreign-aid bill last year. I regret that I did not see the television program. For the record, in that provision, I simply provided that where we gave a foreign country the money to buy from us, they would have to pay at least the prevailing price in the United States.

I met all comers on that provision last year when I got the Congress to adopt it, and will be glad to do so again. The American people are entitled to the facts. At least we should not give away our money and then have it used to pull our own prices down. I voted against the foreign economic aid last year. I have always believed in the Export-Import Bank approach. We should provide credit and sell what we have to sell, not provide money to be spent elsewhere for things we have in surplus. Certainly, if we are going to provide money to other countries to buy commodities from our country, we certainly should not be called to sell at a discount. Before I wrote such provision in the law, foreign economic aid was being increased beyond the extent of which the American public knew about by selling our commodities below cost, in exchange for our own money. We furnished the money and then sold our commodities to the same countries at prices below what we paid for them.

Mr. Speaker, there has been too much of that, and I am proud to have been the author of the prohibition of the continuance of such a policy.

The records show that for each dollar drop in prices received by farmers there follows seven times that much drop in national income. That being true, we can now see what we face. The Republicans made a real mistake in the 80th Congress when they provided flexible supports. I have been trying to keep them from making the same mistake again.

Any effort to support any commodity on a firm basis without limitation of either the total production or quantity supported cannot last. I am hopeful such course will not be prolonged, for to do that will jeopardize a sound program.

Secretary Benson's testimony before our Subcommittee on Agriculture will be released next week. While his statements leave much to be desired, in my opinion he does show that he personally is a fine man with an earnest desire to do the right thing. I call attention to figures which were included in such hearings comparing the agricultural programs with others.

I shall continue to try to point out to Secretary Benson, as I tried to point out to Senator AIKEN, the path to take and the course to follow. That may sound presumptuous, but 8 years of following in detail all programs of the Department of Agriculture certainly is sufficient for an opinion. The need for a prosperous nation far outweighs party or politics.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. Bow) was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LOVRE and to include the transcript of a program entitled "Youth Wants To Know," notwithstanding the

fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $196.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENTLEY and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include a letter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. RILEY) and to include an article.

Mr. POLK and to include House Joint Resolution No. 41 adopted by the Ohio General Assembly on March 3, 1953, and some notes on the admission of Ohio to the Union, which have been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include a statement of General Bradley, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. COUDERT and to include an address by Charles H. Silver of the New York City Board of Education.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include recommendations of Mr. George Meany.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. MCCARTHY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include excerpts from a speech delivered by Hon. PAT SUTTON.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an article by Claude G. Bowers entitled "Jefferson and Civil Liberties" notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $280.

Mr. SHAFER in three instances.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include an article, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and makes 5¼ pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $448.

Mr. HAGEN of California (at the request of Mr. CONDON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas.

Mr. MORRISON (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE (at the request of Mr. MACK of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WAMPLER, for an indefinite period of time, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 697. An act to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

541. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Public Housing Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 103); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

542. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 104); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

543. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 156. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 157. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER: Committee of conference. H. R. 3053. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 158). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO (by request):

H. R. 3909. A bill to authorize the coinage of a special coin to commemorate the ideas of the founders of this country as depicted on the Fugio cent of 1787; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 3910. A bill to amend section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for the imposition of import controls, upon petition by domestic producers adversely affected by priorities and allocation controls imposed under such section; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON:

H. R. 3911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, to permit taxpayers using the standard deduction to deduct such expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 3912. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 3913. A bill to authorize an appropriation to assist in the completion of the International Peace Garden in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 3914. A bill to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952, and to reenact all acts repealed or amended by the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 3915. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 3916. A bill to facilitate the making of proof of service-connected disability in the case of certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 3917. A bill to permit the appointment of certain substitute and temporary rural carriers in the rural delivery service to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 3918. A bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings, through assistance in planning and financing such projects in counties where agriculture is a predominant industry, thereby providing centralized housing and facilities for Federal, State, and local offices engaged in administering agricultural and related programs concerned with the welfare of the farm population; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 3919. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize the extension of old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the act to State and local employees who are covered by State or local retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 3920. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3921. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3922. A bill to grant longevity credit to former postal employees now under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3923. A bill to provide that the hours of work (exclusive of overtime) in any one calendar day of officers and employees subject to section 604 (a) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 shall be limited to a period of not more than 10 consecutive hours; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3924. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of charwoman working part time in the appropriate grades of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3925. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pertaining to the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule, and to place the position of char employee working part time in the appropriate grade of the crafts, protective, and custodial schedule; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 3926. A bill to amend section 205 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to make the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Labor ex officio members of the national labor-management panel established by such section; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 3927. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to remove the present limitation upon the total amount of disability compensation which may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3928. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to increase the maximum and minimum rates at which death benefits may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3929. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to increase the death benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to provide that an injured employee shall have the right to select his own physician, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3931. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to increase the periods for which compensation is to be paid thereunder in cases of permanent partial disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 3932. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, so as to increase the maximum and minumum rates at which disability compensation may be paid thereunder; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 3933. A bill relating to the acquisition of land for the Fort Donelson National Military Park in the State of Tennessee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3934. A bill to amend section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain in certain corporate liquidations) so that it will apply to cases where the transfer of all the property under the liquidation occurs within one calendar month in 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI (by request):

H. R. 3935. A bill to repeal paragraph (b) of section 4 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3936. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 35 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3937. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt from taxation annuities of retired employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3938. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide equal benefits for surviving children of female employees as are provided for surviving children of male employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3939. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3940. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3941. A bill to grant civil-service employees retirement after 25 years' service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3942. A bill to amend (a) of section 1 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3943. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for additional personnel engaged in hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3944. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to change the formula to one based on a 3-year average; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3945. A bill to provide a widow's annuity upon death of employee, prior to attainment of age 50 of surviving widow; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3946. A bill to amend section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3947. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who are involuntarily separated after having rendered 20 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3948. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide a full annuity compensation for employees involuntarily separated after having rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3949. A bill to amend paragraph (b) of section 4 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3950. A bill relating to the computation of the invested capital credit for excess profits tax purposes in certain cases where property has been exchanged for stock and where the stock has been distributed as a taxable dividend; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President by primary elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. J. Res. 224. Joint resolution providing for the creation of an International Food Reserve; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 177. Resolution amending rule XXXIV of the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for televising and broadcasting of sessions of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 178. Resolution to promote the effectiveness of investigations by committees of the House of Representatives to establish uniform rules for the conduct of House committee hearings and to insure orderly and fair procedure and the protection of individuals; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to their senate joint memorials Nos. 9 and 12; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PORAND: Resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress with respect to amendment of the Federal Bankruptcy Act to insure the payment in full of unpaid wages in bankruptcy cases and to increase the priority now given unpaid wage claims in bankruptcy cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting enactment of legislation which will return to the several States amounts collected as unemployment tax by the Federal Government in excess of grants for administration costs of the unemployment insurance and employment service program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to making available the sums necessary for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for the construction of national forest highways situated within the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 3951. A bill for the relief of Frank G. Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY (by request):

H. R. 3952. A bill for the relief of John Charles Keansley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3953. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Burger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 3954. A bill for the relief of Juliusz Bakalarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 3955. A bill for the relief of Wilhelmine Weizenhoefer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3956. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands within the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 3957. A bill to authorize the appointment of Dante Vezzoli as an officer in the Regular Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3958. A bill for the relief of Tungming Chiang, M. D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 3959. A bill for the relief of Julia Meszaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 3960. A bill for the relief of Evert Zeeven; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 3961. A bill for the relief of Margherita Di Meo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Alexander A. Lohmus, Nina Lohmus, and Marie Berejetski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of Mary Anne Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Vytautas Strolia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of Lauren F. Teutsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Aristotelis Kantourou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Ursula Kirkpatrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Mohamed Bin Omar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3969. A bill for the relief of Feliciano Lazay Manendez and Josefina Vallin y Lamblllo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of Bernhard P. Elmers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 3971. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Skoufis (Nicolas Soufis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 3972. A bill for the relief of David Tao-Yung Wen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H. R. 3973. A bill for the relief of Magdalena Lievanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

85. The SPEAKER presented a petition of I. C. Ellis, and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1953

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, grant unto us as we bow in this stillness quiet hearts, freed from fear and feverish anxiety, as we stay our minds on Thee. In a world so full of shouting and tumult, may we keep clear always a path to an inner shrine where, bowing our spirits in humility and reverence, we guard in unceasing vigil the sacred flame of hope and faith and love on the altar of the unseen and the eternal.

Grant us the divine strength and grace that in these demanding days we may prove worthy of every trust the Nation commits to our hands, as on the anvil of vast issues there slowly takes shape the new and better world that is to be. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BUSH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3658. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; and

H. R. 3659. An act to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 176), as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Joint Resolution 52, making an appropriation out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, in the opinion of the House contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House, and that the said joint resolution be taken from the Speaker's table and be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 11, and Thursday, March 12, 1953, be dispensed with.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make clear that I do not intend—at least, it is not my present intention—to continue for a long period of time to object to the request for unanimous consent that the Senate dispense with the reading of the Journal. However, later this afternoon I hope to discuss some problems connected with the application of the rules of the Senate and with protecting the rights of a sovereign State, through one of its elected representatives, to what I think are the courtesies due that State, and as an introduction to my later remarks, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the Journal.

The legislative clerk read the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 11, and Thursday, March 12, 1953.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953, ESTABLISHING DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (H. DOC. NO. 102)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, establishing a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which was received on yesterday, but not laid before the Senate.

The Chair calls attention to its receipt on yesterday, in view of the requirement of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, that the delivery of a reorganization plan shall be made to both Houses of Congress on the same day.

The Secretary will read the message.

The legislative clerk read the message, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

In my message of February 2, 1953, I stated that I would send to the Congress a reorganization plan defining a new administrative status for Federal activities in health, education, and social security. This plan carries out that intention by creating a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as one of the executive departments of the Government and by transferring to it the various units of the Federal Security Agency. The Department will be headed by a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who will be assisted by an Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries.

The purpose of this plan is to improve the administration of the vital health, education, and social-security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental rank. Such action is demanded by the importance and magnitude of these functions, which affect the well-being of millions of our citizens. The programs carried on by the Public Health Service include, for example, the conduct and promotion of research into the prevention and cure of such dangerous ailments as cancer and heart disease. The Public Health Service also administers payments to the States for the support of their health services and for urgently needed hospital construction. The Office of Education collects, analyzes and distributes to school administrators throughout the country information relating to the organization and management of educational systems. Among its other functions is the provision of financial help to school districts burdened by activities of the

United States Government. State assistance to the aged, the blind, the totally disabled, and dependent children is heavily supported by grants-in-aid administered through the Social Security Administration. The old-age and survivors insurance system and child development and welfare programs are additional responsibilities of that administration. Other offices of the Federal Security Agency are responsible for the conduct of Federal vocational rehabilitation programs and for the enforcement of food and drug laws.

There should be an unremitting effort to improve those health, education, and social-security programs which have proved their value. I have already recommended the expansion of the social security system to cover persons not now protected, the continuation of assistance to school districts whose population has been greatly increased by the expansion of defense activities, and the strengthening of our food and drug laws.

But good intent and high purpose are not enough; all such programs depend for their success upon efficient, responsible administration. I have recently taken action to assure that the Federal Security Administrator's views are given proper consideration in executive councils by inviting her to attend meetings of the Cabinet. Now the establishment of the new Department provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 will give the needed additional assurance that these matters will receive the full consideration they deserve in the whole operation of the Government.

This need has long been recognized. In 1923, President Harding proposed a Department of Education and Welfare, which was also to include health functions. In 1924, the Joint Committee on Reorganization recommended a new department similar to that suggested by President Harding. In 1932, one of President Hoover's reorganization proposals called for the concentration of health, education, and recreational activities in a single executive department. The President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937 recommended the placing of health, education, and social-security functions in a Department of Social Welfare. This recommendation was partially implemented in 1939 by the creation of the Federal Security Agency—by which action the Congress indicated its approval of the grouping of these functions in a single agency. A new department could not be proposed at that time because the Reorganization Act of 1939 prohibited the creation of additional executive departments. In 1949, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government proposed the creation of a department for social security and education.

The present plan will make it possible to give the officials directing the Department titles indicative of their responsibilities and salaries comparable to those received by their counterparts in other executive departments. As the Under Secretary of an executive Department, the Secretary's principal assistant will be better equipped to give leadership in the department's organization and management activities, for which he will be primarily responsible. The plan opens the way to further administrative improvement by authorizing the Secretary to centralize services and activities common to the several agencies of the department. It also establishes a uniform method of appointment for the heads of the three major constituent agencies. At present, the Surgeon General and the Commissioner of Education are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, while the Commissioner for Social Security is appointed by the Federal Security Administrator. Hereafter, all three will be Presidential appointees subject to Senate confirmation.

I believe, and this plan reflects my conviction, that these several fields of Federal activity should continue within the framework of a single department. The plan at the same time assures that the Office of Education and the Public Health Service retain the professional and substantive responsibilities vested by law in those agencies or in their heads. The Surgeon General, the Commissioner of Education, and the Commissioner of Social Security will all have direct access to the Secretary.

There should be in the Department an Advisory Committee on Education, made up of persons chosen by the Secretary from outside the Federal Government, which would advise the Secretary with respect to the educational programs of the Department. I recommend the enactment of legislation authorizing the defrayal of the expenses of this committee. The creation of such a committee as an advisory body to the Secretary will help insure the maintenance of responsibility for the public educational system in State and local governments while preserving the national interest in education through appropriate Federal action.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations, it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provisions for the appointment and compensation of the new officers specified in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the reorganization plan. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

Although the effecting of the reorganizations provided for in the reorganization plan will not in itself result in immediate savings, the improvement achieved in administration will in the future allow the performance of necessary services at greater savings than present operations would permit. An itemization of these savings in advance of actual experience is not practicable.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 12, 1953.*

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message and accompanying plan will be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Monday, March 23.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HENDRICKSON, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Public Housing Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Education, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the contributions program of that administration for the quarter ended December 31, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ended December 31, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Two letters from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting proposed amendments to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to renew the present international wheat agreement which expires July 31, 1953, and renegotiate said world agreement

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas the present International Wheat Agreement will expire on July 31, 1953, and that unless this world agreement is renewed and negotiated, chaos in the world wheat trade will result: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to renew the present International Wheat Agreement and to renegotiate the same and thereby prevent chaos in the world wheat trade; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the chairmen of the Committees on Agriculture in both Houses of Congress, to United States Senator KARL MUNDT, to United States Senator FRANCIS H. CASE, to Congressman E. Y. BERRY, to Congressman HAROLD O. LOVRE, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to cooperate with States in the examining and auditing of State departments, institutions, and political subdivisions of the State which are allocated Federal funds either by direct grant-in-aid or on a matching basis; and authorizing the filing of the audit report of Federal examiners with the State auditor and State comptroller or corresponding department of State government

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas State participation in Federal grant-in-aid and Federal aid-matching programs is based on Federal laws, rules, and regulations as well as State law; and

"Whereas the money in most cases is deposited with the State treasurer and paid out by State warrants on vouchers audited and approved by the State auditor; and

"Whereas the State department of audits and accounts under the direction of the State comptroller is required to examine and report on the expenditures and departmental practices of State departments, institutions, and various political subdivisions of the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States to require Federal Agencies, Bureaus, and Commissions of the United States Government, which are authorized to supervise the allocation and checking of Federal funds to State departments, institutions, and political subdivisions which receive Federal funds, to file copies of Federal audits reports made by their auditors and examiners with the State auditor and State comptroller or corresponding agency of State government, at the same time they are filed with the State department, institution, or political subdivision on which the Federal audit was made in order that the State may have knowledge of any expenditures or departmental practices that are questionable under Federal laws, rules, and regulations, in order that the State may determine whether such expenditures or departmental practices are also questionable under State law; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury, to the Honorable KARL MUNDT, and the Honorable FRANCIS CASE, United States Senators from South Dakota, to the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE, and the Honorable E. Y. BERRY, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress of the United States.

"HOBART H. GATES,
"Speaker of the House.
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"REX TERRY,
"Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas a large part of the State of Idaho is embraced within the national forests areas of the State; and

"Whereas Federal funds will be required for the fiscal years of 1954 and 1955 and for the construction of national forest highways situated within the State of Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America immediately to make available the sums necessary for the fiscal years of 1954 and 1955 for the construction of national forest highways situated within the State of Idaho; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States; to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Idaho in the United States Congress."

"Senate Joint Memorial 8

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the Corps of Army Engineers of the United States of America recently completed the construction of an hydroelectric and storage dam at Albeni Falls on the Pend Oreille River downstream from the city of Sandpoint, State of Idaho; and

"Whereas since the construction of said dam the said Corps of Army Engineers has impounded waters of said river above said dam so as to cause the waters of said river to be elevated approximately 15 feet to a level in said lake of approximately 2,062.5 feet above sea level; and

"Whereas as a result of the construction of said dam and the impounding and elevation of said waters the sewage-disposal plant of the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, has been plugged with said waters and said city will be obliged to construct a new sewage-disposal and treating plant and a bypass and overflow and a pumphouse, and that the cost thereof is approximately as follows:

Bypasses and overflow	$63,041.00
Pumphouse	47,342.40
	110,383.40
Treating plant	132,800.00
Total cost	243,183.40

"Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America immediately to reimburse the city of Sandpoint, Idaho, for the said cost of said bypass and overflow, pumphouse, and sewage-disposal and treating plant; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of Idaho in the United States Congress."

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 7

"Memorial relating to the Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags was imposed during World War II to restrict consumer purchases and to keep basic raw materials, then in short supply, primarily available for war use.

"Neither reason for continuing this tax exists any longer. None of the materials used in the manufacture of handbags is in short supply.

"Consumer resistance to the tax has resulted in unemployment, and business failures of manufacturers and retailers of handbags.

"The tax on handbags is economically and socially unjustifiable. It is a tax on a commodity that is definitely a necessity. It is an inequitable and discriminatory tax in that it falls on women only who pay the tax.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress repeal the excise tax on ladies' handbags."

By Mr. GEORGE:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution 180

"Resolution requesting the members of the Georgia congressional delegation to exert their efforts toward obtaining the full appropriation authorized under the provisions of the George-Barden Act; and for other purposes

"Whereas vocational education has meant so much to Georgia and Georgians; and

"Whereas there is a great need for the further development of vocational education in order that all Georgians who need it and can profit by it might have opportunity for vocational training; and

"Whereas there are many schools in Georgia as well as in other States with no programs of vocational education and many others with inadequate programs; and

"Whereas the prosperity and well-being of a State and Nation are dependent on the skill and productive capacity of its citizenry; and

"Whereas vocational education develops skills and increases productive capacity of individuals; and

"Whereas the security of our Nation is dependent in a large measure on the skill, technical knowledge, and the ability of the masses to produce; and

"Whereas the Federal Vocational Education Act of 1946, known as the George-Barden Act, authorizes an appropriation of $29,300,000 annually and less than $19,000,000 is being appropriated annually; and

"Whereas distinguished Georgia statesmen, the late Honorable Hoke Smith, the late Honorable Dudley M. Hughes, our present senior Senator, the Honorable Walter F. George, and ex-Congressman, the Honorable Braswell Deen, authored and championed the National Vocational Education Acts; and

"Whereas the entire Georgia delegation in the National Congress, past and present, have supported vocational education appropriations and measures through the years: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia*, That we commend the members of our Georgia delegation in the National Congress for the support they have given vocational education in the past and urge them to continue their support and redouble their efforts to obtain the full appropriation of $29,300,000 authorized under the provisions of the George-Barden Act; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to immediately make available a certified copy of this resolution to each member of the Georgia delegation in the National Congress."

RECOMMENDATION OF ELMER W. CART FOR APPOINTMENT TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota Legislature, urging the appointment of Elmer W. Cart as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution N

Concurrent resolution urging appointment of Hon. Elmer W. Cart as a member of Interstate Commerce Commission

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

Whereas it appearing that there are two appointments to be made by the President of the United States to the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

Whereas it appearing that the Honorable Elmer W. Cart, president of the North Dakota Public Service Commission, is being considered for such appointment; and

Whereas the said Elmer W. Cart is a North Dakota farm owner, and is a past member of the North Dakota House of Representatives; whereas he has had over 10 years' experience as a public service commissioner of this State, over 4 years of experience as a practitioner before the Interstate Commerce Commission in matters involving rates and services of transportation agencies; whereas he is a member of the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners, a member of the executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, and president of the Midwest Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, he is deemed eminently qualified for appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate of this 33d legislative assembly (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to appoint Hon. Elmer W. Cart as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that the Senate confirm said appointment when and if made; be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to secure said appointment and confirmation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota, and the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.
WALTER BUBEL,
Speaker of the House.
V. L. GILBREATH,
Chief Clerk of the House.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY MATCHING FUNDS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota Legislature, relating to the Federal highway matching funds.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution M

Concurrent resolution relating to Federal highway matching funds

Whereas the present highway program calls for a matching appropriation of not less than $8 million; and

Whereas the funds that are available to North Dakota under the Federal highway matching program rightfully belong to the people of North Dakota and should be made available without the necessity of matching requirements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That Congress be requested to enact the necessary legislation that would effect the immediate availability of all federally collected highway matching money without the necessity of any matching appropriations by this State; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of North Dakota's United States Senators and Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by wire, by the secretary of the senate, to each of the State legislative assemblies.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.
WALTER BUBEL,
Speaker of the House.
V. L. GILBREATH,
Chief Clerk of the House.

PURCHASE OF BUTTER SUBSTITUTES BY ARMED FORCES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to prevent the purchase of butter substitutes by our Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution O

Concurrent resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to prevent the purchase of butter substitutes by our Armed Forces

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States recently purchased 960,000 pounds of butter substitutes for consumption in domestic military establishments; and

Whereas the United States Government, under the commodity credit support program, has purchased for storage over 51 million pounds of surplus butter since November 1952; and

Whereas it would be a sound business practice for the Armed Forces of the United States to purchase and use the surplus butter now being stored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact suitable legislation prohibiting the purchase of butter substitutes by our Armed Forces; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senators Milton Young and William Langer, and Representatives Usher Burdick, and Otto Krueger.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.
WALTER BUBEL,
Speaker of the House.
V. L. GILBREATH,
Chief Clerk of the House.

SPRAYING OF NOXIOUS WEEDS ON FEDERAL WILDLIFE REFUGES IN NORTH DAKOTA—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota Legislature, providing for the spraying and control of sow thistle and other noxious weeds in Federal wildlife refuges in the State of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution H

Concurrent resolution providing for the spraying and control of sow thistle and other noxious weeds on Federal wildlife refuges in the State of North Dakota

Whereas the uncontrolled growth of sow thistle and other noxious weeds constitute a grave menace to the people of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the house of representatives and the senate concurring therein request the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, and the 83d Congress take measures to spray and control sow thistle and other noxious weeds on the following Federal wildlife refuges in the State of North Dakota, which refuges were purchased or withdrawn from public lands: Arrowwood National Wildlife Refuge, located in Foster and Stutsman Counties; Des Lacs National Wildlife Refuge, located in Burke and Ward Counties; Lostwood National Wildlife Refuge, located in Burke and Mountrail Counties; Long Lake National Wildlife Refuge, located in Burleigh and Kidder Counties; Lower Souris National Wildlife Refuge, located in Bottineau and McHenry Counties; Slade National Wildlife Refuge, located in Kidder County; Sullys Hill National Wildlife Preserve, located in Benson County, and Upper Souris National Wildlife Refuge, located in Renville and Ward Counties; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, and the 83d Congress, and to Congressmen USHER L. BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER, and to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG.

WALTER BUBEL,
Speaker of the House.
V. L. GILBREATH,
Chief Clerk of the House.
C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.

LIQUOR ADVERTISING IN MAGAZINES AND NEWSPAPERS—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact suitable legislation to ban liquor advertising in magazines and newspapers.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 11

Resolution to memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass suitable legislation banning liquor advertising in magazines and newspapers

Whereas the liquor industry is currently procuring a great deal of space in newspapers and magazines advertising and promoting the consumption of alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas such advertising is certain to have the effect of increasing the consumption of such alcoholic beverages, and will especially influence the youth of our Nation by glamourizing the use of such alcoholic beverages: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to pass suitable legislation prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages in newspapers and magazines; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to Senators MILTON YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER and Representatives USHER BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPEAL OF LONG AND SHORT HAUL CLAUSE OF SECTION 4 OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and myself, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, opposing the repeal of the long and short haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on March 11, 1953, p. 1842, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

USE OF GRADUATE ENGINEERS BY ARMED FORCES—LETTER FROM TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION, KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from the Tau Beta Pi Association, of Knoxville, Tenn., signed by Robert H. Nagel, secretary, embodying a resolution adopted by that association at its 47th annual national convention in Norman, Okla., relating to the use of graduate engineers in the Armed Forces.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAU BETA PI ASSOCIATION,
March 4, 1953.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At its 47th annual national convention in Norman, Okla., in October 1952, the Tau Beta Pi Association unanimously adopted a resolution concerning the use of graduate engineers in the Armed Forces of the United States, and I was instructed to present it to Members of the Congress, the President and Vice President, the Cabinet officers, and others concerned with the utilization of engineers.

The resolution is as follows:

"Be it hereby resolved by the 1952 convention of Tau Beta Pi, That the association go on record as strongly supporting the proposal that all graduate engineers entering the Armed Forces be employed in a professional engineering capacity commensurate with their training and experience."

The Tau Beta Pi Association is an engineering honor society with 92 collegiate chapters and over 75,000 initiated members. It is a nonpartisan organization concerned exclusively with professional engineering matters. The above resolution originated among the undergraduate delegates to the 1952 convention and was unanimously adopted because of the students' desire to be of the greatest possible service to their country.

We sincerely hope that you will extend such efforts as you can for the maximum professional use of graduate engineers in the Armed Forces.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT H. NAGEL, *Secretary.*

EXTENSION OF FARM PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the general assembly of the great State of Georgia, which commends the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself for introducing a bill extending the present farm price support law, and urging all Members of the Georgia congressional delegation to aid in its passage.

It is with a great deal of pride and appreciation that I make this insertion in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on March 11, 1953, p. 1842, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

ERADICATION OF WEEDS ON FEDERALLY OWNED LAND—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a concurrent resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Legislature. The resolution

refers to the question of the Government's responsibility in weed eradication. I think the resolution is a very pertinent one, and therefore I should like to have it printed in the RECORD, for all to see.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on March 11, 1953, p. 1843, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

TIDELANDS—RESOLUTION OF TENNESSEE SENATE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have been requested to submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be included as part of my remarks, a certified copy of Senate Resolution 12, acts of 1953, of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, adopted by that body on March 11, 1953. I ask unanimous consent at this time that the resolution, properly authenticated, be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in full, as a part of my remarks.

I am pleased to say that I am happy to comply with the request of certain officials of the State of Tennessee, particularly since the resolution gives the strong support of the Senate of the State of Tennessee to Senate Joint Resolution 13, the so-called tidelands measure in whose sponsorship I am joined by 39 other Senators.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 12

Resolution relating to the tidelands and submerged lands issue pending before the Congress of the United States

Whereas for more than 150 years the original colonies now embraced within the various States of the Union and the States since their admission to the Union have been recognized as the owners of the tidelands adjacent to their boundaries on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and on the Gulf of Mexico and under the inland waters in the various States of the Union, this principle having been recognized by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1845 in the case of *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. (U. S.) 391) and followed in more than fifty other decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and approved in more than 250 opinions of the Federal courts of the United States and in opinions of the Supreme Court of the various States; and

Whereas this recognition of ownership in the States prevailed until the split decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *U. S.* v *California* (332 U. S. 19) in 1946, with ringing dissents from the majority opinion in that case by Mr. Justice Frankfurter and Mr. Justice Reed, with Mr. Justice Jackson not participating in the opinion; and

Whereas the question was again before the Court in the case of *U. S.* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707), in which the doctrine embraced in the decision in the California case was affirmed in a split decision by Mr. Justice Douglas, with Mr. Justice Jackson and Mr. Justice Clark taking no part in the consideration of this case and with Mr. Justice Reed, Mr. Justice Minton and Mr. Justice Frankfurter dissenting, leaving the decision to be handed down by four members of the Supreme Court of the United States with three dissents and two members not participating; and

Whereas by a like decision by Mr. Justice Douglas in the case of *U. S.* v. *Louisiana* the doctrine in the California case was reaffirmed; and

Whereas the Supreme Court never has yet held that the United States owns these tidelands and submerged lands but has only held that the United States Government has the paramount right and power over these lands; and

Whereas bills have been passed by the Congress of the United States in two instances within recent years quitclaiming these tidelands and submerged lands to the respective States adjacent to them and said bills have on both occasions been vetoed by the President; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States various bills authorizing that these lands be quitclaimed, one of which is known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 13, by Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, and 39 other Senators, and which is identical in its terms with the so-called tidelands bill enacted by the Congress in 1952 and known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 20, which was vetoed by President Truman; and

Whereas President Eisenhower has stated in his campaign for election and has given the members of the Senate of the United States to understand that if this bill or a similar bill is passed by the present Congress, he will approve it, thereby quitclaiming these lands and restoring them to the States under their original boundaries where they were recognized to belong since the foundation of the United States of America; and

Whereas every State in the Union has an interest in the submerged lands and especially does the State of Tennessee have 182,400 acres of submerged lands under the navigable streams and lakes in the State, which with the submerged lands under the Great Lakes and other navigable streams in the various States amount to 38,595,840 acres and the tidelands or marginal sea lands amount to 17,029,120 acres; and

Whereas the enactment of this legislation, or similar legislation, has been endorsed by the following organizations: The Council of State Governments, the Governors Conference, National Association of Attorneys General, National Association of Public Land Officials, National Association of County Officials, National Conference of Mayors, American Association of Port Authorities, the American Bar Association, American Title Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, National Water Conservation Association, American Municipal Association (representing 10,150 municipalities), and the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 78th General Assembly of Tennessee as follows:

1. That the Senate of the State of Tennessee goes on record as urging the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 13 pending in the Congress of the United States and introduced by Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, and 39 other Senators, by which the title to these submerged lands beneath navigable waters within the States and adjacent to the States where they border on the oceans and Gulf of Mexico, will be confirmed and established as belonging to the States rather than to the Federal Government, subject however to the right of the Federal Government to control them in the interest of national defense, flood control, and navigation, as provided in said resolution.

2. Be it further enacted, that copy of this resolution be furnished to Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Senator from Florida, who is in charge of the effort to pass Senate Joint Resolution No. 13, for such use as he may see fit to use said resolution.

JARED MADDEN,
Speaker of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1110. A bill to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; with amendments (Rept. No. 82).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1078. A bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 83).

By Mr. HENDRICKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1229. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 84).

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capital a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies, and permanent location in Statuary Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 85);

S. Res. 57. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relating to motions to reconsider; with amendments (Rept. No. 86); and

S. Res. 86. Resolution authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services; with amendments (Rept. No. 87).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of Ruth Sonin; and

S. 1291. A bill for the relief of Charalampos Socrates Iossifoglu, Nora Iossifoglu, Helen Iossifoglu and Efrossini Iossifoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1292. A bill providing for the reconveyance to the town of Morristown of certain land included within the Morristown National Historical Park, in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 1293. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Georgios Aslanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1294. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Wan Hsien Wu, Dorothea Wan Lien Wu, Ray Kiu Wu, Christine Wan Ming Wu, and Ying Victor Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (by request):

S. 1295. A bill for the relief of Alexander Andrea Androutsopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Hall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1297. A bill to make the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing lump-sum annual leave payments inapplicable to certain officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1298. A bill for the relief of Sister Agrippina (Agrippina Palermo), Sister Battistina (Franceschina Serpa), Sister Romana (Angela Iolanda Morelli), Sister Franceschina (Maria Caruso), and Sister Bruna (Giuseppina De Caro); and

S. 1299. A bill for the relief of Dr. Panagiotis Darviris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1300. A bill to increase the limitation on Federal funds which may be used with respect to any one project under the provisions of the act to promote conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States by aiding in the development of facilities for water storage and utilization; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 1301. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lucy Yariott Othermedicine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1302. A bill to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of certain tests for alcohol in persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1303. A bill to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election or plebiscite held in occupied Japan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1304. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Earnest Meri Kersh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1305. A bill for the relief of Luigi Tanzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1306. A bill to adjust the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1307. A bill to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1308. A bill for the relief of Leonard Hungerford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1309. A bill to amend sections 203 and 408 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 1245), as amended, so as to authorize certain Government officers to assist in carrying out civil defense aid between the United States and neighboring countries; to modify the loyalty oath so as to allow nationals of neighboring countries or of countries that are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty to participate in State civil defense programs without impairing their citizenship; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1310. A bill to amend section 8 (d) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended;

S. 1311. A bill to amend section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; and

S. 1312. A bill to amend section 10 (l) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1313. A bill for the relief of Olga Balabanov and Nicola Balabanov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1314. A bill to encourage the development of a newsprint manufacturing industry in southeastern Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1315. A bill for the relief of Caroline L. Sterquelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1316. A bill relating to the release of water from the John Martin Reservoir, Colo.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1317. A bill for the relief of Mrs Chester A. Beaver; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1318. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1319. A bill to change the name of the Bonneville Power Administration to the Columbia Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

UNUSED ACCUMULATED ANNUAL LEAVE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to make the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing lump-sum annual-leave payments inapplicable to certain officers and employees, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

The bill (S. 1297) to make the act of December 21, 1944, authorizing lump-sum annual-leave payments inapplicable to certain officers and employees, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, yesterday I was amazed to learn that 215 former Government Cabinet officers and other officials, when they left office, had received $709,538 in cash for unused accumulated annual leave, in individual amounts ranging as high as $12,000.

Since this exposure by the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, many Members of the Senate and others interested in the future welfare of the civil-service employees have contacted me regarding these payments and in regard to future legislation on this subject.

As chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I shall request the committee to make a full and complete investigation of this matter to determine whether it is possible to prevent further raids on the Treasury by outgoing Government officials whose salaries have been more than $12,000 annually.

The many loyal and faithful and hard-working civil-service employees have been subjected to severe criticism and have been restricted by many infamous riders concerning almost every aspect of their everyday lives.

Most of these restrictions have come about after the disclosures of the type made by the House committee. It is not the rank-and-file Federal employee that causes these restrictions. Their supervisors, such as agency heads, department heads, Cabinet officers, and the like, have been wholly responsible for the many restrictive amendments and riders affecting the leave benefits and the working conditions in general.

The situation resulting from the disclosures is not only alarming to the average American taxpayer, but also is a serious blow to the morale of the rank and file of the Federal employees.

I do not believe that a Cabinet officer or any agency head should be made to work a full year without some rest and relaxation, and I believe the present law provides for such benefits. The point I wish to make, however, is that under present regulations there seems to be no way to check the accuracy of accumulated leave records of high Government officials.

The least one can say is that when annual-leave payments are made to high-ranking Government officials in amounts ranging from five to twelve thousand dollars, the average citizen begins to ask some questions.

A detailed accounting is being requested of each of these large annual-leave payments from the General Accounting Office. The records will, of course, speak for themselves.

I have today introduced a bill which has been referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the study and consideration of the entire matter. The bill was introduced with the thought that it will correct this situation, which has resulted in high Government officials receiving cash lump-sum payments for unused accumulated leave.

EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITATION UPON EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS OF EMERGENCY POWERS ACT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which, but for such time limitation, would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950.

In connection with the joint resolution, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in full in the body of the RECORD a letter signed by Roger Kent, General Counsel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, together with various matters referred to in the letter, and to which the joint resolution refers. The letter explains why the joint resolution should be passed.

Let me add that this matter will be presented to the Judiciary Committee, with Mr. Kent appearing in person, at 10:30 o'clock next Monday. The committee will be very glad to hear from

anyone who either favors or opposes the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter and matters presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letters and matters presented by Mr. LANGER are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1953.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of joint resolution "To extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950."

This proposal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget for submittal to the Congress and the Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

This proposed joint resolution would, with certain exceptions, extend from April 1, 1953, to July 1, 1953, those emergency powers which were previously extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.).

On February 19, 1952, the President transmitted to the Congress a draft of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act to extend certain emergency powers for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and for 6 months thereafter, in order to insure the continuation of those powers during the period of international tension while the Nation was mobilizing for defense. The Congress, after hearings, approved the Emergency Powers Continuation Act and extended the authority under 45 statutory provisions until April 1, 1953, rather than for the full period requested, which was for the duration of the present national emergency, plus 6 months. The reason for so limiting the extension is stated in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary on House Joint Resolution 477 (H. Rept. No. 2041, 82d Cong.) as follows: "The committee was chiefly interested in satisfying itself that there was justification for continuing the provisions until such time as the Government agencies concerned could seek, before the proper congressional committees, legislation either on a permanent basis or for a further extension on a temporary basis." At the time of the congressional hearings it was felt by the committee that such legislation could easily be obtained by April 1, 1953.

In consonance with the expressed desire of the House Judiciary Committee, as stated above, the agencies of the Government desiring the continuation of the statutory provisions concerned have prepared and submitted to the Congress, or are in the process of preparing, separate drafts of legislation for the consideration of the appropriate committees which would amend, extend, or make permanent the various emergency powers for which there is a continuing need.

Since the enactment of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act there has been a delay which probably was not anticipated when the date of April 1, 1953, was selected. This delay was caused by a change in administration of the Government and a concurrent change in the appointed officials of the Department of Defense, with the natural requirement of a review of all pending programs by the new officials. Such a review, of course, has included a study of the emergency powers. As a result, not all of the individual items of proposed legislation are in a form ready for submission to the Congress. Moreover, as to those bills which have been introduced in the Congress, action by the committee concerned has been delayed pending decision by the appropriate executive branch officials as to the desirability of continuing the various powers. In view of that situation, it is not likely that any appreciable number of individual bills will be enacted into law by April 1, 1953. Accordingly the enclosed draft of joint resolution is submitted for the consideration of the Congress with the request that it be enacted so as to provide a further extension until ample time has been afforded for a proper consideration of the various statutory provisions by the appropriate congressional committees. The joint resolution is a temporary expedient and will not alter the affected authorities, except as to the date of the termination of their effectiveness, and is intended only to give the responsible departments sufficient time in which to make their presentations to the Congress.

Proposed for the 90-day extension under the joint resolution are 31 provisions of law of primary concern to the Department of Defense. There are also included for temporary extension eight provisions of law affecting other agencies of the Government which the Bureau of the Budget has requested the Department of Defense to include in this joint resolution, so as to permit the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make proper representations to the Congress for continuation or for permanent provisions to replace the temporary provisions affecting their Departments. The joint resolution would, by section 2 thereof, exclude from the effect of its temporary extension 6 provisions of law dealt with by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act; 4 of those provisions of law have been repealed; 1 of them has been amended so as not to be covered by the extension contained in the Emergency Powers Continuation Act; and 1 of them is no longer needed because of changed conditions.

There is also enclosed herewith a document which lists the various sections of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act extending statutory authorities and setting forth an explanation of those authorities, together with a summary of the reasons advanced at the time of the original request in 1952 for their extension, and a statement as to their present status.

Because of the necessity of action by both Houses prior to April 1, 1953, it would be appreciated if early hearings can be scheduled.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION UNTIL JULY 1, 1953, OF STATUTORY AUTHORITIES PREVIOUSLY EXTENDED TO APRIL 1, 1953, BY THE EMERGENCY POWERS CONTINUATION ACT (PUBLIC LAW 450, 82D CONG.)

SECTION 1 (A) (1). PROVIDING FOR THE ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES BY THE NAVY (50 U. S. C. APP. 1201)

The basic provision authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to acquire and operate buildings and facilities in connection with "procurement or construction of items authorized in connection with the prosecution of war" as extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act.

The extension of this statutory authority was originally requested as being necessary for the expansion of the Navy building program and because it would also provide a legislative basis for the acquisition and operation of facilities, the classified nature of which renders the usual specific project authorization inappropriate.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a draft of legislation which will incorporate the essential features of the authorities referred to in this section and section 1 (a) (4) and which will supersede those authorities. Until that revised draft of bill is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the authorities referred to in this section and section 1 (a) (4) should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (2). AUTHORITY OF GOVERNMENTAL OFFICER OR AGENCY DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT TO INSPECT PLANTS AND AUDIT BOOKS OF WAR CONTRACTORS (50 U. S. C. APP. 643, 643A, 643B, AND 643C)

The basic authority applies with respect "to the plant, books, and records of any contractor with whom a defense constract has been placed" during the effective period thereof.

An extension of the basic authority was considered desirable in order to prevent a lapse of the power of the Department of Defense and other agencies to audit books of subcontractors.

H. R. 2313, which is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would extend this authority until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950. Until that bill is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (3). AUTHORIZATION TO DESTROY RECORDS SITUATED ABROAD DURING WAR OR WHEN HOSTILE ACTION APPEARS IMMINENT (44 U. S. C. 376)

The basic provision authorizes the head of an agency to authorize destruction of any records in his legal custody situated outside the continental United States in any military or naval establishment, ship, or other depository during the effective period thereof.

An extension of this authority was needed to authorize the emergency destruction of official records in Foreign Service posts, military or naval establishments, and other depositories outside the continental United States. It was pointed out in connection with the Emergency Powers Continuation Act that the breaking or curtailment of diplomatic relations with any country might lead to conditions preventing the removal and necessitating the immediate destruction of records under this authority.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a proposal which would amend the basic authority so as to extend its application to continental United States, eliminate any doubt as to its applicability to records of civilian activities in support of or under the control of military or naval organizations, and provide for its effectiveness during the period of any national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (4). AUTHORIZATION FOR ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES BY ARMY AND NAVY IN CONNECTION WITH MANUFACTURING OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT IN GOVERNMENT OR PRIVATE PLANTS (50 U. S. C. APP. 775, 776, 1171A, AND 1171B)

The basic provision authorizes the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to provide for installations for the manufacture of military equipment at military posts,

plants, etc. (including privately owned plants), and for storage and shelter, to exchange surplus equipment, to make advance payments to contractors without certain restrictions, and to operate or dispose of plants during its effective period.

The extension of this provision was considered essential inasmuch as it constituted the only authorization available to the Army and Air Force to expedite construction during a period of expansion. Similar authority for the expansion of privately owned plants is contained in section 303 (e) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, but that authority has not been delegated to the Department of Defense and, moreover, will expire on June 30, 1953.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a draft of legislation which will incorporate the essential features of the authorities referred to in this section and section 1 (a) (1).

Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the authorities referred to in this section and section 1 (a) (1) should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (5). ENTERTAINMENT AND INSTRUCTION OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE ENLISTED PERSONNEL (50 U. S. C. APP. 761), AND AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LAND AND INTERESTS THEREIN WITHOUT REGARD TO CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS (50 U. S. C. APP. 767, 771)

The basic provision authorizes the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force to provide for entertainment and instruction in connection with the welfare of enlisted personnel.

The extension of the first part of this authority was considered necessary because it constitutes the only authorization for appropriations for the entertainment and instruction of Army and Air Force enlisted personnel. The incidental extension of the authority to employ interns in the Medical Department of the Army was not intended to be used, inasmuch as such authority is obsolete. The original extension also covered broad authority for the acquisition and use of land prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General.

H. R. 2879, which is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would supersede in part the existing provision and apply to the Navy and Marine Corps, as well as to the Army and Air Force. It would be effective at all times. Until that bill is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (6). FOREIGN CLAIMS ACT; CLAIMS COMMISSION NEED NOT BE COMPOSED OF OFFICERS OF THE SERVICE CONCERNED (31 U. S. C. 224i)

The basic authority provided for the settlement of foreign claims thereunder by a Commission appointed for the purpose but not necessarily composed of officers of the service concerned if such settlement is made "in time of war." The Emergency Powers Continuation Act extended the effectiveness of that provision until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, but not later than April 1, 1953.

This proposal was included in the Emergency Powers Continuation Act because the joint activities of the Armed Forces in foreign countries in all areas of the world at the time made it most desirable that claims be adjudicated by commissions composed of officers of any of the services.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would make this authority effective at all times.

Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (7). MISSING PERSONS ACT; AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENT AND ALLOWANCES FOR MISSING PERSONS AND MOVEMENT OF THEIR DEPENDENTS AND HOUSEHOLD GOODS (50 U. S. C. APP. 1001–1014, 1015)

The basic provision authorizes the President during the effective period of the act (1) to provide for pay and allowances in respect of certain missing persons (2) to take certain administrative action regarding allotments, payments and settlement of accounts of such persons, and (3) to provide for the movement of dependents and household goods of certain missing, injured or dead military personnel. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act, in addition to extending the basic authority, made certain related changes in the statutory language.

The extension of this proposal was considered necessary to insure the continuance of administrative procedures for the settlement of pay accounts of affected individuals and to prevent hardships to dependents of personnel who become missing in the performance of their official duties.

H. R. 3780 and S. 1229, which constitute a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would further extend the basic authority to July 1, 1954, as well as amend the definition therein of certain terms. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (8). PROVISION FOR UNIFORM ALLOWANCES OF $250 FOR CERTAIN OFFICERS AND WARRANT OFFICERS SERVING ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE (10 U. S. C. 904B, 904C)

The basic authority formerly provided that during the term of its effectiveness company grade reserve officers of the Army and Air Force are entitled to a uniform allowance of $250 upon their first tour of extended active duty.

The basic authority has been repealed by Section 803 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.). Accordingly, the inclusion of that authority in any further extension of emergency powers would be inappropriate.

SECTION 1 (A) (9). CERTIFICATES OF OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES FOR PAY AND ALLOWANCE ACCOUNTS TO BE ACCEPTABLE WITHOUT SUBSTANTIATION (50 U. S. C. APP. 836)

The basic authority provides that, during the period of its effectiveness, officers' certificates may be accepted as supporting vouchers for pay and allowance accounts without further supporting evidence.

This provision was included in the Emergency Powers Continuation Act because procedures developed under the basic authority had greatly reduced administrative paper work in connection with the pay and allowances of military and civilian personnel. Destruction of records due to enemy action, acts of God, and accidents would prevent commanding officers from certifying to pay and allowances due military personnel since it would be impossible for such officers to have personal knowledge of all facts pertaining to pay accounts, and they would of necessity have to rely on records maintained for such purposes. To require commanding officers to assume the additional administrative burden of certifying pay and allowance accounts would hamper them in performing their primary military duty. Finally, disbursing officers would be hindered in making timely payments in many cases because of the absence of certificates and other supporting documents.

H. R. 3072 and S. 1078, which are a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would provide permanent authority to replace the wartime authority extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act. Until the enactment of one of those bills into law a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (10). SUSPENSION OF THE PROHIBITION AGAINST PAYMENT OF DEPOSITS, AND INTEREST THEREON, OF ENLISTED MEN UNTIL FINAL DISCHARGE (10 U. S. C. 906 AND NOTE AND 907 AND NOTE)

The basic authority provides that, during the period of its effectiveness the provisions of law which prohibit until discharge and payment to soldiers of their deposits and interest thereon are suspended.

The extension of the basic authority was originally sought because otherwise enlisted personnel of the Army and Air Force would not be able in cases of serious emergency to withdraw deposits. It is manifestly unfair when persons are being held beyond the terms of their enlistment contracts not to allow them to withdraw deposits in meritorious cases.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would extend the basic authority until July 1, 1954. That proposal would also repeal all provisions of law for the forfeiture of such deposits in case of desertion by a member of any of the Armed Forces. Until that proposal is enacted into law a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (11). PROHIBITING PHOTOGRAPHING, SKETCHING, MAPPING, ETC., OF MILITARY AND NAVAL RESERVATIONS, PROPERTIES, EQUIPMENT, ETC. (50 U. S. C. APP. 781–785)

The basic authority prohibits and penalizes, during the period of its effectiveness, the photographing, sketching, mapping, etc., of military and naval installations and equipment except as authorized by the Secretaries of the military departments.

The extension of the basic authority was sought because its termination would have impeded the ability of the Armed Forces to protect their installations and equipment. The provisions of 18 United States Code 793 constitute permanent legislation covering generally the same subject matter. However, an essential element of an offense thereunder is an intent to injure the security of the United States or to help some foreign nation, whereas no such intent is required to constitute an offense under this provision.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would extend the basic authority until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, wthout further limitation. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (12). CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY UNDER THE LANHAM ACT NEEDED TO OPERATE OR REACTIVATE EXISTING HOUSING PROJECTS (42 U. S. C. 1521, 1532, 1541, 1561, 1562, 1571)

Section 301 of the Lanham Act, as amended, provides that the authority contained in sections 1, 202, 401, and 402 of that act (with respect to provision of World War II housing and community facilities) will terminate "when the President shall have declared that the emergency declared by him on September 8, 1939, has ceased to exist" except with respect to contracts on projects previously entered into or undertaken and court proceedings then pending. The World War II housing and community facilities referred to are housing projects which the Federal Government provided for defense workers and military personnel immediately prior to and during World War II, and community facilities or public works such as streets, sewer lines, sewage-treatment plants, water lines, and USO facilities provided in war-crowded areas. Authority with respect to the provision of housing for veterans and servicemen and their families under title V of the Lanham Act also depends upon the effectiveness of section 301.

While it was obviously the intent of section 301 to terminate the power of the Federal Government to provide additional housing and community facilities when the emergency was over, the termination of all powers under the sections listed would then have seriously interfered with the continued operation or reactivation of existing housing projects which were still vitally needed for housing of veterans and servicemen and their families, which were being devoted to fulfilling urgent defense housing needs, or which were being retained to enable the Government to fill future urgent defense housing needs as they arise. If the emergency of September 8, 1939, had not been continued for those purposes, some doubt might have arisen as to whether the Housing and Home Finance Administrator could thereafter utilize or reactivate existing projects to house persons engaged in national defense activities and their families and (under title V of the Lanham Act) servicemen and veterans and their families. Continuation for limited purposes of the state of emergency was also considered necessary in order to continue the Government's interest in land underlying many thousands of units of temporary housing provided under the Lanham Act and related acts where leases or judgments of condemnation are terminable by their express terms upon the cessation of the emergency declared on September 8, 1939, or within a specified period thereafter. Accordingly, the Emergency Powers Continuation Act not only extended the basic statute but provided that the emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, continued to exist, for the purpose of continuing the use of property held under the basic act, until 6 months after the termination of the emergency declared on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but no later than April 1, 1953.

It is felt that the basic authority should be temporarily extended pending a final determination as to the need for a greater extension.

SECTION 1 (A) (13). PROVIDING FOR COMPENSATION TO CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES OR ITS CONTRACTORS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES FOR INJURIES OR DEATH RESULTING FROM "WAR-RISK HAZARDS" (42 U. S. C. 1701–1708, 1711–1717)

The basic authority provides compensation benefits for certain employees of the United States or of contractors with the United States for injury or death resulting from specified "war-risk hazards" arising during its effective period. The persons protected include persons working on projects for the "public use of the United States or its allies." The hazards covered include "belligerent action of an enemy," "taken by an enemy," "attacked by an enemy," and "action of the enemy."

The extension of the basic authority was considered important in order to cover personnel within the purview thereof in the event of death or disability incurred while they are serving in hostile areas. Failure to continue such coverage would seriously impede the recruitment of qualified personnel for potentially hostile areas. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act, in addition to extending the basic authority, redefined the terms "enemy," "allies," "national war effort," "war effort," and "war activities."

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would extend until July 1, 1954, this basic authority, as modified by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act, and also the authority referred to in section 1 (a) (17) of that act. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authorities should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (14). SALES TO CIVILIANS AT NAVAL STATIONS AND POST EXCHANGES WITHIN THE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES WHEN PRIVATE SERVICES ARE NOT AVAILABLE (34 U. S. C. 533)

The basic provision authorizes, during the period of its effectiveness, sales to civilians at naval stations and post exchanges within the continental United States when the Secretary of the Navy finds that it is impracticable for such persons to procure such stores from private agencies without impairing the efficient operation of the stations. The basic provision also authorizes, on a permanent basis, the sale of stores to civilians at stations beyond the continental limits of the United States.

The extension of the basic provision was sought in order to provide civilian employees stationed at various places within the continental United States where private commercial services are not available with facilities for the purchase of clothing, food and other items necessary for existence.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would amend the basic provision and provide uniform authority for such sales both within and without the continental United States, and which would be effective at all times and be applicable to the Army and Air Force as well as the Navy. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic provision should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (15). USE OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION VEHICLES FOR TRANSPORTING EMPLOYEES (38 U. S. C. 11A NOTE)

The basic authority provides that, during its effective period, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to use automobiles of the Veterans' Administration to transport employees between field stations and the nearest public transportation lines at reasonable rates of fare, if the Administrator finds that other public and private facilities are not adequate and that efficiency will be promoted thereby.

The Bureau of the Budget states that a temporary extension of this authority should be provided pending the enactment of separate legislation dealing with this authority.

SECTION 1 (A) (16). AUTHORITY FOR FOREIGN EXCHANGE TRANSACTIONS FOR BENEFIT OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL (50 U. S. C. APP. 1701–1707)

The basic provision authorizes foreign exchange transactions for the benefit of Armed Forces personnel during the period of its effectiveness and is the only statutory basis for the activities specified therein.

It was considered essential to remove any doubt as to the authority of disbursing officers of the Armed Forces while engaged in operations in many foreign countries to accept and dispose of foreign currencies which are vital to operations. The extension of authority would obviate the necessity of obtaining special appropriations and relief legislation for losses arising from foreign exchange transactions with such funds. Authority for disbursing officers to cash checks and similar instruments was considered to be extremely important to military and civilian personnel, contractors, and others in foreign areas where normal banking facilities do not exist. The basic authority affords the only method whereby such personnel may dispose of instruments of that type in carrying out necessary private matters.

The Department of the Treasury is sponsoring a legislative proposal which would provide new authority broader in scope than the present authority and which would be effective at all times. The Department of Defense will support legislation of that nature. However, until such a proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of this basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (17). DISABILITY OR DEATH OF A GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE AFTER CAPTURE OR DETENTION BY AN ENEMY DEEMED TO HAVE RESULTED FROM THE PERFORMANCE OF DUTY (5 U. S. C. 861)

The basic authority provides that, during its effective period, when Government employees suffer death or disability after capture, detention or other restraint by an enemy of the United States such death or disability shall be deemed to have resulted from the performance of duty.

The continuation of the basic authority was sought to avoid a serious impediment to the recruitment of qualified personnel. Without its continuation civilian employees who are captured or detained by hostile forces would be deprived of compensation for injury, disease or death incurred during detention. Furthermore, a question might have arisen as to whether World War II internees could continue to receive benefits. The Bureau of Employees' Compensation was then making payments to several hundred beneficiaries, the residue of 1,244 cases originally adjudged compensable under the basic authority. The continuation of the basic authority was also sought to protect civilian employees interned in Korea and to protect persons in similar situations in the future. During a period of hostilities, it is important that personnel be protected in the event of disability or death due to such hostilities. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act, in addition to extending the basic authority, provided that the term "enemy" as used therein means any nation, government, or force engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States or of any nation, government, or force participating with the United States in any armed conflict.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would extend until July 1, 1954 this basic authority, as modified by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act, and also the authority referred to in section 1 (a) (13) of that act. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authorities should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (18). FREE IMPORTATION OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES ON GOVERNMENT ORDERS (50 U. S. C. APP. 801–802)

The basic provision authorizes, during its effective period, on a duty-free basis the importation, pursuant to Government orders, of personal and household effects of persons in the service of the United States, or their families, or of persons evacuated to the United States under Government orders.

The extension of the basic authority was sought to preserve an inducement to accept overseas duty at a time when a maximum effort was being made to encourage such duty. In view of the expansion of the Armed Forces and of the enlargement of the international commitments and obligations of this Government, many persons in Government service must be assigned to lengthy overseas tours. It did not appear that the obligations of the United States Government would decrease in the foreseeable future to such an extent that it would be practical to eliminate this authority.

The Department of Defense submitted to the Congress a legislative proposal which would make the provisions of the basic authority effective at all times. H. R. 3659, as introduced, would extend the basic authority only until July 1, 1955. A temporary extension of the basic authority is needed until a full extension is enacted into law.

SECTION 1 (A) (19). SERVICE FLAGS AND LAPEL BUTTONS (36 U. S. C. 179–182)

The basic provision authorizes the Secretary of the Army to approve service flags and lapel buttons to be displayed or worn by the family of persons serving in the Armed Forces during its effective period. It also provides

that he may license the manufacture of such service flags and lapel buttons. Penalties are provided for unauthorized manufacture and display.

H. R. 2321, which is a part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1953, would extend the effective date of the provision to any period of war or hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged and place the authority thereunder in the Secretary of Defense. Until that bill is enacted, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (20). PREFERENCE OF VETERANS AND FAMILIES OF DECEASED SERVICEMEN FOR LOANS IN CONNECTION WITH IMPROVEMENT OF FARMHOUSES AND BUILDINGS (42 U. S. C. 1477)

A preference is given by the basic authority to veterans and families of deceased servicemen in the matter of applications for loans or other financial assistance in connection with the improvement of farm housing and other farm buildings. The term "veteran" was defined therein as a person who served in the land or naval forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom on conditions other than dishonorable. The term "deceased servicemen" was defined as persons who served in the land or naval forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation and who died in service before the termination of such war. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act changed, in effect, the reference therein to the period of war to the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but in no event later than April 1, 1953.

The Bureau of the Budget states that a temporary extension of this authority should be provided pending the enactment of separate legislation dealing with this authority.

SECTION 1 (A) (21). PREFERENCES FOR VETERANS FOR WHOM FEDERALLY OWNED HOUSES ARE AVAILABLE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE LANHAM ACT (42 U. S. C. 1573)

The basic authority provides preferences to veterans and their families with respect to the occupation of federally owned housing. The term "veterans" was defined as including persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war and who have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act changed, in effect, the term "during the present war" to the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but in no event later than April 1, 1953.

The Bureau of the Budget states that a temporary extension of this authority should be provided pending the enactment of separate legislation dealing with this authority.

SECTION 1 (A) (22). ELIGIBILITY OF VETERANS FOR FARM LOANS AND MORTGAGE INSURANCE (7 U. S. C. 1001)

Veterans fulfilling certain requirements are eligible under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (the basic authority affected by this section) for loans and mortgage insurance in connection with the acquisition or improvement of farms, and have preference over nonveterans. The term "veteran" was defined as "a person who served in the land or naval forces of the United States during any war between the United States and any other nation, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable." The Emergency Powers Continuation Act changed, in effect, the reference to war to the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but in no event later than April 1, 1953.

The Bureau of the Budget states that a temporary extension of this authority should be provided pending the enactment of separate legislation dealing with this authority.

SECTION 1 (A) (23). UTILIZATION OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS IN AID OF THE ARMED FORCES (36 U. S. C. 10, 11)

The basic provision authorizes the President, during the effective period thereof, to accept the assistance of and to employ the American National Red Cross to assist the Armed Forces. It also authorizes transportation, subsistence, and waiver of passport fees for Red Cross personnel.

An extension of the basic provision was included in the Emergency Powers Continuation Act because it was believed that the services provided by the American Red Cross would be in even greater demand thereafter than at the end of hostilities of World War II because of the expansion of the Armed Forces, which involves the recall of Reserves and National Guard to active duty, the implementation of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and the separation of an increasing number of families because of duty at overseas bases.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would provide a new and revised authority with respect to the utilization of the American National Red Cross and which would be effective at all times. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (24). PRIORITY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR TROOPS AND MATERIALS OF WAR (10 U. S. C. 1362; 49 U. S. C. 6 (8))

The basic authority provides for preference and precedence over all other traffic for the transportation of troops and materials of war during the effective period of the statutes and upon demand by the President.

The extension of the authority was considered to be important in connection with the expansion of the Armed Forces and the consequent expansion of war industries.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would extend the basic authority until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, without further limitation. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (25). AUTHORITY OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, UPON CERTIFICATION BY THE PRESIDENT, TO ESTABLISH PREFERENCES AND PRIORITIES IN TRANSPORTATION (49 U. S. C. 1 (15))

The basic authority provides that certain traffic shall have preference or priority in transportation during the effective period thereof upon the certification by the President to the Interstate Commerce Commission that the preference or priority is essential to the national defense. It further provides that the Commission shall direct that such preference or priority be afforded.

The extension of the basic authority to a period of emergency, as opposed to "war or threatened war", was considered necessary.

H. R. 2347, which is supported by the Department of Defense, would extend the basic statute until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, without other limitation. Until that bill is enacted, a temporary extension of this basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (26). APPLICATION TO FREIGHT FORWARDERS OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, UPON CERTIFICATION BY THE PRESIDENT, TO ESTABLISH PREFERENCES AND PRIORITIES (49 U. S. C. 1020)

The basic authority referred to in Section 1 (a) (25) is made applicable to freight forwarders by the authority referred to in this section.

The extension of this authority was considered desirable for reasons similar to those applicable to the provisions covered by Section 1 (a) (25), although its continuation is not of the same degree of importance as that with respect to carriers.

This provision would also be extended by H. R. 2347 referred to in connection with Section 1 (a) (25). Until that bill is enacted, a temporary extension of this basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (27). EMERGENCY ACQUISITION OF DOMESTIC OR FOREIGN MERCHANT VESSELS (50 U. S. C. APP. 1271–1275)

The basic provision grants to the President authority, during its effective period, to purchase, charter, or requisition the use of foreign merchant vessels which are lying idle in waters within the jurisdiction of the United States and which are necessary for the national defense. The basic provision also authorizes the charter by the Maritime Commission of domestic and foreign vessels essential to the national defense without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes 3709, relating to advertisement for proposals for purchases and contracts.

The continuation of the basic authority was considered necessary inasmuch as the requisitioning authority thereunder had proved most useful in the past and situations might arise thereafter in which this authority would be essential.

The Department of Commerce is sponsoring a legislative proposal which would make certain amendments to the basic authority and would continue its effectiveness until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, without other limitation. The Department of Defense supports that proposal. Until that proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authority should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (28). RIGHTS AND BENEFITS OF OFFICERS OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY WHEN ASSIGNED WITH THE ARMED FORCES ON HAZARDOUS DUTY (33 U. S. C. 855A)

The basic authority provides that commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who, during the effective period thereof, are assigned to any duty with the Armed Forces which is determined by the Department of the Army or Navy to be of immediate military hazard shall have the rights and benefits of officers actually transferred to such force.

The Bureau of the Budget states that a temporary extension of this authority should be provided pending the enactment of separate legislation dealing with this authority.

SECTION 1 (A) (29). PENALTIES FOR DISCLOSING DEFENSE INFORMATION, COMMITTING SABOTAGE, MANUFACTURING DEFECTIVE WAR MATERIALS, AND SPREADING FALSE REPORTS TO INTERFERE WITH THE ARMED FORCES (18 U. S. C. 794, 2153, 2154, AND 2388)

Eighteenth United States Code, page 794, prohibits the delivery of defense information with the intent to, or with reason to believe that it will, harm the United States or benefit a foreign nation. Certain penalties are provided for in time of war which are greater than the penalties provided for under 18 U. S. C. 791 in time of peace. Also, the activities prohibited in time of war are broader than those prohibited during other periods. Eighteenth United States Code,

pages 2153 and 2154, provide greater penalties in time of war than in time of peace for injuring or damaging war materials or for making defective war materials. Eighteenth United States Code, page 2388, prescribes penalties for the spreading, in time of war, of false reports with intent to interfere with the operations or success of the Armed Forces or to promote the success of the enemy.

The enlargement of the scope of the activities constituting a crime and the increase in the punishment for crimes was considered necessary in view of the current situation and the expansion of the Military Establishment. Such enlargement and increased punishment were also considered desirable in view of the participation of the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization defense plan. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act changed the reference to war in the basic provisions to include the period of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but no period after April 1, 1953.

H. R. 2563 and S. 1238, which constitute a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would extend the effectiveness of the basic provisions for the full duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter. It would also add the words "or defense activities" immediately after the words "carrying on the war" whenever they appear in the basic statute and also add such words to the definition of the term "war material." Until that bill is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the basic authorities should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (30). RESTRICTIONS AND PROHIBITIONS UPON THE ENTRY AND DEPARTURE FROM THE UNITED STATES OF ALIENS AND CITIZENS (22 U. S. C. 223–226B)

The basic authority (Passport Act of 1918) permitted the imposition of restrictions and prohibitions upon the entry into and departure from the United States of aliens and citizens during the effective period thereof when the President finds that the interests of the United States require such restrictions and prohibitions.

The basic provision was repealed by section 403 (15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (Public Law 414, 82d Cong.—known as the McCarran-Walter Act), and, accordingly, its further extension is no longer appropriate.

SECTION 1 (A) (31). ADJUSTMENT OF ROYALTIES FOR USE OF INVENTIONS IN AID OF THE PROSECUTION OF THE WAR (35 U. S. C. 89, 90)

The basic provision authorizes, during its effective period, the imposition of a requirement for the return to the Government of an amount representing the difference between royalty returns based upon prewar periods of normal production and those which would be appropriate to the expanded production caused by war.

The continuation of the basic provision was considered essential in view of the substantial increases in military procurement and the prospect that the national economy was facing a period of expanding production for military purposes in order to protect the Government against excessive increases in patent royalties originally based upon returns appropriate to periods of normal production.

H. R. 2560, which is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would continue the effectiveness of the basic provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, without other limitation. Until that bill is enacted, a temporary extension of the basic provision should be provided.

SECTION 1 (A) (32). CLAIMS WHICH ARISE OUT OF COMBATANT ACTIVITIES OF THE ARMED FORCES DURING TIME OF WAR ARE EXCLUDED FROM ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT UNDER THE TORT CLAIMS ACT AND FROM THE DISTRICT COURTS (28 U. S. C. 2680 (J))

The basic authority excludes from administrative adjustment under the Tort Claims Act, and from the jurisdiction of the district courts, any claim arising out of combatant activities of the military or naval forces, or the Coast Guard, during time of war. Claims arising in a foreign country are excluded at all times but there is no provision expressly excluding a claim arising from combatant activities in the United States or its possessions other than those so arising during time of war. Since combatant activities might take place in the United States or its possessions under the unsettled conditions that exist in time of emergency not involving a war, there could arise claims which should be excluded for the same reasons that have led to the exclusion of combatant claims arising in wartime.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would make the provision for the exclusion of claims applicable at all times. Until this proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the exclusion provision should be provided.

SECTION 1 (B) (1). RESTRICTIONS ON APPOINTMENTS OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE RESERVE OFFICERS (10 U. S. C. 353)

The basic provision formerly limited appointments as reserve officers in the combat arms, including the Air Force, in time of peace to appointments as second lieutenants, except in the case of former regular officers and officers serving during World War I. It limited all appointments thereunder in time of peace to former members of the Regular services, National Guard, ROTC graduates, and enlisted persons who served during World War I.

This provision was repealed by section 803 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.). Accordingly, its further extension would be inappropriate.

SECTION 1 (B) (2). USE OF RETIRED PERSONNEL AS ROTC INSTRUCTORS (10 U. S. C. 386)

The basic authority provides that no officer on the active list shall be detailed in time of peace as ROTC instructors when officers on the retired list who are competent for such duty can be secured.

The authority to detail officers on the active list was extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act so as to obviate the need for a prior search of the retired list for competent officers which would prevent the full utilization of officers on the active list in positions for which they might best be qualified. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act deferred that peacetime limitation on authority.

H. R. 2271, which is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would repeal the limitation upon the use of officers on the active list. Until that bill is enacted into law, a temporary deferment of that limitation should be provided.

SECTION 1 (B) (3). NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT; EMPLOYMENT OF NAVY AND MARINE CORPS AVIATION RESERVE OFFICERS IN TIME OF PEACE (34 U. S. C. 850I)

The basic authority provides that, during its effective period, officers of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve commissioned pursuant to the basic authority or to the Naval Aviation Reserve Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 819) may be employed on active duty only during the 7-year period next following the date of their commissioning except for employment on active duty in connection with the training of members of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve.

The basic provision was repealed by section 803 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.). Accordingly, its further extension would be inappropriate.

SECTION 1 (B) (4). AUTHORITY TO OPERATE FARMS AND PLANTATIONS OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR THE PROVISIONING OF TROOPS (10 U. S. C. 1214; 34 U. S. C. 555B)

The basic authority provides that plantations and farms for furnishing fresh fruits and vegetables to the Armed Forces which are under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces and outside the continental United States shall be operated and managed as far as practicable through private contractors, except during the effective period of the authority to avoid such limitation.

The extension of the authority to avoid such limitation was considered desirable for security reasons and to permit the operation of the plantations and farms without restrictions during the buildup of the Armed Forces.

It is not the intention of the Department of Defense to request an extention by separate legislation. However, it would be desirable to continue the extension of the removal of such limitation on a temporary basis. Accordingly, the basic provision should be included in any general temporary extension of the statutes covered by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act.

SECTION 1 (B) (5) AND 1 (B) (6). PURCHASE OF DISCHARGE BY ENLISTED PERSONNEL (34 U. S. C. 196; 10 U. S. C. 651)

The basic provisions enable Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps enlisted personnel to purchase their discharge in time of peace.

The continuation of the suspension of that authority was requested for the reason that it has not been used for many years and is inconsistent with present and proposed legislation designed to provide relief for manpower shortages.

H. R. 2334, which is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would repeal the basic authorities for the purchase of discharges. Until that bill is enacted, the suspension of those authorities should be temporarily continued.

SECTION 1 (B) (7). SUSPENSION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEUTRALITY ACT WHICH PROHIBIT FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH GOVERNMENTS AT WAR WITH EACH OTHER (22 U. S. C. 447)

Subsection (e) of the basic authority provides for a suspension, when the United States is at war, of the prohibition against financial transactions between persons in the United States and Governments proclaimed by the President to be at war with each other. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act extended subsection (e) for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not later than April 1, 1953.

The Bureau of the Budget states that a temporary continuation of the suspension of the prohibition in subsection (e) of the basic authority should be provided pending the enactment of separate legislation dealing with this authority.

SECTION 1 (C). CONTINUATION OF APPOINTMENTS OF WARRANT OFFICERS AND OF RESERVE COMPONENT OFFICERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE (10 U. S. C. 358, 506D (E), 513, 591A, AND 32 U. S. C. 19)

Appointments made under the authority of the basic provisions as officers and warrant officers of the Army of the United States or of the United States Air Force, including appointments as officers and warrant officers in the Organized Reserve Corps, the Air Force Reserve, the National Guard of the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States during a war or emergency were limited to 6 months following the war or emergency. The Emergency Powers Continuation Act extended the authority

to continue such appointments for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not later than April 1, 1953.

The authority to make new appointments under the basic provisions was repealed by section 803 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.). It is not the intention of the Department of Defense to request a general extension of appointments theretofore made under the authority of those provisions. The Department of Defense, however, intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would authorize a limited extension of the appointments of officers and warrant officers who are missing in action, captured, interned, or in a similar status. Until such a proposal is enacted into law, authority for a temporary extension of existing appointments, which would be put into effect only in those cases, should be provided. The limited exercise of that authority will be accomplished through an Executive order.

SECTION 2 (A). PROHIBITIONS AGAINST SALE OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY PRODUCTS FOR USE OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, EXCEPT TO ITS ALLIES IN CASE OF WAR (16 U. S. C. 831D (M))

The basic authority prohibits the sale of products of the Tennessee Valley Authority for use outside the United States, except to the United States Government for the use of the Army and Navy, or "to its allies in case of war," or as extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act.

The Bureau of the Budget states that a further extension of this basic authority is not needed. Accordingly, no further extension of this authority should be provided.

SECTION 2 (B). EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR FILING OF CLAIMS BY ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL WHEN THE LOSS OCCURS IN TIME OF WAR (31 U. S. C. 223C, 223E)

The basic provision authorized the settlement of claims against the United States, arising after December 7, 1939, by military personnel and civilian employees of the Army, Navy, and Air Force for loss of or damage to personal property incident to their service. Such claims must be presented within 1 year after they arise. However, if the incident giving rise to the claim occurs "in time of war, or if war intervenes within 2 years after its occurrence, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after peace is established." The 1-year provision was made a 2-year provision by Public Law 439, 82d Congress.

It was believed that the time for filing claims should be extended for those who serve in the Armed Forces under the present emergency conditions after the end of World War II. Furthermore, it was believed that it should be extended not only with respect to claims arising since the beginning of the 1950 emergency and Korean hostilities but also with respect to those claims which may have arisen prior thereto during World War II inasmuch as there may exist some claims arising prior to the present emergency and Korean hostilities which had not been filed because the claimants were prisoners of war or incapacitated by illness or because of the continuing exigencies of their service.

H. R. 2561, which is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, would provide for an extension of the time for filing claims in the event of an armed conflict, as well as a war, and authorizes in such cases the filing of claims within 2 years after the termination of such armed conflict, which would include the Korean conflict. It would also repeal section 2 (b) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act which purported to extend the basic authority but which did not take into account the amendment of the basic authority by Public Law 439, 82d Congress, approved on the same day.

In view of the failure of section 2 (b) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act to take into account the amendment to the basic authority by Public Law 439, 82d Congress, it would be inappropriate to make an extension of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act applicable to section 2 (b) thereof.

SECTION 2 (C). EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR FILING OF CLAIMS ARISING INCIDENT TO THE NONCOMBATANT ACTIVITIES OF THE ARMED FORCES IN TIME OF WAR (31 U. S. C. 223B, 223D)

The basic provision authorizes the settlement of claims, not in excess of $1,000, for damage to or loss or destruction of property, or for personal injury or death, caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army and Air Force while acting within the scope of their employment, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities. Such claims must be presented within 1 year after they arise. That authority formerly provided, however, that if the incident giving rise to the claim occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within 1 year after its occurrence, such claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after peace is established. Such provision was amended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act to provide that claims arising after the beginning of the Korean conflict and before the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 may be presented within 1 year after the termination of that national emergency or April 1, 1953, whichever is earlier. It was also made applicable to the Navy.

The extension with respect to claims arising during the present emergency was considered necessary to cover claims arising subsequent to June 23, 1950. Such claims arise chiefly as a result of maneuvers and training exercises and as a result of loss of or damage to registered or insured mail while in the possession of military authorities. It was believed that with respect to such claims arising out of World War II a period of 1 year after peace was established constituted ample time. However, an extension was needed with respect to claims which had arisen or would arise after Korean hostilities began for the same reason an extended period was provided for the filing of claims arising during World War II. The public would be denied access to maneuver and training areas and owners of property located therein might not become aware of their loss or damage until after the statutory 1-year period had passed. With respect to mail claims, neither the sender nor the addressee might be aware of the loss within the normal 1-year period. However, those reasons no longer apply with respect to claims arising during World War II and before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea.

The Department of Defense intends to submit to the Congress a legislative proposal which would amend the basic authority so as to provide a time limitation with respect to the filing of claims arising during any war or armed conflict, or within 1 year prior thereto. Until such proposal is enacted into law, a temporary extension of the time limitation on claims arising during the present national emergency should be provided.

ABOLITION OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RECONSTRUCTION OF SENATE ROOF AND SKYLIGHTS AND REMODELING OF SENATE CHAMBER, AND TRANSFER OF RECORDS

Mr. TAFT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92), which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved, That, on or before the 30th day after the date on which this resolution is agreed to, the Special Committee on the Reconstruction of the Senate Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of the Senate Chamber, established pursuant to the authority of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to the appropriation for the roofs and skylights over the Senate and House wings of the Capitol, and for other purposes," approved July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 472; Public Law 155, 79th Cong.) shall transfer all of its records and files to the Committee on Rules and Administration. Effective upon the completion of such transfer, all of the duties, functions, and powers of such special committee are hereby transferred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and such special committee is hereby abolished.

AMENDMENT OF LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES RESULTING IN NATIONAL EMERGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1075) to amend title II of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, with respect to the settlement of labor disputes resulting in national emergencies, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3658. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; and

H. R. 3659. An act to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY FOR PEOPLE OF THE NETHERLANDS IN THEIR RECENT FLOOD AND STORM DISASTER — INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), submitted by me on February 10, 1953, expressing sympathy for the people of the Netherlands in their recent flood and storm disaster, be indefinitely postponed, because Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 has now been adopted by the Senate and the House and has taken care of the problem. I believe this request will help to clear the Senate Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address on home rule for the District of Columbia, delivered by Senator NEELY on March 3, 1953.

Letter advocating a change in Senate rule XIX, written by Howard N. Mantel to the New York Herald Tribune.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Article entitled "Gestapo Methods," relating to certain activities of the Bureau of the Budget, written by Senator SMITH of Maine, and published in the Boston Daily Globe of March 9, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address entitled "Texas Meets Her Responsibilities," delivered by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, before the Texas State Society, at Washington, D. C., on February 27, 1953.

Article relating to conditions in South America, written by J. S. Bridwell, published in the Wichita Daily Times, of Wichita Falls, Tex., on March 5, 1953.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Address delivered by Hon. John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston, Mass., at the graduation exercises of 17th Special Basic Course, United States Marine Corps, at Quantico, Va., on February 21, 1953.

By Mr. TAFT:

Editorial entitled "Taft-Hartley Needs To Be Applied, Not Altered," published in Barron's National Business and Financial Weekly of March 9, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Articles relating to decline in zinc and lead prices, and to opening of a new copper mine in Peru, published in the Denver Post.

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "The Right to Work Is Fundamental Democracy," published in the Burlington (N. C.) Daily Times-News.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Editorial relative to investigation of treatment of American prisoners of war in Korea, published in the Boston Post of March 11, 1953.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

Release by United States Department of Agriculture, dated March 12, 1953, relative to recommendations by a livestock advisory group with respect to the end of control legislation.

MRS. ANNA M. ROSENBERG

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, over the years much has been spoken and written in deserved praise of Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel. Her rare courage, her tremendous ability, her unusual understanding of human problems, and—withal—her great compassion for her fellow men, have made Anna Rosenberg not only respected and admired by all acquainted with her magnificent record, but beloved by all who know her.

In this connection, on January 22, 1953, in Washington, D. C., a most significant resolution was adopted at a plenary session of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, the text of which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our Nation was founded on the principle that man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights among which is the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of individual conscience; and

Whereas our Nation has prospered under God because observance of that principle has undergirded the structure of our national life; and

Whereas under the guise of military exigencies the observance of that great principle of democracy through shortsightedness could be disregarded either partially or completely; and

Whereas farsighted statesmanship and full comprehension of the genuine nature of our democratic way of life, coupled with moral stature and personal integrity of the highest order, are necessary for the perpetuation of that principle in the Military Establishment as a fundamental tenet of our way of life; and

Whereas the Honorable Anna M. Rosenberg, as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel, at all times did demonstrate such farsighted statesmanship and such comprehension of the nature of our democratic way of life, together with such moral stature and personal integrity of the highest order, as proven by her untiring efforts to further the work of the military chaplaincies through the medium of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, Department of Defense: Be it now therefore

Resolved, That the Honorable Anna M. Rosenberg by these presents be commended for her outstanding contribution to the cause of spiritual life in the Armed Forces; and be it now further

Resolved, That the Honorable Anna M. Rosenberg be assured of the abiding gratitude of the members of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board and the three military chaplaincies for her steadfast devotion to the truth that the highest aspirations of military personnel, as of all citizens of our Nation, can be attained only through pursuance of the cherished principles on which our Nation was founded, preeminent among which is the concept of the individual dignity of man as the handiwork of his omnipotent Creator.

Chaplain (Maj. Gen.) Charles I. Carpenter, Chief of Chaplains, United States Air Force, chairman, Armed Forces Chaplains Board; Rear Adm. Stanton W. Salisburg, Chief of Chaplains, United States Navy; Chaplain (Maj. Gen.) Ivan L. Bennett, Chief of Chaplains, United States Army; Chaplain (Col.) P. J. Ryan, Deputy Chief of Chaplains, United States Army; Chaplain (Col.) Constantine E. Zielinski, office, Chief of Air Force Chaplains; Capt. Joshua L. Goldberg, consultant, Armed Forces Chaplains Board; Comdr. Joseph P. Mannion, Office, Chief of Chaplains, United States Navy; Comdr. Francis L. McGann, Executive Director, Armed Forces Chaplains Board.

EIGHTEENTH NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE CONFERENCE

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Nebraska may proceed.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, the city of Washington has been host this week to wildlife technicians, State game and fish administrators, sportsmen, and leaders of conservation organizations. The 18th North American Wildlife Conference, largest annual gathering in the Nation devoted to the problems of resource conservation, was held the first 3 days of the week. Now in progress is the 17th Annual Convention of the National Wildlife Federation, and the Senate is honored today by the presence in the gallery of the delegates to this convention, representing the State Wildlife Federations and Sportsmen's Leagues which belong to the national organization.

I believe I express the sentiment of the Senate when I say we hope these distinguished visitors found the hunting and fishing good along the Potomac. I know we have enjoyed visiting with them, and many of us have been privileged to attend some of their meetings.

This wildlife migration into Washington is timely because next week is National Wildlife Week. This annual observance was started in 1938 by proclamation of the President of the United States, and has been sponsored annually by the Federation and its State affiliates. National Wildlife Week is being devoted this year to finding ways and means of checking the decline of a valuable native grouse, the prairie chicken. The new national committee on the prairie chicken has completed its preliminary survey and issued its first report. With the permission of the Senate, Mr. President, I ask the privilege of inserting in the RECORD this authoritative and enlightening report.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE PRAIRIE CHICKEN

(For purposes of this report, all three living species and subspecies of Tympanuchus are considered: Tympanuchus cupido americanus [greater prairie chicken]; Tympanuchus cupido attwatteri [Attwater's prairie chicken]; and Tympanuchus pallidicinctus [lesser prairie chicken]. Lessons are drawn from the Eastern Seaboard race or subspecies, Tympanuchus cupido cupido [the heath hen, now extinct].)

The bird known as the prairie chicken or pinnated grouse once inhabited grassland areas throughout the eastern part of the United States and extended its range into the Great Plains as far west as New Mexico, eastern Colorado and eastern Wyoming. No accurate estimate of its peak population, which occurred perhaps 75 to 100 years ago, is possible. No doubt its numbers reached into the tens of millions. Today, according to State-by-State surveys and estimates, it is apparent no more than 400,000 of the birds remain alive. An estimate of 350,000 probably would be more accurate.

The decline of the prairie chicken has been especially marked and alarming during the past 3 decades. It is now feared with reason that the entire genus may follow the heath hen into the limbo of extinct American wildlife. In only five States—Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Michigan—were there sufficient birds, in the considered judgment of State game officials, to permit hunting in 1952. And in each of those States the shooting was strictly hedged by brief seasons, zoning, and special protective regulations.

The eastern race of prairie chickens, known as the heath hen, became extinct in 1931, when the death of the last individual was recorded on Martha's Vineyard, an island off the coast of Massachusetts. Civilization had destroyed the habitat of the heath hen.

The general causes of the decline are known. No living species can survive in an unfavorable environment. The prairie chicken is a specialized creature requiring areas of perennial grassland or sod for nesting and for rearing its young. It needs relatively undisturbed, tall grass for winter protection. This is relatively as true of the lesser chicken as of the greater, although pallidicinctus is a creature of the so-called short-grass prairies of the southwest. During the warm seasons the prairie chicken feeds to a large extent upon insects which abound in grass; in winter it likes the green shoots and seeds of the prairie plants or related farm crops.

Except for relatively tiny tracts where the soil or terrain is such as to discourage plow-

ing and cultivation, the unbroken grasslands have disappeared east of a line following generally the western borders of Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa and Minnesota. As a result, what may be described as "remnant flocks" only may be found east of this line, in an area where once the greatest populations and greatest concentrations occurred. These remnants vary in totals from a few hundred birds in Indiana and Iowa to a few thousand each in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois and Missouri. Not one of these States is willing to estimate its prairie chicken population in excess of 10,000.

The prairie chicken became extinct in Ohio about 1903. It probably disappeared earlier from Kentucky, where Audubon wrote of its abundance, and from Arkansas about 40 years ago.

The decline is illustrated by the experience of Minnesota, where as late as 1925 the State conservation department estimated a total hunter harvest of 416,971 pinnated grouse. This was more than the estimated population of the entire Nation today. Minnesota hunters took approximately 58,000 of the birds in 1942. Since then there has been no open season on prairie chickens in Minnesota, yet the decline has continued.

Present inhabited areas of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, and some of the inhabited range of the Dakotas, it should be pointed out, probably were not within the original range of the pinnated grouse. The birds moved in when farming by early settlers helped create grassland-cropland combinations favorable to the species. Since then continued agricultural development, plus reforestation of cleared areas in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, has proved detrimental to the birds.

Largest occupied areas, and the best populations, exist today in Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and the Dakotas. The birds are here because in certain regions a grassland agronomy with livestock ranching and haycropping has been maintained as the most profitable form of land use, as in the notable case of the Nebraska sand hills, or has been restored, as in western Kansas and Oklahoma since the Dust Bowl years.

In these States there exists an apparent opportunity to manage the prairie chicken as a game bird, and thereby to maintain for present and future generations a type of upland gunning sport unique in all the world. The committee stresses this opportunity, and recommends it to the game departments, the sportsmen, and the general public of those States.

There remains a possibility, worthy of cautious optimism, that a limited amount of prairie chicken hunting may be maintained or restored in Wisconsin and a few other States, depending upon future land-use trends and development of new management techniques.

An opportunity to preserve and manage the lesser prairie chicken as a game species lies in the short-grass country of western Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico. The current dry cycle in the Southwest has been injurious to the species and caused the New Mexico Game and Fish Department to cancel open seasons since 1949.

The fate of the Attwater's chicken, native to the lowland prairies of Louisiana and eastern Texas, is most precarious of all. Extirpated from Louisiana since about 1920, it clings to existence in small tracts of coastal Texas, constantly threatened by intensified agriculture. Establishment of permanent refuge areas to preserve occupied range seems essential if this subspecies is not to go the way of the heath hen.

Investigative work on the prairie chicken has been carried on to a greater or lesser degree in all the States having resident populations. In most instances, however, the research had not advanced beyond natural-history studies, population surveys, and perfection of census techniques. Actual experiments with habitat manipulation, and search for land-use combinations favorable both to local agriculture and to the prairie chicken, have been generally lacking.

Certain facts already established form the basis for considerable optimism. A survey in one of the better prairie-chicken counties of South Dakota, for example, disclosed a land-use pattern consisting of 60-percent cultivated acreage, 40-percent grassland. Of the latter, less than one-half was good enough to furnish cover for the birds. This suggests that with proper disperaion and management of a limited amount of grassland, prairie chickens can be maintained in many regions devoted to general farming. Occupied prairie-chicken range in Illinois and certain other States, it has been noted, is not necessarily "native" or "wild" prairie, but is devoted largely to commercial cropping of introduced grasses such as redtop. This indicates an adaptability not always credited to the prairie chicken.

The prairie chicken not only is a magnificent bird, a prime example of native wildlife, it is an inseparable part of American tradition. Its colorful courtship antics on the booming grounds were adapted in the dances and pageantry of the American Indian. It flushed in whirring flocks ahead of the covered wagons as the pioneers pushed from Ohio toward the Rockies. It provided food for the pioneers, and its friendly "booming" dispelled the solitude on the lonely prairies. It must not be permitted to pass from the American scene.

The creation of this national committee on the prairie chicken was timely. The committee sees its function as twofold: (1) To call to the attention of the public and of responsible officials of State and Federal Government, the plight of the species; and (2) by general and specific recommendations, to point a course or program for conserving and managing this valuable wildlife resource. Accordingly we recommend and urge the following:

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Preservation of the bird as a living museum species in those States where remnant flocks and foreseeable land-use patterns offer no hope for hunting. The prairie chicken is a species of native wildlife to be treasured in any State for scientific, educational, and esthetic purposes. To this end, acquisition of suitable refuge areas is desirable. Such areas would serve also to preserve other wild forms, both plants and animals, native to the original American grasslands. Prairie-chicken flocks so maintained would provide adapted birds in every State in case future land-use trends should permit restocking of wider areas.

2. Restoration and management as a game bird in States having a greater potential. The committee believes that in from 5 to 8 States the birds can be maintained in sufficient numbers to provide continuous social and economic benefits as an unusual recreational attraction. Careful and conservative management is, of course, essential.

3. More funds to be devoted by State game departments to prairie-chicken research, and to acquisition of lands needed for adequate investigation and management of the species.

4. Legislation to make available to the States for wildlife purposes an unappropriated balance in the Federal Treasury of approximately $13½ million which accrued in past years under the Pittman-Robertson (Federal Aid to Wildlife) Act. The States are urged to use some of this money, when available, for prairie chicken purposes.

5. Better coordination of research activities undertaken by the various States. A methodical exchange of ideas, techniques, and findings among the research biologists engaged in prairie-grouse studies, including periodic meetings and field visits to projects in other States, is highly desirable. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service is requested to explore methods of facilitating such coordination, and the National Wildlife Federation is urged to use its own resources and organization in furtherance of this end.

6. Coordination of pinnated grouse and sharptail grouse research and management in those Northern and Northwestern States where the two species overlap in range. This is recommended for biological and practical reasons.

7. Establishment of a grasslands national monument for the purpose of restoring and preserving for scientific study and public education an example of the rich and magnificent grassland ecology which produced America's most fertile soils, and ultimately our most productive agriculture. This is not an original proposal, but the committee endorses it and recommends that prairie-chicken habitat be considered in selecting the area or areas. To this end the committee urges favorable consideration of H. R. 214 in the present Congress. This bill would authorize a survey of natural-grassland areas in the United States with a view toward preservation of appropriate samples.

8. Greater recognition of and attention to wildlife values by land-use agencies of Federal and State governments. Specifically, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is requested to bring to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and to other Interior agencies the problem of perpetuating this vanishing species, the prairie chicken. Further, United States Department of Agriculture agencies, including the Soil Conservation Service and Forest Service, are requested to include in their programs and recommendations such practices of land management as will help to insure the preservation of the prairie chicken. State conservation departments similarly should seek the cooperation of State departments of agriculture and forestry in perpetuating the prairie chicken.

9. Educational and publicity campaigns stressing the rarity and value of the prairie chicken and its habitat requirements. Such educational efforts should be directed toward the farmers, sportsmen, and other people of the prairie-chicken range. Even in areas of considerable grasslands, overgrazing of pastures and close cropping of hay lands have depleted the birds—in some instances wiped them out. Such practices usually are bad land use, conducive of erosion. If prevented, an increase in prairie chickens might occur. Poaching—still a factor of depletion in some areas—may be lessened by local public sentiment favoring protection of remnant flocks.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE PRAIRIE CHICKEN

R. A. Brown, Jr., Tootle-Lacy Bank Building, St. Joseph, Mo., chairman.

William B. Barnes, Federal-aid coordinator, Indiana Conservation Department, Indianapolis.

Frank D. Blair, director, fish and game division, Minnesota Conservation Department, St. Paul.

I. T. Bode, director, Missouri Conservation Commission, Jefferson City.

H. R. Dodgen, executive secretary, Texas Game and Fish Commission, Austin.

Paul T. Gilbert, executive secretary, Nebraska Game, Forestation, and Parks Commission, Lincoln.

Dave Leahy, director, Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission, Pratt.

Levon Lee, director of game-bird management, New Mexico Game and Fish Department, Santa Fe.

H. R. Morgan, commissioner, North Dakota Game and Fish Department, Bismarck.

B. A. Nelson, wildlife research coordinator, South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks, Pierre.

H. D. Ruhl, game division chief, Michigan Conservation Department, Lansing.

O'Reilly Sandoz, game division chief, Oklahoma Game and Fish Department, Oklahoma City.

Bruce F. Stiles, director, Iowa Conservation Commission, Des Moines.

Ernest Swift, director, Wisconsin Conservation Department, Madison.

Ralph E. Yeatter, game specialist, Illinois Natural History Survey, Urbana.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor and proceeded to discuss the recent order promulgated by the Director of the Budget to the personnel of the Bureau of the Budget, when he was interrupted by—)

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the morning hour been completed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the morning hour has not been completed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from New York is out of order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on three occasions I inquired whether the morning hour had been completed. I finally saw no Senator seeking the floor, and I again asked for recognition, which was accorded me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York was recognized in the course of the morning-hour business, the order then before the Senate being the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I certainly do not question the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall be very glad if the Senator from New York will yield to me for a moment that I may make an insertion in the RECORD. I am called away from the Senate floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Florida, I think that in the years we have served together in the Senate, the Senator from New York has never refused to yield to the Senator from Florida for the insertion of any matter that he wished to place in the RECORD. I certainly do not think a point of order was necessary under the circumstances.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New York.

(Mr. HOLLAND thereupon requested and received unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a certified copy of Senate Resolution 12, acts of 1953, of the State of Tennessee, which appears elsewhere in today's RECORD, under the appropriate heading.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further morning business, the morning hour is closed, and the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Chair.

ORDER ISSUED BY JOSEPH M. DODGE, DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

(Mr. LEHMAN resumed and concluded his speech, which in its entirety is as follows:)

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to call attention again to the order issued last week to all the personnel of the Bureau of the Budget by Budget Director Joseph M. Dodge. Last week I discussed this subject briefly and inserted into the RECORD a fine editorial on this matter from the Washington Post. Today I wish to explore the problem at somewhat greater length.

The order directs each employee of the Bureau to report to the personnel officer any conduct on the part of his fellow employees which he feels is "inimical to the effective operation, security, and standing of the whole group." It goes even further: it implies punishment to those who fail to do so.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the full text of that order as it appeared in the New York Times of March 2, 1953.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the order was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Office Memorandum No. 380, Bureau of the Budget]

STAFF RESPONSIBILITY FOR PROPRIETY IN OFFICIAL CONDUCT

It is the stated policy of the President that the executive branch of the Government as a whole and the departments and agencies thereof so conduct their business that they be above reproach in every respect, and that any deviations from such course be corrected by prompt and effective Executive action.

The successful application of this policy requires attention not only by agency heads and their principal assistants but also by every person concerned in the conduct of the Government's business.

One of the fundamental obligations of each member of the Bureau staff is to protect himself and the rest of the organization against the development and existence of any situation within the Bureau which is in conflict with law or regulation or which is inimical to the effective operation, security, and standing of the whole group.

Knowledge of anything of this kind should come from within the group and not from without. Any investigation of such a situation should originate with the organization and should not be brought on it from outside sources.

Any member of the staff who has well-founded information indicating that a continuation of an existing course of action is illegal, improper, or detrimental to the interests of the organization is expected and instructed to report this to Mr. Sam Adams, who in turn will be expected and is instructed to report the situation to the Director.

Any individual may request and will be granted a confidential interview for this purpose, either with Mr. Adams or the Director. Any information given in such an interview will be held in confidence and will not be used unless and until it can be verified from other sources. In no case will the individual giving the information be embarrassed by disclosure of the source. Whatever is reported will be used as a basis for an independent check on the facts.

This is not an invitation for snooping or gossiping. It is a reminder that an important responsibility of each member of the organization is to protect and further the constructive interests of the whole group.

It is not assumed that any such situations exist; but if any should exist which come to light later on and it is evident that individuals with knowledge of it failed to report it, in view of these instructions, they will not be easily excused.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that this order was intended to improve the caliber of service within the Bureau of the Budget. This is a laudable objective, for all of us share an intense interest in good government. But I deeply believe that this order will have the opposite effect; rather than improving morale and service, it will create in the Bureau of the Budget an atmosphere of mutual suspicion and distrust, which I am sure every one of us in the Senate would find intolerable for creative and devoted service.

I believe that the effect of this directive will be exactly contrary to the intent which General Eisenhower expressed, just prior to the election, to Mr. Jerry Kluttz, the writer of a local newspaper column, about his intentions to improve public administration.

As President—

Mr. Eisenhower said—

it would be one of the first aims of my administration to bring into Government executives, and to initiate policies, and to create an atmosphere which would make the Government service something to be envied.

That is a laudable objective, and I was pleased to see it so defined. In view of the outcome of the election I am sure that all Federal employees are pleased that President Eisenhower made that statement and welcome it today, as a wholesome sentiment to be reiterated in the midst of all the current harassment of public employees by political sharpshooters. This sentiment should have signaled the end of the national parlor game of picking on bureaucrats and the beginning of a climate which would allow career public servants to concentrate on their work instead of watching the daily headlines to see what fellow worker had been the victim of the latest hit-and-run attack on bureaucracy.

The new administration has brought leaders of business and industry into the Government. Whatever objection we might have on other grounds to a big business administration, many of us have felt that there might be benefits in the promise that business and industrial experts would recognize the necessity of inspiring effective and loyal work from their employees by leadership rather than by intimidation.

This hope was strengthened by one of General Eisenhower's first appointments, that of Joseph M. Dodge to be Director of the Budget. As most of us here in Washington know, the Budget Bureau does far more than add and subtract figures. It is a focal point for administrative standards throughout our entire Federal Government. And Mr. Dodge came to the job from an eminent career in the industrial organizations of Detroit, as well as with a considerable

background of Government experience. He had been president and director of the Detroit bank since 1933, and was a director of the Standard Accident Insurance Co., of Chrysler Corp., and of the Planet Insurance Co.

It was, therefore, with dismay, Mr. President, that I read in last week's newspapers of Mr. Dodge's order. If allowed to stand, it means a medieval practice of requiring employees to inform on other employees as a part of their daily performance, under penalty of disciplinary action.

I am grateful that at least one newspaper put it on the front page. That is exactly where it belongs, Mr. President, and I commend the newspapers which realized its significance. It is far more than just another staff memorandum. I want to read several paragraphs from it. Here are the key parts of office memorandum No. 380, entitled "Staff responsibility for propriety in official conduct, issued to all members of the Budget Bureau staff:"

> One of the fundamental obligations of each member of the bureau staff is to protect himself and the rest of the organization against the development and existence of any situation within the Bureau which is in conflict with law or regulation or which is inimical to the effective operation, security, and standing of the whole group. * * *
>
> Any member of the staff who has well-founded information indicating that a continuation of an existing course of action is illegal, improper, or detrimental to the interests of the organization is expected and instructed to report this to Mr. Sam Adams—the personnel officer—who, in turn, will be expected and is instructed to report the situation to the director. * * *
>
> It is not assumed that any such situations exist, but if any should exist which come to light later on and it is evident that individuals with knowledge of it failed to report it, in view of these instructions they will not be easily excused.

I should like to believe, Mr. President, that the Dodge order was a hasty, ill-thought document that had not received careful study. I am the more dismayed to learn, from the New York Times report, that it was issued only after it had been discussed at a Cabinet meeting, and that, therefore, it has the stamp of approval of the President himself.

I am alarmed that the Dodge order may become the rule throughout the Government. If that happens, we shall have a government by fear, instead of a government by cooperation and willing loyalty.

I have three major fears about the effects of this order.

The first has to do with the effect of the order on the employees themselves. I wonder if any one of us here in the Senate can envision himself issuing an order of this kind to his own office personnel. I am sure that none of us would ever do so, because we can all picture the suspicion and distrust with which each of our employees would begin to look at all the others, wondering who is or might become the informer in the group.

Many of the Members of the Senate have been businessmen. I wonder if any of them has ever instituted such a personnel policy in his business. I strongly doubt it.

Naturally, everyone wants to elicit the best possible service from our Government workers, and to avoid mistakes as well as waste. But this is the responsibility of leadership, by example and by inspiring cooperative effort. In any system of responsible organization, the leadership of that organization sets the tone and should accept full responsibility.

Under the Dodge order, however, it is not the standards of the Director, but the whims and fancies of each individual employee that become the guides by which performance is measured. For who is to determine what is inimical to the effective operation of an organization? The order is based on the assumption that devoted service cannot be elicited or inspired: it must be bludgeoned through the weapon of fear.

Furthermore, the order invites a system of stool pigeons. It says in so many words that what is wanted is more information about fellow employees; that it is wanted so badly that any member of the organization may bring it straight to the director's office, where the door will swing open.

True, the memorandum says that information so gained will be verified and checked with independent sources, but this only aggravates the danger by inviting the loosest kind of gossip and scandal-mongering. It would fill the personnel folders of employees with the most reckless, even malicious, chitchat, and it would stay in those folders until verified, if ever.

The entire spirit of this order is reflected in the declaration that if a situation should come to light later on and it is evident that individuals with knowledge of it failed to report it, they will be disciplined for that failure. The memorandum does not suggest a standard for determining what constitutes knowledge of the situation, nor does it spell out the punishment; but it does say that the employer who does not tell will not be easily excused. I leave it to each Member of this body to interpret that phrase.

The editors of the Washington Post, in an editorial I placed in the RECORD last week, stated that this order was little more than the loathsome Nazi and Communist block reporting system in an agency of the United States Government. The editorial concluded with an excerpt from Judge Hand's great decision on this subject.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield at that point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to associate myself with the comments of the Senator from New York on the editorial in the Washington Post to which he has just referred in his remarks. I think it is well that the attention of the American people be directed to the fact that with increasing rapidity there is sweeping over America a psychology of fear not only on the part of Government servants but on the part of millions of our people, because, as Justice Hand pointed out on October 24, of this year—and I paraphrase his statement—when neighbors begin to fear neighbors and suspicion takes root, we are in danger of losing our system of self-government and entering the portals of a police state.

I may say to the Senator from New York it is my judgment that if we do not quickly bring to an end the psychology of fear that is sweeping America today, we are going to see the techniques of police state methods galloping across America.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon, and I am very glad indeed that he has listened to my speech in order to associate himself with my comments and to express his abhorrence of the situation which I have just described.

I desire to say, further, Mr. President, that I fully share his fears of what is happening, which have been so well expressed by Judge Learned Hand. I am going to read a part of his statement so that it may be included in the RECORD.

We are getting into a situation where men are distrusting their neighbors, friends, and even members of their families. Certainly, Mr. President, when we reach a point where men and women, Government employees, in a great organization employing thousands of persons, are not only permitted but encouraged and ordered to spy on their fellows, the situation is extremely dangerous and critical in our democracy.

I wish to read now an excerpt from remarks by Judge Hand, as follows:

> I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy. * * * Such fears as these are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together; they may in the end subject us to a despotism as evil as any that we dread; and they can be allayed only insofar as we refuse to proceed on suspicion, and trust one another until we have tangible ground for misgiving.

Mr. President, our public servants are adults. True, they sometimes show weaknesses, but they are the weaknesses of adults. Our Government workers must be treated as adults, if they are to serve the public with any sense of dedication.

Our Nation was founded on the fundamental precept of the dignity of the individual. I believe this order is a direct affront to the dignity of every employee of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that Mr. Dodge will withdraw his ill-advised order. I hope it will be made plain to all of us by President Eisenhower that this order is not a pattern for the entire Government. It would be a constructive gesture toward restoring to Federal employees their confidence that the new administration wants to treat them with dignity. It would convince them that their fellow employees are not under orders to be rumor mongers.

The administration can, by withdrawing this order, show its faith in the American way of government, in the responsible way of government. I urge them to do so.

Mr. Dodge and President Eisenhower have the opportunity to advance the art of public administration by resolving this doubt by positive action. It is time to restore a confident belief in the minds

of all people that our country is composed of men and women who want to do justice, who want to be fair, and who do not want to crucify anyone.

COMMITTEE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this being Friday afternoon, I rise to do the committee work of the Independent Party. I have a number of items to take up this afternoon, although before I make my major remarks, which will be on the subject of taxation, I desire to speak about the committee situation in which I find myself, also I wish to talk about the rules of the Senate in relation to recognition of the rights of a great sovereign State in the Senate of the United States, through its representative.

I have not occupied a pleasant role as a Senator during the past week. Others might not follow my course of action. Of course, it is a matter of judgment as to how best to protect the rights of a sovereign State. But I wish to review, very briefly, some incidents of the past week, because I propose to keep the record straight.

I shall go back to the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I will let the record speak for itself as to whether during the 8 years of my service here, I have taken a conscientious attitude in regard to the Unanimous Consent Calendar. On more than one occasion on the floor I have expressed my appreciation for the studious work which the calendar committee on this side of the aisle has performed for the past several years in keeping Members of the Senate apprised as to various problems connected with measures on the calendar, and for the exceedingly courteous treatment all Members of the Senate have received at the hands of the calendar committee.

The Unanimous Consent Calendar is of vital importance to the transaction of business in the Senate, and each Senator has a very definite responsibility and duty to perform in connection with the consideration of measures on the calendar, but we all know that, because of the great burden of work with which each Senator is confronted, we cannot begin to be fully familiar at all times with the details of various bills which come before the Senate. Senators who preceded us were likewise aware of this problem. So there has been developed a set of rules and practices in respect to the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Some of them are aimed at shortcutting the work of Senators in relation to the calendar, and I think they are very wise rules.

In accordance with a long-established practice, in the absence of a real emergency requiring immediate passage of a bill, Members of the Senate are given time for study if they are in doubt about a particular bill. Sometimes that is accomplished by getting consent to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar for consideration later in the day, and the Senators concerned then go to the cloakroom to discuss whatever doubts or difficulties may have arisen in respect to the bill, to see if they cannot iron out, even on that day, any difference which might exist between them. The more common practice is to allow the bill to go over until the next call of the calendar. I think it is wise that the Senate follow this practice.

There is no question that under either rule VIII or rule IX, a bill can be taken up on motion. I have talked to the parliamentarian about this, and I have checked some of the precedents. I am satisfied that the long-established practice of the Senate is that, as a matter of form and as a matter of Senatorial courtesy, resort is not taken to rule IX—to the motion route—to force action on a given calendar day, unless there is really great cause for immediate passage of a bill. Even then, I think it will be found, in the practice of the Senate, that at least an attempt is made to have the bill go to the foot of the calendar, in order that the matter may be discussed with the objecting Senator.

The junior Senator from Oregon, as an individual, is not important in this matter. As I see it I, as a human being, do not count in any matter involving policy; and neither, in my opinion, may I say most respectfully, does any other Senator. According to my view, we sit in the Senate merely as servants, merely as vehicles, for the time being, through which and by which the business of the public is transacted.

I recognize that my critics will not accept the words I now speak as expressing my own views, but I simply say, Mr. President, that they do express my views.

If I had been thinking of my personal interests, I certainly would not have followed the independent course of action which I have followed for 8 years in the Senate. For that period of time I have kept faith with what I consider to be an underlying principle of representative government. Some may disagree with the principle or with my interpretation of the principle, but it is that principle which the great Edmund Burke stated on November 3, 1774, in his notable pronouncement as to the meaning of representative government. I do not think it can be improved upon. I should like to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point certain excerpts from Edmund Burke's famous statement concerning the duty of a representative in a parliamentary body. If I may have the permission of the Senate to insert the excerpts, they will be supplied later.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Certainly, gentlemen, it ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinions high respect; their business unremitted attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasure, his satisfactions, to theirs—and above all, ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own.
>
> But his unbiased opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure—no; nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.
>
> My worthy colleague says his will ought to be subservient to yours. If that be all, the thing is innocent. If government were a matter of will upon any side, yours, without question, ought to be superior. But government and legislation are matters of reason and judgment and not of inclination; and what sort of reason is that in which the determination precedes the discussion, in which one set of men deliberate and another decide, and where those who form the conclusion are perhaps 300 miles distant from those who hear the argument?
>
> To deliver an opinion is the right of all men; that of constituents is a weighty and respectable opinion, which a representative ought always to rejoice to hear, and which he ought always most seriously to consider. But authoritative instructions, mandates issued, which a member is bound blindly and implicitly to obey, to vote, and to argue for, though contrary to the clearest conviction of his judgment and conscience; these are things utterly unknown to the laws of this land, and which arise from a fundamental mistake of the whole order and tenor of our Constitution.

Mr. MORSE. As my colleagues will see—at least those who may deign to read the record of this speech—Burke made it very clear in that great pronouncement of November 3, 1774, that a representative in an elected parliamentary body such as this owes a high duty to keep faith with a gift from providence, namely, his conscience; that the primary obligation as a representative which he owes is to follow the principles dictated to him by his conscience, giving at the same time proper weight to the views of his constituents. But when satisfied that the facts in relation to any given issue dictate, through his conscience, that he should stand up against a public opinion, then he owes a duty to the providence that gave him his conscience to stand by the facts.

There is no doubt that in following that principle of representation and applying it to individual issues as they arise one will make many mistakes of judgment, and men of good faith will differ both as to what the facts are and as to what course of action should be followed in relation to the facts, even when they agree on the facts. I recognize that. I never have expected or demanded or required that others accept my judgment; but I have taken the position that if we are to protect and preserve representative government we must maintain a procedure which permits of the exercise of an honest independence of judgment and which, in the case of the Senate of the United States, for example, affords a duly elected representative of the people of a sovereign State the time and the opportunity to make the study which he may need to determine what the facts are and the judgment he thinks he should render. If we deny him that procedure we not only punish that individual Senator, but we deny to the people of the sovereign State he in part represents the rights to which I think they are clearly entitled.

So in speaking on the question of Senate procedure today I speak, according

to the 1950 census, for 1,521,341 fine people who, as of the date of that census, constituted the population of the great State of Oregon.

It was on January 13 that I made my argument on the floor of the Senate—and I stand by every word I said in it—that in accordance with the true meaning of the Constitution of the United States, as an elected representative of the people of the State of Oregon I was entitled to the protection of my seniority rights on the floor of the Senate unless this body wanted to discriminate against the people of Oregon. That is still my view.

When the last call of the calendar was made, under a procedure which, at least for the duration of the call, was a unanimous-consent procedure, the action taken against the Senator from Oregon by denying to him the time needed to study the bill which he wanted to go into was not action against the junior Senator from Oregon, but action against more than 1½ million people in a great sovereign State of this land. In my judgment, in effect they were denied their representative rights, because they were entitled to the time required for their representative, no matter what anyone in the Senate might think about him personally, to study a bill which greatly perplexed him when the bill was reached on the call of the calendar.

It perplexed him particularly because be was a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate at the time Navy officials gave to the Senate committee information which was subsequently reported to be unreliable and mistaken information, a circumstance which made necessary the introduction of a bill on the subject matter. That particular bill was reached on the call of the calendar last Monday.

I was very much interested in learning how it could be that the Navy would give us such information. I wanted to go into the subject, because my first impression was that we could not solve the problem completely by passing a form of remedial legislation correcting a mistake which apparently the committee had made previously on the basis of unreliable evidence and information given to it by the Navy.

In my opinion, that is a very serious thing. I feel that if the United States Navy officials are giving to the Armed Services Committee unreliable information it is perfectly proper, when there comes before the Senate a bill which purports to remedy the error, to ask some questions about it, as I did, and to ask for an explanation of it, as I did.

I mean no disrespect to anyone. After I listened to the explanation I still did not understand the bill. I wanted time to study it. I was very careful to make certain about the importance of the time element in the consideration of the bill. The RECORD speaks for itself. The demotion of certain naval officers in the lower ranks would not take effect until April 1. As I said on that occasion:

> This is March 9. We will have at least one call of the calendar and perhaps more before that time. I should like to study the bill.

Then I was told that an arrangement had been made with the majority leader to the effect that if the bill was objected to on the call of the calendar, it would be brought up by motion at the conclusion of the calendar. Of course, I was hurt, as I had a right to be. At least I think it was understandable that one should be hurt, because that just had not been the practice in the Senate.

It may be that on my part there is undue sensitivity involved in this matter; but I wonder, Mr. President, if any one of a large number of other Senators had made the same request, whether the same ultimatum would have been given to him, which in effect was, "If you do not give consent, the bill will be brought up by motion."

Mr. President, perhaps I am unfair about my suspicion; but I happen to be of the opinion that if any one of most of the other Senators had made the request which the representative from the sovereign State of Oregon made on March 9, for time to study the bill, the request would have been granted. Feeling that way about it, I would have failed in my responsibility to the people of the sovereign State of Oregon if I did not make clear, as I have tried to make clear in the past few days on the floor of the Senate, that I shall fight, under the rules and within the rules, to obtain for the people of the sovereign State of Oregon what I consider to be their procedural rights on the floor of the Senate.

I shall do it impersonally, and it will not be pleasant. These are not our rules; they belong to the people. This it not our Senate; it is the Senate of the people of the United States. When the people send a Senator to the Senate as their elected representative, whether other Senators may like him personally or not is immaterial; he is entitled to all the rights and prerogatives and courtesies which are due to any other Senator. When he does not receive them it is not the Senator who is injured, but the people of a sovereign State.

Mr. President, let me tell you that so long as there is an ounce of energy left in my body and breath in my lungs, I shall fight to protect the rights of the people of Oregon, to which they are entitled through me as their representative in this body, for so long as they deign to leave me in this body. To my political opposition in the State of Oregon let me say that that will be a long time, God willing. If my political opposition thinks it will destroy me politically by denying to the people of the State of Oregon the rights, prerogatives, and courtesies which they are entitled to receive through me as their Senator in the Senate, then that opposition will have to learn in 1956 how mistaken they were in thinking that such a tactic is the way to eliminate the junior Senator from Oregon from the political scene in America.

I know my State, Mr. President. I know the people of my State. I know their devotion to the rules of the playground, to the principle of fair play, and to the rule of treating every one on a basis of equality even though a certain individual may not be liked in some quarters. I know the reaction the people of my State, not only over the period of the past few months, but over the period of the past few days. I say most respectfully to the Senate this afternoon that thousands of people in the State of Oregon resent what they consider to be the discriminatory treatment which their Senator has received since the convening of this Congress.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate this afternoon once again the provisions of rule XXIV, which read as follows:

> In the appointment of the standing committees, the Senate, unless otherwise ordered, shall proceed by ballot to appoint severally the chairman of each committee, and then, by one ballot, the other members necessary to complete the same. A majority of the whole number of votes given shall be necessary to the choice of a chairman of a standing committee, but a plurality of votes shall elect the other members thereof. All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

Mr. President, I make a point of that rule this afternoon with regard to the subject under discussion because I have promised certain individuals and political forces in my State that I would make it this afternoon.

I wish briefly to review for the RECORD the parliamentary situation in which the junior Senator from Oregon finds himself. On January 13, as the RECORD will show, the junior Senator from Oregon asked to have rule XXIV applied. He had previously on the floor of the Senate made very clear that he would ask for his committee rights entirely on the basis of rule XXIV. He had made very clear that he wanted to be assigned to committees by the Senate, not by a political caucus.

No good purpose can be served by reviewing in any detail the debate of January 13, the debate of January 29, and the debate of a week ago today. So far as my statements of my position on those occasions are concerned I incorporate them here by reference, and I stand by every argument and statement I have made during this whole long fight. That is a matter of record.

I wish to proceed this afternoon with a discussion of the question: What next?

When on January 13 it was decided in the first vote, which was on the question of assignments to the Armed Services Committee, that I should be kicked off that committee—and it was perfectly obvious that that was also the will of the Senate in regard to my service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—I then sent to the desk, as the RECORD will show, a resolution, which was referred to committee, as it properly should have been if the Senate did not want to consider it immediately; and the Senate did not have to consider it immediately, under the rule. That resolution provides that the membership of the Armed Services Committee and the membership of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I have held 8 years of seniority, be enlarged by one Republican member, and that the junior Senator from Oregon, as a member of the Independent Party, but on the basis of his seniority rights, be allowed to retain his position on those two committees.

I had hoped that we could have immediate consideration of that resolution, because I believed that every Member of the Senate was fully familiar with the problem. All Members of the Senate knew, as individuals, whether they favored or did not favor that procedure.

As the RECORD will show, the majority leader made very clear that he had no objection to the proposal. It was, in fact, blocked by the minority side of the Senate. That is simply a matter of record.

Then the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, for, under the rules, that had to be done if any Senator objected to immediate consideration of the resolution; and at that time objection to immediate consideration was made by the minority leader.

Mr. President, a considerable number of my colleagues were appreciative of the fact that a principle was involved in the entire matter; and, as so many of them have told me since, they were greatly disturbed by the course of action the Senate had taken, in which many of them had participated as willing supporters of the proposal to deny to me, under rule XXIV, election to those two committees.

The RECORD will also show that when my resolution went to the Committee on Rules and Administration, an inquiry was made on the floor of the Senate that afternoon as to how soon action could be expected by that committee; and the majority leader responded by saying, in effect, that it probably would take some time. How right he was. I think about 8 weeks have passed since then. I suggested that no final action be taken on January 13 with regard to my committee assignments, until the Committee on Rules and Administration at least had had an opportunity to consider my resolution, which called for the adding of 1 Republican Member to the Armed Services Committee and the adding of 1 Republican Member to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and for the retention of the junior Senator from Oregon—in keeping with his seniority rights of 8 years—on those 2 committees.

I thought it would place me in an unfavorable parliamentary position to have the Senate proceed that afternoon with what I described as a garbage-can-disposal principle for the assignment of the Senator from Oregon to committees, because, as the RECORD will show, the majority leader pointed out that after the Senate finished making the committee assignments in keeping with the mimeographed political party caucus lists, which were used on the floor of the Senate that afternoon, the only two vacancies left were, one on the Committee on the District of Columbia and one on the Committee on Public Works.

Perhaps, Mr. President, I was naive, but on the afternoon of January 13 I simply refused to believe that after my colleagues in the Senate came to study the precedents and the history of this body, they would wish to stand by the action they took that afternoon, because I had studied the precedents. Time permitting, Mr. President, I always try to do my book work in connection with my job in the Senate, because I believe that is what the people of my State sent me here to do. I checked with the Library of Congress research staff; the able staff in my office worked with me; and I checked with the Parliamentarian.

As I told the Senate, Mr. President, it is necessary to go back to 1871 to find any precedent for the action taken by the Senate on the afternoon of January 13, 1953. As I have previously stated, in 1871 the Republicans kicked off of his committees the distinguished Senator Sumner, of Massachusetts, doing so because he was as opposed to Grant as I have made very clear I am to Eisenhower. But it is an interesting commentary that the only precedent which could be dug up was one at the beginning of another military administration in the Government of the United States. I refused to believe—showing how naive one really can be—that my colleagues in the Senate would wish to follow that singular precedent.

Mr. President, you have heard me refer to the substance of the conversation Burton K. Wheeler had with me, in which he said to me, "Why, Wayne, I ran for the Vice Presidency of the United States in 1924, against the candidate of my party. I ran with old Bob La Follette on the Progressive ticket in 1924, and no discipline was meted out to me."

Apparently, Mr. President, when the Senate reconvened in 1925 it did not forget about the rights of the people of a sovereign State. It would appear that when Senator Ladd, Senator Cummins, Senator Norris, and other insurgents in the history of the Senate followed a course of action that was not pleasing to the members of their party—in the case of Senator Norris, going completely independent, as the Senator from Oregon has done—the Senate in those days did not overlook the rights of the people of a sovereign State to full protection, through their representatives in the Senate of the United States, or deny the prerogatives, privileges, rights, and courtesies due the people of such State.

It is not pleasing to say this, but, Mr. President, so long as I am convinced, as I am, and so long as thousands of people in my State are convinced, as they are, that the treatment which has been meted out to the junior Senator from Oregon in connection with his committee rights denies to the people of my State equal representation in the Senate of the United States under the Constitution, I intend to continue, no matter how unpleasant it may make me appear to be in the eyes of some, to battle for those rights. So I point out, Mr. President, that under rule XXIV I am entitled to committee rights.

I appreciate the courtesy and cooperation of the majority leader, on January 13, in accepting my suggestion that no final action be taken then, until the Rules Committee could study my resolution. I think it was the fair and decent thing for him to do on January 13; and he did it. But 8 weeks have passed, Mr. President. No report has come to the floor of the Senate from the Committee on Rules and Administration, no proposal has been made on the floor of the Senate for the assignment of the junior Senator from Oregon to committees under rule XXIV, although not only ample time, but more than ample time, has elapsed between January 13 and this date for action on this matter.

So, once again, on the floor of the Senate, in behalf of more than 1½ million people of a sovereign State, I ask the Senate of the United States to give them the equal representation in the Senate of the United States to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States. I ask for an early consideration of this matter, so that the Senate as a body may decide whether, upon reflection, it wants to stand by the precedent of 1871, or whether in keeping with the clear spirit and intent of rule XXIV, and in keeping with the rights to which the people of Oregon are entitled, through their Senator, in the Senate of the United States, it intends to assign him to the committees to which he is entitled to be assigned under rule XXIV.

Mr. President, if the Senate in its wisdom, rightly or wrongly, wants to follow a garbage-can-disposal principle in assigning the Senator from Oregon to committees, the time has come to find it out. But in no event, Mr. President, has the Senate any right to deny to the people of my State the committee representation to which they are entitled. So I have this afternoon, as pleasantly as I know how—and I think the RECORD will show very fairly, and I know very sincerely—presented the case, not of the junior Senator from Oregon, but the case of the people of the State of Oregon, the inhabitants of a sovereign State, for equal representation in the Senate of the United States under the rules of the Senate, including equal representation on committees.

I certainly would be honest with neither the Senate nor with the public, Mr. President, did I not say that I think no logical argument has been advanced to date—and I am waiting for one—which justifies the adoption of the precedent of 1871, in view of the many precedents to the contrary since 1871, and it may be said that no one has been able to find any precedent prior to 1871.

Oh, I am familiar with what is said off the floor. I am satisfied that great weight has been given by some to this kind of talk: "We have got to show that guy; we have not only got to teach him, but we have got to think of the future; we have got to serve notice on other insurgents in the future that they cannot follow the course of action the Senator from Oregon followed in the late campaign and not get kicked off committees." Well, they can go to bed with that kind of conscience if they want to, Mr. President, but I sleep well with mine, because not a step have I taken since my resignation from the Republican Party that I would retrace if I had an opportunity to retrace it.

I do not propose to discuss this matter on any such irrelevant and immaterial premise as that involved in the question whether the rules of the Senate should be used to discipline an individual Senator merely because his colleagues in the Senate, and also politicians outside the Senate, do not like his political course of action. I am going to continue to discuss it from the standpoint of the principle I laid down on January 13, which was brushed aside because, in my

judgment, no one could meet it on its logic, that if the Senate follows the course of action it has followed in respect to the junior Senator from Oregon, it denies equal representation to the State of Oregon under the procedures of the Senate and in defiance of the intent of the Constitution.

No, Mr. President, after the treatment I received in connection with the call of the calendar, about which I have already spoken, I went back to my office and thought of the symbolism of that treatment, and again I said to myself, "Well, what happens to you is not important, but you cannot sit there and let that treatment be meted out and do nothing about it, and truly represent the people of your State or properly protect their rights on the floor of the Senate."

I had a little talk with the Parliamentarian, Mr. President, and ascertained what was brought out at the next meeting of the Senate, which I already knew, that a technical application of the rules had been made, and that all the traditions and the practices of the Senate for many years were against a denial to the people of the State of Oregon, through their Senator, of the time he requested to study a bill on the calendar, particularly when, as I said, and as admitted by the chairman of the committee, there was no emergency in connection with the bill prior to April 1.

What should a Senator do, Mr. President, when confronted with that sort of treatment? There are various courses of action he could take. I suppose one could go "hat in hand," but I cannot imagine any colleague of mine in the Senate expecting the junior Senator from Oregon to go anywhere with "hat in hand."

So, after deliberation, I said to myself, "Well, they will probably continue to do it to you. You have got to be willing to take it, and you have certainly got to fight to protect the rights of a million and a half persons of a sovereign State to equal representation, through you, in the Senate of the United States." I am perfectly honest about it. I was brought up, Mr. President, in the kind of religious environment in which public confessions of motivations are never embarrassing. So, Mr. President, I publicly confess today that, deliberating on the matter, I said, "You have got to do something that will bring them up short. You must do something that will dramatize the situation in which they have placed you. You are going to have to do something that will, at least, cause them to stop a few seconds to contemplate what they are doing to the traditions of the Senate."

I tried, Mr. President, to be very fair about it. On the day the unanimous-consent calendar was called, as the RECORD will show, I advised the majority leader that it was rather early in the session, and that if his objective was that of saving time by forcing through this bill over my objection, when all I asked for was adequate time to study it, he might discover that it was not a time-saving procedure. May I say, Mr. President, that I will never long consume the time of the Senate by a parliamentary tactic beyond the point of getting across the point which I am seeking to make clear.

So, Mr. President, that is why, on Wednesday, I objected to waiving the reading of the Journal. I thought the Senate's attention should be invited to the fact that if we start applying the rules of the Senate technically to 1 Member, he is placed in a position where he can apply the rules of the Senate technically to 95 Senators. If we get into that kind of a parliamentary situation, Mr. President, I am inclined to think the odds are in favor of the one and not the ninety-five.

I made the objection because I knew it would get my point across, and it did; and thus, today, when the Journal was again read, I made it very clear, and I now restate, that it is not my intention continuously to deny unanimous consent to waiving the reading of the Journal. I would not do it, for many reasons, Mr. President, having made my point. I would not do it because continually doing it, I think, would be an unfair tactic.

I believe it has not been unfair to do it on those two occasions in order to reeducate my colleagues as to the existence of the rule and as to what might happen if Members of the Senate of the United States decided they would apply the rules as strictly as the rules permit their application in order to steamroller over a colleague.

I do not fight vindictively, Mr. President, and a continuous objection to dispensing with the reading of the Journal would be proceeding vindictively.

I have made my point. I want to make it very clear, however, that there are many other rules in the rule book, and it may be necessary to teach other lessons in respect to those rules as I have in connection with rule III. I hope not; but, as a lawyer who knows something about disputes, and as one who has been in the position of mediator, conciliator, and arbitrator in many difficult disputes, I have a little advice to give my colleagues, if they want any from me this afternoon, namely, that they should relax and recognize that no good purpose will be served in carrying on a vendetta against the Senator from Oregon. If they want to assure my reelection, let them go ahead, but there are things more important than the reelection of anyone to the Senate. The orderly, cooperative transaction of the business of the Senate is one of them.

Neither are they going to freeze me out financially, because I can raise the money necessary for my essential stationery. I am sure there are persons in my State who will be interested in knowing that it has been reported to me that some of my colleagues have said about me, "Well, he does not have much money, anyway, and if we do not assign him to committees, then, when he has used up the stationery he now has in his office, he will have to buy stationery, because stationery is not supplied to non-committee members."

I am almost broke; in fact, I borrowed some money this morning with which to pay my income tax; but I am not so broke that I cannot get the approximately $350 which it will take, so I am told, to restock my office with stationery—and I have a couple of weeks' supply left, too.

No, I may say to my colleagues that they are not going to change the course of action of the junior Senator from Oregon by any materialistic pressures or any other kind either.

The Senate, under rule XXIV, has the duty of assigning the Senator from Oregon to two committees, and it has had 8 weeks in which to consider the question. In behalf of more than a million and a half people of a sovereign State, I point out to the Senate that it ought to get on with its business of applying rule XXIV. If the Senate will relax, I do not think they will vote to follow the precedent of 1871. Surely, 8 weeks has been long enough for relaxation.

So, Mr. President, in this very pleasant, but serious, vein, I conclude this item of my committee work for the afternoon. I am not in the least bit disturbed by the empty seats, because I know whereof I speak when I say there is much greater interest across the country in the position taken by the representative of the Independent Party in the Senate on such principles as those I have discussed this afternoon than there apparently is in the Senate of the United States. Time will be both the proof and the judge of this observation.

PAYMENTS IN CASH FOR ACCRUED LEAVE

Mr. President, the next item on which I desire to comment, very briefly, is the very able statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] this afternoon, in which he expressed his concern about disclosures of recent days concerning the collection of Government funds for accrued annual leave by top Government officials, which, in the opinion of the Senator from Kansas, cannot be justified, and which represents some sort of sharp practice.

I do not know what the merits of that controversy are, but I may say to the Senator from Kansas that I certainly join with him in his suggestion, if I heard him aright, that an immediate investigation of the situation should be conducted by an appropriate committee of the Senate. I stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from Kansas on that question. I wish I could get a few Senators to stand shoulder to shoulder with me in order that early hearings may be held on a bill I introduced—and I have introduced similar bills for several years past—calling for public disclosure, at the beginning of each year, of the sources and amounts of income of all Members of Congress and of all public officials who receive pay of $10,000 or more. I think it is a bill that is very much in conformity with public policy, because it specifically applies to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the chairman of the Republican National Committee. I hope the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will be as much interested in an investigation of the financial operations of the chairman of the Republican National Committee in the State of Kansas as he is in the financial operations of some Democrats. As spokesman for the Independent Party, I am interested in the financial operations of all parties.

Perhaps there is a mess in Washington, but I judge from newspaper stories

that there is a mess in Kansas also. At least, it is going to be interesting to see the explanation, under oath, of the chairman of the Republican National Committee concerning his real-estate operations, if that is the appropriate term for them.

PROTECTION FOR WITNESSES IN INQUIRIES

Mr. President, the next committee matter I desire to take up, as a member of the Committee of the Whole, as of now, is an article published in this morning's New York Times, because I wish to express my enthusiastic and sincere commendation of Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, for the position he has taken as chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee to Investigate the Department of Justice, as set forth in the article.

Representative KEATING, as chairman of the subcommittee, has announced—as he has the power to do, and I congratulate him for exercising it—that certain procedural safeguards will be guaranteed to witnesses who appear before the subcommittee.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEATING SETS UP PROTECTION FOR WITNESSES IN INQUIRIES

WASHINGTON, March 12.—Rules establishing procedures by which witnesses whose reputations have been attacked at public hearings may present evidence and question witnesses in their own defense were announced today by Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of upstate New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee To Investigate the Department of Justice.

Representative KEATING said that the rules, a departure from prevailing practice by many congressional committees, would impose restraints on the badgering of witnesses. He expressed the hope that they would be adopted by other committees charged with investigative responsibility and become basic rules of procedure for all investigations conducted by committees of the House of Representatives.

The procedures followed by many committees of both the House and the Senate have been sharply criticized as unfair to witnesses powerless to defend themselves.

COURT DISAPPROVAL CITED

Representative KEATING, in announcing the new rules, cited disapproval of present procedures expressed by the courts in acquitting defendants in contempt prosecutions. He appraised the new rules of his subcommittee as a move to protect the investigative process from falling into disrepute.

Thirteen rules were promulgated by Mr. KEATING. They will serve, he said, "not only to govern the activities of the committee but also to appraise all persons who come before us of their rights." Many of the rules formalize practices already in use.

The rule drafted to protect the rights of witnesses, which is the heart of the code, is No. 10 of the list. It reads:

"Any person who is identified by name in a public session before the subcommittee and who has reasonable grounds to believe that testimony or other evidence given in such session, or comment made by any member of the subcommittee or its counsel, tends to affect his reputation adversely shall be afforded the following privileges:

"(A) To file with the subcommittee a sworn statement, of reasonable length, concerning such testimony, evidence, or comment, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

"(B) To appear personally before the subcommittee and testify in his own behalf, unless the subcommittee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise.

"(C) Unless the subcommittee by a majority vote shall determine otherwise, to have the subcommittee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him and to submit to the subcommittee written questions to be propounded by the subcommittee or its counsel to such witnesses.

"Such questions must be proper in form and material and relevant to the matters alleged to have adversely affected the person claiming this privilege. The subcommittee reserves the right to determine the length of such questioning.

"(D) To have the subcommittee call a reasonable number of witnesses in his behalf, if the subcommittee by a majority vote determines that the ends of justice require such action."

COUNSEL RIGHT AFFIRMED

Another rule provides that any witness, at a public hearing or in executive session, unless a majority of the subcommittee votes otherwise, shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel, who shall be permitted to advise the witness of his rights while on the witness stand.

The other rules mostly indicate procedures already followed by the subcommittee and most other investigatory committees of Congress.

The subcommittee tried out the new procedure last week when it permitted Victor Herwitz, assistant corporation counsel of New York, to submit questions to be propounded to witnesses testifying at an inquiry into alleged police brutality in civil-rights cases in New York.

Although not all the members of the group regarded the results of that test as perfect, they voted unanimously to make it standard procedure hereafter.

Other members of the subcommittee are Representatives EDGAR A. JONAS, of Illinois, and PATRICK J. HILLINGS, of California, Republicans, and BYRON C. ROGERS, Democrat, of Colorado.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, sound as I regard the action of Representative KEATING in what he is doing as chairman of the subcommittee—and I believe his position is absolutely correct—nevertheless, in my opinion, a duty and an obligation rest upon Congress to enact legislation necessary to guarantee such procedure as a matter of law, not as a matter of discretion by the chairman of a committee. We may not always have a KEATING as the chairman of a committee. So I refresh the recollection of the Senate this afternoon with respect to the Kefauver and the Morse bills, which seek to provide a uniform code of procedure governing congressional investigations; a code which would protect the procedural rights of all witnesses appearing before an investigating committee, as a matter of right and law, and not as a matter of discretion or individual committee procedure.

Mr. President, with all the alarm and confusion which exist in this country today and all the emotion connected with the situation in respect to investigations by congressional committees, we have a great opportunity, as the representatives of the people, to enact legislation which, as a matter of law, will guarantee procedural protections to witnesses before committees. What is happening is that many people and organizations are becoming confused over the question of power versus practice and over the question of principle versus practice.

The other night I spoke in Chicago at a banquet of university and college presidents and college administrators. Although there was no unanimity among them, during the day, in conversing with some of them, I had found great alarm over newspaper stories concerning the investigation of colleges by congressional committees. As my speech will show, I asked, "What are you so alarmed about? I think you ought to welcome it. It is one of the risks of living in a democracy."

I do not share the notion that colleges should be exempt from appropriate investigations by congressional committees. Certainly, as I have indicated heretofore on the floor of the Senate, I will not be a party to scuttling or jeopardizing the power of a congressional committee to investigate a matter which it thinks needs to be investigated in order to supply the aids it seeks on the question of whether or not any legislation ought to be enacted. So I said to the college presidents, "I think those of you who are taking the position that there should not be any investigation are making a serious mistake. I think you have a great opportunity for education in regard to such investigations. You might even succeed in educating some politicians in regard to certain basic procedural rights."

I said, "As I see it, your position should not be that of opposing investigations, because if subversive activities are going on in the colleges, we ought to find it out and bring them to light, because the security of this Nation is of first importance."

I urged them to hold fast to two principles which ought to run concurrently in connection with investigations by congressional committees, namely, the principle involving the power to investigate, which I do not care to have shackled, and the principle of guaranteeing a fair procedure in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Bill of Rights. I have spoken at length on that subject on the floor of the Senate in connection with both the Kefauver and the Morse bills for a uniform code of procedure governing congressional investigations. I make only passing comment upon it today. I am very happy to make these favorable comments with respect to the stand on procedure before this committee which Representative KEATING, of New York, has taken, as reported in the New York Times of this morning.

FOREIGN AID IN DEFENSE OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. President, the next item of committee business which I wish to discuss is another story in this morning's New York Times, written by Thomas J. Hamilton, under the heading "United States Drops Threat of Foreign-Aid Cut."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DROPS THREAT OF FOREIGN-AID CUT—ADMINISTRATION TELLS U. N. CHIEFS IT PLANS SAME LEVEL, EVEN IF EUROPEAN ARMY FAILS

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

UNITED NATIONS, N. Y., March 12.—The Eisenhower administration has informed diplomats attending the United Nations General Assembly session that it will ask Congress to continue foreign military and economic assistance at the same level during the 1954 fiscal year, beginning July 1, as during the current fiscal year.

Former President Truman, in his budget message last January, before the inauguration of President Eisenhower, estimated current expenditures for this purpose at $5,775,000,000 and asked Congress to appropriate $7,559,000,000 for 1954 fiscal year.

Foreign representatives have learned from conferences with administration officials, here and in Washington, that the administration's target for the fiscal year will be in the neighborhood of $5,775,000,000.

These sources recognize that the appropriation of this amount is dependent upon the willingness of Congress to follow the administration's recommendations. However, they reported that there had been no talk of reducing the recommendations if Western Germany, France, and the other states that have signed an agreement for the establishment of a European army refused to ratify it.

The absence of any talk of reprisals was welcomed by the diplomats because Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, in a televised speech shortly after the inauguration served notice that "if it appeared that there was no chance of getting effective European unity, and if in particular France, Germany, and England should go their separate ways, then certainly it would be necessary to give a little rethinking to America's own foreign policy in relation to Western Europe."

The administration's recommendations about individual appropriations under the mutual security program and similar plans were not yet available, but one Western European diplomat said he expected that the total for his country would be about the same as before.

Extensive conferences with Washington officials have also reassured leading foreign delegates here that the administration is going to stand by its pledge that whatever military action it now takes in Korea will not run the risk of producing a full-scale war with either Communist China or the Soviet Union.

KOREA STUDY UNDER WAY

Some of them had felt misgivings over President Eisenhower's order allowing the Chinese Nationalists to conduct military operations against the mainland from Formosa and the fact that the United States was considering a blockade of Communist China. However, the need for a blockade has been diminished by Britain's recent decision not to permit British ships to transport goods forbidden under the United Nations strategic embargo.

According to persons conversant with the administration's plans, the military action it is considering in Korea would not have international complications but would probably result in heavy casualties. Whether the plan will be adopted depends upon a high-level appraisal of the situation that is now under way in Washington. For obvious reasons the details cannot be published.

Despite its decision not to threaten reprisals, the administration still attaches the greatest importance to the establishment of a European army, and it is understood that Mr. Dulles will urge early action at the meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Council in Paris, now scheduled for April 23.

According to diplomats here, the Council will have to recognize the fact that a number of the members of the North Atlantic pact have not attained the goals fixed last spring. The intention now is to concentrate on materiel and a better-planned allocation of forces that should produce greater strength. At all events, the increased emphasis on equipment will make it cost more.

ALTERNATIVE PLAN PREPARED

The Eisenhower administration, it was learned, will not give up hope of a European army, with the 12 German divisions that it considers essential, while there is any chance that West Germany and France may agree upon the modifications recently proposed by France to the European army agreement.

However, it is already preparing an alternative defense plan if the European army should be shelved. Called the peripheral plan, this would recognize the virtual impossibility of holding any considerable part of West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France without German troops, and would place corresponding emphasis upon Spain and holding the line of the Pyrenees.

Before the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty and the rearmament of Western Europe, most western military strategists assumed that peripheral defense would be the only possibility in the event of a Soviet attack. However, the NATO defense plan has been based on the belief that, although they would be outnumbered, NATO forces would be able to save a considerable part of Western Europe from Soviet occupation.

Some diplomats familiar with the Washington discussions fear that the peripheral plan would have an unfortunate effect in the countries that could be defended and believe that the best solution, which they grant would be a radical one, would be to admit West Germany to NATO on virtually the same basis as other members.

They recognize that French fears of West German rearmament would be increased still more by the failure to integrate the Germans into a European army; on the other hand, the conclusion of a contractual agreement between West Germany and the Western Powers makes it impossible to impose limitations on German forces unless they are also imposed on other Western European countries.

They believe that these difficulties could be surmounted by imposing ceilings on the armed forces of other members of NATO as well. In addition, the United States and Britain would have to give definite commitments regarding the size of the forces that they would maintain in Western Europe, and how long they would keep them there. These sources concede that French and Italian distrust of West Germany is so intense that, even with these safeguards, they would probably oppose the admission of West Germany to NATO, but they believe that this is the preferable solution if the European army should fail.

It is understood that President Eisenhower and other members of the administration, despite these arguments, are still leaning to the peripheral plan. But with this exception, diplomats here are coming more and more to the belief that, insofar as Western Europe and Korea are concerned, the administration intends to follow a policy along the lines set by the Truman administration.

Most of the discussions reported here took place before the death of Stalin and the succession of Georgi M. Malenkov, which is viewed as having created new dangers, and new opportunities, for the Western World.

One statesman who had a long conversation with President Eisenhower said that the grasp that the President showed of United States foreign policy was perhaps the most heartening impression that he brought back from Washington.

This source said the President was taking a direct interest in the formulation of United States policy, particularly regarding Western Europe, and was showing the same commonsense approach that he did while he commanded NATO forces. Most Western European statesmen developed a warm admiration for General Eisenhower then, and those here are glad to find that, although his responsibility and authority are so much greater, he is still the same man.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite particular attention to the last part of the article, particularly in relation to the comments it makes in the light of the position taken in the Long-Morse report in respect to policies connected with overseas bases. At the end of his article Mr. Hamilton says:

The Eisenhower administration, it was learned, will not give up hope of a European army, with the 12 German divisions that it considers essential, while there is any chance that West Germany and France may agree upon the modifications recently proposed by France to the European army agreement.

However, it is already preparing an alternative defense plan if the European army should be shelved. Called the peripheral plan, this would recognize the virtual impossibility of holding any considerable part of West Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France without German troops, and would place corresponding emphasis upon Spain and holding the line of the Pyrenees.

Before the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty and the rearmament of Western Europe, most western military strategists assumed that peripheral defense would be the only possibility in the event of a Soviet attack. However, the NATO defense plan has been based on the belief that, although they would be outnumbered, NATO forces would be able to save a considerable part of Western Europe from Soviet occupation.

Some diplomats familiar with the Washington discussions fear that the peripheral plan would have an unfortunate effect in the countries that could be defended and believe that the best solution, which they grant would be a radical one, would be to admit West Germany to NATO on virtually the same basis as other members.

They recognize that French fears of West German rearmament would be increased still more by the failure to integrate the Germans into a European army; on the other hand, the conclusion of a contractual agreement between West Germany and the Western Powers makes it impossible to impose limitations on German forces unless they are also imposed on other Western European countries.

They believe that these difficulties could be surmounted by imposing ceilings on the armed forces of other members of NATO as well. In addition, the United States and Britain would have to give definite commitments regarding the size of the forces that they would maintain in Western Europe, and how long they would keep them there. These sources concede that French and Italian distrust of West Germany is so intense that, even with these safeguards, they would probably oppose the admission of West Germany to NATO, but they believe that this is the preferable solution if the European army should fail.

It is understood that President Eisenhower and other members of the administration, despite these arguments, are still leaning to the peripheral plan. But with this exception, diplomats here are coming more and more to the belief that, insofar as Western

Europe and Korea are concerned, the administration intends to follow a policy along the lines set by the Truman administration.

Most of the discussions reported here took place before the death of Stalin and the succession of Georgi M. Malenkov, which is viewed as having created new dangers, and new opportunities, for the Western World.

One statesman who had a long conversation with President Eisenhower said that the grasp that the President showed of United States foreign policy was perhaps the most heartening impression that he brought back from Washington.

This source said the President was taking a direct interest in the formulation of United States policy, particularly regarding Western Europe, and was showing the same commonsense approach that he did while he commanded NATO forces. Most Western European statesmen developed a warm admiration for General Eisenhower then, and those here are glad to find that, although his responsibility and authority are so much greater, he is still the same man.

Mr. President, in conducting the Long-Morse investigation—and this is about all I can say in regard to this particular program, but it has already been mentioned in the press—we had a good many briefings on the so-called peripheral plan. I wish to urge again, in view of the New York Times article, what we urged before the Committee on Armed Services and also in the Long-Morse report, namely, that we must have more cooperation from our allies in implementing the peripheral plan. I believe a great deal of the fear—I was about to say dissension, but I think it is more fear and anxiety than dissension, in the sense of there being disagreements—a great deal of the fear and anxiety that are developing in the areas where some of the major bases are located are brought about by the fact that we are going it alone too much, and that we are not getting enough help from our allies in terms of manpower participation.

Mr. President, this is not the time or place to dwell in any detail on why we are not getting the proper cooperation. We must assume our fair share of the responsibility for the lack of it. However, I should like to express once again, as I have heretofore, that a greater number of their men must be made available to maintain and operate the bases. Certainly we must bear our fair share of the burden. Across north Africa, for example—I will not mention other sites, but all of us know that there are bases in north Africa—and elsewhere I want to see more of the airbases manned by our allies, keeping our so-called mother bases intact.

INDECISION IN ADMINISTRATIVE CIRCLES

Mr. President, the next item of committee business which I wish to bring up is in the form of an article published in the Wall Street Journal of March 6. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "Washington Wire—A Special Weekly Report From the Wall Street Journal's Capital Bureau." It expresses some concern, on the part of the writer of the article, at least, as to the direction which the administration is taking in regard to certain matters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON WIRE—A SPECIAL WEEKLY REPORT FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL'S CAPITAL BUREAU

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Responsibility "blues" assail the fledgling administration.

Ikemen first ducked backing standby price-wage control power, now apparently favor it; they stall on taxes, hedge on the St. Lawrence seaway and whether to have a 1- or 3-man Economic Council, "buck-pass" Taft-Hartley changes to an advisory committee. "They thought they were going to chop the budget in stride," says one GOP Senate bigwig; "now they're appalled at what they're up against."

The promise to give the States offshore oil didn't cover some legal niceties, they discover. Now McKay can't decide whether the States should be allowed to tax output in the Federal areas beyond their borders; Brownell suggests maybe the States shouldn't get title even to the waters right off their coasts but only rights to the underwater resources.

True, Ike wants Congress to take some initiative. But lawmakers grumble at his indecision. Says one Republican: "He's finding government lots more complex than it looked from the rear-end of a train."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I announced before, I shall try on each Friday afternoon, when I complete my discussion of so-called committee matters, to present my view on some particular topic or issue which I think is of concern to the country and ought to receive the attention of the Senate and of the people.

Today I shall discuss some of my views on the tax problem. Next Friday I shall give the next in the series of speeches on natural resources, which I announced earlier I am dedicating to George Norris, and which speeches I am pleased to report, without any solicitation on my part, will be subsequently published in booklet form by people who are very much interested in and concerned over conservation policies.

THE IMPACT OF TAXES ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMY TODAY

Mr. President, 3 days ago, on March 10, the national debt was $267½ billion. To be precise, it was $267,538,866,226.06, that figure being taken from the daily statement of the United States Treasury, at page 3. Mr. President, you can be sure it is higher today. In the past year, the debt has increased by roughly $7¼ billion. The deficit for fiscal year 1953 will be roughly $5.9 billion.

These figures are so vast, so unrelated to every day experience that the average citizen and taxpayer simply cannot comprehend them.

But all of us understand what it will mean to die leaving an estate—if what most of us leave can be dignified by that term—in which what we own will be less than what we owe.

As I have pointed out repeatedly on the floor of the Senate, we cannot justify mortgaging our children and generations after them in this fashion.

What I propose to do today is discuss some of the fiscal and tax problems which face this Nation. I do not have any quick-and-pat answers for the difficulties we face.

I do hope that before I conclude my remarks that it becomes apparent—as it should have been apparent when I discussed this potentially tragic situation in July 1947 and in September 1949—that we cannot continue to patch our economy with expedient adhesive tape and paint our fiscal sores with political mercurochrome. What we need is a thorough, painstaking diagnosis and a complete economic prescription based upon proven need. If an operation is called for—let us face the facts and not take partisan aspirin in a vain attempt to kill the economic pain.

OBJECTIVES OF A SOUND FISCAL POLICY

A sound fiscal policy has several objectives. None can be made the sole aim of our efforts, because they are inextricably interrelated and what may advance one end may injure another.

As I see it, our goals must be:

First. A balanced budget.

Second. Substantial reduction of the national debt.

Third. The creation of an economy which fosters the first two objectives and at the same time can support necessary defense and mutual security programs and maintain, and if possible raise, our incomparable standard of living.

Fourth. Tax relief, especially to relieve existing hardships and to keep our economy productive and expanding.

Fifth. Augmenting revenues to meet our heavy commitments and to replace income lost through tax relief. To do this we must close tax loopholes, enforce the letter of the law, and, by creating national wealth, create taxable income.

Can this be done?

Mr. President, I wish I were sure I knew how it could be done. I wish it involved a matter which could be solved by applying some pat formula, by which we could be sure the result would be an equitable tax structure for the United States, with adequate income to meet our needs, balance the budget, and make a reasonably early retirement of the national debt. However, I know of no such formula.

All I offer today, Mr. President, are some thoughts on the problem. I am ready at all times to modify my thoughts on the basis of any evidence or argument which can be presented to show that we should follow other suggestions. However, I am satisfied that these objectives are necessary of accomplishment, and that this job must be done.

It must be done, perhaps slowly, perhaps incompletely at first, but every effort must be made. Our efforts to maintain a healthy, free, and equitable economy are part of the cold war against communism and economic chaos. If we fail, one can bring the other.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

If we only balance our operating expenses in the next 10 years, our debt will rise by over $60 billion.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement. Others may not think it so important as I do, but I would that I could have every American taxpayer pause today and consider that sentence and contemplate for a moment its meaning. Yes; I would have all our taxpayers do it even in the midst of paying taxes between now and March 16. The sentence is: "If we only balance our operat-

ing expenses in the next 10 years, our debt will rise by over $60 billion."

The reason is simple. The enormous debt we have incurred requires the payment of prodigious amounts of interest.

As an example, payments of interest on the Federal debt in fiscal 1952 came to almost $6 billion, 8.9 percent of the total budget. For fiscal 1953, the estimate of interest payment will come to approximately six and a half billion dollars—the Federal Budget in Brief, Fiscal Year 1954, pages 34 and 35.

Of course, the interest payment will become larger because this administration is already urging higher interest rates on Government obligations, which means that we are going to leave a larger debt for American boys and girls to pay when those obligations come due. I guess it is good politics, Mr. President, but I do not believe it is good economics. I happen to believe that it is not good statesmanship, and I do not think it is very fair to the American boys and girls who are to come after us.

I believe we should leave them a smaller debt, and I think we should be willing to carry out Government obligations at a low rate of interest, particularly in a time when we are asking so much of the young manhood of our country, when we are asking them to make sacrifices so far greater, so far more significant, than any economic sacrifice any investor who has money to invest makes when he does not receive as large an interest payment as he would like to receive from the Government.

Mr. President, it is sad that we did not pay as we earned in World War II. That is why during the war, on the floor of the Senate, I was found supporting a pay-as-you-go program, and I urged adoption of the Baruch plan. We would have saved billions of dollars of loss through inflation, I am satisfied, if we had followed that kind of economic policy. I believe that very shortsightedness has canceled a goodly portion of the wages and profits of our people, in terms of real wages and real profits, from the standpoint of the economic definition of wages and profits.

The economists may call the results we have suffered an inflationary spiral. I call it a rat race. If employment and production and profits are to remain high, we cannot continue this playboy economics. The financial gains are illusory.

AN EXPANDING ECONOMY

I have never believed in profits based upon restricted production and the maintenance of prices by scarcity.

We have been an enterprising, a thriving, a growing, and a lucky people.

The last century in America saw unprecedented industrial expansion resulting from our westward expansion and wondrous advances in technology.

We still have frontiers and new markets; they are within this country, which has an almost limitless need for goods. We have only begun to tap our markets, to say nothing about the welcoming frontiers of economic opportunity for an enlightened capitalism in the areas in which millions of people are striving for a better way of life. I say that taking advantage of those frontiers of economic opportunity and carrying our products to the freemen and freewomen in the so-called backward areas of the world, who are willing to stand on the side of freedom, offers the best hope for the defeat of communism and the establishment of a world order of peace, because in the last analysis we are going to win on the economic front. Of course, we should keep our military strength for defense, but at the same time a sound point 4 program, worked out in cooperation with foreign investments by enlightened American capitalism, marks the economic way to peace.

The people of the world—particularly in the Middle and Far East—represent a potential market for raw and finished products, machines, and heavy industry installations which is unequaled.

Our challenge is to contribute to the economic advance of our own people and our less fortunate and underdeveloped brothers. This is both good democracy and good economics.

This is the long and broad view. It calls for looking into the next century. I admit it calls for looking beyond the immediate economic problem of March 15 and 16, but it recognizes at least the symbolism inherent in the opportunity, as free men and women, to pay taxes in the cause of freedom. Granted that great wastes should be eliminated so as to assure a more economic use of the tax dollar, the fact still remains that in some way, somehow, before it is too late, we must get the American people to see that the general welfare is more important than the selfish welfare of any individual.

At home, our tax policies can be used to encourage consumption, which encourages investment and production, which result in bigger payrolls and bigger profits.

Let me turn to a concrete example of how we have tended to soak up buying power, thereby inflicting hardship and tending to contract industrial activity.

RECENT TRENDS IN TAX COLLECTIONS

In the calendar year 1952 total taxes paid or accrued at all levels of government in the United States reached $93 billion, based on the Department of Commerce gross national product and national income accounts. Government receipts in 1952 were absorbing 27 cents out of each $1 of gross national product. Department of Commerce statistics show that in the calendar year 1949 before the Korean war and acceleration of rearmament total receipts though considerably smaller at $57 billion still represented 21 percent of a gross national product of $258 billion.

In 1939 Federal, State, and local government taxes totaled $15,400,000,000. This was about 17 percent of a gross national product of $93 billion.

II. RISING TREND SINCE 1939 ACCOUNTED FOR BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Taxes have increased substantially at all levels of government. However, the bulk of the rise since 1939 is accounted for by the Federal Government. The following table shows that between 1939 and 1949, although the combined rise in State and local taxes was 100 percent, in absolute terms they accounted for only $9 billion out of a total rise of $41 billion. The remainder, $32 billion, is accounted for by the rise in Federal taxes.

I ask unanimous consent that table 1 may be printed at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I

[Billions]

Year	Federal	State and local	Total
1939	$6.7	$8.7	$15.4
1949	39.4	17.4	56.8
1952 [1]	72.0	21.0	93.0

[1] Estimated.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce Survey of Current Business, Supplements 1951, 1952 and Annual Review Number, February 1953.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from 1949 to 1952 in a 3-year period total tax receipts nearly doubled after having been increased fourfold in the previous decade. State and local taxes rose by one-fourth, but accounted for only one-ninth of the total rise. The remainder of the rise, or eight-ninths of the $46 billion increase was Federal. These tax receipts, after rising nearly sixfold in the 1939–49 decade, almost doubled again in the next 3 years.

Taxation on this rising scale cannot avoid having important economic consequences both for the national economy and for the individuals who must bear its burden.

THE EVOLUTION OF OUR CURRENT TAX STRUCTURE

What these consequences are can best be seen by an analysis of the tax structure evolving from the tax legislation of the last decade.

(A) INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS, 1939–52

Since 1939 Federal tax policy has moved in the direction of taxing income that had theretofore been considered essential for the maintenance of decent living standards, as will be seen.

Since 1939 the cost of living has gone up 92 percent and the minimum health and decency budget standards have also gone up.

In 1939 the standard family and individual exemption enabled those with sufficient income to enjoy an acceptable standard of living.

In 1939 a single person had a tax exemption of $1,000. To equal that exemption under 1952 prices, the exemption would have to be how much, Mr. President? Not $1,000, but $1,920. That gives us some understanding, I think, in a rather dramatic fashion, of the depreciation of the American dollar. But the exemption is $600. It is not difficult to imagine what even a few dollars in taxes mean to a person earning $1,000 a year.

In 1939 a 4-person family was allowed an exemption of $3,300. Today it would require an exemption of $6,349 to provide the same tax-exempt purchasing power.

In fact, the exemption for a couple with two minor dependent children is $2,400.

Mr. President, I have before me a table that brings out in tabular form the points I have just made. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Individual income tax exemptions, 1939 and 1952

Size of family	Exemptions		Equivalent value of 1939 exemption in purchasing power of December 1952 dollars (December 1952 prices)
	1939	1952	
Single person	$1,000	$600	$1,920
Married couple	2,500	1,200	4,800
4-person family	3,300	2,400	6,340

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it has long been common practice to appraise exemptions with reference to the maintenance of an essential minimum standard of living. According to the Treasury Department's 1947 study, Individual Income Tax Exemption—Division of Tax Research, Treasury Department, December 1947:

> This viewpoint appears as far back as the beginning of the Federal income tax during the Civil War period. The then Commissioner of Internal Revenue stated with reference to the $600 personal exemption provided under the 1864 law:
>
> "It was, of course, the purpose of the law to exempt so much of one's income as was demanded by his actual necessities." (Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 1866, P. XXIII (p. 3).)

In other words, the tax principle or policy which was originally adopted to apply to this problem was one of exempting the amount necessary to enable the individual to provide himself with what were considered to be the absolute necessities.

It is of interest to compare the present exemption with the amount required to purchase "a modest but adequate" level of living.

According to the United States Department of Labor:

> The City Worker's Family Budget was designed to determine how much it costs a 4-person urban family to obtain the goods and services it requires to maintain a level of adequate living according to prewar standards of living prevailing in the large cities of the United States. (Monthly Labor Review, May 1952, City Worker's Family Budget for October 1951.)

This is a minimum budget considered necessary by urban families to provide for health, efficiency, the nurture of their children, and participation in social and community activities.

That budget is not a fancy one; it covers essentials and little else.

The average cost of this budget, exclusive of Federal, State, and local income taxes, for a 4-person family ranged from $3,441 in New Orleans to $3,965 in Washington, D. C., in October 1951. Corrected for the rise in prices between October 1951 and December 1952, the average annual cost of the goods and services required by a 4-person family for a modest but adequate level of living in the United States is $3,779. This covers only the cost of food, shelter, and other goods and services, but excludes occupational expenses, OASI contributions of $54 per year, and employee contributions to unemployment or disability insurance as required in a number of States.

The current exemption as provided by our law is $2,400 for a family of 4. This is $1,379, or 36 percent less than the amount needed for "a modest but adequate level of living" for a 4-person urban family.

As time goes on, rural family budgets are coming to equal urban expenses as farm families are less self-sustaining and purchase more of their goods.

The present exemption level needs to be reappraised to ascertain the extent to which we are undermining the future productivity of our work force by limiting the income necessary for health, efficiency and nurture of children.

We would be wise to consider the following counsel by the former Staff Director of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Dr. T. J. Kreps:

> Many often fail to realize how shortsighted a tax policy is that retards human productivity, and how quickly revenue gains from such a policy are offset by the reduced growth of the tax base itself, which is, of course, national income.
>
> * * * sound tax policy should protect both the incentive to efficient work and the human capital resources that constitute our industrial and military strength. For it is mainly by our investment in human beings, their new ideas and methods, that economic progress comes about. (Taxes and the Human Factor, pp. 7–8.)

Of course, Mr. President, I think Dr. Kreps is correct in his view that the great wealth of America is to be found in its human beings. The economic power of America is not in its smokestacks and turbines and its vast material industries, but in its people. Certainly, Mr. President, we should study the tax program from the standpoint of whether it does, in fact, retard human productivity and the promotion of the general welfare as registered by the happiness of our people.

Oh, Mr. President, I know these are broad general principles, but they are really not difficult of application. We can take any specific proposal and ask ourselves the question, "What do the facts show as to the effect of this tax proposal on human productivity? Will its effects be, for example, to limit the opportunity of the people for better health, for better nurture for their children, and, thereby, restrict their general happiness?" We shall have no great trouble in coming to a valid judgment each time. I simply say we too frequently do not approach the problem in that way, and I also sometimes think for political reasons we do not want to face up to the music and do the things we know ought to be done in order to protect the principles which I have mentioned.

The tax policy pursued since 1939, that of restricting consumer demand by increasing the burden upon the lower income wage earners, is sowing the seeds for such an undesirable long-run development.

In a nonwar, noninflationary period, the crush of taxes on lower income families extinguishes a great deal of purchasing power which would keep consumption high. It thereby tends to undermine the maintenance of high employment and ample profits.

During World War II, an expressed purpose of decreasing exemptions was to soak up dollars for which there were insufficient consumer goods.

With lagging farm prices, tons of spoiling butter, a depressed textile industry, and many other danger signals, we owe it to the little people, the people struggling on small incomes, to give this policy a hard look. And we owe it to business.

It is all well and good to talk of confiscatory tax rates, and view with alarm the possible loss of incentive to investment, through high rates in the upper brackets. But we must also make sure that the many small consumers have the wherewithal to live in minimum comfort and to purchase in the interest of an expanding economy.

I have said before, and I repeat today: "I am against soaking the rich; and I am also against soaking the poor."

SHIFTING THE BURDEN OF TAXES

Given the need for a rising level of taxes, the guiding principles of tax policy—equitable taxes and progressive rates—have been discarded. We have become overwhelmed by the pressures of insuring adequacy of receipts to meet our tremendous national expenses.

In the name of adequacy, our tax base has been broadened to take in families at the expense of their living standards. At the same time, resort to the most regressive taxes, excises and sales taxes, has become widespread.

Hand in hand with the emphasis on adequacy, we have been led to believe that there is an allegedly adverse effect upon willingness and ability to invest once you begin to tax business incomes or personal incomes about $10,000. We must guard against this possibility—but we must also determine how much of this alleged effect is slogan and how much is fact.

In the name of promoting incentives to save and invest, all manners of tax-avoidance amendments have been introduced into our tax structure in the last few years. The result of these trends, broadening the base and indirect taxation to serve adequacy, and relief to serve saving and investment incentives, has been to make our effective rates bear little resemblance to the formal schedule of tax rates.

Increasingly, progressivity is disappearing from our tax structure.

In an article appearing in the March 1952 issue of the National Tax Journal "Some Comments on Tax Burden Comparisons," page 2, the authors, after examining both the Musgrave and Tucker studies of tax burden distribution, state:

> Taxpayers in income brackets which are either exempt from the Federal income tax or which pay only a low effective rate, carry such a heavy relative load in indirect taxes, real-estate taxes, and payroll taxes (if these are included) that the progressivity of income taxes is largely offset, as far as the lower and middle brackets are concerned.

This is dramatically illustrated in Musgrave's revised estimates of 1948 effective rates of taxation by spending units grouped according to income.

I have here a table which indicates that effective taxes are highly regressive from the $3,000 bracket up to the $7,500 bracket. I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distribution of tax burdens in 1948 (R. A. Musgrave and L. A. Frane)

Spending units Income brackets:	Effective tax rates in percent
Under $1,000	17.9
$1,000 to $2,000	20.5
$2,000 to $3,000	24.4
$3,000 to $4,000	25.3
$4,000 to $5,000	24.6
$5,000 to $7,500	23.8
$7,500 plus	36.4
Total	27.2

Source: National Tax Journal, March 1952.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since Korea there has been an ever sharper increase in the incidence of indirect consumer taxes.

According to the Bureau of the Census, total State tax receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, totaled $9.8 billions, nearly $1 billion above fiscal 1952. An analysis of the rise shows that nearly two-thirds, or $600 million, was obtained from increased taxes on consumers. Adding to this the $1.1 billion per year increase in Federal excise taxes resulting from the 1951 revenue amendments, we find that in 1952 State sales and excise increases plus the increase in Federal excises raised consumption taxes by $1.7 billion.

This is the equivalent of a yearly boost of close to $50 in taxes on food, clothing, equipment, and services for a family of 4.

According to estimates of the Northern Trust Co. of Chicago, people in the lowest-income group pay about 20 percent of their gross income in taxes today. For people in the $3,000 to $5,000 a year income group, the bank estimated taxes of all kinds absorb 25 to 30 percent of income—Washington Post, October 6, 1952.

Sales taxes are now levied by 33 States, compared with 24 in prewar 1939. They produced over $2 billion in revenue in fiscal 1952, or an increase of nearly 5 times over the $451 million collected in 1939.

Sales taxes are now the biggest single State revenue source, accounting for 23 percent of State tax collections in fiscal 1952, compared with 19 percent from motor-fuel taxes.

An outstanding feature of the post-World War II period has been the reluctance of Congress, while making numerous reductions in corporate-profits and excess-profits-tax rates, estate, and gift-tax rates and personal income-tax rates, to repeal the wartime excise taxes.

In 1947 and again in 1948, I urged the elimination and reduction of many excise taxes. On September 30, 1949, I put forward this plan again, and observed:

Title II of my bill attempts to carry out this general approach. It provides for the repeal of taxes on baby oil and baby powder, on purses, handbags, and pocketbooks, on the transportation of both persons and property, on matches, on electric-light bulbs, and on electric, gas, and oil appliances. It provides for the repeal of war tax rates on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and long-distance telephone and telegram, cable, and radio messages, and reductions in admissions taxes. It provides for the reduction of the tax on photographic apparatus and supplies.

The excise taxes that would be reduced or repealed constitute a fixed charge that tends to reduce the consumption of articles and services taxes. Their repeal would promote expansion of the industries affected and increase employment in these industries.

I stated further on that occasion:

Mr. President, I have checked in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the debates at the time the excise taxes were first imposed. In my opinion, a promise of the Congress is a sacred as the promise of an individual. The word of the Congress I believe should be as redeemable as the word of an individual. Any Senator who will take the trouble to go into the congressional debates at the time these taxes were imposed cannot deny what I now state to be the truth—that they were imposed as wartime measures, chiefly for the purpose of exercising controls over an economy which had become characterized by scarcity. They were imposed, in my judgment, as I interpret the record, with a clear promise on the part of the Congress that, come the end of the war, they would be removed. They were never imposed, in the primary consideration, as revenue-producing measures, but as economic-control measures, for directing the economy of the country into war channels so that we could devote our full attention to the production of goods necessary for the successful prosecution of the war.

Let us face the cold, ugly economic fact, Mr. President, that they have become revenue-producing taxes, and I wonder if that is not why it is so difficult to get the politicians to remove them.

The facts would seem to indicate that about 19 cents out of every Federal revenue dollar now comes from excise taxes. That is a lot of money. But the fact, Mr. President, that in application they have gradually shifted from taxes for the control of a wartime economy of scarcity into revenue-producing taxes is no justification for the Congress not carrying out what I think was a clear moral commitment on its part when these taxes were enacted. I add that I think they are unsound taxes, for I believe they hamstring business incentive because, in my opinion, they are unfairly discriminatory in nature.

So I am once again in this bill urging the repeal of many of them, urging great reductions in all of them, and also urging a thorough study by a bipartisan commission, which title VI of my bill seeks to create, of the whole problem of excise taxes.

The total annual revenue which would be lost if the terms of my bill should become law would be about $1 billion. If we abolished all excise taxes, or greatly reduced all of them, I would be the first to admit that the amount would exceed $1 billion. However, I think I have made a good and proper start in the bill for the handling of the vexatious excise-tax problem.

* * * * *

Mr. President, it should be remembered, however, that estimates of direct revenue lost through the reduction or repeal of excise taxes can be very misleading. These taxes are taxes on consumption. They are regressive taxes that are not based upon the ability to pay, and that in most instances do not take into account the financial resources of the persons paying the tax. Therefore, they operate to restrain the very economic expansion which provides the basis for high tax revenues. The net effect of these reductions for the economy would be extremely wholesome. To the extent that they stimulated an expansion in national income, they would produce additional tax revenue in the form of personal income-tax payments and corporation-tax payments.

This was not done.

That was the position I took when I introduced the bill. I have now in preparation further proposed tax legislation, subject to modifications, in light of new facts and somewhat changing conditions. When that bill is introduced it will contain the same principles. I recognize that we are now at war in Korea, and that our economy certainly is not a peacetime economy. However, I do not think the economy has become so changed we are justified in the imposition of regressive excise taxes to the degree they are now being levied, because there is need for expanding our economy. Unless the world situation becomes much worse, the civilian economy can expand notably, and with such expansion will come the new wealth-creating effects which will provide, as a result of the creation of employment, the tax revenues that are needed by way of a progressive tax structure, rather than a regressive tax structure, which I think we have somewhat unthinkingly let ourselves develop since World War II. I believe the time has now come for a halt in the march toward more and more regression in our tax structure, and for a turnabout and a march in the direction of a more progressive tax structure.

So, total Federal excises which were $3 billion in 1942 rose to over $6 billion in 1946 and in 1952 were over $9 billion.

Because of the regressive nature of these excises and their consumption-restricting effect, they should be given first priority in tax reductions.

The table below compares the impact of Federal, State, and local taxes on various income groups in 1938–39 and 1948. It indicates the discrepancy between scheduled rates and effective tax rates, and shows that in the decade before Korea the burden of taxation had already been shifted significantly onto the middle and lower incomes.

Income group	Total tax payments as a percent of income	
	1938-39	1948
Under $1,000	18.0	17.9
$1,000 to $2,000	17.5	20.5
$2,000 to $3,000	17.4	24.4
$3,000 to $4,000	17.7	25.3
$4,000 to $5,000	18.2	24.6
$5,000 to $7,500	18.7	23.8
$7,500 and up	32.7	36.4
All	20.2	27.2

Source: 1938–39 TNEC Monograph No. 3, Who Pays the Taxes? (1940); revised figures cited in Fiscal Policies and the American Economy, ed. K. E. Poole, 1951, p. 302. 1948: Musgrave and Frane, revised income series, National Tax Journal, March 1952.

Accelerated depreciation allowances, increased depletion, split income, and the other legalized methods for tax avoidance of the 1950's have cut considerably business and high-bracket tax rates.

I do not urge that we overlook the problems of upper bracket taxpayers. Far from it.

But I want to point out that in this big business administration the little business people and the salary earners and

wage earners,—the lobbyless citizens—have their pressing problems, too. I want to make sure that while the administration simonizes and puts glass wax on the chrome of the Cadillacs, the Model T's, and jalopies, which are gamely coughing along, get a few drops of regular gas.

UNITED STAND BY ALL AMERICANS IN PRESENT INTERNATIONAL DIFFICULTIES

Mr. President, I now turn to the last item of my committee work this afternoon.

I am sure that all Americans are deeply concerned about the turn of international events. All of us are deeply concerned about what may be the significance behind the apparent speed-up of outrageous incidents on the part of Russia. I believe we must make clear to the Communist segment of the world that whenever the security of the United States is threatened, we can always be counted upon to stand united behind whoever may sit in the White House.

As one who disagrees on a great many issues with the present President of the United States, I say there is no disagreement on my part or on the part of any other loyal American when it comes to giving united support to the President whenever a question of national security is raised. I can well imagine the anxious hours the President of the United States has been spending since the uncalled for, outrageous air incidents by Russia have occurred.

On this occasion I say to the President that although I fully expect to continue to disagree with him on matters of domestic policy and some foreign-policy issues, my voice will be joined with the voices of all other Members of the Senate in backing whatever final decision may have to be made in the field of international policy in order to protect freedom from enslavement.

STABILIZATION OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES—WORLD TRADE POLICIES

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield. Unless the Senator from Nevada wishes to ask me a question, I yield with the understanding that his remarks appear following my speech, and that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MALONE. That is understood.

Mr. President, in the past few weeks the people of this Nation have become very much perturbed and uneasy over persistent disquieting rumors that we are about to further divide the markets of this Nation with the sweatshop labor European and Asiatic countries—and to embark on a great financial outlay—a plan to further assess our taxpayers to stabilize foreign currencies at their often times fictitious values, through a great new financial structure, or new appropriations to the World Bank, or the Export-Import Bank, of $5 billion or $10 billion per year.

Mr. President, there are two well-defined approaches to destroy this Nation. First, the political, as represented by communism, advanced by our potential enemy, Russia; and second, the economic approach promoted by our allies and spearheaded by England, representing the sterling area or bloc countries seeking to divide our markets, built up over a century of time, through flooding this Nation with the sweatshop labor products of Europe and Asia.

GIFTS AND PROMISES

Mr. President, it will be remembered that all such plans to make the pound and other currencies convertible, starting with UNRAA, the $3¾ billion loan to Great Britain, the World Bank, the Import-Export Bank, and continuing through the Marshall plan, ECA, point 4, and now the present grandiose dream of conquest, have always promised the stabilization of foreign currencies, making them freely convertible, with special reference to the pound in the sterling area; but none of the promises have ever come to pass. Strangely enough, the promises which are made always hinge on the United States giving further of its substance and resources, months or years ahead of the rosy promises of benefits to come. Mr. President, the benefits never come—and they never will be realized under the proposed scheme.

THE BELL REPORT

The latest fantasy was the Bell report. It will be remembered that Daniel W. Bell was Budget Director under Mr. Truman. The first of the 10 recommendations in the Bell report startled the country.

Basing the trade policy on national rather than group interest and adopting measures to help industries affected by the change in policy readjustment by extending unemployment insurance, retraining workers, diversifying production, and converting to other lines.

He can mean only one thing, and that is that for the benefit of workers who are thrown out of work through importing the products of the sweatshop-labor countries, we will finance a Government agency to retrain the workers thus rendered idle and put them into another line of work; and that we shall have unemployment insurance, and other measures to care for them.

BRITAIN SEEKS UNRESTRICTED UNITED STATES MARKET

The Journal of Commerce, of New York, March 11, published an article headed "Butler Urges United States To Assist Traders; Asserts Britain Seeks Unrestricted Chance To Sell Products Here":

British Chancellor of the Exchequer R. A. Butler called on this country last night to clear away obstacles hindering Britain from competing in the American market.

REPEAL TARIFFS—AND THE BUY AMERICAN ACT

Mr. Butler, Chancellor of the Exchequer, is the inventor of the new slogan, "Trade, Not Aid." The British are the inventors of most of our slogans, including reciprocal trade—the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—each of which is designed to get another and larger appropriation from the United States Congress, and also a freer market for their sweatshop-labor goods in our high-standard-of-living Nation.

The article further states:

He singled out as obstacles this Government should review the present system of American tariffs and the Buy American Act, which obliges Government purchasing agencies to give preference to domestic manufacturers.

NEVADA LEGISLATURE, FOREIGN-TRADE POLICIES

I have just received a letter from Mr. Fred H. Settelmeyer, the Nevada State senator from Douglas County, enclosing a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 15 of the Nevada Senate. The resolution reads as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 15

Senate joint resolution memorializing Congress and the National Government to bar foreign products produced by underpaid foreign labor

Whereas livestock prices are experiencing a severe period of readjustment; and

Whereas the members of the livestock industry, employees and employers alike, are meeting their problems with customary independence and fortitude, firm in their devotion to the principles of our free enterprise system, but the task is being made dangerously difficult by the permitted admission of cheap foreign imports produced under economic conditions grossly at variance with the high standards of wages and living existing in the United States; and

Whereas it is essential for the economic stability and continued prosperity of our Nation, upon which rests the fate of human freedom, that our agriculture industry be assured of its place in a free American market: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That they do urge the Congress and the executive officers of our National Government that immediate action be taken to insure that our world trade policies are conceived and administered within the historic principle that foreign products produced by underpaid foreign labor and under substandard economic conditions shall not be admitted to our country on terms which endanger living standard of the American people or threaten financial injury to a domestic industry; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Agriculture of the United States, and to our Representatives in Congress.

Mr. President, the members of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, taking cognizance of the Washington trend, took time out of a busy schedule to say in Senate Joint Resolution No. 15:

That foreign products produced by underpaid foreign labor * * * shall not be admitted to our country on terms which endanger living standard of the American people or threaten financial injury to a domestic industry.

THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE'S FOREIGN-TRADE POLICIES

I have just received a note from Mr. Harold J. Powers, president of the Senate of the California Legislature, enclosing a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 19 of the California Senate, concerning the restoration to Congress of its constitutional powers of fixing tariffs. The resolution was introduced on February 26, 1953, and passed on March 6.

I may say that the current difficulty in the cattle market, due largely to imports from Mexico, New Zealand, Canada, and other nations, touched off this action. The wool market is broken. Wool producers and sheep producers are being

destroyed. The resolution to which I refer reads as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 19

Joint resolution concerning the restoration to Congress of the fixing of tariffs

Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living and the American way of life that products of foreign countries be admitted to this country only on a basis which will not endanger the living standards of the American workingman and the American farmer and will not threaten serious economic injury to any domestic industry; and

Whereas promotion of world trade by the Government of the United States should adhere to this principle so that the economic status of the American people may be maintained and not reduced to that in the depressed areas of the world where work is performed behind the sweatshop curtain; and

Whereas, while recent imports of live cattle and frozen and canned beef from Mexico, Canada, New Zealand, and other areas have dramatically highlighted the problem with respect to one industry, yet it is a problem affecting all of the branches of agriculture, industry, and commercial production; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States abandoned its traditional function of fixing tariffs on foreign commerce entering the United States under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to the executive department of the Government, which has carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the standard of living for all American citizens created thereby; and be it further

Resolved, That until Congress so acts, the executive department of the Government exercise its powers of fixing tariffs only in accordance with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, the California Legislature said that "the Congress of the United States abandoned its traditional function of fixing tariffs as foreign commerce entering the United States under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to the executive department of the Government." The Legislature of the State of California most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the standard of living for all American citizens.

PRODUCTION OF ANTIMONY—THE LEGISLATURE OF IDAHO—FOREIGN TRADE

A letter from Mr. Ira H. Masters, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, dated February 26, enclosed a copy of Senate Joint Memorial No. 4 of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

All these resolutions have been sent or will be sent to the President of the United States and to certain Members of Congress, as well as to certain members of the President's Cabinet.

This Senate Joint Resolution No. 4 covers the production of antimony—a very vital strategic mineral in the defense of this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have Senate Joint Memorial No. 4, from the Mines and Mining Committee of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the HONORABLE DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; THE HONORABLE CHARLES E. WILSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE; THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS MCKAY, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR; HOWARD I. YOUNG, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT AGENCY; AND J. D. SMALL, CHAIRMAN, MUNITIONS BOARD:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, in legislative session, duly and regularly assembled, most respectfully present the following preamble and resolution, to wit:

"Whereas our normal peacetime requirements of primary antimony are about 15,000 tons and in the event of an all-out war these requirements would be increased to about 45,000 tons; and

"Whereas heavy importation of foreign antimony at depressed prices during 1951 and 1952 forced the Yellow Pine Mine in Valley County, Idaho, to shut down with the result that our total domestic production, since this shutdown, has been at the rate of less than 100 tons annually, or less than 1 percent of our total domestic requirements; and

"Whereas the said Yellow Pine Mine, for years had been supplying over 90 percent of the entire domestic mine output and has a productive capacity equivalent to over 20 percent of our peacetime requirement and about 10 percent of our wartime needs; and

"Whereas formerly our principal source of supply was from China, which source is no longer available to the free world, and another major source has been Bolivia, which source is undependable because of an unstable government and economic disturbance, and all other sources are either far distant, declining or undependable; and

"Whereas our Government stockpile has been estimated to contain only 20,000 tons of primary antimony, or approximately 6 months' supply during a wartime demand period; and

"Whereas our major wartime requirements for antimony cannot be satisfied by scrap or secondary antimony, but only by primary antimony; and

"Whereas, since February 1952, the total United States consumption of primary antimony has exceeded the total available supply, including imports; and

"Whereas the United States industrial stocks of primary antimony have declined during 1952 to the lowest point in many years: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we most respectfully urge that in the interests of national security the new administration carefully examine our Nation's stockpiling program with respect to primary antimony; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that since we are now in a war emergency and are currently dependent on foreign sources for over 90 percent of our primary antimony supplies, we believe that our national stockpile of primary antimony, estimated to contain only enough antimony to last 6 months during an all-out war, is dangerously inadequate, and we believe that the antimony stockpile objective should be raised to a more realistic figure; and be it further

"Resolved, That we most respectfully urge that consideration be given to encouraging or maintaining some productive capacity in this country. We particularly refer to the closed down antimony mine and smelter at Stibnite, Idaho, and believe it regrettable that these excellent facilities have not been made use of in building up an adequate stockpile; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson; Douglas McKay, Secretary of Interior; Howard I. Young, Deputy Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency; J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board; Hon. Henry C. Dworshak, United States Senate; Hon. Herman Welker, United States Senate; Hon. Hamer H. Budge, and Hon. Gracie Pfost, United States House of Representatives; Hon. Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Speaker of the House; Hon. George W. Malone, chairman, Senate Mines Committee; and Hon. A. L. Miller, chairman of House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee."

This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 13th day of February 1953.

EDSON H. DEAL,
President of the Senate.

This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 21st day of February 1953.

R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

I hereby certify that the within Senate Joint Memorial No. 4 originated in the senate during the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

BRITT NEDRY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Idaho is deeply disturbed over the realization that we have become dependent upon foreign sources for our wartime supply of this vital mineral.

The joint memorial reads in part as follows:

Be it further resolved, That we most respectfully urge that since we are now in a war emergency and are currently dependent on foreign sources for over 99 percent of our primary antimony supplies, we believe that our national stockpile of primary antimony, estimated to contain only enough antimony to last 6 months during an all-out war, is dangerously inadequate, and we believe that the antimony stockpile objective should be raised to a more realistic figure.

This resolution is given over almost entirely to the subject of the production of antimony, a very strategic mineral. We cannot fight a war or live in peace without antimony.

NEVADA WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION

The Nevada Wool Growers Association, represented by Chandler B. Church, has just sent me a resolution approving the action of the Nevada Legislature—Senate Joint Resolution No. 15—dated March 10, 1953.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution appear at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEVADA WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
Reno, Nev., March 10, 1953.

Hon. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In behalf of the members of this organization, this is to register its approval and support of a joint resolution recently adopted by the Nevada State Legislature which we think aptly sets forth the needs of and the situation confronting the sheep industry of our Nation, as follows:

"Whereas livestock prices are experiencing a severe period of readjustment; and

"Whereas the members of the livestock industry, employees and employers alike, are meeting their problems with customary independence and fortitude, firm in their devotion to the principles of our free-enterprise system, but the task is being made dangerously difficult by the permitted admission of cheap foreign imports produced under economic conditions grossly at variance with the high standards of wages and living existing in the United States; and

"Whereas it is essential for the economic stability and continued prosperity of our Nation, upon which rests the fate of human freedom, that our agriculture industry be assured of its place in a free American market: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That they do urge the Congress and the executive officers of our National Government that immediate action be taken to insure that our world-trade policies are conceived and administered within the historic principle that foreign products produced by underpaid foreign labor and under substandard economic conditions shall not be admitted to our country on terms which endanger living standards of the American people or threaten financial injury to a domestic industry; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President and the Secretaries of State, Commerce, and Agriculture of the United States and to our representatives in Congress."

Very truly yours,
CHANDLER B. CHURCH,
President.

Original copies of letters sent to Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, President; Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; Hon. Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture; Hon. P. A. McCarran; Hon. Clifton Young.

Copy of letter sent to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the resolution from the Nevada Woolgrowers Association is further evidence of the disturbance caused by rumors that the State Department might be allowed to continue to make trade agreements under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act.

THREE STATES DISTURBED: CALIFORNIA, NEVADA, IDAHO

The resolutions point to the fact that if we are forced out of certain businesses or productive industries—and of course the policy of market destruction through sweatshop competition applies equally to the cattle industry, the sheep industry, the wool industry, the textile industry, and to the crockery, watch, precision instrument, and to practically all other industries—we are in grave danger with respect to the defense of our country.

I might mention incidentally that four crockery plants in Ohio closed down within the last 30 or 40 days.

Once we are out of those businesses and the people who produce those commodities and materials are leaving their jobs, we can easily reach the point of dependence upon foreign sources for such minerals and materials so that we will be unable to defend ourselves in the event of an attack. Certainly we could not defend our lines of transportation, which are necessary to be kept open for the necessary foreign imports to fight a third world war.

MEXICO CITY CONFERENCE—54 NATIONS

An article in the Wall Street Journal of September 10, 1952, refers to a shocking attempt to destroy the economic system of this Nation.

The headline reads: "British Talk Penalty for Nations With Bigger Exports Than Imports."

I read from the article:

MEXICO CITY.—The British have—

It will be noted that the meeting was held in Mexico City. It merely goes to show that meetings can be held anywhere in the world, and because we have been hit over the head so long and so often, a meeting held for the purpose of finishing the destruction of the markets of the Nation attracts very little attention.

THE BRITISH PLAN TO DESTROY OUR ECONOMY

MEXICO CITY.—The British have a new plan for ending their chronic financial crisis.

They're hoping to get the nations of the world to penalize countries—like the United States—that continually import less than they export.

Of course, that is not literally true that we export more than we import. If they were to discount our national exports for defense purposes there would be an imbalance in favor of imports, but they say nothing about that here.

I continue to read from the article:

The "guilty" country would be pilloried before world opinion—and if it still failed to import enough, it would be subject to trade and tariff discrimination by the rest of the world.

Of course, we are talking about the United States here.

I continue to read:

The British are already taking up their ideas behind the scenes in the 54-nation International Monetary Fund and World Bank annual meetings now going on here.

That meeting was held on the 10th of September in Mexico City, at the height of the election campaign in this country, when very few Senators were paying close attention to anything but the campaign.

The confabs provide an excellent chance for the British quietly to push new schemes like this, as many of the world's finance ministers and central bank presidents are here along with several hundred other important financial officials from around the globe. And most of these nations, like the British, are having trouble making both ends meet.

STILL VAGUE

The penalty plan is still very vague. British officials will be working out details for several months to come; they don't hope to push officially for its adoption until next year.

Mr. President, they are working out the details now. "Next year"—1953—is here now. They are pushing officially for its adoption. They—Mr. Eden and Mr. Butler—have just left Washington, where they pushed very hard for its adoption.

EUROPE INVOKES PENALTY ON UNITED STATES—UNFAIR LABEL

Quoting further from the article:

In general, the British penalty scheme would work like this:

If a country—the United States or Belgium, for example—continually imports less than it exports and other countries thus get "short of dollars" (or Belgian francs), then the nations of the world would label the United States (or Belgium) as being "at fault." The "fault": Not doing enough to prevent such "deficit" countries as Britain and France from being financially unable to buy what they need.

The British make it clear they would paste the "unfair" label on a country even if its imports and exports were equal—if the people of the world wanted to buy more of its goods but couldn't because of the general lack of dollars or francs or whatever its currency.

Once a country were tagged "unfair" or "at fault" because of this surplus trading position, the British plan would call for sanctions.

The guilty surplus country would be charged by the other nations with its errors and brought to book before world opinion. Just what forum would be used for this purpose hasn't been finally decided; the British would like to do it through a broadened European Payments Union if they could get the United States to join that group (in which case it would probably be rechristened the Atlantic Payments Union). Failing that, the IMF itself might be assigned the task.

WORLD OPINION TO DESTROY THE UNITED STATES

The British have a great deal of faith in the power of world opinion to bring the United States or any other country into line. But if that didn't work, a second sanction could be imposed. This would be economic. If the United States were found unfair, the other countries would be expected to discriminate against the United States goods regardless of what trade and tariff agreements they had with the United States. And these other countries would give trade and tariff favors to deficit countries like France—and Britain.

The theory is that this would enable Britain and other deficit countries to sell goods they had been unable to sell because they had been unable to compete with United States goods in world markets.

Furthermore—

Now we are getting down to bedrock, Mr. President—

Furthermore, as American economists here put it, this would create an enlarged sterling bloc and protect high cost, inefficient industries within that bloc.

TRADE, NOT AID—UNITED STATES FLOODED WITH PROPAGANDA FOLLOWING NOVEMBER 4 ELECTION

Mr. President, beginning right after the election of November 4, 1952, this country became flooded with propaganda calling for trade, not aid.

DANGER TO ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

The junior Senator from Nevada has continually drawn attention to the danger to the economic structure of this Nation of low-cost labor competition. When it is said that European countries can produce some things cheaper than we can, and therefore we ought to buy from them, the argument sounds quite reasonable.

However, what they really mean is that they want us to patronize the sweatshop labor.

Very often the wages paid in European countries are less than what is paid in the United States in social-security taxes, industrial insurance, and unemployment insurance. That is what it amounts to, Mr. President.

FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE WOULD ENCOURAGE HIGHER STANDARD OF LIVING ABROAD

We say that we want to raise the standard of living of foreign countries. I say that the policies which we are following through the State Department, in breaking down the equalizer of the standard of living here and abroad, which we call either flexible duty, import fee, or tariff, are encouraging European countries to hold down their standard of living because they can bring into this country the products of sweatshop labor and sell them here for whatever the traffic will bear and then keep the difference.

On the other hand, if we had a flexible import fee or duty as the Constitution of the United States charges the Congress with the responsibility of imposing, by setting certain duties, imposts, or excises, then when they came to this country with their products and paid the difference into the United States Treasury between their sweatshop labor production and the wage-living standard cost of production in this country, they would soon find that they could not profit by holding their labor down.

Then they would go home and allow their own wage standard of living to rise.

IN FOREIGN NATIONS HANDS TO BRING ABOUT FREE TRADE

As their production cost and their wage-living standards came up, our flexible import fees would go down.

When the foreign countries approached our wage-living standard, free trade would be the almost automatic and immediate result.

NATIONAL DEFENSE ENDANGERED

Mr. President, we are already out of the mining business except insofar as it is being kept alive by taxpayer money through subsidies.

We are slowly putting ourselves out of business in the necessary production for our national defense.

If the foreign nations are able to accomplish their purpose of raiding our markets with their low-cost labor production, we will not be able to either protect them in Europe or to protect ourselves when the fight starts.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to do so.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably 237 nominations of general rank in the Army and Air Force, and flag rank in the Navy, and request that the nominations be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

The nominations reported by Mrs. SMITH of Maine are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, United States Army, for appointment as Director of the National Security Agency, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Whitfield Putnam Shepard, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Jonathan Lane Holman, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Edward Francis Kent, and sundry other officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Roger Maxwell Ramey, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Brig. Gen. Haywood Shepherd Hansell, Jr., and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force;

Henry C. Bruton, and sundry other officers for temporary promotion in the Navy; and

Norgren B. Allen, and sundry other persons for appointment as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps and the Navy.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I now report favorably 2,334 routine nominations in the grade of colonel and below in the Army and Marine Corps, and below the grade of captain in the Navy. In order to save the expense of printing this large list of names in the Executive Calendar, and inasmuch as they have already appeared once in the RECORD, I request that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk, for inspection by any Senator, prior to their confirmation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONFIRMATION OF ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as in executive session, I move that the Senate now proceed to consider the nomination of Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is that the only nomination on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It is the only nomination to be considered today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination of Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, before the nomination is confirmed, I should like to make a few remarks.

It gives me the greatest personal satisfaction to pay sincere tribute to a fellow New Jerseyman whom I have known for several years. I refer to Mr. Ormonde A. Kieb, whose nomination as Assistant Postmaster General for Facilities is presently before us.

I am offering these heartfelt congratulations not merely to Mr. Kieb, but also to President Eisenhower and to Arthur Summerfield, the Postmaster General, for their wisdom and foresight in naming a truly qualified expert in the real estate field to a post so vitally important to the Government.

Ultimately, Mr. President, the American people will be the chief beneficiaries from this expression of the will of their President and Mr. Summerfield.

In my opinion, no department in our Government is closer to the people than is the Post Office Department.

When a man of Toni Kieb's qualities and background is privileged to serve his country, then I can assure the people of the United States that they will be the recipients of honest, efficient, and dependable service from his capable hands.

In his new position, Mr. Kieb will administer the public buildings program of the Post Office Department, and he will be responsible for the operation of Government-owned post-office buildings.

His duties cover general engineering problems involved in present buildings and the design and construction of future post-office buildings. That is the job that Toni Kieb is being called on to perform.

Mr. President, please allow me to touch briefly upon the type of experience and the background which this man, who 25 years ago started in the real-estate business as an errand boy, is going to bring to work with him every day.

Currently, Mr. Kieb is a director of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, and a charter member of the Society of Industrial Realtors.

He served as governor of the Newark, N. J., real estate board, and as president of the New Jersey Association of Real

Estate Boards, and of the Institute of Real Estate Management.

He has been active as a Rotarian, as an official with the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and as a vice president of the Newark YMCA; and he has served his State in many capacities in the housing and property fields.

Mr. President, we are going to get efficiency in a Department which is suffering under the load of perennial deficits, and the people expect that efficiency.

Last November they voted for the capabilities exemplified by Toni Kieb, even though this worthy representative of my home State never found his name on any ballot.

I am grateful for the opportunity to urge the confirmation of the nomination of Toni Kieb to be Assistant Postmaster General for Facilities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Postmaster General?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Kieb, and also of the action taken yesterday by the Senate in confirming the nomination of Albert J. Robertson, of Iowa, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of both nominations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION TO PREVENT ABUSE OF THE TREATYMAKING POWER

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to speak this afternoon about Senate Resolution 1.

In our time the power of government has grown at a rampant rate. Whenever the power of government is enhanced, to the same degree human liberty is suppressed. The contribution of our great country to the developing jurisprudence of the world has been to a large extent the result of a new concept of human liberty.

Great as has been our material contribution to the world's progress, it is small as compared to our contribution in the spiritual realm.

Even though our material resources have been enormous, they have been developed and utilized because the mind and body of our people have been freer than in any other nation of any time.

Our concept of freedom is that mankind has certain God-given inalienable rights which government cannot take away.

On January 7, 1953, I introduced a proposed constitutional amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 1. It would prevent any treaty or executive agreement from undermining the fundamental rights of the American people or from sacrificing essential attributes of sovereignty. I am very proud that 63 other Senators joined me as cosponsors of this vital amendment.

Hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1 are now being held before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. The resolution may be before the Senate in the near future. For that reason, I should like to review some of the principal arguments for and against the adoption of a constitutional amendment to limit the scope of the treatymaking power.

Most American lawyers believe that a treaty may be effective to authorize what the Constitution otherwise forbids. For example, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, speaking last year at the regional meeting of the American Bar Association, in Louisville, Ky., reached this conclusion:

> The treatymaking power is an extraordinary power, liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution, treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are, indeed, more supreme than ordinary laws for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas treaty law can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

Section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would prevent any treaty from cutting across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

With respect to section 1 of the proposed amendment the issue is clear: Shall the supremacy of the Constitution of the United States over treaties be established beyond all doubts? Or, shall the President and the Senate in exercising the treaty power be trusted not to impair the fundamental rights of American citizens?

The Founding Fathers never dreamed that treaties would be used as an instrument of legislation with respect to the Nation's purely domestic concerns. For that reason, they placed no limitations on the treatymaking power. They never intended, however, to trust the treatymaking agency or any other agency of government with unlimited power over the rights of the individual.

The Declaration of Independence proclaims: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," and that governments are instituted among men to secure these rights.

To secure these inalienable rights, the Constitution of the United States was adopted; to secure these rights the Bill of Rights was ratified; to secure these rights Senate Joint Resolution 1, supported by 64 Members of this body, was introduced.

At a recent and very significant prayer breakfast—and I want to say parenthetically that it was one of the most impressive meetings I have ever attended in Washington—the President of the United States said:

> When we came to that turning point in history, where we intended to establish a Government for free men and a Declaration and Constitution to make it last, in order to explain such a system we had to say, "We hold that all men are endowed by their Creator." In one sentence we established that every free government is embedded soundly in a deeply felt religious faith or it makes no sense. Today if we can recall those things and if, in that sense, we can back off from our problems and depend upon a power greater than ourselves, I believe that we can begin to draw those problems into focus.
>
> I have the profound belief that if we remind ourselves once in a while of this simple basic truth—that our forefathers in 1776 understood so well—we can hold up our heads and be certain that we in our time are going to be able to preserve its essentials, to preserve a free government and pass it on in our turn, as sound, as strong, as good as ever. That, it seems to me, is the prayer that all of us have today.

Contrast that concept of freedom with the sentiments expressed by witnesses appearing in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. Dr. Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary of the Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church, said:

> We therefore do not face the future with fear and distrust of our elected leaders such as to require a constitutional amendment which would cripple the freedom and flexibility which has worked so well in the past.

Whose freedom and whose flexibility? The first 10 amendments crippled the freedom and flexibility of government. The wise men who insisted on a Bill of Rights had a healthy fear and distrust of absolute government power even though derived by democratic processes. They were unwilling to trust the President and the Congress with unlimited power. The President and the Senate are worthy of no greater trust. It was Thomas Jefferson who said:

> In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

Compare Jefferson's thought with the following statement of the former Solicitor General, Philip B. Perlman, in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1:

> I believe that the people of the United States are willing to continue to trust the President and the Senate in such matters.

Let me call to the attention of the Senate the fact that Mr. Perlman is the man who argued in favor of Presidential power to seize the great steel industry of this country, which position, if sustained, would have brought an end to the rights of property and to human liberty in the United States.

In a recent address before the American Association for the United Nations, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said:

> We dare not, for instance, sanction legislation such the proposed Bricker resolution * * * which (takes away) from the Senate the power and discretion to judge the validity of all treaties and agreements that may be negotiated.

In answer to that, I call as my witness Woodrow Wilson, who had this to say about the same problem:

> The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it.

On the other hand, Mr. George P. Delaney, international representative of the American Federation of Labor, stated

in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1:

> I, for one, am quite prepared to trust two-thirds of the Senate to judge each treaty on its merits and to yield a verdict compatible with our constitutional rights and liberties.

The fundamental rights of the American people are either inalienable or they may be alienated by treaty. If we want to trust the President and the Senate never to abridge those rights by treaty, we should in all honesty stop calling them inalienable. It is amazing, midway in the 20th century, to find some so blind that they would trust a temporal power not to impair the inherent, divinely bestowed rights of the individual. Has modern government become so benevolent as to justify this radical departure from the concept of freedom enunciated in the Declaration of Independence? On the contrary, the consolidation and abuse of absolute power is the hallmark of our time. Since modern science had made the police state almost impregnable against internal revolt, government is entitled to much less trust today than it was when James Madison said:

> If men were angels, no government would be necessary.

Needless to say, I have the utmost trust and confidence in President Eisenhower and in my colleagues in the Senate. No man can guarantee, however, that some future President and the Senate will not make a treaty contravening the Constitution. In 1924 the President and the Senate did just that. The year before the Supreme Court had held that the 18th amendment prohibited the importation of intoxicating liquor under seal into the territorial waters of the United States—*Cunard S. S. Co.* v. *Mellon* (252 U. S. 100 (1923). To overcome that effect of the 18th amendment, the President negotiated in secret, and the Senate approved in secret, a treaty with Great Britain. The composition of the Congress today makes it possible to establish the supremacy of the Constitution over the conflicting provisions of a treaty. Locking the barn door before the horse is stolen is a better policy than chanting, "It can't be done here."

Even if there were no danger that the President and the Senate would deliberately abuse the treatymaking power, a limitation on the treatymaking power would still be necessary. The President and the Senate cannot always be sure that a treaty will not deny or abridge some fundamental right. Perhaps the best example in the genocide convention which was referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee 4 years ago.

The American Bar Association sees in the genocide convention a grave threat to freedom of speech, press, and the rights of persons accused of crime. Proponents of the treaty deny that such dangers exist. Neither interpretation of the treaty is unreasonable. The Supreme Court has the final word, but it is constitutionally incapable of rendering an advisory opinion. No doubt the Senate could remove any danger to American rights by a series of reservations to the treaty. However, the International Court of Justice has held that substantial reservations to the genocide convention will nullify the effect of ratification. The Senate will never be able to vote intelligently on the genocide convention until such time as the supremacy of the Constitution over treaties is firmly established.

Opponents of any treaty-control amendment contend that the Supreme Court would invalidate any treaty authorizing what the Constitution otherwise forbids. That argument has been thoroughly refuted by leaders of the American Bar Association who appeared before the subcommittee of which the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is chairman. They have fully documented the conclusion of Mr. Dulles that treaties "can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

Section 1 of the joint resolution would prevent some provisions of the proposed U. N. Human Rights Covenant from becoming effective in the United States. For example, article 10 of the U. N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights permits the right to a public trial to be denied. The sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that the accused shall enjoy the right to a public trial in all criminal prosecutions.

The U. N. draft statute for an International Criminal Court nullifies in unmistakable language the constitutional protection of persons accused of crimes. Under the terms of this treaty American citizens could be: tried abroad for crimes committed in the United States—article 21; denied the right to trial by jury—article 37; tried in secret—article 41; convicted by majority vote—article 46; and denied any right of appeal—article 50. Nevertheless, the proposed International Criminal Court is endorsed by some American lawyers and judges. It is hardly necessary to add that these men are violently opposed to any constitutional amendment limiting the treatymaking power.

Section 1 of the joint resolution cannot hamstring any President who wishes to preserve the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution. The only treaties affected by section 1 are those which deny or abridge some right protected by the Constitution. Section 1, therefore, merely carries out this pledge in the 1952 platform of the Republican Party:

> We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution.

A new administration now holds the executive power of the United States. To gain that power, it made certain solemn promises to the American people. Of these promises, none was more important than its pledge to conduct all the affairs of government, foreign and domestic, in accordance with the historic principle that ours is a government of laws, not of men. I hope, therefore, that no officer of the present administration will assert that no amendment is necessary because the new administration can be trusted to avoid the dangers inherent in an unlimited treaty power.

Section 2 of the proposed amendment would prevent any international organization from acquiring by treaty the right to interfere with the purely domestic rights of American citizens or with other matters essentially domestic in character. With reference to section 2, an editorial in the Washington Post of January 11, 1953, had this comment:

> It is difficult to conceive of any treaty of this sort being negotiated by the President or approved by the Senate, but we do not think the door should be closed to international tribunals that could enforce an international bill of rights under a possible federation of free-world powers.

I would close the door that the Washington Post would leave open. Before surrendering vital elements of sovereignty to a federation of free-world powers, public approval should be manifested in a constitutional amendment. No other procedure is appropriate for such a revolutionary and irrevocable step. Responsible spokesmen for the Atlantic Union Committee and the United World Federalists concede that a regional or world government by treaty would violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution. A world or regional government, not imposed by force, requires the voluntary acceptance of common economic, political, social, and moral values throughout the area to be consolidated. That condition does not exist. The leaders of these regional and world government movements admit that their achievements should require a constitutional amendment. They do not seek their goal by using treaties as a subterfuge for the surrender of essential attributes of sovereignty. Their respect for constitutional processes might well be emulated by the Washington Post.

Opponents of section 2 conjured up some fantastic fears. For example, Mr. Dana C. Backus testified that section 2 would prevent the International Telecommunications Union from allocating radio frequencies and the World Health Organization from adopting quarantine regulations to prevent the international spread of disease. Mr. Backus, however, demolished his own argument when he said: "Radio waves and bacteria do not recognize international borders." They are of international concern and would not be affected by this section.

Mr. Backus also argued that section 2 would prevent the United States and Canada from setting up a joint commission for the conservation of salmon in west coast rivers and in the coastal waters of the two countries. He promptly undercut his own argument with the observation that only through international control could salmon "be adequately and efficiently protected." When international boundaries are crossed by fish, migratory birds, radio waves, narcotics, prostitutes, germs, airplanes, or tourists, it is silly to argue that problems arising out of such international travel are purely domestic in character.

Mr. Backus also told the subcommittee that section 2 would prohibit adjudication of claims of American citizens against foreign nations and their nationals. That is perfect nonsense. In such a situation, the American creditor

cannot enforce his right under the Constitution and laws of the United States in the absence of treaty or agreement. Yet, we are asked to believe that the claims of American citizens are purely domestic in character, even though the fullest exercise of the domestic powers of the United States cannot provide a remedy.

The most absurd charge leveled against Senate Joint Resolution 1 is that section 2 of the resolution would prevent United States participation in a treaty for the control of the military applications of atomic energy. Mr. Backus and Mr. Perlman, to whom I referred a moment ago, advanced this reckless charge.

In the atomic bomb, man has created a weapon which can level cities in the twinkling of an eye. Men the world over live in fear of this terrifying weapon. The threat of total annihilation increases daily. How I wish that atomic energy were a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. If only America held the key to atomic energy, I am convinced that world peace would be assured and that the nonmilitary uses of this source of power would be developed for the benefit of all humanity. Unfortunately, atomic warfare may some day destroy all life on this planet. Any treaty designed to prevent the extinction of the whole human race deals with a subject of paramount international concern. No reasonable man can describe the subject as purely domestic or national in character. Section 2 of my amendment is intended to prevent foreign interference only with respect to domestic matters.

The International Labor Organization calls itself a world parliament for labor and social questions. The legislation of this so-called world parliament is embodied in ILO conventions. They deal with such purely domestic matters as social security, insurance, labor-management relations, minimum wages, industrial safety, socialized medicine, and maternity.

No international organization or foreign power has any legitimate interest in our social-security system. No international treaty can add anything whatever to the social-security benefits which can be provided under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Whether the American people, acting through their Representatives in Congress, approve lavish or modest benefits, universal or limited coverage, compulsory or voluntary contributions, the answer remains the same. It is nobody's business but our own.

Last year the ILO passed a convention entitled "Minimum Standards of Social Security." Approval of this convention by the Senate would obligate the United States to socialize the practice of medicine. One member of the United States employer delegation suggested including in the convention a statement endorsing the principle of voluntary association between physician and patient. He was voted down by the ILO socialist majority.

No committee of Congress has ever reported a bill for compulsory health insurance. In spite of the lobbying of Federal Security Agency officials, Congress has refused to act. Nevertheless, Robert Myers, Actuary of the Social Security Administration, was a member of the United States Government delegation and voted for the convention to socialize medicine. Why have representatives of the United States Government voted consistently for socialism by treaty when the Congress has with equal consistency refused to endorse socialism by legislation? Here is the explanation given to Senator LANGER's subcommittee by an employer delegate, Mr. W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, Ohio:

> At last June's conference, we asked the United States Government delegates flatly why they followed the policy they did. Their first answer was that their policy was dictated from Washington.
>
> When pressed further, they indicated, in a general but not very informative fashion, that the idea was that the United States should play up to the Socialists because the Socialists would help us contain the Communists. In other words, internationally speaking, we should be hypocrites. We should pretend to support measures which we know our people would never approve of, in the hope that European Socialists would in turn be more sympathetic to our programs with respect to Russia.
>
> My own personal point of view is that hypocrisy is no proper foundation for international relations. I think that the behavior of our United States delegates in voting in favor of Socialist international laws which are contrary to the principles on which our freedom and our economy have been founded is unforgivable. I do not think we can defend ourselves against communism by pretending sympathy for a system which is equally repugnant to the basic principles of the Constitution of the United States.

Motherhood also would become the subject of international control. At the last ILO conference, a convention on maternity protection was adopted. An employed woman would be given 12 weeks off to have her baby, with government paying the cost of medical care, hospitalization, and an amount equal to two-thirds of her pay. Here is Mr. McGrath's report of the ILO discussions on maternity protection:

> For one whole afternoon government, labor, and employer delegates, from nations all over the world, debated the question as to whether a woman nursing her baby, on time paid for by the employer, should do so in a single period of 1 hour per day, or two periods of one-half hour each. I recall that Israel held out for 1 hour and France was strong for two half-hour periods. On this great international point, the representative of the United States Government appeared neutral.
>
> One morning there was a long debate on the subject of whether the Government should or should not furnish layettes.
>
> Another technical point was this. If a mother was unable to furnish her own milk for her own baby she would have to buy it. Therefore the government should buy it for her. But if the government bought cow's milk for one mother, was that fair to the mother who was able to furnish her own milk? This led to the conclusion that a mother who could furnish her own milk should likewise be paid by the government for doing so, and while dispensing it she would also be paid an hourly rate by her employer.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Apparently, in the ideal socialistic state practically all women are supposed to work. Their babies, legitimate and illegitimate alike, are financed by government benefits; and in due course they bring them to work with them, placing them in government-run nurseries and leaving their machines or typewriters, to nurse them on company time.
>
> The place of the father in the scheme of things is reduced purely to the function of paternity. The state provides against a multitude of contingencies for which, in a free society, the husband and the father, as head of the family, is supposed to provide.

Mr. McGrath sat through all the hearings held during the past 4 years.

When the father becomes a mere biological necessity, can international sterilization of the unfit and scientific breeding be far behind? In this connection, I should like to read article 4 of the U. N. Draft Covenant on Civil and Political Rights:

> No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected against his will to medical or scientific experimentation involving risk where such is not required by his state of physical or mental health.

Such determination would be made by some temporal authority, some bureaucrat, some board, some commission, international in character, no doubt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "Motherhood—Secularist Style," from the September-October 1952 issue of Leaves, published by the Mariannhill Fathers and Brothers of the American Province.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, socialism by treaty, according to opposition witnesses, is a hypothetical danger. They point out that if Congress refuses to socialize the Nation by domestic legislation, two-thirds of the Senate is unlikely to do so by treaty. If that is true, why do our Government delegates to the ILO vote for socialistic conventions, and what would be lost if the United States were unable to ratify such conventions? The best answer, I believe, is to be found in the testimony of Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, representing the United States Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Rhyne said:

> The great effusion of treaties designed to solve many of our unsolved domestic problems—as well as to offer new solutions to those for which solutions have been devised domestically—has gradually brought home to the businessmen of the United States that while they have in the past looked for regulatory law relating to their businesses in local ordinances, State statutes and Federal statutes, they now must focus their attention upon a fourth many-chambered legislative body, which is busy grinding out proposed treaty law. When our triple-layer governmental system has added to it this fourth branch the results can be startling in impact.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It has been estimated that there are some 200 treaties affecting businessmen in one way or another now either proposed or under active consideraiton by the United Nations and its specialized agencies. It is also estimated that last year the United States was represented at more than 3,000 international conferences, committee meetings and discussions. Since these meetings and conferences

are held all over the world under circumstances and arrangements which are not too well known to businessmen, it is obvious that the creation of an effective watchdog in this field is an almost impossible task. This means that many of these conventions will be sprung full-blown upon us without business interests being afforded an opportunity to oppose, in the drafting stage, any provisions believed to be injurious to or destructive of any part of our free-enterprise system.

* * * * *

It seems that we have now reached a point in our history where the great increase in international treaties and the broad scope proposed for them makes it wise to pause and consider whether our treatymaking machinery is adequate to cope with the problems created by this accelerated use of that type of legislation. It is this revolutionary change in the concepts and functions of treaties and the great increase in proposals to delegate domestic matters to international organizations which indicate that the treaty provisions of our Constitution which have served well in the past are not adequate for our present situation.

The United Nations Human Rights Covenants would subject almost every civil, political, economic, and social right of American citizens to international definition, supervision, and control. Traditionally, those rights have been regarded as purely domestic in character. Many of those rights are protected under the power reserved to the States by the Constitution.

Opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 contend that a Federal-State clause in the Human Rights Covenants and in the ILO Constitution adequately protects the powers reserved to the States by the 10th amendment. Such a clause provides that a Federal Government is responsible only for carrying out parts of the treaty which, under its constitution, are appropriate for Federal action. I do not question the sincerity of the argument concerning the effectiveness of a Federal-State clause. It is, however, unsound.

Article VI, paragraph 2, of the constitution declares that treaties become the supreme law of the land. The Supreme Court in *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416), held that Congress has the power to implement a treaty by legislation, even though such legislation, by invading the reserved powers of the States, would be unconstitutional in the absence of treaty. Therefore, while a Federal-State clause would permit the international obligation to be limited to that portion of the treaty within the Federal domain, it cannot prevent Congress under the rule of Missouri against Holland from enlarging its power at the expense of the States. Thus, approval of the Human Rights Covenants would provide a constitutional base for civil-rights legislation which might be invalid in the absence of treaty.

The record will show, Mr. President, that I have always voted to let the Senate pass on the merits of various civil-rights measures. However, this is an American question and not an appropriate subject for regulation by international law. Whatever civil-rights legislation may be passed by Congress should meet the same constitutional tests as all other domestic legislation. The balance of power between Federal and State governments must not be destroyed by treaty.

Almost every witness opposed to Senate Joint Resolution 1 said that it reflected some distrust of the United Nations. In my judgment, the amendment I have proposed will help save the United Nations. Since it is true that the amendment reflects some distrust of the U. N. human rights program, I shall explain why.

This is only consistent with the distrust which the constitutional founders of this country had of the power of government—the same distrust which Woodrow Wilson expressed in the statement to which I referred a moment ago.

The State Department of the previous administration maintained that the proposed human rights covenants were in complete accord with American law and tradition. This was an unsurpassed perversion of the truth. The U. N. Human Rights Commission has been dominated by a Socialist-Communist majority. Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon, Chairman of the U. N. Human Rights Commission, who succeeded Mrs. Roosevelt in that position, described in the September 1, 1952, issue of the United Nations Bulletin a "materialistic revolution" within the Commission brought about by "the increasing impact of Marx" and "the apparent unimaginative helplessness of the Western World." Section 2 of the joint resolution would prevent the disciples of Karl Marx from passing judgment on the political faith proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence and secured in our Constitution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Malik's article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the article may be printed in the RECORD as requested.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. BRICKER. To say that I distrust the U. N. human rights program is quite an understatement. Representatives to the United Nations are not elected by the people. Yet they presume to decide what economic and political rights should be enjoyed by people everywhere. Representatives of nations which have never held a free election solemnly debate what rights are proper for the American people. Yugoslavia's representative on the Human Rights Commission was the former head of Tito's secret police. Czechoslovakia's alternate delegate to the Economic and Social Council had to be expelled for espionage activities. Communists at the United Nations, with the aid of radical Socialists, are busily engaged in deciding, Mr. President, what your rights and mine shall be under the human rights covenants. That I resent. The American people resent it. They want to enact their own laws through their own elected representatives and subject to the protections of their own Constitution.

Apologists for the U. N. claim that the Communists are always outvoted. Dr. Charles Malik, Chairman of the U. N. Human Rights Commission, noted in his article that recent amendments to the human rights covenants "responded for the most part more to Soviet than to western promptings." Referring to the refusal of the U. N. Human Rights Commission to recognize the right to own property, Dr. Malik, who, it will be remembered, is the Chairman who succeeded Mrs. Roosevelt, said:

> A study of this particular debate will reveal the extent to which the non-Communist world has been communistically softened or frightened. It seems incredible that in these economic matters * * * the Western World is so divided on itself as to be incapable of presenting common front against communism.

Finally we are told that the U. N. human rights program is a great contribution to world peace. The truth is that the United Nations courts disaster every time it tries to intervene in matters essentially within domestic jurisdiction of its members. I agree completely with the following statement by Anthony Eden, British Foreign Secretary, at the U. N. General Assembly on November 11, 1952:

> If we attempt to stretch the meaning of the Charter and extend the areas in which the United Nations has jurisdiction, we run grave risks, unless we can carry all our fellow members with us, of weakening the very structure of the United Nations. For this reason I regard it as very dangerous that this organization should attempt to intervene in the domestic affairs of member states. Or that it should in any way contravene the terms of article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter.
>
> The object of our organization is to promote general international cooperation and good feeling. It was never intended to be an agency for controlling the domestic policies of its various members or for intervening between them and the territories for which they are internationally responsible.
>
> I am a profound believer in the United Nations. I have worked for international cooperation since the early days of the League of Nations and I cannot, I think, be accused of being lukewarm toward international institutions. It is precisely because I place such hopes in the part the United Nations can play for peace that I sound this note of warning.

Section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 makes effective, insofar as the United States is concerned, the limitations imposed on the United Nations by article 2 (7) of its Charter. If adopted, section 2 will help to curb a suicidal ambition of the United Nations.

Out of the U. N. there flows a steady stream of propaganda designed to prove that worldwide respect for human rights can be promoted by treaty. Here is the result of 5 years of work on freedom of information treaties as reported by Charles A. Sprague, editor of the Oregon Statesman, and a United States representative to the General Assembly:

> To sum up, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the history of the last 5 years dictates its own conclusions. It has been shown that the writing of treaties on freedom of information is not the way to promote freedom of information, at least at this time. Our disagreements range over too wide a sphere and they are not growing smaller. We have cross currents of ideas and tides of opinion which ebb and flow. We cannot tell where they will take us, except that it appears certain that if we continue our present course we will skirt perilously close to rocks and shoals dangerous to liberty. (Department of State Bulletin, November 17, 1952.)

It seems to me that the United Nations can do much to promote universal respect for human rights. It must rely, however, on programs of advice and education. Nothing in my amendment would hinder such progress. The dangers inherent in using treaties to compel respect for human rights were explained by Mr. John Foster Dulles in his speech at Louisville, Ky., last year when he said:

> It is always tempting to look on treaties as an easy way to make high ideals come true. Actually it may do more harm than good for one nation to attempt by treaty to impose its moral standards on another people. Human rights should have their primary sanction in community will and when treaties ignore that, and try to substitute an alien will, the treaties themselves usually collapse through disrespect, dragging down the whole structure of international law, order, and justice.

Section 3 of Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides that a treaty shall become effective as internal law only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by Congress. Our Constitution is unique in that it permits treaties to become the supreme law of the land without legislative action. Section 3 provides for equality of international obligations.

The legal controversy which has developed over various provisions of the U. N. Charter shows why all treaties should be made non-self-executing. An intermediate court in California held that certain human rights provisions in the charter were self-executing—*Fujii* v. *California* (217 P. (2d) 418, 218 P. (2d) 595 (1950)). The Supreme Court of California decided that those provisions were not self-executing (242 P. (2d) 217 (1952)). The issue is still in doubt. Distinguished lawyers have reached opposite conclusions. No one denies, however, that if the Supreme Court of the United States follows the reasoning of the lower California court in the Fujii case, thousands of Federal and State laws will be automatically nullified. It is equally clear that the Senate anticipated no such result when it voted for the U. N. Charter in 1945. Section 3 of the joint resolution would prevent treaties from having far-reaching and unintended consequences as domestic legislation.

At the present time, it is often impossible for the Senate to know at the time a treaty is approved what its effect will be on existing Federal and State laws and policies. This is particularly true of U. N. treaties. The U. N. has generally followed the advice of lawyers who have no respect for the traditional rules of legal construction. They argue, for example, that the U. N. Charter should be liberally construed, as though it were a world constitution. Often the phrase "liberal interpretation" is a mere euphemism to obscure disrespect for the rule of law. Article 108 of the U. N. Charter clearly sets forth the procedure for its amendment. Here is what Dr. Philip Jessup wrote in regard to article 108, providing for amendments to the United Nations Charter:

> Notwithstanding these formal provisions concerning amendment * * * interpretative resolutions adopted by a majority vote of the General Assembly may have or come to have such compelling force as to constitute in effect changes which will bind all members. * * * The entire development is of interest in relation to the progress toward a system of international legislation by majority rule. When such a system has sufficiently justified itself in practice the old obstacle of absolute sovereignty, which is at the basis of the traditional rule that a treaty may not be modified without the consent of all the original parties, may gradually disappear. (Jessup, Law of International Contractual Agreements, 41 Am. J. Int. Law 378, 379 (1947)).

The late A. H. Feller, former general counsel for the United Nations, wrote a book in which he noted that the U. N. Charter does not mean today what it meant at the time of its ratification—Feller, United Nations and the World Community (1952). The avowed enemies of national sovereignty have made the issue perfectly clear. Unless all treaties are made non-self-executing in their effect on domestic law, the Senate cannot approve any U. N. treaty with any assurance that it will not some day be construed to alter radically the rights of the American people under Federal and State laws.

In the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 1, opponents of any treaty-clause amendment argued that adequate safeguards on the exercise of the treaty power are available. Reference was made to the power of Congress to repeal a treaty by legislation and to the power of the Senate to attach reservations to a treaty. Neither safeguard, in my judgment, is adequate protection against abuse of the treaty power.

It is true that Congress may repeal by ordinary legislation the domestic effect of a treaty. Unilateral repudiation of a treaty, however, cannot relieve the United States of its international obligation. Congress cannot repeal what turns out to be a bad or dangerous contract without inviting whatever retaliatory action the community of nations may decide to take. Nothing is better calculated to undermine international law and order than for the leader of the free world to repudiate its treaty obligations. It is difficult to imagine any situation where Congress would be justified in taking such action.

To show that unilateral repudiation of treaties is not an effective safeguard, let us consider article 17 of the U. N. Charter. That article provides that the expenses of the U. N. "shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly." Most Members of Congress have good reason to believe that the U. N. is extravagant and that the assessment on the United States is too high. However, I doubt if Congress will ever refuse to vote whatever appropriation is required to meet the U. N. assessment in full. I certainly shall not vote to breach article 17 of the charter in the way it operates.

Similarly, the reservation safeguard is more apparent than real. As a practical matter, multipartite treaties must be ratified in the form submitted or not at all. The U. N. Charter was submitted to the Senate on that basis. It is generally acknowledged that the U. N. Charter is one of the most poorly drafted legal documents of all time. In Senate debate on the charter, almost every Senator referred to its imperfections and ambiguities. Yet no reservation to the charter was offered. The International Court of Justice has ruled that substantial reservations to the Genocide Convention will nullify the act of ratification.

Section 4 of the joint resolution which I have introduced makes limitations on the treaty power applicable to executive agreements. The Supreme Court held in *United States* v. *Pink* (315 U. S. 203 (1942)) that an executive agreement, not approved by either House of Congress, became, like a treaty, the supreme law of the land. To limit the scope of the treaty power without placing comparable limitations on the power to make executive agreements would be like locking the front door, but leaving the back door open.

In addition, section 4 brings executive agreements under legislative control. During the past 12 years the executive branch has regarded treaties and executive agreements as interchangeable instruments of national policy. In a book published in 1941, Dr. Wallace McClure, formerly Assistant Chief of the Treaty Division of the State Department, explained the basis for deciding whether to use treaties or executive agreements in assuming international obligations. He said:

> The result is that for controversial international acts the Senate (or treaty) method may well be quietly abandoned, and the instruments handled as executive agreements. But for large numbers of purely routine acts, about which no public opinion exists and no question as to their acceptability arises, the present (treaty) method is desirable as saving the time of the House of Representatives. (McClure, International Executive Agreements, p. 378.)

The McClure theory was later refined so the President could act alone in making highly controversial agreements, such as the one consummated at Yalta, thereby saving the time of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Mr. Theodore Pearson, testifying in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, estimated that approximately 85 percent of the executive agreements made in recent years were authorized by statute or later approved by the Congress. Obviously the President is not going to be handcuffed by bringing the remaining 15 percent of executive agreements under legislative control. Section 4 of the amendment, by eliminating a "no man's land" in the field of constitutional law, will insure a more harmonious relationship between the President and the Congress.

CONCLUSION

Senate Joint Resolution 1 will not prevent bad treaties. It will not dispense with the need for close scrutiny of all treaties by the Senate. The amendment declares, in effect, that international cooperation must end at the point where the constitutional rights of the American people are endangered.

Mr. President, it is my sincere hope that America can persuade the world to accept the doctrine that all men are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights which no government can legitimately deny or abridge. This is the greatest challenge in American foreign policy. If we are successful in meeting

the challenge, the world will experience an unprecedented era of freedom, peace, and material abundance.

If the world can persuade America to accept the doctrine that fundamental human rights are gifts of the state, and may, therefore, be limited by treaty, then America will, indeed, be in grave danger. That is America's greatest danger. To meet a danger of such magnitude to the United States and to the world an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is the only appropriate safeguard.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for an observation?

Mr. BRICKER. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio that, as I have listened to his address this afternoon, I believe he should be commended for his able remarks and for bringing this very important question to the attention of the Senate and the world.

It might be of some interest to the distinguished Senator from Ohio to know that within the past 3 or 4 weeks I have received from my State a great many letters in which I have been requested to be sure to support the position taken by the junior Senator from Ohio in introducing this measure.

I can say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that a very widespread interest and a general appeal on this general question are manifesting themselves among many persons in my State and area.

So I regret very much that, for obvious reasons, not very many Senators have been present this afternoon to hear the splendid address delivered by the junior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas, and I deeply appreciate his action in joining in sponsoring this measure, as he did last year.

I likewise appreciate the action of the other 62 Members of the Senate who are cosponsors of the joint resolution, and thus have joined in expressing the need for a measure of this kind in order to protect the inalienable rights of the people of the United States. The American Bar Association, the American Legion, and, in fact, a group of organizations nationwide in character and so numerous that two pages are required to list them, are supporting the principle involved in this resolution.

The committee is now hearing testimony pro and con. I hope the committee will, at an early date, submit a proposed constitutional amendment that will be satisfactory in wording to everyone.

I have not yet heard any opposition of any substance. It is merely said, first, that such a constitutional amendment is unnecessary; and, second, that it may interfere with our international affairs.

In the first place, Mr. President, such a constitutional amendment is necessary, as I have tried to point out this afternoon.

In the second place, such an amendment will not interfere with our legitimate international affairs, but will interfere only when proposed international action transgresses the rights of the people of the United States under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I said to one or two witnesses who testified at the hearing that if the founders of our Government in the First Congress of the United States had taken the position which those witnesses have taken there would never have been a Bill of Rights.

The Senator from Kansas knows as well as I do that in the history of our country there have been times when our people have been so inflamed by a passing passion of the hour, whatever it may have been, that minority rights and individual rights might well have been wiped out.

The proposed constitutional amendment is of vital importance to every citizen, individually; and it is also of great and vital importance to the minority groups in our country and to the preservation of their inalienable, God-given rights.

No other nation on the face of the earth has ever regarded the rights of its people as otherwise than ones having been given them by their own government. If the government gives them rights, the government can take from them the rights so granted.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, our great contribution to the expanding jurisprudence of all times is the concept that the rights of men are in the spiritual realm, that those rights are inalienable and God-given, and that no government can take them from the people.

To state the matter in a rather forceful way, let me say that the proposed constitutional amendment would prevent the transferral of the most important rights of the American people from the spiritual realm into the temporal power of government—not only our own Government, but any international government of any kind or character.

So I appreciate very much the support of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. President, I hope all other Members of the Senate will read what has been said. This material has been documented. We have worked on this matter constantly for the past 3 years, and have read many treaties, and have followed the activities of the United Nations and the activities of our representatives on many international commissions and conventions.

One was called to my attention only this morning, by telephone, by a representative of an organization in which the Senator from Kansas is vitally interested, namely, the American Farm Bureau Federation, which now is alarmed about an international food pool which is being proposed and to which the United States again would be the chief contributor. A constitutional amendment of the kind we now propose would make such an international arrangement subject to control by the Congress of the United States, and would always prevent the rights of the American people in their property or in their individual human relations from being subject to any international control or domination.

I thank the Senator from Kansas very much.

EXHIBIT A

MOTHERHOOD—SECULARIST STYLE

("The welfare state starts from the assumption that a man's worth is measured by his service to the community. * * * The state proceeds on the assumption that parents cannot afford to look after their children as well as its officials can, that in fact children are more the concern of the community than they are of the parents. * * * The welfare state, being in large measure the offspring of socialism, insists that all should be on the same footing and receive equal treatment. The state thus makes unwarrantable inroads on the family, and usurps functions that properly belong to the parents." (From the 1952 Lenton Pastoral Letter of Most Rev. John F. D'Alton, archbishop of Armagh and Catholic primate of Ireland.))

The modern heresy of secularism, which is so widespread today—and has even poisoned the hearts and minds of countless Catholics—is no laughing matter. There is nothing amusing about this spiritual cancer that is gradually eating away at the moral fiber of modern mankind.

But sometimes even secularism goes to such absurd extremes that it makes a laughing spectacle of itself. In their eagerness to transform the world overnight into a materialistic heaven-on-earth, secularists talk such nonsense and concoct such fantastic schemes that one's first impulsive reaction is that of amusement.

Here is just one such example of the absurdity of secularism. It is contained in a report of the proceedings of the Annual Conference of the International Labor Organization—an official agency of the United Nations—which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, this June. The report is by Don Knowlton, who attended the Conference, and appears in the September 22, 1952, issue of The Freeman magazine. (This excellent journal is published at 240 Madison Ave., New York 16, N. Y. 25 cents per copy.)

Mr. Knowlton's article (he is not, incidentally, a Catholic) is a scathing indictment of those architects of the new utopia who are making eager plans to invade the sacred precincts of the family and to take even new-born babies under the protective maternal wing of the state.

The ILO delegates spent 3 weeks in debating among themselves as to how the rights of the mothers of the world could best be protected, and how to emancipate them from the burden of raising children.

The solution decided upon is simplicity itself: The mothers will simply go to work. In other words, they will become useful and productive members of society, instead of unproductive parasites wasting their time in the home, as they are now. Naturally, the state will look after baby while mamma is on the assembly line. State-supported nursing centers will be established in or near the factories where the mothers work and, at times prescribed by the public authorities, they will leave their machines, rush up to feed their babies (on company time, of course), and then hurry back to work.

The conference almost broke up over a technical point that was raised during the debate on how often and how long mothers should be permitted to feed their babies during working hours. For several hours, 1 group argued that the mother should be given 2 daily half-hour breaks with her baby, while the opposing group insisted upon a single break of a full hour. The argument became even more confused when it was finally discovered that some of the delegates were talking about the mother running home to give junior his state-prescribed quota of milk and pablum, while the others were talking about keeping the baby at the factory with her.

But then another complication arose. At a previous session, the ILO had approved a convention draft prescribing equal pay for

men and women for equal work. And somebody now pointed out that paying the mothers while they were away from their machines feeding their babies would be a violation of the equal-pay convention and would be unfair to the men workers. One American delegate—tempted by the absurdity of the whole discussion—facetiously suggested, as a solution for the dilemma, that the fathers should also be given paid time off to change junior's diapers, while the mother was being paid for feeding him. But the question became so involved, the matter was dropped and the conference went on to other world-shaking problems.

An Australian delegate got up to suggest that, in many cases, the proposed "maternity benefits" for working women were entirely unnecessary, since most men not only were able but preferred to provide their spouses and newborn babies with all the care they needed. He was indignantly voted down. Why? Because the Maternity Convention specifically provides that—as far as the proposed benefits are concerned—any differentiation whatsoever between unwed and married mothers shall be strictly prohibited by law. "Apparently," comments Mr. Knowlton with fine irony, "most women are expected to work in this Socialist utopia, and the production or service group will replace the family as a social unit. And since illegitimacy is on a par with legitimacy, and the economic reasons for the home disappear, the reasons for marriage itself seem a bit nebulous."

By now, you may be thinking that this ILO Conference was obviously just a gathering of leftist crackpots, whose proposed socialistic schemes are so absurd that no responsible government would ever seriously consider them for a moment. Unfortunately, these ILO delegates were far from wild-eyed visionaries and dreamers. They were all official delegates from the 60 countries which comprise the membership of the United Nations—including our own United States. What's more, this Maternity Convention was actually voted upon and passed by a majority of the delegates, as a proposed international treaty, which will have the binding force of international law, as and when each member government ratifies it.

Mr. Knowlton relates an incident that took place during the above-described debates which reveals that even non-Christian orientals are shocked by the moral decadence of our professedly Christian western democracies, as exemplified by this latest international scheme to destroy the very foundation of Christian civilization—the family.

One delegate from China, after reading the proposed Maternity Convention draft for the first time, turned to him and asked in amazement, "Don't you have families over here? In my country, the mother takes care of her babies at home."

EXHIBIT B.

HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Dr. Charles Malik, Minister of the Republic of Lebanon in the United States and Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations)

I

The eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, lasting for 9 weeks (April 14–June 13), was the longest the Commission ever held and one of the longest held by any organ of the United Nations. And yet all that the Commission managed to complete of its agenda was 3 or 4 out of a total of some 20 items. Those of us who have followed closely this enterprise ever since San Francisco now realize that we have all along underestimated the complexity and difficulty of this issue. We began with the somewhat naive, albeit sincere, determination to work out an International Bill of Rights, and in the initial impulse of our inexperience we saw the completion of this task just around the corner. There were three steps to the undertaking: A declaration whereby the rights and freedoms appertaining to man are theoretically defined; a series of covenants whereby adhering states explicitly bind themselves to the strict observance of the rights and freedoms elaborated in them; and measures of implementation whereby the international community can make sure that human rights and fundamental freedoms, whether on the level of the charter or of the declaration, or of the covenants, are, in fact, being promoted and observed. We completed the first step in 1948, and many of us thought the other two steps would be forthcoming in speedy succession. We have been grappling with them now for 4 years, and while much indeed has been accomplished during this time the end is not yet in sight. We have all been sobered by the realization of the truly formidable task assigned to us.

Nature of task

Now, this task was none other than the determination of the proper structure of human dignity, the working out of all those enjoyments which are inherent to man, and without which he would be less than himself, less than his Author intends him to be, less, at any rate, than he is capable of becoming and being. And we were not only to bring about agreement (or register whatever agreement there was) among the nations of the world as to what these natural rights and freedoms were but also to suggest ways and means whereby human dignity, thus determined and thus agreed upon, can be promoted and achieved by international cooperation.

All that one has to do to appreciate what all this really involves is (a) to remember that man by himself is at best very difficult to determine, even if it were one philosopher proceeding from one coherent set of presuppositions who attempted this determination; (b) to reflect that the nations, in the consideration of this question in its present all-embracing scope, have really come together seriously for the first time in history, and that, so far as international action by responsible representatives of governments is concerned, the Commission's work is creative and pioneering in every respect; (c) to keep in mind the radical differences that obtain in the interpretation of man among the effective cultures of the world, some stressing this, some stressing that, side of his nature; and (d) to brood upon the sad phenomenon of power politics entering into and vitiating everything, including man himself. We know now that the nobility and importance of our task is matched only by its inherent difficulty and by the long time we must in all fairness allow for its unfolding.

II

Among the general circumstances that conditioned the eighth session of the Commission, three are particularly worthy of consideration. There was first the oppressive weight of the general world situation which affected our progress at every turn. People's minds were on the whole elsewhere than on the problems of human rights, and some found it difficult to concentrate upon our immediate endeavors. The debate seemed to them utterly academic. Thus it is not clear how much the foreign offices of the member governments, or the respective departments dealing with the United Nations, took active notice of our deliberations, nor whether we were just those 18 experts blissfully left by our governments to hammer out all by ourselves whatever texts we could, as best we could. Now, the troubled world situation has been with us for a number of years, but the more we are removed in time from the original moral indignation evoked by the Second World War in favor of man and his freedoms, the more the questions of war and peace cast their pall upon the reality of our work.

World situation

This is one of man's tormenting paradoxes: That such fundamental work, for man and in his name, cannot go on in a vacuum, but must take its proper place within the context of the serious world situation; must indeed reflect people's concern for their existence and their destiny. When existence is in question, the how of existence recedes to the background. And yet what is the use of existence unless it be made worthy of man and his highest, unless its just how is assured? When discord deepens and war threatens, we slacken in our interest in human rights; and yet is not the violation of these rights among the fundamental causes of war and discord, and can there be tranquillity and progress without adequate recognition of these rights and freedoms throughout the world?

No hurry

The second general situation that determined this session, a situation not altogether independent of the first, was that nobody seemed in a hurry to push our work to a conclusion. I cannot accuse anybody of international dilatoriness, but people were on the whole expansive, and many a decision could have been reached with one-half or one-third of the argumentation that led up to it. Certainly the sense of urgency and drive that characterized the preparation of the declaration back in 1947 and 1948 was absent, and it was impossible to brush aside the reflection that the proclamation of the declaration in 1948 was really something of a miracle, so that if it were not proclaimed then, possibly we would still be working on it now. In these fundamental matters vigorous leadership makes all the difference: one or two nations, knowing exactly what they want and determined in advance to finish a total job, have a good chance to lead the rest in the attainment of their end. But to leave 18 representatives to argue more or less ramblingly about what belongs to the dignity of man, without an overarching vigorous design aiming at the completion of a job no matter how difficult, would doubtless lead if not to trackless, then certainly to inconclusive wanderings. You could not this time—at least until the very last few days—get the Commission to adopt rules limiting the number of interventions per person per subject and the length of time of each intervention, even in respect to those subjects gone over a hundred times before; nor could you set a firm deadline for the receivability of proposals, and amendments, and amendments to amendments; and always when the chairman wanted to close the list of speakers, pratcically the whole round of representatives wanted to put their names in again. People simply loved going on and on—arguing, attacking, coaxing, refining.

One or two covenants

The third fundamental circumstance was that the situation prevailing in the Third Committee of the General Assembly with respect to this matter carried over to the Commission. The issue that was debated for weeks and weeks in the Third Committee last year and the year before was whether to work out one covenant, comprising within its scope civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights, or two separate covenants, one for civil and political rights, and one for economic, social, and cultural rights. One or two became the question; and when great issues are reduced to such absurd simplicity, people in the confusion of the times do not always take sides on the merits of the case. There is room for neat, political maneuvering and bargaining: room to score a victory against or inflict an embarrassment upon the "two'ers" or "one'ers" by shrewdly siding with the opposite camp. From the point of view of the truth, it is always dangerous to oversimplify issues in international gatherings; overlapping, interpenetration, the pro-

viding of significant "riders," the insertion of pregnant nuances, all this helps to prevent false divisions of the house for reasons entirely extraneous to the objective subject matter under consideration. He who thinks representatives are always swayed by the objective compulsion of the truth and never fall to the seductions of abstract simplification does not know the real character of international existence.

Be that as it may, the 1950 decision of the General Assembly was in favor of one covenant, and the Commission in its session in Geneva last year worked assiduously on the basis of that presupposition. But in 1951 the General Assembly reversed its directive to the Commission, asking us to prepare two separate covenants, to be gone over with equal care, to include as much common language as possible, to be presented to the General Assembly and thence to be opened for accession at the same time, but withal to be two separate instruments capable of being adhered to separately and independently.

Now, there was nothing in the reversal in itself to cause the Commission any special difficulty or embarrassment: we receive our ultimate directives from the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council and we try to execute them as faithfully as possible. But in this particular reversal, what was decisive from the point of view of the general conditions under which we carried out our mandate was the structure of the voting in the General Assembly, considered both quantitatively and qualitatively. From the former point of view, the decision to have one covenant for the two types of rights was carried in 1950 by an overwhelming majority, 38 votes to 7, with 12 abstentions. When this decision was reversed last year in favor of two covenants, the voting was 27 for, 20 against, with 3 abstentions. On the other hand, those that favored two covenants were led by the more developed countries, whereas those who favored one comprised underdeveloped countries and the Soviet bloc.

Qualitatively, the house in general divided on this issue between the Western World and the Eastern World (India and Lebanon, however, went with the West) with the Soviet world siding with the East and the Latin American world dividing more or less evenly between the two. As a result, at once two matters came to the fore which are of the essence of our present involvement, matters that were, to be sure, partly the cause, but are undoubtedly also partly the effect, of this division: I mean the host of questions subsumed under the rubric "self-determination of peoples" and the antithesis between the developed and the less developed. The whole atmosphere of human rights in the United Nations is now charged with these two themes.

Two blocs

The structure of voting in the third committee reflected itself both times faithfully in the Commission. Last year a strong majority of the Commission could always be counted upon in support of the idea of one covenant. This year the house was pretty nearly evenly divided on most important issues. Some of the great decisions (whether to adopt or to reject texts) taken this year by the Commission were taken by a bare majority of one or two, and in certain cases we had to call into the room one or two members who were outside attending to some other business in order to enable the Commission to come to a decision. Nothing is more despairing to a chairman than to be dealing with an evenly divided house; the grounds of seriousness seem then to be withdrawn from underneath his feet. The Commission's work at its eighth session this year cannot be properly appraised without constantly keeping in mind (and without fully appreciating the significance of this fact) that two more or less solid and equal blocs at once formed themselves on practically every important issue, the one composed of the U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, Poland, Yugoslavia, Chile, Uruguay, Pakistan, and Egypt, the other of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Belgium, Sweden, Greece, and China, with Lebanon and India sometimes dividing between the two blocs, sometimes voting with the first, sometimes (in fact for the most part) voting with the second bloc. (This statement does not of course apply to every vote taken, but it certainly approximates the normal pattern observed in the voting. Also the listing above is made in the order of firmness with which the country in question stuck to the bloc under which it is listed. Thus the two or three countries toward the end of each listing did not invariably vote with the rest of that bloc, and in one instance—that of communications—the pattern of voting underwent a revolution; the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France coming together in indissoluble union.)

The Commission labored under three great handicaps: the overshadowing world tension, the utter leisureliness with which people moved or wanted to move, and the even division of its membership on the fundamental issues. The first distracted our attention somewhat, the second slowed down our progress considerably, and the third cast a shadow of doubt upon the finality of such results as we were able to achieve.

III

In general and despite the expansiveness and repetitiveness, the quality of debate in this session was high. To attend the meetings day after day and listen carefully to the development of our themes was a veritable education in itself. Because of the nature of our subject matter, the basic structure of human dignity, no fundamental issue in the world today was not directly or indirectly touched upon. This has always been the case in the Commission on Human Rights. It is doubtful whether in the debates of the United Nations anything compares with the proceedings of this Commission in depth and comprehensiveness.

Self-determination

The debate on self-determination revealed two antithetical facts: on the one hand, that in itself this question is exceedingly complex; on the other, that the non-Atlantic nations would brush aside all such complexity in favor of a simple, direct affirmation that every people and every nation has a natural right to self-determination. It is not that the Atlantic nations and their friends are just defensively and selfishly resisting change: the problem is genuinely and objectively complex. Nor is it, on the other hand, that the Soviet, Asian, and Latin countries are just spiting and rebelling against the West; people today insist on their right to determine their own fate freely even if that should mean transfer of attachment from one power camp to another. The western doctrine of freedom is gradually coming to full bloom in nonwestern lands; and in this closely knit world, so long as the two camps remain poised against each other in irresolution and unsettlement, everybody else has a chance to clamor for his right to independence of thought and action. The zest generated by the idea of self-determination is due precisely to the fact that the mind does not at first suspect the formidable complexities concealed under this idea. There is no shortcut to the sophistication of experience and reflection.

Among the questions raised and debated in this connection were the following:

(1) How much does world peace depend upon safeguarding the right of self-determination to peoples and nations?

(2) Whether the right to self-determination, to which all were agreed in principle, was an individual or a group right, and consequently whether it fell under the Charter concept of "fundamental human rights" which it was the intent of the declaration to define and the covenants to implement.

(3) How much does the exercise of other rights depend upon the prior realization of the right of self-determination?

(4) Where should this right be affirmed? As an integral article in the body of the covenant or covenants? Or in the preamble? Or in the Declaration of Human Rights? Or in a separate document? Or in a special and separate resolution of the General Assembly? (Because our instructions were explicit, the Commission decided that self-determination be an article in the body of the covenants.)

(5) Should its content be a short, simple statement of principle or should it be detailed?

(6) If the structure of self-determination should be gone into in detail, was the Commission competent to undertake this job? Should it not rather seek assistance from the international law commission, the subcommission on prevention of discrimination and protection of minorities, and UNESCO, in the determination of the diverse moments of this idea?

(7) How is self-determination related to freedom, independence, self-government?

(8) What constitutes a people?

(9) When are minorities entitled to this right?

(10) When in their maturation are peoples entitled to this right?

(11) What legitimate action may a people take to achieve this right?

(12) What should the attitude of other peoples and nations be to a people struggling for the right of self-determination?

(13) The question of plebiscites: When to be taken? Under whose auspices?

(14) The great question of cultural self-determination: Is there such a thing? Are people, for instance, entitled to suppress freedom of thought, conscience, and inquiry in the name of cultural self-determination?

(15) The great question of economic self-determination—of the right of peoples freely to dispose of their own natural resources: How does this affect international economic cooperation, including the question of development?

(16) Is the right of self-determination, according to the charter, unqualified? Is it subject to overarching considerations of international security and peace?

It will be highly rewarding to the student of this topic to go back to the clashes of opinion in the original proceedings of the Commission, and to try to penetrate to the reason and significance of these clashes.

The text of the article on self-determination finally adopted by the Commission for inclusion in both covenants under consideration was as follows:

1. All peoples and all nations shall have the right of self-determination, namely, the right freely to determine their political, economic, social, and cultural status.

2. All states, including those having responsibility for the administration of non-self-governing and trust territories and those controlling in whatsoever manner the exercise of that right by another people, shall promote the realization of that right in all their territories, and shall respect the maintenance of that right in other states in conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter.

3. The right of the peoples to self-determination shall also include permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources. In no case may a people be deprived of its own means of subsistence on the grounds of any rights that may be claimed by other states.

The Commission was also instructed by the General Assembly to work out recommendations concerning international respect for the self-determination of peoples, the

presupposition being that pending the elaboration and the coming into force of the covenants, surely the United Nations cannot remain inactive in this field. Two such recommendations were drawn up in which the member governments were asked to uphold the principle of self-determination, particularly with respect to non-self-governing and trust territories, and those responsible for such territories were asked to include in the information transmited by them under article 73e of the charter an account of the political progress of these territories.

IV

Whatever we were able to adopt of the covenant on economic, social, and cultural rights was gone over with great care. We have now precise texts on the right to work, to appropriate conditions of work, to social security, to special protection of maternity, children, and the family, to food, clothing, and housing, to an adequate standard of living, to health, to education, to science and culture, and to forming and joining trade unions. There is also an article on the progressive implementation of compulsory primary education free of charge for all. Besides these substantive articles, there are what might be termed "regulative provisions" on nondiscrimination especially as between men and women, on general limitations on the exercise of these rights, on the fact that the present convention cannot derogate from human rights already in force, and on the fact that the realization of these rights is to be "progressive."

The specialized agencies again took active interest in our work. Especially did the representatives of UNESCO and ILO play a significant role in our deliberations. The Commission respectfully deferred to their expert opinion, and our present text reflects some of their ideas.

The Soviet bloc, as is to be expected, were most active in the debates on these matters. They urged the most advanced provisions, especially with respect to nondiscrimination, and never tired of alleging that in their respective countries economic and social conditions were incomparably better than in the Western World. I think a study of our proceedings will reveal that the amendments we adopted to the old texts under examination responded for the most part more to Soviet than to western promptings.

Guaranties

But on their major thesis they were not successful. * * * They wanted to see a strict governmental guarantee for practically every right. According to the Soviet concept the Government is the agency that guarantees for everybody the enjoyment of the right to work, to proper conditions of work, to social security, to education, etc. The majority of the Commission did not share this view, believing, on the contrary, that economic power and enforcement should not be a monopoly of the state. Of course, this fundamental difference in viewpoint between the Soviet and the non-Soviet worlds raises the three formidable issues: (a) of how governments can enter into international compacts in matters over which they do not have direct control; (b) of how such compacts can therefore be implemented; and (c) of whether the international promotion of this type of right lends itself to the same sort of treatment as that possible for civil and political rights.

Limiting clauses

In two limiting but important cases there is an expression of governmental guaranty. The first is the nondiscrimination clause of the general umbrella article. Here the state parties undertake to guarantee that the rights enunciated in this covenant will be exercised without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, etc." The point of this undertaking is that while some of these rights may not be realized except progressively, owing to limitations of available resources and other conditions, yet insofar as a right is exercised at all, it cannot be exercised on a basis of discrimination. Thus there may not be at once enough schools for all children, but the available schools must take in children without discrimination. The second case is the provision on trade union rights, which reads: "The states * * * undertake to insure the free exercise of the right of everyone to form and join * * * trade unions * * *," the idea being that all that the states here obligate themselves to is not to interfere in trade union activity, and therefore such negative (formal) obligation can be assumed all at once.

The other clause of the opening "umbrella" article reads: "Each state party hereto undertakes to take steps, individually and through international cooperation, to the maximum of its available resources, with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in this covenant by legislation as well as by other means." This text was probably fought hardest of all. Behind every phrase lurks a precise intention, or the avoidance of a supposed danger. The enthusiasts saw practically behind every word a possible loophole for evasion by governments; the realists argued that these material rights differed from the formal ones of the other covenant precisely by the feature that they depended on objective, material conditions which can only be brought into effective operation progressively. The realists finally won the day.

Science and culture

In the debate on science and culture, some of the dread ultimate issues in the world today came to the fore. The Soviet viewpoint was again that the states must insure that the development of science and culture subserve the interests of progress and democracy. This proposal was defeated by 12 votes to 4, with 1 abstention. Nothing is more detrimental to the spirit and vitality of a culture than to make freedom of thought and inquiry subject to the opinion of the state as to what is good for progress and democracy or for that matter, for anything. Science, culture, truth are absolutely independent of politics: their development obeys an autonomous law of its own. Even if progress, democracy, peace, were univocal terms (and the present world crisis consists precisely in the fact that they are not), and even if they referred to good and desirable things, it is not the business of science, culture, and creation to pursue them. These pursue their own proper ends, which are nothing other than the discovery and expression of the truth (which is fulness of life and beauty no less than of mind) in complete freedom. Not only will science and truth wither away where freedom is suppressed or curtailed, but the state itself will wake up one day to the realization that, both by reason of a pervasive dullness of mind which it has succeeded in generating among its citizenry, and by reason of the unavailability of material instruments which the inventiveness of freedom alone can supply, it is decisively handicapped in the pursuit of its own ends. He tampers with the source of life itself who tampers with freedom.

Right to property

For the second year an unsuccessful attempt was made to include an article on the right to own property. Article 17 of the Universal Declaration proclaimed this right, but since then the Commission has not been able to agree on an appropriate text for the covenant. The French Delegation put forward a proposal, but so many difficulties and objections were raised, particularly with regard to expropriation and compensation, that finally the Commission, tired of the apparent hopelessness of this matter, decided to adjourn the debate on it. The concept of property and its ownership is at the heart of the great ideological conflict of the present day. It was not only the Communist representatives who riddled this concept with questions and doubts; a goodly portion of the non-Communist world had itself succumbed to these doubts. A study of this particular debate will reveal the extent to which the non-Communist world has been communistically softened or frightened. It seems incredible that in these economic matters, which reflect indeed much more than more economic divergencies, the Western World is so divided on itself as to be incapable of presenting a common front against communism. When the material appetite is aroused, there is no end to its claims unless it be checked at some point with the original restraints of the spirit.

V

No drastic revisions have been introduced in the civil and political formulations that have come down to us from the Commission's labors of 1950. One can in general speak of having subjected these rights only to further refinement.

The catalog comprises the right to life; the prohibition of inhuman or degrading treatment; the prohibition of slavery and forced labor; the right to liberty and security of person; freedom from imprisonment on account of inability to fulfill a contractual obligation; the right to liberty of movement; the protection of aliens against arbitrary expulsion; the right to a fair trail; the prohibition of retroactive criminal legislation; the right to recognition as a person before the law; freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; freedom of opinion and expression; the right of peaceful assembly; the right of association; and equality before the law. There were further three articles of a regulative type; one expressing the obligation to respect and ensure the rights enumerated in the covenant; one on the scope and limitation of derogations allowable under exceptional circumstances; and one safeguarding the covenant from abuse and preventing any restrictions upon rights in force not recognized in it.

The student who wishes to go more deeply into these matters must read the records of the Commission or its report to the Economic and Social Council. Among the themes that received significant discussion were the following: The question of capital punishment; how to preserve the integrity and independence of the genocide convention in respect to the article on the right to life; what medical and scientific experimentation is permissible on man; the distinction between forced and hard labor; the question of conscientious objectors; the question of exile and of the possibility of return to one's own country; minimum guarantees for accused persons; for what purpose speech may be limited; and whether states may be allowed to sign the convention even if at the time they do not measure up to all its requirements.

Freedom of religion

There was an interesting revision of the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. Thanks to the admirable endeavors and openness of mind of the representative of Egypt, and to the studied and profound concern of Dr. Frederick Nolde, representing nongovernmental religious organizations, the modifications suggested by the representative of Egypt were all unanimously adopted. Although it can be philosophically shown that the right to change one's religion or belief (the provision of the Declaration) necessarily implies the right to maintain one's religion or belief, it was felt that this implication had better be made explicit in the covenant. Consequently, the formulation now is "freedom to maintain or to change" one's religion or belief. Now, this revision was meant to guard against an inordinate emphasis upon "changing one's religion or belief," but since it labors the obvious, and since freedom to change neces-

sarily implies freedom to maintain, but freedom to maintain does not necessarily imply freedom to change, it in turn lays itself open to the criticism of overemphasizing the static aspect of freedom of religion or belief. To restore the balance once more, a new clause was introduced into this important article reading: "No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to maintain or to change his religion or belief."

In this way, absolute freedom of conscience to see the truth and follow it, whether by confirming one's previous position or by changing it, is safeguarded. Although he heartily endorsed these modifications, Dr. Nolde read important reservations into our records. I believe no student or interpreter can afford in the future to fail to take notice of these reservations. Important statements guarding against possible misinterpretations of the concept of coercion were also made in the debate. It is always artificial social pressure (the sanction of the group), and not any innate and incurable perversion in man's understanding, that prevents him from seeking, finding, and espousing the truth. But that weakness of the will called cowardice also plays an important role.

Fundamental differences

Again and again it became apparent that our difficulties stemmed for the most part from radical differences in intent with regard to fundamental concepts. We referred above to the equivocal character of such terms as "democracy," "progress," "peace." One can make a list of the fundamental concepts, arising from the objective confusion of the historical moment, which were at the base of our perplexity and torment. Such a list would include, in addition to the three mentioned above, the concepts of "science," "arbitrary," "Fascist," and "Nazi." But it is primarily because government is understood and practiced in entirely different senses throughout the world that our confusion was worse confounded.

The ultimate contrast is between government as the expression of the free will of the people, and government as possessing an independent wisdom and infallibility of its own which would enable it to dictate its will upon the people. This contrast reveals contradictory interpretations of the nature of man, and since our attempt was precisely to determine this nature, no wonder we did not agree. If real horses could meet and argue, presumably, since each is really a horse, they would strike some agreement. But when governments meet (through their representatives), and when, although the same term is used (governments), the realities indicated by the term are so radically different, how is real, effective agreement ever possible? The alternative is not despair, but patience and faith—both infinite—and a lively sense of humor.

Preamble

The Commission decided that there be no difference in the preambles of the two covenants. Much of the adopted language was taken from the preamble of the Declaration. The phrase "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights" stresses the notion that these rights belong to the nature of man. Again, the recital "recognizing that these rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person" refutes any notion that an external power, such as a benevolent government or even the United Nations, granted man these rights. It is difficult to think of a stronger or more adequate language with which to express the law of nature. But the question remains: Do all these rights have the same ultimacy so far as the natural law is concerned?

VI

Communications

Every year the United Nations receives thousands of communications concerning human rights. The procedure of treating these communications is regulated by strict decisions taken by the Economic and Social Council. An attempt was made this year, on the initiative of India, to recommend to the Economic and Social Council to change somewhat these regulations so as to enable the Commission to make reports and recommendations to the Economic and Social Council concerning serious cases of violation of human rights brought to the notice of the Commission by these communications. Some argued that it was a pity nothing whatsoever was done to these communications so far, and that it would conduce to the promotion of human rights if the Commission were allowed to make a significant report to the Economic and Social Council on them. Others, however, stressed the complexity and delicacy of the issue, denying at the same time any competence to the Commission, under the charter and the Economic and Social Council, to consider complaints or form any judgment on them. The Indian effort was beaten by 9 votes to 6, with 2 abstentions.

The Commission permitted the publication this year of a preliminary analysis by the United Nations Secretariat of the communications received during the 13 months from April 3, 1951, to May 7, 1952. Of course neither the Secretariat nor the Commission expressed any opinion regarding either the accuracy of the facts alleged by the communications or the constructions placed upon them by their authors. But it is interesting to note that, according to the analysis of the Secretariat, a total of 25,279 communications were received during this period; 36 of which discussed general theoretical principles; 24,194 alleged persecution on political grounds; 305 alleged genocide; 119 alleged violation of the right to freedom of assembly and association; 64 alleged discrimination against and persecution of minorities; 83 dealt with trade union rights; and some 480 alleged contraventions of a variety of rights and freedoms. Certainly the world seems to expect a great deal of the United Nations in the field of human rights.

So long as the Charter exists, which pledges member states to promote human rights, these concrete communications cannot be altogether disregarded. Sooner or later the Commission or somebody else will have to do something about them. To suppose that all of them are unfounded is, of course, nonsense. To suppose also that to bring some of them, after the most careful and responsible sifting, to the attention of the Economic and Social Council is to contravene the domestic jurisdiction clause of article 2 of the Charter, is to forget that, under the Charter itself, human rights problems are no longer exclusively or even essentially matters for domestic jurisdiction. There is no evading the fact that in the modern world, where everybody knows pretty well what goes on in everybody else's domain, we are all on the spot. The more man awakens, the more he will clamor for his natural rights and fundamental freedoms; and the future does not belong to those who hide their heads in the sand, but to those who, facing the truth in all humility, accept the joyous suffering of transforming the given into the image of the just and true.

VII

Shifting emphasis

A quiet revolution has occurred in the Commission on Human Rights since its establishment. In the years 1946, 1947, and 1948 attention was fastened for the most part on what we now call civil and political rights. The archetype of what we were trying to ensure was freedom from discrimination and from arbitrary arrest, and freedom of religion and speech. It never occurred to us that anything else was as important as these.

Today the emphasis has shifted. Economic, social, and cultural rights have come to their own, and indeed with a vengeance. The paradigm today is "the adequate standard of living." There were three logical steps to this transition. The first is to say, the civil, political, and personal is primary, but the economic, social, and cultural also has its place. The second is to move insensibly from this position to the view that both types of rights are equally important. And the third obviously is to say, what is the use of the civil, political, and personal if the economic and social is not first guaranteed? Ergo, the social and economic is primary and more important. It is a fit topic for research to trace this development not only with respect to the Commission as a whole, but also with respect to individual members of the Commission who have participated in this enterprise since its beginning.

We may characterize the revolution as the overwhelming of the end by the means, the personal and intellectual by the social, the wholeness of life by its components, the integral unity (the soul) of the individual by endless factors, conditions, impulses, the perfect and actual by the imperfect and potential, the dignity of freedom by the turbulence of desire. This is the materialistic revolution of the times.

Three not altogether unrelated causes have brought about this revolution. First, the increasing impact of Marx and the amazing persistence of the Soviet representatives in harping upon their views. Second, the rise of the economically and socially less developed, where the accent is far more on the material and social than on the personal and inner. And third, the apparent unimaginative helplessness of the Western World in the face of these two impacts.

What goes on in the Commission is but a reflection of what goes on in the wide world. There is a general disturbance of right order. It will not be by chance, or by halfheartedness, or by surrendering before the material, or by overlooking its just claims, that order is going to be righted, but by the rejuvenation of the original intellectual and spiritual grounds of life. The task is much harder than some people think, but salvation is coming, and when it comes it will not be from the Commission or the United Nations, but from the living institutions of the mind and spirit vigorously reaffirming their faith in truth, justice, and order. There are, then, independent grounds of hope that the materialistic revolution will be arrested and reversed, certainly not without much suffering.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate this afternoon, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13, 1953:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Philip Young, of New York, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named line officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy, with the grades indicated:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

David A. Broad
Frederick D. Forger

LIEUTENANT

Roy E. Neufeldt

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Cecil G. Allison
Richard S. Baird
George G. Dunn
John E. Fishburn III
Theodore E. Lide, Jr.
Gale W. Nuernberger
William J. Shoemaker
Carlton B. Smith

ENSIGNS

Daniel S. Curran
Gorman L. Fisher, Jr.
Derrell B. Hauser
Murray A. Luftglass

The following-named ensign of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment in the line:

Frederick J. Orrik, Jr.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1953:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Ormonde A. Kieb, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, again through sleep and darkness safely brought, restored to life and power and thought, we face a new day and the tasks of a new week. Wilt Thou lift our duty above drudgery. Even in the heat and burden of noonday's task let not our strength fail nor our vision fade. Make us patient and considerate one with another in all the fret and jar of human contacts, remembering that even in the glare of public gaze each fights a hard battle to maintain his integrity and walks a lonely way. Give us, O Lord, a reverence for truth, a deep desire to think and speak with utter candor, and a passion to hasten the day when the rule of justice and righteousness shall engirdle the earth. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 13, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today, beginning at 2 o'clock.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE—RESOLUTION OF LITHUANIAN AMERICANS OF MANCHESTER, N. H.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution adopted by Lithuanian Americans of the city of Manchester, N. H., relating to the observance of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, signed by the chairman and secretary, and sundry other patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent, with the request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

Unanimously voted by Lithuanian Americans of the city of Manchester, N. H., at the observance of the 35th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, held at the hall, 83 Hanover Street, on the 22d day of February 1953:

"Whereas in the eyes of the people around the world, the United States has been the strongest champion of the oppressed; and

"Whereas the traditional American leadership in principles of justice, morality, and equal rights to all human beings on the earth paved the way for the American supremacy in the political, military, and economic world affairs which this country is today providing for the benefit of mankind; and

"Whereas intolerable conditions which now prevail in eastern and central Europe, including Lithuania and other Baltic States, should be of greatest concern to the United States as no peace and stability in the world is possible without participation of that part of Europe which comprises a force of over 100 million people separated from the rest of the world by the Iron Curtain; and

"Whereas the mere denial to recognize the Soviet claims of that area, when not accompanied by any positive action on the part of the United States to back its stand, did not and will not bear the slightest effect on the Kremlin masters: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, patriotic American citizens of Lithuanian descent, concerned about security and prosperity of this great country and over the fate of our native land, Lithuania, now under brutal Soviet yoke, appeal to the Government of the United States to adopt a clear and firm foreign policy such as America's leading role in the world affairs necessitates; to incorporate the liberation of Lithuania and other Soviet-enslaved countries, as an integral and inseparable part, in the program of the United States foreign policy; to reject any general peace settlement in Europe unless those countries are given an opportunity to freely choose their own form of government under which they wish to live; to inaugurate all suitable means to aid liberation movements in the Soviet-enslaved countries and to enlist their cooperation in the global efforts to fight international communism; to intensify the American campaign of truth inside Iron Curtain and to enlighten the American public regarding the barbarous Soviet tactics in subjugating and destroying free nations; to speed ratification of the Genocide Convention and to implement the ratification by decisive action of the United States Government within the United Nations to make Soviet Russia responsible for the crimes committed in the Baltic States and other countries behind the Iron Curtain; be it finally

"Resolved, That this meeting pledge all possible support of the Lithuanian Americans to the Federal Government in its efforts to resist the evil Communist forces of aggression and to sustain peace and freedom everywhere."

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

"Whereas there is definite need for prompt and extensive correction of the critical deficiencies of our streets and highways in the interest both of our economy and our national security; and

"Whereas highways of the country, including the streets and bridges, are by tradition and by law the property and responsibility of the States and the subdivisions thereof; and

"Whereas many of the States are in need of additional revenue for the construction and maintenance of their highways, but are experiencing extreme difficulty in their efforts to obtain additional revenues for highway purposes because of the magnitude of the existing overall tax burden now imposed upon the motor-using public; and

"Whereas the Federal Government imposed its taxes on motor vehicles, motor fuel, lubricating oil, tires and tubes, parts and accessories as temporary emergency measures during the depression of the early 1930's, but has continued these taxes in effect ever since at increasing rates; and

"Whereas taxation of motor fuel traditionally has been relied upon by the States to produce a major part of the revenues necessary to construct and maintain their highways, and that the Federal Government, by its continued intrusion in this field, has so increased the tax burden on the highway user so virtually to preclude further increases in such taxes by the States; and

"Whereas the Governors' Conference, the Western Governors' Conference, the 11th General Assembly of the States, the National Grange, and the American Farm Bureau Federation recently have urged immediate repeal of the Federal gasoline tax: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of New Hampshire urgently requests that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor fuel taxation; be it further

"Resolved, That the Governor send copies of this resolution to the representatives of our State in Washington with the request that they appear at the appropriate time before the appropriate committees of Congress for the purpose of urging that the Federal tax on motor fuel be eliminated.

"RAYMOND K. PURSONS,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LANE DWINNELL,
"President of the Senate.
"HUGH GREGG,
"Governor.

"Passed February 25, 1953.
"Attest: ENOCH D. FULLER,
"Secretary of State."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of western mines

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the base metal mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the domestic lead and mine miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Utah, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Utahans but not produced in Utah; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Utah be, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this concurrent memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the National Congress and to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 12

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be treated as activities of the Atomic Energy Commission itself for the purpose of securing immunity from State and local taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate of the 55th general assembly (the house concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Iowa respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, contrary to the well-established principles of intergovernmental relations which have assured to the States and their political subdivisions full power to impose nondiscriminatory taxation upon private persons who deal with the Government; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from Iowa in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the establishment of peace between Israel and the Arab States is essential to the free world; and

Whereas the State of Israel is a progressive democracy which is desirous of cooperating with the free world in defense of freedom and against totalitarian aggression; and

"Whereas it is authentically reported that Great Britain is selling jet aircraft to the Arab States and that the United States intends to facilitate the acquisition by the Arab States of military equipment; and

"Whereas the acquisition by the Arab States of the means of waging war, while those states remain technically at war with Israel, imperils the security of the State of Israel and may be the means of provocation of war in the Middle East; and

"Whereas we view with dismay the portent of strife in the Middle East and the endangering of the security of the progressive democracy of Israel; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the President of the United States and the Secretary of State to take such action to prevent the flow of arms and materials of warfare to said Arab States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State use the influence of their office and of these United States to the accomplishment of a speedy and honorable era of peace between Israel and the Arab States; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted immediately to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States; and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the extension by proclamation of the Olympic National Park, of January 4, 1940, includes within its boundaries the corridor north of Quinalt Lake and River and the highway therein known as the North Shore Road; and

"Whereas this extension of boundaries brings within the jurisdiction of the National Park administration a considerable area of land owned by bona fide settlers together with the only road affording entry into and egress from the homes of these settlers, some of which were settled as early as 1888; and

"Whereas the land in question does not belong to the Olympic National Park nor to the United States, but belongs to private citizens who hold it by virtue of patents granted by the United States; and

"Whereas no timber land owned by the United States or the State of Washington is involved in this area which contains approximately 4,000 acres, of which 2,500 acres are potentially tillable; and

"Whereas the area is now the permanent residence of 177 people who enjoy electric lights, telephone service, rural free delivery mail, and bus service for children to an accredited high school; and

"Whereas the National Park Service could at its discretion, isolate the residents of the area by its failure to maintain a road: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to speedily enact legislation to readjust the boundaries of the Olympic National Park so as to restore the private land and road along the north shore of Quinalt Lake and River to the administration of the agency or agencies under whose jurisdiction it existed prior to the proclamation of January 4, 1940; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington."

By Mr. BARRETT:

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects

"Whereas the 160-acre limitation upon farm units involving federally financed reclamation projects is based upon an outworn concept and has become a serious hindrance to the development of the West through reclamation; and

"Whereas, in the case of presently irrigated private lands which need supplemental irrigation, the proper economic size of farm units has already been determined, as a result of decades of trial and error; and

"Whereas there exist in the West many areas which are naturally less favored than others, by reason of short growing seasons due to high elevation, high latitude, or otherwise; and

"Whereas such less favored areas cannot be reclaimed under the present land limitation provisions because they can be made productive only by the use of machinery, the cost of which is not warranted if the farm is limited to 160 acres or less: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the Senate of such legislature concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently and fairly consider and act upon

at this session, legislation designed to modernize the acreage limitation in the following manner: (1) removal of the limitation in the case of lands to which supplemental water is to be supplied, and (2) determination of the economic size of farm units in a new land project by the appropriate State official or agency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT and Representative in Congress WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, and to the governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington.

"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"F. W. BARTLING,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Approved February 17.

"C. J. 'Doc' ROGERS,
"*Acting Governor.*"

"Senate Enrolled Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to redefine the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park

"Whereas chapter 950, Public Law No. 787, 81st Congress, established Grand Teton National Park which embraces a large area described therein; and

"Whereas part of the encompassed area is not necessary for the proper utilization of the park; and

"Whereas much of the land is valuable for ranching and farming purposes and could be better utilized on the tax rolls of Teton County; and

"Whereas the use of the entire area as now described derogates from the proper conservation, management, and control of the wildlife of the area: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt legislation redefining the boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park to conform to the following natural boundaries, to wit: Beginning at a point where the present south boundary of the Grand Teton National Park located along the section lines between sections 17 and 20, township 42 north, range 116 west, intersects the bluff above the west bank of the Snake River; and thence continuing in a northeasterly direction along the said bluff above the west bank of the Snake River to a point where said bluff intersects the east boundary line of section 13, township 44 north, range 115 west; thence north along the range line between range 114 west and range 115 west to the northeast corner of section 12, township 44 north, range 115 west; thence along section lines to the southwest corner of section 6, township 44 north, range 115 west, being a point on the east boundary line of the original Grand Teton National Park; thence northerly following the boundary line of the original Grand Teton National Park to the northeast corner of said original Grand Teton National Park; thence southwesterly along the north boundary of the original Grand Teton National Park to a point on the divide between Snake River and Teton River where it intersects the western boundary of the present Grand Teton National Park; thence southerly and easterly along the boundary of the present Grand Teton National Park to the point of beginning; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the portion of the area which by this memorial would be excluded from the present boundaries of the Grand Teton National Park be transferred to the Teton National Forest, and that part of the land suitable for agriculture and ranching purposes be returned to private ownership as provided by law; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of said United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Congressman WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

"F. W. BARTLING,
"*President of the Senate.*
"DAVID FOOTE, Sr.,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 21.

"C. J. 'DOC' ROGERS,
"*Acting Governor.*"

"Senate Enrolled Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America by proper action to quitclaim unto the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest in and to all sections 16 and 36 within the State of Wyoming, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, so as to vest immediately in the State of Wyoming not only legal title to sections 16 and 36, when surveyed and not otherwise disposed of, but also with an indefeasible proprietary interest in all sections which are surveyed or were surveyed as of the date of the Enabling Act of July 10, 1890

"Whereas, by decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *The United States of America* v. *State of Wyoming and Ohio Oil Company*, rendered during the October term of 1946, it was determined that the enabling act of July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222–C–664), properly construed, would operate to vest title in the State of Wyoming to sections 16 and 36 only as of the date that an official survey of the lines of the sections were approved by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and then only if no inconsistent disposition of the lands had been previously made; and

"Whereas, subsequent to the date of such enabling act and on, to wit, December 6, 1915, these unsurveyed lands had, by Presidential order, been placed in a petroleum reserve; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming considers that the intention of the Congress of the United States at the date of the admission of this State into the Union was, in fact, to grant unto the State of Wyoming for the support of common schools each and every section numbered 16 and 36 in every township of this State whether then surveyed or unsurveyed, and which had not been previously sold or otherwise disposed of by, or under the authority of, any act of Congress; and

"Whereas, notwithstanding there is contained in such enabling act a proviso that, in the event a section numbered 16 or 36 had been previously disposed of, the State would be entitled to select lands in lieu thereof, the State of Wyoming considers that such in lieu selections will fail to duly compensate the State for the loss of certain sections 16 and 36 which were not within approved survey at the date of such enabling act due to the fact that this State, believing itself to be the owner of such unsurveyed lands, had through leases and otherwise caused exploration, discovery, and development thereunder subsurface minerals and values showing such questioned unsurveyed sections to have peculiar and irreplaceable values; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming believes that in equity and good conscience the Congress of the United States should, by proper action, quitclaim unto the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest in and to all sections 16 and 36 within the State of Wyoming, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, so as to vest immediately in the State of Wyoming not only legal title to sections 16 and 36, when surveyed and not otherwise disposed of, but also with an indefeasible proprietary interest in all sections which are unsurveyed or were unsurveyed sections as of the date of the Enabling Act of July 10, 1890: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the House of Representatives of such legislature concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby memorialized to by proper action quitclaim unto the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest in and to all sections 16 and 36 within the State of Wyoming, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, so as to vest immediately in the State of Wyoming not only legal title to sections 16 and 36 when surveyed and not otherwise disposed of, but also with an indefeasible interest in all sections which are unsurveyed or were unsurveyed sections as of the date of the Enabling Act of July 10, 1890; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator LESTER C. HUNT, United States Senator FRANK A. BARRETT, and Representative in Congress WILLIAM H. HARRISON.

"F. W. BARTLING,
"*President of the Senate.*
"DAVID FOOTE, SR.,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 25.

"C. J. 'DOC' ROGERS,
"*Acting Governor.*"

By Mr. WELKER:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to construction of national forest highways within the State of Idaho, and the construction of a new sewage-disposal and treating plant, together with other facilities at Sandpoint, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See joint resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on March 13, 1953, p. 1919, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF LEGISLATURE OF NEVADA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I present three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada. They are Senate Joint Resolution 12, memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines; Senate Joint Resolution 13, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore the gold standard and to increase the price of gold commensurate with the present value of the dollar; and Senate Joint Resolution 14, urging the establishment of a mine rescue station at Reno, Nev., by the United States Bureau of Mines.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were received, referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Senate joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines

"Whereas the base metal mining industry of the United States has suffered serious

curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries; and

"Whereas the domestic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

"Whereas Nevada, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Nevada but not produced in Nevada; and

"Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county, and State governments of much needed tax income; and

"Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

"Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to each member of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Joint Resolution 13

"Senate joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore the gold standard and to increase the price of gold commensurate with the present value of the dollar

"Whereas, by constitutional provision, mining was made the paramount industry of the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas the industry and well-being of many communities in the State of Nevada and the Western United States have been seriously impaired due to the present price of gold, established in the year 1934 and since maintained regardless of the increase in the commodity index and cost of living since the year 1939; and

"Whereas the cost of labor and all other commodities, especially such costs as enter into the production of gold, have increased 100 percent or more; and

"Whereas the purchasing power of the dollar has decreased to approximately one-half of what it was in 1939; and

"Whereas we believe that to stabilize the currency of the Nation it will be necessary to return to the gold standard, with a price for gold at a comparable dollar value; and

"Whereas our country does not have a gold standard, with gold and the dollar interchangeable at a fixed ratio; and

"Whereas the living standards of our country have been lowered and are being lowered continuously by unwarranted inflation of the country's currency; and

"Whereas the restoration of the gold standard with gold and the dollar freely interchangeable at a fixed ratio would stabilize all living costs, including the cost of labor, materials, and commodities as well as the operation of our Government; and

"Whereas all restrictions on the purchase, sale, and ownership of gold by American citizens should be removed, in view of the demand for and the price of gold in all foreign countries, in order that gold may seek a natural level to be ascertained by actual sales; and

"Whereas it is advisable for our Government in the best interests of our national economy to not only maintain the present price of $35 per ounce for gold, but to establish a price for gold based upon the present purchasing power of the dollar, which would indicate a price level more than double the price established in the year 1934 and the commodity index of the year 1939: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to restore the gold standard at the earliest practicable time and that the price of gold be reestablished at a price consistent with its present cost of production and the purchasing power of our inflated currency dollar; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada be authorized and directed to transmit properly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Representatives of the State of Nevada in the Congress of the United States."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Senate joint resolution urging the establishment of a mine-rescue station at Reno, Nev., by the United States Bureau of Mines

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Mines has mine-rescue stations in practically all the western mining States, with the exception of Nevada; and

"Whereas the States of Nevada and California comprise region III of the United States Bureau of Mines, for which a mine-rescue station is maintained at Berkeley, Calif.; and

"Whereas the Berkeley mine-rescue station is the only United States Bureau of Mines rescue station set up to provide assistance in Nevada in case of mine disasters; and

"Whereas the location of the mine-rescue station at Berkeley necessitates the moving of mine-rescue equipment and personnel, in case of an emergency in Nevada, by truck or airplane across the Sierra Nevada mountains at considerable cost and with the loss of valuable time, especially during the winter months when the mountain area receives heavy snowfalls and when airplane service is sometimes not available; and

"Whereas the establishment of a mine-rescue station at Reno, Nev., would provide adequate protection for the entire State of Nevada and would provide better protection for many California mining communities as well: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That Mr. J. Howard Bird, Chief, Accident Prevention and Health Division, United States Bureau of Mines, 428 Acheson Building, Berkeley 4, Calif., be memorialized to take whatever steps may be necessary to secure the establishment at Reno, Nev., of a mine-rescue station of the United States Bureau of Mines; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Director of the United States Bureau of Mines in Washington, D. C., and to our congressional delegation in Washington, D. C."

FEDERAL GASOLINE TAXES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference Concurrent Resolution 2, adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes

Whereas the Federal gasoline tax is levied upon the users of American highways; and

Whereas the highway system of this country and the highway systems of the several States are rapidly deteriorating because the funds needed to develop and maintain a modern highway network are not available; and

Whereas the Federal Government is now distributing to the States only about two-thirds of the revenue which it is deriving from the Federal gasoline tax and is diverting the remainder to its other purposes; and

Whereas if the Federal Government would withdraw from the field of gasoline taxes and the several States would increase the taxes imposed by them on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels in an amount equal to the Federal tax on gasoline, a much larger amount of revenue would be available to the several States for the purpose of developing and maintaining a modern system of highways therein; and

Whereas the 11th general assembly of the States which was held in Chicago, Ill., in the month of December 1952, at which practically all of the States of the United States were represented, went on record as favoring the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the gasoline tax field; and

Whereas the National Conference of Governors and the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, of which the State of Kansas is a member, have declared by appropriate resolutions that the Federal Government should withdraw from the gasoline tax field: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and each member of the Kansas delegation in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate and to the respective houses of the legislatures of the several States of the United States.

THE AGRICULTURE PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF GREENWOOD COUNTY (KANS.) CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and

ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Greenwood County (Kans.) Cattlemen's Association at their annual meeting on March 4, 1953, commending and supporting Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson in his agriculture program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Eureka, Kans., March 12, 1953.

Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: The Greenwood County Cattlemen's Association in annual meeting Eureka, Kans., March 4, 1953, hereby resolves to commend and support Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, in his efforts to expand markets for, and increase efficiency in, the production of and marketing of agricultural products. To the degree that this program is successful, the freedom and well-being of agriculture and the general welfare of all Americans is promoted.

To most cattle producers only the sharpness and timing of the present adjustment in cattle prices was unexpected. To prevent greater distress we urge the exploration and use of available means to promote clearance of meats in existing trade channels and examination of the adequacy of livestock credit facilities to prevent uneconomic liquidation.

Direct intervention to support the cattle industry is no more acceptable now than were the price controls and regulations, from which we were only recently relieved. Greenwood County cattlemen have confidence in an expanding economy in America and faith in the future of their business.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE W. AICHER,
Secretary.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RELEASE AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the week of March 23, the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway will hold hearings on the subject of Senate bill 589, providing for creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. to construct a part of the St. Lawrence seaway in United States territory in the interest of national security authorizing the corporation to consummate certain arrangements with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada relative to construction and operation of the seaway; empowering the corporation to finance the United States share of the seaway cost on a self-liquidating basis; to establish cooperation with Canada in the control and operation of the St. Lawrence seaway; to authorize negotiations with Canada of an agreement on tolls; and for other purposes, and various substitutes and amendments thereto.

Under the bill, a St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corp. would be established for the purpose of joining with our Canadian good neighbor in coconstruction and cotitle to the seaway.

On March 8 I issued a release describing these hearings and urging enactment of the proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the release, together with several resolutions which I have received from Wisconsin, urging the approval of the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the release and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

SENATOR WILEY SCHEDULES 3 DAYS OF HEARINGS ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY LEGISLATION; SCOPE RESTRICTED TO FOUR PHASES; BILL URGED AS SIGNIFICANT FOREIGN-POLICY STEP

During the week of March 23 there will be held 3 days of hearings on St. Lawrence seaway legislation by a Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee, on which I serve as chairman.

I will suggest a subcommittee vote as soon as possible after the conclusion of the hearings in order that the issue may be brought to the full Foreign Relations Committee and promptly forwarded to the Senate floor.

The schedule of the hearings will be:

First day: Members of the Congress and spokesmen from Government agencies.

Second day: Proponents of the varying pieces of legislation, including the Wiley bill S. 589 and amendments and substitutes thereto.

Third day: Opponents of the legislation.

I believe that we can do full justice to this subject in these 3 days, and that we will be rendering the American taxpayer a real service by not attempting to rehash all of the arguments—pro and con—which have been repeated for the last 30 years on this project.

The documentation on the seaway is already so thick—with so many previous printed hearings, reports, studies, memoranda, committee prints—that it would be wasteful to review any but the relatively new phases of the problem.

During recent years when the issue has come up in the Senate, the scope of the hearings has been limited as it will be now.

The four phases to be covered

The following are the four phases to which we will address ourselves:

Witnesses desiring to be heard are requested to confine themselves to these four subjects. In addition, individuals who would like to file statements with the committee are most welcome to do so but are urged similarly to confine their statements to these four phases:

1. Desirability: In view of the fact that Canada is ready to proceed immediately with an all-Canadian St. Lawrence seaway, is it desirable, from the standpoint of national security and other considerations for the United States to construct part of the St. Lawrence canals on United States territory, and exercise joint control with Canada?

2. Corporation: What are the problems in financing the construction of the canals on United States territory on a self-liquidating basis through a St. Lawrence seaway development corporation?

3. Upper lake channels: Is it desirable to authorize the deepening of the connecting channels of the Great Lakes to 27 feet, at the present time, as a part of the proposed St. Lawrence, bill or by separate legislation?

4. Power: In view of the current status of the New York-Ontario St. Lawrence Power application, pending before the Federal Power Commission, is it necessary at this time that Congress take any action with respect to the power project?

Seaway passage will be healthy index to Malenkov

Speaking purely personally and not as the committee or subcommittee chairman, I believe that at the present moment, when all of the eyes of the world are turned toward Moscow, America could take few more significant actions than to demonstrate her unity with her best neighbor, Canada, by immediately authorizing joint construction of this mighty project.

The St. Lawrence seaway is an instrument for peace and prosperity. This legislation is thus not directed against any nation, but rather for the economic health and well-being of the North American Continent, and to further sound trade with all peoples of the world.

Soviet Russia has been engaged in a tremendous program of canal and hydroelectric construction, and no project could better demonstrate to her people and peoples everywhere that the United States is not blind to the need for similar activity on our own continent.

At the same time, the St. Lawrence seaway will tremendously enhance our defensive potential, as attested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Completion of the seaway would, therefore, be a sound index to Mr. Malenkov and company that the United States is moving progressively to equip herself invincibly with the means for self-defense against any possible contingency.

Nothing impresses the Soviets more than vigorous action on our part, particularly action showing that we have the vision to plan with our allies for mutual strength. On the other hand, nothing makes the Soviets more contemptuous of us and fills them with more dangerous arrogance than a feeling that the people and leaders of the United States are blind even to their own best interests, i. e., blind to the significance of a project of this nature.

Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway project is vital to our national defense and economic well-being, and will serve to promote the mutual security of the United States and Canada; and

Whereas the seaway project will provide a needed artery for the transportation of iron ore to our Nation's steel-producing centers, and the shipment of grain and agricultural commodities, as well as essential raw materials and industrial products; and

Whereas Wisconsin agriculture and industry are dependent upon a healthy steel industry in the Great Lakes area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Burlington, Wis., do hereby declare themselves in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project, and the joint participation of the United States with Canada in the development and control of the seaway; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators, ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, and to our Representative, LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Unanimously adopted March 11, 1953.

Whereas the Beloit Business and Professional Women's Club believes that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project will open the middle western region of the United States and Canada to world trade, it will provide an efficient and inexpensive route for bringing Labrador ore to middle-western steel mills, it will provide cheap and steady electricity in a region noted for power shortages and high electricity rates, because the project is completely self-liquidating, and because the national-defense need for the water and power is a pressing need for defense industries: Be it

Resolved, That we urge our Senators and Representative to favorably support the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project after it has been presented before their respective bodies for study and discussion, and for the final vote on the bill; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY, and to Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

Respectfully submitted.

ANNE UBER,
Legislative Chairman.

FEBRUARY 23, 1953.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1362. A bill for the relief of Rose Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 88).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. CARLSON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon, pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 16, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1320. A bill for the relief of Mordechay Dinewitz;

S. 1321. A bill for the relief of Michajlo Dzieczko;

S. 1322. A bill for the relief of George Papadopoulos; and

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1324. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to fix certain licensing and registration fees; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1325. A bill for the relief of Szjena Pelson and David Pelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1326. A bill for the relief of Montchen Thomas Tchou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1327. A bill to require that collectors of customs, United States attorneys, and United States marshals be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, and provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1328. A bill to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1329. A bill to provide for the shipment of surplus food commodities to the people of the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1330. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1331. A bill for the relief of Dr. Byron Marcy UnKauf; and

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Mary Goodyear Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1333. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit States to enter into agreements with the Administrator to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to teachers in the public schools of such States who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith;

S. 1335. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1336. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian refugees;

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1339. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1340. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1341. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1342. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1343. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1344. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1345. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees;

S. 1346. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees; and

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of certain Palestinian Arab refugees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1348. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to improve the credit services available to farmers seeking to adopt soil- and water-conservation systems of farming contributing toward development of a permanently and abundantly productive American agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1349. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1351. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Oscar Ems de Huy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of Siegfried Rosenzweig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1353. A bill to amend section 3469 of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt from tax the transportation of persons to and from Mexico, to and from Central America, and to and from the West Indies; and

S. 1354. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1355. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MONTCHEN THOMAS TCHOU

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Montchen Thomas Tchou. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1326) for the relief of Montchen Thomas Tchou, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The bill would legalize permanent residence in the United States of M. Thomas Tchou, a native of West China. Tchou is a graduate in naval architecture and mechanical engineering of the University of Glasgow, Scotland. Since January of 1952, he has been employed as a naval architect-draftsman in Cleveland.

With the exception of some brief visits out of the country, Tchou has been in the United States continuously since January 1, 1938. During his first years in the United States, Tchou was an official of the Chinese Nationalist Government. He had previously served that government as secretary to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and as a member of Chinese missions in Washington, Berlin, Paris, and London.

Tchou now lives in Cleveland, but owns a home in Yellow Springs, Ohio, where his son Raymond is a student at Antioch College. Tchou's wife, a Scotch woman, has already been granted permanent residence in the United States.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS AND POSTMASTERS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the blue ribbon merit system in our Government. It would require collectors of customs, United States attorneys, and United States marshals to be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws. Furthermore, it would eliminate once and for all political patronage in the appointment of postmasters in first-, second-, and third-class post offices. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1327) to require that collectors of customs, United States attorneys, and United States marshals be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws, and provide for the appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Members of the Senate will recall that I have been an advocate of the blue-ribbon merit system as an essential step in the development of a clean Government program ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. This accounted for my active support in behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, eliminating political patronage from

the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I likewise supported the reorganization plans to eliminate political patronage in the remaining agencies of our Government.

The Senate did not see fit to agree with all of those reorganization plans during the 82d Congress. It is my hope that it will agree to enact legislation to carry out the objectives of good and meritorious government. I was for the merit system when the Democrats were the majority party and I remain for the merit system now that the Republicans are in power. There is room for the argument that political patronage is important in a policymaking Government position, but there can be no legitimate excuse for patronage in other agencies of government. The spoils system should be eliminated and my bill will go far to end it.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a temporary bipartisan National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Members of the Senate will recall that the bill was developed during the 81st Congress by this Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, of which I was chairman. We held extensive hearings and found the testimony unanimous and enthusiastic in support of the establishment of such a Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1328) to establish a temporary National Commission of Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Within the past few days, President Eisenhower has met with representatives of our State governments in a serious effort to improve relations between our Federal, State, and local governments. The volume and complexity of those relations have been substantially increased as a result of our defense program. It is, therefore, important that the establishment of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations not be delayed and that the Commission be instructed to submit its report, as well as its recommendations as soon as possible.

The Hoover Commission specifically recommended that a Commission be established, not only because Federal-State relations is the cardinal question of our Federal system of government, but also to accomplish its other recommendations in an adequate and orderly manner. The Hoover Commission recommended that the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations be of a continuing nature. My proposal and the proposal we developed unanimously during the 81st Congress provides that the Commission be temporary so that the Congress has an opportunity to review its work before establishing it on a temporary basis. In my own mind, I have not precluded the temporary Commission becoming a continuing one if that should be desirable, but I hesitate to create a new Government agency to be added to the already large bureaucratic structure of our Government.

The issue of Federal-State-local relations is basic to good government and to democratic government in the United States. A bipartisan Commission can go far toward placing the problems affecting that relationship in proper focus and toward helping to solve many of them. We ought not to delude ourselves into believing, however, that such a Commission can solve all the problems inherent in our Federal system of government. Having been a mayor of rather a large city, I know intimately many of these problems. They arise out of the need for constitutional revision in many of our States, for reapportionment and for the consolidation of many governmental functions on a local and State level. The best way to preserve States rights is to strengthen States' responsibilities. The best way for the States to assume their rightful responsibility is to strengthen their governmental machinery so that they can respond to the popular will and to popular needs. There can be no lasting solution to the problems inherent in our Federal system of government until this governmental reorganization takes place.

In introducing our bill to create a temporary bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, I deem it important to face up to the issues realistically. A commission can go far and can make a great contribution but it will provide no panacea. We need boldness, courage, responsibility, and a clear will if the role of our State and local governments is to be strengthened and if our Federal system of government is to serve the needs of our people efficiently and effectively.

REVISED BUDGET ESTIMATES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution requesting the President to transmit to the Congress revised budget estimates. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), submitted by Mr. MURRAY, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Whereas the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, provides for the transmission to the Congress at the beginning of every session of a complete budget, including a complete set of estimated appropriations and expenditures; and

Whereas this procedure has proved to be an indispensable factor in the orderly consideration by the Congress of budgetary and fiscal measures; and

Whereas the only budget thus far transmitted to the Congress is the budget transmitted by the former President on January 9, 1953; and

Whereas revisions in this budget have already been obtained from all departments and agencies by the Director of the Budget, on behalf of the President; and

Whereas the transmission of the revised estimates to the Congress is essential to proper congressional consideration of appropriation measures and of proposals for tax reductions and other revenue measures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is hereby requested, in accordance with the established procedures developed under the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, to transmit to the Congress by April 20, 1953, such revisions in or amendments to, the budget transmitted on January 9, 1953, as he may deem appropriate.

The statement by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

One of the most important questions before this Congress is whether or not the budget for the next fiscal year can be balanced.

The established procedure for the orderly consideration of this question by the Congress is the transmission to the Congress by the President of a budget message, recommending a specific amount of appropriations and expenditures and estimating the Government's total revenues.

Unfortunately, the new administration has not presented the Congress with a budget. The only budget before the Congress is the one submitted by President Truman on January 9 of this year, just 11 days before he left office.

Moreover, there is no indication that the new administration is planning to submit a revised budget to the Congress. The only plan thus far announced is the plan described in the New York Times of March 7. According to the New York Times, the Budget Bureau is preparing a series of amendments to the Truman budget. These amendments are to be transmitted separately during the course of April and May.

There is a tremendous difference between a long-drawn-out series of disconnected amendments, on the one hand, and a comprehensive budget proposal, on the other hand. The Congress is entitled to know at an early stage in this session whether or not the administration supports the Truman proposal for expenditures totaling $78.6 billion.

If the administration is proposing to cut the Truman budget—and many conflicting points of view have been expressed on this matter by White House and congressional spokesmen for the administration—how much will the cut be? Will it be as large as $9.9 billion, the estimated deficit in the Truman budget, or will it be only a small fraction of this amount?

If the new administration is going to cut, where will these cuts be? How big a cut will be proposed in national defense and international security? How big will be the cut in the field of natural resources? Will there be cuts in agricultural expenditures?

The Congress of the United States and the people of the United States are entitled to a complete and early answer to these questions.

The only way to answer these questions is through the prompt submission of a new budget.

The concurrent resolution, which I have prepared, requests the submission of such a complete budget by April 20 of this year.

Under this resolution, a 3 months' period is provided between the day upon which the new administration took office and the time for transmitting the new budget. This certainly provides an ample opportunity for the administration to determine its budgetary policies—particularly since the new Budget Director began his study of the budget back in November 1952, 2 months before General Eisenhower took office.

EXTENSION TO STATE OF ARKANSAS OF PROVISIONS OF ACT RELATING TO CONSERVATION OF WATER RESOURCES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on February 6, 1953, I introduced the bill (S. 789) to extend the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, to the State of Arkansas, which would extend the Water Facilities Act,

or the Pope-Jones Act, to the State of Arkansas. The bill was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have been advised by the staff of that committee that jurisdiction of the proposed legislation lies in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The program under the act which the bill seeks to amend is administered by the Department of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, and the original act and the subsequent amendments to it came from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have notified the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and it is my understanding that he has no objection.

Therefore, I ask that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 789) and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "A Fair Conduct Code for Congress," written by Senator KEFAUVER and published in the New Republic of March 16, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address entitled "The Truth May Keep Us Free," delivered by Senator SYMINGTON before the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum on March 11, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Well Done, Mr. Bowles," published in the New York Times of March 15, 1953.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Cattlemen Kiss Santa Claus Goodby," written by Aubrey Graves, and published in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 15, 1953.

Article entitled "Death of John Brandt Ends Life of Great Man," written by W. F. Schilling, and published in the Northfield (Minn.) Independent of March 12, 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "Iowa State's Educational TV," written by Dorothy Thompson and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 10, 1953.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "A Bit of Sunshine," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 13, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Threat to Freedom," from United Evangelical magazine Action.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Point 4 Aid to Backward Peoples Needs Rechecking," published in the Saturday Evening Post of recent date.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "What Now?" published in the Wilmington (Del.) Record of March 13, 1953.

By Mr. KERR:

Poem entitled "The Death of Wiley Post and Will Rogers," written by Dewey F. Dennison.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Justice for Mr. Burkett," published in the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of February 16, 1953.

Editorial entitled "What Price Morality?" published in the Lodi (Calif.) Times of February 19, 1953.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

Article dealing with Communist teachers as a problem involving both indoctrination and academic freedom, written by Sidney Hook, and published in the March 9, 1953, issue of the New Leader.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Farm Policy and Economic Policy," written by John D. Clark, published in today's Washington Post.

Article entitled "The Bohlen Nomination," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in today's Washington Post.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Article entitled "These Days," written by George Sokolsky, published in today's Washington Times-Herald.

Article entitled "Senator McCARRAN Suit and the Public Press," written by Westbrook Pegler, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 11, 1953.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "More Gall From England," published in the Idaho Statesman, March 14, 1953.

TITLE TO RESOURCES OF SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, a copy of a letter I addressed to His Excellency, Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of Rhode Island, on last March 3, relating to submerged lands legislation presently under consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; also a copy of the reply I received from Governor Roberts, and a copy of the resolution introduced in the Rhode Island General Assembly on Thursday, March 12, which passed the house of representatives unanimously that day.

This official correspondence and this resolution I certainly believe will be of interest to the Members of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter, the reply thereto, and the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 3, 1953.

His Excellency DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Governor of the State of Rhode Island, Providence, R. I.

DEAR GOVERNOR: There are pending in Congress bills to give California, Louisiana, and Texas the oil, gas, and other mineral resources in submerged lands of the sea off their shores. These resources belong to all the people of the United States, including the people of our State of Rhode Island. They are of vital importance to us and to the whole Nation. It is proposed to give them away without compensation, and if the proposal succeeds, three States will receive vast benefits and profits at the expense of the people of the other 45 States.

The United States was compelled to sue California, Louisiana, and Texas, and it won all three cases. The purpose of the legislation now before Congress is to change the result of the decisions of the Supreme Court, and to give these three States the Nation's known mineral resources in the submerged lands of the sea. Nobody really knows the amount or value of the oil and gas and other minerals in the submerged lands of the seas near the shores of the United States. Estimates vary from several billion to $40 or $50 billion. Rhode Island is entitled to a share in the benefits from this great wealth.

The pending bills are drawn so as to make it appear that all of the coastal States are to benefit by the proposed gift. They purport to give all of the coastal States the right, title, and interest of the United States in the marginal sea off their shores. The misleading propaganda, circulated ever since the Supreme Court decided against these States, is to the effect that title to the submerged lands of navigable inland lakes and rivers and harbors is in doubt, and also the State's interest in oysters, clams, and other marine life.

None of these statements has any sound basis. The submerged beds of navigable inland waters are not and never were involved in this matter. There is not and has not been any desire by the United States to interfere with the States' control of marine life in the adjacent waters or in submerged lands of those waters. Moreover, the United States has tried for years to obtain legislation expressly relinquishing forever any claim or right to such products of the sea, or to any filled land or improvements built into the sea. But the representatives of these three States, and their supporters, have never allowed any of such bills to come out of any committee, or to pass in any form, because it suited their purpose to prevent such legislation. The obvious purpose has been to keep it tied to their bills to give them the Nation's oil, gas, and other mineral resources in the submerged lands of the sea.

Some of the representatives of the coastal States may be misled by such tactics but I am not, and I do not believe the people of Rhode Island are. These bills do not give us anything we do not now have or else may not get for the asking, but on the other hand they deprive, and are intended to deprive, the people of Rhode Island of the benefit of their interest in the vast oil, gas, and other mineral resources of the submerged lands of the marginal sea. It should be understood that whatever sums of money are to be realized by these three States from this proposed gift will be taken away from the taxpayers of the other States, including Rhode Island. Money which could be used to prevent Federal taxes from going higher, or to reduce present taxes, will go instead to three States. The taxpayers of Rhode Island will be taxed in the future to make up the revenues it is proposed to give California, Louisiana, and Texas.

Some of these bills, with heavy backing, are even more objectionable. They not only purport to give the States the title to the 3-mile belt always claimed by the United States, but they also extend that belt to what they call historical boundaries, so that some States will get much larger areas in the sea than others. In addition to this discrimination, Texas has introduced a bill under which it would receive 37½ percent of all the proceeds from the oil, gas, and other mineral resources beyond its marginal belt, which it claims to be 10½ miles and all the way to the outermost edge of the Continental Shelf, more than 150 miles from its shore.

I think that you will agree that the people of our State and the people of our Nation ought not to be silent in the face of this attempt to strip the Nation of its oil, gas, and other mineral resources in the sea for the benefit of the people of three States. This would be discriminatory and unfair to Rhode Island and other States.

There is a legal question as to whether the Congress has power to divest the United States of its rights, title, and interest in areas subject to international usage and agreement. The Supreme Court has said that the United States acquired its rights in the marginal sea as an incident of national external sovereignty. It has also said that no State has any rights in the submerged lands of the marginal sea. The question as to whether Congress can take such rights away from the

United States and give them, for all practical purposes, to three States is one that demands final decision by the Nation's highest Court.

Rhode Island has not hesitated in the past to question the power of Congress where legislation seemed detrimental to the best interests of the Nation, and I think it ought to be ready to act again if Congress passes bills of the character I have described in this letter. Rhode Island tested the validity of the prohibition amendment to the Constitution of the United States, in the case reported in 253 U. S. 350. It directed the attorney general of the State to file suit and it appropriated funds for the litigation.

If it meets with your approval, I would suggest that the legislature now be requested to adopt an appropriate resolution, directing the attorney general of the State immediately to begin study of the issues involved, and in the event of the passage of any of these bills substantially in their present form, to institute suit by and on behalf of the State of Rhode Island to have any such legislation declared null and void.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND
PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS,
Providence, March 12, 1953.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Upon receipt of your letter of March 3, 1953, relative to certain bills pending in the Congress of the United States, that is, submerged lands, I conferred with the attorney general who advises me that in the event the Rhode Island General Assembly adjourns prior to the enactment of such bills by the Congress, Rhode Island would be powerless to act unless a suitable resolution had been adopted by the legislature of this State. As a result of this conference the attorney general has prepared such legislation for introduction in the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island.

Appreciating that the interest of the people of Rhode Island might subsequently require action by the attorney general of this State such a resolution is deemed advisable.

Sincerely yours,

DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Governor.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND TO TAKE SUCH ACTION AS MAY BE DEEMED ADVISABLE OR NECESSARY TO OBTAIN A FINAL DETERMINATION BY THE COURTS UPON ISSUES AND QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN PROPOSALS PENDING IN CONGRESS CONCERNING RIGHTS, TITLE, AND INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE MARGINAL SEA, PARTICULARLY IN THE OIL, GAS, AND OTHER MINERAL RESOURCES OF SUCH AREAS

Whereas bills are pending in the Congress of the United States to divest the people of the United States of their rights, title, and interest in the submerged lands of the marginal sea; and

Whereas the primary purpose of such proposed legislation is to give, without consideration, all the oil, gas, and other mineral resources of the marginal sea to 3 States—California, Louisiana, and Texas—at the expense of the other 45 States; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has decided at least four times that such natural resources belong to the United States, and do not and never have belonged to any State; and

Whereas such resources are needed for the defense of the Nation and should be administered and developed for the benefit of all the people of the United States; and

Whereas such a gift would be detrimental to the people and particularly the taxpayers of the State of Rhode Island, who would be taxed and continue to be taxed in the future to pay for the cost of acquiring needed oil, gas, and other minerals now belonging to the United States but which it is proposed to give to the States off whose shores such resources have been located; and

Whereas the people of Rhode Island are entitled to their fair share of the benefits accruing to all the people of the United States from its rights, title, and interest in the oil, gas, and other mineral resources of the submerged lands of the sea; and

Whereas it is believed that legislation designed to deprive the United States of its rights in the submerged lands of the sea would create unfair and unwarranted discriminations between the States, and would for many reasons, violate the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the attorney general of the State of Rhode Island be and he is hereby authorized and directed to begin immediately a study of the legal and equitable issues and principles involved in legislation purporting to divest the United States of its rights, title, and interest in any of the submerged lands of the seas bordering the coasts of the United States, and in the event of the passage of such legislation to institute such suits or proceedings, or to take such other action as may be advisable or necessary, to obtain a final determination by the courts as to the power of Congress to make such enactments; and be it further.

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized and directed to transmit to the attorney general of the State of Rhode Island a duly certified copy of this resolution.

HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the 15th day of March is celebrated throughout the free world as Hungarian Independence Day. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the text of a statement which I have prepared for this occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

The 15th day of March is one of the memorable days in the history of mankind's struggle against the forces of tyranny. This day marks the liberation of the Hungarian people from Hapsburg despotism.

As we take note of this significant occasion, the gallant people of Hungary still suffer under the ruthless domination of the Soviet invaders. The Russian conquest of this land, however, cannot erase the memory of the great Hungarian leader, Louis Kossuth. The legacy of freedom which he bequeathed to his people will continue to sustain them until Hungary once again takes her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

On this independence day I hope and pray that Hungary's hour of liberation is near.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday, March 15, was Hungarian Freedom Day. I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared in commemoration of that day, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

With Hungary once more enslaved by a foreign power, it is difficult for us to say that we are celebrating Hungarian Freedom Day. It is more appropriate for us to use this occasion to commemorate the many Hungarian patriots who have in the past striven to attain freedom for Hungary and to dedicate ourselves anew to the ultimate achievement of the goal which all of us so deeply desire: the reestablishment of a free and independent Hungary.

In its long and glorious history, Hungary has had the sad fate of experiencing the rule of many foreign tyrants, but the Hungarian people have seen these tyrants come and go. Through it all it has clung to its own great traditions, repelling the foreign efforts to press it into a different mold. The Hungarian people have thereby won the admiration of the world for their tenaciousness and stubbornness.

I am confident that the fate of the Soviet tyranny that rules Hungary today is not going to be any different from that of its predecessors, even though its brutality and evilness may be more all-pervading than anything that has been experienced previously. The spirit of freedom, the spirit of Louis Kossuth and his associates will live on, in spite of the persecution of such leading citizens as the great Cardinal Mindszenty, in spite of police intimidation, deportations, and mass murder. The time will come again when you will once more recite the words of your national poet, Sandor Petoesi:

"On your feet, Magyars, * * *
We shall not be slaves any longer."

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], speaking on the 55th anniversary of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, gave us a comprehensive and most interesting review of the conditions surrounding the Spanish-American War.

He called our attention to the advancing age of the men of the Spanish-American War. He pointed out that it was the only war in American history that was fought entirely by volunteers.

He reminded us that it was 20 years after the end of the war before the Spanish-American War veteran was granted any benefits whatsoever in recognition of his service and sacrifice.

The Senator from Iowa, as Senators know, served as a sergeant in the Spanish-American War, and I deeply appreciated his gracious reference to me as another veteran of that conflict.

A third Spanish-American War veteran presently holding membership in this body as the able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who served in the First Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry.

The outfit in which I had the honor to serve was the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry. This organization holds a reunion each year and a careful report of its membership is compiled annually by its recorder, Dan A. Dooley.

The latest report of the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteers was given on February 18, 1953, and was as follows:

Members living, 232; died or killed while in service, 677; present whereabouts unknown, 12; or a total of 921.

The 10th Pennsylvania served in the Philippines in 1898 and 1899 as a part of the old Eighth Army Corps. There were many great outfits serving in the Philippines at that time.

It may be of interest to recall the volunteer units fighting in the Philippines more than half a century ago. They were as follows: Astor Battery, New

York; 1st California; California Heavy Artillery; 1st Colorado; 1st Idaho; 51st Iowa; 20th Kansas; 13th Minnesota; 1st Montana; 1st Nebraska; Nevada Cavalry; 1st North Dakota; 2d Oregon; 10th Pennsylvania; 1st South Dakota; 1st Tennessee; Utah Light Artillery; 1st Washington; and 1st Wyoming.

With the exception of the Astor Battery, they all came from the National Guard and all were volunteers. In addition, as is always the case, several fine organizations of the Regular Army served in the Philippines.

Recorder Dooley's report shows that all the field and staff officers and the noncommissioned staff of the 10th Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry have died except two. The survivors are Maj. Everhart Bierer, who was born November 12, 1865, and Principal Musician Frank M. Keffer, who was born October 1, 1875.

A Company's oldest living veteran is William H. McKain, who was born May 31, 1868.

B Company's oldest living veteran is Capt. Harry J. Watson, who was born October 11, 1868.

C Company's oldest living veteran is John R. Barnes, who was born February 28, 1866.

D Company's oldest living veteran is Oliver N. Morrison, who was born August 26, 1868.

E Company's oldest living veteran is James R. Risheberger, who was born June 7, 1868.

H Company's oldest living veteran is Charles L. Stewart, who was born November 29, 1865.

I Company's oldest living veteran is Andrew Banks, who was born March 21, 1866.

K Company's oldest living veteran is Frank Wisecarver, who was born October 4, 1869.

The Spanish-American War veterans are rapidly answering the last roll call.

AN IRISH BLESSING

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, in view of the fact that tomorrow is the birthday anniversary of the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick, and inasmuch as we are observing the day today by wearing green carnations in our lapels, I should like to read a blessing which I have received through the mail. I received it not from one of my own constituents but from a person in Pennsylvania. I believe it is well worth reading. It is a real Irish blessing and reads:

May the blessing of light be on you—light without and light within.

May the blessed sunlight shine on you and warm your heart till it glows like a great peat fire, so that the stranger may come and warm himself at it and also a friend.

And may the light shine out of the 2 eyes of you, like a candle set in 2 windows of a house, bidding the wanderer to come in out of the storm.

And may the blessing of the rain be on you—the soft sweet rain. May it fall upon your spirit so that all the little flowers may spring up and shed their sweetness on the air, and may the blessing of the great rains be on you, may they beat upon your spirit and wash it fair and clean, and leave there many a shining pool where the blue of heaven shines and sometimes a star.

And may the blessing of the earth be on you—the great round earth; may you ever have a kindly greeting for them you pass as you're going along the roads. May the earth be soft under you when you rest out upon it, tired at the end of a day, and may it rest easy over you when at the last you lay out under it; may it rest so lightly over you that your soul may be off from under it quickly, and up and off and on its way to God.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Bush	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Holland	Potter
Carlson	Humphrey	Purtell
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Jackson	Schoeppel
Clements	Jenner	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Kefauver	Sparkman
Douglas	Kerr	Stennis
Duff	Kilgore	Symington
Dworshak	Knowland	Taft
Eastland	Kuchel	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Welker
Flanders	Long	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams
Fulbright	Malone	Young
George	Mansfield	
Gillette	Martin	

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] was appointed as a member of the committee upon the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Honorable Joseph R. Bryson, a Representative from the State of South Carolina, and is, therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar, under rule VIII, is now in order. The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S.242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 24) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschak was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 152) for the relief of Fred P. Hines was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 484) for the relief of J. Don Alexander was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Michigan is not present on the floor. I had something in mind in connection with the debate on the calendar last week. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 102) for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

SOCORRO GERONA DE CASTRO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 173) for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws,

Socorro Gerona de Castro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER ODILIA, ALSO KNOWN AS MARIA HUTTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 255) for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREE POSTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 2466) to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specific areas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTINUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

The bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, while the bill is a very meritorious one, it appears to me that its provisions may go too far. The Department of Defense is cognizant of the fact that need for permanent legislation exists, and is consequently making a study of the problem. However, the committee report does not indicate that the Committee on Armed Services is making the study. As an illustration of what the bill provides, I have made inquiry relative to its provisions, to which I have received the information that for the first 6 months of 1952 the bill, if enacted, would cost $9,607,000. I understand that 11,000 persons are still carried under the category of missing.

I do not know what remedial action is needed, but it seems to me that the Committee on Armed Services and the Senate should give very careful consideration to the subject. I was hoping that the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services would be on the floor this morning.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say that I am handling the bill for the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not object to the consideration of the bill at this time, because it merely extends the provision of the existing law until——

Mr. GORE. To July 1, 1954.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. I was wondering whether we could agree to extend its provisions until December 31, 1953. Such an extension would permit the Defense Department and the committees of the two Houses of Congress to make a study of the subject in order to deal in a permanent manner with the problem. Would the Senator from New Jersey agree to such an amendment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The difficulty about it is that Congress would not be in session when the act expired. If the war in Korea should continue beyond that date many persons would be denied the facilities which this bill provides.

Mr. GORE. The magnitude of the problem has already been indicated and the need for permanent legislation is certified by both the committee report and the Defense Department. Would the Senator from New Jersey be agreeable to an amendment extending the provisions of the act until February 1, 1954?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from New Jersey would accept such an amendment, and I am sure that the Committee on Armed Services would also agree to accept it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withhold my objection and offer such an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the date "July 1, 1954," and to insert in lieu thereof the date "February 1, 1954."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on page 2, line 8, I ask that the word "iterned" be corrected to read "interned."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON SENATE BILL 1229

This bill will do two things. First, it will extend to July 1, 1954, the Missing Persons Act. This law presently expires on April 1 of this year. Second, the bill incorporates in the basic act certain language changes contained in Public Law 450, 82d Congress, which extended the Missing Persons Act from July 3, 1952, to April 1, 1953.

A word with respect to the background of the law. The Missing Persons Act was passed in 1942 and remained in effect until 1947. It was revived by the Selective Service Act of 1948 and has been extended by various acts until April 1.

Broadly speaking, the Missing Persons Act provides that the heads of the executive departments may continue to credit the pay accounts, and make, continue, or modify allotments to dependents of service personnel and civilians who are in a missing status. The largest group of people who are presently in the missing category are, of course, service people who have been either captured or are missing in Korea.

By being able to credit the soldier's pay account, a Department may protect a variety of financial interests of the soldier, such as paying his commercial insurance premiums while he is in a missing status.

With respect to allotments, the Departments, in a sense, assume the guardianship for the dependents of the soldier, by being permitted to alter the amount of the allotments paid the dependents of the missing soldier.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1229) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Missing Persons Act (ch. 166, secs. 1–12, 14, and 15; 56 Stat. 143–147), as amended (ch. 828, 56 Stat. 1092–1093; ch. 371, 58 Stat. 679–682; ch. 70, 61 Stat. 96; ch. 356, 65 Stat. 207), as extended by section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 608), and as it read before the enactment of Public Laws 313 and 450, 82d Congress, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (58 Stat. 679) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force."

(b) Section 6 (56 Stat. 145) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy or is interned in a neutral country" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force or is interned in a foreign country."

(c) Section 9 (58 Stat. 681) is amended by deleting "in the lands of an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force" and by deleting "such enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "such hostile force."

(d) Section 12 (65 Stat. 207) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force."

(e) Section 14 (56 Stat. 147) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. The provisions of this act applicable to persons captured by a hostile force shall also apply to any person beleaguered or besieged by a hostile force."

(f) Section 15 (56 Stat. 147, 1093) is amended by deleting everything following the words "and shall remain in effect until" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1954."

SEC. 2. Section 1 (a) (7) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (ch. 570, 66 Stat.

391) is repealed without effect upon rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or actions taken thereunder.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 86) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether we could have an explanation as to how much money is involved and for what purpose the money would be used.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the resolution at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The resolution will be passed over.

INSTALLATION OF STATUE OF DR. MARCUS WHITMAN IN STATUARY HALL

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies, and permanent location in Statuary Hall was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the last measure and report in my file is Calendar No. 77, Senate Resolution 86. I do not believe the Senate should take up any measure beyond Calendar No. 77, or any measure which is not contained in our files. Therefore, I ask that the next four measures on the calendar be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Order No. 78 covers a noncontroversial concurrent resolution which is of great importance to the people of the State of Washington. We are somewhat pressed for time in connection with it, because of the necessity of making arrangements for the installation of the statue and the ceremony in connection with it. I wonder whether it could not be disposed of at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as a matter of principle I believe, on the call of the calendar, the Senate should not pass bills or agree to resolutions which are not contained in the bill file on our desks. Copies of measures should be available to Senators, so that they may read and study them, before they are disposed of. That is the only basis for my objection.

This particular resolution is, I believe, entirely noncontroversial, and I would have no objection to having it considered and disposed of at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, this is the concurrent resolution authorizing the location in Statuary Hall of a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 64) was considered and agreed to.

RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I now ask that the next three measures on the calendar, namely Senate Resolution No. 57, Calendar No. 79; Senate bill 1110, Calendar No. 80; and Senate bill 1078, Calendar No. 81, be passed over, for the reason that reports on those measures are not in our calendar files.

I wish to say to the proponents of those measures that if they wish to have them taken up on Wednesday, I shall be glad to move to have them considered at that time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I believe that reports on those bills are in my calendar file.

Mr. TAFT. They are not in mine, and I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been made, the resolution and bills referred to will be passed over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Philip Young, of New York, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Anthony Julian, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, vice George F. Garrity, term expiring;

Robert Henry Beaudreau, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts, vice Arthur J. B. Cartier, removed; and

Enard Erickson, of Minnesota, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota, vice John J. McGowan, term expired.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be passed over.

GOVERNOR OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly, but I could not refrain from expressing my feelings about an old friend of mine, Frank Heintzleman, who now has been nominated by the new administration to be Governor of Alaska.

Mr. Heintzleman has had a long and distinguished career in Alaska, having pioneered on many of the war-service projects there. He is well known to most Alaskans. In fact, he himself is almost an Alaskan—not by birth, but by having lived and worked in the Territory for many years.

Just the other day I sent him a telegram in which I said, "If we have to have a Republican as Governor of Alaska, I know of no better man than Frank Heintzleman."

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Washington, that I, too, know Frank Heintzleman. I regard him as a great man and an able man. It is my opinion that the Territory of Alaska will have taken rapid strides toward statehood when the nomination of such a distinguished public servant to be Governor shall have been confirmed. I congratulate the Senate on the action it is about to take in confirming the nomination.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I wish to add a word or two regarding the nomination of Frank Heintzleman to be Governor of Alaska.

It was my privilege to meet him in connection with Forest Service activities. I am convinced that he is a man who has sound ideas for the constructive development of the Territory of Alaska.

I have had correspondence with numerous persons in the Territory of Alaska who have spoken with a great deal of pride of Mr. Heintzleman's work. I feel sure that this appointment will be well received there.

Some reference has been made to Mr. Heintzleman's political affiliation. Personally, I was not aware of his political affiliation, but I have been under the impression that he was identified with the new developments there and would perform constructive service.

I was most happy to see the nomination made, and it is a pleasure to join with my colleagues in commending the appointment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska?

The nomination was confirmed.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, United States Army, to be Director of the National Security Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, these are routine nominations, and are reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, these nominations likewise are routine. On behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who today is absent from the Senate on official business, I request that the nomination of Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White, 238A, which appears on page 5 and also on page 6, of the Executive Calendar, Calendar No. 95, Message No. 148, be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination referred to will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the other nominations in the Air Force be immediately confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the remaining nominations of the Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on my own behalf, I ask that the nomination of Rear Adm. Henry C. Bruton, on page 9 of the Executive Calendar, Calendar No. 97, Message No. 85, be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination referred to will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask the Senate to confirm the remaining nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy, with the exception of the one passed over, are confirmed, including the routine nominations reported and lying on the desk, but not printed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. These are all routine nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the nominations confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the Senate has confirmed the nominations which have lain on the desk since the last call of the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE NEEDS OF OUR NATION'S SCHOOLS

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last week Senators were furnished with an advance copy of an exceptionally valuable report published by the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency. Inasmuch as the report was released to the public as of yesterday, March 15, I wish to take a few minutes to comment on it and to call the attention of the Senate to some of the more important statements contained in it.

This report is worthy of the attention of every Senator who is concerned about the conditions prevailing in our Nation's educational system.

It is to be noted that while the report was prepared last year by the Commissioner of Education, for transmittal to the former Federal Security Administrator, it is now published during the tenure of office of that gracious lady from Texas, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, who is currently presiding over the Federal Security Agency, of which the Office of Education is a part.

In passing, let me say that in reading the provisions of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 I was pleased to learn that Mrs. Hobby will become the first Cabinet member to hold the title of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare if this plan is approved and if the new department thereby is created. The people of Texas will, I am sure, be highly gratified at the honor that is thus bestowed on one of their eminent fellow citizens.

In her position as Administrator of the Agency which publishes this report, as well as in her position as Secretary-to-be of the proposed Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby will be intensely interested in the problem of how the Federal Government can help in improving our Nation's school system—a problem, of course, which affects not 1, 2, or 3 of our States, but all 48 of them. This report will, I know, serve as a useful guide to all who are trying to aid our schools.

In making public the report at this time, Mrs. Hobby's agency has performed an especially useful service. While its contents would merit our closest study at any time, the fact that it has been released just prior to the approaching debate on disposition of revenues from the offshore oil deposits gives it a particular timeliness and an immediate utility in Congress.

The question of how the Federal Government shall join with the locally controlled schools of the 48 States in a common effort to meet the needs of our school system will, of course, be one of the major issues of debate here in the Senate when the submerged lands bill comes before us.

While I have no intention of discussing that momentous question until the bill has been reported by the committee now considering it, I do believe it will be helpful to place in the RECORD at this time some of the facts gathered by the Office of Education and made available to us by the Federal Security Administrator about the needs of our school system this year and in the years ahead. As the report itself states with regard to the problems of education today:

> They are national problems in that they extend beyond the borders of any one State, or any group of States. They are national problems in that they are beyond the resources of any one State, or group of States. They are national problems in that they require national solutions.

Mr. President, let me cite a few of the striking facts set forth in this report. These are facts which every Senator will want to have in mind when the time comes to decide how the revenues from the production of oil and natural gas in the submerged lands off certain of our coasts are to be allocated and expended.

THE NEED FOR SCHOOL HOUSING

On page 7, the report has this to say about the need for school housing:

> One of the most serious situations existing in the Nation today is the shortage of schools * * * To provide adequate classrooms and auxiliary facilities such as gymnasiums and auditoriums for all the children expected to be enrolled in the public schools in the fall of 1952 would require an expenditure of over $10 billion.

I stop here to note that this was the figure estimated as of last fall, whereas, of course, our school population continues to increase at a rapid rate. The estimated costs of adequate classrooms and other school facilities will be even higher this coming fall.

Continuing, on page 8 of the report, I read:

> Moreover, many of the school plants now actually in use do not meet acceptable standards of fire safety; 40 percent of the school buildings are more than 30 years old and 16 percent are more than 50 years old.

Mr. President, these are shocking figures. Two out of every five of our present school buildings are over 30 years old; and the fact that even a few, let alone many, as the report states, are fire traps, is a crime against our children. Farther along on the same page, the report says:

> If it were possible to provide adequate school housing for all the Nation's school children this year, $10 billion would be needed. Yet a conservative estimate by those reporting for the States surveyed indicates that only about half the necessary funds could be provided by the States and local communities through the maximum utilization of bonding capacities. Some form of Federal assistance is imperative if the children of the Nation, regardless of where they live, are to have the advantages even of the basic education which Americans have traditionally considered their birthright.

There is another statement to reflect on, Mr. President. Instead of our educational facilities growing steadily better, particularly in a period of widespread prosperity and full employment, they are getting worse and less adequate—so bad, in fact, that the question can be raised whether our children can

continue to receive even a basic education, let alone anything higher. Congress cannot and dare not ignore this danger much longer.

THE NEED FOR MORE TEACHERS

On pages 9 and 10 of the report, we find the following facts concerning the need for more teachers:

From now on, until at least 1957 or 1958, each autumn will find hundreds of thousands of additional children waiting before the school doors of the United States. * * *

Thus, with the lower grades already crowded to the bursting point, the continued high birth rate will engulf an additional higher grade each year. * * *

It is estimated that the need for additional teachers in our schools for the year 1952–53 will be at least 160,000 teachers. * * *

To meet this need our teacher-training institutions have this year graduated only 106,000 teachers, 96,000 at the A. B. level, and 10,000 below degree level yet meeting certification requirements of some of the States.

Continuing to quote from the report:

In a few years the teacher shortage now so acute in the elementary schools will extend to our high schools. The present apparent oversupply of teachers in some fields in the high schools is distinctly a temporary phenomenon which will quickly change to a shortage as the present large population in the lower age groups advances upward in the school system.

And what does the report say about the reasons for this disastrous shortage of teachers? On page 11 we find one of the basic causes listed: Inadequate compensation. I read from the report:

Salaries of teachers have always been low compared to other occupations requiring education beyond the high school. In recent years, however, while the educational requirements for teaching have risen, the salaries of teachers as compared with those in most other professions and vocations with less exacting requirements have declined even further. In many States and communities salaries compare unfavorably with incomes in occupations requiring little or no formal education beyond the elementary grades.

I shall not quote further from this annual report of the Office of Education at this time, Mr. President, although I expect to have occasion to refer to it again at a later date, and perhaps to read from it at greater length. The few sentences I have cited today are sufficient, I believe, to indicate the scope of the needs of our schools and to suggest how essential it is for the Federal Government to join the 48 States in a powerful attack on the problem.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, Sunday, in Moscow, Prime Minister Georgi Malenkov told the Supreme Soviet there are no issues that cannot be settled peacefully. Deeds, rather than words, would be more impressive.

The free world will not forget that there was a peace meeting going on in the Communist world when the North Koreans started their aggressive war against the Republic of Korea.

There are certain acts the Soviet Union could cause to be done that would indicate good faith:

First. Have the American correspondent Oatis freed from the Czechoslovak prison.

Second. Have Hungary return the American Air Force plane it holds.

Third. Have Czechoslovakia give immediate compensation for the Air Force plane it shot down.

Fourth. Have the Soviet Union compensate—insofar as compensation is possible for the loss of human life—for the American and British airmen and planes shot down by Soviet planes.

Fifth. Announce that forthwith the Soviet Union would abide by the United Nations action declaring North Korea and Communist China the aggressors and in conformity with those resolutions withdraw moral and material aid to the aggressors.

Without a demonstration that this latest speech is not merely more Communist propaganda, while their plans for world conquest go on, there can hardly be any confidence in Sunday's speech.

We have always known that agreements could be entered into with dictatorships such as the Nazi and Soviet Governments providing they were of the Munich or Yalta variety. On such a basis we could not hope to maintain a free world of freemen.

The United States of America and the free world must soon determine if the United Nations is to be an effective organization for collective security and the preservation of peace with honor, or if it is to be an international debating society that plays no adequate part in meeting the challenge to human freedom facing the world today.

On the 25th day of June 1950, the North Korean Communist forces committed aggression against the Republic of Korea. On June 25 the United Nations, through its Security Council, passed a resolution which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIRST UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION—JUNE 25, 1950

(Resolution concerning the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea, adopted at the 473d meeting of the Security Council on June 25, 1950:)

The Security Council,

Recalling the finding of the General Assembly in its resolution of 21 October 1949 that the Government of the Republic of Korea is a lawfully established government "having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of Korea reside; and that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea";

Mindful of the concern expressed by the General Assembly in its resolutions of 12 December 1948 and 21 October 1949 of the consequences which might follow unless member states refrained from acts derogatory to the results sought to be achieved by the United Nations in bringing about the complete independence and unity of Korea; and the concern expressed that the situation described by the United Nations Commission on Korea in its report menaces the safety and well-being of the Republic of Korea and of the people of Korea and might lead to open military conflict there;

Noting with grave concern the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea,

Determines that this action constitutes a breach of the peace,

I. Calls for the immediate cessation of hostilities; and

Calls upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the 38th parallel;

II. Requests the United Nations Commission on Korea

(a) To communicate its fully considered recommendations on the situation with the least possible delay;

(b) To observe the withdrawal of the North Korean forces to the 38th parallel; and

(c) To keep the Security Council informed on the execution of this resolution;

III. Calls upon all Members to render every assistance to the United Nations in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

(Voting for the resolution: China, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, France, India, Norway, United Kingdom, United States. Abstention: Yugoslavia. Absent: Soviet Union, the Soviet Delegate having boycotted meetings of the Council since January 10, 1950.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. This resolution called for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces. It also called upon all members to render every assistance to the United Nations in support of the resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

Two years and eight months have passed, and these facts must be apparent to every person who is willing to honestly face them:

First. The North Korean Communists have ignored the United Nations resolution and deliberately violated its provisions.

Second. The Communist Chinese regime has ignored the resolution and has deliberately violated its provisions.

Third. The Soviet Union, a member of the Security Council and of the United Nations, has ignored the resolution and has deliberately violated its provisions.

On June 27, 1950, the United Nations Security Council passed another resolution, a copy of which I ask to have printed in full at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECOND UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION—JUNE 27, 1950

(Resolution concerning the complaint of aggression upon the Republic of Korea, adopted at the 474th meeting of the Security Council, on June 27, 1950:)

The Security Council,

Having determined that the armed attack upon the Republic of Korea by forces from North Korea constitutes a breach of the peace,

Having called for an immediate cessation of hostilities, and

Having called upon the authorities of North Korea to withdraw forthwith their armed forces to the 38th parallel, and

Having noted from the report of the United Nations Commission for Korea that

the authorities in North Korea having neither ceased hostilities nor withdrawn their armed forces to the 38th parallel and that urgent military measures are required to restore international peace and security, and

Having noted the appeal from the Republic of Korea to the United Nations for immediate and effective steps to secure peace and security,

Recommends that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area.

(Voting for the resolution: United States, United Kingdom, France, China, Norway, Ecuador, and Cuba. Voting against: Yugoslavia. Abstention: Egypt, India (2 days later India accepted the resolution). Absent: Soviet Union.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. In this second resolution the recommendation was made that the members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area.

More than 2 years and 8 months later, of the 60 members of the United Nations only 17 of them have contributed forces to resist the aggression, and all 17 of them are now contributing less than 35,000 men.

The United States of America alone is contributing more than 350,000 and the Republic of Korea more than 400,000.

This means that the United Nations itself has failed to take effective collective security action and has, in fact, only given token support to the request of its own Security Council.

No long speeches in the headquarters of the United Nations in New York and no excuses in the foreign ministries of the world can cover up the fact that the support of the United Nations members outside the United States represents only 10 percent of the forces contributed by this Nation alone and only 5 percent of the combined contribution of the United States of America and the Republic of Korea.

For the most part, the United Nations membership responded as did the townspeople in the motion picture High Noon. They were glad to have a marshal with the courage to risk his life to preserve order and to destroy lawlessness in the form of an armed gunman, but when greatly outnumbered he asked the townspeople to respond by becoming a posse for the preservation of law and order, they gave lame excuses as to why they could not take the risks involved. At the end of the picture the marshal did the job which had to be done, but in righteous indignation when the job had been accomplished, he threw his badge to the street and left the group that had not had the courage to fight for decency and the preservation of law and order. It might be well if a special showing of the film could be arranged for the delegates to the United Nations.

On October 7, 1950, the General Assembly adopted a resolution calling for the unification and independence of Korea. I ask to have this resolution printed at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Document 9 (UN doc. A/1435)]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, OCTOBER 7, 1950

The General Assembly,

Having regard to its resolutions of November 14, 1947, of December 12, 1948 and of October 21, 1949,

Having received and considered the report of the United Nations Commission on Korea,

Mindful of the fact that the objectives set forth in the resolutions referred to above have not been fully accomplished and, in particular, that the unification of Korea has not yet been achieved, and that an attempt has been made by an armed attack from North Korea to extinguish by force the Government of the Republic of Korea,

Recalling the General Assembly declaration of December 12, 1948, that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the Republic of Korea) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the United Nations Temporary Commission on Korea was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of Korea reside; that this Government is based on elections which were a valid expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea,

Having in mind that United Nations armed forces are at present operating in Korea in accordance with the recommendations of the Security Council of June 27, 1950, subsequent to its resolution of June 25, 1950, that Members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area,

Recalling that the essential objective of the resolutions of the General Assembly referred to above was the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government of Korea,

1. Recommends that

(a) All appropriate steps be taken to insure conditions of stability throughout Korea;

(b) All constituent acts be taken, including the holding of elections, under the auspices of the United Nations, for the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government in the sovereign state of Korea;

(c) All sections and representative bodies of the population of Korea, South and North, be invited to cooperate with the organs of the United Nations in the restoration of peace, in the holding of elections and in the establishment of a unified government;

(d) United Nations forces should not remain in any part of Korea otherwise than so far as necessary for achieving the objectives specified in subparagraphs (a) and (b) above;

(e) All necessary measures be taken to accomplish the economic rehabilitation of Korea;

2. Resolves that—

(a) A Commission consisting of Australia, Chile, Netherlands, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand and Turkey, to be known as the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, be established to (i) assume the functions hitherto exercised by the present United Nations Commission in Korea; (ii) represent the United Nations in bringing about the establishment of a unified, independent and democratic government of all Korea; (iii) exercise such responsibilities in connection with relief and rehabilitation in Korea as may be determined by the General Assembly after receiving the recommendations of the Economic and Social Council. The United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, should proceed to Korea and begin to carry out its functions as soon as possible.

(b) Pending the arrival in Korea of the United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea, the Governments of the states represented on the Commission should form an interim committee composed of representatives meeting at the seat of the United Nations to consult with and advise the United Nations United Command in the light of the above recommendations; the interim committee should begin to function immediately upon the approval of the present resolution by the General Assembly;

(c) The Commission shall render a report to the next regular session of the General Assembly and to any prior special session which might be called to consider the subject matter of the present resolution, and shall render such interim reports as it may deem appropriate to the Secretary-General for transmission to members;

The General Assembly furthermore,

Mindful of the fact that at the end of the present hostilities the task of rehabilitating the Korean economy will be of great magnitude,

3. Requests the Economic and Social Council, in consultation with the specialized agencies, to develop plans for relief and rehabilitation on the termination of hostilities and to report to the General Assembly within 3 weeks of the adoption of the present resolution by the General Assembly;

4. Also recommends the Economic and Social Council to expedite the study of long-term measures to promote the economic development and social progress of Korea, and meanwhile to draw the attention of the authorities which decide requests for technical assistance to the urgent and special necessity of affording such assistance to Korea;

5. Expresses its appreciation of the services rendered by the members of the United Nations Commission on Korea in the performance of their important and difficult task;

6. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the Commission with adequate staff and facilities, including technical advisers as required; and authorizes the Secretary-General to pay the expenses and per diem of a representative and alternate from each of the states members of the commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This resolution, like the others, contained brave words which made little impression upon the Communists of North Korea, Communist China or the Soviet Union.

On February 1, 1951, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution naming the Peiping Chinese Communist regime as an aggressor in Korea. I ask that this resolution be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NAMING THE PEIPING REGIME AS AN AGGRESSOR IN KOREA, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, FEBRUARY 1, 1951

The General Assembly,

Noting that the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, has failed to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in regard to Chinese Communist intervention in Korea.

Noting that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China has not accepted United Nations proposals to

bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea with a view to peaceful settlement, and that its armed forces continue their invasion of Korea and their large-scale attacks upon United Nations forces there,

1. Finds that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea and by engaging in hostilities against the United Nations forces there, has itself engaged in aggression in Korea;

2. Calls upon the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China to cause its forces and nationals in Korea to cease hostilities against the United Nations forces and to withdraw from Korea;

3. Affirms the determination of the United Nations to continue its action in Korea to meet the aggression;

4. Calls upon all states and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea;

5. Calls upon all states and authorities to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea;

6. Requests a committee composed of the members of the Collective Measures Committee as a matter of urgency to consider additional measures to be employed to meet this aggression and to report thereon to the General Assembly, it being understood that the Committee is authorized to defer its report if the Good Offices Committee referred to in the following paragraph reports satisfactory progress in its efforts;

7. Affirms that it continues to be the policy of the United Nations to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Korea and the achievement of United Nations objectives in Korea by peaceful means, and requests the President of the General Assembly to designate forthwith two persons who would meet with him at any suitable opportunity to use their good offices to this end.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it took approximately 3 months after the Chinese aggression for the United Nations to muster up its courage to face the facts.

Even this resolution was not passed by the United Nations until the House of Representatives on January 19, 1951, and the Senate on January 23 had adopted the following resolutions:

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the United Nations should immediately act and declare the Chinese Communist authorities aggressor in Korea.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United Nations should immediately declare Communist China an aggressor in Korea.

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Communist Chinese Government should not be admitted to membership in the United Nations as the representative of China.

Again in brave words the United Nations resolution called upon all states and authorities to continue to lend every assistance to the United Nations action in Korea and to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressors in Korea. This resolution, like the previous ones, was ignored and violated by the North Korean Communists, the Communist Chinese, and by the Soviet Union, which then, as now, was a member of the Security Council and a charter member of the United Nations.

How can there be any justification for the town arsonist to be continued as a member of the local fire department or for the gangster to have access to the deliberations of the Federal Bureau of Investigation? It is a mockery of those who have their lives in Korea that no nation, including our own, has had the courage to take formal action in the General Assembly designating the Soviet Union as the aggressor. It is the violator not only of the above resolutions but, as I shall now show, is a willful saboteur of the Charter of the United Nations itself.

I realize that the policy of the former administration was not to advance such a resolution. Recently I read the speech of Ernest A. Gross, who was one of our representatives to the United Nations and has been continued on as deputy United States representative by the present administration.

In an address he made on February 4 at Philadelphia, carried in full in the Department of State Bulletin of February 23, he had this to say on the subject:

The question is sometimes asked why, since the Soviet Union has unquestionably sponsored and supported the Korean aggression, they should be permitted to retain membership in the United Nations. I have already pointed out there is no way of expelling them, since they can veto a decision of that sort.

In answer to Mr. Gross I would say that a vote on such a resolution would certainly separate the men from the boys, and a nation that had so far lost its standing among the law-abiding nations of the world that it had to veto its own expulsion would have a hard time explaining this fact to the world and to its own enslaved people.

Secondly, the veto could not be used against the resolution declaring the Soviet Union an aggressor any more than it could be used against the one declaring the Chinese Communists regime as an aggressor. It was for the purpose of removing the veto that we took the action to the General Assembly rather than the Security Council.

Then, to return to the Gross speech:

Even if this were not so, I think it does not take full account of the realities of the situation to regard membership in the United Nations as a sort of badge of merit. There are advantages in universal membership, even including recalcitrants, for reasons I have just attempted to explain.

Frankly, I believe those advantages are questionable, to say the least. When the United Nations was born in San Francisco in June of 1945 there were less than 200 million people behind the Iron Curtain. Now there are more than 800 million. The endless debates and discussions in the United Nations are small comfort to the enslaved.

Has the advantage of having a restricted American Ambassador in the Soviet Union been of real value to us when compared to the damage done by Communist diplomatic missions acting as centers of espionage in the West as proven by the Canadian atomic spy ring, the Fuchs, and other cases in this country? There is ample reason to believe that from time to time there has been espionage penetration of our embassies by planted operatives. Do any but the most naive doubt that the household help we are required to hire in the Soviet Union are all approved and perhaps trained by the Soviet secret police?

Is our position vis-a-vis the godless Communist tyranny in a relatively better or worse position than it was on V-E Day, on United Nations Charter signing day, and on V-J Day, all of which events took place in 1945? Then the whole world had confidence and faith in the moral, economic, and military power of the free world to overcome the greatest aggregation of tyrannical power the world has ever known. Even though the Soviet Union may have secretly hated us while our ally, there is no doubt they respected our power.

Now, after 2 years and 8 months of stalemated war in Korea, when the United States of America with the alleged support of the United Nations is stopped cold by North Korean and Chinese Communists, does any realistic person think this has contributed to faith and confidence on the part of Asiatics or Europeans in the ability to resist the power of the Kremlin, which has not committed a single division? Were our hands not tied by the neutralists in the United Nations, some acting by fear and some by design? Whose purpose has been really served? Are we to be immobilized until we can be struck a mortal blow?

Mr. Eden to the contrary notwithstanding, will he be better able to carry out the resolutions of the United Nations 2 years from now under this policy of restrained stalemate? We know that when the Soviet Union used the United Nations to propose his cease-fire negotiations the Communist forces were in desperate shape. Our field commander was not consulted nor was his advice sought on the wisdom of our acceptance of the Soviet maneuver.

Since the Chinese Communists have formally rejected the so-called Indian resolution, the United Nations should withdraw it and propose instead that the Republic of Korea be united and that its sovereignty, independence of any outside power, and neutrality be guaranteed by all the great powers as well as by the United Nations.

A divided Korea will be a constant menace to peace. A divided Korea cannot be a free Korea without perpetual military and economic support from the free world. A divided Korea without such support would ultimately be a Communist Korea and a dagger pointed at Japan. The longer this basic issue is avoided the more difficult the solution will be unless India, Yugoslavia, and the Soviet Union are sooner or later to propose in the United Nations a far eastern Munich type of settlement. They may believe that a stalemate carried on for another year or two would so soften up our determination to maintain a free world of freemen that we would yield to the voice of the siren.

Even on the limited prisoner-of-war issue we should forthwith declare that it is no longer acceptable to have a repatriation commission consisting of two Soviet satellites—Czechoslovakia and Poland—one of whom has just shot

down an American jet over Western Germany, and two "neutrals"—Sweden and Switzerland—all of whom have recognized Communist China and none of whom have helped to resist this first overt act of aggression in Korea. Who will preserve order and protect the non-Communist prisoners if the fanatical Communists start another Koje Island type of riot on a neutralized island?

We, of course, should be prepared to negotiate for a peace with honor. But not another Munich, Yalta, or Potsdam conference where the territories or people of countries unrepresented were disposed of by representatives of the great powers meeting in secret session.

The charter of the United Nations which was signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, states in its preamble that the purpose of the organization is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind."

It also states the following:

To insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest.

Article I lists the purposes of the United Nations. The following is contained in subsection 1:

To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace.

Article 2, subsection 2, provides:

All members, in order to insure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present charter.

Subsection 4 provides:

All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Subsection 5 provides:

All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

Subsection 6 provides that—

The organization shall insure that states which are not members of the United Nations act in accordance with these principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Chapter 7, article 39, provides:

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

I again call to the attention of the Senate of the United States and to the attention of the representatives of the member states of the United Nations that for more than 2 years and 8 months after the aggression took place, and 2 years after Communist China was named an aggressor by the General Assembly, none of these resolutions have been lived up to by the total membership. The provisions of the charter have been violated by the Communist regimes of North Korea and China, and in their actions these two declared aggressors have had both the moral and material support of the Soviet Union.

Article 41 provides:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

As I have heretofore pointed out, not only have we been faced with the spectacle of 43 out of the 60 United Nations members furnishing no force whatsoever to resist aggression, but we also find that some of our fellow members in the organization, as well as nations outside of it, have been furnishing manufactured and raw materials to the Chinese Communists and North Korean Communist aggressors. In 1952, last year, 2 years after the aggression broke out, the total importation into Communist China amounted to over $1,250,000,000, by United States dollar value. Of this total, approximately $550 million came by sea, and $700 million overland.

I am not impressed by the argument used that if a complete naval blockade cut off shipments by sea, the Soviet Union would make up the difference by shipment over the Trans-Siberian and Manchurian railway systems. In the first place, there is grave doubt as to the capacity of those rail lines to handle the additional burdens; and even if a substantial part could be handled, it would tie up and wear out a great deal of the rolling stock, and would make means of transportation for other Soviet adventures they may be planning eleswhere less available.

Nor am I impressed by the argument of the British Foreign Secretary in his speech before the Foreign Policy Association in New York on the evening of March 12, when he commended the May 1951, resolution about the denial of strategic materials to Communist China. The joker is, of course, in the word "strategic." No one has claimed that the British have shipped guns or ammunition, tanks or planes or war planes to Communist China. However, many shipments have been made in British vessels, in ships of other members of the United Nations, and, before an aroused Congress insisted on effective controls being instituted, in American ships, as well.

These shipments were and are of great value to the Chinese Communists by contributing to the soundness of their economy, thereby bolstering their morale, their effectiveness for domestic production of war goods, and their transportation of munitions of war which, to a considerable extent at some point in the operations, traveled by railroad or truck. Let me cite the type of materials purchased from abroad by the Chinese Communists in 1952:

Trucks, motorcars, motorcar parts, tires, seagoing vessels of varying sizes, radio receivers and transmitters, vacuum tubes, steel wire, gasoline, diesel oil, kerosene, power motors, generators, steel plates, steel bars, steel pipes, cast iron, scrap iron, tinplate, iron sheets, zinc plates, welding equipment, photograph equipment, rubber, medicine and medical supplies, chemicals, and cotton, to mention only a partial list.

While the recent statement relative to the conference between the British Foreign Secretary and our own Secretary of State regarding the tightening up process with respect to shipments to Communist China discloses a small step forward in the right direction, it should not be used to lull the people of this country into a false sense of security in the thought that these half measures will do the job that needs to be done.

In and of itself it will curtail some trade, but those who are determined to circumvent any restrictions will soon find ways of getting around the new controls, as, indeed, they are already doing.

In more than 2 years and 8 months of aggression, the United Nations has not made full use of article 41 by applying its provisions for either economic or moral sanctions. To the contrary, there are 17 members of the United Nations who recognize the Communist regime of China, and have continued such recognition and participated in an exchange of diplomatic representatives, even though the Communist regime of China is making aggressive war upon the United Nations forces in Korea.

These nations, some of whom have a limited number of men fighting in Korea, are Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Jugoslavia, Burma, Israel, Afghanistan, Norway, United Kingdom, Pakistan, Sweden, India, Denmark, Netherlands, Indonesia, Byelo Russia, and Ukraine.

Article 42 of the Charter provides:

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of members of the United Nations.

Article 48 provides:

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

Referring back to the resolutions passed on June 25, 1950, and February 1, 1951, the United Nations did not call on only a part of the membership. In each instance it called on all members to furnish aid and assistance to the Republic of Korea and to refrain from giving assistance to the aggressors in Korea.

In the light of this documentation, let us now turn to the speech of the then Soviet Minister, Andrei Y. Vishinsky, at the United Nations on March 2, 1953.

Mr. Vishinsky is now the permanent representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations.

Speaking as the official representative of the Soviet Government and as its representative in the United Nations Organization Vishinsky said:

I might add, incidentally, that it is no accident that Mr. Lodge and his Government persevere, as regards the Korean question, in carrying out the Truman-Acheson government's line, since that administration had prepared and carried out the intervention in Korea, and since that administration had unleashed the barbarous and bandit-like war against the Korean people.

What sense of complacency has come over the United Nations itself and the decent governments represented therein and the people who desire an effective system of collective security that they can continue to tolerate a government whose spokesman continues the sabotage and aids the aggressors for more than 2 years and 8 months. Have we completely lost our sense of reality?

Is the wolf to be continually invited by the shepherd to help guard the sheep?

The American people have the right to ask not only the executive branch of this Government, but the United Nations Organization itself and each of its members, what they intend to do now to take effective action in Korea.

We have listened for more than 2½ years to the representatives of the Soviet Union using the United Nations as a sounding board for Communist propaganda. We have watched for more than 2½ years while timid members of that organization placed such restraints upon our Armed Forces that victory was denied and a costly stalemate invited.

This Nation, which has supplied more than 90 percent of the United Nations manpower and suffered more than 95 percent of the United Nations casualties, has the right to get more than lip-service support from those who pretend to believe in collective security under a system of international law and order that will preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and our children.

The road to appeasement is not the road to peace, but is only surrender on the installment plan.

The men who went to Munich to barter away the territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia without the presence of that government at the conference table may have thought they were assuring "peace in our time." We know now they only made inevitable World War II.

The men who went to Yalta may have thought that by the concessions made to Stalin at the expense of the Republic of China and the Free Government of Poland, whose representatives were not present, they may have been assuring a peaceful and cooperative Soviet Union.

We know now that it only made certain the destruction of freedom in Poland and accelerated the Communist domination of China which in turn lead to Communist aggression in Korea.

Again quoting the then Soviet Foreign Minister Vishinsky in his March 2 speech:

The Soviet Union has never concealed the fact that it sold and continues to sell armaments to its ally, China. As is well known, the Soviet Union concluded with China in 1945, even before the Central People's Government of the Chinese People's Republic had come to power, a treaty of friendship and alliance. That treaty was confirmed in 1950 in a new treaty with the new Government of China. It was a treaty of friendship, alliance, and mutual assistance, concluded between the U. S. S. R. and the Chinese People's Republic.

In line with these treaties the Soviet Union has sold and continues to sell armaments to China, while China sells to the Soviet Union various types of raw materials, including strategic raw materials; and this is quite natural.

There we have it laid down cold by the official spokeman of the Soviet Union.

The gangster boldly proclaims he has sold the weapon to the murderer for the killing of the policeman and the defenseless citizen as well. He comes to the police department and the city council and admits his guilt, admits the violation of the charter and the resolutions that have been passed and says, in effect, "What are you going to do about it?"

Mr. President, that is a good question for the United Nations, for the United States, and for the free people of the world. What are we going to do about it? How long is this condition to be tolerated?

What steps are to be taken to declare the Soviet Union the aggressor that it is in Korea?

Not even the timid members of the United Nations, of whom there are too many, can or will deny that for 2 years and 8 months the Soviet Union gave moral support first to the Korean Communist aggressors, then to the Chinese Communist aggressors.

There has been no doubt for 2 years and 8 months that ammunition, arms, planes, and tanks, and technical assistance have been furnished by the Soviet Union to the aggressors.

The evidence has been overwhelming and the proof indisputable. But here on the second day of March of this year the Soviet Union, through its official spokesman, not only admits its guilt, but proudly proclaims it.

Yes; the question is a good one. What are we going to do about it? How long are we expected to carry on a stalemated and costly war in Korea in manpower and in resources under a new doctrine which, for the first time in our history, asks that our men fight and die, but we dare not let them win.

Do the nations that advise such restraint really think that time is in favor of the free world? In January of 1950, our friend and associate, Great Britain, recognized Communist China. To this date, Communist China has not recognized Her Majesty's Government.

Has the moral conscience of the world so degenerated that the respectable and law abiding nations of the world can now grasp the bloody hand of Communist Korea, Communist China, and the master hand of the Soviet Union, whereas it was unthinkable for them to continue diplomatic representation with the aggressors Hitler and Tojo just a decade ago?

Do the nations which continue relationships with Communist China and the Soviet Union, thereby giving to each a place among the decent nations of the world, believe that they gain the respect of either the slave people of the world or the free by so doing?

Even the United Nations Charter itself clearly contemplated that the withdrawal of recognition could be an effective weapon as a moral sanction.

It could serve notice on those who are behind the Iron Curtain, not of their own choice, that no longer would the decent and law abiding nations of the world recognize a government which participated in aggression, supported it morally and materially and proclaimed its lawlessness to the world.

Has the United Nations come to such a point that the ruthless men of the Kremlin are to be faced by timid men and appeasers of the free world, and that while we follow another disastrous "wait for the dust to settle" policy the debates will go on, the resolutions will be passed, the appeasers will come forth with their 1952 version for a far eastern Munich, and time will run out.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded.

Because there are some who constantly state that those of us who are critical of the policies this Government followed in Asia since Yalta are operating with the benefit of hindsight, I may perhaps be pardoned for calling attention to some remarks which were made before the outbreak of the Korean war.

On April 10, 1950, 2½ months before the North Korean Communist invasion of the Republic of Korea, I spoke on the question of American policy in Korea:

The Government of Korea has been constantly faced with the overt acts of aggression across the 38th parallel by Communist irregulars from north of the line. At the time I was in Korea last November there had already been 360 violations of the 38th parallel by Communist groups from North Korea ranging in size from a squad to a battalion. Many additional violations of the border have taken place since last November, the latest being a few days ago. President Syngman Rhee recently pointed out that there had been substantial casualties on the part of the forces of the Republic of Korea, and there have been considerably greater casualties on the part of the invading forces. Needless to say in that part of the world the cold war is quite warm.

There are a number of responsible people in the Republic of Korea who believe that once the Chinese Communists have liquidated the remaining resistance by the forces of the Republic of China to their regime that they will then move both Communist troops and equipment back into Manchuria and make them available to the North Korean Communists for an invasion against the Republic of Korea. (Pp. 4983–4985, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 4, 81st Cong., 2d sess.)

Seven and one-half months earlier on September 26, 1949, I spoke on the floor of the Senate opposing the nomination of Walton Butterworth to be Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs:

In view of the President's atomic announcement of Friday, September 23, may God grant there is time to rectify, in part at least, the Asiatic debacle now in the making even while we meet here today.

Boldly and affirmatively we have developed and maintained a foreign policy in Europe. In many of its aspects it has originated or developed as a result of Republican consultation and support. The world knows

what that policy is. In my opinion it has the overwhelming support of the American people. It is to help maintain freedom against communism, the most tyrannical and brutal force with which the world has had to contend. It is to support a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world will be secure against aggression, whatever its source.

In China we have had no similar bipartisan foreign policy. To be brutally frank, for the years since the close of World War II we have had no policy that could command the respect or support of the Congress and the Nation.

We have vacillated all over the lot. We have attempted to interfere in China's internal affairs by attempting to force a coalition with the Communists. We have done this subsequent to the time when it was clear that coalition with communism is unworkable except as a means of facilitating complete Communist domination.

The more I have studied the China white paper and the documents left out of it, the less satisfaction I have, as a citizen of this country and as a Senator of the United States, relative to what we have done and what we have failed to do.

With great reluctance I say that our record in China during the past 4 years is not one in which this or future generations of Americans can take pride.

We have broken our word time and time again, we have abandoned a friend and ally in need and we have contributed to the disaster of allowing China, with her 470 million people, to be almost overwhelmed by militant communism, knowing full well that if all of China falls there is little that can be done to save southwest Asia or perhaps the entire continent.

We have done this in the face of repeated warnings from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Admiral Badger, Ambassador Hurley, former Ambassador Bullitt, Generals Wedemeyer and Chennault, as well as many other competent observers. (Pp. 13264–13270, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 10, 81st Cong., 1st sess.)

On January 5, 1950—6 months before the Korean war—I made a speech on the floor of this body. My opening statement on that day in my remarks on American policy in the Far East was as follows:

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, within the last 90 days 2 catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development, as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949, and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off chain reactions that have not yet run their full course. (P. 79, vol. 96, pt. 1, of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings and debates of the 81st Cong., 2d sess.).

Then, on page 81, during the course of the same discussion, I said:

It is a sad commentary that Britain, which itself was in such a desperate plight after Dunkerque, which joined us in complaining of Mussolini's stab in the back when France was down but not quite out, should now be contemplating abandoning the Republic of China and giving recognition, aid, and comfort to the Communists who are so closely allied with the same international Communist conspiracy that threatens human freedom in Europe.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country and in Great Britain who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

It is my judgment that history will record the recognition of Communist China as being as great a betrayal of human freedom as was the pact of Munich.

At another point I stated on that day:

It is long past the time when the Government of the United States must give to the Pacific region the attention it deserves. It is, of course, of vital importance that Western Europe, with its great industrial complex and its western civilization, not fall into Communist hands.

It is no less important that nations containing more than a billion people in Asia not become part of the Soviet orbit. The future peace of the world and the security of this Nation may well depend upon what happens in the Far East while most of our attention is being diverted to Europe.

As I pointed out, that was approximately 6 months before the outbreak of the Korean war.

Mr. President, are we to continue to follow a policy of drift and complacency and stalemate? Are we to continue to pour out substance throughout the world while recent testimony clearly establishes that we have not adequately faced up to the problem of delivering the hardware that our fighting men are entitled to and that we must have for the security of our Nation and the preservation of the freedom of the American people?

No longer am I willing to place our faith or our security in the hands of those who lack the moral courage to designate aggresssion for what it is and to take effective steps that will preserve a free world of freemen.

No longer am I willing to have Gulliver tied down by the Lilliputians.

This is no partisan matter. Some of us on this side of the aisle have for many years joined with some Senators on the other side of the aisle in pointing out the dangers inherent in the foreign and military policy we were following.

On August 26, 1949, there were only 9 of us in the Senate who voted to support appropriations for 58 air groups to build our Air Force toward the 70-group level when the then President and his defense spokesman were advocating it to be held at 48 groups. This time lost can never be regained.

The distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] made a speech on the evening of Wednesday, March 11, 1953, in Philadelphia in which he pointed out in very clear language the challenge which our Nation now faces and the steps which we must take if we are to rectify some of the errors. In his speech the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] said:

The face of the world was forever changed on a day in September 1949. That was the day the Soviet Union exploded the atomic bomb.

America then lost its monopoly of that weapon, and was thereupon faced with a peril it had never before known.

Later on in the same speech the distinguished Senator from Missouri said:

When in the fall of 1950, however, the Kremlin gave the order for the Chinese to cross the Yalu, Stalin's intention to take high risks for world conquest finally became clear to everybody.

Let me read some additional significant remarks:

Today the Kremlin's Chinese satellites, backed by Soviet pilots, tanks, and planes, cross and recross the Yalu.

At the same time we provide them with a military university for the instruction of their technicians at no loss to them except some equipment and a few pilots.

At very little cost to the Russians we are teaching them how to defeat us if they decide to expand the Korean war into world war III.

Rather than coming up with the truth to the people we follow the tragic steps of certain World War II allies by again attempting to purchase a nervous neutrality.

Again I propound the question, what effective steps do the members of the United Nations intend to take that will save that organization from the disintegration and futility that overcame the League of Nations?

Is there a single Member of this body who is willing now to risk our freedom, our constitutional form of government, and the lives of our people to the protection that could be afforded us by the United Nations Organization based on its Korean record? The answer must be an overwhelming, if not a unanimous, "No".

Is there any Member of this body who would approve of our becoming engaged in resistance to an aggressor elsewhere in the world if in advance we knew that we alone would have to furnish 90 percent of the manpower and that those associated with us would constantly place restraints upon our winning and would give aid and comfort to the aggressor?

Let the small nations of the world, as well as some of the larger ones, given proper consideration to the significance of their past acts, place themselves in our position and honestly answer whether they would have any call upon us, considering the fact that when the chips were down in Korea, they, like the townspeople in High Noon, were willing for the marshal to risk his life, but they themselves were not willing to become a part of the posse.

First. It seems to me that the very least that can be done now is to devote whatever energy, intelligence, money and effort that are required to place this Nation in a position of real strength.

Second. To find out forthwith which of our allies are prepared to take effective steps for collective security and to concentrate our efforts on those who have demonstrated by word and deed that they are ready to stand up and be counted, come what may. We cannot wait another 2½ years to get the answer to this question.

Third. To have introduced forthwith in the United Nations a resolution declaring the Soviet Union a supporter of aggression in Korea and a violator of the United Nations Charter, based on the available facts and the admission of their own representative.

Fourth. For our State Department to request immediately that the members of the United Nations who have recognized Communist China withdraw their diplomatic representatives to that aggressor regime.

This, more than anything else, would give hope and encouragement to the enslaved people of Communist China that

no longer would their aggressor regime be considered entitled to diplomatic relations with the self-respecting and law-abiding nations of the world.

Fifth. To take forthright action to declare a complete embargo or blockade of supplies going into Communist China.

Sixth. So consider the Far East as requiring the same unity of command as we have considered necessary in NATO and to call upon those free people of Asia who are willing to resist Communist aggression to join in a common Pacific pact of defense against further Communist aggression anywhere in that area of the world.

There is a song which says, "Give me 10 men who are stouthearted men, and I will soon give you 10,000 more."

If we will show by our words and our deeds that the people of Asia represented by the Republic of Korea, the Republic of the Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam, and the Republic of China, all of whom now have forces fighting aggressive communism in Asia, that they, rather than the fence straddlers and the neutralists, such as India, will have our confidence and our support, I believe we can rally millions of people in Asia to the cause of the crusade for freedom and for the purpose of keeping their nations outside the Communist orbit.

There will be some in the United States and abroad who will point out that there are risks involved in any such policy. Respectfully I say to them that in my judgment there are greater risks in the policy of drift, complacency, and fear.

To those who raise objection, I propound these questions:

First. Based on the Korean war record, do you honestly believe that the United Nations is or has been an effective organization for collective security?

Second. Do you honestly believe that with the veto power exercised by the arsonist, the United Nations Organization can put out other fires elsewhere in the world any better than in Korea, where the fire has already burned for 2 years and 8 months?

Third. Do you honestly believe that the people of the United States of America can be expected to respond with alacrity to oppose other aggressions elsewhere in the world if they are to be faced with the problem of furnishing 90 percent of the United Nations manpower, suffering 95 percent of the casualties, and having their hands tied so that a victory is not possible and a stalemate is invited?

Fourth. Do you honestly believe that the United States of America, its Government, or its people, can be expected to pour their resources around the world to nations who are giving help to the aggressor, and to those who have not lifted a finger in opposition to this overt act of aggression which took place 2 years and 8 months ago?

Fifth. Do you honestly believe that the United Nations can survive and command respect in this country or abroad when the Soviet Union through its representative continues to use that organization as a sounding board for Communist propaganda and disparaging remarks concerning our Nation, that has already suffered 130,000 casualties in trying to help make the United Nations something more than a futile debating society?

Sixth. Do you honestly believe, and are you willing to take the responsibility for lulling the people of your Nation into a sense of false security in believing that time is necessarily on our side?

Mr. President, when the United Nations Charter was drafted, the Soviet Union did not have the atomic weapon. It does today. When the Berlin blockade took place, the Soviet Union did not have the atomic weapon. It does today. When the Communists were overrunning all of China on the mainland of Asia, the Soviet Union did not have the atomic weapon. It does today.

In the 2½ years which have passed since the first atomic explosion in the Soviet Union, the Soviets have been stockpiling weapons and building their means of delivering them. Again I ask, do you really believe that time is necessarily on our side?

It is my firm belief that neither this Government nor any other will be performing the service it should render to its own people or to the cause of freedom if it permits the deadly cloak of complacency to cover the cold, hard facts growing out of a ruthless, godless, tyrannical communism, bent on the destruction of human freedom, individual dignity, and a belief in God everywhere in the world.

It was Abraham Lincoln who said:

> Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. * * * We, yes even we here, have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the speech which has just been delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from California. I remember that when I previously served in the Senate for a short time the Senator maintained a continuing interest in our policy in the Far East and was one of the first to point out the dangers of the policy which was then being followed.

However, as I have listened today to the distinguished senior Senator from California, I could not escape the conclusion that in rather large measure he was addressing questions to the United Nations which must be addressed also to the United States.

It happens that on occasions I served as either a delegate or an alternate delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations. There I recognized its inadequacies. Yet I see in it values which I believe have been overlooked in the speech which my distinguished colleague has delivered. I address myself to several of the points he made in his speech.

In the course of his speech the Senator from California designated several courses of action which should be undertaken by the United States. One of them is that members of the United Nations should furnish aid and forces in connection with the war in Korea. I concur with all the strength I have in that recommendation. There can be no question that many members of the United Nations have not lived up to their duties and their responsibilities in that respect.

The Senator from California also said that the United Nations should charge Russia with being an aggressor under the charter. There is no question that Russia is an aggressor and has violated the terms of the United Nations Charter. The point I make in this connection—and to it I invite the attention of my distinguished and able friend—is that when he says that the United Nations should declare Russia an aggressor he is saying to the President of the United States and to our State Department that they should instruct our mission assigned to the United Nations in New York to advocate action declaring Russia to be an aggressor. I make this point simply to say that it is not exactly correct to lay blame upon other members of the United Nations for not having charged Russia with aggression when that decision has not been made by our own country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I made very clear in my remarks that this government also had a responsibility for such action not having been taken. I did not lay the responsibility elsewhere, and I have been critical in the past of certain things which have not been done by the prior administration. However, I think we now have, particularly in view of Mr. Vishinsky's recent speech, an entirely new situation. While we had evidence of the participation of the Soviet Union in the Korean war and, as the Senator will remember, Mr. Austin exhibited before the United Nations organization certain Soviet equipment which had been captured from the Chinese Communists and from the North Koreans—and while we knew that the jet fighters which were being used to shoot down our planes were of Soviet manufacture—we do not know whether they are being flown by Russians or not, but we have very strong suspicion that some of them may be—while we knew of those things, nevertheless, it was the first time that the official representative of the Soviet Union had come into the United Nations organization not only to admit the guilt of his government but also proud to proclaim it.

It seems to me that that is something which neither the American people, the American Government—either in its legislative or executive branch—nor the free world can ignore; because when a large nation, merely because of its size, comes forward and says, in effect, "Yes, we are helping to commit this murder, we are supplying the arms which are being used to try to defeat the very purpose of the United Nations; we are proud of it; this is what we want done," and then we and the free world do nothing, it seems to me we completely stultify the entire United Nations organization.

Mr. COOPER. I will say to my distinguished friend that the recent statements of Mr. Vishinsky have not added anything to our knowledge that Russia has been assisting Communist China and

North Korea. But I do want to emphasize that I believe the implications of the statements the Senator made are more far reaching and much deeper than simply saying to the United Nations as a body, "You ought to declare Russia an aggressor." The truth of the matter is that the United States has the same responsibility as any other member, and if he says that to the other nations who are members, he must also say it to the United States, to the President and to the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have.

Mr. COOPER. Under the participation act which Congress passed, the representatives of the United States to the United Nations are under the direction of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. So, the Senator is calling upon the President of the United States to instruct former Senator Lodge, our present Ambassador to the United Nations, to move in the General Assembly of the United Nations that Russia be declared an aggressor. I think that is a very far-reaching statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is my personal statement as a Senator of the United States, for which I take sole responsibility. But if the United Nations is to be preserved—and I happen to be one who has supported our foreign policy in the hope that we would build a system of international law and order that would preserve the peace for ourselves and our children—I do not feel that we would be performing a service either to the cause of a collective-security system or to a system of international law and order, if we were to continue to let the representative of Soviet Russia sit in the very inner councils of the organization, inviting, so to speak, the town arsonist to head the fire department, hear him admit the guilt of his nation, and then say, "Because you are a large and powerful nation, we will not take the action in regard to you that we would take in the case of the little regime in North Korea, or even in the case of the Chinese Communists who entered the conflict." I say to my distinguished friend from Kentucky that that is a doctrine which would recognize that might makes right, and that if a nation is big enough and powerful enough it can commit an aggression and sabotage an organization devoted to peace, and get away with it, whereas the United Nations itself would never permit a small nation to get away with it. If such a doctrine is finally countenanced and used as a precedent, then I say most respectfully—and again I am expressing only my own judgment—the United Nations is headed down the same road the League of Nations took when it became impotent to meet the aggression of Mussolini in Ethiopia and the aggressions by Japan in Manchuria.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it was known at the time of our entrance into the United Nations that its greatest weakness would be the difficulty of dealing with aggression by one of the great powers who was a member.

I think the proposal which the Senator now makes is one which could really lead to outright war with Russia. In my opinion, that is the great question that must be decided. It is unquestioned that Russia is an aggressor, and that it has violated the charter, but today we have to weigh these questions in the light of what are the best long-term interests of the United States; and what are the best ways to prevent a larger war. I think it is a much larger question than simply the denunciation of Russia as an aggressor. Even though we consider it from the standpoint of the best interest of the United States, I would not want to see this country take action which could only be one of words, and which could be interpreted as a final breach. I have raised these questions because I think there are much deeper implications than perhaps my good friend has stated in his speech.

SENATE PREROGATIVES CONCERNING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, March 9, the Senate passed by unanimous consent Senate Joint Resolution 52, which was thereafter transmitted to the House. This resolution appropriated $17,000 out of the general fund of the District of Columbia for the operation of the Office of Rent Control in the District of Columbia.

On March 12 the House passed House Resolution 176, returning Senate Joint Resolution 52 to the Senate on the ground that it "contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution and is an infringement of the privileges of this House."

I invite the attention of the Senate to a similar situation which obtained during the 82d Congress. On May 7, 1952, the Senate considered and passed S. 2703 which would increase the District of Columbia gasoline tax from 4 to 5 cents per gallon. At that time the House refused to consider S. 2703, also on the ground that it contravened the constitutional provision referred to in House Resolution 176.

It is suggested that the issue thus raised on two occasions within the past year by the House of Representatives involves not only a parliamentary question but a constitutional question as well.

Indeed, these recent House actions appear to constitute a challenge to the concept that home rule may be achieved in the District of Columbia by means short of a constitutional amendment.

The issue of whether such legislation can originate in the Senate was one aspect of the routine analyses the Republican calendar committee gave to these bills. Their consideration of the bills included a routine discussion of the parliamentary question with the Parliamentarian of the Senate, Mr. Charles L. Watkins. He stated that article I, section 7 of the Constitution does not apply to such bills. He reasoned that the bills do not contemplate the raising of Federal revenue; that they are limited in their application to the District of Columbia; and that, as such, like any other bill affecting the District, the Senate may initiate such legislation.

It is believed that additional comment on this subject may be of some interest for the record, because, actually, this is not a routine subject to which I am addressing myself; it involves, rather, a major principle.

Article I, section 7, paragraph 1, of the Constitution provides as follows:

> All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

Article I, section 8, paragraph 17, provides Congress with power—

> To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States.

It is well established that the various provisions of the Constitution must be harmonized.

> In expounding the Constitution of the United States every word must have its due force, and appropriate meaning; for it is evident from the whole instrument, that no word was unnecessarily used, or needlessly added. The many discussions which have taken place upon the construction of the Constitution, have proved the correctness of this proposition; and shown the high talent, the caution, and the foresight of the illustrious men who framed it. Every word appears to have been weighed with the utmost deliberation, and its force and effect to have been fully understood. (*Holmes* v. *Jennison* ((1840) 14 Peters 540, 570); see also, *Cohens* v. *Virginia* ((1821) 6 Wheat 264).)

There is no conflict whatever between the two provisions of the Constitution cited above, and where Congress exercises exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia, article I, section 7, of the Constitution does not apply.

Only one case comes to hand that construes article I, section 7 of the Constitution. In *Hubbard* v. *Lowe* ((1915) 226 Fed. 135), the District Court for the Southern District of New York had before it a challenge to the validity of a statute dealing with contracts for cotton futures. A bill which originated in and passed the Senate called for their exclusion from the mails. The House struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute by way of a prohibitive tax. The House version was the one which was ultimately enacted. The court in that case threw out the statute as being unconstitutional, since prior to enactment it had a Senate number—S. 1107. The question became moot because of the enactment shortly thereafter of a revenue bill which dealt with the problem of cotton futures.

It will be recalled that some years ago the Congress provided by statute for the establishment of local government in the District of Columbia. The legislative body of that government passed revenue and appropriation measures. In this connection, attention is directed to an 1885 decision in the case of the *District of Columbia* v. *Waggaman* (4 Mackey 328). The following is quoted from that decision:

> We have to consider first, then, the validity of the act of the legislative assembly which imposed this tax on commissions earned by real-estate agents, and required a semi-annual return of those commissions and a bond to secure the performance of these and other acts prescribed by law.
>
> In *Roach* v. *Van Riswick* (7 Wash. L. Rep., 496), this court held that the very broad

terms in which the organic act of 1870 granted legislative powers to the legislative assembly had the effect to clothe that body with only such powers as might be given to a municipal corporation, and that it was not competent for Congress to delegate the larger powers of general legislation which it had itself received from the Constitution. We are still satisfied with that decision; but we hold, on the other hand, that the provision referred to had the effect to bestow every power of municipal legislation which could be given to a municipal corporation, and especially the power of taxation and implied or included power to provide measures by which taxes may be enforced and collected. Section 49 of the organic act provided that "the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation within the District, consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of this title"; and section 57 provided that "the legislative assembly shall not have power to tax the property of the United States, nor to tax the lands or other property of nonresidents higher than the lands or other property of residents."

The court referred to the legal tender cases and then went on to state that "the general grant of power to legislate on all rightful subjects, and so forth, is by inclusion, an express grant of power to legislate on this subject of taxation, except as limited in section 57." There is another case which bears on the subject, namely, *Welsh* v. *Cook* (97 U. S. 541, 542).

It can thus be seen that a local legislative body in the District of Columbia was given authority to enact revenue legislation affecting the District of Columbia; that pursuant to such authority that local legislative body enacted such revenue legislation; and the cited cases established judicial sanction for such enactment. If a local legislative body can pass valid revenue legislation for the District of Columbia, it appears equally clear that the Senate of the United States has authority to initiate a revenue bill concerning the District of Columbia. That conclusion certainly would be consistent with the Senate's share of responsibility in exercising exclusive legislative power over the District under article I, section 8, paragraph 17, of the Constitution.

There is a further aspect to the issue raised by the House last week in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 52. This is the question whether an appropriation bill comes within the purview of article I, section 7, paragraph 1 of the Constitution, relating to the raising of revenue. However, the issue of whether a general appropriation bill may originate in the Senate, notwithstanding long established custom to the contrary, warrants much fuller discussion than will here be made. As a Member of the Senate, I categorically dispute the House's contention in respect to Senate Joint Resolution 52.

UNITED STATES MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, within the last week, the world has witnessed two of the most brutal and unprovoked acts in modern times. Two aircraft, one belonging to the United States and the other to Great Britain, have been shot down in cold blood. They were attacked, without provocation, while flying on routine, nonbelligerent missions.

It would serve no purpose for anyone to use these incidents as a springboard for a hysterical dive into panic. They are serious—indeed, grave. We have been brought face to face with the only too evident reality that our Nation could be thrust into total war in a matter of hours.

A show of firmness and unity on our part may convince the Communists who attacked our men that there must be reparations and that the present reckless course must end.

However, regardless of the outcome, we cannot afford to ignore the clear warning of the past 3 days. We can refuse to learn this clear lesson only at the peril of our lives and our liberties.

These incidents may serve to awaken us to the full magnitude of our danger. If we awaken in time, we can count ourselves fortunate. For it is only such an awakening that will save us from the threatened destruction that hangs over our heads.

We are now paying the price for the years of complacency and ease we shared together, the years in which we blindly shut our eyes to the realities that surrounded us. The price is bitter. It may be the price paid by the householder who checks his insurance only when the flames leap out of the basement and lick at the rafters.

There have been many years of such complacency—years in which we decided it was too expensive to pay the premiums on our insurance against aggression.

They began in 1945, when we demobilized with a haste that was neither prudent nor economical the mightiest army the world has ever known.

They continued through 1946, 1947, and 1948, when we peddled our military equipment as surplus at a fraction of its cost and without regard to the future.

They reached their high point when the funds appropriated by Congress to build a 70-group Air Force were impounded.

They were summed up in the pre-Korea era, when the needs of defense were placed second to the objective of convincing the country that military budgets could be slashed without weakening our preparedness.

The complacency, which was shared generally, continued even after the Korean war had spelled out its grim warning to democracy. Even then officials persisted in trying to sell our vital synthetic-rubber plants, our only reliable source of this material so crucial to military operations.

There were those who warned against this course of weakness and folly. There were those who refused to believe that it was more important to live in luxury than to preserve for our children and their children the liberties which we enjoy.

Among such persons were the members of the Senate Preparedness Committee, the group of which I had the honor to be chairman during the last two Congresses. It was a fine committee, all of whose members worked, without regard to politics, to strengthen our defenses.

In our very first report, issued on September 6, 1950, we warned against the "siesta psychology" that pervaded our defense program. Just 2 months later, on November 11, 1950, we cautioned that "paper-work preparedness is only flimsy protection against the threat we face."

Yet one year later, on November 29, 1951, a survey of the facts compelled us to report that complacency still ruled the defense program.

We said in our 35th report:

> Deliveries on defense hard goods—planes, tanks, ships, and guns—have fallen dangerously behind schedule, and, as those deliveries have fallen behind, so, too, has our capacity to fortify the strength of our allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

A few months later, on March 20, 1952, the Preparedness Committee summed up the mobilization program in the following words:

> The objective has been ample supplies of both butter and guns. The result has been a small number of guns and a great amount of butter, with a considerable number of lollipops thrown in.

On June 17, 1952, in our 39th report, we presented a summary of the views of the military commanders upon whom we rely for the defense of our country. I shall quote one paragraph from that report:

> They (our military commanders) do not believe we have the strength we need; they do not believe we will have the strength we need unless we raise our sights at once and raise them drastically.

A few weeks later, on August 23, 1952, we reported that America had "lost the right to claim unquestioned mastery of the air. America is behind in the very weapon in which we should have unchallenged supremacy."

Mr. President, the situation was perfectly clear. The story was outlined in the reports of the Senate Preparedness Committee. It is available now, and was available then, when so many of the crucial decisions were made.

Nevertheless, the clear warnings were met only with stretchouts and cutbacks. Our preparedness program was stretched out and our defense production was cutback.

"Stretchout" and "cutback"—two of the most dangerous phrases in the English language today.

The real tragedy of our time is not that we lacked the ability to bring ourselves to the necessary level of military strength. The real tragedy is that we lacked the will to use the ability.

I have not reviewed the history of the last few years merely to rake over the ashes of the dead past. I have reviewed the past only because it points the way to the present and the future.

The lesson of the past is inescapable. We cannot have military strength by trimming our defense program to our desires for ease and luxury.

There is still another lesson to be drawn from the history of the post-World War II world, namely, that we cannot have freedom unless we are willing and able to defend it.

Have we learned those lessons?

There are many who even now advance such slogans as "balance the budget," "reduce taxes," "cut back military production," "stretch out the defense program," as the solution to all our ills. They would trim our defense program to what they consider the needs of our budget rather than trimming our budget to the needs of the defense program.

It may be that we can balance the budget, reduce taxes, cut back military production and stretch out the defense program. But if we do so and at the same time relegate our defense needs to a second priority, it will be at the peril of our lives and our liberties.

There are some who insist that we cannot afford the kind of defense program that will guarantee our survival. I am no economist—no expert in fiscal policy.

But I do know that the one thing we cannot afford is a defense program that is inadequate—a defense program too small to safeguard our liberties.

We cannot, of course, afford waste, because in total war the margin of waste could well be the margin between defeat and victory. No one has fought harder than I against military waste, but our objective should be to cut out the waste and institute efficiency—not to weaken our defenses on the excuse that some of our generals do not use their money and their authority prudently.

Our goal is the preservation of America as a free nation. If we lose sight of that goal, we will lose not merely our money, but our liberties.

The Communist pilots who shot down our plane and the British plane were merely the forerunners of the future. There will be other incidents; there will be other acts of provocation. If they continue we must sooner or later face the supreme test.

Are we ready to meet that test?

Our President faces responsibilities that are frightening. He must make the decisions that will determine the course of the future, that will decide whether we are to survive as a free Nation or succumb to the aggressors.

Thus far, he has had very little time to assess the situation and come to the necessary conclusions. But as many Members of Congress know, there are facts and figures on his desk which cannot be avoided and which I know he does not want to avoid. Soon—only too soon—the Congress and the people must reckon with those facts and those figures.

I believe the President should be told that he will have the support of the Congress no matter how difficult the decisions that must be made. I should like for him to think, with justification, that Americans will support him, not as Republicans and not as Democrats, but as Americans who place the salvation of their Nation above all else.

He has the responsibility for leadership because he is our Commander in Chief. In calm, measured words, the people must have the facts—the facts upon which decisions can be based. I hope that when the time comes the President and the Congress can work together to arrive at the correct answers to the basic questions before us.

Does an aggressor nation have the planes and the weapons with which the United States can be attacked at any and every point?

Does an aggressor nation have a stockpile of atomic bombs that could be used to strike at every American city?

Do we have a defensive force adequate to beat off an attack?

Do we have a force that could deliver devastating counterblows against an enemy or have we placed our faith in equipment that is obsolete?

How much time do we have before an aggressor nation will be up to its peak strength?

Is our military force large enough to keep pace with the build-up of the aggressor or should we be building more?

There are answers to all those questions, and they are not pleasant answers. But they must be faced. The alternative is to drift helplessly into extinction.

We live in the age of the totalitarians—an age in which war is total, victory is total, and defeat is total. It is also the age of the atomic bomb—an age in which the first battle may decide the war.

We cannot wait to decide upon a course of action after the bombs begin to fall. We must decide now—now while there may still be time.

We do not know how much time still remains. That is the factor that is out of our hands—the factor that we cannot control.

We can appropriate money, mobilize manpower, and step up production. But we cannot appropriate 1 minute, mobilize 1 hour, or step up the number of days.

We must use our time and use it wisely. Whatever we waste can never be recovered.

Furthermore, there is only one yardstick by which the size of our defense program should be measured. It should be no smaller than the force needed to defend our lives and our liberties. Anything smaller is waste—tragic waste that we cannot afford.

I sympathize deeply with those who wish to introduce more economy and more efficiency into our Armed Forces. No one has fought harder than I for those goals.

We can have greater economy and efficiency. But we must not permit our zeal to lead us into the false economy of weakening our defense structure in what may well be the hour of our greatest need.

I emphasize the fact that we pointed that out in each of our 44 reports. Those reports were agreed to unanimously by Democrats and Republicans alike.

I am not speaking as a partisan nor do I think this is a partisan subject. The reports of the Senate Preparedness Committee were signed by all members—both Democrats and Republicans.

The American people are looking for leadership to defend their country. They do not care whether that leadership comes from Democrats or Republicans so long as it is effective.

We are past the stage where we can afford partisan bickering. We must discard trivialities and petty arguments. It is far more important to determine how we will get out of this situation than how we got into it.

We are in it. We must look to the past only insofar as it is a guide for the future.

We can, if we wish, exhaust our strength and squander our substance through partisan quarrels that serve only to set American against American. We can, if we wish, use our time and our energy in searching the records of the past for minute details that will pin down the blame for our present situation.

Personally, I would rather concentrate our strength and mobilize our substance against the Soviet enemy who threatens our lives and our liberties. Personally, I think we will find that there is enough blame for all of us to share. It would be better if we were all to concede the errors of the past without further divisive argument and proceed to work toward the only worthwhile goal—the defense of our country.

Mr. President, the incidents in the air space over Germany were but the handwriting on the wall. They indicate clearly the shape of the future. If we are incapable of understanding that future we have no one to blame but ourselves.

It would be tragic were we to be caught unprepared—with defenses that were inadequate and forces incapable of delivering a counterblow. It would be even more tragic if we were caught unprepared simply because of timidity—simply because we hid from the facts.

There may still be time—time to arm—time to arouse ourselves to the defense of our lives and liberties. Let us seize that time. Let us use it to forge defenses so strong that freedom will triumph over the designs of the aggressor and guide mankind throughout eternity.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, tomorrow will be St. Patrick's Day, a day dedicated to the patron saint of Ireland, that little Nation which has won the hearts of all who know the story of its gallant fight for freedom.

It has become traditional in America and, indeed, in every corner of the world wheresoever Irishmen have wandered from their native land to observe the feast day of St. Patrick.

Though more than 14 centuries have elapsed since St. Patrick brought the gospel of Christianity to the Irish people, his spiritual influence still continues and his memory is cherished in story and song to a greater degree possibly than that of any other national hero or saint.

On St. Patrick's Day we are not celebrating a victory of war; we are not gloating over the conquest or repression of any people. The Irish claim no heritage of superiority in the great human family; they seek simply to uphold the principles of justice and freedom which all mankind so deeply yearns for.

The age-long fight of the Irish for freedom in their homeland will live for all time in history. That historic struggle for freedom, which continued from the day when Strongbow, Earl of Pembroke, with powerful British forces, invaded Ireland in the 12th century, down to the date of the British treaty which recognized the Irish Free State as a free

and self-ruling Commonwealth, is a story of bravery and patriotism unexampled in all human annals.

Since the Irish Treaty and the establishment of the Free State Government in Dublin, Ireland has made extraordinary progress in setting up a democratic government which, for adherence to pure fundamental principles of justice, of morality, and of Christian precepts, is not excelled anywhere in the world. Great strides have been made in balancing the Irish economy, making it more self-reliant, and bringing about social and economic readjustments and improvements of far-reaching effect. The rapid development of home industries, the establishment of hydroelectric power plants, and extensive public works and improvements of many kinds have literally transformed the Emerald Isle into one of the most happy and contented countries on earth.

And let me not forget to tell you in passing that Ireland has paid in full her debt to the American people who bought Irish bonds to aid the Irish rebels in their fight for freedom. She borrowed this money in America to prosecute that victorious fight. The Free State, freely and voluntarily, without the slightest compulsion, assumed that obligation and has paid it off in full. That should be an example in international honesty and good-faith which richer and more powerful nations might emulate.

The one and only problem which remains to interfere with the full fruition of Irish nationhood and the full development of its economic and social possibilities is the wicked and indefensible partition of Ireland. I think this mutilation of the Irish nation—an act of British Tories separating a small and unwilling section of the north of Ireland from the Irish Republic—if not soon terminated will prove to be a most serious and dangerous error of British statesmanship.

No person conversant with Irish history can be misled by this partition, which is referred to as the Ulster problem. This small area of northern Ireland was arbitrarily set up by the British at the instance of intriguing politicians who were seeking the mutilation of the living body of the Irish nation and the perversion of Ireland's national destiny. In the counties under the Ulster government, if a free and honest election were held tomorrow, it would undeniably be found that the majority of the people are favorable to the unity of Ireland. It has never been a separate unit for any purpose—historic, social, economic, or traditional. It simply sets up an arbitrary fragment of the ancient province of Ireland, determined on by pure political intrigue. It represents the last fortress of British control in Ireland and can only be continued and maintained in violation of the spirit of the Irish Treaty by British financial aid, propaganda, and intrigue.

Mr. J. B. Morton, a distinguished English author and historian, in his book, The New Ireland, says:

> Partition is an artificial state of affairs. Not one single Irish vote was cast for it. It serves not one solitary Irish interest. It can only be maintained by active propaganda and sheer lawlessness. * * * It would be powerless for the Ulster Government to continue without the financial and moral support of the British Government.

The partition of Ireland stands out as a conspicuous example of imperialistic oppression and perfidy which must disturb the conscience of British leaders. The First World War was fought and won on the principle of all nations having the right to determine the form of government under which they choose to live and to determine their own internal affairs without outside interference.

Mr. President, I know of nothing more important to the future welfare of the British Commonwealth of Nations and all the free nations of the world than the adjustment of this problem of Irish unity. The whole world is seething with political disturbance and dissension. Wars are threatening on every side. The Irish people, in these turbulent and dangerous times, are in a position to exercise a vital force for the preservation of democratic institutions. What a boon it would be in these threatening times, with dangerous "isms" the world over menacing democracy, to have a united English-speaking people. Such a force would be an invincible bulwark for democracy.

What the world sorely needs today is peace. Peace is not merely the removal of contending armies from the field of battle. It means the reestablishment of international justice and good will—the cessation of exploitation and oppression of weak countries. It means the deliverance of nations from policies of aggression and from the obsession of wasteful preparation for war. It means improvement of the conditions of the masses in all parts of the world, and the raising of the standards of living for all.

Ireland, where the taint of communism has not entered, will be a strong voice in the family of free nations. Wherever you find an Irishman today, you will find a champion of democracy and the rights of individuals. Yet his native land is not entirely free. The fact that Britain permits these conditions to continue, when they could be remedied to the benefit of all concerned, is an enigma which can never be explained or justified.

The world today is at the parting of the ways. Either it must take, through the ending of oppression of small countries, the path leading upward to an era of peace and prosperity which will be immeasurable; or else, through efforts to maintain huge military establishments exhausting the resources of the earth, it will sink through confusion and disaster to a ruin which will be irretrievable.

And so, Mr. President, on this St. Patrick's Day of 1953, let us hope that there will soon be an end to this British policy of partition in Ireland, so as to permit the Irish Nation to go forward in the development of its resources and improvement of its social and economic conditions, and thus stand out as an example to the world of the fruits of justice and freedom.

PROGRAM FOR THE SESSIONS OF THE SENATE ON WEDNESDAY AND FRIDAY OF THIS WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what his plans are so far as the program of the Senate is concerned for Wednesday and Friday of this week.

Mr. TAFT. On Wednesday I intend to call up the measures on the calendar which were reported too late to be considered today. They include specifically the resolution to continue the Military Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. It is Order No. 77, Senate Resolution 86. Also, Orders Nos. 80 and 81.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is the program for Wednesday?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is the program for Wednesday of this week. Of course, there will be some nominations to be confirmed.

On Friday I know of no special business to be taken up by the Senate. Some additional bills may be reported by that time, as well as perhaps an important nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask whether the distinguished majority leader has any hope that the so-called tidelands bill will be reported this week?

Mr. TAFT. I have some hope that it will be reported, but not that it will be taken up this week.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then am I to understand that the majority leader will not ask that it be considered even if it is reported, until next week?

Mr. TAFT. It could not be reported until Friday anyway, and certainly I would not move to take it up then.

DEATH OF DR. HERMAN BARUCH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in this morning's New York Herald Tribune there appeared an article on the death of Dr. Herman Baruch.

I wish to pay brief homage to him at this time. When he was Ambassador to Holland it was my privilege to be his guest. In this age he was what one might call a mid-Victorian. The people of Holland loved him. He went out among the farmers and sold America to them. He has gone to his reward and it is well that there be noted in the RECORD the passing of a good public servant.

I ask unanimous consent that the article in the New York Herald Tribune be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> DR. HERMAN BARUCH DIES AT 80; EX-ENVOY TO PORTUGAL, HOLLAND — FOLLOWED FATHER'S TRADITION AS PHYSICIAN, BECAME PARTNER IN H. HENTZ & CO.
>
> WYANDANCH, L. I., March 15.—Dr. Herman B. Baruch, 80, former American Ambassador to the Netherlands and Portugal, died today at his home, Bagatelle. He achieved great distinction in his field, as did his three brothers in theirs: Bernard M. Baruch, the elder statesman; Sailing W. Baruch, a financier, who now lives in San Marino Island, Fla., and Hartwig Baruch, a famous actor in

the 1890's, who died on March 1 at the age of 84.

Dr. Baruch, the third son of Dr. Simon B. and Belle Wolf Baruch, set his course early in the direction his father had taken. He was graduated second in the City College class of 1892, ranked similarly at the Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons in 1895, and placed first in the subsequent city-wide internship examinations. In practice and research, Dr. Baruch thereafter shared his father's deep interest in physical medicine.

Though he continued to write frequently for medical journals, Dr. Baruch in 1903 followed his brother Bernard into finance in the firm of Baruch Bros. Through a merger in 1918 Baruch Bros. brought special emphasis to the securities business of H. Hentz & Co., which this year will celebrate its 97th anniversary under the same name. The consolidation made Dr. Baruch a senior partner in H. Hentz. In 1945 he became a limited partner, but continued to maintain an office at the commodity house, at 60 Beaver Street.

NAMED TO BRAZIL POST

His gradual withdrawal from the stock exchange was prompted by a new diplomatic career. In 1943, he was made Chief of the Board of Economic Warfare's representatives in Brazil. It was felt his appointment would end the interdepartmental bickerings between the BEW and various RFC agencies. So many representatives of these groups were being sent to Brazil that the natives called them "paraquedistas," or parachute troops. Dr. Baruch's job, in large part, was to reestablish American operations on a plane that would hold the Brazilians' respect.

He soon reported that his and other agencies were working in full cohesion, and reminded himself and his superiors, "When my job is done, I shall return to private life." Instead, President Roosevelt, who leaned heavily on Bernard Baruch, appointed Dr. Baruch, who had been a Democratic presidential elector in 1932, American Ambassador to Portugal in 1945. President Truman extended his public career by making him Ambassador to The Hague in 1947.

HONORED BY DUTCH

Dr. Baruch often expressed his high regard for the Dutch, and particularly noted the "magnificent use of every dollar" of Marshall plan funds that they were making. The Dutch recognized his service by awarding him the Grand Cross of the Order of the Netherlands Lion. On January 1, 1949, he submitted his resignation to President Truman, and it was accepted.

Dr. Baruch's friends said the President's action came as a surprise to him. Ambassadors, like other officials of the executive branch, submit their resignations as a matter of form when the Chief Executive begins a new term. Although the Ambassador had not been involved in any dispute with the President, Bernard Baruch and the President had been on poor terms for some months.

On his return to America, Dr. Baruch, as president of the Simon Baruch Foundation, devoted its resources principally toward discovering the origin and cure of infantile paralysis. Last April he and Bernard Baruch broke ground for Baruch Houses, a 2,194-apartment project under construction on the lower East Side. The Simon Baruch public bath, one of the many his father established in New York, will be left standing in the project, and recalled the survey the two brothers made for the mayor in 1934 for the extensive renovation of public baths in the city.

BROUGHT BROUGHAM IN 1942

Dr. Baruch's name was newsworthy from time to time in minor ways. In 1942, with the oppression of gas rationing, he bought an elegant red and black brougham and put his chauffeur in appropriate livery. In 1937, newspapers told how he financed an expedition to Brazil to experiment with electric eels. This was only a bizarre facet, however, of his fascination with animal and plant life. He devoted much of his energy to studying the correlation between them.

Dr. Baruch, moving to Long Island, began a nursery as a hobby in Wyandanch, but he soon found himself wholesaling thousands of chestnut and fruit trees, garden shrubs, and flowers, and could scarcely retire had he wanted to. The family said yesterday that a private funeral will be held at Bagatelle on Tuesday morning.

Surviving, besides his two brothers, are his second wife, the former Anne Marie, Baroness Mackay, of the Hague; two children by a previous marriage to the late Mrs. Rosemary Emetaz Baruch, Robert P. Baruch and Mrs. Marina Symmers, of New York; and three grandchildren.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16, 1953:

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Ford Q. Elvidge, of Washington, to be Governor of Guam.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice Charles Morris Irelan, resigning.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 1953:

GOVERNOR, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

B. Frank Heintzleman, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska.

NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY

Maj. Gen. Ralph Julian Canine, O7154, United States Army, to be Director of the National Security Agency, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., O9325, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Whitfield Putnam Shepard, O11908.
Maj. Gen. Walter Joseph Muller, O12224.
Maj. Gen. Paul Wolcott Rutledge, O7289.
Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246.
Maj. Gen. Robert Miller Montague, O12261.
Maj. Gen. Harlan Nelson Hartness, O12269.
Maj. Gen. Claude Birkett Ferenbaugh, O12479.
Maj. Gen. Clovis Ethelbert Byers, O12769.
Maj. Gen. Henry Irving Hodes, O12845.
Lt. Gen. Isaac Davis White, O15080.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Hickey, O16062.
Maj. Gen. Ira Platt Swift, O12205.

To be major general, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Rex Van Den Corput, Jr., O12700.
Maj. Gen. Homer Watson Kiefer, O12701.
Maj. Gen. Crump Garvin, O12746.
Maj. Gen. George Honnen, O12816.
Maj. Gen. Orlando Clarendon Mood, O14781.
Maj. Gen. John Francis Uncles, O14914.
Maj. Gen. Robert Nicholas Young, O15068.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Sherman Timberman, O15328.
Maj. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475.
Maj. Gen. Charles Day Palmer, O15519.
Maj. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068.
Maj. Gen. Leslie Earl Simon, O15567.
Brig. Gen. William Henry Colbern, O6809.
Brig. Gen. Charles Wilkes Christenberry, O8373.
Brig. Gen. Edwin Luther Sibert, O11193.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Jones Twitty, O12079.
Brig. Gen. George Vernon Keyser, O12089.
Brig. Gen. Robert Gibbins Gard, O12247.

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Martin Eugene Griffin, O16537.
Brig. Gen. Alvin Levi Gorby, O16546.

To be brigadier general, Dental Corps

Brig. Gen. Egbert Wesley Van Delden Cowan, O11744.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Jonathan Lane Holman, O11226.
Brig. Gen. George Bittmann Barth, O11241.
Brig. Gen. Boniface Campbell, O9788.
Brig. Gen. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663.
Brig. Gen. Charles Kenon Gailey, Jr., O12782.
Brig. Gen. William Lemuel Mitchell, O12832.
Brig. Gen. James Dunne O'Connell, O14965.
Brig. Gen. George Craig Stewart, O15349.
Brig. Gen. Charles Trueman Lanham, O15568.
Brig. Gen. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., O15634.
Brig. Gen. William Henry Maglin, O15812.
Brig. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602.
Brig. Gen. Guy Stanley Meloy, Jr., O16892.
Brig. Gen. Robert Frederick Sink, O16907.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Kenner Fisher Hertford, O15120.
Col. William Elgie Carraway, O15144.
Chaplain (Col.) Patrick James Ryan, O17363.
Col. Peter Conover Haines 3d, O15657.
Col. David Henry Tulley, O16075.
Col. Richard Walden Mayo, O16430.
Col. Jeremiah Paul Holland, O16812.
Col. Walter Morris Johnson, O16835.
Col. Ralph Wise Zwicker, O16878.
Col. Earl Clarence Bergquist, O16998.
Col. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512.
Col. John Elliot Theimer, O17566.
Col. William Carson Bullock, O17635.
Col. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157.
Col. Carl Irven Hutton, O18177.
Col. John Phillips Daley, O18358.
Col. Sam Carroll Russell, O18678.
Col. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747.
Col. Louis Watson Truman, O18755.
Col. William Wilson Quinn, O19283.

The nominations of Edward Francis Kent et al., for transfer in the Army, and the nominations of William Herschel Allen, Jr., et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 25, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations,"

beginning with the name of Edward Francis Kent, shown on page 1404, and ending with the name of June Elizabeth Williams on page 1411.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Roger Maxwell Ramey, 91A.
Maj. Gen. Francis Hopkins Griswold, 94A.
Maj. Gen. George Warren Mundy, 356A.
Maj. Gen. Walter Edwin Todd, 361A.
Maj. Gen. Frank Fort Everest, 366A.
Maj. Gen. Frederic Harrison Smith, Jr., 461A.
Maj. Gen. William Fulton McKee, 467A.
Maj. Gen. Emery Scott Wetzel, 464A.
Maj. Gen. Edward Wharton Anderson, 514A.
Maj. Gen. Robert Whitney Burns, 527A.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. John Morris Hargreaves, 233A.
Maj. Gen. Lucas Victor Beau, 174A.
Maj. Gen. Byron Elihu Gates, 186A.
Maj. Gen. Colby Maxwell Myers, 246A.
Brig. Gen. Alfred Henry Johnson, 270A.
Maj. Gen. John Stewart Mills, 357A.
Brig. Gen. Homer LeRoy Sanders, 411A.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Benton McDonald, 469A.
Brig. Gen. John Walker Sessums, Jr., 469A.
Brig. Gen. Lewis R. Parker, 438A.
Brig. Gen. Jarred Vincent Crabb, 535A.
Maj. Gen. Oliver Stanton Picher, 540A.
Maj. Gen. Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., 552A.
Maj. Gen. William Dole Eckert, 560A.
Maj. Gen. Edward Julius Timberlake, 603A.
Maj. Gen. Archie Jordan Old, Jr., 605A.
Maj. Gen. Herbert Bishop Thatcher, 634A.
Maj. Gen. Dan Clark Ogle, 602A.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Haywood Shepherd Hansell, Jr., AO17468.
Brig. Gen. Edmund Clarence Langmead, 207A.
Brig. Gen. Robert Lynn Copsey, AO104024.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO922780.
Brig. Gen. John Morris Hargreaves, 233A.
Brig. Gen. Homer LeRoy Sanders, 411A.
Brig. Gen. Lewis R. Parker, 438A.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Benton McDonald, 469A.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Harold Hicks, 227A.
Brig. Gen. Paul Ernest Ruestow, 548A.
Brig. Gen. David Hodge Baker, 557A.
Brig. Gen. David William Hutchison, 601A.
Brig. Gen. John Raymond Gilchrist, 836A.
Brig. Gen. Kingston Eric Tibbetts, 436A.
Brig. Gen. Jarred Vincent Crabb, 535A.
Brig. Gen. Harlan Clyde Parks, 472A.
Brig. Gen. Morris John Lee, 556A.
Brig. Gen. Robert Edward Lee Eaton, 594A.
Brig. Gen. Gabriel Poillon Disosway, 654A.
Brig. Gen. Albert Boyd, 424A.
Brig. Gen. Leigh Wade, AO403535.
Brig. Gen. Delmar Taft Spivey, 385A.
Brig. Gen. John Koehler Gerhart, 525A.
Brig. Gen. Elmer Blair Garland, 322A.
Brig. Gen. Charles Raeburne Landon, 712A.
Brig. Gen. Lee Bird Washbourne, 810A.
Brig. Gen. James McCormack, Jr., 17981A.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Auby Casey Strickland, 134A.
Col. Ray Henry Clark, 212A.
Col. John Phillips Kirkendall, 234A.
Col. James William Andrew, 289A.
Col. Joseph Gerard Hopkins, 339A.
Col. Edward Harold Porter, 346A.
Col. Joseph Arthur Bulger, 379A.
Col. Edwin Lee Tucker, 420A.
Col. Benjamin Scovill Kelsey, 433A.
Col. Raymond Lloyd Winn, 435A.
Col. Harold Huntley Bassett, 445A.
Col. Thomas Jefferson Dubose, 470A.
Col. Harold Winfield Grant, 497A.
Col. James Leroy Jackson, 503A.
Col. Stoyte Ogleby Ross, 531A.
Col. Frederick Earl Calhoun, 545A.
Col. Royden Eugene Beebe, Jr., 587A.
Col. Richard Tide Coiner, Jr., 619A.
Col. Edward Willis Suarez, 633A.
Col. Sidney Francis Giffin, 649A.
Col. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, 18819A.
Col. Russell Keillor, 798A.
Col. Loyd Eugene Griffis, 19047A.
Col. William Jeffers Kennard, 19048A.
Col. Richard Mattern Montgomery, 1025A.
Col. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, 1115A.
Col. James Howard Walsh, 1120A.
Col. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., 1298A.
Col. Augustus Maine Minton, 1301A.
Col. William Porter Farnsworth, AO922626.
Col. Edgar Eugene Glenn, 160A.
Col. Herbert Leonard Grills, 432A.
Col. Robert Shuter Macrum, 519A.
Col. Llewellyn Owen Ryan, 521A.
Col. Daniel Webster Jenkins, 528A.
Col. Stanley Tanner Wray, 608A.
Col. Thomas Samuel Moorman, Jr., 644A.
Col. Claude Edward Duncan, 686A.
Col. Millard Chester Young, 934A.
Col. William Sebastian Stone, 1059A.
Col. Raymond Judson Reeves, 1082A.
Col. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., 1129A.
Col. Russell Lee Waldron, 1164A.
Col. John Dale Ryan, 1418A.
Col. William Hugh Blanchard, 1445A.
Col. Clifford Harcourt Rees, 630A.
Col. William Edward Rentz, 918A.
Col. Charles Wesley Schott, 949A.
Col. William Monte Canterbury, 1071A.
Col. Charles Pratt Brown, 1185A.
Col. Major Samuel White, 19056A.
Col. James Oscar Guthrie, 1266A.
Col. Henry Russell Spicer, 1487A.
Col. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, 1613A.
Col. Ralph Emanuel Fisher, 240A.
Col. Woodbury Megrew Burgess, 323A.
Col. Alvord Van Pattern Anderson, Jr., 371A.
Col. Glynne Morgan Jones, 398A.
Col. Alfred Frederick Kalberer, 607A.
Col. Ethelred Lundy Sykes, 914A.
Col. Benjamin Jepson Webster, 974A.
Col. George Stewart Cassady, 994A.
Col. Karl Truesdell, Jr., 1023A.
Col. Joseph D. Croft Caldara, 1048A.
Col. Albert Theodore Wilson, Jr., 1086A.
Col. Ira David Snyder, 854A.
Col. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., 1211A.
Col. Joseph James Nazzaro, 1241A.
Col. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, 1283A.
Col. John Dudley Stevenson, 1320A.
Col. Thomas Alan Bennett, 1513A.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Joseph M. Carson	Edward N. Parker
Charles P. Chilling-worth, Jr.	Lewis S. Parks
	Robert B. Pirie
Howard L. Collins	Lester K. Rice
Henry Crommelin	James S. Russell
William L. Erdmann	John H. Sides
Harry H. Henderson	John Sylvester
Ira E. Hobbs	Edmund B. Taylor
Willard K. Goodney	John M. Taylor
Peter W. Haas, Jr.	George C. Towner
Robert S. Hatcher	David M. Tyree
Frederick N. Kivette	Frederick B. Warder
Victor D. Long	Joseph H. Wellings
Redfield Mason	Austin W. Wheelock
Armand M. Morgan	George C. Wright

MEDICAL CORPS

Thomas F. Cooper	French R. Moore
James R. Fulton	Ocie B. Morrison, Jr.
Bartholomew W. Hogan	

SUPPLY CORPS

Charles G. DeKay
Frederick W. Hesser

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Joseph F. Jelley

DENTAL CORPS

Ralph W. Malone

The nominations of Norgren B. Allen et al. (with the exception of Eleanor M. Haim to be a lieutenant in the Nurse Corps of the Navy, which was confirmed on March 6, 1953), for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on March 4, 1953, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Norgren B. Allen on page 1629 and ending with the name of Robert J. Vroegindewey, which appears on page 1630.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art unchanging in Thy love and goodness, we are again turning unto Thee for guidance and strength, for courage and hope.

We thank Thee that Thou art always willing to satisfy our nameless longings and to give us of Thy companionship and counsel as we walk the ways of life, which at times seem so very dark and devious.

May Thy spirit of peace and power descend upon our troubled minds and hearts, lifting us out of those fears which paralyze our energies into a faith which inspires us with confidence and joy.

Wilt Thou illumine our souls with a glorious vision of the fulfillment of Thy gracious promises when all our doubts shall be dispelled and righteousness and truth shall be victorious.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 12, 1953, was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday next for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARDY. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saw to the effect that some people achieve fame and others have it thrust upon them. I guess I am in that latter category because I was joined with

you Saturday in the column of a gentleman I shall leave unnamed but denominate as the champion liar of the United States. He lied about me as he did about you, Mr. Speaker. I mention this only because as time goes on, and he names me again, each time he lies I shall call it to the attention of the House. Saturday was No. 1. The only thing I really regret about it is he had an idea that I had not thought of first. He said that I had suggested investigating Americans for Democratic Action. I have done no such thing, but it is a very good idea. That leftwing outfit has approved the teaching of communism in our schools. It has sponsored the idea that teachers be allowed to belong to the Communist Party. Maybe we should look into the antecedents of that outfit.

AMMUNITION SHORTAGE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a lady in my home county in Ohio a few days ago sent one of her sons to see the State representative, who also lives in my home city, and she wanted the State representative to call me by telephone to deliver to me a telephone message that she had gotten from her son, who was then in Seoul, Korea. She wanted me to know that her son told her that it was true that they had been repulsed and driven back from Triangle Hill, because they did not have sufficient guns and ammunition with which to adequately carry on their attacks or to defend themselves adequately. Her son had said that quite a number of his companions were waiting in a long line at that time to get to the telephone so they could call their parents in the United States to tell them the same story. Her son said that he had been at the front since October.

Mr. Speaker, this is eloquent testimony as to whether our boys on the bleak fighting front have been neglected. However much this story of a shortage of ammunition distresses us, we hope it will never occur again.

AMMUNITION SUPPLY IN KOREA

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I have on my desk a letter whose contents are of timely interest and should be brought to the attention of the Congress. It was written by an officer only recently returned from the battlefields of Korea. With your permission, I will quote a few excerpts:

> The reason for my letter is the current investigation of ammunition in Korea. The testimony of the generals makes sense to me for each is telling just what he wants to paint his picture. My experience was on the lowest possible level, so it may be presumptuous of me to even bother to write. Be that as it may, in November of 1952 every mortar, recoilless rifle, tank, and artillery piece had an ammunition allocation, and expenditures in excess of the authorized amount had to be explained to higher headquarters. The three forward observers under my supervision were constantly reminded of the ammunition restrictions. Orders were published that 15 enemy had to be spotted in a group before the forward observer could fire on them. All of these restrictions made for supply economy but were frustrating to the little men fighting the war (such a war as it is).
>
> So Van Fleet is correct that there was a shortage, Clark is right that there is never enough for those who want to shoot it, and from the Olympian heights of Collins it may be true that there is plenty in the stockpiles.

Mr. Speaker, letters of this nature are approaching epidemic frequency. What can 10,000 congressional investigations prove more than these letters prove? I say let us have an end to words and let us have a little action in the Defense Department, and woe be to the little man whose dereliction of duty has been responsible for a single drop of American blood.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, if there were any doubt in the minds of those in charge of our foreign policy or for that matter of just the ordinary layman as to what the policy of the new Soviet regime is to be, that doubt should now be dispelled.

The Supreme Soviet met in Moscow yesterday. The new dictator, Georgi Malenkov, told his applauding hireling delegates from behind the Iron Curtain that there are no controversial issues with the capitalistic world that cannot be settled peacefully.

Surely this propaganda has a familiar ring. It was to the tune of similar statements that his predecessor, Dictator Stalin, committed many warlike gestures and aggressions. We get again the picture of the masters of the Kremlin holding the olive branches in one hand and pulling the strings of international discord with the other. Yes, the pattern is the same with the exception of new faces in the picture. Peace propaganda is broadcast while at the same time our innocent planes are being shot down from the skies.

Mr. Speaker, it has now been some 2 years since American and allied leaders were lulled into a false sense of security and misled into giving up the advantages gained in Korea at the expense of so much American blood by a simple suggestion of one of the Kremlin's hirelings, Malik, that there was no reason why a truce should not be had in Korea. At that time, we took this floor to admonish our leaders that this was nothing more than a Trojan horse. We regret exceedingly that this prophecy proves to be correct.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, our leadership will not forever remain blind to the real purpose and design of the Kremlin, the destruction of our economy. We repeat again what we have pointed out on this floor and elsewhere over a period of the past 7 years:

> Russia wants neither war nor peace. Her real purpose is to bleed us white; and through the resultant chaos and confusion divide and conquer.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WINSTEAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, the first formal celebration of the centennial year of the University of Florida will be held March 19–21, when Gen. James A. Van Fleet, alumnus, former football coach, and professor of military science and tactics, will be an honored guest. Many other outstanding figures will take part in the 3-day educational program.

Because of its system of student government, the University of Florida has made a great impact on the State and Nation, and many of the political leaders of the State received their early training as student leaders on the campus of the university. Seven of the 10 men in the Florida congressional delegation are University of Florida alumni. The Governor of Florida, most of the members of his cabinet, and many members of the State legislature are former students of this great institution.

I feel that the contributions of the University of Florida, which is located in my district, the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, are of such major significance that it is proper I call the attention of my colleagues to the centennial celebration of this great institution of higher learning.

This year is the 100th anniversary of the founding of the University of Florida. On January 6, 1853, Gov. Thomas Broome signed the bill which created the East Florida Seminary—the first State-supported institution of higher learning—from which the College of Arts and Sciences of the present University of Florida traces its origin.

Public desire for higher education in Florida goes back to 1824, 2 years after Florida became a Territory. At that time, public land was set aside for two seminaries, one east of the Suwannee River, and one west.

In 1837, 8 years before Florida became a State, a board of trustees was appointed for the university that was to be. Not until 1851 was an enabling act passed which made action possible.

After the eloquent appeal for the cause of higher education made by Gilbert Kingsbury, principal of a private school already in existence in Ocala, the Florida Legislature agreed to adopt his school as the East Florida Seminary.

During the Civil War years, the young school struggled, but a reorganization moved it to Gainesville in 1866, where it functioned until 1905.

Meanwhile, other State-supported schools of higher learning were competing for scholars and funds. Consequently, in 1905, the Buckman Act called for a consolidation of these schools into the University of Florida for boys at Gainesville; the Florida Female College—later Florida State University—and the Florida Agricultural and Mechanical College for Negroes, both in Tallahassee.

Supervision was placed with the board of control, representing the seven geographical regions of the State. Schools, incorporated into the University of Florida, were located in St. Petersburg, Bartow, Gainesville, and Lake City. Buildings were also erected at Eau Gallie, but the proposed school there never functioned.

In 1935, the University of Florida pioneered in the field of higher education by establishing the University College curriculum for the first 2 years. This is a general liberal arts course which is required before a student may enter a specialized professional course.

In 1947, the University of Florida became coeducational, and a $20,000,000 building program was launched.

Today, in the centennial year of 1953, the University of Florida has an 1,800-acre campus, a plant valued at $35½ million, a faculty of over 1,300, a student body of over 9,000, and consists of 10 colleges and 4 divisions.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, because of recent publications and statements criticizing, misconstruing, and exaggerating the meaning of personal expression of opinion in answer to hypothetical questions propounded to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I take this time and opportunity to say, as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, that the committee has never given any consideration to investigation of communism in the churches or the clergy of America. The subject has never been considered or mentioned in any respect by the committee. In fact the clergy and churches of our country have been and are the most powerful and effective force in our fight against the godless slavery of communism. The Kremlin leaders despise religion, but American church leaders know, or should know, that the Communists are not indifferent to the possibilities of exploiting the Soviet-sponsored Russian Orthodox Church of America, which is controlled by the Kremlin through the Moscow archbishop.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has and will continue to expose communism. It has an excellent record of public service in exposing and warning the American people of the evils of communism, and we must not permit baseless propaganda to injure the work of the committee.

I am confident that the Committee on Un-American Activities will proceed in its important work of combatting the menace of communism and Communist propaganda and infiltration with the highest regard and respect for academic freedom and the state of due process and protection of the law of our land, and without injury to basic safeguards of our cherished freedom in America.

WEST VIRGINIA BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the district which I represent in the Congress is located in the heart of the bituminous coal fields of southern West Virginia. The Mountain State produces more bituminous coal than any other State in the Union, and the second and third largest coal producing counties are a part of my congressional district.

During the past several years the economy of that section of West Virginia has been a healthy economy, founded as it is upon a healthy and prosperous coal industry. At the present time the coal industry is a sick industry and the resulting effect upon the economy of my State is being severely felt. Reports show that 14,100 fewer men were employed at the mines in December 1952 than in December 1951.

My own Beckley area has been experiencing an employment decline since 1950, the lack of coal markets bringing about a closing of numerous small mines and also retarding the opening of new operations. There were about 1,350, or 12 percent, fewer coal miners employed in this area in January 1953 than in the same month in 1952. Seven operations have shut down completely and underemployment has become fairly prevalent, a three-day week being relatively common and with some mines operating one day per week.

The decline in the coal industry has affected other industries, and of a total labor force of 25,500 in the Beckley area, a total of 2,800, or over ten percent, were unemployed in January. Practically all of the unemployed are men, many of whom are over forty-five years of age, with none other than mining experience, a fact which in many instances precludes them from finding employment elsewhere.

This situation exists because coal mines are being closed down for lack of markets due to the excessive importation of fuel oil. That the importation is excessive and serious can be seen from a look at the recorded figures. In 1946, 44,647,000 barrels of residual oil were imported from foreign sources, but in 1952 there were 126,964,000 barrels imported, or an increase of almost 300 percent. Inasmuch as a ton of coal is equivalent in energy value to 4.167 barrels of residual oil the 1952 importation represents the equivalent loss of some 31 million tons of coal.

Cumulatively, the volume of fuel oil imported amounts to 592,390,000 barrels through the seven years since 1946. Expressing this same amount of oil in equivalent tons of bituminous coal, we arrive at the stupendous figure of 142,163,000 tons of coal which have remained unmined or unutilized. Since the price of coal has varied from $3.44 in 1946 to $4.95 in 1952, the cumulative total of revenue loss in the seven years amounts to $671,057,000; and predicated on the fact that the median number of tons mined per day per man averaged 6.3 to 7.2 tons during the period, one can say that the aggregate loss of man-days for the seven years amounts to 21,086,000 days. The average hourly earnings of the bituminous coal miner since 1946 have fluctuated from $1.40 to $2.25. The aggregate loss of wages which could have been earned by coal miners for coal displaced by foreign oil amounts to a cumulative total of $335,992,000 since 1946.

Not only is the coal industry hard hit by the dumping of residual oil in this country, but the railroads are likewise being made to suffer. Railroads transport approximately 83 percent of all coal produced, so that the railroads did not carry 25,289,000 tons of coal not produced due to displacement by oil. Since 1946 this loss has amounted to 119,217,000 tons. The Interstate Commerce Commission has estimated that the average railroad freight rate per ton during the first nine months of 1952 was $3.40. By mathematical calculation the revenue loss suffered by the railroads during 1952 amounted to $85,983,000. The cumulative total since 1946 is $358,346,000.

Since from figures generally acceptable to the ICC, labor receives about 48.2 cents out of each railroad-revenue dollar, another simple mathematical calculation reveals that railroad labor took approximately $41½ million of the total transportation loss resulting from imported residual's displacement of coal.

Not only does the deluge of residual oil weaken the coal industry, rob the miners and the mine owners, railroads and railroad workers, oil industry owners and oil workers, of profits and jobs and wages, but it also undermines our Nation's self-sufficiency.

The United States production of residual fuel oil has been held relatively constant over the postwar years, with the 1951–52 figures being only 2 and 5 percent over the 1946–48 averages. On the other hand, world oil production and refinery operations outside the United

States have grown rapidly in the last decade. Foreign refineries produce a substantially higher proportion of residual oil than do the United States refineries, partly because of the refinery processes used and partly because of the gravity of the crudes used. Cheap foreign residual entering the American ports in quantity results in depressed prices for residual oil domestically produced and depressed prices for coal from eastern fields which must meet the competition of foreign residual or get out of the market altogether.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come when we, the Members of the Congress, must pursue not a policy that is detrimental to the economy of this Nation and which impairs its strength while enriching other nations, but a policy that will strengthen our beloved country by assuring development of its own oil and coal—the basic energy sources on which we must pin our hope if war comes. And who is there to say that the hour is not already near at hand?

In these perilous days, there can be no choice. It is time to act. Twenty-one bills, including my own, have been introduced in this body which would limit the permissible importation of foreign residual fuel oil in any calendar quarter to five percent of the total domestic demand for the corresponding quarter of the previous year.

I hope that the Congress will act quickly to stop the flood of cheap residual which is creating havoc within our midst.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks literally millions of income-tax returns have been filed by persons who while they are not liable for any tax payments have been forced to spend $4 or $5 to have their returns prepared.

While the battling forces of this Republican administration are accomplishing nothing in the way of tax relief and because of this lack of agreement are actually contributing to the possible loss of a substantial source of income, namely, the excess-profits tax, which will expire without giving any relief to those who need it most, I want to call the attention of the leadership to a relief which can be extended to millions of persons in the lower income brackets without any loss of revenue to the Federal Government by giving attention to a proposed change which would eliminate the filing of returns by those whose income is not sufficient to require a payment.

Also, Mr. Speaker, if this administration is actually interested in giving relief to those who are in the greatest need I respectfully call your attention to the advisability of increasing the exemption rather than reducing the percentage of tax.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 35 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the other special orders.

GREAT LAKES STORM DAMAGE DEDUCTION ON INCOME-TAX RETURNS

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that on Friday last the Commissioner of Internal Revenue handed down a ruling which affects not only the people of my district but the citizens of all Great Lakes States.

Under this ruling, which comes under section 23 (e) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, as limited by section 24 (a), the Bureau has taken the position that damage which is done to property by storm or some other sudden event of nature may be deducted from gross income when computing net income for tax purposes; while damage which is done to the same property by erosion or inundation cannot be so deducted.

Under the provisions of this ruling, Mr. Speaker, a man whose house is along the lake and whose basement is flooded or whose walls are broached by the high water of a storm, may deduct the cost of repairing that damage from his income, but the same man whose foundations are shaken because the bank is washed away by exceptionally high waters is not permitted to deduct the cost of repairs made to his house because of this exceptionally high water. As a matter of fact, if he moves his house or repairs a seawall to prevent the damage because of this erosion, he is deemed to be improving his property instead of saving it.

Mr. Speaker, as usual the legal reasoning behind the interpretation of the statute would appear logical and clear on the basis of precedent, and the Bureau is undoubtedly on firm legal ground, but this is not just a question of clear legal interpretation—it is also a question of right and justice. It is my hope that the Committee on Ways and Means will institute such legislation as is necessary to correct this interpretation of the law which brings about such inequity. There has been property damages in excess of $60 millions in the Great Lakes Basin area during the years 1947 to 1952 because of the abnormally high-water level of the Great Lakes. Those whose property has been damaged by this abnormally high water should receive equal treatment with those whose property has been damaged by the abnormally high water of a storm.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, statistics show that there is more need by more people for social-security coverage today than there was 18 years ago when the system was started.

The number of people who are 65 and over quadrupled between 1900 and 1950. If the present trend continues, 325,000 more people will live beyond the age of 65 this year than did in 1952.

Today we have about 13,000,000 people in the United States who have passed the age of 65. This is almost 6,000,000 more than there were when the social-security system was started in 1935.

The proportion of people older than 65 in the overall population is increasing, too. In 1900, for example, those over 65 represented only 4 percent of the total population. Today they represent 8 percent and, in another 20 years or so, it is estimated they will represent about 20 percent.

Facts show that relatively few older people are working today. In 1900 about 60 percent of those over 65 worked. Today only 40 percent of that group work.

It seems obvious that it would be for the good of the country to broaden social security now so that practically all the gainfully employed can receive protection under some type of retirement system. In this way people will have the basic protection of social security upon which they can build additional protection through their own private arrangements.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on House Joint Resolution 223.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INCOME TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Federal individual income tax is now so high that it complicates business, stifles the development of new industries and the expansion of pay rolls.

The present individual income tax is diminishing drastically the purchasing power of every United States community.

These oppressive taxes should be reduced and the Government should protect the people in the possession of the money they have earned by the sweat of

their brow, instead of robbing them of their earnings through exorbitant taxation.

H. R. 1, a bill to reduce taxes, is to relieve the people of some of the crushing tax load now depriving them of the liberty to spend their own income. The following editorial is in point:

People only have so much money to spend, and if things cost more, they buy less of them.

And when people buy less things, less things are made. And when less things are made, less labor is employed. So when taxes are high, not only does the consumer bear the burden, but labor shares the burden. Similarly when taxes are high, less manufactured goods are bought and made and less raw material is used and sold.

The evil of high taxation falls blightingly on the farmer and on the miner, and all producers of raw materials. It falls devastatingly on the consumer because of high prices and his consequent loss of purchasing power or diminution of return for his money. It falls ruinously upon labor, because the fewer goods are sold the fewer goods are manufactured, and the less labor is employed. It falls destructively upon our foreign trade, because high prices make competition in foreign markets impossible. It even opens up competition to foreign nations in our domestic markets; because when high taxation sufficiently raises the cost of our home products it makes it possible for foreign manufacturers to pay our tariff and still compete favorably in our home markets.

The Republican Party promised tax reduction to gain power. Based on this promise the voters elected a Republican administration for the first time in 20 years. When the Congressmen return home for their Easter vacation they will be called upon by their constituents to explain why they have failed to reduce taxes as promised. What will your answer be? What will your answer be when the 1954 congressional election rolls around?

You will not need to answer if the Republican Party keeps faith with the voters by passing H. R. 1 to give 11-percent reduction to 30 million withholding taxpayers on July 1, 1953.

If H. R. 1 is not passed by the House, then the indignant voters of the country will say, "We shall send a man or a woman to represent us in Congress who believes with us that excessive taxation creates and constitutes deflation—the worst kind of deflation. Taxation takes money out of general circulation, and gives it to the Government. Taxation provides the Government with money to buy gold to store in the ground in a virtual financial concentration camp. Taxation gives the Government the people's money to support parasitic politicians, Representatives who violate their election pledges to reduce taxes."

Taxation taxes money out of productive labor-employing enterprise and gives it to nonproductive bureaucrats. Taxation takes the money the people would spend at stores and gives it to idle jobholders.

If the people have less money, they will buy less goods; and if they buy less, they will have less comfort and convenience and they will give less employment.

Taxation in a word means depression, and it also means oppression, and excessive taxation means destruction. Let the people keep the money they earn. Let them be able to buy what they want and need. Let their purchases stimulate production and employment. Men at work make production and prosperity—not men on a dole. If spending is a stimulus to prosperity, let the people spend their own money on themselves, and on their fellow workers and not on an ever-increasing horde of idle, useless politicians.

The time for the Republican Party to match its promises with performance is now, not when it is too late to give the tax relief to 30 million withholding taxpayers on July 1 of this year. These are the persons who are hoping and praying for the 11-percent increase in their take-home pay.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 117 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be made pursuant to House Resolution 109, by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs), acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 1 after the word "That," insert "effective January 3, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 128, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1953, the expenses of the investigations and studies conducted pursuant to House Resolution 127, by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000, including expenditures for employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after "committee", strike out "or subcommittee."

Page 1, line 9, after "committee", strike out "or subcommittee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS — STUDIES AND INSPECTIONS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 168 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective March 5, 1953, the expenses of conducting the study and inspection authorized by House Resolution 34 of the 83d Congress incurred by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITION TO CASTILLO DE SAN MARCOS NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1530) to supplement the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2020), relating to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that some of the local people are trying to resolve some difficulties that will make this bill completely acceptable to all parties in the area affected. I understand that this compromise arrangement is to be worked out in the very near future, but they have requested, in the meantime, that no action be taken on the legislation. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDE FOR ADDITION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1532) to provide for the addition of certain

Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Interior without reimbursement or transfer of funds, administrative jurisdiction over an area of approximately 21⅝ acres of federally owned land, formerly designated as the Naval Amphibious Training Station, together with any improvements thereon which may exist at the time of the transfer, situated on Ocracoke Island within the village of Ocracoke, County of Hyde, in the State of North Carolina. The property so transferred shall be administered by the Department of the Interior and shall become a part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, when established.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF PRISONS EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 395) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the Department of Justice and the General Accounting Office are not inclined to recommend enactment of this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FACILITATING THE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1524) to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to facilitate the administration of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection therewith, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, to carry out the following activities, and he may use applicable appropriations for the aforesaid system and miscellaneous areas for the following purposes:

1. Rendering of emergency rescue, fire fighting, and cooperative assistance to nearby law enforcement and fire prevention agencies and for related purposes outside of the aforesaid areas.

2. The erection and maintenance of fire protection facilities, water lines, telephone lines, electric lines, and other utilities adjacent to areas administered by the National Park Service, where necessary, in the administration of such areas.

3. Transportation to and from work, outside of regular working hours, of employees of Carlsbad Caverns National Park, residing in or near the city of Carlsbad, N. Mex., such transportation to be between the park and the city, or intervening points, at reasonable rates to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior taking into consideration, among other factors, comparable rates charged by transportation companies in the locality for similar services, the amounts collected for such transportation to be credited to the appropriation current at the time payment is received.

4. Furnishing, on a reimbursement of appropriation basis, all types of utility services to concessioners, contractors, permittees, or other users of such services, whenever necessary to insure adequate and uninterrupted service to the public: *Provided*, That reimbursements for cost of such utility services may be credited to the appropriation current at the time reimbursements are received.

5. Contracting, under such terms and conditions as the said Secretary considers to be in the interest of the Federal Government, for the sale, operation, maintenance, repair, or relocation of Government-owned electric and telephone lines and other utility facilities used for the administration and protection of the national park system and miscellaneous areas, regardless of whether such lines and facilities are located within or outside said system and areas.

6. Acquiring such rights-of-way as may be necessary to construct, improve, and maintain roads within the authorized boundaries of any area of the said national park system and miscellaneous areas, and the acquisition also of land and interests in land adjacent to such rights-of-way, when deemed necessary by the Secretary, to provide adequate protection of natural features or to avoid traffic and other hazards resulting from private road access connections, or when the acquisition of adjacent residual tracts, which otherwise would remain after acquiring such rights-of-way, would be in the public interest.

7. The operation, repair, maintenance, and replacement of motor and other equipment on a reimbursable basis when such equipment is used on Federal projects of the said national park system and miscellaneous areas, chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies. Reimbursement shall be made from appropriations applicable to the work on which the equipment is used at rental rates established by the Secretary, based on actual or estimated cost of operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment management control, and credited to appropriations currently available at the time adjustment is effected, and the Secretary may also rent equipment for fire-control purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal agencies that cooperate with the Secretary in the administration of the said national park system and other areas in fire control, such rental to be under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the amount collected for such rentals to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time payment is received.

SEC. 2. (a) The term "national park system" means all federally owned or controlled lands which are administered under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended, and which are grouped into the following descriptive categories: (1) National parks, (2) national monuments, (3) natural historical parks, (4) national memorials, (5) national parkways, and (6) national capital parks.

(b) The term "miscellaneous areas" includes lands under the administrative jurisdiction of another Federal agency, or lands in private ownership, and over which the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to cooperative agreement, exercises supervision for recreational, historical, and other related purposes, and also any lands under the care and custody of the National Park Service other than those heretofore described in this section.

SEC. 3. Hereafter applicable appropriations of the National Park Service shall be available for the objects and purposes specified in the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 885).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 7, strike all of subsection 2 and insert in lieu thereof:

"2. The erection and maintenance of fire protection facilities, water lines, telephone lines, electric lines, and other utility facilities adjacent to any area administered by the National Park Service, where necessary, to provide service in such area."

Page 3, line 1, strike the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon, and add "*Provided*, That if adequate transportation facilities are available, or shall be available by any common carrier, at reasonable rates, then and in that event the facilities contemplated by this paragraph shall not be offered."

Page 3, line 5, strike all of subsection 4 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"4. Furnishing, on a reimbursement of appropriation basis, all types of utility services to concessioners, contractors, permittees, or other users of such services, within the areas administered by the National Park Service: *Provided*, That reimbursements for cost of such utility services may be credited to the appropriation current at the time reimbursements are received.

"5. Furnishing, on a reimbursement of appropriation basis, supplies, and the rental of equipment to persons and agencies that in cooperation with, and subject to the approval of, the Secretary of the Interior, render services or perform functions that facilitate or supplement the activities of the Department of the Interior in the administration of the national park system and miscellaneous areas: *Provided*, That reimbursements hereunder may be credited to the appropriation current at the time reimbursements are received."

Page 4, line 4, strike the figure "5" and insert the figure "6."

Page 4, line 12, strike the figure "6" and insert the figure "7."

Page 4, line 22, change the period to a colon and add "*Provided*, That no land or interest in land may be acquired without the consent of the local taxing body by adoption of appropriate resolution."

Page 5, line 1, strike the figure "7" and insert the figure "8."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, occasionally the National Park Service finds it necessary to construct and maintain utility lines and facilities in areas outside of, but adjacent to, areas under its administration in order to provide utility service within the park area and to avail itself of opportunities to effect economies in cost of construction and maintenance. The committee has amended

subsection 2 to make it clear that this authority may be exercised when necessary to facilitate the furnishing of service only in the areas under the administration of the National Park Service. This subsection does not authorize the furnishing of any utility service to users outside the boundaries of any area administered by the National Park Service.

Subsection 4 is required by the National Park Service to simplify accounting procedures concerning the sale of essential utility services. It would authorize the application of receipts derived from the sale of utility services to reimburse appropriations. In some instances, in the case of emergencies, receipts are authorized to be used to reimburse appropriations, pursuant to authority contained in section 4 of the act approved May 26, 1930—Forty-sixth Statutes, page 382, Sixteenth United States Code, 1946 edition, section 17c. Basic statutory authority is required in order to continue arrangements presently in force and to provide legal authority for future similar agreements. No additional costs will result from this authority. The committee has amended subsection 4 to make clear that it is not intended by this subsection to authorize the National Park Service to provide utility services to users outside the boundaries of areas administered by the National Park Service.

AMENDMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS ACT OF 1945

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2561) to further amend the act of May 29, 1945, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property, occurring incident to their service" by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do I correctly understand that we would be paying claims for all of those connected with the military who have property in Europe if the Russians were to move and overrun Western Europe? Would we be paying the claims for all the personal property that has been moved over there by 40,000 or 50,000 dependents of servicemen and civilian employees of the military? I wonder if there is anyone here who can answer that question?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest the gentleman propound his inquiry to the Committee on the Judiciary. While it has some relation to the Department of Defense, this bill was considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, not the Committee on Armed Forces.

Mr. FORD. If the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I understand this proposal is simply an extension for a 2-year period of the existing legislation, to permit the Department of the Army to consider properly claims submitted to it as a result of the war we now have in Korea. The legislation would have expired, and they have been unable adequately to handle the claims that have been presented, which I understand are legitimate.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that this would not apply to the property of servicemen and civilian employees of the military presently in Europe if Western Europe were overrun by the Russians and their property lost? This then would not apply to such personnel or their dependents?

Mr. FORD. I would not want to be absolutely certain in answering the gentleman's question. I suspect that if Western Europe were overrun by the Soviet forces those stationed there at the present time would have a legitimate claim subsequently against the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. So we would stand to pay out from the United States Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars to indemnify those losers?

Mr. FORD. I suspect that that is the case.

Mr. GROSS. What is the limit today on the amount of property that can be shipped overseas by a member of the Armed Forces or a civilian employee?

Mr. FORD. There are certain weight limitations. I do not suspect there are dollar limitations.

Mr. GROSS. It is probably not advisable to delay extension of this legislation but I warn that indemnification for personal property losses of the thousands upon thousands of Americans in foreign countries, and particularly the huge tonnages of such property being shipped overseas, is a subject that should have the immediate consideration of the proper committees in this Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (d) of the act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 225), as amended by Public Law 439 of the 82d Congress, is hereby further amended by deleting therefrom the first proviso of that subsection and substituting therefor the following: "*Provided*, That, if a claim accrues in time of war or in time of armed conflict in which Armed Forces of the United States are engaged, or if war or such armed conflict intervenes within 2 years after it accrues, it may, on good cause shown, be presented within 2 years after such good cause ceases to exist, but not later than 2 years after peace is established or the armed conflict terminates. The dates of commencement and termination of an armed conflict for the purpose of this subsection shall be as established by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by determination of the President:".

SEC. 2. Effective as of July 3, 1952, section 2 (b) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (Public Law 450, 82d Cong.) is repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISBURSING OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2567) to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), is hereby amended by—

(a) striking out the words "and within 2 years from the passage of this act."

(b) striking out the date "July 1, 1946" and substituting therefor the date "July 1, 1948."

SEC. 2. The provisions of the above-mentioned act of July 26, 1947, as amended by this act, shall be applicable in like manner and with like effect to disbursing and certifying officers and special disbursing agents of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized, through such officer as he may designate, (a) to relieve disbursing and certifying officers, including special disbursing agents of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, from accountability or responsibility for losses, occuring between September 8, 1939, to July 1, 1948, of funds, or of accounts, papers, records, vouchers, or data pertaining to said funds, for which said officers or agents were accountable or responsible; and (b) to allow credits, in the settlement of accounts of said officers or agents, for payments made in good faith on public account during said period, notwithstanding failure to comply with the requirements of existing law or regulations pursuant thereto: *Provided*, That in cases of losses or payments involving more than $2,500 the Comptroller General shall exercise the authority herein only upon the written recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, which recommendation shall be concurred in by the Attorney General if the amount exceeds $10,000 and which recommendation shall also set forth the facts relative to such loss or payment and shall state that such transaction, expenditure, loss, or payment appears to be free from fraud or collusion and incurred or made in good faith: *Provided further*, That the Comptroller General in all cases shall certify that such transaction, expenditure, loss, or payment appears to be free from fraud or collusion and incurred or made in good faith."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM to the committee amendment:

Page 1, immediately after the enacting clause insert the following: "That the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493) is hereby amended to read as follows."

Page 2, line 9, after the date "1939" strike out the word "to" and insert "and."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar today.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up a privileged resolution (H. J. Res. 206) to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) upon the request of any Member, officer, or committee of the House of Representatives and with the approval of the Committee on House Administration, but subject to the limitations hereinafter prescribed, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to furnish electrical or mechanical office equipment for use in the office of such Member, officer, or committee. The cost of such equipment shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

(b) The original cost of equipment furnished under this joint resolution, together with the original cost of any equipment purchased under House Resolution 318, 82d Congress, which may be in use in the office of a Member at any one time shall not exceed $2,500.

(c) The electrical or mechanical office equipment which may be furnished under this joint resolution for use in the office of a Member shall be limited to not more than two of each of the following general types of equipment:

(1) addressing machines;
(2) automatic typewriters;
(3) electric typewriters;
(4) recording machines for dictating and transcribing; and
(5) duplicating machines.

SEC. 2. Electrical or mechanical office equipment furnished under this joint resolution shall be registered in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and shall remain the property of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. The last paragraph under the heading "Contingent expenses of the House" in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby repealed, and the provisions of House Resolution 318, 82d Congress, shall not hereafter be in effect.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this joint resolution, the term "Member" means a Representative in Congress, a Delegate from a Territory, or the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico.

SEC. 5. The Committee on House Administration shall prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "Member", insert "officer, or committee."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "Member", insert "officer, or committee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AN ANTI-COMMUNIST EDUCATIONAL PLAQUE, THE TRUTH ABOUT COMMUNISM, THE ENEMY OF FREEDOM, IS PRESENTED TO SPEAKER JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.—CEREMONY RECORDED BY THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the honor, along with other Members of the House, to participate in one of the most unusual and important ceremonies, in my opinion, ever held in our Nation's Capital. The ceremony was held in the Speaker's room, at which time an anti-Communist educational plaque called "The Truth About Communism, the Enemy of Freedom" was presented to Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., honoring this great statesman for his outstanding leadership and patriotism, and at the same time bringing to the attention of the people of the Nation and the world a program designed for the classrooms of the schools to teach our youth while they are still in school the truth about this evil ideology called communism, and what it would mean to the American way of life.

The plaque was presented to the Speaker in behalf of its author, Ernest G. Albright, by Representative WILLIAM C. COLE, of Missouri. Those attending the ceremony were as follows: Harold H. Velde, of Illinois, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities; Martin Dies, of Texas, former chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities; William C. Cole, of Missouri, author of bill to outlaw the Communist Party in America; William H. Colmer, of Mississippi; Tom Steed, of Oklahoma; Ernest G. Albright, author of the plaque, and myself. Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Director of the Veterans' Administration, was invited to attend but was detained because of his official duties.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there is not a Member of this House who would not do anything possible to help fight and expose communism wherever it is found. However, in these confusing days when we are talking about investigating various subversive groups in our Nation, we should pause and consider seriously our actions. We are all talking about communism and Communists, and many times we accuse people of being a Communist when we ourselves are not fully informed as to the meaning of this evil ideology. And I am afraid that we have so carelessly used the term "Communist" that it has become more or less a political football.

I, for one, am willing to go along with any committee to investigate to the fullest extent any group or individual where evidence points that they are affiliated with any movement to hurt our Government.

Mr. Speaker, recently it has been charged that the clergy of this country might be infiltrated with communism and that they should be investigated. My friends, communism is a godless philosophy or ideology. And I want to say here, as one who believes in God and the Christian religion, that if communism is to be destroyed, one of the main bulwarks that will help to destroy it is the church. And we must depend upon the clergy to fight it from the pulpit, and we should not in any way cast reflections upon those men of God who have given their lives in the field of service to bring the message of Jesus Christ on earth. Therefore, let us be sure of our ground before we take drastic action.

In closing may I again refer to this plaque. I believe in one short page that this disabled veteran has said more than has been written in many books dealing with communism. I feel that, in view of the fact that it is so concise, so easy to remember, this plaque should hang not only in every classroom of our schools but also in a conspicuous place in every public building in America.

For the information of the Members of the House, I am including as part of my remarks the complete transcript of the ceremony held in the Speaker's room, together with a press release concerning the event and the recording of the Voice of America.

The press release follows:

MEMO TO THE PRESS, PHOTO, RADIO-TV NEWS SERVICES

Monday, March 9, at 11:30 (sharp) in Speaker's room (off House floor), the following group will meet—Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., Veterans' Administration; Hon. Harold H. Velde, Illinois, chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities; Hon. Martin Dies, Texas, former chairman, Committee on Un-American Activities; Hon. William C. Cole, Missouri, author of bill to outlaw Communists in United States of America; Hon. William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Hon. George S. Long, Louisiana; and Hon. Tom Steed, Oklahoma—to take part in a ceremony presenting to the Honorable Joseph W. Martin, Jr., an anti-Communist educational plaque, "The Truth About Communism, the Enemy of Freedom."

PURPOSE OF PLAQUE

The plaque, written and designed to use in the classrooms of the schools of the Nation, has for its purpose the teaching of the youth, while they are still in school, the truth about communism and its danger to the American way of life.

HISTORY OF PLAQUE

In 1948, Ernest G. Albright, of Oklahoma, a disabled veteran of World War I, left his sickbed in the veterans' hospital at Biloxi, Miss., to come to Washington to testify before Representative COLE'S Subcommittee on Election's, which was considering a bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States of America. It was while testifying before this committee that Albright saw the need for some program to teach our youth just what communism would do to the American way of life. Returning to Biloxi, he wrote the anti-Communist school plaque. In 1950, a group of Oklahoma civic and industrial leaders had the plaque published. Among the group were D. W. Hogan, Sr., president of City National Bank, Oklahoma City; Frank Buttram, president of Buttram Oil Co., Oklahoma City; John H. Dunkin, Brown-Dunkin Department Store, Tulsa, Okla.; and W. G. Skelley, president of Skelley Oil Co., Tulsa.

The plaque is now in use in many schools in Oklahoma. Last June, Albright accompanied his former boss, Hon. William H. (Alfalfa Bill) Murray, former Governor and Con-

gressman from Oklahoma, to New York, where a plaque was presented to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. (Albright served as page in Congress with Murray when the former Governor was a Member in 1914.)

The author has refused to commercialize the project. He represents no organization and is paid no salary. The plaque is presented to the schools free without personal profit. Only the actual cost and distribution expenses are paid by the sponsors. Albright's only ambition is to place the plaque in all the schools of the Nation.

The plaque won a 1951 Freedom's Foundation award at Valley Forge, Pa., in February 1952.

Following is the transcript of the Voice of America:

VOICE OF AMERICA SPECIAL EVENTS RECORDING

Title: Representative WILLIAM C. COLE, Republican, Missouri, presents an anti-Communist educational plaque to Speaker JOSEPH MARTIN, Republican, Massachusetts (also statement by Ernest G. Albright, originator of plaque).

TEXT

Representative COLE. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Mr. Ernest G. Albright, author of the plaque, The Truth About Communism, the Enemy of Freedom, I am delighted to present to you a copy of this great document.

Speaker MARTIN. Well, I am very happy to get from you this plaque that has been given by Mr. Albright. As one who has sacrificed for freedom he realizes the necessity of freedom being everywhere, all over the world. And so he is trying to teach the American people and the peoples of the world the real truth about communism, in the hopes that we can rally everybody who believes in freedom and opportunity for the individual to stand steady in support of that great principle. The American people have no ambitions upon the territory or any desire to encroach upon the prerogatives of other nations. And so all they ask is that the other nations of the world respect freedom as they do.

Mr. ALBRIGHT. This is Ernest G. Albright. I have been asked to read the plaque:

"THE TRUTH ABOUT COMMUNISM, THE ENEMY OF FREEDOM

"Religion

"Communists claim there is no God and that all churches should be abolished.

"Public schools

"Communists believe that all schools, both public and private, should be controlled by the Federal Government and administered by a central government agency.

"Press, radio, television

"Communists believe that newspapers, press services, magazines, television, and radio broadcasting stations should be taken over, owned, and operated by the Federal Government, placing all news under a Federal censorship board, and that public forums be abolished.

"Business, industry, agriculture

"Communists believe that the Federal Government should take over and control all business of every type, including all banks, stocks and bonds, investment houses, building and loan companies, insurance companies; all public utilities, such as power, light, gas, telephone, and telegraph companies; oil and gas fields; railroads, bus, and air lines; all retail and wholesale stores and the movie industry; all phases of agriculture.

"Labor

"Communists believe that all free labor organizations should be abolished and workers forced to join a federally controlled, slave labor trade union, without collective bargaining.

"Medical services

"Communists believe that all medical and dental professional services, including all doctors and all hospitals, both private and public, should be owned, operated, controlled and directed solely and entirely by the Federal Government and denying any citizen the right to choose his own doctor or hospital.

"Civic, fraternal

"Communists believe that all commercial, civic, fraternal, and patriotic organizations such as the Rotary, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, Cosmopolitan, Toastmasters, and Kiwanis Clubs; the chambers of commerce and trade organizations; the Masons, Elks, Knights of Columbus, Knights of Pythias, and Odd Fellows; the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of World War II; all school fraternities; the American Red Cross and Salvation Army; Boy and Girl Scouts of America should be dissolved and prohibited.

"Farmlands

"Communists believe that farmlands should be socialized and owned by the Federal Government and that all farmers be forced to work for the Government as sharecroppers.

"Profit system

"Communists believe that the profit system should be abolished and that no citizen receive more than is needed for housing, food, and clothing.

"Dictatorship

"Communists believe that the Government of the United States should be taken over by force and ruled under a foreign dictator.

"America

"These are a few of the liberties America will lose if Communists win their objectives. Our country, under God, became the greatest Nation on earth through free enterprise and individual initiative. Let's keep it free and great."

THE MRS. EARL BROWDER CASE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 35 minutes.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, several days ago a news item appeared in one of the local papers that probably brought but a passing glance from the average reader, but behind which lies a story of one of the most flagrant violations of our laws that has ever come to my notice. I refer to the article regarding the warrant of arrest for the deportation of Raissa Irene Browder, wife of Earl Browder, deposed head of the Communist Party in the United States.

The complete story of this agent of the Kremlin has never been told and I think the American public is entitled to know the facts. I will be as brief as the facts permit.

The story begins in Russia in the year 1926. That year Earl Browder was on one of his many trips to the Communist shrine. Incidentally, it is very apparent that Browder was traveling on a fraudulent passport as the State Department has no record of having issued him a passport in 1926. On April 25, 1926, while in Russia, Browder secured a Russian divorce from his wife, Gladys, and on September 15, 1926, married Raissa Berkmen. I am not a lawyer, but I seriously doubt the legality of that divorce.

Mrs. Browder remained in Moscow where two children were born to her—one in 1927 and the other in 1931. On or about November 1, 1933, Mrs. Browder entered the United States by crossing the Canadian border. She was without the proper visa and therefore her entry was illegal.

On October 31, 1939, 6 years after the illegal entry of Mrs. Browder, the Immigration and Naturalization Service issued a warrant for her arrest. In an attempt to forestall the arrest of his wife, Earl Browder, on November 15, 1939, filed a petition with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, stating that he was married to Raissa Berkmen Browder in Russia on September 15, 1926; that he was an American citizen by birth; that he was employed by the Communist Party of the United States of America, and was able to support his wife, and that his wife was entitled to a nonquota visa exempt from the limitation of the Russian quota. Mr. Browder was advised that the records of the State Department failed to show he had been issued a passport for travel to Russia in 1926. He promptly abandoned his petition.

On August 30, 1940, Mrs. Browder was given a hearing at which time she was represented by Carol Weiss King, well-known attorney for prominent Communist Party members. Under oath, Mrs. Browder stated that she belonged to no political party in the United States; that she had no connection with the Soviet Government; that she was not familiar with the aims of the Communist Party in the United States, and, in fact, never gave it a thought.

On October 29, 1940, the Board of Immigration Appeals ordered Mrs. Browder deported, and on October 30, 1940, Attorney General Jackson refused to exercise the discretion, conferred upon him by law, that would permit Mrs. Browder to remain in the United States.

On November 13, 1940, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt wrote the Attorney General on White House stationery as follows:

Will you please give me a statement on Mrs. Browder's case? I have had several letters on the rights and wrongs of it, and have promised to inquire.

With the attack on Russia in June 1941, the deportation of Mrs. Browder was laid aside. In November 1943, Mrs. Browder filed a motion for a reopening and reconsideration of her case on the grounds that there was now a new Attorney General who had not exercised his discretion in her case. Mrs. Browder's case was then referred to Mr. Ugo Carusi, executive assistant to the Attorney General, who returned it with the notation, "No need of review by the Attorney General." On December 2, 1943, the Board of Immigration Appeals denied the motion to reopen and reconsider.

On January 3, 1944, President Roosevelt wrote the new Attorney General for statements for himself and Mrs. Roosevelt on the Mrs. Browder case.

On January 6, 1944, Attorney General Francis Biddle reported to the President. He said, in part:

The Board's opinion stated that suspension recommendations are a matter of discretion, exercised with extreme care and only in deserving and meritorious cases, and that a full and frank disclosure by the applicant of conduct and activities, past and

present, is required so that a certificate may be made to Congress of worthiness and good moral character. In view of the applicant's failure to remove the doubts and evasions in the record in conformity with Attorney General Jackson's order, the Board's conclusion was the only logical result which could have been reached. Furthermore, we cannot overlook the policy considerations attendant upon the certification to Congress of as controversial a matter as the Browder case.

Subsequent to the first hearing Mrs. Browder made a request for voluntary departure. This was abandoned when she petitioned for a reopening and reconsideration of her case.

Between December 2, 1943, when the Board of Immigration Appeals denied the motion to reopen and reconsider, and January 19, 1944, something happened. On the latter date, Mrs. Browder was given another hearing for the purpose of voluntary departure and preexamination. And this before the same Board that had denied her motion or petition for reopening and reconsideration.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my desire to burden the record or usurp the time of other Members of this body but because of what has recently occurred in this case, I feel that I should insert in the RECORD at this point the opinion of the Chairman of the Board of Immigration Appeals, who, on the face of the record, seems to have made a complete about-face in the Mrs. Browder case.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Can the gentleman state the name of the Chairman of the Board of Appeals?

Mr. BUSBEY. Thomas G. Finucane.

On April 5, 1944, the Board labored and brought forth the following masterpiece of confusion and evasion. The Chairman of the Board, in his opinion, said:

On its first consideration of this case October 29, 1940, this Board directed the respondent's deportation to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the ground that she was in the United States in violation of the Immigration Act of 1924 because not in possession of an immigration visa at the time of entering this country. At the same time an application for suspension of deportation under section 19 (c) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1917 was denied. The order of the Board was affirmed by the Attorney General. A motion based on the record as it then existed seeking suspension of deportation was denied without prejudice December 2, 1943. A second motion dated January 17, 1944, requesting reconsideration and reopening of the case and for the privilege of voluntary departure under section 19 (c) (1) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and preexamination was filed with this Board. The application for suspension of deportation was abandoned. We granted this motion to the extent of directing further hearing. The hearing has been accorded and the case is now before us on the issue of whether this discretionary relief prayed for should be granted.

That the respondent is deportable on the ground that she lacked an immigration visa required by the Immigration Act of 1924 when she entered the United States from Canada in November 1933 without undergoing immigration inspection is not questioned. The only issue is whether she should be accorded relief permitted by section 19 (c) of the act of 1917, as amended.

The respondent was married to Earl Russell Browder, a citizen of the United States, in Moscow in September 1926. She has had three sons by this marriage, two born in Moscow and one in New York, all citizens of the United States. They reside with her and her husband in New York. At the original hearing, the respondent testified that her husband is the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States and that she assisted him as a secretary and by doing research for his writings and speeches. The original record was at best sketchy as to the respondent's beliefs concerning the tenets of the Communist Party.

The authority to authorize suspension of deportation or to grant voluntary departure under section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917 is limited by section 19 (d) which so far as pertinent to the consideration of this case prohibits the grant of either relief to aliens subject to deportation under the act of October 16, 1918, as amended. This act provides for the deportation, among other groups, of aliens who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or who have been members of or affiliated with any organization that believes in or advocates such overthrow.

In the consideration of the case in 1940, although not concluding that the respondent was deportable under the 1918 act, Attorney General Jackson held he could not make an affirmative finding that she was not because of a failure on her part to disclose fully her political beliefs made necessary because she was the wife of an outstanding member of the Communist Party of the United States, Earl Browder. The Attorney General further held that the record as then constituted did not justify granting the relief requested. He pointed out, however, if the respondent desired to come forward and produce evidence to dissipate the doubts induced by the record, she might at any time prior to deportation move to reopen the hearing.

The recent hearing accorded the respondent was to enable her to "dissipate the doubts" induced by the original hearing. At this hearing she answered all questions propounded to her. First, it must be remembered that there is no direct evidence of any kind that the respondent is or ever was a member of the Communist Party in this country or in Russia or had views in common with those who thought the Government of the United States should be overthrown by force or violence. The respondent denied that she was a member of the Communist Party in Russia and denied membership in any organization of any kind in this country except a parents-teachers organization in Yonkers. Her life as revealed at the last hearing, both in Russia and in this country, gives no basis for inferring anything to the contrary, and in fact is consonant with her testimony. The respondent graduated from Petrograd University in 1917, while the Czarist government was still in power. She studied law, which included a course in political economy. Her interest, however, has not been political economy but education, specializing in criminology and delinquency of young children. Prior to her marriage to Earl Browder in Russia on September 15, 1926, she supported herself by teaching. Her attitude toward the political upheaval in Russia was that of an observer rather than of an actor, although, she says, she was in full accord with the overthrow of the Czarist regime.

The respondent met her husband, Earl Browder, at a social function when he was a journalist and writer. She denied that then she knew his political theories. Her interest in him was not as a political personage but as a man. It was not until after Earl Browder was elected general secretary of the Communist Party that the respondent discovered he was a member of that party. Sometime after she came to this country the respondent says she helped her husband to the extent of doing some historical research, finding special quotations and special material for him, specifically in reference to Thomas Jefferson, and doing some typing. This work was done at home. She claims to have known only a few of her husband's political associates, and these few seldom visited her home. In a word, she claims that the maintenance of her home and caring for her three sons so occupied her time that she had little left for political matters.

In reference to her political beliefs, the respondent testified that she has read the Communist Manifesto, the program of the Third International and parts of Das Kapital, but says she has not studied these documents. When questioned specifically in regard to her beliefs in communism or in the capitalist system, her reply was that she had not made a sufficient study to form an opinion and that she did not believe she was competent as an expert to discuss the question. This explanation is reasonable remembering that the respondent is by occupation a housewife.

We conclude, therefore, that the doubts heretofore entertained in this case concerning the respondent's possible membership in or affiliation with an organization believing in or advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence, or belief in the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violance have been dissipated by the last hearing. There is nothing but favorable comment on the respondent's character and demeanor during the years she has lived in the United States. Upon full consideration of the entire record and because of her three United States citizen sons, we conclude that she should be permitted to depart from the United States at her own expense rather than be formally deported and granted preexamination.

Order: It is ordered that the order of deportation of October 29, 1940, and the warrant predicated thereon directing the deportation of the respondent to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be withdrawn.

It is further ordered that an order of deportation not be entered at this time but that the alien be required to depart from the United States without expense to the Government to any country of her choice within 6 months after notification of decision conditioned upon arrangements being made with the local immigration office for verification of departure.

It is further ordered that preexamination be authorized conditioned upon approval by the Department of State of the alien's preliminary application for an immigration visa.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that the opinion I just read was written by the same person who, on October 29, 1940, wrote:

Such answers, coming from the wife of the leading representative of the Communist Party in this country and from an individual, furthermore, who, according to her own testimony, has assisted him actively in preparing his articles and speeches, are hardly credible.

And who, again on December 2, 1943, wrote:

The doubts and evasions mentioned in the opinion of Attorney General Jackson and in our former opinion have not been dispelled nor have these been any proffer of evidence which might tend to dispel them. The respondent has persisted in her failure to remove these doubts and evasions.

Inasmuch as both Earl Browder and his wife, Raissa—or Irene as she is sometimes referred to—have been indicted for

perjury in connection with obtaining voluntary departure and preexamination, it is now clear that the Board of Immigration Appeals was guilty of malfeasance when they, on April 5, 1944, authorized the preexamination. Whatever information was available to obtain the indictment was available to the Board of Immigration Appeals upon proper inquiry.

For instance, the Daily Worker of May 28, 1938, says:

Comrade Irene Browder's report to the commission dealt in detail with every phase of party activity with definite proposals for work among women, the mass of Italians, Jews, Poles, and Germans in the Nation.

Mrs. Browder's report was published in toto in the September 1938 issue of the Communist, official monthly publication of the Communist Party, U. S. A. It is replete with such phrases as "comrades," "our commission," "our party," and so forth. When considered with the fact that Mrs. Browder made her report at the Tenth Convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., it is a little hard to understand the conclusion of the Board of Immigration Appeals that "there is nothing but favorable comment on the respondent's character and demeanor during the years she has lived in the United States."

It cannot be said that the State Department was without information concerning the questionable activities of Mrs. Browder for there was in the files of the State Department a lengthy memorandum dated May 10, 1944, reciting numerous facts regarding Mrs. Browder and concluding with this paragraph:

It is submitted that her activities and writings show clearly she was an important member of the American Communist Party at least in 1938 and 1939, which membership would render her ineligible under the act of June 28, 1940, and for exit permit and subsequent entry on a quota immigration.

The decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals authorized preexamination conditioned upon approval by the State Department of Mrs. Browder's preliminary application for an immigration visa. Mrs. Browder then applied for a visa. A committee for preliminary hearings unanimously rejected the application. A review committee consisting of a representative of the Army, Navy, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the State Department then voted 4 to 1 against granting the visa. The lone vote in favor of granting the visa was by the State Department representative.

The case then went to the Board of Appeals for Visa Cases. This Board was made up entirely of political appointees. In the opinion, signed by Robert J. Buckley and Milton J. Helmick, the Board said:

It would be a clumsy thing for the United States ever to seek to separate her from her family and deport her on the basis of her alienage from a home in which she has lived nearly 11 years.

The American consular officer in charge of the Montreal office was then notified that the State Department "has no objection to the issuance of an immigration visa to Raissa—Mrs. Earl—Browder, also known as Irene Browder and Raya Berkmen, who is presently residing at 7 Highland Place, Yonkers, N. Y."

On October 26, 1944, Julian L. Pinkerton, a Foreign Service officer at the consulate general in Montreal, testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities. He stated that in the latter part of August the consulate at Montreal received a letter from the attorney of Mrs. Browder, and after talking the matter over with Mr. James E. Callaghan, his immediate supervisor, he replied to Mrs. Browder's attorney saying that Mrs. Browder might come to Montreal to make formal application if she wished, but that she might be found ineligible under the immigration law to receive a visa. Mr. Pinkerton further testified that several days later Mr. Callaghan told him he had just received a call from Mr. Traves, Chief of the Visa Division of the State Department in Washington, who said that the letter to Mrs. Browder's attorney had caused concern among her friends and advisers and that the Montreal office should have known better than to send a letter to Mrs. Browder's attorney that was practically a refusal of the visa; that Mr. Travers said he had fought the issuance of a visa to Mrs. Browder but that his chief told him that refusal of a visa at that time would be very embarrassing. Mr. Pinkerton further testified that Mr. Callaghan made it very clear that when Mrs. Browder made an application at Montreal she was to be issued a visa. He said he was given orders not to ask Mrs. Browder any embarrassing questions and that he did ask her a few innocuous questions and issued the visa which was signed by Mr. Callaghan.

On March 15, 1948, Mr. Travers, Chief of the Visa Division of the State Department, testified before the same committee. He stated he did not tell Mr. Pinkerton that a visa to Mrs. Browder must be granted. He said he was approached by Consul General Byington with the question:

What is the big idea of sending an instruction up here to grant a visa to Mrs. Browder? You know very well that she is a Communist.

The witness said that after a meeting in Secretary Hull's office he was informed by Mr. Berle that Secretary Hull had stated that President Roosevelt did not desire to be embarrassed by having Mr. Stalin take the matter up with him on one of his trips where he was to meet Mr. Stalin and that he felt that the good of the country demanded that the visa should be granted. When asked as to what influence was brought to bear in the Raissa Browder case the witness stated:

I think it was the White House—Mrs. Roosevelt, that is, Miss Thompson, to Mr. Hull and to Mr. Berle, and then through to me.

Further light on the political aspects of this case is revealed in a memorandum to Mr. Stettinius from Mr. Travers, dated October 31, 1944, just a few days before the election. The memorandum is as follows:

Complying with your request, the following is a brief résumé of the Browder case.

Mr. Carusi, who was then the executive assistant to the Attorney General, telephoned to me and asked that every possible consideration be given to Mrs. Browder's case. He said that he was sending the BC forms to me personally; I asked him at that time how she could be admitted under the Immigration Act and he stated that the Board of Immigration Appeals had decided that she had not been a member of or affiliated with the Communist Party.

The case then went to the Primary Committee, on which the Military Intelligence Service, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and the Department of State were represented and was unanimously refused as it was considered that Mrs. Browder was inadmissible. It then went to the Interdepartmental Visa Review Committee and was refused by a vote of 4 to 1. The matter was then taken up with Mr. Carusi in a letter from Mr. Berle to Mr. Carusi. Mr. Carusi replied and gave a copy of the findings of the Board of Immigration Appeals. The case then went to the President's Board of Appeals, which reversed the Primary and Review Committees and found Mrs. Browder to be admissible insofar as the public safety was concerned. Confidentially, it was my opinion then, as it is now, that the findings of the Board of Immigration Appeals are erroneous. I do not believe that they had the benefit of the entire file as I believe it is generally known that Mrs. Browder has been affiliated with the Communist Party. The matter was discussed with the Secretary and Mr. Gray, of the Secretary's office. It was my feeling that if the Browders were friendly to the administration and to our Government that they would not demand that the case be considered just prior to election as it was bound to be made a political issue.

The authorization to grant a visa was forwarded to the American consulate general at Montreal and Mrs. Browder was informed accordingly. The consulate general forwarded a regular form letter to Mrs. Browder informing her that she should present herself in person at the consulate general supplied with the necessary documents. A postscript was added to the general effect that a visa would be withheld if it were found that she was inadmissible under the Immigration Act and I believe that she telephoned to Washington to inquire as to the meaning of such a postscript. I discussed the matter again with the Secretary's office and with Mr. Berle and it was decided that I should telephone to the consulate general and state that the case had been approved by the immigration board of appeals and by the President's board of appeals. When I telephoned, the consul general was in the hospital for an eye operation. Consul Johnson, who was temporarily in charge, was at lunch and I therefore spoke with Vice Consul Callahan, who is in charge of issuing visas. I gave him the information concerning the board's decision and told him that the case had a green light, but certainly never stated that the visa must be issued nor did I imply that they had been stupid in the handling of the case, as has been indicated by the newspapers.

Consul Pinkerton examined the documents when they were submitted by Mrs. Browder and was evidently very much perturbed concerning the issuance of the visa as it had been he who had placed the postscript on the letter to Mrs. Browder. Unfortunately, Mr. Pinkerton had a nervous breakdown some time previous and for that reason had not been placed actually in charge of the visa office. He was annoyed at not being placed in charge but I feel the consul general was quite correct as he could not have stood the nervous strain in his nervous condition. We must realize that this officer had recently been a patient at St. Elizabeths and to put him in charge would have been criminal.

Personnel records will show, I believe, that roughly a month prior to this case being given any publicity that he had presented himself at the Department and, I understand, was given leave for 1 year without pay or until he could regain his mental equilibrium.

I have had many telephone calls from newspaper correspondents and have seen Mr. Donoghue of the Hearst papers on two occasions. It seems that Mr. Pinkerton went to a lawyer named Grimes to state his case and it is rumored that Mr. Grimes is a strong Dewey supporter. You have, no doubt, seen that considerable publicity has been given on the matter, which I shall be glad to submit should you desire.

Mrs. Browder entered the United States on the visa granted her by the State Department. On April 12, 1946, she filed a petition for naturalization in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

On March 31, 1947, the Immigration and Naturalization Service filed a lengthy memorandum setting forth the history of the Raissa Browder case, her activities and affiliations, with the statement that she is ineligible for naturalization and the facts should be presented to the court.

Thus the case of Raissa Browder lay quietly gathering dust until, in the dying days of the Fair Deal, she and her husband were indicted for perjury.

If she committed perjury in 1940, why did it take 12 years to discover it? The Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Department of Justice and the State Department could have obtained sufficient information regarding Mrs. Browder's activities to know that she was perjuring herself when she testified under oath. In fact, the record favors the conclusion that the several Government agencies and departments were aware of the fact. Who is responsible for this mess? There is much more to the Browder case, but time does not permit a detained analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this matter be referred to the proper committee of the House for a thorough and complete investigation and determination as to who is responsible for this deliberate and willful evasion of our laws. Any committee of Congress is welcome to all the information I have concerning the manipulations by the State Department to obtain a visa for the wife of the head of the Communist Party of the United States.

PUBLIC UTILITIES LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution relative to the regulation of utilities within the District of Columbia. Similar legislation has been public law in Illinois since 1934. In our State it is called the Illinois Public Utility Act, impairment of capital of public utility, dividends; powers of commission.

Before introducing this resolution I have conferred with Mr. Harrison, of the corporation counsel's office. Mr. Harrison has conferred with Mr. Spencer, of the utilities commission. Both of these gentlemen state there is no such legislation relative to utilities in the District of Columbia. It applies to all utilities, and is a safeguard in the public interest.

I have no way of knowing to what committee this resolution will be assigned. Regardless of where the Speaker assigns it, I will ask for immediate consideration of it. I believe the legislation is justified and a safeguard for the District of Columbia regardless of any present utility controversy.

If it has proved a safeguard in Illinois, it should prove the same for the District of Columbia. I have talked by phone with the Honorable George Perrine, of Illinois, chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, and he stated to me that the law has been proven in the public interest.

The Illinois law is as follows:

(1) Whenever the commission finds that the capital of any public utility has become impaired, or will be impaired by the payment of a dividend, the commission shall have power to order said public utility to cease and desist the declaration and payment of any dividend upon its common and preferred stock, and no such public utility shall pay any dividend upon its common and preferred stock until such impairment shall have been made good.

(2) No utility shall pay any dividend upon its common stock and preferred stock unless:

(a) The utility's earnings and earned surplus are sufficient to declare and pay same after provision is made for reasonable and proper reserves.

(b) The dividend proposed to be paid upon such common stock can reasonably be declared and paid without impairment of the ability of the utility to perform its duty to render reasonable and adequate service at reasonable rates.

(c) It shall have set aside the depreciation annuity prescribed by the commission or a reasonable depreciation annuity if none has been prescribed.

If any dividends on common stock are proposed to be declared and paid other than as above provided, the utility shall give the commission at least 30 days' notice in writing of its intention to so declare and pay such dividends and the commission shall authorize the payment of such dividends only if it finds that the public interest requires such payment: *Provided, however,* That the commission may grant such authority upon such conditions as it may deem necessary to safeguard the public interest.

THE EQUAL-SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the present session of the 83d Congress I introduced House Joint Resolution 74, known as the equal-rights amendment. I also introduced this resolution in the 82d and in the 81st Congresses and also sponsored it for a brief time in the 80th Congress after the passing of Mr. Robsion, of Kentucky, who was the original sponsor.

We have worked with many women's organizations and many women throughout the country for the passage of this amendment. It is a very simple amendment and it is a constant source of amazement to me that there can be any possible opposition to it. The amendment reads as follows:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

3. This amendment shall take effect 1 year after the date of ratification.

May I say that this amendment has had the endorsement of both political parties in 1944, 1948, and 1952 in their party platforms? The Republican Party platform endorsed it as far back as 1940. It merely follows the logical pattern set by the Women's Suffrage amendment which was passed many years ago and it is a remarkable thing that it has not been passed before.

Some will try to make you believe that if this amendment is passed the status of women will be completely changed. Of course, we know that is utterly ridiculous. We know that you are not going to change anything fundamentally. But by this amendment you are going to make women first-class citizens. You are going to make women in the United States first-class citizens as they are in every country in the world that has a modern constitution, because in all these new constitutions the words appear that there shall be no discrimination on account of race, creed, color, or sex. This is also true in the U. N. preamble where women are given full equality and where it is so stated.

Some may say: Oh, well, women are very well-treated in the United States, in fact they have many advantages that they will lose under this legislation. That, of course, is a matter for debate. Maybe some women do have privileges, maybe a small group is very well taken care of, maybe there is a wealthy class where women have larger incomes, where they pay a big income tax, where they are protected; but there are many women, the rank and file of women in the United States, who do not have this protection.

Mr. Speaker, although it may not come under the same act, women will never get equal pay for equal work until they have equal rights. That is the primary and the fundamental reason why this amendment should be written into the Constitution of the United States. But granting that we pass this amendment in the House and that it is passed in the other body, as we hope it will be—it is sponsored in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, Senator BUTLER—even then it is still up to the States. If the States reject it, it will not become a part of the Constitution. Therefore I cannot see why Members of this body should be so fearful about contemplating the passage of this amendment.

May I say for those who are afraid and frightened by certain pressure groups, that there is a change in the temper of the country toward this amendment? Many organizations that used to be against it are now coming

over to our side; some who are more obstinate in their opposition merely say that now they have no objection, that they do not consider the amendment will make too much difference. They even say that the amendment will not make any difference.

People will ask: How about your special legislation for women? The answer to that is a very simple one. What about your special legislation for veterans? Does that put them in a different category? Does that say that they will not have equal rights under the Constitution? Why, of course we have to have special legislation for many groups, but that does not change their constitutional rights. We have to have special legislation for the needy, for the sick, for the aged, for the veterans, and, if you please, for women. That is not going to change their being first-class citizens and that, after all, is all we want.

Then it has been asked, How about the protection and the advantages women will receive? How about alimony? All I can say in answer to that, Mr. Speaker, is that if this amendment will stop the alimony racket in the United States it should be passed for that reason if for no other reason. No American woman can be proud of the alimony racket and certainly if that can be ended by any legislation we should all welcome it. That is nothing to boast of or to be proud of.

But women are not being given jobs that they could well fill and that are highly paid. Women in this country are still being discriminated against under the guise of protection. I have spoken on this before many times, but I have to reiterate it again.

Take the matter of night work for women. Women are not allowed to do certain jobs after the hour of 11 or midnight. They are not allowed to wait in restaurants. They are not allowed to run elevators. Both these jobs are highly paid during the night hours, but I have never heard anybody criticize the fact that a woman can go in and clean and scrub an office all night long. That apparently is perfectly all right and has never been questioned. It is illogical, it is stupid. The answer is that the job is not quite as well paid.

No; there are many people who are still anxious to keep the women on a lower plane as far as the labor market is concerned. Personally I do not want to see women get better jobs because they are women. I only want to see them get them if they have the capacity to do the work. But I think it is unfair to have things as they are today, where a woman can get a job only if she is just a little bit better than a man. I think we should be fair. I think that women should be paid equally. I think they should be given equal status, and I believe that where they need protection on account of sex there is absolutely nothing under this amendment that can possibly preclude their getting it. There is no reason why women should not have maternity care and maternity benefits, just as much as that the veteran should get hospitalization and special care for the suffering that he has undergone as a veteran. The veteran is doing something for his country that the women cannot do. On the other hand, the women are doing something for their country that the veteran and the men cannot do. So we know, and we admit, and we welcome the fact that there is a difference between the sexes, and we know that this amendment will in no way change the facts of life and will in no way change the laws governing these differences.

I am happy to report that 12 identical bills have been introduced into this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks the numbers of these bills, as well as the names of the sponsors, and a list of 122 Members of this House who have expressed themselves as being favorable toward this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

BILLS INTRODUCED ON EQUAL RIGHTS 83D CONGRESS

House Joint Resolution 64, MILLS, Arkansas.

House Joint Resolution 74, ST. GEORGE, New York.

House Joint Resolution 90, POULSON, California.

House Joint Resolution 146, DAVIS, Tennessee.

House Joint Resolution 148, HARRIS, Arkansas.

House Joint Resolution 175, VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania.

House Joint Resolution 182, WILSON, California.

House Joint Resolution 185, REED, New York.

House Joint Resolution 186, BARRETT, Pennsylvania.

House Joint Resolution 191, CHUDOFF, Pennsylvania.

House Joint Resolution 197, THOMPSON, Michigan.

House Joint Resolution 198, GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania.

SPONSOR LIST FOR EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED BY WOMEN'S PARTY GROUP

Alabama: FRANK W. BOYKIN, CARL ELLIOTT, LAURIE C. BATTLE.

Arizona: JOHN J. RHODES.

Arkansas: WILBUR D. MILLS, OREN HARRIS, W. F. NORRELL.

California: HUBERT B. SCUDDER, JOHN E. MOSS, JR., J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, ALLAN OAKLEY HUNTER, ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, DONALD L. JACKSON, CARL HINSHAW, NORRIS POULSON, HARRY R. SHEPPARD, JAMES B. UTT, JOHN PHILLIPS, ROBERT C. WILSON, HARLAN HAGEN, CHARLES S. GUBSER.

Colorado: BYRON G. ROGERS, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

Connecticut: JAMES T. PATTERSON, THOMAS J. DODD.

Florida: A. S. HERLONG, JR., DWIGHT L. ROGERS.

Illinois: RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, EDGAR A. JONAS, LESLIE C. ARENDS, WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, MELVIN PRICE, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN.

Indiana: E. ROSS ADAIR, EARL WILSON.

Iowa: THOMAS E. MARTIN, HENRY O. TALLE, H. R. GROSS, PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

Kansas: CLIFFORD R. HOPE.

Kentucky: BRENT SPENCE, CARL D. PERKINS, JAMES S. GOLDEN.

Louisiana: F. EDWARD HÉBERT, OTTO E. PASSMAN.

Maine: CHARLES P. NELSON.

Maryland: EDWARD T. MILLER, JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, GEORGE H. FALLON, DEWITT S. HYDE, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL.

Massachusetts: HAROLD D. DONOHUE, EDWARD P. BOLAND.

Michigan: GERALD R. FORD, JR., RUTH THOMPSON, ALVIN M. BENTLEY.

Minnesota: EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, HAROLD C. HAGEN.

Missouri: MORGAN M. MOULDER.

Nebraska: R. D. HARRISON, A. L. MILLER.

Nevada: CLIFTON YOUNG.

New Jersey: CHARLES R. HOWELL, WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, GORDON CANFIELD, FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

New York: STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, J. ERNEST WHARTON, LEO W. O'BRIEN, DEAN P. TAYLOR, BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, WILLIAM E. MILLER, EDMUND P. RADWAN, JOHN R. PILLION, DANIEL A. REED, ALBERT H. BOSCH, WILLIAM R. WILLIAMS.

North Dakota: USHER L. BURDICK, OTTO KRUEGER.

Ohio: FRAZIER REAMS, THOMAS A. JENKINS, WILLIAM H. AYRES, ROBERT T. SECREST, FRANK T. BOW, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, WAYNE L. HAYS, GEORGE BENDER, GORDON H. SCHERER.

Oklahoma: TOM STEED.

Oregon: HOMER D. ANGELL.

Pennsylvania: WILLIAM A. BARRETT, WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, EARL CHUDOFF, IVOR D. FENTON, JAMES G. FULTON, ROBERT J. CORBETT.

South Dakota: HAROLD O. LOVRE, E. Y. BERRY.

Tennessee: PAT SUTTON, CLIFFORD DAVIS, JOE L. EVINS.

Texas: OLIN E. TEAGUE, FRANK IKARD, BRADY GENTRY, LLOYD M. BENTSEN.

Utah: DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW.

Vermont: WINSTON L. PROUTY.

Virginia: HOWARD W. SMITH.

Washington: RUSSELL V. MACK, WALT HORAN, THOR C. TOLLEFSON.

West Virginia: HARLEY O. STAGGERS, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN.

Wisconsin: GARDNER R. WITHROW, ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, WILLIAM K. VAN PELT.

Hawaii: JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have many friends in Congress and out of Congress who will help with the amendment and who will help in securing its passage. I am also happy to say that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has assigned this amendment and this bill to a subcommittee, and it is my hope that this subcommittee, under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] will take up the study of this brief, simple, noncontroversial amendment, will work on it, will report it to the House favorably, so that we can see who our friends really are, what is going to happen to it, and then turn it over to the States and let the States decide. After all, in the world at large, this legislation is already a foregone conclusion. It has taken place everywhere: In India, in Russia, behind all the Iron-Curtain countries, not that we intend to imitate them in any way. It is also true that it exists in France and England, and practically wherever parliamentary procedure is now in existence. The only reason we have not had it written into our Constitution is that our Constitution is very, very old, and in the days when it was written no such thing was contemplated any more than woman's suffrage was contemplated. During the fight for woman's suffrage the same arguments, exactly, were advanced as are advanced against this amendment. We were told that women would regret suffrage; that it would completely change

the Government; that it would completely change the home. Of course, it has done nothing of the kind. It has made very little difference, in fact, in the number of women interested in politics. That, I as a female politician, deplore. But when you look at how few women have come to the House of Representatives or to the Senate, you can see that woman's suffrage has not made a very great difference. It has not made a great difference in the American home because most women, all right-minded women in fact, are more interested in their homes than they are in going into politics. So they have to go into politics when they already have reached a certain age, and that means that all the best jobs and all the experience has already been preempted by the men and so, you see, they do not get any further anywhere. I can assure those of you who may be fearful that the world and the country is going to be taken over by women on account of the passage of this amendment, that it will not be so.

What it will do is give equality, so that men and women can work together in our country as they do all over the world as first-class citizens together, as patriots together, and as people who are going to work for the good of their country for the equality of both sexes.

There is no more reason why a man should be penalized than a woman. There is no more reason why a man should have to pay alimony to a woman who chooses to marry one husband after another just to collect alimony than that a woman should pay alimony for a like reason.

There is no reason, for instance, why my husband cannot sell any property in the State of New York without my signature, but I can sell any property I want without his signature.

So you see the amendment is a just amendment. It is just for both sides. It is not going to revolutionize the world, it is not going to change the status of women very much, but we do believe that working through this amendment we may in time see women get equal pay for equal work, an equal status and an equal right to take their place beside their men as they have always done anyway in our history, as they did in the days of the pioneers and as they can do today. The American woman wants no privileges. The American woman is willing to stand on her own two feet beside her man and beside the men of the Nation and work for the United States of America. We will work together, but we will work far better together if we work as equals.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I simply want to compliment the gentlewoman on her very fine statement, and to say that the women of America have no better advocate than she in behalf of their interests. I trust that in the persistency and the consistency of her views she will make them felt in the near future.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague. I hope I can count on his help.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN), for 1 week, on account of death in family.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT AND VISIT TO THE INFANTRY SCHOOL AT FORT BENNING, GA.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, had I been able to be here on Friday to attend my subcommittee meeting on the Treasury, I would have done so. However, I left for an inspection trip to the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga., where I believe I picked up information that compensated for what I might have lost here that day.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to list below a series of observations gained during the Fort Benning trip and what has been done about them:

(a) Contacted Department of Defense, Public Information Division, and the Department of State requesting that vocal and visual recordings be made of ceremonies showing the Korean officers graduating the Infantry School this week at Benning with particular emphasis on the Korean national anthem as it will be sung. Here for the first time, perhaps, the people of the free world will have a chance to see and hear the flower or Korean manhood render their national anthem in stirring mood. For the first time, I think, the west will see and hear the east unfold with a passion that will stir its heart. I was informed the Department of Defense likes the idea and will follow through on it. My contact to the State Department informed me the suggestion will be passed along. Here the Voice of America can bestir the Orient as it has never been stirred. I trust the commandant of the Infantry School, Brigadier General Malloy will give all concerned his fullest cooperation.

(b) On a visit to the congressional liaison office, Department of the Army, I asked several questions concerning Fort Benning activities. Some were:

(1) Why the officer candidates' pay scale has been changed from its prior status? Who authorized the change, and inasmuch as all candidates are on an equal footing for almost 6 months why they aren't equally paid? Here is Americanism with a low blow.

(2) Why officer candidates are not exposed to winter warfare tactics though they are trained in jungle and mountain survival techniques?

(3) Why officer candidates have not been shown any significant training films dealing with the Korean war, now in its third year? While it is appreciated that training companies have Korean-experienced officers in command, surely no one officer has lived through all the significant battle phases of the Korean war. Thus we deny our future combat leaders an exposure to valuable battle experiences by denying them these films. Why haven't they been shown? Or even made?

(4) What is the status of clothing allowance?

(5) What is there to the rumor that medical care for military dependents will soon be disallowed?

(6) Is it true that Regular Army officer survival benefits are less advantageous than Reserve officer survival benefits? Why?

(7) Is there a deliberate plan to demoralize our Armed Forces personnel here at home?

(8) Why hasn't the Armed Forces sold the American people on the fact that only what the ground soldier holds, civil government controls; that in spite of our Navy and our Air Force being able to shell and bomb offshore and overhead to the Yalu, the minds and hearts of the free world know that political control extends to just above the 38th parallel, Navy and Air Corps notwithstanding?

(9) Why don't we have a Chief of Infantry whose job it would be to fight for just such points and more, as are raised here?

There will be more to this, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VELDE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY.

Mr. HILL and to include a radio broadcast.

Mr. MASON on the subject Congress Can Stop Government Waste and to include excerpts from an article in the current Reader's Digest.

Mr. AYRES and Mr. MORANO.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON and to include an article.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous material.

Mr. REAMS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an editorial from the Toledo Blade.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances and to include certain statements.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. ABERNETHY and include a speech.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota and include an editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and include certain factual information.

Mr. JENSEN and include an editorial.

Mr. HOSMER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHERER and to include an editorial taken from the Paris Beacon News.

Mr. GROSS and to include copies of certain letters.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE and to include a newsletter.

Mr. PILLION and to include a statement.

Mr. REED of New York in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a letter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include en editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "What Eisenhower Said About Taxes."

Mr. BROYHILL in two separate instances, in one to include an editorial from the Alexandria Gazette and in the other a broadcast by Earl Godwin.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1188. An act to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 17, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

544. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a report of operations, expenditures and obligations under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953, pursuant to the act of June 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

545. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation amending section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, entitled "A bill to simplify the procedure for securing licenses to operate certain types of radio facilities"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

546. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation amending section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, entitled, "A bill to extend the time within which the Commission must act on a protest from 15 days, as now provided to a period of 30 days"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

547. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Virgin Islands Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

548. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

549. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Department of the Interior on a plan for the construction of the potential Payette Heights Unit, Payette Division, Boise project, Idaho, together with related documents and letters of comment on the report, pursuant to the authority of the Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

550. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a joint resolution entitled, "Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

551. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

552. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization dated January 16, 1953, authorizing the granting of conditional landing permits to bona fide alien crewmen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 212 (a) (28), pursuant to section 212 (d) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 117. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations authorized by House Resolution 109; with amendment (Rept. No. 159). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 128. Resolution to provide funds for the investigations and studies made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce pursuant to House Resolution 127; with amendment (Rept. No. 160). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 168. Resolution authorizing funds for the inspection of the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 161). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 206. Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 162). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1880. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of Northern Alaska for use as a mission school; without amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 3974. A bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the United States Senate; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3975. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 3976. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 3977. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to provide that station licenses shall be issued for an indefinite term, and shall be revoked only by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 3978. A bill amending section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 3979. A bill to prohibit picketing in the immediate vicinity of the White House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 3980. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 3981. A bill to restrain further deterioration of our currency and to restore confidence in the dollar by returning the currency of the United States to the gold standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 3982. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 3983. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENKINS (by request):

H. R. 3984. A bill to amend section 10 of the act of October 15, 1914, commonly known as the Clayton Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3985. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 3986. A bill to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3987. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 3988. A bill to provide automatic annual pay increases for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 3989. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to improve the credit services available to farmers seeking to adopt soil and water conserving systems of farming contributing toward development of a permanently and abundantly productive American agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 3990. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:
H. R. 3991. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RAINS:
H. R. 3992. A bill relating to the extension of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to ministers and members of religious orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:
H. R. 3993. A bill to establish effective means to determine Communist domination in unions and to eliminate Communists from positions of influence and control in labor unions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:
H. R. 3994. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADLAK:
H. R. 3995. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the receipt in bond and taxpayment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; and the production in bond and taxpayment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:
H. R. 3996. A bill to amend section 81, National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, and 176), to provide for the organization of the National Guard Bureau, and to define the responsibilities, functions, and duties of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3997. A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:
H. R. 3998. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:
H. R. 3999. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act for the purpose of prohibiting compulsory unionism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:
H. R. 4000. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:
H. R. 4001. A bill to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal, Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATTS:
H. R. 4002. A bill to provide for continuing retirement pay, under certain conditions, of officers and former officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, who incurred physical disability while in the service of the United States during World War I, World War II, or any subsequent conflicts in which the United States has engaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:
H. R. 4003. A bill to extend rural mail delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:
H. R. 4004. A bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York:
H. J. Res. 225. Joint resolution designating August 17 of each year as National Holstein-Friesian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:
H. Con. Res. 79. Concurrent resolution recommending a new 60-nation conference to consider the advisability of reorganization, revision, and amendment of the Charter of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials was presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature requesting the formulation of a plan for cooperation in the development of ground-water supplies on Indian reservations in central and southern Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature relating to the Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags and requesting the Congress to repeal this excise tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming: Memorial of the 32d State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Federal Communications Commission to continue the reservation of VHF television channel 8 at Laramie, Wyo., for educational purposes for a period of 2 years from the date of expiration of the original reservation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the 32d State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to passing legislation to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 32d Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to redefine the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 32d State Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America by proper action to quitclaim unto the State of Wyoming all right, title, and interest in and to all sections 16 and 36 within the State of Wyoming, whether surveyed or unsurveyed, so as to vest immediately in the State of Wyoming not only legal title to sections 16 and 36, when surveyed and not otherwise disposed of, but also with an indefeasible proprietary interest in all sections which are surveyed or were surveyed as of the date of the Enabling Act of July 10, 1890; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to granting the Territory of Hawaii statehood in the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, concerning the restoration to Congress of the fixing of tariffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to using money collected by Federal gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oil taxes upon Federal-aid primary highway systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting enactment of legislation providing for the withdrawal of Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to transmitting a copy of the civil defense and mutual aid interstate compact developed on the model form established by the Council of State Governments, and adopted for use by the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the restoration of the gold standard and to increase the price of gold commensurate with the present value of the dollar; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the approval of legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the establishment of peace between Israel and the Arab States and its essentiality to the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the enactment of legislation to readjust the boundaries of the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to redefine the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting legislation to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging the appropriation of funds to construct a road between Fairbanks, Nenana, and Healy, Alaska, during the 1953 building season; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting certain tax exemptions covering income derived from the industrial use and production of natural resources in Alaska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):
H. R. 4005. A bill for the relief of Frank T. P. Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4006. A bill for the relief of Karen McDougal Reed and Christine Cornell Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES (by request):
H. R. 4007. A bill for the relief of Joao Pinguel-Rodrigues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4008. A bill for the relief of Tomas Aguirre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4009. A bill for the relief of Jose Louis Barrenechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4010. A bill for the relief of Enrique Izaguirre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4011. A bill for the relief of Luis Izaguirre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARDY:

H. R. 4012. A bill for the relief of Guy Plumail, Mrs. Jacqueline Plumail, and Michael Plumail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4013. A bill for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 4014. A bill for the relief of Li Chiu Fu and wife, Leung Sue Wa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4015. A bill for the relief of Josef, Paula, and Kurt Friedberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4016. A bill for the relief of Silverio Bolsoni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4017. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land and improvements to the England Special School District of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 4018. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jackson S. Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4019. A bill for the relief of Eugene Lucci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 4020. A bill for the relief of Ahamad Meah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 4021. A bill for the relief of Reginald Wynne Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4022. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo D. Meadows; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

86. By Mr. HILLELSON: Petition of J. L. Lewis, and 35 others, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will reduce the tax burden caused by the payment of 32 cents out of every dollar earned by the average American; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

87. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Kenosha County Medical Society for the revision of the doctor draft law, Public Law 779; to the Committee on Armed Services.

88. Also, petition of members of the WCTU of Janesville, Wis., urging passage of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

89. Also, resolution of the Business and Professional Women of Burlington, Wis., in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project and in the joint participation of the United States with Canada in the development and control of the seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

90. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, Corning, Calif., requesting enactment of legislation to appropriate moneys necessary to bring the Veterans' Administration hospital program to the needed standards to meet the needs of the veteran population of California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

91. Also, petition of Mrs. Beulah Phillips, and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

92. Also, petition of Mrs. Faith B. Barkre, and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and gracious spirit, who hast made us for Thyself, may we now be numbered among the seekers and finders of God for we need Thee so greatly in our private and public life.

Grant that we may yield ourselves gladly and unreservedly to the guidance and discipline of Thy divine truth in order that our minds and hearts may be emancipated from all those fears which weaken, those doubts which darken, those sins which blind and deaden our souls, and those sorrows which make us lonely.

We are daily beseeching Thee that Thou wilt create within the hearts of men and nations those finer feelings and nobler thoughts which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a more glorious civilization.

Inspire us with the same lofty aspiration which filled the life of St. Patrick, Thy servant, whose Christlike character and ministry, many in this and other lands are honoring today.

Hear us in the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas; and

H. Con. Res. 64. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Washington State Whitman Statue Committee to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Dr. Marcus Whitman, the holding of ceremonies, and permanent location in Statuary Hall.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 173. An act for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter; and

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, on this special day—St. Patrick's Day—from the bottom of my heart I wish "you all"—of the North, the South, the East, the West—"The top o' the mornin'."

This is one day of the year when the world is divided into two classes—those who are Irish and those who would like to be Irish.

St. Patrick's Day is and always will be a day of national importance. I have heard it said not only that St. Patrick was a Scotsman but that he was a Republican. There is no question that he was an Irishman, either real or adopted, and by the results of the last election St. Patrick must have been on the side of the Republicans in the United States.

As direct descendants of the kings of Erin, the Republican Irish—the Allens, the Bates, the Bennetts, the Byrneses, the Corbetts, the Cunninghams, the Dollivers, the Dorns, the Gavins, the Goldens, the Heseltons, the Hillings, the Horans, the Kearneys, the Kearns, the Keatings, the Kilburns, the McConnells, the McCullochs, the McDonoughs, the McGregors, the McVeys, the Martins, the Meaders, the O'Haras, the O'Konskis, the Pattersons, the St. Georges, the Sheehans—all acclaim the affection we have for "the other side of the aisle" Irish: the Bolands, the Byrnes, the Carnahans, the Delaneys, the Dempseys, the Donohues, the Donovans, the Doyles, the Fallons, the Feighans, the Fogartys, the Granahans, the Harts, the Kelleys, the Keoghs, the Kildays, the Kirwans, the Lanes, the McCarthys, the McCormacks, the McMillans, the Macks, the Maddens, the Mahons, the Mollohans, the Murrays, the O'Briens, O'Hara of Illinois, the O'Neills, the Philbins, the Regans, the Rileys, the Rooneys, the Shelleys, the Sullivans, and the Suttons.

St. Patrick was a great missionary and early Christian. While in this House the Republican Irish may be slightly outnumbered by the Irish on the other side of the aisle, we promise you much missionary work in the next year.

Lest there be overconfidence on the side having the greater numbers, let it be said that the fighting Irish may have been outnumbered but never outfought. We shall send into this battle O'Konski, of Wisconsin, to convert O'Klein, of New York, and in reserve against the unbelievers we challenge you with "County Clare" Hoffman.

If anyone makes light of the difference in numbers, remember, there may be only one saint but many sinners.

Which proves conclusively that St. Patrick was an Irishman and a Republican.

But today on St. Patrick's Day—and for today only—all is sunshine and harmony among the Irish and the non-Irish

from alpha to omega—from ABBITT, of Virginia, to ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin.

Special greetings of affection to you all and Erin go Bragh.

LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS TO PUBLIC OFFICIALS FOR ACCRUED ANNUAL LEAVE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will exclude from the provisions of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, officials in the executive branch of the Government specified in Public Law 359, 81st Congress, the act which established the rates of pay of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent offices. This includes Presidential assistants and top level Presidential appointments.

This bill, when enacted into law, will prevent any such payments to department and agency heads in large sums such as has been recently disclosed by the Comptroller General's report to the Appropriations Committee. This report pointed out that some retiring department and agency heads of the Truman administration received in excess of $5,000 in accumulated annual leave. In fact, one high official received over $12,000 in a lump sum for accumulated annual leave.

In addition to legislation which will prevent such payments in the future, I am asking the Comptroller General to conduct such investigations as are necessary to determine whether or not there was misrepresentation in the certifications of officials calling for such large lump-sum payments for accumulated annual leave.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INQUIRY INTO CERTAIN OPERATIONS AND CONDITIONS IN KOREA

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 171).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense report to the Clerk of the House in broad general terms—

(a) the purpose of the combat raid called Operation Smack;

(b) whether a timetable for the attack was made available to invited guests before the attack was staged;

(c) whether the schedule for the attack was bound in covers and given a colored front;

(d) if the answer to the last question is in the affirmative—

1. what was the reason for that procedure?;

2. how many were printed and the number, by whom and to whom distributed?;

3. if schedules, or any advance notice of, or orders for, the attack were printed, to what officers—not individual names—were they distributed?; and

4. please furnish us a copy;

(e) who, if anyone, was present as visitors or spectators and, broadly, what were the reasons for the attendance of each?

(f) were motion pictures made of the operation? If the answer is in the affirmative—

1. by whom;

2. for what purpose; and

3. if made, by whom and for what purpose were they to be used in the United States, or elsewhere?;

(g) have the lines in Korea been more or less stabilized for a year? And, if so, what was the specific purpose of this raid?; and

(h) approximately how many men in the Armed Forces of the United States were killed, how many additional men in the Armed Forces of the United Nations lost their lives, and how many in each category were casualties?;

(i) who representing the press was present?;

(j) have there been shortages of ammunition and weapons in Korea? If the answer is in the affirmative—

1. during what time; and

2. to what extent?;

(k) at the present time, have the Armed Forces in Korea an adequate supply of ammunition and weapons, adequate food and clothing?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report contains all of the information requested in the resolution offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD in its entirety with the exception of the colored cover which is not readily susceptible of reproduction. At this point I might say that any Member of the House may look at the cover which merely contains the infantry division insignia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to let the Members of the House know that there is nothing on the inside, but the report, as the gentleman from Missouri states, does contain answers to the questions filed.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan, in order to be exact, that I think the report as I am submitting it for this purpose in its entirety with the exception of the reproduction of the cover will answer the questions in his resolution. Any Member of the House, however, is perfectly welcome to examine the contents of the folder which is in the safe over at my office. It is top secret, because it contains a minute description of battle actions and maneuvers.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SHORT. Gladly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand, the committee of the other body is going into this matter of ammunition anyway.

Mr. SHORT. That is quite correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO INQUIRE INTO CERTAIN OPERATIONS AND CONDITIONS IN KOREA

Mr. SHORT, from the Committee on Armed Services, submitted the following adverse report (to accompany H. Res. 171).

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 171) to inquire into certain operations and conditions in Korea, having considered the same, report unfavorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, March 14, 1953.

Hon. DEWEY SHORT,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for a report by the Department of Defense on House Resolution 171, 83d Congress, a resolution of inquiry into the circumstances surrounding Operation Smack.

The attached memorandum from the Secretary of the Army contains the information requested by the resolution.

Very sincerely yours,

ROGER M. KYES,
Acting.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1953.

Memorandum for: Secretary of Defense.

Subject: House Resolution 171, resolution to inquire into certain operations and conditions in Korea.

Reference is made to your memo routing slip of March 10, 1953, from Rear Adm. H. A. Houser, United States Navy, Director, Office of Legislative Liaison, Office of the Secretary of Defense, assigning to the Department of the Army the responsibility for preparing replies to Congress on the questions set out in House Resolution 171.

On February 3, 1953, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, appeared before the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and presented full factual information with respect to this military operation. Additional information which became available to the Department of the Army since that date was submitted to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives in connection with the report of the Department of Defense on House Resolution 121. The information furnished with respect to House Resolution 121 is, however, repeated herein so that an integrated report may be furnished to the committee with respect to House Resolution 171. The answers to the specific questions set out in House Resolution 171, to supplement the testimony of General Collins, are set out below.

(a) The purpose of the raid: The general purpose of Operation Smack was to destroy the enemy on the objective, to capture prisoners, to obtain military information of intelligence value, and to destroy underground

fortifications by the combined and coordinated employment of air-artillery-tanks and infantry.

(b) Whether a timetable for the attack was made available to invited guests before the attack was staged: A timetable, or better, an itinerary, outlining in prose style the main events including the tactical plan of attack and a withdrawal was furnished the observers just before the attack.

(c) and (d) 1. What was the reason for that procedure (using a colored cover)? The purpose of such a cover in this case was to identify the issuing headquarters and to indicate the security classification.

2. How many (covers) were printed and the number by whom and to whom distributed? The approximate number of mimeographed copies produced (none were printed) was 30. These were distributed by an officer of the Operations Sections, Headquarters 7th Infantry Division, to the commanding generals of the 5th Air Force, the 7th Infantry Division, the United States I Corps, and the 7th Infantry Division Artillery. In addition, copies were furnished to regimental and battalion commanders (a total of 7 officers) of the 7th Infantry Division, staff officers of the United States I Corps, and 7th Infantry Division (16 officers), and staff personnel of the 5th Air Force (3 officers). None were distributed to the press.

3. If schedules, or any advance notice of, or orders for, the attack were printed, to what officers—not individual names—were they distributed? It is believed that the answer to this specific inquiry is contained in 2 above. The schedules were presented to the officers indicated in the preceding paragraph at the briefing which occurred just prior to the actual attack.

4. Please furnish a copy of the schedule. There is attached hereto a copy of the operation plan for Operation Smack classified as Secret, although there is no security reason for protecting this operation now, since it has been completed. The operation plan, however, actually furnishes information on combat methods now employed in Korea and, for that reason alone, should not be made public at this time. It is, therefore, requested that this classification of the plan itself be retained and that the plan be returned to the Department of the Army when it has served the committee's purposes.

(e) Who, if anyone, was present as visitors or spectators and, broadly, what were the reasons for the attendance of each? In addition to the key military personnel described in the answer to (d) 2 above, 15 members of the press were invited by the public information officer of the 7th Infantry Division to attend as spectators although the action was in no way designed as a demonstration for military observer or spectator benefit. The arrangement for the press was in no way unusual and their presence was for the purpose of assisting them in obtaining a better understanding of the action to be expected and of the operation as a whole, so that they could report accurately to their respective news agencies timely items of interest that would fulfill their particular needs. Such procedure is not unusual, having been employed during World War II and during the more active phases of the present Korean conflict.

(f) Were motion pictures made of the operation? Yes.

1. By whom? Motion pictures were made of the operation by Mr. Knoshi Kiisuchi, representing Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer News of the Day, and Mr. Akri Shirashi, representing United Press television.

2. For what purpose? These pictures were taken for public newsreel release and/or television purposes.

3. If made, by whom and for what purpose were they to be used in the United States, or elsewhere? It is assumed that such pictures, if suitable, would be processed by the home offices concerned for public release within the United States and elsewhere. Established procedure provides that film processed by home offices shall be submitted to the Department of Defense Security Review Board for censorship prior to public release. To date no such pictures have yet been presented to the Security Review Board.

(g) Have the lines in Korea been more or less stabilized for a year? And, if so, what was the specific purpose of this raid? The lines in Korea have been more or less stabilized for about a year with both sides engaging in small-scale patrol activities and probes of defensive positions. Due to a number of factors, such as the extensive defensive works constructed by the enemy, and his reluctance to move about openly during the bitter cold months of winter, it has become increasingly difficult for United Nations forces to obtain ample numbers of prisoners for interrogation. Hence the specific purpose of this raid was solely military in nature and was, as stated before, to destroy the enemy on the objective, to capture prisoners, to obtain military information of intelligence value and to destroy underground fortifications by the combined and coordinated employment of air-artillery-tanks and infantry.

(h) Approximately how many men in the Armed Forces of the United States were killed, how many additional men in the Armed Forces of the United Nations lost their lives, and how many in each category were casualties? Friendly casualties resulting from this raid were as follows: Killed in action, 3; wounded in action, 61; and missing in action, 0. All casualties were United States Army personnel.

(i) Who representing the press was present? The following members of the press were granted permission to watch the operation: Forrest Edwards, Frederick Waters, and George Sweers, Associated Press; Louis Cioffi, Columbia Broadcasting System; Sarah Park, Honolulu Star-Bulletin; Ichiro Fujimura, International News Photos; John T. Casserly, International News Service; Knoshi Kiisuchi, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer News of the Day; Frederick Painton, United Press; Hisao Egoshi and Warren Lee, United Press Photos; Akri Shirashi, United Press Television; Irwin Fox, Voice of America; and M. Sgt. Richard H. Bertlett and Airman 1st Class Kenneth C. Johnson, Pacific Stars and Stripes.

(j) On March 10, 1953, the Chief of Staff, United States Army, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, appeared before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and presented full information with respect to the Army's ammunition situation. There is attached to this memorandum the statement submitted by General Collins to that committee, which answers the questions in House Resolution 171 concerning ammunition. There have been no shortages of weapons reported to me.

(k) At the present time, have the Armed Forces in Korea an adequate supply of ammunition and weapons, adequate food and clothing? Yes.

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

STATEMENT BY GEN. J. LAWTON COLLINS, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE, ON AMMUNITION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, before I enter into a discussion of the Army's ammunition situation, please allow me a few general observations in order to place my remarks in proper perspective.

First, I wish to reiterate my profound respect and admiration for General Van Fleet, who commanded with great gallantry the assault regiment of my VII Corps in Normandy on D-day. It has been my high privilege and pleasure to have recommended General Van Fleet for his first star; to have had a hand in his selection for assignment to Greece; and to have recommended him to command the Eighth Army. In my judgment he is one of the finest Army commanders ever to wear the American uniform.

My next observation is that we are literally fighting a war in peacetime—or what is supposed to be peacetime. This is something unprecedented in American history. We have been mobilizing, fighting a large-scale war, and demobilizing all at the same time. Never before have we struggled to meet enormous battlefield rates of consumption of materiel with only a limited mobilization of this Nation's great industrial capacity.

The next point is that when considering the ammunition situation, responsible authorities in Washington must consider not only each military theater of operations but the global situation as well. About 50 percent of our Army today is overseas. Most of our forces are in the Far East and Europe, but others are guarding vital outposts elsewhere throughout the world. The ammunition reserve stocks necessary, both overseas and in the United States, to back up these forces are of tremendous importance. Similarly, the commander of an active theater—such as the Far East Command which includes Korea—is responsible for, and must weigh carefully, the distribution of ammunition in his theater. Finally the 8th Army Commander must hold some ammunition in reserve and arrange a system for allocation to his front-line units. The fighting in Korea is, of course, the gravest concern of all of us. However, any examination of ammunition supplies in Korea cannot be isolated from our ammunition supplies worldwide.

It is not only natural—it is the duty of a field commander in battle to concern himself with the situation in his particular command. At times he may even disagree with a higher commander on what he thinks he needs to accomplish his mission; and it is entirely possible that they both may be right; for they are making their estimates from different points of view and with different responsibilities. It is also possible that their estimates may be based on different concepts of the job to be done. In other words, "What is the mission, and how is it to be carried out?"—or in layman's language, "What is the job, and how is it to be done?" and "How much is required to do that job?"

Every combat commander is interested in getting as many weapons and as much ammunition as possible for his troops. It is to be expected that vigorous, aggressive commanders will demand more and more ammunition. When I was a division commander during the campaigns on Guadalcanal and in New Georgia, and a corps commander in Europe, I was always concerned with the amount of ammunition I had, and the tanks, artillery and aircraft to shoot it, particularly if I thought I could get my hands on any more.

As I have said many times, I have not been satisfied and I am still not satisfied with our ammunition reserve stocks, which is really one of the true measures of our complete readiness to fight. However, before going further, let me emphasize that since the outbreak of the conflict in Korea the Congress has appropriated all the ammunition funds requested by the Department of Defense in its budgets on Army account. None of my remarks are to be construed as implying anything else, and, so far as I know, no responsible officer of the Army has ever said otherwise. Congress has done what it was asked to do, and has given us the ammunition funds which have been requested of it.

The Army's ammunition situation is nothing new.

On December 9, 1950, 6 months after the Korean war began, I told a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations:

"It will take some time to regain an acceptable reserve position."

On July 30, 1951, I reported the following to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

"If the fighting continues, there must result a consequent weakening of our readiness

posture because much of the equipment being procured would have to go to Korea, thus adversely affecting our planned war reserve position."

On May 5, 1952, I told a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, at a time when some consideration was being given by the Congress to a proposal to limit actual expenditures of money already appropriated by the Congress:

"We cannot cut ammunition—too many American lives are immediately at stake in Korea and too many American lives are potentially at stake in Europe. * * * The most severe drain has been on ammunition and we could not risk a reduction in deliveries under any circumstances. If combat in Korea should continue, or if our troops in Europe were attacked, we would have no reserves of some of the most important types of ammunition and our frontline troops would have to limit their ammunition expenditures to what came off our production line. Some of the types of ammunition most important to our frontline soldiers have been rationed in Korea because production still does not equal normal expenditures, and World War II stocks either have been exhausted or have approached exhaustion."

As a result of my testimony and that of the Secretary of the Army on that subject, Congress did not place a limitation on the expenditure of Army funds during fiscal year 1953.

[Discussion off the record.]

On March 5, 1953, I told a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations:

"The ammunition situation in the Far East Command is generally good, and is steadily improving. Ammunition stocks within the Eighth Army are on the whole up to the authorized level of supply. Our real problem is that we have not been able to fill the necessary reserves which the Far East Command needs."

So much for the ammunition reserve stockage for our worldwide needs which has been unsatisfactory, and still is, but which is gradually improving. Its rate of improvement depends on a number of factors which will be discussed in detail later.

But what about the ammunition in the hands of front-line troops in Korea?

Mr. Chairman, I have made seven trips to Korea since the fighting began, with the principal objective of determining the needs of our men on the ground. My first trip was on July 10, 1950, and my most recent one was in January 1953.

During the early fighting our troops were, in general, permitted unlimited quantities of ammunition, although it was necessary to control the firing of certain types from the very beginning. However, there has always been a sufficient supply to carry on the United Nations operations and to insure that our forces could withstand any attack the enemy could launch and sustain, considering his capabilities. I have no doubt but that there have been instances when small units have run short of ammunition because of unusual weather or terrain conditions or because of enemy action, but these instances have been rare and of a temporary nature.

Along with our concern for ammunition in the hands of troops in Korea has been our consideration of the overall reserves necessary to meet possible contingencies throughout the Far East Command. In this regard, the former theater commander in the Far East, General Ridgway, told this committee on May 21, 1952:

"We have had shortages, and we still do in certain categories * * * some artillery calibers, and we do not have quite the ammunition that has been authorized and which was felt necessary, which I recommended, and which was authorized from here. But that is on an ammunition stockage level, and I would say that generally there are adequate supplies of ammunition there now, except in one or two particular categories."

Only last week the present theater commander in the Far East, General Clark, said that there had been some rationing of artillery ammunition but added:

"There was always enough whenever we needed to shoot it—in any quantity. The Eighth Army has enough ammunition to stop any all-out Red offensive in Korea."

Here in the United States we have been concerned not only about the ammunition in the hands of troops, and in reserve in Korea and to meet contingencies in the Far East Command, but also about our overall reserves to meet a potential threat in Europe and elsewhere in the world. In this regard, a special subcommittee of the House visited Korea during the period August 15, 1952, to September 14, 1952. This is what the committee's report says:

"One of the principal matters of concern to the committee prior to its departure from the United States was the alleged shortages of ammunition in the forward areas. In Korea and the Far East, the committee was gratified to find that these alleged shortages of ammunition were by no means as critical as had been rumored. Based upon the testimony of high-ranking officers, the committee concluded that the ammunition supply is entirely adequate to meet the present tempo of the war and any foreseeable emergency that may arise. At the same time, considering the overall world picture, it is highly important that the production of certain types of ammunition be increased. Two factors which seem to have considerable bearing upon the production of ammunition are the recent steel strike and the apparently inevitable delay between determination of needs and the actual receipt of the ammunition end production. Factories must be placed in operation, assembly lines organized, and all of the other elements of mass production must be effectively carried out well in advance of the actual turnout of ammunition.

"There is no lack, however, in this respect from which the enemies of our country can receive any gratification or encouragement."

Thus far, I have tried to make it clear that there is a difference between ammunition stocks in reserve and those in the hands of front-line troops. That is why it is important that there be a complete understanding of just what we are talking about, for there can be wide differences in the use of the term "shortage." It is largely a matter of determining "how much is enough" and "enough for what purpose."

Our problem has always been—and this has often been stated publicly—that we have not been able to build our ammunition reserve stockages to the point where we feel they should be. On the other hand, there has never been a shortage of ammunition in the hands of our troops (unless some isolated instance because of local difficulties of distribution) either to repel an attack that actually developed or to conduct our own operations. It is important that this be understood not only to reassure the American people and their United Nations partners who have troops in Korea, but to give pause to the enemy who might otherwise be misled into further aggression because of a mistaken belief that such aggression could be successful.

To understand completely our current ammunition problems, it is necessary to review the pre-Korea days when the world situation was much less tense.

At the end of World War II the Army had rather large stocks of ammunition, but these stocks were not as useful as the quantities would indicate. Much of this ammunition had become "not ready for use" due to normal deterioration in storage. Because of these stocks of ammunition—large, but unbalanced in quantities of the different types of rounds, and to a degree unserviceable—and the understandable urge for economy in the early postwar years, the Army bought almost no ammunition prior to the fall of 1950 except for training and for new types. The record of obligations of appropriated funds during the period fiscal year 1947 through fiscal year 1950 shows that less than $25 million per year went toward ammunition. In the face of such small procurement and because of the regular firing of ammunition for training, our stocks were gradually being reduced.

[Discussion off the record.]

At that time, reserves of ammunition were concentrated chiefly in depots in the United States. The size of these depot stocks may appear quite formidable to anyone unfamiliar with the rate at which ammunition is expended in violent combat, such as began on June 25, 1950, against a ruthless Communist enemy with seemingly endless manpower. For a time our weapons fired without limitation. As our reserves fell off, and it became increasingly evident that the war in Korea was likely to be prolonged, it became necessary to exercise firm controls over the firing of ammunition through a system of allocation or rationing. But even with such a system in effect, let me illustrate the intensity with which the Korean conflict has raged. From June 1950 to December 31, 1952, we have fired against the Communist in Korea:

More than 600,000 tons of 105-millimeter ammunition.

More than 300,000 tons of 155-millimeter ammunition.

More than 75,000 tons of 8-inch howitzer ammunition.

More than 80,000 tons of 4.2-inch mortar ammunition.

More than 55,000 tons of 81-millimeter mortar ammunition.

More than 15,000 tons of 60-millimeter mortar ammunition.

More than 8,000 tons of grenades.

In addition, we have expended more than 1.8 billion rounds of small arms ammunition.

What do these figures mean?

They mean that we have expended in Korea:

Almost as much artillery ammunition as was shot during the whole of World War II in the Mediterranean and Pacific theaters combined.

Almost as much artillery ammunition as was expended in all theaters of World War II during 1944—the year when our operations were at their peak and expenditures were the heaviest.

The tremendous amounts of ammunition which we actually fired have enabled us to outshoot the enemy throughout the war in Korea. As indicated in this chart, which I would like to insert in the record, during 1952 we fired 22,917,757 rounds of all types of ammunition as compared with the enemy's 2,365,062, a daily average of 62,616 for us and 6,462 for the enemy. This means we fired nearly 10 times as much as the enemy did. Even at the peak of the enemy's artillery firing in October and November of last year, their daily average was 20,849, compared to our average of 119,137. In other words, during the month they did their heaviest firing we shot back six times as much.

These heavy expenditures in Korea have been necessary to save casualties and at the same time to destroy the enemy in his heavily fortified positions. I have supported these expenditures in every possible way even to the extent of lowering our depot stocks here in the United States.

[Discussion off the record.]

In summary then the reserves of certain kinds of artillery ammunition in the Far East command have not been as great as we would like to have had them during the past year and a half, even though Congress has appropriated all the money asked of it. Our difficulties are practically all traceable to the

fact that we have been fighting a large-scale war in Korea in "peacetime."

In order to build up the necessary emergency reserve stocks of ammunition in the Far East Command, it has been necessary to reduce our reserve stocks here in the United States, and it has been necessary to control the normal average daily firing rates of the Eighth Army in Korea. The control of firing rates is nothing new. It was necessary in past wars just as in this one. If commanders are given unlimited quantities of ammunition, there will be waste because of the natural tendency to fire if it is available. General Clark, as the theater commander, must maintain ammunition reserves not only for Korea but for Japan as well. Therefore he must allocate ammunition to the Eighth Army in Korea.

General Taylor, who is responsible for the entire front, must also maintain ammunition reserve stocks and must allocate supplies to his corps commanders, and they in turn to the divisions. This is possible without endangering our troops because attacks very seldom occur simultaneously along the entire front, and reserve stocks must be immediately available to support the sectors where combat is most violent.

Although ammunition reserve stocks and the allocation of ammunition have been necessary, a unit under attack is authorized to expend whatever ammunition is necessary to repel the attack. Similarly, a commander is authorized to expend all the ammunition necessary when conducting raids or similar operations.

As a result of my inspection in January 1953, I can report that the ammunition situation in the Far East Command is generally good, and is steadily improving. Ammunition stocks within the Eighth Army are on the whole up to the authorized level of supply. Again, I would like to emphasize that our real problem is that we have not been able to fill the necessary reserves which we believe are necessary within the Far East Command as a whole.

While I regret the necessity of going into such details for the record—if they have served the purpose of reassuring the American people that our troops at the front have the ammunition to defend themselves as they have so ably done in the past; if they have given notice to potential aggressors that fire will be met with much greater fire, then I feel that this has been well worth while.

WHAT CONSTITUTES A CRITICAL DEFENSE HOUSING AREA?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned today with the confusion and misunderstanding surrounding the phrase "critical defense housing area" as used in the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. The reason for my concern on this point will, I think, be crystal clear when you realize that the Oak Ridge, Tenn., area lies in my district.

And even though there has been a nearly continuous shortage of housing in the Oak Ridge atomic-energy area ever since the Manhattan project started, the Oak Ridge area cannot qualify as a "critical" defense housing area under the rent law as it is now written.

That the development of atomic energy is essential to defense is indisputable in this age of nuclear fission. That the availability of adequate and economically obtainable housing is a necessary aid to getting the job done at Oak Ridge as well as at other defense establishments is also an indisputable fact. Why then is it impossible for Oak Ridge to obtain a "critical" designation? Simply because, under the present rent law, the Congress requires there be a "substantial in-migration" of defense workers or military personnel before "critical" designation can be made for the area.

The requirement of "in-migration" is absurd when you think about it. To point up the absurdity consider this: The Oak Ridge area could be certified as "critical" if, in the face of the present critical housing shortage, a "substantial" number of additional personnel were brought into this Oak Ridge area, thus making an already dangerously tight housing situation a disastrous housing situation—and a still more serious threat to the successful operation of vital atomic energy plants.

This senseless restriction of "in-migration" before critical certification was written into the law 2 years ago by a Democratic-controlled Congress. It has no place in any sensible legislative standard for determining critical areas. Surely, we Republicans can do better than this. We can remove this proviso which has caused so much confusion and has operated in such an erratic manner that, if continued, it could result in a serious threat to the effectiveness of the whole mobilization program.

I am certain that when President Eisenhower called for the continuation of rent control beyond April 30 he had in mind situations such as exist in the Oak Ridge area and similar situations which exist in other defense areas.

Of all the major atomic energy centers, Oak Ridge is the only one which cannot qualify as a critical defense housing area. The Savannah River area, South Carolina and Georgia, the Arco-Blackfoot area in Idaho, and the Hanford, Wash., works are all now enjoying the full protection of the Federal rent-control law—but the Oak Ridge area does not have this protection from the ironic circumstance that it was in many ways the most important to the whole atomic energy program and was operating full blast even before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea.

Oak Ridge will not be able to get full rent-control protection and neither will a lot of other very important defense centers, unless the proviso dealing with "In-migration" is eliminated from any new rent-control law this Congress provides in answer to the request of the President.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received, as I suppose each of the Members did, a letter from a colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], advising everyone that today he will address the House for 1 hour.

I want to call the attention of the Members, Mr. Speaker, to the last paragraph of that letter, in which it is stated:

> The committee, since its inception, has been under constant and unremitting attack from those whose goal it is to destroy America and its free institutions.

I wish the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] in his talk this afternoon would let us know whether or not that is a warning or a threat that any Member who does not agree with the procedure of the Committee on Un-American Activities or privately or publicly disagrees with its findings, is to be classed as one who is attempting to destroy the free institutions of America and America itself. Is that the technique that the Committee on Un-American Activities wants to use? In other words, that anybody who finds fault with that committee is to be classed as an individual who desires to destroy the free institutions of America.

I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] will have time this afternoon to answer that question.

THE 10–A DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION, CALIFORNIA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2936) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10–A District Agricultural Association, California.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this bill had not been reported in time and was not on the Consent Calendar for consideration yesterday; is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. That is right. It was No. 15 on the Consent Calendar, but could not be considered because it had not been on for 3 legislative days.

Mr. HALLECK. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from California has conferred with me about calling this bill up at this time, and after discussing the matter with him and learning something of its urgency, also learning that it had been otherwise cleared with the leadership on both sides, I told him he might call it up. However, I think it may be well for me to make a statement at this time, after which I would like to have the gentleman from California explain for the RECORD the urgency of the matter.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to make this statement: As we all know, these remarks are reported by the committees and are placed on the Consent Calendar. As a general rule, it promotes orderly

procedure to have the measures considered by the objectors who are charged with that responsibility, rather than for those of us who are in positions of leadership to undertake the responsibility of examining the bills and arranging for them to come up by unanimous consent.

The gentleman from California does not find himself in disagreement with that position. He insists upon the urgency of this matter, and, as I say, it seemed to me there was sufficient urgency to justify it being called on this occasion. But I make this statement only to put everyone on notice that unless there is some unusual reason for this sort of procedure, the measures that are on the Consent Calendar should come up for consideration on the days regularly assigned for the calling of that calendar. Now, if the gentleman from California will explain for the RECORD the urgency of this particular matter, I would appreciate it.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, and, of course, I am wholly in agreement with what he says. This bill involves a transfer of 34 acres of land that the 10–A District Agricultural Association of California has to use in order to conduct its fair operations. Unless we get this land swap through immediately, they will not qualify for State funds and, as a consequence, will be put off for another year. They have to qualify at least by the end of the present fiscal year. This bill has yet to go through the Senate. In view of these considerations the majority leader was good enough to waive the general rules in this case, which I appreciate very much.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of California all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described land in Siskiyou County, Calif., containing an area of thirty-four and one-half acres, more or less:

South half of the south half of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter, section 35, township 48 north, range 4 east, Mount Diablo Meridian, and lot 1, section 2, township 47 north, range 4 east, Mount Diablo Meridian, containing approximately thirty-nine and nine-tenths acres; less five and four-tenths acres containing rights-of-way for county road, Bureau of Reclamation laterals and drains, and treatment plant and sewer line to the city of Tulelake, Calif.

SEC. 2. The land conveyed pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be used only for public purposes, including but not limited to such purposes as are authorized for a district agricultural association, and the conveyance herein authorized shall be made upon the expressed condition that if the land shall be used for other purposes the conveyance shall be held to be forfeited and the title shall revert to the United States. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to determine the facts and declare such forfeiture and reversion and such determination and declaration shall be final and conclusive.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 2229, a bill to increase the maximum amount of Federal funds which may be expended for any one water facilities project in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and that it be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

It is the sense of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that this bill properly comes within the scope and jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, one of the chief criticisms which has been made against the Committee on Un-American Activities is that it has operated without a clear and adequate definition of the meaning of "un-American activities" and without any rules of procedure. I cannot speak for the committee after I left the Congress on January 3, 1945, but during the nearly 7 years that I served as its chairman I can state emphatically that we did have rules of procedure, rules that were announced on the first day of the hearings in 1938, and that we also defined very clearly the meaning of "un-American activities." Whether those definitions and rules have been carried forward by the present committee, I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight and for the information of those who seem to be deeply concerned about this matter, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the principles and rules of procedure for the Committee on Un-American Activities announced by its chairman on August 12, 1938, and I invite anyone who is interested in procedure for congressional committees to read those rules; and I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the definition adopted unanimously by our committee in the first report of the committee on January 3, 1939, defining "un-American activities" and the scope of our inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. The information referred to is as follows:

PRINCIPLES AND RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, ANNOUNCED BY ITS CHAIRMAN, HON. MARTIN DIES ON AUGUST 12, 1938

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

I understand that it is customary for the chairman to make a preliminary statement before the committee begins to take evidence. The Chair will make his statement very brief.

This special committee was created by a resolution of the House of Representatives, House Resolution 282, for the purpose of conducting an investigation of the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution; and all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Chair wishes to reiterate what he has stated many times—namely, that this committee is determined to conduct its investigation upon a dignified plane and to adopt and maintain throughout the course of the hearings a judicial attitude. The committee has no preconceived views of what the truth is respecting the subject matter of this inquiry. Its sole purpose is to discover the truth and report it as it is, with such recommendations, if any, as to legislation on these subjects as the situation may require and as the duty of Congress to the American people may demand.

We shall be fair and impartial at all times and treat every witness with fairness and courtesy. We shall expect every witness to treat us in the same way. This committee will not permit any character assassination or any smearing of innocent people. We wish to caution witnesses that reckless charges must not be made against any individual or organization.

The Chair wishes to make it plain that this committee is not after anyone. All that we are concerned with is the ascertainment of the truth, whatever it is.

It is the hope of the committee that we can admit the public to the hearings. However, in the interest of a dignified and judicial hearing we cannot tolerate any demonstration, disorder, or interruption on the part of those who are the guests of the committee. If any such demonstration, disorder, or interruption occurs, the person or persons responsible for it will be immediately ejected by the police and denied further admittance.

The Chair wishes to emphasize that the committee is more concerned with facts than with opinions, and with specific proof than with generalities. Opinions, conclusions, and generalities have no probative force in any court of justice and they cannot be made the basis of any findings on the part of this committee. It is the Chair's opinion that the usefulness or value of any investigation is measured by the fairness and impartiality of the committee conducting the investigation. Neither the public nor Congress will have any confidence in the findings of a committee which adopts a partisan or preconceived attitude. Statements and charges unsupported by facts have no evidentiary value and only tend to confuse the issue. It is easy to smear someone's name or reputation by unsupported charges or an unjustified attack, but it is difficult to repair the damage that has been done. As I previously stated, this committee is determined to be fair and just to everyone, and when any individual or organization is involved in any charge or attack made in the course of the hearings, that individual or organization will be accorded an opportunity to refute such charge or attack.

In investigating un-American activities it must be borne in mind that because we do not agree with opinions or philosophies of others does not necessarily make such opinions or philosophies un-American. The most common practice engaged in by some people is to brand their opponents with names when they are unable to refute their arguments

with facts and logic. Therefore, we find a few people of conservative thought who are inclined to brand every liberal viewpoint as communistic. Likewise, we find some so-called liberals who stigmatize every conservative idea fascistic. The utmost care, therefore, must be observed to distinguish clearly between what is obviously un-American and what is no more or less than an honest difference of opinion with respect to some economic, political, or social question.

WHAT ARE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES?

AMERICANISM DEFINED

In order to determine what activities and propaganda are un-American, we must first define Americanism. No scientific definition will be attempted, but we will undertake to set forth in simple and understandable language what some of the chief principles of Americanism are. In the first place, Americanism is the recognition of the truth that the inherent and fundamental rights of man are derived from God and not from governments, societies, dictators, kings, or majorities. This basic principle of Americanism is expressed in the Declaration of Independence, where our immortal forefathers said that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, chief among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. From this declaration and the well-established interpretations that have been put upon it from the beginning of the Republic down to the present moment, it is clear that Americanism recognizes the existence of a God and the all-important fact that the fundamental rights of man are derived from God and not from any other source. Among these inalienable rights which are the gifts of man from his Creator are: (1) Freedom of worship; (2) freedom of speech; (3) freedom of press; (4) freedom of assemblage; (5) freedom to work in such occupation as the experience, training, and qualifications of a man may enable him to secure and hold; (6) freedom to enjoy the fruits of his work, which means the protection of property rights; (7) the right to pursue his happiness with the necessary implication that he does not harm or injure others in the pursuit of this happiness. Upon this basic principle, the whole structure of the American Government was constructed. The system of checks and balances in the Constitution was wisely conceived and ingeniously constructed to provide every possible guaranty that every citizen of the United States would enjoy and retain his God-given rights. First, the Federal Government was specifically enjoined from exercising any power that was not expressly or by necessary implication granted to it in the Constitution. Second, such powers as the Federal Government was authorized to wield were wisely distributed between the three great departments, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The essence of Americanism is therefore class, religious, and racial tolerance. It should be emphasized in the strongest language possible that the maintenance of these three forms of tolerance is essential to the preservation of Americanism. They constitute the three great pillars upon which our constitutional Republic rests, and if any one of these pillars is destroyed, the whole structure of the American system of government will crumble to the earth. Therefore, the man who advocates class hatred is plainly un-American even if he professes racial and religious tolerance. The converse of this proposition is equally true. It is as un-American to hate one's neighbor because he has more of this world's material goods as it is to hate him because he was born into another race or worships God according to a different faith.

The American Government was established to guarantee the enjoyment of these fundamental rights. It therefore follows that in America the Government is the servant of the people. The rights of the people are protected through laws and their strict enforcement. For this reason, law and order are essential to the preservation of Americanism while lawlessness and violence are distinctly un-American.

Americanism means the recognition of the God-given rights of man and the protection of those rights under the Constitution through the instrumentality of an independent Congress, an untrammeled judiciary, and a fair and impartial Executive operating under the American system of checks and balances. Americanism likewise means the protection of an unorganized majority from an organized minority as well as the protection of a helpless minority from an inconsiderate and thoughtless majority.

The characteristic which distinguishes our Republic from the dictatorships of the world is not majority rule but the treatment of minorities. Dictatorships muster huge majorities at the polls, through intimidation and high-powered government propaganda, but these majorities are used for ruthless tyranny over minorities. The majority rule of the American form of government is distinguished by its recognition of certain rights of minorities which majorities cannot alienate.

All of these definitions of Americanism are based upon the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. (From Report of Committee on Un-American Activities, January 3, 1939.)

RÉSUMÉ OF FIVE IMPORTANT CURRENT LEGISLATIVE SUBJECTS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit here a résumé of five important current legislative subjects in which I am sincerely and actively interested:

INCOME TAX

Recently I introduced in this House of Representatives, H. R. 3713, a bill which provides for an increase of dependent exemption from $600 to $800 for the current year 1953, and from $800 to $1,000 for 1954 and subsequent years.

Some tax relief is long overdue, especially for the low-wage peoples of this Nation, as I have stated so many times in the past. There is much talk and speculation regarding the lowering, and in some cases the complete elimination, of some other types of taxes, but there is no better way to give relief to the school teacher, the farmer, the small-business man, the family man, and all the lower-income groups, than by lowering the personal income tax. This great group of working Americans needs attention first and now.

SOCIAL SECURITY

I have called to the attention of the House Ways and Means Committee the need for revision of the social-security law to increase the benefits and to include lawyers, ministers, farmers, school teachers, small-business men, and other interested groups on a purely voluntary basis, and to lower the age limit for receiving benefits from 65 to 60 years. Both of our great political parties pledged revisions of the social-security law; now is the time to prove the value of those pledges.

TIDELANDS OIL

The tidelands oil issue will be debated before the House soon. As I have said before, and I want to repeat, that I believe this great wealth belongs to all the States and not to just 3 or 4 and their cohorts, some powerful oil companies. Who paid for the Louisiana Purchase? All the people. Whose blood was spilled in the Mexican War, the result of which brought the great Southwest and the far-western areas into the folds of the United States? It was the blood of our sons from all over the Nation. Should one particular section of this great country have the benefits of tidelands-oil revenue? No. I say, let this revenue be channeled through the veins of our weakened and worn educational system. Let every young American in this Nation have a change for better education. I have six children to educate in the great mountain State of West Virginia. I want them to have the best education available to our young children. On the other hand, I want every other man's child to have equal opportunity with mine, no matter where he lives, what his race, his creed, or his color. Let the teachers, who are the real sculptors of future America, be paid salaries worthy of their position and value. A generous God gave us this natural resource; let us use it as He intended it to be used—for the benefit of all men.

AGRICULTURE

As goes the economy of the farmer, so goes the economy of the Nation. This I believe. Now, and not in June, or next year, is the time to get started on a long-range farm program that will give hope and proof to all our farmers. We look to the Agriculture Committee for a concrete program that will be neither a handout nor a desertion, and with all sincerity, I pray that that committee bears in mind special recognition for the small farmer.

PEACE

Korea is with us still. Mothers of Korean fighters pathetically ask, "What is being done to end the war in Korea?" I feel an answer is long overdue.

Yes, Korea is still very much with us, but there is no better time to think, and speak, and work for peace than at the time peace is absent. My bill, H. R. 1421, to create a Department of Peace, is before this august body for recognition. We need a Department of Peace and I agree wholeheartedly with the noted newspaper publisher Frank Gannett when he said in his recent letter to President Eisenhower:

A Department of Peace could help America put an end to war.

Unity for peace is as necessary as unity for defense. We, as representatives for all the people of these United States, must work together, not only for a strong and victorious defense, but we must never forget for one moment that peace is the real purpose of all our efforts. New and world-shaking problems come to us daily and sometimes we find it extremely difficult to know and use the right methods to solve them. But, by keeping our eyes on the ultimate goal of

peace; remembering history has shown that those things that are lasting and permanent are based on the Holy Scriptures; and by applying the logic of the teachings of this Great Book—we cannot fail.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today is a great day for the Irish. It is a great day for all freedom-loving people. It is a great day for all who believe in religious freedom.

St. Patrick was one of the great leaders in the fight for freedom for all people, not only because he was a deeply religious man, but because he personally had suffered the pains of slavery.

The sons of Aaron are happy to join with the sons of Erin and the sons of all other freemen in today's tribute to the memory and spirit of St. Patrick.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker—

A fruitful clime is Eire's, through valley, meadow, plain,
And the fair land of Eire, O!
The very bread of life is in the yellow grain
On the fair hills of Eire, O!
Far dearer unto me than the tones music yields
Is the lowing of her kine and the calves in her fields,
And the sunlight that fell long ago on the shields
Of the Gaels, on the fair hills of Eire, O!

Let me take this joyful occasion, the celebration of the anniversary of St. Patrick's entry into the glorious host of the saints of God, to speak, not of that great and beloved saint, nor of the tragic past of his dear Ireland, nor of the splendid contribution the Irish have made in the building of our own Nation, but of Ireland now. Let me give some consideration to answering, for the present day, that famous question of Napper Tandy's, "How's poor ould Ireland, and how does she stand?"

"Poor ould Ireland," for all her antiquity, is one of the youngest nations of the world today, and, for all her past sorrows, one of the happiest and most peaceful. In Red Donough Macnamara's words, translated by James Clarence Mangan, "A fruitful clime is Eire's, through valley, meadow, plain, and the fair land of Eire, O!" The Republic of Ireland is today a handsome, healthy baby, due to celebrate her 4th birthday on the 18th of next month.

In spite of the fact that some 50,000 agricultural workers have left the farms since 1947, going into manufacturing and trade, Irish farm products have shown, in general, a steady increase in money value and a small increase in production sufficient to provide more consumption on the farm, more consumption in the towns and cities of Ireland, and greater exports. Greater use of agricultural machinery and the increasing adoption of principles of scientific farming have, of course, contributed to this result. So, doubtless, has the progress of the great land rehabilitation project, introduced in 1949, by which 4 million acres of underproductive land are being cleared of rocks, drained, graded, terraced, or treated with the needed fertilizers, and put to the most profitable use. Still other acres of underproductive land are being removed from agricultural production, and reforested, repairing the damage done by centuries of absentee-landlordism during which timber would often be cut and sold without provision for its replacement, until today the visitor from almost any other part of the world is astonished to see, on so evidently fertile an island, such vast treeless expanses.

As indicated by the movement of workers from farm to manufacturing and trade, Ireland is continuing its trend toward achieving a healthy balance in production, and in some manufactures, notably railways and tramways, brewing, and distilling; figures for recent years show substantial increases. How pleasant it is to think that Guinness and Irish whisky, whose taste evokes the very spirit of Ireland, are becoming more available throughout the world, and contributing to the enrichment of that dear land. And in the matter of railways, I find it surprising that that small country, only 300 miles from north to south, and a little over 100 miles from east to west, was served, in 1950—the latest year for which figures are available—by almost 2,500 miles of railways.

Ireland's merchant marine has made a good start, with a fleet of 12 vessels flying the Irish flag on the seas of the world.

For the provision of power that will allow Ireland's industry to continue its growth, the Turf Board is carrying out the ambitious project of draining the peat bogs that cover one-seventh of the country's surface, so that the peat, the characteristic fuel of Ireland, may be available for the use of those industries equipped to burn peat; and, by supplying domestic needs, may free great quantities of other fuels for industrial use.

It has been Ireland's unfortunate necessity to import far more than she exported, but recent years have shown the happy tendency for imports to decrease, and exports to increase; and emigration, always a drain on Ireland, is fortunately lessening, though population figures still show some decrease from year to year on account of emigration.

In the arts, particularly poetry and drama, participation is general and interest intense. Such organizations as the Gaelic League and the Gaelic Athletic Association, bringing back to full life and vigor the ancient Irish tongue, literary traditions, and violently exciting games, enrich and intensify the lives of all the people. Poets, both in Gaelic and in an English colored by Gaelic verse form and turns of phrase, are making their poems out of the stuff of the life around them, and experiencing the salutary effect of having a large, vitally interested audience to greet their productions with enthusiasm or sharp criticism. As the schools go on turning out graduates with a command of spoken Gaelic, it is to be expected that more and better writing will be done in that language, and that the audience for literature in Gaelic will continue to increase.

Ireland is happy now, in its independence, and enjoying an increasing prosperity. Its hopes for the future are excellent. May that future soon bring to Ireland the restoration of the six counties still held from her by England—the last remaining relic of the 800 years of occupation and attempted colonization of Ireland. In two of those six counties there is a substantial minority in favor of union with Ireland—and in the other four counties there is a majority in favor of union with Ireland. England's possession of Ireland, through all those 800 years, was never complete. Always there has been some region clinging to the forbidden language, some group carrying on determined resistance to political domination and economic oppression, and always the vast majority of the people of the country clinging to their Catholic faith, against whatever repression their masters might devise. It is to be hoped that the freedom of Ireland is not to be forever limited by the stubbornness of her would-be conquerors in clinging to that last remnant, of little value to England, but essential to the completeness of the land of Ireland—one with her by every reason of geography and history. This is said in the warmest friendship to England and her people, our blood brothers and our brave allies in two world wars, and today in Korea fighting side by side with our men to protect the right of a small nation to its complete independence and territorial integrity.

It is all Ireland, not so ridiculous a percentage as twenty-six thirty-seconds of Ireland, that I mean when I speak of Ireland; it is all Ireland that is held in the living arm of St. Patrick, and it is all Ireland that is celebrated in Joseph Mary Plunkett's great poem, This Heritage to the Race of Kings:

This heritage to the race of kings,
Their children and their children's seed
Have wrought their prophecies in deed
Of terrible and splendid things.

The hands that fought, the hearts that broke
In old immortal tragedies,
These have not failed beneath the skies,
Their children's heads refuse the yoke.

And still their hands shall guard the sod
That holds their father's funeral urn,
Still shall their hearts volcanic burn
With anger of the sons of God.

No alien sword shall earn as wage
The entail of their blood and tears,
No shameful price for peaceful years
Shall ever part this heritage.

Plunkett's words were no figures of poetic speech. He gave his life, as many of my hearers will remember, with his friends, fellow poets, and fellow patriots, Padraic Pearse and Thomas MacDonagh, when they were captured and executed by the British after the unsuccessful revolt of Easter Week, 1916.

We honor today the saint who, having been a slave and escaped, went back to his former masters, armed only with the love of God, and conquered them. We honor, too, the land that, under his patronage and through the blessing of God, has held its faith and its essential, spiritual freedom through eight centuries of foreign rule. In this spirit, let us pray that the example of St. Patrick and of the heroic people of Ireland may be a powerful encouragement, and a stimulus to hope, for those people and lands now enslaved by alien powers, and that those people and lands may soon breathe the free air that now blows over Ireland.

JOHN BARRY, FATHER OF THE AMERICAN NAVY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I assure the House that while my ardor is great, I do have sufficient restraint and I will not use the bit of blackthorn which I hold in my hand to rescue from his Republican captivity the wandering member of the O'Hara clan from Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, on the morning of this St. Patrick's Day at the monument to John Barry, father of the American Navy, I was presented with this symbol of Irish virility in righteous causes—the shillelagh. Men and women of Celtic blood have made large contributions to the cause of free government and to the welfare of mankind of every clime. With men and women of other bloods they have wrought in the great American melting pot an indestructible cathedral of democracy. Generations of Irish Americans have gone to their graves with bitter disappointment because a deserved recognition had not been accorded the great Irish American regarded by them as the real father of our American Navy. Mr. Speaker, I think that this St. Patrick's Day of 1953 can be made memorable by a virile revival in the chambers of this historic hall of the demand that the name of John Barry be engraved on the roll of immortal American heroes at Arlington. There must be no continuing discrimination anywhere in the fabric of our democracy, and certainly not where rest the remains of our heroes. I hope and pray that my words today will be taken up throughout the length and breadth of these United States and that they will not be silenced until the visitor to the shrine of American patriotism scanning the engraved names of our heroes at long last can see the name of John Barry.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in honoring the memory of St. Patrick, the patron saint of the Irish, and in extending best wishes to my friends of Irish descent.

As witnessed in the tributes being paid him here in the House today, the memory of St. Patrick is as green as the living shamrock itself, or as the land of Ireland. It was St. Patrick who changed the character of the people of Ireland from pagan to Christian; from a chaos of marauding bands under rival chieftains, stealing, destroying, enslaving, and killing, to a land of order and peace, that grew to be the center of learning and civilization for all Europe.

In his youth as a slave in Ireland, St. Patrick began to love the island and its people, and to learn Gaelic. When free and away from Ireland, he dreamed and planned for his return. There is a legend, supported by geographical probabilities, that on his way back to Ireland as a missionary, he stood on a mountain in Wales and looked over, calling down a blessing upon the land to which he was to devote the rest of his life. As a good missionary, he worked all his life to perfect himself in the language of the people he lived among and served, but contemporary Irish accounts speak with affectionate amusement of his foreign-sounding phrases, and occasional use of words which he thought were Gaelic, but of which his Irish listeners could make no sense at all. This was a fortunate failing for us, for critical and skeptical scholars, examining the writings attributed to St. Patrick, find in them, besides the thoughts and feelings consistent with his character, blunders in Gaelic of precisely the sort that amused his contemporaries, and the sort that would have been impossible to a native speaker of Gaelic, however uneducated. With his brilliance as an administrator, his saintly nobility of character, and his iron determination of will, St. Patrick might have been too perfect to inspire the devotion of the Irish of his own time and of the succeeding centuries, had he not had this harmless and endearing imperfection to make it plain that he was human.

The story of the quick wit of St. Patrick, in demonstrating the nature of the Trinity by plucking a shamrock from the ground where he stood, is brought to mind by the rhyme still taught to children in Ireland by their parents or grandparents:

Three folds of the cloth, yet only one napkin is there,
Three joints in the finger, but still only one finger fair;
Three leaves of the shamrock, yet no more than one shamrock to wear.
Frost, snowflakes, and ice, all in water their origin share,
Three Persons in God; to one God alone we make prayer.

Among the writings attributed to St. Patrick is a blessing on Munster, which has been well translated by Alfred Percival Graves. For this occasion, on which all Ireland and all who love Ireland celebrate St. Patrick's glorious entry into the kingdom of Heaven, I shall take the liberty of changing a word, so as to call down blessings on Ulster, Leinster, and Connacht, as well as on Munster.

Blessing from the Lord on High
Over Ireland fall and lie;
To her sons and daughters all
Choicest blessings still befall;
Fruitful blessing on the soil
That supports her faithful toil!

INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX REDUCTIONS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, those persons who are trying to block action on H. R. 1, the tax-reduction bill reported favorably from the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 21 to 4, ask me why I am in such haste to get a rule to bring the bill to the floor for a vote. First of all, it is a part of the parliamentary practice that a chairman directed to report a bill to the House ceases to function individually so far as that measure is concerned and becomes the representative of the committee in charge of the bill. Moreover, so binding are the obligations of a chairman in the handling of a bill reported by his committee that charges to the effect that he is not sincerely cooperating to secure its passage give rise to a question of privilege. It is my duty as chairman under instructions of the Ways and Means Committee to use all parliamentary means to bring H. R. 1 to the floor. There is a second reason for urging immediate action on H. R. 1. I have made official inquiry as to how long a time will be needed administratively to make the individual income-tax reductions provided for in H. R. 1 effective July 1, 1953.

A study of this matter has been made by the administrative officials and it is believed that a minimum of 60 days after the law is enacted will be required to prepare, print, and distribute the withholding tables and instructions required under H. R. 1. There will be about 6 million circulars consisting of 16 pages which will have to be sent out to the field officers of Internal Revenue for distribution to various employers and employees. This will mean that H. R. 1 should be enacted at the latest by May 1, 1953.

Since time will, therefore, be necessary in order to meet the July 1, 1953, deadline to get H. R. 1 through the House early in April.

Why, I ask, endanger the tax relief of 30 million taxpayers who come under withholding and, therefore, should get their full 11-percent reduction on July 1, 1953, under H. R. 1?

Why should the membership be placed in the position of repudiating a solemn campaign promise to reduce personal income taxes to get elected to Congress?

Is our political party to be charged with obtaining public offices under false pretenses?

The promise to reduce individual income taxes should be acted upon now,

before it becomes a settled conviction of the people that the candidates elected last November cannot be trusted.

I know that given an opportunity to express their will on H. R. 1 the Members' support will be unanimous in discharge of their preelection promise to reduce taxes. In urging action immediately I am performing my duty under the instruction of 21 members of the Ways and Means Committee. H. R. 1 is a committee bill. It is to fulfill a party as well as an individual promise to the people.

MILITARY SITUATION IN EUROPE AND THE FAR EAST

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, who or what can we believe about our military situation in Europe and the Far East?

In recent weeks the following statements have emanated from high places:

General Eddy, who will retire at the end of this month as head of the United States Army in Europe, says: "We're all set—ready for anything."

But General Ridgway, supreme commander of the NATO European army, says Russia could capture Paris in 40 days.

French General Juin declares: "Russia could take Paris in 23 days."

British General Fuller describes as pathetically unreal, particularly without German troops, the NATO military of about 25 partially equipped divisions to oppose some 200 Russian divisions in the event of war.

Secretary of State Dulles told the American people by radio and television not long ago that the NATO military is not dead—just asleep.

After 2 long years of propaganda, the spending of hundreds of millions of American tax dollars, and thousands of American homes broken by the draft to furnish troops for NATO, as well as Korea, we end up with a European military that is admittedly asleep.

General Van Fleet says there has been, and is today, a shortage of ammunition in Korea. General Collins claims there is no such shortage.

British General Ismay, Secretary-General of the NATO, says the building of Europe's defenses is ahead of estimates. He says NATO has 4,000 first-line aircraft ready to meet any aggression from the east.

On the same day that British General Ismay made this statement, two Russian MIG–15's roared out of Czechoslovakia and shot down one American F–84 Thunderjet and sent another scurrying for safety.

The Associated Press dispatch from Germany, describing the shooting down of the American plane, said this:

His—

Lieutenant Brown's—

F–84, an early type of jet outclassed by the Soviet-built MIG–15's for at least 3 years, crashed and burned.

It is obvious that the other American plane headed for safety because the pilot knew he could not possibly compete with the more modern Russian aircraft.

If the statement of General Ismay is correct—that there are 4,000 first-line planes in the NATO setup—then it does not make a lick of sence that American pilots should be forced to fly obsolete planes in patrol duty along the Russian frontier.

It is high time the American people be told the truth. It is time that those in places of authority provide more facts and less fiction.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A–6963020, Amsel, Andor.
A–7898535, Avilo, Rudolf.
A–6592016, Balberiski, Miron or Bell.
A–6756307, Baqal, Mohamad Amir or Mohamad Amir Boukal.
A–6552873, Brotleit, Zofia Kusewicka.
A–9825254, Bussani, Andrew.
A–7099697, Chang, Peter Yun-Pao.
A–6431861, Chang, Jean M. Y. (nee Young).
A–6623722, Chang, Shau Hoa.
A–6623721, Chang, Tsaing Wa.
A–6625811, Chang, Yuan Lo.
A–6851532, Chao, Tsei-Yu or T. Y. Chao or Chao Tsei Yu.
A–7073396, Chechik, Luba (nee Luba Russak).
A–6848439, Chen, Min.
A–6830501, Dischka, Zeuzsanna.
A–6917990, Domb, Mozes.
A–7828138, Domb, Cyla.
A–7828139, Domb, Pryda.
A–7131176, Esop, Verner.
A–6740258, Fanaberia, Calel Morika.
A–6713644, Fanaberia, Masia (nee Rubin).
A–6886818, Feldblum, Meyer.
A–6536894, Fleischman, David.
A–6841247, Fleischman, Ilona Sara (nee Elzikovitz).
A–6769948, Frankel, Nechemie.
A–6758622, Frankel, Chana (nee Wachs).
A–7056845, Furer, Menashe or Menasze or Menasche or Menash Furer.
A–7210070, Gawronski, Antonina (nee Rittigstein).
A–6769935, Gedeon, Elie Jabra.
A–6860145, Gedrovics, Alberts.
A–6903711, Grunwald, Alexander.
A–6448004, How, Julie Lien-Yng or Julie How.
PR901282, How, Bang.
PR901281, How, Rose May Ng or Rose Howe.
A–6737212, Huang, Yao Sien or Eva Yai-Sien Huang.
A–6576346, Jacobowitz, Bela (Jakobowitz).
A–6848236, Jacobowitz, Eva.
A–7197382, Jaszkowski, Tadeusz or Ted Jaszkowski or T. Jaszkowski.
A–7427989, Karm, Meinhard.
A–6772233, Khalidi, Suleiman Faud El.
A–7491361, Kirilloff, Boris Ephim.
A–6887572, Kopelowitz, Ester (nee Tesaler).
A–7178548, Laurik, Evald.
A–8091096, Lee, Margaret Chia Lin (Margaret Therese Lee).
A–6171207, Lee, Yiu Yung.
A–6953010, Lieber, Sarolta (nee Berger).
A–6851545, Loo, Ching Chee.
A–7135305, Loo, Chia-Ying Chang (nee Chang).
A–6819172, Masliyah, Noory Heskel or Noory Heskel Musaleh.
A–6467056, Metsalo, Valentin.
A–6415978, Molnar, Theresia.
A–6923768, Muller, Vera.
A–7095882, Munteanu, George Nicholas.
A–9107940, Nakielski, Bernard or Makielski.
A–8091555, Novak, Joakim Ante.
A–6801965, Pan, John Joei-Siang or John Pan.
A–6611055, Potocka, Maria.
A–9668080, Rand, Vladimir.
A–6776588, Rotbart, Motel.
A–7094824, Saltoun, Ishaq Heshel.
A–7841095, Saltoun, Raina.
A–7841096, Saltoun, Salum.
A–9825231, Scrivanich, Antonio Nicolo.
A–7048886, Shulman, Joel or Julian Shulman or Julian Szulman.
A–6606633, Spierer, Villiam or William or Vilimos.
A–6568114, Stern, Herman.
A–9825170, Swidzinski, Czeslaw.
A–7144911, Swoyski, Emery Anthony or Emerich Antonin Svojski.
A–7365957, Szekely, Suzanne.
A–9541479, Tani, Johannes.
A–6862642, Tessler, Margit (nee Margit Sonnenschein).
A–6258292, Tsia, Pe Chiu.
A–7934047, Tulk, Johannes.
A–7243463, Tye, Josephine Chou.
A–6930780, Wagner, Wienczyslaw Josef.
A–6701808, Weiss, Rachel Ruth.
A–6881779, Weisz, Eva.
A–7134269, Wisniewski, Roxalia.
A–7197533, Woo, Kok Liang.
A–7197534, Woo, Lily Ji-Yuen.
A–7197535, Woo, Andy Ying-Chung.
A–7197536, Woo, Benny Fong-Chung.
A–6291894, Zydorowicz, Zygmunt Stanislaw.
A–6291893, Zydorowicz, Stanislawa (nee Babel) (Bombel).
A–6615482, Cimze, Brigita.
A–6619075, Sils, Jekabs Rudolfs.
A–6615484, Cimze, Wilhelmina Albertine (nee Upmanis).
A–7181298, Ambaras, Berek.
A–7181299, Ambaras, Ruchla Leja (nee Spektor).
A–7181301, Ambaras, Szmul or Samuel.
A–7181300, Abaras, Chaja.
A–6933862, Antos, Viktor or Viktor Adler.
A–7073948, Bajor, Laszlo.
A–7073949, Bajor, Margaret (nee Bermann).
A–7125348, Belohlavek, Ladislav.
A–8015690, Boni, Donato or Bonich.
A–7982580, Chen, Betty Shu-Hsien.
A–7350806, Chen, Chi-Cheng.
A–6542129, Deutsch, Emery.
A–6542128, Deutsch, Edith.
A–7395122, Dunn, Fung Wen-Feng.
A–6899359, Eisendraft, Jente Perl.
A–7975403, Greisman, Chaim.
A–6933870, Greisman, Dyna (nee Dyna Stern).
A–6511066, Gulewski, Chaim Ber.
A–6843542, Halberstam, Serena.
A–7143248, Hauser, Moses.
A–6896010, Kac, David or David Katz.
A–6794615, Kahan, David.
A–6819107, Konig, Simon.
A–7383019, Konig, Judit.
A–6917988, Leffel, David.
A–7841092, Leffel, Ilania Sarah Leffel.
A–7841094, Leffel, Henry.
A–7066379, Leicht, Alfred.

A-6757850, Liberman, Chaja Cross.
A-7057929, Loblovics, Jirina.
A-7445230, Loblovics, Peter Stepan.
A-9669698, Loser, Ladislav.
A-6429571, Lukacs, John Adalbert.
A-7184075, Nagy, Gustav.
A-6933276, Ostreicher, Sally or Sara Ostreicher.
A-9825173, Piccini, Giovanni or John Piccini.
A-9825233, Piccinich, Antonio.
A-9825234, Picinich, Giovanni (John).
A-7048776, Pribramska, Milena Jaroslava.
A-6303937, Propper, Hinda.
A-7243272, Rofe, Clemy (nee Hassoun).
A-7243273, Rofe, Roland.
A-6542415, Ronikier, Adam.
A-6275446, Rosenthal, Cecilia Lucy (nee Rochlin).
A-6937373, Rottenberg, Laszlo.
A-6851434, Shen, Mary.
A-6441693, Shew, Lester Fook.
A-6441694, Shew, Alice Lee.
A-6450187, Shimanovsky, Alexander Eugene.
A-6450157, Shimanovsky, Xenia Nikoaevna.
A-6450158, Shimanovsky, Nickolai Alexander.
A-6450159, Shimanovsky, Natalie Alexander.
A-6905008, Strauss, Leo.
A-7069422, Strauss, Elizabeth (nee Elizabeth Brody).
A-7125300, Szilas, George.
A-7125301, Szilas, Veronica Anna.
A-6913912, Tabak, Guta.
A-9825237, Tarabocchia, Antonio Giovanni.
A-6805581, Teitelbaum, Dorothy.
A-7185687, Werner, Vera Stein.
A-7116390, Winter, Berek Litman.
A-7427544, Winter, Mordechai.
A-7802010, Zaharoff, George Alexander.
A-6659388, Zak, Irene Anna (nee Segal).
A-6663293, Zak, Daniel.
A-6663244, Zak, Michael.
A-6779061, Abdul-Nabi, Sion Moshi.
A-6907333, Abramczyk, Abram.
A-7074032, Blumenstein, Jerta.
A-6509235, Brecher, Samuel.
A-6703334, Chang, Joyce Loretta.
A-6848604, Chien, James Tai Tze.
A-7975994, Chiu, Leung.
A-9836671, Cymer, Alfred or Alfred Ziemer or Alfred K. Cymer or Cymer Alfred or A. Cymer.
A-7934149, D'Antoni, Giuseppe Giovanni.
A-6949998, Dresdner, Desider.
A-6983006, Felkay, Miklos.
A-6983007, Felkay, Magdalena.
A-7445428, Felkay, Julia Agnes.
A-6496385, Fischman, Moses.
A-6472344, Fischman, Piri (nee Jeremias).
A-9765956, Fook, Lum or Lam.
A-6390069, Gerencser, Frank.
A-6390070, Gerencser, Anne.
A-7132030, Goldberger, Ernest.
A-6929650, Gorodecki, Aba.
A-6430449, Gorog, Frigyes or Frederic Gorog.
A-7125154, Gorog, Margit.
A-6887741, Gunsburg, Mendel.
A-6666944, Haberfeld, Eugene.
A-6922074, Halpert, Mendel.
A-7491705, Ho, Hao Jo.
A-7828496, Ho, Hsiang-Chiao Huang.
A-7828498, Ho, Lily Li-Lien.
A-7828495, Ho, Louise Li-Si.
A-7828597, Ho, William Wei-Yu.
A-7125390, Iritz, Magda.
A-7354858, Iritz, Andras Ferenc.
A-6438637, Jurisevic, Milo Tripe.
A-6438638, Jurisevic, Jelena Milo.
A-6438640, Jurisevic, Radmila Milo.
A-6438639, Jurisevic, Svetozar Milo.
A-6987919, Karastoyanova, Marguita Bogdanova.
A-7056457, Karcz, Jerzy Feliks.
A-7097876, Karcz, Irena.
A-7134826, Karlik, Oldrich (Olda) Evse Spitihnev.
A-7095980, Kovacs, Ilona Marie (nee Tovolgyi).
A-7095981, Kovacs, Judith Ilona.
A-7095982, Kovacs, Katalin Piroska.
A-6847906, Keng, Hilda Hai Ling.
A-9506169, Kingsepp, Alexander.
A-7210424, Kotas, Jindrich.
A-7197295, Kucera, Sonia or Sonia Kucerova.
A-7802992, Kun, Jozsef Lajos or Joseph Kun.
A-9290474, Lian, Choo Joon.
A-6709345, Kwong, Tin Yu.
A-6991771, Leidermann, Susan Veronica.
A-6985787, Leidermann, Paul.
A-6848564, Lin, Ru-Kan or Ru Kong Lin.
A-8001257, Ljubcic, Maria Luca.
A-7210293, Madis Voldemar.
A-7210288, Madis Ilona.
A-7863133, Madis, Ilona, Jr.
A-7863134, Madis, Voldemar, Jr.
A-7931037, Maram, Maria.
A-7629040, Michalski, Stefan Antoni.
A-6555335, Milikowski, Boruch or Milikowsky or Boruch Milikowskie or Milkowski or Bouch Milikowski or Borouch Milikowski.
A-7483287, Moy, Don Tsit.
A-7095886, Miculescu, Mircea.
A-6849839, Nieh, Tseng-Lu.
A-7125298, Olkin, Golda.
A-6852886, Ostteicher, Ester or Esther (nee Peristein).
A-7868150, Pi, Teh Ho.
A-9825275, Piccini, Matteo.
A-7201404, Ripka, George Prokop.
A-7863155, Ripka, Hubert Jean Michel or Hubert Jan Michal Ripka.
A-6704266, Romanowska, Alicja Theresa or Alice Romanowski.
A-6983560, Setton, Renee Albert.
A-6746537, Shina, Isaac Saleh.
A-9825384, Tarabochia, John.
A-6403591, Tkachenko, Arkady.
A-7142101, Twardon, Gerard Edward.
A-7828393, Veres, George Stephen.
A-7828395, Veres, Catherine Renee.
A-7828394, Veres, Paul Stephen.
A-7095791, Vizer, Jozsef or Joseph.
A-7095792, Vizer, Erzsebet or Elizabeth (nee Papa).
A-7264780, Pal, Peter or Paul Vizer.
A-7915647, Wang, King-Ching.
A-7354350, Wang, Shen Kuang.
A-7379754, Wang, Chao-Chih Shih.
A-6622376, Wang, Shih Jien.
A-7427597, Yang, Bernard Kenneth.
A-7248107, Yu, Pu Ching.
A-6699842, Choye, James Hung or Tsai Hung.
A-6933906, Feder, Solomon.
A-7052513, Feher, Janos.
A-7052514, Feher, Klara (nee Vajda).
A-7052515, Feher, Agnes Julianna.
A-7053576, Friend, Jacob Lion.
A-6159672, Hudec, Ladislas Edward.
A-6159473, Hudec, Gisella Isabella.
A-6903729, Irany, Jalal, Zend.
A-6704668, Jacob, Ellis Samuel.
A-9778019, Kaplur, Serge Michael.
A-9506849, Kiak, Tadeusz Boleslaw.
A-7052354, Kremnitzer, Samuel.
A-7898806, Kremnitzer, Sala.
A-7298909, Ku, Ta Hai.
A-7350229, Kurzenbaum, Konstantin Paul.
A-1804133, Lillo, Rudolf Karl.
A-6460280, Lis, Josef Lisek Vel.
A-6071234, Liu, James Hsi-Hwa.
A-9825110, Maslobojew, Ryszard.
A-7356260, Metes, Mircea Virgil P.
A-7809812, Nacinovich, Francesco Giovanni.
A-9831492, Paszek, Emil.
A-7249625, Quon, Yuk Lum or Egai Kim Quon.
A-6704260, Rymarska, Stanislawa Janina or Stella Rymarski.
A-7197296, Schwarzenberg, Francis (Frantisek).
A-7197297, Schwarzenberg, Amalie (Amalia).
A-7809033, Schwarzenberg, Ludmila.
A-6982895, Sevcik, Jaromir.
A-7809012, Siao, Ruby Wang.
A-7809013, Siao, Lilly.
A-5206882, Silia, Johannes.
A-6992868, Sion, Caroline Eliahou (nee Caroline Eliahou Khazzam).
A-6943745, Somogyi, John.
A-6985795, Stransky, Frank.
A-6985796, Stransky, Kamila.
A-9716791, Strawinski, Adolf.
A-9825125, Szymankiewicz, Kazimierz.
A-6844603, Wang, Kung-Lee.
A-6848123, Yen, Jen Hwa (Moore Yen).
A-9766047, Abelnicks, Karlis Alexsandris.
A-6763814, Ahmad, Abder Raouf Sayied.
A-9621982, Baric, Slavko.
A-9825347, Bresaz, Metodio Vittorio.
A-7201326, Chao, Margaret Ellen.
A-6868652, Chasan, Samuel.
A-6843905, Chasan, Lala.
A-6843906, Chasan, Daniel.
A-6665493, Djordjevich, Ilija Milan or Eli M. Georgevich.
A-6363788, Dwek, Joseph.
A-7021050, Fung, Corinne Lillian or Corrine Lillian Kwong.
A-9825078, Geba, Waclaw Stanislaw.
A-6857645, Gedeon, William Jabr-.
A-7176712, Geiger, Leslie alias Lelsie Laszlo Geiger.
A-7197556, Geiger, Elizabeth nee Elizabeth Klein alias Elisabeth Kozmo.
A-6870411, Gottlieb, Suszanna Gabriella.
A-6829523, Hofer, Andras or Andre or Andrew or Andre, Fernand, Francois Hofer; Andras Nandor Ferenc Hofer.
1100-23457, Huang, Yuan Chung or Wei Ta Huang or Walter Huang.
A-6652642, Kenigsberg, Szaja Abram.
A-7144083, Lederman, Abram.
A-6923751, Lewita, Pinkas.
A-7903765, Mikulich, Gilido (nee Ermine-gilido Miculich).
A-6819103, Pick, Teresa Zeller.
A-6555822, Rosenstein, Muzza.
A-6987833, Sebestyen, George Stephen.
A-7941803, Simicich, Giovanni.
A-9825228, Tarabocchia, Antonio.
A-6881776, Traube, Moses.
A-6949360, Traube, Frida Pessa.
A-6848504, Tsou, Kwan Shung or Tsou-Kwan Chung.
A-6983523, Visoianu, Florica Corneliu (nee Balteanu).
A-8001252, Wei, Chue Sue.
A-7118818, Winkler, Thomas.
A-9634634, Adamson, Armant.
A-7074001, Alimanestiano, Mihai.
A-7052865, Alimanestiano, Ioana.
A-7118760, Blau, Sidonia (nee Weiss).
A-6953297, Brod, Ivan.
A-6739686, Chao, Pei Chu.
A-6973682, Chang, Linda Tung-Chen.
A-7111908, Chiao, Gene Liang.
A-7111909, Chiao, Wei Ying Lin.
A-6522482, Chou, Kuo-P'ing alias Ch'Iao-Chen Chou (or Chow), alias Shou-Ying Chou (or Chow) alias Hsien-Chen Chou (or Chow).
A-6921258, Deutsch, Joel.
A-6595663, Druker, Haim Girsch.
A-6595664, Druker, Rebecca Afraim.
A-6595662, Druker, Leah alias Lillian Druker.
A-6854411, Fabry, Gavriella.
A-7135698, Fan, Kwan Chi alias Quincey Chi-Chun Fan.
A-6897918, Faybik, Alojz Stefan alias Allen Stefan Faybik.
A-6945554, Froemel, Robert Boris Ivanchenko.
A-6968029, Goldstein, Margarita Martin.
A-7395111, Hu, Helen or Yu Hsin Hu.
A-6851699, Huang, William Yung-Nien alias William Edward Huang.
A-7141717, Izsak, Julianna.
A-7279652, Izsak, Robert John.
A-6771471, Karkar, Ya'Qub (Jack) Nasif.
A-7985654, Kask, Johannes alias Johannus Kask.
A-7176540, Kask, Nelly (nee Jarg) alias N. Jarg or Nelli Jarg or Nellie Jarg or Millie Jarg or Nellie Jarge or Nelly Jarg Kask.
A-7863386, King, Peter Wei Kong.
A-6930672, Kramer, Esther or Ester.
A-6279271, Landau, Judith.
A-6521591, Loutchan, Ludmila Maria.
A-7125164, Lowinger, Ida (nee Ida Klein).

A-9914609, Pusic, Paul.
A-9825124, Puszka, Jan.
A-7184152, Radnai, Pal Andras alias Paul Andrew Radnai.
A-7197543, Radnai, Eva (nee Eva Balazs).
A-7383442, Sakin, Anna (nee Boxer).
A-7383443, Sakin, Shulamith.
A-7383444, Sakin, Judith.
A-7178370, Sihv, Eduard (or E.; or Edward Sihv; or Eduard Shiv).
A-6183233, Tamm, Igor.
A-9580292, Toomberg, Valdemar.
A-7057641, Treblinska, Rywka alias Rywka Treblinski or Regina Treblinski, or Hochsztein (nee Treblinska).
A-7967275, Tung, Chen Huan.
A-7398350, Vali, Eduard Julius.
A-6922682, Winkler, Sandor.
A-7046213, Winkler, Margit (nee Szerou).
A-6790612, Wu, Chien Keng.
A-9825045, Swiderski, Romuald.
A-6916445, Uim, Arvo Johannes.
A-6779243, Schidlof-Vojnovic, Ivan, or Ivan Schidlof.
A-7079927, Weiss, Bernat, or Bernard Weiss.
A-6354566, Krajden, Moszko.
A-6849467, Skarzynska, Aniela, or Irena Merenholc.
A-5534198, Zombory, Ladislas.
A-7941170, Chong, King Kee, or Kee Chong King or Casey King.
A-786119, Gorski, Boleslaw Pawel.
A-6862321, Adamus, Stanislaw.
A-7193792, Kulej, Hanna Teresa.
A-7193793, Cholewicki, Victor Stefan.
A-9677603, Aasma, August.
A-7129220, Aurel, Mozes.
A-6903692, Bluth, Lenke Einhorn.
A-6861310, Chao, Hieh Chang, or Frank Chao.
A-6852888, Feldbrand, Manci.
A-7868117, Frank, Frieda.
A-6857573, Halpert, Sari Meisels.
A-6887552, Ickowicz, Majer.
A-6983574, Indig, Abraham.
A-7841098, Indig, Irene.
A-7052337, Levendel, Irene.
A-6691413, Lin, Shuh Yuen, alias Shuh Yuen Liu.
A-6794943, Malhas, Ruhi Abdul-Hamid.
A-6612875, Masri, Mahmud Said.
A-9778303, Mazurek, Eugeniusz.
A-6887709, Meisels, Naftali.
A-7190317, Molostvoff, Catherine Basil.
A-7125385, Nowomiast, Mojzesz Hirsz, alias Marvin Henry Newton.
A-7125386, Nowomiast, Mina (nee Kaplan), alias Mina Newton.
A-7841684, Nowomiast, Mark, alias Mark Newton.
A-8001241, Petelka, Zofia (nee Korpowska).
A-7427649, Rzepkowicz, Michael.
A-6917991, Schwimmer, Zoltan.
A-7390586, Sedlak, Mirko Svatopluk, or Mirko Sedlak.
A-4768149, Shu, E. Hah.
A-7048743, Stern, Martin.
A-7124129, Tan, Pai Chu.
A-9766004, Toomepuu, Juhan.
A-9766003, Toomepuu, Juri.
A-6163781, Tsai, Chen Yu.
A-7144079, Wolf, Aron Nathan.
A-6862641, Adam, Mozes.
A-6440636, Aizer, Salim Shaoul.
A-5876212, Ambrus, Jan.
A-8001260, Arro, Arnold.
A-6952382, Beer, Adam, Eugin.
A-7210292, Bekefi, Laszlo, alias Leslie Bekefi.
A-7210291, Bekefi, Magdalena.
A-6967636, Chen, Paul Kuan Yao.
A-7483958, Cheng, Ai Ming.
A-7483959, Chen, Lilly Li.
A-9765114, Cieslak, Alfons.
A-6929687, Diller, Abraham Iser.
A-6662080, Domb, Jerachmiel, alias Jerachmiel Donn.
A-6805594, Faber, Laszlo, alias Laszlo Theodore Faber and George Leslie Faber.
A-6567671, Friedman, Leopold.
A-6903791, Gilbert, Suzanne, alias Suzanne Goldberger.
A-6737204, Godkin, Michael Joseph, or Moses Joseph Godkin.
A-9536244, Gutmann, Villem or Willem, or Vellem, Willem, William, Vilam, or Wilheim Gutmann, Gutman, Guttmann.
A-7049993, Hazan, Leon Isaac.
A-7049994, Hazan, Renee.
A-6862650, Herman, Michel.
A-6991850, Herman, Maria.
A-6887727, Horowitz, Majer.
A-7276014, Hwang, Lai-Yin Grace.
A-6985811, Ionnitiu, Mircea.
A-6903748, Kaftanski, Seymour, alias Szepsel Kaftanski.
A-6390210, Kangro, Valdeko.
A-7085991, Kassab, David Jacob.
A-6627380, Kiang, Frederica Shu-Ya.
A-9635272, Kiploks, Ludvigs, Paul or Ludvigs Kiploks.
A-6922685, Klein, Moric.
A-7828455, Klein, Julie.
A-7828456, Klein, Tomas.
A-6386367, Kogerman, Sulev Kristjan.
56133/591, Kuljaca, Jovo Petro.
A-6847740, Kwong, Man Hong.
A-7087401, Lautman, Zoltan.
A-6983796, Lee, Joseph Alexander.
A-6694226, Li, Kuan.
A-6625627, Li, Frances.
A-6794979, Lieber, Leopold.
A-6794944, Loh, Ellen (Ai Lien Loh, Ellen Lo).
A-7757809, Loo, Ping Yok.
A-6995548, Lowy, Gustav.
A-6756293, Lucaci, Larisa.
A-6805570, Odinak, Alec (Elya Odinak).
A-6373385, Petrova, Olga Gregorie.
A-6904771, Pizyc, Stefa.
A-6934637, Popoff, Sergei Vasilievich.
A-6390227, Raid, Kaljo, alias Kaljo Raamann.
A-7073587, Rizk, George Sliman, formerly George Sliman Rizk Abu Judom.
A-7463362, Sabel, Bela.
A-7463363, Sabel, Ilona (nee Adler).
A-7903795, Sabel, Irene.
A-6771472, Salah, Nadim John.
A-6647101, Schulz, Jiri.
A-6938007, Schwartz, Hillel Aron.
A-7243320, Shalmon, Yacoub Raphael, alias Jack Rachael Shalom.
A-6867165, Sommerstein, Emil.
A-6886844, Szeto, Shih-Chuan.
A-7290210, Sztrachman, Aleksander.
A-9734415, Tai, Ying Wah.
A-6983820, Taub, Ladislas Vasile, alias Lawrence Taub.
A-6628885, Vaughan, Nellie Ladd.
A-7197550, Waldman, Arpad.
A-7752326, Wang, Chi-Yuan.
A-6849833, Wang, Virginia Fu-Chuang.
A-6904341, Wechsler, Samuel.
A-6760585, Weil, Nicholas Andrew (Miklos Andor Weil).
A-6886824, Weiss, Josef.
A-6844256, Wenger, Irving (Izrael Wegier).
A-6844257, Wenger, Ida (Chaja Wegier).
A-7130820, Berland, Felicja, alias Felicia Berland.
A-7182346, Borowiec, Andrzej Stanislaw.
A-9758751, Bracco, Giovanni.
A-7139089, Bracco, Simon Guisto.
A-8057048, Cugliani, John, or Ivan Kuljanic or Ivan Milan Kuljanic.
A-7046293, David, Masouda M. S. S.
A-7139010, Deblinger, Srul.
A-6959748, Deblinger, Kate (nee Guttman).
A-7934151, Fable, Joseph, or Joe Fable.
A-7079925, Fulop, Jeno.
A-7144001, Goldberger, Magdalena.
A-6528723, Halpern, Aron.
A-9565851, Hindreus, Hans Meeme.
A-6159671, Joles, Joel Leib.
A-6737779, Klein, Moritz.
A-6891804, Kohn, Judith.
A-6755538, Liang Taich.
A-7779160, Loo, Shou Ming.
A-6903760, Morrissey, Suzanne Rath.
A-6949995, Neufeld, Josef.
0300-299946, Paema, Ernst.
A-7244193, Picinich, Matteo.
A-7123477, Rawicki, Jerzy Jacob alias Jerry Rawicki.
A-7276711, Sang, Chang Chuan.
A-6934990, Schnabel, Moses.
A-9776513, Stilger, Wlodzimierz Jan.
A-7828578, Surian, Giovanni.
A-6849828, Tai, Gertrude Loe or Hsiao Tso Loe.
A-6620485, Tsang, John Lien-Kwei.
A-9555577, Veider, Carl (Karl) Alfred.
A-7118759, Weiss, Ervin, alias Erwin Weiss.
A-7118778, Weiss, Frieda.
A-6238175, Yang, Peter Quay, also known as Yang Quay and Yang Kwei.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD H. BACKUS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 777) for the relief of Richard H. Backus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to credit the accounts of Richard H. Backus, of Fernow Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., with the sum of $313.12, representing the value of Government property lost, for which he was held accountable, while in his custody as first lieutenant, Army Air Force.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JENNIE MAURELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 778) for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

KURT J. HAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 782) for the relief of Kurt J. Hain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of Kurt J. Hain, of Rochester, N. Y., in the amount of $434, which was paid him as a per diem allowance during the time he was employed as a civilian in Europe by the United States Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge be, and they are hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $434 and $322, respectively, representing the amounts of certain payments received by them from the United States in lieu of quarters and subsistence, while they were civilian employees of the United States Army and on detached service at London, England, in 1946. In settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the said payments of $434 to Kurt J. Hain and $322 to Arthur Karge."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. THOMAS C. ROONEY AND MRS. THOMAS C. ROONEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 814) for the relief of Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

HARRY BLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 870) for the relief of Harry Block.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is hereby authorized and directed to execute a quitclaim deed to Harry Block, covering the premises located at 111 Conselyea Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LOUISE BLACKSTONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Louise Blackstone, Greenwood, Miss., the sum of $1,481.85. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Louise Blackstone against the United States for payment of an amount which is equal to the difference between the amount (based on pay and allowances of a private) which was paid on account of the active service with the United States Army which her brother by adoption, the late Scott W. Crull (Army service No. 6970975), rendered during the period beginning December 1, 1941, and ending June 16, 1945, and the amount which would have been so paid if such amount had been computed on the basis of the pay and allowances of a sergeant. The said Scott W. Crull was captured by the Japanese armed forces in the Philippine Islands, and died when a Japanese ship on which he was being transported was sunk. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSAN KAY BURKHALTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1456) for the relief of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DAVID H. ANDREWS AND JOSEPH T. FETSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2363) for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David H. Andrews, 36 Woolsey Avenue, Glen Cove, Long Island, N. Y., the sum of $157.53 to cover the allowable cost of the shipment of household effects, including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking, from Washington, D. C., to Glen Cove, Long Island, N. Y., incident to his transfer from the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C., to the New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y., and to Joseph T. Fetsch, 77 Middle Neck Road, Sands Point, Port Washington, N. Y., the sum of $278.60 to cover the allowable cost of shipment of household effects, including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking, from Washington, D. C., to Sands Point, Port Washington, N. Y., incident to his transfer from the Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D. C., to New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y.

SEC. 2. No parts of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with either of the foregoing claims and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOYD C. BARBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2815) for the relief of Floyd C. Barber.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

GEORGE A. FERRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2817) for the relief of George A. Ferris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George A. Ferris, of Scotville, Mich., the sum of $110.40, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for refund of a penalty for overloading his truck while carrying a load of Army freight, which overloading was admittedly the error of the Anniston Ordnance Depot, Anniston, Ala., in May 1951: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a penalty" and insert "the amount of the penalties collected from him."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEMMER CONSTRUCTION CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3215) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Clemmer Construction Co., Inc.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CARROLL O. SWITZER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3230) for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 1204 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, or any other provision of law, there shall be paid, out of any appropriation available for payment of salaries of judges of the district courts of the United States, to Carroll O. Switzer a sum representing the salary of a judge of a district court of the United States for the period which the said Carroll O. Switzer served as district judge for the southern district of Iowa after August 9, 1950.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. SGT. ROBERT A. ESPE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3231) for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert A. Espe, master sergeant, United States Air Force, the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert A. Espe against the United States on account of the death of his wife, Joyce Merlyn Espe, and his infant son, Victor Robert Espe, on January 26, 1950, while

passengers in an Air Force plane which disappeared after leaving Elmendorf Air Base at Anchorage, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALASKA COUNCIL OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2011) to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a campsite and other public purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the organization for a campsite and other public purposes, the following-described public lands situated in Alaska:

Lots 1, 2, 6, 7, and 8 of section 10, township 5 north, range 9 west, Seward meridian, embracing approximately one hundred thirty-three and eighty-six one-hundredths acres.

SEC. 2. That the conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said council for the land at its reasonable appraised price of not less than $1.25 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public-land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2013) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the church, for use as a church site, the following-described land situated in Alaska: Beginning at corner numbered 3, United States Survey No. 3047, A & B, North Addition Numbered 4 to Anchorage Townsite, located at the point of intersection of the northerly side of Manor Avenue with the easterly side of North Seventh Street; thence north fifty-four degrees twenty-eight minutes thirty seconds east, one hundred ninety-nine and ninety-six one-hundredths feet; thence north thirty-five degrees thirty-one minutes thirty seconds west, twenty-six and ninety-three one-hundredths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west, one hundred ninety-four and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet; thence south fifty-four degrees twenty-eight minutes thirty seconds west, forty-one and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet; thence south thirty-five degrees thirty-one minutes thirty seconds east, exactly one hundred and forty feet to the point of beginning, containing four-hundred-and-thirty-seven one-thousandths acre.

SEC. 2. That the conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said church for the land at its reasonable appraised price of not less than $1.25 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public-land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TED B. LANDOE AND RODERIC S. CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2019) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to Ted B. Landoe and Roderic S. Carpenter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon the filing of an application within 1 year from the date of this act and the payment of the purchase price within such period, the Secretary of the Interior shall sell and convey to (1) Ted B. Landoe, a tract of land described as lot 1, block 15, original Anchorage townsite, Alaska, and (2) Roderic S. Carpenter, a tract of land described as lot 6, block 15, original Anchorage townsite, Alaska.

SEC. 2. The purchase price for each lot shall be the appraised value of such lot, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement of the lot by Landoe or Carpenter, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 73) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-6571865, Azouni, Omar Suleiman.

A-6034282, Basri, Saul Abraham alias Shaoul Abraham Basri.

A-7362992, Beker, Jiri or George.

A-7056018, Bigajer, Henry.

A-7927807, Bigajer, Maria (nee Klein).

A-7184426, Bornemisza, Adele.

A-6868564, Brodt, David Majer.

A-7125013, Cerveny, Jaroslav.

A-2688593, Chang, Yuan Wen-King alias Pauline Yuan Wen-King Chang.

A-8057496, Chang, Pan Yih alias Daniel Chang.

A-6819167, Dahlan, Joseph George.

A-6886895, Deutsch, Gyula.

A-6803930, Diamant, Robert.

A-7164060, Fabian, Bela.

A-6464490, Garutso, Alexander Steven.

A-7362421, Goldstein, Miksa or Max.

A-6862635, Grandjean, Ilona Elisabeth.

A-6933905, Groberg, Abram.

A-6933838, Hajnski, Henryk.

A-6754448, Hodnette, Emilie Syrova.

A-7134271, Horowitz, Herman.

A-7182150, Horowitz, Regina Scheer.

A-7483633, Ioan, Marie Chantal.

A-7095883, Bratianu, Vintila.

A-7483207, Bratianu, Despina Marguerite.

A-6709343, Jacob, Leah.

A-6843562, Jastrab, Iboiya.

A-6794727, Joseph, Sabat.

A-6929652, Kassees, Hanna Sa'Adallah alias John S. Kassees.

A-6759331, Kourilova, Vlasta Jindra or Kouril.

A-6847969, Kuo, Chi Sheng.

A-7828052, Li, Chu Fang Wu.

A-7243087, Li, Pei.

A-7133238, Liang, Tomson Chuan-Po.

A-7795750, Ling, Theodore.

A-6196851, Ling, Leah.

A-6196853, Ling, Amy.

A-6196852, Ling, Hubert.

A-6803965, Macsai, John or Janos Macsai.

A-6956200, Mikolajczyk, Marian.

A-9914607, Mojsilov, Milenko Rada.

A-6985784, Mostecky, Iva (nee Eret).

A-6985785, Mostecky, Iva Vaclava Marie Luisa.

A-6922679, Oestreicher, Moric.

A-7915652, Oestricher, Ester (nee Schon).

0500-37887, Ounapuu, Anton.

A-7915651, Pavich, Krsto.

A-5358599, Pezzulich, Emilio alias Milan.

A-6985963, Pollak, Rudolf.

A-6830454, Qalla, Mahmoud Abdullah.

A-9716946, Rannik, George Juri alias George Tilling.

A-7802994, Rannik, Ole (nee Laanvere).

A-6903774, Rogel, Samuel.

A-6952327, Stein, Geza.

A-6887557, Stein, Herman.

A-6855671, Szamet, Josef.

A-7975176, Tercovich, Joseph.

A-6163703, Tsai, Chun Hsiang.

A-5291485, Tsai, Shu Chen or Anna Tsai or Sister Marda Tsai.

A-9764882, Walczat, Josef.

A-7279395, Walter, Lajos.

A-7078090, Walter, Irene Wiesner.

A-6820502, Wang, Henry Kung-Chueh.

A-6923160, Weinberger, Saul.

A-7975402, Weinberger, Cyla.

A-7975401, Weinberger, Jacob.

A-7079576, Weiss, Judith.

A-7187464, Winkels, Elena or Elena Bohdanecka.

A-6009015, Zia, Joshua E.

A-6009018, Zia, Doris Pan.

A-9825023, Sawicki, Zbigniew Joe.

A-6509234, Apter, Moses alias Mozes Apter.

A-6422791, Autengruber, Milan or Milan Rastislav Autengruber.

A-7048870, Beckmann, Veronica Eszter.

A-6949996, Berkowiski, Mojsze or Moisze.

A-6924618, Bialkowska, Danuta.

A-7967726, Chao, Shih Shun alias Richard Chao.

A-7057123, Dolinska, Zofia Helena.

A-7197506, Frohlinger, Eugene.

A-7367900, Giernalczyk, Stefan or Giernalczk or Gieralczyk or Gierwalczyk.

A-7283199, Glikson, Josef.

A-7283200, Glikson, Cypora.

A-7283201, Glikson, Jerzy.

A-6916044, Herzer, Ivo.

A-7095740, Jogis, Arvi formerly Jurgins.
A-7095741, Jogis, Helga formerly Jurgins (nee Sulla).
A-7841818, Kucich, Oscar.
A-6330092, Lau, Johann also known as Lau Tso Han.
A-7445337, Loh, Carolyn Y-T.
A-6818121, Nessim, Abraham Salim or Ibrahim S. Nessim.
A-6903693, Nussenzweig, Olga.
A-6886828, Paneth, Alter.
A-7210287, Pill, Jerzy also known as George Pill.
A-8001229, Radovich, Maxmillian.
A-7178955, Rottmann, Mozart.
A-6916032, Steinmetz, Klara (nee Polatsek).
A-6916034, Polatsek, Elsa.
A-6851519, Tao, Kwang-Yeh known as William K. Y. Tao.
A-7941175, Tao, Yu-Tsai known as Anne Tao.
A-7941176, Tao, Ke-Chiang known as David Tao.
A-6851546, Tsun-Hou, Lu.
A-6835823, Zelouf, Victor Sasson also known as Yictor Sasson Zelouf.
A-6612442, Bohosiewicz, Erwin.
A-7190311, Bohosiewicz, Pawel.
A-6958987, Chow, Lee Yuen.
A-7955269, Dimini, Milano.
A6617748, Dimitriyevitch, Pierre or Peter Aleksander.
A-6968042, Feierabend, Ivo Karel.
A-9825160, Gornicki, Adam Waclaw.
A-9037759, Grzeta, Josip Marko.
A-6698714, Hamoui, Salomon Aslan or Hamwi or Hamwai.
A-6386627, Jizba, Zdenek Vaclav.
A-9673334, Jurkovic, Luka.
A-9542733, Kodurand, Leo.
A-7056415, Korda, Peter Bela (Krausz).
A-7056416, Korda, Marianne Rose (Engel Endrenyi).
A-7292654, Lee, Ying alias Robert Ying Lee.
A-7985399, Lo, Agnes Kit-Ling or Kit-Ling Lo.
A-6855623, Mandel, Salamon.
A-6610332, Mashal, Haskel Shaul.
A-6920582, Matrai, Bela Ludwig.
A-7174072, Negulescu, Istrate Gheorghe.
A-6667084, Niselbaum, Echel or Yechel Niselbaum.
A-6528823, Nuseibeh, Hisham Zaki.
A-7809073, Skenazi, Sarah.
A-6937366, Szatai, Janos E. or Szatay, alias Jean Szatai.
A-7178989, Tasnady, Joseph alias Joseph Tasnady Tiedrenzel alias Hans Bruner.
A-6751969, Wyszogrol, Morris alias Moses Morris Wyszogrod.
A-7445765, Ye, Richard Cheng (Cheng Richard Ye (Yeh), Cheng Ye).
A-6857543, Moorma, Eino Fred.
A-7186415, Ajgengold, Symcha Jojna.
A-6669703, Alpern, Berek.
A-6952374, Balazsy, Elizabeth or Elizabeth Balazsy-Barta.
A-7955268, Carcich, Romeo Peter.
A-6923157, Feig, Lea.
A-6623435, Gersten, Zorica.
A-7419844, Hsia, Wei Yen.
A-7419843, Hua, Yu-Ching.
A-9685271, Kong, Lee Wing or Lee Wai Ding.
A-9542194, Kotova, Grigorija.
A-7125194, Krausz, Erno.
A-7138433, Krausz, Magdolna (nee Friedman).
A-7352275, Krausz, Eva.
A-6095041, Li, Loo-Yi.
A-6095146, Li, Yu Hwa New.
A-6095147, Li, Ronald Liang-Kuh.
A-6166808, Osusky, Stefan.
A-6704109, Paley, Iona Solomonovich.
A-7143252, Pan, Henry Cheng Hsing.
A-7686295, Perkins, Valentine Smoleff.
A-7244215, Plir, Helmut Evald.
A-7439283, Raun, Joann.
A-6771850, Saliba, George Shamoun.
A-6031934, Szubert, Jadwiga Adelberta.
A-6537002, Tang, Yueh-Mei (nee Huang, known as Madeleine Tang).
A-6665387, Trela, Stanley (Stanislaw).
A-6794976, Zeller, David.
A-6891800, Zeller, Herman.
A-9825095, Zmyslowska, Josefa.
A-6218708, Kallab, Jiri.
A-7057982, Kallab, Aloisie.
A-8021333, Kallab, Valeriana.
A-8021334, Kallab, Anna.
0300–233579, Kallab, Maria-Jana.
A-9765892, Kurkiewicz, Marian.
A-7073954, Szalatnyaova, Louisa.
A-6316965, Tang, Chi-Chien alias Jack Chichien Tang or Jack C. Tang.
A-6821620, Tcheng, John Tsou-Ling.
A-6933872, Apel, Izchok.
A-6904306, Berger, Josef.
A-7279367, Berger, Melanie.
A-7279368, Berger, Robert.
A-7116341, Birnbaum, Dora (nee Lebovitz).
A-6819585, Borek, Feliks Rubinstein.
A-6709169, Cernius, Filomena or Filomena Vaidilaite.
A-6986499, Chow, Frances Chi.
A-6989489, Duvan, Boris.
A-6989488, Duvan, Nadejda.
A-6989487, Duvan, Irene.
A-6884230, Farkas, Ernest.
A-6904299, Galupkin, Elja or Elia.
A-6760568, Garai, Lydia Agnes.
A-6521600, Goldner, Noemi Susan.
A-6916062, Gottesmann, Dezso or David Gottesman.
A-8031937, Hanja, Aita (nee Oiv).
A-8031938, Hanja, Rudolph.
0300–309594, Hanja, Yuri Thomas.
A-6616280, Hariri, Mahmud Said.
A-6452910, Hawinowicki, Mara or Havinoviski.
A-7197515, Horvath, Tibor.
PR-902563, Jones, Lilia Carola.
A-8021273, Klaas, Selma alias Selma Nilson.
A-6887212, Kennedi, Miklos alias Miklos Stern.
A-6414654, Koo, Ge-Tsung.
A-7594552, Koo, Ts-Zung.
A-6704261, Kopera, Maria (nee Rycerz).
A-7046752, Lempicki, Alexander.
A-9650707, Lepa, Mihkel.
A-6554469, Lipaki, Tadeusz.
A-6251862, Liu, Li Shiang.
A-7046283, Marecek, Karel Vaclav.
A-095897, Marecek, Maria Barbora.
A-8082101, Marecek, Karel Frantisek.
A-8082100, Marecek, Miriam Anna.
A-8082099, Marecek, Bozena Vera.
A-6999088, Menache, Esther Shaoul.
A-9731416, Peaske, Kaarel.
A-9766019, Piaskiewicz, Jan Tadeusz.
A-9765690, Rabar, Simone.
A-6949334, Rios, Eszter or Esther or Eszter Fazekas (nee Major).
A-7095380, Rubinstein, Simon.
A-6922094, Schachter, Imrich.
A-6564147, Sheng, Marie Ming-Yi.
A-6690379, Sohn, Isabella (nee Ravay) alias Isabella Herman.
A-7056451, Staas, Ludmila (nee Kregiel).
A-7046265, Sturc, Ludovit.
A-7046266, Sturc, Helena.
A-7046267, Sturc, Susan Vera.
A-6858259, Ting, Pu Sheng alias Andrew Pusheng Ting.
A-6848022, Shung, Ming Cheng or Ming Cheng Ting alias Luch Shung Ting.
A-9770893, Trela, Leon Tadeusz.
A-6848499, Tsai, Nai Hsin.
A-6142235, Tung, Tze-Kuei.
A-6963104, Vali, Viktor.
A-6534362, Wainer, Dora (nee Segerman).
A-6667951, Wainer, Joseph Abraham.
A-7483336, Wang, Kwang Nien or Kenneth Wang.
A-8021362, Wen, Li Shu or William Li Shu Wen.
A-6952371, Wiener, Berek.
A-7138101, Zachariasiewicz, Wladyslaw.
A-6827524, Zakova, Marie-Antonie Jarmila.
A-7095569, Barton, Frank X.
A-7095570, Barton, Alice Margaret.
A-7863152, Benedig, Erno.
A-7863158, Benedig, Margit (nee Steinberg).
A-7196419, Chan, Kwoon Chung.
A-7118737, Chang, William or Ching-Sung Chang or Ching-Sheng Chang.
A-6851661, Chen, Christine Ching-Sung.
A-0946874, Chen, Chung Chi.
A-8021403, Chen, Fu-Hwa Yien.
A-7383215, Ettisch, Felix Hsu.
A-7934152, Fishman, Leon.
A-6917983, Fried, Magdalina.
A-6891816, Hsu, Tao-Chiuh or T. C. Hsu.
A-7821461, Ing, Z. T. or Ting Shang-Teh.
A-7052331, Kolaja, Jiri Thomas.
A-7128146, Laamann, Uno.
A-8057474, Lee, Hong-I.
A-8057472, Lee, Ya-Wei Yew.
A-8057475, Lee, Jeannette.
A-6612725, Li, Sumin.
A-7795633, Li, Suefong.
A-7795635, Li, Suetse.
A-7276375, Li, Virginia Cheng.
A-6933858, Muller, William or Viliam Muller.
A-7910447, Ozolins, Bruno Francis.
A-7419933, Pao, Boris or Boris Bolian Pao.
A-7419934, Pao, Krystyna Bogdanska.
A-6851541, Pastoohoff, Peter Michael.
A-6772211, Saad, Edward Theodore or Saliba Saad.
A-7064188, Schwartz, Paul or Paul Soros.
A-6624082, Sheng, Chenhua H.
A-6624081, Sheng, Dora S.
A-8057047, Shun, Wah.
A-6923163, Stern, Carol.
A-6949345, Stocki, Gabrielle.
A-6333110, Trumbic, Mate.
A-7768049, Tsu, David Teh-Wei.
A-7073968, Weiner, Jacobina.
A-7868089, Weiner, Mircea or Mitchell.
A-7868090, Weiner, Mariano or Murray.
A-6891808, Wolf, Jacob.
A-7415061, Wu, Louise Siu Ching.
A-6032950, Yang, Biau.
A-6567550, Yang, Chang-Tsing.
A-6991827, Zacharia, Esa Matuk.
A-7283179, Grossfeld, Henrik or Haym or Henry David.
A-7048905, Moravcsik, Michael Julius.
A-7048902, Moravcsik, Julius Matthew Emil.
A-6976873, Racz, Marianna Maria, alias Reihard.
0500–40102, Hasal-Ova, Dagmar Zofie.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 10, line 3, strike out line 3 and insert "A-6623735, Huang, Linda Min-Hui."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a full statement of the purpose of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire at this time to make an explanation of the purpose of House Concurrent Resolution 13 and similar resolutions which I will periodically offer in the House.

In 1948, the Congress authorized the Attorney General to grant permanent residence in the United States to 15,000 aliens who had entered this country lawfully on a temporary basis if they prove to his satisfaction that they are displaced persons who cannot return to their native countries because of fear of persecution based on their race, religion or political beliefs. Under the same law, the Attorney General had to submit those applicants to a thorough screening and if he found them to be eligible for permanent residence he was directed to submit their names to the Congress for

a rescreening and approval of his recommendations.

In Congress, the Committees on the Judiciary of both Houses scrutinize the Attorney General's recommendations and under an arrangement with the Senate, concurrent resolutions approving the Attorney General's rulings originate with the House committee.

In each case an FBI and a CIA investigation was conducted and in each case approved, a quota number is being deducted for every alien who under such resolution is granted permanent resident status in the United States.

This entire operation is a self-liquidating one. The deadline for filing applications with the Attorney General expired on June 16, 1952, and it is therefore expected that by the end of this Congress all cases deserving of congressional approval will be taken care of.

I might add that according to what the committee hears from the Immigration and Naturalization Service the congressional allocation of 15,000 quota numbers will not be used. It looks like not over 8,000 aliens falling within this category will be permitted to remain in this country.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALEXANDER FIALA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 663) for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Alexander Fiala shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "fee", strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. ALEXANDER D. MORUZI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 673) for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "immigration and naturalization laws" and insert "Immigration and Nationality Act."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "fee", strike out the words "and head tax."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AKIKO NIINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 688) for the relief of Akiko Niina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Akiko Niina, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Romanki, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Akiko" and insert in lieu thereof "Takako."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Takako Niina."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES RENNICK MOFFETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 731) for the relief of James Rennick Moffett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, James Rennick Moffett, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of S. Sgt. and Mrs. Milton R. Moffett.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, James Rennick Moffett, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of S. Sgt. and Mrs. Milton R. Moffett, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIBOR KALMAN JALSOVICZKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsoviczky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tibor Kalmán Jalsoviczky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNELIESE ELSE HERMINE WARE (NEE NEUMANN)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 748) for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of the ninth category of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (Public Law 414, 82d Cong.), shall not hereafter apply to Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann), German wife of Harlen Odgeton Ware, a United States citizen and member of the United States Armed Forces, with respect to any conviction or admission of the commission of any crime in her case of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge on the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. SUZANNE VAN AMERONGEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 880) for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration laws, Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on the date on which she entered the United States.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEPHANIE MARIE DORCEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 884) for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stephanie Marie Dorcey, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. Carlyle John Dorcey and Alberta Tondera Dorcey, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULA AKIYAMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 955) for the relief of Paula Akiyama.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Paula Akiyama, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Ralph C. Egolf, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL ROBERT LEARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1101) for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Daniel Robert Leary, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Maj. and Mrs. William E. Leary, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Daniel Robert Leary, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Maj. and Mrs. William E. Leary, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASTRID INGEBORG MARQUEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1186) for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Astrid Ingeborg Marquez may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEVE EMERY SOBANSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1192) for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Steve Emery Sobanski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of T. Sgt. Conrad E. Sobanski, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUGA UMEZAKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1704) for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Suga Umezaki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMA SHELOME LAWTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ema Shelome Lawter, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James S. Lawter, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAOLA BOEZI LANGFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2624) for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paola Boezi Langford may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. IDA BIFOLCHINI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 757) for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ida Bifolchini, Adams, Mass., the sum of $2,149.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Ida Bifolchini against the United States for death compensation payable to her as the widow of Marino D. Bifolchini (XC-3860207), a veteran of World War II, for the period beginning January 12, 1945, and ending April 14, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. JAMES D. WILMETH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 837) for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CLINT LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of Clint Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clint Lewis, of Caldwell, Tex., the sum of $200. Such sum represents property damage sustained by the said Clint Lewis as the result of an accident involving a United States Air Force airplane in Burleson County, Tex., on January 4, 1951. The claim of the said Clint Lewis is not a claim which is cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "represents" and insert "is in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Act", insert a colon and the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD F. SHEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1780) for the relief of Edward F. Shea.

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

STEBBINS CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1967) to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Federal District Court of the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of loss, if any, sustained by the Stebbins Construction Co., Tulsa, Okla., for reclamation contract No. 12r-16727, arising out of or attributable to the alleged failure of the Government to supply materials, as provided for in said contract.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the amount set forth in said findings to the Stebbins Construction Co.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "contract", insert "and not arising out of or attributable to any disagreement between the Stebbins Construction Co. and any third party which undertook to supply such materials."

Page 2, after line 7 insert "*Provided, however*, That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LENNIE P. RIGGS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2667) for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $243.83, $212.17, and $141.83, respectively. Such sums represent compensation received by the persons aforesaid as employees of the United States Post Office, Indianapolis, Ind., during the periods August 1, 1951 to March 15, 1952; January 16, 1952, to March 31, 1952; and March 16, 1952, to April 30, 1952, respectively, all dates inclusive, while they were also employed by the General Services Administration and each was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by them, respectively, or withheld from sums otherwise due them, respectively, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claims of the United States for such refunds.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARET D. SURHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3385) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims (a) to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and through it the claims of its subcontractors, against the United States arising out of the performance of a contract dated July 25, 1941, which the said contractor had with the Veterans' Administration for the construction of a hospital building at Fort Howard, Md., the work on which contract was completed on or about November 19, 1943, and (b) to enter judgment as provided in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 2. If the said court shall find (a) that after the date of said contract the United States through any of its departments or agencies delayed the issuance of priorities which resulted in subjecting the said contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to additional costs, including overhead expenses, or if the said court shall find (b) that after the date of said contract the United States, through any such departments or agencies, or either of them, including Defense Plant Corporation, sponsored any work program or programs in the general area of Fort Howard, Md., which rendered it impossible for the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to achieve that degree of labor performance which they, respectively, would have achieved if such work program or programs had not existed, or which made it necessary for such contractor or subcontractors, or either of them, to pay higher wages for the labor which was available to them, respectively, than they would otherwise have had to pay, and that the result of such work program or programs was to subject the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to additional costs, including overhead expenses, then the said court shall in either case, and notwithstanding the bar or defense, if any, of laches, lapse of time, or statute of limitations, enter judgment for the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, against the United States in the amount of such additional costs and expenses incurred by them, respectively: *Provided*, That such judgment or judgments shall not include any profit to the said contractor and its said subcontractors, or either of them.

SEC. 3. Suit shall be filed in the Court of Claims by said contractor within 6 months from the approval of this act.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

SEC. 5. Private Law 643, 81st Congress, approved July 6, 1950, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIO VALENSIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3369) for the relief of Pio Valensin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pio Valensin, route 2, box 684, Galt, Calif., the sum of $452. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Pio Valensin against the United States for property damage sustained as a result of a fire caused by a United States Weather Bureau balloon on September 27, 1951. The claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act

of 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EMILY WILHELM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3446) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

BOLINROSS CHEMICAL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3458) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc., of Newark, N. J., for alleged damages or losses resulting from the raid on its chemical plant at 12–22 Orange Street, Newark, N. J., including the alleged destruction of its machinery, equipment, raw materials, and finished products, and the loss of its business, by prohibition agents of the United States, on or about February 20, 1929.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, and proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. WALTER C. WOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the Private Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file two additional reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CORONATION INVITATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication for the information of the House.

MARCH 11, 1953.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The British-American Parliamentary Group, through its honorary secretary, Sir Howard d'Egville, has advised the Department that the group has secured 50 seats for the coronation, for use of Members of Congress and their wives. These seats are along the coronation route and will be furnished free of charge.

I believe it would be appropriate for you and the Vice President, to whom I am also writing, to select Members of Congress who may wish to avail themselves of this opportunity.

Sir Howard has suggested that first choice on the seats be offered to the members of the American committee. A list of such members is enclosed. I am passing this along only as a suggestion, for I think you should use your own judgment in the matter.

If I can be of any assistance in furnishing additional information, please do not hesitate to call on me.

It will be necessary to notify Sir Howard by April 18 of the names of the Congressmen and their wives who will occupy the seats, since the Government of the United Kingdom requires these names. The tickets are not transferable, and the trip, of course, will be at the expense of the individuals. In addition, I might point out that the making of travel arrangements and accommodations in London during this period is a serious problem and that early decision on this matter would be helpful. I would appreciate it, therefore, if you would advise me of your selections at your early convenience.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

THE CONTINUING ATTACK

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have conferred with the gentlemen holding special orders after mine, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials.)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I must first of all apologize to the sons and daughters of Ireland for presuming to address the House at length today upon a very un-Irish subject. I hope that I will be forgiven this intrusion of St. Patrick's Day in dwelling upon the red rather than upon the green. The patron saint of Ireland won immortal fame for his job of ridding the old sod of a plague of snakes, thus freeing the green isles forever of serpents. Later, the Pied Piper of Hamlin was to achieve a lesser degree of immortality by ridding a city of its rodents.

Today, hundreds of years later, a committee of the Congress of the United States is under unremitting attack for a new and tremendous effort to destroy the vermin and the rodents of a new plague—that of global, aggressive, Godless communism, which international conspiracy would strip from man not only the hope of redemption in the hereafter, but the cloak of human dignity while he lives. Under the guise of preserving the basic liberties of men, communism and the agents of the conspiracy seek by every means to destroy the last vestiges of self-determination and of human initiative.

To an ant, the world is a sea of grass, and to one born to the solitude of the North Pole, all directions are south. It is not difficult to understand the orientation, political and economic, of one born to communism and bathed in the turgid waters of Marxist-Leninist philosophy since birth. To a man like Malenkov, throughout his lifetime isolated from the expressions of freedom, there exists no inherent dignity of the individual. One can understand the native brutality of a creature never exposed to human kindness, mutual consideration, the concept of divine providence, and the immortality of man. These are creatures whose plight should stir, if not human pity, at least human understanding.

Communism, as a political force, is not new. It has existed, in pure form, since man emerged, upright and dignified, from the mists of history in the Valley of the Nile. Throughout the ages, communal living has been the tradition of aboriginal tribes in Asia, Africa, and elsewhere. From each according to his merit—to each according to his need—was a practical expression of jungle life—and those who practiced it have remained jungle dwellers.

In 1848, in a Paris attic, two German emigrees, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, sat down together to draft a blueprint for world domination. Their blueprint was the Communist Manifesto and the drafting tools were envy, hatred, and greed. In calling upon the proletariat to strike off its chains, the draftsmen gathered together the scattered tenets of aboriginal communism, gave them new direction and vitality, and the Communist revolution was on its way.

In pursuit of the original blueprint, those who were to implement the design were faithful, and their dedication to the achievement of a Communist world absolute. With a fanaticism only matched by the children of medieval history, who flocked by the thousands to join the crusade, the Marxist-Leninists utilized every weapon, psychological and physical, as the movement expanded and raced down the corridor of time.

Into every land went the emissaries of the new order. Into factories, into the ranks of the working class, into schools, churches, and the organizations of young and old infiltrated the "Typhoid Marys" of the new plague. Not bound by any recognizable code of moral ethics, the Communists were not bound by the rules of any game. Truth could be used as a

weapon, but there extended no moral compulsion against the lie, if a temporary or long-range end could be better served. Persuasion, logic, and reason walked hand in hand with coercion, brute force, and torture. Freedom of speech and assemblage were twisted and distorted into weapons to be wielded by those who were evil, stupid, or both. God was derided and crass materialism replaced the Sermon on the Mount and the ethical standards of human conduct which had served to lift mankind from the morass of insensible vassalage to the heights of spiritual understanding were cast aside as evidence of bourgeoisie stupidity. The insidious deployment of minority against minority, creed against creed, race against race, and color against color was effectively adopted as a major tenet of Communist technique, and out of the labor pains of a civilization attempting to achieve a child of order and justice was spawned a monster of fearful proportions.

In the United States the Communist conspiracy made slight progress during the early years of the present century. The land was founded by men and women of deep spiritual convictions and their posterity in turn builded a new order of things in the Western World upon a firm foundation of faith in God and in mankind. Too, in the building of this country, the architects of the Constitution, and those who later did the actual construction, discovered at an early date that the substantial contributions to the new society were made, not by the drones who were prepared to live off the fruits of those who labored and builded, but by men and women of vision, determination, and initiative. These they honored and these they made the heroes and heroines of our national history.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Addonizio	Chudoff	Frazier
Albert	Church	Granahan
Alexander	Clardy	Green
Aspinall	Cole, N. Y.	Gwinn
Auchincloss	Crosser	Hagen, Calif.
Bailey	Crumpacker	Hardy
Baker	Curtis, Mass.	Harrison, Nebr.
Barrett	Curtis, Mo.	Hart
Beamer	Curtis, Nebr.	Hays, Ark.
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Hays, Ohio
Bender	Deane	Heller
Bennett, Fla.	Dempsey	Herlong
Bentsen	Devereux	Hinshaw
Boland	Dingell	Hoeven
Bolling	Dodd	Hoffman, Ill.
Bow	Dollinger	Hope
Boykin	Donovan	Hruska
Brownson	Dorn, N. Y.	Hull
Budge	Dorn, S. C.	Ikard
Bush	Durham	James
Byrnes, Wis.	Elliott	Javits
Campbell	Engle	Jones, Ala.
Cannon	Fallon	Jones, Mo.
Carlyle	Feighan	Kelley, Pa.
Carrigg	Fine	Kelly, N. Y.
Case	Fino	Kirwan
Chatham	Fogarty	Klein
Chelf	Forand	Kluczynski
Krueger	O'Neill	Sadlak
Landrum	Osmers	Saylor
Long	Patterson	Sheehan
McConnell	Poff	Shelley
McCormack	Polk	Sheppard
McMillan	Poulson	Smith, Wis.
Mack, Ill.	Powell	Spence
Miller, N. Y.	Preston	Sutton
Mills	Price	Vursell
Morgan	Rabaut	Weichel
Morrison	Reams	Wheeler
Moulder	Rivers	Wilson, Ind.
Multer	Robeson, Va.	Wilson, Tex.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Robsion, Ky.	Wolcott

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAMBLE). On this rollcall 304 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE CONTINUING ATTACK

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I feel that as far as I am personally concerned, I should explain that I had no part in this call of the House. I am glad to see that we have a few more Members present. I think anyone addressing the House is moved by that consideration, but it was not, I assure you, by any prearrangement.

I had explained very briefly up to the time of the call of the House in bare outline the organized attack of the Communist Party throughout the world and upon this country, with particular reference to the early part of the present century.

Upon dissension and greed the Communists based their appeal and founded their attack. Masters at the art of propaganda and its dissemination, the agents of the conspiracy found most fertile ground among national and minority groups in this country. Following closely the blueprint of the manifesto, the Communists in the Western World sought to divide and conquer, to reap the whirlwind of greed and dissension. As midcentury approached, the fruits of their labors became too obvious to be longer denied, even by the most abject of Communist apologists.

The Congress of the United States, oft declared by the Communists and the fellow travelers to be an odd assortment of dull and insentient fools, was, on this one occasion at least, ahead of the Nation. It moved promptly to institute counteraction against the agents of the Communist conspiracy, and with firmness and determination which, in rare flashes, characterizes the actions of a representative body in a republic, took the offensive.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would the gentleman care to yield during the course of his speech, or would he prefer to yield after he has finished?

Mr. JACKSON. If the gentleman would not mind, I would prefer to yield after I have completed my statement so that I will be sure to get in all of the things I want to get in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do you think that you will have time enough to answer some questions?

Mr. JACKSON. I hope so.

The Congress organized and gave legal status to the House Committee on Un-American Activities because a real and evident need existed. It was considered essential then, as it is now, that the Congress have under its own jurisdiction, and free from any executive restriction or other outside influences which might exert political pressures, a group responsible only to the will of the membership of this body. The Committee on Un-American Activities was not born out of confusion and hysteria, as its critics would have the world believe, but out of study, consideration and deliberate debate.

From its very inception, the committee has been an exposed flank of the House, a flank upon which the waves of Communist and fellow-traveling fury have been hurled. Apologists for traitors and treason have excoriated the individual members of the committee, always reserving their deepest scorn and most bitter invective for any member elevated to the chairmanship. Those chairmen, good and bad, able or mediocre, have been pilloried by a few of their colleagues; by the fellow-traveling press, and by a small minority of citizens who, while not themselves members of the Communist conspiracy, have followed the devious turnings and twistings of Soviet foreign policy without vomiting or turning a hair. Honest Americans by the hundreds have, in the past, entered the Communist Party, seeking justice and equity, a better life for more people, or for other reasons best known to themselves. Disillusioned, frustrated, and embittered by what they found, they left the party and have since devoted their lives to an exposure of the greatest threat to human freedom since those posed by Ghengis Khan and Adolf Hitler. Among the greatest supporters of the House Committee on Un-American Activities today are those who lived the lie of communism and know it for what it is.

This has not been the case with the Communist line of support. In the gray area which lies between the bright red of communism and the white of freedom, thousands of puppets, dupes, and fellow travelers have hewed to the Communist line with a devotion which must bring smiles of derision to the men in Moscow who would make the world an armed camp and barbed wire, rampant on a sea of blood, an heraldic device for mankind.

While professing to deplore communism and human slavery, these allies of aggression attack whenever and wherever possible the agencies of government and the committees of the Congress upon whom has been laid the heavy charge of defending this Nation and its institutions from those forces which would destroy them. Ignorance of the law is said to be no excuse for the commission of a crime, nor is ignorance of the nature and design of slavery any excuse for lending the slavers material and moral support.

The Communist Daily Worker and its party affiliates constitute no grave threat to American institutions when they denounce the committee, its members, and the Congress. One expects that the Communist press will defend an Alger Hiss, a William Remington, or two identified Communists awaiting death in a

prison cell for treason. It is when a Washington Post quotes out of context and paints a distorted picture relative to the activities of congressional investigating committees that there is reason for concern on the part of loyal Americans. A sly comment relative to the work of your committees by any one of a dozen columnists whose goal in life appears to be the undermining of public confidence in the American Congress and its committees is worth a platoon of Chinese Reds in the lines in Korea. An editorial depicting the members of any committee as petty tyrants, fools, and moral lepers does greater damage to the foundations of the American Republic than a successful Communist counterattack above Panmunjon.

It has become the smart thing for certain newspapers and reporters, radio commentators and television performers, to seize upon every opportunity to deride the Congress, to fulminate and fuss over its conduct, to attack personally the motives and methods of its Members, and to generally hold up to public ridicule the elected representatives of 150 million Americans. It is high time that the people of America distinguish between freedom of the press and an unquestioned right to criticize on one hand, and personal attacks upon the Congress, which, if not motivated by the Communist Party and the fellow travelers, at least carry the express blessing of the conspirators.

Secretary of Defense Wilson is said to have stated that "What is good for General Motors is good for America." I say that what is good for the Communist Party is no good for America. Recent editorials attacking the investigating committees of this Congress were good for the Communists. They were not good for America.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is a legitimate target for honest criticism. Every member of that committee expects to be criticized, justly or unjustly. Criticism is a natural concomitant of service. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, made some comments on this subject in March of 1947. The Director said, and I quote:

> My feelings concerning the Communist Party of the United States are well known. I have not hesitated over the years to express my concern and apprehension. As a consequence its professional smear brigades have conducted a relentless assault against the FBI. You who have been members of this committee also know the fury with which the party, its sympathizers and fellow travelers can launch an assault. I do not mind such attacks. What has been disillusioning is the manner in which they have been able to enlist support often from apparently well-meaning but thoroughly duped persons.

The Communists, the leftwing, the sympathizers in press, radio, and television whine and squeal at the methods employed by congressional investigating committees. They profess to believe that the work of disclosing the diabolical nature of the Communist conspiracy should be performed by the FBI, which they hate.

With editorial hands raised in pious alarm, the apologists for human slavery express their horror at the operations of congressional investigating committees in bringing to the light of day those who are sworn to destroy this Nation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities saw fit to make a point of order before, that there was no quorum present, I now make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAMBLE). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 14]

Addonizio	Dingell	Long
Alexander	Dodd	McConnell
Arends	Dollinger	McCormack
Aspinall	Donovan	McMillan
Bailey	Dorn, N. Y.	Mack, Ill.
Baker	Dorn, S. C.	Mahon
Barrett	Durham	Miller, Md.
Beamer	Elliott	Mills
Belcher	Fallon	Mollohan
Bender	Feighan	Morgan
Bennett, Fla.	Fine	Morrison
Bentsen	Fino	Moulder
Boland	Fogarty	Multer
Bolling	Forand	O'Brien, Mich.
Bow	Garmatz	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boykin	Granahan	O'Neill
Brownson	Green	Osmers
Broyhill	Hagen, Calif.	Patterson
Buckley	Halleck	Philbin
Budge	Hand	Poff
Bush	Hardy	Poulson
Byrnes, Wis.	Hart	Powell
Campbell	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Cannon	Hays, Ohio	Price
Carlyle	Heller	Rabaut
Carrigg	Herlong	Reams
Case	Hoeven	Reed, N. Y.
Celler	Hoffman, Ill.	Riley
Chatham	Holifield	Rivers
Chelf	Hope	Robeson, Va.
Chudoff	Hruska	Robsion, Ky.
Church	Hull	Rooney
Clardy	Ikard	Sadlak
Cole, N. Y.	James	Saylor
Coudert	Javits	Sheehan
Crosser	Johnson	Shelley
Crumpacker	Jones, Ala.	Sheppard
Curtis, Mass.	Jones, Mo.	Spence
Curtis, Mo.	Kee	Steed
Curtis, Nebr.	Kelley, Pa.	Sutton
Davis, Ga.	Kelly, N. Y.	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	Kirwan	Weichel
Dawson, Ill.	Klein	Wheeler
Deane	Kluczynski	Wier
Delaney	Landrum	Wilson, Ind.
Dempsey	Lane	Wilson, Tex.
Devereux	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 282 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE CONTINUING ATTACK

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, again I assure the Members of the House I had nothing to do with the calling of the roll. I have all night myself, and I am quite content to stay here although I hope that will not be necessary.

The appeal to let the "FBI do the job" is as false and phony as most of the attitudes taken by the liberal press and the professional apologists. Conspirators work in the darkness and they prefer political darkness. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a great and effective instrument for the gathering, evaluation and documentation of information. Its agents, working within and outside the Communist Party, are, of necessity, anonymous. To disclose their highly secret work and the sources upon which they depend for accurate and factual information would be to destroy the utility of the organization, and to leave the Nation defenseless against the machinations of the conspirators.

The work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is one designed to give the American people a continuing picture of the Communist Party at work; to expose its propaganda efforts, and to inform citizens of organizations and individuals dedicated to the destruction of the American Republic. Its investigations are confidential only to the extent necessary to determine facts. Its hearings are public, open to all informational media, and its millions of publications go directly to the people of this Nation.

There is no area of duplication or of overlapping in the work performed by the FBI and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This is best indicated by the words of Mr. Hoover, himself:

> The aims and responsibilities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are the same—the protection of the internal security of this Nation. The methods whereby this goal may be accomplished differ, however. I have always felt that the greatest contribution this committee could make is the public disclosure of the forces that menace America—Communist and Fascist. That is why the venom of the American Communist and the now defunct German-American Bund has been directed at this committee as it has also been directed at the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This committee renders a distinct service when it publicly reveals the diabolic machinations of sinister figures engaged in un-American activities.

In the face of aggression from abroad, in spite of mounting American casualties, irrespective of sworn testimony from scores of witnesses identifying as Communists thousands of citizens of the United States, there still appears to be a fantastic and unbelievable unwillingness on the part of many people to accept the fact of the Communist conspiracy or its efforts to destroy this Nation.

The Ford Foundation, sustained by funds earned in the competitive market place of America, last week announced the grant of $15 million for investigation. Investigation of what? The nature and extent of Communist infiltration into its own plants in Detroit; the character of organized plans for espionage and sabotage in American science and industry; Communist infiltration into churches, schools, and organizations throughout the Nation?

Not at all, Mr. Speaker. The $15 million grant was made for the purpose of investigating the Congress of the United States and its committees, to determine whether additional safeguards are required for the protection of civil rights, and for other related purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the House some days ago voted an appropriation of $300,000 to the

House Committee on Un-American Activities. That appropriation was the greatest given the committee since its organization. It will enable the committee to add new counsel, new investigators and to expand generally the scope of its activities. The total appropriations made for all investigative committees do not exceed $1 million for the period of a year. If it requires the expenditure of $15 million to investigate congressional committees, the need for a relatively small appropriation for the investigation of the total area encompassed by the Communist conspiracy can be better appreciated.

The Ford Foundation might well devote some of its efforts to public disclosure of the substantial and vital work performed by the committee in its attempts to preserve the American system under which the Ford Co. acquired the millions being spent in investigation of the United States Congress and its duly constituted committees. Needless to state, the investigations proposed by the Ford Foundation will be greeted with enthusiastic approval from Shanghai to East Berlin. The approval will not be given voice by the silent millions of captive peoples, but by the commissars and their agents.

I respectfully refer the directors of the Ford Foundation to other critics of the committee, and other fighters in the cause of civil rights.

The Civil Rights Congress, cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General of the United States and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, will doubtless be happy to join in the investigation.

The Communist Party of the United States would unquestionably be anxious and willing to document the police state methods of congressional investigating bodies.

But the list of willing witnesses available to the Ford Foundation experts is too long to recite at this time. I suggest that the investigators for the foundation consult the Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications, available on request from the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Fifteen millions of dollars, wisely expended, would flush a lot of Communists out of hiding. It might, in fact, break the back of the Communist conspiracy in this country. But, as it is proposed to be used, it will serve only to lend additional aid and comfort to the Communist Party, and further roil the troubled waters of national determination and unity.

The Ford plant in Dearborn is a seething mass of intrigue and conspiracy, and thousands of unsuspecting and loyal American workers there are being duped. As indicated beyond any question of a doubt during the committee hearings in Detroit last year, the local union, the world's largest, is dominated and directed by Communists and Communist sympathizers. In the event of hostilities with the Soviet Union it is certain that organized sabotage would wreak havoc with production. In the face of the evidence available, it appears criminal folly for the Ford Motor Co. to associate its name and its prestige with any effort to hamstring or delay the vital investigations designed to render sabotage and subversion less likely in case of war.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities saw fit to make the point of order that a quorum was not present in order that the entire membership might hear these remarks of the gentleman from California, I now, for the same purpose, make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to make a statement.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is within his rights but the Chair will state that the gentleman from California has been granted 70 minutes; he has used 27. The Chair is going to see that the gentleman from California gets his 70 minutes no matter how late we stay tonight. These roll calls, of course, are not taken out of his time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Addonizio	Devereux	Kluczynski
Alexander	Dingell	Landrum
Arends	Dodd	McConnell
Aspinall	Dollinger	McCormack
Bailey	Donovan	McMillan
Baker	Dorn, N. Y.	Mahon
Barrett	Dorn, S. C.	Mills
Beamer	Durham	Mollohan
Belcher	Elliott	Morgan
Bender	Feighan	Morrison
Bennett, Fla.	Fernandez	Moulder
Bentsen	Fine	Multer
Boland	Fino	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolling	Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bow	Forand	O'Neill
Boykin	Garmatz	Osmers
Brownson	Granahan	Patterson
Broyhill	Green	Philbin
Burleson	Hagen, Calif.	Poff
Bush	Halleck	Poulson
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Powell
Campbell	Hart	Preston
Cannon	Harvey	Price
Carlyle	Hays, Ohio	Rabaut
Carrigg	Hébert	Reams
Case	Heller	Riley
Chatham	Herlong	Rivers
Chelf	Hoeven	Robeson, Va.
Chudoff	Hoffman, Ill.	Rooney
Church	Hope	Sadlak
Clardy	Hruska	Saylor
Cole, N. Y.	Hull	Sheehan
Crosser	Ikard	Shelley
Crumpacker	James	Sheppard
Curtis, Mass.	Javits	Steed
Curtis, Mo.	Johnson	Sutton
Curtis, Nebr.	Jones, Ala.	Teague
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley, Pa.	Weichel
Davis, Wis.	Kelly, N. Y.	Wheeler
Deane	Kirwan	Wilson, Ind.
Dempsey	Klein	Wilson, Tex.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 299 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE CONTINUING ATTACK

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will proceed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I knew it was St. Patrick's Day, but I did not expect a Donnybrook like this.

I was speaking, Mr. Speaker, of the situation in the Ford plant in Dearborn, pointing out that the committee investigations there last year proved that the leadership of Ford Local No. 600 was in large part pro-Communist, to be very charitable.

The Congress of the United States is better able to decide questions of tremendous import to the people of this country than is any group of dreamy-eyed visionaries in search of a novel way to spend money.

A few nervous educators, egged on and abetted by the Communist Party and the so-called intellectual and liberal press, have created a major tempest in recent weeks over the activities of congressional investigating groups in calling before them persons known to have been members of the Communist conspiracy. Editorial writers, frothing columnists, and commentators have ranged themselves with the Communist wolfpack in decrying any investigation whatever of the extent and nature of Communist infiltration into American education.

Let us get down to cold facts, Mr. Speaker. There are, as of today, more than 150 American educators, past and present, who have been identified as one-time members of the Communist Party in the United States. There are doubtless many more. The American people consider a classroom to be no place for a Communist. So, it would appear, do the college authorities at Rutgers, Ohio State, Temple University, and Harvard, which institutions have suspended or fired professors who refused to affirm or deny identifications under oath naming them as members of the Communist Party. The fact that only a few of the many thousands of educators and teachers are or may be disloyal in no way minimizes the danger, and to say that there are only a few and that they are not important is to say that it is perfectly all right to have one rattlesnake in a kindergarten class.

There is irrefutable evidence of sustained Communist efforts to recruit American educators and students into the Communist Party. There is gradually shaping up a frightening picture of indoctrination and rigid discipline among those educators and teachers who entered the party.

What is the role of a teacher in the conspiracy? One needs look no further than the pronouncement of the Communist Party itself on this point. The Communist, official publication of the Communist Party of the United States, carried an article in the May 1937 issue, entitled "The Schools and the People's Front." The following excerpts may bring illumination to some of the unenlightened minds who view the Com-

munist conspiracy in education as evidence of a healthy spirit of academic freedom.

The Communist states—page 440—speaking of teachers:

They must take advantage of their positions, without exposing themselves, to give their students to the best of their ability working-class education.

To enable the teachers in the party to do the latter, the party must take careful steps to see that all teacher comrades are given thorough education in the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism-Leninism will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure and at the same time to conduct struggles around the school in a truly Bolshevik manner.

After commenting on antagonism between students and teachers, page 441:

It must be the task of the party to break down this antagonism between students and teachers by arousing both groups to the realization of their common interests, of the fact that they suffer a common oppression from the same group (capitalists) and that improvement of their conditions demands joint struggle.

Page 445:

Marxist-Leninist analysis must be injected into every class. In addition to this, serious education on immediate social problems and in Marxism-Leninism must be undertaken independently * * *. The ultimate demand in this realm (in the college community) must be * * * presenting its (higher education's) material in such a way as to synthesize knowledge, to impart a scientific outlook upon the whole world as a whole, Marxism-Leninism being the only such outlook.

One year later, the same publication carried an article entitled "The Communist Party and the Professionals." Here was stressed the urgent need for new and selective recruiting, willingness to accept Communist discipline, and the importance of rewriting history from the Marxian viewpoint.

Pertinent excerpts of the article follow:

Page 805: Says entry of numerous professionals into the party presents problems which must be solved "before we can fully utilize our Communist professionals."

Page 808:

Selective recruiting: In drawing professionals into the party, care should be exercised to select only those individuals who show by practical work that they definitely understand the party line, are prepared to put it into effect, and especially display a thorough readiness to accept party discipline * * *.

Intensive education: There must be special attention paid to Marxian education of professionals entering our party * * *. This should have the definite goal of thoroughly communizing their outlook and reorientating their previous intellectual training, so that its full value may be utilized in a revolutionary sense by our party and the masses.

Page 809:

Our teachers must write new school textbooks and rewrite history from the Marxian viewpoint.

The other day the committee had before it Prof. Byron T. Darling, associate professor of physics at the Ohio State University. His answers are characteristic of the line taken by so-called unfriendly professors. He was asked the question by Mr. Russell, chief investigator of the committee:

Mr. Darling, do you now have in your possession or under your control any classified information pertaining to any project of the United States Armed Forces?

Mr. DARLING. I refuse to answer that question for the same reasons.

Meaning the reason he previously stated that of the fifth amendment.

Mr. KEARNEY asked the question:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the witness if he has ever acted at any time as an agent for the Russian Government.

Mr. DARLING. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the answer?

Mr. DARLING. Oh, I said "No."

Mr. KEARNEY. Have you ever acted as an agent of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARLING. I refuse to answer that question for the aforementioned reasons.

Mr. KEARNEY. Have you ever transferred any information that was in your possession to officials of the Communist Party?

Mr. DARLING. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason.

Communist recruiting drives snared many educators. The exact number is not now known and probably never will be known. In spite of the squeals of the editorial defenders and Communist apologists, an ever-increasing number of American educators are joining in the fight to purge the Communist minority. Among the courageous leaders is President Lewis Webster Jones, of Rutgers University, whose statement, "Academic Freedom and Civic Responsibility" should be read by every American citizen. Dr. Jones discharged from the university two professors who refused to affirm or deny alleged membership in the Communist Party before an investigating committee of the United States Senate. This prompt and courageous act brought down on him the wrath and fury of the apologists, who were almost apoplectic in their denunciations. The calm and considered statement by Dr. Jones is in the finest spirit of loyal Americanism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in my speech the article by President Lewis Webster Jones, of Rutgers University, entitled "Academic Freedom and Civic Responsibility." It may be that the article has previously been inserted by another Member, but as I consider it essential to a proper understanding of the position taken by myself in the matter of the current investigations, I ask that it be reprinted notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to is as follows:)

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY

(By President Webster Jones, of Rutgers University)

On December 12, 1952, the board of trustees of Rutgers University announced its decision in the cases of Prof. Simon W. Heimlich and Prof. Moses I. Finley, who had refused to answer questions concerning Communist affiliation put to them by the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, on the grounds that their answers might incriminate them, relying on the privilege provided in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The cases involve issues in which the public, the members of the university, and the academic community at large are deeply interested.

Acting on my own responsibility as president of the university, I offer my interpretation and amplification of the statement made by the board in announcing its decision.

REVIEW OF PROCEDURE

The cases have been under consideration by the trustees since September 26, 1952. It was obvious from the first that they raised questions of the gravest concern to this university, and indeed to the entire academic world. They should not be decided hastily, nor in response to the balance of pressures. The facts were not in dispute. It was clearly a matter of formulating a policy in a situation both new and serious, in which the Rutgers decision might have the effect of setting a precedent for the larger university community. For these reasons, my main concern was to invoke procedures which would insure thorough, fair, and judicious deliberation by those responsible for university policy. No clear line of procedure is provided in the statutes for cases of this kind; the situation is a new one, not envisaged when the statutes were agreed upon.

The first step was the appointment of a special committee of faculty, trustees, and alumni which was charged to advise me as to the course of action, if any, to be followed in the disposition of the cases.

After extended deliberations, during which both professors were heard, the faculty-trustee-alumni committee reported to me on October 14. The unanimous conclusion, based on detailed consideration of the facts and of the applicable university statutes governing academic freedom, was that the refusal of Professors Heimlich and Finley to answer the questions of the Senate subcommittee relating to possible connections with the Communist Party, on the grounds of possible self-incrimination, did "raise a real question as to their fitness to continue as teachers on the university faculty." The committee further recommended that a special committee on review be appointed by the faculty committee on committees and urged the importance of prompt decision in the interests both of the university and of the two men concerned.

I accepted and acted upon the report of the faculty-trustee-alumni committee, and summoned the faculty committee on committees. This group elected a special faculty committee of review, which was charged with the task of advising the president and the board of trustees as to whether the refusal of Professors Heimlich and Finley to answer the Senate subcommittee's questions as to Communist Party membership, on the grounds of possible self-incrimination, impaired their fitness to be members of the university faculty, taking into consideration the university statute 3.92, which states:

"The teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and a representative of this university. Since the public may, because of his position, give special attention or credence to his utterances and tend to judge his profession or this university by his conduct his position imposes on him the following special obligations: (1) That he bear these possibilities constantly in mind and seek at all times to conduct himself appropriately."

This was the one issue to be determined, and upon which advice was sought.

On December 3 the faculty committee of review met at the president's house with a committee of the board, and presented its preliminary report, identical in substance with the final report presented to the full meeting of the board on December 12. The

cases had been thoroughly discussed at innumerable committee meetings by members of the board since their inception on September 26; and from December 3 onward, when the recommendation of the faculty committee were known, possible alternative policies were carefully considered. On December 7 a small group of trustees met with me at the president's house and spent the afternoon and evening reading and analyzing the report of the faculty committee, formulating tentative proposals to be considered by the board. I cite these facts to show that the action of the board taken at the meeting on December 12 was neither hasty nor arbitrary; and I am impelled to record my own conviction, based on many conversations with members of the board since September 26, that the trustees have been fully aware of the complexities of the case, and conscientious in meeting their responsibilities to the two professors, the university community, and to the public.

The final faculty report was presented and read to the board at the meeting on December 12 by the faculty committee of review. Subsequently the report was thoroughly discussed. The board reluctantly but unanimously found itself in disagreement with the recommendation of the faculty committee that "no further action should be taken" in the two cases.

The action taken by the board was to offer the two professors the alternatives of reconsidering their decision and satisfy the president and the two vice chairmen of the board as to their willingness to testify, or severing their connection with the university as of December 31, 1952.

THE ISSUES

A great deal has been said and written by those members of the university community who disagree with the action of the trustees. The statement of the trustees was necessarily brief, since it was extremely difficult for so large a group to draft a detailed reply to the report of the faculty committee of review. I feel constrained, therefore, to point out some of the issues which were not involved in the cases of Professors Heimlich and Finley.

First, freedom of teaching and research was not an issue. In their statement of December 12, the trustees reaffirmed that the teacher "has the privilege of freedom to search out and teach the truth," and that "this university will protect him in the exercise of that freedom." The issue was rather that of the definition of the obligations on which freedom rests.

Second, the right to hold unorthodox opinions was not in question. The tolerance of heterodoxy is an essential element in freedom of thought. It is platitudinous to point out that creative changes in thought and action have come from heterodox views. The questions Professors Heimlich and Finley refused to answer did not relate to their opinions, but to their possible membership in the Communist Party. Such membership is not compatible with the freedom of thought and inquiry on which American teaching and research are based. It is no invasion of that freedom, but a necessary measure of protection of the freedom of all of us to seek to determine whether teachers and others in positions of trust are committed to the discipline and program of the Communist Party. Professor Heimlich has been willing to make a full explanation of his position and deny any past or present connection with the Communist Party to me and to the press. There would seem to be no additional "invasion of privacy," therefore, in asking him to reconsider his refusal to answer the questions put to him by the Senate subcommittee.

Third, professional competence was not in question; nor did the trustees attempt to inquire into this matter, which is clearly the province of the faculty and administrative officers. No suggestions of lack of professional competence, or of improper conduct, had been made. The inquiry into the teaching records of the two professors was irrelevant to the issue.

Fourth, the legal right of any citizen to refuse to testify, on the grounds of possible self-incrimination as provided under the fifth amendment, is not in dispute, though the legal as well as the moral wisdom of exercising it is open to serious doubt. Again, the central question was one of the obligations of citizenship.

The sole issue before the faculty committee of review, and before the trustees, was whether, under all the circumstances, a university teacher, and a representative of this university, has an obligation to answer the questions of a legally constituted investigatory body concerning membership in the Communist Party. It is on this issue that the conclusions and recommendations of the faculty committee of review are contrary to the considered convictions of the trustees.

THE PREMISES

The peculiar importance, and the newness, of this issue arise out of the nature of communism, and the world conflict between our own country, embodying the western tradition of freedom, and the bloc of Communist countries under Russian domination. The universities must carefully consider their relationship to this conflict, and their responsibilities as key institutions in the defense of the free world.

The Communist Party is not a political party like any other. It is a secret, conspiratorial organization imposing on its members a discipline and a regimentation of thought quite alien to the normal political parties of a democracy. Its standards of ethics are radically different from the ethical principles on which a free society, freedom of thought, freedom of research and teaching are based. The distinction between heterodoxy and conspiracy is relevant here: the university must insist on the tolerance of honestly held and frankly proclaimed differences of opinion, and its faculty must be free to engage in ordinary, open political activity; but it must protect itself, and cooperate in protecting the country, against any conspiracy which, if successful, would destroy all freedom.

It is true that the fear of communism can lead to excesses, and that many of the actions of self-styled anti-Communists have shown inadequate respect for individual rights. But it is unreasonable to deny that there is a real danger of Communist subversion, or to dismiss all public concern with Communist activity as hysteria.

The public has the right, through its legally constituted representatives, to inquire into the Communist Party membership of individuals. Legitimate and nonhysterical criticisms of the methods of such inquiries are in order; ways must be found to protect loyal people from irresponsible charges. But improvement is not likely to come from negative attitudes of noncooperation.

Universities, both public and private, are strongly affected with a public interest. They occupy a position of central importance in our free society, embodying highest aspirations, and our hope for material and spiritual progress. They are at once the most characteristic expression and the principal guardians of the western tradition of freedom. They are charged with the preservation of the cultural heritage, the discovery of new knowledge and its dissemination, the education of young people as persons, workers and citizens. They cannot confine themselves to techniques, and adopt an attitude of neutrality and withdrawal in the face of the central moral issues of our times. They must teach with conviction; they must not abdicate the larger intellectual and moral leadership which has been their historical function, and on which their claim to freedom rests.

Public investigation of the universities is legitimate, and should be frankly met. It implies no invasion of academic independence. The interference of any outside group with the proper functions of the university must be resisted, whatever the cost in criticism and loss of financial support. In the determination of the curriculum, methods of teaching and research, the selection of faculty or speakers, the permission of free discussion, the university must be completely independent. In all these matters, which relate to the proper performance of the intellectual functions of a university, public inquiry is legitimate; interference or dictation is not.

But the freedom the universities claim is not a negative concept. It is not freedom from all restraint, from all commitment, but the positive freedom to perform the traditional functions of research and teaching in the spirit of truth. The university is an integral part of society; it is not an isolated company of scholars but a group of citizens—students, faculty, administrative officers, trustees, and alumni—with certain clear responsibilities to the general community and to the scholarly world.

Traditionally and by law American universities—and, indeed, American schools—have been governed by lay boards of trustees. University communities are regulated by statutes jointly agreed upon by the faculties and the boards of trustees, but the trustees are legally in a position of stewardship and must be ultimately responsible for the policies of the universities.

The trustees and administrative officers of Rutgers University are called upon to defend faculty members in their legitimate exercise of freedom of expression, of teaching and research, and the independent control of their own professional affairs. It is clearly part of the duty of the trustees to insist on such independence, and they will continue to do so. It is, indeed, one aspect of the broad educational function of a university to seek to strengthen public understanding and support of the vital importance of freedom of inquiry, expression, and research.

A university almost inevitably is out of step with the wider community. Since one of its essential functions is to be a critic of conventional beliefs and values, with a view to extending the frontiers of knowledge and intensifying the appreciation of values, it must come into conflict with uncritically adopted mores and opinions. This essential conflict is the perennial source of attacks on the universities.

University faculties have only one truly valid defense against such attacks; namely, that they can demonstrate, on demand, that their educational methods and their theoretical findings have been arrived at by trained personnel through the use of thoroughly rational procedures. This demonstration of rationality wins support and confidence from those who for the moment understand neither the procedures nor the results. It is the one firm foundation on which academic freedom rests.

It follows that for members of a university faculty to refuse to give a rational account of their position on vital community issues not only cannot be defended by an appeal to academic freedom but, in fact, cuts the ground out from under academic freedom itself. The one weapon of defense is gone and the entire academic community must suffer accordingly.

Academic freedom has unfortunately become a defensive notion. As such it does not logically imply the freedom to be silent, as the faculty committee of review has maintained. The freedom to be silent is a civil right guaranteed under special circumstances by the Constitution. But academic

freedom entails the obligation to render an explanation, as clearly and rationally as possible, whenever such an explanation is called for by duly constituted governmental bodies acting within the limits of their authority.

The independence and self-regulation of the university cannot be reasonably claimed, still less maintained, unless our policies are framed with full recognition of our public responsibilities.

Under all the circumstances of our relations to world communism, a minimum responsibility would seem to be that members of the university state frankly where they stand on matters of such deep public concern, and of such relevance to academic integrity, as membership in the Communist Party, even when by a straightforward statement they believe they might incur certain personal risks.

In the cases of Professors Heimlich and Finley, the legal risks suggested as possible were those of a charge of perjury or contempt. These risks must be balanced against the risk of damage to the entire university, and to the profession to which the two men belong, incurred by refusal to testify on the grounds of possible self-incrimination. They must also be balanced against the public risks from Communist conspiracy: A plea of self-incrimination may be used to shelter conspirators, and has, in fact, been so used by members of the Communist Party.

THE QUESTION OF THE PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUALS

I recognize that the consideration of these two cases, and the concern of the faculty committee of review to stress the legal rights of the two professors, is strongly influenced by the fact that inquiries into subversion—a new problem for the United States—have often been conducted by methods and in an atmosphere which have bred fear and distrust among many loyal citizens. The ordinary protections against irresponsible or malicious accusations have not always been afforded. As a university community, we must give serious thought to the best methods of meeting future investigations, with due regard for legitimate public concern, and full cooperation in the attempt to discover subversion; but with regard also to the protection of individuals, and our own continued independence and integrity. I do not believe that a negative attitude of noncooperation is a constructive approach to these problems.

I therefore agree with the policy stated by the board of trustees in the December 12 meeting, requiring all members of the university faculty to answer questions concerning Communist Party membership put to them by any duly constituted public body. If, as a result of forthright testimony, a member of the faculty or staff should incur unjustified charges of contempt or perjury, his defense would become a matter of concern to the entire university community. I have no doubt that substantial aid as well as moral support would be forthcoming, it was indeed available to Professors Heimlich and Finley. To get such cases before the courts, where established rules of evidence prevail, would seem to be the most constructive method of clarifying these issues, and combating malicious, vague, or unfounded accusations.

THE TRUSTEES' DECISION

The responsibility for decision in these two cases, which involved a crucial matter of university policy, clearly rested with the board of trustees. The relevant university statutes had been formulated jointly by the faculty and the board; the original committee considering these two cases was a joint faculty-trustee-alumni committee; its recommendations for further procedure in a type of case not fully covered nor envisaged in the statutes were followed. The functions of the faculty committee of review were advisory. The trustees could not agree with its advice, which was that no further action should be taken.

The trustees expressed their appreciation of the conscientious work of the faculty committee, but were reticent in stating their criticisms in any detail. The main criticism was this: That the faculty committee's report established at some length the legal right of the two professors to invoke the fifth amendment in refusing to testify, a right which was not in dispute, though the legal wisdom of its exercise is questioned; but it did not deal adequately, in the opinion of the board, with the central issue, namely, the obligation of a member of the teaching profession, and a representative of the university, entitled by his position to freedom of teaching, research, thought, and expression, to state his position with respect to the Communist Party in the spirit of truth and courage upon the basis of which intellectual freedom is justified and valued. The faculty committee completely endorsed the stand of the two professors, a stand which the trustees felt to be wrong, and undermining to the integrity of this and other universities.

It is a matter of sincere regret that, on this central issue, the trustees found themselves in unanimous disagreement with the faculty committee of review. It is further a matter of sincere regret that Professors Heimlich and Finley could not accede to the request of the trustees to reconsider their stand, and make themselves available to testify.

REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION

The board of trustees has considered the requests for reconsideration of the two cases which have been received from groups within the university and elsewhere, and has taken cognizance of the votes of the university assembly, as well as communications in support of the decision announced on December 12.

No new considerations relevant to the fundamental issue of policy has been introduced at this time. The communications did not deal with the broad issues which have been discussed in the foregoing statement; they dealt narrowly with technical questions of professional self-regulation which were not at issue.

On the broad question of policy, I affirm the decision of the trustees to be right, and the only decision possible if they are to fulfill their obligations under the charter of this institution.

These cases have been heard at length; the decision is final; and the cases are closed.

May I call on the entire university community to turn their attention to the constructive tasks which lie ahead.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Un-American Activities has never undertaken an investigation of American education. What is more, it never will. There is a tremendous difference between an investigation of education and an investigation of individuals in education who have been identified as Communists, subject to the discipline and directives of the leaders of the conspiracy. If this distinction will be made by those who are understandably concerned with the current investigation, I am confident that the overwhelming majority of American educators, teachers, school administrators, regents, and other officials will join with the committee in an effort to rout out and disclose the Communist vassals in the classrooms of the Nation. The committee's concern is not now, and has never been, classroom procedures, nor the objective teaching of any political philosophy by objective and honest men and women. The citizens of this country do not believe that one subject to Communist directives can do an honest job, and I heartily agree with them on that score.

A week ago, Mr. Speaker, the distinguished and able chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities precipitated a considerable controversy as a result of an appearance on Mutual Broadcasting System's Reporter's Roundup. My first knowledge of the matter came as the result of several calls to my home by newspaper men. These reporters told me that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] had advocated an investigation of the churches of America. I was shocked at the purported statement, and together with other members of the committee, I disassociated myself from the chairman's position and issued a statement to that effect.

You will recall that certain elements of the press—certain commentators—certain political analysts—succeeded in stirring the entire Nation to dispute. Thousands of words were filed by the press services relative to the matter, and a nationwide controversy came into being.

Religion and the church are very close to the hearts of the American people. Through our national history, in war and in peace, we have, as a people, placed our trust in God and in the theory that right makes might. We have concurred in the old saying that "God and one makes a majority."

Our legislative bodies open their sessions with prayer to the Almighty. The inauguration of President Eisenhower was marked by his simple prayer asking guidance and strength. Unlike the Communists, we Americans believe in the efficacy of prayer, and our churches, cathedrals, and synagogues hold a very special place in our national life. No one can, with impunity, attack the church or churchmen and the suggestion that a congressional committee anticipated an investigation of American churches met with violent opposition.

I was very much concerned about this matter, as were many other Members of the Congress. I made it a point to obtain a copy of Mutual's press release which was made available to press and radio following the program on Monday, March 10. My interest in the matter, aside from a quite natural concern as a member of the committee, was heightened by the fact that mail reaching my office following the broadcast did not evidence the alarm expressed by a few editorial writers and commentators.

To the contrary, the expressions were predominantly in favor of whatever the chairman had said.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the best and only honest approach to this important matter is to give the House and the country the verbatim and quoted remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], as reported by the Mutual Broadcasting System. In that way there can be no charge made by the Communist apologists that words and phrases were taken out of context by me with reference to this important matter. I beg of the House to give close attention to the following portion of my remarks, for this is a classic example of how the Communist sympathizers and others pervert ideas,

corrupt meanings, and twist intent to fit their purposes.

A questioner on the program—

And I am using the exact words of the press release—

said that church leaders were becoming increasingly critical of the committee investigation of Communist influences in the colleges and universities and asked whether there was any likelihood of it being extended to the church field.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] answered, and I quote directly:

I can't say at this time. There are so many other phases of communism and subversive activity that we have to investigate and report upon that it is doubtful that this year we shall get into that field at all. However, I do think that this is very important to get across to the American people: The Soviet Union, through the American Communist Party, is out to destroy all religious freedom in this country.

Authorities to support Mr. VELDE'S statement that communism seeks the destruction of religion are too numerous to document here. Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party in the United States, said of religion, and I quote:

We Communists do not distinguish between good and bad religions, because we think they are all bad.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] continued, and I quote directly:

I believe our religious leaders should be made aware of that, and, while we welcome criticism, the committee welcomes honest constructive criticism, we do not like to be condemned for our efforts to point out to the American people and Congress that the Soviet Union is attempting to destroy our religion, and that we are doing our best to avoid that.

Question:

You don't preclude getting into the church field?

Answer by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE]:

Oh, no; it is entirely possible.

Perhaps the chairman had in mind the words of Nikolai Lenin, who said:

Down with religion. Long live atheism. The spread of atheistic views is our chief task.

Question:

Do you think there is a field for investigation there?

Answer by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE]:

Yes; I think there is a field. I cannot tell which direction it would take, whether it would be into some of the organizations which are affiliated with the various churches or whether it would be individuals. I would rather presume it would be individuals.

In mentioning "organizations which are affiliated with the various churches," the chairman may have had in mind one classic instance of a Red-dominated, Red-infiltrated front, the Methodist Federation for Social Action. That group, the activities of which were branded as Red by the California Senate Committee on Un-American Activities in the 1948 annual report, pages 73 and 246, was lauded by Bishop Bromley Oxnam of Washington, a gentleman who now presumes to criticize the work of your House committee in its investigations of identified Communists. Bishop Oxnam has been to the Communist front what Man o' War was to thoroughbred horse racing, and no one except the good bishop pays much attention to his fulminations these days. Having served God on Sunday and the Communist front for the balance of the week, over such a long period of time, it is no great wonder that the bishop sees an investigating committee in every vestry. If reprinting Bishop Oxnam's record of aid and comfort to the Communist front would serve any useful purpose, I would ask permission to insert it here, but suffice it to say that the record is available to any Member who cares to request it from the committee.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action is not affiliated with the Methodist Church, and it has been repudiated by millions of loyal Americans in that church.

To continue with the script.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] was asked this question:

Do you think if such an investigation were undertaken—if and when—a man who called you a pretended patriot and morally unfit to investigate the colleges and universities, might come under investigation?

Answer by [Mr. VELDE]:

No, not because of what he called me, or that he criticized the committee. We will make these investigations as fair as we possibly can and we will go ahead and let the record speak for itself.

Mr. Speaker, could any statement be more forthright, more honest than that? Personal considerations are repudiated by the chairman in what must be considered a decent and admirable position.

This constitutes all of the discussion of the religious matter during the actual telecast, as reported by Mutual's press statement. There was a further and informal interview between the chairman and the panel members following Reporter's Roundup broadcast, and the general tenor of the discussion is revealed to be very similar to that which was broadcast.

In reply to questions, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] stated that any investigation by the committee of Communist influences in religion would, and I quote, "probably include individual members of the cloth, including some who seem to have devoted more time to politics than they have to the ministry."

Perhaps the chairman had in mind the statement made by the Reverend Claude C. Williams, of Birmingham, who is alleged to have stated in public meeting:

Denominationally I am a Presbyterian, religiously, a Unitarian, and politically I'm a Communist. I'm not preaching to make people good or anything of that sort. I'm in the church because I can reach people easier that way and get them organized for communism.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] continued, and I quote:

The investigation would be in the field of individuals. We would not be investigating the churches any more than we are now engaged in investigating the colleges and universities. We are engaged at present in investigating the extent of Communists in the colleges—for the benefit of the colleges themselves and the people—and we would be doing the same in relation to churches.

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that there is not the slightest suggestion of a blunderbuss, overall investigation of any church, any creed, or any denomination. It is stressed, time and again, that this is a matter concerning individual Communists in the various fields.

The chairman went on to state that any broadened scope of the committee's investigations, and I quote the words of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], "would be to determine whether the American Communist Party, through its membership, is attempting to destroy religion in this country by infiltration and by external means."

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that that statement should meet with the ardent approval of churchmen everywhere whose colleagues of the cloth are rotting in Communist jails throughout the world today.

Upon these statements rest the controversy which has raged for the past week, and which actually resulted in the introduction in the House of a resolution calling for the removal of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I acted hastily in disassociating myself from the chairman's words. For that I am sorry, and if any apology is needed, and I am sure it is not, I tender it to my chairman at this time. There is not a word of his reported remarks on this occasion with which I am not happy and proud to associate myself.

I am a Congregationalist by birth and breeding. The little white church across the street from my birthplace in South Dakota holds a special place in my affections. But I see no threat to it and its counterparts throughout this great land in the words and actions of the gentleman from Illinois, HAROLD VELDE. To the contrary, I feel that no greater service can be rendered to God and man alike than to find out what men, if any, would place the thorny crown of the Kremlin upon the brow of the Prince of Peace.

There are Communists in the church, as there are in labor, education, entertainment and the arts and sciences. The robes of a churchman were never intended to cover treason to the Almighty nor to act as a shield against legitimate investigation. A churchman who serves the Communist Party compounds his treason. A layman who advances the cause of the Communist conspiracy betrays his fellow men into slavery, but the man of God who treats with the conspirators betrays those things which are of transcendent importance—his oath, his moral obligations and his Creator.

Those engaged in treason, whatever their callings, enjoy no immunity, nor should they. The educator in the classroom, the churchman in the pulpit, the doctor and the lawyer in their offices, the labor leader in his union, the star of stage, screen, and radio, all are integral forces in a society under bitter and unremitting attack. Their responsibilities as citizens are no less than those imposed upon other Americans in meeting the godless aggression confronting our people. America expects them to meet this challenge honestly and wisely.

defending their proper activities and disclosing to constituted authorities those which they consider to be improper and dangerous. They can do no more—they should do no less.

I am proud to be a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; happy to be in the vanguard of those charged with the defense of my country. I have no apology to make for the work of this important committee, nor for any member of the committee or its staff. The confidence expressed in the committee by the membership of this House some days ago in voting an unprecedented sum of money for its operations, reflects, I believe, the opinions of the American people. It may not reflect the ideas of the professional apologists for communism in the press and on the airways, nor of those in and out of the Congress who have always despised the committee and its individual members, whomever they may be.

It is my sincere hope that the distinguished members of the Rules Committee will see fit to report the so-called Roosevelt resolution to the House for action. That resolution calls upon the House to remove our colleague the gentleman from Illinois, HAROLD H. VELDE, from his post as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. While the resolution is aimed at one colleague, its passage would destroy the utility of the committee and shatter the confidence of the American people in its operation. Let that one fact be understood. If there is further evidence of an unspoken collusion between the Communist Party and the fellow-traveling press to abolish the committee, it is my intention to introduce a resolution into the House to do the same thing—but not for the same purpose. I think that the House and the Nation should force into the open those whose animosity is deep seated and of long duration. They should be required to stand up and be counted, and the purpose would be served by reporting the Roosevelt resolution.

If the leftwing and the apologists can drive a wedge between members of the committee, or between the Congress and the committee, a battle will have been won which no Communist divisions could match on the battlefield.

The sound and the fury of the present controversy presents no new voices and very few new faces.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. VELDE. Naturally I appreciate the kind words of the gentleman from California. I want to apologize to the sons of Erin, whose day this is, for encroaching upon their time.

I notice the gentleman from California apologized for a remark that he made to the press. I, of course, appreciate that apology and insist that it was not necessary at all. I accept it in all humility.

Furthermore, I want to tell the Members of this House that I concur in the request of the gentleman from California that the Roosevelt resolution be voted out by the Rules Committee; and I especially request that from my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], chairman of the Rules Committee, that he immediately bring this matter before his group. I realize, of course, that the Rules Committee is a very important arm of the Congress in sifting out and directing what legislation shall come before this House. Since, however, there has been such tremendous demand on the part of the American people to determine this issue once and for all, and since we, the Members of Congress, are the representatives of those people, I feel that it is vitally important that the Rules Committee vote this resolution out, so that we might give consideration to it on the floor of the House; and I am willing to say right now that I will pit my support against the element that is supporting the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT]. I ask this because I know that the Roosevelt resolution is hindering and impeding the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I would like to get it over with as soon as possible so that we may continue that work which I feel all the Members of this body realize is very important at this time in view of the attempted, I might say deliberately attempted, effort on the part of Soviet Russia to provoke war at the present time.

Mr. JACKSON. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the traditional opponents of the committee have, as I have said, advanced in closed order, well-contained. They know where they have been, where they are, and where they are going; and the time has come for the Congress and its committees to stop back pedaling their way into disaster.

The opponents are using brass knuckles and blackjacks, and in attempting to lean backward out of the way, the committee has surrendered the initiative to its attackers. This is a time to stand up and fight, a time to reread the charge laid upon the committee by the House, and a moment to move forward in fulfillment of that charge. Faint heart never won fair lady, and faint heart, mortally wounded by editorial criticism, never preserved liberty nor liquidated the enemies of human freedom.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], one of the valuable members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, for what I consider to be one of the greatest speeches that has ever been made on the floor of the House of Representatives in the entire history of the United States. I think the speech of the gentleman from California will go down in history as one of the great speeches that have been made in this body. I only hope that enough patriotic Americans throughout the United States will come forward with sufficient money to have enough copies of this speech reprinted to be sent throughout the breadth of our land, and particularly to every rabbi in every synagogue, every priest in every Catholic church, and every Protestant minister in the entire United States. Further, I have observed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], the one who made a point of order that a quorum was not present, at one time gave as one of the reasons for making the point of order the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], when he made the original point of order did so in order that the Members of the House of Representatives could hear the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]. I particularly noted that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has not been on the floor of the House of Representatives at any time during Mr. JACKSON's speech except to come in and make a point of order. I do not know whether the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] had the gentleman from Pennsylvania in mind or not when he mentioned those who disliked the committee, but I had the honor of serving on this Committee on Un-American Activities in 1943 and 1944 in the House of Representatives, and I think it should be reported to the House that when we brought out the report on the CIO Political Action Committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] was a member of that committee, when the committee was chairmanned by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable MARTIN DIES, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] refused to sign that report. I congratulate my colleague from California. You have done a masterful job in the cause of Americanism today.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Today was quite a day in Congress. Today was quite a day because one of our distinguished colleagues delivered an address that, as the gentleman from Illinois said, will go down in history. I had the privilege of sitting next to HAROLD VELDE in the Labor Committee, and I therefore do not want to talk about him as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee. I want to talk about him as my colleague on the Labor Committee. He has always worked hard to do the best he could for everyone. He has always been sincere. The speech of the gentleman from California today reminds me of the story told of Mark Twain. He used to be noted for his use of strong language. He had a very sweet and demure wife who hated his profane outbursts. She tried in every way to correct his speech. One day he was shaving and he was indulging in his customary language. His wife stood outside the door and repeated everything. He finally opened the door, and he said: "My dear, you have the language, but not the music." So to the distinguished gentleman from California I say: You put beautiful music to words today to eulogize our great colleague.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman.

PREPAREDNESS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to a great and inspiring message by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON]. He talked to us about the fight against communism at home. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I shall talk to you about our military strength. Are we prepared to combat communism abroad? That is a most serious question.

We face today one of the gravest periods in the history of our Nation. At this time a great part of the whole world is lined up on the side of Russian communism.

We know, of course, with Stalin's death Malenkov has taken over. What changes that will lead to, we cannot say. Most people hope that a struggle for power within Russia will bring about a conflict which will lead to a breaking of strength in Russia proper and to a breaking away of Russian satellites.

Such a course would have some appeal, but I caution you that such a period would be fraught with great danger for another all-out conflict. A war on foreign soil has frequently been the means used by tyrants to direct public attention away from troubles at home. Already we have had an American plane shot down over Germany. A few days later it was a British plane. Is this the beginning of Malenkov's effort to demonstrate to his people and the world that he is tough? Is this a beginning of all-out war? These questions I cannot answer, but the outlook is so serious that I feel I should point out to the Congress and to the country that, while we have spent billions of dollars for preparedness, we must raise the question, Are we truly prepared? Is our military in readiness? Is it doing its part within its own organization? I am afraid it is not.

Let me read you recent headlines: "Senators Set Full Probe on Lack of Ammo"—ammunition; "Van Fleet Charges Substantiated."

I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I heard General Van Fleet's comment. He did not say as much before our committee as has been attributed to him; however, his statement on the shortage of ammunition is most disturbing.

Mr. Speaker, we read in the press where our planes are outflown by Russian planes with superior speed and that we are outproduced in great numbers. These and many other things cause us to be alarmed. We have spent billions of dollars, but has our armed services spent it wisely? Is it bogged down by its own red tape, its own conflicts and competition? May I pause here to say that, by no means, do I wish to imply that all our military leaders are inefficient. Many are outstanding and do what they can to eliminate waste.

I submitted evidence in my possession to the Armed Services Subcommittee on Procurement, which brought about the investigation of the Elvair Corp. I hope every Member who has not done so already will read this report which was signed by Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT, subcommittee chairman, and approved by Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, June 20, 1951. I quote the conclusions and recommendations of this subcommittee:

CONCLUSIONS

The story unfolded in testimony, documents, and investigation of this company is fantastic. It places a severe strain on the patience and the credulity of the committee. It reveals a serious defect in our procurement system, a lack of interest and failure of duty on the part of procurement officers to rise to the full obligation of their offices and assignments in the interest of the United States. It shows how these promoters and banker allies, who were more interested in a "lead-pipe cinch" profit than anything else, can cause the established manufacturers of the country to be passed over, notwithstanding the assurances of the procurement officers that all that has to be done is for them to keep in communication with the nearest ordnance district.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends a thorough overhauling of the procurement investigating staffs so that alert, capable, and interested personnel qualified in their duties are placed in charge; and that inquiries be answered fully and completely, including the passing along of helpful information to the other inquiring district offices. Too much responsibility is vested in preparation and circulation of notices of Government needs on persons having limited capacity and knowledge in the field of procurement, with the result that promoters of the type managing Elvair can gain a foothold.

The committee recommends that all ordnance and procurement districts be required to consult and notify all prospective suppliers listed with them and other districts for quotations in advance of any negotiated bid. Only in this way can the full potential of the industry and manufacturing experience of this country be availed of.

The committee recommends that since none of these contracts have been performed (except a limited portion of one of them), that appropriate steps be taken to terminate or cancel them, whichever is to the greater advantage of the Government.

The committee recommends that the investigation proceed into all the operations of the procurement organizations.

It is recommended that the investigators at Birmingham Ordnance District, John S. Mitchel and Frank Legare, be discharged.

Even though, as a result of this investigation, the contract awarded to the Elvair Corp. was canceled and the military advised me that their entire procurement procedures were corrected and tightened up, not a single person who was involved in awarding this contract was ever dismissed from the service. Presumably, the military is still depending on the same men to do a job for them at a new stand. Can we count on them? This individual case is a minor part of the billions being spent, but it is a symbol of greater laxity and inefficiency. I refer you to committee reports of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON'S committee, that of Hon EDWARD HÉBERT'S committee, Hon. HERBERT BONNER'S committee, and that of my colleague on the Armed Services Committee, Hon. PORTER HARDY'S committee—all of the 82d Congress.

We have billions of dollars' worth of military equipment which this Nation has paid for and which is stored around the world—materiel on which we must depend if we are faced with a larger conflict.

Did you know that most of this equipment is individually packaged, and it cannot be determined, unless tested, whether it is good or bad until the individual package is opened? How many wheels are there that will not roll? How many guns are there that will not fire? The old familiar saying: "For want of a nail, a shoe was lost; for want of a shoe, a horse was lost; for want of a horse, a battle was lost," is quite fitting. For example, every piece of mechanized equipment runs on bearings. Without bearings, equipment will not operate. Truly, bearings are strategic. Yet, in one of the largest branches of our military service, over 50 percent of its bearings were last year in questionable condition due to inadequate preservation and/or packaging. Of those reaching the field in serviceable condition, one-half was ruined due to careless depreservation and/or installation after depreservation.

To make this condition worse, rejected bearings were disposed of and some resold to the Armed Forces as serviceable.

Bearings are only one item in the vast quantity of materiel used by the Armed Forces. Radar equipment, planes, ships, ordnance items, medical supplies, and generators are all protected so that in the event of global war, or an expanded Korean war, equipment can be immediately available for action.

These facts were admitted by Mr. N. L. Klein, Chief, Fuels and Lubricants, in Section R. and D. Division, in March 1952, more than a year ago, when he said that in the past a majority of our bearing stocks have been in questionable condition due to inadequate preservation and/or packaging. Of the percentage that has reached the field forces in serviceable condition, approximately one-half of these bearings are generally ruined as a result of careless depreservation and/or installation after depreservation.

The same condition prevails in many areas. We have much materiel stored in the open, much of it in humid areas. Much of it has been in storage for a number of years.

A means, an inexpensive means, to keep tab on these billions of dollars worth of stored equipment has been a prime need. This fact has been recognized for years.

The thing that burns us all up in these critical times is that the military claimed more than a year ago that it had the answer, that it had come up with an inexpensive piece of equipment that would tell the story before we faced a great need, and before lives were lost. It is my information that proof exists that the military authorities did have such an instrument, but due to inefficiency within the service only a relatively small number of such units have been used and that further use is now being held up without any real cause.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, I called these facts to the appropriate subcommittee of my Committee on Armed Services. In view of my past experiences, I feel that I should enlist the Congress and the country in my efforts to get a bad situation corrected.

Let me briefly review the salient facts in this case involving a proper means of testing stored equipment. The construction of a reliable and inexpensive device with which to test unopened packages would be a major gain for economy and efficiency. We cannot invest vast sums

in stored equipment unless we know it is maintained in good shape, and the storage will be worse than useless if the equipment becomes spoiled and defective without our knowledge while in storage.

A year ago the magazine Steel revealed that the Army ordnance officials believed they had found the solution to this storage problem. Let me quote from the article published in Steel, entitled "Moisture Meters":

Army Ordnance, continuing its attack against rust, uncovered a new weapon in the age-old struggle. Moisture meters, developed by Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Minneapolis, and American Instrument Co., Silver Spring, Md., are the latest additions to the growing arsenal.

The meters consist of two parts: One, a moisture-sensing element about the size of a cigar lighter—it's inserted into a hole in the side of a package—the other, an electric meter plugged into the protruding end of the moisture-sensing part. Readings are taken from a dial needle that points to a green safe area or a red unsafe area. Moisture accumulations can be spotted before the damage actually occurs, and we can save millions, say Ordnance officers. Development work is still going on to make the instrument even more sensitive.

Moisture meters plug a big gap in the defense against rust. Most rustproof packages (for guns, artillery, automotive replacement parts) are used to wrap items—along with desiccant—in an airtight parcel. Most packages serve well; a small percentage prove leaky. Formation of rust, since it otherwise couldn't be detected without opening and inspecting, runs into the big money for ordnance. It figures the cost of the meters (under $5 each) will be well worth saving.

Yet not one of these meters has been purchased by Army Ordnance.

A committee was appointed by Assistant Chief of Staff, G–4, to study humidity sensing elements. This committee was composed of a representative from Office, Chief of Ordnance, Corps of Engineers, Signal Corps, and Office, Chief of Transportation. This committee reported on February 5, 1952, that committee members were in agreement on the following recommendations:

(a) The investigation has shown that no further development appears necessary by the Army Technical Services.

(b) Laboratory tests begun September 1951 by Frankford Arsenal resulted in this statement December 1951:

The four A sensing elements checked each other to within 1 percent RH throughout the test.

(c) Service tests by Corps of Engineers October 22, 1951, concluded November 9, 1951, resulted in these recommendations, November 1951:

It is recommended that the electrical method of testing method II A packs for humidity conditions within the barrier, as described herein, be adopted by the Corps of Engineers as standard practice in all method II A packs and that the specifications be revised to require the placing of sensing elements therein.

(d) Service tests were begun November 13, 1951, at Frankford Arsenal. Installations were made in a "cocooned" 90-millimeter gun, and 3 method II packs. These elements have been recalibrated by that agency with no change in calibration.

(e) Corps of Engineers approved this method of inspection on December 5, 1951.

(f) Secretary, General Motors preservation-packing conference, wrote on July 6, 1952:

It seemed to me at the time that this was a rather significant advance in the field of packaging for military purposes.

(g) Service tests were held by United States Air Force at Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa. Several defective packs were found. The depot recommended its use to the Air Materiel Command.

(h) Tests were set up August 26, 1952, with Medical Service at Louisville Medical Depot.

(i) Report of tests at a medical depot October 2, 1952, resulted in the conclusion:

(1) That inspection of method II packages may be performed without opening and destroying the package.

(2) That this system of inspection may be applied to existing method II packages by the addition of sensing elements to the package.

(3) That this system of inspection is considered more economical than the present methods of inspecting method II packages.

Recommendations:

(1) That this system of inspecting method II packages be adopted by the Medical Service.

(2) That this system of inspection be applied to existing method II packages.

(3) That this system of inspection be applied to method II packages on future procurement.

(j) Naval Gun Factory in August 1952 recommended:

(1) That a specification be prepared to cover an electric-type hygrometer.

(2) That this type hygrometer be authorized for use on metal and plastic enclosures aboard ships and in large method II packages.

(3) That the majority of hair hygrometers tested read as much as 30 percent high after 90 days.

(k) The Engineer Research and Development Laboratories, Fort Belvoir, Va., in a report dated October 3, 1952, states that it concluded that an electric type hygrometer satisfactorily measured conditions of relative humidity in a torpedo container within certain limits. It is recommended that this type hygrometer be considered applicable for use in torpedo containers provided the conditions represent the safe relative humidity conditions for items shipped and/or stored in such containers as determined by the service agency concerned.

(l) This system has been used in many tens of thousands of service installations. The reorder by these agencies signifies satisfaction and includes Corps of Engineers, Signal Corps, Transportation Corps, Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks, and the United States Air Force.

(m) The Standards Branch, G–4, in December 1952, directed Army Technical Service to withhold procurement pending standardization. The staff position, according to Lieutenant Colonel Woodrow, on December 31, 1952, was only to control procurement. Knowledge of previous recommendations by the subcommittee was denied by Lieutenant Colonel Woodrow and Mr. Sargeant of his office. I understand that the action was taken, affecting the entire Army storage program, without the knowledge of Colonel Woodrow. Why was procurement of this instrument halted in such a devious fashion? I have no personal knowledge of the quality of this device, but all of the responsible groups charged with testing such instruments in the service have given it their stamp of approval. Is it economy to provide such an advantageous technical improvement, spend months in developing and testing it, and then virtually halt its procurement at the very time when the device should be in the fullest use?

This individual case warrants the fullest attention of the entire Defense Department, and it warrants the immediate attention of the proper committee of the Congress. Is this another case of too much administration? There is no economy in cutting down procurement of items which have been built for the purpose of eliminating waste, especially after every test apparently proves its practicability. Was procurement cut back merely because someone neglected to inform a lieutenant colonel that the device in question affected the entire military storage and supply program?

Mr. Speaker, we have spent more than a hundred billion dollars since World War II on preparedness. We have supported our military forces. I have been on the Armed Services Committee for 8 years. We have given full support to recommendations of the military, many times with reservations, but resolving doubts in favor of military advice because of our primary interest in national security.

Mr. Speaker, the military today and many times in the past has reduced its fighting strength and eliminated needed equipment when such action would have been unnecessary if wasteful practices had been eliminated.

In this one problem which I have pointed out today, according to the information furnished me, we are wasting billions of dollars. But more important than this is the risk we run. How much of this more than $100 billion of equipment on hand and on order will be usable and dependable when we try to use it?

I, too, want to stand up to Russia, but, Mr. Speaker, let us know that the gun is loaded before it is pointed—even in self-defense. The lives of our soldiers and civilians may depend upon early determination and correction of what I believe is a most serious situation. This packaging may be a symbol of similar failures to make proper use of vast funds which have been voted to defend America—not for waste.

I do not want to see our fighting strength weakened. On the contrary, I want to see it increased. In order to do this, we must eliminate the type waste of which I have spoken and we must eliminate every other type of unnecessary spending now going on in the Defense Department.

If we are short of ammunition and supplies, who is responsible? If the proper solution for our supply storage can be stalled for so long, will it be ready

when the supreme test comes? We must insist on corrective action.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman's remarks disclose to the House of Representatives what I already knew, and that is that he has made a considerable study of the subject. That is not new to me, because I have been aware for 3 or 4 years that the gentleman is intensely interested in government economy. I want at this time to express my appreciation to him for the many conversations we have had and the many times he has assisted me in my efforts to save taxpayers money. In the course of my activities as chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee during the past 4 years he has been most helpful and has always demonstrated consecration to his duties as representative of his district, his State, and the Nation.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank the gentleman.

I have not had time to mention many things that I intended to mention. I have called attention to the committee of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, the Bonner committee, the Hébert committee, the Hardy committee, and some others. I have supported the military in sound undertakings for 10 years. When General Van Fleet or any other military man comes before my committee and says, "We must have more equipment and more materiel," I only answer, "If you need it, of course we must provide it." As far as the Congress is concerned, we have provided selective service during peacetimes, something we regretted that was necessary. We gave in authorizations and appropriations every year that which was needed for military preparedness.

As chairman of the subcommittee which did such a marvelous job, you know if the military had spent a little more time helping to clean up their own ranks and getting rid of bad personnel and looking into this wasteful storage proposition, then we would be saving, in my opinion, millions of dollars. I am one of those who want to see the strength of our Air Force maintained. I led the fight for a 70-group Air Force. I served on the subcommittee for stockpiling strategic materials, I helped write the magna carta of the Reserves, certainly I do not want to see our military strength cut down. I do believe much of the reductions that the military may have made in personnel and in strength was completely unnecessary if they would only eliminate waste.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. If I understand the gentleman's position correctly, he joins me in the belief that we can accomplish considerable economy in the military without in any way weakening our military strength.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I want to say that I have been in agreement with the gentleman and other Members of this House and have joined in every effort to wake up the military leaders to what goes on in their own shop. The gentleman has contributed as much or more than any other Member to improving the operations of Government.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I have been very much interested in the gentleman's frankness about wastefulness in the military. I want to compliment the gentleman upon the splendid statement he has made of it. I am wondering if the gentleman does not agree with me that regardless of how active and alert the Congress may be, we in the Congress are more or less—more, I would say—at the mercy of the military, in that we are not experts in that field, and must, of necessity, resolve doubts in favor of preparedness, and perhaps we are thereby taken advantage of. Therefore the chief burden of trying to relieve this situation that the gentleman has so graphically described must, in its final analysis, rest upon the military itself.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Exactly so. I am fully in accord with you. Saving waste gives dollars for needed enlargements of strength. We will never do the job unless the military helps by cutting out duplication, removes those people who are either inefficient or who willfully do not do the job they should do in procurement and production.

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman also go along with this fact, that possibly whatever danger—and according to my viewpoint the chief danger there to this country is not from military aggression by the Soviet Republic but from the fact that we are in real danger of playing into the hands of the masters of the Kremlin in their chief objective of destroying the economy of this country. If this wastefulness continues we are certainly making a very adequate contribution to the Communists.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I would say that I am certainly fearful of the things the gentleman pointed out; I am also fearful that if we do not put our defenses in strong order the Russian Communists may destroy us also. I know my colleague has been one of the most foresighted Members of Congress. He saw the Russian threat long before many others recognized it. We must not spend ourselves into bankruptcy, neither must we be caught unprepared. Eliminating waste serves both needs.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FISHER. Did I understand you to say that these individual packages, in the absence of this equipment, have to be opened before you can tell whether they are good.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That is what I mean. When the military itself says that half the ball bearings of a major segment of the Military Forces were not usable because of poor handling and such facts were not found out until they were needed in forward areas, it is time we checked on the hundred billion dollars worth of equipment we have already bought before we lose lives and perhaps a war. We say we are prepared. Are we? I must say it is open to question. We must now take action.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I just want to say that the gentleman has made a real contribution. I certainly hope the military will follow this matter up as the gentleman has requested. He is, as usual, completely sound. Times are too serious to have a hundred billion dollars worth of military equipment turn up unsound when it is needed.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I thank my friend and colleague.

FOREIGN CHILDREN ADOPTED BY GI'S

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we in Massachusetts have been brought face to face with a law that apparently exists which I for one think is very cruel: A GI is ordered home; he and his wife adopted a little foreign child and have had the child 2 years. They are now told they cannot bring the child to the United States, that the child must wait 5 years for admittance. GI's and their wives are allowed to adopt children, but they cannot bring them away from a foreign country for 5 years. They either should not be allowed to adopt foreign children or else we should so amend the law as to enable them to bring those children back to this country. Imagine the cruelty of separating a little adopted child from its foster parents or the cruelty of taking those parents away from the child.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, some days ago 22 Members of this body were invited by President Eisenhower to be his luncheon guests today. Realizing it was St. Patrick's Day and that no business was scheduled before the House, we accepted the invitation and spent a very pleasant hour with President Eisenhower.

Imagine our surprise at the conclusion of the luncheon to learn there had been a series of quorum calls in the House, at least three, during our absence; and, of course, none of the 22 Members in the group were recorded as having responded to the roll calls.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the RECORD to show the names of the Members of Congress who were present at this luncheon. I am sure that had they not been so engaged they would have been on the floor of the House and responded to the rollcalls.

The Members in attendance at the luncheon were:

Democrats: PORTER HARDY, JR., Virginia; PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR., Georgia; ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Pennsylvania; CHARLES E. BENNETT, Florida; RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; CARL ELLIOTT, Alabama; and MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri.

Republicans: BENJAMIN F. JAMES, Pennsylvania; HOWARD H. BAKER, Tennessee; PAGE BELCHER, Oklahoma; FRANK T. BOW, Ohio; CHARLES B. BROWNSON, Indiana; HAMER H. BUDGE, Idaho; ALVIN R. BUSH, Pennsylvania; MARGUERITE CHURCH, Illinois; SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, JR., Indiana; THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri; and JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, Maryland.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman agrees with me when I say that it was very gracious of the President to ask us all to lunch with him at the White House.

Mr. BAILEY. And I enjoyed it immensely.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. He was a very gracious host.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have this day introduced a resolution of disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1, the plan to establish a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have done this for three reasons:

First. I personally oppose the reorganization plan, very heartily;

Second. I feel this resolution of disapproval had to be introduced to insure adequate discussion of the proposal; and

Third. I feel that the proposed method of reorganization as attempted in this plan is unconstitutional.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think it might be noted that in 1951 during the 81st Congress when an almost identical reorganization plan was submitted by President Truman only one Member of the now majority party supported that plan and every other Member on that side opposed it.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. The gentleman and I opposed it then, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I hope they still recognize the dangers in such a proposal and that the bill that will be before us for consideration tomorrow will be defeated and that the gentleman's resolution of disapproval will eventually be accepted by the House.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include a report of the Mecklenburg County Get Out the Vote Committee, based upon which the American Heritage Foundation award was made.

Mr. REES of Kansas in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include an editorial from the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. YATES) in two instances.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan and to include an editorial from the Muskegon Chronicle in relation to Elmer J. Engel, a former Member of Congress.

Mr. ELLIOTT in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRETELLA (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Illinois).

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Florida).

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 173. An act for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 255. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POFF (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Illinois), on account of official business.

Mr. SCHERER, for the period from March 19, 1953, to April 2, 1953, on account of hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee in the State of California.

Mr. CLARDY, for the period from March 19, 1953, to April 2, 1953, on account of hearings of Un-American Activities Committee at Los Angeles, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 171. Resolution to inquire into certain operations and conditions in Korea; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3853. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. House Joint Resolution 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution; with an amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 179. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 223, providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution; without amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Intermediate Report pertaining to the German Consulate-American House Program (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Committee on Government Operations. Intermediate report pertaining to retention of Rhoads General Hospital as a standby Army facility

(Rept. No. 169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 4023. A bill to provide for the revision of the public land laws in order to provide for orderly use, improvement, and development of the Federal lands and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the Federal range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4024. A bill to change the name of the Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Monument to the "Appomattox Courthouse National Historical Park"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4025. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin, for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4026. A bill for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Corson County, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4027. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4028. A bill to prohibit the use of funds of or available for expenditure by any Government corporation or agency for certain payments of annual leave, accruing during any calendar year and unused at the close of such year, of a civilian officer or employee whose salary exceeds the maximum rate of basic compensation provided for grade 15 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4029. A bill to equitably adjust the salaries of auditors at central accounting post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4030. A bill to repeal section 4 of the act of March 2, 1934, creating the Model Housing Board of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 4031. A bill to allow temporary employment of annuitants in the postal field service during the month of December; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4032. A bill to amend section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, relating to import controls of commodities and products which affect the national defense; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4033. A bill to establish in the Bureau of Customs the United States Customs Port Patrol and the United States Customs Border Patrol in order to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 4034. A bill to amend paragraph 1615 (g) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4035. A bill to provide that when a member of the Armed Forces has had a close relative killed in action he shall not be assigned to a combat zone for a period of 1 year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 4036. A bill for the establishment of the National Monetary Commission, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4037. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin, for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4038. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, so as to improve the credit services available to farmers seeking to adopt soil- and water-conserving systems of farming contributing toward development of a permanently and abundantly productive American agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4039. A bill to exempt from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 the heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and certain other officers and employees in the executive branch; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4040. A bill to provide for the transfer or quitclaim of title to certain land in Florida; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 4041. A bill to provide that certain holders of national service life insurance or United States Government life insurance shall have the premiums on such policies waived for the remainder of their lives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 4042. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4043. A bill for the purposes of erecting in Sulphur, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 4044. A bill to provide emergency relief for certain nationals of the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4045. A bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4046. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution extending until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. Res. 180. Resolution favoring Irish unity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Res. 181. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY: Memorial of the 33d session of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to cooperate with States in the examining and auditing of State departments, institutions, and political subdivisions of the State which are allocated Federal funds either by direct grant-in-aid or on a matching basis; and authorizing the filing of the audit report of Federal examiners with the State auditor and State comptroller or corresponding department of State government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to flood-control works on the San Joaquin River; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to provide for the construction of that portion of the central Arizona project known as the Bridge Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon power plant; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to reducing the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting the approval of legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of western mines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 4047. A bill validating certain conveyances heretofore made by Central Pacific Railway Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the county of Alameda, State of California, acquired by Central Pacific Railway Co. under the act of Congress approved July 1, 1862 (12 Stat. L. 489), as amended by the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. L. 356); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 4048. A bill for the relief of the Maxwell Hardware Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Drago Radman, Ante Keznic, Josip Nacinovic, Miro Nacinovic, Sime Bosotima, Miro Vulin, and Ante Bacic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4050. A bill for the relief of Joe Penovich, Gino Yurman, Frank Zgagliardich, Dan Kurich, Lorenzo Laconi, and Sime Vulin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4051. A bill for the relief of Sister Constantina (Teresia Kakonyi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 4052. A bill for the relief of Andreas Boulamandis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4053. A bill for the relief of Dr. Cristjo Cristofv, his wife Jordana Dilova Cristofv, and his children George and Daphne-Kremena Cristofv; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4054. A bill for the relief of Jorge Sole Massana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4055. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Juarez Diaz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4056. A bill for the relief of Manfred Singer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 4057. A bill for the relief of Tamami Kusuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4058. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Antonia (Suk-fong) Leong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4059. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eustadio D. Papavasilopulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4060. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Demarino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4061. A bill for the relief of Michele Attanaso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 4062. A bill for the relief of Jahangir Afkhami and Fatima Afkhami Mohajer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4063. A bill for the relief of Demetrio Serafino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4064. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Albano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4065. A bill for the relief of Irene Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 4066. A bill for the relief of Simonella Evonne Magliulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 4067. A bill for the relief of Franca Spagnuolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4068. A bill for the relief of Akira Hara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4069. A bill for the relief of Magda Erdossi Frosh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4070. A bill for the relief of Larry Eugene Lynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 4071. A bill for the relief of Shady Saleme Shelhoup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

93. By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: Petition of Mrs. H. C. Head, and 71 others, living in Madison, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television, and in magazines and newspapers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

94. By Mr. HILLELSON: Petition of the 20th Ward Republican Club of Kansas City, Mo. urging that the Congress of the United States wait until the true national condition of the Federal Government is ascertained before making any cut in taxes, and that the policy followed by President Eisenhower is correct; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

95. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William B. Esterman and Ben Margolis, attorneys for Libby Burke and Edward Huebsch, of Los Angeles, Calif., requesting that all subpenas returnable March 23, 1953, before the House Un-American Activities Committee, on behalf of themselves and other witnesses, be quashed for reasons set forth in the petition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. Also, petition of Mrs. Grace Matson, and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1953

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal and Almighty God, who dost bring forth Thy righteousness as the light and Thy judgments as the noonday, in the presence of ageless realities we pause in reverence and, with a deepening sense of obligation as servants of this great people, pray for courage to attempt, power to achieve, and patience to endure.

Grant that with these virtues we, who hold the birthright of democratic traditions, may meet the crisis of our time with avowed faith in it, praying as we work:

"Faith of our fathers, we will strive
To win all nations unto Thee,
And through the truth that comes from God
Mankind shall then be truly free.
Faith of our fathers, holy faith!
We will be true to Thee till death."

In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 16, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 663. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala;

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi;

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Rennick Moffett;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsoviczky;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann);

H. R. 757. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini;

H. R. 777. An act for the relief of Richard H. Backus;

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 870. An act for the relief of Harry Block;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen;

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of Clint Lewis;

H. R. 1524. An act to facilitate the management of the national park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1532. An act to provide for the addition of certain Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.;

H. R. 2011. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a campsite and other public purposes;

H. R. 2013. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site;

H. R. 2019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to Ted B. Landoe and Roderic S. Carpenter;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch;

H. R. 2561. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford;

H. R. 2667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10-A District Agricultural Association, California;

H. R. 3230. An act for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer;

H. R. 3231. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

H. R. 3385. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon;

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 3458. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to

the bill (H. R. 2466) to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. SYMINGTON were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and the remainder of the week.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CLEMENTS was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on next Friday and all of next week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LEHMAN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate on Friday next.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. CAPEHART, and by unanimous consent, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization dated January 16, 1953, authorizing the granting of conditional landing permits to bona fide alien seamen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF POTENTIAL PAYETTE HEIGHTS UNIT, PAYETTE DIVISION, BOISE PROJECT, IDAHO

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Interior on a plan for the construction of the potential Payette Heights Unit, Payette Division, Boise Project, Idaho (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUDIT REPORT ON JOINT SENATE AND HOUSE RECORDING FACILITY

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to the request of the former Clerk of the House of Representatives, dated November 26, 1952, an audit report of the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility, for the period June 5, 1952, to January 3, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AUDIT REPORT ON VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Virgin Islands Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to flood control works on the San Joaquin River

"Whereas the Federal Flood Control Act, approved by Congress December 22, 1944, authorized a plan of improvement for flood control, and other purposes, on the San Joaquin River and its tributaries in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief Engineer in Flood Control Committee Document No. 2, 78th Congress, 2d session; and

"Whereas the legislature by section 33 of the State Water Resources Act of 1945 adopted and authorized this plan of improvement; and

"Whereas losses from floods during 1937 and 1938 throughout the San Joaquin Basin aggregated more than $5,340,000, and losses from floods during 1950 and 1951 in that area aggregated over $9,340,000, and since 1900 these lands have suffered 40 damaging floods; and

"Whereas the loss due to flood damage increases with the passing of years because of the increased population and the greater centralization of agriculture and industrial growth which are subject to the ravages of the floods; and

"Whereas it is essential that the added work be done on the San Joaquin River to prevent to the extent possible further flood damage; and

"Whereas the completion and operation of Friant Reservoir makes it feasible to commence construction of the unit of the project comprising channel improvement works along the San Joaquin River between the Merced and Tuolumne Rivers and levee construction from the mouth of the Merced downstream to Puerto Creek near the town of Westley, and the revetment of river banks and levees at critical locations near the head of Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, requiring the expenditure of approximately $800,000; and

"Whereas Federal funds have not been made available for this work; and

"Whereas the State water resources board has included in its recommendation to Congress for Federal flood-control funds for the 1954 fiscal year the $800,000 required for the construction of this work, thus recognizing its importance to the welfare and safety of the people of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That Congress is respectfully memorialized to provide the funds necessary to construct the channel improvement works along the San Joaquin River, the levees from the mouth of the Merced River downstream to Puerto Creek, and the revetment of river banks and levees at critical locations near the head of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in accordance with the recommendations of the State water resources board; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate submit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the speaker of the assembly, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief Engineer of the United States Army."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution concerning the restoration to Congress of the fixing of tariffs

"Whereas it is essential to the protection of the American standard of living and the American way of life that products of foreign countries be admitted to this country only on a basis which will not endanger the living standards of the American working man and the American farmer and will not threaten serious economic injury to any domestic industry; and

"Whereas promotion of world trade by the Government of the United States should adhere to this principle so that the economic status of the American people may be maintained and not reduced to that in the depressed areas of the world where work is performed behind the sweatshops curtain; and

"Whereas while recent imports of live cattle and frozen and canned beef from Mexico, Canada, New Zealand, and other areas have dramatically highlighted the problem with respect to one industry, yet it is a problem affecting all of the branches of agriculture, industry, and commercial production; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States abandoned its traditional function of fixing tariffs on foreign commerce entering the United States under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to the executive department of the Government, which has carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of American agriculture, industry, and commerce; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to return to its traditional method of fixing tariffs based on principles of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce, and the standard of living for all American citizens created thereby; and be it further

"Resolved, That until Congress so acts, the executive department of the Government exercises its powers of fixing tariffs only in accordanace with the traditional principles of American policy as set forth in this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Assembly Joint Resolution 3

"Joint resolution relative to using money collected by Federal gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oil taxes upon Federal-aid primary highway systems

"Whereas the Federal Government imposes a 6-cent-a-gallon tax on lubricating oil, and a 2-cent-a-gallon tax on gasoline and diesel fuel sold by the producer or importer thereof; and

"Whereas the ultimate burden of paying such taxes is on those who operate motor

vehicles over the Nation's highways and who use lubricating oil to lubricate machinery; and

"Whereas it is only just and equitable that the revenue derived from such taxes be used primarily for the benefit of those who make them possible: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal gasoline, diesel fuel, and lubricating oil tax acts so that all revenues collected thereunder shall be used solely for the construction, improvement, repair and maintenance of Federal-aid highway systems throughout the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to granting the Territory of Hawaii statehood in the United States

"Whereas for many years the people and the governments of the State of California and the Territory of Hawaii have enjoyed the most close and friendly business, personal, and cultural relationships; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory of Hawaii, regardless of racial descent, at all times have demonstrated their complete loyalty to the United States and during World War II, particularly, served with great valor and distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

"Whereas in April of 1950 a convention drafted a constitution, which was approved by the voters in the 1950 general election and also the Territorial Legislature;

"Whereas it is important for the Territory of Hawaii in its present status to enjoy the sovereignty to which it is entitled and to develop its resources most advantageously: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress and the President of the United States be, and they are hereby, urged and memorialized to enact at this session of the Congress such laws as will grant the present Territory of Hawaii the status of statehood in the United States and create the State of Hawaii as the 49th State of our country; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes

"Whereas the Federal gasoline tax is levied upon the users of American highways; and

"Whereas the highway system of this country and the highway systems of the several States are rapidly deteriorating because the funds needed to develop and maintain a modern highway network are not available; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is now distributing to the States only about two-thirds of the revenue which it is deriving from the Federal gasoline tax and is diverting the remainder to its other purposes; and

"Whereas if the Federal Government would withdraw from the field of gasoline taxes and the several States would increase the taxes imposed by them on gasoline and motor vehicle fuels in an amount equal to the Federal tax on gasoline, a much larger amount of revenue would be available to the several States for the purpose of developing and maintaining a modern system of highways therein; and

"Whereas the Eleventh General Assembly of the States which was held in Chicago, Ill., in the month of December 1952 at which practically all of the States of the United States were represented, went on record as favoring the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the gasoline-tax field; and

"Whereas the National Conference of Governors and the Midwestern Regional Conference of the Council of State Governments, of which the State of Kansas is a member, have declared by appropriate resolutions that the Federal Government should withdraw from the gasoline-tax field: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully urge and request the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and each member of the Kansas delegation in the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate and to the respective houses of the legislatures of the several States of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"To the President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; Director of Defense Mobilization; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of the Interior; the Governor of Alaska; the Delegate to Congress from Alaska; the Bureau of Public Roads; and the Alaska Road Commission, Juneau, Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the connection by road of the Nenana coalfield center at Healy, Alaska, via Nenana, Alaska, to Fairbanks, Alaska, is important for the defense and development of the interior of Alaska; and

"Whereas a road constructed via Nenana would make the construction feasible as to the foothills of the Tortella Range are so located as to give material, grade, and drainage; and

"Whereas the much needed link between these three northern communities would open up vast portions of land needed for homesteading, grazing, mining, and various other industries; and

"Whereas the travel of persons to and from Fairbanks, Nenana, Healy, and Suntrana would soon justify this construction cost through the rapid development of farming and industry; and

"Whereas the coal supply to the military as well as the civilian industries and population of the greater Fairbanks area would be safeguarded in case of war; and

"Whereas the head of river transportation is located at Nenana for the Yukon and Tanana Rivers, with the river marine ways and shops as well as docks located at Nenana, thus giving all the interior of greater Alaska a direct link with the United States and cities of Alaska by road; and

"Whereas the Alaska Road Commission has surveyed the proposed link between Nenana and Fairbanks in the year of 1951; and

"Whereas the settlers and farmers of Nenana are waiting to bring cattle and farming into the little Gold Stream Valley as soon as the road is constructed; and

"Whereas the development of this area is greatly dependent on the immediate construction of this 60 miles of road.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, Director of Defense Mobilization, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of Alaska, the Delegate to Congress from Alaska, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Alaska Road Commission, Juneau, Alaska, to appropriate sufficient funds to construct this proposed link between Fairbanks, Nenana, and Healy, Alaska, in the construction year of 1953.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 14

"To the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Delegate From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas Alaska's welfare, economy, and growth are dependent upon private enterprise making use of and developing all of her natural resources; and

"Whereas the use and development of Alaska's natural resources will induce increased population of American citizens with their homes, schools, and churches; and

"Whereas the initial risks in developing the Territory's natural resources are such as to deter the investment of capital therein without adequate, offsetting incentives; and

"Whereas the basis of an enduring, sound economy of the Territory must be founded upon productive industry and its wage earners; and

"Whereas the entire United States will greatly benefit by making available to it the natural resources of Alaska through their use and production; and

"Whereas the temporary exemption of taxes is the most available and expedient incentive to the investment of risk capital in the development of Alaska's natural resources,

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session convened, requests that the Congress of the United States may be pleased to exempt from taxation for a period of 3½ years after production commences all income derived from the industrial use and production of natural resources in the Territory but limited to income derived from capital investment which has not been placed in productive operation prior to January 1, 1953.

"And your memorialist will every pray."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, relating to the tax exemption of private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GILLETTE on March 16, 1953, p. 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relating to the flow of arms and ammunition to Arab States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MAGNUSON on March 16, 1953, p. 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relating to the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park, the quitclaim of certain lands to the State of Wyoming, and to modernize the 160-acre limitation now imposed upon farm units in federally financed reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See joint resolutions printed in full when presented by Mr. BARRETT on March 16, 1953, p. 1959–1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A letter from the Deputy Director, Civil Defense Corps, Adjutant General's Department, State of Ohio, Columbus, Ohio, transmitting a copy of a Civil Defense and Mutual Aid Interstate Compact entered into between the State of Ohio and the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Maryland, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and West Virginia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Appropriations.

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial requesting the establishment of an additional international gate at Nogales, Ariz.

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The present border inspection facilities at Nogales, Ariz., are entirely inadequate due to heavy traffic and the tremendous growth of Ambos Nogales and surrounding territory.

"With the completion of the Nogales-Mexico City highway it will be impossible to handle the large increase of commercial and tourist travel in both directions.

"The present border inspection facilities are so situated that it is not feasible to attempt to enlarge them.

"It has been officially estimated that the cost of establishing additional border inspection facilities would be approximately $170,000.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress appropriate the sum of $170,000 for the purpose of establishing additional border inspection facilities at Nogales, Ariz."

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I present three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Nevada. They are Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1, memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits; Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5, ratifying a defense plan to provide a secondary line of defense railway from San Pedro, Calif., to Portland, Oreg., via Hawthorne, Nev.; to provide for reserves of fuel, food, medicine, and other supplies, providing locations for storage and other matters connected therewith; and Assembly Joint Resolution No. 28, memorializing the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation for and to provide for the immediate construction of that portion of the central Arizona project known as the Bridge Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon powerplant.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolutions were received, referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to reduce the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits

"Whereas between 1941 and 1951 the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits has been increased 162½ percent; and

"Whereas in the same period the median increase in Federal excise taxes on 44 other product groups subject to Federal excise taxes was but 45½ percent; and

"Whereas since pre-World War II, the proportion of the average retail price consisting of tax has increased 89 percent in the case of distilled spirits, whereas it has decreased 19 percent in the case of cigarettes and 21 percent in the case of gasoline; and

"Whereas some half million families in the United States of America look to the production and sale of distilled spirits as their source of livelihood; and

"Whereas some 400,000 families in the United States of America have an ownership-participation in one branch or another of the distilled-spirits industry; and

"Whereas on the basis of recent financial statements, the profits available to stockholders in distilling companies has declined between $52 million and $103 million and the resale value of their stock holdings has declined some $200 million; and

"Whereas in the year 1952 the lawful sales of distilled spirits declined by some 27 million gallons over the previous year, thus causing a loss of revenue to the Federal Government, as well as to employees and stockholders; and

"Whereas the latest increase in the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits has cost the American consumer some $346 million over the cost for the same gallonage at the previous tax rate; and

"Whereas the present Federal excise tax on distilled spirits is obviously discriminatory and confiscatory and economically unsound, and causes a very substantial reduction in the tax revenues of the several States, as well as of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and it hereby is, memorialized to reduce the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits from its present discriminatory and confiscatory rate of $10.50 per gallon to $6 per gallon, which is still 50 percent above the applicable tax rate in 1941; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President of the Senate of the United States of America; the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America; each of the United States Senators from the State of Nevada; and the Members of Congress from the State of Nevada."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution ratifying a defense plan to provide a secondary line of defense railway from San Pedro, Calif., to Portland, Oreg., via Hawthorne, Nev.; to provide for reserves of fuel, food, medicine, and other supplies, providing locations for storage and other matters connected therewith

"Whereas in the light of the present situation of world events it appears likely that an outbreak of war on our Pacific coast would generate an exodus of people from the coastal metropolitan cities to certain areas in Nevada, more particularly the area around the eastern part of the Sierra Nevadas; and

"Whereas the Secretary of Defense in Washington, D. C., in conjuncton with the committee on civil defense for the State of Nevada are presently considering plans of defense; and

"Whereas it is imperative that we establish large reserves of fuel, food, medicine, and other supplies in strategic locations; and

"Whereas the replacement of trackage on the abandoned Mina, Nev., to Bishop, Calif., road bed will complete a direct San Pedro-Hawthorne-Portland east of the Sierra national defense railway by the usage of railroads already serving between these two extreme points. It is requested that the 'missing link' in this railway system be filled: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly)*, That the Secretary of Defense in Washington, D. C., be memorialized to consider a plan of defense for the western United States, to include a railroad from San Pedro, Calif., to Portland, Oreg., via Hawthorne, Nev.; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the said Secretary of Defense in Washington, D. C., in conjunction with the committee on civil defense of the State of Nevada, establish reserves of fuel, food, medicine, and other supplies in strategic localities east of the Sierra Nevada mountains with the following points of storage suggested: Bishop, Calif.; Tonopah and Goldfield, Nev.; Ely, Nev.; Wells, Nev.; Elko, Nev.; Winnemucca, Nev.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Yerington, Nev.; Lovelock, Nev.; Fallon, Nev.; Mina and Schurz, Nev.; Reno, Carson City, and Gardnerville, Nev.; Gerlach, Northern Washoe County, Nev.; others as may be selected; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the committee of civil defense for the State of Nevada and the Secretary of Defense in Washington, D. C., be memorialized to begin concrete consideration of this plan as soon as possible in the interest of public safety; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of Defense, to our congressional delegation in Washington, D. C.; to the commanding general of the Sixth Army at the Presidio, San Francisco, Calif.; to the commanding officer, Naval Ammunition Depot, Hawthorne, Nev.; to the commanding officer, Sierra Ordnance Depot, Herlong, Calif.; to the commanding officer, Naval Test Laboratories, Inyokern, Calif; to the commandants of the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth naval districts; and that 50 copies of this resolution be furnished to Charles A. Hendel, Mineral County Assemblyman and initiator of this proposal."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 28

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation for and to provide for the immediate construction of that portion of the central Arizona project known as the Bridge Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon power plant

"Whereas the central Arizona project plans for the development of water for irrigation and power development purposes on the Colorado River and the development of electric energy is of tremendous importance to the Southwest and the needs of the defense program of our Nation; and

"Whereas the legislation necessary to forward the project and develop the great area of the Pacific Southwest has been bitterly opposed in the courts, and by disputations between the States of Arizona and California over water rights and use of the water involved, and it appears that it will be many years before these arguments and disputes can be settled; and

"Whereas the best interests of the States of the Pacific Southwest and the national

defense program will be served by the immediate construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon power plant without at this time attempting to make any determination as to the water claims of the service States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That this body hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to give its immediate approval to the construction of the Bridge Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon power plant, to authorize contracts for the construction of those structures and to make necessary appropriations therefor, for the purpose of impounding the water and generating electricity and without regard to irrigation development; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Nevada is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to each of our Senators and to our Representatives in Congress, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate of the United States."

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference two resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts relating to the granting of United States citizenship to certain mothers and fathers, and to increase the quota of immigrants from Italy. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship

Whereas many mothers and fathers whose sons have made the supreme sacrifice in the service of the Armed Forces of our country during World War II and during the Korean campaign are resident aliens desirous of embracing United States citizenship, but are unable to do so because of their inability to comply with certain educational requirements in the naturalization law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby alien mothers and fathers whose sons lost their lives in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war may be granted United States citizenship, notwithstanding their inability to speak, read, or write the English language or to sign their names; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth.

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the quota of immigrants from Italy

Whereas Italian immigration to this country was not allowed during World War II, inasmuch as Italy under its dictatorship was a belligerent against this country; and

Whereas Italy has during these past several years reconstructed her politico-social structure on the basis of democratic principles, and has fully assumed her share of responsibility in the mutual defense of the peace-loving democratic nations; and

Whereas Italy, in her present active participation in the Atlantic Pact, has demonstrated her international position in opposition to the spread of communism; and

Whereas the freedom-loving people of Italy, who were dictated into the Second World War, have now taken their position with the peoples of the free nations of the world in the struggle against Communist aggression: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby requests the Congress of the United States to revise the immigration laws so that the present quota of immigration from Italy will be so increased as to permit an additional number of immigrants equivalent to the number of immigrants prohibited during the period of belligerency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROGRAM—RESOLUTION OF MEMBERS OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by members of the Nebraska Legislature, relating to the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for carrying forward the Missouri River Basin program.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

Whereas the people of the Missouri River Basin and the economy of the Nation as a whole sustained staggering losses in the floods of 1951 and 1952, and the basin and the Nation will remain vulnerable to similar disasters until the authorized program now partially under construction is completed as a whole; and

Whereas a soil conservation program should be coordinated with the existing authorized conservation program in the Missouri River Basin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the Nebraska Legislature in 65th Session Assembled:

1. That the Congress appropriate the funds recommended in the budget for the fiscal year 1954 for carrying forward the Missouri River Basin program, specifically the funds for work by the Corps of Engineers on the Garrison, Oahe, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Reservoirs, on the agricultural levees, and for the channel stabilization work from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River.

2. That the Congress enact legislation to authorize a soil conservation program coordinated with the existing authorized water conservation program in the Missouri River Basin by the Department of Agriculture at an accelerated rate.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR GENERAL PUBLIC-SCHOOL EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF INDIANA

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Concurrent Resolution No. 5, adopted by the 88th session of the General Assembly of Indiana, opposing the enactment of legislation providing grants-in-aid for general public-school education. The concurrent resolution was officially transmitted to me by the principal clerk of the Indiana House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Enrolled Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to enact Federal legislation providing grants-in-aid for general public school education

Continuously for the past 16 years, the control by local citizens over their public schools has been under threat by forces which have presented bills before Congress calling for a nationwide Federal subsidy of the public schools.

Those who advocate this departure from our traditional system of local and State support for general public education insist—and in every bill so far presented to the National Congress they have pledged—that the States and local school units shall be free to administer their own educational systems without interference from Washington. Their insistence makes clear they recognize that Federal control is inherent in any system of Federal aid. There is no record or instance of an existing Federal grant-in-aid that is not accompanied with Federal regulations and controls. There is, moreover, no way to make a promise of noninterference binding. Congress may at any time write a new law. Under these circumstances, it is only rational that the Federal Government ultimately would supervise that which it subsidizes. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated that such is a natural and legal consequence. Our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, at a time when he was head of Columbia University, said, "The Federal Government has no right to take money out of our pockets and then give it back to us without some form of supervision."

When such controls develop, one of our basic freedoms—the right of a free people to think—is threatened. Such freedom is not found in totalitarian countries. We should not want to destroy it here.

There are many other substantial reasons why Federal aid to education should be opposed. General education is not properly a function of the Federal Government. Both the Federal Constitution and tradition in this country make it a matter of State and local concern. It is better controlled locally by a system that has democratically brought our people into direct contacts with their own schools. Federal grants-in-aid would surely weaken local initiative as we have it today. Moreover, Federal grants would inevitably tend toward standardization and regimentation of education, a situation clearly repugnant to Hoosiers who resist outside interference in the management of their affairs.

The alleged objectives to be realized by Federal aid to education, it has been proved, can be secured by State and local governments without recourse to Federal aid. Equalization of educational opportunity is

proceeding rapidly under the auspices of State and local governments, and even in the so-called poor States recent economic progress has reduced substantially the disparity in educational opportunities that formerly existed. Clearly, one of the major reasons for low per capita spending for public schools in those States in the past has been due to unwillingness of the States themselves to improve their own school systems, particularly the schools for their Negro children.

On the national scene it is obvious that our National Government must reduce rather than increase its spending. The proposals to subsidize general education would only further demoralize the Federal budget at a time when an enormous national debt already is imposing serious and onerous financial burdens upon further generations. Our national officials have set a goal of balancing the Federal budget and ending deficit spending and recognize this is urgent to prevent disastrous inflation. They cannot do so if new programs of vast Federal spending are to be adopted.

Before calling on the Federal Government for grants-in-aid, we are of the opinion that it is necessary for the States to assume their rightful obligations by putting their own houses in order. The interference of the Federal Government on the educational scene at this time not only would perpetuate uneconomic school organizations which prevent increased efficiency in our local school systems, but would unfairly call upon such States as Indiana to carry the financial burden of improving school systems in other States, none of which has as yet proved conclusively its dire need for Federal assistance. It is the enormous increase in Federal spending and taxation that has preempted almost every method of taxation and made the financing of State and local government so difficult. We must halt this trend or this country will go all the way to strong, centralized Federal Government and the destruction of State and local government, which is one of the goals of socialism: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States should refrain from enacting any legislation which would provide a Federal subsidy for general public school education, thereby opening the way for Federal controls and supervision over a function that clearly is the responsibility of State and local government.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to all Members of the Congress of the United States, and to all governors of the various States.

THE ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM—TELEGRAM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a telegram addressed to me by various citizens of Boston, Mass., dealing with the disturbing problem of Arab refugees.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., *March 16, 1953.*

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We unanimously commend your efforts to find a just and fair solution to the disturbing Arab refugee problem by seeking the appointment of a Senate committee to investigate it. By so doing you are bettering Arab-American relations in an area of vitally strategic importance to the free world.

Syrian and Lebanese Relief Association of Boston: Roger J. Abizaid, M. D., President; Marie Karell; James Karrell; Frederick Assad; Mary Assad; Charles Abizaid; Mary Ayash; Ernest Ayash; R. S. Ferris; Edna Jabbour; Lillian Barakat; Naheel Bourjaily; Anoon Mudarri; K. Mudarri; Elias K. Matthew; Shareen K. Matthew; Nassim Khouri; George Abizaid; Josephine Abizaid; Joseph Houri; Emilie Houri; Mrs. Roger Abizaid; Mrs. Edna Kamer; Crandon Samya; Mrs. Mabel Samya; J. Sheffield, Esq.; Mrs. Linda M. Sawyer; Richard Sawyer; Dr. Philip Sawyer; Sadie Jahjah; Selma Saba; Sophie Derany; Issa Saba; Hannah Shakir; N. George Sabbagh; Mrs. Helen Sabbagh; Adele Sabbagh; Alia M. Malouf; Adalia N. Malouf; John Samaha; Mrs. Joseph Jabaily; Joseph Jabaily; Mrs. Hanny Maouf; Farris S. Malouf, Esq.; Hanna Dow; Nazira Abdallah; Joseph Resha.

RESOLUTIONS OF SPOKANE PUBLIC FORUM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the Public Forum of Spokane, dealing with matters of great interest to the people today.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas in the past few years, the Honorable ISIDORE DOLLINGER, of New York, has introduced resolutions asking for an investigation regarding the reestablishment of cartels and the resumption of power by former Nazis and the resurgence of fascism and anti-Semitism in Germany. No action has been taken on these resolutions. Why? And

"Whereas one Alfred Krupp, archenemy of the free world in 1948 was sentenced to 12 years in prison for unspeakable torture and crimes, now paroled, again heads the Krupp war-munition plant by negotiation with top war diplomats in the United States: Be it

"Resolved, That the Spokane Public Forum go on record challenging the Members of Congress for being remiss in their duty to their constituents by not taking definite action to stop the rearming of Nazi Germany. That you apologize to the Honorable ISIDORE DOLLINGER for your negligence in this matter.

"THOS. L. LYNCH,
"President.
"JOS. E. NESBITT,
"Secretary."

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Whereas the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER of North Dakota has introduced a bill calling for a change in the voting age of our citizens, making it eligible to vote at 18 years instead of 21 years: Be it

"Resolved, That the Spokane Public Forum go on record commending the distinguished Senator for action taken in this long delayed important step to give our boys the right to vote, seeing we draft them to defend the Nation against foreign foes we have made. They are old enough to defend us on foreign soil, and old enough to defend their country from corrupt politicians who are breaking down our democracy.

"THOMAS LYNCH,
"President.
"JOSEPH E. NESBITT,
"Secretary."

FORT TOTTEN HOSPITAL, BENSON, N. DAK.—RESOLUTION OF CROFTON LODGE, NO. 3, INDEPENDENT ORDER OF ODD FELLOWS, DEVILS LAKE, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by members of Crofton Lodge No. 3 of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Devils Lake, N. Dak., relating to the continued operation of the Fort Totten Hospital, at Benson, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, the members of Crofton Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows No. 3 of Devils Lake, N. Dak., have been informed that the Federal Government through its departments and agencies have determined to close Fort Totten Hospital, located on the Fort Totten Indian Reservation in Benson County, N. Dak.; and

Whereas the members of this lodge have for the past many years observed the functions and benefits which the said hospital has rendered to the Indian population located upon the Fort Totten Indian Reservation; and

Whereas the only other hospital facilities within a reasonable distance on the said Indian reservation are located at Devils Lake, N. Dak., and that the said hospitals are already being utilized to their capacity; and

Whereas we feel that the facilities of the Fort Totten Hospital are necessary to serve the community of Indians residing upon the said reservation, and that proper and adequate service cannot and will not be rendered to them if they should be forced as a result of the closing of said hospital to depend upon other present available hospital facilities in the area: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved, in regular meeting assembled, That it be and hereby is the recommendation of Crofton Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows No. 3, Devils Lake, N. Dak., that the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of Interior of the United States of America take the necessary steps to continue the operation of the Fort Totten Hospital located upon the Fort Totten Indian Reservation in Benson County, N. Dak., operated and maintained by the said Department as a function of the Government; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Congressmen and Senators from the State of North Dakota and to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.

RESOLUTIONS OF BLACK HILLS SIOUX NATION COUNCIL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a copy of a letter from J. M. Cooper, area director, Black Hills Sioux Nation Council, Aberdeen, S. Dak., together with various resolutions adopted by that Council. I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Af-

fairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ABERDEEN AREA OFFICE,
Aberdeen, S. Dak., September 25, 1952.

Mr. EDWIN REDDOOR,
Chairman, Black Hills Sioux Nation Council, Poplar, Mont.

DEAR MR. REDDOOR: We have carefully reviewed the resolutions passed by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council on July 22, 1952, particularly as it relates to the area offices. Following this review we can only assume that the Council is not fully informed concerning the formation and functions of the area offices.

In no instances have program people who deal directly with the Indians on extension and credit, relief, education, health, and any other program directly affecting the Indians been moved to the area offices. Actually the program people in the area offices were obtained from the central office and particularly from field supervisors reporting to the central office under the former organizational setup. The authorities of the superintendents with respect to these programs remain substantially the same as before the area offices were established.

As stated above authorities were not taken away from the superintendents, but various authorities which had been retained in the Washington office have now been delegated to the area offices bringing such reviewing authorities of these programs closer to the Indians rather than further away as implied by the resolutions. Much quicker action is now possible by having these authorities in the area offices than was the case when they were in Washington.

It is true that certain housekeeping functions were transferred from the agencies and centralized in the area offices. It was necessary to do this because of the cut in appropriations. Even though this had not been forced upon us it would still be to the advantage of the Service to centralize bookkeeping, personnel, and other housekeeping functions where the work can be specialized and compliance had with the laws and regulations. While the transfer of these functions have removed a few employees from the agency staffs, it has not had an adverse effect on the programs directly concerned with the Indians. Incidentally administrative officers positions at five agencies have recently been reestablished as funds became available.

We sincerely believe that the Indians, the superintendents and the program people on the reservations are now getting better and quicker service from the area offices than they did when they had to go all way to Washington. The organization of the Indian Bureau has been studied by various commissions and private concerns and they all recommended and endorsed the present organization, which has proved to be successful in other branches of the Government and in large business concerns.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. COOPER,
Area Director.

P. S.—This letter is in reference to the resolutions passed at a special meeting held at Rosebud, S. Dak., on July 1, 2, and 3 of this year, the following are the resolutions: Extension and Loan Program, In Regards to Land Policy, Land Transaction, Relief and Welfare.

In the event you do not have copies of the above resolutions, I suggest that you contact Mr. Antoine Roubideaux, secretary of the Rosebud Sioux Tribal Council, to obtain copies.

Very sincerely,

EDWIN J. REDDOOR,
Chairman, Local BHSNC (Fort Peck Reservation).

Resolution 41

Whereas when the various area offices were established many of the field personnel were moved from the agencies to the area offices with a resultant loss of services to the Indians where the services are actually needed; and

Whereas respective tribal council are of the opinion that eventual integration into society of the Indians could be accomplished much more effectively and expeditiously if the personnel and services were restored to the agency level; and

Whereas the area office at Aberdeen, S. Dak., has proven itself to be ineffective and unnecessary, having contributed to the knowledge of the respective tribal council, not one item of benefit to the Indians that it constitutes one more hurdle to be surmounted in the completion of any item of tribal and individual business with the Indian Office; and that such work as is performed at the area office is merely a duplication of work already performed by field personnel; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council that certain administration over tribal and individual business be restored to the agency level or field personnel and facilities would effect economy in administration, better service to the people, and a more workable approach to the eventual withdrawal of restriction and supervision over the persons and property of the Indians in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council assembled this 2d day of July 1952, That authority and responsibility as vested in the officials of the Aberdeen area office over the administration of tribal land and individual land transactions be restored back to the agency level.

Resolution 42

Resolution in regard to land policy

Whereas when the various area offices were established many of the field personnel were moved from the agencies to the area office with a resultant loss of services to the Indians where the services are actually needed; and

Whereas respective tribal council are of the opinion that eventual integration into society of the Indians could be accomplished much more effectively and expeditiously if the personnel and services were restored to the agency level; and

Whereas the area office at Aberdeen, S. Dak., has proven itself to be ineffective and unnecessary, having contributed to the knowledge of the respective tribal council, not one item of benefit to the Indians, that it constitutes one more hurdle to be surmounted in the completion of any item of tribal or individual business with the Indian office; and that such work as is performed at the area office is merely a duplication or work already performed by field personnel; and

Whereas it is of the opinion of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council that certain administration over tribal and individual business be restored to the agency level of field personnel and facilities would effect economy in administration, better services to the people, and a more workable approach to the eventual withdrawal of restrictions and supervision over the persons and property of the Indian in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council assembled this 2d day of July 1952, That Commissioner of Indian Affairs be prevailed upon with the request to reconsider land policy as issued under memorandum No. 146—policy statement pertaining to sale of land to the tribe and to individual Indian without advertising, and be it further

Resolved, That each tribe of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council be given an opportunity to express their privilege to promulgate regulations over whatever type of land program it may desire in accordance to status of reservation lands.

Resolution 43

Resolution pertaining to relief and welfare

Whereas when the various area offices were established many of the field personnel were moved from the agencies to the area office with a resultant loss of services to the Indians where the services are actually needed; and

Whereas respective tribal council are of the opinion that eventual integration into society of the Indians could be accomplished much more effectively and expeditiously if the personnel and services were restored to the agency level; and

Whereas the area office at Aberdeen, S. Dak., has proven itself to be ineffective and unnecessary, having contributed to the knowledge of the respective tribal council, not one item of benefit to the Indians, that it constitutes one more hurdle to be surmounted in the completion of any item of tribal or individual business with the Indian office; and that such work already performed by field personnel; and

Whereas it is of the opinion of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council that certain administration over tribal and individual business be restored to the agency level of field personnel and facilities would effect economy in administration, better services to the people, and a more workable approach to the eventual withdrawal of restrictions and supervision over the persons and property of the Indian in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council assembled this 2d day of July 1952, That authority and responsibility as vested in the officials of the Aberdeen area office over the administration of welfare and relief be restored back to the agency level.

Resolution 44

Whereas when the various area offices were established many of the field personnel were moved from the agencies to the area offices with a resultant loss of services to the Indians where the services are actually needed; and

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council believes that eventual integration in society of the Indians could be more effectively and expeditiously accomplished if the personnel and services were restored to the agency level; and

Whereas the area office at Aberdeen, S. Dak., has proven itself to be ineffective and unnecessary, having contributed to the knowledge of this organization, not one item of benefit to the Indians; that it constitutes one more hurdle to be surmounted in the completion of any item of tribal or individual business with the Indian Office; and that such work as is performed at the area office is merely a duplication of work already performed by field personnel; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council that restoration to the agency level of field personnel and facilities would effect economy in administration, better services to the Indians, and a more workable approach to the eventual withdrawal of restrictions and supervision over the persons and property of the Indians in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council this 27th day of February 1953, That the Congress of the United States is hereby petitioned that the area offices be abolished entirely and that services and personnel that have been removed to the area offices be restored to the agency level; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution of protest be submitted to the President of the United States, Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the Members of the congressional delegations of the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska; to the

chairmen of the Senate and House Subcommittees on Indian Affairs of the United States Congress; and to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Resolution 46

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council believes the Indian Office program of so-called orderly withdrawal to be ill-advised and detrimental to the interest and welfare of the Sioux Tribes, and of all Indians in general; and

Whereas the States are not ready to take on the additional responsibility of providing for the Indians those services now furnished by the Federal Government which the great majority of the Indians must have for years to come if they are ever to become truly self-sufficient; and

Whereas public health and educational facilities in the States are even now inadequate to serve even the needs of the non-Indian population of the States; and

Whereas the Federal Government, over the years, has spent millions of dollars to foster among the Indians an awareness of the value of education and medical service; and

Whereas Indian Office is now proposing to nullify the good that has been accomplished by its so-called orderly withdrawal program just at a time when the Indians are beginning to appreciate and take advantage of the opportunities afforded for the advancement of themselves and their children; and

Whereas the Sioux Tribes and the members thereof are in no position to even approximate the kind of services and facilities that are now provided by Government agency; and

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council believes that no program of withdrawal should be attempted or forced on the people of the Sioux Tribe until all tribal claims against the Government have been settled, one way or the other, and until all laws that discriminate against Indians in any way have been eliminated entirely; and

Whereas the withdrawal of services at a time when the majority of the Indians are not prepared for such withdrawal would be a violation of treaties with the Government which guarantee to the Indians that the Government will take care of them so long as any Indian remains who need such care: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council, this 27th day of February 1953, That the so-called orderly withdrawal program now being proposed by Indian Office is hereby protested; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution of protest be presented to the President of the United States, Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower; to the members of the congressional delegations of the States of Montana, North and South Dakota, and Nebraska, to the chairman of the Senate and House subcommittees of the Congress of the United States, to the governors of the aforementioned States, and to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Resolution 47

Whereas one of the promises made by the party in power to the Indians of the United States during the recent presidential campaign was that the Indian people themselves might have a voice in the appointment of a new Commissioner of Indian Affairs; and

Whereas nearly 2 months have elapsed since the new Republican administration to office and as yet no appointment has been made, and Dillon S. Myer continues to occupy this important post; and

Whereas it has been definitely established that a vast majority of the Indians in the United States are opposed to the said Dillon S. Myer and his policies; and

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council, an organization composed of eight Sioux Reservations in the States of Montana, North and South Dakota, and Nebraska and representing approximately 40,000 Indians, wishes to go on record as opposing the continuation in office of the said Dillon S. Myer as Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and protesting the application of his policies to the reservations represented by the said organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council this 27th day of February 1953, That the party in power is hereby petitioned to fulfill its campaign promises by removing Dillion S. Myer from office immediately, and appointing to the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs a man who will give due consideration to the views of the Indian people in any program that may in the future be proposed by the Indian Bureau; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the members of the congressional delegations of the States of Montana, North and South Dakota, and Nebraska, to the respective chairmen of the Subcommittees on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Governors of the aforementioned States.

Resolution 49

Whereas there are now before the Congress a number of bills which affect, directly or indirectly, and in varying degrees, the welfare of the members of the eight Sioux tribes of Montana, North and South Dakota, and Nebraska; and

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council, an organization composed of the said eight Sioux tribes, in special meeting assembled at Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak., has given due consideration and study to the said bills and it has been agreed that certain recommendations be made to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council in special meeting assembled, this 27th day of February 1953, That the following recommendations be made on the said bills:

S. 132, by Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska).

H. R. 303, by Mr. JUDD: To transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operations of Indian hospitals to the United States Public Health Service. The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as opposing and protesting the enactment of these or any other bills, now in the Congress or which may be introduced, that provide for such transfer.

S. 130, by Mr. THYE: To amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crime and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Minnesota civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State. The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record that any bill which proposes such transfer shall provide for consent by the separate reservations in each State to which such bills are applicable.

H. R. 1242, by Mr. D'EWART: To authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies. The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as protesting the enactment of this or any other bill that proposes to vest such authority in the Secretary of the Interior.

H. R. 2515, by Mr. BURDICK: Providing that in the interpretation of any treaty between the United States and any other independent State, the Supreme Court of the United States shall be the sole judge hereof, notwithstanding the provision of any treaty now existing or hereafter to be made, to the contrary, and for other purposes. The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as recommending that clarification of the intent of this or any other bill which so provides be sought with a view to specific action at a later date if deemed necessary.

S. 695 and H. R. 2233, by Mr. CASE and Mr. BERRY, respectively: To provide for the acquisition of lands by the United States required for the reservoir created by the construction of Oahe Dam on the Missouri River and for rehabilitation of the Indians of the Cheyenne River Sioux Reservation, S. Dak., and for other purposes, at the request of the Cheyenne River delegation. The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as favoring and supporting the enactment of this bill.

H. R. 104, by Mr. BURDICK: To declare that the United States hold certain lands in trust for the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of the Standing Rock Reservation in North and South Dakota. At the request of the Standing Rock delegation, the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as favoring the enactment of this bill; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, with appropriate letters of transmittal, be presented to the President of the United States, Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, to the respective chairmen of the Subcommittees on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to the congressional delegations from the States of Montana, Nebraska, and North and South Dakota, and to the Secretary of the Interior.

Resolution 50

Whereas the Black Hills Council of American Indians, an organization composed of members of the several tribes residing in the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., and representing approximately 3,000 Indians, has submitted to the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council for its consideration and support 6 resolutions, numbered 1 to 6 inclusive, and attached hereto which provide for assistance to the said Indians of Rapid City in health, education, rehabilitation, welfare, and social problems; and

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council has given due consideration and study to the appeal from the Black Hills Council of American Indians of Rapid City, S. Dak.: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council this 27th day of February 1953, That the following action be taken on the separate resolutions from the above-mentioned group:

Resolution 1, health and medical facilities:

The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as recommending to the proper authorities that the Indian Office change its policy to make available to off-reservation Indians the services of the reservation doctors and hospitals, and that consideration be given to the possibility of contracting with one of the doctors in Rapid City for medical services to the Indians who reside there.

Resolution 2, educational loans:

The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as favoring this resolution, and that Congress be asked to appropriate in

the year's budget funds for educational loans to Indians.

Resolution 3, education discrimination:

The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as recommending no action on this resolution.

Resolution 4, rehabilitation loans:

The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as adopting this resolution.

Resolution 5, welfare:

The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council goes on record as recommending to the proper authorities that there be no limitations on welfare funds for the various areas; that such funds be expended for the benefit of off-reservation Indians as well as those who reside on the reservation.

Resolution 6, repeal of Indian liquor law:

The Black Hills Sioux Nation Council having already gone on record as advocating such repeal, reaffirms this stand by adopting this resolution.

"Resolution 1

"Whereas we, the members of the Black Hills Council of American Indians, residing in Rapid City, S. Dak., have been denied hospitalization at reservation hospitals though we are counted on the rolls; and

"Whereas we have been denied hospitalization here at Rapid City hospitals unless we are able to make a down payment of $50; and

"Whereas there are emergencies which sometimes arise and some of our people have no money to pay even the doctor for needed examination: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge our South Dakota Congressmen in Washington, D. C., to do all in their power to alleviate the situation.

"Resolution 2

"Whereas we, the members of the Black Hills Council of American Indians residing in Rapid City, S. Dak., are not entitled to educational loans given to students on the reservations, attending Government Indian schools; and

"Whereas we who live off the reservation have not relinquished our rights or have had our names stricken from the tribal rolls; and

"Whereas we are counted in the number given for appropriation on our respective reservations; and

"Whereas our children are in need of aid in obtaining education: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge our South Dakota Congressmen in Washington, D. C., to do all in their power to alleviate this situation.

"Resolution 3

"Whereas we, the members of the Black Hills Council of American Indians, residing in Rapid City, S. Dak., have heard of the discrimination toward Indian school children by the school board at St. Charles, S. Dak.; and

"Whereas we do not believe that such practices should spread in America where we are a country of many nationalities represented: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge all State and county officials to do all in their power to discourage discrimination toward Indians and to other minority groups. It is not good for a democracy to practice racial discrimination.

"Resolution 4

"Whereas we, the members of the Black Hills Council of American Indians, residing in Rapid City, S. Dak., are not entitled to the loans provided by the Government for rehabilitation of Indians on the reservation; and

"Whereas we Indians living off the reservation are refused the privileges of such loans although we have not been stricken off tribal rolls and are counted for appropriations made; and

"Whereas we need aid in establishing ourselves with homes by obtaining house and lot; and

"Whereas we also need aid in establishing ourselves in business with needed money equipment: Be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge our South Dakota Congressmen in Washington, D. C., to do all in their power to alleviate this situation.

"Resolution 5

"Whereas we, the members of the Black Hills Council of American Indians, residing in Rapid City, S. Dak., are not eligible for relief and other aid provided on the reservations, and the county setup here is not too anxious to carry the additional loads of indigent Indian families; and

"Whereas we do have some indigent families who need aid in case of emergencies for hospital care and food: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge our South Dakota Congressmen in Washington, D. C., to do all in their power to alleviate this situation.

"Resolution 6

"Whereas the Black Hills Council of American Indians, an organization of Indians living here in Rapid City, S. Dak.; and

"Whereas time and again different Indian organizations throughout the United States have gone on record for the repeal of the Indian liquor law, which is known as title 25 U. S. C. A., section 241; and

"Whereas we feel that this is a racial discrimination: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* by the Black Hills Council of American Indians this 6th day of February, 1953, that it is hereby declared to be the will and desire of the Black Hills Council of American Indians that the legislation providing for the repeal of the Indian liquor law be enacted at this session of the Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be presented to the chairmen of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, respectively, of the Congress of the United States, and to the Governor of the State of South Dakota."

Resolution 51

Whereas the various Sioux Tribes were invited to send delegates to a meeting at Pine Ridge, S. Dak., on December 18, 19, and 20, 1952, at which meeting Alva P. Simpson was endorsed for the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, allegedly by unanimous vote; and

Whereas the said meeting, which was alleged in the minutes thereof to have been a special meeting of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council, was not called by the recognized and elected chairman of the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council and was, therefore, not a legal meeting of that organization; and

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council wishes it known for the record that the name of this organization was improperly and illegally used by the group that met at Pine Ridge, and that any action taken at the said meeting, particularly the endorsement of Alva P. Simpson for the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs, not concurred in by this organization; and

Whereas the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council wishes rather to go on record as endorsing for the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs Dr. Ben Reifel, now superintendent of the Fort Berthold Indian Agency, Elbowoods, N. Dak., for these reasons:

1. That we know and respect and are proud of Dr. Reifel as one of our Sioux boys; that we have watched him develop through the years and know him to be capable, just, and fair.

2. That he has been successful in his long years of service in the Bureau of Indian Affairs and that as a result of that service, he would be thoroughly qualified to assume the duties of the commissionership and it would not be necessary for him to spend years becoming acquainted with the Indian problem.

3. That we believe he can be of great service, not only to the Indians but to the Government and the non-Indian citizens of the United States in that capacity.

4. That we feel his appointment as Commissioner of Indian Affairs would give recognition to the Indian Tribes, and bring a man of experience and sympathetic understanding to the office.

5. That Dr. Reifel's appointment to that high office would be an example and an incentive to every Indian young person to take advantage of such educational facilities as are available and to seek the benefits of higher education.

6. That we believe he will not delude us with more promises nor will he try to "give the country back to the Indians": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council, this 27th day of February 1953, That the action taken at the Pine Ridge meeting on December 18, 19, and 20, endorsing Alva P. Simpson for the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs is hereby repudiated without qualification; and be it further

Resolved, That the Black Hills Sioux Nation Council petitions the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, that Dr. Ben Reifel be appointed to the office of Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the reasons stated hereinabove; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be presented to the President of the United States, Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Members of the congressional delegations of the States of Montana, North and South Dakota, and Nebraska.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I report an original concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee To Make a Study of Public Transportation Serving the District of Columbia, and I submit a report (No. 89) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19), reported by Mr. CASE from the Committee on the District of Columbia, was, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of 3 Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 3 Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and

shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(b) A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of four members, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, including the fiscal, management, and operating policies of common carriers which transport passengers in the District of Columbia, the regulation of such carriers by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, and other matters related thereto.

(b) The joint committee shall, from time to time, report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report not later than January 2, 1954.

(c) The joint committee shall cease to exist, and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate, upon the submission of its final report.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress (prior to January 3, 1954), to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of January 1953, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, DECEMBER 1952 TO JANUARY 1953, AND PAY, NOVEMBER TO DECEMBER 1952

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for January 1953 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In January numbered	In December numbered	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December was—	In November was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,554,310	2,560,479	−6,169	$913,809	$768,565	+$145,244
1. Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,224,395	1,230,206	−5,811	487,182	387,062	+100,120
2. Department of Defense	1,329,915	1,330,273	−358	426,627	381,503	+45,124
Within the Department of Defense:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,297	2,297		1,164	1,025	+139
Department of the Army	536,967	538,227	−1,260	154,338	146,318	+8,020
Department of the Air Force	315,988	315,140	+848	100,811	87,605	+13,206
Department of the Navy	474,663	474,609	+54	170,314	146,555	+23,759

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, and III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further breakdown in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because payroll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1953, and comparison with December 1952, and pay for December 1952, and comparison with November 1952*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	November	December	Increase	Decrease	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	$20,931	$23,696	$2,765		70,722	70,090		632
Commerce [1] [2]	19,177	21,761	2,584		51,377	50,943		434
Interior	19,027	21,067	2,040		55,811	55,846	35	
Justice	11,533	13,347	1,814		30,646	30,437		209
Labor	2,525	2,808	283		6,450	6,097		353
Post Office	159,687	231,470	71,783		525,217	520,803		4,414
State	9,976	10,763	787		32,095	32,198	103	
Treasury	29,782	33,994	4,212		86,845	86,389		456
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	149	136		$13	250	263	13	
Bureau of the Budget	258	290	32		470	469		1
Council of Economic Advisers	17	21	4		31	29		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	23	24	1		95	106	11	
National Security Council [3]	11	12	1		[4] 22	22		
National Security Resources Board	48	53	5		82	84	2	
Office of Defense Mobilization	64	71	7		215	201		14
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	70	90	20		133	141	8	
President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation [5]	30	38	8					
President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization	12	14	2		26	24		2

[1] January figure includes 2,839 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 324 from the December figure of 3,163.

[2] January figure is exclusive of 4,904 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

[4] Revised on the basis of later information.

[5] Deactivated Dec. 28, 1952.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1953, and comparison with December 1952, and pay for December 1952, and comparison with November 1952*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	November	December	Increase	Decrease	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	$80	$91	$11		159	157		2
Defense Production Administration	195	233	38		374	324		50
Defense Transport Administration	68	77	9		167	159		8
Economic Stabilization Agency	4,301	4,617	316		9,846	9,469		377
Federal Civil Defense Administration	390	445	55		763	766	3	
Mutual Security Agency	1,768	2,004	236		4,474	4,447		27
National Security Training Commission	3	3			5	4		1
Renegotiation Board	339	391	52		682	677		5
Small Defense Plants Administration	204	241	37		422	444	22	
Subversive Activities Control Board	14	16	2		26	25		1
Postwar agencies:								
Motor Carrier Claims Commission [5]	6	19	13		8			8
War Claims Commission	68	79	11		224	224		
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	82	84	2		452	457	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	2,721	3,034	313		6,788	6,816	28	
Civil Aeronautics Board	259	288	29		557	555		2
Civil Service Commission	1,718	2,024	306		5,249	5,213		36
Export-Import Bank of Washington	72	81	9		138	140	2	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	2	3	1		6	7	1	
Federal Communications Commission	476	550	74		1,108	1,095		13
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	395	460	65		1,031	1,038	7	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	207	242	35		385	393	8	
Federal Power Commission	287	330	43		660	656		4
Federal Security Agency [7] [8]	10,836	12,074	1,238		37,542	37,733	191	
Federal Trade Commission	301	337	36		647	652	5	
General Accounting Office	2,229	2,599	370		6,192	6,230	38	
General Services Administration	8,160	8,701	541		28,974	29,157	183	
Government Printing Office	2,576	2,999	423		7,699	7,676		23
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,805	5,323	518		12,504	12,426		78
Indian Claims Commission	7	8	1		11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	846	957	111		2,017	2,003		14
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	16	17	1		27	3		24
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	[6] 2,688	3,078	390		7,479	7,415		64
National Capital Housing Authority	105	124	19		358	357		1
National Capital Planning Commission	2	3	1		6	6		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission		1	1		1			1
National Gallery of Art	86	99	13		310	307		3
National Labor Relations Board	555	642	87		1,328	1,336	8	
National Mediation Board	64	72	8		119	120	1	
National Science Foundation	51	57	6		146	151	5	
Panama Canal	4,179	3,559		$620	[6] 18,932	19,312	380	
Railroad Retirement Board	715	811	96		2,191	2,217	26	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,027	1,142	115		2,266	2,239		27
Securities and Exchange Commission	400	439	39		793	786		7
Selective Service System	1,663	1,867	204		8,048	7,987		61
Smithsonian Institution	171	197	26		517	515		2
Soldiers' Home	129	155	26		750	743		7
Tariff Commission	91	105	14		194	195	1	
Tax Court of the United States	63	69	6		133	131		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,459	8,567	1,108		20,926	21,011	85	
Veterans' Administration	50,863	58,213	7,350		176,085	176,468	383	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	387,062	487,182	100,753	633	1,230,206	1,224,395	1,554	7,365
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			100,120				5,811	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [9]	1,025	1,164	139		2,297	2,297		
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	134,044	140,735	6,691		485,368	484,015		1,353
Outside continental United States	12,274	13,603	1,329		52,859	52,952	93	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	80,167	92,357	12,190		277,789	278,265	476	
Outside continental United States	7,438	8,454	1,016		37,351	37,723	372	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	137,684	160,559	22,875		440,679	440,438		241
Outside continental United States	8,871	9,755	884		33,930	34,225	295	
Total, Department of Defense	381,503	426,627	45,124		1,330,273	1,329,915	1,236	1,594
Net change, Department of Defense			45,124				358	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	768,565	913,809	145,877	633	2,560,479	2,554,310	2,790	8,959
Net change, including Department of Defense			145,244				6,169	

[6] Revised on the basis of later information.
[5] Activities terminated Dec. 31, 1952.
[7] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[8] January figure includes 2,596 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service a decrease of 11 from the December figure of 2,607.
[9] Includes 272 employees assigned to Defense Management Supply Agency and 45 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1953, and comparison with December 1952*

Department or agency	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	69,241	68,589		652
Commerce [4] [2]	48,070	47,747		323
Interior	49,658	49,761	103	
Justice	30,092	29,883		210
Labor	6,346	5,986		360
Post Office	522,937	518,520		4,417
State	11,045	11,005		40
Treasury	[3] 88,617	88,165		452
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	250	263	13	
Bureau of the Budget	470	469		1
Council of Economic Advisers	31	29		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	95	106	11	
National Security Council [4]	[3] 22	22		
National Security Resources Board	82	84	2	
Office of Defense Mobilization	215	201		14
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	133	141	8	
President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization	26	24		2

[1] January figure includes 2,620 employees of the National Production Authority.
[2] January figure is exclusive of 4,964 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[3] Revised on the basis of later information.
[4] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1953, and comparison with December 1952*—Continued

Department or agency	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	151	150		1
Defense Production Administration	374	324		50
Defense Transport Administration	167	159		8
Economic Stabilization Agency	9,720	9,344		376
Federal Civil Defense Administration	763	766	3	
Mutual Security Agency	1,089	1,072		17
National Security Training Commission	5	4		1
Renegotiation Board	682	677		5
Small Defense Plants Administration	422	444	22	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	25		1
Postwar agencies:				
Motor Carrier Claims Commission [5]	8			8
War Claims Commission	184	184		
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	14	14		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,777	6,805	28	
Civil Aeronautics Board	548	547		1
Civil Service Commission	5,239	5,203		36
Export-Import Bank of Washington	138	140	2	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	6	7	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,082	1,069		13
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,031	1,038	7	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	385	393	8	
Federal Power Commission	660	656		4
Federal Security Agency [6 7]	36,955	37,159	194	
Federal Trade Commission	647	652	5	
General Accounting Office	6,169	6,204	35	
General Services Administration	28,866	29,047	181	
Government Printing Office	7,699	7,676		23
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,356	12,270		86
Indian Claims Commission	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,017	2,003		14
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	27	3		24
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,479	7,415		64
Idependent agencies—Continued				
National Capital Housing Authority	358	357		1
National Capital Planning Commission	6	6		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	1			1
National Gallery of Art	310	307		3
National Labor Relations Board	1,305	1,310	5	
National Mediation Board	119	120	1	
National Science Foundation	146	151	5	
Panama Canal	[8] 538	523		15
Railroad Retirement Board	2,191	2,217	26	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,259	2,232		27
Securities and Exchange Commission	793	786		7
Selective Service System	7,827	7,767		60
Smithsonian Institution	515	513		2
Soldiers' Home	750	743		7
Tariff Commission	194	195	1	
Tax Court of the United States	133	131		2
Tennessee Valley Authority	20,926	21,011	85	
Veterans' Administration	174,844	175,220	376	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,169,449	1,163,244	1,125	7,330
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			6,205	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,239	2,243	4	
Department of the Army	485,368	484,015		1,353
Department of the Air Force	277,789	278,265	476	
Department of the Navy	440,679	440,438		241
Total, Department of Defense	1,206,075	1,204,961	480	1,594
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,114	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,375,524	2,368,205	1,605	8,924
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			7,319	

[5] Activities terminated Dec. 31, 1952.
[6] Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[7] January figure includes 2,365 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during January 1953, and comparison with December 1952*

Department or agency	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense)				
Agriculture	1,481	1,501	20	
Commerce	2,307	3,196		111
Interior	6,156	6,085		71
Justice	553	554	1	
Labor	105	112	7	
Post Office	2,280	2,283	3	
State	21,050	21,193	143	
Treasury	1,028	1,024		4
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	8	7		1
Economic Stabilization Agency	126	125		1
Mutual Security Agency	3,385	3,375		10
Postwar agencies: War Claims Commission	40	40		
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	438	443	5	
Atomic Energy Commission	11	11		
Civil Aeronautics Board	9	8		1
Civil Service Commission	10	10		
Federal Communications Commission	26	26		
Federal Security Agency	577	574		3
General Accounting Office	23	26	3	
General Services Administration	108	110	2	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	148	156	8	
Independent agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	23	26	3	
Panama Canal	18,394	18,789	395	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7	7		
Selective Service System	221	220		1
Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
Veterans' Administration	1,241	1,248	7	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	60,737	61,151	597	203
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			394	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	58	54		4
Department of the Army	52,859	52,952	93	
Department of the Air Force	37,351	37,723	372	
Department of the Navy	33,930	34,225	296	
Total, Department of Defense	124,198	124,954	760	4
Net increase, Department of Defense			756	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	184,955	186,105	1,357	207
Net increase, including Department of Defense			1,150	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during January 1953, and comparison with December 1952*

Department or agency	December	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Commerce	539	383		156
Interior	2,523	2,342		181
State	186	184		2
Treasury	9,260	9,260		
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	94	95	1	
General Services Administration	152	166	14	
Panama Canal	1,492	1,512	20	
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,405	12,519	114	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	26,651	26,461	149	339
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			190	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	252,408	250,984		1,514
Outside continental United States	33,121	33,059		62
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	163,810	163,455		355
Outside continental United States	21,506	21,870	364	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	294,466	294,059		407
Outside continental United States	25,544	25,728	184	
Total, Department of Defense	790,945	789,155	548	2,338
Net decrease, Department of Defense			1,790	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	817,596	815,616	697	2,677
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			1,980	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In November was—	In December was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In December numbered—	In January numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$11,690	$12,001	+$311	30,143	32,210	−6,933
State Department	124	126	+2	87	87	
Mutual Security Agency	9	8	−1	13	12	−1
Office of the Secretary of Defense	85	91	+6	178	174	−4
Department of the Army	8,999	9,066	+67	30,645	23,472	−7,173
Department of the Air Force	1,482	1,606	+124	4,985	5,293	+308
Department of the Navy	991	1,104	+113	3,235	3,172	−63

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government in January totaled 2,554,310, according to certified reports from 72 agencies which have been compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

The January total reflected a decrease of 6,169 as compared with employment in December. This was the sixth consecutive monthly decrease.

Principal decreases were reported by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Army and the Post Office Department.

Partially offsetting these decreases were increases during the month reported by the Department of the Air Force, the Department of State, Federal Security Agency, General Services Administration, Panama Canal, and Veterans' Administration. This is the fourth consecutive monthly increase in civilian employment reported by the Air Force. The increase since September has totaled 5,721. The net decrease in the Defense Department was 358.

The net decrease in the Department of Defense was due to reductions totaling 1,260 by the Department of the Army. The Air Force and Navy reported net increases.

Employment outside continental United States in January totaled 186,105, an increase of 1,150 over the December figure of 184,955. 394 of the increase were reported by the civilian agencies, and 756 were in the Department of Defense.

White collar employment in January totaled 1,738,694, a decrease of 4,189 as compared with the December total of 1,742,883. Industrial employment in January totaled 815,616, a decrease of 1,980 as compared with the December total of 817,596.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to unexpended balances of Federal appropriations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY BYRD ON BEHALF OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES RELATIVE TO UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Agencies of the Federal Government entered the second half of the current fiscal year, which ends June 30, with $140.9 billion of unexpended balances in appropriations, and other authorizations already made.

Of this total remaining spending authority nearly $61.4 billion was in appropriations and other authorizations made during calendar year 1952, and more than $79.5 billion was in appropriations and other authorizations made in some previous year.

As of December 31 the military services, exclusive of civil functions, had unexpended balances in appropriatitons already made totaling $86 billion, and $13.7 billion was still available for Mutual Security expenditure in appropriations to the President and other Mutual Security Agency accounts.

Within the military services the Air Force began the second half of the fiscal year with unexpended balances totaling $36.4 billion; the Army, exclusive of civil functions with balances of $25.8 billion; and the Navy with balances totaling $23.2 billion; and Office of the Secretary of Defense with balances totaling $500 million.

Among the Mutual Security programs balances in appropriations and other authorizations for economic and technical assistance as of December 31 totaled $1 billion, and at the beginning of the second half of the fiscal year balances in military assistance programs totaled $11¼ billion. The remaining balances of more than a billion dollars were scattered through other foreign assistance programs.

There was $16.7 billion of balances in appropriations and other authorizations to Independent Offices, including $4.7 billion for the Atomic Energy Commission; there was $7.1 billion in balances in appropriations and other authorizations to the Department of Agriculture, including $4.6 billion of authority for the Commodity Credit Corporation to expend from public debt receipts; and there was $5.1 billion in remaining expenditure authority for agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

These figures were shown today in the third of a series of reports on unexpended balances available to Federal agencies, compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

This report showed that in the first 6 months of the current fiscal year Federal expenditures totaled $35.5 billion. Of this total $18.3 billion was from appropriations enacted last year by the previous session of Congress, and $17.2 billion was spent from appropriations enacted in previous years.

The first of this series of reports estimated that, as of the end of the fiscal year next June 30, Federal agencies would carry over into fiscal year 1954, beginning July 1, a total of $102 billion, in addition to new appropriations which are to be enacted in the current session. If this estimate proves to be accurate expenditures in the second half of the fiscal year would total more than $38 billion, as compared with $35.5 billion in the first half of the year.

If new appropriations totaling $72.9 billion, as requested in the Truman budget, should be enacted by this session of Congress, total expenditure availability beginning next July 1 will exceed $175 billion.

THE SHORTAGE OF AMMUNITION—RESOLUTION AND NEWSPAPER COLUMN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution offered by me in the Senate Armed Services Committee and adopted unanimously, providing for an investigation of the shortage of ammunition.

The following were appointed to this subcommittee: Senator SMITH of Maine, chairman, Senator HENDRICKSON, Senator COOPER, Senator KEFAUVER, and myself.

Following this, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a column by David Lawrence published in the Washington Star on March 17.

There being no objection, the resolution and newspaper column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD AND UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MARCH 12, 1953

Whereas Gen. James A. Van Fleet has testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee substantially as follows:

(a) That during the period of his command in Korea, extending over a period of 22 months, there have been serious and at times critical shortages of ammunition;

(b) That he reported almost daily the existence of such shortages;

(c) That the shortages of ammunition substantially restricted the action of our troops and endangered our defense lines;

(d) That when he left Korea the supplies of ammunition were improving but shortages still existed; and

Whereas the officials of the Army Department have unanimously testified that defense appropriations for ammunition, as promptly made by Congress upon request since the beginning of the Korean war, have been adequate: Be it

Resolved by this committee, That it is our judgment that the statements above referred to by General Van Fleet have been fully substantiated by the testimony before the committee; and

Resolved further, That the chairman appoint a subcommittee of five for the purpose of continuing this investigation and reporting to the committee the officials and conditions responsible for this situation of ammunition shortages in our services wherever they may exist and making such other recommendations as the subcommittee may deem helpful and advisable, and at the same time require regular reports from the Defense Department as to the progress being made in producing ammunition in adequate supplies.

[From the Washington Star of March 17, 1953]

GENERAL VAN FLEET IS CORROBORATED—FORMER CHIEF OF 10TH ARMY CORPS SAYS GENERAL'S TESTIMONY BEFORE INVESTIGATORS IS 100 PERCENT CORRECT

(By David Lawrence)

Congress has only scratched the surface of the ammunition scandal of the Truman administration, and, despite the buckpassing

and the attempts to cover up, the truth is bound to come out.

Today this correspondent presents a copy of a telegram just sent by Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond to Gen. James A. Van Fleet backing up the latter's charges.

General Almond, who retired on February 1, and is, therefore, in a position now to speak freely, was commander of the 10th Army Corps in Korea from the time of the Inchon landing, on September 15, 1950, until July 1951. Since General Van Fleet took command on April 14, 1951, and General Almond left Korea on July 15, 1951, their terms of service overlapped for several months. Here is the text of the telegram to General Van Fleet from General Almond:

"Hearty congratulations on your magnificent testimony, as reported in the press, before Congress on the military situation in Korea. Your honest and correct interpretations of conditions there have served to enlighten the people of our country and to confound and to deflate the generalizations and equivocations made by those who have tried to discredit your statements. I know the facts to be as you have stated them from the beginning of the Korean conflict until the time I left you in July 1951. Since my departure, my interpretation of information corroborates your testimony. Public statements made by me since my retirement support your views 100 percent, and I am ready at any time to substantially support your position. Your service to our Nation has been magnificent, and your statements in Congress add emphasis to your loyalty and patriotism. My best wishes to you always as a comrade in arms."

But perhaps the most significant piece of information comes from Tracy S. Voorhees, Under Secretary of the Army in the last administration. In a copyrighted interview in U. S. News & World Report this week, Mr. Voorhees says:

"We have gone into this Korean war, for instance, without either any budgetary or production plan for it. It was assumed budgetwise, and therefore productionwise, that the Korean war would end by July 1, 1951. But the war got rather obstinate and temperamental and declined to end, so they extended its life to July 1, 1952. The war was still stubborn, so its lease of life was extended by the United States planners until July 1, 1953. That was, I believe, one reason for this cutback which was made in United States production announced early last December. The net result has been that the Korean war remains alive and hungry for military equipment and supplies, and that we have just kept taking things that were produced for Europe and have shipped them to Korea.

"And nobody can criticize our military people for doing that when our fighting men in Korea were short of these arms. But we can criticize the failure to plan to carry on a war we are already in, so that our men will have the equipment and supplies to fight it. There is certainly high support for such a statement since President Eisenhower came back from Korea and made a general reference to shortages of some supplies over there that would have to be corrected. But the shortage, it seems to me, was not due to the Army's failure to buy what was needed, but to the Budget Bureau's decision not to let the Army budget and procure on a scale which would see the Korean war through without diverting to Korea equipment and supplies produced for our allies in Europe. * * *"

"Whose responsibility was that—Secretary of Defense? Chief of Staff?" Mr. Voorhees asked.

"No. I think it was a basic Government policy that was wrong," he replied. "A policy of partial, restricted, limited effort which went right straight through our Government. The Budget Bureau, which presumably had the President's approval, took this position about not budgeting for a possible or probable continuance of the Korean war. Then it was unpopular to deprive the American consumer public of anything, so we went right on manufacturing automobiles, refrigerators, and everything else, instead of manufacturing these things we needed to fight with in Korea and to create a real defense in Europe.

"As I see it, it is the policy of 'too little and too late' that was wrong. The point is that we have been at war for 2½ years and have this big Russian military threat hanging over Europe, and so threatening us also. And we are the one country in the world that can certainly succeed in production, but we just haven't done it fast enough."

What do the GI's think of all this?

In a letter to this correspondent received today, a lady writes about her brother's boy who had come home from Korea covered with medals and Purple Heart decorations:

"Now that he is at home and in college, his only bitterness is when he gets talking about how all his buddies got killed right before his eyes and how they wouldn't have been if they only had some ammunition. * * *

"My younger son is on an ammunition ship plying up and down both coasts of Korea rearming the carriers and battleships.

"The day your article came out, we got a letter from him saying his ship went into some little town to give a load of ammunition to some Army unit that had gotten stranded there with absolutely nothing."

The point is that the soldiers in Korea have for many months been writing home about the shortage of ammunition in Korea. They knew it. The enemy probably knew it—because attacks were sporadic. But the American people haven't known the truth, and if it were not for the sometimes condemned system of congressional investigations, they wouldn't know about it yet.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1356. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system of child's insurance benefits to children who have attained the age of 18 but are incapable of self-support because of physical or mental disability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 1357. A bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to small and independent business; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1358. A bill to equitably adjust the salaries of auditors at central accounting post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1359. A bill for the relief of Solena Viana Bryant (Mrs. William C. Bryant); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1360. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from airmail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1361. A bill for the relief of Adolfo L. Kalb, and his wife, Mrs. Eugenia G. Kalb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1362. A bill for the relief of Rev. Ishai Ben Asher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of Eddie L. Bennett, Jr. (Joji Chitose); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Emma Schmitt Guthell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG

S. 1365. A bill for the relief of Leopold Mistlberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose Montero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1367. A bill to amend section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to extend for 4 years the authority of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop-insurance program into additional counties; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN and Mr. YOUNG when the above bill was introduced today, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1368. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1369. A bill to establish a Foreign Trading Division in the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to promote the disposal in foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1370. A bill for the relief of Linda Lee Drake (Ami Kuroda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1371. A bill to extend for 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans for the purpose of making available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1372. A bill to provide for the authorization of a national cemetery in the State of Washington and for the utilization of surplus Army-Department owned military real property at Fort Lewis, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1373. A bill for the relief of Lionginas Kublickas, Juozas Grismanauskas, and Edmondas Paulauskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 1374. A bill for the relief of Spiridon Ioannis Athanasopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1375. A bill to amend section 5210 of the Revised Statutes; and

S. 1376. A bill to amend section 503 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1377. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CAPEHART when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1378. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the sesquicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1379. A bill to authorize the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees, persons of German ethnic origin, and natives of Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1380. A bill for the relief of Simonella Evonne Magliulo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution designating August 17 of each year as National Holstein-Friesian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STRENGTHENING OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ANTI-PRICE DISCRIMINATION ACT AND PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAINE], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to strength the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to small and independent business. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 3 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

The bill (S. 1357) to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Anti-Price Discrimination Act and the protection which it affords to small and independent business, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to provide greater protection to small business by plugging up a glaring loophole in the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act.

That loophole is the so-called good faith defense. In its recent decision in the *Standard Oil of Indiana* case (340 U. S. 231), the Supreme Court held that good faith is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act.

The Robinson-Patman Act was intended merely to give all business, large and small, an equal opportunity in the competitive race for survival. At the time of its enactment in 1935, small business was being driven to the wall. Chain stores and other large buyers were obtaining price concessions which enabled them to sell at prices that the smaller merchants, regardless of their efficiency, could not possibly meet. The evidence presented in reports of the Federal Trade Commission, hearings before congressional committees, and investigations by State authorities was conclusive. Favoritism had come to replace efficiency and service to the public.

In passing the Robinson-Patman Act Congress acted to remedy this situation. The rule underlying the new law was a simple one. A seller must not discriminate in price where such discriminations are not justified by differences in his costs of servicing his different customers and where the effect of such unjustified discriminations may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

This rule is a good one, and it ought to be preserved. Experience has shown that big suppliers, selling in many markets, can destroy smaller competing suppliers selling in only one market. The big supplier can drive these smaller competitors out of business by reducing his price in one market at a time, making up any losses through high prices charged elsewhere. Experience has also shown that where a supplier offers discriminatory prices beyond what is justified by differences in his costs, those concessions are usually granted only to the big buyers while the smaller buyers must pay higher prices.

In the Standard Oil of Indiana decision, however, the Court largely nullified the rule underlying the Robinson-Patman Act. The essence of the Court's interpretation is that wherever the FTC challenges a discriminatory practice and the supplier shows that he has carried on that practice in good faith, the Government is estopped from issuing a cease-and-desist order, and the supplier is free to continue the practice, regardless of its effects on competition.

As the law now stands, there is no limit on discriminations, as long as they are made in good faith. Once this simple test is met, the big firm is given carte blanche to drive his smaller competitors out of business, to destroy competition, and to create monopolies. He can even sell below his competitor's costs, because his good faith is held to be more important than the protection of competition and more important than the right of all smaller buyers whose business is ruined. This is a far cry from the original objectives of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The present bill would go a long way toward attaining the objectives which the authors of the Robinson-Patman Act thought they had secured when the act was passed some 18 years ago. I say it would go a long way. But it would not go all the way. The good-faith defense would still be a complete defense in all cases except where the effect of the discrimination fell short of probable injury to competition. It would still be a complete defense where only an individual competitor, or individual competitors, as distinct from competition were injured. But it would not be a complete defense where the discrimination was of such breadth and proportions as to result in a probable injury to competition.

Although this is the first time it has been introduced as a separate piece of legislation, the substance of the bill introduced by me has had a legislative history of some 4 years. On June 1, 1949, I submitted a somewhat similar provision as an amendment to the so-called basing-point bill, S. 1008. Although passed by the Senate, the protecting amendment was eliminated in conference. More recently, on August 2, 1951, I offered a similar amendment to S. 719. The amendment was defeated in the Senate by only one vote, 39 to 38.

The purpose of these amendments was the same as the purpose of the bill now introduced, namely, to prevent the destruction of competition through price discrimination. Like this bill they were supported by virtually all the legitimate small-business organizations. Among the organizations that have supported this type of measure in the past and support the present bill today are the National Association of Retail Druggists, the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, the National Food Brokers Association, the National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, the National Federation of Independent Business, and others.

In offering this proposed legislation I am seeking no special favors for small business. I am merely urging that small business be given an equal opportunity with big business to compete on the basis of efficiency and service. I am confident that, given this opportunity,

small business will prosper and the free competitive system will be immeasurably strengthened.

SOLENA VIANA BRYANT (MRS. WILLIAM C. BRYANT)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Solena Viana Bryant (Mrs. William C. Bryant). In case any Senator is interested, let me say that this is one of the times when the person involved is not a Pakistinian.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1359) for the relief of Solena Viana Bryant (Mrs. William C. Bryant), introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMMA SCHMITT GUTHEIL

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Emma Schmitt Gutheil. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1364) for the relief of Emma Schmitt Gutheil, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The bill would restore the United States citizenship of Emma Schmitt Gutheil, who lost her citizenship by voting in an election in East Germany. The choice given her by the Russian authorities was to vote in the election or go without food.

At the age of 11, Mrs. Gutheil became an American citizen through naturalization of her father, who had then been in the United States for 5 years. Eight years later, in 1921, Mrs. Gutheil, then Emma Schmitt, went to Munich, Germany, where her father was representing an Ohio company, and soon began work for the American consulate there. She continued working for the American consulate for about 10 years, until shortly after her marriage in 1931.

Emma Schmitt married a German national, Helmut Gutheil. Under the law then in effect, or shortly thereafter, she lost her American citizenship by so doing, and she was deemed a German citizen when her first daughter was born in July 1932. Later, through an act of Congress, the law was changed, and her American citizenship was restored. She retained her American citizenship throughout the entire Hitler regime. She now has five living children, four of whom are American citizens.

The end of hostilities in World War II found Mr. and Mrs. Gutheil living in the Russian-controlled zone of Germany. During this period, an election was ordered by the four-power government in Berlin. Mrs. Gutheil objected to voting in the election, because she was afraid of losing her United States citizenship. However, the Russian authorities compelled her to vote by withholding ration books for her and her family until she had voted.

Mr. and Mrs. Helmut Gutheil and their eldest daughter were admitted to the United States as German nationals. Their four youngest children were admitted as American citizens.

The Gutheil family is now living in Columbus, Ohio. Both Mr. and Mrs. Gutheil have applied for United States citizenship and did so at the earliest opportunity. However, it would help the family circumstances a great deal to restore Mrs. Gutheil's citizenship by congressional action. If her citizenship were restored, Mr. Gutheil would more quickly become eligible under the law to become an American citizen. He would then be able to obtain work at his profession, power engineering. His services are in demand, but his alien status bars him from the kind of work he is eminently fitted for.

The bill, then, would have two beneficial effects. It would restore the American citizenship that Mrs. Gutheil lost through Russian pressure under the guise of carrying out an order in which the United States Government had a voice. It would also indirectly make Helmut Gutheil available for employment in a profession which is short-handed.

EXPANSION OF CROP INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf myself and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to extend for 4 years the authority of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop-insurance program into additional counties.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately refererd.

The bill (S. 1367) to amend section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to extend for 4 years the authority of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop-insurance program into additional counties, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not to exceed 2 minutes on the bill just introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall not object during the morning hour to requests to speak if the speeches are limited to 2 minutes. I think I must object to any unanimous-consent request for permission to speak for longer than 2 minutes, until the morning hour is completed. After that a motion will be made to take up a bill. If the Senate proceeds to consider the bill, it will be open to indefinite debate, and speeches of any length may be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota may proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the measure which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I have today introduced would extend the authority of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand crop-insurance protection for 4 additional years—or through 1957.

Following a restudy of the crop-insurance program in 1947, the scope of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's activities was reduced by Congress to an experimental level. This was deemed necessary so as to permit the Corporation to gain needed experience by operating in a limited number of counties. Thereafter a gradual expansion was authorized, but this legislative authority expires in 1953.

Crop insurance has now been developed into a sound and workable program. The 1952 losses will all be paid from 1952 premium earnings and it appears that nearly a million dollars of the 1952 premiums will go into the insurance reserve. During the 5-year period 1948 to 1952 the total earnings from premiums amounted to $79,393,926. During the same period $76,754,892 was paid to farmers for crop losses. The Corporation should most assuredly be permitted to continue the expansion of crop-insurance protection which is so important, not only to farmers, but the rest of the economy as well.

To a considerable extent this program has alleviated the great hardships to farmers occasioned when crops have been destroyed by drought, hail, plant diseases, insects, or other causes. The program is self-financing, save for the cost of administration. Those who are insured pay for the protection just the same as any individual would under an ordinary casualty insurance contract. A majority of the farmers support the principle of crop insurance enthusiastically. Businessmen, too, have a full understanding of the indirect benefits which accrue when farmers are able to meet their financial obligations promptly. In the past during periods of drought and adversity many farmers were forced to seek Government assistance by way of feed and seed loans and other types of disaster relief. Crop insurance offers a method whereby financial crisis, to a considerable extent, can be alleviated in years of crop failure. Government assistance programs upon which we have had to rely in the past can and will be largely supplanted by more comprehensive protection affected by crop insurance.

LIBRARY SERVICE IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduced for appropriate reference a bill to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas. I ask unanimous consent to have an analysis of the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1368) to promote the further development of public-library service in rural areas, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The analysis presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL S. 1368 (THE ACT IS TO BE KNOWN AS THE LIBRARY SERVICES ACT)

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2: (a) Its purpose is to stimulate the States to extend public-library services to farming communities, small towns, and villages, now without such services or with inadequate services. The term "State" includes all the States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The term "public library" means a library that serves free all residents of a community, district, or region, and receives its financial support in whole or in part from public funds.

(b) No provisions of the act are to be considered as giving the Federal Government any power to interfere with the right and responsibility of the State and its local subdivisions to administer public-library services, to appoint the librarians and library assistants and to select the books, periodicals, films, recordings, and other library materials. In addition, the States and their local subdivisions, such as counties, etc., would have the power to determine what constitutes the best use of the funds in attaining the objectives of the legislation, provided such determination does not conflict with the provisions of the act.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 3: The act would authorize an annual appropriation of $7,500,000 to the States for a 5-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. In order to receive the payments, a State must submit to and have approved by the Commissioner of Education a State plan for the extension of public-library service to rural areas, which have either no service or else inadequate service.

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

Section 4: (a) Of the $7,500,000 to be appropriated each fiscal year, the Commissioner of Education would allot $10,000 to the Virgin Islands and $40,000 to each of the other States. Of the remainder of the $7,500,000 after these initial allotments, the Commissioner would allot to each State an additional amount based on the ratio of the rural population of the State to the total rural population of the United States according to the 1950 decennial census.

(b) If any part of the allotment to a State remains unpaid at the end of a fiscal year, it would be available to that State until the end of the next fiscal year, under the conditions governing the payments to the State as set forth in section 6. A State must exhaust this carried-over allotment before it can receive any payment out of the allotment in that following fiscal year.

STATE PLANS

Section 5: (a) In order to receive approval, a State plan for the further extension of public-library services must contain the following:

(1) Provision for the administration, or the supervision of the administration, of the plan by the official State agency charged by State law with the extension and development of public-library services throughout the State. Proof must be submitted that this State agency has adequate authority under the State law to administer the plan in accordance with its proposals and the provisions of the Act;

(2) Provision for the receipt and safekeeping by the appropriate State officer of all funds paid to the State under the terms of this act. Provision must be made also for guaranteeing that the funds will be expended solely for the purposes of the act;

(3) Provision for establishing policies and administrative methods to be followed in using any funds made available for expenditure under the State plan for extending public-library services to rural areas. The State library agency administering the plan must certify that the policies and methods proposed will, in its judgment, assure the use of the funds to maximum advantage in attaining the objectives of the act;

(4) Provision for the State library agency administering the plan to make reports on such items of information as the Commissioner of Education may reasonably require from time to time to keep the Congress and the public informed;

(5) Provision that any public-library services furnished to an area under the plan shall be made available free of charge, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the State library administrative agency.

(b) If a State plan meets the conditions specified in the preceding subsection, section 5 (a), the Commissioner of Education must approve it.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

Section 6: (a) The Secretary of the Treasury would pay from time to time to each State with an approved plan an amount equal to the computed Federal share of the total expenditures for public-library extension under the plan. No payment would be made to a State until the Commissioner of Education finds for the fiscal year in question that—

(1) The State or local communities will have available sufficient funds to enable them to receive at least the minimum Federal allotment of $40,000, and $10,000 in the case of the Virgin Islands;

(2) That the total amount available for public-library services from State and local sources in the area under consideration for the fiscal year in question will not be less than the total amount actually expended for public-library services from State and local sources for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953;

(3) That the amount of State aid for public-library services in the fiscal year under consideration will not be reduced below the amount of State aid actually expended for public-library services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

(b) The Commissioner of Education would be required, at least semiannually and prior to the period for which a payment is to be made, to estimate the amount likely to be needed to pay the Federal share of expenditures for carrying out the approved State plan for the period in question. The Commissioner would then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury this estimated amount, reduced or increased by a sum depending on whether his estimate for a prior period was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to a State for that prior period. The Secretary of the Treasury is required to pay to the State, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, the amount certified by the Commissioner and at the time or times fixed by him.

(c) In the calculation of the Federal share of the total expenditures for carrying out an approved State plan, the formula used for the purpose of matching takes into account the relative ability of the States to pay. As stipulated in the act, the Federal share for any State is 100 percent less the State percentage. This State percentage is that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the per capita income of that State bears to the per capita income of the continental United States (excluding Alaska). In other words, if a State with a per capita income of $1,297 as compared with the national per capita income of $1,380, is entitled to a maximum Federal allotment of $128,835 (the flat allotment of $40,000 plus the $88,835 based on the rural population ratio), it must put up $114,204 from State and local sources to obtain that amount of Federal money. The calculations would be as follows:

The ratio of the State per capita income to the per capita income of the United States (excluding Alaska) is 1,297 divided by 1,380 equals 0.9398.

The State share bears the same ratio to 50 percent as the one derived above, 0.9398. That is, State share divided by 50 equals 0.9398; or State share equals 0.9398 times 50 equals 46.99 percent. Federal share equals 100 percent less 46.99 equals 53.01 percent.

To obtain the maximum Federal allotment of $128,835, which represents 53.01 percent of the total expenditures, the State would have to put up $114,204. That is, $128,835 is to the State share as 53.01 is to 46.99, or $128,835 multiplied by 46.99 and divided by 53.01 equals $114,204.

Ceilings and floors have been placed on the Federal shares. In no case, can it be more than 66 percent or less than 33 percent. Furthermore, the Federal share in the case of Hawaii is to be 50 percent, and in the case of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, it is to be 66 percent.

(d) The Commissioner of Education would be required to announce officially between July 1 and August 31 of each even-numbered year the Federal percentage of the total expenditure for public library services under the plan for each State. This Federal percentage would be calculated on the basis of the averages of the per capita incomes of States and of the continental United States (excluding Alaska) for the 3 most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such official announcement would be in effect for each of the 2 fiscal years beginning with the first July 1, which follows the official announcement establishing the Federal percentage. The Commissioner would be required, however, to announce the Federal percentages as soon as possible after the enactment of the Library Services Act, and these percentages would be in effect until July 1, 1954.

(e) States are prohibited from purchasing or erecting any building or buildings, or purchasing any land by the use, directly or indirectly, of any Federal money paid to it under the provisions of this act.

WITHHOLDING

Section 7: The Commissioner must withhold further payments to a State, if he finds (1) that the State plan has been so changed as to be no longer in accordance with the requirements of the Library Services Act, or (2) that there has been a failure to comply substantially with the provisions required and set forth in the State plan. Before such action is taken, the Commissioner must give reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the previously approved State plan. The Commissioner is required to make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury until he is satisfied that the State is no longer failing to comply with the requirements of the Services to Libraries Act.

ADMINISTRATION

Section 8. (a) The Commissioner of Education would administer the act under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Administrator and would issue, with the approval of the Administrator, such regulations as might be necessary for the administration of the act.

(b) The Commissioner would be authorized also to make such studies, investigations, and reports as might be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. This would include among other things periodic reports for public distribution on the values, methods, and results of the various State activities in the extension of public-library services in rural areas, undertaken under this act.

(c) Authorization would be given for the appropriation of such sums as would be necessary to enable the Administrator of the

Federal Security Agency and the Commissioner of Education to carry out the functions required by this Services to Libraries Act.

APPLICATION OF CLAYTON AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACTS TO CERTAIN PRICING PRACTICES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1377) to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

I have today introduced a bill that will encourage a competitive economy, permit sellers to compete for the business of additional customers, give buyers additional sellers competing for their business, and—perhaps most important—give businessmen assurance that their Government truly believes in a free, competitive economy.

I am particularly concerned that we avoid the necessity for utilizing artificial implements—such as controls—to keep prices in line. A competitive business economy, with the maximum number of sellers competing for each buyer's business, is the surest way to keep prices from reaching artificially high levels. In fact, had the legality of freight absorption been clarified 4 or 5 years ago, by adequate legislation, I am certain that buyers would have been saved many millions of dollars during the 2½ years since the Korean aggression.

The bill will, if enacted into law, permit a seller—who is acting in good faith and is not in collusion with anyone—to pay part or all of the cost of transportation on sales to a customer in order to meet a lower price which a more favorably located competitor offers to that customer. It will permit a seller—but only when he is acting in good faith and not in collusion with anyone—to meet a lower price which his competitor is offering to the customer.

This bill is drafted to follow—and is fully in accord with—the applicable decisions of the Supreme Court. It closely follows the Court's 1951 decision in *Standard Oil Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231), and in fact uses the language of the Court in that case. Further, this bill would not make lawful anything that the Court held to be unlawful in *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute* (333 U. S. 683).

To keep the record straight I also want to call attention to other things that the bill will not do. It will not permit sellers to use basing point systems as that term has been defined by the Supreme Court. It will not make it easier for businessmen to conspire or harder for the Federal Trade Commission to prove a conspiracy. It will not permit sellers to raise prices or to meet a competitor's higher price. It will not permit a seller to meet a price which he knows, or should know, is illegal. It will not permit a seller to undercut his competitor's price except in maintaining a differential normally prevailing between them.

I am certain that all those who believe in competition will support permitting sellers, who are competing and not conspiring, to meet the prices which their competitors are offering to the customers. That is all this bill does.

In the 80th Congress a committee, of which I had the honor to be chairman, made a thorough study of this problem. We heard over 100 witnesses, the overwhelming majority of whom clearly supported such competitive practices as are provided for in this bill. The committee also approved such competitive practices. Since that time 4 other congressional committees have gone into the problem, 2 in the Senate and 2 in the House of Representatives.

In the 81st Congress a bill was passed to accomplish this purpose. This bill, S. 1008, was drafted at the Federal Trade Commission, but was vetoed by the President on the ground that its provisions were so confusing it would not clarify the law.

In the 82d Congress a bill to accomplish this purpose, S. 719, passed the Senate and was favorably reported out of committee in the House of Representatives, but did not reach the floor.

The bill that I have introduced today combines the best features of S. 1008 and S. 719. It follows the pattern of S. 719, covers most of the area of S. 1008, and avoids the confusion said to exist in the latter. Its provisions are clear and can readily be understood because it follows the language of the Supreme Court majority opinion in the Standard Oil case.

The enactment into law of the bill will give businessmen the assurance that is required with respect to pricing matters to maintain and expand our high level of productivity in a free, competitive economy.

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK FOR WOMEN—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 176) providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 663. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala;

H. R. 673. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi;

H. R. 688. An act for the relief of Takako Niina;

H. R. 731. An act for the relief of James Rennick Moffett;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Tibor Kálmán Jalsoviczky;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Anneliese Else Hermine Ware (nee Neumann);

H. R. 757. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini;

H. R. 777. An act for the relief of Richard H. Backus;

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 870. An act for the relief of Harry Block;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Dr. Suzanne Van Amerongen;

H. R. 884. An act for the relief of Stephanie Marie Dorcey;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;

H. R. 955. An act for the relief of Paula Akiyama;

H. R. 1101. An act for the relief of Daniel Robert Leary;

H. R. 1186. An act for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of Clint Lewis;

H. R. 1704. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suga Umezaki;

H. R. 1967. An act for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co.;

H. R. 2353. An act for the relief of Ema Shelome Lawter;

H. R. 2363. An act for the relief of David H. Andrews and Joseph T. Fetsch;

H. R. 2561. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 by extending the time for filing certain claims thereunder, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2567. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 2624. An act for the relief of Paola Boezi Langford;

H. R. 2667. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie P. Riggs, James A. Carson, and Vernon L. Ransom;

H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;

H. R. 3230. An act for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer;

H. R. 3231. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

H. R. 3385. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon;

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin; and

H. R. 3458. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1524. An act to facilitate the management of the national-park system and miscellaneous areas administered in connection with that system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1532. An act to provide for the addition of certain Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2011. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for a campsite and other public purposes;

H. R. 2013. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site;

H. R. 2019. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land to Ted B. Landoe and Roderic S. Carpenter; and

H. R. 2936. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the State of California for use as a fairground by the 10-A District Agricultural Association, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following concurrent resolutions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM J. LITTELL TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William J. Littell, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Illinois, vice Robert Grant, removed. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT W. WARE TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Robert W. Ware, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California, vice James J. Boyle, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD W. SCRUGGS TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomition of Edward W. Scruggs, of Arizona, to be United States attorney for the district of Arizona, vice Frank E. Flynn, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN B. STODDART, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John B. Stoddart, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois, vice Howard L. Doyle, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LEO A. ROVER TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Leo A. Rover, of the District of Columbia, to be United States attorney for the District of Columbia, vice Charles Morris Irelan, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], chairman; the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the White House sent to the Senate today the nominations of Walter S. Robertson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, and William Howard Taft III, to be Ambassador to Ireland. I give notice that the nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations after 6 days have expired in accordance with the committee rule.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

Address entitled "Germany Today," delivered before the Exchange Club of Bismarck, N. Dak., on March 2, 1953, by William S. Murray, assistant attorney general of North Dakota.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Address entitled "Electric Power and the Atomic Bomb," delivered by Philip Sporn at the ceremony attendant upon the breaking of ground for the Clifty Creek plant of the Indiana-Kentucky Electric Corp., at Madison, Ind., on December 5, 1952.

Address by B. T. Fitzpatrick at the farewell staff dinner in honor of Raymond M. Foley, retiring Housing and Home Finance Administrator, at the Bethesda Naval Center on March 10, 1953.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Address delivered by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, archbishop of Boston, before the Immigration Institute of Boston College, on February 6, 1953.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "The Moral Laws," published in the Farm Journal of April 1953.

Article entitled "What's the Outlook?" written by Claude W. Gifford and published in the Farm Journal of April 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Editorial entitled "An Open Letter to the New Russian Dictator, Mr. Malenkov," published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of March 12, 1953.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Release relating to the appointment of Philip Young as Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, issued by the National Civil Service League.

By Mr. WELKER:

Article entitled "Political Revolution On," written by Holmes Alexander.

Article entitled "Build Alaska," written by George E. Sokolsky and published by King Features Syndicate, Inc., on March 16, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Resolution relating to the oppression of Jews and other minorities behind the Iron Curtain, adopted by the board of directors of the Schenectady County Council of Churches of Schenectady, N. Y.

Editorial entitled "Offshore Oil Again," published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 11, 1953.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Article entitled "What Keeps You Strong," written by Paul G. Hoffman and published in the newspaper supplement Parade, on March 15, 1953.

By Mr. MORSE:

Concluding statement in address of welcome to Oregon Dairymen's Association made by Mr. P. M. Brandt.

Resolution adopted by the 42d annual convention of the Oregon Dairy Industries.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Hugh Grant to Deliver Talks in Birmingham" published in the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of March 11, 1953; and an article entitled "Georgia Engineers' Group Addressed by Hugh Grant" published in a recent issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle.

Article entitled "Colorful Ceremonies Held at Dedication of Pelham Marker" published in the Jacksonville (Ala.) News of March 11, 1953.

Editorial entitled "GOP Blast at GOP" published in the Mobile Register of March 11, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Fortunate for Republicans That It Isn't Election Day" published in the Mobile Register of March 12, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial from Memphis Commercial Appeal of March 16, 1953, entitled "Shocking and Objective," relating to outrages of Communists in Red China.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial entitled "Well Done, Mr. Bowles" published in the New York Times of March 15, 1953.

By Mr. BEALL:

Article describing the Irvington dairy farm at Gaithersburg, Md., published in the Baltimore Sun of March 15, 1953.

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, last Sunday, March 15, a special service was held in the city of Philadelphia to commemorate the 272d anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The service was held in Old Christ Church, one of the sacred shrines of American patriotism, dating back to 1695.

In this historic edifice the Continental Congress attended services in a body on more than one occasion.

The pew occupied by George Washington when he was a resident of Philadelphia is appropriately marked.

Benjamin Franklin is buried in its churchyard, as also are Robert Morris and James Wilson, signers of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. President, it seems to me that these days of crisis in the world call upon us to look with deeper reverence upon our historic shrines as sources of renewed patriotic inspiration.

I believe my colleagues will find it interesting to read an article on this anniversary service written by John M. Cummings, of the Philadelphia Inquirer, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 16, 1953]

ALL IN STATE SHOULD HAIL CHARTER DAY ANNIVERSARY

(By John M. Cummings)

In the recorded history of Christ Church in the heart of old Philadelphia it is set forth that its bells pealed in unison with the Liberty Bell on a July day in 1776 to proclaim to the whole world the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The whole world, of course, didn't hear the ringing of the bells on that particular day. Many years would pass before sound took wing and traveled with the speed of light.

These same Christ Church bells rang out again yesterday. Now their pealing was in commemoration of the 272d anniversary of the establishment of Pennsylvania. There was a special commemorative service in the old church where Washington and others of the founders of the Republic worshiped when Philadelphia was young, or reasonably so.

The Colonial Society of Pennsylvania, headed by its governor, Frank W. Melvin, attended the special service in a body. This was eminently fitting and proper since the Colonial Society, made up of descendants of early families in these parts, is spearheading a movement to have the legislature make charter day a legal holiday in the State.

It should be noted the Colonial Society is not asking the legislature to create a holiday to be observed annually. Once every 10 years, on March 15, would be sufficient, it is suggested, to keep alive the memory of 1681 when England's King Charles II signed the charter granting to William Penn the vast territory known as Pennsylvania.

A year ago, having sipped mulled wine with the lads of the Colonial Society in the Union League, we suggested in this space that all our people should join, not every 10 years, but annually, in marking what is regarded as the birthday of our State. It is true that the Swedes were here in the lower end of the Delaware Valley before Penn landed on Pennsylvania soil. But, as Sylvester K. Stevens, our State historian, points out, "Pennsylvania history began on a more substantial basis * * * when King Charles granted a charter to William Penn to found a colony."

It was urged here a year ago that the anniversary of the founding be observed in the schools, public and private, to the end that the rising generation may know something of the beginning of their State.

"Pennsylvania," says Governor Melvin, "appears singularly lacking in State pride as to its origin. This doubtless has been due to early Quaker influence, which decried celebrations of Christmas, birthdays, and so on. Such feelings now are obsolete, of course, and there is no reason why Pennsylvania should not take note annually of its creation. Pennsylvania shares with Plymouth Colony, Rhode Island and Maryland, the distinction of having been created primarily for spiritual and moral reasons. Pennsylvania was established to preserve and maintain principles."

Once again on this date we shall mingle with the Colonial Society. So, for that matter, will Governor Fine. We shall try again the mulled wine, steaming hot and delicately spiced.

It must be comforting to the spirit of Penn and the others long since gone to know that in this atomic age men still have reverence for the sturdy founders of the city and the Commonwealth.

At the same time it must give the shade of King Charles II a bad time whenever he thinks of the untold wealth he handed over to Penn. So let us commemorate the birthday of the State today and let us urge on the legislature at Harrisburg that speed be the order with the Charter Day legislation.

PAYMENT OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE TO PERMANENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I intend to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters I have received, but first I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may have 2 minutes in which to explain them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina that he may proceed for 2 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to make further reference to my remarks contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 6, 1953, concerning an incident in the Office of Rent Stabilization by which 49 permanent employees of that office in 1950 were separated by reason of a reduction in force and collected lump sum payments for accumulated leave without any break in service by virtue of their reinstatement as temporary employees and their appointments being later reconverted to permanent appointments.

It was my impression that such a practice could not occur under Public Law 233 of the 82d Congress, the new Annual and Sick Leave Act sponsored by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. However, I discovered what seemed to be a new loophole under present law as a result of the decision of the Comptroller General dated December 14, 1951, volume 31.

On February 11, I addressed a letter to the Comptroller General urging his review of that decision.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter, together with the Comptroller General's reply of March 4, 1953, and the Comptroller General's letter of opinion to the Civil Service Commission be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 11, 1953.

Hon. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL WARREN: My attention has been called to certain practices in the Office of Rent Stabilization by which permanent employees were separated by a reduction-in-force and collected lump sum payments for accumulated annual leave. It appears that the day following their separation they were reinstated as temporary employees which on the expiration of the accumulated leave were converted to permanent appointments.

It was my impression that such a practice could not occur under Public Law 233 of the 82d Congress; however, on looking into this matter, I have discovered what seems to be a loophole under present law or as a result of your decision dated December 14, 1951, vol. 31, with respect to this matter.

I respectfully urge you to review your decision in light of recent occurrences, and I enclose for your information copies of a statement that I made in regard to this matter in the Senate on Friday, February 5.

With kind personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senator.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 4, 1953.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: Reference is made to your letter of February 11, 1953, wherein you urge reconsideration of the answer to question 6 (b) in office decision of December 14, 1951, to the former Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission (31 Comp. Gen. 215 (at p. 222)), which decision covered several questions arising under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 (65 Stat. 679). There was enclosed with your letter copies of a statement regarding the matter which you made in the Senate on Friday, February 5, 1953.

The aforesaid statement indicates that the decision of December 14, 1951, involved an interpretation of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951. However, the conclusion reached in the decision was not premised on any provision of the said act but was based on the view that applicable provisions of the Lump-Sum Leave Act of December 11, 1944 (58 Stat. 845), contemplated a refund only in the event a reappointment carried with it a potential right, at least, to the accrual of additional leave. Therefore, and since it was obvious that, under an appointment for less than 90 days following a break in service, an employee could not become entitled to any leave accruals, it was concluded that a refund of the lump-sum leave received by an employee in a prior position was not required under such circumstances. It is to be observed that, under such view, departments and agencies are spared the necessity of processing considerable paper work which is involved in receiving and depositing the refund from the employee, setting up a leave account covering the unused annual leave from the prior position and, within a period of less than 90 days, making a second payment to the employee. In such connection, it is to be noted that one of the stated benefits of the Lump-Sum Leave Act of 1944 was the elimination of time-consuming paper work for payroll sections with a resulting saving of expenses to the Government. See Senate Report No. 1300

and House Report No. 1836, 78th Congress, 2d session.

Moreover, it was not contemplated at the time the said decision was rendered that departments and agencies, through a series of separations and appointments, would undertake to use such interpretation as a vehicle to avoid other laws pertaining to the use of appropriated funds or restricting the accumulation of annual leave such as sections 203 (c) and (d) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 or section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953 (66 Stat. 418). You may be assured that, in the event any instances of such action by departments or agencies are brought to my attention, steps will be taken immediately to recover any illegal or improper payments from the responsible certifying or disbursing officers or from the individual employees involved.

The matter has been carefully considered further as requested by you and while it is still believed that there is a proper legal basis for the conclusion reached in the decision of December 14, 1951, it is felt that the Lump-Sum Leave Act of 1944, likewise justifies the view that refunds on account of the unexpired portion of annual leave are required to be made by all employees covered by the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, upon their reappointment regardless of the type or tenure of the new appointment and even though the employees will accrue no additional leave under the new appointment. Accordingly, and in order that there may be no possibility of department or agencies attempting to avoid laws restricting the use of appropriated funds or the accumulation of annual leave, the decision on the point in question has been modified as set forth in the attached copy of my letter of today to the Acting Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 4, 1953.

ACTING CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR,
UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION:

MY DEAR MR. EDWARDS: Reference is made to Office decision of December 14, 1951 (31 Comp. Gen. 215), to the former Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, concerning several questions under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, effective January 6, 1952 (65 Stat. 679).

This Office recently has received a letter from Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, a member and former chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, wherein he urges reconsideration of the conclusions reached in the above-mentioned decision with respect to employees who are separated from positions for one or more workdays and then reemployed under temporary appointments for less than 90 days—more specifically, the answer to question 6 (b).

In the aforesaid decision it was held that, under the Lump-Sum Leave Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 845), an employee who received a temporary appointment for less than 90 days after a break in service of one or more workdays, would not be required to make refund for the unexpired portion of the lump-sum leave payment received in the prior position.

That conclusion enabled the departments and agencies to appoint employees to temporary positions for short periods up to 90 days after they had been separated from permanent positions without the necessity of processing the paper work incident to the refund of payment for the unexpired portion of the annual leave accrued by such employees in their permanent positions. It has been brought to attention that such rule possibly could be the subject of abuse in that administrative offices might use it as an instrument to avoid assuming the burden of annual leave accumulated by employees in prior positions even when they know the employee's services are needed for more than 90 days. That is accomplished by separating the employee from the temporary appointment limited to less than 90 days upon expiration of the period covered by the lump-sum leave payment in his prior position and then reinstating him in a permanent or indefinite position after a break in service of 1 or 2 days from the temporary position. Likewise, it is possible that departments or agencies might, by the use of the same method, undertake to make payments to employees for leave which they otherwise would be required to forfeit by reason of sections 203 (c) and (d) of the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, or of section 401 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953 (66 Stat. 418).

The referred to holding in the decision of December 14, 1951, was intended, of course, to apply only in cases of bona fide appointments for less than 90 days.

The matter has been further considered and it is felt that there is a substantial legal basis for the conclusion reached in the decision of December 14, 1951. However, on the other hand, a strict construction of the language of the Lump-Sum Leave Act of 1944—requiring a refund on account of unexpired leave by employees when reemployed under the same leave system—equally warrants the view that, in cases such as those here involved, a refund is required despite the fact that an employee will accrue no additional leave under his temporary appointment. This seems particularly so since the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 was intended to place all employees covered thereby under the same leave system regardless of the type or tenure of their appointment.

Accordingly, in order to prevent departments and agencies from avoiding restrictions on appropriations or on the accumulation of leave, you are advised that, on and after the date of this decision, a refund will be required of the unexpired portion of the lump-sum leave payment received by an employee who is reemployed in a temporary position for less than 90 days after separation of one or more workdays from a prior position. Of course, the employee under such circumstances would be entitled to a recredit of the annual leave represented by the refund which would be available for use during the temporary employment period. The answer to question 6 (b) in decision of December 14, 1951, supra, is modified to that extent.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am pleased that the Comptroller General has now reversed his decision of December 14, 1951, and that there no longer exists any possibility of recurring action such as that pointed out to this body by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

It will be noted that in the last paragraph of his letter the Comptroller General has this to say:

> In order that there may be no possibility of department or agencies attempting to avoid laws restricting the use of appropriated funds on the accumulation of annual leave, the decision on the point in question has been modified as set forth in the attached copy of my letter of today to the Acting Chairman, Civil Service Commission.

I am glad to have this matter clarified.

REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire at this time to submit the final and complete reports of the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

This subcommittee was authorized and directed by Senate Resolution 53, approved February 19, 1951, to conduct a study into the manpower and personnel policies and practices of the Federal Government with a view to the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of civilian personnel during the period of national emergency.

Mr. President, during the 82d Congress, this subcommittee investigated many phases of the personnel and manpower policies of the executive branch, and it is on the basis of this study that the following reports were compiled:

First. Personnel recruitment and employment practices in the Federal Government.

Second. Improving the Federal administrative management program.

Third. Classification and compensation processes.

Fourth. Personnel investigations of employees and applicants for employment in the executive branch of the Government for loyalty, suitability, and security.

Fifth. Military personnel in civilian occupations.

Sixth. Training and education in the Federal Government.

Seventh. Effect of personnel office staffing ratios.

Eighth. Contractor labor.

Ninth. Grievance and appeal procedures.

Tenth. Effect of the Whitten amendment on manpower utilization.

I ask unanimous consent that these reports be printed as Senate documents for proper distribution.

Mr. President, these reports have not been officially adopted by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but represent the work of the staff assistants employed to carry out the directives under Senate Resolution 53, during the 82d Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that certain reports, which he submits from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which are staff reports, not reports of the committee, be printed as Senate documents. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not at all familiar with this matter, but I have had some questions raised with reference to the printing of staff reports which have not been approved by a subcommittee or a committee, even though I understand that the subcommittee has approved of these reports.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say to the distinguished majority leader that the committee has approved of the printing of the reports, which are very voluminous and which contain information the Senate ought to have before it.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator from South Carolina be willing to renew his request on Friday and permit the matter to go over until then, so that I may have an opportunity to examine the reports?

I have had a good many complaints made about printings of this kind. This particular request may be a perfectly proper one. However, if the Senator does not mind renewing his request on Friday, I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I would certainly not ask the majority leader to act on the matter until he has had an opportunity to fully look into it.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, with regard to the printing of the reports I wish to state to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that our committee did examine the reports, but we did not have time to go into them fully and to approve them. It was requested that they be printed after a study of them by our committee staff. That is why the Senator from South Carolina has brought up that point. I am sure he will not object to letting the matter go over until Friday.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I appreciate what the chairman has said, and I agree with him. We did agree on the printing of the reports.

FREE POSTAGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, for the purpose of establishing legislative intent and to clarify the meaning of H. R. 2466, a bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas, passed by the Senate on March 16, 1953, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on page 2, line 9 of the bill, the word "describe" is inadvertently used instead of the word "prescribe." This language was contained in the bill as approved by the House on March 2.

I consider it unnecessary to propose a concurrent resolution to correct this error because the Post Office Department has informed me that it will construe the language as if the word "prescribe" had been used instead of the word "describe."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 77, Senate Resolution 86.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 86) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 86) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, which had been reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate briefly on the subject of statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon would like to ask the Chair whether Order No. 77, Senate Resolution 86, was adopted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; but the motion to proceed to its consideration was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the New York Times is one of the great newspapers not only of our Nation but of the world. It is comprehensive in its national and international news coverage and its editors are able and usually objective in their approach to public issues. To me, therefore, the recent editorial of the Times entitled "Forty-ninth State?" was surprising in its departure from fairness and objectivity when it said:

> The real basis for the fight against admission of Hawaii boils down to the fear of many Congressmen from the South that the two new votes in the Senate will be cast for civil-rights legislation and to the unwillingness of some Congressmen from both North and South to grant such voting strength to an area that contains only a half million people.

That deliberate injection of racial prejudice into the consideration of a statehood measure is reminiscent of the tactics of the northern abolitionists who in 1850 injected the slavery issue into the consideration of statehood for California, New Mexico, and Utah. California got by since it was coming in as a free State, but the discussion of the slavery issue tied up all business in the Senate including necessary appropriation bills for over 7 months, and it might have lasted longer but for the persuasive eloquence of Daniel Webster, who favored the admission of California but opposed the admission of Utah and New Mexico.

While southern Senators are proud of being members of the white race and no doubt prefer that more than 16½ percent of the population of a new State be of the white race as an unspoken assurance of a similarity of ideals and interests, the opposition of southern Senators to the granting of statehood to Hawaii is not based upon racial prejudice nor partisan objection to two new Republican Senators.

Our objection is far more fundamental. It is the same objection voiced, as I have indicated, more than 100 years ago by Daniel Webster with respect to Utah and New Mexico when he said:

> I have the strongest objection to a premature creation of States. I stated that objection at length in the Senate some 2 years ago. The bringing in of small States with a representation in the Senate equal to the representation of the largest States in the Union, and with a very small number of people, deranges and disturbs the proper balance between the Senate and the House of Representatives. It converts the Senate into a kind of oligarchy. There may be 6, or 8, or 10 small States in the Southwest, having as many Senators in Congress as they have Representatives. This objection is founded upon the incongruity which such a case produces in the constitutional relation of the Senate and the House.

As in the case of all true statesmen, Webster was speaking not only for his day and generation, but for subsequent generations when he said:

> There may be 6, or 8, or 10 small States in the Southwest, having as many Senators in Congress as they have Representatives.

At the present time there are 9 States with 2 Representatives and 1 State with only 1 Representative. But they are all in one contiguous land mass, and railroads and highways have brought us close together, while newspapers, magazines, and the radio disseminate, from coast to coast, information on national issues. No minor ingredient of the success of our unique experiment in self-government has been the fact that all our 48 States were settled and developed by our own kind of people, imbued with the spirit of free, competitive enterprise and American constitutional liberty.

Let it be likewise remembered that in every State in our great Southwest there are still ample opportunities for population growth and development as our national program of reclamation brings life-giving water to millions of rich but thirsty acres. That is not true of the Hawaiian Islands, which reached their peak population as the result of war activities during and immediately after World War II, and have since been steadily declining. The area of arable land in the Hawaiian Islands is strictly limited, and is largely owned by a few large corporations and wealthy individuals. With the exception of fish, sugar, and pineapples, the Hawaiian Islands have to import virtually all their foodstuffs, and the cost of living in the islands for a number of years has been roughly 25 percent above that of our mainland. There is not the slightest chance that the Hawaiian Islands will ever develop a population comparable to that of an average State of our Union, notwithstanding the present claim that the islands' present population of 400,000 citizens is larger than that of any territory heretofore admitted to the Union, except Oklahoma. In other words, if the Hawaiian Islands be admitted and start out with 2 Senators and 1 Representative, that will always be their representation so far as anyone can now tell on the basis of physical facts.

At this time, when we are fighting one war in the Orient, without knowing when an even larger one may develop in that area or on the mainland of Europe, and when our economy is being strained to carry the unprecedented tax burden incident to the development and maintenance of a great military establish-

ment, we are asked to grant statehood to an indefinite area, thousands of miles away from our homes, and to confer upon the representatives of 400,000 citizens of that indefinite area the same power of taxing and spending as is conferred upon the Members of Congress who represent the great taxpaying States of New York, Pennsylvania, California, and Texas. Exclusive of Federal employees, who frequently travel at the taxpayers' expense, it is safe to say that not 1 percent of the 400,000 citizens of Hawaii have ever been to the United States or ever expect to come. A large majority of them are of Oriental origin, far removed from our inherited institutions; and Communists have infiltrated their ranks. Yet those 400,000 citizens will select 2 Senators, and each one of the 400,000 will exercise in taxing and spending and in all other congressional legislation 31 times as much influence as that exercised by a native-born citizen of our largest taxpaying State, New York, resulting, as Webster said, in "the incongruity which such a case produces in the constitutional relation of the Senate and House."

What is the constitutional relation which the House so conveniently ignored when it passed a bill to add 2 new Senators and 1 new Member of the House? The Constitution provides that each State shall have two Senators. That, of course, is clear and explicit. It should be equally clear to those who are familiar with the debates of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 that representation in the House should definitely be on a population basis, and that representation as evenly distributed among the States of the Union as the burden of taxation. This is the language of article I, section 2, clause 3:

> Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined—

And so forth. That fundamental principle of proportional representation was emphasized by the 14th amendment, which was adopted because during the days of slavery, slaves were not counted as citizens, just as Filipinos were not counted as citizens when we took title to the Hawaiian Islands in 1898. Section 2 of the 14th amendment reads as follows:

> Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed.

The present membership of the House is 435, and for many years it has been generally agreed that to make the House any larger would make it a very unwieldy body from a legislative standpoint. Yet, in passing a statehood bill for Hawaii, the House gaily says that the membership of the House shall hereafter be 436, and that the additional Member shall not be allocated, on a proportional-representative basis, but shall just be given outright, as an evidence of our generosity, to the Hawaiian Islands.

Incidentally, the time is not too far distant when serious consideration will have to be given to the constitutional issue of proportional representation in the House and whether the membership of that body shall be measurably increased. In a forthcoming book, the great naturalist and noted author, Dr. Fairfield Osborn, of New York, will present conclusive statistics to show that our present birth rate exceeds that of India, and that we may look forward within the foreseeable future to an increase of at least 30 million in our population. Dr. Osborn will discuss that population trend from the standpoint of how we are going to feed our people, with a steady disparity between those who are in industry and services and those who are producing food. But we in Congress will likewise have to consider how we are going to operate a government of 180 million or ultimately 200 million people and still preserve the constitutional checks and balances intended by the framers of our Constitution when they authorized 2 Senators for each State but proportional representation in the House of Representatives.

I cannot blame the editor of the New York Times for ignoring, in his recent editorial, some of the serious problems implicit in statehood for Hawaii, because no hearings on this issue have been held by Congress since 1950, and the House had to look primarily for its information to the very persuasive speech of Delegate FARRINGTON, of the Hawaiian Islands, who—I say with all due deference—was a special pleader. Possibly the viewpoint is now old fashioned; but when statehood for California, New Mexico, and Utah was being considered, Daniel Webster said:

> Sir, it is curious enough to observe how differently this idea, that a member chosen into a public body to act for the whole country, is bound, nevertheless, by the instructions of those who elected him, which has risen to a sort of rule in some of the American States, is received and treated elsewhere. According to our notions and habits of thinking, it is not only allowable for, but incumbent upon, a Member of Congress to follow the instructions given by his own particular constituents, although his vote affects the interest, the honor, the welfare, the renown of 20 millions of people. * * * Sir, I am of opinion that every public consideration connected with the interests of the State, one of whose representatives, and the most humble of them all I am, shows the absolute necessity of settling this question at once, upon fair and reasonable terms; the necessity of judging subjects according to their real merit and importance, and acting accordingly.

Mr. President, let me point out, therefore, to the distinguished editor of the New York Times that one item of importance involved in the pending issue from the standpoint of the general welfare of the Nation, and not from the standpoint of the petitioners from the islands of Hawaii, is the fact that for the first time in 150 years, during which our national boundary lines have been fixed and definite, it is proposed to violate what had become an accepted doctrine, both here and abroad, namely, that we would never reach across either the Atlantic or the Pacific for new territory to be made a part and parcel of our Union and go for an indefinite distance out into the Pacific Ocean to confer statehood upon what still remains as an indefinite area. Not one member of the Congress knows just what islands generally referred to as Hawaiian are to be included in the statehood program, although we do know that Palmyra Island, according to a 5–4 split decision of the Supreme Court, is one to be included, notwithstanding the fact that it is 1,000 miles away from the main group. Incidentally, Mr. President, Chief Justice Vinson and three of his Associate Justices were definitely of the opinion that we had no legal title to Palmyra Island, and they concurred in this dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Rutledge:

> I agree with the dissenting judges in the circuit court of appeals that the possession shown on behalf of respondents is not sufficient to establish the presumption of a lost grant, even if title can be acquired from the Government in that manner. According to my understanding, the possession, to have that effect, must be actual, open, notorious, adverse and continuous from the time when the grant is presumed to have taken place. Here for long periods the possession was constructive at the most, not actual. By the same token it was not continuous. I do not think this Court should expand the established basis for acquiring title to Government lands so as to include acquisition by adverse possession, as in effect the Court's opinion does. Accordingly, I dissent.

When 13 States formed a Union in 1787, the Mississippi River was the western landmark of the new Nation. Sixteen years later, President Jefferson, through the purchase of the Louisiana Territory from France, moved it to the Rocky Mountains. The Oregon settlement of 1846 and the Mexican cession of 1848 moved the boundary to the Pacific Ocean, where it has remained for the last century. In 1823, with the tacit agreement of Great Britain, whose navies ruled the waves, President James Monroe announced that all nations of the world would thereafter be required to recognize the boundary lines fixed by our Nation on the North American Continent and those fixed by the nations of the South American Continent. One reason that Monroe Doctrine has gone unchallenged is the assumption of other major world powers that our experiment in self-government was not predicated upon an empire concept, and that we would never reach out from our mainland across either the Atlantic or Pacific Ocean to add additional territory to our Union.

But, some 70 years ago, a spirit of imperialism sprang up in this country. The dollar diplomacy of that era did not seek to move the boundary line our fathers had set, but sought merely to extend our trading rights and privileges and to make the world more conscious of our power. In 1898, Congress forced upon President McKinley, a conscientious and God-fearing man, a declaration of war against Spain. He spent 4 days in constant prayer before issuing a proclamation that a state of war with Spain existed. He knew there was no proof that Spain had sunk our battleship.

It was in that year, when no one knew just how far our war in the Orient with Spain might spread, and when the King of the Hawaiian Islands was fearful of hostile action from some foreign nation,

that he prevailed upon us to accept as a gift his kingdom; and all he wanted, and all he expected, was friendly protection which, through the years, we have generously and effectively given, plus the boon of free trade with the mainland.

After an easy military victory in the Spanish-American War, we took charge of Cuba, but, fortunately, lived up to our assurances both to Cuba and the outside world that we entered Cuba as liberators only. For a long time afterward, we held on to the control of the economy of Cuba, including currency control, but never with any idea of making Cuba a part and parcel of the United States.

After taking the Philippines by force from Spain, we had an attack of conscience, and we paid Spain for the Philippines as much as Jefferson had paid Napoleon for Louisiana. Then, we had another attack of conscience, plus a realization of a bad financial deal, and we promised independence to the Philippines. But it was years later, in 1935, before it was actually granted. In granting that independence we sought to prove to the world that we acted as we talked about the subject of personal freedom, and that we had no delusions of empire grandeur.

Unfortunately for us, after World War II, the mere fact that of the free nations of the world we alone had the wealth, the resources, and productive capacity to build a levee against the onrushing tide of communism, has again created a suspicion, especially in the Orient, that we want to dominate the economy of the world on an empire basis. I heard many references to that at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Bern, Switzerland, last summer. That feeling is so deep rooted that we have few, if any, real friends in the world. Even the NATO ties in Europe are hardly more than a shotgun wedding.

Realizing, however, that if we sit idly by while the Russian Communists gain control of both Europe and Asia, the final showdown battle may be our Armageddon, we are making a military stand in Korea and subsidizing, in a costly way, the military establishments of our European allies.

In those circumstances it is important for us to allay the fears of the Orient that our boundary lines are fluid, and may later be extended in the Orient.

If we pass the pending statehood bill and extend our boundaries from the Golden Gate 2,500 miles to Honolulu, and then another thousand miles to Palmyra, who can thereafter say that at some future date we will not develop an empire complex and take into our Union additional areas in both the Atlantic and the Pacific?

Lest the distinguished editors of the New York Times or anyone else may say that such a consideration has no validity in this argument, let me quote a recent statement published in the Christian Science Monitor by an able and trained political observer and world traveler, who cannot be accused of being motivated by racial prejudice—Mr. Joseph C. Harsch. On March 13 he wrote:

Since the year 1912, when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted to the Federal Union, the United States has been a solid land mass. Since much before that its frontiers were defined as they stand today, and understood to be so defined and so fixed the world around.

The present land frontiers of the United States have not been in substantial dispute since the Louisiana Purchase and the Oregon settlement. They stand today among the few undisputed, uncontested frontiers of the world. One of the reasons they have not been challenged has been their stability, their quality of being fixed and final. The world understood that Americans were satisfied with their frontiers and wanted no more territory. Therefore, in turn, there has not been for a century any serious, sustained pressure back against the American frontiers.

The moment the United States adds an island State lying 2,000 miles away from the established mass to its Federal Union the concept of fixed American frontiers comes to an end. It is true that American ownership of the Hawaiian Islands is not contested. But to make these islands in the mid-Pacific part of the Federal Union is to make the frontiers of that Union fluid and flexible. A precedent will have been established. The American frontiers, instead of being one of the most stable elements in the political world, become another set of movable frontiers.

Movable, fluid, unsettled frontiers invite trouble. The history of every empire in time is proof of this. The potential of expansion invites the potential of attack. Does the United States really want to inform the world that its frontiers, long presumed to be fixed, are in fact not fixed; that first Hawaii and Alaska will be admitted to the Union and then, by implication what else?

Overseas expansion by admission of new States has a not too happy modern parallel. France has attempted to hold its colonial empire by offering admission in the French political union to its colonies. The northern part of Algeria is incorporated politically in metropolitan France. It has not been a happy operation.

It would seem unlikely that anything beyond Hawaii and Alaska would be admitted to statehood for many years, if ever. Yet once they are admitted the precedent exists for taking in remote areas. Australia once talked tentatively of applying for admission. That could happen again. Does the United States really wish to open the way, by precedent, for a potential expansion of its political frontiers to the far corners of the world?

At least, it is a question which ought to be asked, and then examined. Perhaps it has no validity, but the step into the Pacific will be a precedent. It will unfreeze the American frontiers. It is a step which certainly should not be taken lightly and in unawareness of its many and heavy implications.

Mr. President, the northern Abolitionists, who injected the racial issue into the question of statehood for California, New Mexico, and Utah, and who kept up the debate for 7 months, were not conducting a filibuster, because they were liberals; and filibusters are only conducted by conservatives who believe that the liberal viewpoint in a given instance is not consistent with the general welfare. I and other southern Senators, who do not agree with the so-called liberal viewpoint that now is the time to grant statehood to Hawaii, do not intend to stage a filibuster against the bill. But we shall insist that adequate hearings be conducted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, before which the bill is pending, before members of that committee vote on reporting a bill. And we shall insist upon a reasonable opportunity, should a bill be reported, to elucidate the truth of King Solomon's warning to his people centuries ago, "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

PROPOSED AIRPORT AT BURKE, VA.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the question as to whether or not the proposed Burke, Va., Airport is to be completed has been revived and has again engendered considerable controversy. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared crystallizing my views on this matter, the substance of which was transmitted to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in a letter dated February 27, 1953.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF MARYLAND

With the increasing trend toward economy in all phases of Government operations, as expressed by President Eisenhower and congressional leaders, I respectfully urge that the proposed construction of a supplemental airport in the Washington area be reviewed and again evaluated in terms of objectives as set forth by the new administration.

Long one of the former President Truman's favorite projects, the 81st Congress authorized the construction of such an airport at a cost of $14 million, and a site at Burke, Va., was later selected. There are those in the contracting and aviation industries who now feel that the final cost of this airport facility, at today's figures, would greatly exceed the original estimate of $14 million, and that the Congress will ultimately be called upon to approve many more millions of public funds to finish this undertaking.

The 81st Congress also made available $1 million to enable the acquisition of land, and to request for $1,662,000 additional funds was denied in May 1952, but a similar amount has been included in the budget for the 1954 fiscal year. The original appropriation of $1 million has since been exhausted with the purchase of only 1,020 acres and the completion of certain preliminary engineering surveys.

Approximately 4,200 acres compose the contemplated site at Burke, Va., and the 1,020 acres already deeded to the Government represent only 25 percent of the total area, and about 50 percent of the total land value, since it includes mostly small, improved tracts. In addition, another 320 acres must eventually be acquired for access roads.

It is my feeling that the mounting serious congestion at Washington National Airport must be alleviated as quickly as possible, but in considering the entire problem, from a sectional standpoint, I believe that the economies which could be effected through the use of Friendship International Airport must be fully explored.

I quite agree that the location of Friendship Airport is slightly more distant than the Burke site, but when the Washington-Baltimore expressway is completed, in the very near future, a direct and rapid access road to Friendship Airport will become available. Also, it is not too fantastic to predict, that helicopter service between downtown Washington and Friendship Airport is now within the realm of possibility.

Projected traffic and planning studies confirm the need for facilities supplementary to Washington National Airport, but my position is based on the premise that the Government must now, as never before, exercise practical judgment in the expenditure of further funds for this project. At this time,

it is generally conceded that taxes cannot be reduced until the budget is balanced, and the people of America are therefore entitled to the full facts as to the continued wisdom of proceeding with this project especially when another excellent facility, with available capacity, is nearby for use and further development.

By way of summary, I feel that the following factors enunciate the practicability and desirability of utilizing Friendship International Airport as a supplemental facility to Washington's National Airport:

1. The proposed airport at Burke, Va., could not be completed at the original cost estimate of approximately $14 million.

2. Multi-million-dollar expenditures, such as would be needed, would be inconsistent with the administration's present objectives for greater economy in Government.

3. Friendship International Airport is characterized as being "one of the world's finest airports" and its excellent facilities are capable of handling greater traffic without difficulty.

4. With the completion of the Baltimore-Washington Expressway, later this year, the travel time from Washington by auto to Friendship Airport will not exceed 40 minutes.

5. The possibility of eventual helicopter service from downtown Washington to Friendship Airport must be recognized.

6. Residents of the Burke, Va., area are vigorously opposed to this project.

It shall be my expectation to pursue this matter actively and oppose any additional appropriations unless the Burke Airport project can be unequivocably justified as essential to the welfare of the country and the security of the Nation's Capital.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have the honor to bring before the Senate a matter of most urgent importance, the national problem of mental illness. I shall subsequently submit a resolution which requests the President to set aside, by proclamation, a mental health week, from May 3 to May 9.

The resolution is sponsored by myself and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], my colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. President, in 1946, when Congress was considering the National Mental Health Act, the then Surgeon General, Thomas Parran, called mental illness the Nation's No. 1 health problem. An examination of the situation as it exists today confirms that assertion.

According to statistics gathered by the National Association for Mental Health, there are as many people in mental hospitals today as there are in all other hospitals in the United States put together. There are at this time under care in the Nation's mental hospitals 650,000 men, women, and children, and this number is larger than the number now in hospitals as a result of polio, cancer, heart disease, pneumonia, and any other physical illness. Two hundred and fifty thousand new patients are being added each year to the mental hospital rolls.

The records show that during World War II more than 2,000,000 men were rejected for military service or discharged from the service because of mental or emotional disorders.

In addition, the medical authorities report that almost half of all the millions of patients that come to physicians for medical treatment are in reality suffering from a mental or emotional disorder.

The criminologists tell us that mental and emotional illnesses are the causes of a major portion of the millions of acts of crime and juvenile delinquency committed each year. Psychiatrists tell us that mental illness is responsible for alcoholism, absenteeism, poor work performances, and many of the family troubles and divorces.

And from the reports of the State governments and the Federal Government come the figures which show that the taxpayers are paying an average of $1 billion a year to maintain the mentally ill in hospitals and to pay benefits to the dependents of persons mentally sick. This figure does not include the unestimated billions of dollars lost in crime and the cost of maintaining the courts, prisons, and welfare services. It is no wonder that mental illness has been called the Nation's No. 1 health problem when we consider the waste of human resources and the amount of human suffering which results from it.

In the light of these facts it is proper to ask how is the Nation meeting this problem? What is being done about giving proper treatment to the victims of mental and emotional illness? What is being done to sponsor research so that more adequate methods might be found to prevent mental illness?

Here are some facts in answer to these questions, and I must say they are facts which are not too heartening. Despite the very great progress which has been made in the State mental hospitals, the facts as reported by the mental hospitals themselves to the Council of State Governments lead to the conclusion that the average State mental hospital is still more like a huge detention ward, or displaced-persons camp, than a medical institution. Not a single public mental hospital today meets the standards of the American Psychiatric Association. Overcrowding exists in 95 percent of them. There is a 40-percent shortage of doctors and a 60-percent shortage of nurses in the State mental hospitals. The majority of these mental hospitals are compelled to deny most of their patients adequate psychiatric treatment because they do not have the equipment and staff to give the patients the treatment they need. As a result only about 40 percent of the patients who enter mental hospitals ever come out improved or recovered. This is a great tragedy in light of the fact that doctors agree that there is more hope for recovery from mental illness than from any of the other serious illnesses. Let me read a sentence from a statement by Dr. Karl Menninger, one of the country's leading psychiatrists:

> The worst part of it is that most of these unhappy patients could be cured, as many as 85 percent of them, if they could be given proper treatment early enough. Of all the serious illnesses that confront mankind mental illness is one of the most hopeful of recovery.

It is not only in the mental hospitals that we see evidence of this tragedy. It has already been established beyond any doubt that the psychiatric clinic can help to correct mental and emotional disorders in their early stages, yet there are only 500 full-time psychiatric clinics in the entire country, and most of these are concentrated in a few States. Last year these few clinics treated 250,000 children and adults. According to Dr. George Stevenson, medical director of the National Association for Mental Health, there is a need for 10 to 20 times that number of clinics. One proof of this is the fact that every single psychiatric clinic has a long waiting list; many applicants have been waiting for admission from 6 months to a year, sometimes even longer. In my State of Florida, there are many boys who have been held in jails for months at a time because they could not gain admission

to any psychiatric hospital. This forced wait in the case of mental illness is extremely serious, for it is during the early stages of mental illness that a cure can be most effectively applied—and then it is inhuman, aggravating, and sometimes dangerous to have these mentally ill people wait outside an institution for 6 months to a year. How would we feel about putting on a 6-month waiting list children who are suffering from polio, rheumatic fever, or pneumonia? Yet that is the situation with children suffering from mental and emotional disorders. These children and adults need help quickly and desperately, the same as other severely sick people. Lacking that help, many of them become delinquents, criminals, alcoholics; some commit suicide, while many do not follow any drastic course but drift along living lives of misery and heartache to themselves and their families.

Scientific research which could be finding new ways to prevent mental illness and which could be improving the methods of treating the mentally ill is severely limited by lack of funds. Hundreds of millions of dollars are being spent annually on all kinds of scientific research. Yet only about two and a half million dollars are being spent in basic research for causes and cures of mental illness. If more money were put into research we could hopefully anticipate that there would be a need for fewer and fewer mental hospitals.

These facts add up to the conclusion that the Nation is just superficially dabbling at the problem, instead of digging into its roots to discover its cause and its cure.

This problem represents a challenge to the entire Nation. The Federal and State Government agencies are doing their best within their financial limits and within the limit imposed by the severe shortage of trained psychiatric personnel.

The professional organizations, such as the American Psychiatric Association and the American Medical Association, are devoting a great deal of their resources to help improve the present situation. They are providing the scientific technical knowledge which is needed to combat mental illness and they are cooperating with the Federal and State agencies in working out improvements and expansion of the treatment and research facilities. There are 250 citizens' voluntary mental health organizations now associated with the National Association for Mental Health. They are continuing to do their splendid job of alerting the Nation to this problem of sponsoring research leading to improved conditions in mental hospitals, and expansion of psychiatric facilities in local communities, and to increased mental health education.

To the National Association for Mental Health and the other mental health associations goes great and continuing credit for grinding away at the problem for the past 40 years. The mental health associations have had a direct hand in changing the mental hospitals from the torture chambers which they were 50 years ago to the beginnings of medical institutions which many of them are today. They have been responsible for introducing new methods of treatment in the mental hospitals. They have had a hand in the establishment of every one of the mental health clinics which exist in the country today. The National Association for Mental Health carries on the only comprehensive research attack on schizophrenia, the mental illness which accounts for more than 300,000 patients in mental hospitals today. They have carried on and continue to carry on mental health education so that more and more of our people can live mentally healthier, more useful, and happier lives.

Together the Government agencies, the professional organizations, and the mental health associations make up the team which is tackling the Nation's No. 1 health problem and together they must continue to intensify their activities so that the Nation as a whole may soon conquer this problem.

On May 3 to 9 the National Association for Mental Health and its hundreds of State and local mental health associations are conducting the national observance of Mental Health Week, an observance that reaches into thousands of communities in every one of the 48 States and which is supported by thousands of Government, professional, and citizens' organizations, among them the National Institute of Mental Health of the Federal Security Agency. The purpose of Mental Health Week is to carry on education and to help organize all the forces in the country for a frontal attack against mental illness.

This resolution which has been introduced today by more than 50 Senators calls on the President to proclaim May 3 to 9 as Mental Health Week and urges the entire Nation to support and participate actively in it, to the end that the No. 1 health problem confronting this Nation can be met and solved, thus bringing greater strength and productivity, improved health, and happiness to all the people of our Nation.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit, out of order, the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 93), submitted by Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas there is presently a great need for nationwide action for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness; and

Whereas the National Association for Mental Health and the State and local mental health organization associated therewith are working diligently in the fight against mental illness; and

Whereas the mental health fund is in dire need of public support in order to improve conditions in mental hospitals, provide more adequate treatment for the mentally and emotionally ill, carry on research in the field of the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and promote mental health education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation designating the week beginning May 3 and ending May 9, 1953, as National Mental Health Week, and urging the people throughout the Nation to cooperate in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness, and inviting the communities of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply wish to say that I am glad to join with the Senator from Florida in offering the resolution. In the State of Massachusetts, I think there are more mental hospitals and more psychiatric clinics than in almost any other State in the Union, and we realize their importance. I commend the Senator from Florida for the statement he has made and the action he has taken.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE PROBLEM OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the field of mutual security aid to our allies abroad, we hear much these days of the phrase "trade, not aid." I shall address myself briefly to a suggestion that the phrase be revised somewhat as it is applied to problems of American agriculture, and that we consider using the phrase "trade to aid."

It seems to me that it has become clear to all citizens that, from the standpoint of maintaining parity prices for products which are raised in surplus in this country, the crux of the problem which we confront is to find consumers abroad or at home who are able to pay for surplus products prices which will enable the Government to dispose of them without suffering or incurring any serious loss. I propose that we expand our foreign trade in farm products by exporting foods and fabrics so as to aid our foreign friends as well as our American farmers.

The problem of agricultural surpluses has been dramatized by such efforts to support prices as those undertaken by the previous administration in connection with potatoes, eggs, and certain other products. The situation has been further dramatized by problems confronting the present administration with respect to price supports for butter, cotton, and other products which are raised in surplus in this country.

In an effort to grapple with this particular problem, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1369) to establish a Foreign Trading Division in the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to promote the disposal in foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also ask, because the bill is brief, that the full text of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended by inserting after section 10 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 10A. Foreign Trading Division: (a) Within the Corporation there shall be a Foreign Trading Division, which shall be headed by a Vice President of the Corporation to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. All of the powers and duties of the Corporation relating to foreign trade shall be exercised by the Foreign Trading Division, subject to the supervision and control of the Board. The provisions of this section shall not affect the responsibility of the Board for the management of the activities of the Corporation relating to foreign trade or otherwise affect the authority of the Board or of the Secretary, other than the authority with respect to the delegation of the powers vested in the Corporation relating to foreign trade.

"(b) (1) Within the Foreign Trading Division, there shall be a Foreign Trading Advisory Council which shall consist of a representative of the Department of State, to be appointed by the Secretary of State; a representative of the Department of Defense, to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense; a representative of the Department of Agriculture, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; and a representative of the Department of Commerce, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. It shall be the duty of the Advisory Council to survey the policies of the Foreign Trading Division and the policies of the Board with respect to matters relating to foreign trade, and to make such recommendations to the Foreign Trading Division and to the Board as it deems advisable.

"(2) Members of the Advisory Council shall receive compensation of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in performing their duties, except that any such member who is also an officer or employee of the United States shall not receive any compensation in addition to his compensation as such officer or employee. All members of the Advisory Council shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary traveling expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

"(3) The Corporation shall furnish to the Advisory Council such technical and clerical assistance as may be necessary to enable it to perform the duties imposed upon it by this subsection.

"(c) (1) In addition to the powers conferred upon the Corporation by sections 4 and 5 of this act, the Corporation shall have power to remove and dispose of, or aid in the removal or disposition of, surplus agricultural commodities by selling, trading, or bartering in or to a foreign country such surplus agricultural commodities and accepting in exchange therefor—

"(A) any agricultural product of such foreign country (or any agricultural product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which is not competitive with domestic agricultural commodities, or with respect to which the domestic production of competitive domestic agricultural commodities is insufficient to meet domestic demand;

"(B) any nonagricultural product of such foreign country (or any nonagricultural product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which is not competitive with domestic products, or with respect to which the domestic production of competitive products is insufficient to meet domestic demand; or

"(C) any product of such foreign country (or any product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which is needed by the United States for military or defense purposes or of value in developing our atomic energy program.

"(2) The Corporation shall also have power to sell in a foreign country any product acquired by it under clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection and to accept in exchange therefor any product of such foreign country (or any product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which it has power to acquire in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities under the authority of paragraph (1).

"(3) In exercising its powers under this subsection, the Corporation shall give priority to acquiring products described in paragraph (1) (C) of this subsection.

"(d) In exercising its powers under subsection (c), the Corporation shall, insofar as practicable, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce. In making the semiannual reports required by subsection (g), the Corporation shall enumerate all transactions made under authority of subsection (c) in which the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce were not used.

"(e) The Corporation may exercise the powers conferred upon it by subsection (c) to acquire strategic and critical materials, but any strategic and critical materials so acquired shall be disposed of in the manner provided in section 4 (h) of this act.

"(f) To enable the Corporation to exercise the powers conferred upon it by this section, not less than $500 million of the funds available to the Corporation shall be available solely for the use of the Foreign Trading Division.

"(g) The Corporation shall, 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and at the end of each 6-month period thereafter, submit a complete report of the activities of the Foreign Trading Division during the preceding 6-month period to the Senate and the House of Representatives. If the Congress is not in session at the time for submission of any such report, such report shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives for transmission to the Senate and House, respectively, at the commencement of their next session."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of our friends in the Press Gallery to the fact that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] called my office after I had made some brief discussion of the proposed legislation in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, which met this morning. The Senator from Kentucky asked that his name be associated with that of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from South Dakota. For that reason his name did not appear in the news release which dealt with this particular legislation.

In short, we propose in the bill which has just been sent to the desk to create within the boundaries and the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation a separate section to be known as the Foreign Trading Division. It is our thought that this Foreign Trading Division should be able to provide the Government leadership and activity which is necessary in order to stimulate the movement of foods and fabrics raised in this country in excess, into the hands of those who need them and are able to pay for them, either with currency of their own nationality or with products which they have in abundance, and which we can use in this country.

Members of the Senate and the people of the country generally are well aware of the fact that many different formulas have been suggested for dealing with the problem of putting into use and consuming agricultural surpluses which have tended to accumulate or which have come into the hands of the Government as a result of the price-support program.

We had before us for general discussion a year or two ago a proposal called the Brannan plan. The Brannan plan was carefully studied by the Agriculture Committees of both Houses. It was a proposal which would have subsidized American consumers by having the Federal Government pick up the check for a part of the grocery bill paid by every American family, whether it was a rich family or a poor family. It was an effort, of course, to do something about the agricultural surpluses, but, on balance, it was generally conceded by those who studied the legislation that it was an unwise experiment and that it would not only cost the American taxpayer a tremendous amount of money, but would also eventually prove injurious to the American farmer. So, in my opinion, the Brannan plan was wisely abandoned, and we have continued to look for other methods and other procedures to make available to those who need them American foods and fabrics which we can produce in such abundance in this country provided the farmer is paid a fair and adequate price for his efforts.

Another approach in this same direction has been the school-lunch program, which, so far as it operates to provide needy children with the proper well-balanced diet, meets the problem of malnutrition and contributes to the national health, certainly serves a useful purpose, but it has only limited practical possibilities.

However, with the many millions of people around the globe who are suffering from malnutrition and from lack of proper food and adequate clothing, it seems to me that the problem we confront is largely to find an answer to the question of how to place in the hands of those people who need our foods and fabrics the products of the American farm.

The problem is how to place such products in the hands of foreign countries in such a way that they, in turn, can pay for them, so that the American farmer can receive for his products the full parity price or the honest cost of production plus a reasonable profit, to which he is entitled.

The proposed legislation, with respect to which I have been joined as a sponsor by the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Kentucky tackles the specific problem confronting us, which we recognize to be a substantial problem. We do not contend that it would prove a cure-all for all the problems involving agriculture and agricultural surpluses, but we honestly believe that it would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that after the meeting of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry today the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] stated that he

would like to have the privilege of being associated with the Senator from South Dakota in the sponsorship of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as one of the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to have him join us. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] made a similar request after the bill had been briefly reviewed before our committee this morning.

In brief, our bill proposes to set aside from the funds now available to the Commodity Credit Corporation an initial fund of $500 million. With that fund of $500 million the proposed legislation would convey to the Commodity Credit Corporation some authorities which do not now exist in the field of foreign trade. It would provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with the authority, under the express direction of Congress, to move into the field of international trade from the standpoint of agricultural products which are raised in surplus quantities in the United States.

The bill would give the Commodity Credit Corporation the authority to purchase in the open market, or to take the products which come into its possession through the operation of the farm-support program, and go abroad actively seeking markets in which such products could be sold. It would give the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to take the products which come into its possession by one device or another, and sell them abroad, if they can be sold, for the native currency within the given country. In turn, the Commodity Credit Corporation could use such currency to purchase products which are in demand in this country, and which are not raised on our farms or fabricated in our factories in quantities adequate to supply our domestic demands.

The bill would go further and provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with authority to make trades, to barter, and to make exchanges with people in foreign countries, so that the products which we have to make available to them could be exchanged or bartered for products which we need, and which, in turn, are not raised, produced, or fabricated in this country in quantities sufficient to meet our domestic demands.

The only respect in which the bill would convey authority to import products which would compete with the products of this country which are not in short supply would be in two specific fields—first, in the field of national defense, in which the Commodity Credit Corporation would be directed by Congress to exercise its authority to make what trades it can for strategic materials to be stockpiled for war supplies which are needed, in exchange for agricultural products. The same authority and direction are incorporated in the legislation from the standpoint of any material useful in the development of our atomic energy program, so that the products which we raise can be exchanged for foreign products raised on the farm, for foreign products which are fabricated, processed, mined, or produced abroad, and which are not produced in this country in quantities sufficient to meet our demands. In addition there would be authority to barter or exchange for products essential to our national defense for stockpiling purposes, and for the development of our atomic energy program.

It should be called to the attention of the country that in a great many cases the problem is not simply one of making a bilateral trade agreement whereby the United States is able to trade with foreign country X, Y, or Z, for some specific product which we need. The Commodity Credit Corporation, through the Foreign Trading Division, would be expected to negotiate multilateral trading agreements when necessary, and to make trades in which perhaps four or five countries would be involved, in a process in which eventually the product of the American farm, produced for the American consumer, would be exchanged for some foreign product which the American consumer desires and needs, and for which he is willing to pay ready cash.

From the standpoint of the utilization of foreign currency, the difficulties confronting us arise because of the monetary differences between countries, the lack of interchangeability, and the fact that the world is divided into two monetary areas, in the main, namely, the dollar area and the sterling area. All this contributes to the stifling and stultification of the intenrational trade.

That has become a special problem in the field of agriculture. The proposed legislation would give the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to utilize not only the products, but the money it obtains in such multilateral exchanges to purchase eventually for us products which we need and desire.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad to say that I am happy to join with the Senator from South Dakota in this legislative proposal. As a matter of fact, I have had a little experience in that field in attempting to arrange barters. On one occasion, at a time when the then Secretary of Agriculture was as well chairman of the Combined Food Board, which was allocating food all over the world, a representative of the Government of India came to the Department of Agriculture. He wanted wheat desperately for the people of his country. India did not have the dollars, but he still felt that the wheat should be available. I reminded him that the Cuban people were objecting to the fact that his country was not selling them the proper quantity of bags in which to pack their sugar. I also reminded him that the Cuban people were not supplying this country with sufficient sugar for the summer canning program of our women. We called the Cuban Ambassador and arranged a three-way trade in which dollars were never mentioned. We shipped to India a number of tons of wheat, India shipped to Cuba a number of bags for carrying sugar, and Cuba shipped to the United States the sugar necessary for the canning program.

I can say that it was all worked out in our minds on the basis of dollars, but it was purely a barter arrangement, which would be very difficult under any other sort of program.

The Senator from South Dakota has called attention to atomic-energy projects. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I recall at one time we were greatly concerned about getting certain products from specific areas. The situation was such that it was not desirable to name the specific products we wanted. We wanted to arrange a transfer of some kind. I am glad to note that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is present in the Chamber, because he was one who raised his voice in an attempt to have done what was necessary to be done. If there had been authority at that time to exchange wheat for the products we desired, the transaction could have been arranged in a simple manner. However, it was not done, and there was a great loss to this country. It could have been done readily if the necessary machinery had been available.

At one time an attempt was made by a previous Secretary of Agriculture to get the very type of authority provided in this proposed legislation. It was opposed by some persons who felt that we must never barter. However, we have seen recently situations in which barter is the only arrangement and the only device that can be used successfully.

I am glad that the Senator from South Dakota has presented a bill which would make such an arrangement possible.

I know that at one time the mills and mines in a portion of Germany over which the American flag was then flying needed additional supplies of wheat. The French were in great need of the products of the factories. At the same time the farmers in Italy were not able to operate their tractors because most of the tractors were not made in the United States but in European countries. By trading and trafficking and mixing back and forth the products of a host of establishments spare parts for the tractors of the Italian farmers were obtained, and in exchange goods came into the United States which were noncompetitive with American products.

That is against the law at the present time. The Commodity Credit Corporation is supposed to get dollars. It is only occasionally that a representative of the Department feels justified in trying to get something other than dollars and then he must be very sure of his ground. The proposed legislation would permit the Government to operate, and I think operate very successfully, in that way.

One final example, Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to give it.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was a time when the British Government, because of the austerity program, felt it necessary to cancel purchases of tobacco from the United States. A hogshead of tobacco which is packed in the United States for shipment to Britain is packed in a different fashion than is the hogshead of tobacco shipped to other countries or used in the United States. The leaves are laid in a different manner. That is the way the British people want it. When the British Government closed down their tobacco buying programs because of the serious financial difficulty, tobacco farmers in certain

States were worried. They thought there would be a tremendous addition to the surplus of tobacco, and there seemed to be no way of moving it.

That tobacco finally found itself in Spain. The Spanish tobacco monopoly is government owned. We were not at that time, as a government, dealing very much with Spain. However, it seemed to me that if the tobacco could be moved to England and then to Spain, it could also be moved directly to Spain. We could not get the dollars, which was the requirement. But the Spanish Government had great quantities of pesos on deposit with a New York bank. By pledging those pesos they were able to take the stock of tobacco and use it in their industry. We were able finally to provide payment in dollars over a long series of months. But the Treasury of the United States lost nothing, and the American farmers profited greatly, because that supply of tobacco did not hang over the market for a long time. We have a situation now in which great quantities of wheat are hanging over the market.

If the American farmer is to have a chance, that wheat ought to disappear from the market. It ought to be moved. I think it could be moved by barter. I do not think it can be moved by dollars.

That is why I am glad that the Senator has introduced the proposed legislation at this time. It will give a chance to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and his committee to take a good look at it and possibly make some suggestions which will eventually make it possible to move some of the surpluses before they become burdensome and difficult for the American farmer.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much for his valuable contribution to the debate. He has been very helpful in formalizing this particular piece of proposed legislation. It was largely brought about because of his experience in the field of agriculture, and his calling the specific situation to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which he is a very useful member.

There is nothing malicious or mischievous about a barter proposal. Ever since the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was fortunate enough to see the light of day in South Dakota, where he was born, he has lived, as I have lived, in what we call horse-trading country. A horse trade is a perfectly legitimate process of exchange. No one is cheated, and both sides are benefited. Perhaps we can apply that Yankee philosophy to these complicated problems of international trade.

I may point out that in this proposed legislation we specifically spell out that the Commodity Credit Corporation in implementing it shall use the practicable and customary channels of trade.

Mr. President, this is not an effort to put the Government into business. It is an effort to get Government out of the stockpiling business and the warehousing business, and out of the activity of accumulating farm products, which are kept in storage until they deteriorate, and to use the values such products have abroad by either selling or exchanging them.

I may say that this proposed legislation provides an opportunity for dollars, pounds, francs, or any other form of currency to be used as a measuring device in evaluating the true worth of the various types of products and an opportunity for bringing about a meeting of minds, so that property of this kind can be exchanged, instead of having the various currencies, as they now operate, stand as guardians at the edge of the water or at the boundary line to keep various products away from the people who need them. I think we can have these currencies serve the mucilaginous purpose of bringing people and products together instead of keeping them apart, if we provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with the authority envisioned in this proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield further.

Mr. ANDERSON. The question may arise on the part of the farmers: "Are you trying to take away $500 million from the Commodity Credit Corporation and thereby harm its program?" Is it not true that the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation is nearly $7 billion, as authorized by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MUNDT. That is corerct.

Mr. ANDERSON. And only a small portion of that amount would be utilized. Therefore, the $500 million would not impair its capital or make it difficult for the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the farm program.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy the Senator from New Mexico has pointed that out. Nothing is further from my mind. This bill, if enacted, could not in any way impede the credit of the Commodity Credit Corporation; but enactment of the bill would provide an initial fund with which to begin, on an experimental basis, slowly, an effort to develop a formula by which to dispose of, in a useful manner, the products which we raise in such abundance in our country.

It is fair to expect that for a while the Commodity Credit Corporation would have some attrition of this fund; the Corporation might make some bad deals, and thus might reduce the $500 million fund. On the other hand, the Corporation might make some good deals, and thus might increase the amount of the fund.

However, by proceeding slowly, the Corporation might very well develop some very desirable procedures, so that ultimately it would be possible for us to help other countries get what they need, and at the same time help our own farmers obtain a permanent program which would maintain the prices of our agricultural products at the point where they deserve to be maintained, rather than to have unwanted surpluses stored in places where they would not be used.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from South Dakota suggests that in working out the proposed program, some bad deals might be made. However, is it not true that some bad deals occasionally are made in connection with the storage programs which cause the grain to hang over the market? Grain deteriorates and spoils in storage, and such spoilage and deterioration have cost the Government money.

Would not it be better to have the food consumed by people somewhere on the earth, rather than to have the food deteriorate and spoil while in storage?

Mr. MUNDT. I could not agree more completely with the Senator from New Mexico. Certainly a rather long and melancholy list of bad deals would have to be engaged in, one after another, before the use of the food for human consumption would cost more than the storage programs have actually cost. My recollection is that in the case of wheat alone, the International Wheat Agreement program cost the American taxpayers approximately $200 million a year; and, of course, in connection with this matter we are dealing with all agricultural products.

Mr. President, perhaps this measure will also open up an avenue and will enable a formula to be provided by which to deal with the rather difficult category of perishable products, which cannot be stored, but have to be used, for the bill, when enacted, will enable us to purchase, trade, or exchange such products for things which will be useful and helpful to us. Perishables must be used promptly if loss is to be averted. Thus storage programs for perishables which fail to find early usage for the product are extremely expensive and have made it difficult to give producers of perishables the benefits of a price support program.

I shall be very happy to have, as I know the Senator from New Mexico will be, the thoughtful criticisms of our colleagues and also of persons throughout the Nation who may care to comment on this proposal. I expect to discuss it in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and tomorrow I expect to send a copy of the bill to our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, so that his experts may pick it full of holes, if they can, or make constructive suggestions, if they are available, and try to develop with us a program which over the long pull will shore up, bolster, and effectuate economies in our agricultural program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am very hapy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who, by the way, is a good Yankee horse trader.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from South Dakota began his speech, and I regret that I have not had an opportunity to read his bill. Of course, I do not suppose it will be the entire answer to the problem.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, it will not be.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I suppose enactment of the bill will be of help in answering the problem caused by our agricultural surpluses, both now and in the future.

Let me say that we have two major problems in connection with our agricultural program, as it relates to the

other nations of the world. First of all, because of the higher prices paid in the United States, there is a desire on the part of practically every major producer in the world, outside the United States, to sell its surplus agricultural products to the United States. In fact, other nations seem to have a desire to sell to us more than their surpluses, for they want dollars desperately, and today some of the other countries are engaging in the practice of dumping on the United States, in order to obtain dollars.

Mr. MUNDT. They also tamper with their own currencies, in order to undersell us in our own market.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. That occurs in the case of wool, for example.

Mr. AIKEN. When those countries are unloading those commodities in the United States, they are keeping them from other countries in the world which actually need them, whereas we in the United States do not need them at all.

Another major problem in connection with our agricultural program is that another group of nations would like to buy the surplus commodities of the United States, but simply do not have the dollars with which to do so. Therefore, in order to meet their particular problem, they are attempting to subsidize agricultural production in their own countries. They are subsidizing at a very high rate the production of agricultural commodities which we ourselves would like to sell to those countries, and which we would sell to them if some means were arranged whereby they could pay reasonable prices for them.

For instance, today Great Britain is subsidizing almost 45 percent of her food commodities, I believe; and other countries are similarly subsidizing the production of food commodities at costs in excess of what our surpluses would cost those countries, if some ways and means could be devised to meet the situation.

So I am glad the Senator from South Dakota has taken the step he has taken today. We shall receive the report of the Department of Agriculture on the bill as soon as possible. Of course, I do not know how long that will take. In the meantime, as the other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry know, in the committee we shall begin hearings immediately after Easter on the export and import situation in relation to farm commodities and the effect of that situation on the United States farm program.

I am glad that by means of the introduction of this bill—whether it is perfect or not; and probably it is not perfect, because very few bills are——

Mr. MUNDT. No claims for perfection are made for the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. At any rate, by means of the introduction of the bill, we shall be making a start toward solving what I believe to be the major agricultural problem not only in the United States, but in the entire world today.

At present we have in the United States what we call agricultural commodity surpluses. Actually, they are very small. For instance, we have 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 head of cattle more than we need, and that excess represents approximately 2-months' supply. We have 300 million bushels of wheat more than we need, and we have a few million pounds of butter more than we need.

However, those amounts are not surpluses, when we think in terms of world consumption; in that respect, they are not surpluses at all, for they could be used to alleviate the needs of other countries.

So I believe what the Senator from South Dakota has been referring to, and what he is making a start on today, may be the big agricultural problem which will come before this session of Congress. Certainly the solution he proposes is one which promises the greatest hope.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the chairman of my committee very much indeed for his intelligent commentary and for his encouraging remarks.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is a new but very valuable member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has discussed a subject which I know is of tremendous interest to many farmers and many Members of Congress, including members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as we have to deal with the question of agricultural surpluses.

If the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to do so, at this time I should like to say that I shall be happy to join him in sponsoring the bill he has introduced.

The subject dealt with by the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from South Dakota has been called to my attention by some of the members of two of the large farm organizations in my State. They discussed this very situation, although of course they did not do so in the detail in which it has been discussed and presented by the Senator from South Dakota. But they were hopeful that it might be found possible to arrange for some means of exchanging surplus commodities for materials which we need.

Last year, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I recall that a suggestion was made that a number of the foreign countries have strategic materials which we need in our defense program, but seemingly there have been no arrangements for a system of exchanging our surplus agricultural commodities for the critical and strategic defense materials we need, so that we could readily obtain the benefit of those materials, which are so greatly needed for defense purposes.

So I desire to compliment and commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for introducing the bill; and if he wishes to have me do so, I shall be happy to join him in sponsoring it.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Kansas very much, and I shall be happy to add his name to be added as one of the sponsors of the bill.

I may say, Mr. President, we are making pretty good headway. On behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself, we welcome the association of the other Senators who have expressed their support for the proposed legislation, namely, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

I only regret that earlier in the day I promised my distinguished friend, the minority leader, that this would be a short speech; otherwise, I should try to extend my remarks long enough to get a majority of Senators as sponsors of the bill, so that we might pass the measure now. However, I realize that legislation of the kind proposed ought to have careful committee study, and should be given careful scrutiny; and, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, I make no claims to perfection. I think we are attacking a basic problem in the agricultural picture which must be solved if we are to have a permanent farm program which will operate to the advantage of the farmer and be within the capacity of our American economy to sustain. We believe that the measure submitted wrestles with that problem in a general way, will help assure the taxpayer a sound economy, and will assure the farmer, first of all, an opportunity to sell his products in the market place at a fair and decent level, and will afford to the Government the opportunity to put under the farmer's prices a price floor which will give him the parity he deserves, without in turn jeopardizing the Government by putting it in the business of stockpiling endlessly products of which it cannot dispose.

I yield again to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before concluding, though I alert the distinguished minority leader that his turn is about to arrive.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I simply wish to point out the alternative, in the event we fail to meet the challenge which agriculture faces today, namely, the disposal of relatively small and temporary surpluses. If we fail to devise any means of meeting this challenge, we shall then be forced to restrict the production of certain commodities. I would name wheat, cotton, and possibly a few others, which we are producing in surplus and which ordinarily are exportable commodities. If we are forced to restrict the production of those commodities, then there will be two serious results. The first will be a reduction in the income of the American farmer, and consequently, a reduction in his purchasing power, which he would utilize in buying the products of industry and of the other people who go to make up the population of our Nation.

The second result would be the creation of hard feelings on the part of other countries of the world, who look askance at any suggestion that the United States, the greatest food producing country in the world, would consider reducing production of food of which so many countries in the world are today short. So

we must devise some means whereby our surpluses, which I still maintain are comparatively small, can be sent to the nations which are trying to meet shortages of the very same commodities as best they can.

Mr. MUNDT. Again, I thank the Senator from Vermont very much. To what he has said, I would add but two very short statements about economics. The first is that a surplus, even though small, has a depressing effect upon all the products involved in the creation of the surplus. So we have a very dangerous situation occurring at the price-level point, whenever we produce a product in surplus, because the price the consumer is willing to pay for the item in surplus tends to permeate down to what he is willing to pay for all the items engaged in building up the surplus.

In the next place, it is certainly true, as my distinguished friend from Vermont has pointed out, that unless we can find a way by which we can provide a market for such surplus products, we not only depress the income which the farmer receives, but, every time we depress the income of the American farmer by a single dollar, we depress the national economy by $7; because, for over a half century, the economic tables demonstrate clearly that in this country the total national income is seven times the total income obtain by the creators of new wealth. So when anything tends to reduce the level of the farmer's income by a dollar, it destroys by seven times that much the whole national income, which in turn reduces the income of labor, reduces the capacity of the Government to collect from the taxpayers the money it needs to conduct its operations and to pay the national debt and the interest, and also reduces the profits made by businessmen generally.

And now, I will say to the minority leader, while this has not been exactly a short speech, I still submit that, according to the senatorial standards by which we operate, it cannot be called a long one; and I am happy to yield the floor. Before doing so, may I say that I have just been informed that my colleague the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] desire to add their names as cosponsors of this bill. I am indeed happy to add their names to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have listened with interest and appreciation to the very informative address by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and I trust it will prove productive of much good.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 86) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of pride and confidence that I rise to urge the approval of Senate Resolution 86, submitted by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The senior Senator from Texas is proud of the past achievements of the Senate Preparedness Committee. He is confident that under the able leadership of his good friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the work of the committee will be carried on in the same nonpartisan spirit of the past.

In the ordinary course of events, a shift in control of a legislative body also means a shift in the outlook of that body. In the case of the Senate Preparedness Committee this need not be so nor do I think it will be so.

The spirit of partisanship has never governed the deliberations of the Senate Preparedness Committee. We have been partisans only for the defense and security of our country. We have been advocates only of an efficient and an effective defense program.

As the chairman of that committee for the past 2½ years, the senior Senator from Texas can testify that no member—be he Democrat or Republican—has brought his politics with him into the committee room.

I am grateful for the support that they have given me. Without their nonpartisan, unstinting cooperation, the achievements of the committee would not have been possible.

As a member of the minority on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I shall strive to match the selfless nonpartisanship demonstrated by the present majority members when the situation was reversed.

Mr. President, the need for continuing the Senate Preparedness Committee is, to my mind, self-evident.

We are passing through one of the great crises of American history and one of the great crises of mankind. We are confronted with the issue of survival—survival of our Nation and survival of freedom as a tenet of Government.

The tensions of our world are in many respects greater than those which existed before Pearl Harbor.

In Korea, American soldiers are engaged in a hot war which may any day be dwarfed by a greater cataclysm.

One of our planes has been shot out of the air space over Germany and another attacked in the northern reaches of the Pacific by an unfriendly power.

Part of our continent has been reconnoitered by planes which have not been identified officially but which unquestionably belong to the same power.

All of these factors must be considered against the background of the change now taking place in the Soviet regime. Can we avoid the thought that one of the men in the Kremlin may plunge the whole world into war as one step of a master plan to seize absolute and uncontested power?

Mr. President, we can surmount this crisis—but only if we are resolute and determined. We can live through this period—but only if we heed the dictates of reason rather than the dictates of panic. We can survive—but only if we act as a unified people in mutual confidence, alert to the hard realities of our times.

There is an important role for the Senate Preparedness Committee in this period. It can be—and should be—the agency of Congress which works with the Defense Department in solving the problems of America's preparedness.

The members of the Senate Preparedness Committee have never looked upon themselves as a body of prosecutors. They have regarded investigations as a method of looking for positive steps to correct deficiencies—not merely as a means for detecting and punishing culprits.

The objectives of the committee have been twofold:

First, to determine whether this Nation is doing enough—soon enough—to safeguard the lives and liberties of our people.

Second, to determine whether we are getting full use out of our defense dollar—to be certain that we are not squandering our money uselessly.

In our investigations, we have sought the cooperation of the members of the executive agencies charged with responsibility for carrying out the defense program. Sometimes we have received that cooperation and sometimes it has been refused.

But whether cooperation was offered or withheld, we were never satisfied with merely exposing unsatisfactory conditions. We insisted—with all the force at our disposal—that the changes in mobilization policy and practice revealed as necessary by our investigations be made promptly. We insisted—with equal force—that wasteful practices be discontinued and that efficient and sound methods be adopted.

Because of our insistence, the Nation's synthetic rubber industry—so vital to our defense—was restored to health and the taxpayers were saved well over $1 billion.

Because of our insistence, the Government presented a solid front against the international tin cartel and the taxpayers were saved at least $500 million.

Because of our insistence, wasteful and imprudent practices for the disposal of surplus commodities were eliminated.

Because of our insistence, supplies of critical nickel and tungsten have been increased.

Because of our insistence, the armed services have instituted cost-consciousness campaigns which, if followed through, will result in saving billions of dollars.

Because of our insistence, the armed services stripped surplus manpower from its training centers—an act which ultimately will save at least $50 million a year.

Our battle against waste, inefficiency, and prodigal spending was summed up in our 34th report issued on December 7, 1951, in which we said:

> It is a distressing—but inescapable—fact that one of our major shortages is a sense of prudence, a zeal for frugality, and an enthusiasm for economy on the part of the armed services.
>
> The inevitable result of this shortage is waste—waste of manpower, waste of equipment, and waste of the taxpayers' money.

Our battle against the apathy and "siesta psychology" that has characterized so much of our defense program

was summed up in our 4th report on December 27, 1950, in which we said:

> As a result, it may be fair to say that our most critical shortage is not one of nickel, or wool, or rubber, or any other commodity, but rather a shortage of bold planning.

Our battle against those who were failing to arm the United States at the necessary level and speed was summed up in our 39th report issued on June 17, 1952, in which we said:

> The question of an adequate air defense for these United States is a question of life and death for ourselves and our institutions.
>
> Our defense leaders responsible for our military protection do not believe we have the strength we need; they do not believe we will have the strength we need unless we raise our sights at once and raise them drastically.

The problem of our defense is a continuing one. It is not solved in 1 day or 1 year—or even the 2½ years in which the committee has been in existence.

The problem is as acute today as it was in July 1950, when the Preparedness Committee was formed. If anything, the need for the committee is even more pressing in light of the state of world affairs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be pleased to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The question I should like to ask is this: Has the situation changed considerably from what it was a year ago that it makes military leaders so apprehensive as to our defense and our preparedness that they are now advocating something entirely different and more expanded than they advocated a year ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I cannot speak for the military leaders, nor do I know with certainty to whom the Senator from Minnesota refers. I was quoting from a report issued by the Preparedness Subcommittee based upon testimony taken from the Joint Chiefs of Staff almost a year ago. I am not in position to speak for the military leaders beyond the testimony they gave to our committee. But I do think it is extremely important, in the light of the developments of the past 10 days, that the committee continue to function, and to have the military leaders come before it and explain what defense build up we should have, and to what extent it should go.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the reason why I was prompted to ask the question of the Senator from Texas was primarily because of a speech which I believe the Senator delivered last Sunday evening which dealt with the same question. My understanding of it was that the Senator from Texas was somewhat critical of our lack of national defense and was of the opinion that our national defense must be stepped up. For that reason I was prompted to ask the question.

Is there a report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which would indicate that we are in a more precarious position than we were in a year ago? As I recall, Congress appropriated great sums of money for national defense, but not all of that money has been expended in the period since the Congress made the appropriation. I was wondering whether there is some international situation on which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have reported that makes it necessary that our national defense should be greatly stepped up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say in reply to the Senator from Minnesota that the Congress has never appropriated and the Defense Department has never requested the full amount the Joint Chiefs of Staff have felt was necessary to insure the security of this Nation.

Mr. THYE. But, Mr. President, there are unexpended funds at the present time in a greater amount than had been anticipated when Congress deliberated on the appropriations a year ago. Why have not the funds been expended?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it takes a period of years to produce some of the items needed for the defense of this Nation. So long as we have the system which is now in force there will always be unexpended funds. Production takes many years, depending on the items in question.

Mr. THYE. I grant that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Last year we had a cut-back program, and the Defense Department requested less money than the Joint Chiefs of Staff thought was absolutely essential to protect the Nation's security.

Mr. THYE. We take the word of the Defense Department as being the truth with reference to the entire international as well as the national situations. As a member of the Appropriations Committee and of the subcommittee on military appropriations, I know that we granted the military the funds they stated were necessary in order to provide adequate defense for our Nation in the light of the world situation.

I go back to the original question. Is there something in the world situation today which places us in a more precarious situation than that in which we found ourselves a year ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think we have improved our situation since last year. But the Senator from Minnesota may not be mindful of the events of the past few days. I hope the committee is mindful of them and that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are mindful of them. When American and British planes are shot out of the air over Germany, and one of our own planes is attacked near Alaska, I think it is time to give serious consideration to the adequacy of our defense, regardless of what the Appropriations Committee may have done. I recall that when it was necessary to restore substantial sums last year they were restored in the Senate by a vote of 78 to 0, after the committee had not allowed the funds.

The same action was taken with respect to research funds, by way of an amendment on the floor of the Senate. But such action taken by the Senate does not mean that the United States is in the state of readiness that I think it should be in today. Nor does it mean that we no longer need a committee to prod the Pentagon, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the production agencies of the government to bring us to our goal as soon as possible.

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, it was decided, after considerable debate, that the minimum size of an Air Force necessary to protect our country was 143 groups. We are far short of that number as of today. How much the building-up of the Air Force can be accelerated is, I think, a matter that world events will determine.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I agree with the Senator from Texas. I am one who was greatly disturbed and disappointed by the action of President Truman in impounding some of the appropriated funds for air expansion. For that reason, I have followed the question very carefully. I lead back to the original question: In view of the situation in the world are there reports that have come to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas about our military forces which would indicate that our national defense is so wholly inadequate? A year ago we had anticipated disturbances elsewhere than in Korea, and they were contemplated when appropriations were made.

I am endeavoring to ascertain this information from the able and distinguished senior Senator from Texas, because I know he is very influential and is very close to the Department of Defense, by reason of the position he held as chairman of the original investigating subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which made such an extensive research into our defense and our lack of defense.

My question is simply this: Aside from the fact that airplanes have been shot at and have been shot down, is there anything which would lead one to believe that the United States is inadequately prepared to meet other possible world disturbances than the one in Korea, and which would lead the Senator from Texas to make the statement he has made about the fact that we are not prepared? Other members of his party have spoken on the same subject in the past 10 days, and have said that as a Nation we are wholly unprepared to meet crises that are apparent throughout the world.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator cannot discuss preparedness without becoming slightly partisan, I will state that I regret, as does the senior Senator from Minnesota, that it was a Democratic President, President Truman, who impounded the funds. I said so at the time, and I have said so many times since.

The very statements which I have read today from the reports of the Preparedness Subcommittee did not come from me alone. They came from all seven members of the subcommittee. If the events of the past few months cannot convince the senior Senator from Minnesota that this Nation is not fully and completely prepared, I am sure there is nothing I could say which would convince him. But I still intend to bring to the attention of the Senate, and the attention of the country, statements of our own Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Senator

had read them. The full committee of seven members—four Democrats and three Republicans—embraced those statements on the basis of sworn testimony, which for security reasons we could not and did not publish. It was felt that there should be a program to step up production and perhaps give us a greater feeling of security. The ammunition shortage alone should indicate the present situation to all persons concerned.

Based on the testimony of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our committee outlined the facts. The senior Senator from Texas has repeated a statement from the report, and he has repeated it many times since, I am afraid sometimes without complete success. Here is the statement:

Our defense leaders responsible for our military protection do not believe we have the strength we need. They do not believe we will have the strength we need unless we raise our sights, and raise them drastically.

Mr. President, we have not raised those sights. We had a cut-back. We had a stretch-out. We postponed until 1956 a production target that our Joint Chiefs of Staff thought we should reach in 1954. So the answer to the question asked by the Senator from Minnesota is that our Joint Chiefs of Staff did not think we were prepared in 1953 and do not think we will be prepared in 1954, unless we raise our sights.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If we are not prepared, is it not a fact that the Department of Defense erred in its judgment and recommendation to Congress? Is it not also a fact that the Department of Defense has not been as aggressive in the use and expenditures of funds which were made available to it as it should have been? I have seen reports as to the amount of unused and unexpended funds in excess of any amount that we were informed would be an unexpended balance as of this year, as to which we were given facts a year ago in a study of the appropriations. If they have erred in not having expended the funds, there is no one but the Department of Defense itself responsible for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the statements I have just made reflect the judgment of the committee that there has been blame enough to go around to all. Many months ago the committee felt we were getting more butter than guns, and so stated in the report. The committee has felt production should be stepped up, and stepped up at a much more rapid rate. At times, Congress was willing to go much farther than the Executive who headed my own party was willing to go, and at times Congress has not been willing to go as far.

Mr. President, I remember very vividly that the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who had the vision and foresight to see the trouble that was likely to take place in the world, offered an amendment on the floor to build rapidly a 70-group Air Force. I recall, with not much pleasure, that when the roll was called, only 8 Senators were willing to support the senior Senator from California. I am glad to have the RECORD show that the senior Senator from Texas was one of the eight.

I remember very vividly the days of the Louis Johnson economy administration, when we were going down and pulling back, instead of going ahead. I remember Mr. Johnson's advisers, and I recall the assurance we received that $13 billion, or approximately that amount, was sufficient to carry on the defense programs.

I remember that our own present distinguished Commander in Chief appeared before the committee of which the senior Senator from Minnesota is a member, in connection with the Louis Johnson budget. I protested then, and I protest now. I shall not be one who says to the people of the United States that we are prepared because money has been appropriated. The cold facts and the real truth are that we are not prepared. We have started to cut back. We have stretched out and cut back. We do not have the planes or equipment that are needed to insure the security which this country should have. The senior Senator from Texas cannot close his eyes to what is happening in the world. When American boys are attacked off the coast of Alaska; when American planes are shot down over Germany; when the planes of our allies are destroyed in the Corridor, I think it is time for the preparedness-conscious Members of Congress to take notice. I have no doubt that the able chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the other able Senators who serve on that committee, regardless of party, will take cognizance of these events. I think they have already done so. I believe that if the preparedness subcommittee is continued, it will produce for the American taxpayer as good a return on his investment as any committee ever established in either House of the Congress.

Furthermore, the subcommittee has proven itself to be a bargain—one of the best bargains obtainable. Since its formation—up to yesterday—the total cost of the committee has been $289,873.

In return for that investment, the country has received savings of well over $1 billion in rubber, over $500 million in tin purchases and incalculable but undoubtedly substantial savings in the cost-consciousness program.

But even more important, the committee has provided the Congress with a trained staff keeping a constant scrutiny upon the defense program. I believe the wisdom of having such a staff and keeping such a scrutiny has been amply demonstrated.

Mr. President, there is no more important issue before the Senate and before the Nation than the preservation of our country. Every day brings us increasing evidence of the serious proportions of that problem.

For 2½ years, the Preparedness Committee has been deeply concerned with that issue. It has made investigations and issued reports. It has insisted upon corrective action and has followed through upon its recommendations.

It has served the Senate as a body and it has served Senators as individuals. Thousands of pieces of mail—of inquiries and complaints—have passed through its hands.

As the chairman of the committee during that period, I am proud of the service it has performed. I have no hesitancy in advocating that it be continued and my enthusiasm is not lessened because it will now be directed by members of another political party.

Our soldiers do not fight as Republicans or as Democrats. We Senators can—and will—serve as Americans and not as partisans in the defense of our country.

Defense issues are not and must not be thrown into the arena of political partisanship. We will work together in the future as we have worked together in the past. Whatever may be our differences on other subjects, we stand together in the defense of our Nation.

I urge every Senator to cast his vote in favor of continuing this committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks in support of Senate Resolution 86 a brief summary of the reports issued by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF REPORTS OF THE SENATE PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE

The Senate Preparedness Subcommittee was established by resolution of the Senate Armed Services Committee on July 17, 1950. Since that time, it has issued 44 reports which in practically every instance have led to strong measures to bolster the Nation's defense program and to protect taxpayers against waste and fraud.

FIRST REPORT, SEPTEMBER 5, 1950

The first report found that the Korean war had failed to jolt administrative officials out of a business-as-usual attitude and that they were selling critically needed surplus property, including synthetic rubber plants. The committee's activities blocked the sale of these plants and thus saved for the defense program vitally needed productive facilities.

In this report we stated:

"One of the subcommittee's primary jobs, in its view, is to accelerate in and out of the Government, the slackened tempo of the postwar period to the pace realistically called for by world events."

SECOND REPORT, NOVEMBER 20, 1950

The second report found a siesta psychology prevailing in Washington, particularly in the field of rubber production. The subcommittee forced the adoption of a synthetic rubber program which not only produced a stockpile of this vital material but beat down the price of natural rubber. It has since been estimated that this program saved the taxpayers well over a billion dollars.

In commenting on this problem we stated:

"Progress in paperwork—of which there has been considerable—is no substitute for progress in performance—of which there has not been enough. Paperwork preparedness is only flimsy protection for the threat we face."

THIRD REPORT, DECEMBER 18, 1950

The third report disclosed that the Munitions Board clearly had failed in many of its responsibilities, including the stockpiling of wool. This report prodded several of the departments into action and led to some cooperation between the Agriculture and Defense Departments.

On the subject of Munitions Board deficiencies in dealing with the wool problems, we said:

"While the Munitions Board was obviously doing plenty of 'wool gathering,' none of it was for a stockpile. Its shortsightedness will cost the taxpayers a minimum of many millions of dollars and might well result in inadequately clad troops if rapid mobilization becomes necessary."

FOURTH REPORT, DECEMBER 31, 1950

The fourth report disclosed the critical shortage of nickel which could be traced partially to the strangling monopoly of the International Nickel Co. of Canada. As a result of the committee's work, a number of steps were taken which promise to at least put a dent in the Canadian monopoly and assure the United States greater supplies of nickel.

Commenting on the lack of initiative and good judgment we discovered in the executive agencies, we stated:

"As a result, it may be fair to say that our most critical shortage is not one of nickel, or wool, or rubber, or any other such commodity, but rather a shortage of bold planning."

FIFTH REPORT, FEBRUARY 19, 1951

The fifth report found that the Air Force policy of hoarding manpower had led to overcrowding and other unjustifiable conditions at Lackland Air Force Base at San Antonio, Tex. Upon publication of the report, the Air Force moved to clear up Lackland immediately and set up a program to guard against a recurrence of the abuses.

We said in this report:

"It is the conclusion of the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee that full responsibility for conditions at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., during January 1951 rests upon Air Force headquarters in Washington. The Lackland command made diligent and reasonable efforts both to prevent excessive overcrowding and to relieve that condition, but those efforts were not heeded by the responsible officers in Air Force headquarters."

SIXTH REPORT, MARCH 5, 1951

The sixth report disclosed that the United States was being gouged unmercifully by tin producers of southeast Asia and recommended that the Government withdraw from further purchases. This recommendation was accepted, and as a result the price of tin tumbled from $1.90 to $1.03 per pound. It has been estimated that this action has saved the American Treasury at least a half billion dollars.

In regard to this situation we stated:

"It seems clear that unless steps are taken to control prices, allocate supplies, increase production, or reduce our stockpile purchases, tin prices will continue to go up still further and without limit."

SEVENTH REPORT, FEBRUARY 22, 1951

The seventh report covered the general subject of Alaskan defenses, and the committee's activities were instrumental in ironing out a labor-management dispute which had threatened to break down the defense building program during the Territory's short construction season.

We concluded in that report that:

"It is believed that the military in Alaska, within the limit of forces made available to them, is embarked upon a realistic plan for the defense of the Territory."

EIGHTH REPORT, APRIL 9, 1951

The eighth report disclosed the misconduct of any Army employee who accepted payments for improperly routing shipments through the port of Orange, Tex. The case has been referred to the Justice Department for appropriate action.

The amount of money involved in this case was not large; no one profited greatly, and the Government's loss was slight, but we believed that important principles were violated and stated:

"In our determination to insure that there be no compromise with moral and legal integrity by those connected with the Nation's defense effort, we believe no distinction should be made between large or small episodes."

NINTH TO TWENTY-FIFTH REPORTS, APRIL 16, 1951, TO JUNE 1, 1951

These reports covered unsatisfactory conditions found in a survey of 16 military indoctrination centers. The three services took corrective action which eliminated certain practices, improved training standards, and insured better conditions for uniformed men.

In the summary report covering the 16 separate reports on the indoctrination centers covered in the investigation, we said:

"Today the American military man is the most expensive in the world. His food, his shelter, his clothing, his training, his medical care, his retirement benefits or veteran privileges, and the care afforded his dependents are the costliest provided by any nation."

TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT, JUNE 11, 1951

The 26th report disclosed that there were enough men at these 16 centers performing "chair corps" and various housekeeping jobs to make up three to five combat divisions. As a result of this report, the armed services revised their manpower policies and the Army now expects to get more combat divisions out of the men called into the service.

In this report it was pointed out that:

"Today the great weakness of America is lack of manpower. Of resources and technology and industry and arms, we have much; of men, we have few. We are, thus, weakest where our enemy is strongest, for the enemy's great strength is manpower."

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT, JULY 5, 1951

The 27th report revealed that the Munitions Board and the Army had been asleep at the switch during the days when it was easy to stockpile tungsten and as a result this Nation entered the Korean war with very low supplies of this critical material. A number of steps have since been taken to rectify the situation as far as possible.

Because of the early bungling by the Munitions Board and the Army, we were compelled to say in this report:

"Today, the United States and the free world stand on the verge of tungsten starvation. Production can be increased; more efficient methods can be found; nonessential uses can be slashed ruthlessly. But the fact remains that no foreseeable eventuality will provide all that is needed by the European democracies and the Americas to meet their essential civilian and military requirements."

TWENTY-EIGHTH AND THIRTIETH REPORTS, JULY 19, 1951, AND SEPTEMBER 24, 1951

These reports disclosed that dependents of servicemen were being unmercifully gouged with high rents for chicken coops, barns, tool sheds, and miserable hovels in the vicinity of military camps. They were forced to live in these makeshift dwellings because nothing else was available. A number of steps have been taken which promise some relief to these dependents.

We said in those reports:

"The committee regrets that there is not a course open to compel redress for the exploitation disclosed by this investigation. These landlords operate in most instances within the limits of the law. Where the law is weak, however, the community conscience and the national conscience must be strong. This is a problem to be dealt with by an aroused national conscience—a conscience which visits the wrath of rightful indignation upon those among us who would, for a paltry profit, extort the self-respect of freedom defenders."

TWENTY-NINTH REPORT, SEPTEMBER 4, 1951

The 29th report covered the progress that had been made in the rubber program since the early days of the committee. It disclosed that the country has "made substantial progress toward real rubber readiness, but still has far to go."

We added that:

"An aggressive program to stockpile and conserve natural rubber is a 'survival must.' We cannot permit the psychology of peacetime economy to override this program or even cut into it. We must stockpile and conserve rubber as though our very lives depended on it because that may be the reality."

THIRTY-FIRST REPORT, OCTOBER 28, 1951

The 31st report covered conditions at six Navy and Marine Corps training centers and revealed a widespread dissatisfaction among recalled marine reservists and a lack of cost consciousness which characterized all operations. It recommended that the Navy grade its officers on their ability to conserve men, materials, and equipment.

We observed in this connection:

"It is impossible, of course, to estimate the savings that could be made through a determined effort by each commander to cut out all waste. But there can be no doubt on the basis of studies that we have made thus far that it would be great."

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT, NOVEMBER 11, 1951

The 32d report disclosed that the Army and the Agriculture Department had failed to carry out the committee's recommendations made nearly a year previously for cooperation and that this failure was costing the taxpayers money.

Commenting upon the subject of waste in Government because of the laxity of responsible officials, we said in the report:

"It is particularly inexcusable when the Nation faces a crisis against which it must be ready to mobilize all its resources. We have neither the men nor the money to make the waste of either tolerable."

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT, NOVEMBER 13, 1951

The 33d report found that there were so many generals and admirals stationed in Washington that the city was topheavy with brass. It said that unless this practice was discontinued the armed services would soon consist of "all chiefs and no Indians." Defense officials have been warned that they will have to explain this heavy concentration of gold braid to the committee in an open session.

We observed in the report that:

"It is to be hoped that time will not be wasted on excuses to justify the situation outlined above, but that a real attempt to eliminate wasteful and extravagant use of personnel will be made."

THIRTY-FOURTH REPORT, DECEMBER 7, 1951

The 34th report described wasteful practices found by committee investigators at six Air Force training centers. These included replacements of dining hall furniture with expensive plasticized-top tables and upholstered chairs; mishandling of foodstocks with resultant spoilage; and the construction of hotel-style dormitories at Carswell Field. It was noted that these instances were trivial but that the "trivial compounded becomes profound" and that "trivial waste in the armed services is a profound danger to the finances of the Nation."

In commenting on our findings we stated:

"It is a distressing—but inescapable fact—that one of our major shortages is a sense of prudence, a zeal for frugality, and an enthusiasm for economy on the part of the armed services.

"The inevitable result of these shortages is waste—waste of manpower, waste of equipment, and waste of the taxpayer's money."

THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT, NOVEMBER 29, 1951

The 35th report disclosed that deliveries of planes, tanks, ships, and guns to the Armed Forces "have fallen dangerously behind schedule." The committee said that defense production was behind the goals that had been set because "we did not have the courage to put guns ahead of butter; to put security ahead of selfishness; to put the cause of liberty ahead of the pursuit of luxury."

We further added:

"Today mobilization cannot await the overt act of war. Modern weapons have annihilated space and time as bulwarks of defense. A nation desiring to preserve its integrity and freedom in the face of threatened aggression must be in such a constant state of limited preparedness as will enable it to frustrate the initial attack to the maximum extent possible; to strike back immediately after it receives the first blow; and, to hold its defense lines while it builds up for total war and ultimate victory. This level of preparedness constitutes the minimum military strength necessary to our national security and to the security of free people throughout the world."

THIRTY-SIXTH REPORT, DECEMBER 21, 1951

The 36th report covered the conditions found at eight advanced Army training centers. The committee, among other things, described the "valueless repetition of elementary training" which had been inflicted upon several units and which was both wasteful and damaging to morale." Programs instituted by Secretary of the Army Frank Pace to combat wasteful practices were praised and it was pointed out that it was still too early to determine the extent to which these programs have resulted in genuine economy.

The committee stated in this report that:

"We have reached a time when the public mind is rightfully closing to the expedient pleas that instances of waste are justifiable or even that they are 'small.' At this period when there is so much to be done, so little time in which to do it, and such high costs for all that is undertaken, waste has no degree: any waste is too much waste."

THIRTY-SEVENTH REPORT, APRIL 12, 1952

The 37th report disclosed that gambling interests in Biloxi, Miss., were victimizing airmen at nearby Keesler Air Force Base. Following committee hearings in Biloxi, local authorities clamped down on the gaming establishments and the Air Force instituted rigorous enforcement of "off limits" procedures to prevent the airmen from entering such establishments.

In connection with this investigation, the committee stated:

"Plain common sense would seem to dictate that no young airman can be very happy when he finds his pockets empty a day or two after pay day and is compelled to borrow money from his associates or to write home for money to tide him over until pay day comes once more."

THIRTY-EIGHTH REPORT, APRIL 17, 1952

The 38th report was a description of the powers, functions, organization, and procedures of the Munitions Board. It is the only authoritative document that has been issued on that subject. In this connection, the committee said:

"Now that economic mobilization has become everybody's business, the businessman, the student of public affairs, and the interested citizen have a real need for a comprehensive survey of the economic mobilization effort."

THIRTY-NINTH REPORT, JUNE 17, 1952

The 39th report set forth the conclusions of the Nation's military leaders that the United States did not have the air strength needed for its defense and that current programs were insufficient to achieve that strength within the time limits dictated by prudence. Following the issuance of this report, Congress authorized the Air Force to proceed as rapidly as possible to achieve the goals established by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In this report, the committee said:

"The actions that we take today will bind us for the foreseeable future. Should we be plunged into armed conflict in the defense of our liberties in the next 2 or even 3 years, the limitations of our military capabilities will be determined not by our needs of that moment, but by the decisions we are making now."

FORTIETH REPORT, JULY 7, 1952

The 40th report disclosed the overstaffing and the waste of manpower prevalent in all branches of the armed services. As a result, the Defense Department established a Committee of Businessmen to examine personnel practices and recommend means by which military manpower could be used more efficiently and waste could be eliminated. In this connection, the Committee stated:

"Victory has usually gone not to the largest army, but to the best organized army. Military efficiency has been measured not by the number of guns but by the destructive power of the guns that can be brought to bear.

"Were this not the fact, our cause would be hopeless. We face an enemy who numbers his manpower as the grains of sand on the beach—whose vast resources have yet to be encompassed in numerical terms. Against that manpower and those resources we must compose our superior ability at organization and our superior productive capacity."

FORTY-FIRST REPORT, JULY 16, 1952

The 41st report described the efforts of American officials to combat the tin cartel, which has forced prices of this vital defense material up to astronomical level. It concluded that their efforts had been successful to an extent which promised to save the United States at least $500 million. In this report the committee said:

"The savings of $500 million that will result are important. By far more important is the principle that has been established. If our officials stand by their principle, the savings will be many times $500 million and the American prestige will be assured."

FORTY-SECOND REPORT, AUGUST 18, 1952

The 42d report disclosed the large-scale waste that entered into construction of American airbases in North Africa. As a result, the Army—which, through its Corps of Engineers, bore primarily the responsibility for the construction—instituted procedures to recapture money that had been lost and to correct wasteful practices. In this report, the committee said:

"The committee is well aware of the fact that these bases were not for sale on a dime store bargain counter. We realize fully that they could not be bought cheaply. We know that under the best of circumstances, they would represent a substantial bite on our Treasury.

"Nevertheless, we do not believe that these considerations justified the compulsion to spend the taxpayer's money that appeared to characterize this project. We do not believe that they justified the flagrant disregard for specifications and a sound engineering practice."

FORTY-THIRD REPORT, AUGUST 28, 1952

The 43d report discussed the many factors which had prevented an adequate buildup of America's air power. It outlined in detail the results of "stretchouts," "cutbacks," and lack of clearly defined authority in the mobilization program. In this report the committee said:

"America has lost the right to claim unquestioned mastery of the air. America is behind in the weapon in which we should have unchallenged supremacy.

"Many reasons, many justifications have been advanced for the loss of this mastery. But whatever the reasons or whatever the justifications, the loss remains a fact. It cannot be denied."

FORTY-FOURTH REPORT, FEBRUARY 10, 1953

The 44th report outlined the steps that had been taken to correct wasteful conditions in the construction of North African air bases and disclosed that racketeering at a New Jersey terminal had a direct effect on the cost of shipping materials to the airbase construction site. Since the committee's investigation, the Army has canceled the contract with the firm. In this report, the committee said:

"At a time when the resources of our country are being so heavily taxed to provide the necessary defenses for ourselves and our friends in the free world against a ruthless aggressor, it is an effrontery to the American people that a small group of racketeers and hoodlums should be permitted to levy tribute on the shipment of military supplies and the materiel necessary to that task."

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

In addition to the reports, the committee also handled the Universal Military Training and Service Act finally approved by Congress in 1951. This measure gives the Armed Services a consistent manpower policy and also sets up a system under which American soldiers overseas have much better prospects for replacement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that as the present chairman of the Armed Services Committee I thank him for his remarks. I believe he will agree with me that we have tried to conduct his subcommittee on an absolutely non-partisan basis, for the best interests of the Services. I know I can count upon his cooperation in the same spirit in the coming year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator.

RESIGNATION OF CLAUDE WICKARD AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to express my surprise and shock over the forced resignation of Mr. Claude Wickard as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I think none of us in the case of positions which involve policy-making for this administration would question the right of the President to appoint men of his own choosing. But as we know, the position of Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration is not in any sense a policy-making position. It is simply the position of administrator of a lending agency. The sole function, duty, and purpose of the REA has simply been to make loans for the purpose of carrying electricity to the farm homes of the Nation.

Since this administration came into being it has been the intent and purpose of the Congress that REA should

be free from any politics, and that politics should not enter in any way whatever into the administration or the business of the REA.

We recall that the REA was originally established by executive order of the President. In 1936 the Congress enacted a law making the REA a permanent organization in our governmental machine.

We recall that the late distinguished Senator Norris of Nebraska, who at that time was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, was the author of the REA bill.

I wish to invite the attention of Senators to a few words spoken by Senator Norris at the time the REA bill was before the Senate, in 1936. I quote from the statement by Senator Norris, to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 80, part 3, page 2785:

> The particular administration we are talking about and which, if this bill shall be passed, undoubtedly will have control of the enforcement of the law, is entirely free so far as I know, from politics of any kind. There has been no partisan influence anywhere in the Rural Electrification Administration, so far as I know. Personally I have had considerable to do with the different officials in that organization. I do not know the politics of a single one of them. The organization is entirely free from politics. That is the way its members are operating, without any law to that effect. So far as I know, there has not been any attempt on the part of anybody, in Congress or out of it, to induce them to deviate from their rule of basing their entire organization upon efficiency, without regard to politics.

In the debate on the bill on February 25, 1936, I find this interesting colloquy between Senator Norris and Senator McNary, of Oregon, the then Republican leader of the Senate. Senator McNary asked Senator Norris to yield and Senator Norris yielded. Then Senator McNary said:

> I commend the Senator for that portion of the language of section 9 which is found in lines 18, 19, and 20, on page 6, namely.

This is the section which Senator McNary, the Republican leader, commended Senator Norris for having in the bill. I read section 9:

> This act—

This is the REA Act of 1936, under which the REA has been operating ever since—

> This act shall be administered entirely on a nonpartisan basis, and in the appointment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration. All of such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

That is the language of the law. It is binding on everyone. It is the law of the United States.

We all know that Mr. Wickard has made a faithful, able, and devoted Administrator. I cannot help deplore the fact that the spirit, the intent, and the language of the law have been violated in the enforced resignation of Mr. Wickard. I think that not only the members of the REA co-ops throughout the United States, but all farmers in the United States and the people generally ought to realize just what has been done in the removal of Mr. Wickard, and what is involved. For the first time in all these years—and REA has been in existence for approximately 20 years and it has operated under the act of 1936 for approximately 17 years—it would seem that politics has been brought into REA. Farmers must take cognizance of this fact. They should realize that REA and the other great programs which have done so much for them can only be endangered if the programs are put into politics and if the merits of a question are to be ignored and if appointments are to be made on any kind of political basis. Surely, I strongly hope today that this action will not be followed in the future by other acts which can result only in one thing, and that is in seriously hamstringing the REA. The loss of Mr. Wickard's services, and thereby the loss of his knowledge and leadership, is a heavy blow to the farmers of this country and to the REA co-ops themselves.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under the law, how much longer would Mr. Wickard have had to serve?

Mr. HILL. The Congress of the United States provided a 10-year tenure for the REA Administrator. Of course, as is self-evident, the reason for providing this long term—I should say certainly one of the reasons for it—was to have this office entirely removed from the field of politics. Mr. Wickard was appointed under the law for a 10-year term. That 10-year term has not expired. It is my impression that he has at least 2 more years, or perhaps a little longer, to serve under his appointment. His appointment was in accordance with the section of the law which says that there shall be no politics in REA.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the statement has been made at different times that in policy-making positions the present administration naturally wanted people who would carry out the policies of the administration. In other words, if they contemplated to change any policy, that would be their procedure. Does the Senator believe that Mr. Wickard's resignation means that the present administration contemplates a change in the program and policy of REA which has functioned so well over the past 15 years?

Mr. HILL. In view of the long record of REA and its functioning so well over the past years, the fact that it has paid back loans into the Treasury, and the fact that it has brought so many benefits to the farm families, it is hoped that it will not mean a change in policies. Yet, I must ask: Why should Mr. Wickard be required to resign, unless someone had in his mind to change the policies? What was the motive?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to join the senior Senator from Alabama in his expression with regard to the competent administration of the REA under the leadership of Mr. Wickard. Does not the Senator agree that every REA co-op throughout the United States and citizens generally have joined in trying to make the administration of REA, both in Washington and in its offices throughout the country, a success without regard to whether Republicans or Democrats were involved?

Mr. HILL. That is absolutely correct. I have just quoted the words of a distinguished former Republican leader in the Senate, Senator McNary, to Senator Norris, with reference to the provision in the act providing that there shall be no politics in REA.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not also true that in REA the spirit of that law has been carried out for many years?

Mr. HILL. The spirit has been carried out.

Mr. KEFAUVER. And that both Republicans and Democrats were appointed, not because of any partisan label but because of their proficiency?

Mr. HILL. Because of the qualifications they had to perform the work they had to do. That has been true in the office in Washington and that has been true in the field. In the making of loans there has been no politics involved; indeed, there has been no politics in any way, shape, or form involved in REA.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not also true that it was seriously questioned in the Supreme Court whether the President of the United States had the right to discharge an official who had been selected for a term before the expiration of the term, and that in the case of Myers against United States, involving a postmaster, the Supreme Court held that the President, notwithstanding the fact that the term had not expired, had the right to discharge an employee or official; but was it not indicated in that case that the reason for that right had to do with misconduct or lack of conformity with the President's policymaking right, which elements would not be true in the case of Mr. Wickard?

Mr. HILL. As I recall the case, the Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Like the Senator from Alabama, I am very much disturbed by what I think is the first indication of the injection of partisan politics into an agency which has been concerned only with bringing electricity to farmers. As my colleague from Alabama has said, in 1936, when the REA began, approximately 10 percent of the farm homes had electricity, and approximately 90 percent of farm homes were without electricity.

Mr. HILL. When the REA was first established—and, as I have said, it was created by Executive order—I believe as few as 4 percent of the farm homes had electricity, whereas today, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows, approximately 90 percent of them have electricity.

Mr. MONRONEY. Furthermore, the nonpartisan approach to the solution of this problem has been strictly adhered to not only in Washington, but also on the local levels. Republicans and Democrats have served side by side on the State boards; and no one question is raised as to a man's politics, in the case of managers, linemen, and others who keep the current flowing to the farms through sleet and storm.

But now I am very fearful that the interjection of patronage at the top level will be a signal for the interjection of patronage all along the line, and will change this agency, which during the past several decades has done so much for the farmers, into an agency which will be organized on the basis of politics and on the basis of loyalty to one political party or the other.

Of course, as I recall, the REA was organized as an independent agency on a strictly nonpartisan basis.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Subsequently the REA was merged, for purposes of efficiency and economy, perhaps, with the Department of Agriculture. If matters of high policy need to be handled, undoubtedly the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to give guidance without having this very valuable program subjected to patronage appointments.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oklahoma is entirely correct. Farmers throughout the United States should be alerted to this situation; they must be on guard lest this most important program be impaired and lest other programs which have meant so much to them suffer a similar fate.

Mr. MONRONEY. During the recent campaign our farmers in Oklahoma and, I believe, the farmers throughout the Nation were assured that the REA would not be touched, and remarks of appreciation of its services were made by the candidates for President and by many of the other candidates. Now, however, we not only find this disturbing note of politics in connection with the operations of the REA, but I am reliably informed that on the operating level the funds which Congress has appropriated for the purpose of extending the REA service and bringing electricity to the farmers have been frozen and withheld from REA's. In fact, I understand that a cut to $9,000,000 a month in loans has been made. That happens to be the same as the amount which was spent in the low period, namely, January. The result is that no matter how much may be needed, the program must now conform to a low monthly limitation based not on need but by an arbitrary figure for only 1 month's loan approvals, despite the determination of Congress to supply this agency with an adequate amount of funds, so as to enable it to render this necessary service.

Mr. HILL. In other words, an impairment has already occurred.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; and the farmers have reason to be worried.

Mr. HILL. Yes; they have good reason to be worried.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it would be well to pinpoint the record relative to the service of Mr. Wickard.

The Senator from Alabama is one of the most expertly informed Members of the Senate in regard to the REA program. He has been interested in it throughout his service. Does he recall that at any time the REA and its administration by Mr. Wickard have been a matter of congressional investigation?

Mr. HILL. Yes; there was an investigation. The distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was chairman of the investigating committee; and, as I recall, the investigation gave to the REA a clean bill of health.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Alabama recall that within the past 2 years no one has charged Mr. Wickard with playing politics with the REA or with exercising any political influence with that agency?

Mr. HILL. If there has been any such charge, I certainly have never heard of it or even had any suspicion of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has there ever been a time within, let us say, the past 2 or 3 years, so far as the Senator from Alabama recalls, that a congressional committee, in examining the REA's requests for funds, has posed the problem of political influence or of partisan politics to the REA administration?

Mr. HILL. I happen to sit as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as the Senator from Minnesota knows. Representatives of the REA have testified before that committee each year, in connection with the appropriation bills. Certainly, so far as I know, absolutely no question has been raised in any way whatever about any politics or any favoritism or any partisanship or anything of the kind by the REA.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama is familiar with the statements of the Secretary of the Interior with reference to the development of public power. Does the Senator recall that the Secretary of the Interior has made plain his views on that issue?

Mr. HILL. I think that is undoubtedly true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama will recall that before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on which our colleague, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who sits alongside us, serves as a member, Mr. McKay took a different view regarding the development of public power in the construction of transmission lines for the distribution of public power; Mr. McKay's view was different from that of his predecessor, Mr. Chapman. Is not that correct?

Mr. HILL. I did not hear Secretary McKay's testimony, but that is my understanding of it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it fair to say, at least, that the generally accepted view is that some change will be made in the so-called public-power policy of the Federal Government?

Mr. HILL. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also true that under the so-called preference provisions of the Public Power Act—

Mr. HILL. It is the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Is it not true that under those provisions of the Flood Control Act of 1944, the REA's are one of the preferred customers?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The REA cooperatives and the municipalities are the two preferred customers under that act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not also true that the position of those interested in REA throughout the country—and I am speaking particularly of the Rural Electric Cooperatives—has been in favor not only of distribution lines for REA, but also of generation facilities?

Mr. HILL. That has come up in a number of instances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Alabama know whether the REA association which represents the many REA cooperatives has made a policy statement about generation facilities and distribution lines?

Mr. HILL. I think undoubtedly the Senator from Minnesota will find that the National REA Cooperative Association has stood squarely for such generating facilities where it is necessary to have them in order to get the power to the REA cooperative members at reasonable rates and in adequate amounts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama is very familiar with the work of the National REA Association, or whatever the proper name of that group may be. Is he familiar with the position of the Association regarding the issue of the development of public power for use by REA's?

Mr. HILL. I think that Association strongly favors the provision of the Flood Control Act of 1944 which provides for the generation of public power and gives a preference to the REA cooperatives and municipalities in the distribution and sale of the power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been stated here that the position of Administrator of the REA is not a policy position inasmuch as the Administrator of the REA is governed by public statute.

Mr. HILL. Not only is he governed by public statute or law, but the statute is clear that the agency is a lending agency, one to make loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, if Mr. Wickard were to be removed on the basis of a change in policy or in terms of having in that position someone sympathetic with a new policy, the question which our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] raised a moment ago seems to be very pertinent and relevant, namely, whether there is to be a change in policy.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the question is whether, instead of having Congress change the policies now written in the REA Act and now written in the Flood Control Act of 1944, an effort is being made to change the policy by changing the Administrator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama has put his finger directly on the point, and what he has said seems

to me to be somewhat in conformity with the developments we may see in the Department of the Interior.

I think it should be crystal clear that the Department of the Interior, through its Bureau of Reclamation, in the development of hydroelectric power has a great deal to do with the availability, use, and distribution of such power for Rural Electrification cooperatives.

At this time if the private utility interests, as such, are to be given special consideration over the public interest, in the Department of the Interior and its program and policies, is it not entirely probable that the same attitude could be translated into the operation of the rural electrification program?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct about that, because in so many cases the work of these two agencies dovetails.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, without any explanation as to the removal of Mr. Wickard, I think it may be fairly presumed that there must be a change of policy in mind, since there are no complaints as to Mr. Wickard's capabilities, as to his integrity, as to his honor, or as to the manner in which he has performed the duties of his office. The only logical conclusion that I can see is that a change in policy is in the offing.

Mr. HILL. The Senator certainly has good strong grounds for drawing such a conclusion.

CERTAIN ELECTRICAL OR MECHANICAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT FOR USE OF MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 206) to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 206.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I understand from the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that this is a House joint resolution which is applicable only to the House.

Mr. JENNER. It is applicable only to House business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, is this the joint resolution about which the distinguished Senator from Indiana spoke to me a few moments ago?

Mr. JENNER. It is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 206) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 86) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investiations by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, before the vote is had upon Senate Resolution 86, I should like to speak briefly upon the resolution and, of course, in favor of it.

I have been very much interested in the speech made today by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and, in fact, in several speeches which have been made within the past few days upon the subject of our defenses. I have not been here for the past 4 years, and certainly do not have the background of those Members of the Senate who have taken an active part in helping to prepare the defenses of the country. While lacking that experience, I can speak from the viewpoint of one who has been recently on the outside. I must say that in my short stay here, and particularly in my short service, upon the Armed Services Committee, I have become greatly concerned, and even shocked about the grave inadequacies in the defense program of this Nation. When we examine the hearings of the recent investigation which has been held upon the question of ammunition shortages, and consider with that evidence the report which was made by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] upon the negligence and delay in the preparation of air bases, I think there is reason to raise inquiry as to the state of our defenses. Certainly, if, after 2½ years of warfare in Korea, and after the appropriation of $163 billion—and, as I am informed, the expenditure of $103 billion—our Defense Department has not yet been able to produce a sufficient supply of the most basic necessity of warfare—ammunition, there is great reason to inquire as to our preparation in other fields of defense.

These evidences, if they are considered in connection with the recent and grave incidents in Europe, the shooting down of an American plane and a British plane, ought to call for a reassessment of our entire defense program. I believe there is a great deal of uncertainty in this country about the state of our defenses. Certainly I believe that most of the American people do not know the state of our defenses as of today. There should be a reassessment, and there should be a statement to the Congress and to the people by those who have the responsibility for defense. How can the facts be known and what corrective steps can be taken?

I have not prepared a speech upon this subject. I have been led to speak this afternoon only because of the fact that this resolution is before the Senate, and because of the speeches which have been made. I believe strongly that primary responsibility is upon the administration, upon the executive department, upon the Defense Department, to make every fact known to the Armed Services Committee, to the Appropriations Committee, to the Congress, and to the people. I must confess that I was greatly disappointed, when, during the investigation by the Armed Services Committee into ammunition supply, the defense officials, instead of coming before the Armed Services Committee and stating the situation, in the context of the war in Korea and in the context of our obvious needs, it seemed to me placed emphasis on giving excuses for a shortage of ammunition which has been in existence from the very beginning of the Korean war.

Last year the people of the United States were concerned about the Nation's defenses. This concern was one of the reasons which led to a change of administration. The people believed that President Eisenhower, with his obvious and preeminent experience in this field, would quickly analyze the situation, would quickly determine if our defenses were adequate, would know if defense appropriations were sufficient, and that he would take every necessary step to insure the safety of this country. The people believed that President Eisenhower would do these things. They had confidence that he would move quickly, that he would inform the Congress and the people, and he would provide the leadership to make the Nation secure.

I have confidence that the President and his administration will do these things.

The administration should, upon its part, bring to the Congress the true facts and recommend the action which should be taken by the Congress upon this question, the most important which can possibly come before it.

Along with the other Members of this body, I hear talk about the reduction of defense expenditures. I have entertained such a hope and at times the hope of a reduction of taxes; but before everything else it is imperative that in the fearful circumstances of today it be determined first if this country is safe, and if everything in the field of defense is being done that should be done.

When the Armed Services Committee was investigating ammunition shortages a few days ago, every witness from the Defense Department testified that the Congress had always supplied every cent in the way of appropriations requested by the Department of Defense. The letter of the Department, written after the hearings to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], did not deny that fact, but stated that the witnesses did not testify that the appropriations were adequate. A reading of the entire testimony would show that they had considered, at the time requests for appropriations were made, that their requests were adequate. For that reason, I think the letter to the distinguished Senator from Virginia was really begging the question.

But that does not answer, Mr. President, the question of whether appropriations are adequate today.

I do not know why we do not have a reasonable defense and why we are not adequately prepared. It is a tremendously serious matter. If, after 2½ years, we cannot supply sufficient ammunition to adequately supply our men in Korea, if we cannot supply the forces and the equipment which can make Russia know that her aggression cannot succeed, and give hope that Russia might be moved to negotiations and to a truce; if, after 2½ years, we do not have confidence that the country is reasonably secure, these facts should some day be made known. It is wrong to lull the people of the United States into a false sense of security.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I understood the Senator, he stated that the testimony of the military authorities was that Congress had appropriated all the money it had been requested to appropriate. In that respect I think the Senator is correct. But the Chief of Staff would not say that the figure actually requested was the figure he thought was necessary and he did not say that he thought it should not have been more.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. So far as the testimony has shown, that is also the view of the other chiefs of staff?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. The statement was made by the witnesses from the Defense Department that the amounts which had been finally determined by the Department of Defense and submitted to the Congress were granted, but the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Collins, said that he had recommended larger amounts for his own establishment.

Mr. President, I return to my point. If the Defense Department has made, in the past, the mistake of not asking the Congress for appropriations which it believed necessary to make the country secure, there is now no justification and there can now be no excuse for the Department of Defense not making known today to the Congress their beliefs and views as to whether appropriations are adequate to protect this land. I say it will be negligent, it will be criminal, in the circumstances of danger in which we find ourselves today, if the new administration and the Department of Defense do not make known to us the sum of money which they believe necessary to adequately arm and equip our armies in Korea and our other military forces wherever they may be stationed, abroad or in this country, and to assure the Nation a reasonable defense and security. If, they will state that the appropriations which have been requested are sufficient, then it is obvious that there have been deficiencies somewhere along the line. Whether it be in failure of production, in procurement, or in organization of the Department of Defense, the situation certainly must be corrected without delay.

On the other hand, Mr. President, the Congress has its responsibility. I do not believe we can merely accept requests which may be made by the Department of Defense. If we will learn from the experience of the past 2½ years, it is our duty to press and to inquire as to our own responsibility if the appropriations which have been or will now be presented to the Congress are sufficient in our judgment, for the proper defense of the United States. Then the responsibility would pass to the Congress.

Mr. President, I have wanted very much to make these statements. I believe, in good conscience, that I was compelled to make them. I hold that above every other question before the Congress and before the people, or which can come before the Congress, greater than the matter of a reduced budget, or reduced taxes, or social programs, or any other program, the most important concern of the Congress is the Korean war and its successful prosecution to an honorable end and the larger question of the security of the United States. We must believe that this Nation, its people and its institutions are secure. A much larger question is involved than the investigation of ammunition or some other single item. It is a matter which goes to the very heart of the national-defense program.

I earnestly hope that the administration will not make mistakes like those which have been made in the past 2½ years. I hope it will demonstrate the leadership the people believed last fall and believe now it will give. I am certain that if that leadership is given, Congress will follow. I know the people will follow and will respond even more readily than will the executive branch or the legislative branch of the Government.

I repeat that the adequacy of the defenses of the United States is the supreme question before Congress and the people today. I hope that there will be no stopping until the true facts are known and until necessary corrective steps are taken to make this country safe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I commend the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] for his observations. I hope his statement will be read by every Member of the Senate. We who have been fortunate enough to hear him appreciate the constructive suggestions he has made.

Certainly I wish to associate myself with the thought which the Senator from Kentucky has expressed, namely, that the most important problem facing Congress today is to provide the security necessary for the people of the United States.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from Texas.

RESIGNATION OF CLAUDE WICKARD AS ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I listened with a great deal of interest to the comments made by the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] with respect to the REA, and also to the colloquy in which he engaged with several of his colleagues, the apparent purpose of which was to create an erroneous impression that the REA was now being made the innocent victim of political manipulation.

I have served on the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as has the senior Senator from Alabama. I am sure that he is fully aware of the fact that at no time during the course of many years has there been a proposal to reduce budget requests for funds to be used by the REA. The RECORD will show that in the 80th Congress, when the Republicans were in control, the largest appropriation for REA made during any Congress was made by that Republican-controlled Congress.

I know the senior Senator from Alabama to be a man of integrity and forthrightness. I am certain that he would not wittingly or unwittingly, create the impression that the Republicans are now attempting to play politics with REA. I think it is preposterous to take the position that in order to keep REA out of politics, Claude Wickard should be considered an indispensable man. Everyone knows that prior to his appointment to the position of Administrator of REA, Mr. Wickard had served as Secretary of Agriculture; and, as we all know, he served as a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, under a Democratic administration.

Surely no legitimate defense can be made, as has apparently been made, that if Claude Wickard should be removed from his position, politics or political manipulation would be involved. I think the record shows conclusively that if the same approach had been used by Republicans when Claude Wickard was appointed to his position, there might have been some justification for contending that a former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture might be expected to play politics with REA. I do not recall that any such charges were then made by Republicans; consequently, I cannot now conceive that the Republicans should be charged with playing politics when it is proposed that another person be appointed to this important post in our Federal Government.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho. Like my colleague, I certainly hope REA will never become an instrumentality of any political party.

I listened to the crying session on the opposite side of the aisle, and I am prompted to observe that I am sorry that, in some way or other, Mr. Wickard could not have been placed under civil service, where he would have been sealed in his position forever, and nothing could be done about it.

With reference to the matter of playing politics, I wish to ask my colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho, whether he has any knowledge about REA mailing lists and about REA participating actively and directly in political campaigns within the State of Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; I am reluctant to say that that occurred in several elections. It took place in 1948, and

again in 1950, when a certain REA unit in northern Idaho published at least two issues of a paper, the objective of which was to discredit the then incumbent Republican Representative from the First Congressional District. If Claude Wickard knew of that particular activity, I feel certain he did not approve of it. When local units of the REA engaged in political activity, it was in direct violation of the ethical code of the REA.

I reiterate that REA is a meritorious program, which has always commanded the whole-hearted, almost unanimous support of Members of Congress. Under such circumstances, I feel sure that no charges can justifiably be made on the floor of the Senate that the proposal to remove Claude Wickard as director is actuated by a political motive.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am impressed by the Senator's remarks to the effect that no person, especially Claude Wickard, is indispensable. I am quite sure that we would agree that should Claude Wickard have died unexpectedly, the REA would have continued operations, as it was intended to do, for the betterment of farmers throughout the land.

I shall ask my colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho, if he does not believe this debate today could have been well reserved to a time when the successor to Mr. Wickard would have been known, and we could have ascertained whether he was appointed solely for political purposes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I would answer the Senator's question by saying that I think it was wholly inopportune to bring up this discussion on the floor of the Senate today. In fact, if there is any intimation of political manipulation, I reluctantly charge that those who are accusing Republicans of such motives in the removal of Wickard are the ones who are engaged in political manipulations.

I believe that President Eisenhower and his administration are entitled to name the top-level policy-making personnel of the Government, and I will stand on that statement, whether it concerns REA, or any other agency or board of the Federal Government. In making this statement, I express my belief that it is wholly out of order to make political charges that, in substance, REA is going to be brought down to the level of partisan politics. If that should eventuate, I feel certain that it will be others than Republicans who will be responsible for placing that brand upon the meritorious organization known as REA.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to ask my colleague, the senior Senator from Idaho, one more question. I think that in Idaho the REA has done as fine a job as it has in any other State in the Union. I join my colleague in saying that both of us are interested in a bigger and better REA, one that is beyond reproach from politicians. I feel certain that he and I will join in opposition should we ever see our party or the opposite party using the farmers of America as a political tool, when all of America should be proud of REA. May I ask the Senator if I am correct in that statement?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator is correct, and I desire to thank him for his contribution. I shall merely add that I am very confident that the Republican administration will not in any way endeavor to involve REA in partisan politics.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we have a situation in which the Congress of the United States writes a law providing that there shall be no politics in the appointment of the officials or employees who are to administer the law. It goes one step further and gives to the Administrator a 10-year tenure of office, seeking to insure that there shall be no politics. Ten years is a very long tenure for any official or officer of the Federal Government, as we all know. The Administrator was given this tenure so that he would be free from the pressures, the changes, and the influences of politics.

But a new administration comes in, and we find the administrator, who has at least two years, and perhaps three years, yet to serve under his 10-year appointment, is removed over night. His resignation is forced. If that resignation was not forced for political reasons, why was the resignation forced?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if he contends that it is impossible to find an outstanding, capable Republican who is qualified to direct the activities of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. HILL. That is not the question at all. The record shows, and the Senator by his very question admits, that Mr. Wickard has been a good, faithful, able, and devoted Administrator. He has the knowledge, the training, the experience, and the leadership which he has developed in this position. No new man, no matter who he might be or how able he might be, could hope to enter upon that position with the knowledge, experience, training, and leadership which Mr. Wickard possesses.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly the Senator does not contend that several years ago when Mr. Wickard, for whom I have a high regard, was named to head the REA, he had such training experience and background as the Senator claims he now has?

Mr. HILL. That has nothing in the world to do with the question. There was a vacancy at that time. Some new man had to be appointed, and Mr. Wickard was named. He was performing the duties of his office well, ably, and faithfully, when overnight he was kicked out, before his 10-year term had expired, when he had at least 2 or 3 years more of that term to serve. The intent and will of Congress, and the very spirit of the act were violated. The intent and purpose of the Congress when it wrote the act was defeated. If Mr. Wickard was not removed for political reasons, if it was not politics that was responsible for his removal, what was it?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator admit that Harry Truman was removed for political reasons?

Mr. HILL. Ah, but that is an entirely different question. Under the Constitution of the United States Mr. Truman had served a 4-year term, and his term had expired. Surely the Senator from Idaho would not seriously seek to draw a comparison between the office of President of the United States, the most powerful and greatest and most responsible in all the world, and the position of head of a lending agency down the line in the Government.

The Senator from Idaho says that local REA cooperatives in Idaho engage in politics. Does the Senator take umbrage at that fact? Does he deny the right of their members to take part in politics? Who are the members of the local REA units of which he speaks? They are proud, free, independent citizens of the great State of Idaho. Would the Senator from Idaho deny them the right as American citizens to play their part as members of the great American electorate? The Senator from Idaho brings us a new doctrine today—the doctrine that because a man happens to be a member of a REA cooperative, because he borrows enough money from the Government to get an electric line into his home so that he may have a refrigerator, so that his dear wife will not have to bend her poor aching back over the washtub, he must surrender his rights as an American citizen.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator from Alabama heard my remarks when I said that I was not imputing political motives. I think the Senator from Alabama recognizes, as does every other Member of this body, that in the past we have scrupulously refrained from involving the REA in politics. So whether it be on the local level, the regional level, or the national level, I am sure the Senator from Alabama will agree with me that there is little, if any, justification for playing partisan politics. Certainly it would be perfectly proper for members of the REA cooperative to engage in political activities as individuals, but in order to continue to command unified support in Congress, they should not make possible criticism with respect to political activities of an REA group as an organization.

The Senator from Alabama knows that the law does not provide that members of REA cooperatives should refrain from participation in politics. Rather, the prohibition is aimed against political activity as an organization. The Senator from Alabama has frequently said that the REA should remain outside the political realm, and should be consistently nonpartisan. If that course were to be pursued, then certainly at the local level, the national level, and every other level, the REA should refrain from engaging in political manipulation. Now let it be clearly understood that I am an ardent supporter of the REA, but I do not want to see REA jeopardize

itself by letting itself be used as a political football.

Mr. HILL. I am glad that the Senator from Idaho has stated that "in the past" the REA has been free from politics. I am glad that he used the words "in the past," because now we witness a new day, when the Administrator of the REA is thrown out of office, if not for political purposes, then for what purpose?

So far as the local REA cooperatives in Idaho are concerned, the REA administration has no control over them. Would any Member of the Senate want to give the REA in Washington any control over the REA local cooperatives, with respect to what they shall do or shall not do? Do we want the REA in Washington to decide whether or not the members of such cooperatives shall exercise their right, as free-born American citizens, to participate in elections?

I say it is a sad day in this Republic when any Senator rises on this floor and even questions the efficacy or wisdom of a group of farmers back home exercising their American right to participate in elections, to participate in the selection of candidates of their choice to be sent to Congress, men who, they feel, will do the best not only for their States, but for the United States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator from Alabama does not wish to take the unfair attitude of contending that the Senator from Idaho has indicated that he would deny to the members of any REA unit the right to engage in political activity. I pointed out that REA members should confine their political activities to an individual basis and not embroil the REA as an organization in partisan politics.

Mr. HILL. I would not be unfair to my friend for one moment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator would not be unfair.

Mr. HILL. But surely the Senator from Idaho has taken exception in very definite language to an REA co-op, or unit, as he has called it, participating in politics back home. I know of no reason why the farmers of X County in Idaho, gathered together in seeking to promote their welfare and the welfare of their families, and in seeking to promote the welfare of their State and the welfare of the United States, should not act politically.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator from Alabama would not contend that Mr. Wickard, as Director of REA, would be justified in following the same line of reasoning.

Mr. HILL. No; Mr. Wickard——

Mr. DWORSHAK. And thus embroil REA in politics. I am sure the Senator would not make that contention.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Wickard would not be justified in doing so, and there is not one iota of evidence that Mr. Wickard has in any shape, fashion, or form, engaged in any politics. However, the REA co-ops, I will say to my friend from Idaho, are the people back home; they are the people across the creek; they are the people at the grass roots of the democracy of America. If I have any cause for complaint it is that more of them have not been more active in politics, that more of them have not been more diligent to make certain that the right kind of men are sent to Washington to represent them.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Certainly the Senator from Alabama would not want to have anyone draw the inference that any considerable group of Members of either the House or the Senate in the past decade have objected to or opposed or obstructed the program of REA or its extension. Will the Senator answer that?

Mr. HILL. I am not talking about that. What I brought up was the umbrage which my friend from Idaho displayed because farmers, who happen to be members of local REA groups and little cooperatives, have banded together in order to bring an electric line into their homes by means of a loan from the Government, and because they happen to play their part as good citizens by participating in elections.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Alabama has stated that they have used their funds for the purpose of expanding the program of the REA. Certainly, I have no quarrel with that. But would the Senator say that that would justify active participation in politics and a diversion of the funds collected from all members without regard for partisan politics? Most assuredly, I do not take umbrage over the efforts of the farmers who band themselves together to provide themselves with electricity through REA. And again I want to emphasize that my objection is not to individual political activity on the part of REA members. That is their prerogative, and even their responsibility. But I would say the line should be drawn when we reach the unit or organizational level. I am sure also that the rank and file of the REA membership would take the same position.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho in his desperation seeks to ask some kind of hypothetical question, when there is not one shred or iota of evidence at all showing that there has been any diversion of funds. Does the Senator mean to say that his folks in Idaho are not honest, that they have not lived up to the law, or that they have not carried out the spirit and intent of the loans?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have not and would not impute any dishonesty to the people of Idaho. I should like to ask the Senator if Claude Wickard has been alert and vigilant so that he has been able to prevent any violation of the REA program by local units.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the record shows that Mr. Wickard has been vigilant and that he has been alert and that, thank God, so far as the American farmers are concerned there is not one of them who has tried to chisel or cheat in the case of loans from the REA, but all have played fair and square and aboveboard. I cannot help think that what is true of farmers in Alabama is also true of farmers in Idaho.

Mr. President, we could continue this debate indefinitely. I wish to say only that everything that has been said here this afternoon, from the citation of the provisions of the REA Act prohibiting politics, down to this very moment, confirms and reconfirms the fact that the Administrator of the REA was thrown out on his head because of politics.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of Senate Resolution 86, authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, for the past 3 hours we have been trying to dispose of three small measures on the calendar. I wonder whether we could proceed with their consideration. If we should get into such lengthy debate every time a Democrat is dismissed from the Government during the next 3 months, we shall have to be in session every day until next August or September. If there is any opposition to the resolution to authorize expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services I should like to have it brought forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The committee amendments will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 1, line 5, after the word "ending", it is proposed to strike out "March" and insert "January"; in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$167,000"; and in line 11, after the word "through", to strike out "March" and insert "January", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.), the Committee on Armed Services or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period ending January 31, 1954, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $167,000 for the period beginning March 18, 1953, through January 31, 1954, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 80, S. 1110.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The CHIEF CLERK called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarthy
Anderson	Gore	McClellan
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Griswold	Monroney
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hennings	Murray
Bush	Hickenlooper	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hill	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Kuchel	Thye
Eastland	Langer	Tobey
Ellender	Lehman	Watkins
Ferguson	Long	Welker
Flanders	Magnuson	Wiley
Frear	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Mansfield	Young
George	Martin	
Gillette	McCarran	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1110, Calendar No. 80, to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "appoint", to insert "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate"; in line 6, after the word "services", to insert "whether in an active or retired status"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "allowances", to strike out "(including personal money allowance)" and insert "(active or retired, as the case may be including personal money allowance)"; and after line 12, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The rank or grade of any such commissioned officer shall, during the period in which such commissioned officer occupies the office of Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, be in addition to the numbers and percentages otherwise authorized and appropriated for the armed service of which he is a member.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, from among individuals in civilian life or commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status, who shall receive compensation at the rate established for such position. The Deputy Director of Central Intelligence shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as shall be prescribed by the Director of Central Intelligence or by law and shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during his absence or disability.

SEC. 2. If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the Department of Defense or the armed services or any component thereof. He shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he may possess or as may be prescribed for him as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of Defense, or any department, branch, bureau, unit, or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

SEC. 3. Except as provided herein, appointment to, acceptance of, and service as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade which a commissioned officer of the armed services may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank or grade.

SEC. 4. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, continue to hold rank and grade not lower than that in which serving at the time of his appointment and to receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be, including personal money allowance) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service, for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Central Intelligence Agency. He shall also be paid by the Central Intelligence Agency from such funds an annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the salary established for that office exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

SEC. 5. The rank or grade of any such commissioned officer shall, during the period in which such commissioned officer occupies the office of Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, be in addition to the numbers and percentages otherwise authorized and appropriated for the armed service of which he is a member.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1110) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, immediately following the passage of Senate bill 1110, a brief statement which I have prepared in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

The purpose of Senate bill 1110 is to make possible the appointment of a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces to the position of Deputy Director of Central Intelligence without the officer concerned having to relinquish his commission and cease being a military officer.

The bill is made necessary by a provision of existing law (10 U. S. C. A. 576) that requires a commissioned officer appointed or elected to any civilian office to cease being a military officer and to have his commission vacated. An exception has been provided in the case of a commissioned officer of the Armed Forces being appointed to the position of Director of Central Intelligence and until the present time, all of the Directors of Central Intelligence have been appointed from among the commissioned officers of the Armed Forces. Mr. Allen Dulles has recently been appointed from civilian life as Director of Central Intelligence. Since it appears desirable to continue the practice of having an experienced military officer as either the Director or Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, this bill would make possible the appointment of a commissioned officer as Deputy Director, notwithstanding the contrary provisions of law as set forth in Tenth United States Code Annotated, page 576.

The committee amended the bill to require the advice and consent of the Senate to an appointment of the Deputy Director. The committee considered the desirability of an additional amendment to prohibit military officers from serving as Director and Deputy Director of Central Intelligence concurrently. The present Director of Central Intelligence testified that it is unlikely that the President would in time of peace nominate two military officers to the top posts at CIA because the agency is essentially the combination of civilian and military functions, but in time of war it might be desirable to appoint a person who was normally a civilian but who, because of war conditions, was in uniform, to one of the two top positions at CIA. Since the committee adopted an amendment to require the advice and consent of the Senate to the nomination of a Deputy Director, it is felt that the Senate retains adequate control over these appointments and could, if it so desired, prevent military officers from serving in both these positions at the same time.

The committee also amended the bill to allow the appointment of a retired officer on the same basis as an active officer can be appointed.

Under the terms of this bill, a military officer appointed as Deputy Director would continue to draw his military pay and allowances and the military department concerned would be reimbursed by the Central Intelligence Agency. If the pay and allowances of the officer were less than the rate established for the position of Deputy Director, $14,800 at present, the CIA would pay the officer an additional amount equal to the sum by which the established rate for the position exceeds the total of his military pay and allowances.

Because of the so-called Davis amendment, as amended, and limitations imposed by the Committee on Armed Services, there is a rather rigid restriction on the total numbers of general and flag officers that the military services are allowed to have on active duty. The committee therefore amended the bill to allow the armed service furnishing a Deputy Director of Central In-

telligence one additional officer so long as the commissioned officer from that branch of service is serving as Deputy Director.

USE OF CERTIFICATES BY OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1078, Calendar No. 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1078) to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay-and-allowances accounts of military and civilian personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1078) to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay-and-allowances accounts of military and civilian personnel, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 8, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 2. The act of October 26, 1942 (ch. 624, 56 Stat. 987), as extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 331) is repealed.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on April 2, 1953, and shall expire on April 1, 1954.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with consideration of the bill, I think it would be helpful to have an explanation of the bill made by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this bill is in charge of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I am confident that he will explain the bill satisfactorily.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Senate bill 1078 came before the committee because the authority which officers of the Defense Establishment presently have to certify accounts without supporting evidence rests upon some emergency legislation which has an expiration date of April 1. The bill, as it was drafted and came to the committee, proposed to create blanket authority, from now on for field officers and others in like categories to use such certificates. The committee did not think that that kind of blanket, permanent legislation should be established. We had before the committee a recommendation from the General Accounting Office that it be limited to periods in which there was a declared national emergency. The junior Senator from South Dakota felt that even that was too broad, because we had some evidence of cases in which the power had been abused. So it was suggested that the bill be amended so as to put a maximum time limit of 1 year on the extension, or the expiration of the presently declared emergency, whichever should come earlier.

The amendment that is proposed to be offered is drawn with that in mind, so that the authority proposed would expire April 1, 1954, or upon the ending of the emergency proclaimed by the President, or upon the adoption of a concurrent resolution by the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator explain what great inconvenience would be caused if no extension were granted, and to whom the inconvenience would be caused?

Mr. CASE. It is not so much a matter of inconvenience. It would be inconvenient, but it is primarily a case in which there are beneficiaries of possible allotments by soldiers or others who are missing in action, or are beleaguered. There is involved a question of family dependencies and dependency allotments. It makes it possible for the certification office to act though full proof of the position or condition of the person beleaguered or imprisoned cannot be supplied by the office.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. In a moment. In many cases, particularly in field movements, and under the kind of war now going on, officers are separated from their records. They do not have the full data that is normally required.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield further.

Mr. MORSE. Is not that always going to be true?

Mr. CASE. Not always.

Mr. MORSE. The time element is what bothers me.

Mr. CASE. It will not be true in peace time.

Mr. MORSE. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the extension is for a year?

Mr. CASE. The amendment proposed to be offered will make the maximum time 1 year, which could be extended, of course, should the need develop. The amendment that is proposed to be offered as a substitute for section 2 reads:

This act shall take effect on April 2, 1953, and shall terminate upon the issuance of a proclamation by the President, or the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution, terminating the national emergency existing on the date of the enactment of this act, or on April 1, 1954, whichever is the earlier.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator to say that one reason why he did not want this authority extended beyond a definite period of time was that there was some evidence before the committee that abuses had developed under this procedure. Will the Senator tell the Senate what those abuses have been, and the nature of them?

Mr. CASE. The General Accounting Office in its recommendation of a limitation felt that there were abuses. There was a definite recommendation from the General Accounting Office that the authority should be limited to a period of emergency, because in some cases there had been abuses in connection with dependent allotments, where false certifications, or certifications without adequate factual support had been made.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. That is the problem I thought the Senator had in mind, and I am trying to figure out what the time element has to do with the procedure for ending such abuses. Perhaps the answer is that, even with the passage of this bill, and in spite of an abuse that may exist in the first instance, the General Accounting Office, nevertheless, eventually gets all the vouchers and information it needs, and then retroactively can correct the abuse. Am I right or wrong about that?

Mr. CASE. That is true, although the Senator may remember that the Congress on two or three occasions, and particularly during World War II, has waived some of the requirements for repayment when the payments have been made in good faith, and the beneficiaries, the dependents and such as the children of a soldier, may have expended the money and simply were without means to reimburse the Government afterward.

Mr. MORSE. I can understand that, but I am thinking now about the problem of out-and-out fraud.

Mr. CASE. Of course if there is out-and-out fraud, the Government should recover any payment, if there is any possible way of collecting it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the language of this bill in any way waive the duty of the appropriate government officials, even after the payments have been made on the basis of certificates of the officer, to proceed to collect all the information which would be needed in the absence of the certification procedure?

Mr. CASE. No, it does not; and the bill specifically provides that the "Secretaries of the departments concerned shall prescribe regulations governing the conditions under which, and the classes and types of facts to which, the above authority will be applicable."

Mr. MORSE. That is what disturbs me. I am for any procedure that will bring needed relief to the dependents of servicemen. I am for any procedure that will take care of the human element involved. But I do not see why we should adopt a procedure which, after the so-called human element has been taken care of, fails to impose the duty on the department concerned to complete the record and collect the same evidence and information that would be collected if there were not a certification procedure, in order to determine whether any undeserved collection had been made.

Mr. CASE. There is nothing in this bill which waives the authority of the General Accounting Office to examine the correctness of a payment.

Mr. MORSE. But it places no duty upon it to do so.

Mr. CASE. Oh, it has that duty under general law.

Mr. MORSE. This bill only waives the procedure for the payment in the first instance?

Mr. CASE. Yes; so far as the certificates of the officers are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. Then, I either misunderstood the Senator or he misspoke in answer to my other question as to whether there is a duty resting upon the Government department concerned to collect all the information which otherwise would be collected in the absence of certification. I understood the Senator to say that that was not provided for. His position now is that they would go ahead and collect that information, anyway, and that all the bill seeks to do is to shortcut the time element. Whatever amount is paid mistakenly the Government is in position to recover unless Congress sets aside the repayment.

Mr. CASE. That is correct. This bill merely continues the procedure under which we have been operating since 1942.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the amendment which the committee desires to have considered in substitution of section 2 is as I read it rather than as it is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add certain words to section 2, as amended, so that it will read as follows:

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on April 2, 1953, and shall terminate upon the issuance of a proclamation by the President, or the adoption by the Congress of a concurrent resolution, terminating the national emergency existing on the date of the enactment of the act, or on April 1, 1954, whichever is earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1078) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Burns was unanimously recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency as one of the three members of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a series of questions pertaining to this nomination. May I, first, say that Mr. Burns made a very fine impression upon the members of the Banking and Currency Committee. In fact, the committee recommended unanimously that his nomination be reported to the Senate for confirmation. That action was taken immediately following the hearings. We were very favorably impressed by Mr. Burns.

While I do not believe we could have a better man serving as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, something has come up which disturbs me somewhat, and I should like to get some clarification from the distinguished majority leader, if I can.

Mr. Burns was nominated as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. That Council is provided for in the Employment Act of 1946, from which I now read:

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created in the Executive Office of the President a Council of Economic Advisers (hereinafter called the "Council"). The Council shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and each of whom shall be a person who, as a result of his training, experience, and attainments, is exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, to appraise programs and activities of the Government in the light of the policy declared in section 2, and to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise. Each member of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The President shall designate one of the members of the Council as Chairman and one as Vice Chairman, who shall act as Chairman in the absence of the Chairman.

Mr. President, that is now the law; and it is under that law that Mr. Burns' name was proposed to the Senate as 1 of 3 members of the Economic Council.

There is pending at the present time a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill 1953 which has in it a provision with reference to which I wish to ask some questions of the distinguished majority leader. It provides for an additional grant of salaries and expenses, including the employment, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, of an economic adviser to the President, and a staff incidental thereto, of $50,000. It seems to me that that provision, if enacted into law, will have the effect of repealing the present provision of law which calls for an Economic Council of three members. So I am wondering if the distinguished majority leader can give me some information as to whether my interpretation is, in his opinion, correct.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator mind if I make a rather comprehensive explanation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should be glad if the Senator would give me an explanation covering the whole question. It might remove the necessity of asking further questions.

Mr. TAFT. I understand the committee had various recommendations, some from persons who felt that the whole Act should be repealed and there should be no Council of Economic Advisers, and others from persons who felt that there should be one and not three members. The President did not feel that he, himself, was sufficiently familiar with the general situation, so he attempted to find a leading economist who would go over it and make definite recommendations to him. He selected Mr. Burns because he thought he was the best man for the purpose. He proposed to appoint Mr. Burns as a member of the Council and have him make a complete study of the entire question and make recommendations to him.

After that, the House of Representatives, either because of a doubt or because they would not appropriate any money, refused to appropriate for the Council. They finally agreed, under considerable pressure, to provide money for this study, or for one man, at least, to make the study, leaving to the 1954 appropriation bill the question of whom the advisers should be.

I may say that I myself have urged upon the President very strongly that the present law be continued in full force and effect, and I shall do all I can to bring that about. Of course, another policy could be followed permanently if Congress should undertake to repeal or to modify the law.

I had some doubt about the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Burns to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, when he cannot draw a salary as such, but I have been assured that he can draw salary for about a month as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. If the House cannot be persuaded to provide money in time in its

next bill, then an attempt will be made to persuade Mr. Burns to become an assistant to the President, his compensation to be paid out of the $50,000 which is provided in the first supplemental appropriation bill.

When funds are finally provided, there will have to be confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Burns to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, as will also be true of his two associates.

I myself feel very strongly that the plan embodied in the act is correct. When there is a question of broad economic policy, looking to the future, designed to do those things which will prevent a depression, it will be found that the best economist in the world may have one particular theory of which he is very fond, so it seems to me it is advisable to have perhaps three economists, having slightly different approaches to the economic problems to be solved. Therefore, I think the act should definitely be continued as it is now written.

The real purpose of the act is to establish a long-distance program which will prevent the development of a depression, and in order to reach that result the law must be maintained to the very limit. The purpose is that the Council may plan economic policy, just as the National Security Council plans long-range military and foreign policy.

I hope the matter will be straightened out. I have conferred with the White House on the question, and I am sure the best course to follow in order to get Mr. Burns is to confirm his nomination today as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Then he can proceed with his work, because under the bill now in conference, $50,000 can be so transferred that it can be used by him in that position.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I missed a point in the description of the work as given by the Senator from Ohio. I missed the point as to how the provision for a fund for the employment of an assistant to the President can be applied to a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Would the Senator from Ohio be willing to go over that point again?

Mr. TAFT. If no other means could be found, there is no doubt that Mr. Burns could resign as a member of the Council and be appointed an assistant to the President and draw his salary from the $50,000 appropriated to the President to enable him to secure economic advice.

Mr. FLANDERS. Then it would be the opinion of the Senator from Ohio that this matter should not be raised in connection with the conference report.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection to that. I disagree with the House. If there is no other way, I would just as soon raise the question. The Senate appropriated $60,000, I believe, for the Council of Economic Advisers, in the normal way. I think that would have been a better way to handle the matter. But the House has its own viewpoint on the subject, and we seem to have been unable to prevail over the stand of the House. I would have no objection to the Senator raising objection to the conference report when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. It would seem to me that if the question could be settled in the conference report, perhaps by referring it back to the committee, it would not be necessary to consider the whole matter again, as it looks now as though we may have to do if this anomaly is permitted to remain.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it would be necessary to do anything over. The appropriation bill is to provide merely for the time between now and the 1st of July. At that time the permanent appropriation law will come into effect. I think that would be the time to make the real battle to make certain of an adequate appropriation for the Council of Economic Advisers as such, and I shall be glad to participate in that effort.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am very glad, indeed, that the Senator from Ohio has given expression to his belief in the usefulness of this law, because it seems to me that, in the months and years ahead, if we are able to reduce our military expenditures, we shall be facing a difficult situation in maintaining our economic prosperity. I think we may be certain that our new and our old friends in Russia confidently expect us to go into a tailspin if we stop our high expenditures for war.

Furthermore, in talking to many people throughout the country who have a scarcely discernible tinge of pink in their complexion, I have found the general theory among them to be that we really do not want to keep out of war, because if we did, we would go into an economic tailspin. Such people merely grin, and indicate in every conceivable way, except by direct charges, that we really must keep on warring or preparing for war, if we desire to keep out of economic trouble. It is necessary to show such people that that is not a fact.

The act, which was passed, as I remember, in 1946, was directed toward an emergency which is now at the peak of its importance.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator from Vermont is correct, but I believe the best way to reaffirm our belief in those views is now to confirm the nomination of Mr. Burns as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am certainly agreeable to confirming the nomination of Mr. Burns, but I believe it would be most desirable to have an understanding now as to what is desired.

I join with the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] in his expression of gratitude to the able majority leader for the statement of his confidence in the present law.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Vermont, and of all other Senators, the statement which Dr. Burns himself made in the hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency. He made very much the same point which has been made by the Senator from Ohio, namely, that it would be much better to have the composite view of three economists rather than to rest upon the opinion of a single economist, although he did say that it was a question he wanted to study very thoroughly, because others had strongly recommended the opposite view.

Do I understand the Senator from Ohio correctly to suggest that the best arrangement is to confirm the nomination of Dr. Burns as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, in which he will function under existing law so long as the money lasts, which probably will be a month or a little more? If Congress has not acted by that time to make more funds available to the Council, probably the President simply will name Dr. Burns as an adviser to the President, without confirmation by the Senate being necessary.

I gather that it will be the principal function of Dr. Burns to make a study of the advisability of what should be recommended for the permanent appropriation bill, which will come before the Senate later in the spring.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. From assurances received, I have every reason to believe that the entire matter will be classified in the 1954 appropriation bill, although there is a possibility of a recommendation that there be one adviser instead of three. But I think there is now sufficient support in both Houses, and in the White House, as well, to justify the assurance I have given.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am pleased to hear the statement just made by the Senator from Ohio. I am not greatly concerned about the question whether there should be one adviser or three. I think that both the Senator from Ohio and Dr. Burns have stated a very good reason for having three, and I think it is more desirable to have three, but I certainly would not make a point of the matter if the President should recommend otherwise.

What I do not desire is to have the Council of Economic Advisers in effect abolished by action taken in an appropriation bill. I gather from what the Senator from Ohio has said that he feels as I do, and believes the matter can be adjusted before the fiscal year ends.

Mr. TAFT. I so believe.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask one further question. I am sure the Senator from Ohio knows that the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers was discharged as of March 12, when the funds ran out, except for enough to pay for leave. It is my understanding that we are in danger of losing some very good members whom Dr. Burns apparently would like to keep. He said that he had already talked with various members, and that there were some good ones whom he would like to keep.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that the $50,000 to which reference has been made can be used for that purpose, and will be so used.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the nomination of Dr. Burns is confirmed, he will then be able to act.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a very good article written a few days ago

by Sylvia Porter, entitled "Dr. Arthur Burns, Man Who'll Keep Ike Tabbed on Economic Situation, Knows Score." I offer it for the RECORD as it appeared in the Birmingham News of March 12, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. ARTHUR BURNS, MAN WHO'LL KEEP IKE TABBED ON ECONOMIC SITUATION, KNOWS SCORE

(By Sylvia Porter)

This is a fine appointment—the selection by President Eisenhower of Dr. Arthur F. Burns to be chief economic adviser to the White House.

Burns is slated to be chairman of the President's reorganized Council of Economic Advisers. As such, he can have a vital influence on the President's economic decisions and thus on your job, your paycheck, your security, your entire bread-and-butter life.

Who, then, is Burns?

The official releases will tell you that he is research director of the National Bureau of Economic Research and full professor of economics at Columbia University. He is a fellow of the American Statistical Association, a member of the American Economic Association, he is married, has children, etc.

But this doesn't tell you anything about Burns.

Who, then, is Burns?

He is an economist in the true sense, what his fellow workers affectionately call an economic scientist.

He is a lifelong student of business cycles—of why we have booms, why we have busts, how we can recognize them before they hit us, what we can do to level off the tops and bottoms.

He is not a politician, eager to make political policy. He is an economist eager to find the facts and truths upon which all policies can be based. I've been studying and reporting on Burns' works for years; I think he is a thoroughly intelligent person.

What, then, does Burns stand for?

Out of all that he has said and written in recent years, here are three fundamentals worth emphasizing now:

1. He believes that we have not yet conquered the business cycle and that it is folly, it is dangerous to suggest we have.

Burns in 1950: "For the present, obituaries on the business cycle are romantic expressions of human impatience, not records of solid achievement." The recession of early 1949 would have gone much deeper had there not been such abnormally large demands for cars and houses. The serious threat to us comes not from mild or brief contractions; we can readily adjust to these.

"The crucial problem of our time is the prevention of severe depressions."

2. He stresses that this country has made truly remarkable strides toward absolute equality in incomes since 1929.

Burns in 1951: These strides "may already be counted as one of the great social revolutions of history." For instance, in 1929, the highest percent income group obtained 34 percent of total personal incomes; now that's down to 18 percent.

"It is permissible to wonder whether many of the so-called people's democracies can point to so vast a democratization * * *. We must seek to attain a material reduction of income inequalities in the future principally by raising the productivity of those at the bottom of the income scales."

3. He salutes you and me—as consumers—as the greatest forces in the past few years in checking inflation and respects our importance in the marketplace as few others do.

Burns in 1952: "The consumer, rarely a heroic figure in economic affairs, scored a noteworthy success in the struggle against inflation during the past year. * * * The consumer has emerged as a complex economic personality"—playing a strategic role.

As chief economic adviser, he will be on the alert for signs of major changes, try to anticipate timing, propose offsets.

He will try to remain an economic scientist, working with no illusions about the perfection of the American system but with a basic desire to get the facts to perfect it.

Burns is an excellent choice. If in the future he lives up to his record in the past, we will be the gainers.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I correctly understand that the President is in favor of continuing the Council of Economic Advisers, to consist of three members?

Mr. TAFT. No. The President is definitely in favor of continuing the Council of Economic Advisers, but has not made up his mind what recommendation he will make, as to whether the membership shall consist of one or three. That is one thing which has given the House some excuse for holding up the proceedings until that determination is made. The President is postponing that determination until he receives Mr. Burns' report.

Mr. MURRAY. If he should eventually decide that he is in favor of only one economic adviser——

Mr. TAFT. He would have to ask for an amendment to the law; and if the Congress should see fit to do so, it could still insist on a membership of three.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator one further question.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was impressed by what the Senator from Ohio just said, to the effect that Congress would have to amend the basic law. I hope the Senator means that we would have to consider an amendment to the law itself, and that he does not refer to action by means of an appropriation act.

Mr. TAFT. That is my meaning. I do not approve of wiping out something indirectly in that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Arthur F. Burns to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers?

The nomination was confirmed.

AIR FORCE—NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Air Force nominations on the calendar be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations passed over are as follows:

Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White, 238A, to be brigadier general for appointment in the Regular Air Force to the grade indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White, 238A, to be major general for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

THE NAVY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the Navy nomination, which is on the Executive Calendar be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nomination passed over is as follows:

Henry C. Bruton for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip Young to be Civil Service Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anthony Julian to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Henry Beaudreau to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Enard Erickson to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS FOOD—LET CARE HELP SHOW WE CARE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have repeatedly called the attention of the Senate to the urgent need for developing new and useful outlets for our abundant agricultural production.

I have emphasized how necessary some constructive action in that direction has become as a result of falling farm prices theatening to undermine our entire agricultural economy.

I have emphasized the stake we all have as consumers in making sure that American agriculture is provided with the incentive of fair prices to continue producing in abundance for our own future security and protection against scarcity.

I have repeatedly urged that in providing such protection we make good use of the abundance our farmers produce and not waste it. I have called upon the

Secretary of Agriculture to look beyond present storage programs toward new and better ways of making good use of our abundance, particularly of perishable products. In that connection, I suggested several alternative proposals for his consideration that would serve the double purpose of aiding American agriculture while still making more beneficial use of our present food abundance.

Ranking foremost among such alternatives, in my opinion, is making greater use of our abundant food supplies to eliminate hunger and misery where it exists in the free world.

As a sound and constructive move in that direction, I am proud to be a cosponsor with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and concurred in by many others of the proposal for creation of an international food reserve. I certainly hope action can be rushed on that undertaking as a positive part of our foreign policy.

But hunger in the world does not wait for either Senate debate or international negotiations.

Nor can Senate debate and international negotiation halt the depressing effect on farm prices of any temporary oversupply of farm commodities accumulating in this country.

For that reason I would like to suggest today a more immediate step that can be taken to prevent waste or deterioration of farm surpluses in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation, by getting such commodities distributed among friendly peoples throughout the world who urgently need such assistance.

I would like to suggest—and urge—that the Secretary of Agriculture take immediate steps to turn over as much of our existing surplus food supplies as can be intelligently distributed to an organization like CARE—Cooperative for American Remittances to Europe—to further its mission of good will in the name of the American people.

Offhand, the presence of over a billion dollars' worth of agricultural surplus foodstuffs in Government warehouses may be regarded as a yardstick for the abundance with which this country of ours and its economy is blessed, and we certainly must continue maintaining adequate reserves as a safeguard for our own economy. But there seems no point to allowing any of these commodities—wheat and corn, seeds and butter, beans and cottonseed oil—to go to waste, grow rancid, be eaten by rats and mice, and be otherwise destroyed by time and weather when at the same time millions of people in other parts of the world are actually starving to death for the want of a crust of bread.

In this connection I am not thinking primarily of the people of Western Europe, to whose aid the Government and the people of the United States rallied in such magnificent fashion in the immediate postwar years. I am thinking rather of the people of the so-called backward areas of the world. War-ravaged Korea comes to mind first, of course, with its population decimated by hunger, want, and disease. It is not war, however, but drought and other disasters that bring hunger and famine to India and Pakistan.

Both Israel and the Arab countries are facing serious problems of food shortages. These were brought about, in the case of Israel, by opening the doors to all needy immigrants; and in the case of the Arabs, by the refugee problems resulting from the establishment of the State of Israel. Our surplus could help in both of these areas.

The northern villages of Greece still need help, and Yugoslavia is facing its third year of drought. The northeastern states of Brazil are in the throes of a famine as a result of the second serious drought in 2 years. Floods in the uplands of Peru and a drought in the northern central valley of Mexico offer needs that could be helped by our surpluses.

Immediate help is needed in many parts of the world. Help is at our disposal, yet the food lies unused in our warehouses.

It may, of course, be argued that to release these surpluses would mean that the Government, and that means in the last analysis the taxpayer, would in addition to their original cost have to shoulder also the cost of their distribution. But such is not the case if these foodstuffs were turned over to a private agency like CARE.

A precedent was in fact established 2 years ago when the Commodity Credit Corporation of the United States Department of Agriculture made available to CARE more than 52 million pounds of milk powder, egg powder, and butter, foods which were then filling the Government warehouses. More than 48 million pounds of these foods were distributed by CARE throughout Yugoslavia, which was then suffering the worst drought and crop failure in its history. The rest was sent by CARE to Greece, Italy, and other European countries greatly in need. CARE's entire cost of hauling these foods from Government warehouses, packaging and shipping them, and distributing them to the ultimate consumer was paid for, not by the United States Government, but by the voluntary contributions of the American people.

For obvious reasons the CARE experiment in Yugoslavia, officially termed "the largest single relief operation ever undertaken by a private American welfare agency within a given country," was followed with the closest attention. CARE itself watched the distribution of these foods with a team of special observers, all of them American citizens, who toured the country in jeeps for the whole 6 months of the operation, to see that there was no discrimination of any kind. None was encountered. Even the most critical observers, some of them delegated by political and religious groups in America, agreed that the Tito government was scrupulously honoring the letter and spirit of its contract with CARE. Orthodox and Roman Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and Mohammedans alike benefited equally from these foods brought to them by CARE as a gift from America.

The success of that CARE experiment speaks for itself. Here is an agency—a private agency, I might underscore—that in 7 years of existence has built the facilities and the apparatus to disseminate direct and immediate aid to "the man on the bottom of the pile." Nor does it seem necessary that the pattern CARE established in Yugoslavia be precisely repeated in every case. Different countries with their conditions may well call for varied approaches to the problem of distribution. At any rate, CARE has the know-how to see the job through.

I suggest that as much of our billion dollars' worth of stored and unused agricultural surplus as is not necessary against eventual emergencies in our own midst be given to CARE for free distribution in the world's present areas of need.

One of the lessons that may be drawn from CARE's Yugoslavian experiment is that it netted us the true and lasting friendship of a courageous people. Friendship, I feel, is something that we as a nation stand more in need of than anything else in the world. There is no better way to a man's heart than timely aid in the hour of his need. We have the means of giving such aid. We should avail ourselves of the opportunity of winning new friends and knit old friendships even closer.

It is my hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will heed this plea.

ADDRESS BY GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a short statement which was made by Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Association of Graduates at the Founders' Day dinner of the Military Academy, held in New York last Saturday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On behalf of the Association of Graduates, I welcome everywhere all those attending the Founders' Day dinner. This anniversary stirs many poignant memories in me—memories which in many respects are common to all graduates of the Military Academy. They take each one back to that ceremony on the plan at West Point when he entered the military service and dedicated himself to "duty, honor, country." They carry through successive academic years toward mastery of the rudiments of military science and the art of war—toward absorption of one of the highest moral codes on any campus, to culminate in the assumption of the responsibilities and obligations of commissioned leadership. Thereafter, all paths diverge from that crucible of common experience, but all continue to rest upon a fundamental concept written in blood by our fighting men upon the battlefields of all the world. It is that military strategy and tactics must produce victory.

Napoleon once said that military organization and tactics should be revised at least every 10 years. He recognized that in the evolution of military science nothing would remain static and that new techniques would become indispensable to attain the changeless goal of victory. Down through the ages, the character of war, but not its purpose, is a constant record of change. From the elephant of Hannibal's day to the modern tank and airplane, the story is always the same—the tactics in one war are always deficient in the next, but the endless purpose remains immutable—victory.

I, myself, have witnessed this evolution over a span of more than 50 years. At the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

turn of the century, the target was one enemy casualty at the end of a rifle. Then came the machinegun designed to kill by the dozen. After that, the heavy artillery raining death upon the hundreds. Then the aerial bomb to strike by the thousands, followed by the atom explosion to reach the hundreds of thousands. Now electronics and other processes of science are being perfected to raise the destructive potential to encompass millions. But at each introduction of a new weapon or a new method, new tactics have been devised based upon the one unchanging fundamental purpose and ideal, victory. Always the aim has been the same, victory.

But, now, oblivious to the lessons of military history and the American tradition, a new concept has arisen from outside our ranks which tends to disavow victory as the combat objective and to advocate in its stead a new kind of tactic on which to base the battle. The result can be nothing but failure, nothing to repay the terrible human sacrifice of war. We of the military shall always do what we are told to do. But, if this Nation is to survive, we must trust the soldier once our statesmen fail to preserve the peace. We must regain our faith in those lessons and traditions which have always sustained our victorious march through the military perils which have beset our past. We must recapture the will and the determination to win come what may once American arms have been committeed to battle. We must reject the counsels of fear which strange and alien doctrines are attempting to force upon us. We must proclaim again and again and again an invincible adherence to the proposition that in war there can be no substitute for victory. It is for this the "thin Grey line" must stand.

Again my greetings and warmest welcome to you all.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am proud to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives of the State Legislature of the State of Minnesota yesterday by a vote of 76 to 39 adopted a resolution memorializing the Congress to protect the Federal ownership of the offshore oils. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress relative to legislation now before the Congress of the United States affecting tideland oils

Whereas the United States Supreme Court, on three separate and precedent-setting occasions, has ruled that the wealthy offshore oil lands, known as tidelands, belong to all the people of the United States of America rather than to any individual States;

Whereas a number of private and governmental estimates have indicated that the amount of wealth now known to be found in the oil resources of these tidelands amounts to at least $50 billion;

Whereas this wealth of oil not only is the property of all Americans but is vital to the peacetime and defense needs of the United States, which does not have enough oil reserves for either purpose and has recently been importing large quantities from abroad;

Whereas the income from offshore oil as long as it is not given over to individual States will be available for use in financing needed Federal Government programs, thus reducing Federal taxes;

Whereas 40 Senators, at the urging of private oil interests, have now introduced a bill in Congress to give the $50 billion offshore oil lands to the several coastal States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Minnesota State Legislature, now in session, do memorialize Congress and President Dwight D. Eisenhower to oppose the passage of any such proposed legislation which would obviously circumvent the decision of the Supreme Court, raise Federal taxes, injure our peacetime oil reserves, and jeopardize the defenses of the United States of America: Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the president of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each Member of the Congress from the State of Minnesota.

DISPOSITION OF SO-CALLED TIDELANDS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of letters and resolutions which I have received in recent days opposing the quitclaim legislation designed to turn our offshore oil reserves over to the four coastal States and in favor of the Anderson bill of which I am a cosponsor also be printed in the body of the RECORD at this time. It is clear to me that the best interest of my State of Minnesota and the best interests of the people of the United States calls for enactment of the Anderson bill and the Hill amendment to that bill, which would utilize the Federal Government's royalties from the offshore oil for our national defense and for the education of our children.

There being no objection, the letters and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ULM CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
New Ulm, Minn., March 6, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The national affairs committee of the New Ulm Civic and Commerce Association has discussed the tidelands dispute and have asked that I express their views on this issue.

Their arguments for Federal control of the submerged coastal lands are as follows:

(1) Giving the States title to submerged coastal lands is a step toward a policy of giving away our national resources—so essential to our defense.

(2) Federal control of the lands makes it beneficial to all of the people in place of a limited number. Income therefrom should be beneficial to the entire Nation.

The above arguments were voiced by the committee, composed of seven members, who have asked that I express their stand.

Very truly yours,
NEW ULM CIVIC AND COMMERCE ASSOCIATION,
H. G. MEINE, *Secretary.*

HON. SENATOR HUMPHREY: We, Local No. 967, Operating Engineers, of the A. F. of L. for the public schools in the city of St. Paul assembled this day, March 7, 1953, would like to commend you on your action concerning the quitclaim offshore oil land to the coastal States. We and the United States Supreme Court feel that the tideland offshore oils belong to all of the States.

We, the undersigned, are signing our names asking you to again vote against any bill that would turn the offshore tideland oil to the coastal States. We ask you to support the Lister Hill amendment.

Arthur A. Beisang, Olof H. Gurd, Anton Haus, Emil Le May, C. P. Bauer, Halger Swenson, J. Magnuson, Benjamin Henderson, John H. Spriggs, Lewis N. Hastrawser, M. Huss, George Limire, Joseph A. Nickelson, Charles Burlingame, H. Bredemann, Sam Delmont, James R. Lynn, Gunnard H. Johnson, Eben Pollock, Frank A. Duprus, Emil G. Keller, Kenneth Nickelson, Wilbur Simons, Theo. Fettinger.

NORTHOME COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Northome, Minn., March 6, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: The Northome Commercial Club held their regular meeting on February 23, and the tideland oil question was discussed. It was moved that the club was in favor of having the Federal Government control same and that all royalties be reserved for educational purposes, which I am sure you will agree are in dire need of improvement.

We will appreciate your able support in regard to this proposition.

Very truly yours,
EARL R. LHOTKA,
Secretary, Northome Commercial Club.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF POST OFFICE CLERKS,
St. Paul, Minn., March 9, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: By action taken at the last meeting of Local 65, National Federation of Post Office Clerks, St. Paul, Minn., I was instructed to write to you that our members are opposed to giving the offshore oil to the States.

Also our members are opposed to a percentage tax-reduction program. We urge your support of increasing the basic exemptions as the fairest way to reduce taxes.

Thank you for your support.

Very truly yours,
WALTER O. NOREEN,
Secretary, Local 65.

CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY STOCKHOLDERS AT 22D ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., MARCH 5, 1953

Upon motion, duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"TIDELANDS OIL

"We are much concerned as a group in the extremely rapid rate of dissipation of the irreplaceable natural resources of the Nation, all too often to the benefit of a few and detrimental to the the national welfare as a whole.

"For instance, one of the few remaining great natural resources is the tidelands oil off the United States coastline. We fear that the relinquishment of national rights in this area will set a precedent which may result in a very short-sighted policy in the disposition of the remaining Federal natural resources, such as timber, range lands, water, and minerals.

"We believe that administration of these great potential revenue producing natural resources by the United States Government will be of great relief to all taxpayers of our Nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this meeting favors control of the so-called tidelands oil by the Federal Government for the benefit of the whole population of this great country."

I, Ruby M. Heraty, assistant secretary of the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc.,

do hereby certify that the forgoing is a true and complete copy of resolution adopted at the 22d annual meeting of stockholders of the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., March 5, 1953.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said corporation this 13th day of March 1953.

RUBY H. HERATY,
Assistant Secretary.

COOPERATIVE SERVICES, INC.,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 13, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The more than 5,000 members of Cooperative Services wish to express their deep appreciation of your stand on the off-shore oil lands of the United States. They believe and want you to continue your efforts to adjudicate these lands to all the people of the United States.

Yours truly,

COOPERATIVE SERVICES,
WALTER HOFFMAN,
General Manager.

ST. PAUL CIO COUNCIL,
St. Paul, Minn., March 13, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the last meeting of the St. Paul CIO Council the delegates discussed pending legislation in the National Congress, more particularly legislation dealing with offshore oil and gas resources.

As a result of that discussion I have been instructed to inform you that our members are opposed to any legislation which would authorize the granting of these resources to several individual States. We are of the opinion that these resources belong to the entire Nation and should be retained for the benefit of the entire Nation.

We also are in complete support of Senator Hill's amendment which would earmark the funds received from these resources in royalties to help build new schools, pay better salaries to teachers and provide more adequate educational equipment throughout the country.

We, therefore, sincerely request that you oppose any efforts to turn over to individual States these resources which belong to all of us, and further request that you support the Hill amendment.

Sincerely yours,

OTTO P. SIMON, Jr., *President.*

MIDLAND DISTRICT, NO. 1,
Lewiston, Minn.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with the motion adopted at our district conference, I am forwarding the following resolution:

"RESOLUTION ON OFFSHORE OIL DEPOSITS

"Great petroleum reserves lie off the coasts of the United States which would be developed for the benefit of all the people. The United States Supreme Court has ruled three times that oil deposits beyond the tidelands belong to all the States.

"Now an effort is again being made to take the rights to offshore oil from the Federal Government and give them to the few States that lie contiguous to these deposits.

"Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and a number of other Senators have proposed an amendment that would earmark a large portion of the funds derived from offshore oil development for educational purposes in all the States: Be it

"Resolved by the delegates of District 1, Midland Cooperative Wholesale, representing 37 cooperative organizations in southeast Minnesota, That our Representatives and Senators in Congress be urged to work and vote for the retention of existing Federal rights to offshore oil deposits, or, failing that, to support the oil-for-education amendment mentioned above.

"We also call upon the cooperatives in this district of Midland Cooperative Wholesale, as well as their thousands of members, to express to their Congressmen and Senators their concern that the rights of all the States in offshore oil resources be protected."

Cooperatively yours,

HOMER GOSS,
Secretary-Treasurer.

"RESOLUTION 2

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States ruled twice that tide oil lands are a Federal property; and

"Whereas the bill of Senator HILL, of Alabama, provides that said tide oil deposits are valued at approximately $40 billion, and also provides that royalties from the oil earnings should be used for the educational school system of the Nation; and

"Whereas the private oil interests are attempting to monopolize this oil resource by State rights: Be it

"Resolved by the Clark County Farmers Union, assembled this 5th day of February 1953 in the little Burton School House in the Evergreen district, Vancouver, Wash., that the Clark County Farmers Union express its fullest support of the Hill amendment regarding Federal rights to tide oil lands; and be it further

"Resolved, That we respect and favor the decision of the United States Supreme Court on this very important subject."

We recommend that a copy of this resolution be sent to Senators and Representatives from this State in the United States Congress, also a copy be sent to the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, also a copy to the Governor of the State of Washington, Arthur B. Langlie, and one copy to the President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, and one copy filed with the County Farmers Union secretary.

SARA LOCAL UNION RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
ALBERT BAUER.
T. A. SNYDER.
BERTHA SNYDER.

Endorsed by the Clark County Farmers Union, Inc., this 5th day of March 1953:

ALBERT MILLER.
JOHN L. HOCKINSON.
CLYDE CHRISTENSEN.
R. C. UNGEMACH.

OTTER TAIL COOPERATIVE OILS, INC.,
Fergus Falls, Minn., March 14, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand that there is a proposal before the Senate to give the income from the offshore (tidelands) oil to 3 States, California, Texas, and Louisiana.

We sincerely solicit your support in opposing any such move as it would be very unfair to the other States.

Sincerely yours,

OTTER TAIL COOPERATIVE OILS, INC.
ANTON L. RIPKA, *Manager.*

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
March 5, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The issue of whether the ownership of the vast deposits of oil which lie outside of the coastal waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean shall belong to all the States or to the three States of Louisiana, Texas, and California will soon come before Congress for its consideration.

I want to urge you to retain the ownership of these vast resources for all the States and all of the people of the United States. The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that these vast resources rightfully belong to all of the people of the United States. It would be a serious injustice to surrender the ownership of these resources to the three States.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN B. VANDERMYDE.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I finally ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me for distribution to my constituents on this question be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFSHORE OIL—A STORY OF A TREASURE HUNT: THE FACTS AND THE FABLES

What is the controversy over submerged oil land all about?

Why should oil under the sea give rise to one of the critical public-policy debates of this century?

What is at stake for every American in this offshore-oil issue?

HERE ARE THE FACTS

It is conservatively estimated that there is between $50 and $75 billion worth of oil and natural gas off the southern and southwestern coasts of our country.

That's a big stake, indeed.

To four coastal States—California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida—it's well worth working for.

But to the American people it is worth speaking and fighting for. It's theirs, by virtue of law and history.

COURT DECISIONS CLEAR

The Supreme Court has settled the question of legal title to oil in submerged lands off the coasts of the United States. In 3 different decisions, it has determined that the offshore-oil reserves belong to all of the people—not just to those of 4 States.

The Court recognized that the Federal Government has consistently claimed these seas and submerged lands since Thomas Jefferson first did so in 1793.

It recognized the century-old doctrine of international law that the Federal Government controls the marginal seas.

It recognized the chief reason for this doctrine—the Federal Government controls those seas because it defends those seas, and their defense is essential to the defense of the country.

WE ALL SHARE DEFENSE

All of the people contribute to that defense.

Why should four States be allowed to make off with resources the whole Nation protects?

But the oil is buried treasure.

As usual, when treasure is found, there are treasure hunters around to grab it if they can.

The four coastal States—and the oil companies who stand behind them—now want the Congress to ignore the Supreme Court decisions that this treasure belongs to all the people.

They want the Congress to reverse every traditional American policy involved.

They want the Congress to ignore the interests of national security.

They want Congress to give them quitclaim deeds to these submerged oil lands.

And the Congress, unless the public intervenes, may side with the treasure hunters and do it.

BETTER ALTERNATIVE OFFERED

Why not oil for education instead?

Fortunately, the Congress also has before it a sensible alternative.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It is the Anderson bill and Hill amendment providing that the Government's revenue from royalties on the submerged oil reserves shall be used for educational purposes in all the States.

That would mean at least $319 for every schoolchild in America.

It would be in keeping with the traditional American policy of using proceeds from the public lands for education of our children.

It would provide a means of meeting the pressing financial needs of education when no other source is in sight.

It would mean an estimated $165,500,000 for the schools of Minnesota alone.

Yet Congress, instead, is seriously considering giving these offshore oil rights away.

HERE ARE THE FABLES

Instead of being faced squarely, the entire issue has purposefully been confused by erroneous talk about tidelands and misleading use of the States rights battle cry as a smokescreen.

NO DISPUTE ON TIDELANDS

Tidelands are the thin strip of shore land between low and high tide. Such land isn't even involved in the offshore oil controversy. Everyone agrees that this land belongs to the States.

But the four States—behind the misnomer of "tidelands"—also want to claim the oil reserves which lie beyond the tidelands—beyond even the historic national 3-mile limit, out in the area known as the Continental Shelf.

None of these States ever claimed any rights in these offshore waters until discovery of oil.

They have claimed more and more, however, as larger oil reserves have been found to be further out in the Continental Shelf.

Now, they are asking control over the ocean out to 150 miles from the shore, all under the disguise of tidelands and States' rights.

How much more ridiculous can they be, when international law only recognizes national sovereignty out to a 3-mile limit?

But that's the tidelands fable.

THE RIGHT OF EQUALITY

The four States say the Supreme Court decision violates States' rights. Yet, from the beginning of our Nation, no such State right to the marginal waters has ever been recognized.

The constitutional basis of States' rights is an assumed equality between the States.

This equality will not be preserved by turning over from $50 billion to $75 billion worth of Federal oil to four States.

It will, however, be preserved if all the States share equitably in the proceeds.

All of the States control their tidelands; none control more.

Why should four States ask for control of up to 150 seaward miles beyond the tidelands?

Under the Constitution, all States have entered the Union on an equal footing with the other States. Yet Texas now claims she reserved the ocean to herself, despite the fact that she entered the Union with no reservations.

That's the States' rights fable—a repudiation of the fundamental doctrine of the equality of the States.

JUST WHO IS TRYING TO GRAB?

Who is doing the grabbing?

These submerged lands have always belonged to the Federal Government. The Supreme Court says they still belong to the United States, not just the four adjacent States.

Yet the four States, in trying to seize this rich source of revenue for themselves, are cleverly making it appear to the American people that the United States is trying to grab something away from the States.

How can we be grabbing something that already belongs to all of us? How can we be taking anything away from the States when they don't own it now nor never have?

But that's another of the fables—the fable of who is grabbing what from whom.

HERE'S WHAT WE RISK

The national security of our people is at stake. Today, in a mechanized, mobilized, and uncertain world, the United States is a net importer of oil.

We desperately need an overall petroleum policy, and our military forces must be assured of oil.

Is this any time to consider giving up control of offshore oil reserves?

ALL PUBLIC LANDS PERILED

Other national interests are at stake, too. All of the public lands of the United States are threatened.

The so-called tidelands bill is only the first step of a thoroughgoing attack. Already, two bills are before the Congress to turn over other of the public lands to the States.

Since the days of Theodore Roosevelt, the United States has painstakingly built a conservation policy which is coherent and in the national interest.

Now, as a result of the tidelands quitclaim bills and other attacks on the public lands, that policy faces wanton destruction—at a time when it urgently needs extension in the interests of national security.

HERE'S WHAT WE CAN GAIN

Since 1785, our Government has devoted proceeds from public land for aid to education. That policy has given us the world's finest land grant college system.

Yet today, our entire public school system is in grave financial danger, due to higher costs, a growing population, and the fiscal demands for defense. It is estimated, as a result of a nation-wide survey of school construction needs, that Minnesota will need over $165 million in the next 10 years for school construction purposes.

HOW CAN NEEDS BE MET?

Today, in Minnesota, our State legislature is at its wit's end to raise money for education. If it appropriates all funds available for school construction and the school districts exercised their full bond issue powers, Minnesota would still fall short $46 million for school construction purposes alone.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for localities to vote bond issues for education. Many local governments are at their millage limits, and cannot raise more money.

A spiraling population makes the situation even more critical.

But our rich oil reserves under the sea can provide ample means of meeting this educational crises, at no additional cost to the American taxpayer. Minnesota school construction needs mould be fully met by the oil-for-education proposal.

ARE WE BEING FAIR?

Nobody wants to see the four coastal States deprived of anything they are entitled to. Everybody wants to see them get a square deal.

Under the Anderson bill, the four coastal States are still being favored rather than discriminated against.

The bill provides that the four States, which by accident of geography are closest to the oil resources, will get 37½ percent of the royalties from oil produced within the 3-mile limit, plus the same fair share of the rest of the royalties as apportioned among all States according to school enrollment.

FOLLOWS MINERAL-LEASING PRECEDENT

The Anderson bill establishes the division of royalties on the same fair basis as established in the Mineral Leasing Act for leasing of mineral rights on other publicly-owned lands—37½ percent to the States, the rest to the Nation as a whole.

The Hill oil-for-education amendment, in turn, provides that the Federal Government would deposit its revenues from the oil in a special fund to be set aside for the educational needs of our youth.

The coastal States would get a special slice of the revenue first, then share equally in the rest of the distribution. As a result, under the combined Anderson-Hill proposal, the coastal States would get about $100 more per child than other States of the Union.

Isn't that fair enough?

But it doesn't satisfy the four coastal States. In defiance of the Supreme Court, they still want this valuable source of revenue turned over to them, leaving the educational crisis in the rest of the country right where it is.

Who is being fair and who is being unfair?

TIME FOR THE SHOWDOWN

The moral right of general welfare and the legal right of established national sovereignty are both clearly on the side of the people in asking Congress to reject the 4-State grab and adopt the fair-to-everybody Anderson bill with the Hill oil-for-education amendment.

The American people have the record of American history and American law on their side in their fight to preserve their public lands, to educate their children, and to provide for their defense.

This record and the entire tradition of our public policy and general welfare are now being called in question. They are in danger of being annulled.

Past and future are both in jeopardy.

The majority of our people are once again having to fight for the public interest.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATORS OF HOMES FOR THE AGED

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution unanimously adopted by the Twin City Association of Administrators of Homes for the Aged, Minnesota, concerning earning power of the aged be included in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA ASSOCIATION OF ADMINISTRATORS OF HOMES FOR THE AGED,
March 7, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At a meeting of the Twin City Association of Administrators of Homes for the Aged, held January 27, it was unanimously voted that a resolution be sent to the Members of the Senate and the House from Minnesota, relative to the recipients of old-age assistance grants.

It seemed strongly indicated to us that for a recipient of such a grant to be able to earn up to $300 per year would not only give him financial assistance, but would stimulate his interests, improve his morale, and in addition, relieve the labor shortage in many instances; consequently, we are urging that such a bill be passed by Congress. We are directing this resolution to you, knowing of your high interest in the problems of aging and your protective attitude toward those who have attained advanced age.

Most sincerely yours,
Mrs. CAMPBELL KEITH,
President.

AIR MAIL SUBSIDY SEPARATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, the air mail subsidy separation bill, on behalf of myself and

the following 23 distinguished Senators of both parties: The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

This bill is the text which was favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—House Report 3041 of the 81st Congress—which bill, with only small changes, unanimously passed the House on December 11, 1950. Our new Senate bill, with the single exception of a technical amendment inserted on page 5, at the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], is also the companion to House bill 131, introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts, Representative HESELTON.

Four years ago, Mr. President, the bipartisan Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch unanimously recommended that any subsidies to commercial airlines be separated from compensation for the cost of carrying air mail. On the same day when this Hoover Commission report was transmitted to the Congress I introduced in the House a bill—H. R. 2908, of the 81st Congress—to carry out this reform, which, with the cooperation of my colleague, Representative HESELTON, and with the strong support of Members of both parties, unanimously passed the House in the 81st Congress. However, because the bill came to the Senate toward the end of the session, the Senate was not then able to act on it.

I hope that this new bill, having the strong support of so many outstanding Senators of both parties, will successfully pass this Congress.

Back in the 80th Congress the Senate Appropriations Committee made a report—Senate Report 1389, 80th Congress—submitted by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] containing this recommendation:

> The present bill contains $58,583,000 for payment of costs of carrying air mail and the subsidy to commercial airlines. The subsidy represents the major portion of this amount, and has no direct relationship to the cost of air-mail transportation. * * * The rate of air-mail transportation is not fixed by the Post Office Department but by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and is intended to represent the amount which, added to other revenues, is sufficient to guarantee to the airline in question profit on their venture. The Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is the authority for this arbitrary charge against the Federal Treasury.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The committee recommends to the appropriate legislative committees that a comprehensive study be made of the administration of the subsidy provision of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with a view to enacting legislation which will divorce subsidy from the legitimate air-mail transportation costs so that the true picture can be made available to the American people.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate, Mr. President, to the wisdom of this report by the senior Senator from Oregon. I should also like to point out that during the approximate 5 years since this recommendation was made to the Congress, the amounts involved in so-called "air mail pay" have very substantially increased, to the point where now we are told that the requested postal appropriation for the fiscal year 1954 contains $134,000,000 to be given to the airlines under the misleading label of "mail pay." In response to continuous congressional questioning, the Civil Aeronautics Board has now admitted that of this vast sum, no more than $63,000,000 can be considered compensation for mail services actually rendered. By subtracting the second figure from the first, Mr. President, we can see that the difference is $71,000,000 per year, which is simply a hidden subsidy to the recipient airlines, a subsidy given without the knowledge or consent of the taxpayers.

Our bill provides that in the future airlines will be paid fair and reasonable compensation for carrying the United States mail, at a rate not to exceed the cost of services actually rendered by those airlines, plus a fair return. Anything over and above this mail compensation will have to be a direct subsidy out in the open, instead of hidden, and will have to be charged to the Civil Aeronautics Board, instead of to the Post Office Department. These subsidies will have to be reviewed each fiscal year by the Congress, as was specifically recommended by the Hoover Commission. Our bill increases the emphasis on national defense, instead of on deficits, as the standard for granting subsidies.

Furthermore, our bill requires an annual public report to the Congress on who is given how much mail pay and who is given how much subsidy, and why. As a result of our reform, the public, the Congress, and the President will know the amounts of the subsidies, and will have a chance to pass on the purposes for which they are used.

This bill exactly carries out the recommendations of another report by the Senate Committee on Appropriations—Senate Report 310 of the 81st Congress—submitted by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]:

> The committee calls the attention of Congress to the incongruity of charging the Post Office Department appropriation, under the guise of cost of carrying the mails by air, huge sums of money running into millions of dollars which, in truth, have no relation whatever to the costs of air-mail transportation but, in fact, are simply subsidies to the recipient airlines. The committee believes that the Civil Aeronautics Authority Act of 1938, as amended, should be further amended so as to provide for the payment of this subsidy under its present destination and, thus, to relieve the Post Office Department from being required to carry the item as a part of its appropriation. Such change in the 1938 law will also serve to let the Congress and the people know the nature and extent of this subsidy.

In addition, this bill was favored by the report of the Senate Committee on Small Business—Senate Report 540, 82d Congress—made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]:

> Further, your committee advises immediate enactment of legislation to separate airlines subsidy from compensation for the cost of carrying air mail.

The bill we are today introducing, Mr. President, has been supported in two sets of hearings before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and in two sets of hearings before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, by the Commerce Department, the Post Office Department, the Budget Bureau, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., the taxpayers organizations of a great many States, numerous veterans associations, other public-spirited groups, and individual citizens. There has been no opposition to this reform, save from some of the subsidized airlines.

Some of the subsidized airlines have urged and are urging upon the Congress that no legislation be enacted to separate subsidies from air mail pay, and that the subject be left to administrative handling by the Civil Aeronautics Board. There are two fundamental difficulties with this procedure, Mr. President:

First. Such a plan would leave airlines subsidies as part of the Post Office Department appropriation, thus unnecessarily increasing the postal deficit and also depriving the Congress of an opportunity to vote upon these subsidies as a separate and open appropriation item.

Second. The reports of the Civil Aeronautics Board indicate that the Board has not estimated proper mail compensation on the basis of a full allocation of the cost of the airlines between mail, passenger, and freight services. The Hoover Commission recommended that "the mail rates should no longer include any need for subsidy element, but should be based on the service rendered. They should reflect a fair allocation of costs by the mail, passenger, and freight services." This recommendation is not carried out in the administrative reports of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and indeed this Board has no obligation to do so in the absence of a legislative directive. However, this recommendation of the Hoover Commission is amply carried out in section 2 of our bill being introduced today.

Questions have also arisen as to the difference between our bill, S. 1360, and Senate bill 908. While both bills have similar titles, their content is very different; and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum on the differences between our bill and Senate bill 908.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON DIFFERENCES BETWEEN S. 1360 (THE AIR MAIL SUBSIDY SEPARATION BILL OF THE 83D CONG.) INTRODUCED BY MR. KENNEDY, FOR HIMSELF, MR. AIKEN, MR. CLEMENTS, MR. COOPER, MR. CORDON, MR. DOUGLAS, MR. FERGUSON, MR. GILLETTE, MR. HENNINGS, MR. HUMPHREY, MR. IVES, MR. JACKSON, MR. JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA, MR. KEFAUVER, MR. KILGORE, MR. LANGER, MR. LEHMAN, MR. MANSFIELD, MR. MAYBANK, MR. MUNDT, MR. MURRAY, MR. SCHOEPPEL, MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY, AND MR. SPARKMAN, AND S. 908, INTRODUCED BY MR. JOHNSON OF COLORADO TO PROVIDE FOR THE SEPARATION OF SUBSIDY FROM AIR MAIL PAY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Our bill, S. 1360, is designed to carry out the recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commission for an effective separation of airline subsidies from mail pay, and was originally introduced on the same day, February 21, 1949, that the Hoover Commission Report on the Post Office was released to the Congress. In accordance with the Hoover Commission recommendations, our bill defines mail compensation as being fair and reasonable and not exceeding the cost to the airline of rendering mail service plus a fair return; this cost standard is applied equally to all airlines; anything above this mail compensation is considered as subsidy and will have to be a separate appropriation item charged to CAB, and not the Post Office, and subject to annual review by the Congress. In addition, our bill requires annual public reports by CAB.

S. 908 is quite different and its conflict both with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and with our bill is as follows:

1. Contracts: The Hoover Commission recommended that "losses and subsidies should be made clear each fiscal year and passed upon by the Congress." (Hoover Commission Report on Federal Business Enterprises, p. 16.) This recommendation is carried out in our bill, S. 1360, which provides that any subsidies to commercial airlines will have to be a separate appropriation item voted on each year by the Congress. By contrast, S. 908 grants the CAB additional power to give out several-year subsidy contracts to certain airlines. This provision naturally gets around annual congressional review of the subsidies and weakens the control which the Congress should rightfully have over Federal expenditures.

In support of the principles contained in our bill, S. 1360, as distinct from S. 908, I quote the following report made to the House by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]:

"It is the recommendation of the committee that the subsidy element in airmail pay be separated. It has been suggested that this could be arrived at by accounting procedures in the Post Office Department. However, this procedure would not eliminate the basic objection which is that, under the present situation, we have an administrative board allocating public funds through which basic public policies are established without action directly by the Congress. The better solution is to make provisions for subsidies directly to the Civil Aeronautics Board."

2. Cost standard: The Hoover Commission recommended that "The mail rates should no longer include any need or subsidy element but should be based on the service rendered. They should reflect a fair allocation of costs between mail, passenger and freight services." (Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Regulatory Commissions, page 77). Our bill faithfully carries out this recommendation by providing that henceforth mail pay shall be fair and reasonable and shall not exceed the reasonable and necessary cost of rendering mail service, plus a fair return. (S. 1360, p. 3, lines 5–10.) In addition, S. 1360 (p. 6, lines 14–19) provides that these cost figures shall be secured through a fair cost allocation system. By contrast, S. 908 provides no cost standard at all for mail pay. It will be impossible effectively to divide mail pay from subsidy unless a definite dividing line, like the cost standard, is established. Otherwise, it will be easy for the present mail payments to airlines to be whitewashed as mail compensation and we will be right back where we are now, with the airlines charging the post office, on the average, $2.00 for $1.00 of service. Furthermore, S. 908 contains a special favor for our international airlines (p. 5, lines 12–16) providing that their "mail pay" shall be no less than the highest rates permitted anywhere in the world under the Universal Postal Union. The practical result of this provision would be to proclaim as being simply "mail pay" a price for carrying letter mail of about $1.91 per ton-mile (meaning 1 ton moved 1 mile) which is almost three times the rate charged by those same airlines for luxury passengers. We would therefore, under S. 908, see the ridiculous result of airlines being paid three times as much for mail as luxury passengers even though the sacks of mail do not enjoy the comfortable seats, the attentions of the stewardesses, and the champagne which is provided on transatlantic flights.

The Post Office Department has officially estimated that this provision of S. 908 would cost the Post Office $15 million per year more than would the mail pay provisions of S. 1360.

3. Eligibility to apply for subsidies: The Hoover Commission advocated a complete divorce between the carriage of mail and the payment of subsidies, and this is the effect of S. 1360. By contrast, S. 908 (p. 7, line 25 through p. 8, line 2) limits the carriers eligible even to apply to the Government for subsidies to carriers holding mail certificates. All of the carriers holding mail certificates are, incidentally, members of the Air Transport Association. In objecting to such a limitation, and in support of the principle contained in our bill S. 1360 (the same as H. R. 131 by Mr. HESELTON), the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce commented: "The committee feels that, with the separation of subsidy from airmail pay made by the bill, there is no logical basis for limiting the class of air carriers eligible for subsidy to those holding mail certificates, particularly in view of the fact that subsidy determinations are to be made with respect to furthering not 1 national objective but 3; that is, the national defense and the commerce of the United States, as well as the postal service" (H. Rept. 3041, 81st Cong., p. 8). In choosing between the more restrictive language of S. 908 (only carriers holding mail certificates) and the language now contained in our bill, S. 1360 (any certificated carriers, meaning any carriers holding any type of certificate, regardless of whether or not mail is specified), the Defense Department stated (letter of March 28, 1952, to Congressman HESELTON): "The Department of Defense would prefer that any certificated air carrier be made eligible to apply for subsidy. If mail pay is to have an actual service or use basis, there would seem to be no reason to relate separate subsidy payments to the carrying of mail."

Not only does our bill, S. 1360, carry out this recommendation of the Department of Defense, but also it makes national defense the No. 1 test for the granting of subsidies, whereas no such priority for defense is contained in S. 908.

4. Compulsory tender of mail regardless of cost: S. 908 prevents the Postmaster General from withholding mail from one flight because another flight is cheaper, even though there would be no faster delivery of the mail to the addressee. Furthermore, S. 908 (p. 2, line 21) includes an artificial minimum-weight limit, which the Postmaster General has denounced as likely to involve substantial payments to airlines for fictitious loads. These objectionable provisions do not appear in S. 1360.

5. Public reports: Our bill (S. 1360, p. 7, lines 4–11) requires the CAB to report annually to the Congress on who got how much mail pay, and who got how much subsidy, and why. This requirement is necessary to carry out the recommendation of the Hoover Commission that subsidies be brought out into the open so that "the President, the Congress, and the public may know what the amounts of the subsidies are." This requirement for annual reports on the justification for subsidy payments is omitted from S. 908.

S. 908 is not an effective air mail subsidy separation bill.

On the other hand, S. 1360 provides for effective separation of airline subsidies from mail pay in a fair and logical manner, and its passage would place on the statute books another valuable reform recommended by the Hoover Commission and by six congressional committees under the chairmanship of men of both parties.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that our bill S. 1360, does not in any way prohibit subsidies to airlines or cut off subsidies. Our bill simply brings them out into the open and leaves it up to Congress each year to determine whether to raise or lower the amount of public money to be devoted to subsidizing commercial airlines.

In other words, Mr. President, our bill is not antiairline, and does not eliminate subsidies, but simply brings them out into the open.

Mr. President, the taxpayers of the United States are now carrying the heaviest load in peacetime American history. On all sides we hear about the need for economy and efficiency in the Federal Government.

We have here one bill which can reduce the postal deficit by $71,000,000 a year and can bring these hidden subsidies out into the open, where the taxpayers, through their elected Representatives, may have an opportunity to pass on them each year. I believe this is one simple and logical reform which we should make for greater economy and efficiency in our Federal Government.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have the air mail subsidy separation bill, which I am introducing at this time, on behalf of myself and 23 of my colleagues, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1360) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Air Mail Subsidy Separation Act of 1953."

RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL AND SUBSIDY FOR ESSENTIAL AIRCRAFT OPERATION

SEC. 2. (a) Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 406 of the Civil Aeronautics Act

of 1938, as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"RATES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL AND SUBSIDY FOR ESSENTIAL AIRCRAFT OPERATION

"Authority to fix compensatory rates

"SEC. 406. (a) (1) The Civil Aeronautics Board is empowered and directed, upon its own initiative or upon petition to the Postmaster General or an air carrier, to determine and fix from time to time, after notice and hearing, fair and reasonable rates of compensation for the transportation of mail by aircraft, the facilities used and useful therefor, and the services connected therewith (including the transportation of mail by an air carrier by other means than aircraft whenever such transportation is incidental to the transportation of mail by aircraft or is made necessary by conditions of emergency arising from aircraft operation), by each holder of a certificate authorizing the transportation of mail by aircraft, and to make such rates effective from such date, after the institution of the proceeding under this subsection, as it shall determine to be proper; to prescribe the method or methods, by aircraft-mile, pound-mile, weight, space, or any combination thereof, or otherwise, for ascertaining such rates of compensation; and to fix different rates for different air carriers or classes of air carriers, or different classes of service, or on the basis of any other reasonable classification of carriers, services, routes and route segments, or any combination thereof. The rates so determined and fixed shall be published by the Board and shall be paid by the Postmaster General from appropriations for the transportation of mail by aircraft.

"(2) The rates determined and fixed under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall in no event exceed the reasonable and necessary cost to the air carrier, under honest, economical, and efficient management, of the mail transportation services rendered or to be rendered, including a fair return.

"(3) The Board is authorized to issue orders, with or without hearing, prescribing temporary rates for the transportation of mail pending determination of final rates. Such temporary rates shall not be considered final for any period and shall be superseded by the final rates fixed for the periods during which the temporary rates were in effect.

"Recommendations as to rates

"(b) (1) Any petition for the fixing of rates under subsection (a) of this section shall state and support in detail the rates recommended by the petition as being fair and reasonable.

"(2) The Postmaster General shall introduce as a part of the record in all proceedings under subsection (a) of this section a comprehensive statement of all service to be required of the air carrier and such other information in his possession as he deems, or as may be deemed by the Board, to be material to the inquiry.

"(3) The burden of proof in any proceeding under subsection (a) of this section which is initiated by petition shall be with the petitioner.

"Subsidy for essential aircraft operation

"(c) (1) The Board is empowered, upon its own initiative, or upon the petition of the air carrier, to make, after notice and hearing, subsidy payments to a certificated air carrier in amounts determined by the Board to be essential (when taken together with all the other actual and potential revenues of the air carrier) to enable the air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the national defense, the commerce of the United States, or the postal service. The Board is empowered to make subsidy payments for individual air carriers or classes of air carriers, or on the basis of any other reasonable classification of carriers, services, routes and route segments, or any combination thereof, and to prescribe the method or methods of such payments and duration of period for which applicable. The Board may make such subsidy payments effective from such date, after the institution of the proceeding under this subsection, as it shall determine to be proper. Payments under this subsection shall be made by the Board out of sums appropriated to the Board for such purpose, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

"(2) Every petition for the fixing of a subsidy shall state and support in detail the amount the petitioner believes that he is entitled to under the subsidy provision of this section and the carrier shall have the burden of establishing the amount of subsidy payment, if any, which is required for its operations under the standard established by this act. The fact that an air carrier has been granted a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing it to offer certain services shall not be deemed conclusive of the issue as to whether such services are sufficiently required in the interest of the national defense, the commerce of the United States, or the postal service, to justify the amount of subsidy that would be required to keep such services in operation.

"(3) The Board is authorized, with or without hearing but upon a showing by the air carrier or carriers concerned of essentiality and urgency, to make temporary subsidy payments pending the determination of final subsidy payments. Temporary subsidy payments so made shall not be considered final, and when final subsidy payments are determined, they shall cover any period with respect to which a temporary subsidy payment was made and shall supersede such temporary payment for such period."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only with respect to (1) the transportation of mail, or (2) operations in air transportation occurring after June 30, 1953.

ALLOCATION OF AIR CARRIER RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES

SEC. 3. Section 407 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) By inserting "(1)" after "(d)"; and

(2) By inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) On or before June 30, 1953, and from time to time thereafter, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall, after notice and hearing, prescribe standards by which air carriers, in keeping their accounts, records, and memoranda, shall allocate receipts from, and expenditures for, the air transportation services rendered by them. From and after July 1, 1953, it shall be unlawful for any air carrier, in keeping any account, record, or memorandum (other than any additional account, record, or memorandum kept pursuant to the proviso of paragraph (1) of this subsection), to allocate any receipt from, or expenditure for, any air transportation service it renders in any manner other than a manner which conforms to the standards prescribed pursuant to this paragraph."

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN ANNUAL REPORTS

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 206 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after "civil aeronautics" a comma and the following: "including data relative to the mail payments and subsidy payments, both in the aggregate and on an individual basis, made under this act with a separate analysis of the bases upon which each such mail payment and each such subsidy payment was provided."

STUDIES AND REPORT

SEC. 5. (a) The Civil Aeronautics Board is authorized to make studies in connection with any of the provisions of this act. In the conduct of such studies the Board is authorized, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes to enter into contracts or other arrangements, or modifications thereof, for the carrying on of such studies by such persons or organizations as may be designated by the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the chairmen of the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

(b) On or before July 1, 1953, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall, on the basis of a comprehensive study, render a written report to the Congress on what aggregate sums it estimates will be required during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, (1) to provide fair compensation for services to be rendered by air carriers in the carriage of the mails, in accordance with the provisions of section 406 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended by this act, and (2) to provide for payment of essential subsidy, in accordance with section 406 (c) of such act, as amended by this act. Such report shall include a study of the potential revenues from all forms of air traffic and of the potential economies which could be achieved in airline costs, as well as such other factors as may be pertinent to the development, with the least possible expenditures by the United States, of an efficient and economical air transport industry to the extent and of the character and quality required for the national defense, the commerce of the United States, and the postal service.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Civil Aeronautics Board such sums, not to exceed $300,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, I should like to ask the majority leader what he has in mind for the program on Friday.

Mr. TAFT. So far as I know, the business of the Senate on Friday will be purely routine.

I understand that the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, which was reported today by the Foreign Relations Committee, probably cannot be taken up on Friday, because of the need for preparing and having printed the record of the committee hearing; and it will not be printed by Friday. So that nomination will not be taken up then.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the intention of the majority leader to have the nomination taken up on Monday?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; on Monday.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Ohio for the information.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, March 20, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 18, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Walter S. Robertson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

AIR UNIVERSITY

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Commanding General, Air University, with rank of lieutenant general and date of rank April 11, 1951, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Hepner, Thomas Gabriel, 18794A.
Brennan, George Joseph, 18795A.

To be captains

AIR FORCE

Shepard, Leland Casper, Jr., 21435A.
Aikens, Edwin Corry, 20035A.
Kuehl, Albert Robert, 21436A.
Gibson, Ralph Duane, 17284A.
Murray, Francis Peter, 21437A.
Dean, Louis Jefferson, 17285A.
Keeler, William Joseph, 21783A.
Jones, Arthur Meriwether, 17286A.
Anthony, William Harold, 22993A.
Weatherford, Ross Holmes, Jr., 17288A.
Buchta, Joseph, 20036A.
DeGrothy, Cornell, 21784A.
Messmer, Eugene John, 17289A.
Hunter, Cedric Vernon, 17290A.
Kult, Milton Louis, 17291A.
Carroll, Bill Junior, 17292A.
×Wier, Charlie Younger, 21785A.
Gasiewicz, Sigmund Ignacy, 22994A.
Hurn, James Lee, 17294A.
Mutch, Alex Young, 17295A.
Bridgers, Sam, Jr., 17296A.
Jewell, Harold Roger, 17297A.
×Mackie, John Victor, 17298A.
Adair, Luther Ewell, Jr., 17299A.
Cathcart, Charles Earl, 17300A.
Joseph, Adolph Davis, Jr., 17301A.
Kelly, Charles Edward, 22995A.
Bryan, Donald Williams, 17302A.
MacKinnon, Robert Louis, 17303A.
Cunningham, Arthur Sylvester, Jr., 17304A.
Burcham, Lee Aubrey, 17305A.
O'Neil, Earl William, Jr., 17306A.
×Miller, Sumner Stark, 20037A.
Barr, Thomas James, 17307A.
Augustyn, Frank Joseph, 17308A.
Immig, Richard Graham, 17309A.
Crisp, Harold Newark, Jr., 17310A.
Grossmiller, William John, 17311A.
Shackelford, Dave Seale, Jr., 17312A.
Carroll, Thomas Lee, 17313A.
Lindeman, Jack Ray, 17314A.
Smith, Clyde Barton, 17315A.
Posvar, Wesley Wentz, 17316A.
Poytress, Earl Francis, 17317A.
Creveling, Louis Gregory, 17318A.
Temple, William Alan, 17319A.
Bryan, Robert Howell, 19582A.
Strain, Bailey Toland, 17320A.
Adams, George Talmage, Jr., 17321A.
Stewart, Robert Benfred, 17322A.
McKinney, Joseph Tomlinson, 17323A.
Harper, Gilbert Stewart, Jr., 17324A.
Lengnick, Roger Horace, 17326A.
Wheat, Allen Albert, 17327A.
Yeoman, Wayne Allen, 17328A.
Cahill, Laurence James, Jr., 17329A.
Bellis, Benjamin Neil, 17330A.
Welch, Stanford Alden, 17331A.
Studer, William Francis, 17332A.
Blazina, Thomas David, 17333A.
Naleid, Jerome Frederick, 17334A.
Bradburn, David Denison, 17335A.
Adams, Ranald Trevor, Jr., 17336A.
×Tallman, Kenneth Lee, 17337A.
Cole, Frank Ellsworth, 17338A.
Atkinson, Anderson Watkins, 17339A.
Christensen, Everett Eugene, 17340A.
Hafer, Frederick LeRoy, 17341A.
Allen, Lew, Jr., 17342A.
Colladay, Martin Grimes, 17344A.
Logan, Lewis Benjamin Castle, 17345A.
Lyman, Walter Alfred, 17346A.
Knight, Harry Russell, 17347A.
Wright, Robert Kenneth, 17348A.
Sherman, Milton, 17350A.
Hildebrandt, James Edwin, 17351A.
Buckley, Robert Clarence, 17352A.
Jernigan, Ernest Deloy, Jr., 17353A.
Williams, Henry Kirk, 3d, 17354A.
Evans, William John, 17355A.
Hauenstein, Charles Judd, 17358A.
Brothers, William Wesley, Jr., 17359A.
Lobdell, Harrison, Jr., 17360A.
Gorman, Robert Thomas, 17361A.
Chapman, Kenneth Richard, 17362A.
Brechwald, Edward Joseph, 17363A.
Williams, Harold, Jr., 17364A.
Hopkins, Herbert Ziegler, Jr., 17365A.
Fryberger, Philip Henry, 17366A.
Lester, Frank Gibson, 17367A.
×Heiberg, Harrison Howell Dodge, Jr., 17368A.
Lusk, Joe Fenton, 17369A.
Barricklow, John Alan, 17370A.
Deatrick, Eugene Peyton, Jr., 17371A.
×Baugh, Hale, 17372A.
Dresser, Richard Lloyd, 17373A.
Hackney, Donald Ingram, 17374A.
Upland, Robert Theodore, 17375A.
Berge, Truman Kent, Jr., 17376A.
Felices, Salvador Enrique, 17377A.
Smith, Sam Hugh, 17378A.
Dunlap, Lloyd Leslie, Jr., 17380A.
Dosh, Robert Nathaniel, Jr., 17382A.
Burgess, Richard Benton, 17383A.
Clemenson, Robert Carey, 17385A.
Baisley, William Denton, 17386A.
Lundholm, Donald Alfred, 17388A.
Molchan, John Eugene, 17391A.
Galt, Richard Russell, 17392A.
×Poe, Bryce, 2d, 17393A.
Jenkins, William Henry, 17394A.
×Shawe, Hamilton Bruce, Jr., 17395A.
MacWilliams, Malcolm Means, 17396A.
Wayne, Robert Earl, 17397A.
Hamilton, Francis Frazee, 17400A.
Doolittle, John Prescott, 17402A.
Tribolet, Robert Webb, 17404A.
Hunt, Senour, 17405A.
Pitts, John Emmett, Jr., 17406A.
×Harton, William Martin, Jr., 17407A.
Wilson, Donald, Jr., 17408A.
Griffin, William Aiken, 17409A.
Jones, Gerald Marshall, 17410A.
Dorman, George Stanton, 17411A.
×Nemetz, Albert Michael, 17414A.
×Minor, John Max, 17415A.
Plank, David Heber, 17417A.
White, Richard Taylor, 17418A.
Umlauf, John Louis, 17419A.
Lowry, Robert Mason, Jr., 17420A.
Zeh, Theodore George, Jr., 17421A.
Stringer, Elbert Madison, 17423A.
McBride, Benjamin Ransom, 17424A.
Roddenberry, Harry H., Jr., 17425A.
Kimball, Jack Quentin, 17426A.
Paschall, James Ernest, 17427A.
Birdsall, Alan Homer, 17429A.
Richards, Marion Rich, 17430A.
Kellogg, Richard Allan, 17431A.
Hairston, Guy Edward, Jr., 17432A.
Hutto, Merl Galbreath, 17433A.
×Longarini, Edmond Charles, 17434A.
Clements, Philip Lee, Jr., 17435A.
Bodie, Jack Lowman, 17436A.
Denniston, Clyde Roscoe, Jr., 17437A.
Bowers, Grayson Hunter, Jr., 17438A.
Safford, Philip Riviere, 17439A.
Turner, Richard Hugh, 18060A.
Hilovsky, Steve Edward, 17441A.
Langstaff, Thomas Corbett, 17442A.
Withers, William Price, Jr., 17443A.
Carbine, James Thomas, Jr., 17445A.
Castle, Johnny Rudd, 17446A.
Green, Jesse Edward, 17447A.
×McPhee, Harry John, Jr., 17448A.
Grier, Samuel, 3d, 17449A.
Lembeck, Edward Adams, 2d, 17451A.
Burke, Robert Oscar, 17453A.
Reed, William Preston, 17454A.
Carnright, Richard Glenn, 17455A.
×Lacouture, Harold Francis, 19671A.
×Dobbs, Robert Lee, 17456A.
Korn, Alden Davis, 17457A.
Wilson, Robert Seedorf, 17458A.
Walsh, Robert Arthur, 17459A.
×Skladzien, Thaddeus Stephen, 17460A.
Weber, Marvin Octavius, Jr., 17461A.
Minnich, E. Scott, 17462A.
Whitfield, Raymond Palmer, Jr., 17465A.
Messmore, Donald Morgan, Jr., 17466A.
Gordon, Lawrence Norman, 17467A.
Gilbert, Raymond Harlan, Jr., 18092A.
Hughes, James Donald, 17468A.
Schmitt, John Jacob, Jr., 17470A.
Furuholmen, James Bjarne, 17471A.
Hudspeth, Roy Ritter, 17472A.
Cameron, Burton Gordon, 17473A.
×Wiedman, Charles Orion, 17474A.
×Moore, Arthur Raymond, Jr., 17475A.
×Yancey, William Burbridge, Jr., 17476A.
Miller, James Robert, 17477A.
Feibelman, Max Milton, 17478A.
Eichenberg, Robert John, 17479A.
×Berry, Waldron, 17480A.
Buckingham, Charles Edward, 17483A.
Newell, Richard Gordon, 17484A.
Horton, Clarence Frost, Jr., 17486A.
Ruggiero, Charles, Jr., 17487A.
×Clapp, William Lefayette, Jr., 17489A.
Fox, Harold Paul, Jr., 17490A.
Nelson, George Joseph, 17491A.
McMillan, Cornelius, Jr., 17492A.
Gordon, Mose Williams, Jr., 17493A.
Brosius, Charles William, 17494A.
×Rountree, Fred Brinson, 17495A.
Reed, Marvin Chapman, 17496A.
Memminger, Charles Gustavus, 17499A.
Melo, Eugene Emil, 17501A.
Bartholf, John Copeland, 17502A.
×Roney, William Rogers, 17503A.
Hopkins, Philip Bird, Jr., 17504A.
Harris, Edgar Starr, Jr., 17505A.
Martin, John Alexander, 17507A.
Norris, Paul Maxfield, 17510A.
×Walker, Robert Lawrence, 17511A.
Stees, Hubert Sheldon, Jr., 17513A.
Bowley, William Theodore, 19944A.
Parsons, Charles Henry, 2d, 17514A.
Chatfield, James David Lloyd, 17515A.
VanSickle, Earl Rosenquist, 17516A.
Jackson, John Wallace, 17517A.
Daye, Thomas Maldwyn, 17518A.
Flavin, Michael John, 17519A.
Schmidt, Julius Henry, Jr., 17521A.
Freshwater, Robert Earl, 17522A.
Zuppan, Lawrence Louis, Jr., 17523A.
Bajcura, Orestes Methodius, 17524A.
Norwood, Billie Jack, 17525A.
Murphy, Robert Denslow, 17526A.
Trexler, David Howerter, 17527A.
French, James Raymond, 17528A.
Potter, Campbell McLeod, 17529A.
Baxter, William Dee, 17530A.
Hicks, Arlie Hugh, Jr., 17531A.

MEDICAL

Clark, Ernest James, 20059A.
Wright, Walter Dick, 23063A.
Does, Charles Wordsworth, 22954A.
Crabtree, Sam Ferrell, 22987A.
George, John Wendell, 22555A.
Reynolds, George Edward, 22955A.
Gregory, R. D., Jr., 22956A.
Donnell, Alonzo McDonnell, Jr., 22957A.
McGrade, Hugh Patrick, 24123A.
Dewey, Walter Webber, 22958A.
Adams, Robert Harold, 22960A.
Schwarting, Bland Hugh, 22959A.
Fraysse, Louis Augustus, 3d, 22961A.
Austin, George Nicolo, 22556A.
Talley, Thomas Peter, 22962A.
Spiro, Franklyn Cyrus, 22964A.
Staples, Pelham Porter, Jr., 23064A.

Kruse, Francis, Jr., 22558A.
Hensen, James Paul, 22966A.
Smith, Arthur Gene, 22560A.
Levine, Robert, 22559A.
Graf, John Edward, 22967A.
Simmons, Frederic Rudolph, Jr., 22561A.
Eastwood, Herbert Kendrick, Jr., 23065A.
Van Pelt, James Fred, Jr., 24124A.
Hough, Jerald Pat, 23169A.
Sanford, Clarence Edward, 23066A.

DENTAL

×Sundberg, Paul Vernon, Jr., 19846A.
Strong, William Lawrence, 19968A.

VETERINARY

Dalziel, George Teddy, 21605A.

CHAPLAINS

Alt, Eugene Runkle, 23202A.
Shelton, David Knight, 21863A.
Puseman, Edmund Alexander, 21864A.
Carlock, Freddie Willard, 23203A.
Terry, Roy Morton, 21429A.

To be first lieutenants

AIR FORCE

×Collier, James Carlton, Jr., 20050A.
×Refson, Jacob Spencer, 20049A.
Oles, Francis John, 20051A.
Woods, John Paul, 23802A.
Stevens, Patrick Roy, 21550A.
Courlas, John George, 23803A.
Strother, James William, 23804A.
Proffitt, James Vernon, Jr., 24403A.
Schumann, Richard Paul, 24402A.
Bock, Charles Cornelius, Jr., 24404A.
Yingling, John Wright, 20428A.
×Duncan, Kenneth James, 20427A.
Geil, William Clinton, 23805A.
Coward, Roderick William, 22842A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, 81st Congress. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law. The other officer has been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

NURSE

Selleck, Ada Louise, 21403W.
×MacDonald, Goldia Nadine, 21754W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Francis S. Low, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Western Sea Frontier, and commander, Pacific Reserve Fleet.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

Vice Adm. James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as United States Naval Deputy Commander in Chief, Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Rear Adm. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18, 1953:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Philip Young, of New York, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Anthony Julian, of Massachusetts, to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Robert Henry Beaudreau, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

Enard Erickson, to be United States marshal for the district of Minnesota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, as we continue to address ourselves to the tasks and responsibilities of this new day, may we have a clearer and loftier conception of the fundamental moral and spiritual principles and their bearing upon the problems which we are seeking to solve.

Help us to cultivate a more receptive attitude to those truths and principles and may we never espouse and proclaim them with any cowardly "if's" and "peradventures," but courageously and with a positive and everlasting "Yea" and "Amen."

Give us the calm assurance that all the conflicting and warring elements in the social order and the whole universe are under the divine control of an omnipotent and omniscient Ruler who has not abdicated His throne and whose plans and purposes can never be defeated.

May we be serenely confident that light will triumph over darkness, and that out of the strife and confusion of our troublous times there is destined to come the golden age with its reign of peace and righteousness.

Lord, we believe; help Thou our unbelief. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union has called a meeting of the American group for 11 a. m., Friday morning, March 20. The meeting will be held in the old Supreme Court chamber at the Capitol. All Members of both Houses of Congress who are interested are requested to attend this meeting. At the meeting officers for the group to serve during the 83d Congress will be elected.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the Superior Court of the State of Washington for Snohomish County to give testimony on March 23, 1953, at 9:30 a.m., in the case of Washington against Tom Warnock, Lewis Flanigan, Earl Weaver, and George Hudson. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read the subpena, as follows:

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON FOR SNOHOMISH COUNTY—STATE OF WASHINGTON, PLAINTIFF v. TOM WARNOCK, LEWIS FLANIGAN, EARL WEAVER, AND GEORGE HUDSON, DEFENDANTS; NO. 1380, SUBPENA, CRIMINAL

TO DON MAGNUSON:

You are hereby commanded in the name of the State of Washington to be and appear before the said superior court at the courthouse in Everett, said county and State, on the 23d day of March 1953, at 9:30 o'clock a. m., then and there to give evidence in a certain cause therein pending, wherein the State of Washington is plaintiff, and Tom Warnock, Lewis Flanigan, Earl Weaver, and George Hudson are defendants, on behalf of the State of Washington.

Herein fail not and have you then and there this writ.

Witness the Honorable Edward M. Nollmeyer, judge of said superior court, and the seal of the said court hereto affixed this 22d day of January A. D., 1953.

ANDERS ANDERSEN,
County Clerk and Ezofficio Clerk of Superior Court.
By DWIGHT ENGEBRECSON,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 182) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas DON MAGNUSON, a Representative in the Congress of the United States, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the Superior Court of the State of Washington for Snohomish County to testify at 9:30 o'clock a. m., on the 23d day of March 1953, in the case of the *State of Washington* v. *Tom Warnock, Lewis Flanigan, Earl Weaver, and George Hudson;* and

Whereas by the privileges of the House of Representatives no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by the order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative DON MAGNUSON is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the Superior Court of the State of Washington for Snohomish County on Monday, March 23, 1953, in the case of the *State of Washington* v. *Tom Warnock, Lewis Flanigan, Earl Weaver, and George Hudson;* and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of the said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CREATING A DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 223, providing that Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Beamer	Dondero	McCormack
Blatnik	Donovan	McIntire
Bolling	Dorn, S. C.	Martin
Boykin	Durham	Mollohan
Broyhill	Feighan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Forand	Poulson
Byrne, Pa.	Green	Preston
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagen, Calif.	Price
Campbell	Hart	Rabaut
Cannon	Hays, Ark.	Rivers
Case	Heller	Sadlak
Chelf	Hope	Sheehan
Cole, N. Y.	Hunter	Shelley
Crosser	Jones, Mo.	Sutton
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Vursell
Dingell	Keogh	Westland
Dodd	Knox	Wheeler

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CREATING A DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 179 makes in order, under an open rule, the consideration of House Joint Resolution 223, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations. House Joint Resolution 223, in turn, simply provides the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, which was submitted to the Congress on March 12, 1953, shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and its approval by the President notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution that would raise to Cabinet status the agency now known as the Federal Security Agency. The new name would be the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I hope that this resolution can be passed by both bodies, and this reorganization take effect without delay.

My reason for favoring the creation of this Cabinet Department is based upon the simple fact of the magnitude and importance of the Agency. By reason of the size of the job that the head of this Agency must do, it ought to have Cabinet status.

The annual budget of the Federal Security Agency exceeds the combined budgets of the Department of Commerce, the Justice Department, the Labor Department, and the Interior Department. The decisions made within this Agency affect the lives of millions of American people.

There is far more involved here than the honor and standing of this Department. By creating this Department and making the head thereof a member of the President's Cabinet, we make better administration possible. It will enable the President, whoever he may be, to carry out his program more effectively. It will enable the head of the Department to maintain the necessary liaison not only with the President but with the heads of the other departments of Government.

The activities of several of the agencies that will make up this Department are exceedingly important. The Food and Drug Administration is important to everyone, and it can be a constructive or a destructive force in the commerce of the Nation. The Social Security Administration is a multi-billion-dollar operation. It involves the lives of millions of people as taxpayers and as recipients. It is here to stay, and in this Congress we will have some legislation to improve it. The activities that have been carried on by the agencies that will make up this new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are too important to be conducted outside of the President's official Cabinet family.

I am for this reorganization for the further reason that it will make possible an internal reorganization within these agencies. It will make it possible to carry out the policies and plans to be undertaken in the next 3 or 4 years. It will make for responsibility and for proper executive control. We want executive agencies to be directed by officials responsible to the President, who in turn is responsible to the American people, rather than permit the growth of irresponsible, untouchable bureaucracy.

In my opinion, the individual that is slated to head this Department is an outstanding American. She is intelligent, capable, and honest, and more than that, she is devoted to the America that we all love and to the system that has made this country the envy of the world throughout the years. I predict that Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby will do an outstanding job in behalf of all the people of these United States.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there is not any opposition to the rule, as far as I know. There is some question among members of the Committee on Government Operations as to the method by which this resolution is brought to the floor. I understand there was a division in the committee on the method by which the resolution is being presented.

My colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] wishes to say a few words on the resolution, and I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the merits of the reorganization plan submitted by the President have scarcely been discussed. All debate has been centered on the procedure. The present procedure, while novel, in no way does violence to good legislative consideration. On the contrary, it is a much more direct approach to consideration of this or any proposed Presidential reorganization plan.

I have read and carefully studied the report filed by the committee, as well as the "additional views" as they are labeled, filed by individual members of the committee. I am of the opinion that this resolution should be adopted. It allows adequate time for debate and consideration; in addition the present resolution permits amendments.

I want to pay tribute to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. He is one of the very fine and interesting characters in this House of Representatives. He is an enjoyable gentleman, a man of much ability. I think he and I are in somewhat the same position on this reorganization plan. Some years ago we would have opposed a very similar plan of reorganization presented by the President of the United States. This resolution, however, has the attraction of beauty and intelligence that far exceeds that of the previous personality associated with the FSA. So often, I am sure, most of us are influenced by personality and circumstances.

Actually, the question of whether or not there should be in the Government a similar department of Cabinet rank has been discussed for many years. If you will permit me to suggest, I won a medal back in 1927 while I was in high school, debating the subject of whether or not there should be established in the Government a department of Cabinet rank on education. I have forgotten which side I took, however. I am, however, in a comfortable position in defending this resolution at this time.

I do want to call attention to the "additional views." They require a great deal of study and thought. My first reaction was that they were not well taken.

Sober consideration, however, must be given to those views. It may be that this is a bad precedent; it may be that we should not follow it in the future. That, of course, is for the House to decide. I think they raise some very serious questions. However, the question here at this time is, Shall this resolution pass? I shall support it. Frankly, I prefer the present method over the one set up in the reorganization plan; I much prefer to move head on into things than to back into them. I prefer the positive approach. The plan provided under the reorganization act is negative. It is a sluggish and somewhat lazy way to legislate. It is a passive acceptance of a President's suggestions.

The terms of the Reorganization Act are similar to those presented by many Presidents. I called attention yesterday to the fact that there was not a great deal of difference. There is one, one important one. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] called attention to the fact that there was a considerable difference between the two plans in that this present plan provided that a recognized physician or doctor should have charge of the Health Division. I think that is good; I think that such change is well taken; I think that strengthens the plan.

There is another great difference—the proposed Secretary, Mrs. Hobby. I have had the privilege of knowing Mrs. Hobby a great number of years. When I was in the Texas Legislature before the war that very lovely, talented, and able lady then served part time as parliamentarian of the Texas house of representatives; and if you think that does not require a capable person, then you do not know as many Texans as I do, particularly in a legislative body. She brings hope to this great and jumbled field that is associated in the Federal Security Administration and I am certain that she will bring honor to the country as the head of this new division of Government.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say that as the gentleman and everybody else knows who had anything to do with World War II, Mrs. Hobby as head of the WAC's did a magnificent job in the prosecution of the war; and repeatedly I had the opportunity to observe her work and to observe the character of the organization she was putting together. As its head she did a significent job; she has real ability.

Mr. LYLE. I am certain of that. Unfortunately, during the war I did not get to associate with any WAC's, but that was my misfortune.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be well to adopt this resolution since we have it here. I do think it might be well for the House to consider seriously the desirability of having all future resolutions of this type brought up in the same manner.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to underscore what the gentleman from Texas has said of the plan. Perhaps the major difference in this reorganization plan as compared with plan No. 27 of 1950, or plan No. 1 of 1949 is the provision for a special assistant to the Secretary for health and medical affairs, who is to be chosen from among recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience to review the health and medical programs with a view of advising the Secretary with respect thereto. I think that is a very wise provision; I think it recognizes the contribution of the medical profession, the importance of the medical profession, and the vast work embodied in this soon-to-be Cabinet Department, which is of interest to and which affects all persons engaged in any form of the practice of the healing arts. If there are other major differences, I have not had my attention called to them and I am bound to wonder why it is that the same gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who suddenly and without very much warning decided to oppose this plan in committee are the same people substantially who were very ardent in their support of the 1949 plan and the 1950 plan. If the plan was good in 1949 and 1950 under the former administration, why is not the plan good in 1953 under the present administration?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman because I know he would like to offer some contribution.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I attended the hearings of the committee and I did not hear any member there voice objection to plan No. 1 of 1953.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. If I am correct, the gentleman made a statement that there were those in the committee who objected to the plan and he asked the question why did they object to plan No. 1 of the President now and supported plan No. 27 of President Truman? I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that being present at the hearings of the committee I heard no member of the committee on either side voice any lack of support for approval of the plan.

Mr. SCOTT. I am delighted, of course, if the gentleman from Illinois means by his statement that there is no opposition to the reorganization plan on his side of the aisle.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. But there is opposition, sir, to attempting to do it under this type of resolution. We believe that the plan should operate under the Reorganization Act and you should not seek to bring it before this House and approve it here without giving the Members of Congress a right to study the plan and to object to the plan as set up in the Reorganization Act.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman. I admit he is entitled to his point of view and to express it, and that this is the place to express it. But again I say, if there were no objections to the plan in 1949 and 1950—this is the third time that the reorganization plan has been before the House of Representatives—and it being before the House for the third time, no good purpose can be served by asking for the 60 days' delay and no good purpose has been announced on the other side of the aisle that I am aware of except they do not want to do anything here in a hurry. These are the same gentlemen, I submit, who at the beginning of this session assured us of absolute, utter and complete cooperation with the administration if we were right. They say we are right so far as this measure is concerned, but they say we are trying to do things too fast. Until today these same gentlemen have been complaining that we have not been doing things fast enough. I think you had better make up your minds.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I do not appear in the well of the House today against the rule, neither do I appear against plan No. 1 for 1953 of the President; but I do have some very definite views on the way that this is being handled, which I will express in general debate a little more fully than I can at the present time.

I hope the Members will read the additional views that appear in the report, if they have time to get a copy of the report on this bill. I would like to point out that there is a basic philosophy underlying the Reorganization Act. In the Reorganization Act of 1949 and in previous acts we set up a method whereby the executive branch and the legislative branch could cooperate with each other. We were very careful in that act, and those Members who were here at that time will remember that this remained in controversy in conference for over a month while we worked out the methods by which reorganization legislation should be considered on the floor. In section 5 of that act we put six major limitations on the executive branch in formulating Presidential plans. We also gave certain rights and privileges to the Members of Congress as a check to this right that we were delegating to the executive branch.

In this particular resolution which we have today we have an affirmative resolution introduced by the chairman of the committee, and I have no quarrel with the parliamentary situation. He is entitled to do that under the rules of the House. But I shall point out in some detail later just exactly what it does to the Reorganization Act. This is not simply a question of accepting the President's plan. You are going to have that opportunity in about 11 days from now. This is an example of the confusion which exists on the Republican side of the aisle in their legislative program. They are offering an affirmative resolution today to make this act immediately effective. On yesterday the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], who is on the floor at this time, offered a resolution of disapproval. Under the Reorganization Act, unless the Committee on Government Operations of the House acts upon that resolution of disapproval within 10 days and reports it to the floor of the House, the gentleman from Florida has the high privilege of calling that resolution up after the 10-day period has passed. So you are going to be faced with the ridiculous position, if the gentleman from Florida is sincere—and I

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

have no reason to believe that he was acting idly in his placing the resolution of disapproval in the hopper, and I have talked with him today on this matter and I understand he is sincere in his disapproval of the plan itself, but under the Reorganization Act of 1949 Congress is bound to give this gentleman consideration, the committee is bound to give this gentleman courtesy in regard to his resolution of disapproval.

We are going to be faced with this proposition today in voting for the Hoffman resolution. You are going to attempt to put the plan into effect immediately, or within a certain period of time, as soon as the other body acts, and as soon as the President signs the bill. Now, if the other body does not act within the 10 days' time, and if the President does not sign the bill within the 10-day period—and even if that does happen, in my opinion—and I believe I am backed up by the Parliamentarian—the gentleman from Florida can still call his resolution of disapproval up for House consideration. So, you may have the House marching up the same hill twice—not up the hill and down again, but up the same hill twice. This is the ridiculous position that the gentleman's resolution is putting the House in today.

Now, I am not quarreling with the plan itself, although there are provisions in the plan that I certainly think could be improved upon. I intend, however, to support the plan; I intend to vote against the resolution today, and then when the gentleman from Florida brings up his resolution on the floor, or when the committee reports it to the House after additional consideration, I intend to vote against the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida in behalf of the plan. I think my position is entirely consistent, and I think the position of the members of the committee who have subscribed to the additional views are completely consistent. A vote against this resolution is not a vote against the plan. It is a vote against short circuiting the Reorganization Act and setting a precedent of considering a matter within 5 legislative days of its introduction to the Members of the House, with 1 day's hearing, with 1 day in the Committee on Rules, and the next day bringing it to the floor. Remember, this plan was only given to us on the 12th of March.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. I quite agree with everything that the gentleman from California has said about the hurry in not bringing this plan in as I think it should be. I think his ground is well taken. I think the minority views on this matter are well taken, but the thing is here. And, in voting for the rule and in voting for the resolution I am one of those who is pleased to say that I will not have to do any flipflop. I was for the plan when it was up before, and I am not against it now because a Republican President is going to make the appointment of this Cabinet officer. I just wanted to make myself very clear on that point. I do not have to back up and fill around in order to bring this resolution before the House or to vote to confirm it when it comes to a vote.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the minority leader for his contribution, and that recalls to my mind some remarks that were made by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] in which he complimented the minority leader on his consistency. I wonder what position the gentleman from Indiana finds himself in today, since he opposed the reorganization plan on this particular matter in the past and now finds himself voting for it today. I assume he is going to support it today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to yield for that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there are several gentlemen from Indiana, and I do not understand to whom the gentleman refers.

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have great respect for my friend, the gentleman from Indiana, and I did not care to call his name at this time. I know the gentleman from Michigan knows to which gentleman I am referring.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, seemingly this resolution is going to be adopted overwhelmingly, since everybody except the gentleman from Florida appears to be for the plan. The contention that exists here today is over whether or not the proper procedure has been followed in bringing this legislation to the floor.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], if I understood properly the meaning of his remarks, as well as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], contend that the Reorganization Act should be paramount, and that when the Reorganization Act of 1949 was adopted and passed by the Congress, it set aside all the other rights of the Congress to consider legislation under the usual procedure.

If the gentleman will consult with able parliamentarians, I think he will learn that all we did when we adopted the Reorganization Act was to provide another method by which reorganization plans or reorganization of the Government could be considered by the Congress. In other words, under the Reorganization Act of 1949 we gave to the President certain rights and privileges in connection with reorganization matters, but by so doing we did not take away from ourselves, or from the Congress, any of the rights which have been inherent in this legislative body throughout the 150 years or more of our Government's existence. We still retain those rights. We can reorganize the executive branch of the Government, any time we in the Congress please, by the passage of affirmative legislation. So all this joint resolution does today is to speed up the process, and I am sure the former Speaker will agree with me.

Mr. RAYBURN. I will say this to the gentleman, that I am glad to see some speed about something.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will tell the gentleman a little more about speed just a little later, if he will stay with us for a while.

What this resolution does is speed up the process so as to make this reorganization plan effective at the earliest possible date.

Of course, the Congress has considered this plan. Our committee did hold hearings on this plan and on this resolution in spite of what has been said here in these additional views.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman tell the House that any testimony on this resolution was solicited or given during the one day this hearing was held? Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I will be happy to explain it. If the gentleman will go back to his office and look at the notice of the committee hearing which he received, he will see that the notice called for a hearing on this joint resolution. If the gentleman from California, who is on the committee, did not read his notice and did not ask any questions during the hearing about the resolution, but only about the plan contained in the resolution, that is his fault and no one else's. Please do not blame anyone else in the Congress for any dereliction of duty on your part, if there is such a thing.

Now, if I may go ahead. As I said at the beginning, this resolution is simply using the normal processes of the Congress by passing affirmative legislation. Of course, every Member of the House has an opportunity to discuss this resolution and to be heard on it just as he has with respect to any other bill. Now, however, the opposition talk about how this is such an unusual procedure, and how it has never been used before, and how it is wrong to approach reorganization this way. Oh, they now say here that this sets up a new method of handling reorganization plans—I am referring to their additional views stated in the report. They say it is a dangerous precedent to use this method.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who said it is a dangerous precedent?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The minority, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and those who signed it. They say it is a dangerous precedent. Why heaven bless your soul, Mr. HOLIFIELD, the Federal Security Administration, which we are now changing over into a department, was created in 1939 by a reorganization plan submitted by President Roosevelt which was adopted by the Congress by a joint resolution exactly like the one now before us. Now you say this resolution now before us is establishing a dangerous precedent.

Yes; the gentleman has the record before him, but he evidently did not read back far enough.

The Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1939 was made effective July 1, 1939, by joint resolution adopted June 7, 1939. Look at Fifty-third Statutes, page 813. There is the record. Now, we have adopted numerous joint resolutions exactly like this one under a Democratic administration to make reorganization plans effective quickly. The fact of the matter is Congress adopted Reorganization Plan No. 2 in 1939 in the same way. Then Congress adopted Reorganization Plans Nos. 3, 4, and 5 in 1940 by the joint-resolution method. Reorganization Plan No. 5 was adopted in 1940 after President Roosevelt requested the Congress to act quickly and to use this affirmative joint-resolution method of making the reorganization plan effective immediately. Now that Mr. Eisenhower is President and the Republicans want to use the same method, it is terrible. Are you of the minority now repudiating Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his Democratic administration? I see the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] on his feet—just a moment—he can answer that one "yes" or "no" real quick. It was all right for Mr. Roosevelt to do it. It was all right back in 1939 and 1940, when Congress accelerated reorganization procedure, and it was only 13 days between the time the plan was sent up here and when it was made effective. But now it is claimed we are speeding up things, we are rushing things, we are acting in a precipitant manner, and we are not giving enough time to thought and study. Remember, this very Agency which we are now reorganizing was originally created—let me repeat that; then you can explain it when we have debate of the joint resolution—this very Agency, the Federal Security Agency, which is now being reorganized, was originally created under a reorganization plan which was sent up here by President Roosevelt, through a joint resolution, just like the one now before us, introduced and adopted by the Congress, so the plan was put into effect 23 days after it was sent up on the Hill—a pretty good record for speed at that, was it not? Was President Roosevelt and the Congress then in existence, under Democratic control, acting precipitantly? Were they doing something terrible; were they violating all the rules and laws of God and man when they did that? I am amazed—literally amazed—because I have great respect for my colleague, the gentleman from California, and his brilliant mind, as well as great respect for my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], the ranking member of the committee—by the statements they have made in view of the official record. They evidently have failed to go back into the record far enough to find out what has actually been done, or even to learn how this Agency was created in the first place.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman recalls, too, that of the two affirmative resolutions which the Congress passed, one was offered by Jack Cochran, our former colleague.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There was never a more competent man in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And he was Democratic chairman of the Committee on Expenditures of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the other one was offered by Mr. Manasco, who was also chairman of the committee at the time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But now a Republican chairman of the same committee brings in a resolution to do the very same thing, and seemingly it is considered almost criminal in nature. Everybody is for the plan, except they do not like the way it is being presented, but it is being presented in exactly the very same way similar plans have been considered under Democratic administrations.

The great former Speaker of this House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], said he did not have to twist and turn to take a position on this matter. I wonder whether some of the other individual minority Members will not have to twist and turn. Are they going to stand by the same sort of procedure used by the Roosevelt administration to put through their own organization plans, or are they going to change their position, now we have a Republican President and a Republican Congress? We use here exactly the same method of hastening up reorganization action as was used in the administration of President Roosevelt. What is wrong with that?

Now, there is a fair question. You cannot make flesh out of one and fowl out of another. It is the same method exactly, concerning the same department—believe it or not, the very same agency of government. If it was fine and proper and right to hasten up the reorganization process in 1939, when you now in the minority created the Federal Security Administration by introducing a joint resolution just like this, why is it wrong to reorganize it once more by the very same method, now that we have a Republican President and a Republican Congress? I want some of you gentlemen to answer these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time, and I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 223, providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 223, with Mr. KEATING in the chair.

The first reading of the House joint resolution was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is entitled to 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], 1 hour.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us House Joint Resolution 223, which, as amended in the committee, reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, submitted to the Congress on March 12, 1953, shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution and its approval by the President, notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, except that section 9 of such act shall apply to such reorganization plan and to the reorganization made thereby.

The purpose behind the introduction of this resolution was twofold. As introduced on the 12th of March and reported by the committee on the 17th, the resolution provided "the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, submitted to the Congress on March 12, 1953, shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution." In committee, the resolution was amended by adding after the word "resolution" the words "and its approval by the President." As so amended, it was reported to the House by the Rules Committee yesterday, the 17th.

Those familiar with our basic reorganization legislation will recall that reorganization plans sent down by the President are not, under usual procedure, subject to amendment and become effective unless—to use understandable common language—the plan is vetoed by a majority vote of the authorized membership of either the Senate or the House.

That method of legislation has always been opposed by me, as it has previously been opposed by an overwhelming majority of the Republicans of the House—on one ocasion, 164 of the 168 Members who were voting opposed such a method. And this resolution was introduced by me in an effort to demonstrate that, by this unusual procedure, the House could, if it desired, bring before it a proposed plan in such a way that it might be amended either in committee or from the floor.

When the day ends, we will have established the fact, provided that, when the procedure providing for the consideration of a reorganization plan is followed, the plan cannot be amended either in committee or from the floor by the introduction of and action upon a resolution such as the one now before us, a plan can be amended; this for the reason that the resolution was amended in committee, and, before the debate has ended, amendments will be offered from the floor and voted upon.

Mr. Chairman, as I recall, in the committee one member on the minority side did not vote on the adoption of the resolution. One member, the gentleman

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], voted for the adoption of the resolution. Several members on the minority side were not present, and their votes were cast by proxy, as is proper under our rules.

All the majority members voted in favor of the resolution. Both in the committee on the adoption of the report and on the motion to report out the resolution, the opposition seemed to be centered on the procedure we followed in considering and reporting the resolution.

In the hearings, and perhaps in the consideration of the resolution by the committee, on the admission of both the Director of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, and Mrs. Hobby, who will be the head of the new Department, neither could put a finger on any particular saving that would be immediately effected by the adoption of this plan. Both, as I understood their testimony, were of the opinion that with a proper change in personnel ultimately and in the not too far distant future, there would be not only increased efficiency but some economy.

As for the argument that was made both in committee and before the Rules Committee yesterday while the House was listening to the very instructive and eloquent talk by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] and which if I may be pardoned now I would like to concur in and express the hope that the Rules Committee does bring out the resolution calling for the removal of our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] so that we may stand up and be counted as expressing our confidence in him—the argument was made before the Rules Committee that the method here followed established a dangerous precedent and would act in the future as a precedent for and was at this time an amendment of the Reorganization Act, a repudiation of that act.

Our colleagues who made that argument evidently overlooked the fact as stated by our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], appearing here for the Rules Committee, that this resolution is almost word for word, even as to punctuation, the same as resolutions heretofore offered and adopted by the House.

As an illustration, the gentleman from Ohio calls attention to our procedures when, in 1940 a plan was sent up by a Democratic President. Then a resolution was offered by Jack Cochran, the gentleman from Missouri who was then chairman of this committee, which accelerated the effective date of plans 5, 3, and 4.

That resolution reads as follows:

Joint resolution providing for the taking effect of Reorganization Plan No. V

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. V, submitted to the Congress on May 22, 1940, shall take effect on the 10th day after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

SEC. 2. Nothing in such plan or this joint resolution shall be construed as having the effect of continuing any agency or function beyond the time when it would have terminated without regard to such plan or this joint resolution or of continuing any function beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested would have terminated without regard to such plan or this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. Any appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, made after the taking effect of such reorganization plan, for the use of the Immigration and Naturalization Service or the Department of Labor in the exercise of functions transferred by such plan, shall, for the purposes of section 3 of such plan, be considered as having been made prior to the taking effect of such plan. Any provision, in any act of Congress enacted at the third session of the 76th Congress, after the taking effect of such plan, which confers upon the Secretary of Labor any function with respect to the Immigration and Naturalization Service or with respect to the immigration and naturalization laws, shall be construed as having conferred such function upon the Attorney General and not upon the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 4. The provisions of Reorganization Plan No. III, submitted to the Congress on April 2, 1940, and the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. IV, submitted to the Congress on April 11, 1940, shall take effect on June 30, 1940, notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Approved, June 4, 1940 (54 U. S. Statutes at Large 231).

So it is somewhat difficult for me to understand why the two ranking minority members of our committee should so vigorously and repeatedly insist that we are doing something that was perhaps out of order or at least in their opinion not good legislative procedure and that we were establishing a precedent which might do away with reorganization legislation. I could save some time for our friends over there—I see our friendly colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], who I think is very, very familiar with reorganization plans——

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I recall the incident the gentleman from Michigan was about to mention. As I remember, it was a plan similar to this. However, I want to point out that we were not operating under the Reorganization Act of 1949; and, furthermore, in those days there was an emergency. But now there is no emergency to warrant this sort of procedure, as I understand.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. This was in Korea—just take note of that; it is no emergency? please be advised.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, I am simply repeating his words.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. From 1933 on we have been told there was an emergency all the time, and though there was no real one, one was created—so it has all been under a claimed emergency. If you will look at 54th Statute, page 230, you will find the situation is practically the same today as then. Now I know the gentleman from Missouri will agree with me in this if nothing else, that in neither his time nor mine has there ever served in this body a more capable, active, patriotic gentleman than the gentleman who was then chairman of the committee, Jack Cochran.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Michigan in this one case. But if the gentleman will yield, we have made great progress since 1939 in the field of reorganization. By one stroke of the pen you are attempting to destroy all that progress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that?

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. By one stroke of the pen you are attempting to destroy all that progress we might make in the future.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Oh, yes, indeed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Just how will we destroy all that progress and what was that progress?

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield I will be glad to explain it to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Here you have a resolution that takes away from a Member of Congress his right to present a resolution of disapproval; furthermore your resolution is open to amendment and the gentleman knows as well as I do that over the years Congress has never reorganized effectively because all of the plans and bills have been open to amendment. Everyone has a pet project. The gentleman from Michigan and myself are no exceptions. You throw this open to amendment and you are not going to have real effective reorganization. The gentleman from Michigan knows that as well as I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is in error when he states this resolution takes away a right from a Member of Congress. A resolution of disapproval has been or will be offered. Progress, the gentleman says. Look at the increase in the national debt. I admit there has been progress in that—an ever-greater debt. I admit there has been progress in the rate of taxation—an ever-increasing rate. Who wants that? Call that progress? That the taxpayers have been soaked, I admit.

Sure, progress? If that is what you call it. I do not. There is more water can run out of the bunghole of the barrel than has been put into it by the New Deal. I will tell you, they have made progress. But it has been in the wrong direction.

He talks about safeguarding our rights, which was the theme of the song of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and, I believe, of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] in argument before the Rules Committee. They talked about preserving our rights, but there is nothing in any reorganization bill, there cannot be anything in any law, that prohibits a subsequent Congress from changing it, can there? We are trying to safeguard the rights of the present Congress, and any subsequent Congress can legislate as it pleases.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman referred to the New Deal. I wonder if he would explain again whether he said bunghole or bungle?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Either will do. I can remember a very distinguished colleague of ours from Illinois, Miss Sumner, who stood down here in the well at one time and said here is

where she bulged for Britain but the taxpayers were down to skin and bones in paying for it. Sure it was bungling all right, but I was talking about that old statement that more water can run out of the bunghole than you can put in at the top, something like that. More dollars and more important is the fact that more men have, by the New Deal, been wasted abroad than we could afford to lose. Progress? Our Democratic administrations have given us three wars; they have given us a debt of more than $260 billion, and the end is not yet in sight. That result may be the gentleman's understanding of progress. It is not mine.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am not so much interested in the manner in which this legislation is being handled. That seems to have been determined when the House adopted the rule a few minutes ago. I am more interested in the plan that is proposed to be approved or disapproved. I wish the gentleman would explain the differences between the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, and Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950, any differences that might have caused all of these gentlemen to suddenly reverse their position and decide to support the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Which gentleman? On that side?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Some of these gentlemen who have just spoken in favor of it, who voted against the plan in 1950. I am wondering what the difference is between the two plans.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from Missouri was talking about this resolution providing for amendments. Sure. The one that was introduced by Mr. Cochran, of Missouri, the chairman at that time, did the same thing, and there were amendments. Some of the resolutions were amended in the Senate, they came back and we accepted the amendments.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. We have come a long way since 1939. I can tell the gentleman that Jack Cochran was for the reorganization method we are using today and it was one of his last acts in the Congress.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, we have come a long, long way. But, as I said, the so-called progress of the gentleman from Missouri has, in reality, been a retrogression from the sound, forward-looking ways of the forefathers.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What is the difference between the two plans?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. A comparison of the plans is set forth in the report which, no doubt, the gentleman has read. To that statement I have nothing to add. As I understand it, their position is this, and I may be mistaken: If you will look at Reorganization Plan No. 1 just sent up, you will find in section 5 that the plan transfers personnel together with records and functions and so forth, as they now exist over to the new organization. Note that word "personnel."

Then over in section 9 on the opposite page you see that several positions are named and that there the President is given the right to keep those same old employees in office for, I think, it is, 60 days.

The real objection from that side comes from the fact that, if this present resolution goes through, the President and his assistants may be able to change these top policy-making individuals and to get them out of office and, of course, being inoculated, or whatever you want to call it, with the New Deal theories.

I can understand why, on that side, there are some who want to keep those political appointees in office until the last day that they can possibly serve, and, on our side, inasmuch as the new Secretary, who has 37,000 employees, can only appoint one, we on our side—at least I personally am very, very anxious that she gets, insofar as possible, individuals in there who will follow her ideas and the policy declared by the administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Of course, I am not going to argue the merits or demerits of the spoils system. I think that the new Republican administration in power is entitled to name its policy makers, but I think also the gentleman met himself coming up the road in attempting to answer my question. What is the basic difference, philosophically, between the plan we have now and the plan that was presented to the House in 1950? Is there any difference?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; there are some differences.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Basically?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, and if you will look at the report you will find a chart which points out the differences paragraph by paragraph between the plans.

Now you asked a question which to me is very, very embarrassing because I have always been and I still am opposed to this centralization of power in the administration. That is what the gentleman was fishing for. I know what you were trying to get at, and that is all right, I cannot help it now, and as long as we have to take it, I am not going to relax and enjoy it, but I am going to relax and take what I am forced to take. I do not expect to vote for the plan.

I do not believe in bureaucracy any more than I did when, in our former report, with a plan similar to this—I think it was No. 27—we wrote that the plan was the answer to a bureaucrat's dream, only this time we have some folks, I think, I hope, who will be administering this plan, who will have first in mind the good of our country and not the continuation of a certain group in power—the theory of Harry Hopkins, you remember that, the old, old saw, tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. That, I hope, is out.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. With reference to the impression that I interpret from your remarks a few minutes ago that this plan will enable the new Administrator, or the new Secretary, to get her own team working with her and enable her to clean out a lot of these people frozen under civil service——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The top ones.

Mr. LANTAFF. Top ones, is it not true, on page 82 of the testimony, it was pointed out by Mrs. Hobby that under this plan, if enacted, she would be enabled to fill two positions now filled by civil service, and both of those positions are currently vacant?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand, there will be some Executive orders and some changes in legislation if necessary, so that the administration may clean up the mess that the voters had in mind last November, and if this plan was to be administered by an Oscar Ewing, I do not care if he wore a skirt, I would not be for it.

Mr. LANTAFF. Of course, the point I wanted to clear up you have cleared up, but that is not the action of the President in issuing an Executive order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It may be encouraging to him, though, to have it passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am always amazed at the ability of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to blow a bubble up into a balloon, and today was another occasion. Of course, it is true that similar resolutions have been presented to this body in the past, but I point out that the House was then working under a different Reorganization Act than at the present time. The resolution to which he referred at the time cut down the time from 60 days to 51 days. It was done for the purpose, according to the statement of Mr. Cochran, of providing that the accounts of the Department involved could be started with the fiscal year beginning July 1. That was his expressed purpose for changing from 60 days to 51 days, so that the accounts would be set up in an orderly fashion on the first of the fiscal year. As I say, it was under a different form of reorganization plan. We have had several, 1939, 1945, and 1949, and we are now operating under the 1949 plan.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Just what basic merit would there be in bringing this plan in under the Reorganization Act as against bringing it in as it has been brought in?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The plan if brought in under the Reorganization Act would be brought in on the basis the Reorganization Act provided for the consideration of that type of legislation. I think I will answer the gentleman in the content of my remarks.

Action on House Joint Resolution 223 is unnecessary. Whether you vote for it or against it has no bearing on the merits of the plan or the acceptance of the plan, because the House will be in the confused condition I referred to a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

moment ago of having later on to consider the resolution of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] of disapproval as provided under the Reorganization Act.

I call to the attention of the House the fact that we received the President's plan on March 12. On March 16 we had 1 day of hearings on the plan. On March 17 the rule was granted. On March 18 we have it here on the floor. In other words, 5 legislative days have elapsed since the presenting of the plan, not 3 weeks or 60 days, for the Members to acquaint themselves with the plan. Many of you have never seen the plan or studied it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman referred to the 51 days. As I recall the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and I have the joint resolution in front of me, 54 Statutes, 230, it read, "shall take effect on the 10th day after the date of enactment of this resolution," whereas it was the following resolution which shortened the period from 60 to 51 days. The gentleman's attention was being directed by Mr. BROWN to the fact that he and others on that side of the aisle had supported a resolution which would have effect in 10 days.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If I was misinformed as to the resolution, I will accept the gentleman's correction. I thought he referred to the one where Mr. Cochran spoke on June 1, 1939, which is found in the RECORD, volume 84, part 6, page 6527, where the time limit is changed from 60 days to 51 days.

Mr. SCOTT. This resolution is No. 551 of June 4, 1940, and became 54th Statutes, page 230, and become effective in 10 days.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will have to look that up later. Apparently I do not have the same resolution here that the gentleman has.

Now I ask why the rush to bring this about in 5 days? Is this a pattern for future Presidential plans which are going to be brought to the Congress? Are we only going to be allowed 5 legislative days for these future plans? I understand there are quite a number of them coming up here. Some of these plans may be controversial. This does not happen to be a controversial plan. I am for this plan. What I want to know is—is this a pattern that the leadership here and the administration is going to set up? Are they going to set this up as a pattern? Are they going to slip us a bunch of these plans at one time, and then give us 5 legislative days in which to study them? Again I want to say there were no hearings held on House Joint Resolution 223, although the notice of the chairman included that along with the plan—there was no question on the method of handling the resolution, or no testimony offered. There was no testimony at all as to the manner in which the plan would be effectuated. Now I said that this plan would nullify the rights of some of the Members, and I plan to prove that.

Under the reorganization plan, a 60-day period for study and processing of plans is given to the Members of Congress. This is contingent, of course, on House action on a resolution of disapproval. The right to file a resolution of disapproval is given to the House. Of course, I think that right still remains, but it becomes futile in view of the fact that the House will have previously acted in an affirmative way. The right of individual Members to file a resolution of disapproval and to secure floor consideration notwithstanding the fact that the Committee on Government Operations might not report his resolution to the floor, or a rule might not be given providing for its consideration still exists, a Member still has the privilege of bringing this resolution up. I understand that this is what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] intends to do. The right of disapproval is extended both to the House and to the Senate acting separately. Now, if we affirm this matter in this House, and it is disapproved in the other body, we have a confusing situation, and the plan does not become a law. Vice versa the same thing would happen if the other body approved it by affirmative resolution, and we disapproved it by a disapproving resolution. So I say, you are taking these rights from the individual Members which were given to them wisely under the Reorganization Act of 1949, as an offset to the privilege we gave to the executive branch to send plans up here. I say we should retain our right to examine these plans, and have an adequate time in order to do a good job in examining the plans. I think the House is going to be put in a ridiculous position in passing this bill today, and then having to consider the Bennett resolution later on. A vote on House Joint Resolution 223 is not a clear-cut vote on the issue of the President's plan. It is also a concurrent vote on changing in effect the reorganization procedure. A vote on the Bennett resolution would be a clear-cut vote for or against Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. That is why I am going to urge my friends to vote down House Joint Resolution 223, and then use the orderly procedure under the act, the approved procedure as outlined in the Reorganization Act of 1949 to consider this matter. I say that this does not make a great deal of difference in this case at all because this is a noncontroversial plan, but I can clearly see that plans might come up a little bit later which might be very controversial, and if this same procedure is used, then the Members of the House would be denied the time that is necessary to study these plans to find out what the measure is all about. Many of these plans are very complicated, having to do with administrative functions and overlapping agencies and duplications in Government functions. They could be brought up in many different ways, and they can have a great deal of effect upon the functions of our bureaus and our departments of Government. I say we should retain that right and not set a precedent by shortening the time from 60 calendar days to 5 legislative days as we are doing in this case.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the plan is not controversial, as I understood the gentleman to say—that was your statement, was it not? This plan is not controversial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would say there are opponents to the plan. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] happens to be one of them. I think the majority of Members approve of the plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, if that is true, what can be gained by hearings on the plan itself?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Time for the Members to study the plan. Time for additional witnesses to come before the committee on a resolution of disapproval, which I understand we will have to consider.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman contend we will consider that resolution if this resolution is passed?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the parliamentary situation is such that that resolution will be in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Have you conferred with the Parliamentarian, and did he advise you that if this plan went through, and it was also adopted by the Senate, then we would be forced to consider the disapproving resolution?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was informed by the Parliamentarian that the right of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to call up his resolution is not affected by House Joint Resolution 223, whether we vote for it or against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Were you also advised that the committee would be required to hold hearings if both Houses approved House Joint Resolution 223?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the committee does not hold hearings on the Bennett resolution, it will lose control of the time when the matter is considered on the floor of the House, and the time will then be under the control of the gentleman from Florida. I think the gentleman from Michigan will protect the jurisdiction of our committee to handle legislation and I invite him to help me in this instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, in many ways this is a debate of artificially and politically created issues. It represents a carefully contrived "tempest in a teapot" designed to produce just enough spray to cloud the real issue without splashing the political tea of the Democrats back into their own laps.

I have noticed very carefully that nearly every Democrat who has spoken on this resolution today, has prefaced his remarks by stating the exact stand he intends to take on the matter of creating a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In other words, the members of the minority party have al-

ready found plenty of time to make up their minds as to whether they are for or against this reorganization plan.

Some of my distinguished colleagues of the minority have told us how their particular friends in the House intend to vote on this bill. What reason can there be then for stalling any longer? What reason can there be for advancing the argument that the full 60 days is required for this body to make up its mind on this plan when all the evidence presented indicates that not a vote would be changed by this time-consuming procedure.

As long as every Member who has spoken in opposition during debate on the rule or in opposition to the resolution itself, has prefaced his remarks by indicating that his own mind is already made up and that his colleagues' minds are already made up, I can see no valid argument for delay, procrastination, or adopting a negative approach to this legislation.

In an attempt to bring the matter of precedent to bear on this question, the opposition has actually introduced the most ridiculous argument into the discussion. When my distinguished colleague pointed out that House Joint Resolution 551, introduced on May 27, 1940, by the late John Joseph Cochran, distinguished Democrat Representative from Missouri, was passed by a Democrat Congress through exactly this same procedure, the opposition cried that this action took place under the Reorganization Act of 1939 whereas our present action takes place under the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Actually, House Joint Resolution 551 and today's House Joint Resolution 223 have one phrase almost in common. House Joint Resolution 551 of May 27, 1940, reads: "shall take effect on the 10th day after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939."

House Joint Resolution 223, in its present form, reads: "shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949."

Reduced to its simplest terms, the argument of the opposition states that because we are asking the committee to enact this legislation notwithstanding the Reorganization Act of 1949 instead of notwithstanding the Reorganization Act of 1939 we are committing this body to a perilous parliamentary course.

Notwithstanding the "notwithstanding" clauses, what we are actually doing today is legislating affirmatively on the basis of the inherent right and authority of Congress to originate positive legislation.

It is interesting to turn back in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and note the strangely different attitude of some of our Democrat friends a little over 2 years ago when H. R. 1545, authorizing emergency reorganization was debated. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who was then the chairman of this committee, made a statement which is strangely in contrast to his position today. I now find myself in wholehearted agreement with his previous statement which I wish to quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 2, page 2131:

> Mr. DAWSON. How long a time can 18 days be; how short a time can 18 days be? It is my belief that power is best organized by giving the responsible head for the use of that power sufficient power to meet the emergency which faces him. I am saying to you that this bill should pass without opposition.

I am the first to grant that this is not a defense emergency we face today such as the type of emergency that was much discussed when we were asking for emergency reorganization powers for President Truman. I do feel, however, that our national security and certainly our national solvency are affected by certain other reorganizations in other departments of our Government. Particularly this close upon the heels of March 15, our annual taxpaying day, ever-expanding bureaucracy presents a very real emergency to our people and an emergency which they are anxious to have this Congress face up to in order that their newly elected President have the authority he needs to work for economy and efficiency in government.

There has been some discussion about this bill and about the difference between this current plan and the plans of 1950 and of 1949; as a matter of fact, plans to reorganize this whole health, education, and welfare area which we are discussing are not a new idea. Back as far as 1923 under the Harding administration, if you please, a President tried to reorganize these same functions.

In 1924 the Joint Committee on Reorganization recommended a new department similar to that suggested by President Harding. In 1932, one of President Hoover's reorganization proposals called for the concentration of health, education, and recreational activities in a single executive department. The President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937 recommended the placing of health, education, and social-security functions in a Department of Social Welfare. This recommendation was partially implemented in 1939 by the creation of the Federal Security Agency, by which action the Congress indicated its approval of the grouping of these functions in a single agency. A new department could not be proposed at that time because the Reorganization Act of 1939 prohibited the creation of additional executive departments. In 1949 the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government proposed the creation of a department for social security and education.

This concept of a Cabinet position for this type of operation is certainly not new and had bipartisan support throughout a long period of years.

When we look at the actual details of organization, this is a distinctly different and more workable concept than its predecessors.

We are first impressed with the significant fact that for the first time we now have a Special Assistant for Health and Medicine who is required to be a recognized leader of the medical profession outside of Government, if you please. That gives the medical profession and a large area of the American public more confidence in this plan, being reassured as they are, that the medical activities of the Department are not going to be supervised by somebody who has either a bureaucratic or theoretical knowledge of medicine. This plan is different in that it calls specifically for a man who is a professional, a medical practitioner, an honored member of an honored group of an honored profession in American society. That one provision makes a very great difference in the palatability of this plan as compared with plan 27 of 1950 and as compared with plan 1 of 1949. The significance of this difference cannot be glossed in debate. It makes this plan quite different from its predecessors.

It seems to me, also, that the public now realizes that earlier reorganizations would have granted greater authority to the previous Federal Security Administrator, Oscar Ewing. That was unthinkable to many liberty-loving American people who were worried and dissatisfied with the way he was running his bureaucracy in the Federal Security Administration. I have no qualms about making the point very definitely that one of the situations that makes this legislation palatable to the American public today is the fact that we are not dealing with Oscar Ewing; we are not dealing with the man whose attitude toward increasing and expanding the hold of Federal bureaucracy over our lives, we feared. In fact, Oscar Ewing's conduct and philosophy became a major political issue.

We are now looking ahead with confidence, a confidence shared to a great degree on both sides of the aisle because we are dealing with a new administration. We are dealing, I repeat, with a head of this department who I am sure has the confidence of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and who has a distinguished Government record. So I say that another of the reasons this plan is more palatable than previous plans is because Oscar Ewing does not fit into this picture and because this reorganization has been carefully worked out so that it will enable the new secretary to coordinate the activities of these strategic agencies which have been loosely administered in the past.

These, then, are essentially the considerations that face us today:

First, is it a good plan?

Second, is Cabinet status desirable for the head who directs the activities which are grouped under the present Federal Security Administrator?

Third. If there is widespread approval, if minds have been made up on this program, why should we here in Congress sit around and stall over technicalities for a 60-day waiting period before we place in effect a program where we have a reasonably common area of agreement, a program on which, I dare say, not a single vote will be changed in the next 60 days?

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida, a member of the committee.

Mr. LANTAFF. I was wondering whether or not the present occupant of the office and the Acting Administrator

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the Federal Security Agency is serving as a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. BROWNSON. That is a very moot point, as the gentleman well knows, having heard the same discussion at the hearings that I did.

Mr. LANTAFF. She has been invited by the President to sit in with the Cabinet.

Mr. BROWNSON. I understand that President Eisenhower has invited Mrs. Hobby to meet with the Cabinet.

Mr. LANTAFF. Is she serving as a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. BROWNSON. I do not know. If it is legally construed that she is, at least I can assure the gentleman she is not being paid as a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. LANTAFF. Is she voting as a member of the Cabinet?

Mr. BROWNSON. I must admit I have never had the privilege of sitting with the Cabinet to know whether she does or not.

Mr. LANTAFF. I call the gentleman's attention to page 52 of the hearings at which Mr. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, stated that Mrs. Hobby was already a member of the Cabinet, she has been made a member of the Cabinet and she votes as a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. BROWNSON. I thank the gentleman very much for his close attention to the hearings. I am sure that with Mrs. Hobby's charm and persuasive ability it would not make any difference if she voted or sat as an ex officio member, her viewpoint would be equally effective in the President's distinguished Cabinet.

Mr. Chairman, the issue in this case seems clear. If the plan is a good one it should be adopted without delay, since plans of this nature have been studied by Congress for the past 30 years. You have heard the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] speak strongly in favor of this plan which assures us that its immediate adoption will not affect the careful study which his subcommittee is conducting in the matter of social security. I was very impressed by his remarks. If he is not in favor of delay, I certainly can see no case for those who would deprive the Eisenhower administration of the opportunity of creating this new Cabinet post immediately.

Other reorganization plans might come along where it will be neither wise nor proper for Congress to shorten the normal 60-day waiting period. If such be the case, I will fight for additional time for their consideration. The issue here seems clear to me. The minds of those who intend to vote either for or against the plan have apparently been made up. I hope that unnecessary delaying tactics will not prevail at a time when the American people expect action from their Congress.

I shall vote in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1 by supporting House Joint Resolution 223, because I have confidence that the Eisenhower administration will utilize this authority to bring economy and efficiency out of chaos, disorganization, and disorder.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, last Thursday, March 12, the President of the United States transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, the first such plan to be submitted by this administration under authority of the Reorganization Act of 1949 as extended by this Congress. The plan is designed to create a new executive department which will include all the functions now located in the Federal Security Agency. There seems to me to be little room for argument as to the desirability of this proposal. It is my sincere hope that within a few weeks we will have in the executive branch of the Federal Government a full-fledged Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This is not a new idea. The need and the desirability of coordinating the functions of the Federal Government dealing with health, education, and security or welfare has long been recognized. Thirty years ago, President Harding recommended the creation of a Department of Education and Welfare in which health functions would have been included. During the following year, the Congressional Joint Committee on Reorganization recommended the creation of an executive department similar to that proposed by President Harding. A few years later in 1932, President Hoover attempted to consolidate in one of the existing departments the functions with which Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 is concerned. Then in 1937, the President's Committee on Administrative Management proposed the creation of a Department of Social Welfare to include health, education, and social-security functions. Two years later, in 1939, this proposal was partially implemented by the creation of the Federal Security Agency.

The Hoover Commission in 1949 recommended the creation of a department for social security and education and the creation of a separate United Medical Administration.

We realize that in these times of tension and potential danger, we have an obligation to keep ourselves as strong both physically and mentally, as is possible. We cannot for a moment afford to neglect this greatest of all human resources. We are all familiar with the programs of the Public Health Service and the contributions they are making through such research programs as those on heart disease and cancer. The functions of the Food and Drug Administration in promoting purity of essential commodities are well known and necessary. The Office of Education likewise is performing an essential function in assisting State and local school officials throughout the country in improving the organization and management of their educational systems. The provision of financial aid in certain emergency situations where an undue burden has been placed upon local resources also is part of our goal to provide more and better education to all our people. The welfare programs of the Federal Security Agency, among them social security, vocational rehabilitation, assistance to the aged, to the blind, to dependent children, and other related programs have become thoroughly integrated in our attempt to provide greater security to American families.

There is no argument over the desirability of these functions and these programs. Our problem now is how we can strengthen their administration, how we can grant them the status or prestige which will contribute to the accomplishment of their goals. The establishment of these functions of health, education, and welfare—in the broadest sense of that term—in an executive department is part of the answer. Not only should the problems in these fields receive regular consideration at the meetings of the President's Cabinet, but it is easier to get competent people to serve in an executive department than in an independent agency whose status is somewhat less secure.

Speaking of securing competent people, I am sure you agree with me that we are indeed fortunate to have Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby as the head of the Federal Security Agency at this time. Mrs. Hobby has been active in public affairs for many years, not only in Texas affairs but in national affairs as well. For several years, Mrs. Hobby served as parliamentarian of the Texas House of Representatives; she has been director of a radio station, she has been editor of a great newspaper, the Houston Post; she worked in the War Department Public Relations Office; she was director of the WAC during the Second World War; she has been on the board of regents of Texas State Teachers College; she was closely connected with the work of the Hoover Commission, she had participated in all sorts of welfare activities such as the Community Chest and the American Cancer Society programs, on both the local and the national level. She has many more accomplishments which I can not take time to mention here. I believe that she has demonstrated her ability as an administrator with wide experience in the fields with which she is now intimately concerned. President Eisenhower has invited Mrs. Hobby to sit as a member of his Cabinet. There is ample precedent for this step. Both the Attorney General and the Postmaster General were members of the President's Cabinet before their respective agencies gained the status of executive departments. We should follow through and make Mrs. Hobby the first Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In addition to the reasons I have just advanced for transforming the Federal Security Agency into an executive department—namely, that its functions are vital and warrant consideration at the highest level and that we now have an Administrator of exceptional ability and merit—there are several other provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 which are worth while. The creation of the positions of Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries certainly is reasonable and justified from an administrative point of view. The Secretary should be free to select policy advisers of his or her own choice. Making the Commissioner of Social Security a Presidential appointee gives him greater independence and makes his position comparable to those of the Commissioner of Education and the Surgeon General of the Public

Health Service. The Special Assistant—health and medical affairs—will give medical problems recognition at the top level of the proposed department.

It is my sincere belief that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 should be allowed to go into effect. It gives recognition to health, education, and welfare functions which are vital to all of us and assures their consideration at the highest level of our Government; it improves the organizational structure for the administration of programs in these fields; and it consolidates the progress we have made in our attempts to establish a desirable social program for the American people.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 submitted to us by President Eisenhower is substantially the same as Reorganization Plan 27 of 1950 submitted to the Congress by President Truman and rejected by the House by a vote of 249 to 71.

On numerous instances throughout the printed RECORD you will find statements by the Director of the Budget, Joseph M. Dodge, and Federal Security Administrator, Oveta Culp Hobby, to the effect that the plan before us today is substantially the same as Reorganization Plan 27. Illustrative of this testimony is the exchange between the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOLTZMAN], a member of the committee, and Mr. Dodge, appearing on page 57 and which reads as follows:

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Dodge, we are all agreed now, are we not, that this plan is substantially the same as the 1950 plan which was submitted by President Truman? Is that correct?

Mr. DODGE. Substantially, I would say.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. I should like to read the conclusion of the Republican minority in connection with the 1950 plan, and I quote:

"In the absence of conclusive evidence to show the need for elevation of the present Federal Security Agency to Cabinet rank, the House of Representatives should reject the plan by approval of House Resolution 647."

Has anything, Mr. Dodge, transpired since the writing of this minority opinion to change the situation?

Mr. DODGE. I think two things, sir: A change of administration and a change of Administrators.

In essence, then this plan merely provides an administrative superstructure for the Federal Security Administration. The present Administrator, who now serves and votes as a member of the Cabinet, will be elevated to the level of a Secretary and the salary of the head of this Agency will be increased from $17,500 to $22,500 a year. The Assistant Federal Security Administrator will be entitled "Under Secretary" and the salary of that office increased from $15,000 to $17,500 a year. The office of Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs will be created at a salary of $15,000 a year. The offices now entitled "Assistants to Administrator" will be changed to "Assistant Secretaries," and the salary of these two offices which are now vacant, will be increased from $10,000 to $15,000 a year. Additional assistants to the Secretary are provided for in the plan, but no salaries are specified, except that they will be paid such compensation as prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government. Therefore, increased salaries alone in this administrative superstructure amount to at least $32,500 annually.

The Director of the Budget was unable to estimate how much additional expense would be required by way of administrative overhead to support this new Department structure. Nor was he able to say how many would be furnished such accouterments of office, as limousines and chauffeurs.

Let me point out to you that not one single agency is abolished by this plan. Not one single consolidation is provided for. Not one single job is abolished, but, on the contrary, new positions are created.

All Reorganization Plan No. 1 calls for is a creation of an administrative superstructure for the already existing Federal Security Agency.

As I interpret the mandate of the people of this country last November, they voted to cut down the cost of an expanding Federal Government. They responded to promises to balance the budget, provide efficiency and economy and cut taxes. In my opinion, that mandate called on this Congress to provide less Federal Government, rather than more Government. However, the first measure we were asked to consider when the 83d Congress convened was to create the new office of Under Secretary of State for administration, at a salary of $17,500 a year. Most of us went along with the administration on this proposal and the assurance that the creation of such an office would enable our new President to effect needed administrative reforms in the State Department. However, the second proposal submitted to us for efficiency and economy is one raising the salaries of several high officials of the Federal Security Administration and one which creates new jobs at an increased cost to the taxpayer. The American people, already suffering under a staggering taxload, can no longer afford this type of economy.

The Director of the Budget, in testifying in behalf of this plan before our committee, stated that the creation of this new administrative superstructure would make it easier to attract the most highly qualified persons to fill the major administrative positions in the Department. In my opinion, this is certainly a reflection on the highly qualified, competent, and intelligent lady who has accepted the position as Administrator for the Federal Security Agency. What more highly qualified persons do we hope to attract to the office than Oveta Culp Hobby?

The committee report on this plan recites that it "meets with approval of individuals and groups concerned with health, education, and social security." May I point out to the House that not one single witness appeared before the committee on behalf of education or social security. School people in general have for many years held to the principle of a separate and independent United States Office of Education in the Federal Government under a lay Board of Education appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, which lay Board would have authority to select and appoint the United States Commissioner of Education. At the moment when the public schools are kept close to the people, there may be no particular urgency in this matter. If and when the Federal Government expands its interest in and support of public education, which proposal I would oppose with equal vigor, then it will become a matter of greatest importance if we are to protect our freedom in education and thought. It is all too obvious what happens when a strong Federal Government enters the field of control of education and the thinking of the people from which it draws its authority.

It is true that the house of delegates of the American Medical Association endorsed the creation of a Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs who is to be selected from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience, as a step in the right direction. In my opinion, however, we should follow the recommendation of the Hoover Commission which has long been endorsed by the American Medical Association, for the creation of an independent health agency with executive status. I fear greatly that this position in the wrong hands could well result in the political control that not only the medical profession, but most of us here in Congress, oppose.

The report filed by the committee recites on page 8 that under this plan, the Secretary may consolidate service activities common to the various agencies of the Department. Let me point out to you that rather than consolidating any such activities, the plan specifically provides that the new Secretary may "establish central administrative services in such fields as procurement, budgeting, accounting, personnel, library, and legal services." Does this mean that this new administrative superstructure will have the power to frustrate congressional desires to centralize the procurement of common-use items in the General Services Administration? And may I further point out to the House that no estimates were furnished as to the increased cost of operating the Federal Security Agency that would be entailed by the establishment of such central administrative services.

The committee report includes a paragraph entitled "Hoover Commission Recommendations," creating the inference that this proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a recommendation of the Hoover Commission. You will also be told that former President Hoover sent a telegram to the chairman of this committee, favoring the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1. However, no member of the Hoover Commission or of the former Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report appeared before the committee. The truth is that this plan departs from and is in actual conflict with the Hoover Commission program. The only point at which this plan touches the program of the Hoover Commission is in its creation of a new Department.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The proposed new Department, however, would not be that which was recommended by the Hoover Commission. A major point of difference from the Hoover Commission program is the inclusion of health functions in a Department with Education and Social Welfare. Another point of difference is in the lodging in the new Department of the Public Health Service which, under the Hoover Commission program, would be made a part of an independent United Medical Administration. Still another vital point of difference is the granting of autonomous power to bureaus within a Department. The Surgeon General, the Commissioner for Social Security, and the Commissioner of Education will each be appointed by the President and, as the committee report points out:

The plan safeguards the status of the constituent units of the Department, particularly the Public Health Service and the Office of Education. It does not transfer from these agencies any professional or substantive functions vested in them by law or provide for any such transfer. A fair interpretation of the plan is that, except as regards the establishment of common administrative services, the authority of the Secretary under the plan with respect to the constituent units of the Department will be the same as the present authority of the Federal Security Administrator.

This is at wide variance with the basic philosophy of the Hoover Commission.

In commenting on Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950, which is substantially the same as the plan before us now, the distinguished chairman of this committee, together with the distinguished majority leader, commented:

The plan in scarcely any particular follows any recommendation of the Hoover Commission. Its stated objectives are not those of the Hoover Commission, more efficient organization and greater economy, but rather increased prestige and influence for particular activities.

The logical argument advanced by my warm and distinguished friend from Illinois, now serving as majority whip against adoption of this plan when it was last considered by Congress, applies with equal force to Reorganization Plan No. 1. He said:

In my judgment this plan conforms to none of the objectives of the reorganization act for efficiency and economy. Instead of reducing expenditures, this plan will lead to increased spending. Instead of less government, this plan proposes more government. Instead of promoting efficiency, this plan will bring about political control in those fields, such as education and public health, where there should be a very minimum of such control. * * * It simply takes all the agencies and their functions now constituting the Federal Security Agency and makes a Department out of FSA. It thereby promotes the Federal Security Administrator to the highly desirable rank of a Cabinet officer, with the salary and prestige commensurate with that rank. * * * We know from experience with Government budget matters that a host of other jobs to serve these new high rank officers will, in due course, be set up.

In conclusion, permit me to cite from the 1950 minority report signed by many of the same Members who now advocate adoption of this plan, because it summarizes my objections to Reorganization Plan No. 1. It read:

Reorganization Plan No. 27 is the answer to the bureaucrat's prayer. It provides increased power with which to extend the activities, influence, and payrolls of existing agencies which every bureaucrat seeks. That is virtually all it does.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. May I assure the distinguished gentleman that we have a rather definite commitment from Mrs. Hobby that these increases in salary will be made up by her lack of travel all over the world such as the last particular occupant of that office did.

Mr. LANTAFF. I appreciate the assurances given.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I realize that the distinguished gentleman has been trying to point out some of the additional costs that are to be incurred when this plan goes into effect, but I wonder if he would not agree with me that the Director of the Budget pointed out in our hearings that these additional costs would be more than offset by the efficiency and the economy that would be brought into the Department if and when Mrs. Hobby had the opportunity.

Mr. LANTAFF. I do, and as you recall I asked the Director of the Budget where he would cut the budget submitted by the President for the Federal Security Agency. He replied that he had not completed his analysis, was not able to recommend one single cut, but that he hoped to be able to do so within a week.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. I think the gentleman would agree that the Director of the Budget for the last 60 or 90 days has been rather busy, but he did agree and very frankly state that he would study the budget and he would give us information in certain areas where there could be definite reductions made.

Mr. LANTAFF. I hope such proposals will be forthcoming. On that, Mr. Chairman, I rest my case opposing Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANTAFF. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That was a correct statement as I saw it. My only hope is that now we will get rid of those bureaucrats—I hope and pray that we will—and I will vote for legislation to do it.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am going to restrict my remarks to the joint resolution we are now debating and not particularly to the merits of the reorganization plan itself.

It seems to me that in recent weeks we have been hearing on the floor of this House some very peculiar arguments advanced by the opponents of legislation brought on the floor. Only recently, when we were debating the question of the admission of Hawaii as a State, we heard the great former Speaker of the House say that he was going to vote to recommit the bill because he wanted the bills for Hawaii and Alaska to come out together so he could vote against both of them. Then we heard the great former majority leader from Massachusetts say during the same debate that he was going to vote to recommit the bill on statehood for Hawaii in order that he might vote for statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not talking on the subject.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Just a minute and I will. Now, we have with reference to this particular resolution one of the ranking members of the committee in the minority, the gentleman from California, stating that he wants to vote against this resolution so that he will have an opportunity to vote against the Bennett resolution. Now, if a thing is good, it generally is well to get it as quickly as possible. This resolution is here today because this matter of reorganization of this particular department has been before the Congress for years. There is not a single Member on either side of the aisle who is not familiar with the plan as such. As a matter of fact, those on my right all through the hearings attempted to claim authorship of this particular resolution. They did not say it was not a good bill, but they simply said it was the same bill that they had proposed, and, therefore, they were going to support it. Now, if that is so, then we are all for it and to make the simple argument against advancing by several days something that is good for the American people simply in order that we might go through a shallow procedure here of having a resolution come up which we all know we are going to vote against, and thus postpone the good effect of this legislation and go through a silly show—what a record we would be writing for the American people. The only argument that is advanced against the passing of this resolution today is the argument that it sets a bad pattern, and that other controversial legislation, with which we are not familiar, will some day come before us perhaps under a similar resolution—and that is bad. In my humble judgment, that objection is an indictment against the intelligence of the Members of this House. We are familiar with this matter, and we are prepared to vote its speedy enactment. When such is not the case, and when more time is needed for study, and when some new matter is involved, I am sure the membership of the House will not vote in favor of a resolution to speed up the enactment of a plan with which they are not familiar, as we are doing today with reference to this resolution, simply because on this particular occasion it is being done—as it should be. So I say, let us get on with our work.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I assure you in taking the position that I do, I am taking a position clearly and wholeheartedly in opposition to this legislation. It is not merely a question of the technicalities of how the matter has been brought up. I think I have a right to ask the people in the district I represent if they would like to testify on this legislation. The head of the Department of Education of

my own State of Florida is opposed to this legislation. And I have in my hand a letter from the head of one of the most important life insurance companies in our country, Mr. S. Kendrick Guernsey who last year was president of Rotary International. He writes me concerning this measure as follows:

We of the insurance industry are frankly frightened by the reports that shortly there will be recommended the establishment of a Department of Welfare, which could easily come under the dominance of a head inclined toward socialistic principles. We know that you are not in favor of that, but we earnestly call to your attention these dangers which are inherent in such a proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I admit there are some matters of administration which might be helped by having the present head of the Federal Security Administration appointed as a Cabinet member. Actually, I would have no particular objection if that is all this legislation did, but, of course, this legislation goes very much further than that. I have no particular objection to Mrs. Hobby, nor to her appointment. But I do not think we should establish a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and that is the reason I oppose this legislation.

We are not dealing with just a Republican administration nor just with the next 4 or 8 years. We are dealing from here on out permanently through the future existence of our country. Have you any idea that a department established by our Government would ever be abolished? We have never abolished a department yet. What makes us think we could abolish this one? What makes us think we will have conservative people in the White House forever? If there happens to be a wave of left-wing people in control, that would be our hard luck, and what we do today might then wreck our country. We today are the ones who are making the decision at this time for what may be a calamity in the future.

I think as we look upon the international scene, this particular time is probably the worst time we could possibly pick to expand our basic welfare commitments. Our great country is today having a hard time storing all the butter which it is producing, but it is not producing enough bullets to use in Korea. That is the sort of country we are running today. Do we want to tell those boys in Korea that we think so much of this local situation of welfare that we should establish a Department of Welfare at this time, when they themselves are not being given sufficient assistance in ammunition to fight the enemy from whom they are protecting us on this shore? Is that the sort of thing for which ballots were cast in the last election? No. The people of this country rose up and said, "We want economy in government. We want less centralization of government in Washington." We want less centralized and paternalistic government, because every time we have things done for us we lose a certain amount of our freedom. If we lose it, step by step, soon we will have really lost our freedom.

We cannot possibly shirk our responsibility in looking at what we are doing here today. This is a proposal to establish a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Similar proposals have been rejected time after time in both the House and in the Senate.

The first reason I would like to give for rejecting this proposal is the breakneck way in which the matter has been presented. We have not had an opportunity to have adequate hearings.

Another thing I would like to point out is this word "welfare" which we have in this legislation. The Democratic Party was not so bold about the matter. We termed it "a Department of Security." Our Government has constitutional authority and responsibilities in dealing with security, but does it have these in the field of general welfare? I think our forefathers, who formed the Constitution, might question that.

Article X in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution specifically says that specific powers not given to the Federal Government under the Constitution are left in the States or in the people. That was done for a very good purpose, because they feared the extension of centralized government even back there 150 years ago. Today we have all the more reason to fear big government. I point out that this particular proposal, coming to us from the Republicans, puts this word "welfare" in the resolution, embracing in thought and deed many more things than obtained in the resolution which the Democrats brought in.

We in the South have been generally for States rights. That has been our heritage, to support that idea. This proposal is contrary to States rights. It is contrary to what the people said everywhere in the last election. The people said clearly that they wanted States rights upheld and a minimization of Federal power in Washington. I think the Southern Democrats certainly should stick by their guns and uphold the idea of States rights in this matter and defeat this particular proposal.

It seems to me the Republicans have a definite responsibility in this matter. They led the people of my State to think that they were for States rights. The best example of that was the tidelands issue. Now, in the first thing that comes before the Congress on a States rights issue it looks to me as if the Republicans are going to change their views. They are not going forward and strengthen States rights, but they are going backward and increasing centralized government.

All of us on the Democratic side, southern and northern, have many reasons for objecting to this resolution. We all stand for States' rights generally, and there are a number of other things which are important to mention. We have, for instance, been anxious to see to it that, when the Hoover Commission reports came in before us, we would carry out the ideas presented in those reports. But the measure before us today is in conflict with the Hoover Commission reports in many important matters, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] has pointed out.

If this reorganization plan is adopted it will prove to be very expensive; expensive from all standpoints. Of course, it will be expensive from the standpoint of salaries and things of that kind. But this is not the real issue. The question is not just about whether or not we are going to have a few more people drawing a few more dollars or thousands or millions of dollars. The question is whether we are going to open the door to a new concept of government, establishing Federal responsibility for broad social programs or the welfare state. The Federal Government has tried to assist wherever it could in the welfare of the people throughout the Nation, but generally only in the particular fields where the general welfare clause of the Federal Constitution applies to specific grants of power to the Federal Government. Certain specific powers were given by the Federal Constitution to the Federal Government. But this measure before us today implies that we will hereafter make it the National Government's business to look after the welfare generally of all people throughout this country; and if we accept this broad responsibility in creating a Department of Welfare we will have done a very very definite thing adding tremendously to national commitments. We will have thereby changed the concept of our Federal Government in a very real and a very definite way. I have no doubts that the costs of this legislation could be, in less than 10 years, not merely hundreds of thousands of dollars or millions, but in the billions of dollars. It takes no imagination to see that the new Assistant Secretary for Welfare would have a splendid time thinking about all the things the Federal Government could do for the welfare of the general population. The possibilities are absolutely unlimited. The possibilities are also almost as unlimited when it comes to the field of education. This underlines my chief objection to this legislation, which is that the establishment of this department would offer an implied promise to the people of this country that the Federal Government would do things for the people of this country which the Federal Government is not financially able to do and is not able to do from the standpoint of administration. Despite the inability to achieve the high objectives which might be outlined for any such department now or in the future, I can really visualize one of the first functions of the new department would be to have a planning staff, whether so-called or not, to fill in the vacant spaces in the department, create new bureaus and new functions, and set out to propagandize the American public with press releases and other methods of information, explaining to the American public why they should request these things from the Federal Government. You should bear in mind at all times that the Federal Government is very much in the red financially; is faced with the most terrible international situation that any country has ever faced in the history of the world, and has responsibilities which are absolutely staggering under the Constitution as it was drafted by our forefathers, to say nothing of the responsibilities which would be promised by the establishment of a department of this type.

What I have said about increased expense which would result from the establishment of such a Department goes

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

hand in glove with the question of increased bureaucracy. I firmly believe that if this Department is established it will outshadow every other department of Government as far as the number of Federal employees is concerned within 10 years. Of course, in this I am excluding men who are actually in the services of the armed services because they run in the millions at this time, but as far as ordinary civilian employment is concerned, I believe that this Department could not be held in check and that it would grow by leaps and bounds because of the demands that would be made upon it and the Federal Government as the result of its very establishment. Let me point out what an article in the Christian Science Monitor recently said about the Government embarking in this particular field. The article in that distinguished newspaper indicated that the cost of only one piece of legislation, a bill introduced by a Republican in the Senate, a bill to carry out a health insurance program, would cost about $2 billion a year. The legislation now before us will open the door to compulsory health insurance and all manner of expensive new programs.

Now what about the fact that the doctors are supposed to be for this legislation now, when they were supposed to be opposed to it before. I do not know if the doctors were once opposed to the legislation except that I do know that I had a flood of telegrams from doctors in opposition to the legislation when it was here before, and the few opportunities that I had to talk to doctors before indicated that they were in opposition to it. I have had no further telegrams, or even any telegram, or any communication from a doctor telling me that he favors this legislation which is before us today. I understand that the President of the United States recently addressed a small gathering of doctors, who were probably in a representative capacity, it is true, and that this small gathering of doctors did go on record as favoring this legislation. Their resolution or report favoring the legislation is certainly an ambiguous one, however. In that report they said in part:

> Inasmuch as Federal health benefits and programs are established by the Congress, an administration bent on achieving the nationalization of medicine cannot reach that goal except with the support of Congress. Therefore, an organizational plan through which Federal health activities are administered, although important, is not nearly so vital an issue as the policies adopted by the Congress of the United States. * * *
>
> The association reserves the right to make recommendations for amendment of the then existing law * * * if the present plan does not, after a sufficient length of time for development, result in proper advancement in and protection of health and medical science and in their freedom from political control.

You will note that they indicate that they feel that this legislation is not so dangerous as far as nationalization of medicine is concerned because Congress would have to enact legislation nationalizing medicine, even after this department is created to supervise health activities. But they failed to observe that the establishment of this Department would open the door for a gradual process of socialization of medicine, and that, in fact, the establishment of this Department may be considered to be the start of such a process.

Then the association reserves the right to make recommendations for amending any laws if the proposed plan fails to provide protection of health in an atmosphere free from political control. My observation on that is primarily that if the Federal Government expends increasingly larger amounts of money in the field of health, it is inevitable that control will follow; because it is inevitable that a Government which taxes and spends money must control how that money is spent; otherwise, it violates its most fundamental duty to its citizens. It is wishful thinking to think that a Government may tax and spend and not control. If it failed to control, it would fail to do its duty. It is nice to know that the doctors may come back and tell us some time in the future that things have gone too far, that medicine has now been socialized, but who among us here think that all of the recommendations that they might make could stem the tide of an established socialistic policy.

I wonder what is going to happen to veterans' hospitals if this legislation is enacted. Are they going to be swallowed up in some general program of hospitals throughout the country? If so, will veterans receive adequate treatment; and will we be able to take care of the other people who desire to get into any Federal hospital which is established such as those who may be drawing old-age assistance and things of that kind?

I have spoken a great deal about health matters in discussing this legislation. I should also like to say something briefly about the question of education. We have already established a program of Federal aid to specific types of schools where a Federal obligation is involved. Such assistance as that is not dangerous to our way of living because the schools are limited in number and even if all Federal programs in this field came to an end the States would in some way be able to carry on even if greatly hampered.

However, if this country ever adopted a general Federal aid to education program where assistance would be given to all States, those that need it and those that do not need it, it is my opinion it would be only a question of time before there would be control of schools throughout the United States as to their textbooks, teachers standards, and so forth. As a matter of fact, if the Federal Government is going to spend the money and raise the taxes for running the schools throughout the country, it is very doubtful to me if it would be an honorable thing for Congress to allow the money to be spent without any controls attached to it. It is fundamental in government that there is a great deal more waste in money that is given from one government to another than there is in money which is raised by the Government which spends it. Some controls would be necessary in order to preserve reasonable financial and other standards. Therefore, I have never approved of a general Federal-aid-to-education program of the type which I have outlined. I believe that a program which gave assistance to a few States—those which actually need it—might be a good program if we could afford it; and I would have no objection on principle to such assistance, but after this department is established, if it is established, I believe that it would only be a question of a relatively short time before a general Federal aid to education program would be established giving assistance to States which are wealthy and those that are poor. I see no necessity for such a program. Such a program would raise the question of parochial schools. People who support parochial schools with their own private funds already also assist in their local public schools. It seems hardly fair that they should then be called upon thereafter to assist the schools throughout the United States—in the rich States as well as in the poor States—in addition to the local public schools. I do not believe that Congress could ever pass, or should ever pass, a bill which would give Federal aid to education to private schools of any type on the general basis that I have outlined before, but I think the danger of such legislation is infinitely greater if we pass legislation such as we have before us today.

We must retain our freedom and we cannot retain freedom when somebody is taking care of us.

Who among us would challenge the statement that the creation of the Department suggested would facilitate the Federal Government going into Federal aid to education of a general sort and compulsory health insurance? We all know that it would facilitate such procedures and that they could be established with the help of propaganda and publicity from this newly established Department if we establish it. There would be no other agency pointing out the dangers and the people could be misled.

I would like to say that I think that every suggested advantage that might come from the passage of this legislation could be better achieved by specific consideration of the specific agencies which are suggested to be included in this general Department. It is true that much reorganization is needed in these individual departments. It is not at all clear to me that any reorganizations within the individual bureaus and agencies would be assisted in any way at all by combining them under a general departmental organization. I do not think that many people would say, for instance, that the Department of the Army or the Department of the Navy or the Air Force achieved very much in reorganization within themselves by the simple process of putting them under the Department of Defense. It is obvious that it would be more efficient to leave the reorganization within each group rather than lumping them all together.

I very sincerely urge all Democrats, southern and northern alike, to oppose this legislation as dangerous to the welfare of our country, and I urge the Republican Party to do the same thing and to bear well in mind what they consider to be the issues which helped the Republican Party to be elected last November—the issues of economy and the elimina-

tion of bureaucracy and centralization of power in Washington.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that whatever I may say here will not change a vote, however for the RECORD I should like to make a few observations. It is a red-letter day when New-Deal Democrats accuse Republicans of being interested in human rights. We have caught it from all New-Deal partisans that we are the party of property rights, and here we are interested in welfare, interested in human rights, but that is as it should be for we have always been the party of human rights. They have pinned labels on us that did not fit. Our party was born to make men free and our concern for human rights and public welfare is genuine and basic. Everyone agrees that President Eisenhower has selected a capable administrator to head this department. She looks good, she wears well, and knows her stuff. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] is apprehensive about salary increases. Let me say to the gentleman that we Republicans appreciate the fact that we are on trial. People voted for us in Democratic States, they voted for President Eisenhower and the Republican Party on the representation that we would balance the budget and that we would cut taxes. As a matter of fact, on our side today the only question is as to which comes first, the cart or the horse. There is no discord on the Republican side.

Washington is a new place these days. The whole atmosphere is different from what we had in the dying days of the Truman regime. Eisenhower is responsible for the facelifting operations, but the men he has placed at the helm are equally to be credited with the new tone. The pace has quickened, and as more and more changes in departments take place, the climatic change now becoming apparent in the Capital will radiate out through the country.

This metamorphosis is intangible, but you can put your finger on many of the specific items which make it evident. First, the Cabinet is a working Cabinet. Other Cabinet officials have worked, of course, under every administration, but the new men are the kind of people who think hard and straight and demand action. They cannot be diverted by conversation. Platitudes at the Government level do not sit well with business executives accustomed to decision-making. More than this, there is the spiritual lift that comes with new men tackling new jobs with definite goals in view. The goals make the jobs meaningful—reaching for a decisive step in the Korean war—balancing the Federal budget—pushing atomic research into civilian areas for human betterment—taking hold of America's international role under a man who knows the world scene intimately. There will be lots of hard work and no play for official Washington for a good long time to come. That is the way it should be.

Congressmen on the Republican side of the aisle are in a dilemma which has pleasant aspects for a change. They are confronted with the responsibility of determining which to cut first, the Federal budget or the taxpayers' income tax. Either or both will be welcome news, and in this choice, there are valid arguments on both sides.

The tax cutter says that you never can convince the bureaucrat that you mean business unless you cut off his funds. The budgeteer insists that you cannot jeopardize the economy and encourage already inflated inflationary trends by cutting taxes without a balanced budget. It is asking a great deal of the new men who have been cajoled into serving the first Republican administration in two decades to suggest that we may be able to achieve both goals, but this is precisely the task which they must set for themselves.

We ought to be able in this congressional session to evolve a balanced budget by draining the water from Federal departmental spending taps. When it is balanced by this rigorous but determined process, the tax-cutting ax can be safely drawn from its rusty case and applied where it will do the most good.

We Republicans like to be in control for a while. We have been out for 20 years on the administrative side, and we have been out in the Congress. In this 83d Congress we want JOE MARTIN in as Speaker again, and we want to continue as the majority. So we are out to do a good job and, believe me, Mrs. Hobby understands that she is to cut expenses and that the budget must be balanced. We were elected on that basis. Do not think for a minute that there is a Republican on this side who is interested in increasing costs.

Under the circumstances, do not worry about Mrs. Hobby adding people to the payroll. Mrs. Hobby understands her job. She knows her stuff, and we are fortunate, indeed, that she is available to serve as head of this department. You can rest assured whether we cut taxes first or cut expenses first that we are going to do both, and quickly.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I should not bring up the things that I had intended following the brilliant, nonpartisan, statesmanlike speech that just preceded. But I am opposed to this legislation in its entirety, the same as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], Mr. LANTAFF, and others who have spoken before me. I am opposed to this legislation because I believe that to make a department out of this agency would be to place more power in the hands of one individual than it would be right or reasonable or safe to do. I believe in a government of laws and not a government of men, and that is the reason that I am maintaining my position, regardless of the change in administration, the same one that I took in 1950, when the shoe was on the other foot. I voted against it then and I am going to vote against it this time. As far as I am concerned, the principle has not changed. It is still just as dangerous to place this power in the hands of a Republican now as it was to place it in the hands of a Democrat in 1950.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that this will be permanent legislation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It will be permanent legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. And certainly the same party that is anticipated to be elevated to this important post now cannot expect to be the same party who will have it from here on out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That party is temporarily in power. Whether it is 4 years or 40 years, sooner or later, we will have another radical leftwing President, whether he is a Democrat, a Republican, or a member of some other party. And when we get him, he will already have the tools to put socialized medicine into effect, if this plan is approved.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am afraid if we get him, that he will put all of these leftwingers back in. I am just as fearful as the gentleman is, but, of course, you are not opposing this because the new department head is a Democrat from Texas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I think the gentleman knows that I have earned my right, during the last 3 or 4 years, to criticize either party.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think that is correct, and very effectively, too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. He knows that I always voted on issues independent of party considerations. The gentleman from Michigan exercises the same independence, and I am very proud to be associated with him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Many times.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And I am sure he is going to maintain the same position he did in 1950, along with every other member of the Republican Party except one. If you will just look at the rollcall in 1950, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 6, page 9864, you will find that this very same measure was defeated by a vote of 249 to 71, and of those 249 Members who voted against this very same proposition we are considering today, you will find listed every single Member of the Republican side present and voting, with the one exception of Mr. JAVITS.

Oh, I know the shoe is on the other foot now, but one of these days our side will be in them again, and when this comes about you had better look out. And let me tell my Republican friends another thing: I am getting ready to read some of your own remarks back into the RECORD, some of the remarks that you gentlemen made in 1950 when you were opposing this bill, at that time supposedly on philosophical grounds. Why, Arm & Hammer cannot manufacture bicarbonate of soda fast enough to kill the indigestion you will get from eating your own words. If this plan was a rotten egg in 1950, 3 more years of aging does not make it fresh.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Now, first let us take the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. Let me tell you something about this leadership of your party. As I say, I think I have earned the right during the last 3 or 4 years to criticize you. I have helped you out on occasion. I have learned one thing since I have been in Washington. I have grown to think about the Republican Party in this light, that your leadership—and I am not talking about individuals; I am talking about some of the politicians in your party, if you have any. I want to stay within the rules of the House, so I certainly do not intend any personal reflections on any Member of this House. But it appears to me that one of the great distinguishing characteristics of the Grand Old Party is its ability, on any given occasion, to change its color from black to white and then back to black again at will. Now, let us see what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had to say just 3 years ago when this very same proposal was before the House:

Now, mark it well, your vote on this proposition is going to put you on one side or the other of this great issue of socialization of medicine. I do not think anyone can affirmatively deny that, although I have listened to these other statements.

Yet here you are today arguing for a plan that flies right straight in the face of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Is not the Hoover Commission report sacred over on your side?

In my opinion, you cannot blow hot and cold on this.

So said the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. Well, it is his hot side that is turned to us today.

Then I turned over to the rollcall. Let us see how the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] voted. He voted among the 249 stalwarts who killed this plan only 3 years ago.

Then there is Mr. HALLECK's assistant, the whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. What did he say?

I ask that you take a good, hard look at what this plan actually does. It simply takes all the agencies and their functions now constituting the Federal Security Agency and makes a Department out of the Federal Security Agency.

I am not going to read all of this, but listen to his next statement:

The plan not only does not conform to the Hoover Commission recommendations, it runs counter to them.

That was the same plan you have before you today. If that was his real objection then, it is still applicable with equal force.

Then I turn to my good friend, the great statesman from Minnesota, the erudite gentleman who went down before the American Medical Association Saturday and threw them a bone. Of course, the bone did not have any meat on it. I cannot blame the AMA for jumping for that bone. I will tell you the truth, it has been 20 years since they have had even so much as a bone, even if this one did not have any meat on it.

Let us see what the gentleman from Minnesota said 3 years ago. At that time he said on the floor of the House:

I cannot see why your committee does not take out the health services and bring in a bill for education and security if it wants to. I am for that. I am not in favor of including in the same department the health features because I think it would be bad for the people of the country. It is not the way to get the better medical care you and I both want.

I know that they created a new position under this bill, an advisory medical position, an advisory medical assistant to the Administrator, the Secretary, as the case will be. You gave this to the American Medical Association, and very properly so, because certainly they should be permitted to regulate their own profession. True, you furnished them with a gun, and then you proceeded to stop up the barrel so they could not get a bullet in it, because you placed this assistant in a purely advisory capacity without any authority whatsoever over the Public Health Service or the operations of the Department.

You will have the health service as an autonomous element in the loose framework of a conglomerate, gigantic Department of Public Welfare.

Now we come to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I wish Mr. BROWN were on the floor. I wish he could hear some of this I am about to read. It would bring back nostalgic memories I am sure. Mr. BROWN said, in 1950—here it is in the RECORD:

Whenever we put all of the educational activities, all of the social-security activities, and all of these other activities of the Government, plus all of the health activities of the Nation under one man, you have given that individual more power than any one person should exert or should be endowed with for the good of the people.

How now, Mr. BROWN? How do you feel about it today, now that your folks are in power?

A little bit later on in this same speech, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], whom I love as the rest of you do and have the utmost of respect for—I know he must still be on our side, particularly in view of what he said before—Mr. JENSEN asked Mr. BROWN a question:

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that if this Reorganization Plan No. 27 goes into effect, it will make one individual, the Secretary of Welfare, an all-powerful, superpolitical medicine man, a superpolitical dictator of public education, and a superpolitical Santa Claus?

And how did Mr. BROWN reply?

Yes; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, that brings me to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], one of the great educators of this country, a man who is looking after the interests of the public schools of our country; who is seeing to it that the States are permitted to operate their public schools without any Federal encroachment. What does Mr. KEARNS say on the subject that we have here; let us see. He says:

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to plan No. 27. As an educator I have come up through the ranks of the teaching profession. I know the trials and tribulations of the teacher and the school administrator and I am not going to vote to put Oscar Ewing—

And neither would I. But our distinguished schoolteacher friend did not stop there, he said he was not going to put Oscar Ewing—and listen to this—

or any other administrator on their necks.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let me quote just one more sentence. I am sure the gentleman will be interested, he is an educator too, I understand.

Then Mr. KEARNS went on to say:

I would take this stand—

Listen carefully, now—

even though a Republican were the administrator of social security.

And, Mr. Chairman, just a few moments ago, some Republican said he was confused by the stand taken by the Democrats. Let me assure him that it is not the Democrats who are confused. His crowd is the one looking for a storm cellar.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I just want to say as a school man, I opposed it then: As a school man, I oppose it now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. God bless the gentleman from Illinois. He is a rock of Gibraltar. May his tribe increase.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, if one did not examine with care the speech of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] who just preceded me, one might draw the erroneous conclusion that the proposal before us today is the same proposal that both he and I spoke and voted against in 1950. Two facts refute his argument. First, the proposal is not the same. Second, even if the plan were the same and in identical language, the circumstances are entirely different.

Let me deal with the second fact first. To raise the Federal Security Agency to a department in 1950 could not have been done without putting the official stamp of our approval on the ideas, policies, and methods of the persons who then ran that agency. It would inevitably, and I think properly, have been interpreted as approval or endorsement of Ewing and his team and their policies, which they openly declared were aimed to produce socialization of medical practice and, ultimately, of almost everything else in the United States. For Members of the Congress, either Democrats or Republicans, to vote for that plan then would have given those men and their ideas and programs vastly greater respectability, influence, prestige, standing, and power. It was out of the question for us to do that if we were responsible legislators.

Now we have a totally different situation. There was an election in this country last November 4, and the policies of Oscar Ewing and his whole crowd were emphatically rejected by the American people. A new philosophy

and new leadership were chosen. To make this agency a department now gives congressional ratification to the philosophy of Government chosen by the people last fall—a philosophy, and a leadership, quite the opposite of those which we overwhelmingly rejected 3 years ago. If the plan and the circumstances today were those that existed 3 years ago, I think I have earned the right, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has well put it, to expect you to believe that I would be opposing such a plan now as I did then. The suggestion that that it is some sort of a flip flop to have voted against the plan before us in 1950 and then to vote for the different plan before us under the circumstances of today, simply will not hold up. For not only are the circumstances different; today's plan is different in several respects. I mention the one that is in the field in which I have most interest and experience. It has to do with the provision of medical care for the people of the United States. The American medical profession for more than 80 years has asked for a Department of Health in the Cabinet, just as most State governments have. For more than 80 years it has repeatedly taken such action in its annual conventions, or by its responsible authority, the house of delegates of the American Medical Association. Doctors have been wary about health being put into some sort of basket with a lot of other functions, and then handled by people who are not themselves trained physicians. It might be called, Health, Education and Welfare, and sold to the people on the basis of their concern for health, but the tail end of the dog, "welfare," being far bigger in the amount of money expended and the number of people involved than either health or education, could well wag the dog, to the detriment of health and education.

We do not want to get hooked into that kind of a setup, without appropriate protections. I could not support this plan if it did not contain certain protections; protections, I repeat, which no previous plan contained. It sets up a special assistant to serve as an adviser on all health matters to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He must be a person who has had extensive experience in the medical field, in a nongovernmental capacity. That is, he cannot be just some person who has handled statistics on medical care, or a medical economist, or a social-service worker, admirable as most of them may be. The special assistant must be a person who has had experience in the medical field outside the Government. That means he must know from firsthand experience what is involved in furnishing good medical care on a private basis.

The reason doctors oppose socialized medicine is not because they are doctors. It is because of what they know as doctors about the practice of medicine. They know what things are necessary to have good medical care. Their opposition is not due to concern for themselves; it is due to concern for the sick. Many, perhaps most doctors, would be better off financially under socialized medicine. A fellow just out of medical school would not have to hang out his shingle and prove himself good in order to build up a practice; he would go right on the payroll of the Government at six or seven thousand dollars a year, whether he is any good or not. Again, when a doctor gets old or does not keep up to date and is not too good, the public leaves him for some better doctor if he is in private practice. But under a Government-operated and financed system of medical care he would be taken care of. Yes; a majority of the doctors would be as well or better off under socialized medicine. Why then do they oppose it?

I am proud of the fact that my profession has not yet sunk to the level where it will sacrifice its concern for the well-being of the sick in order to improve the financial status or the security of some of its members.

A doctor knows there are three things absolutely essential if people are to have good medical care: First, the relationship between the doctor and the patient has got to be wholly voluntary—voluntary on the part of the patient or he is not going to have the necessary confidence in the doctor; voluntary on the part of the doctor or he is not likely to be as fully interested in the patient as he ought to be. The patient tends to become another case or another card, another number in a long line. That tendency has invariably developed under government medicine.

Second, there must be a direct and intimate relationship between the doctor and the patient with no intermediary like a government agency between them. If the doctor gets all or part of his fee paid by the Government, then he begins more and more to work not for the patient but for the Government, and God help the patient when that happens.

The third thing necessary is that there be maximum incentive for the doctor to improve himself, to make the most of his abilities.

What are the major incentives that cause men to work hardest to improve themselves? One is financial reward. Some people have an inner self-starter which causes them to throw themselves into their work without thought of any monetary reward. Unfortunately, they are the exception, not the rule. Most men do their best work if thereby they can better get ahead and provide more adequately for their families and their future. The other major incentive is opportunity for professional advancement, recognition of superior effort and ability by one's colleagues. If you set up socialized medicine where a doctor gets ahead not on the basis of merit, but on the basis of seniority or of senility, as some call it here—then why should a man strive his hardest to improve himself? Why should he stick out his neck and perhaps get in trouble with his superior in the bureau? In order to advance in skill, he must use imagination and exercise creative ability. But how many will strive to be better than their associates if that brings more trouble than reward, as so frequently happens in a regimented system which penalizes the man who pioneers and rewards the fellow who just conforms?

These are the major reasons why doctors have opposed socialized medicine, they know it would gradually destroy the high quality of medical care in this country which they have been responsible for developing during all these years. No conscientious and responsible physician would ever want to associate himself with a plan under which the medical profession would not have at least opportunity to check carefully and to advise on any proposals, from whatever source, having to do with the practice of medicine.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JUDD. I am sorry I do not have time.

Mr. HARRIS. I have a very important question I would like to ask the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I hope the gentleman will not press his question now; I hope he will let me proceed.

In this new and different reorganization plan provision is made for a Special Assistant to advise the Secretary of the new Department on all matters dealing with health and medical subjects.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Not at this time for the reason I stated to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I just wanted to find out if this individual is what is known as a pooh-bah?

Mr. JUDD. I do not know what the gentleman is talking about. I cannot yield now. The gentleman can get time from his side.

It was said during the hearings that medical care in the United States is the best in the world. How did it get to be the best in the world and who is responsible? It got to be the best in the world through the efforts of the physicians of this country, working under a free and private system. It is not perfect, but we would be derelict in our public duty if we were not ceaselessly vigilant to preserve those things which have brought it to its high level. Is it possible for you to believe those very people, the medical profession, who have built up such a wonderful standard would try to undermine and destroy it, as some seem to want us to believe?

The medical profession does not demand a veto but it does want a powerful voice in these matters, and the bill provides in section 3 for a special assistant and adviser who must be chosen from persons who have had wide nongovernmental experience in this field. This special assistant has opportunity to make sure that the views of the medical profession and the reasons for those views are available to the Secretary before decisions are made affecting medical and health matters.

Now I must go ahead and summarize what I think are the advantages in making a department out of the Federal Security Agency. First, its size. It has 37,500 employees. Second, its scope. It affects more people in our country than any other branch of our Government except perhaps the taxgatherer. Even he does not touch as many people for he does not reach those who do not pay taxes. But this agency affects every

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

single person in our land in one way or another. Through the Office of Education it affects every child in America and every family that has a child in school. Through social security it affects every worker who has a deduction for that purpose from his pay check and who looks forward to the day when he may get back some assistance in his retirement or old age. Through health it affects every person in the United States. Every person sooner or later has to have medical, dental, hospital, or related care.

Third, it affects our people in fields where the responsibility of the Federal Government is secondary. The full force of this consideration was brought to my attention only recently.

There is some advantage in having one department which handles matters in which the Federal Government deals with its citizens in a secondary way. It focuses attention and responsibility to have all such functions lumped into one basket where they can be dealt with together. The Federal social-security program is primarily one assisting the States. Education has always been in the hands of the States, the counties, the municipalities, and local school districts; and it must be kept so. Responsibility for medical care has always been in the hands of State and local governments, and of private agencies. This new Department will not change that status. In fact, it will make it more firm.

The Federal Government has primary responsibility when it comes to defense. The Department of State has primary responsibility in foreign affairs. But everything that this Department of Health, Education and Welfare does or should do is in assistance of State, local, and private programs under direct control of State, local, and private agencies which have, and must continue to have, primary responsibility.

I want to fix this relationship by having all of these functions lodged at the Federal level in one responsible agency of department status, with a clear understanding that the function of the Federal Government is not primary direction or control but secondary and supplementary. It can and should collect statistics and make reports, provide research, serve as a clearing house for information on the 48 State programs, make available to the States its tax-collecting facilities, and under proper safeguards make grants-in-aid to State, local, and private programs in these various fields.

I think there is a real value in having in one place all these functions in which the role of the Federal Government is secondary, with its responsibilities identified and its limitations defined. Again, there is real value in having this agency tied in with the other departments. With the head of this Department sitting in with the Cabinet, it becomes more a part of the total administration. It is given greater standing and prestige, that is true, but it is also subjected to some restraints which it has not had heretofore. As a full partner in the whole team, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare cannot go its own way in building a separate empire as freely as we know the Federal Security Agency has done heretofore. It will have greater influence, but be less independent. If, God forbid, it proves impossible to get rid of all the outright Socialists who have dominated its activities, then at least they will be moderated by other people in any administration who are more conservative and better balanced.

Our trouble with the socializers is that in their concern for better distribution of goods and services, they generally forget the first thing is to have a system which will produce more and better goods and services so that there will be something worth distributing more equitably.

The medical profession and local educational agencies have been successful in raising quality, but there are areas where adequate health and education are not available to large numbers of our citizens. We must give more attention to getting better distribution. This Department can be of the greatest assistance at this point, but I want it to be tied in with the rest of the Government so that it will not be in a position to go off on tangents pretty much on its own, as has been the case in the past.

These, it seems to me, are some of the main reasons why we should vote for this resolution. The plan is different from previous plans. The situation is different. The leadership is different. To vote for this plan today gives approval to a wholly different philosophy of Government than that of the former plans when the agency was under Ewing and his associates. The changes in the plan itself are wise and sound. Since we are going to have the agency in some form, is it not better to put it in a place where it is under more effective control of both the President and the whole Cabinet? The heads of the Treasury Department, the Departments of Defense, of Agriculture, of Commerce, of Labor, and so on, can deal with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare directly and regularly in Cabinet meetings. As a Department it can be held down and its functions carried on in a more responsible, careful way. It should be able to do its job more efficiently and more economically, and with appropriate restraints. Thus I think the disadvantages and dangers existing in 1950 are outweighed by the advantages present under the circumstances existing in March 1953 after the election of November 1952.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the administration is to be commended on Reorganization Plan No. 1, which provides for the establishment of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan, which has for its objective the improvement of our health, education, and social-security programs, is long overdue.

Over the past 20 years great progress has been made in these three important fields, and I am in favor of the present plan because it could well provide the means for further development of these programs. The granting of Cabinet status to the functions of the Public Health Service, the Federal Security Agency, and the Office of Education, should have the effect of strengthening all three agencies.

The Public Health Service is the one Federal agency directly concerned with the health of our Nation. It is what might be called an old-line Government agency, as is the Office of Education, which was established in 1867. The Federal Security Agency is a comparatively new one, having grown out of the depression of the early 1930's. All three agencies have developed greatly over the past several years and they have reached the point where they should be grouped together in a single department.

The reorganization plan, as I have studied it, is not materially different from similar proposals which have been submitted over the past few years. While the previous plans were rejected, there appears to be little or no opposition to the present reorganization plan. It is a good plan and should be allowed to become law under the Reorganization Act.

It is unfortunate that in the consideration of the present plan there has been a radical departure from the reorganization procedures which have been followed in the past. Under the Reorganization Act, if Congress approves a reorganization plan, no action is necessary. It becomes law after a period of 60 days unless a resolution of disapproval is introduced and it is passed by a constitutional majority, which is 218 in the House and 49 in the other body. This time-honored method has served very well and provided the means by which the majority of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were adopted.

The resolution before us is equivalent to a new law. This resolution does not require a constitutional majority but can be passed or defeated by a simple majority. If the resolution before us should fail to pass, the President's plan would still become effective unless resolution of disapproval is brought up and the plan rejected according to the terms of the reorganization law.

This procedure we are following today, in effect, seeks to dispense with the Reorganization Act. Aside from that, it appears to be a backward step in reorganization because a resolution such as we have before us would appear to be open to amendment. One of the reasons Congress has never been able to reorganize the Federal Government itself is because proposals originating here are subject to amendment, and in the past such bills have been amended to death. The only effective reorganization which has ever been accomplished has been done under the Reorganization Act method. The precedent we are setting here today may easily destroy great progress in the broad, general field of reorganization in the future.

While I favor Reorganization Plan 1, I cannot make myself a party to the dubious procedure which is being followered here today. For that reason I must oppose the resolution, for I believe it is not only unnecessary but also unwise.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire

to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support the measure which is now before us. I was not in favor of it when it was presented in 1950. There were various reasons: one was that I did not believe any useful purpose would be served by creating the new Department; another was the resentment which I have always felt over the demotion of the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air. Once these Departments were of equal dignity with the Departments of State, Commerce, Labor, and others whose Secretaries were of Cabinet rank. Now, the Secretaries of these three vitally important agencies are far down the ladder of rank, precedence, and relative importance. This, I think, is very bad and should be remedied.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], spoke of the attitude of the soldiers in Korea toward the move which we are making today and implied that they would resent the creation of this new Department. He may be right, but I believe their resentment would be far greater if they realized that their Secretary has been booted off his place on the President's Cabinet by so-called unification.

I wish to correct two points concerning Mrs. Hobby who is to be the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF], said that no one appeared before his committee in favor of this measure who was a member of the Hoover Committee or of the Citizens' Committee on the Hoover Reforms. If I am not mistaken, Mrs. Hobby was a member of the Citizens' Committee.

On the other side of the aisle, a gentleman stated that the increased salaries to be paid to Mrs. Hobby and her new staff would be more than offset by some economies which Mrs. Hobby said she would place in effect. The inference, I believe, is unfair to Mrs. Hobby because it leaves the thought that she will effect these economies only if she is made a Secretary. I believe that even if we turn down this measure today which, of course, we will not do, Mrs. Hobby as a member of the President's Cabinet, as an Administrator and as a well-meaning American citizen would surely go ahead and effect the economies anyway.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the approval of this resolution and shall vote against it for the following reasons:

It has not been shown that there is any emergency facing the country, which requires a departure from the method of procedure provided for in the Reorganization Act. On the contrary the testimony of Mr. Dodge and Mrs. Hobby leaves the distinct impression that there is no such emergency.

The saving in time would be most insubstantial even if the resolution would pass both Houses without any great delay, and would in essence be tantamount to an amendment to the Reorganization Act and contrary to the intent thereof.

This plan requires real study because it does not embody, nor does it fairly present the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The plan does not establish a clear line of authority from the President through the Secretary to the various bureaus.

The testimony reflects that the members of the Hoover Commission were not consulted, nor was the Citizens' Committee asked for an opinion with respect to this plan.

The fact is that the creation of the Special Assistant is in direct contravention of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

This country has managed to survive for many years since it was recognized that reorganization would make for better government.

A few more days cannot do us any harm, and will give the Congress sufficient time and opportunity to examine and discuss this plan thoroughly.

I respectfully urge the disapproval of this resolution.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON].

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, one or two things have occurred to me that have not already been stated during the debate. I wonder just what is the necessity for all the haste on a measure which does not save a dollar of the taxpayers' money, but raises salaries and creates a new top-level position. Moreover, how much sooner will the plan actually become effective? Presumably the Senate cannot possibly pass a resolution if we sent it over to them at least until tomorrow or Friday, which would be the 20th of the month. Then there is a 10-day waiting period before the plan becomes operative. The 60-day period expires May 11, so at the most you are saving about 40 days of time. If there is any appreciable delay in the Senate, the rate of acceleration is to that extent cut down.

In addition we are presumably going to have to vote upon the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] disapproving the plan. From what I gather was a statement made by the Parliamentarian, the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] is still in order even if we pass the approving resolution. Instead of conserving time of this body as one of the Members suggested we do, what we are actually doing is having the debate today, and then we are going to spend another day on it when the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida comes before us. I do not think it is wise administrative or parliamentary procedure to have two full debates on the same subject, if you can otherwise avoid it. Moreover, by having two debates it is conceivable for the House to reach opposite results, particularly since the approving resolution requires only a simple majority and the disapproving resolution requires 218 votes. So I am going to vote against this resolution.

I would like to make one further observation. As is already apparent, the only major difference between plan No. 27 in 1950 and plan No. 1 in 1953 is the creation of this special medical assistant that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] referred to. There was some talk about some travel made by former Federal Security Administrator Oscar Ewing. We find in the transcript of the hearings before our committee on page 107 a description of the duties of this special assistant. This job description arrived in the record in a rather peculiar way, which I will advert to later. The third paragraph of the duties of this special assistant are as set forth on page 107 are:

> The special assistant to the Secretary will from time to time represent the Secretary in various international meetings, such as being a delegate to the World Health Assembly and World Health Organization and other major international assignments.

I do not therefore think we are necessarily going to cut down on the international travel by making this Agency an executive department and giving its head Cabinet rank.

I do think it might be worthy of the attention of the Members to note how we came by this information about the duties of this medical special assistant. We questioned Mr. Dodge at great length as to what the duties of this special assistant were, and what functions he performed. Obviously creating the sort of a job that interferes with the direct line of authority is very much against the whole philosophy of the Hoover Commission as to how an administrative setup ought to be established. Mr. Dodge could not give us any description of his duties except the general description that the man would recommend to and advise the Secretary on matters of public health and that the duties would be fixed by the Secretary. Mrs. Hobby could not give us any description of the duties. But then the representatives of the American Medical Association came before our committee and testified they had a job description that prints up to almost a full page of the hearings, a very complicated job description. We pressed them as to where they got that job description and how they knew those would be the duties of this new special assistant. We were informed they received it from the Rockefeller Committee, which, by executive order, is part of the executive branch of the Government.

We pointed out at that time, and I think it is an observation that might well be made now, that we think the Administration would have done better to present that job description to Mr. Dodge and to Mrs. Hobby, who were appearing before our committee. We also feel it was rather unfortunate that it was only by accident that the joint committees of Congress got any detailed information about the type of job this new special assistant would be doing. We think the administration might well consider taking the Congress more fully into its confidence.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Chairman, the matter before us is the consideration of House Joint Resolution 223, which states:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, submitted to the Congress on March 12, 1953, shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, and its approval by the President—

Thereby making this a legislative matter—

notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, except that section 9 of such act shall apply to such reorganization plan and to the reorganization made thereby.

This joint resolution is before us now. If it is defeated it will in no way cause this plan not to become the law of the land under the Reorganization Act under which the reorganization plan was drawn.

I think this is a bad precedent for the House to set. I think it is a bad precedent in the light of the remarks of the last speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, whom we all admire for his erudition and his ability to state his views so clearly.

I am sorry all the Members of the Congress have not had a chance to read the hearings on this joint resolution. I am sorry that some members of the committee were not present at the hearings, because we learned that a committee composed of Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, Mr. Flemming, and Mr. Milton Eisenhower got together with a group of doctors and there bargained with them for their support of this measure. As a result of their getting together they drew up and gave to the doctors of the American Medical Association a job description. That job description is on page 107. If you will read that, you will find there is nothing in the charge that they make a bureaucracy. Never in the days of the Truman or the Roosevelt administrations was there such a brazen attempt to buy the support of any group by offering them the thing that was offered the medical association to get their support for this plan.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. The gentleman did not yield, and I have less time than he had.

Mr. JUDD. That is correct, but the gentleman's charge is completely unsupportable.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. The best evidence of the charges is that after this first meeting this job description was drawn up, and as the delegates came into that meeting of March 12 each one of them at the door was handed a job description. Then at that meeting of delegates at which they okayed and agreed to support this measure a representative of the President of the United States and our good friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] spoke. That is the meeting at which the statement was endorsed.

I say to you that we have every reason to believe that a price was paid, and the price was the thing set out in this special job setup, if you will read that job description.

Mr. JUDD. But there was no bargaining.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Director of the Budget Dodge appeared before us, and he was asked if he had any description of this job and he said "No." The present head of the FSA, Mrs. Hobby, who I believe to be as fine an administrator as the administration will ever get, also answered that she had no job description. I think it is a shame not to give to Mr. Dodge, the Director of the Budget, and not to give to the head of this agency, this job description which had been given to the doctors in order that they might tell the joint Members of the Senate and the House what was in this job and what was bound up in it. I claim that we are entitled to know what is in a job description which is set up in legislation given to us. I say to you that under the evidence brought out in this hearing, if you will go back and read the evidence, you will find the facts are as I have stated those facts. It is bad legislation. We should not proceed in this manner to handle a reorganization plan for the very reason of the position that we find ourselves in now. The reorganization act was thought out. It was given hearings. It was carried through this Congress in the regular manner, and the provisions of that were drawn up. It gave every Member of the Congress the right to file a disapproving resolution. Now we stand here with a disapproving resolution filed on this matter before the Congress, and at the same time we are considering a measure which will take from that individual the rights that he had under the law. I say that we cannot blow hot and cold. I say to you that this is not the means to amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, which has been extended to terminate in 1955. I say to you this entire procedure does not justify the saving of time. I say to you that you are setting up a pattern here and now that, if followed throughout by this administration, will show the things that they have yelled against in their talk of bureaucracy and patronage are but small things when the administration will go to the extent of creating additional jobs in order to get support from any pressure group in these United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I stated just a moment ago that we had only one speaker.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. That is why I closed on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman from Illinois rely on that?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Yes; that is why I closed on that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I regard the approval of this resolution as a most significant step which we in Congress can take to help the President in his efforts to improve the administration of Government functions while bringing about necessary economies. In the first place, the Government's activities in the field of health, education, and social security are so important to the national welfare and to the welfare of each citizen of this great country that they should be on an equal footing with other important Federal activities. These programs which Congress has established to promote the well-being of all our people should be accorded the same recognition as other governmental programs which promote the well-being of commerce, labor, and agriculture. This resolution will accomplish that purpose by approving the establishment of a new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I should like to call attention particularly to the provisions in the President's plan which will make possible continuing study and attention to problems of health and education. For this purpose the Secretary will have the advice of professional people, presumably the leaders in their respective fields. We have been told that the new Secretary will appoint an advisory committee on education, the members to be selected from outside the Federal Government. State and local responsibility in the field of education not only must be maintained; it must be strengthened. Yet we are all aware of the problems confronting our school systems and educational institutions. How do we train good teachers for our children, pay their salaries, and provide adequate buildings and equipment? It is a matter of great national interest that the future citizens of this land have the best possible education. The proposed advisory committee should provide the Secretary with excellent professional advice concerning necessary and desirable Federal action to strengthen State and local school systems in this objective.

Under the reorganization plan a new office will be created in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—a special assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs. A recognized leader from the medical field will advise the Secretary with respect to necessary improvement in the department's health and medical programs. The health of our people is of the utmost concern. Our national strength and ability to lead the Western World in the struggle for freedom and for the overthrow of Soviet imperialism and aggression depends on the physical and mental well-being of every citizen. Yet in World War II approximately one third of those men examined under the Selective Service System were rejected for physical or mental disability. Since the Communists attempted the plunder of Korea 1½ million men have been classified IV–F and rejected as unfit for service. The President and Mrs. Hobby recognize that these problems of health and education must receive the attention of the best minds of the country. This reorganization plan not only provides for continuing the functions of each of the major units of the present Federal Security Administration; it also reflects the conviction of the President and of the new administration that better leadership is needed to help our States, our

communities, and our citizens solve these problems.

I am pleased to see that the Secretary of the new department will have the necessary authority to bring about sorely needed reforms in the internal administrative affairs of the agency. These management reforms should result not only in improved administration, but in real savings to the American taxpayer. The President is moving swiftly in every field to make good on his promises for better government at reduced costs. We in Congress cannot fail to support him.

Some of my colleagues on the minority side are assuming that they have somehow been offended because we propose to permit this reorganization plan to take effect almost at once. They do not oppose the reorganization. In fact, it is admitted by nearly all that it is timely and that the plan for the new Department is well conceived. Why then this opposition to the resolution before us? When Congress passed the Reorganization Act of 1949 it was recognized that some of the reorganization plans to be submitted by the President might be rather complicated and controversial and that we should have sufficient time to give them careful study. Surely there was nothing in the intent or spirit of the act to prevent us from hastening the reorganization process in different circumstances. If we are generally agreed that this plan is good and desirable, that it will help the President and the present Federal Security Administrator provide better service to the American people, why should we not help them to get on with the job? If it will result in economies in administration, is there any reason why we must wait 60 days to start saving money? I fail to see any logic or consistency in such a position.

Mr. Chairman, the President believes—and I believe the testimony before our committee supports this view—that the administration of these vital functions of health, education, and social security will be improved by this reorganization. Favorable action on this resolution will assure a prompt beginning in the accomplishment of this objective. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, before I yield the balance of the time to our colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], I want to say this—that never—no never since I have been here have I heard such an absurd charge as has just been made by the last speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]. The charge was that the American Medical Association, because the members exercised their right to make their position clear and to learn what was in the bill, are now accused of having sold out to the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, Mr. Chairman; I do not.

Mr. Chairman, I say the charges are absurd. That it is infamous to charge the medical association and every doctor in this country whom they represent with having sold out to the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will address the Chair if he desires to ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the gentleman from Illinois, and every other Member from that side who was in hearing heard the representatives of the medical association deny that charge, and now they come in here and make a charge that they sold out to the administration. In my opinion that charge is without justification.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to make a statement?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was asking if the time is being deducted from the remaining time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time consumed is being deducted.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I would like to know if the remarks made by a Member who has not been yielded time remain in the RECORD.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] made remarks. Nobody yielded him time. Do those remarks remain in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. Remarks remain in the RECORD only with the consent of the gentleman who has the floor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I did not yield.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who knows more about the subject than most of us; I mean the medical end of it.

Mr. JUDD. I want to say about the charge just made that there was bargaining with the medical profession, first, that the medical profession has always fought against any kind of proposal that would regiment medical care. Are doctors to be deprived of their rights as citizens, to come before responsible Government officials and say, "We do not like this proposal. We think it ought to be changed thus and so in order to do the job"? There was no attempt by the medical profession. It was an effort to prevent a mistake that might otherwise have been made. I resent the suggestion that there was any deal or any bargain or anything improper. It was an attempt by doctors to help those planning reorganization to get this plan into a form that will serve the interests of the people of America.

I was not present at the meeting——

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I was not present at the meeting at which this job description was discussed. I never heard of it until today.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for a discussion on the floor.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. For the sake of the record, and to end some insinuations that have been made, I never heard of this job description until today. I was not at any meeting where any medical people went to see any officials. I heard them report that they told officials in the FSA that this was the first time they had ever been able to get a hearing in the Agency. They said, as I recall, that Mrs. Hobby told them the door would always be open to them to appear and present any grievances or suggestions.

As to the meeting of the house of delegates in Washington last Saturday, I went down there as an interested physician and as a private citizen. While waiting there for other speakers they called on me to make a few remarks to my friends. If there was anything improper about that, I ask the gentleman from Illinois to point it out.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. You were present at the meeting.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has the floor.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the few instances in which I have not wished for additional seniority in the House. I am not in the position of ever having had to vote before on any of the so-called similar bills. To my colleagues on my own side I would say that, had I been a Member of two previous Congresses in which such vote was taken—knowing then the partisan atmosphere, knowing the socializing philosophy of the times—I probably would have voted with them against the formation of this new Department. We are now in a new administration and in a new time and the bill, in addition, provides new safeguards.

I am here speaking briefly, not to explain the plan itself, which has been so adequately described, but to support the resolution which seeks to insure prompt action. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations, I am glad that it is possible to hasten action on a good plan by bringing in an affirmative resolution of this nature. Those of you who have listened to me with patience on the subject of reorganization know that there has probably been no one in the House more eager to put into effect the Hoover Commission plans, but that I have had two major questions in my own mind about the process. I have been willing to concede the need for drastic reorganization and the accepted method involved in the Reorganization Act, but I have always regretted the necessary delegation of congressional power, and I have particularly regretted, because of the weakness and technical imperfection of some of the plans that were handed down to us in the 82d Congress, that under the act it is not possible to offer any amendment to any plan, no matter how necessary or desirable. Since such amendment is impossible, I doubly welcome the procedure by which this plan was discussed carefully, long, cooperatively, by the executive branch, with members of the House committee. It is interesting to note that Mrs. Hobby and members of her staff and members of the White House staff took the time and patience to discuss with us this plan before the President submitted it officially.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Not only did they just present it to us, they asked for our suggestions, they listened to our advice, weak or strong; and they made a great effort to have an area of agreement before the plan was sent down in final form.

The plan, Mr. Chairman, has therefore had long study, careful preparation, and, insofar as is possible the executive branch did seek, as I said, to have an area of agreement on major points and most of the minor ones with Members who had it under consideration. I not only consider such a procedure to be a healthy beginning for this plan but deem it another outstanding example of the respect which the President continues to pay to a coordinate and equally powerful branch of Government.

I see reason for the affirmative resolution. In the first place, there is nothing new about this method. It has been used many a time. It was used as early as June 4, 1940, in a Democratic Congress, the 76th, when House Joint Resolution 551 was introduced carrying the same provision for affirmative action on a reorganization plan.

The former speaker asked: Why the haste? I think we know why the haste. The people on November 4 demanded efficiency, economy, integrity, and common sense in government; and on the Republican side of the House we promised that to the best of our ability we would so reorganize this Government as to produce efficiency and economy. If a plan has been carefully thought out, if it has been well weighed, if it appears sound, then why delay? If a thing is good who would want to wait for it?

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a last point. It has always concerned me that during the waiting period of 60 days, little study or consideration is apt to be given to any plan except by members of the Committee on Government Operations. Plans go into effect without adequate consideration by other Members of House and Senate, unless each accepts an individual responsibility—and that is not apt to happen.

But when you have a resolution such as No. 223 seeking approval of a plan by affirmative action of the House, the responsibility is on everyone of us to make up his mind. In the present case, it is only a question of whether or not we want the plan; it is not a question of whether or not to use a method which has already been used over and over again. The question indeed is whether or not you dare wait and put off action on necessary reorganization of this Government along the lines of the efficiency, economy, and common sense which the American people demanded on November 4.

I urge you to vote for the resolution and welcome it as giving us a chance to take such positive action as will put our pledges into prompt operation.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Considerable has been said concerning the vote for a similar resolution back in 1950 and at other times. I think it is safe to say that the situation then was so frightening when Congress was called upon to entrust this to Mr. Ewing and his lieutenants that those opposing it were justified in resorting to any ingenious argument they could to defeat it, and I believe the people so regard it.

Mrs. CHURCH. I do too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Illinois has expired, all time for debate has expired. The Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, submitted to the Congress on March 12, 1953, shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, except that section 9 of such act shall apply to such reorganization plan and to the reorganization made thereby.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "resolution," insert "and its approval by the President."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Strike out section 3 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Dawson amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It does not specify wherein the resolution that is now before the Committee is to be amended and, further, Reorganization Plan No. 1 is not before the Committee at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Illinois had already been recognized.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this shows the position we are in, this shows why this type of legislation should not have been brought up at this time. The Reorganization Act if carried through, or any plan sent down by the President under the Reorganization Act, is not subject to amendment, and House Resolution 223 makes this general legislation. The President's plan is now open to amendment at any point in that plan. I think this is the time when the Congress ought to exercise its right to amend this legislation which comes before us as general legislation. This is now the time that we can afford to look into this question of the special assistant that is going to be appointed. Let me read what it says:

The special assistant to the Secretary will be top staff policy adviser to the Secretary with respect to health and medical matters. He will have responsibility for reviewing the health and medical programs throughout the agency and, where necessary, making recommendations for improvement. On matters of legislative policy where health and medical policies are involved, he will be responsible for making recommendations to the Secretary. This will include review of legislative reports involving health and medical care matters, proposed testimony before congressional committees relating to health and medical-care matters, and other related policy statements such as annual reports, etc.

As chief staff policy adviser in the health and medical field, the special assistant to the Secretary will represent the Secretary on top-level interdepartmental committees concerned with health and medical-care matters, such as the Health Resources Advisory Committee to the President. He will have responsibility for liaison on behalf of the Secretary with important nongovernmental groups, such as the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the American Hospital Association, the American Public Health Association, and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers. Such liaison will not, of course, supplant liaison by the constituents of the Department but would be broadly representative of the total interests of the Department in the health field. He will, when appropriate, represent the Secretary in making speeches before various groups interested in health and medical problems faced by the Federal Government and particularly by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That is only the second paragraph.

The special assistant to the Secretary will, from time to time, represent the Secretary at various international meetings, such as being a delegate to the World Health Assembly of the World Health Organization, and other major international assignments. Such representation will not, of course, supplant appropriate representation from the Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau, and other constituents of the Department. The new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will continue to have major and numerous international responsibilities in the field of health as a positive arm of United States foreign policy.

That is only the third paragraph.

As directed by the Secretary, the special assistant to the Secretary will see that related health and medical problems arising in any of the various constituents having health or medical-care programs are properly coordinated. These constituents are: The Public Health Service, the Social Security Administration (including the Children's Bureau), the Food and Drug Administration, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and St. Elizabeths Hospital. Coordination between related activities of these constituents is a matter of very substantial importance.

Once more you have a duplication of services rendered by this particular individual which is already being performed and paid for.

In short, the special assistant to the Secretary will be the top staff policy adviser to the Secretary on health and medical matters, will represent the Secretary in important external relationships of the Department with national and international bodies concerned with health and medical matters, and will, as needed, coordinate related health and medical programs within the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, there you have before you the multitudinous duties set out in this job description that was given to the doctors at the time they voted on this matter. Talk about duplication. Here on the face of this thing it says that they are to duplicate the work already being done by constituent departments of the Federal Security Agency set out in this plan. Is this individual to mess with the Food and Drug Administration? Why, the businessmen of this country, if I read the papers aright, have already waited on the President and asked him not to mess with those who are now handling the Food and Drug Administration; that that department has been satisfactory to business, and yet we find that they went down there and gave a job description that sets up an individual who, under this job description, has the power to go into the Department of Food and Drugs. The same is true about vocational rehabilitation. The Federal Security Agency has done a good job and they are doing a good job. I have no objection to one of these agencies being given Federal status because I have always been for that, and in that I am consistent, because I realize the need and the problems of this Social Security Agency, but I say to you that there is no indication of any need if they are interested in economy and efficiency to set up this overall individual with all of these powers. I say to you if you are going to pass this resolution then you ought to remove from this plan this superstructure that is plainly overlapping, that is set up to take over these duties, and do it also because of the condition under which this job description came to the attention of this Congress. I repeat once again that if anybody ought to have had previous knowledge of this job description it should have been the Director of the Bureau of the Budget instead of the head of this agency which is to be elevated into a position of Cabinet rank. She should have known and read the duties that they intend to give this new assistant. But they said they had had no notice of it, so I am led to believe that neither Mr. Dodge nor Mrs. Hobby had any knowledge of the description that has been read here today. If so, they would have given it to the Members of Congress. Certainly the Members of the House and the Senate, if they were going to meet and pass on this plan, should have had this job description before them then.

They are trying to push this thing through the House without adequate consideration by the Members of Congress, without giving them an opportunity to study the plan thoroughly. Why, we were not permitted to hear one witness against this plan. Not a single adverse witness was called. The hearings were had only for those who were in favor of the plan. No opportunity was given to the members of the committee to get in touch with other Members of Congress and tell them about this plan. The public was not notified that this matter was going to be considered. What kind of public hearing do you call it when only one side is called and given notice of the hearing? I do not understand that type of public hearing, and I say to you that that is the type of public hearing under which this Joint Resolution 223 was eased in here, a public hearing at which the testimony of no one was taken at all on House Joint Resolution 223.

I say that we should not set here a pattern of this type for Congress as we go along. I say that the Members of Congress are entitled to come before the Committee on Government Operations as provided by law to pass on presidential plans and there state their objections. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] should not be forced to come in here almost without notice to speak on this matter, when he is objecting to the plan itself, and when the law that gave the President the right to create the plan gave the Members of Congress the right to come in and file a petition of objection to it.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman, if his amendment is adopted and this Joint Resolution 223 is passed by both the House and the Senate and signed by the President, then, if within 60 days a resolution of disapproval of this plan is not adopted by a constitutional majority of the House, in the gentleman's judgment would the provisions of section 3 be a law or not?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. That does not require an answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the last 10 minutes, if I understand the statement of the gentleman correctly, is principally an indictment of the medical profession, just as was his previous speech. There is no reason why, if anyone wanted to offer a resolution of disagreement with the plan, he should not have done it prior to today.

Just how absurd can we get? Listen to the facts and then form your own judgment.

What is before us today? We have here Resolution 223. It is a legislative proposal which is in conformity with the rules of the House. It is subject to amendment. But permit me to read the gentleman's amendment.

I quote:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: "Strike out section 3 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953."

Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 is not before us. The only thing that is before us is Resolution 223 which accelerates the date.

The point of order is not made to delay proceedings. You cannot amend the reorganization plan today if you tried because the plan expressly prohibits amendments and it is not here. As well might an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act be proposed. The only thing we can amend today is this resolution. The plan can be changed by an amendment of the resolution. But this amendment is not being offered as an amendment to the resolution; no. The gentleman offers it to the reorganization plan. He is asking Members of the House to vote for an amendment to a plan which is not before you. Could anything be more absurd?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, what the gentleman says is correct. In other words, the amendment might have been something in the nature of a proviso following the language of House Joint Resolution 223. If the gentleman will permit me, and if he will yield further, may I just point out that the gentleman from Illinois has just vigorously proclaimed against this method of procedure. He seeks now to amend the substantive provisions which would come into effect if this resolution finally becomes a law. He contends for the adoption or for the following of the regular reorganization procedure when, if that procedure were to be followed in this case, then any amendment would not have been in order. In other words, we would have had to take the plan as it was without any opportunity of amendment.

I think this thing further should be pointed out. The effort of the gentleman to strike this section 3 from the provisions of plan No. 1 is an absolute admission that this plan, as sent up by President Eisenhower, is different in this regard as it is different in other regards, from the plans that have heretofore been before us. In other words, I do not think that the gentleman should blow hot and cold on it. If it is to be argued here that this plan is exactly as other plans that have been before us, then to argue that this provision must be stricken out because it was not in the previous plans, is simply to admit what I said before—that it is clear that this plan is different from the plans that have been before us heretofore.

May I say also that in this particular regard, it is different in a manner and in a way that reassures many of us who have had deep concern about some of the implications in some of the plans which have been submitted heretofore, particularly in view of the circumstances under which they were submitted.

Finally, if this amendment is to be supported, and if you vote for it, you might as well understand you are striking out of this plan the very language that the responsible people in the medical profession have sought to have included in the plan in order that there be no question about the movement in the direction of socialized medicine. In other words, we stand up and take our places in that regard when we vote on this amendment. It seems to me very, very clear.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not only that, Mr. Chairman—not only that, which is sound argument, but all afternoon the burden of the argument from that side, with one or two exceptions,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

has been that if we vote for this resolution, we are establishing a precedent that would permit amendment of a reorganization plan and that they did not intend to do that as it would be dangerous, and that they did not want anything in here that would hereafter permit the amendment of a plan. Now the gentleman comes along and offers an amendment, which is clearly out of order, to amend a reorganization plan.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is an indication of the confusion which the House can be thrown into by trying to work on a reorganization plan by an affirmative resolution. I will be the first to state that a reorganization act comes before the House and cannot be amended either way, it cannot be amended by deleting from it or by adding to it. This is one of the primary safeguards in the reorganization act which we gave to the President so that logrolling could not take place and amendments could not be made which might jeopardize Presidential plans. But, by bringing a reorganization act before the House in this fashion, and in your affirmative resolution referring to the provisions of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, you open it for amendment. I have 2 or 3 amendments in my hand at the present time, which the Parliamentarian says are in order. I do not know that I shall offer them, but this is an example of ill-advised handling of a piece of legislation. You have opened up the reorganization plan of the President, which we are all for, to amendments.

You are weakening the power of your President to reorganize the executive departments. Are you going to follow this method in future plans? I would like the gentleman to answer that.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, what the gentleman says about opening the plan to amendment is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman realizes that the reorganization plans are not supposed to be amended.

Mr. HALLECK. I made that point just a moment ago. I said, from all the reports of unanimity in support of this plan, that there would be no question about amendments, let alone mustering enough strength to get by in Committee of the Whole, because it seems highly desirable that this plan be put into effect quickly, and this method of approach was adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman argues the point, but the important point is that you have opened up a presidential reorganization plan to amendment by this method of handling, whereas if you had waited 11 days and acted upon the disapproving resolution of the gentleman from Florida, no one could have offered any amendment. That is the point I have been making all day, that the method of handling this presidential plan is wrong and weakens the power of the President to reorganize.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. If we had followed the regular procedure, the plan could not have gone into effect for 60 days.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Unless both Houses acted on a resolution of disapproval and then acted on a resolution such as is before us now.

Mr. HALLECK. But it still would have been subject to amendment, would it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

Mr. HALLECK. I am afraid I cannot agree with my friend.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If a resolution of disapproval had been acted upon by both Houses unfavorably, then the plan would automatically become law. It is provided in the Reorganization Act of 1949 and there is a provision relating to how a plan can be made effective at an earlier date.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Let us assume that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] were to carry in the committee, and we went back into the House and called the roll on this particular amendment; in view of the origin of this amendment and the support for it, how many votes do you suppose there would be in the House when we called the roll?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not think the gentleman from Illinois, or the gentleman now addressing you, has any illusion as to the result of the vote on this amendment. We realized in advance, of course, that the amendment would be voted down, but this is a very fine illustration, in my opinion, of what the leadership is letting itself in for on reorganization plans if they persist in trying to effectuate them by hasty affirmative resolutions.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I want to correct the statement which the gentleman made. I conscientiously believe that this amendment should be sustained, and we should take out of this plan this superstructure that is now being set up that will duplicate functions that are already being performed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize the gentleman's sincerity, and my remarks related only to the probable vote on his amendment. I have in my hand, for instance, an amendment which would insert in the resolution the President's language as found in the plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not talking on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I did not think my friend would press that point of order. We all like our chairman. In spite of the fact that we differ with him, we know that he has a kind heart, and he accords to the Members on both sides all the favors that he can, as chairman of the committee. I am fighting today for the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations to handle these reorganization plans without interference, handle them the way they should be handled, and not by this method which lays itself open to interference by crippling amendments, and putting our committee in the ridiculous position of having to act twice on the same Presidential plan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: Page 4, line 1, after the numbers "1953" insert the words "except the words in section 6 thereof which read: 'The Secretary may from time to time establish central administrative services in the field of procurement, budgeting, accounting, library, legal, and other services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department'."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order because it is not an amendment to any legislation now pending before the House.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of the joint resolution under this procedure we are following under the Reorganization Act in line 3 the provisions of the Reorganization Plan No. 1 are incorporated in the joint resolution. The plan therefore is open to amendment in this manner.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in reply I state that the amendment does not even purport to be an amendment to the resolution.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I call the Chair's attention to the fact that the amendment is so worded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

On a rather narrow and technical ground the Chair is forced to rule that the amendment is not in order because it refers to page 4 of the bill and there is no page 4 of the bill.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: Page 1, line 4, after the numbers "1953" insert the words "except the words in section 6 thereof which read: 'The Secretary may from time to time establish central administrative services in the field of procurement, budgeting, accounting, library, legal, and other services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department'."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. The amendment refers to section 6 thereof and the language read is not in section 6 thereof.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment and reoffer it by adding thereto the word "personnel" which will correct it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: Page 1, line 4, after the numbers "1953" insert the words "except the words in section 6 thereof which read: 'The Secretary may from time to time establish central administrative services in the field of procurement, budgeting, accounting, personnel, library, legal, and services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department'."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment quotes language which comes from section 6 and there is no language in section 6.

Mr. LANTAFF. Section 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to substitute "section 7," and if the gentleman refuses to grant this I will reintroduce the amendment.

Mr. JUDD. I will be glad to grant it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANTAFF: Page 1, line 4, after the numbers "1953" insert the words "except the words in section 7 thereof which read: 'The Secretary may from time to time establish central administrative services in the field of procurement, budgeting, accounting, personnel, library, legal, and services and activities common to the several agencies of the Department'."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The point is that in line 4 there is the first figure 1953 and along toward the end of the line we have another 1953. The amendment is indefinite in that it does not specify which 1953 he means.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is in order following either 1953. It is appropriate at either point in the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is an alternative proposition and that is not a proper amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to state in his amendment after which 1953 he seeks to offer an amendment.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer it following the first 1953.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if I might inquire of the gentleman if it is proposed by the amendment, if he has the substantive language before him, to strike out the words beginning with the word "the" in the second line of section 7 down to and including the word "and" in line 5?

Mr. LANTAFF. I have a twofold purpose in offering the amendment. One is to give those Members of the House who favor economy an opportunity to vote for some economy. The second is to show up just what action is taking place on this floor and the difficulties that we have in acting on reorganization plans through the resolution which has been introduced.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it not still true that the amendment carries a part of section 6 and a part of section 7?

Mr. LANTAFF. No.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, the amendment refers only to section 7. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out to the majority leader, this illustrates the difficulties involved in trying to approve reorganization plans in this manner. The committee has not had the 60 days which Congress intended in the Reorganization Act in order to examine this legislation carefully. My amendment is directed to one of the same provisions that was in Reorganization Plan No. 27. Had I been here at the time I would have vigorously opposed it. This language to which I object confirms the fact we are establishing a bureaucracy. The only purpose of Reorganization Plan 27, as the distinguished majority leader called to our attention, was to answer the bureaucrat's prayer.

Let us look and see what we do in this plan. We transfer to the new Department Director all of the functions of the Federal Security Agency. We transfer all of the personnel, all of the property, all of the records.

Let us see what we transfer when we do that. We transfer the following functions:

Office of Administration, Office of the General Counsel, Office of Publication and Reports, Office of International Relations, Office of Federal-State Relations, Office of Field Services. Now we have in this reorganization plan which, as I say, is the answer to the bureaucrat's prayer, given the proposed Secretary the power to establish additional services in the field of legal services; and additional procurement services, perhaps to conflict with the General Services Administration which this Congress had in mind to be the central procurement agency for all of these various departments and agencies. So, in other words, we are not limiting the number of additional salaries and the additional jobs we are creating; we are putting in catch-all authority and saying notwithstanding what is in the bill setting up the Federal Security Agency, you can go ahead, Madame Secretary, and establish whatever other agencies you want; you can set up whatever further legal services you want or whatever procurement agencies you want. We in Congress are writing you a blank check.

Mr. Chairman, I pointed out a few days ago that the mandate of the American people in November was to cut down taxes, cut down the cost of Government; give us less government, they cried, instead of more government. But no, these people who are now offering this bill, which they claimed was the answer to the bureaucrat's prayer, are not only trying to increase the salaries of all of these officials of this agency by $32,500, not only trying to increase the tremendous overhead with which the American taxpayers are already burdened today, but they are asking you to write a blank check; setting up, in addition to the Federal Security Agency, all of the other departments and agencies that they think they might need.

Mr. Chairman, I have just one plea. If you are truly interested in economy, vote for this amendment. If you are opposed to economy, vote against it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the real objective of the gentleman who has just spoken is to make it impossible to get economy and efficiency, then his amendment is one way to do it. This particular provision of section 2 was discussed repeatedly in the hearings; the same fear held up by the gentleman from Florida was expressed and the section used as a whipping boy again and again. All this portion of section 7 does is to make it possible for the new Secretary to take the separate procurement agencies, accounting services, legal staffs, libraries, and so on, which the Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Social Security Division, the Food and Drug Administration, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and so forth, have and put them together into one procurement agency, one accounting agency, one legal staff, one library, for the whole Department or as much of it as is practicable. Why should five or six branches or divisions of one department have five or six separate legal and accounting and procurement services? If we want economy and efficiency, then this provision which the gentleman would strike out is one of the most important in the bill. One aim of reorganization is to authorize an administrator to coordinate and pull together and unify and prevent overlapping and waste and duplication. So, I can only conclude that one of the purposes of the amendment is to make it impossible to get real efficiency and economy.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. The reason we need that is because you are setting up a superstructure here over the FSA. FSA has already consolidated all of these agencies, and if you will look at the memorandum submitted by Mrs. Hobby, which I hold in my hand, you will find that she has already consolidated in FSA the Office of General Counsel, the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Office of Administration, the Office of Publication and Reports, so they are already consolidated, and the only reason you need this is because you are setting up such a large overhead structure you have to incorporate more agencies.

Mr. JUDD. She has consolidated a few and she is not sure what authority she has with respect to the others. This gives her the authority she needs.

Mr. LANTAFF. But these are new offices you are setting up.

Mr. JUDD. I cannot find in the language of the plan anything to support the gentleman's contention. This point, I repeat, was raised several times in the hearings. Several Members asked Mr. Dodge and Mrs. Hobby if it did not mean that they would be setting up new agencies. They said, no, it would mean uniting and coordinating the agencies or services so that they could operate more economically and efficiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the Expenditures Committee, 81st Congress, that considered Resolution No. 27 in the 81st Congress. I voted against the resolution. I did not vote against the resolution on the ground of Oscar Ewing; I voted against the resolution because certain Members of this House and witnesses who appeared before the committee in the lengthy hearings convinced me that the plan was dangerous and unsound.

I have the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. I have read the debate on plan No. 27, 81st Congress I have read the speeches of many of the Republican leaders and the outstanding Members of that party that were delivered on June 10, 1950. I have checked over the list of names. It is a funny situation here today, Mr. Chairman, that the hound and the hare are running together. I left my leadership and voted with the minority against this proposal, and, Mr. Chairman, as has been well pointed out here today, the reorganization plan before us now carries a greater opportunity and danger than the plan that was offered in 1950.

The material, the thought expressed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] has been in my mind for some time. Of course, Mrs. Hobby is a fine woman, but she was not appointed to this office for life. There will be others in that place. I have not been convinced that a liberal turn will not take place and another opportunity be offered to appoint a man as head of this Department who will be just as liberal or more liberal than Oscar Ewing. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] spoke against the plan in 1950.

Mr. JUDD. I am still against that plan. This is a different plan.

Mr. BONNER. This plan is more liberal than the plan the gentleman spoke against. I wonder if the plan is just for expediency. I wonder if these fine gentlemen in the majority after making the promises they made last September, October, and November, have forgotten their promises to bring about efficiency and economy in the Government.

I worked hand in hand with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], pointing out deficiencies in the existing operation of the depar ments of our Government during the last administration, during the last Congress. We were dedicated to bring about efficiency and economy. But certainly, as the gentleman from Florida has pointed out, this plan offers an opportunity for expansion far beyond what has ever been dreamed of before.

I cannot understand how my fine Republican friends have changed so fast. It is sort of a chameleon act between 1950 and the present date. I propose, when we go back into the House, to ask permission to put in the RECORD the vote of 1950, and ask that those who are interested in reading this debate read the debate that took place on June 10, 1950, and what was said then by those who advocate this proposal today.

ROLLCALL No. 197, JULY 10, 1950, 81ST CONGRESS

Yeas, 249: Abbitt; Abernethy; Albert; Allen, Calif.; Allen, Ill.; Andersen, H. Carl; Andresen, August H.; Andrews; Angell; Arends; Aspinall; Auchincloss; Barden; Baring; Bates, Ky.; Bates, Mass.; Battle; Beall; Beckworth; Bennett, Fla.; Bennett, Mich.; Bentsen; Bishop; Blackney; Boggs, Del.; Bolton, Md.; Bonner; Boykin; Bramblett; Breen; Brehm; Brown, Ga.; Brown, Ohio; Burdick; Burleson; Burnside; Burton; Byrnes, Wis.; Camp; Canfield; Cannon; Case, N. J.; Chatham; Chelf; Chiperfield; Clevenger; Cole, Kans.; Cole, N. Y.; Cooley; Corbett; Cotton; Coudert; Cox; Crawford; Crook; Cunningham; Curtis; Dague; Davis, Ga.; Davis, Tenn.; Davis, Wis.; DeGraffenried; D'Ewart; Dolliver; Doughton; Elliott; Ellsworth; Elston; Fallon; Fellows; Fenton; Fernandez; Fisher; Ford; Fugate; Fulton; Gamble; Garmatz; Gary; Gathings; Gavin; Golden; Goodwin; Gore; Gossett; Grant; Gross; Guill; Gwinn; Hagen; Hale; Hall, Leonard W.; Halleck; Hand; Hardy; Harrison; Harvey; Hays, Ark.; Hays, Ohio; Hedrick; Herlong; Herter; Heselton; Hill; Hobbs; Hoeven; Hoffman, Ill.; Hoffman, Mich.; Holmes; Hope; Horan; Hull; Jacobs; James; Jenison; Jenkins; Jennings; Jensen; Jonas; Jones, Ala.; Jones, Mo.; Judd; Karst; Kean; Kearney; Kearns; Keating; Kee; Kilburn; Kilday; Kruse; Kunkel; Lanham; Larcade; LeCompte; LeFevre; Lichtenwalter; Lind; Linehan; Lovre; Lucas; Lyle; McConnell; McCulloch; McDonough; McGregor; McGuire; McMillan, S. C.; Mack, Wash.; Macy; Mahon; Marsalis; Martin, Iowa; Martin, Mass.; Merrow; Meyer; Michener; Miller, Md.; Miller, Nebr.; Mills; Morgan; Morrison; Morton; Murray, Tenn.; Murray, Wis.; Nicholson; Nixon; Noland; Norblad; Norrell; O'Hara, Minn.; O'Konski; Pace; Passman; Patten; Patterson; Perkins; Peterson; Pfeifer, Joseph L.; Philipps, Calif.; Poage; Polk; Potter; Poulson; Rains; Rankin; Redden; Reed, Ill.; Reed, N. Y.; Rees; Ribicoff; Rich; Riehlman; Robeson; Rogers, Fla.; Rogers, Mass.; Sadlak; St. George; Sanborn; Sasscer; Saylor; Scott, Hardie; Scott, Hugh D., Jr.; Scrivner; Scudder; Secrest; Shafer; Short; Sikes; Simpson, Ill.; Simpson, Pa.; Smathers; Smith, Kans.; Smith, Va.; Smith, Wis.; Spence; Steed; Stefan; Stigler; Stockman; Taber; Talle; Taylor; Teague; Thomas; Thornberry; Towe; Trimble; Underwood; Van Zandt; Vorys; Vursell; Wadsworth; Walter; Weichel; Welch; Werdel; Whitten; Whittington; Widnall; Wigglesworth; Williams; Wilson, Ind.; Wilson, Tex.; Withrow; Wolcott; Wolverton; Woodruff; Young.

Nays, 71: Addonizio; Bailey; Barrett, Pa.; Biemiller; Blatnik; Bolling; Bosone; Buchanan; Buckley, Ill.; Buckley, N. Y.; Burke; Byrne, N. Y.; Carnahan; Cavalcante; Celler; Crosser; Davies, N. Y.; Dawson, Denton; Dollinger; Donohue; Douglas; Doyle; Eberharter; Engle, Calif.; Feighan; Flood; Forand; Gorski; Granahan; Granger; Hart; Havenner; Heffernan; Holifield; Howell; Javits; Karsten; Kelly, N. Y.; Keogh; King; Kirwan; Lynch; McCarthy; McKinnon; McSweeney; Mack, Ill.; Madden; Magee; Mansfield; Multer; Murdock; Murphy; O'Brien, Ill.; O'Brien, Mich.; O'Hara, Ill.; O'Neill; O'Sullivan; O'Toole; Philbin; Powell; Price; Ramsay; Rhodes; Rodino; Shelley; Sullivan; Tauriello; Walsh; White, Calif.; Yates.

Answered "Present", 2: McCormack; Miller, Calif.

Not voting, 108: Allen, La.; Anderson, Calif.; Barrett, Wyo.; Boggs, La.; Bolton, Ohio; Brooks; Bryson; Bulwinkle; Carlyle; Carroll; Case, S. Dak.; Chesney; Christopher; Chudoff; Clemente; Colmer; Combs; Cooper; Davenport; Deane; Delaney; Dingell; Dondero; Durham; Eaton; Engel, Mich.; Evins; Fogarty; Frazier; Furcolo; Gillette; Gilmer; Gordon; Graham; Green; Gregory; Hall, Edwin Arthur; Harden; Hare; Harris; Hébert; Heller; Hinshaw; Huber; Irving; Jackson, Calif.; Jackson, Wash.; Johnson; Jones, N. C.; Keefe; Kelley, Pa.; Kennedy; Kerr; Klein; Lane; Latham; Lodge; McGrath; McMillen, Ill.; Marcantonio; Marshall; Mason; Miles; Mitchell; Monroney; Morris; Moulder; Nelson; Norton; Patman; Pfeiffer, William L.; Phillips, Tenn.; Pickett; Plumley; Preston; Priest; Quinn; Rabaut; Regan; Richards; Rivers; Rooney; Roosevelt; Sabath; Sadowski; Sheppard; Sims; Smith, Ohio; Staggers; Stanley; Sutton; Tackett; Thompson; Tollefson; Velde; Vinson; Wagner; Wheeler; Whitaker; White, Idaho; Wickersham; Wier; Willis; Wilson, Okla.; Winstead; Wood; Woodhouse; Zablocki.

Now compare rollcall No. 197 with the rollcall on plan No. 1 that will appear later today in this RECORD:

It is beyond my conception to find out and to understand just what this is unless it is for the specific purpose that you charged at that time.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that I believe in, it is to be consistent. I voted against this proposal in 1950, and I am going to be consistent and vote against it now because I think it is bad. I think it is dangerous. I think it offers much danger for the future—more than has been exposed here today. I am terribly disappointed that the committee did not have more extensive hearings on the proposal. I think that is what has brought about the confusion here today. I think if my good Republican friends will look at their vote, and look at their word, they will be consistent and vote down this reorganization plan.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have always, prior to coming here, looked upon the opportunity of serving in the Congress of the United States as one of the finest privileges afforded a citizen. I have always cherished the thought that one day I might have the privilege of serving in this honorable body. Since childhood I have thought of the Congress of the United States as the greatest deliberative body on earth, composed of men of action and also men of thought and of purpose, men who were sincerely interested in making a careful study of the matters that come before them, and who, as a

result of thorough study and deliberation, would take such action as they felt was for the best interests of the people of America.

I do not believe the passage of House Joint Resolution 223 at this time will be serving the best interests of America for a number of reasons, only a few which I can mention in the short time permitted me.

The reorganization plan which this resolution seeks to approve was submitted by the President of the United States on March 12, 1953, I believe, and on that day it was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed. A hearing was held on Monday, March 16, before the Committee on Government Operations of which I happen to be a member. It was only yesterday, March 17, just before the convening of yesterday's session of this body that this resolution was reported out of committee. The record of the hearing on March 16 reached our respective offices just a short time before we came to this session at noon. I seriously doubt that any Member of this body has had the opportunity of reading that record of the testimony presented at the hearing, and yet in so short a period of time, this matter is presented today for final disposition. In my opinion, it is not the American way of disposing of legislation. It is not the right way, regardless of its merits.

Just a few weeks ago I had the opportunity of supporting H. R. 1979 extending the reorganization authority of the President. I supported that piece of legislation with great enthusiasm because during my campaign I advocated more economy and efficiency in government, less extravagance, and the elimination of unnecessary bureaucracies in Washington. The people of America are calling upon us to eliminate unnecessary expenditures and to bring about economy in our governmental operations. I think it is appropriate for us in thinking upon this legislation to give ourselves sufficient time to determine whether or not this resolution approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 will bring about a portion of the result so long sought by the people of America.

I say I supported the reorganization proposal wholeheartedly, thinking and believing at the time that the President would submit to this Congress a reorganization plan which would spell out the method and the means of eliminating unnecessary agencies and jobs and of reducing expenditures and promoting efficiency in government. Lo and behold, when I read the plan I discovered that it calls upon us to look into the minds and into the hearts of the people who are to administer the plan or the program. We are to rely exclusively upon their attitudes of mind and of heart and their promises and commitments to us through the Committee on Government Operations. There is not one provision which gives assurance of the result which the American people expect and the result which I have already alluded to. As a matter of fact, the plan itself and the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the head of the Federal Security Agency, Mrs. Hobby, tends to show that instead of reducing expenditures we will be increasing it by the addition of highly paid individuals. I was disappointed at the hearing to discover also that the witnesses who testified in behalf of this plan were unable to offer any tangible evidence that it would accomplish its purpose of more economy within the Agency and greater efficiency of operation. Most assuredly, the very able Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the charming and able head to be of this new executive department gave assurances that they would try to carry out the purpose of the plan, and I believe they were sincere in their statements. But ours is and should forever be a government of law and not of men. The best way to receive assurances is to have a law that makes the desired result mandatory and to have administrative heads such as Mr. Dodge and Mrs. Hobby who will sincerely administer the law.

If given sufficient time to study this proposal I might be inclined to support it because of a belief that it should be given Cabinet status. However, there are serious questions in my mind as to what we might expect. I believe in centralizing responsibility to a certain extent but the centralization of authority in this plan, as I have studied it, may well open the door to the creation of more agencies and the employment of additional people. If this plan is adopted, I hope that we will not one day wake up and find that such is true.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am not standing here in opposition to this resolution primarily because of questions in my mind about this reorganization plan. As a matter of fact, I had not anticipated speaking upon the resolution. I am concerned and seriously concerned at the precedent we may be setting, or if a precedent has heretofore been set, at the danger of continuing a precedent which makes exceptions to legislation which has been studied and enacted into law, such as the reorganization act which permits Reorganization Plan No. 1 to become effective upon the expiration of a period of 60 calendar days following the date of submission unless a resolution of disapproval is adopted by a majority of the authorized membership either of this body or the Senate.

What was the purpose of this 60-day rule provided in the reorganization act? Was it a perfunctory and useless provision inserted in the act as superfluous? To me it had a significant purpose and a meritorious one. It has been so well described by others who have preceded me.

If you pass this resolution and deprive any individual Member of this House of the opportunity of making a careful study of this plan and even going over to the Federal Security Agency, if he wants to, to find out just what is taking place; and if you take from any Member of this body the opportunity of filing a resolution of disapproval within the 60-day period, and getting a hearing, then you are doing the dangerous thing of opening the door to the possibility that a majority, of whichever party may happen to be in control, may take advantage of the rule and rush legislation through, legislation of even greater importance than this, before it is thoroughly studied, and thereby do a grave injustice to the people of America and deprive the individual Member of the privilege which was purposely granted him in the reorganization bill. I say to you in all sincerity that, regardless of the merits of the reorganization plan, this resolution should be defeated. As I have said, I have serious doubts about the plan. I will not say I would not support it after more careful study. But even Mr. Dodge, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in his testimony before the committee, made the statement that neither he nor others in charge have had enough experience thus far to be able to assure the committee that one dollar would be saved. He simply gave promises which I have previously referred to. If you will permit this matter to remain open for a period of 60 days, as was the original intention or as should have been the intention, every Member of the House will be given an opportunity to read the record of the testimony and to study the matter more carefully, and Mr. Dodge and Mrs. Hobby will have an opportunity to get that experience which they do not now have, and as a result of their experience the President may even be able to submit a reorganization plan which in and of itself offers tangible evidence and tangible phraseology—something that we can read—which will be convincing to us that economy and efficiency will be the result.

Let me repeat I am not opposing the reorganization plan except as opposition to this resolution may be so construed. I am simply saying that this resolution should not pass and that I am not convinced as yet by the greater weight of the evidence that Reorganization Plan No. 1 will accomplish the desired results.

I think we might well insist upon something more tangible supported by evidence of experience. May I repeat what I said in support of legislation giving the President reorganization authority:

> Reorganization is necessary. It can result in a substantial reduction of expenditures and of our tax burden. It can result in more efficiency in government. Should it be undertaken by the President because of a desire to make provision for patronage for an untold number of supporters, then it is doomed to failure and it could be a crime against the American people. If, however, reorganization of the executive branch is attempted by the President in a nonpartisan way, without thought of his party affiliation, without fear of political repercussions if certain supporters of his, or friends of his supporters, lose their jobs or places of trust; if it is attempted by him vigorously and honestly, as I believe it will be attempted, it can well result in substantial improvement and efficiency of the executive arm of government and in substantial reduction of our expenditures, both at home and abroad.

However, let us be sure that reorganization is accomplished pursuant to well defined law, and within reasonable limitations, and not just according to the good intentions of men. Let us forever maintain the reputation of this great body for giving all of its Members—representing the grass roots of our land—the opportunity, not just to be heard, but

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to study legislation, to deliberate upon it for at least a reasonable period of time before acting. Let us be democratic, and regardless of our party affiliation, let us act upon all legislation in the true American way—the way of the founders of this great Nation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have several more amendments, but I have had some discussion with Members, and I understand some of the Members want to catch a plane at 5 o'clock. In deference to the fact that I think all the points have been adequately made as to the lack of wisdom in this method of handling a Presidential reorganization plan, I shall not offer my amendments in order to save time. The opposition we have made today has been in the nature of a defense of the procedures outlined in the Reorganization Act of 1949. I believe we have demonstrated that hasty action, such as we have witnessed today, is ill-advised and dangerous to the future of reorganization by Presidential plan. I trust that future plans will be handled under the careful procedures set forth in the Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from California, I wonder if we might not arrive at time for debate on the bill. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at the expiration of the time allowed the gentleman from Nebraska who I see is on his feet.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have about 3 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I will modify the request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes, the last 3 minutes to go to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to delay consideration of this measure. I am in favor of this bill to create a Department of Health. In 1947 I introduced legislation that would have this effect, and again in 1949. I introduced a bill in the 83d Congress to make these changes. I am interested from a physician's standpoint, because the present Federal Security Agency is a sprawling, Frankenstein monster that needs to be reduced in size. I found in 1949, and I think it is worse today, that there are 44 different agencies of Government dealing with some phase of health. The hard core of Socialists in the Department must be fired. I hope that under this new administration, instead of having all of these sprawling agencies dealing with that problem, they may be brought under one umbrella. I know it is difficult to approach these questions from an objective angle. I hear the opposition say, "Oh, let us send it back for more study." Well, it has had a great deal of study, from the standpoint of the Hoover Commission, and it has been before the Congress from time to time. What more would you learn by sending it back for more study? I suppose if it were sent back the committee would give it more serious consideration. There will be other reorganization bills before this Congress. There is one coming up shortly on the Department of Agriculture. I daresay that the same arguments will prevail against reorganizing the Department of Agriculture as have prevailed here today. Here is an agency that spends more money than 3 or 4 other agencies put together. I do not know that it will save money. It may not, but it will bring together some of these agencies that are springing up all over the country and having no direction. So I ask the Members of the House to adopt this reorganization plan. It is part of the President's program. It should be tried.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] is recognized.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Committee to raise a question which I think very important. I, like other Members of this House, am quite concerned about this proposal. We have been told in no uncertain terms by those who are in position to know so much about this proposal today that it is different from the proposals that we have had presented to us heretofore. For the life of me I cannot see that there is any difference basically between what we have before us now as a matter of procedure in government and what we had presented to us in other plans presented by Mr. Truman.

It is obvious that this whole issue has turned on personalities. I think it is a mistake. There has been some tension here today and I do not think it is the best, but it has been obvious that emphasis has been placed on certain individuals who held certain positions. It is a mistake to enact permanent legislation on a fundamental policy solely on personalities.

I have a great admiration for the gentleman from Minnesota; he is a very fine statesman and a very fine medical officer, and I would like to ask him a question or two. Is this not permanent legislation?

Mr. JUDD. Of course it is permanent legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. All right; it is permanent legislation. Should there be another President from the one we now have in the White House in 4 years, 8 years, or in time, and there will be, and should there be appointed another person to fill the positions we are considering here today, I ask the gentleman from Minnesota: Could that President appoint the same Administrator, Mr. Oscar Ewing, who was the Administrator of the Federal Security Administration under the Truman administration?

Mr. JUDD. Why, of course, he could. The FSA now is also under permanent legislation. This law would not change that situation.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has answered the question which seems to me an important factor. It is a fundamental and basic question. Four years from now, or 8 years, or any other time in the future we have another President and another Administrator. We can have the very same difficulties leading to socialization of the medical profession. The same dangerous stigma will be facing the people of this country as we had last year and the years before.

Mr. JUDD. The thing the gentleman seems to be afraid of is that the Democrats may sometime win an election.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is sure the Democrats are going to come back, and perhaps sooner than you think. But this applies to both Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. JUDD. That is the only way those people can ever get in again down there.

Mr. HARRIS. And we are going to preserve this great American system of ours when we get back in just as we did on this issue when we were in the majority by turning the same type of proposal down.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this proposal. You cannot satisfy your conscience, in my opinion, by supporting it on the basis that this is a procedure matter. To vote for this is giving approval to the plan. It has been branded over the years as socialized medicine. To vote for it then can only be voting for this long step toward the socializing of the medical profession.

You say you are for it because the circumstances are different. That is, Mr. Ewing is out and Mrs. Hobby is in. To me that is an untenable position. It is the same type of legislation and becomes a part of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that this is designed to eliminate waste and inefficiency. Why, it creates the biggest Government bureau we have in our entire system other than the Military Establishment into an overall policy-making Cabinet position. Everyone knows the Social Security Agency is the most extensive of our civilian agencies. The Social Security Agency will inevitably consume the educational and medical phase of this program.

The bigger and more extensive the bureau and the more powerful, the more costly, the more extravagant, the more inefficiency we will have.

I am against this attempt to create bigger bureaucracy. I am against this effort to socialize this great profession. I am against it because it will increase inefficiency by having a bigger and bigger agency. It will increase the cost as surely as it is adopted and I intend by my vote against it to protest this windfall for greater waste and inefficiency in the Government as well as for the other reasons which I have already given.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEATING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 223 providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, pursuant to House Resolution 179, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 291, nays 86, answered "present" 3, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—291

Adair	Donohue	Knox
Addonizio	Dorn, N. Y.	Krueger
Allen, Calif.	Edmondson	Laird
Allen, Ill.	Elliott	Latham
Andresen, August H.	Engle	LeCompte
Angell	Evins	Lesinski
Arends	Fallon	Long
Auchincloss	Feighan	Lovre
Ayres	Fenton	Lyle
Bailey	Fernandez	McCarthy
Baker	Fino	McConnell
Bates	Fisher	McCulloch
Battle	Fogarty	McDonough
Beamer	Ford	McGregor
Becker	Forrester	McMillan
Belcher	Frazier	McVey
Bender	Frelinghuysen	Mack, Wash.
Bennett, Mich.	Friedel	Madden
Bentley	Fulton	Mahon
Benteen	Gamble	Mailliard
Berry	Garmatz	Martin, Iowa
Betts	Gary	Matthews
Bishop	Gathings	Meader
Boland	Gavin	Merrill
Bolton, Frances P.	Gentry	Merrow
Bolton, Oliver P.	George	Metcalf
Bonin	Golden	Miller, Md.
Bosch	Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.
Bow	Graham	Miller, N. Y.
Bramblett	Granahan	Morano
Bray	Gubser	Morgan
Brooks, La.	Gwinn	Morrison
Brooks, Tex.	Hagen, Minn.	Moss
Brown, Ga.	Hale	Mumma
Brown, Ohio	Haley	Murray
Brownson	Halleck	Neal
Broyhill	Harden	Nelson
Budge	Harrison, Nebr.	Nicholson
Burdick	Harrison, Wyo.	Norblad
Busbey	Harvey	Oakman
Bush	Hays, Ark.	O'Brien, Mich.
Byrd	Heselton	Osmers
Byrnes, Wis.	Hess	Ostertag
Canfield	Hiestand	Passman
Carnahan	Hill	Patman
Carrigg	Hillelson	Patterson
Cederberg	Hillings	Pelly
Celler	Hinshaw	Perkins
Chelf	Hoeven	Pfost
Chenoweth	Holt	Philbin
Church	Horan	Phillips
Clardy	Hosmer	Pilcher
Clevenger	Howell	Pillion
Cole, Mo.	Hruska	Poff
Coon	Hyde	Polk
Cooper	Ikard	Priest
Corbett	Jackson	Prouty
Cotton	James	Radwan
Coudert	Jarman	Ray
Cretella	Javits	Rayburn
Crumpacker	Jenkins	Reams
Cunningham	Johnson	Reece, Tenn.
Curtis, Mass.	Jonas, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Curtis, Mo.	Jonas, N. C.	Rees, Kans.
Curtis, Nebr.	Judd	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dague	Kean	Rhodes, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Richlman
Davis, Wis.	Keating	Riley
Dawson, Utah	Kee	Roberts
Dempsey	Kelly, N. Y.	Robsion, Ky.
Derounian	Kersten, Wis.	Rodino
Devereux	Kilburn	Rogers, Colo.
D'Ewart	Kilday	Rogers, Fla.
Dies	King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Rooney
Dolliver	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Dondero	Klein	St. George
	Klucznynski	Saylor
		Schenck
		Scherer
Scott	Thomas	Weichel
Scrivner	Thompson, La.	Wharton
Scudder	Thompson, Mich.	Wickersham
Secrest		Widnall
Seely-Brown	Thompson, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Short	Thornberry	Williams, N. Y.
Simpson, Ill.	Tollefson	Willis
Simpson, Pa.	Utt	Wilson, Calif.
Small	Van Pelt	Wilson, Ind.
Smith, Va.	Van Zandt	Wilson, Tex.
Spence	Velde	Withers
Springer	Vinson	Wolcott
Stauffer	Vorys	Wolverton
Stringfellow	Vursell	Yorty
Sullivan	Wainwright	Young
Taber	Walter	Younger
Talle	Wampler	Zablocki
Taylor	Warburton	
Teague	Watts	

NAYS—86

Abbitt	Grant	Norrell
Abernethy	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Alexander	Hand	O'Hara, Minn.
Andersen, H. Carl	Hardy	O'Konski
	Harris	O'Neill
Andrews	Harrison, Va.	Patten
Aspinall	Hays, Ohio	Poage
Barden	Herlong	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Holifield	Preston
Bonner	Holtzman	Reed, N. Y.
Buchanan	Jensen	Richards
Burleson	Jones, Ala.	Robeson, Va.
Byrne, Pa.	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Tex.
Camp	Karsten, Mo.	Selden
Carlyle	Kearns	Sheppard
Chudoff	Landrum	Shuford
Colmer	Lane	Sikes
Condon	Lanham	Smith, Kans.
Cooley	Lantaff	Smith, Wis.
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Staggers
Dawson, Ill.	Mack, Ill.	Steed
Deane	Marshall	Trimble
Dowdy	Mason	Whitten
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Ellsworth	Miller, Kans.	Williams, Miss.
Fine	Mills	Winstead
Fountain	Mollohan	Withrow
Gordon	Multer	Yates

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Hoffman, Mich.	Magnuson	Smith, Miss.

NOT VOTING—51

Barrett	Dorn, S. C.	Machrowicz
Blatnik	Doyle	Moulder
Boggs	Durham	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bolling	Forand	Poulson
Boykin	Green	Price
Buckley	Hagen, Calif.	Rabaut
Campbell	Hart	Rains
Cannon	Hébert	Regan
Case	Heller	Rivers
Chatham	Hope	Sadlak
Chiperfield	Hull	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Hunter	Sheehan
Crosser	Jones, Mo.	Shelley
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Dingell	Keogh	Sutton
Dodd	McCormack	Westland
Donovan	McIntire	Wheeler

So the House joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Westland for, with Mr. Smith of Mississippi against.

Mr. Dodd for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Campbell against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Boggs for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Poulson with Mr. Rabaut.

Mr. Sadlak with Mr. Hart.

Mr. Hope with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Case with Mr. Forand.

Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. O'Brien of New York.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Hunter with Mr. Heller.

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Sheehan with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Washington, Mr. WESTLAND. If present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore change my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order of 30 minutes for today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be transferred to tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEPRESSION IN THE WESTERN MINING STATES

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution passed by the Legislature of Utah.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today I have submitted to the Clerk a joint resolution adopted by the State Senate and House of Representatives of Utah. A similar resolution was submitted recently from the Colorado Legislature. The subject matter is the same. The documents call the attention of Congress to the fact that a rapidly spreading depression—and I use that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

word advisedly—is hitting the western mining States.

Thousands of miners are out of work and their unemployment-compensation benefits have run out. Thousands of small-business men—barbers, grocers, pharmacists—whose livelihood depends upon mining payrolls are in dire straits. And what is more serious, mines which have for more than 50 years supplied the rich output which has made this Nation great are closed down, their underground workings gradually filling with water.

I draw the attention of this plight in Utah to Congress because both directly and indirectly, Congress is responsible for bringing the situation about. Utah miners are out of a job not because of grasping mine owners; not because of avaricious labor leaders; not because of failing ore supply. They idle because the preceding Congresses and administration have followed policies calculated to make boom towns in French Morocco, and ghost towns in Utah, Colorado, Idaho, New Mexico, and the rest of the mining States.

Let me give you an example. Beginning next month, our Government is committed to buy zinc from a firm in Peru—the Volcan Mining Co. It is committed to pay this foreign firm 17½ cents per pound for this zinc for a period of 3 years. The current market price for zinc is 11¼ cents per pound. Our mines in Utah could operate nicely if they could get 17½ cents—they cannot. They must compete on the free market with foreign zinc production our Nation paid to develop. The Peruvian firm, conversely, could get along nicely with their 50 cents per day labor by selling zinc at 11¼ cents, but it does not have to. Our Government buys Peruvian zinc for 17½ cents. We have a similar contract with a Mexican zinc producer. Our mines close. Theirs operate. Our country pays 5½ cents to 6½ cents more than necessary for zinc.

I asked the Office of Defense Mobilization to justify these contracts. Acting Director Arthur S. Flemming wrote back:

> The assistance in all cases was justified before the contracts were approved based upon a study of the then determined future requirements—prospective supply and the determined stockpile objective.

In other and simpler words: "It looked like a good deal at the time."

This is just one example of the effects of a program—dimly perceived through a cloudy crystal ball—that has brought a great American industry to its knees. Loans are granted foreign mines; tax considerations are given to those who invest in foreign mining development; technical assistance granted—all they want—free of charge.

We who are from districts whose miners have lost their jobs because of these policies are, of course, vitally concerned. We have countless letters urging action. But we want more than sympathy from the rest of the country. The rest of the country is vitally involved.

Let me show you how vitally you are involved in Utah's mines. This country needs strategic metal production. That was one of the reasons the administration gave for adopting the program that has brought domestic zinc-lead mining to the brink of disaster. What has the program accomplished?

A year ago we produced a quarter of our requirements in antimony. Now we import it all. The antimony mine at Stibnite, Idaho, is shut down. Its 300 workers scattered in search of other jobs. Domestic antimony production has been destroyed just as effectively as if Communists had taken over the mine.

In 1943, this Nation produced all the quicksilver we needed and supplied all that required by our allies. We now import 80 percent.

What has happened to antimony is happening to zinc and lead. Our mines are shut down. Our workers are leaving lifetime jobs for new occupations.

There are boomtowns in French Morocco, Peru, and Mexico. They should be booming. They have been given by our Government a large segment of the industry that made this country the strongest Nation in the world. But, remember, they not only get our mining industry. Our steel plants, our jet-engine factories, and our brass foundries go too. The Defense Department does not know it, but in reality these production facilities could just as well be scattered physically around the world as to be wholly dependent upon the rest of the world for their raw materials.

Shortly a bill will be introduced in Congress to give our mines the protection they need to keep this country from being dependent upon the rest of the world for many of her vital metals. It will not be a tariff measure, really. It will be a bill to maintain the defense and productive capacity of this Nation.

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to approve legislation designed to provide a stabilized market for the products of western mines

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

Whereas the base metal mining industry of the United States has suffered serious curtailment, and is threatened with further curtailment, through dumping of lead and zinc from low-wage foreign countries; and

Whereas the domesttic lead and zinc miner has suffered from the effects of currency devaluation and the monopolistic practices of foreign governments in the purchase and sale of metals; and

Whereas Utah, as well as many other sections of the United States, is in a large measure dependent upon the new wealth created by the mining and processing of these metals for the maintenance of its economy and for the purchasing of commodities needed by Utahans but not produced in Utah; and

Whereas unemployment and loss of production caused by dumping from low-wage countries is depriving local, county and State governments of much needed tax income; and

Whereas the American taxpayer has been called upon to finance the expansion of foreign production of metals and minerals in competition with home production to the detriment of the development of reserves vitally needed in this country for national security; and

Whereas propaganda from Washington during recent years has endeavored, without foundation, to place this country in a have-not class, to the end that tariffs on basic commodities, including metals, should be abandoned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to approve legislation for the stabilizing of the market for metals at prices consistent with the prevailing domestic economic level through the enactment of constructive legislation providing for a sliding scale stabilization import tax. This legislation will promote the development of our natural resources and protect our domestic economy in the interest of national security; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Utah be, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this concurrent memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Utah in the National Congress and to the Honorable Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

TUTTLE CREEK DAM, KANS.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a Senate resolution and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, we have heard here this afternoon and a good many times heretofore that the membership on both sides of the main aisle are very much in favor of a balanced budget and the saving of money in the operation of the Government and at all possible places.

Fifteen years ago, at a time when there was much unemployment in the United States and when the Federal Government was casting about for suitable projects upon which to furnish work for men out of a job, Congress authorized the construction of a dam across the Big Blue River near Manhattan, Kans. No appropriations were made to implement this project until July of 1952. The people of the First Congressional District of Kansas, in which this project is located, by a decided vote disapproved the construction of this dam when they elected me to Congress last November.

A week ago the Kansas State Senate passed a resolution memorializing the Congress to order the immediate cessation of construction work on this dam. This dam was laid out by the Army engineers and is estimated to cost in the neighborhood of $100,000,000. I have introduced into this Chamber H. R. 2730 requesting that construction of the Tuttle Creek Dam be abandoned.

The senate resolution to which I referred follows:

"Senate Resolution 19

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until certain debatable issues have been resolved

"Whereas during recent years studies and research in flood-control methods have evolved new theories and practices for the

effective and economical control of flood water; and

"Whereas the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam may not control flood waters to a measure commensurate with the cost and damages occasioned by and resulting from such construction; and

"Whereas the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas, in conjunction with the Kansas industrial development commission, recommends that the said Tuttle Creek Dam should not be constructed and that more modern methods of flood control should be initiated for the prevention of flood damage on the Kansas river: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas*, That we respectfully urge, request, and memorialize the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until debatable issues have been resolved, as recommended in the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States."

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate, and was adopted by that body March 9, 1953.

FRED GALL,
President of the Senate.
SIDNEY MARGARET GARDINER,
Secretary of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to say that it is proposed that the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill will be called up for consideration tomorrow. I do not know whether it will be controversial or not. It is possible it may be in a particular or two at least; however, it is hoped it will not take us too long to dispose of it.

I just want to put the membership on notice that it will be called on tomorrow.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, at the time of the last rollcall I was in the actual performance of congressional duties elsewhere. On inquiry as to what the bells were for, I was erroneously informed, so I was not here in time to be recorded. If I had been present I would have voted "yea" and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD so show.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE BRAVES MOVE TO MILWAUKEE

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukee is a big league town. We have been doing big things in Milwaukee for many years and our city has always been right up in front in their interest in the great national pastime. We are now assured that the Braves are coming to Milwaukee, and that our city will be in the big league circuit. Milwaukee will prove to other big league cities of the country that we will give overwhelming support to the Braves. We have a fine new stadium in which to house them, but more important than that, we have the interest of all of our people. I will make you a promise, Mr. Speaker, that our support shall be such that it will not be long before the Milwaukee Braves will win the National League pennant and I would not be too surprised if that happened in 1953.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HILL and to include a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. JAVITS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINO and to include a statement prepared by himself.

Mr. OSTERTAG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHITTEN and to include an editorial.

Mr. SIKES and to include an article.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an article.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN in two instances and to include an editorial.

Mr. CELLER in four instances.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM and to include a resolution.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an article.

Mr. BENDER in seven instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include a letter he has writen to Mr. Cole.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOLIFIELD and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BONNER the remarks he made today on the reorganization bill and to include rollcall No. 197 of July 10, 1950, 81st Congress.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include an article.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ELLIOTT and to include a statement made by Mr. Elbert W. Kilgo, president, Cullman County, Ala., Farm Bureau.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCINTIRE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for an indefinite period of time on account of illness in family.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois (at the request of Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri), on account of illness in family.

Mr. HAGEN of California (at the request of Mr. CONDON), for the rest of this week, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 19, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

553. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the District of Columbia, in the amount of $3,871,931.04 for the fiscal year 1953 and prior years (H. Doc. No. 106); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

554. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the application for permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

555. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

556. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 15 of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

557. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal pursuant to provisions of the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380) as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

558. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

559. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense and the semiannual reports of the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force from July 1 to December 31, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

560. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Security Agency for 1952, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3780. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; with an amendment (Rept. No. 170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4072. A bill relating to the disposition of certain former recreational demonstration project lands by the Commonwealth of Virginia to the School Board of Mecklenburg County, Va.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4073. A bill to establish a basic administrative workweek and pay periods of two administrative workweeks for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4074. A bill to establish a separate customs collection district comprising the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4075. A bill to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4076. A bill to further amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, approved October 12, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4077. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, to provide coverage of supervisory employees under the 8-in-10 hour law; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4078. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, to provide promotions at the beginning of the month following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 4079. A bill relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4080. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4081. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4082. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, with respect to automotive-equipment maintenance payments to special-delivery messengers in post offices of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4083. A bill to protect the national-defense effort and the normal flow of interstate and foreign commerce from the interferences caused by the movement of business enterprises to premises leased from States and political subdivisions of States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4084. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4085. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1902, to define the powers of the United States members of the International Joint Commission relating to the disposition of electric power developed at dams and hydroelectric plants located in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4086. A bill to amend section 265 of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to notification to the Attorney General of changes of address by aliens within the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4087. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain agricultural commodities to the Republic of Korea, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4088. A bill to provide additional compensation for Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 4089. A bill to amend section 502 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to increase the maximum amount in which farm realty loans may be guaranteed thereunder; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 4090. A bill to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES of KANSAS:

H. R. 4091. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, so as to make the exclusion from such act of temporary employees of Congress inapplicable to such employees who are appointed at an annual rate of salary; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 80. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 81. Concurrent resolution providing funds for the expenses of the joint congressional committee created pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 80; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. Con. Res. 82. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to call upon the International Joint Commission to submit a plan for the coordinated control of the water levels of the boundary waters between the United States and Canada and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 183. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2510, 82d Congress, the report of the Select Committee on Current Pornographic Material; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging that the construction of the Copper River Highway be accelerated; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States to increase the quota of immigrants from Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to enact legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the quota of immigrants from Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to enact legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of the passage of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to acts of persecution reported to be committed against the members of religious faiths and their institutions in Russia and its satellite countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to increase the quota of immigrants from Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4092. A bill for the relief of Mira Tellini Napoleone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4093. A bill for the relief of Dr. Syed Abdul Qadir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4094. A bill for the relief of Hayg Zafer Demerican-Seferian (Zafer Demerican); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4095. A bill for the relief of Hagop Mehmet Demircan-Seferian (Mehmet Demerican); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4096. A bill for the relief of Esther Brandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4097. A bill for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 4098. A bill for the relief of Kikue Tsurukawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4099. A bill for the relief of Lee Siu Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4100. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lau Hong Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4101. A bill for the relief of Hidenori Utada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4102. A bill for the relief of Rose Fusae Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4103. A bill for the relief of Alberto D'Agliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4104. A bill for the relief of Frank St. Charles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Bernard Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4106. A bill for the relief of Emanuel and Fanya Stegman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4107. A bill for the relief of Michael Kyrazias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4108. A bill for the relief of Leon W. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4109. A bill for the relief of Charles Whaley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 4110. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 4111. A bill for the relief of George Reichman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4112. A bill for the relief of John L. Shearer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4113. A bill for the relief of Marlene D. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4114. A bill for the relief of Raymond H. Hempel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 4115. A bill for the relief of Mario Valeriano Sessarego; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 19, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art man's infallible counselor and faithful friend, may the memory of Thy sustaining presence in all our yesterdays inspire us to meet the adventure of each new day with faith and fortitude.

Show us how we may keep our moral balance and our loyalty to the spiritual ideals in these days when we are severely tempted to become infatuated with materialistic habits of life.

Grant that as individuals and as a nation we may be eager to do Thy will for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Hear us in the name of the great Captain of our salvation. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1078. An act to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel; and

S. 1110. An act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 158)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 28, 35, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 21, 23, 26, 29, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for 'Capitol Buildings', $800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", to remain available until expended, $13,000,000, of which $8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 42.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 1: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 4 and 5: Permit payment of existing funds to additional employees in offices of Senators from Florida and New Jersey, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate funds for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $500,000 for Senate inquiries and investigations, as proposed by the Senate.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments No. 13 and 14: Insert titles, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $800 for Capitol Buildings, instead of $3,651 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $54,000 for Senate Office Building, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER II

Department of State

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 20: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $130,000 for salaries and expenses of the Patent Office, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $13,000,000 for access roads, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $18,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 23: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 24 and 25: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER IV

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $60,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Employment Security, as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 28: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to increase the limitation for expenses of technical services for school construction.

National Mediation Board

Amendment No. 29: Inserts title, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 30, 31 and 32: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 34: Changes chapter number, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to waive the prohibition in Public Law 470, 82nd Congress, against the purchase of land. The conferees on the part of both Houses recognize the desirability of accomplishing the purposes of the amendment but it was felt that the cost of the land to be acquired should receive further consideration. The conferees instruct the Bureau of Indian Affairs that any funds allocated for the purposes contemplated by this amendment shall be held until the matter can be reviewed in subsequent hearings.

Amendment No. 36: Changes chapter number, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VII

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $50,000 for an economic adviser, and staff, to the President, instead of $25,000 as proposed by the House and $60,000 for the Council of Economic Advisers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $250,000 for the Emergency Fund for the President as proposed by the Senate, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House.

Veterans' Administration

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $1,000,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines, as proposed by the House.

Amendments No. 40 and 41: Change chapter numbers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments No. 43, 44 and 45: Change chapter and section numbers, as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is signed by all the conferees.

The House estimates were $2,313,719,590. The House passed the bill at $925,172,920. The Senate estimates were $2,327,521,114. The bill passed the Senate at $947,325,579.

The conference agreement, including the items in dispute, is $943,298,728. There is one rescission of $1,000,000 in the bill, and there are two items of $1,000,000 that the conferees agreed to the Senate amendments on that go out.

After the conference report is agreed to, and I know of no opposition to the report, it is my purpose to ask unanimous consent that certain amendments that have been agreed on by the conferees and which are absolutely noncontroversial be considered en bloc.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out at this time that the House conferees were in unanimous agreement on this conference report, and that your House conferees have obtained the best possible settlement it was possible to obtain with the Senate conferees. An appropriations conference is all a matter of give and take, a matter of compromise. Further I might say that the bill, as passed in the other body, was $22,152,659 more than the amount passed by the House. Of course, there were estimates submitted to the other body which had not been submitted to or considered by the House. These additional estimates totaled $13,801,524. The amount now before the House in this conference report for your consideration is $18,115,808 more than the amount originally passed by the House in this second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 fiscal year.

One further matter: Amendment No. 33 on page 13 pertaining to the Rural Electrification Administration of the Department of Agriculture is reported back to the House in disagreement. An amendment will be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to recede and concur with an amendment to reduce the figure $40,000,000 on the last line of the Senate language and figures, to $35,000,000. The effect would be to increase loan authorizations for the rural telephone program from $25 million to $35 million and decrease loan authorizations for the rural electrification program from $50 million to $35 million. As one who has always supported REA over the years, I would not have agreed to the decrease in the rural electrification loan program authorization if it were not for the fact that we received assurance in writing from Mr. Ralph Roberts, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, that—

Inasmuch as a loan program of $165 million was planned and approved by the Congress for the fiscal year 1953, there will be an unused balance of $32,298,000 in loan funds as of June 30, 1953.

The conferees have further been assured that the transfer of $15 million from the electrification-loan program to the telephone-loan program will not have the effect of reducing the electrification-loan program in the current fiscal. On such assurances I shall support the amendment which will later be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. In regard to amendment No. 33, I have conferred with our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] who heads the Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture. He had prepared what amounts to a substitute amendment, but unfortunately he has to be out of town today on official business which was set when it was thought this matter would be up yesterday. I agreed with him that we would oppose the conference report in that regard and offer a substitute provision and in his absence I would present the matter.

I will appreciate such time as might be needed to present our side of this matter to the House.

Mr. TABER. That amendment is not in the conference report. It is reported in disagreement and motions will be made at that time, and at that time I will yield time to the gentleman if he so desires.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with what I said prior to the adoption of the conference report, I ask unanimous consent that the House consider en bloc those amendments which are in technical disagreement and upon which the conference has agreed to recede and concur in the Senate amendments as follows:

Amendments Nos. 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 30, 31, 32, and 42.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendments, as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 1, line 10, insert:

"For payment to Rosemary T. McMahon, widow of Brien McMahon, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, $12,500."

Amendment No. 6: Page 2, line 22, insert:

"Office of the Secretary: Effective March 1, 1953, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1953 is made available for the compensation of 1 camera and sound engineer, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of $4,080 per annum, and 1 shipping clerk, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of $1,500 per annum."

Amendment No. 8: Page 3, line 6, insert:

"Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing, at rates to be fixed by the committee, $555."

Amendment No. 10: Page 3, line 17, insert:

"Vice President's automobile: For an additional amount for purchase, exchange, driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, $980."

Amendment No. 12: Page 4, line 7, insert:

"Salaries, officers and employees

"Office of the Clerk: For an additional amount for the 'Office of the Clerk', $3,835 to be available for the compensation of one editor and laboratory supervisor, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of $4,020 per annum, and one script writer and general secretary, effective March 1, 1953, at a basic rate of $2,500 per annum, Joint Recording Facility."

Amendment No. 16: Page 5, line 19, insert:

"Senate Restaurant: For repairs, improvements, furnishings and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Capitol Building, including personal and other services, $1,600, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended."

Amendment No. 18: Page 6, line 4, insert:

"SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Preparation of rules for civil procedure

"For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed amendments or additions to the rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 2072, to be expended as the Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed $10 per day, $11,500, to remain available until June 30, 1954."

Amendment No. 19: Page 7, line 16, insert "of which $1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'International information and educational activities', Department of State Appropriation Act, 1953."

Amendment No. 20: Page 7, line 20, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

"The Attorney General is hereby authorized to transfer from appropriations contained in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953, not to exceed $270,000 to the appropriation 'Fees and expenses of witnesses, Justice', 1953, and not to exceed $600,000 to the appropriation 'Support of United States prisoners, Federal prison system', 1953."

Amendment No. 25: Page 10, line 1, insert:

"Claims

"For an additional amount for 'claims', $300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Transportation of mails', fiscal year 1953."

Amendment No. 30: Page 12, line 22, insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $7,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses', National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953."

Amendment No. 31: Page 13, line 3, insert:

"Arbitration and emergency boards

"For an additional amount for 'Arbitration and emergency boards', $10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses', National Railroad Adjustment Board, fiscal year 1953."

Amendment No. 32: Page 13, line 8, insert:

"NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

"Salaries and expenses

"The amount made available under this head in the National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1953, exclusively for compensation and expenses of referees is decreased from '$216,000' to '$199,000.'"

Amendment No. 42: Page 20, line 20, insert:

"CHAPTER X

"Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

"For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document No. 19, 83d Congress, $13,230,038, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to those amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 30, 25, 30, 31, 32, 42 and concur therein.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of explaining amendment No. 28. You will recall that about 2 weeks ago, when this legislation was before the House, I offered an amendment to provide for the transfer of certain supervisory funds from the Office of Education to General Services. I note in the conference report the Senate receded from its position. I asked for $145,000. The Senate had put in the bill which went to conference $125,000, which cut the item from $145,000, in the same ratio that they cut the $24 million back to $20.5 million.

There is nothing that can be done about it at this time, but I want the RECORD to show that you are going to have difficulty in administering this law, because General Services does not have the money which is now in the hands of the Office of Education, to cover the cost of this supervisory work. I think it should be notice to the Committee on Appropriations that additional funds will have to go into the regular appropriation bill which will become effective July 1 to cover this cost. They positively cannot administer this law without these funds to pay General Services.

May I add, if the gentleman will bear with me, that as the author and sponsor of this legislation I particularly wrote into the legislation words that would prohibit the Office of Education from setting up an engineering supervisory staff, and directed them to enter into an agreement with some other governmental agency, which they did with General Services. It is a matter of economy, and it is the best way I know to keep the Office of Education from setting up a costly staff of its own, that we make the money available to pay General Services for this supervisory work.

I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity to clarify the RECORD.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the evidence showed that the outfit had spent too much money on administration; that it is supposed to have too many personnel employees, too many bookkeepers and accountants, and that sort of thing. That is the basis for the attitude of the committee.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: Page 9, line 21, insert:

"Postal operations

"For an additional amount for 'Postal operations', $28,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Transportation of mails', fiscal year 1953."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 24, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$28,000,000" in said amendment, insert "$24,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 27: Page 11, line 18, insert ": *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed on Federal property situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed by the Department of Defense on Federal property, other than in the District of Columbia, situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 13, line 14, insert:

"CHAPTER V—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

"Loan authorizations

"The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural electrification program is decreased from '$50,000,000' to '$35,000,000,' and the basic amount authorized by said act to be borrowed for the rural telephone program is increased from '$25,000,000' to '$40,000,000'."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$40,000,000" named in said amendment, insert "$35,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire time?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, if the gentleman please.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to present the other side in this matter. We are opposed to the gentleman's motion, which would reduce the REA authorization for loans by $15 million and would increase the loan authorization for rural telephones. In taking this action I am speaking for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], who is chairman of this subcommittee. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and I are both for the increase in loan authorization for rural telephone loans but we believe such increase should not be at the expense of reducing loan authorizations for electric-power loans. If you will help us defeat the motion of the gentleman from New York, I will offer a motion increasing the authorization for telephone loans, which is badly needed but which will not reduce REA authorizations.

Our Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I was chairman last year and which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] heads this year, in its report last year committed itself to approving additional loan authorizations for the telephone program if the number of loan requests required it.

In our report we stated:

While there were some indications from witnesses appearing before the committee that a total of $50 million would be required for the telephone program next year, the committee has decided to recommend the amount provided in the budget together with a contingency fund of $10 million. The record of Congress on these programs over the years is such that the committee feels that additional funds will be made available if needed.

With a valuable program such as this just getting under way, I believe it would be highly inadvisable to practically shut it down at this point because of the lack of loan funds. We must remember, Mr. Speaker, that these are loan funds and not direct appropriations. These funds are borrowed from the Treasury for making loans to rural cooperatives and will, as experience has shown us, be practically fully repaid plus interest, there is no ultimate cost to the taxpayers and unless loan applications meet the requirements of the law, the money will not be withdrawn from the Treasury at all. In this connection, I wish to again call to your attention the splendid repayment record of Rural Electrification, which is unusually good. The latest data available to our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture shows that delinquency in repayments is running less than two-tenths of 1 percent. Based on this splendid record, Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt as to the eventual repayment of practically all of the loan funds made available by Congress for the REA and the REA telephone program.

In January when the initial request for an additional $15 million in loan authorization for this fiscal year was allocated, we had in mind then that only about 33 of the most urgent pending cases of the 611 applications on hand prior to June 30 could be taken care of. Please also keep in mind that most of these urgent cases are those where loans must be approved before June 30 to enable borrowers to exercise options on properties needed and to meet other deadlines imposed on them by State regulatory bodies. Any unnecessary delay now will create many difficulties and in some cases direct financial loss for these applicants. So much for the need on increase in loan authorizations for the rural telephone program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the REA and the rural telephone programs are two entirely different operations. There is no reason, in my opinion, to penalize the REA by reducing its loan authorizations $15 million to give the rural telephone program an increase in loan authorization of $10 million. If requests for telephone loans are sound they should be authorized. If electricity loan requests are sound they should be made. Certainly to obtain a loan for one should not be made contingent upon turning down a sound application of the other. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that this particular item was not referred to our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, as would have been the normal course. This language adding to one program at the expense of the other was put in the bill by the Senate and consequently our subcommittee which would ordinarily be concerned with these items is now giving them the first consideration possible. I respectfully urge the House to leave the decision as to how much loan funds REA should have to our Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. We should not reduce retroactively without a proper hearing. If it proves that the program does not need the present existing loan funds, we will take that into account when considering the authorization for this coming year. Today—in this particular bill—is no place to make that decision. I do not recall any similar instance in the past years where in order to give one program needed funds, we took a larger amount or more from another. It is not good legislative procedure.

I want to say that the REA program is a loan program that pays 2 percent interest on all loans. The committee, contrary to a statement made by the budget officer, which I am sure the gentleman from New York will present to you, the subcommittee last year and the Congress stated and have repeatedly stated that if further loan authorization were needed to carry out the law for the REA program they would be provided; and I want to be absolutely certain that that will be done.

Bear in mind the fact that the repayment rate is sufficiently good that less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the borrowers from REA are as much as 30 days in arrears on repayments.

Last year we made provision for the REA program, but in December of this year they were told to cancel out and rescind $30 million. Now it is said that with that $30 million in loans canceled you can take this $15 million away from them. I do not know that the REA should have withdrawn that $30 million of loans which they had some time before approved, do you? Our committee has had no opportunity to study such action.

It could be the Congress after our committee hearings would wish to direct the Department to restore their approval to such loans. It may not, but until we have hearings on this matter, how can we justify reducing the authorization provided last year.

Who told the REA to rescind these loans? I do not know, do you? I, too, believe in a rural telephone program where the requirements of the law are met, but I cannot see how you can say to anybody in this country that we will help you by lending you money for a telephone if you will do without lights or if somebody else will do without lights. The user and his co-op borrower pay for either with interest.

The budget officer has sent down a letter saying that in view of rescinding of $30 million of loans in December 1952, they can take $15 million from the $30 million, but in so doing they limit to that extent the funds that would be available under the actions of our subcommittee of last year which was approved by the Congress. As the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has so ably argued this is the first time in my experience, or that I remember of, that such an occurrance as this has taken place. I concur with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], chairman of the subcommittee, that it is an unsound practice. I do not believe it is sound to take such action. The late REA Director in one of his last official utterances, said the increase in telephone-loan authorizations should not be by reducing the authorizations for electricity loans. Whether he was correct in that statement our committee has had no chance to check. I do not know whether that influenced Mr. Roberts or not, but I do know that the REA will not borrow a dime from the Treasury until the loan is approved. The loan under the law sets up requirements to be met before a loan is made. If the authorization is larger than the total number of loan applications which are determined to be sound, the money will not be taken from the Treasury. In fact, when a loan is granted, the money is not withdrawn from the Treasury except as expended for labor and materials and other purposes for which the loans were granted.

The law states the basis upon which the loan shall be made available and if applicants qualify and show it will be repaid, and the people to be served cannot otherwise be served, every Member of this Congress, with a few exceptions, would like to see those loans made for they have proven to be sound. Electricity on the farms, on loans, repaid with interest is one of the best ways to balance the budget I know of. Today 16 percent of the farms of this country that do not have electricity and many of the 84 percent which do have service have an inadequate supply. There has been a 10 percent increase in the use of electricity by those who are already on the lines. But there is hardly a system in the United States that does not need some replacement of lines so that they will bring better service to the country. Let me tell you also that 64 percent of all the power that all of the REA's use is bought from the private power companies. One of the best customers of the private power company is the REA.

I say to you, do not by this action say that the Congress will lend to rural people money for a telephone if somebody will do without lights. Do not be misled by the statement that will undoubtedly be made that the budget officer says you can do this and take it out of the $30 million. We may, and I do not know, but we may want to make them go ahead with a part of that $30 million they took back after approval. Perhaps we will not but let us know the facts. If there is going to be any restriction in the REA development of this country, because of action by the Budget Bureau or the Executive Department, let the responsibility be fixed. Do not let it be because of congressional action on last year's authorization. Loan applications should not be approved unless they are sound, but if they are sound, they should, period.

I want to repeat again, the chairman of the subcommittee, Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, says this is the first time he has seen this course followed. He is strongly opposed to the Taber motion and has approved the motion I shall offer. I assure you when the matter comes before our subcommittee we will give proper attention to it. If the pending motion is defeated I will offer the amendment which I have discussed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, your conferees gave every consideration to the statements of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. I talked to him for a half hour on this matter. We gave every consideration to the actual situation of the REA funds and we found certain facts to exist. I have here a letter from Ralph Roberts, budget officer of the Department of Agriculture, dated March 18, 1953, which reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
March 18, 1953.

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TABER: This will confirm information given you during our telephone conversation this afternoon regarding the current status of loan funds available in the Rural Electrification Administration.

Funds available in the current fiscal year for electrification loans, including balances carried forward as well as the current authorization carried in the 1953 Agricultural Appropriation Act, total $197,298,000. Inasmuch as a loan program of $165 million was planned and approved by the Congress for the fiscal year 1953, there will be an unused balance of $32,298,000 in loan funds as of June 30, 1953. If the Congress approves language inserted by the Senate in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1953, $15 million of these funds will be transferred for additional telephone loans to be made between now and June 30. Accordingly, the transfer will not have the effect of reducing the electrification loan program in fiscal year 1953.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH ROBERTS,
Budget Officer.

On top of that I wish to call attention to the fact that when the budget went to the Senate the Budget Director called attention to the fact that funds for electrification loans are in an excessive amount needed for carrying out the current year's planned program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wondered if the gentleman is aware—I am sure he is—that the REA loan authorization is based on a formula, and while there might be funds available within the total, due to the formula, they may be completely exhausted in a particular State, and the fact that the total amount authorized is not committed would not change that. I wonder further if the gentleman is aware that the subcommittee and the Congress has given assurance each year that if the requirements of the law were met by applicants for loans, and additional funds were needed, they would be provided. The program that the budget officer lists is not correct when he mentions the amount that was set up for it, because we directed further, and a statement in our report on the telephone program will show, that if the requirements of the law were met, that those additional funds would be provided.

Mr. TABER. We are aware of just what the subcommittee has done. We know that the adoption of this motion will not in any way impair the operations of the Rural Electrification Administration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 69, noes 54.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 191, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—165

Allen, Calif.	Fogarty	Mumma
Allen, Ill.	Ford	Neal
Angell	Frelinghuysen	Nelson
Arends	Friedel	Nicholson
Auchincloss	Fulton	Norblad
Ayres	Gavin	Oakman
Bates	Golden	Osmers
Belcher	Goodwin	Ostertag
Bender	Graham	Patterson
Bentley	Gubser	Pelly
Betts	Hale	Phillips
Bishop	Halleck	Prouty
Bolton, Frances P.	Hand	Radwan
	Hébert	Ray
Bolton, Oliver P.	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Bonin	Hiestand	Riehlman
Bosch	Hillelson	Robsion, Ky.
Bow	Hinshaw	Rogers, Mass.
Brambletl	Hoffman, Ill.	Rooney
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	St. George
Brownson	Holt	Saylor
Broyhill	Hosmer	Schenck
Budge	Hruska	Scott
Busbey	Jackson	Secrest
Bush	James	Seely-Brown
Byrnes, Wis.	Jenkins	Shafer
Canfield	Jensen	Short
Carrigg	Jonas, Ill.	Small
Cederberg	Jonas, N. C.	Smith, Wis.
Chenoweth	Kean	Springer
Chiperfield	Kearney	Stauffer
Church	Kearns	Stringfellow
Clevenger	Keating	Taber
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Taylor
Coon	Kilburn	Thomas
Corbett	King, Pa.	Thompson, Mich.
Cotton	Knox	
Coudert	Krueger	Utt
Cretella	Laird	Van Pelt
Crumpacker	LeCompte	Van Zandt
Curtis, Mass.	Lyle	Velde
Curtis, Mo.	McConnell	Vorys
Curtis, Nebr.	McCulloch	Vursell
Dague	McDonough	Wainwright
Davis, Wis.	McGregor	Wampler
Dawson, Utah	McVey	Warburton
Derounian	Mack, Wash.	Weichel
Devereux	Mailliard	Wharton
Dondero	Mason	Widnall
Dorn, N. Y.	Meader	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	Merrill	Wilson, Calif.
Engle	Merrow	Wolverton
Fallon	Miller, Md.	Yates
Fenton	Miller, N. Y.	Young
Fino	Morano	Younger

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

NAYS—191

Abbitt	Grant	Patten
Abernethy	Green	Perkins
Addonizio	Gregory	Pfost
Albert	Gross	Philbin
Alexander	Hagen, Minn.	Pilcher
Andresen, August H.	Haley	Poage
Andrews	Harden	Polk
Aspinall	Harris	Powell
Bailey	Harrison, Nebr.	Preston
Baker	Harrison, Va.	Priest
Battle	Harrison, Wyo.	Rains
Beamer	Harvey	Rayburn
Bennett, Fla.	Hays, Ark.	Reams
Bennett, Mich.	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Bentsen	Hoeven	Regan
Berry	Holifield	Rhodes, Ariz.
Blatnik	Holmes	Rhodes, Pa.
Boggs	Holtzman	Richards
Boland	Hope	Riley
Bonner	Howell	Roberts
Bray	Ikard	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, La.	Javits	Rodino
Brooks, Tex.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ga.	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Buchanan	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Burdick	Karsten, Mo.	Roosevelt
Byrd	Kee	Scrivner
Camp	King, Calif.	Selden
Carlyle	Kirwan	Sheppard
Carnahan	Klein	Shuford
Cole, Mo.	Kluczynski	Sieminski
Colmer	Landrum	Sikes
Cooley	Lane	Simpson, Ill.
Cooper	Lanham	Smith, Kans.
Cunningham	Lantaff	Smith, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Lovre	Spence
Deane	Lucas	Staggers
Delaney	McCarthy	Steed
Dempsey	McMillan	Sullivan
D'Ewart	Machrowicz	Sutton
Dies	Mack, Ill.	Talle
Dollinger	Madden	Teague
Dolliver	Magnuson	Thompson, La.
Donohue	Mahon	Thornberry
Dowdy	Metcalf	Tollefson
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Trimble
Edmondson	Miller, Kans.	Vinson
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.	Walter
Evins	Mills	Watts
Fernandez	Mollohan	Wheeler
Fine	Morgan	Whitten
Fisher	Morrison	Wickersham
Forand	Moss	Wier
Forrester	Multer	Williams, Miss.
Fountain	Murray	Williams, N. Y.
Frazier	O'Brien, Ill.	Willis
Gary	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson, Ind.
Gathings	O'Hara, Ill.	Wilson, Tex.
Gentry	O'Hara, Minn.	Winstead
George	O'Konski	Withers
Gordon	O'Neill	Withrow
Granahan	Passman	Yorty
	Patman	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—75

Adair	Doyle	McCormack
Andersen, H. Carl	Durham	McIntire
	Feighan	Marshall
Barden	Gamble	Martin, Iowa
Barrett	Garmatz	Matthews
Becker	Gwinn	Moulder
Bolling	Hagen, Calif.	Norrell
Boykin	Hardy	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Hart	Pillion
Burleson	Hays, Ohio	Poff
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Poulson
Campbell	Heriong	Price
Cannon	Hillings	Rabaut
Case	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Hull	Rivers
Chatham	Hunter	Sadlak
Chelf	Hyde	Scherer
Chudoff	Jarman	Scudder
Clardy	Johnson	Sheehan
Condon	Jones, Mo.	Shelley
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	Kelly, N. Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Keogh	Westland
Dodd	Kilday	Wolcott
Donovan	Latham	
Dorn, S. C.	Long	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. McCormack against.
Mr. Scherer for, with Mr. Dodd against.
Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Price against.
Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Moulder against.
Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. Case for, with Mr. Campbell against.
Mr. Becker for, with Mr. Heriong against.
Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Barrett against.
Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Garmatz against.
Mr. Poulson for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Chatham against.
Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Thompson of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Horan with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Heller.
Mr. Westland with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Wolcott with Mrs. Kelly of New York.
Mr. Johnson with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Adair with Mr. Chudoff.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Matthews.
Mr. Scudder with Mr. Rabaut.
Mr. Hyde with Mr. Bolling.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Clardy with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Feighan

Messrs. D'EWART and HARRISON of Wyoming changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement on amendment No. 33 and concur with an amendment to read as follows:

"The basic amount authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1953, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury for the rural telephone program, is increased from $25 million to $35 million."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say my motion provides an increase of $10 million in loan authorization for the telephone program. It accepts the figures of the gentleman from New York as the difference being that it is not deducted from the REA authorization passed last year as Mr. TABER's motion would have done.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the budget and the budget officer of the Department have said that the money for this purpose could be taken away from the REA without any harm. If we are ever going to save a dollar and redeem the pledges that we made to the people of the United States, it is time for us to do so now. If there was any reason for it, I would not fuss so much about this, but if we are going to start irresponsibly, this is the way to do it.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, this is not an expenditure of funds but an authorization. If the applicants do not meet requirements the loans will not be made nor the money spent. If the applications qualify, I think the loans should be made for they are sound.

I read the newspapers and the platforms last year and I do not recall ever reading anywhere that anybody, of either party, ran on the basis that they would reduce the amount of loan authorizations for the REA electrification program and make such reduction retroactive. I take the stand I took a moment ago that I am for rural-telephone loans where the requirements of the law are met, but I do not believe that you folks believe we should say you can have a loan for a telephone for which you pay if you or somebody will do without lights. The motion of the gentleman was to reduce firm figures in authorizations that were passed last year, and I helped to sponsor those, as did the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] for whom I spoke. The motion I now have is to give increased authorization for loans for the telephone program by $10 million. That is all that is before you. Those loans, too, will be repaid with interest, and there is not a finer record in the United States than the repayment rate for electricity and for rural telephones. You have just now voted with me against taking this authorization away from the authorization for rural electricity. You voted down Mr. TABER's motion and I think in the future many of you are going to be glad you did. Now the only thing is, are you going to approve the increased authorization for rural telephones? There is a real need for the increased ceiling. Here again the money will not be loaned unless the requirements of the law are met as to need and as to soundness. Remember there are over 600 loan applications now pending.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman from Misssissippi is talking here about something that the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations has not gone into in detail this year but will within the next few weeks.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. The action of our committee will be for the period July 1, 1953, to July 1, 1954.

Mr. LAIRD. The Budget Director of the Department of Agriculture has assured the Members of Congress that there will be $32,298,000 in unused loan funds available as of June 30, 1953. Accordingly, the transfer will not have the effect of reducing the electrification-loan program in fiscal year 1953. It seems strange after many of us have made certain pledges to the people of this Nation that we were going to come to the Congress this year and work for the reduction of spending authorizations, that, on one of the first votes where we can actually reduce authorizations which are not necessary for an agency this year, we are willing to vote $10 million of new money that is not needed at this time. The amendment, of our distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, transferring $10 million of unspent loan funds from electricity loans to telephone loans for the remaining part of fiscal year 1953 should have carried.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not know of any pledges you made to reduce the loan authorization for the Rural Electrification Administration electric program or the telephone program which was passed last year. The law specifies that not a dollar shall be loaned until certain requirements of the law are met; that is, they must be economically sound so the loans will be repaid. The record shows they are being repaid, less than two-tenths of

1 percent of all loans being as much as 30 days in arrears. When the American people asking for such meet the requirements of that law, all the Members of Congress on both sides have permitted them to lift the ceiling of the loan authorizations each and every time. Each time it has led to further development of our country on a sound basis. The loans have been sound. You are not saving money by this shortsighted action. I do say that in this instance it is only loan authorization. If the loans are not made, the money will not come out of the Treasury, even. The loans will not be made unless they are 100 percent sound and meet all the requirements of the law. There is not a dollar wasted, and the loans will not be made unless the need exists. If the need exists, if the loan will be repaid with interest I do not think anyone would want the lights to be turned off or withheld over this country when the farmers pay for them with interest. The same goes for the telephone program. I repeat, why say, "We will help you to finance your needs on the telephones, if somebody will do without lights?" It is not sound.

Mr. LAIRD. The gentleman is talking about something that has no place in this discussion. We have never pledged to anybody appropriations in addition to those actually needed, and that is what you are doing here. You are authorizing unneeded balances in the electrification program. All this amendment did was transfer some of these unused authorizations to the telephone program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does anyone know they will not be needed or used for the rest of the year? If the need exists, and I understand nearly every REA borrower needs to enlarge his lines to carry the loads now needed by the farmer. I have had many requests to urge the REA to expedite loans for this reason. If such need is not met by the REA I wish to be sure it was not because of action of the Congress.

Mr. LAIRD. It is an authorization for spending in addition to the requests that have been made upon the electrification program. All appropriations are merely authorizations and remain in the Treasury until actually expended. We now have too many unused authorizations outstanding in our various Federal departments.

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, here your administration will determine what loans are made. They cannot be made unless they meet the requirements of the law, and the law provides the loans must be for service to farmers who do not otherwise have service. It further provides that the loan must be repaid with interest. If those conditions exist, I think the people ought to have the loans. The Congress said so last year. I did not see that anybody last fall on either side committed himself to go back and reduce the Rural Electrification Administration authorization passed last year to meet this year's need for telephone loans. Our subcommittee did agree last year to go along with an increase in the authorization for telephone loans. Such need has been proven, and I trust my motion will be approved.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 80, noes 97.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were yeas 171, nays 174, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—171

Abbitt	Harden	Patten
Abernethy	Harris	Perkins
Addonizio	Harrison, Nebr.	Pfost
Albert	Harrison, Va.	Philbin
Alexander	Harrison, Wyo.	Pilcher
Andrews	Harvey	Poage
Aspinall	Hays, Ark.	Polk
Bailey	Hébert	Powell
Battle	Hill	Preston
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Priest
Bentsen	Holifield	Rains
Berry	Holmes	Reams
Blatnik	Holtzman	Rhodes, Pa.
Boggs	Hope	Richards
Boland	Ikard	Riley
Bonner	Javits	Roberts
Brooks, La.	Jonas, N. C.	Robeson, Va.
Brooks, Tex.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ga.	Jones, N. C.	Rogers, Fla.
Buchanan	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Burdick	Kee	Roosevelt
Byrd	King, Calif.	Secrest
Camp	Kirwan	Selden
Carnahan	Klein	Sheppard
Cole, Mo.	Kluczynski	Shuford
Colmer	Landrum	Sieminski
Cooley	Lane	Sikes
Cooper	Lanham	Simpson, Ill.
Cunningham	Lesinski	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Tenn.	Long	Smith, Miss.
Dawson, Ill.	Lovre	Smith, Va.
Deane	Lucas	Spence
Dempsey	Lyle	Staggers
D'Ewart	McCarthy	Steed
Dies	McMillan	Sullivan
Dollinger	Machrowicz	Sutton
Dolliver	Magnuson	Talle
Donohue	Mahon	Teague
Dowdy	Metcalf	Thompson, La.
Eberharter	Miller, Calif.	Thornberry
Elliott	Miller, Kans.	Tollefson
Evins	Miller, Nebr.	Trimble
Fisher	Mills	Vinson
Forand	Mollohan	Walter
Forrester	Morgan	Wampler
Fountain	Morrison	Watts
Frazier	Moss	Wheeler
Friedel	Moulder	Whitten
Gary	Multer	Wickersham
Gathings	Murray	Williams, Miss.
Gentry	Norrell	Willis
Golden	O'Brien, Mich.	Wilson, Tex.
Grant	O'Hara, Minn.	Winstead
Gregory	O'Konski	Withers
Gross	O'Neill	Withrow
Hagen, Minn.	Passman	Yorty
Haley	Patman	Zablocki

NAYS—174

Allen, Calif.	Bentley	Budge
Allen, Ill.	Betts	Busbey
Andresen, August H.	Bishop	Bush
Angell	Bolton, Frances P.	Byrnes, Wis.
Arends	Bolton, Oliver P.	Canfield
Auchincloss	Bonin	Carrigg
Ayres	Bosch	Cederberg
Baker	Bow	Chenoweth
Bates	Bramblett	Chiperfield
Beamer	Brown, Ohio	Church
Belcher	Brownson	Clevenger
Bender	Broyhill	Cole, N. Y.
Bennett, Fla.	Budge	Coon
		Corbett
Cotton	James	Reed, Ill.
Coudert	Jenkins	Reed, N. Y.
Cretella	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Crumpacker	Johnson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Curtis, Mass.	Jonas, Ill.	Robsion, Ky.
Curtis, Mo.	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis, Nebr.	Kearney	Rooney
Dague	Kearns	St. George
Davis, Wis.	Keating	Saylor
Dawson, Utah	Kersten, Wis.	Schenck
Derounian	Kilburn	Scott
Devereux	King, Pa.	Scrivner
Dondero	Knox	Seely-Brown
Dorn, N. Y.	Krueger	Shafer
Ellsworth	Laird	Short
Engle	Lantaff	Simpson, Pa.
Fallon	LeCompte	Small
Fenton	McConnell	Smith, Wis.
Fernandez	McCulloch	Springer
Fino	McDonough	Stauffer
Fogarty	McGregor	Stringfellow
Ford	McVey	Taber
Frelinghuysen	Mack, Wash.	Taylor
Fulton	Madden	Thomas
Gamble	Mailliard	Thompson, Mich.
Gavin	Mason	Utt
George	Merrill	Van Pelt
Goodwin	Merrow	Van Zandt
Gordon	Miller, Md.	Velde
Graham	Miller, N. Y.	Vorys
Gubser	Morano	Vursell
Gwinn	Mumma	Wainwright
Hale	Neal	Warburton
Halleck	Nelson	Weichel
Hand	Nicholson	Wharton
Heselton	Norblad	Widnall
Hess	O'Brien, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Hiestand	O'Hara, Ill.	Williams, N. Y.
Hillelson	Osmers	Wilson, Calif.
Hinshaw	Ostertag	Wilson, Ind.
Hoffman, Ill.	Patterson	Wolverton
Hoffman, Mich.	Pelly	Young
Holt	Phillips	Younger
Hosmer	Prouty	
Hruska	Radwan	
Jackson	Ray	

NOT VOTING—86

Adair	Doyle	McIntire
Andersen, H. Carl	Durham	Mack, Ill.
Barden	Edmondson	Marshall
Barrett	Feighan	Martin, Iowa
Becker	Fine	Matthews
Boiling	Garmatz	Meader
Boykin	Granahan	Oakman
Bray	Green	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buckley	Hagen, Calif.	Pillion
Burleson	Hardy	Poff
Byrne, Pa.	Hart	Poulson
Campbell	Hays, Ohio	Price
Cannon	Heller	Rabaut
Carlyle	Herlong	Rayburn
Case	Hillings	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Horan	Regan
Chatham	Howell	Riehlman
Chelf	Hull	Rivers
Chudoff	Hunter	Rodino
Ciardy	Hyde	Sadlak
Condon	Jarman	Scherer
Crosser	Jones, Mo.	Scudder
Davis, Ga.	Karsten, Mo.	Sheehan
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Dingell	Kelly, N. Y.	Thompson, Tex.
Dodd	Keogh	Westland
Donovan	Kilday	Wier
Dorn, S. C.	Latham	Wolcott
	McCormack	Yates

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Edmondson for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Case against.

Mr. Dodd for, with Mr. Hillings against.

Mr. Campbell for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Herlong for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Thompson of Texas for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Chatham for, with Mr. Becker against.

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. Sadlak against.

Mr. Matthews for, with Mr. Scudder against.

Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Adair with Mr. Keogh.

Mr. Warburton with Mr. Delaney.

Mr. Westland with Mr. Heller.

Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Celler.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Fine.
Mr. Oakman with Mrs. Kelly of New York.
Mr. Reece of Tennessee with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Poff with Mr. Doyle.
Mr. Clardy with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Bray with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Hyde with Mr. Rabaut.
Mr. Pillion with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. H. Carl Andersen with Mr. Granahan.
Mr. Meader with Mr. Barrett.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Chudoff.
Mr. Hunter with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, Mr. OSMERS, and Mr. MERROW changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. RICHARDS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks previously made in connection with the conference report and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation which was read by the Clerk:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1953.

HON. JOSEPH MARTIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, sections 1083 and 1084, United States Code, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

AMENDING UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement, and then to include in my announcement an explanation of the bills which I intend to talk about.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and I have introduced identical bills to amend the Unemployment Compensation Act. We want to make the act more sound and more stable than it is, and we also want to see to it that all the money collected for unemployment compensation shall go for unemployment compensation and not for other purposes. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] had a bill in a year ago. It was the same kind of bill. We had extensive hearings, and I have been assured that the new chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] will announce that we will have open hearings on these bills immediately after the Easter recess. I am making this announcement so all those who are interested in this proposition may read the explanations that I shall put in the RECORD so that they will know what it is all about.

AN EXPLANATION OF H. R. 3530 AND H. R. 3531, UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION BILLS

The bills, H. R. 3530 and H. R. 3531, introduced by Mr. MILLS and myself, have but one purpose—to improve and strengthen the nationwide Federal-State employment-security system. This system, which makes so important a contribution to the economic security of the Nation's workers and provides a publicly supported placement service for workers and employers, thereby promoting stability in the whole economy, owes its existence to the Wagner-Peyser and Social Security Acts, passed by the Congress in 1933 and 1935 respectively. This is so because these acts stimulated the States to pass legislation which placed employment security programs in actual operation.

Over the years the States have acted, within their sphere of authority, to improve and strengthen their employment security programs. The States cannot, however, act with respect to those matters which are within the sphere of the authority of the Congress. These bills would effect improvements which only the Congress can make.

These bills would improve the employment security system in three major respects:

First. They would insure that all unemployment payroll taxes are used only for employment security purposes by making it impossible for the Federal Government to divert any part of them to finance its general expenses.

Second. They would promote more effective administration by placing administrative financing on a more stable basis.

Third. They would promote sounder benefit financing by making permanent the expired George loan fund provision for loans to States whose reserves become low and by providing machinery which would insure that any such loans would be repaid.

The Federal Unemployment Tax Act imposes a tax of 3 percent on the payrolls of employers subject to it. Employers actually pay only 10 percent of this tax to the Federal Government; the remainder is offset by virtue of payments to States of taxes imposed by State unemployment compensation laws.

The revenue thus collected by the States must be placed in a benefit trust fund, which cannot be touched except for the payment of benefits. For administrative funds the States are entirely reliant on Federal grants.

The payments which are made to the Federal Government—10 percent of 3.0 percent, or at a rate of 0.3 percent of payrolls—now go into the general funds of the Treasury. During the years since the Federal Unemployment Tax Act became effective in 1936, collections under it have exceeded congressional appropriations for grants to States for the administration of their employment security programs by about $1 billion. This excess has constituted a profit for the Federal Government at the expense of the employment security system, for these taxes are paid by employers as unemployment payroll taxes, under a law labeled as the "Federal Unemployment Tax Act."

Employers who pay these taxes want them used solely for employment security purposes and by their very nature they should be so used. This bill, therefore, would specifically earmark them and place them in a special account in the United States Treasury, and they could be withdrawn from this account and used only for employment security purposes. Specifically, these earmarked revenues would first of all be used as the source from which the Congress would make appropriations.

First. For grants to States to pay the costs of administering their employment security programs.

Second. To pay the costs of administering Federal employment security functions performed by the United States Department of Labor.

Third. To pay the costs incurred by the Post Office in handling the official mail of State employment security agencies.

In each of these cases the Congress would control the amount of the withdrawals from the earmarked fund through appropriations. The appropriations process would be exactly the same as now, except that the source of the funds would be the earmarked unemployment tax revenues rather than the general funds of the Treasury. Moreover, the bill would preserve the present Federal controls that insure minimum standards in all the States.

These bills further provide that the yearly excess of Federal unemployment tax collections over the appropriations specified above would be used in two ways:

First. Twenty percent of it would be placed in a special revolving reserve fund in the United States Treasury, as a source from which loans could be made to State employment security agencies whose unemployment reserves become low. Twenty percent of the annual excess would go into the special revolving reserve fund until a total of $100 million had been accumulated.

Second. The remainder of the excess would be distributed among the States pro rata according to the size of their taxable payrolls for their use either (a) to build up their benefit reserve funds or (b) to pay costs of administration, as the individual States found necessary. The States would thus be freed from total reliance on the Federal Government for administrative funds, and would be

given needed flexibility to meet fluctuating economic conditions and leeway to improve operations.

These bills would, further, make permanent the George loan fund, initially created in 1944 by the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act, for the purpose of making loans to State employment security agencies whose unemployment reserve funds become low. As outlined above, the bills would place 20 percent of the annual excess of Federal unemployment tax collections in the fund, until a total of $100 million had been accumulated, thus providing revenues from which to make loans. They would also establish machinery to enforce repayment of any such loan, by reducing the tax offset allowed employers in any State which failed to repay within a specified time.

The Congress, by creating the George loan fund, recognized the national interest in assuring that State unemployment reserves remain solvent. In the same way it also established as national policy that the appropriate method of expressing this national interest was by making loans to needy States rather than by outright gifts. These bills include these two basic principles.

It is not expected that any State will need a loan within the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, adequate provision for the future requires recognition that some State may need one at some time. Action cannot wait until the actual need arises, just as no community can afford to wait until a fire occurs to establish a fire department. The George loan fund expired on December 31, 1951. It should be made permanent now and improved as these bills would provide.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader if he can give us the legislative program for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, Monday is the day regularly assigned for the consideration of bills having to do with the District of Columbia. I understand there are several bills that have been reported out and which are waiting action on next Monday, some of which may be controversial. However, we shall undertake to dispose of them on Monday. There are numerous bills on which we anticipate rules will be granted so that they may be taken up and considered next week. A couple of them involve existing statutes which have an expiration date of March 21. Probably those rules will be granted on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Is H. R. 1 among those bills?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not have the floor. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. REED of New York. He probably could not answer that question.

Mr. PRIEST. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. H. R. 1 is not one of them at this moment.

Mr. REED of New York. I wanted that for the record.

ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY NEXT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next when the House adjourns, it adjourn to meet on the following Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. If rules are granted—and I have no reason to think they will not be—we would expect to take up on Wednesday and Thursday H. R. 3853, which has to do with the extension of certain war powers. We will also consider House Joint Resolution 226, which deals with the matter of extension of war powers. Both are measures which, as I indicated before, deal with existing statutes which have an expiration date.

Mr. PRIEST. Taking up these matters will depend on rules being granted in each case?

Mr. HALLECK. That is correct.

There is also pending, reported by the Armed Services Committee, House Resolution 3780, which deals with the extension of the Missing Persons Act. If a rule is granted, we expect to call that up and dispose of it.

There is also pending before the Committee on Armed Services the bill S. 1110, having to do with the appointment of a Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. If a rule is granted, we would also like to dispose of that next week.

For the information of the membership, it is my understanding that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary handling the submerged-lands bill has reported the bill, and the full committee is to consider that measure on Tuesday next. We express the hope that the measure may be reported by the Committee on the Judiciary the latter part of next week, so that we may get a rule on the measure, with the expectation of bringing it in for consideration 1 week from Monday. I would anticipate that we could conclude it in 2 or 3 days. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] is chairman of the subcommittee. What does the gentleman say about the probability of time involved?

Mr. GRAHAM. We expect to get through with it in the Committee on the Judiciary next week. We will ask for a rule at once. Then we should begin on Monday. The amendments that were offered in committee have been considered, and we should be able to finish in at least 2 or 2½ days.

Mr. HALLECK. Then, for the information of those who have been inquiring, we would expect to take that up week after next.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have a list of Members who were attending a luncheon with President Eisenhower today. I ask unanimous consent that that complete list may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The list referred to follows:

Republicans: Representatives WALT HORAN, Washington; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, New York; E. ROSS ADAIR, Indiana; WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, California; GEORGE MEADER, Michigan; Delegate JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii.

Democrats: Representatives JAMES C. DAVIS, Georgia; EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland; F. ETHEL CARLYLE, North Carolina; JAMES J. DELANEY, New York; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, Pennsylvania; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Pennsylvania; CHARLES R. HOWELL, New Jersey; PETER P. MACK, JR., Illinois; PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; ROY W. WIER, Minnesota; SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois; EDNA P. KELLY, New York; SIDNEY A. FINE, New York; JOHN JARMAN, Oklahoma, and Delegates E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska, and A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday, March 20, to file reports on sundry bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DRAGGING FEET—PEOPLE ARE DEMANDING ACTION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party has the absolute responsibility for leadership. Last November the people voted overwhelmingly for a change. They were promised

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a change, yes, a clean-sweep administratively and legislatively and they will not be satisfied with excuses. They are waiting to see the Washington mess cleaned up, they are looking for some signs of a new direction in foreign policy, a cut in taxes, a considerable reduction in spending and a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, a friend and constituent has expressed the view of millions of people in a letter which I have just received and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD:

The Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LAWRENCE: I am prompted to write you even though I recently had a very fine visit with you in Washington. I am much concerned with the way some things seem to be going. I realize it is pretty hard to get any fair appraisal of the situation from the public press because of the prejudice of most of the writers and the interest of too many of them in creating dissension and discrediting the Republican administration. However, there are certain broad trends which I would like to mention.

1. TAXES AND EXPENSES

There seems to be somewhat less determination on the part of the administration, and among some Members of the new Congress, to really curtail Government expenses and give the people relief from the confiscatory taxes. The comments about the difficulty in reducing these huge expenditures are particularly discouraging when they come from people we consider to be leaders in the Republican Party. Certainly, all the waste and inefficiencies of the Federal Government which were so effectively emphasized during the campaign still exist and still require attention. This waste, inefficiency and useless expense are no less apparent to the citizens who voted for the change in Government today than they were prior to election, but I can't help but get the impression that it is somewhat less apparent to the leaders of the new administration and to some people in the Congress.

2. BIG GOVERNMENT

It doesn't seem quite consistent to me that after all the recognition that was given to all evils of the big government problem that we should proceed to attack this problem by creating new departments and new agencies. I do not believe you will reduce the size of Government by enlarging it, and the proposal to create a new department with Cabinet status certainly appears to me to be inconsistent with the program of the Republican Party.

There seems to be an awful lot of talk about the difficulties of reducing the size of the Federal payroll because of civil service regulations. If I understand this problem correctly, the difficulty arises only in those cases where it is the intention to replace the present employee with another employee of like status and it should, in no way, interfere with reducing and removing from the Federal payroll the vast number of unnecessary Federal job holders.

While I may be a little premature, I am concerned about the lack of any efforts to eliminate the multitude of Government corporations operating in competition with private citizens and to terminate useless and unnecessary Federal agencies.

I cannot understand Senator CAPEHART devoting so much of his time and energies to the establishment of what is called "standby" controls when the whole effort, during the campaign and in the early days of the administration, was to get the American economy out from under the yoke of Federal controls. Some of the publicity coming from Republican sources would lead you to believe that they were in complete agreement with Mr. Truman's philosophy on this subject. You do not free the economy from controls by removing them and then continuing to hold them over the heads of the citizens as a threat to be invoked on the whim of some individual or group of individuals. The elimination of price and wage controls has been an excellent step in the right direction, but it is only the beginning and there should not be any "standby" controls and there are many other direct and semidirect controls, as well as those which are exerted through pressure of Federal bureaucracy, which will need to be eliminated.

3. FOREIGN RELATIONS AND FOREIGN POLICY

After all the talk in the campaign about the need for an entirely new and different approach to this problem, it sometimes seems as though the new administration has begun to lose their determination to do this. At least it doesn't seem feasible to me that they can expect to accomplish these changes by retaining in positions of responsibility, or placing in other positions of responsibility, the same people who have been so closely identified with the previous and disastrous policies in this field. With the exception of a very few people our State Department and our foreign relations are being handled by the same names which have handled them over the past many years. Some of the individuals have been moved around, but far too many of them are still in places of major responsibility and where they can influence the direction and execution of our policies.

I am very much concerned over the reports which indicate that the Bricker amendment limiting the treaty-making powers does not any longer have the strong support in the Congress and the administration that it earlier enjoyed. This, of course, is needed in order to correct one of the most fundamental and frightening affairs facing us.

4. LABOR LEGISLATION

In this field of so-called labor legislation it seems that many people have forgotten or have suddenly become confused as to what the underlying problem really is. The special-privileged, the license to engage in monopolistic practices, the tendency of the Government to lay its heavy hand on the side of any type of skulduggery cloaked with the name of labor union, the failure to recognize the degree to which the labor-union movement in this country has become a political organization trying to saddle socialism and slavery on the American workers, are some of the things which are fundamental in the problems today. There seems to be a failure to recognize, for what it really is, the union's efforts to extend compulsory unionism. Certainly the principles of the Republican Party, dedicated to preserving the free choice of the individual, cannot condone placing him in a straitjacket through the vehicle of compulsory unionism. The defiance that the top labor leaders (misleaders is a more proper name) have for all types of law and order, the horrible example on the New York waterfront, the situation in Kentucky where they attempted to take over an entire community, and many other examples should be ample evidence that the inordinate power which has been placed in the hands of the labor union hierarchy has to be curtailed and eliminated by removing all special privileges and recognizing coercion, corruption, and crime and the interference with individual rights as being just as much an evil when it is done in the name of organized labor as it is when done under any other name.

5. GENERAL

It seems to me that no matter whether you consider the election in November as a Republican victory or as a victory for General Eisenhower, the people clearly expressed themselves as having had enough of the Truman Fair Deal, New Deal type of government philosophy and, certainly, they are entitled to a complete change from this policy—not watering down or a slight revision of it. Some of us are unable to understand, for example, why Mr. Flemming and Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, who were so often architects and advocates of many of Mr. Truman's plans and programs, still occupy such an important and influential position as advisers to the new administration. There are many other names of individuals who are in a similar position.

This letter has been longer than I would like to have it, but I am much concerned about the situation. I have no special convictions about any particular piece of legislation, but I am no less convinced today than I was prior to the election that this country faces a serious situation and that it is going to take leadership which is forthright, courageous, and sound to get us out of our difficulties.

This letter is written in the interest of being constructive and in no way is intended to be critical of the wonderful work you have done as Representative of the people of your district.

In the hopes that my thoughts may be of interest to others from Wisconsin, I am sending copies of this to both Senators and some of the other Congressmen.

Sincerely yours.

SUBVERSIVE FILMS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest in the House and throughout the country generally with respect to a moving picture being made in Silver City, N. Mex., under the auspices of a number of witnesses who have in the past refused under oath to affirm or deny their alleged membership in the Communist Party.

I have asked all major studios, the Hollywood A. F. of L. Film Council, the Secretaries of State and Commerce, and the Attorney General of the United States to submit suggestions as to what legal steps can be taken, following upon a proper finding that the picture is indeed designed to inflame racial hatreds, toward stopping the export of this picture abroad to the detriment of United States policy and interests abroad.

I wish I could have waited for all of the replies to these inquiries before inserting any in the RECORD. However, as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities I am leaving tomorrow for Los Angeles where the committee opens hearings on next Monday. I am inserting those answers which I have received to this time from Roy M. Brewer, chairman, Hollywood A. F. of L. Council, Mr. Howard Hughes, of RKO, the Secretary of Commerce and the Assistant Secretary of State. I will insert other replies following my return to Washington.

I hope that a legal method can be found by which the completion of this picture in the United States and its export to foreign nations can be stopped pending a legal finding as to its contents and purposes.

(The letters referred to follow:)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *March 18, 1953.*

DONALD L. JACKSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Hollywood AFL Film Council assures you that everything which it can do to prevent the showing of the Mexican picture, Salt of the Earth will be done. However, an investigation discloses that at this time there is no work being done on this picture in Hollywood nor by any Hollywood persons except those who have been involved in one way or another in pro-Communist activities. The best information seems to indicate that final shots of this picture are to be taken in Mexico and it is probable that processing of film is being done there. The film council will solicit its fellow members in the theaters to assist in the prevention of showing of this picture in any American theaters, but the extent to which we can as a union take action in such a matter is limited by reason of the restrictive features in the Taft-Hartley Act which continues to be a burden on loyal American unions. Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

ROY M. BREWER,
Chairman, Hollywood AFL Council.

MARCH 18, 1953.

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: In your telegram you asked the question, "Is there any action that industry and labor in motion picture field can take to stop completion and release of picture and to prevent showing of film here and abroad?"

My answer is "Yes." There is action which the industry can take to stop completion of this motion picture in the United States. And if the Government will act immediately to prevent the export of the film to some other country where it can be completed, then this picture will not be completed and disseminated throughout the world where the United States will be judged by its content.

According to newspaper reports, photography of this motion picture has been finished at Silver City, N. Mex.

However, completion of photography of a motion picture is only the first step in production.

Before a motion picture can be completed or shown in theaters, an extensive application of certain technical skills and use of a great deal of specialized equipment is absolutely necessary.

Herbert Biberman, Paul Jarrico, and their associates working on this picture do not possess these skills or this equipment.

If the motion picture industry—not only in Hollywood, but throughout the United States—will refuse to apply these skills, will refuse to furnish this equipment, the picture cannot be completed in this country.

Biberman and Jarrico have already met with refusal where the industry was on its toes. The film processing was being done by the Pathe Laboratories, until the first news broke from Silver City.

But the minute Pathe learned the facts, this alert laboratory immediately refused to do any further work on this picture, even though it meant refunding cash paid in advance.

Investigation fails to disclose where the laboratory work is being done now. But it is being done somewhere, by someone, and a great deal more laboratory work will have to be done by someone, before the motion picture can be completed.

Biberman, Jarrico, and their associates cannot succeed in their scheme alone. Before they can complete the picture, they must have the help of the following:

1. Film laboratories.
2. Suppliers of film.
3. Musicians and recording technicians necessary to record music.
4. Technicians who make dissolves, fades, etc.
5. Owners and operators of sound rerecording equipment and dubbing rooms.
6. Positive and negative editors and cutters.
7. Laboratories that make release prints.

If the motion picture industry wants to prevent this motion picture from being completed and spread all over the world as a representative product of the United States, then the industry and particularly that segment of the industry listed above, needs only to do the following:

Be alert to the situation.

Investigate thoroughly each applicant for the use of services or equipment.

Refuse to assist the Bibermans and Jarricos in the making of this picture.

Be on guard against work submitted by dummy corporations or third parties.

Appeal to the Congress and the State Department to act immediately to prevent the export of this film to Mexico or anywhere else.

Sincerely,

HOWARD HUGHES.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 16, 1953.

The Honorable DONALD L. JACKSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JACKSON: This is in reply to your letter of February 26, 1953, in which you inquire whether effective legislation exists to prevent the exportation of finished prints of the motion picture Salt of the Earth, now in this country. You have stated further that this film presents a distorted and untrue picture of life in this country, and if shown abroad would serve anti-American purposes.

The Export Control Act (63 Stat. 7) authorizes the President (who, in turn, has authorized the Secretary of Commerce) to prohibit or curtail exports of any articles, materials, or supplies to the extent necessary (1) to safeguard the domestic economy from supply shortages, (2) to safeguard the national security insofar as it might be affected by exports of strategic commodities, and (3) to further our foreign policy. At the present time, exposed motion picture film is not on our list of controlled commodities and may, therefore, be exported to all countries except those of the Soviet bloc without our specific authorization. Shipments of film to the Soviet bloc would, however, now require our approval.

It is not usual in the administration of export controls to single out for control one transaction from a group of general transactions or one item from a group of similar items. That is to say, we would ordinarily place all exposed film under control and then act upon proposed shipments in accordance with established licensing criteria. However, our existing regulations do provide for the revocation of all licenses, including the general license which presently covers exposed film of this nature, and such revocation could be accomplished by specific prohibitory order directed to the particular film, copies thereof, its producers and owners, and also to any proposed foreign consignee.

Such an order, if violated, would then be subject to possible criminal prosecution. Otherwise, as to its effectiveness, I should mention that customs officers and postal inspectors would, of course, be alerted, but there would be obvious practical difficulties in actually preventing an attempted illegal shipment.

I am not expressing an opinion as to whether such action should be taken since, as you are aware, it would necessitate a foreign policy determination with respect to which I should have to obtain advice from the Secretary of State, and possibly the President. It is my understanding that you have already written to Secretary Dulles in this connection, and also that regarding the alien agent aspect of this matter, referred to in your letter, you have written to the Attorney General.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 18, 1953.

The Honorable DONALD L. JACKSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR DON: Reference is made to your letter of February 26, 1953, regarding the motion picture, Salt of the Earth, now being produced in New Mexico. The background material which you have furnished relative to the content of this film and the circumstances of its production would apparently justify your concern as to its effect if released abroad.

A study of the existing legislation which might be employed to prevent the export of this film indicates that there are two principal relevant acts. Section 5b, of the Trading With the Enemy Act, would apparently offer control over the export of any item. The history of this legislation did not contemplate its use as a means of censorship. Its terms, however, are broad and general in nature and can be employed to prohibit any type of export. This act is administered by the Treasury Department.

The other applicable legislation is the Export Control Act which is administered by the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce under this act has the authority to license any item and may then exercise its authority by refusing to grant an export license for specific articles. The terms of the Export Control Act are also rather general and can be interpreted very broadly. The legislative history of this act, as in the case of the Trading With the Enemy Act, does not indicate that it was designed to enter the field of censorship; but in view of the fact that it covers anything that might affect the foreign policy of the United States, it is believed that it could be applied. The application of the provisions of these acts to a specific motion-picture film might present administrative complications; however, it appears that these would not be insurmountable.

In regard to your question relating to the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, it would appear that this is a matter of interpretation and ruling by the Attorney General. This act is administered by the Department of Justice, and I am informed that it becomes applicable when it has been determined by the Attorney General that funds are being employed whose source can be traced to a foreign principal. The problem, therefore, apparently would be to determine the source of the funds used in the production of this picture and whether or not they are acting under order, request, or direction of a foreign principal, and a subsequent ruling by the Attorney General on the basis of his findings.

It would appear that the laws and regulations outlined above represent the acts which could be best employed to prevent the foreign distribution of this film.

I would like to discuss this with you.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

PROSPECTING PERMITS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 433 of title 18, United States Code, covering exemptions with respect to certain contracts. My bill is intended to clarify any latent ambiguity which may exist in the law with regard to leases and prospecting permits which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into under the act of February 25, 1920, as amended. That act specifically enumerates certain classes of persons who may not own any interest in such leases. Members of Congress are not included in the enumeration. They would not normally be considered among those disqualified under the well-known rule of statutory interpretation that where a statute specifically enumerates classes to whom it shall apply, no others will be added to those specifically enumerated. That is the maxim "Expressio unius est exclusio alterius."

Recently, however, for the first time during the 30 or more years that the act has been in effect the question has been raised as to whether or not a Member of Congress may enter into such a lease. It seems perfectly clear to me that he is not disqualified, but in order that the matter be made perfectly clear to everyone concerned, I have introduced this bill.

CODE OF ETHICS FOR INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act in two respects: First, to give the House Rules Committee legislative oversight over all standing and select committees engaged in investigations; and, second, to make binding on each such investigating committee specific rules for the procedure of the committee, members, and employees and for the protection of the rights of those called as witnesses and others about whom comment may be made in the hearings adversely affecting their reputations. I am informed that the House Un-American Activities Committee, for example, has rules but that they are uncodified and I submit that they should be codified.

The rules of procedure which are contained in the bill and are to be binding upon all investigating committees are substantially the same as those promulgated recently by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee investigating the Department of Justice under the distinguished chairmanship of my colleague, Mr. KEATING, of New York, with two exceptions. The first exception is that any witness testifying in an effort to clear his reputation may not be the subject of photographs, moving pictures, television or radio broadcasting of the proceedings while testifying without his consent, as suggested by the civil-rights committee of the Association of the Bar of New York City. The second is that the committee shall not circulate on its letterhead or over the signature of its members or employees charges against individuals or organizations except as the committee by a majority vote shall so determine. The substance of this latter provision is taken from the text of the policy statement on congressional investigations of communism in education adopted by the general board of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America.

The protests from this source and other responsible sources with reference to investigations pursued in the Congress call our attention to the need for assuming responsibility on the highest possible level for what is done in House committee investigations. The courts have given great freedom to the Congress in respect of investigations; therefore such regulatory mechanisms as are desirable must be put into effect by the Congress itself. The Rules Committee of the House of Representatives is frequently referred to as the special instrument of the majority leadership. It therefore should express the utmost responsibility of the majority. Justice and fairness in congressional investigations are vital, particularly as reputations and lives can be so seriously affected. To do a job in the world for freedom we must be zealous to practice what we preach at home. I believe we can do no less than to charge with the highest responsibility—that of the Rules Committee—the exercise of such great authority as that of our investigating committees in the House. The Rules Committee generally authorizes subpena powers for committees before the House considers them. It should therefore have continuing oversight as to how these powers are exercised.

THE LATE SETH RICHARDSON

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, in the death in this city last Tuesday of Seth Richardson this country loses a most distinguished lawyer, a public servant who had served well both the State of North Dakota and the Federal Government, and a most patriotic citizen. He was also a militant Republican. President Harding appointed him a United States District Attorney. President Hoover had made him an Assistant Attorney General, and later nominated him to the bench of the Circuit Court of Appeals, but for partisan reasons he was not confirmed. More recently he was named by President Truman to the Loyalty Review Board and later as Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board. He was also counsel for the committee which investigated the Pearl Harbor disaster. In the performance of public duty he never stinted himself.

Seth Richardson was an accomplished athlete in his youth, and in his later life a keen fisherman and hunter, who traveled widely over the world in pursuit of adventure often spiced with danger. He was an omnivorous reader and student, a great and highly entertaining talker, a true and loyal friend. He loved his fellowman. It is remarkable and regrettable that he never held elective public office, for he was the sort of man who would have served any constituency with great devotion.

I take this occasion to express my great sympathy for his devoted wife and daughter.

THE IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to urge the Members of this House of Representatives to look into the importation of residual oil into this country. I join today with several of my colleagues who have brought this situation to the attention of the Congress and desire to state that I, along with several of them, have introduced bills which we hope, will curtail this activity.

I understand that the benefits derived from the importation of this residual oil are going to a few of our large oil companies, at the expense of several thousand miners and their families throughout the Nation. Several hundreds of these miners and their families live in my district. They are now out of work because this cheap oil is being brought in. I think the time is now when we should do something about it.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his position and to state to the House that there is more unemployment in my district now because of the importation of this residual oil than we have had since 1932.

Mr. STAGGERS. I want to thank the gentleman for his observations and I agree with him wholeheartedly. That is exactly the situation in my district. You can go into any of the counties where coal mining is one of the industries and you will find many of those coal miners out of work. This can be traced directly to the bringing in of this cheap residual oil. It is only a matter of whether we think that profits are more important than the lives and well-being of thousands of people in this country. As for me, the answer is obvious. The welfare of any human being comes first in any Christian nation.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of House Joint Resolution 223 agreed to on yesterday and were it possible for me to have been on the floor at that time when the rollcall vote was taken I would have so indicated.

THE IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I spoke of the need for legislation which would provide a limitation on importations of residual fuel oil into this country. I submitted facts and figures which revealed some of the damaging effects these shipments of foreign oil are bringing to bear upon the coal industry.

Yesterday's Charleston Gazette, printed in the capital city of West Virginia, contained an article with reference to current conditions in the coal fields—conditions which are alarming and which, in my opinion, are being caused by the increased flow of residual into east coast ports from the Caribbean area.

I include as a part of my remarks this newspaper article, and I hope that the Members of Congress will take action to limit the importation of this oil and thereby bring relief to the coal industry and to the many thousands of Americans who depend upon that industry for their livelihood:

MINE STATISTICS PAINT UNHEALTHY PICTURE—WHOLE STATE FEELS PINCH OF PIT CLOSING

(By Don Seagle)

The specter of unemployment and declining production today presents an alarming picture for West Virginia's coal-rich lands and industries.

Just how alarming is a matter of opinion. Some say it threatens to be tragic. Others disagree. The United Mine Workers Union, which has good cause to consider the situation carefully, takes a more optimistic view and predicts smoother sailing for 1953.

But any change in the mines' status quo is reason for the rest of the State to take notice. And that there's been a change is beyond dispute.

It affects nearly everyone and everybody. That includes the Gazette, the gas station on the corner, the neighboring movie house, the stores of Charleston, and any organization or individual whose livelihood depends on miners' fat paychecks.

Down in Mingo County, the Williamson Daily News took a look at the situation. Here's what it found:

"Since June 1951 nine operations have shut down—permanently or indefinitely, or have drastically curtailed production. In addition to 2,000 men without jobs, these closings also mean the loss of over 1,000,000 tons of coal annually. The resultant loss in dollars is certain to be felt in the trade and commerce in each trading center—and Williamson is the largest in this field."

Other cities and other papers have noticed the same thing; many of them commented in a similar vein. Cities such as Williamson, Logan, Welch, Bluefield, Beckley, Fairmont, Elkins and others know they would be near ghost towns if there is a significant downward trend in production.

There is not reason to believe this will happen. At least not unless some new factor is added. There's good reason to believe the industry is going through a period of major change and it appears to be a change for the worse. Here are some of its symptoms:

Coal mines closing: Boone County, 9; Barbour, 5; Clay, 1; Harrison, 4; Kanawha, 3; Logan, 14; McDowell, 22; Mingo, 9; and Raleigh, 11. (Figures are from the newest Department of Mines Quarterly Report.)

Employment: Nineteen thousand eight hundred and seventy-four applications were filed in January-February, 1953; 8,440, or nearly half, were filed at offices in southern West Virginia, including 4,511 in the Charleston metropolitan area. The employment service paid $1,106,310 in unemployment compensation to coal miners in the first 2 months of 1953. (Figures from the West Virginia Department of Employment Security's research and statistic division.)

Coal production: Down an estimated 53,000,000 tons in 5 years: 1947, 173,653,000; 1948, 168,589,000; 1949, 122,913,000; 1950, 145,563,000; 1951, 163,448,000; 1952 (preliminary), 143,000,000; 1953 (estimated on basis of January production), 120,000,000. (Figures from the Department of Mines and Western Virginia Coal Association.)

Mine employment: 1948, 139,100; 1949, 130,000; 1950, 130,500.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. Is it not also a fact that it is driving into bankruptcy some of the domestic oil producers of this country?

Mr. BYRD. It certainly is, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this fact to our attention.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATION PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the day I announced the program for next week and also indicated the probability of having before us, starting March 30, Monday, the offshore submerged lands bill. It has been called to my attention that the 30th and 31st are Jewish holidays. In view of that fact I want to add to my former announcement this word, that we will try to complete general debate and probably the reading of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule on the 30th and 31st. At any event, the vote on the measure will not come until Wednesday, April 1.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give us any idea when the Easter recess may start?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, we are working on that now and I will be glad to talk to the gentleman about it as soon as I conclude here.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a radio program entitled "Reporters' Roundup."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, it has always been my desire and earnest attempt to answer personally every item of mail which comes to my office, whether it be from my own district or elsewhere in the United States. In recent weeks an immense volume of correspondence has come to me by letter, telegram, postal card, and so forth, and even my already overworked office staff finds it impossible to acknowledge each communication properly.

This correspondence largely has to do with the question of communism, subversion, and the investigations and hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is my intention to determine the contents of these communications and I hope to reply to each one by the sending out of reprints of my statements here today.

I would like to say that it is heart warming and a source of tremendous personal satisfaction to me to note the surge of interest on the part of my correspondents in the problem of Communists operating in the various free American institutions. I hope that the thousands of alert and loyal Americans who have taken the trouble to write to me personally, or as the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, will bear with me in this method of acknowledging their correspondence. I feel I can do more justice to their inquiries by taking up the majority of their questions and suggestions one by one and answering in this manner.

First, during the Reporters' Roundup, a radio program over the Mutual Broadcasting System, on Monday, March 9, upon which I appeared, and which program is entirely spontaneous and unrehearsed, I, as chairman was asked a series of questions about the work and aims of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Much issue has been made in various newspapers and publications, as well as on radio and television programs, regarding my supposed proposal of an investigation to be made by our House Committee on Un-American Activities of religious institutions and the clergy in general. I made no such proposal on my own behalf, neither did I make a proposal as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities that a general investigation be made of communism in religious fields. My only statements, as shown by a transcript obtained from Mutual Broadcasting System and quoted below, were that it was entirely possible that committee investigators might make inquiry concerning some individual Communists and ex-Communists in the religious field. In response to a question as to whether there was any likelihood of the committee investigations being extended to the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

church field because certain church leaders were becoming increasingly critical of the committee's investigations of Communist influences in colleges and universities, I stated:

I can't say at this time. There are so many other phases of communism and subversive activity that we have to investigate and report upon that it is doubtful that this year we shall get into that field at all. However, I do think that this is very important to get across to the American people: The Soviet Union, through the American Communist Party, is out to destroy all religious freedom in this country. I believe our religious leaders should be made aware of that and, while we welcome criticism, the committee welcomes honest, constructive criticism, we do not like to be condemned for our efforts to point out to the American people and Congress that the Soviet Union is attempting to destroy our religion, and we are doing our best to avoid that.

Question:

You don't preclude getting into the church field?

Answer:

Oh, no, it is entirely possible.

Question:

Do you think there is a field for investigation there?

Answer:

Yes, I think there is a field. I cannot tell which direction it would take—whether it would be into some of the organizations which are affiliated with the various churches, or whether it would be individuals. I would rather presume it would be individuals.

Question:

Do you think if such an investigation were undertaken—if and when—a man who called you a "pretended patriot and morally unfit to investigate the colleges and universities" might come under investigation?

Answer:

No; not because of what he called me or that he criticized the committee. We will make these investigations as fair as we possibly can and we will go ahead and let the record speak for itself.

Despite the clarity with which this issue was presented by me, it was badly, and in some cases I am afraid intentionally, distorted by many newspapers and radio stations. I now find, however, that people all over the Nation have voiced an overwhelming interest in favor of such an investigation and demand the committee's immediate attention to this particular problem.

I would like to state here that to have denied there were Communists in the field of religion would have been a lie on my part and misleading to the American public.

My congressional office staff has made a compilation of the communications favorable, as well as unfavorable, to the question of investigation of Communists in religious fields and it is astounding to note the results. Out of 1,755 communications received during this week, 1,692 expressed interest in, requested, and even demanded that this particular investigation be made, and were favorable to me personally and to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Only 62, some of which correspondence was anonymous, disapproved. I might say at this time, too, that none of these letters, cards, and telegrams were printed on form letters or cards. In other words, this was not the planned pressure type of mail which sometimes is sent to congressional offices.

To those who did sincerely disapprove, may I say that your criticism, where constructive upon the procedures of making investigations and holding hearings by the committee, are most welcome and helpful in preserving the processes of our American Republic.

The favorable correspondence received contained generally the following types of statements and issues:

No. 1. Demands and requests that an investigation be made of individual Communists in the religious field: To these loyal and sincere citizens, may I say that I feel Communists should and will be ferreted out and reported to the Congress and to the people, wherever they may be found. The staff and facilities of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, however, is too limited to make a special investigation at this time. It is already busily engaged and working overtime on the investigation of individual Communists in the field of labor, education, and so forth. Such a special investigation of individual Communists in the religious field, therefore, must necessarily be delayed until some future date. Such an investigation, also, can only be made with the concurrence of the majority of the membership of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

No. 2. Statements that the writers were offering prayers for me personally, and for the continuance of the good work of the Committee on Un-American Activities: To all these good people may I answer that I, too, have prayed for guidance concerning the work in which I am engaged and sincerely welcome and deeply appreciate their concern for me and the committee. I know they will continue their supplications, and am thankful for it.

No. 3. Many have requested a statement as to my own personal faith or church affiliation, as well as that of other members on the committee: In answer to these, I joined the Methodist Church at the age of 12 and have, since 1938, been a member of the First Methodist Church of Pekin, Ill.

During my service here in Washington, D. C., as a Member of Congress, I have attended the services of many major Protestant churches, as well as several Jewish and Catholic services. As a matter of fact, just 2 weeks ago I attended a christening of several babies performed by a priest of a Catholic church here in Washington. I want to say now that I believe every American citizen has the right, under our constitutional guarantees, to worship God as he or she chooses and I shall always keep that fundamental right firmly in mind in handling the problem of communism, which through theory and practice attempts to destroy our freedom of worship.

Regarding the faith of other members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, may I respectfully refer these persons to their nearest library in which they will be able to find the answer in the current issue of the Congressional Directory.

No. 4. Correspondence giving information concerning Communist activities: This information will be turned over to the investigative staff of the House Committee on Un-American Activities for its consideration and possible future assistance.

No. 5. Correspondence asking what right the House Committee on Un-American Activities has to investigate subversion in the fields of education, labor, and so forth: I would like to point out, in answer to this type of question, that the responsibility of the committee to investigate goes beyond a mere right or privilege. The committee is operating upon the explicit direction and is under obligation to the Congress of the United States to investigate subversive activities and propaganda under Public Law 601. In charging the committee with this duty the Congress did not indicate or direct that such investigation should be only those which are nationally popular. It must be recognized that in practically every field of investigation, even those individuals who may not come within the scope of investigation feel a certain stigma attached to them because of those traitors and subversives within their field.

No. 6. Letters commending the committee for its investigation of individuals in the field of education, and asking for information as to the progress of the committee in that particular field: In answer to the doubting Thomases who feel there is no profit in this, I would like to say that as the investigations and hearings proceed the record will speak for itself and will be disseminated to all interested persons through the medium of printed hearings as soon as possible.

Also in this connection I would again like to reiterate the statements that I have made on numerous occasions that the committee is not investigating colleges and universities—that it is investigating individual members in that field who are now or who have been members of the Communist Party. There need be no fear that the investigation being conducted by the committee will in any way abridge academic freedom or place an undue burden upon any college or organization composed of educators if they are working honestly and forthrightly in their important field. It is not my desire, or that of the committee, that the word "communism" or "Marxism" become an unspeakable term in any American institution. I feel that every American youth should know the honest truth about communism and Marxism. I do not feel that a Communist can deal with this honestly or objectively. I sincerely feel that there is a very grave distinction between the instruction in communism and the indoctrination in communism.

No. 7. Correspondence regarding the Roosevelt resolution of March 11 to remove me as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities: This correspondence reveals the fact that practically all are unfavorable to such a resolution; nevertheless, I feel that Representative ROOSEVELT undoubtedly felt he was serving the public interests by the introduction of such a resolution, and certainly as a Member of Congress

he has a right to do that. Again I say that I welcome the opportunity to pit the supporters of my chairmanship against that element supporting Mr. ROOSEVELT'S point of view.

Mr. Speaker, I have appeared on numerous radio and television programs within the past several weeks, such as the American Forum of the Air, Keep Posted, Reporters Roundup, Crossfire, the Cracker Barrel, Chronoscope, and so forth. These programs have likewise increased the flood of mail coming into my office. In answer to the hundreds of good people who have written me after my appearances on these programs, may I say that I feel by such methods a Member of Congress can most accurately present to the American public his views on legislation and his feelings concerning the problems which face our Nation today. I am greatly encouraged for the future of America by the loyalty to American principles shown in these letters, as well as the confidence in the work of the various investigative committees, our Chief Executive, and the various agencies operating under him.

I appreciate the kind comments concerning my appearances, as well as the constructive criticism contained in the letters and intend to make use of all suggestions.

I want to assure you the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities will go forward with no slackening of effort or lessening of zeal.

Let us be thankful to God that we are still under a form of government which makes possible the writing of these letters without fear of being thrown into concentration camps or being purged. I know I speak for all members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities when I say your communications are most welcome, and give us courage to go ahead with a very difficult job in the face of all obstacles thrown in our way by the followers of, and sympathizers with, the Soviet way of life.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BURDICK in three instances and to include an editorial and a letter.

Mr. MASON and to include an editorial.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include a resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Grundy, Va.

Mr. LANE in two instances; in one to include a speech by Gordon F. Graham, of the National Association of Manufacturers, and in others editorials.

Mr. LONG and to include a radio broadcast.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and include a statement.

Mr. PHILBIN and include some remarks he made in two instances.

Mrs. CHURCH and include extraneous material.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLTZMAN (at the request of Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOSS (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OAKMAN and Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $189.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1078. An act to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Armed Forces of the United States, in connection with certain pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1110. An act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOYLE, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. CONDON, for Thursday, March 19, 1953, on account of official business.

Mr. JACKSON, for the period of March 20 to April 13, 1953, on account of committee hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Los Angeles, Calif.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 23, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

561. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Munitions Control Board, transmitting the semiannual report of the National Munitions Control Board for the period January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (h), section 12 of the Neutrality Act of 1939 (Public Resolution No. 54, 76th Cong.); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

562. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 8, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Town River, Quincy, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 2, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

563. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

564. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

565. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ending December 31, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 47, 66th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1936. A bill authorizing the acceptance, for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, of school board land in exchange for park land, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3380. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for Prince William Forest Park, Prince William County, Va., for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings therein, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3411. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to reestablish and correct the boundaries of the Quincy National Cemetery by the exchange of Government-owned lands in the Quincy-Graceland Cemetery, Quincy, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 163. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Monroe County, Ark., to the State of Arkansas; without amendment (Rept. No. 176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 233. A bill to release all the right, title, and interest

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; without amendment (Rept. No. 177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1832. A bill to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2277. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3180. A bill to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property; with amendment (Rept. No. 195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3307. A bill to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3425. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1951; with amendment (Rept. No. 197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3704. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEARNS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3795. A bill to adjust the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1127. A bill to validate a conveyance of certain lands by the Central Pacific Railway Co., and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., to the Union Ice Co. and Edward Barbera; without amendment (Rept. No. 171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1128. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama; without amendment (Rept. No. 172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille; with amendment (Rept. No. 178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 788. A bill for the relief of Beryl Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 937. A bill for the relief of the estate of Frank DeNunzi; with amendment (Rept. No. 180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1141. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1180. A bill for the relief of Virgil N. Wing; without amendment (Rept. No. 182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of Sportservice Corp.; with amendment (Rept. No. 183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1769. A bill for the relief of Oscar P. Brown; with amendment (Rept. No. 184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1901. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; with amendment (Rept. No. 185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2018. A bill for the relief of Daryl L. Roberts, Ade E. Jaskar, Terrence L. Robbins, Harry Johnson, and Frank Swanda; without amendment (Rept. No. 186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2881. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaline Spagnola; with amendment (Rept. No. 187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3012. A bill for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3275. A bill for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3757. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Kilmer Nickerson; with amendment (Rept. No. 190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3823. A bill for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner; with amendment (Rept. No. 191). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3832. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Orinda Josephine Quigley; without amendment (Rept. No. 192). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 4116. A bill to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, so as to make applicable to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare the provisions of title IV of such Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 4117. A bill to extend the time within which former prisoners of war may apply for and be granted waiver of premiums and total disability benefits under United States Government life insurance and national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4118. A bill to authorize the preparation of rolls of persons of Indian blood whose ancestors were members of certain tribes or bands in the State of Oregon, and to provide for per capita distribution of funds arising from certain judgments in favor of such tribes or bands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4119. A bill to validate certain mustering-out payments prematurely made under title V of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 4120. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to, technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4121. A bill to increase the rates and amounts of compensation which may be earned by certain retired commissioned officers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4122. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters, supervisors, and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4123. A bill to provide legislative oversight and rules of procedure for investigating committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 4124. A bill to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4125. A bill to amend section 433 of title 18, United States Code, relating to exemptions with respect to certain contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4126. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4127. A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 4128. A bill to facilitate the broader distribution of health services, to increase the quantity and improve the quality of health services and facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 4129. A bill to authorize the use of checks protected by bank letters of credit in payment of internal-revenue taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4130. A bill to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 4131. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the coal miners and coal industry of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution permitting the entry of 500 children under 6 years of age, adopted by United States citizens who

are serving abroad in the Armed Forces of the United States, or who are employed abroad by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to their house joint memorial No. 5, requesting the establishment of an additional International Gate at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, seeking enactment of H. R. 91 and H. R. 92, 83d Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, relative to their house joint resolution No. 10, memorializing the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and to enact legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to their senate resolution No. 4, opposing legislation pending in the Congress for the support of prices of beef cattle at 100 percent parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 4132. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Raymunda Panart de Zanino and Julio Zanino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4133. A bill for the relief of Mendel Kuchcik and Civia Kuchcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG:

H. R. 4134. A bill for the relief of Francesco Gorga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4135. A bill for the relief of George Telegdy and Julia Peyer Telegdy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 4136. A bill for the relief of Willi Wetterich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4137. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4138. A bill for the relief of Sara Salcer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4139. A bill for the relief of Jankiel Berek Blumaztajn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4140. A bill for the relief of Hyman Drayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4141. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Kingsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. R. 4142. A bill for the relief of Edward Smiley, formerly Eddie Nichichuk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

97. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the County Clerk, County of Hawaii, petitioning consideration of their resolution No. 115 with reference to the passage of H. R. 2843, providing for the investigation in the Territory of Hawaii of the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

98. By Mr. McDONOUGH: Petition of a number of citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against any move to extend the draft and favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

99. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the City Council, Lowell, Mass., asking that Congress take action to extend the authorization for the Federal Government to control rents in Lowell; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 20, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of all being, whose glory flames from sun and star and on the resurrected earth: We bring to Thee our parched and jaded souls that they may be restored and become as gardens of the Lord. O Thou, from whom in vain we try to flee, in a violent world grant us now a saving experience of inner quiet and serenity. The futile years with their bitter lessons have taught us that the things for which men really grasp, the bauble of fame, the glitter of gold, the allurements of sense, the bread of pleasure, are but vanity and vexation of spirit. And now, at this noontide hour, with the unsatisfied desires of our yearning hearts, we turn in contrition to Thee. Like the flowers in spring gardens uplifted to the sun, like still waters that mirror the eternal stars, so we would lift our needy souls to Thee, our light and our life, our health and our hope. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 18, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 30, 31, 32, and 42 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24 and 27 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 206) to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

PROGRAM FOR TODAY AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes, in order that I may make an inquiry of the majority leader.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall have to be absent from the Senate Chamber for a brief period during the noon hour. Therefore, I wish to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what business he plans to bring before the Senate today and next week.

Mr. TAFT. Presumably there will be nothing but formal matters considered today, such as the business of the morning hour and the Executive Calendar.

As to next week, I expect to bring before the Senate on Monday the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, which is on the Executive Calendar, and will be passed over today. I hope that by Wednesday it may be possible for the Senate to consider the resolution approving the plan to raise the Federal Security Administration to the status of a Cabinet office. That is all I can report at the present moment.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the supplemental appropriation bill still in conference?

Mr. TAFT. The message just received informs us the House has now acted on the conference report, so I see no reason why it could not be taken up today by the Senate, although it may not be advisable to do so, because the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is not present today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the distinguished majority leader may find it possible to include the conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill in his plans for Monday.

Mr. TAFT. I know of no reason why it should not be considered then, so I shall be glad to propose that it be considered on Monday.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GREEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and Monday.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary considering the Trading With the Enemy Act was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the former Secretary of Defense, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the final financial statement of the Legion for the period up to and including December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MUNITIONS CONTROL BOARD

A letter from the executive secretary, National Munitions Control Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of that Board, for the period January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service for the year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Alfredo Herrera-Arraga from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on May 15, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUDIT REPORT ON FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution petitioning and memorializing the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and to enact legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate

"Whereas the 21st amendment to the Constitution of the United States vests in the individual States control over the trade in and use of alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas in the exercise of such control 46 States including the State of Maryland have recognized the compelling demand for alcoholic beverages, and have enacted laws to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the people by allowing only those who are morally responsible to engage in the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages, and by strictly supervising such production and distribution; and

"Whereas the aforesaid 46 States have levied excise taxes on alcoholic beverages for the purpose of encouraging temperance, reimbursing the States for their costs in maintaining such strict supervision and control, and providing revenue; and in fixing the amount of these excises, States have sought an optimum figure which will achieve a balance between the three enumerated objectives; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has so substantially increased its excise tax on alcoholic beverages that the consumer price of such beverages has risen to several times their cost of production; and

"Whereas the result of such increase in consumer price has been to divert many sales from the controlled distribution system set up by the State of Maryland to the bootleg industry with an accompanying disregard for law, danger to the health of its citizens, and loss of revenue to both State and Federal Governments; and

"Whereas it is considered judgment that the Federal Government has raised its excises beyond the optimum level consistent with the objectives of taxation and control; and has taken from the State of Maryland the power to restore the proper balance: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That in order to eliminate bootlegging, restore respect for law and order, and provide adequate revenues for both State and Federal Governments, that the General Assembly of Maryland does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and enact legislation reducing the present excessively high tax rate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to send a copy of this joint resolution under the great seal of Maryland to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States from Maryland, the United States Senators from Maryland, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 4

"Resolution in opposition to legislation pending in Congress for the support of prices of beef cattle at 100 percent parity and providing that copies of this resolution be mailed to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, and to the Secretary of Agriculture

"Whereas there has been introduced into the Senate of the United States a bill to support various commodities, including beef cattle, at 100 percent parity; and

"Whereas it has been the long-standing policy of the cattlemen of the State of Montana to oppose any form of subsidy for the cattle business; and

"Whereas it is the feeling of the cattlemen of Montana that recent unsettled conditions in the cattle business are a direct result of past unsound and ill-considered regulation of the economics of the cattle business by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana, That any attempts to force such subsidy on the cattlemen of the State of Montana are contrary to the best interests of the cattle industry in the State and should be opposed; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, duly attested, be mailed to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY and MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators; and WESLEY D'EWART and LEE METCALF, Representatives in Congress from the State of Montana, and to the Secretary of Agriculture."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 19

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until certain debatable issues have been resolved

"Whereas during recent years studies and research in flood control methods have evolved new theories and practices for the effective and economical control of flood water; and

"Whereas the construction of said Tuttle Creek Dam may not control floodwaters to a measure commensurate with the cost and damages occasioned by and resulting from such construction; and

"Whereas the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas, in conjunction with the Kansas industrial development commission, recommends that the said Tuttle Creek Dam should not be constructed and that more modern methods of flood control should be initiated for the prevention of flood damage on the Kansas River: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and memorialize the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until debatable issues have been resolved, as recommended in the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; the United States Senate; the United States House of Representatives; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of the Department of Agriculture; the Honorable Secretary of the Army; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska; the Commander in Chief, Alaska Command; the Commanding General, United States Army, Alaska; and the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas the people of Alaska desire to attract new industry and new population to the Territory, to develop Alaska's economy to a high level, resulting in a higher standard of living and the creation of taxable treasure through utilization of natural resources; and

"Whereas Wood Canyon, on the Copper River, the largest remaining undeveloped hydroelectric power site on the Pacific coast of the United States, has been under investigation during the past few years; and

"Whereas development of the Wood Canyon power site would attract and permit the establishment of aluminum and/or other light metals industries and other large consumers of low-cost hydroelectric energy in the electrochemical and electrometallurgical fields; and

"Whereas copper deposits in the region are not being worked during a period of serious copper shortages throughout the free world owing to the lack of surface transportation to Cordova, Alaska, a year-round, deep-water seaport; and

"Whereas the Katalla petroleum province, also adjacent to Cordova, cannot be explored adequately, or brought into actual production without construction of an access road link with Cordova; and

"Whereas the Bering River coalfield, estimated to cover more than 50 square miles and to contain more than 2 billion tons of coal, ranging in rank from subbituminous to anthracite, including unknown quantities of metallurgical-grade coking coal, remains undeveloped because no highway links the coalfield with port facilities at Cordova; and

"Whereas it already has been demonstrated that construction of the Copper River Highway not only is feasible from the engineering standpoint, but also may be placed in the low-cost construction category, since use of the abandoned Copper River and Northwestern Railroad bed, including several steel bridges which are in good condition, are involved; and

"Whereas the 109-mile right-of-way is the property of the United States Government; and

"Whereas construction of the Copper River Highway would provide an alternative route from the Gulf of Alaska to defense installations in interior Alaska, important in the defense scheme of the Territory.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully urges that the construction program of the Copper River Highway, now under way on a piecemeal basis, be accelerated to permit development of resources of the region at the earliest possible moment.

"And your memoralist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 23

"To the President of the United States; the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled; and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska is at a crucial stage in its growth and economic development; and

"Whereas the most important factor in continued growth and development is the building and expansion of basic industry in Alaska; and

"Whereas the high costs of transportation for persons and freight in Alaska are a most serious deterrent to the making of new investments and the growth of Alaskan industry; and

"Whereas there are pending before the 83d Congress measures providing for the repeal of the wartime emergency transportation tax on passenger travel and the reduction of the transportation tax on freight; and

"Whereas the passage and approval of these measures would so lower transportation costs in Alaska as to provide a large incentive toward the expansion and healthy growth of industry;

"Now, therefore, your memorialist urgently requests that favorable action be taken at the earliest possible time on H. R. 91, providing for the repeal of the 15-percent tax on passenger travel, and on H. R. 92, providing for certain reductions in the 3-percent tax on transportation of freight, to the end that the people may be relieved of undue tax burdens and hindrances to the development of a sound economy.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 25

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Congress of the United States; the Alaska Road Commission; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the $25 million Annette Island Airport is an instrument-equipped airfield capable of handling practically every type of aircraft on a 24-hour basis and is the only airfield serving Ketchikan and its trading area; and

"Whereas the important community of Metlakatla is connected by a 6-mile road with the Annette airfield but neither the airfield nor Metlakatla are connected with Ketchikan which is located on a separate island some 18 miles from Metlakatla with the only communication being by air during daylight hours or by small boat with neither of these two forms of transportation being possible during frequent periods of storm conditions that prevail in the area; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Commission, the United States Weather Bureau, and other agencies and organizations have a large number of personnel stationed at the Annette airfield together with the fact that the United States Coast Guard has its largest air detachment in Alaska based at the Annette airfield and its largest operating base in Alaska located in Ketchikan thus creating a need for connecting the 2 areas on a 24-hour basis from a defense and military standpoint; and

"Whereas the Alaska Road Commission has surveyed and estimated the cost of a proposed 14-mile road route between Metlakatla and Walden Point on Annette Island which point is only separated from the Ketchikan Road system by a narrow channel of protected water approximately 1½ miles across capable of being spanned by a small commercially operated car ferry; and

"Whereas the linking on a 24-hour basis of the Annette Airport and the community of Metlakatla on the one hand and the Ketchikan trading area on the other hand is only possible by construction of such a road and is further desirable because of a new $46 million pulp-mill plant presently under construction at Ketchikan which will have a far-reaching effect on the entire economy of the area involved: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States appropriate the necessary funds for construction of the proposed Metlakatla-Walden Point Road on Annette Island as above described.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress From Alaska; to the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; and to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the people of Alaska in a free expression of opinion at their general election on October 12, 1948, did by the unprecedented majority of 19,712 to 2,624 vote to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

abolish fish traps from the waters of this Territory; and

"Whereas this expression of the people of Alaska was made after the fullest discussion ever given any issue in the history of the Territory; and

"Whereas fish traps have been abolished by the respective States and the Province of British Columbia from all coastal waters of the Pacific coast except in Alaska; and

"Whereas repeated attempts to gain a transfer of authority for regulating Alaska fisheries from the Federal Government where it now resides to the Territorial government, have been unsuccessful; and

"Whereas the people of Alaska by referendum at the October 14, 1952, general election voted for Territorial control and operation of the fisheries by a vote of 20,544 to 3,479; and

"Whereas Alaska's salmon fisheries, particularly in the areas where fish traps are common, have been depleted to a dangerous extent, requiring immediate remedial action: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully requests that legislation be enacted abolishing the fish traps from the waters of the Territory of Alaska.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to the establishment of an additional international gate at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GOLDWATER, on March 18, 1953, p. 2034, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of Hawaii, T. H., favoring the enactment of House bill 2843, providing for the investigation of the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WELKER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Commitee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 12

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America; to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled; to the Secretary of State; the Secretary of Commerce; the Secretary of Agriculture; the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission:

"Whereas it is essential to the American standard of living and the American way of life that products of foreign countries be admitted to this country only an a basis which will not endanger the living standard of the American workingman, and the American farmer, and will not threaten serious economic injury to any domestic industry; and

"Whereas the production of world trade by the Government of the United States should adhere to this principle so that the economic status of the American people may be maintained and not reduced in the area of the world where work is performed behind the sweatshop curtain; and

"Whereas while recent imports of live cattle and frozen and canned beef from Mexico, Canada, New Zealand, and other areas have dramatically highlighted the problems with respect to one industry, yet it is a problem affecting all of the branches of agriculture, industry, and commercial production; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States abandoned its traditional function of fixing tariff on foreign commerce entering the United States, under the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, to the executive department of the Government which has carried out policies inconsistent with the welfare of the agriculture industry and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of Idaho most respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to return to a traditional method of fixing tariff based on principle of protection of American agriculture, industry, and commerce and the standard of living for all American citizens created thereby; be it further

"Resolved, That until Congress so acts the executive department of the Government exercise its power of fixing tariff only in accordance with the traditional principle of American policy as set forth in this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each Senator and Representative from the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, as assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas title to more than 67 percent of the total area of the State of Idaho is vested in the Government of the United States of America; and

"Whereas a large portion of said lands are suitable for reclamation and irrigation; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America on March 3, 1877, enacted desert land laws (now ch. 9 of title 43, U. S. C. A.) for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the reclamation, by irrigation, of the arid and semiarid public lands of the Western States through individual effort and private capital; and

"Whereas the purpose of said public land laws is being thwarted by the unreasonable requirements of the Lands and Minerals Section of the regional office of the Bureau of Land Management (Portland, Oreg.) and by the cumbersome procedure of the administrative hierarchy of said regional office; and

"Whereas the appropriations for the administration of the public land laws are being used to overstaff said Lands and Minerals Section of the regional office, and an insufficient portion of said appropriations is reaching the field where such appropriations are needed in order to properly and efficiently administer said public land laws on a local level; and

"Whereas it is deemed advisable that said procedure of administering the public land laws be modified and made to conform to the intent and purpose of said public land laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we hereby urge upon the Congress of the United States to make an investigation and take such action as it deems necessary to facilitate and expedite the administration of the public land laws and that such action be taken as shall be deemed necessary in order to accomplish the results intended under the provisions of said public land laws; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, to the United States Senators and Representatives of the State of Idaho and to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COLORADO RIVER DEVELOPMENT—JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I present Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 of the Legislature of the State of Utah, with reference to proceeding with the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States.

The upper Colorado River project is vital to the future development of Utah and the intermountain west. It is my feeling that this project should be authorized without delay so that we can move forward with the years of planning and development which will be required before construction can be started.

I believe that the entire project should be authorized in one measure and not piece by piece to be fought over for a long period of time.

There has been much talk of differences of opinion regarding this project. There probably are minor differences and local rivalries, but so far as the overall project is concerned, there is general agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States of America with reference to proceeding with the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States by authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

Whereas the development of the Colorado River in the upper basin States, consisting of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, is of foremost importance to the future development and general welfare of said States and of the western United States; and

Whereas the allocation of the waters of the Colorado River apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact has been amicably settled by and between the above States; and

Whereas the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, comprising one member each from the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming and the Federal Government is a functioning body and has already completed a dynamic plan for the development of the project; and

Whereas a report of the participating projects has been compiled by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, approved, with modifications, by the Secretary of the Interior, and submitted by him to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas this desirable development cannot be commenced without the authorization of the Congress of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 30th Legislature of the State of Utah, That the Congress of the United States of America, be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly, diligently, and fairly consider and act upon at this session, legislation to authorize the Colorado River storage project and participating projects; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies hereof be promptly transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of said Congress, United States Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, United States Senator WALLACE BENNETT, Representative in Congress WILLIAM A. DAWSON, and Representative in Congress DOUGLAS R. STRINGFELLOW, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission, and to the Governors and legislatures of the following States: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I present three resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, at the January session, 1953. They are H. 541, memorializing Congress with respect to amendment of the Federal Bankruptcy Act to insure the payment in full of unpaid wages in bankruptcy cases and to increase the priority now given unpaid wage claims in bankruptcy cases; H. 601, memorializing Congress with respect to the enactment of Federal laws to insure equal opportunity for employment, security of persons, full and equal participation in the Nation's political life and strengthening of the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights; and H. 602, respectfully urging the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon Senate bill 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H. 541

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to amendment of the Federal Bankruptcy Act to insure the payment in full of unpaid wages in bankruptcy cases and to increase the priority now given unpaid wage claims in bankruptcy cases

"Whereas in 1941 the legislature of this State passed a State wage payment and collection law, the purpose of which is and has been to insure the payment of all employees working in this State; and

"Whereas although this law has been in general highly effective, whenever bankruptcy proceedings intervene and employees involved must then look to the Federal bankruptcy laws for the payment of their wages, the power and efficacy of this State law is greatly curtailed, if not totally superseded by the Federal statute; and

"Whereas while the Federal bankruptcy laws do afford unpaid wage claims a certain priority in payment, said priority does not always insure the payment in full of employee's wages; and

"Whereas as a result thereof the State labor department has actual knowledge of not a few instances involving bankruptcy or receivership cases wherein employees did not receive wages earned by them; and

"Whereas such nonpayment of wages is against public policy and contrary to the spirit and intent of our State wage payment laws: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to exert their best efforts to attempt to amend the Federal Bankruptcy Act so that the priority now given unpaid wage claims in bankruptcy cases be increased or the act be otherwise, if possible, amended so as to insure the payment in full of unpaid wages in bankruptcy cases, insofar as the same may be feasible; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

"H. 601

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to the enactment of Federal laws to insure equal opportunity for employment, security of persons, full and equal participation in the Nation's political life and strengthening of the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights

"Whereas the Democratic Party in its platform, adopted July 24, 1952, promised to continue efforts to eradicate discrimination through Federal as well as State and local action, advocating Federal laws to insure equal opportunity for employment, security of persons, full and equal participation in the Nation's political life, and strengthening of the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights; and

"Whereas the Republican platform, adopted July 10, 1952, declared that while primary responsibility lies with the States, 'the Federal Government should take supplemental action * * * to oppose discrimination against race, religion, or national origin'; and

"Whereas it is evident that neither party should be allowed to forget the importance of its stand on civil rights made at a time when each was endeavoring to obtain the support of the American voter, since both parties have promised to make advances in this vital sphere of domestic action, which has such an important impact on our foreign relations; and

"Whereas it is imperative that pressures never be relaxed to secure these rights of which the Federal Constitution that gave birth to our Nation speaks so movingly; and

"Whereas although much progress has been made, it is also obvious that much remains to be accomplished; and

"Whereas a group of distinguished Senators headed by Mr. HUMPHREY, and including Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE, has caused to be introduced in the Senate of the United States seven bills and a concurrent resolution dealing with various aspects of the civil-rights questions, based upon the famous 1947 report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, which report still stands as the yardstick for legislation on the subject; and

"Whereas these bills according to the statement accompanying them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contain proposals to make lynching a Federal crime, to provide penalties for discrimination in interstate transportation, outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting, to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights, to protect the right to political participation, to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery and involuntary servitude, to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes, and to establish a joint congressional committee on civil rights: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Rhode Island General Assembly, being in full accord with the broad program for civil rights that is the objective of S. 462, S. 463, S. 464, S. 465, S. 466, S. 467, and S. 468, now pending in Congress, and realizing that this program is fully consistent with the traditions of our democracy, respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact said proposed bills; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of each body of Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress with special request to the Rhode Island Members that each should work for the passage of the aforementioned bills."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"H. 602

"Resolution respectfully urging the Congress of the United States of America to act favorably upon S. 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry

"Whereas there was introduced into the Senate of the United States of America upon January 29, 1953, Senate bill 692, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; and

"Whereas this bill was introduced under the nonpartisan cosponsorship of the following distinguished Senators: Mr. IVES, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. LANGER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. MORSE; and

"Whereas according to the statement accompanying its introduction by its sponsors, elimination of discrimination in employment is the very heart of the civil-rights program; and

"Whereas such discrimination denies equality of opportunity and constitutes an outright violation of our American creed; and

"Whereas this legislation furnishes the most practical and effective medium by which to guarantee to everyone equal opportunity to earn a living according to his ability, regardless of parentage, or religious faith; and

"Whereas the Rhode Island General Assembly, having witnessed the constructive accomplishments in this field by the operation of our own State law, realizes the need for a similar act at the Federal level for employment in interstate commerce; and

"Whereas we are in agreement with the sponsors that the passage of this bill would provide a process that will assist in making our American creed a living reality and in establishing at home the observance of the ideals and principles for which we profess to stand among the nations of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations does respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon Senate bill 692 and requests the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island in said Congress to use their good offices to secure the prompt passage of this measure; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States of America."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FINANCING OF HIGHWAYS AND ROADS—RESOLUTION OF COMMISSIONERS' COURT OF ANGELINA COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the financing of highways and roads in the State of Texas is always a pressing problem, because the vast distances in our State call for a farflung system of highways. A resolution recently adopted by the honorable Commissioners' Court of Angelina County, Tex., proposes for this problem a solution that I consider deserves to be brought to the attention of the Members of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the resolution, as adopted by the Angelina County, Tex., Commissioners' Court on March 9, 1953, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas under existing law the United States Government imposes a tax of 1½ cents on each gallon of gasoline sold; and,

Whereas some of this tax now collected by the Federal Government is returned to the States for road and highway purposes; and

Whereas the State of Texas is in desperate and urgent need of more funds to improve and maintain its vast highway and road system; and

Whereas we, as individuals and county officials, believe it beneficial to return as much government activity as possible to the local level: Now, therefore,

We, the duly elected and constituted Commissioners' Court of Angelina County, Tex., do hereby Resolve, That the United States Congress be petitioned to authorize that the aforementioned tax be relinquished to the several States, and that henceforth all road and highway maintenance, and development be conducted exclusively by the several States. And we hereby resolve that this resolution and petition be sent to the Members of Congress from the State of Texas and ask that it be read on the floor of Congress and appended to the official record.

Done at Lufkin, Angelina County, Tex., this 9th day of March 1953.

J. Q. MARONEY, Jr.,
County Judge.
J. C. STUBBLEFIELD,
Commissioner, Precinct 1.
W. P. FENLEY,
Commissioner, Precinct 2.
W. L. VANGLAHN,
Commissioner, Precinct 3.
E. JONES,
Commissioner, Precinct 4.

RESOLUTIONS OF REPUBLICAN FOUNDERS' DAY MEETING, LINCOLN, NEBR.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, resolutions adopted at the Republican Founders' Day meeting in Lincoln, Nebr., on March 16, 1953, which I had the pleasure to attend.

This meeting commemorated the 86th anniversary of Nebraska's statehood, and is traditionally the largest celebration of Republicans in Nebraska each year.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUNDERS' DAY RESOLUTION, MARCH 16, 1953

Whereas we are assembled together in Nebraska's capital city this 16th day of March to commemorate the 86th anniversary of Nebraska's statehood; and

Whereas Founders' Day is the highpoint in this Nebraska Republican year:

I. LEADERSHIP

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express our deep appreciation for the outstanding leadership demonstrated by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in taking up the call and leading the crusade for governmental integrity issued last November by the American people; his issuance of the mandate that "we who are free must proclaim anew our faith"; and in his establishment of fixed and understandable principles that will guide us in pressing our labor for world peace.

We further commend the national administration:

1. For its economy program as exemplified by the stopping of all civilian and military construction until its necessity is reviewed, and the freezing of governmental employment until the advisability of replacements is definitely established;

2. For the outstanding quality of those summoned to serve in our Federal Government, which has as a theme the establishment of a national administration of such integrity and such efficiency that its honor at home will insure respect abroad;

3. For recognizing the necessity and humanitarian goal involved in fostering the Hawaiian statehood bill;

4. For the vigorous drive to oust graft and corruption in all phases of the Federal Government;

5. For acknowledgment of the advisability of formulating policy—in a forward moving, constructive sense—in the field of natural-resources construction because all Nebraskans are vitally interested, one way or the other, in meeting the real farm problem centering on soil and the water which either tears it away or makes it produce food.

6. For the courageous abolition of controls;

7. For the timely trip to Europe by Secretary of State Dulles and Mutual Security Director Stassen, and resultant crystallization of the realistic approach which our Government is setting forth in all aspects of the foreign-aid programs—to lend financial assistance only to those groups that demonstrate the ability and willingness to assume responsibility and to properly administer such funds for the benefit of western civilization and the United States. Plain talk is the real voice of America, Mr. Dulles.

8. For the encouragement of those virtues that inspire initiative in our economy so that the productivity of our society will fortify and stimulate freedom everywhere.

9. For the realization that all New Deal spenders and Socialists who are in policy-making positions, whether political, civil service or otherwise, must be removed from office.

10. For recognizing the basic fact that religion and faith are fundamental to the solution of all problems.

We express our gratitude to Senators BUTLER and GRISWOLD and our Congressmen CURTIS, MILLER, HARRISON, and HRUSKA for the leadership that they have shown in the halls of Congress during the present reversal of centralizing trends in our Federal Government.

We note particularly:

1. That Senator HUGH BUTLER and Representative A. L. MILLER are now the respective chairmen of the Senate and House Interior Affairs Committees—the actions of which vitally affect Nebraska economy.

2. That Senator DWIGHT GRISWOLD has attained positions and seniority on three important Senate committees, namely, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Labor and Public Welfare, and Post Office and Civil Service; and further that Senator GRISWOLD was elected chairman of the group of first-term Senators.

3. That Congressman CURTIS has become an important figure on the powerful House Ways and Means Committee; that Congressman HARRISON has been made a member of the House Agriculture Committee; that Congressman HRUSKA has been placed on the Appropriations Committee.

We also recommend the wise leadership of Gov. Robert B. Crosby; his fair and impartial administration of State affairs; his fearless and courageous efforts to bring about restraint and solve the problems that have confronted our State since he assumed office.

We note particularly:

1. His insistence that the State tax program be straightened out once and for all.

2. His efforts to reorganize government on the State level so as to increase efficiency and economy.

3. His constant desire to work with and to talk with the people of Nebraska.

4. His keen interest in providing Nebraska with a decent system of highways always under equitable and impartial administration.

5. His devotion to those principles that insist upon delegation of governmental activities to the lowest echelon of administration.

We express our gratitude to National Committeewoman Edna Donald and National Committeeman Abel Shotwell; Dave Martin, chairman of the State central committee, and his vice chairman, Mrs. Arthur Bowring; Finance Chairman Joe Wishart; Young Republican Chairman Dean Kratz; Farm Council Chairman Herbert Hughes; and to all who served under their able leadership in consolidating our party and insuring Republican success in Nebraska elections.

II. LABOR

We commend the Republican leadership for its efforts to amend and strengthen the Taft-Hartley law so that it will eliminate industrial strife, thereby consolidating the industrial and labor forces of America.

III. AGRICULTURE

The present farm recession is the result of faulty planning and faulty administration of programs perpetuated and initiated under the irresponsible Truman administration; therefore, we, living as we do in the middle of the farm belt, urge that the Agriculture Department and the Agriculture Committees of Congress diligently construct a worthwhile and comprehensive program which will insure freedom of the farmer, and at the same time maintain his economic security. We urge that this administration continue to formulate policies under the guidance of the grassroots expression of active operating farmers and their organizations.

IV. NATIONAL FINANCE

We wholeheartedly endorse a balanced budget and believe that a pay-as-you-go program is possible even with an immediate tax reduction. We submit that the answer is to be found in the national administration's move toward a sound and equitable economy and strongly urge that both a balanced budget and tax cut be effected.

V. FOREIGN POLICY

We heartily commend President's Eisenhower's action in removing the Seventh Fleet from the Formosa Straits and earnestly urge that every effort be made to provide our allied troops with all of the munitions and equipment required to prosecute the war in Korea to a successful conclusion and that we immediately take political, economic, and

military measures to stop the shipping of war materials by our allies to Red China.

And, in conclusion, we humbly reaffirm our dedication to the guardianship of the well-being of all citizens, to the attainment of equality of opportunity for all so that our Nation under God will ever act with the strength of unity in every task to which it is called, and we invite all men and women of good will and high principles to join our ranks. To all of you we say, "Join the party of the future. Join your Republican Party."

Respectfully submitted.

MARY K. ERNST,
Falls City.
BONNIE KUHR,
Blair
E. F. WOODARD,
Hebron.
PAUL PETTIGROVE,
Oxford.
ELMER RAKOW,
Neligh.
JOHN R. HIGGINS,
Grand Island.
CHARLES THONE,
Lincoln, Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 55. A bill for the relief of Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht (Rept. No. 90);

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Bernard W. Olson (Rept. No. 91);

S. 142. A bill for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee (Rept. No. 92);

S. 306. A bill for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe (Rept. No. 93);

S. 314. A bill for the relief of Cornelius A. Navori (Rept. No. 94);

S. 389. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi (Rept. No. 95);

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Che Kil Bok (Rept. No. 96);

S. 516. A bill for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning (Rept. No. 97);

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas (Rept. No. 98);

S. 712. A bill for the relief of William R. Jackson (Rept. No. 100);

S. 846. A bill for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell (Rept. No. 101);

S. 853. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue) (Rept. No. 102);

S. 954. A bill for the relief of Robert Harold Wall (Rept. No. 103);

S. 1039. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi (Rept. No. 104); and

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950 (Rept. No. 110).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 69. A bill for the relief of Dr. Peter C. T. Kao (Rept. No. 105);

S. 166. A bill for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir (Rept. No. 106);

S. 167. A bill for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo (Rept. No. 107);

S. 811. A bill for the relief of George Mauner (Rept. No. 108); and

S. 851. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall (Rept. No. 109).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 18. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom (Rept. No. 111);

S. 30. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts (Rept. No. 112);

S. 39. A bill to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution (Rept. No. 113); and

S. 41. A bill to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended (Rept. No. 114).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 252. A bill to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury (Rept. No. 115); and

S. 984. A bill making provision for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions (Rept. No. 116).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1082. A bill to approve a conveyance made by the city of Charleston, S. C., to the South Carolina State Ports Authority, of real property heretofore granted to said city of Charleston by the United States of America; without amendment (Rept. No. 117).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 922. A bill to provide for a commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 118).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 719. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 119).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3658. A bill to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 120); and

H. R. 3659. A bill to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 121).

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1041. A bill to abolish the United States Commission for the Construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard; without amendment (Rept. No. 122).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution relating to the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 99) thereon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-6471827, Angelaras, James George.
A-7476562, Astwood, Carl Henry alias Carl Brown Clifford Astwood, Clifford Astford.
A-6854483, Baarle, Jan Van.
A-7921576, Babkirk, Cecil Leonard.
A-9767669, Bari, Abdul.
A-6451068, Baruela, Carmen Verzola alias Carmen Verzola Benales (nee Carmen Tsucano Verzola).
A-7445007, Beck, Moises (Mozes).
A-7903408, Blyden, Ida Louise.
A-8106368, Boni, Rocco.
A-6904780, Bose, Peter alias Peter Kaltenberger.
A-6981483, Botello-Antura, Manuel or Ascension Botello-Antona, or Concepcion Botella-Antona.
A-5970209, Bouquet, Jean Pierre Edouard alias Jean Pierre Elouard Chautemps.
A-7863124, Bourgugnon, Paul Henri Joseph.
A-6379324, Braudo, Abram.
A-3424978, Bruni, Giuseppe.
A-5969316, Callwood, Agnes Enez.
A-7983111, Chang, Kuo Chang.
A-3474752, Chen, Dora Tseng Fong.
A-5508435, Chiappane, Rose Margaret (nee O'Neill).
A-9562048, Chong, Wong or Chong Wong alias Tom Kin or Tam Ken.
A-3541386, Chruszczyk, Jerry or George Chruszczyk.
A-7145949, Coleman, Sophie Emma.
A-8021893, Connor, Zabrina Bethelda.
A-7390835, Costanzo, Francesco alias James Scotto.
A-7828206, Crawford, Cristina M. (nee Meily).
A-4502362, Cruz, Pomposo.
A-7395423, Csicsery-Ronay, Istvan.
A-5241207, Daly, Elsie May.
A-7962046, De Anda-Contreras, Ramon Ramiro.
A-2875289, De Bandala, Adelina Herrera, nee Adelina Herrera-Orvera or Despart or Covarrubias.
A-3122673, De Frausto, Josefa Gonzalez or Josefa Gonzelez-De La O.
A-7978997, De Gonzales, Maria Ana Montoya.
A-7978918, De Montoya, Maria Ramirez vda.
A-7980331, Montoya, Victoria.
A-7873807, Denkins, Constance Carmela.
A-5673755, Denniston, Carlton Sylvanus or Carlton Sylvanios Denniston, alias "Frenchy."
A-6425349, De Ramirez, Julia Ortiz or Julia Ortiz-Rodriguez or Julia R. Ortiz.
A-7139138, De Sousa, Jose Esteves.
A-7927613, Di Lieto, Joseph.
A-5567326, Douglas, Miriam Adelia Constantia (nee West).
A-9567551, Drumo, John.
A-7539105, Du, Darfoon.
A-4553433, Dutchak, Semen Nicol, alias Sam Nicol Dutchak and Frank Hoffman.
A-7249128, Eerenberg, Grietje (nee Huizenga).
A-7203900, Eerenberg, Johannes.
A-5860280, Ehlert, Antone Frederick.
A-6626042, Eleazarian, Anahide Boudjikanian.
A-8039463, Felix-Avila, Pedro or Juan Sanchez.
A-7023558, Fernandez-Parada, Consuelo Armida.
A-7457597, Fleischner, Kurt.
A-6989467, Flores-Limon, Macario.
A-7963045, Forbes, Verna Herodia.
A-4657800, Frazer, Luther Daniel or Luther Daniel Fraser or Luther Frazer or Louis Frazer.
A-4717221, Furnari, Mary Frances.
A-4539679, Caputo, Antonia Frances Helen.
A-8106620, Gallo, Antonio or Antonio Domenico Mario Gallo.
A-3745514, Garcia, Manuel.
A-7962512, Garcia-Jaime, Secundino.
A-7130095, Garza, Francisco Benavides.
A-6819098, Ghazi, Ibraham Moses or Abraham Moses Ghazi.
A-3591839, Graf, Ludwig or Louis Graf.
A-6938849, Gravitsky, Catherine, alias Catherine Uirich.
A-6097876, Gushi, Chiru Gushiken.
A-5981991, Gushi, Koshin.
A-5966555, Guth, Dora Kathleen.
A-4132492, Gutierrez-Lavorico, Rosa.
A-9757521, Haw, Tek King.
A-3456258, Hayashi, Toshiko or Toshiko Tani Hayashi.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A–1660305, Heinzie, William Eleasar.
A–8106367, Herandez-Borja, Carlos.
A–7849795, Heron, Victor Joseph.
A–6315638, Holtzman, Andree Francoise (nee Le Mentec).
A–7390566, Il-Begi, Taji Motamedi.
A–1339705, Jacques, Gerardus.
A–7677448, Jankowska, Maria or Maria Stawska.
A–7356278, Jankowski, Sylwim.
A–7055678, Kaainoni, Leopoldine Maria Forjan.
A–4544710, Katz, Samuel alias (first names): David, Samuel D., Samuel Samuel David, David Samuel; (last names): Goldcheker, Goldseker, Goldchecker, Goldsecker, Golsecker.
A–7802020, Klapp, Margarete Karolina Suzanne Magdalene alias Greti Klapp.
A–4773382, Kovalink, Mary (nee Tkachuk).
A–2636329, Kyriacatos, Christ N.
A–8091971, Lavie, Laetitia, Afivor Hiamabe.
A–69069826, Lee Fai.
A–3401031, Leuci, Josephine (nee Salvemini alias Angela Basso).
A–7821878, Liddell, David Francis.
A–7707784, Limon, Maria Fernandez y.
A–7759995, Lin, Kuo-Yung.
A–6703347, Lin, Florence Shen or Pung-Hwa Shen.
A–6989301, Liu, Wei Kung.
A–9686023, Look, Pong alias Pang Jung.
A–5849282, Lumbantobing, Muara.
A–7247958, Macias-Hernandez, Zenon.
A–4627136, Martinoff, Sophie Vladimir formerly Kovalevsky, formerly Blagoy formerly Golikova (nee Dafergoff).
A–7050100, Mata, Reyes.
A–9532298, Mathisen, Wolfert.
A–4011396, McLaughlin, Margaret Jane (nee O'Shea).
A–5487436, Meier, Constance Mary alias Mrs. F. W. Meier.
A–2101785, Miyagishima, Katsugoro.
A–4502949, Miyashita, Nobuichi or Jim Miyashita.
A–2595310, Modl, Richard.
A–3890186, Monteiro, Jose Maria.
A–8106350, Moreno, Raquel Cordova.
A–8091152, Morgan, Mildred Lillian (nee Lewis).
A–6149807, Munsie, Margaret Alice.
A–7945035, Musella, Pasquale.
A–5155465, Nakayama, Tomojiro.
A–4525627, Nakayama, Masako.
A–7903015, Navarro-Ornelas, Jose.
A–6961606, Ngun, Kong Tsao or Katherine Kong formerly Tsao Ngun Woolridge.
A–5461589, O'Connor, Marie.
A–8106496, Orlove, Gregor Boris.
A–8106491, Palma, Francisco De Sousa Romeiras alias Frank Santas.
A–8091736, Panela, Jose Senoa.
A–3564917, Pesole, Nicola.
A–7941829, Pimentel-Palacios, Lorenzo.
A–7927525, Ramirez Sebastian.
A–7197620, Ricciardella, Felice alias Philip Ricciardella.
A–2080844, Robinson, Lawrence Robert.
A–5301634, Robledo-Guajardo, Pedro.
A–5571122, Runge, Frederick Wilhelm Arthur or Friedrich Runge or Friedrich W. Runge or Friedrich Wilhelm Arthur Runge.
A–6423124, Sabbah, Edgard Moussa.
A–6685257, Sanchez Salvador or Salvador Gopar-Sanchez.
A–1091331, Sandoval-Barrientos, Eulalio.
A–6316890, Sekros, Sofia or Sekropoulos.
A–6817370, Sekros, Efterpi.
A–6590225, Serbeniades, Vasilios Dimitrois.
A–1282934, Shirae, Shinzo.
A–6377708, Siegel, Hazel Keitha Ashley.
A–2956945, Simpson, John MacLaurin alias John MacLaurin.
A–6723494, Spotorno, Giuseppe.
A–5946348, Sun, Wong (Sang).
A–6147036, Sutter, Doris Lucille.
A–6147037, Sutter, Harry John.
A–9776880, Szwec, Teodor.
A–7000271, Taylor, Herbert Robert or Herbert Robert Gillespie.
A–5998831, Torres, Rodolfo Valencia.
A–5443687, Touma, Nahima (Norma).
A–6628906, Vafiadis, Konstantine Daniel.
A–6628909, Vafiadis, Ekaterina Ellena.
A–9624272, Valk, Cornelius William or William Valk.
A–5818944, Vernice, Vito.
A–8091058, Waage Solveig Johannessen.
A–2536887, Wang, Joseph En-Pao.
A–5871669, Weber, Heinrich Ignatz alias Henry Weber.
A–7910008, Wenckheim, Beatrice Mary or Beata Wenckheim.
A–7353077, Wexler, Jeanette or Jeanette Moser.
A–1331075, William, Goerge Kapa.
A–5741883, Williamson, Robert or Robert T. Williamson.
A–5281604, Willison, Margaret Rose.
A–6924621, Wood, Valerie Laverne (nee Hamilton).
A–4354547, Yglesias, Remedios Vasquez (nee Perez).
A–4715237, Yruegas-Bueno, Raymundo or Raymundo Yruegas or Raymundo Iruegas-Bueno.
A–3894324, Zinnamosca, Joseph Anthony.
A–6355233, Zulueta, Enrique Costa.
A–2858251, Amzqua, Donato.
A–2384429, Andrade, Aniba or Hanibal De Andrade.
A–9767603, Andresen, Ragnar.
A–6984215, Andruchow, Peter or Peter Andy.
A–7131569, Asymkos, Johanna nee Frentzos or Ioanna George Frentzos.
A–6613791, Baillie, Sophie Margarethe.
A–5447673, Baptista, Manuel Gomes or Manuel Gomes Batista.
A–5540288, Barbulescu, Arghir Juan or Bob Barbulescu.
A–7828698, Baublis, Mary nee Vizaimiskiute.
A–6172606, Bautista, Antonio Marquez.
A–6172609, Bautista, Antonio Molin.
A–6604116, Belmonte, Fidencia Alvarado.
A–9836641, Bergersen, Else Berit.
A–1716162, Bliber, Hugo.
A–6390963, Bochner, Moses.
A–2834288, Bosher, Laura Annie.
A–7131924, Capua, Dioscoro.
A–7756316, Cardenas-Lalinde, Luis Eduardo or Luai E. Cardenas.
A–6522838, Chen, Chi Hsin or Chi Hsin Chow.
A–6451980, Chen, Fu Liem Franklin or Fu Liem Chen.
A–8010634, Chinnery, Harold Henrique.
A–7991824, Choo, Sa Sik or Sa Sik Eun Bong Lee Choo.
A–7879888, Choo-Chew, Chang or Chu-Chiu Chang.
A–7879887, Ling, Chang Loo (nee Hang Loo Ling).
A–7858998, Chu, Ming or Chu Ming.
A–5263138, Chu, Yong Chen or Chu-Yong-Chen or Joseph Paul Chu.
A–7035759, Cortez, Miguel Jose Juan.
A–3590687, Cottakis, Nicholas Leonidas.
A–7127831, Coussis, Theodore John.
A–7394774, Currie, Olga May Campbell or Olga May Currie (nee Campbell).
A–7356548, D'Alfonso, Yolanda or Yolanda Zanfrisco or Iolanda Zanfrisco or Yolanda Mazzela.
A–6554691, De Banuchi, Esperanza Cruz.
A–5816898, De Cortez, Juana Anica Aragon.
A–2924399, Dedousis, Anthony or Papadoupulis.
A–1955451, De Florio, Angelina Macias.
A–2732596, De Hernandez, Fiorentina Cardenas Murillo or Flora Murrillo de Hernandez.
A–9698428, Delen, Borje Kuno.
A–6044903, De Leon, Rosa Prudencia.
A–6877285, De Lopez, Carmen Lopez or Carmen Lopez vda de Chavez or Juana Lopez or Carmela Lopez.
A–6877277, Chavez-Lopez, Maria Rita or Maria Rita Chavez-Lopez.
A–7188338, De Salazar, Lorenza Guzman or Lorenza Guzman S.
A–4724593, De Self, Mary Louise Nava or Maria Luisa Avelar.
A–6295509, De Vito, Stella Marie.
A–3998273, De Yanez, Josefa Avelar.
A–8082878, Diakostamatis Michael or Michael Thomas.
A–9620397 Diakoyanis Stamatios Georgios.
A–3064690 Diluilo, Dominic Antonio.
A–2859923, Dong, Ruby Lee (nee Ruby Lee Joe or Shew Guey Jew).
A–7890880, Duarte, Rafael Argentino.
A–7119155, Dudley, Ella (nee Stopard).
A–2830750, Edwards, Reginald Stanley.
A–7054530, Eskildsen, Edward Carl.
A–2365566, Evans, Edra Varona.
A–6515700, Farrant, Laurence Geoffrey.
A–7983049, Filoteo, Gennaro.
A–4845245, Fleischer, Martin Andreas.
A–4007904, Frangakis, Ioannis or John or James Andre Frangakis or John Andre Frages.
A–1000369, Franz-Josef of Austria, Archduke or Prince Don Francisco-Jose De Habsburgo Y Borbon or Francisco-Jose De Habsburgo Borbon.
A–1410440, Borbon, Princess Martha De Habsburgo or Marta De Habsburgo Borbon nee Marta Beumer Locatelli.
A–5101358, Friedman, David.
A–3625157, Fujino, Chuji (Chester).
A–6644479, Gagliardi, Giuseppina Gasdia.
A–7188303, Garcia-Larios, Juan Angel.
A–7140534, Gawel, Wladyslaw Jan or John Gavel or Walter Gawel.
A–2263835, Giacalone, Ignazio or Joseph Giacalone or Joe Giacalone.
A–6819623, Giordano, Vincenzo.
A–9025886, Glavan, Mijo Mate.
A–9715436, Gonzalez, Hermino Castillo.
A–7423227, Gonzalez, Josefina Garcia de.
A–6063722, Gonzalez-Hernandez, Galdino.
A–6200611, Goseco, Franciso Navarro.
A–6207837, Goseco, Nenita Bradley.
A–6207839, Goseco, Elizabeth Bradley.
A–6207838, Goseco, Margarita Bradley.
A–7284919, Gotsis, Theoni Athanasiou or Theoni Athanasiou Barios.
A–7137743, Gradillas-Calsada, Jesus.
A–7290364, Gradillas-Gradillas, Jesus.
A–7290365, Gradillas-Gradillas, Domingo.
A–7290366, Gradillas-Gradillas, Eduardo.
A–6920657, Grant, Frederick William alias Lenord Grant.
3–4684021, Grimmesey, Satoye alias Satoye Itagaki alias Kay Grimmesey.
A–8021475, Hachisuka, Masako.
A–6345097, Hansen, Vivienne Kathleen (nee Smith).
A–1478191, Hattori, Tadashi or Frank Hattori.
A–7079560, Henriksen, Corina Kyllingmark or Corina Kyllingmark.
A–3436032, Heron, Edward Peter.
A–7981944, Hjort, Paul Konrad Thorvold or Paul Hoyt or Paul Thorvold Konrad Hjort or Paul Konrad Thorvald Hjort or P. Hoyt or Paul Konrad T. Hjort or Paul Konrad Thorvold Tjorst or Paul Hjort.
A–7197027, Holguin, Gregoria or Gregoria Holguim De Godfrey or Georgoria H. Godfrey.
A–4963380, Horshan, Bruno Hugo.
A–6847799, Huang, Pao Chyuan or Pao-Chyuan Huang.
A–6956636, Huang, Shao Chen (nee Shao Chen Wu or Shao-Shen Wu).
A–2470946, Iman, James or Mohammed Bin Abdullah.
A–6670226, Ingdal, John Andreas.
A–7423243, Jarrett, Adriel.
A–5605706, Johnson, Eveline Mary formerly Larr (nee Lauria).
A–5602270, Kalafatich, Gregory or George or Grgo Kalafatich.
A–1823997, Kanakakos, Panagiotis alias Peter Kanakos or Panos Kanakakos.
A–3196587, Karanas, John or Ioannis Teodoro.
A–1719629, Karavidas, Petros or Peter Nicholas Papas or Petros Pappos or Pete Pappas.
A–6581692, Kasparian, Minas or Arnak Minas Kasparian.
A–1883332, Kennedy, John.
A–1381848, Kershaw, Frederick.
A–5792320, Kershaw, Ann.
A–6680602, Kettler, Geoula Rachel.

A-7284987, Krause, Luciana Ansaldo (nee Ansaldo).
A-9769909, Kristoffersen, Osvald Meier or Osvald Kristoffersen or Osvald M. Kristoffersen, Oswald Kristoffersen.
A-8811608, Kulikov, Laura (nee Samoyloff).
A-8031133, Kim, Young Ja (nee Kwon).
A-5575162, Langlais, Mary Frances or Mary F. Langlais.
A-5464805, Langlais, Pascaline Maud.
A-7130504, Lassince, George.
A-7115976, Lattyak, Ellen Marianne formerly Ellen Marianna Herden.
A-8117167, Lekic, Maria (nee Humer).
1600-99344, Levine, Dianne Lee.
0300-344955, Lewis, John or Babun.
A-5901797, Lung, Vincent Leslie or Eng Hong Doon.
A-7858241, Maiorano, Francesco or Frank Maiorano.
A-3761454, Malik, Abdul.
A-7862064, Maloberti, Irma.
A-7280460, Margules, Esther or Esyera Frydman or Esther Frydman Ackerman.
A-7445691, Martinez, Domingo (Sunny).
A-7390663, Martinez, Martin.
A-3010001, Mastrantoni, Ignazio.
A-1988773, Matsuo, Shigeru.
A-6721172, May, Mon Tin alias Mon Tin.
A-6097030, Melendez, Elsie Egea.
A-6525483, Mendoza-Trujillo, Jose.
A-6802547, Miguel, Francisco San.
A-3356136, Mistretta, Vito.
A-7058329, Mitchell, Marie.
A-5173117, Moggia, Arideo alias Arideo Maggia.
A-6918512, Molocea, Eugene.
A-6918513, Molocea, George or Gheorghe.
A-7019900, Moulas, Elaine Gust formerly Helen Moulas.
A-6888048, Moustafa, Hussein Kamel.
A-7366691, Murray, Helen alias Helen Clanin.
A-4706795, Mustafa, Mohamed.
A-4706775, Mustafa, Dina Merita.
A-7828672, Mustafa, Lillian.
A-6492414, Naboa, Patrocinio P. Navidad.
A-4518091, Naboa, Roy.
A-7290839, Nenna, Vito.
A-5977617, Noguni, Kame.
A-6240780, Neely, Antoinette.
A-7203934, Ocaranza, Aurelia.
A-7203935, Cortez, Angelina.
A-70920168, Ortegon, Pablo or Pablo Ortegon-Dominguez.
A-2509077, Ozdemir, Orham Sakir.
A-4968317, Pagan, Virginia Felix or Virginia Felix.
A-7145867, Parrilla, Josefa.
A-5444736, Peel, Ampara or Amparo Perez.
A-3818102, Pesce, Paul Anthony alias Antonio Pesce alias Paul Pesce.
A-6811855, Pestic, Prospero.
A-4988608, Petterson, Aligot.
A-5943396, Pisaraki, Joseph.
A-7116336, Ponitkoff, George V.
A-7116337, Ponitkoff, Vadim V.
A-7044542, Posen, Ibolya (nee Endsweig).
A-9831052, Primavera, Tommaso or Tommasso Primavera.
A-7145943, Prisciandaro, Damano.
A-7387859, Procaccio, Michele.
A-3498519, Pullai, Armand or Armugam Pullai.
A-7955664, Pyman, Ada Gertrude (nee Terry).
A-8091703, Rainey, Margaret Amy formerly Sudbury (nee Wittingham).
A-5295100, Ramirez, Jose.
A-5988032, Ramirez, Manuel or Manuel Ramirez Canuta Sicon.
A-7717576, Rell, Virginia Pauline (nee Hulsman).
A-7927929, Reimer, Mary or Mary Fowler or Mary Farrelly.
A-4513345, Revello, Antelo Arthur or Anbelo Revello.
A-1131359, Rose, Christian, Heinrich or Carl Rose.
A-2572993, Rossi, Marie Anna.
A-3743323, Russomanno, Nicola.
A-3205205, Sabo, Samuel Ivon, Jr.
A-6371788, Salinas-Martinez, Jose Emigdio.
A-6881658, Sarian, Jirair Nerse.
A-7082564, Sasso, Flora Erma or Flora Erma Rizzi or Erminia Domenica Bonini.
A-8021832, Saunders, Mabel (nee Mabel Benjamin alias Eugenie Prince).
A-7280051, Schauflinger, Klaus Dieter or Bobby Bishop.
A-6178370, Schermerhorn, Paulina Maligos.
A-2491132, Schlei, Peter.
A-2491126, Schlei, Suzan (nee Suzan Muller).
A-1219097, Sciancalepore, Giammaria alias John Sciancalepore.
A-2592388, Sciciuna, Anna.
A-6985470, Shahan, Nevart (nee Asiroglu or Ashroglu).
A-2727483, Shimizu, Hideaki.
A-4404619, Sikora, Mary alias Mary Shmura.
A-5600476, Singh, Jawala.
0502-6163, Sipsis, George alias George Callins.
A-6848763, Smith, Maria Carmen.
A-9825453, Socolich, John Anthony.
A-5127063, Steel, Joseph William.
A-3520552, Steinlauf, Eduard Elieser.
A-6791514, Strahammer, Josef Vincent.
A-5552117, Takizawa, Kichiro or Kenny Takizawa.
A-4116938, Tana, Antonio or Anthony Tarrio or Julio Tarrio or Julian Farrio.
A-4209592, Tana, Lucia Molino.
A-6609640, Taviarides, Corteiss Vassilios.
A-7388957, Torres, Joaquin.
A-7388958, Torres, Jesus Manuel.
A-7388959, Torres, Socorro.
A-7388960, Torres, Ruben Narciso.
A-8091254, Towles, Katherine.
A-7491336, Ulrich, Patricia.
A-7995810, Vaca-Reyes, Miguel.
A-6487513, Vartanyan, Hayik or Haig Vartanyan.
A-5832901, Vela-Garza, Rufino.
A-4235815, Vela-Garza, Jesusa.
A-4235816, Vela-Garza, Santos.
A-9732674, Visser, Adolph.
A-9579878, Vrolyk, Jan Zier.
A-6524277, Weinberger, Chaim Hersh.
A-5582983, Weiss, Arnold or Irving Weiss or Weist alias User.
A-8021437, Willard, Cherie Eugenie formerly Kemp.
A-8117016, Wilmot, Noel Eaton alias Samuel Lowe.
A-4528159, Wollion, John or John Walian.
A-5951210, You Chen Tuck or Chang Tuch You or Chenk Tuck You.
A-4794527, Young, Chee Dick alias Clarence Chee Dick Young.
A-4120628, Young, Frank alias Tien Fu Yang.
A-4193296, Zaganas, Leonidad alias Leo Z. Gray.
A-6291236, Zahawi, Faizi Khalid.
A-6374953, Zahawi, Sevim Miral.
A-7034695, Zeid, Larry.
A-2353697, Zemmel, Leon or Leon Semel or Leon Semi Leibisch or Leon Semmel.
A-6738148, Zielinski, Claudia (nee Dombrovski).
A-7469542, Balaba, Daniel.
A-1472027, Berndt, Heinz Werner.
A-7898442, Blagrove, Archibald Nathan or Nathan Blagrove.
A-7073695, Bollino, Savino or Babino or Bollino or Bellino Savino or Savaino or Sabino Bellino.
A-2752500, Boncich, Sam.
A-2411018, Calderon, Jesus Alejandre.
0300/394666, Calero, Gladys or Gladys Milagra Negrin-Rodriguez.
0300/394667, Calero, Isabel or Isabel Negrin-Rodriguez.
A-3377743, Camia, Bonfiglio or Phil Camia or Giacomo-Cavana.
A-7132987, Chu, Edith Ju-Hwa or Edith Tseng-Chun Chu or Edith Ju-Hwa.
A-7457602, Chu, Tseng-Chun.
A-7025727, Chung, Jack.
V-1240753, Dadaian, Serabi Adour (nee Kabakian).
A-2555368, De Ramirez, Ernestna Escobar or Ernestina Ramirez or Ernestina Escobar Ad Echevarria.
A-9692102, De (or Do) Rosario, Joaquim Francisco Lopes or Joaquim Rosario or Roasario; Joaquim Francisco Lopes Rosario; Joaquim Maria Francisco; Joaquim Maria Francisco Rosario; Joaquim Francisco De Rosario or Derosario; Joackim Rosario; Joaquin Rosario; Joaquim or Joaguim Francisco Rosario; Joaquin F. Rosario; Joaquim De Rosario.
1700-5241, Dolor, Rosalia Ea (Estefania Ea).
A-7975641, Donovan, Ione Orilda.
A-3449690, Dwyer, Michael Francis.
A-7351273, Eng, Frank Gee or Ng Fong.
A-5394243, Enlow, Julia Irene.
A-6912654, Fiore, Marie Louise (nee Williams formerly Horton).
A-5960623, Flanagan, Ursel Renate Meyer (nee Ursel Renate Meyer).
A-7070741, Flores, Maria Teresa.
0300-311750, Fong, Eng Lun or Hoy Yin.
A-2582238, Garcia, Amancia or Amancia Hernandez.
A-6574522, Garcia, Andrew Winant.
A-2469265, Garcia, Eduardo or Eduardo Garcia Ris or Viriato Guttierrez.
A-4705880, Gardella, Giuseppe alias Carlos Alonso.
A-6825202, Gergits, Hannelore Stefanie.
A-6825203, Gergits, Karl Alois.
A-3535341, Giannicchini, Gino or Gino Giannecchini or Gino Giannichini or Gino Giannechini.
A-6498461, Gonzales, Hector Manuel Modesto-Lopez or Hector Frazer.
A-9836695, Hansen, Niels Thuroe.
A-6920912, Hassab, Antoine Antoun.
A-6329559, Henryk, Jan or John Henry Stillbach.
A-6872523, Huff, Lucille May Plummer.
A-3112979, Kaltenmaier, Eugen.
A-5883854, Kenyeres, Andras or Andras Kanczuga.
A-5883855, Kenyeres, Krisztina formerly Krisztina Deak (nee Molnar).
A-4685154, Knuth, Herman Ernst.
A-9659166, Kondiles, Gabriel.
A-9671075, Koolhoven, Herman.
A-7983079, Lanuez, Luis Alfredo or Luis Alfredo Laneuz Mendive.
A-6730666, Liao, Tien Ren.
A-6886839, Liao, Wei Ping Wu.
A-8064339, Macias-Hague, Edna Antonio Aileen.
A-5566403, Maruyama, Masamori or Paul Masamori Maruyama.
A-5960624, Meyer, Irmgard Emma Martha.
A-5673350, Muller, Joseph or Joe Muller.
A-5531956, Nagel, Charles Bernhard.
A-5970800, Neugebauer, Erich.
A-5970801, Neugebauer, Gwenyth Audrey.
A-5970802, Neugebauer, Audrey Moonyeen.
A-5886923, Nibbs, Phyllis Geneva.
A-6965247, Nordmark, Dalton Everett.
A-4360220, Ogle, William.
A-1690705, O'Leary, Elizabeth.
A-7192474, Osio, Antonio De Guerrero.
A-7192475, Osio, Angelina Villasenor De.
V-192353, Pedota, Guiseppi Nicola.
A-5995217, Pena-Flores, Salvador.
1407-20647, Pena, Maria Lopez De.
A-7176011, Pereira, Francisca Josefa.
A-7457684, Perez, Rafael Santiago Sanchez Y.
A-7457685, Perez, Miriam Rogelia Sanchez Y.
A-6332084, Pires, Donald George.
A-2523066, Ransom, Alexandra Serjanko formerly Alexandra Zrum.
A-5976847, Richards, Robert Vincent or Robert Vincent Soso.
A-4763940, Robinson, Hilda Amy Jane (nee Hilda Soso).
A-2927242, Romano, Francesco or Frank Romano.
A-8091608, Rosberg, Nechama or Nechama Farber.
A-4871200, Royce, Dorothy Beryl (nee Fleming).
A-4272778, Santiago, Joseph.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A-2414442, Schaffer, Ludwig or Louis John Schaffer.
A-5693325, Shaw, Gilbert Henry.
A-5693329, Shaw, Edward Meredith.
A-7197890, Shuster, David Abram.
A-7197892, Shuster, Ida (nee Rubin).
A-9765543, Springvloed, Arnold or Arnoldus Springvloed or Springbloed.
A-4024200, Steinbrecher, Eduard Georg or George Edward Steinbrecher or Edward or Eduard Steinbrecher.
A-6449231, Stephanidis, Dean Constantine John.
A-5015878, Ticehurst, Katherine Elizabeth (nee McLellan).
A-3161661, Tsarnas, Stephanos Emanuel.
A-6275119, Valdovino-Navarro, Francisco.
A-5320950, Welch, Cecil Carlisle.
A-7445720, Wen, Shao Lien or Shao Hsiung.
A-1560215, Wong, Shi Ching or Wong Shi Ching.
A-4491534, Yee, Cora Sue Moy (nee Moy or Moy Su Wah or Su Wah Moy or Cora Sue Moy).
A-9836629, Zvans, Carl or Karlis Zvans or Karl Zvans.
A-7140102, Acosta, Gregorio or Gregorio Acosta Rodriguez.
A-7140088, Carreon, Maria Mercedes or Maria Mercedes Carreon De Acosta.
A-5804142, Afentakis, Konstantinos D.
A-344460, Antoneff, Spass or Spass Anthony or Stanley Anthony.
A-5444895, Avramides, Clearchos Hercules.
A-7962226, Ayo-Guanilo, Gabriel or Gabriel Ayo or Lucio Gabriel Ayo-Guanilo.
A-3798195, Balsamo, Raffaele or Ralph Balsano.
A-5930326, Barry, Violet Marie.
A-6062967, Bateman, Florence Lilian formerly Florence Lilian Cunningham.
V-941386, Bertucci, Primo.
A-1743346, Borina, Nadina Grigorieva or Nadina Roman Grigorieva Borina or Nadina Roman Bakaleinikoff.
A-5693328, Bradley, Edith May (nee Shaw).
A-7049692, Brewster, Adelia Keturah.
A-7841167, Castillo, Ana Elvia nee Leon-Martinez.
A-8014959, Christian, Ethel Virginia.
A-6399522, Cooper, Josefa Artiles or Josefa Artiles or Josefa Artiles Vasquez.
A-7251660, Crivello, Anna (nee San Filippo).
V-934834, Cutino, Caterina Sansone.
A-4025239, De Castro, Erilda Agatha.
A-6476416, de Hoyos-Torres, Enrique or Henry de Hoyos.
A-7702320, de Mederios, Agnelo Clementino.
A-6937351, Dertien, Maartje (nee Sleutel).
A-6660658, De Soto, Maria Salazar.
A-1162399, De Velasquez, Natividad Lopez (nee Natividad Lopez).
A-5101863, Di Giorgio, Domenico or Ciagio Bennardo.
A-7057985, Diorio, Mary Carmela.
A-9535114, Do Nascimento, Joaquim or Joaquin Do Nacimento or Joaquin De Nascimento.
A-7178251, Dounias, Garifalitas or Garifalitea, or Garifalia (nee Trango).
A-8001797, Erkus, Ali Orhan.
A-8001796, Erkus, Guzide Nesrian.
A-5948745, Fleming, Ina.
A-7049155, Florio-Macias, Armando.
A-9825449, Fong, Eng Gum.
A-5966266, Foy, Rachel Ann.
A-8017203, Freeman, Samuel Frederick.
A-7122091, Freshour, Raimund Haring.
A-7197981, Gagliarducci, Pacifico.
A-2346359, Garcia, Felix P.
A-7978757, Garcia-Hurtardo, Alfonso.
A-7903421, Gibbs, Samuel James.
A-8021949, Glass, Anya, formerly Chana Singer.
A-7995664, Gomez, Jorge.
A-4827036, Gon, Mary Tom or Mary Quon Yee or Fung Kum or Gow Sheung or Fong Dai Muey.
A-6846919, Gonzalez, Genaro.
A-6846916, Gonzalez, Manuela Herlinda.
A-6846917, Gonzalez, Alicia.
A-6846918, Gonzalez, Roman Alfredo.
A-5233140, Gonzalez-Vela, Manuel.
A-5352453, Grasso, Joseph.
A-4359194, Grenier, Marie Jeanne (nee Beauchemin).
A-6482237, Griffiths, Ada Agnes.
A-6482236, Griffiths, Thomas Littleton, Jr.
A-6482235, Griffiths, John Scott Randolph.
A-7435313, Grossholz, Iris.
A-7435314, Grossholz, Heidemarie.
A-7189146, Guccione, Matteo.
A-4066567, Gugliotta, Michael Guiseppe or Michele Guiseppe Gugliotta.
A-5967979, Gumbs, Joseph Nathaniel.
A-6549358, Hallas, Mary Lillian.
A-1577231, Harlan, Doris May.
A-7043770, Harrigan, Cecil Cleve.
A-4347545, Haskakis, William or Basilios Haskakis.
V-661046, Heong, Kwai Ting alias May Kwai or Ting Heung Kwai.
V-1078972, Hiatt, Clemintina Bedoy.
A-7999538, Hoover, George Melvin.
A-3683690, Hoskinson, Bertha Rosalie or Berta Tiant de Munoz or Bertha Rosalie Tiant Y Rodriguez or Bertha Nonos or Bertha Tyndall.
A-6690031, Hyder, Yvonne G. (nee Haddad).
A-8014950, Industrious, Valentine.
A-5782508, Industrious, May Louise.
A-5436893, Itzkovitz, Evelyn Eve (nee Schnaier).
A-4889195, Jakush, Alexander.
56263/630, Karavasilis, Michalis or Ghatzimichalis or Hajimihalis or Hatsimihalis alias Demetrius or James Hajimihalis or Hatsimihalis.
A-4133211, Kellman, John Reuben or Oscar Herbert.
A-7983188, King, Albertha.
A-1719615, King, Ordenia Gwyndhor (nee Garrold).
A-7849694, Lay, Joachim Ellery.
A-7356719, Lee, Yue Chang or Yue Lee.
A-5971755, Leonard, Alice Olivia.
A-5921673, Lettsome, Anita (nee Venzen).
A-7802509, Lettsome, Norris Alexander.
A-3565855, Lewis, Rene Rose.
A-6450121, Liang, Daisy Yu Ching Liu, formerly Yu Ching Liu.
A-6271439, Liang, Ta.
A-7415647, Lois, Ramon Novas.
A-4482881, Lucchino, Antonio.
A-6982455, Magas, Venetia Andre (nee Fragoyiannopoulou).
A-4937264, Malandruccolo, Michele L. or Mike Malandruccolo.
A-4276678, Marohnich, Anton.
A-2578212, Mazzilli, Giuseppe.
A-6205358, McIlvain, Pilar Tobias.
A-5067380, Mirbach, Wilhelm Joseph or William Joseph Mirbach.
A-1631832, Nash, Frank Jesse alias Frank Jesse Naish.
A-8117351, Navarro-Lozano, Rafael.
A-3851086, Neave, Dorothy Kathleen (nee Smith).
A-6492284, Nicolas, Jolita Quimangan alias Felipa Salbosa Laforga.
A-3432011, Nilsen, Alfred Edwart Martin.
A-9607259, Penn, Gibson Alonzo.
A-5852635, Penn, Ophelia Perlina.
A-5938746, Petersen, Ellen Rebecca.
A-6295510, Picciottoli, Josephine Lucy (nee Cuomo).
A-2522320, Radoontsoff, John E.
A-8102958, Ranck, Gladys Karolyn, formerly Kanther formerly Halliday (nee Madill).
A-6860161, Rodriguez, Otilia Planas Punceles (nee Otilia Planas Punceles) or Otilia Punceles-Planas.
A-8065865, Ronan, Alexander Wallace.
A-5987803, Ronan, Christina.
A-3458654, Ronzakolski, Wladyslaw or Walter Rolland.
A-7967458, Salto, Isaac or Issac.
A-6178372, Schermerhorn, Esperanza Bangui.
A-4847982, Schnaier, Liba.
A-4907048, Schnaier, Louis.
A-7980292, Seller, Madeleine Antoinette.
A-6002100, Smith, Conrad Arthur.
A-8010661, Smith, Inez Beatrice.
A-6631947, Soroko, Haim.
A-6544316, Standaart, Johanna Margaretha.
A-6611877, Steffen, Marie Elizabeth (nee Weber), formerly Czekalla or Elsie Steffah.
A-7111334, Stiers, Dorothy (nee Bok Ye Pak).
A-6816811, Stout, Maria Grazia Russo (nee Maria Grazia Russo).
A-6245757, Strat, Athena.
A-7065645, Sun, Lee Wing.
A-7065635, Quong, Lee Wing.
A-3092016, Tachibana, Iku.
A-4641933, Takakuwa, Yayoi.
A-7606771, Tiber, Erwin or Ervin Tiber.
A-7178010, Torielli, Giovanni Francesco or Jeames Franklin Hibes.
A-6250841, Torrez, Andrew or Andres Torres.
A-6887100, Triantafillis, Spero or Spiros Triantafilliou.
A-3848578, Tsi, Tsu Sih.
A-5889279, Tutcher, Margaretta May (nee Kline).
A-7616390, Vinyets, Antonio Rojas or Antonio Vinyets.
A-6770010, Vinyets, Virginia (nee Moran) or Virginia Maria Del Pilar Moran Sierra Vinyets.
A-5170833, Webber, Katherine Rose (nee Kehoe).
A-8078910, Williams, George Ashbourne or George Ashbourn Williams or Ashburn Williams or George Williams or George A. Williams.
A-6624332, Williams, Jack James.
A-5971748, Williams, Vernon George.
A-6541785, Williams, Inez.
A-7863864, Woo, Sun Nam.
A-5149798, Wundt, Mirdza Agnesa (nee Zirnis or Jackel or Gackel).
A-3570617, Yee, June or John Yee.
A-4827305, Zimmerman, Hazel Johanna (nee Ryan).
A-6630018, Agnello, Elda Naomi (nee Pedrazzoli).
A-1269810, Ala'i, Hershmat or Hechmat Alai or Heshmat Husain-Ali'i or Hesmat Alai.
A-6465786, Alexander, Neville Garfield alias Neville Wilson.
A-5886885, Alexay, Mary Krizsan or Mary Krizsan.
A-6650760, Alquizola, Pia C. (nee Pia Caballero).
A-8091720, Amey, George Wallace.
A-6609666, Anastopoulos, Vasilios Panagiotis alias Basil P. Anastopoulos.
A-3765515, Anderson, Frank Ezediel.
A-6043095, Anderson, George Ruthven or Boysie (nickname) or Monte Cristo (State name).
A-4381407, Andrichik, John or John Andrichick.
A-5456402, Arpe, Carl Johannes Adolf Wilhelm or Carl William Arpe.
A-4933624, Barbieri, Leonardo Antonio or Leon Barber.
A-7809752, Bastian, Gladys Elaine.
A-7019831, Gegin, Joseph Real Gaeton.
A-5970035, Belanger, Joseph Raymond Napoleon or Raymond Napoleon Belanger or Mattias Bizier.
A-7140098, Belmontes, Luz or Luz Belmontes De Rodriguez or Luz Belmontes De Cruz.
A-6997918, Berindei, George.
A-6997919, Berindei, Madeleine Jeanne.
A-2418775, Bismann, Georg.
A-7863967, Boivin, Patrick.
A-7991520, Boots, Habbe or Habbe Dorenbusch.
A-4809720, Burre, Karl Ferdinand.
0608-7520, Cabanzo, Jose Lanza alias Jose Cabanzo or Jose Lanzas.
A-7520764, Caldwell, Ivan Edwin Lindsay.
A-5374313, Campana, Francisco.
A-7589823, Campos, Juana Ampiro.
A-5786864, Carich, Luca.
A-5402298, Challis, Elizabeth Lesley (nee Judd).

A-7264165, Champe, Olga Tapavichky alias Olga Petrovna Tapavichky.
A-9709799, Chen, Chin alias Jen Chin alias Chun Chan.
A-2481534, Cheng, Amber Lieng-Shan.
A-7079889, Chiu, Chung Chi alias Franklin Chiu.
A-8056959, Chiu, Shang Chun (nee Shang Chun Shu).
A-4641184, Chwalibog, Szyje Zalme now known as Joe Burg.
A-7712792, Clarke, Israel Edward.
A-6148907, Coster, Felix.
A-2372178, Cruz-Herrera, Tomas Jose.
A-1469007, Cruz, Rosalina Reyes De.
A-5059353, Dainoff, Clara or Kraina Dainoff or Rose Draina Dainoff.
A-6860782, Di Maria, Annunziata.
0900-56713, De Vitis, Filippo or Di Vitis.
A-5055163, Del Vescovo, Cosmo.
A-7427042, Djakonova, Alexej.
A-4507723, Economopoulos, Nicholas.
A-4684507, Ellenbogen, Mark or Mike Allen.
A-6021739, Esposito, Anthony.
A-4988318, Falvo, Sebastiano or Sam.
A-5952820, Galea, Giovanni Baittista.
A-5439085, Garcia, Reynaldo or Jose Reynaldo Garcia.
A-9669427, Georgandis, Adamantios.
A-7858118, Gilbert, Rosa Elvira Salas.
A-4744989, Gonsalves, Joseph alias Joseph Alexander Gonsalves.
A-7445900, Gonzalez, Gertrudis Mireles alias Gregorio Garza.
A-5977709, Gonzalez y Soto, Francisca or Francisca Gonzales or Francisca G. Patino or Francisca Vargas.
A-2320697, Gratsos, Helene.
A-7389931, Graziani, Cipriano.
A-7457706, Grevas, Efstathia or Efstathia Grivas.
A-3800537, Grosz, Herman.
A-4958770, Hale-Rodriguez, Carlos.
A-4809648, Hamada, Harumatsu.
A-4312231, Heimerman, Marjorie (nee Laliberte).
A-7210378, Hellmann, Ilse Anna Adolfine.
V-12484, Henriques, Jose Maria, Jr., alias Joseph or Joe Costa.
A-6498411, Hernandez de Trejo, Ana Maria.
A-6498445, Trejo-Bravo, Antonio.
A-6498444, Hernandez, Maria Graciela or Graciela Trejo-Hernandez.
A-6498443, Trejo-Hernandez, Ana Maria Cristina.
A-6883852, Herrera-Fidela, Fermin.
A-8015884, Hines, Roy Fitzgerals or Aston Thomson.
A-3309720, Howes, Jorge Eugenio.
A-6271457, Hsien, Che Cheng.
A-7419845, Hua, Margaret Pai-Ya alias Margaret Zia.
A-5189047, Irvin, George.
A-5903725, James, Elecia Constancia.
A-7379701, Jung, Norbert Hermann, known as Norbert Hermann Kanyer.
A-1595698, Kawamoto, Yuji.
A-7084211, Keller, Lieselotte Charlotte.
A-6848648, King, Sing.
V-369350, King, Cissie (aka Ng Fung Tsang King) (nee Ng Fung Tsang).
1000-19778, Kipper, Henry John.
A-4059204, Klimanoff, Vladimir alias Adolph Piedro or Adolf Piedro.
A-6072051, Korbai, Paul Charles alias Pal Karoly Korbai.
A-6756670, Kostis, Vasilikie alias Vassiliki Kostis (nee Razis).
A-1789925, Krendle, Lily (Lilly) or Lillian Crandell.
A-9825376, Larino, Manuel Lamela.
A-7424881, Lawrence, Dale.
A-7558790, Lawrence, Sandra Jill.
A-2020548, Lazaroff, Zaharia (nee Pop Thanas).
A-7903004, Lee, Hing Jeung alias Lee Hing or Hing Lee.
A-6165966, Linares, Bruno.
A-6474925, Lopez, Salvador Calvillo.
A-4065628, Lucin, Bozo or Bob Lucin or Bozo Nicholas Lucin.
A-7263445, MacLeod, Phillipa Beatrice Collins.
A-7483284, Madrell, Robert Scott.
A-7483285, Madrell, Evelyn Maud.
A-5900738, Maduro, Lillian Agatha.
A-6576006, Maiorano, Enrico.
A-7457248, Maiorano, Barbara.
A-7225043, Man, Fung.
A-6365490, Mandamadiotis, Sperios Demetriou.
0301-18521, Manetas, Anthony Demetrios.
A-7025022, Mark, Wee Git, also known as Fred Mark, Jr.
A-8106254, Markes, Christ Harry, formerly Christos Markos.
1100-25000, Martinez Flores, Jose, known as Joseph Florez Martinez.
A-1060161, Matancias-Morales, Candelario.
A-8080689, McDonald, Albertina (nee Fanfani).
A-1771384, McLeod, Pearl, formerly Venner (nee Churchill).
A-6011826, Mefford, Florence Vivian, formerly Bryan (nee Alexandra).
A-7886788, Meijer, Manfred.
A-5825318, Mendolia, Margarete Sofie or Margarete Jensen.
A-6057677, Meyers, Blanche.
A-5932933, Meyers, Clemencia Dawson.
A-3285696, Miyashita, Katsuyoshi, alias K. Hirayama.
A-6178929, Morch, Milan (William), or Edward William Sadig-Alved or Edward William Cecil.
A-5645201, Morquecho-Hernandez, Jose.
A-5690083, Morquecho, Angela Ramirez de.
A-4531719, Morris, Stafford Clinton.
A-2566504, Muentes, Ignacio Rogoberto.
A-7222175, Nilssan, Egil Martin.
0807-4942, Olmoz-Andaverde, Amelia, alias Maria Ulda Gonzalez.
A-7117819, Papa, Domenico.
A-6089658, Papazidis, Christos, or Chris Papazidis.
A-6938915, Pardo, Roman Becerra, or Roman Becerra.
1600-05282, Pena-Ceja, Alfonso.
T-1774508, Perera y Suarez, Armando Elpidio, alias Armando Elpidio Perera.
A-8057558, Piazzi, Giueseppe Celestino, alias Joe Turri.
A-5265022, Poriles, Jennie (nee Bazar).
A-7821700, Porteili, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-3380724, Prentiss, Annie Catherine (nee Delves).
V-1465729, Prevots, Georgette Marie Louise (nee Cierhout).
A-7903801, Quiogue, Francis.
0616-1568, Rabsatt, Vaneta.
A-7383689, Rathbun, Margaret Annie, formerly Howard (nee Sedgman).
A-4721933, Reimann, Emma Augustie.
A-7978828, Richards, Helen Ruth.
A-8001777, Richardson, Reuben Johnson.
A-5393445, Ringwall, Emil or Konrad Emil Ringwall.
A-3641414, Ross, Angus Nicholson.
A-8010610, Roza, Socorro Dela (nee Buraga).
A-7941746, Rubin, Mihaly.
A-7189642, Rumfeld, Heinz Albert.
A-3607555, Sam, Chu Buck or Buck-Sam Chu.
A-6336122, Shar, Tom Tse or (Mrs.) Buck-Sam Chu.
A-9748289, Santalla, Carlos or Carlos Santalla Lojo.
A-4980723, Sardo, Manuel Ferreira.
1300-110059, Scopazzi, Albino.
A-6743297, Sedilo Evelyn May, formerly Evelyn May Hollingum.
A-3483335, Seinberg, Heinrich.
A-4750637, Seinberg, Emma.
A-5967454, Shirado, Seishu.
A-7818429, Skouson, Peter James.
A-66770579, Smith, Henry Hallam.
A-6621142, Spira, Pinchas (nee Pinhas Shapiro).
A-3598815, Steiner, Elizabeth Bessie.
A-5964203, Stensel, William.
A-7279651, Stern, Eva Stepanek.
A-7141224, Stoppani, Caridad (nee Trevejo also known as Caridad Fernandez Trevejo Rodriguez).
A-7978816, Storrs, Margaret (nee Rush).
A-7978815, Storrs, Timothy John.
A-7980305, Storrs, Peter Kip, Jr.
A-5949820, Stramm, George Carl Bruno.
A-6610968, Suavage-Gonzalez, Carlos or Carlos G. Suavage.
0502-6546, Sup, Chong or Chang.
A-6216393, Sylvestrowicz, Stefania, formerly Bielawa (nee Wolinska).
A-4368963, Takakuwa, Shujiro.
A-4433609, Tanaka, Hiraku or Henry Tanaka.
V-155193, Tebele, Linda (nee Cohen).
A-1101889, Theodorakis, John.
A-6963152, Threlfall, Elia Maarit Hyyrylainen.
0803-2303, Torres, Felix.
A-8117373, Torres, Severa Valencia.
A-9634774, Tramontano, Francesco or Franco or Frank.
A-5948479, Turnbull, Esme Viola.
A-2682458, Ullah, Walter or Walter Ali.
V-6423, Uyehara, Marianna Teiko.
A-5784790, Valdes, Joaquin Munoz or Joaquin Munoz.
A-7387449, Valentino, Ernesto.
A-3193878, Valeriano, Francesco or Francesco or Frank Vallarino.
A-6245147, Venetis, Koula.
A-7222547, Verze, Antonio or Anthony Verze.
A-7130589, Villarreal, Margarito Leal.
A-7046255, Wiazemsky, Pauline Princess (nee Pauline Cumbo).
A-7046241, Obolensky, Lydia Princess (nee Lydia Cumbo).
0616-2461, Williams, Melanie Olivia.
A-4004798, Wong, Beatrice or Yuen Choy Kee.
A-6317860, Wong, Gordon Patrick or Youe Han Wong.
A-6497638, Wong, Sun Chong or Wang.
A-6497641, Lee, Tse Seng.
A-4053840, Wu, Pai Tuan.
A-3401043, Yow, Jung known as You Jung known as Yow Jung.
A-7984804, Zamorano-Garcia, Segundo or Ramon Miramontes or Ramiro Miramontes.
A-6989249, Zani, Cesare or Chester Zani.
A-9726397, Zawadzki, Witold.
V-1462278, Zuder, Jacqueline Ivy (nee Cairns).
A-2622696, Zumbo, Paul.
A-5225187, Alexandridi, Alexandrina Maria or Sandra Alexandridi.
A-5305385, Aliaer, Alfons Albert.
A-4902610, Aliaer, Helena Charlloette (nee Van Der Haegen).
A-4808389, Araujo, Francisco Alexandre or Francisco Alexandre or Francisco Araujo.
A-4797132, Bonifacic, Gaspar.
A-6845710, Brooks, Newton Alvin or Rudolph Crossdale.
A-8015494, Carboni, Ciro Carlo.
A-4792487, Cassidy, James Joseph.
V-939068, Chelini, Giuliano.
A-7748712, Choy, Alfred Hernando.
A-7983490, De Miranda, Socorro Cardenas or Maria De Socorro Cardenas or Socorro Cardenas.
A-5960317, Dona, Mario Antonio or Mario Antonio Nandino Dona or Mario Dona or Dona Mario Antonio.
A-5856811, Engel, Eira Deryn.
A-7112023, Estrada, Jose Luis.
A-6881287, Franco, Gonzalo or Gonzalo Franco-Acosta.
A-6828807, Getas, Gus Peter or Constantinos Gkitzias.
A-6817855, Haddad, Alfred or Fred Haddad.
A-4463290, Herrera-Hernandez, Pablo.
A-6709361, Hodge, Henrietta Rose (nee Brown).
A-2626026, Holter, Anna Josephine.
A-4678190, Krute, Fritz Heinrich.
A-5237120, Krute, Anna Sophie.
A-3449747, Lahikainen, Otto or Henry Johnson.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A-7941123, Lew, Suey Sen or Robert Lew or Lew Wo Ching or Lew Suey Sen.
A-3361379, Lopez, Serafim or Rafael Serafin Lopez Rajo.
A-6597443, McIlrath, Elena Dolores (nee Ortiz-Milord).
A-4160485, Moreno-Sanchez, Refugio.
A-6923176, Nguyen, Nguyen Thanh.
A-6849421, Nguyen, Li Thi or Thi Ly Phan.
A-7858019, Novella, Daniel Palma.
1600-99778, Ochoa-Ochoa, Robert or Roberto Ochoa-Ochoa.
A-7740671, Ozamis-Ormaechea, Domingo.
A-7079629, Papayannacos, Stylianos.
A-4864916, Pelayo, Soledad Garcia (nee Soledad Garcia Albarracin).
A-1732177, Petok, Irma or Emma.
A-6268920, Preen, Brian Norman.
A-6288190, Prenn, Harold Norman.
A-6268921, Preen, Kate Helen or Kate Elen Haferkorn.
A-2308244, Raimo, Gennaro.
A-7984830, Ramirez, Victoria Orozco or Victoria Orozco.
A-5582943, Roblejo-Rober, Jose Celedonio or Charlie Molina or Joseph Roblejo.
A-6833430, Rodriguez, Miguel Flores or Miguel Flores or Miguel Angel Flores.
A-7298526, Rumi, Amalia Julianna (nee Mezei).
A-7019158, Saunders, Joan.
A-4456942, Schillaci, Angelina.
A-4456944, Schillaci, Philip.
A-4946941, Schintu, Guiseppe Salvatore or Joseph Schintu or Joseph or Guiseppe Salvatore Pinna or Joseph S. Pinna.
A-4585065, Schultz, Senior, Martin.
A-1718311, Sergei, Jacob or Jack Sergei or Jacob or Jack Shergei.
A-5166619, Shuell, Michael Elmer.
A-7991978, Sitaras, Byron John or Viron Sitaras.
A-9509086, Tarkowski, Franciszek or Frank Tarkowski.
A-4553895, Thompson, Susannah (nee Wylie).
A-6989243, Trotman, Vivian Estelle or Vivian Estella Webbe-Mary Estelia Meade-Mary.
V-38960, Valenti, Giuseppina or Giuseppa Valenti (nee Pagano).
1209-9337, Walter, Frank Edy or Frank E. Ruhl or Frank Edy Foster.
A-4625481, Wechsler, Irene (nee Fischer or Rosalia (Rosa) Perlstein).
A-6755973, Wein, Wu Big or Wu Big Woon or Mrs. Mark Chong.
A-4083830, Westphal, Frank or Franz Theodore August Westphal.
A-5359781, Vergottis, George C.
A-4674944, Vergottis, Mary G.
0300-260344, Dehkan, Afsar.
A-6381363, Dehkan, Abdul or Abdul Hussian Dehkan.
A-5975666, Loukatos, Evangelos Kosmas.
A-2320696, Gratsos, Constantin George.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1381. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of Elie Joseph Hakim and family; and

S. 1383 (by request). A bill for the relief of Leonardo Bertolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1384. A bill for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc.; and

S. 1385. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1386. A bill to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. GILLETTE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1387. A bill for the relief of Beth Barbara Burpee (Fujiko Maezawa); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for Mr. CLEMENTS):

S. 1388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and stockmen for agricultural purposes in any area or region where he finds that an economic emergency has caused a need for agricultural credit not readily available from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENNINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1389. A bill for the relief of Ami Hanada (Margaret Ami McClung);

S. 1390. A bill for the relief of Ann Marie Longworth and John Francis Longworth; and

S. 1391. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1392. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit the earning of $1,200 in wages in a year without loss of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and to increase from $900 to $1,200 the amount of net earnings from self-employment which may be received in a year without loss of such benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1393. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1394. A bill for the relief of Yolanda M. Caruso; and

S. 1395. A bill for the relief of Manasseh Moses Manoukian, Elize Manoukian, nee Kardzair, Socrat Manoukian, also known as Socrates Manoukian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1396. A bill to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 1397. A bill to clarify the status of mining claims in areas held under an oil and gas prospecting permit or lease and to encourage the exploration and development of fissionable source minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 1398. A bill to authorize and direct the Civil Service Commission to make a study of the classification of, and rates of basic compensation payable with respect to technical, scientific, and engineering positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1399. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 1400. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to release the reversionary rights of the United States in and to a tract of land located in Wake County, N. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 1401. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to require carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad to install power brakes which comply with specifications and requirements prescribed by the Commission and to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of such power brakes; and

S. 1402. A bill to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, to authorize navigation of foreign, nontransport, civil aircraft in the United States through reciprocity and under regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1403. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia; and

S. 1404. A bill to adjust the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1405. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure the right to judicial review;

S. 1406. A bill to revise the basis for certain disability compensation awards; and

S. 1407. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1408. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration from the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 1409. A bill to prohibit the transmittal of communistic propaganda matter in the United States mails or in interstate commerce for circulation or use in public schools; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. BUSH):

S. 1410. A bill to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1411. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1412. A bill to establish a national natural resources policy; to create a Natural Resources Council; to provide for a natural resources inventory; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1114, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURES—PROTECTION OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a memoranda from the National Association of Postal Supervisors, Washington, D. C., signed by J. V. Horton, legislative representative, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memoranda will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1385) to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, so as to extend its protection to postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting after "any post office inspector" the words "any postmaster, officer, or employee in the field service of the Post Office Department."

The memoranda presented by Mr. LANGER is as follows:

Title 18, United States Code, Crimes and Criminal Procedures, extends no protection to personnel in the postal service other than post office inspectors, though section 1114 covers personnel of many other Government services.

Through the years there have been occasional cases where employees of the postal service, particularly supervisors, have been assaulted, both on and off duty, by obstreperous employees or other individuals because of grudges or ill feeling resulting from performance of duty. During recent years, especially the past year in which all new employees have come in on a temporary basis, most of them without civil service examination, many persons of an unusually low type have been employed as laborers and mail handlers, clerks and carriers, and cases of assault by them on their supervisors have become too frequent. Several such cases which have come to attention are:

January 22, 1946: Foreman at Chicago assaulted by a temporary war-service substitute. Reported to Department. No action. Sub dropped on January 28, 1946.

June 4, 1947: Foreman at Chicago assaulted by substitute mail handler. Reported to police, who arrested culprit. No record of disposal.

August 15, 1950: Foreman at Chicago assaulted by substitute mail handler, who was arrested by police next day and fined $10. No other information.

January 10, 1951: Foreman at New York assaulted by substitute clerk, who was later arrested by police, but no information of disposal. Foreman hospitalized.

January 27, 1951: Foreman at New York assaulted by temporary mail handler. No information on disposal.

January 27, 1951: Foreman at New York assaulted by temporary mail handler. No information on disposal. Foreman treated at medical unit.

September 27, 1951: Foreman at New York assaulted by temporary mail handler. No information on disposal.

October 8, 1951: Foreman at New York assaulted by temporary mail handler. No information on disposal.

In two instances at New York, post office inspectors have taken assault cases to the United States district attorney, who would not consider either case because the Federal statutes do not cover postal employees. In other cases, local police have declined to make arrests because the assaults occurred on Federal property.

So long as assaults of this kind on postal employees, on or off Federal property, are not Federal offenses, unruly employees or private individuals know that the worst that can happen to them is the loss of their job, disgruntled employees or former employees of a low type who resent supervision or instructions will continue to try to manhandle a supervisor who tries to make them work. Certainly there should be some protection to a supervisor or other employee who is doing his duty.

The National Association of Postal Supervisors is proposing that title 18, section 1114, United States Code, be amended as shown in the attached tentative bill. When so amended, section 1114 would read:

"SEC. 1114. Protection of officers and employees of the United States.

"Whoever kills any judge of the United States, any United States attorney, any assistant United States attorney, or any United States marshal or deputy marshal or person employed to assist such marshal or deputy marshal, any officer or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, any post-office inspector, any postmaster, officer, or employee in the field service of the Post Office Department, any officer or employee of the Secret Service of the Bureau of Narcotics, any officer or enlisted man of the Coast Guard, any officer or employee of any United States penal or correctional institution, any officer, employee, or agent of the customs or of the internal revenue or any person assisting him in the execution of his duties, any immigrant inspector or any immigration-patrol inspector, any officer or employee of the Department of Agriculture or of the Department of the Interior designated by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior to enforce any act of Congress for the protection, preservation, or restoration of game and other wild birds and animals, any officer or employee of the National Park Service, any officer or employee of, or assigned to duty in, the Field Service of the Division of Grazing of the Department of the Interior, any employee of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture, or any officer or employee of the Indian Field Service of the United States, while engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be punished as provided under sections 1111 and 1112 of this title."

Section 111, title 18, now reads:

"SEC. 111. Assaulting, resisting, or impeding certain officers or employees.

"Whoever forcibly assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates, or interferes with any person designated in section 1114 of this title while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

"Whoever, in the commission of any such acts used a deadly or dangerous weapon, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both."

When amended as in the attached proposed bill, section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, would make it a Federal offense to kill a postmaster, officer, or employee in the postal field service while engaged in or on account of the performance of his official duties, and under the existing section 111 of title 18, United States Code, it would then be a Federal offense to assault or intimidate them under the same circumstances.

The fact that an assault on postal personnel would constitute a Federal offense would surely deter many hot-tempered employees or persons from committing assaults because of grudge or ill-feeling caused by official acts of postal personnel, which anger them.

J. V. HORTON,
Legislative Representative, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

COFFEE PRICES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in connection with the introduction of a bill, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on March 12, the Office of Price Stabilization announced that it had lifted controls from a number of commodities, including coffee. The following morning on its front page the Washington Post carried a story by one of its reporters declaring:

A rise in retail coffee prices of 5 to as much as 10 cents a pound is expected following the lifting of controls last night. It may take 2 weeks or more, however, for the new price tags to show up at retail stores.

The story went on to say:

OPS officials talked of coffee-price rises of as much as 10 or 12 cents a pound. Industry circles, here and in New York, said that seemed too big a rise.

In any event, by March 17, 5 days after decontrol, one large food company had raised its price by 3 cents to 89½ cents a pound wholesale. Another company had marked up its wholesale price by 5 cents a pound. Other companies are obviously going to do likewise, since green coffee prices on the exchange are steadily increasing, and the roasters, wholesalers, and retailers will have to follow suit.

It is clear from news reaching me from all parts of the country that the housewife is going to have to pay a considerably higher retail price for coffee hereafter than she has been paying in recent months—and even under controls coffee prices were exorbitantly high. One telegram from a gentleman in New York told me that if I did not do something to stop it, retail prices per pound of coffee would go up as much as 16 or 20 cents. I have to inform him that I do not know what I or any other individual Senator can do other than to set forth the facts as they are.

I do not wish to take issue with the decision to lift controls on prices. That is a policy decision which the Eisenhower administration has made with respect to all commodities and products, and, of course, coffee could not logically be the only exception. This is a policy decision which the American people will approve or disapprove, depending largely on what happens to the prices of the things they have to buy.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

THE GREAT SPECULATIVE RAID OF 1949

With respect to coffee, however, it would seem likely that consumers are not going to applaud. But they would have much less reason for disapproval if the level of coffee prices under OPS control had been unconscionably high when controls were originally imposed—unconscionably high, Mr. President, because of the great speculative raid on our pocketbooks in the late months of 1949.

Following that first almost perpendicular price rise in coffee, when green-coffee prices on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange zoomed up from around 28 cents in early September to above 50 cents 6 weeks later, the Subcommittee of Agriculture, of which I was then chairman, made an exhaustive investigation into the causes of this enormous upward leap in price. Among the principal reasons for it we found to be speculation in the coffee market both by individuals in the coffee-producing countries and by American citizens trading on the exchange in New York.

Having completed our study, we filed our report, and instantly we were engulfed in a wave of organized criticism and abuse. The ambassadors from coffee-producing countries descended on the Department of State to protest. The Department of State in turn descended on the Agriculture Committee to transmit that protest. Our report was held back; it was restudied and it was rewritten. Finally, on August 23, 1950, almost a full year after the speculative raid had begun, the report was published as Senate Report No. 2377, 81st Congress, 2d session.

I hold a copy of that report in my hand, Mr. President, and turning to page 40 I find a list of 14 recommendations which our subcommittee made in an effort to rectify some of the conditions that had permitted and even encouraged this billion-dollar gouging of our consumers.

I will say flatly, Mr. President, that if those recommendations had been carried out at the time we made them, that when price controls over coffee were removed last week the rise in price which is now taking place would have hurt the consumer a great deal less for the simple reason that the base from which this new increase has started would have been so much lower.

As it is, the ultimate consumer of coffee has been gouged billions of dollars since the speculative raid of 1949, and the current rise resulting from decontrol will simply add insult to already great injury.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS

What were some of the key recommendations of our report? One of them was that legislation be promptly enacted to place trading in coffee under the Commodity Exchange Act. To accomplish this I had introduced S. 3577 on May 12, 1950. This bill, I regret to say, died in committee. When I have finished my remarks, I intend to reintroduce the same bill again today.

We further recommended that the Attorney General investigate the sales and storage practices of foreign coffee interests in the United States and take any appropriate action under the antitrust laws. The Justice Department failed to act on this recommendation.

Then, seeking to curb the undesirable speculation existing in coffee futures, we urged that the revenue laws of the United States be amended so as to place a tax on profits made by foreign interests trading on the commodity exchanges of this country. Since tax legislation must originate in the House, we prepared and published in our report a draft of suggested legislation for consideration by the House of Representatives. Nothing was done about this recommendation Any profits which foreign speculators are making out of the present trading in coffee will therefore not be taxed by the United States Government.

We further recommended that a representative of the United States who is conversant with the antitrust laws be present at all meetings of the Special Commission on Coffee of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council or any of its committees in which the United States participates. To my knowledge, this recommendation, like the others, has been ignored.

Those interested in the other recommendations will find them on pages 40 and 41 of the report.

In conclusion, Mr. President, if today, tomorrow, or in days to come any housewife enters her grocery store and finds the price of her favorite brand of coffee has gone up 3 or 5 or 10 or 12 or 16 or 20 or any other number of cents—as a direct result of the lifting of price controls—she should realize that whatever price she is asked to pay is higher than it need have been—higher than it would have been if the recommendations of our subcommittee had been acted upon long ago before price controls were instituted in the first place. The base from which the present increase starts is already so high that the additional increases will hurt far more than otherwise would have been the case.

I now introduce for appropriate reference the bill to which I have referred.

The bill (S. 1386) to amend section 2 of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, relating to the meaning of the word "commodity", introduced by Mr. GILLETTE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EMERGENCY LOANS TO FARMERS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is absent from Washington on official business and has been excused by unanimous consent from attendance at this session of the Senate, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and stockmen for agricultural purposes in any area or region where he finds that an economic emergency has caused a need for agricultural credit not readily available from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources.

In connection with the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Kentucky concerning the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1388) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans to farmers and stockmen for agricultural purposes in any area or region where he finds that an economic emergency has caused a need for agricultural credit not readily available from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources, introduced by Mr. HENNINGS (for Mr. CLEMENTS), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement of Mr. CLEMENTS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CLEMENTS

One of the greatest aids to American agriculture has been the combination of programs to provide farmers with enough credit to enable them to carry on their yearly production jobs and to become full owners of their farms. These credit programs are of several different types, each designed for different uses and needs.

In the system supervised by the Farm Credit Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture we have cooperative credit. That is, farmers who use these credit facilities become members of the system and extend a helping hand to other farmers. The farm-credit system has been highly successful in providing money for the out-of-pocket costs which farmers must meet at crop time, and in giving them the long-term credit at reasonable rates which is necessary to achieve land ownership.

Another type of credit which has made American agriculture great is that administered by the Farmers' Home Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. This is direct, supervised credit which is extended only to farmers who are unable to obtain credit from commercial banks.

It is the kind so often needed by the typical family farmers who cover our great Nation and contribute so much to rural America. This program, alone, has saved thousands and thousands of farmers from going under, when only a little help was needed to get them back on their feet. And the help has been repaid remarkably well, with interest. The record of the Farmers' Home Administration and its many borrowers is a tribute to a good program designed to be helpful to people who need it most.

Another type of credit, which is also administered by the FHA, is the disaster loan. This line of credit has proved a godsend to the farmers who have suffered from disasters of nature, such as floods and droughts. The designation of areas for this kind of disaster help has opened the door to many, many farmers who would otherwise have to abandon their farmlands and homes because they didn't have enough of a financial stake to replant a flooded crop or to import hay for drought-stricken animal herds. The farmers who were hit by the unusually widespread drought of last summer and fall know the value of this program.

This money, too, is repaid with interest, and the congressional authorizations for it have been some of the best investments ever made in the productive future of a country.

But this disaster credit is available only for disasters of nature—it is not authorized for purely economic disasters. The distinction between the two types of adversities is strictly theoretical, of course, to a farm family which has been hit by either. It

doesn't matter to a farmer whether he needs a little assistance because of a flood or because the bottom dropped out of cattle prices before it was time for him to market his beef. The impact on him, and the consequence to the entire economy, is equally severe in either case. The problem is to fashion our credit resources so that they can be applied soundly in any kind of situation.

It seems to me, that there is a gap in our credit system which makes it difficult, if not impossible, to assist the farmer who has been struck by economic disaster. I am not talking about a general economic slump, or about the normal operation of the price support program, but I am talking about economic adversities suffered by farmers in a specific market condition.

Nor am I talking about charity. The farmer in this kind of situation wants to repay his help, but he does need the help and he needs it at reasonable terms which can be repaid. He will thank his country many times, if he can be extended a line of credit that will enable him to become again a productive citizen, growing crops on his land.

To fill this gap, I am introducing a bill to reestablish in the Department of Agriculture the authority formerly vested in the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. I do this in the hope that other legislators and that various farm leaders will give it careful consideration as one way of helping the current distress in the cattle market. Many of us have heard from constituents who would like to hold their cattle back in an effort to comply with the Secretary of Agriculture's request for orderly marketing until the market firms up, but they simply cannot find the credit necessary to hold their animals.

The general drought has made feed supplies so scarce and so high, in most instances, that the line of credit originally extended many cattle farmers has run out before either the creditor or debtor thought it would. Neither man wants the loan called in, but it is only natural that a slump in the market requires some such action in individual cases. My proposal is to bolster the situation, and prevent one from arising in the future, by having Congress and the Department ready to stand back of farmers caught in such a condition.

Like the other credit programs which have made this country so productive, I believe that this one would be a wise and sound investment in our future.

BROADCASTING OR TELEVISING OF PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL EXHIBITIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1396) to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to discuss the bill for about 18 minutes.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield so that I may make a statement for about 4 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont if I am recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado is recognized. The Chair would suggest that the Senate is still proceeding under the morning hour. If the Senate could first conclude the morning hour the Chair would be very happy to recognize Senators who seek recognition in connection with other matters.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have stated before, and perhaps I should state again, that I shall adhere to the rule of objecting to any speeches of more than 2 minutes during the morning hour. If any Senator wishes to make a 2-minute statement I shall not object; that will be perfectly satisfactory to me, but otherwise I believe we should first conclude the business of the morning hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator's statement apply to a speech about a bill that has been introduced?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. Any bill that cannot be discussed in 2 minutes cannot be much of a bill. [Laughter.]

JOINT COMMITTEE TO STUDY HIGHWAY FINANCING, USE, AND SAFETY

Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. BUSH) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee shall be appointed, composed of five Members of the Senate to be designated by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works, and five Members of the House to be designated by the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works, and said joint committee is hereby authorized and directed to inquire into the methods currently used and the sources from which funds are now provided for financing highway construction, maintenance, and operation as now authorized by Federal, State, and local laws, practices, and procedures, including toll roads and an appraisal of the adequacy or inadequacy of present financing to meet the highway needs of the public, national defense, and safety, and to report its findings thereon with recommendations to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, and for this purpose said committee is hereby authorized by subcommittee or otherwise to sit during the sessions or recesses of the Congress, at such times and places as it may deem advisable, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to summon and compel the attendance of witnesses, and to employ such clerical, stenographic, and expert assistance as shall be necessary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PRINTING OF REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on Wednesday last, March 18, 1953, I brought before the Senate the matter of having printed the reports of the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. At that time the majority leader asked that the request be deferred and that no action on it be taken until today. I am informed by the majority leader that he does not object to the printing of the reports.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I renew the request that the reports be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The reports which were ordered to be printed are as follows:

Effect of Personnel Office Staffing Ratios on Manpower Utilization (S. Doc. No. 28);

Personnel Investigations of Employees and Applicants for Employment in the Executive Branch of the Government for Loyalty, Suitability, and Security (S. Doc. No. 29);

Military Personnel in Civilian Occupations (S. Doc. No. 30);

Training and Education in the Federal Government (S. Doc. No. 31);

Manpower Utilization by the Federal Government Through the Use of Private Contract Labor (S. Doc. No. 32);

Appeals and Grievance Procedures in the Federal Government (S. Doc. No. 33);

Administration of the Classification Act of 1949 and the Compensation Process Established by the Act (with illustrations) (S. Doc. No. 34);

Analysis of the Whitten Amendment (with an illustration) (S. Doc. No. 35);

Improving the Federal Administrative Management Program (with illustrations) (S. Doc. No. 36); and

Personnel Recruitment and Employment Practices in the Federal Government (with illustrations) (S. Doc. No. 37).

NOTICE OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Special Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 24, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 637, to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Address entitled "Agricultural Chemicals and Southern Agriculture" delivered by him

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

before the spring meeting of the National Agricultural Chemicals Association held at New Orleans on March 11, 1953.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Report of Washington Day dinner honoring Senators BYRD and TAFT.

By Mr. HILL:

Address delivered by James A. Farley at 50th anniversary banquet of the Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Montgomery, Ala.

Editorial in tribute to Dr. F. D. Patterson, third president of Tuskegee Institute, published in the Birmingham (Ala.) News of March 13, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Article entitled "Mr. and Mrs. Texas," written by William E. Gardner and published in the magazine Texas Parade of March 1953.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Article entitled "Native Nationalism Mounts in French North Africa," written by Egon Kaskeline and published in the Christian Science Monitor of March 6, 1953.

By Mr. MORSE:

Article entitled "Arms and Men," written by Walter Millis and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 9, 1953.

JEWISH YOUTH WEEK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, today, March 20, 1953, marks the beginning of Jewish Youth Week in the United States, which has been so designated by the National Jewish Youth Conference. The conference is a permanent, nationwide youth body representing more than 300 local councils and 11 national Jewish youth organizations, and it is sponsored by the National Jewish Welfare Board.

The theme of Jewish Youth Week this year is "Jewish Youth—A Vital Force in the Community." In this connection Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has sent the conference a message commemorating the occasion, the text of which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, January 30, 1953.

Mr. SELDON M. KRUGER,
Chairman, National Jewish Youth Conference, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. KRUGER: I am delighted to send cordial greetings to the members of the National Jewish Youth Conference as they celebrate Jewish Youth Week from March 20–27, 1953.

The theme chosen for this year's celebration is highly significant. Jewish youth is a vital force primarily because it is genuinely Jewish, cherishing Jewish ideals, aspirations, traditions.

Jewish youth is a vital force because it puts into practice the precepts of the great body of law which it has inherited in the Torah. From that imperishable code, all of us who live in our Judaeo-Christian civilization, derive the principles of justice and freedom which constitute the moral and ethical foundation of our free Republic.

Jewish youth is also a vital force in our community because it has not merely adopted American principles and aspirations but has made them an integral part of the thought and conduct of young Jewish people.

I congratulate the National Jewish Youth Conference upon its phenomenal growth, consisting as it does now of more than 300 local and regional youth and young adult councils as well as national Jewish youth organizations. May its happy influence continue to grow in the years to come.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is concluded.

ROANOKE RAPIDS, N. C., POWER PROJECT

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, the decision of the Supreme Court in the Roanoke River dam case is a distinct victory for the people. This means that private enterprise will build the dam at Roanoke Rapids, and thus save the taxpayers from $30 to $40 million.

It will be recalled that the Virginia Electric Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission in 1948 for permission to build this multi-million-dollar hydroelectric dam at Roanoke Rapids, a project which was planned many years before. After a full hearing the Federal Power Commission granted this license over the protest of Oscar Chapman, then Secretary of the Interior, who instituted court action to delay and defeat the building of the dam. Last year the case was heard by the Fourth United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and Chief Judge John J. Parker wrote a strong decision holding against Chapman, and maintained the right of the private company to build the dam.

A large number of North Carolina citizens in the Roanoke Rapids area came to Washington and appealed to Secretary Chapman not to delay this matter further by appealing to the United States Supreme Court, which he was certain to do. However, he was adamant in his course, and appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court, which now decides against him and affirms the decision of Judge Parker, all of which is most gratifying.

Secretary Chapman was seeking to maintain the position that eastern Carolina needed more power, which was true, but by his actions he kept the State from getting this power for 4 years, all because he wanted the Government to build the dam and the taxpayers to foot the bill rather than let private enterprise build it.

The public should understand that the rates prevailing for power provided by private enterprise will be just as reasonable as would obtain if the Government should build the dam. This is true of the power which will come from Buggs Island or the John H. Kerr Dam.

The decision of the Supreme Court is in line with a wholesome public policy, which is that the Government ought not to be required to provide facilities and levy taxes upon the people to pay for them when private enterprise is able and willing to provide the same facilities at comparable costs. The people are to be congratulated upon this decision of the Supreme Court.

Some of the critics of the decision of the Court say that it will result in making a gift of a large sum of money to the private power company by virtue of the benefits which will accrue on the river because of the construction of the Buggs Island Dam. This has been provided for by the Federal Power Commission, and in its licensing order provision is made for the private power company to pay to the Government annually compensation for the benefits which it will receive by virtue of the construction and operation of the Buggs Island Dam, and this sum will amount to several hundred thousand dollars annually, so there will be no loss to the Government and no gift to the private power company.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks there be printed in the RECORD two editorials from leading North Carolina newspapers discussing this subject. The first, entitled "Exit: Dog in Manger," is from the Greensboro Daily News, and the second, "A Socialist Assault Is Turned Back," is from the Charlotte Daily Observer. The editorials represent the prevailing thought in North Carolina on this question.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXIT: DOG IN MANGER

By clearing the way for construction of the Roanoke River hydroelectric dam by Virginia Electric & Power Co. the United States Supreme Court has gone a long way toward assuring North Carolina of a vitally needed water resource in at least one section of the State.

We have contended from the beginning that where private industry is willing and able to produce new hydroelectric power it ought to be allowed to do so. This is the case in the Roanoke Dam controversy. Although the Court specifically refrained from ruling on merits of the private versus public power argument (simply upholding the right of the Federal Power Commission to make the decision), the majority ruling did demolish the contention that the Government's potential profits are a major criterion in deciding such issues. The Federal Government claimed that it is being forced to put up auxiliary units—the unprofitable ones—while private power groups take the plums—the choice ones.

The Court's majority opinion replied: "It has never been suggested that such is the criterion under which the Commission is to determine whether a project ought to be undertaken by the United States." The Court is right. The United States Government is not in the power business for profits; it is in the business to take care of public needs which cannot be met by private enterprise. When Government begins to argue that the profit motive is primary, then it encroaches on the domain of private enterprise and ought to be restrained.

The Daily News believes private enterprise ought to develop power resources of the Nation where it can do so efficiently and profitably. That does not mean the Government should abandon its supervision over power monopolies; nor does it imply that public power projects per se are evil. In many cases they are vital to the development of whole regions and definitely serve the public interest.

But in the circumstance under discussion—the Roanoke River Dam—the Government has been acting like a dog in the manger. There was little hope that it ever could persuade Congress to appropriate funds necessary for the development. In the meantime Vepco had clearly shown that it had the ability and the will to build the Roanoke River project. The Court has rightly decreed that it ought not to be further barred from carrying out that determination.

A SOCIALIST ASSAULT IS TURNED BACK

In its opinion Monday upholding the Federal Power Commission in granting a franchise to the Virginia Electric Power Co. to build a dam at Roanoke Rapids, the Supreme Court turned back one of the most determined assaults made on private enterprise by a department of Government that had become heavily loaded with socialism.

The Department of the Interior under Oscar Chapman had made an issue of the Roanoke Rapids Dam. The Federal Power Commission had already granted the private power company the franchise to build it, but the Department stepped in and challenged this franchise on the flimsy ground that the shallow, sluggish Roanoke River was a navigable stream. Above Roanoke Rapids it will hardly float anything bigger than a rowboat.

It should be noted that Congress never authorized the Government to build a dam at this point. It was not a contest, therefore, on whether the dam should be built with public or private funds. Interior was simply trying to prevent a private company from building it.

The reason was that the Army had drawn up tentative plans listing flood-control projects on practically every important stream in the country, including the Roanoke River. This report was "approved" in the flood control act of 1944, but none of the projects was authorized.

Interior contended that "approved" meant "authorized," and that was the main point in the suit. If the Supreme Court had ruled with Interior, then private development of water power on every important river in the country would have been practically prohibited. Socialized power would have been almost assured, because TVA has demonstrated that water power cannot supply the demand and must be "firmed up" by steam plants. As steam plants are built, the public authority monopolizes power production and drives private companies out.

The object of the Interior suit, therefore, was not to supply the people of the Roanoke valley with power, but to set a precedent that would have enabled it to get advance control of every hydroelectric site of importance in the country. The Interior lawyers advanced the bizarre argument that potential electric power from a dam not yet built or authorized is property of the United States. It is easy to see what a far-reaching effect a favorable decision by the Supreme Court would have had.

The whole scheme was an attempt to socialize electric power. Interior was trying to get control of undeveloped hydroelectric sites and also to bring the Federal Power Commission under its authority.

The Fabian Socialists, with whom the Interior Department was packed, have made their first assault on the power industry, because, since all business and industry depend on power, with that in control of the Government, the next steps toward socialism would be easier.

The Supreme Court has given us a victory for freedom. It may be years before we realize how great the victory has been.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS—IN THE NAVY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there are two nominations on the Executive Calendar to which I believe there is no objection. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination of Adm. Henry C. Bruton be considered and confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry C. Bruton for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination of Robert D. Murphy, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, be considered and confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert D. Murphy to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President will be notified of both confirmations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of John C. Doerfer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, and withdrawing the nomination of Eugene H. Merrill, of Utah, to be a member of that Commission, which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

George E. MacKinnon, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Philip Neville, resigned.

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

John J. Dermody, to be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

EDWARD F. HOWREY TO BE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONER—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably the nomination of Edward F. Howrey, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1952, vice John Carson, term expired, with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be received, as in executive session, and placed on the Executive Calendar.

THE KAMCHATKA AIRPLANE INCIDENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado obtained the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for 3½ minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON. I shall be glad to yield provided I do not lose the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on three occasions within the last few days allied planes have been fired on by Russian or satellite fighters. The incident on the Czechoslovakian border was an aggravated one, since our plane was apparently fired on by a jet fighter which had crossed the border from Czechoslovakia. Our plane it will be remembered, was brought down, but the pilot escaped injury. We are very properly changing our practice on this border. Instead of patrolling it with single obsolete fighters, we are using a detachment of F–86 Sabres.

The second incident was the shooting down, with the loss of life of the occupants, of a British transport plane flying the assigned corridor from the British sector of Germany to the British sector of Berlin.

The third incident was of an entirely different sort. It was reported by the Air Force that a reconnaissance bomber fought off a Russian-made MIG 25 miles off the east coast of Kamchatka on Sunday last, March 15. It reported that the plane was on a "routine weather reconnaissance flight from an Alaska air base."

This story is preposterous. There is no need to go within 25 miles of Kamchatka to look for weather. There is just as much weather 50 miles out or 100 miles out.

Information from sources which I cannot suspect is to the effect that the "routine" flights are made from Bering Straits to Attu, the westernmost of the Aleutian Islands. This course does not bring a plane within 400 miles of Kamchatka. The plane in question may nevertheless have been engaged on a useful mission, but it was just not there on weather business.

The serious thing about this incident is the false report given to the American people by the Air Force. It tended, and probably was intended, to influence public opinion by making the third incident appear as an act of aggression. In publishing this false report the Air Force has been guilty, in effect, of waging psychological warfare on the people of the United States. This must stop.

Mr. President, there are two honest and honorable courses open in a case of this sort. One is for the Air Force to tell the truth. The other is for it to say nothing. It had better decide to do one or the other.

BROADCASTING OR TELECASTING OF PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL EXHIBITIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I introduced, for appropriate reference, a bill

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to authorize the adoption of certain rules with respect to the broadcasting or telecasting of professional baseball exhibitions in interstate commerce, and for other purposes. At this time I wish to discuss the bill for 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. President, one of the great difficulties under our free-enterprise economy has been and is that, because of monopoly, the few may become more and more powerful and the many may become weaker and more dependent. During the past decade that tendency in America has been frightening. National advertising out of tax deductions has contributed its full share to this unfortunate trend. Through the years the Congress, by the enactment of antitrust laws, has tried to protect the people against the gargantuan growth of monopoly, the crushing concentration of wealth, and the economic power in the hands of the few but Congress has not kept pace with the trend.

Today I have the honor of introducing a bill to protect the weak and helpless elements of America's national game of baseball from a cruel and ruthless monopoly which, strangely enough, was forced upon organized baseball by the antitrust division of our own Justice Department. Last month a major league franchise was sold for $3,750,000, and this week a major league franchise was offered for sale for $2,400,000. These are relatively small sale prices in the major league world. The major leagues' business has become very big business in this country.

In the baseball industry, as in the automobile industry, the transportation industry, the tobacco and liquor industries, and the hundreds of other American industries, a few have become very powerful, while the many who have contributed immeasurably to our way of life have been struggling for survival. There is big business and small business in baseball, just as there is in every other endeavor in our great country. Without equivocation I state that my bill is in the interest of "the little fellow" in organized baseball.

In this industry we have 2 major leagues located generally in America's centers of population, and 39 minor leagues spread out over the rest of the country. The 2 major leagues and most of the minor leagues consist of 8 ball clubs each. For many years these leagues, in spite of their varying strengths, have made their own rules and have done a good job in self-discipline and self-government. They have respected the laws of their country, and have responded to the public sense of propriety, decorum, dignity, and fairness. They have paid their bills promptly, met their obligations fully, and assumed the responsibilities expected of all American businessmen. At the same time they have developed interest and respect for the game of baseball until all the people claim it as their own.

The men and women responsible for the operation of minor-league baseball do so generally without monetary reward. They believe, with our former colleague, "Happy" Chandler, that organized baseball belongs to the people, and that its officers and directors are merely agents and trustees of the people. They feel strongly that the great public interest in the sport is wholesome for young and old. They take commendable pride in their local communities; and, above all, they want to build community morale and community spirit to the highest point possible. Theirs is a labor of love.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by George M. Trautman, who is president of the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues—in other words, the small leagues, the minor leagues. The statement was delivered by Mr. Trautman when he appeared before the Celler committee of the House of Representatives, the House committee which is investigating monopolies.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Friday, August 3, 1951, George M. Trautman, president, the National Association of Professional Baseball Leagues, the little leagues, the minor leagues, appeared before the Celler committee of the House, investigating monopoly, and made the following statement:

"I assert most emphatically that territorial limits are necessary to the preservation of minor-league baseball.

"Clubs, particularly in the B, C, and D classifications, are located principally in small towns and cities situated in more or less sparsely populated areas, which of necessity limits the number of persons from which the clubs can draw their attendance. Even with such limitations I sometimes wonder if the saturation point has not been reached in some sections, as, for example, the States of Texas and North Carolina, in each of which there are approximately 50 minor league clubs.

"Be that as it may, it is the fact that in a majority of instances the clubs in such classifications are organized in response to a popular demand for baseball, and the clubs are organized and operated primarily as civic enterprises and out of a sense of civic loyalty and pride. As evidence of this fact I call your attention to the fact that as of July 12, 1951, out of 2,287 officers and directors of the minor league clubs, but 291 could be classified as making their living as baseball executives. The remaining 1,996 were men from all walks of life, with representatives of the distaff side, as the following table will show:

Attorneys	128
Bankers or banking business	77
Business executives (heads of firms or responsible positions)	377
Judges	9
Manufacturers	6
Insurance brokers or agents	54
Realtors and real-estate salesmen	46
Accountants	41
Brokers (various fields)	19
Amusement field (motion-picture actors, directors, and theater owners)	13
Automobile dealers and associated business	166
Hotel and restaurant owners, operators, and employees	43
Soft drinks, beer, night clubs, etc	50
Florists	2
Contractors (various fields)	45
Farmers and ranchers	65
Small business (a variety of occupations in the small-business field too numerous to classify)	529
Doctors, dentists, etc	75
Newspaper and radio officials and employees	73
Morticians	14
Salesmen (various fields)	62
City, county, State, and Federal officials and employees	76
Teachers and professors	7
Architects	1
Housewives	18

"Minor league baseball is far from a profitable sport. A survey was made of the results of the 1950 operations; and, with 18 leagues having a total of 134 clubs reporting, it shows that 65 percent of the clubs reporting operated at a loss.

"The operation of a minor league club is most assuredly no bonanza. In fact with a great many of them it is rather a case of keeping losses to a minimum rather than making or expecting to make a profit. Under these conditions I feel that these small clubs, these civic enterprises, if you please, are entitled to attempt to live, and the territorial limit is one of their chief supports.

"If these clubs in the lower classifications are to survive they should have an area in which they can operate free from interference by any other club in organized baseball. Any club not in organized baseball can come into the territory and operate and the club of organized baseball can do nothing about it. It requires an area to support a baseball team to insure that some baseball may be played."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to quote briefly from the statement delivered by Mr. Trautman, and I desire to make some reference to it. Mr. Trautman began his statement by saying:

I assert most emphatically that territorial limits are necessary to the preservation of minor league baseball.

Clubs, particularly in the B, C, and D classifications, are located principally in small towns and cities situated in more or less sparsely populated areas, which, of necessity, limits the number of persons from which the clubs can draw their attendance. Even with such limitations I sometimes wonder if the saturation point has not been reached in some sections, as, for example, the States of Texas and North Carolina, in each of which there are approximately 50 minor league clubs.

Then Mr. Trautman pointed out that in the minor leagues there were 2,287 officers and directors when he made his survey; and among those 2,287 directors and officers, his survey showed that only 291 of them made their living from baseball; the others contributed their time, their money, and their efforts to the game, free, without any remuneration whatsoever. Mr. Trautman made a list of those who carry on baseball in the minor leagues, and the list is very significant. It was made according to occupation. Mr. Trautman found that there were 128 attorneys, 77 bankers, 377 business executives, 9 judges, 6 manufacturers, 54 insurance brokers or agents, 46 realtors and real-estate salesmen, and so forth, and he concluded the list by pointing out that among the 2,287 directors and officers in the minor leagues were 18 housewives.

A bronze plaque was unveiled on the occasion of the dedication of baseball's hall of fame, at Cooperstown, N. Y. The inscription on the plaque states in eloquent language the purposes, ideals, and objectives of baseball. It reads as follows:

To build for baseball sound ideals of community participation and recreation and to perpetuate for the game integrity of administration and high standards of excellence in

performance, the national association was organized in 1901. The skill and spirit of countless thousands on the playing fields have contributed to the wholesome enjoyment and recreation of countless millions more. Baseball claims a continent today. To those who play and who love the game this tablet is inscribed.

These are not merely fancy, high-sounding words. They represent the spirit and the character of the sport of organized baseball which has spread clear across the North American Continent, from the Arctic Circle to the Equator and beyond, into South America and the islands in the adjacent seas. Canada, the United States, Mexico, Central America, Panama, Venezuela, Peru, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and other areas all have organized baseball leagues and clubs, and love the game. Everywhere that baseball is played, it has made a notable contribution to community morale and national integrity.

Practically every State in the Union has organized baseball operating within its borders. Even far-away Japan adopted baseball as its favorite sport. It is my solemn and considered conviction that organized baseball has accomplished more for the good-neighbor policy and for good international relations in the Western Hemisphere than any other institution, except religion and education, if these may be termed institutions. Human beings are peculiar in that they require athletic rivalry and prowess to stimulate their spirits and save them from the boredom of a too serious view of life and its events. In the past, war served that purpose, but today man is striving to eliminate war because of the fierce cruelty and terrible destruction of modern weapons. War's tragedies and sorrows, and its promotion of hate, chaos, instability, and confusion, can no longer be tolerated as a pastime, as it has been in the past. But some competitive endeavor must be found to take the place of war. Athletic sports fill that requirement perfectly. If the so-called free world and the Iron Curtain countries would engage each other on the baseball diamond in friendly but spirited combat, the costly rearmament program, sapping the strength of every nation, could be set aside, and plans for war would disappear from the face of the earth like an early morning dew.

Baseball is democracy in action. On the diamond no questions are asked about which side of the railroad tracks a player came from, or who his parents might have been. Questions as to ability to play the game with spirit and skill are the only questions. That is all the managers and the fans want to know about any player. Here men of all colors, races, national origins, and religions meet on a common ground, to engage on even terms in a great contest of skill and strategy and wits. Baseball teaches youth fair play, sportsmanship, clean living, respect for those in authority, and obedience to its laws and rules. On the diamond, rivalry is keen and tempers fly, but men are taught to control their emotions as the supreme requirement of the game.

Nevertheless, 1949 was an evil year for organized baseball in the United States. That year marks the beginning of the decline of organized baseball in America. In that year the Justice Department, in good faith and with the purest of intentions, struck a foul blow against America's great grassroots sport.

In 1949, 59 minor leagues with more than 10,000 players were operating in the United States. Today there are but 39, and many of these 39 are weak and wobbly, and may fold before the present season is ended. In 1949 there were 17 minor-league clubs in the State of Ohio. Today there are but two minor-league clubs in that great baseball State. Oddly enough, this decline occurred during the period of the Nation's greatest prosperity. In the period from 1949 to the present day, more people have been employed at the highest take-home wage in the history of America. Dog racing, horse racing, midget auto racing, wrestling, and many other sports have prospered as never before, but minor league baseball has declined steadily, and it continues to decline. The one and only explanation is the unfortunate action of the Antitrust Division of the United States Justice Department in destroying one of baseball's own, but necessary, rules against major league baseball monopoly.

In 1949 baseball in the United States operated under rule 1 (d). This is a very simple but a very important rule, because it protects the territorial rights of the minor leagues from invasion by the majors. George Trautman, the president of the Minor League Association, says organized baseball cannot exist without the protection of its territorial rights. That, of course, is not a new principle in America. Each of our utilities, operating under a certificate of convenience and necessity, has a certain territory to serve; so there is nothing very original about that arrangement. George Trautman is correct. The rule, which was adopted by the major leagues, themselves, reads:

> Each major-league club may broadcast or telecast its games (both home and away from home) from a station located within its "home territory."
>
> No major-league club shall consent to or authorize a broadcast or telecast (including rebroadcast or network broadcast) of any of its games to be made from a station outside its home territory and within the "home territory" of any other baseball club, major or minor, without the consent of such other baseball club.
>
> The words "home territory" shall mean and include, with respect to any baseball club, the territory included within the circumference of a circle having a radius of 50 miles, with its center at the baseball park of such baseball club.

Under that wise rule, organized baseball has prospered in this country, to the detriment of no one, and to the benefit of all. The fans who support the game, the ball players who do the playing, the hundreds of communities, and the men who direct it, all benefit. Then the heavens caved in. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice called the major-league officials into Washington during the summer of 1949 and said:

> Rule 1 (d) is in violation of the antitrust laws of this country. Either repeal it or we will bring suit against organized baseball as a law violator.

Baseball always has prided itself upon being obedient to the law. As the national game of our Republic, it has assumed most seriously the responsibility to uphold its country's laws. So, without a moment's hesitation, it repealed that rule when asked to do so by the Justice Department. The minor leagues were stunned by the action, but they were helpless. They feared the worst, and the worst has happened. The Justice Department did not see fit to confer with any official of the 59 minor leagues, or with the officers of their association. Their rights and their views were ignored as the ground was laid for their destruction by that cruel and arbitrary order of the Justice Department.

Most certainly rule 1 (d) is reasonable, and most emphatically it is vital to the very existence of the minor leagues. Whether it is illegal is something else. After long and careful study and consultation with able counsel, I believe that the Federal courts possibly might hold that rule 1 (d) is in violation of the letter of the antitrust laws, but most certainly it cannot be in violation of the spirit of those very necessary laws. I desire to make it plain that I believe wholeheartedly in the antimonopoly laws of the United States. I do not want to weaken them; I want to strengthen them. In my mind, rule 1 (d) does no violence to the antitrust laws; but, until the Federal courts speak, one can only guess as to the legality of rule 1 (d). Baseball, itself, has no stomach for a lawsuit, so the matter has no chance to reach the courts.

For 3 years, the minors have tried to work out with the majors some satisfactory solution, but with no success whatsoever. Good legal counsel has advised that if rule 1 (d) is illegal, the door is closed for any effective relief through a baseball rule. If any agreement by baseball to protect itself brings upon it the ugly charge of conspiracy, then nothing can be done.

The minor leagues find themselves in the anomalous and ridiculous circumstance and situation of being destroyed by major-league monopoly under the antitrust laws of the United States enacted primarily to eliminate monopoly. In this particular case, the antitrust laws impose monopoly instead of protecting against it. The suit in the Federal court recently tried in Philadelphia has some bearing on the problem, but it did not and does not meet baseball's dilemma foursquare. Moreover, a decision in that suit is not likely for many months, and whatever the decision may be in the trial court, both sides have indicated that eventually the case may go to the Supreme Court, which means years before a final decision.

Consequently, because of the importance to the people of the United States of preserving baseball as its great national sport, I plead with Congress to act now. That would seem to be the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

better way out of a most difficult and trying situation.

Ford Frick, the commissioner of organized baseball, has publicly stated:

> Destroy the minors and you destroy the majors.

A more realistic statement could not be made. Without a healthy minor-league system to train ball players and provide them with experience, baseball talent in the majors would drop far below present standards.

In December of 1952, Commissioner Frick appointed a committee of two representatives from the National League, two from the American League, and two from the minor leagues; also George M. Trautman, president of the Minor League Association; Clarence Rowland, president of the Pacific Coast League; and Commissioner of Baseball Ford Frick. Frank C. Lane, Chicago White Sox, and George M. Weiss, New York Yankees, represent the American League. Chub Feeney, New York Giants, and William Walsingham, St. Louis Cardinals, represent the National League; and Frank Shaughnessy, president of the International League, and I, president of the Western League, represent the minor leagues. Mr. Frick has asked us to submit a report by July 7, 1953, of the effect of TV and radio on baseball and to make recommendations to meet this serious problem. We are making a survey of the injury caused to baseball by TV and radio but we have made no progress toward a solution.

Furthermore, if organized baseball is to be played only in the great metropolitan centers of population, baseball would wither and die on the vine, for baseball is and forever should be kept an American grassroots institution. Indeed, any institution laying claim to being the great national sport of America must be kept a grassroots institution. America does not consist merely of a handful of great cities. America has tens of thousands of very well-defined communities. America is all of that vast area between the Atlantic and Pacific, including the wide-open spaces which many of us love and in which we take much justifiable pride. Big-city monopoly of baseball in this country is unthinkable. But unless rule 1 (d) is restored, such a monopoly will continue in its mad path of destruction.

Every year, beginning in 1949, the Association of Minor Leagues in their Annual Convention has tried to solve the problem and avert the destruction facing them by the adoption of some rule that would satisfy the Justice Department, but absolutely no progress has come from these strenuous efforts. Unless Congress comes to our rescue we are through.

Accordingly, I have introduced a bill which simply says that the language of baseball's old rule 1 (d) is not illegal. My bill does not direct baseball to do anything. It does not regiment it; it does not regulate it; and it does not interfere with it. It merely makes baseball's own rule to eliminate one serious phase of major-league monopoly effective if the major leagues want to reenact it and use it. There is nothing more and nothing less to my bill. The rule was reasonable and necessary when it was adopted voluntarily by baseball years ago. It is reasonable and necessary today. Its repeal, as ordered by the Justice Department, acting in good faith as I firmly believe, is destroying the minor leagues. Therefore, this rule ought to be restored and only Congress can restore it. In doing so it would be striking a telling blow against one very serious phase of monopoly in baseball.

Since what I am proposing is nothing more than permissive legislation, what assurance do I have that the major leagues will avail themselves of it if it is enacted? I can give no positive assurance that the majors will respond by reenacting rule 1 (d) if the Congress acts now, but many major-league officers have told me that they are looking for a legal way to preserve the territorial rights of the minor leagues. I believe their statements are sincere. Many of them admit frankly that each of the major leagues has two or perhaps three clubs that are anxious to sell their TV and radio rights to networks to be broadcast and telecast into the territory of every minor league ball club from one end of the country to the other, regardless of the injury it may do. One minor-league-club owner suggests that "the major leagues are the only animals who devour their own young." But the majority of the major leagues realize how destructive to the minors this policy is proving to be, and, therefore, they want the legal right to protect the minors. If Congress will provide a legal way by which this can be done, I feel certain the major leagues will jump at the chance to reenact rule 1 (d). The overwhelming majority of the majors believe wholeheartedly in the policy of live and let live.

Incidentally, I am quite shocked, as I know other persons will be, to learn that the Justice Department has not been content to compel the major leagues to repeal rule 1 (d). During recent months the FBI has sent questionnaires to the major-league front offices asking for a report on their sale of telecasts and broadcasts. This I have been told by four major-league clubs. This week one major-league-club manager wrote me as follows:

> While you are campaigning to try and get major-league ball clubs to restrict their broadcasts, by radio and television, into minor-league territory, the Department of Justice is still engaged in harassing major-league clubs because of the mild restrictions which some of them now impose or did impose last year on the rights to broadcast or televise their games. As you know, this is a real busy time around baseball offices, but we have all had to stop everything else, and try to dig up some complicated information on broadcasting and telecasting for the Department of Justice.

I have said, frankly, that the Department of Justice was acting in good faith when, without supporting authority of Congress, it frowned upon the language in rule 1 (d). I do not hold that against them, but when they use their own offices to harass baseball and try to compel them to go ahead with the job of finishing off the minor leagues, I think they go too far. Their talents should be more fruitfully employed.

In the long run, my bill will not injure TV or radio or the programs of broadcasting or telecasting, and it will not in any way impede the progress of the art of communications. In fact, if rule 1 (d) is reenacted and made effective, there will be more telecasting and broadcasting of better baseball than if we continue the present ruinous policy of destroying the minor leagues by the continual invasion of minor league territory by the majors through radio and TV. Radio and TV, properly used, can help and have helped baseball. The restoration of rule 1 (d) will, of course, stop network broadcast and telecasts of major league baseball into minor league territory, but it will promote minor league broadcasts and telecasts by minor league clubs in their own territory, and that will be good for radio and TV, and it will promote community spirit everywhere, which is essential to radio and television and to America. I can think of nothing worse for everyone than to make our whole country dependent on a dozen large cities for anything, including sports. Decentralization of American life is in the interest of all of us.

My bill does not affect the nationwide or network telecasting and broadcasting of the All Star game in July and the World Series games at the end of the season.

The networks that want to exploit major league baseball in every minor league park throughout the country, to the detriment of the minor league clubs, will be stopped by the restoration of rule 1 (d), but in the overall picture that will be a good thing for them and for everyone else.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Colorado, should his bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill affects television and radio. Therefore, it should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. However, I should like to have hearings held on the bill in that committee, and if thereafter the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the Senator from North Dakota is chairman, wants to consider the bill I shall be very glad, of course, to have the bill referred to his committee to see if anything that is not in the public interest has been done to the antitrust laws.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished acting majority leader, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], has suggested that, after all, the effect might be the overruling of a decision by the Supreme Court.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not believe the effect would be the overruling of a decision by the Supreme Court.

Mr. LANGER. That is, as to whether or not professional baseball might be considered a monopoly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it would not do that at all. The bill is a very simple one, and does not go very

far. It would be simply permissive legislation. All it would do would be to make legal a rule which baseball itself adopted a long time ago, and under which it has operated for many years. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice contended that the rule was illegal and that, if baseball did not repeal the rule, the Department would bring a suit to try to compel repeal of the rule; so baseball repealed its own rule. My bill simply would make the rule legal. That is the only effect it would have. All the rule protects is the territorial rights of the minor leagues.

Mr. LANGER. My recollection is that Mr. H. Graham Morison, who was at that time head of the Antitrust Division, gave an opinion that the rule had the effect of creating a monopoly, and he said he would bring a lawsuit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He was speaking with respect to the rule; but the major leagues repealed the rule. He was speaking about rule 1 (d) of baseball. He called in officials of the major leagues, and also "Happy" Chandler, and discussed the matter with them. He did not call in the minor leagues, to ascertain how the rule would affect them. He merely called in the major-league owners and told them to get busy and repeal the rule; that if they did not, he would bring a suit against them. The major leagues repealed the rule, because they did not want to have a suit brought against them. But Mr. Morison brought suit against the National Football League, and the arguments in that suit were completed in Philadelphia only last week.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Colorado is president of the Western League, and of course he knows much more about baseball than any other Senator on the floor. However, my understanding is that the objection to the reserve clause in baseball contracts was that it involved monopolistic practices.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My bill does not have anything to do with the reserve clause. It does not touch the reserve clause at all. It deals only with the one question of major league broadcasting and telecasting of games to minor-league territory. Minor-league territory is described in rule 1 (d), and also described in my bill as an area having a radius of 50 miles from the center of a minor-league ball park. It is merely that small territory. My bill provides that if a major-league club gets the consent of a minor-league club to broadcast into that territory, it can go ahead and do so under rule 1 (d). But if the minor-league club does not give such permission, of course, the broadcasting cannot be done.

But here is the rub. The minor leagues cannot continue to charge for their games and at the same time pay taxes to Uncle Sam, if the major leagues broadcast or telecast baseball games to the people living in a minor-league town without charge to them.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota if the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has finished. I may say that if the Senator from North Dakota desires to have his committee hold hearings on the bill, I shall be very glad to cooperate with him fully.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to propose that there be formed a subcommittee of three members each from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Perhaps something along that line could be worked out.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Personally I speak as a baseball enthusiast; and I even still play when I get a chance, when I am considered good enough for the team. I am very much interested in the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado, and I should like to see accomplished something like that he proposes, so that minor league baseball can be preserved, because necessarily the fields of the minor leagues and junior baseball are the fields from which the major leagues must recruit their baseball players.

However, in view of the answers of the Senator from Colorado to the queries by the senior Senator from North Dakota, I was wondering whether the Senator from Colorado thought the Attorney General was merely bluffing when he got the major league officials to abandon their rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No, I do not think he was bluffing at all. I think he meant what he said when he told them to repeal the rule, or suit would be brought against them. I think he meant it, and they believed he meant it.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator believe it was a question of blackmail, or would the major league owners have run afoul of the law and had to go to court?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know what the court might have decided. No question on that point has ever been decided, so we are entirely without any judicial opinion on the subject. But, as I have said in my remarks today, I am satisfied that rule 1 (d) does not violate the spirit of the antitrust laws. Whether it violates the letter of the antitrust laws, I am not sure. I do not know how the court would decide that question—and it is an interesting question. Some lawyers say that there is no violation of the antitrust laws under rule 1 (d), but the major leagues thought so, and whether they were using it as a good excuse, or whether they grasped that point as something very convenient, so that they could broadcast and telecast more generally, I cannot say. I believe they were acting in good faith. I think they wanted to avoid a lawsuit. Baseball people generally try to avoid lawsuits. They try to keep out of court. I think that was the real situation.

Mr. CASE. It simply occurred to me that if the question involved was not fairly important as a matter of law, the action of the Attorney General amounted more or less either to bluff or blackmail, or there was an act of poor sportsmanship on the part of the major leagues.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I think the Department of Justice was acting in good faith, because after the rule was repealed by the major leagues, the Department did bring a lawsuit against the National Football League. That case, which had been pending for 2 years, was recently tried in Philadelphia. It was not exactly on all fours with the baseball case, but the same question was involved. The National Football League does not have minor-league competition.

Mr. CASE. Has the question, in any form, been before the Senator's committee, so that he would feel in a position to indicate what he thought the prospects were for early, favorable consideration of the bill by his committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I have not canvassed the committee about the question at all, but I think I will have an answer for the Senator very shortly. That is, in 6 weeks I think we will know something about how the committee, how baseball, and how the Department of Justice feel about the matter. All parties interested will be given an opportunity to testify. We will invite the participation of everybody who has an opinion with reference to the subject and let each one state what he wishes to say. I think that in 6 weeks I can give the Senator a pretty good idea of how the bill will be received generally.

Mr. CASE. In concluding my observation, I may say that I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Colorado in yielding. With baseball in the air these days, and with the news coming from the training camps, this is a good time to press the bill, and I hope the Senator from Colorado will take advantage of the situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from South Dakota very much. Of course, I knew of his great interest in baseball, but I did not know about his playing skill; otherwise, I might have tried to sign him up for the Western League. However, now that I know about his ability, I think I will try to interest some of the Western clubs to see what they can do with the Senator from South Dakota. We would regret losing him from the Senate, but if baseball can pay him more, we could not blame him for taking an offer.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the Senator's very kind suggestion. However, in all candor, I think the Senator ought not to be too diligent about that, for it might prove to be embarrassing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is not my desire to promote the Senator out of the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is it not true that if the Senator from South Dakota is as good a ballplayer as he is a Senator, the baseball people will want to sign him up before the sun goes down this afternoon?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. CASE. I doubt that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I believe the Senator from South Dakota will have a great many invitations before the sun sets today.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. President, some day Congress may be compelled to begin looking into the tremendous assistance television and radio are giving to the growth of monopoly in this country. Congress, through the antitrust laws, has tried to eliminate monopoly by placing definite restrictions on the operation and ownership of retail outlets. But the national advertising campaigns of the large American industries are destroying small producers throughout America.

For instance, there is a terrific death struggle going on in this country today between the large and small breweries. The gigantic breweries are buying into baseball, due to baseball's tremendous advertising value to beer. That trend is very bad for baseball. The radio and television networks are rendering great aid to the few very large breweries to destroy the small breweries, just as they have helped major-league baseball destroy minor-league baseball. I am told that 29 local breweries folded last year because of the national advertising campaigns of the big brewers.

Rather than being worried about baseball's earnest effort to respect minor league territorial rights, the Justice Department would do well to make a study of network influence and methods and their impact on the economy of America.

I hope everyone understands my solid devotion to TV and radio. To me, these fantastic and phenomenal miracles have done more to educate, inform, and entertain young and old than all of the other creations of science together. I have been their friend and I will continue to support their wholesome aspirations always. However, their progress does not depend upon the destruction by them of other American institutions. They need not climb to the pinnacle over the dead bodies of victims. I am sure that a careful weighing of the merits of my bill will clearly reveal the long-range benefits radio and TV will derive from this legislation. We must remember that there are more than 2,000 radio stations and eventually there will be more than 2,000 television stations, each of them fostering and promoting individual American communities, and that is good for America. America is more than its mammoth centers of population.

A vote for my bill to restore baseball's rule 1 (d) will prove a great boon to America's great national pastime and sport.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an address on this subject which I delivered in New York City on February 1, 1953, at a banquet attended by sports editors and writers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED IN NEW YORK CITY, FEBRUARY 1, 1953, BY EDWIN C. JOHNSON, TO THE SPORTS EDITORS' AND WRITERS' BANQUET

Mr. Chairman, it is a great honor to be a guest of the sports editors and scribes of the world's foremost metropolis, the beautiful city of New York.

Up to this moment I have enjoyed with you every minute of your lovely banquet and great show, but now I hope you will indulge me in a bit of pessimism. Some of my baseball friends say I am an alarmist. Well, maybe, but I recall that Paul Revere was an alarmist, too. He warned the American patriots that the red coats were coming and then the shot for liberty was fired that was heard around the world. I hope that you, with your usual patience, will permit me to sound the alarm of an approaching crisis in baseball.

All is not well in baseball. Fortunately, this celebrated sport has a true weather vane and a dependable barometer. When this barometer is busy it sings a cheerful note and everyone is happy, but when it is silent the whole atmosphere is filled with gloom. The barometer I speak of is the turnstiles in the baseball parks.

The year 1952 was the most prosperous this Nation has ever experienced. More people were employed than ever before. Folks had more money to spend and they spent more than at any time in history. They trampled one another to get to the racetracks where their wagers registered a new high watermark. But baseball, the great national sport of America, has shown a decline of 40 percent in its paid admissions since 1948.

What has gone wrong? The answer is that baseball no longer believes in "live and let live." Greed, avarice, and a reckless disregard for the rights of its associates and colleagues has raised its ugly head in high places in baseball. A new word of two letters—"TV"—has raised hades.

If the majors are determined to commit major league hara-kiri, the minor leagues cannot do much about it. What they do to their own is their business and not ours. If they give up control of their revenues at the ball parks for the 30 pieces of silver of a TV sponsor who intends only to exploit them and who will drop them like a dead mackerel the moment their drawing power subsides, if they are determined to make that God-awful decision, then the minors can only pity their shortsightedness in grasping for the "fast buck."

If that were the end of the story I would not be pleading with them tonight to consider well their tragic policy, but alas it is only the beginning of the trip over Niagara Falls.

Now a very smooth salesman is going from club to club among the majors feeding them soft soap and promises of big cash returns. When this TV salesman tells them more and more TV is the cure for the shrink in their admissions, he does not tell them that TV is the direct cause of their poor gates in the first place; something they are too stubborn to admit to themselves. He coos to them about the money out in the country. He leads them to believe that there is a role of bills big enough to choke a cow growing on every blade of grass out there at the grass roots. He says to them "TV and I will put your game in every minor-league city in the United States and all you need do is bank the cash." So Paul Revere cries in the night, "Minor leagues, wake up, the majors are no longer satisfied with the bloodletting in the major leagues, they are conniving with a supersalesman to bleed the minor leagues to death, too." This bold and clever salesman is even trying to bribe the minor leagues to invite the majors to come into minor-league territory with major-league TV. He has the audacity to suggest three or four hundred dollars a year to each minor-league club for this "game of the week" each Saturday. His is a foot-in-the-door proposal. Once the minors agree to 1 day a week his enterprising competitors will take a day a week too and it will be 7 days a week and Mr. Minor League will fold his tent and, like the ancient Arab, steal silently into the night, bankrupt and betrayed.

Last Thursday night in Boston at a sportswriters' banquet like this I heard Ford Frick, the wise and alert commissioner of baseball, speak these solemn and significant words: "Destroy the minors and you destroy the majors."

The professional-football people are crying because they have no professional football farm clubs to carry part of their personnel load. I wonder if the major baseball leagues really appreciate what a blessing minor-league baseball is to them.

The three New York clubs have the most lucrative baseball territory in the entire world. There is nothing that begins to compare with it anywhere. Why are they not satisfied with this baseball bonanza? Why should they covet the baseball pennies in Toronto, Dallas, Denver, and Seattle? They murdered in cold blood in their own backyard Newark and Jersey City, once prosperous minor-league cities. Now they seem determined to wreck every minor-league club in the entire country.

Since America's great game was created at Cooperstown, some spectators have wanted to see baseball for free. Knotholes have been enlarged in the fence, and Annie Oakleys have been in great demand. Something for nothing is an oldtimer in this business. Now the salesman for stemwinder cigarettes and humdinger beer has found a way to give them free baseball. And put this in your cigarette and smoke it. They don't give away their product. They give away your ball games.

Not only is it to be free but he will take it to them in their own home. On a hot night they tell him, take off your shoes, crawl into the old family rocker in your own home, light up a coffin nail, pour yourself a mug of liquid yeast, and enjoy a major-league baseball game. Why fight your way to the minor-league park, dig up 90 cents apiece for you and your wife, to watch a lot of youngsters fighting their hearts out when the majors will bring a classy ball game right into your own house? The answer is he won't and he doesn't.

Television today is pretty crude alongside of what will be available in a very short time. There were 108 stations in 1951; 169 additional stations were licensed in 1952; 200 will be licensed in 1953; and every year thereafter 200 additional stations will be licensed until the Nation will have 3,000 TV stations with antennas on almost every dwelling throughout the length and breadth of this land. Forty- and fifty-inch screens will be commonplace. Color television which improves the image 100 percent is ready to come out of the laboratory. The three-dimension picture will be here too. It makes the televised ball games so realistic that you will jump right out of your rocking chair and try to grab for yourself a souvenir when you think the ball is heading your way.

The owner of one of the major-league clubs is supposed to have said to one of baseball's greatest managers: "Make up your mind, Hollywood or baseball." This major-league owner lived a year or so too soon. Not a year too soon since Tallulah is taking over the Giants tonight. Soon the cry will be, "Hollywood, send us some artists, directors, and producers to stage the world series." If the Yankees keep on winning the pennant, doubtless they will sell Yankee Stadium and construct a new and beautiful baseball studio with green grass, green shrubs, and green trees laid out by the ablest Hollywood landscape artist in the world and there the world series will be staged. A small grandstand will be built that will hold a hundred or so curious creatures who want to hear the production manager yell "cut" when Yogi Berra loses one in the shrubbery.

Won't some enterprising pencil artist write a new baseball song, "Take Me Out to the Movie" so we can junk that old classic, "Take Me Out to the Ball Game"?

Last year, when the Celler committee explored the possibility of monopoly in baseball, the minor league's president and his officers made tracks to Washington and argued long

and loud that there was no monopoly in baseball. We told this committee that we were all one big, happy family working together in harmony and understanding to serve well the public interest in America's great game and that everyone, big and little, players and clubs alike, were treated fairly and justly. I can speak for myself only, but if the major leagues indiscriminately invade the territory of the minors with television as they have with radio, I for one will testify before God and Congress that major-league organized baseball is a cruel and heartless monopoly motivated only by avarice and greed, determined to rule or ruin anything or anyone who gets in its path.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, today I am introducing three bills designed to correct some provisions of the present law, which have created hardships and inequalities among some of our veterans.

One of these bills is designed to reenact the long-established policy of paying pensions for service-connected partial disability commensurate with the percentage of disability.

Because the rising cost of living does not discriminate between veterans who have less than 50 percent disability and those who have greater than 50 percent disability, I feel that all eligible veterans should be paid a pension commensurate with their disability. Under that system, which has worked successfully for many years, any increases in payment would apply proportionately to all veterans receiving pensions.

The other two bills which I am introducing pertain to national service life insurance.

One of the bills will assure dependents the right of appeal to the courts whenever a controversy arises as to whether or not a timely application for a waiver of premium payments has been made.

Under the present law there are certain exemptions to the National Service Insurance Act of 1940, whereby premium payments may be waived. These recognized exceptions occur when circumstances beyond the veteran's control prevents his timely application for a premium waiver as when a veteran dies during a period of permanent disability of less than 6 months' duration. However, as the law is now written, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may determine whether or not the veteran or the veteran's dependents have made a timely application for a premium payment waiver and if the Administrator's determination is in the negative the contention arises that such determination, being discretionary, is final and judicial review to determine whether or not the application is timely should not be allowed.

The question as to whether or not a timely application has been filed is a matter of proof and in the event a controversy arises between the applicants and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs it should be settled by the courts.

The other measure which also deals with national service life insurance would restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance.

Prior to April 25, 1951, insurable World War I veterans, who served between October 6, 1917, and July 2, 1921, could obtain new United States Government life insurance, and insurable World War II veterans, who served between October 8, 1940, and September 2, 1945, could obtain new mutual national service life insurance. Public Law 23, 82d Congress, removed that right.

I believe that veterans who can qualify for insurance under those acts should not be excluded from obtaining such insurance.

I submit the three bills relating to veterans' affairs for proper reference.

There being no objection, the bills introduced by Mr. MALONE were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

S. 1405. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure the right to judicial review;

S. 1406. A bill to revise the basis for certain disability compensation awards; and

S. 1407. A bill to restore the right of certain veterans to apply for insurance.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what I am about to say gives me no joy, and will give me none. I speak not out of partisanship, not out of rancor, or personal feeling, but out of a sense of duty to my country and to the people of America; not with bitterness, or with anger, but with sadness. I wish I did not have to say these things, but events coerce me.

If ever the people of a republic by their votes demanded a specific change in their Government, the people of the United States of America by their votes last November demanded that the State Department be cleaned out. This is one job the people have expected would be done promptly and thoroughly; and they have had a right to expect this.

To the people of the United States, and to my colleagues in the Senate of the United States, I say, the job is not being done. And to those in power, who are not doing this job or who are preventing it from being done, I say, the people of America have made known their will in this matter, and if the job they have demanded is not done, and well done, the people will not hesitate to speak again.

Those who today resist the doing of this job are only fighting a delaying action; for a thorough housecleaning in the Department of State cannot now be avoided. It can be delayed, yes; certain of those who should be swept out can be protected, for a little while; but in the end, the job must be done, and will be done. The people of this Nation have put their minds to it, and the eventual outcome is sure. Those who thwart the will of the people for even a little time will be held answerable for their actions.

Mr. President, I will not go into detail here this morning; but I must mention a few points so that the burden of my remarks will be perfectly clear.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate, after a thorough and painstaking investigation, filed one of the most carefully documented reports ever presented to this body; and in that report unanimously found that the Institute of Pacific Relations was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives; and that over a period of years John Carter Vincent was the principal fulcrum of IPR pressures and influence in the State Department. The loyalty Review Board found reasonable doubt of his loyalty. But the present Secretary of State reversed the Loyalty Review Board which had passed on Mr. Vincent's case, and the record stands that John Carter Vincent has been officially cleared with respect to both loyalty and security. This man who admitted that he deliberately influenced the course and direction of the mission of Henry Wallace to Soviet Asia, who wrote the original drafts of two of the three documents which became the directive that sent Gen. George Marshall to China with the impossible mission of seeking a coalition between the National Government of China and the Communists; this man who wrote documents that followed almost slavishly the recommendations of Owen Lattimore; this man who admitted the basic responsibility for instructions by the military, at the instance of the State Department, which were directly contrary to the recommendations transmitted by General Wedemeyer—this man, John Carter Vincent, has been completely cleared by the Secretary of State, and allowed to retire with honor.

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee made just two recommendations with regard to departmental activity. One of those recommendations was that the Department of Justice submit to a grand jury the question of whether perjury was committed before the subcommittee by Owen Lattimore. The other recommendation was that the Department of Justice submit to a grand jury the question of whether perjury was committed before the subcommittee by John P. Davies, Jr.

The Lattimore case has been submitted to a grand jury, under the orders of a former attorney general, and the grand jury returned an indictment charging perjury. The Davies case has not been submitted to a grand jury, and it seems evident there is no intention it shall be so submitted. John Patton Davies, Jr., is still a trusted employee of the State Department, holding a position of honor and influence, in an extremely sensitive post. This man, whose work over a span of many years advanced the interests of the Chinese Communists, who carried messages for known Communists, who recommended that the Central Intelligence Agency use known Communists for policy guidance, and then lied about the matter before a Senate committee—this man seems even more firmly entrenched than ever in his job and in his influence and in the respect and trust of his present superiors in the State Department. I do not know what the Secretary of State knows about Mr. Davies; perhaps not all he should; but the Under Secretary of State for policy matters knows that Mr. Davies is a security risk, and knows that Mr. Davies' value to the State Department and to this country is a negative factor. And yet the State Department does nothing at all about the Davies case.

Mr. President, when the Senate passed the Immigration and Nationality Act of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

1952—the much-maligned, so-called McCarran-Walter Act—it was provided that there should be established in the Department of State a new bureau of security, and that the head of this bureau of security should report directly to the Secretary. One of the purposes of creating this new job was to make it possible for the person holding the job to have a direct line of authority to the Secretary, with no intermediaries, in order that he might have the actual power to do the clean-up job which was and is necessary. Well-intentioned clean-up efforts of security officials in the State Department have failed in the past because communication between the security official and the Secretary was fouled up. There was and is, in the State Department, a clique which has in the past protected both persons who were loyalty risks and persons who were security risks, and which today is protecting such persons, in both categories. This is a clique which has gathered to itself the reins of power over a period of many years; which has held Secretaries of State virtually captive; a clique which has been able to prevent a new Secretary of State from ever effectively taking over his responsibilities, by the simple device of keeping him jumping from conference to conference, mostly outside the country, while a subordinate did the real job of running the State Department. I am sorry to say it is clearly apparent this clique has not yet been defeated; but has, on the contrary, just won one of its greatest victories.

The new position of head of the Bureau of Security, to which I have referred, very recently was filled through an outstanding appointment. Into this new post was placed a fine young man, with a background and a record of exceptional ability and outstanding service to his country; a young man of high loyalty and fidelity to duty. It was announced, and it was understood by all concerned, that this young man would have the job of cleaning out the State Department, and that he would be given a free hand in the doing of that job. He started out well, and for a few short days no one interfered with him, and he began to get some results. Then there came to his desk an important case; the case of a man proposed for an important ambassadorship.

I shall not mince words, Mr. President; I refer to the case of Mr. Charles Bohlen, sometimes called "Chip" Bohlen. This case came to the desk of Mr. McLeod, the new head of the Bureau of Security; and with the case came the report of an FBI investigation—astonishingly enough, the first such investigation ever made of Mr. Bohlen, in spite of the many positions of importance which he has held in the past. On the basis of the information thus furnished to him, Mr. President, Mr. McLeod concluded that he could not clear Mr. Bohlen. He reported this conclusion to the Secretary of State. I do not know, Mr. President, what the Secretary of State told the Committee on Foreign Relations; but I am confident he did not tell the committee that Mr. McLeod had reported to him that he, McLeod, could not clear Bohlen. The current understanding is that the Secretary of State told the Foreign Relations Committee the FBI report cleared Mr. Bohlen completely. If that is what he did say, he said it knowing that his own security chief, the man brought into the Department to do the job of cleaning out the Department, had reported he could not clear Mr. Bohlen, on the basis of the FBI report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOBEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nevada know whether Mr. McLeod was called by the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether he was. I understood he had not been.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nevada hold to the point of view that if the action he has just described to the Senate had taken place within the State Department, Mr. McLeod should be called by the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is my judgment that he should be called.

Mr. President, Mr. Dulles has been quoted in the press as saying that Mr. Bohlen is "uniquely qualified" and "the best available person we could think of with the qualifications desired by the Eisenhower administration." Mr. President, if Mr. Dulles said that, he said it knowing that the expert selected to be top man in the State Department on security questions, and so selected because of his training in evaluation of security reports, had reported that he was unable to clear Mr. Bohlen.

Here we have a situation in which a man trained to evaluate, and hired because of that training, and who spent many years doing just that, was appointed to the State Department to continue in his chosen field and to clean up a situation which badly needs cleaning up. Yet it is reported that when this gentleman, exercising the duties for which he was hired, reached a valid conclusion sustained by facts in the file available to him, and conveyed that conclusion to the Secretary, the Secretary, rather than welcoming the information, summarily told him that he could not substitute himself for the Secretary of State; and this in spite of the fact that Mr. Dulles has made it quite clear on the public record that he regards his job as policy, not operational.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield again to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nevada know whether the information in regard to the McLeod-Dulles conversations was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Nevada inclined to share my view that if this incident has not been submitted, it should be?

Mr. McCARRAN. I certainly think it should be.

Mr. President, no attempt was made by Mr. McLeod to take over the prerogatives of the Secretary of State. Mr. McLeod was only expressing the judgment for which he was hired, when he conveyed his recommendations in this matter to the Secretary. Yet Mr. McLeod's judgment was summarily overridden.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield again to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my interpretation of the remarks of the Senator from Nevada when I conclude that Mr. McLeod went through the FBI file, and that Mr. Dulles went through the FBI file, and that Mr. Dulles arrived at a conclusion opposite to that arrived at by Mr. McLeod, in regard to this particular nominee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am unable to state what Mr. Dulles went through.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Nevada does not know whether Mr. Dulles went through the FBI file?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, and I do not know what he stated before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. My knowledge is based entirely on the newspaper stories; but I read in the press a story to the effect that Mr. Dulles testified before the Foreign Relations Committee that he found nothing in the FBI file that would justify any conclusion that Mr. Bohlen was disqualified for security reasons.

Does the Senator from Nevada recall reading such stories?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not recall reading a story to that effect. I do recall reading a statement by the Secretary of State as to his having had or having seen the FBI file; but I do not recall the substance of it now, and I do not pretend to quote from his statement before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. I do not, either; I simply quote from the newspaper story regarding what Mr. Dulles said.

Mr. McCARRAN. In any event, the attitude of the security officer selected for that purpose under the law should have been made known to the Foreign Relations Committee, and he should have appeared before the committee, in order that he might give it the benefit of what he found from the FBI file.

Mr. MORSE. My earlier question was designed to elicit whether that was the conclusion of the Senator from Nevada.

If the fact should develop that Mr. McLeod and Mr. Dulles reached contrary conclusions from an inspection of the FBI file, is there any precedent of which the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee is aware for calling officials of the FBI before the committee, to testify to the extent they may care to, or would be prone to, as to the implications of the file?

Mr. McCARRAN. I know of no precedent for that. But the chairman of a committee which has a nomination before it has, according to the precedents, the right to see the FBI file. For years, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I had the FBI files handed to me, and usually took them home for Saturday night and Sunday reading, in the case of every nomination which came before the Judiciary Committee. I am quite certain that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has the same right.

Mr. President, what Mr. McLeod does about this matter is, of course, up to him, and I have no knowledge what his course will be. My expectation is that either he will be given a free hand to do the job for which he was hired, or else he will refuse to continue to accept any responsibility for doing that job.

However that may be, the fact remains that when the first clear test came, in an important case, under the new setup which the American people had been told was going to guarantee that the State Department would be cleaned out, the decision was against the will of the people, and against the facts, and in full accordance with the same old line of coverup which we have learned in the past to expect from the State Department.

I am informed, and I believe reliably informed—and this is solely on information—that in at least one other instance the Secretary of State has reversed an action taken by Mr. McLeod. I refer to the case of a State Department official whose file shows by his own admission that he is unfit to serve because of a personal characteristic; a man who was sent a summary letter of discharge as soon as Mr. McLeod examined the file and found this admission in it. My information is that the Secretary of State has since stated that this official has only been recalled for questioning and has indicated that the questioning concerns only a minor matter. I withhold the name of the official in this case because I have not confirmed all the facts.

Mr. President, I do not often on the Senate floor indulge in guesses. When I do guess out loud in the Senate, I will always label the guess as a guess. My guess is that the suggestion for the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Russia did not originate with the President of the United States, but rather that it came to him from the State Department. Yet I do not believe it came from the Secretary of State himself to the President. I think it came to Mr. Dulles from the President; and I think I could name the man who made the suggestion to the President. I will not do so, because as I have said this is a guess; but if my guess is wrong, I should be very glad to have those who were parties to the matter, and who know the facts, state them publicly.

Mr. President, the situation with which I have dealt for the past few minutes is one of the gravest possible concern to the Nation and to the American people. I shall not labor this matter. I have taken the floor today because events forced me to the conclusion that it was my duty to speak out. For years I had the privilege of being chairman of the Internal Security Committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I went into the details of these matters, so much so that they linger with me night and day.

The situation with regard to Mr. Bohlen's fitness is the acid test which the new administration must face, and face squarely, if they intend to carry out what they have expressed as a mandate from the people of the United States.

I neither make nor imply any criticism of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations or the members of that committee for their action in approving the nomination of Mr. Bohlen. On the basis of the facts as they knew them and the representations made before the committee by the Secretary of State, they acted in accordance with their consciences. But, Mr. President, in the light of the facts as we now know them, the Senate of the United States should refuse to pass on this appointment until there is made available, for the inspection of any Senator who desires to see it, the full and complete FBI file on this nominee.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor and proceeded to address the Senate on the general subject of natural resources, when he was interrupted by

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my rights to the floor, I should like to yield at this point to my good friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], with the understanding that his remarks and insertions in the RECORD will follow my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Senate on the subject of the rules of procedure of committees. His remarks appear after the conclusion of Mr. MORSE'S speech.)

Mr. MORSE resumed and concluded his speech, which, entire, is as follows:

THE NEW WILSON PLAN: CHEAP DAMS AND EXPENSIVE POWER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is the third in a series of speeches in the Senate on the general subject of our natural resources and how they are to be developed and preserved for the benefit of all the people and not for a privileged or monopolistic few.

In my first talk of this series, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 13, 1953—a Friday—I discussed the electric power policy of Congress from the opening of the century to date. In that speech I also discussed the legislative principle which Congress has enunciated with respect to electric power.

In my second speech, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 27, 1953—which by some odd chance was also a Friday—I discussed the coordinated campaign which the private utilities are employing in order to discredit public power, and I pointed out that these campaigns are conducted with the assistance of funds that come from the bills paid by the consumers of electricity.

SELLING THE PEOPLE'S POWER PROJECTS

For some time in Washington and throughout the country, there have been proposals that the Federal Government should sell its Federal power projects to the private utilities.

Sometimes those who would raid these Federal installations have been very subtle; often they propose that the Government should develop the power and sell it to the private utilities at the bus bar. Regardless of the language employed, these suggestions have identical aims—the throttling, once and for all, of the effective yardstick of public generation of power so that the private electric utilities can have the monopoly field all to themselves.

CHARLES E. WILSON'S REMARKS

The statement that the Government should sell its Federal generating facilities to the private utilities has gone far beyond the stage of mere private conversation. There has been a definite suggestion by an outstanding businessman of our country which, if carried out, would produce that result. I refer to the remarks of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, formerly the president of the General Electric Co. The fact that Mr. Wilson was a former Director of Defense Mobilization has given a certain atmosphere of respectability to his shocking proposal. As a student of politics, I have been interested to note how carefully and artfully such astonishing plans are sprung upon the American people. The private utilities have not yet had the audacity to make such a proposal. Therefore, it comes with more grace to have an outstanding industrialist carry the ball for them.

Where did Mr. Wilson make such a proposal and exactly what did he say?

On September 16, 1952, there was a luncheon held by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York. From their literature, we learned that this luncheon "opened a national program designed to win public support of an effort to modernize Government regulation of the railroads."

However, the above-mentioned Mr. Charles E. Wilson presented an address at this meeting called Big Government and Little People.

BIG GOVERNMENT AND LITTLE PEOPLE

Mr. Wilson is much too subtle a citizen to say that the Government should sell its Federal power projects to the private utilities—that would be a little too raw. So, let us examine his exact language:

> Our national debt today is approaching $270 billion. Suppose we could cut that by about 10 percent?
>
> * * * * *
>
> The public power and water projects and similar enterprises that we have built are book valued at approximately 10 percent of our national debt. They are sound and going businesses, and they are serving an important public need. We have never argued the need—just the method. But they are operating under the big government concept, which has never in history proved itself an intelligent and efficient operator of any business.

We should not lose sight of the implications and significance of the words "and similar enterprises" in the paragraph last quoted. They tell an alarming story, for as we shall see, $27 billion includes national assets far in excess of the existing Federal power projects; it could include public-housing projects, the properties employed in the atomic-energy program, and the facilities of the Post Office Department.

Before going on with Mr. Wilson's further remarks, we should glance briefly at what he has stated above. In contrast to the private utilities who said

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

at the outset that the Federal Government could never operate such projects at all, or successfully, we find Mr. Wilson admitting publicly that these Federal projects "are sound and going businesses."

In contrast to the private utilities who have long proclaimed that there was no necessity for the Federal Government entering this field, Mr. Wilson tells us the truth when he says:

They are serving an important public need.

These concessions are highly significant for they demonstrate beyond any doubt what the advocates of Federal power have always contended, that the Federal Government had the brains and the ability to do an essential big job, and to do it well.

In view of his concession, Mr. Wilson blithely gallops off in two directions simultaneously, which normal men cannot do. I admire his prowess, but not his logic.

SELLING OUR NATIONAL DAMS

From the foregoing generalities, Mr. Wilson now asks this question:

What is wrong with selling our national dams, generating equipment, and distribution facilities to the people?

Very clever, Mr. President, and very good political soap salesmanship, of the type to which we became accustomed in the late campaign. There is still time for the people to whom Mr. Wilson refers in this sales talk to see through the big-lie technique which is fast taking over American politics.

Knowing Mr. Wilson's rare industrial understanding, he must have had his tongue in his cheek when he asked what would be wrong with a sale of the Federal power sites to the people. His misgivings were demonstrated in the language of the very next sentence following his statement of the question. He remarked:

Immediately this will be attacked, I know, by a lot of those people who will say that we are thereby trying to give these facilities to Wall Street.

But Mr. Wilson assures us that this is not a fact. He says:

The potential buyers are all around us. They are exactly the millions of our fellow Americans we want to reach, the same people who need to learn about and understand the true democracy and strength of the American competitive system. They are the people who own Government bonds.

The soothing words which Mr. Wilson gives us should not lull us into a false sense of security. He would have us believe, apparently, that American citizens from all walks of life—laboring men, housewives, white collar workers, widows, elderly retired people, possibly orphans, the little people of this country—would be the real owners of these Federal power projects. This charming thought has little to support it by way of reality. In order to get at the true facts of potential ownership and operation of these Federal projects, let us consider the ownership of the Federal debt. According to the July 1952 midyear Economic Report of the President, the following is the estimated ownership of the Federal debt as of January 1952:

Owners of Federal debt:	Debt in billions
Federal agencies	$42.7
State and local governments	9.7
Commercial banks	62.1
Federal Reserve banks	22.7
Nonbank corporations and associations	58.9
Individuals	63.7
Total	259.8

Mr. Wilson would have done the people of this Nation a favor had he pointed out that under his plan the real owners and operators of these Federal projects would be those who control the private utilities of this country. They would be the financial institutions, insurance companies, investment trusts, and the wealthy individuals who have the means to raise the billions of dollars with which to purchase such enormous Federal projects. Furthermore, if we recall what the Government encountered when it sold its oil pipelines after World War II, we have a preview of what a bonanza the promoters would hit in working out such a sale as Wilson proposes.

THE WILSON PLAN BECOMES EPIDEMIC

Mr. Wilson's proposal appears to have been music to the ears of those who would join in taking from the people of this country assets which were acquired through years of planning and building. Not long after Mr. Wilson talked to the industry group in New York, Mr. David Lawrence's U. S. News & World Report came out with an article in the September 26, 1952, issue entitled "How To End Socialism in the United States." An early paragraph of this article contained the loaded statement:

A plan is being offered to denationalize that part of industry in this country that now is socialized. That plan will be explored, and may get a try, if Republicans control the White House and Congress after next January 20.

Mr. President, this constant repetition of a falsehood, this constant driving away, in rhythmical fashion, at public opinion, this great fallacy about public power being "creeping socialism"—a subject which I discussed in my previous speech on natural resources—is having some effect on the country. However, I wish to suggest to the users of that slogan—and much of this Wilson plan is based on it—that they should watch out for the swing of resentment in American public opinion. Once Americans come to wake up to the fact, as they will, that big business is trying to sell them political soap, it will be the liberals, Mr. President, who will be exercising the influence to hold the American people where they must stay—which is in the middle of the road, with a cooperative program between Government and business, whereby the Government participates in the economy only to the extent it becomes necessary to do for the people what needs to be done, but what they cannot do or do so well for themselves.

Mr. President, that is liberal philosophy. We must apply it project by project, and meet the exploiters as they come along with their various proposals to raid the economic interests of the people by such schemes as Wilson is proposing, which contemplate selling to private interests the people's power projects, Government operation of which, I say, must continue if the people are to be protected from the exploitation of monopolistic enterprise which is coming to characterize the private utilities of America.

The full potentialities of Mr. Wilson's proposal are revealed in the following excerpts from the same article:

Now comes Charles E. Wilson, former Defense Mobilizer, former president of General Electric Co., wartime production boss, with a proposal to denationalize the Government's huge investment in the electric-power industry and other enterprises. He would sell to private investors the great Tennessee Valley Authority system, the Columbia River development, Hoover Dam, and other electric-power projects.

Mr. President, would that there could be on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that great liberal to whom I am dedicating this series of speeches on natural resources—the great George Norris, of Nebraska, the father of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the man who for months and years fought on the floor of the Senate, as liberals have found it necessary to do so many times in defense of the people of the United States. Would that he were alive to read a serious proposal to take away from all the American people, by means of a so-called sale, the people's interest in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I read further from the article:

Other suggestions are being made for getting the Government out of business. Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, introduced in the last Congress a bill to study all Federal programs and projects to find out how many could be turned over to State and local governments or to private firms. The Council of State Chambers of Commerce supports the Ferguson plan and suggests that the Post Office might be better operated under private managers. The Atomic Energy Commission holds that the Government monopoly in this field should be relinquished in order to realize all possible benefits from peaceful developments of atomic energy.

* * * * *

Denationalization of Government industry probably would not bring as much as Mr. Wilson estimates, but it would be substantial. The Government does not carry any precise estimate of the value of its business properties, but indications are that they are worth around $14 billion.

Electric-power projects, which Mr. Wilson cites as especially salable, are valued by the Government at around $1.7 billion. This estimate is reached by valuing Interior Department holdings on the same basis that TVA appraises its electric-power property. TVA plants are carried on the books at $700 million. That makes the Interior Department holdings, which have a larger capacity, worth about $1 billion.

Sale of these properties, however, might net more than $1.7 billion. Private utilities are valued at an average of $300 per kilowatt of installed capacity. On that basis, Government plants, with a capacity of 8.1 million kilowatts, would bring around $2.5 billion.

Equally important from the Wilson viewpoint is the prospect that the sale would return the electric industry to private hands.

I am still quoting from the article about Mr. Wilson:

The Government also owns about $1.3 billion worth of housing and community facilities. Much of this property is connected with defense projects, such as the atomic cities at Los Alamos, N. Mex., Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Hanford, Wash. A few properties, however, compete with private owners. The Government probably could release most of this property for sale to private owners.

The Post Office is the country's oldest and most extensive socialized enterprise. This agency seldom is cited as a candidate for sale to private operators, but the State chambers of commerce hold that the Post Office should not be overlooked in any program for disposing of Government-owned businesses.

An organization designated as the Council of State Chambers of Commerce promptly waxed enthusiastic over the same program. Under date of October 7, 1952, it circulated a memorandum from its research office in Washington stating:

It is pleasing to have one of our research studies cited in a magazine of the importance of U. S. News & World Report, but it is more significant to see that the idea of getting Uncle Sam out of the proper fields of business enterprise is beginning to take hold.

In the belief that the attached article from U. S. News & World Report offers encouraging news, we are glad to send along this reprint.

Mr. President, on November 5, 1952, a publication called Pathfinder also enthusiastically endorsed Mr. Wilson's proposal. This magazine informed the public that Mr. Wilson "suggested turning over all Government-owned enterprises—rubber plants, power plants and distribution lines, and atomic-energy plants—to free enterprise."

Some of our elected representatives in Congress have likewise been diligent in supporting, directly or indirectly, this proposal to empty Uncle Sam's pockets.

For example, S. 106, of the 83d Congress, would promote economy and efficiency in the Federal Government by following certain courses of action, some of which are entirely laudable, but tucked away in this proposed statement of congressional policy are "sleeper" provisions, such as the following:

Section 1, subsections (6) and (7):

(6) Eliminating services, functions, and activities more properly within the jurisdiction of State and local governments.

(7) Eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise.

Mr. President, one of the reasons why I was never a New Dealer and one of the reasons why I have stood on the floor of the Senate and have criticized certain pieces of what I call New Deal legislation was that they had embedded in them just such "sleeper" clauses as the ones I have just read from that proposed piece of Republican-sponsored legislation—a piece of legislation which uses very broad terms. Similarly broad terms in past legislation have given rise to the danger of the exercise of capricious discretionary power.

Mr. President, insofar as big government is concerned, the danger in the United States is not that the Government will do for the people what they cannot do for themselves or what they cannot do so well for themselves, in the case of something that needs to be done; but the danger is that there will be a failure to be true to the checks-and-balances system of our Government. This potentiality is inherent in legislation which contains broad grants of power without defined limits and standards.

So, Mr. President, I say that, when carried out to their fullest extent, these policy statements could be employed as the hangman's trap through which several generations of public power facilities could be sent to oblivion.

In the House some very amazing proposals have been made in an endeavor to accomplish the same result. Outstanding illustrations are House Joint Resolution 12, introduced on the opening day of the 83d Congress, and House Joint Resolution 184, of February 12, 1953.

HOW WILSON'S PLAN WOULD WORK

Mr. President, let us go on with this unique Wilson proposal and see how his plan would work. Here are Mr. Wilson's exact words:

Under this plan, bonds could be exchanged for shares of stock in the new companies to spring from the presently Government-owned plants.

Obviously, Mr. Wilson refers to Federal Government bonds.

In short, here would be a bonanza for the security jugglers who could build new financial empires from the profit that could be obtained in selling these priceless Government projects that belong to all the people, and which really should be left as a heritage and a legacy for the American boys and girls who are to come on the American scene in future centuries.

TAXES

Of course, Mr. President, we would expect Mr. Wilson to bring in "the old one" about taxes—tax-free power and water projects, as he calls them. Sure enough, he does so in these words:

Instead of tax-free power and water projects, the new companies would pay taxes approximating a billion yearly.

This misrepresentation—and misrepresentation it is—has been repeated so consistently and so often that I believe the perpetrators of this fraud are now beginning to believe it themselves.

In the first place, many projects like TVA now pay to local, county, and State governments, sums, in lieu of taxes, that are several times the amounts that were paid previously when the private utilities were in the same area.

As an example, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, such payments in lieu of taxes to 7 States and 135 counties in the TVA area totaled $3,036,207; and, during the same period, municipal power boards and cooperative associations which distribute TVA power paid property taxes amounting to $4,333,240, for a total of $7,369,447.

This total was $4,135,655 in excess of the property taxes formerly paid in a comparable period on all reservoir lands and power-producing and distribution property under private ownership. These facts are matters of common knowledge; Mr. Wilson should be fully acquainted with them; and he cannot square with any code of intellectual ethics such a misrepresentation of the facts to the American people.

Moreover, the vastly lowered power rates of Federal power projects have stimulated business and industry to a great extent. These areas now receive overall taxes from property, income, sales, and the wide variety of local taxes that are many, many times greater than the taxes that were paid by private utilities. Likewise, they are vastly more than the taxes that could be paid by private utilities, if such industries did not have the low electric rates made possible by Federal power generation. And Mr. Wilson, as an industrialist, knows that fact, too.

Nor do they mention the wide portions of the area surrounding such Federal projects that suddenly become useful farm land, home, factory, and industrial sites, which also pay vast sums of taxes to the State and local treasuries. No, under the private utility propaganda campaign, all these proven facts are completely ignored.

WHAT THIS MEANS TO AMERICA

Let us strip Mr. Wilson's proposal of all its fancy language and ask ourselves: "Exactly what does this mean to the great majority of little people in this country?"

In the simplest possible language, this fantastic proposal to transfer ownership of Federal power plants to those who own the private utilities is the most effective means they have yet devised to halt the future progress of the United States.

In my earlier speeches, I pointed out that the history of the elevation of the United States from a minor nation to that of world leadership has followed closely upon the stimulus to industry resulting from the development of the vast power resources of the country. If we did not have the essential electric power that was supplied by Federal dams during the last world war to make the additional aluminum, and fabricate the other products that were so essential to winning the war, our problems would have been vastly more difficult. At that time, no one questioned the worth of these Federal projects, nor did anyone question the vital role they were playing in winning that global war. Only when the conflict has ended successfully do they have the temerity to say that these priceless natural resources of the people should be deeded away for all time.

Let us see how this fantastic private utilities' proposal to transfer the Federal power plants—this raid on the Commonwealth—would work in actual practice—exactly what it would mean and cost the American people. In order to do so, I would like to take the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior as a challenging example.

WILSON "PLAN" EFFECT UPON THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROJECTS

First let us consider the capacity of all Federal power plants in kilowatts as of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

June 30, 1952. These are all the hydroelectric projects:

	Kilowatts
U. S. Bureau of Reclamation	[1] 4,181,200
Tennessee Valley Authority (estimated, including steam-generating power)	3,165,850
Bureau of Indian Affairs	22,080
Army Corps of Engineers (marketed by):	
Southwestern Power Administration	157,000
Southeast Power Administration	425,600
Bonneville Power Administration	518,400
U. S. Bureau of Reclamation	85,000
Subtotal	1,186,000
Total	8,555,130

[1] A portion of this capacity is marketed by Bonneville Power Administration.

It is important to keep these facts in mind because the Bureau of Reclamation now has nearly one-half of all the hydrogenerating capacity and approximately one-quarter of the total generating capacity in the area in which it operates. If its program continues along the forecasted course, in 1975 it will still be providing approximately the same portion of the power of the West. This reclamation program in turn currently accounts for half of the Federal Government's power activities, although reclamation operations are restricted by law to the 17 Western States.

POWER COSTS AND REVENUES

As of December 31, 1952, there were 4,609,927 kilowatts of actual hydroelectric-generating capacity existing in plants on United States Bureau of Reclamation projects, or plants whose output was marketed through reclamation. Many of these plants were not complete. The total ultimate capacity of reclamation plants operating, under construction, or authorized as of December 31, 1952, was scheduled at 7,796,877 kilowatts. These plants were elements in 19 reclamation multiple-purpose projects.

Of these 19 projects, the total ultimate construction costs were estimated in December 1952 at $7,776,791,411. Of this total cost, the portion tentatively allocated as the cost of producing commercial power amounted to $1,619,775,851, and the portion tentatively allocated as the cost of irrigation features was $3,834,362,994. Remaining costs were allocated to navigation, flood control, municipal water, and other costs.

The cost of the power facilities of these projects is to be repaid with 3 percent interest from power revenues.

In addition, power revenues are to repay $2,489,558,478 of the irrigation costs and $81,531,058 of the other costs.

The latter figure includes such items as river regulation on the Columbia Basin project and the provision of power facilities reserved for future use on the Central Valley project.

The importance of the foregoing facts is that the power revenues are relied upon for the repayment of $4,190,710,409 of the total $7,776,791,411 program, or slightly more than half. They are to repay $2,489,558,478 of the $3,834,862,994 irrigation program, or approximately two-thirds.

IMPORTANCE OF REVENUES DERIVED FROM POWER

These figures reveal the dependence of the entire reclamation program upon revenues derived from the power facilities of reclamation.

The easier, less expensive irrigation developments have already been built, and only the more complex and expensive ones remain. Thus the irrigation water users will generally be less able in the future than in the past to defray the full costs of remaining developments. Therefore the continued expansion of vital irrigation undertakings will rely to an even greater degree upon power revenues.

EXPERIENCE OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

This prediction is borne out by the experience of modern developments in contrast to earlier ones. On the $754,476,000 Columbia Basin project, for example, the power cost allocation is only $158,404,633, but power revenues are relied on for repayment of $649,571,560, or more than 85 percent of the total costs.

Likewise these power revenues are relied on for the repayment of $450,561,947, or some 83 percent, of the $538,026,947 cost allocated to irrigation. On reclamation's $5,400,429,000 portion of the Missouri River Basin project, the power cost allocation is $736,337,000, but power revenues are to repay $2,633,718,000, or about half the total, and to repay $1,816,829,000, or about two-thirds, of the $2,745,880,000 irrigation cost.

On the $164,131,000 Colorado-Big Thompson project, the power cost allocation is $63,224,000, but power revenues are to repay $133,691,000, or more than three-fourths of the total cost, and $70,467,000, or about 70 percent, of the $99,356,000 cost allocated to irrigation.

In contrast, on the Minidoka, Idaho, project—begun in 1904—power revenues will repay about one-fourteenth of the total costs and only about one-seventh of irrigation costs.

On the Yuma project—1905—about one-tenth of the total costs and one-twenty-fifth of the irrigation costs will be paid for by power revenues.

On the Shoshone, Wyo., project—1904—the figures are about one-forty-seventh of the total costs and one-twenty-eighth of the irrigation costs.

On the Riverton, Wyo., project—1920—the power revenues will repay about one-thirty-third of the total costs and one-eighty-seventh of the irrigation costs.

PROJECTED RECLAMATION POWER COSTS

The 7,796,877 kilowatts of reclamation capacity existing or under way thus will be derived from a total allocated construction cost of $1,619,775,851. The power features, however, are but incidentals in large multiple-purpose developments whose total cost will be $7,776,791,411.

It is extremely doubtful, however, that more than a small fraction of the electric power capacity could be developed without construction of the full, large development. Single-purpose power dams proposed from time to time as alternatives to multiple-purpose reclamation dams—e. g., on the Colorado River instead of Hoover Dam, Tennessee River instead of TVA dams, and on the Snake in place of the proposed Hells Canyon Dam—have promised—mark this, Mr. President—only from a third to a half of the capacity of the higher dams. One will note the approach of these monopolists.

They could not build the multiple-purpose dams in the first instance. There can be no successful contradiction of what I am now about to say, Mr. President. The Tennessee Valley Dam, the Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Hungry Horse, and the other multiple-purpose dams would never have been built by private industry.

In most of these areas private utilities were not beginning to meet the needs of the people in the remote areas for the light of electricity. We would not have had these dams as great defense weapons in World War II, had we relied on Wilson and the other big-business spokesmen of today who are seeking to deal the American people out of a precious heritage. You and I, Mr. President, and approximately 160,000,000 other persons, paid for them. Watch the manipulators try to get them now for as little as they may have to pay for them.

I believe the American people will see through this scheme before it is too late. The American people will soon realize, if they do not realize now, based upon the kind of projects the private utilities constructed, that if they had relied on the private utilities to meet the power needs of the day they would have had provided from one-third to one-half the power which is now available.

Talk about creeping socialism. Mr. President, let me say that the cooperative program between the Federal Government and the people in the areas where these projects have been built has been one of the greatest boons to the development of new business, new industry, and private enterprise wherever a multipurpose dam has been constructed.

There is a situation on the Snake River which I shall discuss in 2 or 3 weeks at considerable length. There the Idaho Power Co. is seeking to obtain permission to construct five low-head dams and thus prevent for all time the building of the great Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River. If they "get by" with it, Mr. President, they will cheat the American people out of great quantities of kilowatt potential which should be preserved for future generations of Americans by the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam. It should be prevented by serving clear notice on the Idaho Power Co. that it is not going to be allowed to gain monopolistic control over the people's interest in the Snake River.

That is the issue. Oh, I would, Mr. President, that I had the ability, I would that I had the knowledge, I would that I had the persuasive qualities of the great Norris, so that I might do on the floor of the Senate, in the months immediately ahead, what he so heroically did when, during his years of fighting for the people's interest in the Nation's natural resources, he stopped in their tracks persons who sought for predatory purposes to exploit those resources of America.

If a sufficient number of my liberal colleagues in the Senate will join me in the months ahead, I think, combined, we might begin to approach the job that Norris did, and once again stop the exploiters in their tracks as they start their raid on the natural resources of the Nation.

That is exactly what this Charley Wilson proposal is; it is a raid on the economic interests of the American people.

IMPORTANCE OF POWER REVENUES TO THE GOVERNMENT

However, costs are not the only measure of the value of reclamation power installations to the Government nor to the people served by the projects. As has been shown, reclamation power revenues are vital to the operation of the multiple-purpose projects and to all the functions and interest served by these projects. If they are deprived of the power revenues, the Government or the project managers would have to find an alternative source of income. Therefore, any estimate of the value of the power facilities should take into consideration the capital value of the revenues.

RECLAMATION ENERGY SALES

Now let us get down to basic facts and see how much electricity Reclamation sold last year and what it is likely to do in the future:

In the fiscal year 1951—July 1, 1951–June 30, 1952—the Bureau of Reclamation energy sales amounted to 25,332,204,310 kilowatt-hours and yielded an income of $43,310,035. It is estimated that by 1975, Reclamation will be producing 108 billion kilowatt-hours a year from an installed capacity of 18,970,000 kilowatts. On the basis of the 1952 ratio, the yearly income will be $184,680,000. Assuming a total ultimate reclamation development of 25 million kilowatts to 50 million kilowatts, annual sales in the future may be estimated at 142,325,000,000 kilowatt-hours to 284,650,000,000 kilowatt-hours, and annual revenues, at $243,375,750 to $486,751,500.

WHAT SALE OF POWER FACILITIES MEANS

Now the question we have to ask ourselves is what would it cost the Federal Government if it disposes of its power facilities in the case of the Bureau of Reclamation.

If the above income figures are capitalized at 3 percent, the investments required to replace needed incomes that would be lost through severance of power facilities would amount to $1,443,667,833 if the reclamation program were instantly stopped at its present level; $6,156,000,000 if the reclamation program were brought to a halt in 1975, and from $8,112,525,000 to $16,225,050,000 if construction of multiple-purpose projects were to continue on present principles until the West's hydro potential were fully developed.

We need to go forward with it, Mr. President, not to stop it. That amount, Mr. President, is not chicken feed. The American people have a tremendous interest in the problem.

OTHER IMPORTANT FACTS

In addition to finding other sources of income for repaying costs allocated to irrigation and other purposes of multiple-purpose undertakings, loss of power facilities would also compel the Government or project-operating agency to purchase power needed in project operations and now provided by the projects themselves.

The Central Valley project, for example, at present consumes approximately one-fourth of all power generated on the project.

If that project is carried out to its ultimate planned development, it will on completion still be using one-fourth of all the power it produces.

Similarly, 6 of the 18 giant generators at Grand Coulee Dam are connected for use in operating the Columbia Basin project, though not all of them will be so used at all times.

COSTS OF PURCHASING POWER

In the fiscal year 1951, of Reclamation's net total generation of 26,065,609,702 kilowatt-hours, 14,302,474,754 kilowatt-hours, or about 54 percent, went to other Federal utilities or interdepartmental use such as irrigation, pumping, and AEC projects. If this power had had to be purchased at 5 mills—a very good rate—the cost would have been $71,512,373.

That is what it earned for the people; that was the people's wealth. It constituted a huge benefit for the people. Is it creeping socialism, Mr. President, to assure a free people working with their Government those benefits, or must we allow some monopoly to get a rakeoff?

I say to the American people on this point, "Do not ever forget that when you are dealing with the generation and distribution of electric power you are dealing with a monopoly. A monopoly is not a free enterprise." What the monopolists want is a rakeoff from the people's projects now generating power to the tune of some $70 million.

The word "shakedown" is as appropriate as the word "rakeoff," Mr. President, for what these selfish interests want in this proposal is to gain control of the great public power dams built by the taxpayers' money.

COST OF OPERATING NECESSARY VITAL POWER

Applying the same percentage, we may estimate that in 1960, 30,402,000,000 kilowatt hours of Reclamation's total generation of 56,300,000,000 kilowatt hours would be used federally at the same low rate of 5 mills; this would cost $152,010,000. In 1975, 58,320,000,000 kilowatt hours of the total output of 108,000,000,000 kilowatt hours would be used federally and at 5 mills; this would cost $291,600,000.

CAPITALIZING COSTS

Capitalizing at 3 percent, the value of Reclamation's power facilities to the Federal Government as a source of federally used power may be computed at $2,383,745,792 if Federal use of power were to stop immediately at its present level; $5,067,000,000 if Federal consumption of power were to expand at expected rates until 1960 and then freeze; $9,720,000,000 if Federal consumption of power were to level off at the rate expected in 1975.

WATER SUPPLY AND RELATED COSTS

Undoubtedly, other costs would be incurred by the Government or project operators if the power system were disposed of. The water supply of the system in such event presumably would be controlled by the power utility, and the project would have to provide other dams or regulatory works below the power plant to assure control of water flow for its irrigation and other purposes. In some cases, provision of an alternative water supply for standby purposes, perhaps from underground sources, might be necessary.

Any curtailment of the irrigation program would result in considerable annual tax losses from wealth which might result from it. The size of the loss is indicated by the fact that Federal taxes yielded from currently operating reclamation projects amount to approximately the same as the cumulative total appropriations for reclamation, or about twice the total spent on the projects already brought to crop-yielding development. Yet, the Federal income-tax law has been in effect only since 1916.

At a later date, in a separate address, I shall discuss the whole problem of irrigation as related to the conservation of our natural resources. Suffice it to say that today I desire only to mention that if the development of the kilowatt potentials of our streams is left to private utilities, it will be done at the expense of irrigation development. Private utilities have never been, to any great degree, active in irrigation development. But there is a national interest in irrigation development. In the address I shall make some weeks hence, which will go into detail on the entire question of the relationship of irrigation development to the maintenance of a higher standard of living for American boys and girls a hundred years from now, I shall point out that when the time comes to build the electric power-generating projects in our generation, we had better think in terms of a food supply 100, 200, and 300 years from now. If anyone will take the time to read the writings of population experts, he will not, at the conclusion of such a reading, feel at ease about the food potentials of America 300 years from now. So I say that a part of the national interest, a part of the interest of 160 million people in Federal power projects, is directly related to the problem of maintaining an adequate food supply for the American people in the generations ahead.

I, for one, am not going to leave behind me a record in the United States Senate for future generations to read, that I at any time favored turning over the great sites still remaining for the development of the maximum potential of electric power in the streams of our country, to private utilities, which on the record have shown that they have never been particularly interested in developing irrigation projects in connection with power projects.

I know the argument that is made by private utilities. They say that the consumer of electricity has to pay as a part of his bill the cost of financing irrigation projects.

What is wrong with that?

It is in the national interest that the necessary steps be taken in our generation to think ahead about the food-supply needs of America 100, 200, and 300 years

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from now, and to build power projects sufficiently large and multiple in purpose so that land can be irrigated, and thus bring into cultivation thousands upon thousands of acres which need only water to flourish, for the benefit of the boys and girls 100, 200, or 300 years from now.

That is the kind of will I want to leave behind. That is the kind of legacy I think it is our challenge to leave to future generations of Americans.

I do not propose to stand here, when a wave of selfishness is sweeping America, and swallow the political concept in the Charlie Wilson proposal, which is, allegedly, to sell these dams to private industry.

COST TO GOVERNMENT FOR DISPOSING OF POWER FACILITIES ALONE

A summary of the highly significant facts just recited shows what tremendous sums it would cost the Government, that is, all of the taxpayers, if the Federal Government should dispose of the power facilities of the Bureau of Reclamation alone.

When the program presently under way is completed, Bureau of Reclamation cost allocated to power will total $1,619,775,851. The total costs of the projects will be $7,776,791,411 on the basis of December 1952 estimates.

Full development of western hydro power will involve reclamation power-cost allocations of $6,814,085,865 to $12,008,395,579. Likewise the total project costs will be $32,648,260,497 to $57,519,729,583.

If power facilities were to be disposed of on the basis of power-cost allocations only, the cost to the Government, in addition to the construction cost, would be $8,112,525,000 to $16,225,050,000 as capital needed to replace power revenues. In addition, $5,067,000,000 will be needed as capital to provide funds for purchasing power consumed by the Federal Government. The latter sum is calculated on the assumption that the 1960 Federal consumption comes closest to that which will be provided by completion of the program presently under way. The costs incurred by the Government from disposal of power allocations alone would total $19,993,610,865 to $34,300,445,879.

THESE ARE NOT ALL THE COSTS

These figures are a minimum estimate, but are inadequate to reveal the true costs. They make no allowance for alternative water control works, water supplies, or tax revenues. They contain no allowance for any construction costs but those allocated to power. It is also questionable if these could be construed as including enough interest in such plant items as storage works to make a satisfactory operating proposition for the purchaser.

Finally, they include Bureau of Reclamation facilities only. No attempt is made here to estimate in detail the cost of turning over the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Army Corps of Engineers' facilities, and other Federal power installations. Since reclamation has approximately only half the total Federal generating capacity, the total Federal costs would be greatly in excess of those already described.

THE MAIN FACTS

Unfortunately, you cannot deal with programs that have developed over a generation without getting into some details. A program involving billions calls for some detailed fiscal facts. These details may seem to be dull, but they have tremendous implications for all of the people, as consumers and taxpayers.

First, let us take costs. How would you like to pay 2 or 3 times more than you are now paying for the electricity that is the very lifeblood of city and rural homes? The plain fact is that before your Federal Government established the power yardstick, electricity cost several times what it does today.

Cheap power has made possible widespread use of the electric refrigerator, washer, mangle, radio, and television set. I venture to state that all the marvelous electrical conveniences which contribute to our unequaled standard of living would not be so extensively used today if people paid 2 or 3 times as much for electricity as they no longer do since the Federal power yardstick was established.

Was the establishment of that yardstick "creeping socialism"? Or was it an example of the philosophy that it is the duty of our Government to establish regulations necessary to protect the public interest? I think it was the latter, as I believe the American people will come to recognize before the end of this debate, which will probably last for some years.

Where would Wilson's General Electric Co. and other manufacturers of electric equipment be without the enormous market for appliances opened up and developed by inexpensive Federal power? Certainly their tremendous sales would not have taken place. The resultant loss of earnings by and taxes from manufacturers, distributors, retailers, and mail-order houses is obvious.

In short, cheap power has made private wealth and revenue for all levels of government.

We must consider the billions of taxpayers' dollars that Congress would have to appropriate for substitutes for power revenues that do so much to finance the vast irrigation program that has remade our arid desert lands. Taxpayers would have additional burdens so as to provide funds to replace the power revenues which now pay for the wide variety of Federal services partially enumerated above.

CONCLUSION

Any possible feasible plan for the reduction of the national debt deserves sympathetic and searching consideration. Any reasonable plan for reduction of the tax burden of our people requires our closest attention.

The Wilson plan—tricked out as it is in the gaudy clothes of debt and tax reduction—just does not meet the tests of feasibility or reasonableness.

The plan bristles with fallacies and false hopes. As embroidered by its publicists, it proposes that public works and Federal departments—from dams to the Post Office—be turned over to the holders of Government bonds. It has been shown that the largest holders of Government bonds are banks, insurance companies, large corporations, and the wealthy—the very same people who own the private utilities.

Stripped of its camouflage—the plan would turn over public power projects—composed of public natural resources developed on public sites with public funds—to the private utilities.

Our national experience with surplus property and other sales of public property shows that the Nation cannot expect a fair price for its investment.

Moreover, taking Bureau of Reclamation multipurpose dams as an example, we would see that inexpensive power, which its opponents try to label the bad boy of socialism, would become draped in the more respectable but expensive clothes of monopoly private power.

Irrigation and other Federal projects which are now largely supported by public power revenues would be seriously impaired if not destroyed. To save them, vast sums of new public investment would be required to replace power income and duplicate facilities which would be lost to the public if private groups were to take over public multipurpose dams.

These are but a few of the problems already described in detail—which would result from this questionable scheme.

The net effect of the Wilson plan would be to strip the Nation of enormous assets. It promises in the power field: cheap dams—for private utilities; and expensive power—for the people.

COMMITTEE WORK OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. President, I now turn to my work as a member of the committee of the whole. Each Friday afternoon I try to deliver one major speech on a subject matter which I consider to be of national concern. I am perfectly willing to let the public be the judge as to whether or not the subject matter of my major speech today is imbued with a public interest. I think a good many of my absentee friends in the Senate this afternoon are going to find when they get back to their bailiwicks a growing interest in such issues as this. On Friday afternoons I propose to continue to speak to the people of the country from this desk.

As one of the first items of committee work I wish to take up a little problem in Arkansas. I am sure that my two good friends the Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT] will not object to my doing so, because I can well imagine that when a little problem such as this arises in a State, when two communities find themselves in conflict, the Senators from that State are always glad to have someone else discuss the problem, rather than to become involved in it themselves.

I shall read for the benefit of the Pentagon building, and particularly of the Air Force, a letter which I have received from the mayor of the city of Hope, Ark., and the president of the Hope Chamber of Commerce.

SEATING ACCOMMODATIONS IN THE SENATE FOR THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. President, it is significant to note the increased interest which is being shown across the country in the Independent Party. More and more people are beginning to recognize that it is not

either handicapped or handcuffed by partisanship. The Independent Party in the Senate is interested in only one issue in connection with all matters, namely, What is the public's interest? So these days I am receiving from every State in the Union a great many communications from people in all walks of life, in one instance from the mayor of a city and the president of the local chamber of commerce. People in all walks of life are becoming interested in the work of the Independent Party.

Before I finish with one of my committee items this afternoon, I shall have something to say on the subject of why I think there ought to be a new section started on the other side of the aisle for the seating of members of the Independent Party. I am perfectly willing to accept a seat on the end. I am convinced that there is such increasing interest in the Independent Party that it is only a matter of time before more than one seat will have to be supplied in the Senate for the Independent Party. I think we ought to get the program started. I see no reason why the Independent Party should sit with the majority party. I have a good many reasons why I do not want to sit here, personal and otherwise. I have good hearing. I am pretty thick skinned, but I am human. I hear the "asides." In a social situation or anywhere else, Mr. President, I do not like to foist myself on others. I am perfectly willing to go off by myself.

I am satisfied that increasing millions of American people are going to be with me, and I will say good naturedly that I prefer to associate with them anyway.

So I have suggested to the minority leader, and I have cleared the suggestion with the majority leader so far as he personally is concerned, that I be given a seat in the back row on the Democratic side of the aisle, not a Democratic seat. Let me clear up that point right away. I mean an Independent seat. I do not think the Democrats have any ownership of the entire area of the Senate across the aisle. I think the Independent Party is entitled to have a few square feet on the minority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOBEY in the chair). Aboveground or underground? [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I always work aboveground. However, I must protect myself, so far as my back is concerned. That is why I would like to have a seat on the back row, with my back to the wall. That is no new posture for me. Sometimes it is difficult to protect one's self from all angles. I like to see the light of their eyes.

I am a little weary of hearing the "asides." I do not know what the rules of the Senate require. The minority leader has been very kind to me. He said that he would take the question up with the Democrats. Apparently, he wants to check into the question whether or not the Democrats have jurisdiction over every square foot of the area across the aisle. I challenge that. I insist that the Independent Party, as a matter of right, is entitled to 4 or 6 square feet for a desk and chair, on the minority side of the aisle, once the Independent Party has decided, as it has, that it does not want to sit any longer with the majority. I think that is all I need to say about it this afternoon. I shall await the conference of the Democratic Members of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon would mind telling us why he has a preference for a corner on the Democratic side rather than a corner on the other side.

Mr. MORSE. Is that not the lee side?

Mr. SMATHERS. It depends on where one sits. It is not, looking down from the chair. It might be so considered from the other side.

Mr. MORSE. It is, according to the direction in which we are facing. I think it is a pretty good space.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I say half facetiously and half seriously that I do think a minority should sit with the minority.

Mr. SMATHERS. Obviously, at the moment, and we hope only temporarily, there is more room on this side of the aisle. However, as the Senator from Oregon knows, the minority leader is looking on the Senator's proposal with all kindness and fairness, as he looks on the Senator from Oregon kindly.

Mr. MORSE. He has been very polite to me.

Mr. SMATHERS. The minority leader looks very kindly on the Senator from Oregon and I know that the minority leader will try to give an answer to the Senator from Oregon. What the minority leader is trying to find out is, if the Senator from Oregon should move to the location indicated, and in a year or so the question of seniority should come up, would the Senator then move his position to the left, to the right, forward, sideward, or remain in the same seat?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon is a fairly good horse trader, but he never offers to trade horses in futurity.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is the reason why it is impossible for the minority leader to give the Senator from Oregon an immediate answer. He wanted to determine what the precedents called for in the situation insofar as moving the Senator's seat is concerned.

Mr. MORSE. I made the suggestion to both the majority leader and the minority leader as to what my real preference would be, and that is to move the back rows on each side of the chamber a few feet to the left and right and to give me a seat in the middle.

Mr. SMATHERS. In other words, the Senator wanted to shift his historic position from the left not to the right but to the middle. That might be considered very encouraging by a great many people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say something about that point. A great many people are encouraged when they read the voting record of the junior Senator from Oregon, rather than the distorted newspaper stories which are published about his record. There is a great difference between my voting record and the propaganda put before the reading public about that voting record. I believe that an analysis of my voting record will show it is a pretty sound record in the middle of the road.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Oregon a question? I seek information. I do not know the answer. Does the Senator from Oregon believe it is within the jurisdiction of the minority party leadership to decide where the Senator should sit, or is it a matter that relates primarily to the majority party?

Mr. MORSE. I have gone into the question and I believe the Senator from Florida will find, if he will check into it, that, unless someone wishes to raise an issue about it, it is merely a matter of courteous accommodation of a Member of the Senate, and a matter of Senatorial courtesy. If someone wishes to raise an issue about it, the subject would go to the Commitee on Rules and Administration, and the committee would then go into the very "major" question as to where a minority Member of the Senate should sit in the Chamber. Does the Senator from Florida know what I think ought to be done?

Mr. SMATHERS. No, but I would be interested to have the Senator tell me.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the matter should be handled in the same way in which so many problems are handled in the Senate, namely, on the basis of a gentlemen's understanding and a courteous man-to-man agreement. Once it is recognized that the junior Senator from Oregon prefers to move his seat, so long as he is not infringing on anyone's seniority rights, the attitude should be: "Of course, if you want to sit over there your seat will be moved over there." My occupancy of the seat I have asked for would interfere with no one's rights at all, and I would be very much surprised to find any personal objections from any Senators sitting in the immediate surroundings on the minority side.

Mr. SMATHERS. I can assure the Senator from Oregon that, speaking for the minority leader, the minority leader does want to accommodate the Senator from Oregon as a person just as he would any other Senator who made a similar request. I am sure he wants to treat him courteously. I can assure the Senator from Oregon that the matter will be taken up properly and that the Senator will have an answer very shortly.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the Senator from Florida that I was quite surprised when any information about it got out to the public. I know that the majority leader, the minority leader, and the Senator from Oregon were not the source of the leak.

I had fully expected that the change in the seating arrangement would be an accomplished fact by now, and that I would merely have to go to the other side of the Chamber and take my seat, with nothing being said about it until after the seating had been changed. The other evening Mrs. Morse and I were at dinner at about 9 o'clock when I was called to the telephone by Al Friendly of the Washington Post. I thought something important had been discovered. I was somewhat amused to find that what the journalistic detectives had tracked

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

down was that I had requested to have my seat moved. He wanted to know if that great question of state was true. I told him that it was true. I hope we can get the matter consummated very quickly——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. And without any great disturbance to anyone.

I now yield to my good friend from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as acting majority leader for a few moments, I should like to ask a question so that I might pass the answer on to the majority leader. The question is this: If we move the Senator's seat, as he requests, what assurance do we have that he will not wish to move somewhere else in about 30 days?

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Indiana that one great difference, of many differences between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Indiana, is that I take pride in my intellectual flexibility.

Mr. CAPEHART. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Whenever I think facts warrant my changing an opinion I have no pride of opinion and change my view in accordance with the facts. Let me assure the Senator from Indiana that if in the last 5 minutes of debate on any issue I am satisfied that my previous held notion was a mistaken one, I do not hesitate to change my opinion.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Indiana may think that to be a great limitation, but I do not think so. I think it is a great asset.

Mr. CAPEHART. How can one entertaining that philosophy expect anyone else to believe in anything he says? If he stands up one day and says something is an absolute truth and ought to be believed, and then 10 minutes later or 30 minutes later or 30 days later decides to change his mind? Would he do that because he had new information?

Mr. MORSE. Let the record speak for itself. Whenever the Senator from Oregon changes his mind on any question he always sets forth the facts which suggested the change to him. I suggest to my friends like the Senator from Indiana, that they get off the partisan line and substitute political principle for political expediency.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does that mean, in the case of the Independent Party which the Senator from Oregon is trying to start, or perhaps has already started, that if I wanted to join the party I would have to wait for perhaps 60 days before joining, because at the end of 60 days the Senator from Oregon might have new facts which would convince him that he should not after all start a new party?

Mr. MORSE. I am sure my good friend from Indiana is speaking hypothetically. I cannot imagine the Senator from Indiana ever having the intellectual flexibility which would cause him to want to become a member of an Independent Party and to place in first position an independent judgment on the facts pertaining to issues.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator from Oregon will find the Senator from Indiana to be conscientiously honest about his opinion and that he will not tell the people of this country one thing one month, misleading them, and the next month go in another direction, misleading them possibly again. I remember that at the Republican Convention in Chicago the able Senator from Oregon sat right in front of the Indiana delegation, and every time the name Eisenhower was mentioned he pushed his hat up in the air.

Mr. MORSE. I worked for Eisenhower. However, when I found that he lacked political morality I had to tell the American people that I would not stultify myself by further supporting a man who in my judgment is completely lacking in political morality.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is certainly strange that anyone could discover it in such a short time.

Mr. MORSE. Read Eisenhower's Detroit speech.

Mr. CAPEHART. Based on one speech which Mr. Eisenhower has made, the Senator from Oregon pulls down the curtain and says, "No more for me." How many people did the Senator from Oregon influence in Chicago to vote for Mr. Eisenhower? What was the Senator's purpose in supporting the nominee if the Senator did not know where Eisenhower stood?

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator from Indiana that I can recognize "the big lie" technique when I see it, and I recognized it throughout the Eisenhower campaign.

Mr. CAPEHART. The words "the big lie technique" are rather strong language, Mr. President.

Mr. MORSE. I used it throughout the campaign, and I proved it in speech after speech.

Mr. CAPEHART. Perhaps I do not understand "the big lie technique"; but, if it means what I think it means, it seems to me the able Senator from Oregon ought to apologize to the President of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. When the President of the United States was a candidate for the Presidency, he made at Detroit, Mich., a speech in which, in effect, he told the American people that it was the State Department that made the decision to take our troops out of South Korea—although at the time when he was Chief of Staff of the United States Army, he joined in a recommendation, as a matter of military policy and strategy, that our troops be removed from South Korea. So I say he engaged in a "big lie" technique. I so stated during the campaign, and I obtained permission to use the document which proved it; and not a Republican speaker during the campaign could deny the contents of the document.

Mr. CAPEHART. My personal opinion is that the able Senator from Oregon thoroughly and completely and 100 percent enjoys being different.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to assure the Senator from Indiana that I would not enjoy being like him; I enjoy that kind of difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If Senators will allow the Chair to make an observation, the Chair will say that he regrets exceedingly that there is not a rule of germaneness in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. It would not be half so much fun.

AIR BASE AT HOPE, ARK.

Mr. President, at this time I shall read a letter I received from the mayor of Hope, Ark., and the president of the Hope Chamber of Commerce:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Hope, Ark., March 17, 1953.

The Honorable WAYNE C. MORSE,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We, the undersigned, our fellow townsmen, and 15 towns and cities of south Arkansas, who have been waging for the past several weeks a most vigorous campaign to secure the location of the jet-bomber base, which is to be located in Arkansas, at our Hope Airport instead of the proposed Little Rock, Ark., location, are well aware of the fight you have been waging for economy in government on the floor of the United States Senate. Because of the strong position you have taken in the interest of economy and national defense, we thought it would be fitting and proper for us to write and give you comprehensive information concerning the suitability of our airport for the jet-bomber-base facility our Federal Government has announced it will locate in Arkansas. As perhaps you know, it has already been announced that the jet-bomber base, estimated to cost $55 million, is to be located at Little Rock, Ark., in an area consisting of open land, farmland, small communities, and industrial property. The relocation of the industrial property alone will cost our Federal Government in excess of $2 million.

We are urging that, in the interest of economy and national defense, the jet-bomber base be located at the Hope Airport instead of at the selected area near Little Rock, Ark.

The Hope Airport, which was built in connection with the southwestern proving ground just prior to World War II, was built for bomber operations and it is the largest airport in Arkansas today. The statistical information in connection with this airport is included, along with other information, in the enclosures. From the study of the enclosed information, it will be readily apparent to you and anyone interested that a saving of $15 to $17½ million can be made by our Federal Government utilizing the said Hope Airport facilities. They are already owned by the city of Hope and will be transferred without cost to our Federal Government. The Hope Airport facility was built originally at the expense of the Federal Government and deeded to the city of Hope for $1.

In connection with the airport is 2,000 acres of land. Close by is a 300-acre plot presently owned by the United States Government.

In conclusion, we wish to stress again that the United States Government will achieve a saving of $15 to $17½ million by locating at the Hope Airport bomber base instead of at Little Rock, Ark., the contemplated and projected jet airbase. Surely you and all those fine public-spirited Senators and Congressmen who are vitally interested in economy in these days of high taxes and world crises will urge the complete utilization of the existing airport facilities at Hope, Ark.

With kindest regards, we are,

Respectfully yours,

JOHN L. WILSON,
Mayor, City of Hope.
BEN J. OWEN,
President, Hope Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum which

they sent with their letter incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRBASE AT HOPE, ARK.

HOUSING

The city of Hope, at this time, has some 160 available housing units ready for occupancy. There are, within about 1 mile of the airport, the officers quarters erected for the southwest proving ground, which consists of 23 beautiful homes that have been maintained in an excellent state of repair, that although privately owned at this time, it is our opinion that these housing facilities would be made available for governmental purchase if desired.

Prescott, Ark., 15 miles to the east of Hope, has provided us with information which shows that they have housing facilities that accommodate about 300 families at this time. The city of Prescott, in 1950, extended their water and sewer facilities at a cost of $500,000. This expansion accommodates 1,200 additional families and homes. Other utilities are also available at these sites.

In addition to this, there are several communities within Hempstead County which would comfortably accommodate several families in existing facilities of housing. In summary the housing facilities in this immediate area is 860 units including apartments and houses and sites with utilities available for 1,700 additional homes.

PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES

The present school facilities in the city of Hope can accommodate an additional 750 students. School facilities in small towns and communities within Hempstead County can accommodate an additional 1,200 to 1,500 students according to the county school supervisor. The Nashville public school system can at the present time accommodate approximately 400 additional students. The Prescott public school system can accommodate approximately 300 addtiional students.

To summarize the existing school facilities in the Hope area some 2,950 additional students can be accommodated at this time.

THE ABILITY OF THE CITY OF HOPE TO ABSORB POPULATION INCREASE

During World War II the Federal Government built the southwestern proving ground in Hempstead County about 4 miles from the city of Hope. During the construction of this project Hope accommodated an additional population of about 6,000 to 8,000 people. The population of the city of Hope at that time was about 7,500.

During the continued operation of the proving ground there were about 1,500 families absorbed by the city of Hope in addition to its normal population.

Since World War II there have been built in the city of Hope approximately 300 additional housing units and other community facilities have been expanded accordingly. There have been four brand new school buildings erected in addition to one new one to replace an old one.

Recently the city government of Hope has inaugurated a parks and recreation department which is directed by full-time trained personnel. The recreational facilities of the city of Hope have been expanded to such an extent that we have accommodated crowds in excess of 5,000 people on such occasions as Horace Heidt, Xavier Cugat, etc.

Narrows Dam which was built by the Federal Government on Little River impounds a large amount of water over an acreage with 175 miles of shoreline. There are ample cottages, boats, picnic and dining facilities along with the finest of fishing and other outing activities at Narrows Lake which is situated only a few miles from the Hope and Nashville area.

There are several hunting and fishing clubs in the county and quite a number of lakes and rivers which afford the finest in hunting and fishing.

Hope, Ark., is served by three-major railroads which provide ample rail transportation. The Broadway of America, Highway No. 67, offers to Hope direct and short routes to any point east and west and direct highways extend from Hope north and south.

It is felt by the people of this community that the experience gained during the southwestern proving grounds days of World War II affords us an opportunity to state with assurance that the necessary increase of population in connection with a jet bomber base can be very satisfactorily accommodated and absorbed in our community life.

EMPLOYMENT AND LABOR-MARKET DATA ON AREA SERVED BY THE ARKANSAS EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DIVISION OFFICE, HOPE, ARK.

In conformance with your request for labor-market data, the following is submitted:

Total nonagricultural employment of Hope and its immediate environs, 2,500 individuals employed in an estimated 307 establishments.

Lumber- and wood-producing industries comprise the chief field of employment with 39 such industries listed employing approximately 889 persons.

Active application files in the Arkansas State employment service number 1,214. Of this number 830 are within easy commuting distance of the Hope area. Male applicants total 489, while the female are listed at 341.

Considering the fact that some of the labor force of the community is not listed with the employment service, the following figures reflecting unemployment are set forth as follows:

Male: 750 white and 350 colored. Female: 120 white and 60 colored.

A further breakdown of the above paragraph would indicate that the following are immediately available:

	White		Colored	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Skilled	120	20	20	0
Semiskilled	250	100	100	40
Unskilled	350	100	150	30

As to the type of character of the labor of this area, it is highly adaptable, easily trained, conscientious, and motivated by a desire for steady, gainful employment.

AIRPORT DATA

(a) Airport name: Hope Municipal Airport.
(b) Nearest city: Hope, Ark.
(c) Distance and direction: 4 miles south.
(d) Population: 10,000.
(e) Other cities within 15-mile radius: Prescott, Ark., 15 miles northeast, population 4,000.
(f) *Other cities within 25-mile radius*

Name	Distance and direction	Population
Texarkana, Ark.-Tex	30 miles west	29,000
Lewisville, Ark	27 miles south	3,000
Nashville, Ark	26 miles north	4,000

Runways

Direction	Number	Length	Width	Wind coverage	Capacity	Glide angle
		Feet	*Feet*			
North-northwest south-southeast	1	5,500	150	100 percent up to 10 miles per hour within 30° of runways.	15,000 pounds wheel load.	41:0 or better.
Northeast southwest	1	5,500	150			
West-northwest east-southeast	1	5,500	150			

Aprons

Area	Length	Width	Capacity	Remarks
	Feet	*Feet*		
6,000 square yards	500	150	15,000 pounds wheel load	Hangar is completely surrounded by concrete apron 150 feet wide on all four sides.
8,000 square yards	500	150		
2,500 square yards	150	150		
2,500 square yards	150	150		

Taxiways

Area (square yards)	Length	Width	Capacity
	Feet	*Feet*	
55,555	2,000	250	15,000 pounds wheel load.
16,666	2,000	75	
11,111 (2)	1,000	100	

Hangars

One brick and steel, clear opening, steel trusses; 120 feet by 140 feet; 16,800 square-foot area.

Flying weather

	Visual	Instrument	Below minimum
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Spring	60	25	15
Summer	75	15	10
Fall	80	10	10
Winter	50	35	15

Temperature, 1952

Maximum, 103; minimum, 24; mean, 65

Precipitation, 1952

Annual, 44; maximum 24 hours, 3.1.

GENERAL INFORMATION, HOPE AND HEMPSTEAD COUNTY, ARK.

1. Climate

(a) Elevation above sea level, 350 feet.

(b) Precipitation, 1952, precipitation 65.66; yearly average precipitation over past 45 years, 53.34; humidity, 81 percent, several-year average.

(c) Natural disaster frequencies: Windstorm, no record; floods, none on record; tornados, only two on record. Both missed Hope about 10 miles. One was in 1921, the other in 1946. No frequency pattern established. Sand and dust storms, none on record.

2. Community post office service

Postmaster, Robert Wilson. The United States Post Office in Hope is a medium sized, first-class post office. The doors are open from 4 a. m. to 9 p. m. and the window is open from 8 a. m. to 5 p. m. 6 days each week. Town-city carriers provide once a day delivery and the business district has two deliveries daily. One star route is operated from the Hope Post Office. The postmaster, assistant postmaster, and eight regular clerks provide the office with its staff. Mail is received and dispatched nine times daily by trains in and out each way.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

3. Special community facilities

(a) Medical facilities: There are 10 practicing physicians in Hope. Nine are white and one is colored. Three hospitals provide a total of 80 beds, and two of these hospitals are privately owned while the third is a nonprofit corporation operated by a board of directors. The county has voted to build a new hospital and is now collecting the tax for the project. This county hospital will replace two of the present facilities and will have approximately a 75-bed maximum. This would give an approximate total of 100 beds. Six drug stores, each one with a registered pharmacist, provide the community with ample drug facilities.

There is a Federation of Women's Garden Clubs and a Hope Music Club, both of which are active in a cultural and civic way. The music club sponsors a concert program each season which brings in three outstanding artists. The Hope Youth Center is sponsored by the civic agencies who are interested in the cultural and civic life of the young people.

(b) Religious facilities: The religious facilities of Hope include churches of the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Assembly of God, Episcopal, Pentecostal, and Catholic creeds and faiths. Many of these churches have educational and recreational buildings and facilities. Two of these churches were completed in 1951 and the others have been kept in a good state of repair. In addition to the Sunday services, most of the churches have midweek services. There are brotherhoods, auxiliaries, etc. The main auditorium of the First Baptist Church accommodates 1,000 people and is used by the community on various special occasions. The colored population have adequate religious facilities also.

(c) Education facilities: The Hope public schools are second to none in physical plant and quality of training. Four grade schools are conveniently located in each of the four city wards. Two of these buildings were built in 1949. The high school and the junior high school are situated on the same grounds. The junior high school was completed in 1951. On these some 40 acres of school property are located the football stadium, the "home ec" cottage, the band building, "agri" and shop building, and the gym. Present school facilities can accommodate about 450 additional students.

(d) Recreational facilities: Hope's municipal park consists of forty landscaped and well-equipped acres for play and recreation. There is a swimming pool, tennis courts, and plenty of playground equipment for children. A baseball park, seating about 2,000 people is here also. This beautiful park is the home of the annual Third District Livestock Show and Fair. The main building, the coliseum, houses the rodeo arena and the exhibit hall. Several gas-fed barbecue pits and picnic tables make this an ideal spot for outdoor entertainment. Two Malco theaters provide motion-picture entertainment of the highest type. The Saenger was built in 1949 and seats about 1,000 people. The Rialto seats 600. In 1951 the Saenger won the Malco Theater Award. Hope has a municipally owned and operated park very well equipped for colored.

4. Type of government

Hope, Ark., is governed by a mayor and a council form of government. Two aldermen from each of the four city wards make up the council.

(a) Bonded indebtedness: City, none; county, $60,000 (county courthouse).

(b) Laws applying to industry: There are no city or county laws which apply only to industry. State laws only.

(c) Effect of new plant on community: Some number of citizens of Hope and Hempstead County have been forced, in the past year, to find suitable employment in neighboring towns. A new plant would bring those people back home and would provide employment for those who are only part-time employed. Certainly a new plant would increase retail and wholesale trade in this community and its vicinity. It is not felt that a new plant would make this a boom town, but would serve to bolster and stabilize the economy of Hempstead County.

(d) War risk: Closeness to primary targets—The Red River Arsenal is located 46 miles from Hope and the Shumaker Naval Ordnance is located 60 miles southeast of Hope. Barksdale Air Force Base is 100 miles south of Hope.

(e) Insurance rates and bank facilities: Inside city—Owner and occupied dwelling, fire and extended coverage, $7.50 per $1,000 per year; tennant-occupied dwelling, fire and extended coverage. Outside city—Dwelling, fire and extended coverage, $14.40 per $1,000 per year. The industrial insurance rates in this area are determined by the Arkansas Rating and Inspection Bureau, Little Rock.

Bank facilities: Hope is served by two national banks with a combined total of assets of approximately $10 million. Total daily check clearance for both banks, about $400,000.

5. Labor

(a) Wage rates: Prevailing wage rates in Hope is 80 cents per hour for unskilled labor. Semiskilled wages vary with the different job classifications in the plants.

(b) Percentage of homeowners: Approximately 75 percent; turnover of homes, medium to slow.

(c) Death and birth rate: Birth rate—1940, 19.9; 1949, 25.1. Death rate—1940, 8.6; 1949, 8.1.

(d) Labor disputes: There are no labor disputes on record in Hope with the exception of nationwide railroad and telephone strikes.

6. Taxes

(a) Personal property tax: The tax rate in Hempstead County is the same on personal and real property tax, which is $43.50 per $1,000 assessed value inside the city. Outside the city limit the rate is $38.50 per $1,000 assessed value. The tax rate breaks down thusly: General tax, 5 mills; road tax, 3 mills; courthouse bond retirement, 1.5 mills; hospital tax, 3 mills; library tax, 1 mill. The corporation tax rate is 5 mills.

(b) Tax trends: The tax trend in Hempstead County compares with that of the country in that, in recent years, the rate has increased. That is due primarily for improved and additional school facilities. These additions have now been completed.

7. Transportation facilities

Charter plane service is available at the Hope Municipal Airport. The Texarkana Municipal Airport, 30 miles west on Highway 67, is served by three airlines. American Airlines have scheduled 4 flights daily, passenger and cargo, 2 east and 2 west. Mid-Continent Airlines have 2 flights scheduled daily, 1 north and 1 south. Central Airlines has 1 flight to and 1 from Dallas daily.

(a) Land transportation: Hope is served by three major railroads, the Missouri Pacific, Louisiana & Arkansas, and the Frisco.

The Missouri Pacific has scheduled 10 freight trains daily each way with direct or connecting service to all points from Hope. The L. & A. goes south to Shreveport twice daily and from there has service to all points. The Frisco leaves daily for Fort Smith, Kansas City, and all points north and west. The Missouri Pacific has four passenger trains scheduled daily.

Motor: The Arkansas Motor Freight and the East Texas Motor Freight companies operate depots in Hope. The two firms provide either direct or connecting service to all points in the United States.

Passenger bus service is available by the Arkansas Motor Coach, Missouri Pacific Motor Coach, and the Continental Trailways, all making several arrivals and departures daily.

Transportation home and to work is provided by a fleet of taxicabs. The Railway Express Co. operates an office in the Missouri Pacific Station with pickup and delivery service.

8. Water

Underlying, Hope, Hempstead County, Ark., is two water-producing sands, the Tokio and the Nacatoch. The depth to the bottom of the Nacatoch is 620 feet and to the bottom of the Tokio is 1,480 feet. The thickness is 130 feet. This is accurate as it was determined by an electric log of a well.

The Nacatoch sand has produced 340 gallons per minute during acceptance tests of the wells and the Tokio has produced 380 gallons per minute during the same kind of test. The specific yield in each case is approximately 2.25 gallons per foot of drawdown. These tests, of course, in reality are tests of the capacity of the pump used and not of the maximum possible production of the well.

[From the Arkansas Gazette of March 15, 1953]

CURE FOR CROWDED SCHOOL CONDITIONS HINGES ON BOND ISSUE VOTE TUESDAY

(By James L. Meadow)

Amid the recent furor involving legislation and administration affecting the Little Rock schools, the prime issue confronting voters about the schools was shoved into the background.

Voters in the district will go to the polls Saturday to approve or reject a proposed tax increase from 32 to 40 mills to finance a $4 million bond issue for a gigantic expansion program.

The proposed building program resulted from long and careful study by the school board and its consultants of the present overtaxed system and the trends for future needs.

NOT A CURE-ALL

From the outset of the discussion the board at no time contended that a bond issue in the proposed amount was a cure-all for the present crowded conditions.

On the other hand, it appears now that one of the major needs—a new senior school in the Pulaski Heights area—will have to be delayed because the bond issue, even if approved, may not afford enough funds for the entire program.

School officials, however, are hopeful that by close bargaining on contracts if the bond issue is successful to "squeeze" all of the program, including the high school, into the designated amount.

PROJECTS

Here is what the board proposes to do with the $4 million if the voters approve:

Three new junior high schools, one of them for Negroes, will be constructed.

Two new elementary schools, one of them for Negroes, will be built.

Five of the worst crowded schools will be enlarged.

One new senior high school will be built if enough money remains. Estimates for its construction run in excess of $800,000.

Actually, the board will have at its disposal $4,073,000 if the bond issue is successful. The additional $73,000 was allocated in 1949 for renovation of the Gibbs Elementary School for Negroes and is still on hand.

The proposed construction would call for changing virtually all of the areas served by present schools. The shifting in all cases would result in smaller areas served by each school.

TWO SITES PICKED

The sites for only two of the new schools have been determined already. The board, however, has agreed on the general location for the other structures. Final determination and purchase will await outcome of the bond issue voting.

Specific estimates on the cost of the individual structures also must await further negotiations, officials said. Competitive bidding and site costs may vary considerably from preliminary planning on the projects, it was explained.

The overall planning for the construction program was guided by the desired ratio of not more than 30 pupils for each teacher-room in the various schools. The enrollment in all elementary schools now exceeds that figure in one or more rooms.

Projection of the crowded conditions, along with student enumeration trends, determined what could be expected at the future junior and senior high school levels. The most urgent aspects of the needed relief were embodied in the proposed building program.

SCHOOL FOR 1,000

The new senior high school would be constructed in the vicinity of Cantrell Road and Hayes Street, preferably in connection with one of the new junior high schools which will be built in the area.

The senior high would accommodate 1,000 students and have 30 rooms, cafeteria, laboratories, shops, special rooms, and an auditorium-gymnasium. The area it would serve would be roughly all of the city north of West Markham Street. The present senior high school would serve the rest of the city.

The junior high school in the northwest section of the city would contain 25 classrooms and accommodate about 750 students, with cafeteria, auditorium-gymnasium, and auxiliary rooms. Students from the present Jefferson, Forest Park, and Fair Park elementary districts would attend.

Another junior high school would be built on a site already acquired at McKinley and 32d Streets and serve about 1,000 students from the present elementary districts of Franklin, Oakhurst, and Wilson in the southwest part of the city. The building would contain 30 rooms, with cafeteria, auditorium-gymnasium, and auxiliary rooms.

The area now served by Pulaski Heights Junior High School would be reduced to care for elementary students from the Pulaski Heights and Woodruff districts and part of the Lee district between 8th and 12th Streets.

The West Side Junior High School area would be changed to include only the elementary districts of Centennial, Mitchell, Garland, and the Lee district south of 12th Street. The area served by East Side Junior High School would remain unchanged.

UNIT FOR NEGROES

The building program also includes a junior high school containing 30 rooms for 1,000 Negro students to be located in the southeast section of Little Rock. The site will be determined after a thorough survey and enumeration of the prospective enrollment.

One of the proposed new elementary schools would be located in the Booker Homes housing project for Negroes. It would contain 14 rooms and care for 420 pupils. This area was annexed to the Little Rock School district recently by the legislature. Until the new schools are constructed, pupils in the area will attend the Washington and Bush Elementary Schools and the Dunbar Junior High School.

The other proposed elementary school, for which a site has been acquired at Eighth and Arthur Streets, will relieve crowded conditions in the western part of the city. It will serve parts of the present Fair Park and Franklin districts.

Funds for enlargement of Franklin School were obtained through a Federal grant.

Additions for five elementary schools are proposed under the bond-issue program. Plans call for 12 more rooms at Jefferson School, 4 rooms at Oakhurst, 8 rooms at Wilson, 4 rooms at Forest Park, and 2 rooms at Parham. The Parham district also will be relieved of one block on the north, which will be placed in the Kramer district.

ENDORSED BY NEGRO GROUP

A citizens committee of the Colored PTA Council endorsed the Little Rock school bond issue yesterday and recommended communitywide support of it.

I. S. McClinton, a member of the committee, said the group would sponsor a mass meeting at 8 p. m. Thursday at the First Congregational Church, Ninth and State Streets, to discuss the bond issue.

The citizens committee previously had approved the proposed bond issue by the Pulaski County Special (Rural) School district but withheld a stand on the city issue until it learned what the Negro schools would receive from it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have gone into this matter sufficiently to satisfy me that a prima facie case exists that justifies thorough investigation by Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, into the contest between Little Rock and Hope, Ark., to see whether we are wasting millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money by not utilizing and reactivating the base at Hope, Ark. As a former member of the Armed Services Committee, I am satisfied that sufficient evidence exists in support of the position taken by the mayor and the president of the chamber of commerce at Hope, Ark., to establish a prima facie case for the reactivation of the base at Hope, rather than for the spending of some $55 million for a new base at Little Rock.

TRANSPORTATION OF GOODS TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES IN SHIPS SOLD BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. President, the next item I wish to take up bears on an article entitled "Ships Sold to Greece by United States Now Carrying Goods to Reds." The article appeared in this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald. In the article it is pointed out that the Senate committee headed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is making an investigation of alleged trade with the enemy behind the Iron Curtain, on the part of purchasers of certain ships from the United States, ships which have been sold to interests purportedly from behind the Iron Curtain; but I am far from convinced, and I judge from the story that the committee is also far from convinced, that all the interests themselves are behind the Iron Curtain.

In my judgment this matter should be pursued thoroughly, because on several occasions on the floor of the Senate I have deprecated the tendency to ship to Communist China and to other potential enemies, even in bottoms that may fly a so-called neutral flag, goods which will aid the enemy and will result, directly or indirectly, in larger casualty lists of American boys.

Mr. President, there has been submitted to me a documentation of former United States merchant ships on which the Federal Maritime Board, now the United States Maritime Administration, holds mortgages, and which have traded behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1952, so it has been going on for some time. In my judgment it is a matter that the former administration should have done something about; and I am glad to see that a committee of the new administration proposes to do something about it.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article which appeared this morning in the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPS SOLD TO GREECE BY UNITED STATES NOW CARRYING GOODS TO REDS

(By Frank Holeman)

The fantastic story of how a mysterious Greek millionaire built a worldwide shipping empire with the help of the United States Government, and has ships now ferrying contraband goods to Red China and other Iron Curtain countries was disclosed yesterday.

The mystery man is Starvros G. Livanos, 61, who has offices at 52 Broadway, New York, and lives in quiet luxury at the Plaza Hotel.

Details of Livanos' amazing activities were dug out of files supplied to the Senate permanent investigating committee by the Federal Maritime Administration, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and other Government agencies.

The committee, headed by Senator McCARTHY (Republican, Wisconsin), is going to turn the spotlight on Livanos' dealings when it reopens its investigation of Iron Curtain trade next Thursday.

Earlier, Senator McCARTHY revealed that 96 ships, on which the United States Government has mortgages totaling millions of dollars, are engaged in the trade which has been barred to ships flying the American flag.

LIVANOS, CHIEF OPERATOR

The biggest single operator, it appears from the files, is Livanos. He is expected to be called as a major witness before the committee.

At least 28 ships in which Livanos is listed as having a major financial interest have been spotted entering or leaving Iron Curtain ports from Dairen, Manchuria, to Odessa, Russia.

The Maritime Administration, it turns out, has mortgages on 11 of the vessels involved, totaling $3,129,700. They were sold to Livanos' various companies at knockdown prices after World War II. The lot went for $6,080,871—only a fraction of what they cost American taxpayers.

All the mortgaged ships are under Greek registry, fly Greek flags, with crews of mixed nationality. United States flag vessels have been barred entirely from Chinese waters since 1950. They can only carry minor, nonstrategic goods to east European Communist ports.

How Livanos operates is shown by what happened to a typical vessel, the *Dudley M. Hughes*, an old Liberty ship. The *Hughes* was sold by the old United States Maritime Commission to the Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus, Greece, on February 10, 1947. Its name was changed to the *Aliaknon*.

SAILED TO RUSSIA

The files of the Maritime Administration, which succeeded the old Commission in 1950, show that beneficial owner of the vessel is really S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York City. The registered owner is still the Theofano Maritime Co., in Greece.

Hitherto secret reports of the ONI show that the *Aliaknon* sailed from Genoa, Italy, on May 29, 1952, from Odessa, Russia. It passed Istanbul, Turkey, on June 3, 1952. It arrived at Alexandria, Egypt, June 15, 1952, from Odessa.

When next reported on August 13, 1952, it sailed from Yokohama, Japan, for Tsingtao, a principal port in Red China. It left Tsingtao on August 29 for Constantia, Red Rumania's port on the Black Sea. On October 29, it left there for Cyprus.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Maritime Commission has a $280,500 mortgage on the *Aliaknon* right now. The sale price was $544,506.

Government lawyers are going over the mortgage contract with a fine-tooth comb, hunting for a way to pull the vessel back, or at least keep it out of Iron Curtain trade. So far, they confess, they are up against a blank wall.

ALWAYS MAKES PAYMENTS

Livanos is always careful to make mortgage payments promptly. The insurance is paid up. There is no recapture clause in the contract. The vessels were sold under a law passed by Congress in 1946, to help build up the war-ravaged merchant marine of Allied countries.

Other Livanos-mortgaged ships which have been spotted in Iron Curtain ports are the *Akti* (*W. B. Rodgers*); *Aifos* (*Alexander Wilson*); *Azios* (*James Ives*); *Evros* (*Joshua A. Leach*); *Kima* (*Erastus Smith*); (*Meandros* (*Charles H. Shaw*); *Nestos* (*Mary Lyon*); *Pinios* (*Robert L. Hague*); *Aliki* (*Louis Joliet*); and *Nedon* (*William W. Campbell*).

In addition to these vessels, Livanos' companies have many others, operating under various flags, in the Iron Curtain traffic.

The *Atlantic Air*, belonging to his Atlantic Maritime Co., of Panama, for example, flies the Panamanian flag. It was bought from the Maritime Commission as the *Elizabeth Blackwell*.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea 96 former United States merchant ships of over 650,000 gross tons, sold under mortgage by the United States Maritime Administration, and registered under foreign flags, have traded behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe. The United States Federal Maritime Board, now the United States Maritime Administration, still holds mortgages on all these ships in the amount of approximately $25,000,000.

Of these ships, 52 are registered in Greece, 40 in Italy, and 4 in France.

We have poured millions and millions of dollars of aid money into Italy, Greece, and France. I am not one who says we have any right to say to a foreign ally, "You do this or else"; but I am one who says we have a duty to urge our allies to sit down with us and talk with us about practices, procedures, and policies being pursued in their countries which are aiding our enemies. I simply refuse to believe that some progress, at least, cannot be made in settling some of these problems through negotiation. These ships have made a total of 183 voyages behind the Iron Curtain, 78 to Communist China and 105 to Soviet bloc ports in Europe.

To me that is shocking and astounding. I believe it is information which ought to be made available to the American people. To that end let me say that I have before me a 12-page chart in which will be found data cataloged under appropriate headings. The first five pages contain a chart headed "Former United States Merchant Ships Sold to the Italian Government on Which the United States Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration) Now Holds Mortgages, and Which Have Traded Behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe, July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1952." The columns are headed "Name," meaning name of ship, "Gross Tons," "Beneficial Owner and Registered Owner," "Sales Price," "Amount Due," and "Voyage Details." I ask unanimous consent to have the chart material which bears upon the Italian ships inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, pages 1 to 5, inclusive, of the chart were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Former United States merchant ships sold to the Italian Government on which the U. S. Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration) now holds mortgages and which have traded behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe, July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1952

Name	Gross tons	Beneficial owner and registered owner	Sales price	Amount due (Apr. 9, 1952)	Voyage details
Absirto (ex-*Glen Curtiss*)	7,162	Societa de Navigazione per Azioni Lussino, Trieste; same.	$544,506	$280,500	Sailed Rotterdam Oct. 8, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Venice Nov. 13, 1950, from Gdynia.
Aida Lauro (ex-*John Ericsson*)	7,170	Lauro Achille, Fu Gioacchino & Co., Naples; same.	544,506	288,000	Sailed Spezia Mar. 17, 1951; arrived Constantza Mar. 23, 1951; sailed Constantza Apr. 3, 1951; arrived Buenos Aires May 4, 1951; sailed Istanbul July 29, 1951, for Bourgas and Constantza; sailed Constantza Aug. 13, 1951; arrived Buenos Aires Sept. 14, 1951.
Angelina Lauro (ex-*Benjamin M. Brewster*)	7,176	Lauro, Achille, Fu Gioacchino & Co., Naples; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Immingham Oct. 23, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Venice Dec. 3, 1950, from Gdynia; sailed Messina Nov. 15, 1952; arrived Odessa Nov. 19, 1952; sailed Odessa Dec. 14, 1952; arrived Messina Dec. 19, 1952.
Aspromonte (ex-*George B. Porter*)	7,154	Societa Co-Operativa de Navigazione Garibaldi, A. R. L., Genoa; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Middlesbro Aug. 10, 1951, for Gdynia; sailed Gdansk Aug. 24, 1951, for Civitavecchia.
Ciclope (ex-*J. Frank Cooper*)	7,189	Mattee Scuderi Catania, Sicily (Soc. de Nav. Marittima, Unione).	544,506	306,000	Sailed Hong Kong Feb. 20, 1952, for Tsingtao; sailed Istanbul Apr. 7, 1952, en route China to Bourgas; passed Istanbul Apr. 24, 1952, en route Bourgas to Italy.
Citta Di Savona (ex-*Robert Y. Haynes*)	7,155	Societa Anonima Importazione Carboni E. Navigazione (Saicen) Savona; same.	544,506	306,000	Passed Istanbul June 9, 1951, en route Tunisia to Odessa; arrived Liverpool July 1, 1951 from Odessa; sailed Civitavecchia Aug. 28, 1951, for Novorossisk; arrived Liverpool Sept. 23, 1951; sailed Beirut Nov. 24, 1951, for Odessa; arrived Belfast Jan. 2, 1952; sailed Belfast Jan. 14, 1952, for Odessa; arrived Leith Feb. 25, 1952, from Odessa.
Delfin (ex-*Jost J. Acosta*)	7,174	Societa di Navigazione, Polena, Genoa; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Spezia July 5, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Naples Aug. 6, 1950, from Gdynia; sailed Emden Oct. 18, 1952, for Gdynia; arrived Naples Nov. 18, 1952, from Gdynia.
Emanuel V. Parodi (ex-*Joseph E. Wing*)	7,147	Societa per Azioni Emanuele V. Parodi, Genoa; same.	544,506	288,000	Sailed New York Sept. 19, 1951, for Gdynia; arrived Genoa Nov. 5, 1951, from Gdynia.
Fides (ex-*James A. Wilder*)	7,182	Grimaldi, Fratelli Armatori, Naples-Genoa; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Rosario July 4, 1950, for Dairen; arrived Aabenraa Oct. 30, 1950, from Dairen; sailed Norresondby Nov. 10, 1950, for Gdansk; arrived Buenos Aires Dec. 22, 1950, from Gdynia.
Frederic A. Eilers (ex-*Frederic A. Eilers*)	7,152	Compagnia di Navigazione San Siro, Soc Per Azioni, Genoa; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Trieste Jan. 2, 1951, for Odessa; arrived London Feb. 2, 1951, from Odessa.
Giacomo Fassio (ex-*Nathan B. Davis*)	7,164	Villain & Fassio, Societa Anonima Italiana de Navigazione Mercantilo, Genoa; same.	544,506	288,000	Sailed Marseille Apr. 27, 1950, and Haiphong June 18, 1950, for Dairen; arrived Malmo Aug. 23, 1950, from Dairen.
Giambattista (ex-*Ben B. Lindsey*)	7,184	Societa di Navigazione Dani & C., Genoa; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Antwerp Aug. 19, 1951, for Murmansk; sailed Murmansk Aug. 31, 1951, for Gdynia; arrived Genoa Oct. 4, 1951, from Gdynia; sailed Antwerp Nov. 7, 1951, for Gdynia; arrived Savona Dec. 6, 1951, from Gdynia; sailed Bona Dec. 17, 1951, for Gdynia; arrived Genoa Jan. 26, 1952, from Gdynia; sailed Baltimore Nov. 5, 1952; arrived Hamburg Nov. 24, 1952; sailed Hamburg Nov. 27, 1952, for Gdynia; sailed Gdynia Dec. 10, 1952; arrived Civitavecchia Dec. 24, 1952.
Gioacchino Lauro (ex-*Luther S. Kelly*)	7,188	Lauro Achille, Fu Gioacchino & C., Naples; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Savona Nov. 4, 1950, for Bourgas and Constantza; arrived Buenos Aires Dec. 30, 1950, from Constantza; sailed Genoa June 10, 1951, for Constantza; arrived Buenos Aires July 8, 1951, from Constantza.
Giorgio (ex-*Lilian Wald*)	7,165	Insom, Enrico, Fu Antonio, Rome; same	544,506	280,500	Sailed Bahia Blanca Oct. 2, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Venice Dec. 17, 1950 from Gdynia.
Grifone (ex-*John A. Roebling*)	7,181	Compagnia di Navigazione Arrivabone, Leonardo, S. P. A. Venice.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Piraeus Sept. 26, 1952, for Black Sea.
Humanitas (ex-*Claus Spreckles*)	7,167	Ravano, Alberto, Fu Pietro Genoa (associated with Tidewater Commercial Co., Inc., Maryland Trust Bldg., Baltimore, Md.) (Soc. per Azioni Industria Armamento.)	544,506	280,500	Sailed London June 28, 1950, for Gdansk; arrived Leghorn July 21, 1950, from Gdansk; sailed Marseilles Dec. 29, 1950, for Odessa; arrived Bizerta Jan. 8, 1951, from Odessa.
Italcielo (ex-*Walter Wyman*)	7,097	Italnavi Societa di Navigazione per Azioni, Genoa; same.	544,506	280,000	Sailed Alexandria Dec. 4, 1951, for Novorossisk; sailed Novorossisk Dec. 19, 1951; arrived Glasgow Jan. 1, 1952.
Italico (ex-*Howard Gray*)	7,177	Ditta Marino Querol, Genoa; same	544,506	312,000	Sailed Middlesbro Nov. 2, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Oxelosund Nov. 18, 1950, from Gdynia.
Italterra (ex-*Nelson Dingley*)	7,155	Italnavi Societa di Navigazione per Azioni, Genoa; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Marseilles Dec. 18, 1951, for Odessa; arrived Avonmouth Jan. 20, 1952, from Odessa.

Former United States merchant ships sold to the Italian Government on which the U. S. Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration) now holds mortgages and which have traded behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe, July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1952—Continued

Name	Gross tons	Beneficial owner and registered owner	Sales price	Amount due (Apr. 9, 1952)	Voyage details
Laura Lauro (ex-*Elwood Haynes*)	7,176	Lauro, Achille, Fu Gioacchino & C., Naples (Naples).	$544,506	$288,000	Sailed Leghorn Sept. 16, 1950, for Gdynia; sailed Gdynia Oct. 13, 1950; arrived Genoa Oct. 27, 1950; sailed Bagnoli Mar. 21, 1951, for Constantza; sailed Constantza Apr. 7, 1951; arrived Buenos Aires May 8, 1951.
Louis Pasteur (ex-*Louis Pasteur*)	7,195	Romano, Raffaele, Fu Domenico, Naples (Soc. Raffaele Romano e Pasquale Mazzella).	544,506	306,000	Sailed Rotterdam Sept. 24, 1951 for Gdynia; arrived Venice Oct. 24, 1951, from Gdynia; sailed Genoa Nov. 6, 1952; arrived Gdynia in December; arrived Algiers Dec. 25, 1952, from Gdynia.
Muriel Bibolini (ex-*Wm. H. Moody*)	7,167	Giovanni B. Bibolini, Genoa; same	544,506	280,500	Sailed Venice June 20, 1950, for Nicolaieff; arrived Hull July 22, 1950, from Odessa; sailed Tyne Sept. 23, 1950, for Gdansk; arrived Venice Oct. 27, 1950, from Gdansk.
Maria Parodi (ex-*Wm. I. Chamberlin*)	7,184	Societa per Azioni Emanuelo V. Parodi, Genoa; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Hamburg Oct. 11, 1950, for Gdansk; arrived Genoa Nov. 3, 1950, from Gdansk.
Matteo Marsano (ex-*Peregrine White*)	7,172	Adrea Marsano, Genoa (Cia. Ligure di Nav.)	544,506	306,000	Sailed Bremen Nov. 5, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Antwerp Nov. 19, 1950, from Gdynia.
Nazareno (ex-*Augustus St. Gaudens*)	7,173	Societa Co-Operativa di Navigazione Garibaldi, A. R. L., Genoa; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Pepel Aug. 6, 1950; arrived Gdynia Aug. 26, 1950; sailed Gdynia Sept. 3, 1950; arrived Venice Sept. 19, 1950; sailed Middlesbro Nov. 11, 1950; arrived Gdansk Nov. 14, 1950; arrived Buenos Aires Dec. 26, 1950, from Gdansk.
Nasario Sauro (ex-*James Oliver Curwood*)	7,193	Navigazione Libera Giuliana, Genoa; same	544,506	306,000	Sailed Gdynia June 20, 1950; arrived Genoa July 5, 1950; sailed Bombay Sept. 21, 1950, for Dairen; arrived Rotterdam Dec. 22, 1950, from Dairen.
Ninetto Gavarone (ex-*James G. McGuire*)	7,165	Boso & Rollo, Genoa Giuseppe Gavarone Fu Giuseppe, Genoa.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Kiel Sept. 8, 1952 for Gdynia; sailed Gdynia Sept. 25, 1952 for Civitavecchia.
Olimpia (ex-*James Screven*)	7,207	Lauro, Achille, Fu Gioacchino, Naples; same	544,506	306,000	Sailed Civitavecchia Apr. 29, 1951, for Constantza; arrived Buenos Aires June 13, 1951, from Constantza.
Orsolina (ex-*Grant Wood*)	7,171	Michele Bottiglieri & C., Torre del Greco, Italy; same.	544,506	280,000	Sailed Sauda July 10, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Algiers July 31, 1950, from Gdynia.
Patrizia Fassio (ex-*Howard E. Coffin*)	7,190	Villain & Fassio, Societa Anonima Italiana di Navigazione Mercantile, Genoa; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Mouston Oct. 14, 1952; arrived Trieste Nov. 11, 1952; sailed Trieste Nov. 13, 1952; arrived Novorossisk in November; arrived Liverpool Dec. 9, 1952, from Novorossisk.
Pietro Bibolini (ex-*John B. Kendrick*)	7,181	Giovanni B. Bibolini, Genoa; same	544,506	306,000	Sailed Glasgow Nov. 6, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Buenos Aires Jan. 5, 1951 from Gdynia; sailed Genoa Dec. 18, 1951 for Odessa; arrived Barry Jan. 16, 1952, from Odessa.
Rialto (ex-*Henry C. Payne*)	7,153	Compagnia Armatoriale Italiana S. A. S., Venice; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Alexandria Nov. 22, 1950, for Bourgas; arrived Buenos Aires Jan. 15, 1951 from Constantza; sailed Palembang Mar. 19, 1952, for Tsingtao; arrived Singapore Apr. 18, 1952 from Tsingtao.
Santa Rita (ex-*John H. Thomas*)	7,175	Santa Rita Societa di Navigazione S. P. A., Genoa; same.	544,506	288,000	Sailed Hull July 29, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Spezia Aug. 23, 1950; sailed Saffi in November 1950 for Gdansk; arrived Genoa Dec. 19, 1950, from Gdansk.
Saronno (ex-*Charles Robinson*)	7,175	Compagnia Italiana Marittima, Rome; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Middlesboro Oct. 24, 1950, for Gdansk; arrived Genoa Dec. 4, 1950, from Gdansk.
Sibilla (ex-*David L. Swain*)	7,175	Lauro & Montella, Naples and Torre del Greco (Cennaro Montella Fu Onofrio).	544,506	290,200	Sailed Liverpool July 22, 1950, for Gdynia; sailed Gdynia for Naples; sailed Naples Sept. 6, 1950, for Constantza; arrived Buenos Aires Nov. 6, 1950, from Constantza.
Trevizo (ex-*Samuel Samuels*)	2,066	Societa per Azioni di Navigazione Adriatica, Venice and Trieste; same.	408,617	280,800	Sailed Istanbul Dec. 7, 1951, for Bourgas; arrived Venice Dec. 28, 1951, from Bourgas.
Valentino Bibolini (ex-*Frank M. Dodd*)	7,144	Giovanni B. Bibolini, Genoa; same	544,506	280,500	Arrived Glasgow July 16, 1950, from Odessa; sailed Hamburg Oct. 16, 1952, for Gdynia; sailed Gdynia Oct. 31, 1952; arrived Ancona Nov. 15, 1952.
Varallia (ex-*Edward G. Acheson*)	7,138	Societa di Navigazione Viareggina, Viareggio; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Brake Sept. 26, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Venice Oct. 26, 1950, from Gdynia; sailed Rotterdam Nov. 18, 1952, for Gdynia; arrived Genoa Dec. 17, 1952, from Gdynia.
Villa Di Brugine (ex-*John R. McQuigg*)	7,185	Arrivabene Riunione Campagnia Armamento Societa in Accomadita Semplice A. R. C. A., Venice.	544,506	294,000	Sailed Port Swettenham June 27, 1950, for Odessa and Poti; arrived Baltimore Oct. 8, 1950, from Poti.
Zenaida (ex-*Fremont Older*)	7,179	Zena Societa di Navigazione di Musso, More & Co., Genoa; same.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Rotterdam Dec. 8, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Genoa Dec. 30, 1950, from Gdynia.

Mr. MORSE. I have a similar chart, page 6 of this 12-page compilation, entitled "Former United States Liberty Ships Sold to the Republic of France, on Which the United States Federal Maritime Board—Maritime Administration—Now Holds Mortgages, and Which Have Traded Behind the Iron Curtain, July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1952." I make the same request, that that material be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, page 6 of the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Former United States Liberty ships sold to the Republic of France on which the U. S. Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration) now holds mortgages and which have traded behind the Iron Curtain—July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1952

Name	Gross tons	Beneficial owners	Registered owners	Sales price	Amount due (April 9, 1952)	Voyage details
Bastia (ex-*Andrew Carnegie*)	7,176	Compagnie de Navigation Cyprien Fabre, Marseilles.	Marine Marchande (Government of France).	$544,506	$288,240	Sailed Aarhus, Oct. 8, 1952; arrived Gdansk, Oct. 18, 1952; sailed Gdynia Oct. 23, 1952; arrived Genoa, Nov. 5, 1952.
Grenoble (ex-*Henry George*)	7,176	Compagnie de Messageries, Maritimes, Paris, Marseilles, and London.	do	544,506	288,240	Sailed Saigon, Mar. 2, 1952; arrived Shanghai, Mar. 9, 1952; arrived Dairen, Mar. 11, 1952; sailed Dairen, Mar. 26, 1952, for Dunkirk.
Mortain (ex-*Stephen Johnson Field*)	7,176	do	do	544,506	288,240	Sailed Dunkirk, Apr. 20, 1950; arrived Taku Bar, July 18, 1950; arrived Yokohama, July 30, 1950, from Taku Bar.
Oyonnax (ex-*Wilbur O. Atwater*)	7,176	do	do	544,506	290,420	Sailed Haiphong, May 10 1952, for Taku Bar; sailed Taku Bar, May 25, 1952; arrived Constantza, July 4, 1952; passed Istanbul July 15, 1952, en route Constantza to Marseilles.

Mr. MORSE. Then, Mr. President, I have a chart, pages 7 to 12, inclusive, which covers the ships that were sold to Greek concerns, and which have been used in trade behind the Iron Curtain, with China, and in Europe. I ask permission to have these pages of the chart inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, pages 7 to 12 of the chart were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Former United States merchant ships sold to Greek concerns on which the U. S. Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration) still holds mortgages and which have traded behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe—July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1952

Name	Gross tons	To whom sold	Beneficial owner and registered owner	Sales price	Amount due (Apr. 9, 1952)	Voyage details
Aghios Nicolaos (ex-*Cushing Eels*).	7,176	N. C. Madjipateras (1947)	Constantine Madjipateras & Sons, Odos Averoff 12, Athens; A. C. Madjipateras & N. C. Madjipateras.	$544,506	$280,500	Sailed Antwerp Nov. 16, 1950, for Stettin; sailed Stettin Dec. 4, 1951; arrived Shimizu Jan. 30, 1951; sailed Noji Aug. 12, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen Aug. 26, 1951; arrived Madras Sept. 14, 1951; sailed Hartlepool Dec. 15, 1951, for Wismar; arrived Hartlepool Jan. 7, 1952, from Wismar.
Akti (ex-*W. B. Rodgers*).	7,176	Livanos Bros. Maritime Co., Ltd., Megaron Economou, Piraeus (1947).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Livanos Bros. Maritime Co., Ltd., Megaron Economou, Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Yawata May 13, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen June 5, 1951; arrived Hamburg July 30, 1951; sailed Yawata July 31, 1952, for Tsingtao; arrived Hamburg Oct. 23, 1952, from Tsingtao.
Alfios (ex-*Alexander Wilson*).	7,176	Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd., Megaron Economou, Piraeus (1947).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd., Megaron Economou, Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Hakodate May 25, 1951 for Dairen; sailed Dairen June 20, 1951; arrived Madras July 12, 1951; sailed Muroran Sept. 10, 1951 for Dairen; sailed Dairen Sept. 30, 1951; arrived Madras Oct. 19, 1951; sunk off Saigon Apr. 2, 1952.
Altaikmon (ex-*Dudley M. Hughes*).	7,234	do	do	544,506	280,500	Sailed Genoa May 29, 1952 for Odessa; passed Istanbul June 3, 1952; arrived Alexandria June 15, 1952 from Odessa; sailed Yokohama Aug. 13, 1952 for Tsingtao; sailed Tsingtao Aug. 29, 1952 for Constantza; sailed Constantza Oct. 29, 1952 for Cyprus.
Anastassios Pateras (ex-*Obetty Zane*).	7,177	Demetrios A. Pateras, Chios, Greece (1946).	Lemos & Paternas, Ltd., London; Demetrios A. Pateras, Chios.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Shimizu July 24, 1950, for Taku Bar; sailed Moji Apr. 13, 1951, for Taku Bar; arrived Rotterdam June 4, 1951 from Taku Bar; sailed Muroran Aug. 13, 1951, for Taku Bar; sailed Dairen Aug. 31, 1951; arrived Hamburg Oct. 18, 1951.
Anna L. Condylis (ex-*Wm. Grayson*).	7,191	Nicolaos L. Condylis, Athens (1946).	Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc., 80 Broad St., New York; Nicolaos L. Condylis, Athens.	544,506	272,000	Sailed Venice Feb. 11, 1951, for Novorossisk; arrived Antwerp Mar. 13, 1951, from Novorossisk; sailed Osaka June 21, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen July 5, 1951; arrived Calcutta Aug. 7, 1951.
Antonis (ex-*John Constantine*).	7,176	Spyros A. Lemos, Oinoussai, Chios (1947).	Lemos & Pateras, Ltd., London; Spyros A. Lemos, Oinoussai, Chios.	544,506	255,000	Sailed Kamaishi July 10, 1951, for Tsingtao; sailed Tsingtao July 23, 1951; arrived Hamburg Sept. 14, 1951; sailed Camalti May 5, 1952, for Tsingtao; sailed Tsingtao July 2, 1952, for Gdynia; arrived Bremerhaven Sept. 12, 1952, from Gdynia.
Asteria (ex-*Henry H. Sibley*).	7,176	Hector C. Dracoulis, Athens, Greece.	Hector C. Dracoulis, Athens; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Antwerp Oct. 1, 1950, for Gdynia; arrived Buenos Aires Nov. 21, 1950, from Stettin; sailed Yokohama Sept. 6, 1951; arrived Tsingtao Sept. 11, 1951; sailed Tsingtao Sept. 16, 1951, for Gdynia; arrived Hampton Roads Dec. 6, 1951, from Gdynia.
Axios (ex-*James Ives*)	7,176	Livanos Maritime Co., Ltd., Megaron Economou Piraeus (1947).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Livanos Maritime Co., Ltd., Megaron Economous, Piradus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Yokohama Feb. 12, 1951, for Darien; sailed Dairen Mar. 7, 1951; arrived Genoa Apr. 16, 1951; sailed Antwerp June 3, 1951; arrived Whampoa July 15, 1951; sailed Whampoa Aug. 15, 1951; sailed Taku Bar Sept. 3, 1951; arrived Hamburg Oct. 30, 1951; sailed Alexandria Apr. 30, 1952; arrived Novorossisk May 7, 1952; sailed Novorossisk May 10, 1952; arrived Alexandria May 15, 1952; sailed Alexandria May 28, 1952; arrived Constantza June 1, 1952; sailed Constantza June 8, 1952, for Odessa; sailed Odessa June 11, 1952; arrived London June 27, 1952.
Castia Lee (ex-*James J. O'Kelly*).	7,176	Lee Bros., & A. K. Pezas, Chios (1946).	Marton Steamship Co., Inc., 44 Whitehall St., New York; Lee Bros. & A. K. Pezas, Chios.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Alexandria Dec. 5, 1951 for Kherson; sailed Odessa Dec. 20, 1951; arrived Liverpool Jan. 19, 1952.
Eiros (ex-*Joshua A. Leach*).	7,256	Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd.; Megaron Economou, Piraeus (1946).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd., Megaron Economou, Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Yokohama July 22, 1950; arrived Dairen July 27, 1950; sailed Dairen Aug. 30, 1950; arrived Rotterdam Sept. 25, 1950; sailed Yawata June 12, 1951, for Tsingtao; arrived Cochin July 17, 1951; sailed Cochin July 27, 1951; arrived Dairen Aug. 14, 1951; sailed Dairen Aug. 23, 1951; arrived Madras Sept. 12, 1951. Reported trading North China port during April; arrived Hamburg May 28, 1952, from Tsingtao.
Fotini (ex-*Frank J. Cuhel*).	7,176	Michael C. Peratikos, Athens (1947).	Carras Ltd., London; Michale J. Carras, Ioannis M. Carras, London.	544,506	288,000	Sailed Chittagong Mar. 30, 1952, for Taku Bar; sailed Dairen Apr. 23, 1952; arrived Hamburg June 9, 1952; arrived Chinwangtao Sept. 5, 1952 from Muroran; sailed Chinwangtao Sept. 16, 1952; arrived Hamburg Nov. 11, 1952.
Hadiotis (ex-*St. James M. Courts*).	7,240	Kassos Steam Navigation Co., Ltd., Syra (1946).	Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd., London; Kassos Steam Navigation Co., Ltd. Syra.	577,073	310,700	Arrived Liverpool July 8, 1950 from Odessa; sailed Belfast Sept. 22; arrived Gdansk Sept. 28, 1950 sailed Gdansk Oct. 11, 1950; arrived Bari Oct. 26, 1950; sailed Gdynia Dec. 10, 1950; arrived Venice Dec. 26, 1950; sailed Alexandria Oct. 27, 1951; arrived Novorossisk Nov. 2, 1951; sailed Novorossisk Nov. 9, 1951; arrived Hull Nov. 28, 1951.
Hellas (ex-*William Dewitt Hyde*).	7,176	George Christos Lemos, Athens and New York (1946).	Lemos & Pateras, Ltd., London; George Christos Lemos, Athens and New York.	$544,506	280,500	Sailed Nagoya Feb. 17, 1951, for Chinwangtao; sailed Chinwangtao Mar. 8, 1951; arrived Rotterdam Apr. 25, 1951; sailed Kobe Sept. 19, 1951, for Yulin; sailed Yulin Sept. 29, 1951; arrived Gdynia about Nov. 11, 1951.
K. Hadjipateras (ex-*George C. Childress*).	7,255	J. C. Hadjipateras, Athens (1947)	Constantine Hadjipateras & Sons, Athens; Constantine Hadjipateras & Sons, Athens.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Antwerp Nov. 12, 1950, for Stettin; sailed Stettin Nov. 28, 1950, for Nagoya; sailed Calcutta May 22, 1951, for Tsingtao; sailed Tsingtao July 11, 1951; arrived Hamburg Sept. 6, 1951.
Kehres (ex-*Harry Toulmin*).	7,17	Thomas N. Epiphaniades, Piraeus (1947).	Thomas N. Epiphaniades, care of Fanmaur Shipping & Trading Corp., 39 Broadway, New York; Piraeus Thomas N. Epiphaniades, Piraeus.	544,506	8,000	Sailed Ancona June 14, 1951, for Odessa; arrived Belfast July 12, 1951, from Odessa; sailed Beirut Sept. 22, 1951, for Novorossisk; arrived Hull Oct. 17, 1951, from Novorossisk.
Kyma (ex-*Erastus Smith*).	7,244	Livanos Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus (1947).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Livanos Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Moji Dec. 14, 1950, for Dairen; sailed Dairen Jan. 3, 1951; arrived Rotterdam Feb. 23, 1951; sailed Cochin Aug. 25, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen on Sept. 20, 1951; arrived Belfast Nov. 22, 1951; sailed Yokohama Aug. 30, 1952, or Chinwangtao; sailed Pulo Bukom, Sept. 26, 1952, en route from Chinwangtao to Hamburg.

Former United States merchant ships sold to Greek concerns on which the U. S. Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration) still holds mortgages and which have traded behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe—July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1952—Continued

Name	Gross tons	To whom sold	Beneficial owner and registered owner	Sales price	Amount due (Apr. 9, 1952)	Voyage details
Louis Nomikos (ex-*Mary Walker*).	7,229	Evangelos P. & Markos P. Nomikos.	Evangelos P. Nomikos, Commercial & Maritime Enterprises, S. A., Athens; Evangelos P. Nomikos, Commercial & Maritime Enterprises, S. A., Athens.	$544,506	$280,500	Sailed Venice Oct. 5, 1952, for Kherson; passed Istanbul Oct. 28, 1952, en route from Kherson and Novorossisk to Avonmouth.
Maria Lee (ex-*E. A. Poden*).	7,244	Anthony Manthos & Others, Athens (1947).	Martran Steamship Co., Inc., 44 Whitehall St., New York; Los Bros., & A. K. Pezas, Chios.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Yawata Mar. 18, 1952; arrived Dairen Mar. 21, 1952; sailed Dairen Mar. 27, 1952; arrived Hamburg May 13, 1952.
Meandros.....	7,176	Livanos Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus (1946).	S. Livanos & Co., 52 Broadway, New York; Livanos Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus.	585,811	317,200	Sailed Osaka July 6, 1951 for Dairen; sailed Chinwangtao July 19, 1951; arrived Bombay Aug. 14, 1951; sailed Bombay Aug. 28, 1951; arrived Dairen Sept. 17, 1951; sailed Dairen Oct. 11, 1951; arrived Bombay Nov. 3, 1951.
Megalohari (ex-*Geo. G. Crawford*).	7,198	John Theodorakoupoulos, Athens (1947).	Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc., 80 Broad St., New York; John Theodorakoupoulos, Athens.	544,506	272,000	Sailed Yokohama May 18, 1951 for Dairen; arrived Hamburg July 31, 1951 from Tsingtao; sailed Hamburg Aug. 8, 1951 for Gdynia; arrived Buenos Aires Sept. 26, 1951 from Gdynia.
Michael (ex-*John Drew*).	7,207	Costos M. Lemos, Piraeus (1947)...	C. M. Lemos & Co., Ltd., London; Adamastos S. S. Co., Ltd., (Constantine Michael Lemos), Piraeus.	544,506	280,000	Sailed Tsingtao Oct. 8, 1950, for Dairen; arrived Rotterdam Dec. 2, 1950, from Dairen; sailed Pulo Bukom July 6, 1951, for Tsingtao; sailed Tsingtao Aug. 1, 1951; arrived Hamburg Sept. 23, 1951.
Mount Athos (ex-*J. Maurice Thompson*).	7,235	Constantine Scarvellis, Chios, Greece (1947).	Rethymnis & Kulukundia, Ltd., London; C. Scarvellis and others, Chios.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Alexandria May 27, 1951, for Novorossisk; sailed Novorossisk June 6, 1951; arrived London June 24, 1951.
Nestos (ex-*Mary Lyon*)...	7,176	Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus (1947).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Arrived Dairen Apr. 12, 1951, from Sasebo; sailed Dairen Apr. 21, 1951, for Hamburg; sailed Rotterdam June 9, 1951, for Whampoa; sailed Tsingtao Sept. 6, 1951; arrived Rotterdam Oct. 24, 1951; sailed Alexandria May 4, 1952, for Novorossisk; passed Istanbul May 15, 1952, en route Novorossisk to Alexandria; passed Istanbul June 3, 1952, en route Alexandria to Constantza; passed Istanbul June 19, 1952, en route Constantza to Belfast; sailed Ellesmere Port Dec. 24, 1952, for Tsingtao.
Nicolaos Pateras (ex-*Benjamin Bonneville*).	7,194	S. N. Pateras (1947).....	N. J. Pateras Sons, Ltd., London; Okeanoporos Shipping Co., Ltd., Athens.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Karachi Nov. 5, 1950, for Dairen; arrived Hamburg Feb. 16, 1951, from Dairen; sailed Moji May 5, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen May 27, 1951; arrived Antwerp July 12, 1951; sailed Rotterdam Jan. 4, 1952, for Constantza; sailed Constantza Jan. 29, 1952, for Taku Bar; passed Brunsbuttel May 15, 1952, en route Tsingtao to Gdynia; arrived Rotterdam May 30, 1952, from Gdynia.
Nicolaou Zografia (ex-*Raymond T. Baker*).	7,207	Mrs. Z. Nicolaou and family, Athens (1947).	George Nicolaou Ltd., London; Mme Z. G. Nicolaou and children, Athens.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Cordenas Oct. 31, 1950, for Tsingtao; sailed Tsingtao Jan. 14, 1951; arrived Vancouver Feb. 20, 1951.
Pinios (ex-*Robert L. Hague*).	7,207	Theofano Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus (1947).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Athina Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus.	544,506	288,000	Sailed Yawata Apr. 10, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen Apr. 26, 1951; arrived Hamburg June 19, 1951; arrived Tsingtao Aug. 2, 1952, from Kaoshuing; passed Port Said Sept. 12 en route Tsingtao to Constantza; arrived Izmir Oct. 6, 1952, from Constantza.
Psara (ex-*Mark A. Davis*).	7,255	D. S. Fafalios, Chios (1946).....	D. J. Fafalios, Chios, Greece; Stamos and Demetrios Fafalios and partners, Chios.	581,381	314,600	Sailed Amsterdam Feb. 21, 1952, for Odessa; arrived London Apr. 11, 1952, from Odessa; sailed Chios Dec. 10, 1952, for Novorossisk; arrived London Jan. 15, 1953, from Novorossisk.
Richard D. Lyons (ex-*Richard D. Lyons*).	7,253	Galaxias S. S. CO., Ltd., Piraeus (1946).	Lyras Bros., Ltd., London; Galaxias S. S. Co., Ltd, Piraeus.	580,654	313,950	Sailed Karachi Sept. 22, 1950, for Dairen; arrived Hamburg Jan. 3, 1951 from Dairen; sailed Bombay Feb. 25, 1952 for Odessa; arrived Avonmouth Apr. 14, 1952 from Odessa.
Samos (ex-*John L. Stoddard*).	7,176	D. Inglessis Fils, Piraeus (1947)c..	Frinton Shipbrokers, Ltd., London; Navigation de Samos, Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Antwerp Nov. 30, 1950; arrived Tsingtao Jan. 28, 1951; sailed Tsingtao Feb. 17, 1951; arrived Hamburg Apr. 4, 1951; sailed Osaka Sept. 10, 1951; arrived Tsingtao Sept. 14, 1951; arrived Hamburg Nov. 11, 1951 from Tsingtao; arrived Rotterdam Apr. 11, 1952 from Dairen; sailed, Bremen Apr. 10, 1952; arrived Shanghai June 11, 1952; sailed Shanghai June 19, 1952; arrived Cochin July 9, 1952.
Themoni (ex-*Josiah Cohen*).	7,196	Kassos S. N. Co., Ltd., Syra (1947).	Rethymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd., London; Kassos S. N. Co., Ltd., Syra.	564,694	296,400	Arrived Belfast July 7, 1950, from Odessa; sailed Antwerp Nov. 1, 1950, for Gdansk; sailed Gdynia Nov. 18, 1950, for Venice; sailed Dec. 19, 1950, for Nicolaieff; sailed Novorossisk Jan. 11, 1951; arrived Liverpool Jan. 30, 1951; sailed Kobe May 1, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen May 23, 1951; arrived Rotterdam July 29, 1951; sailed Dairen Feb. 11, 1952; arrived Rotterdam Apr. 1, 1952; sailed Leghorn Apr. 10, 1952, for Odessa and Kherson; arrived Alexandria May 1, 1952, from Odessa; sailed Alexandria May 12, 1952, for Odessa; arrived Liverpool June 13, 1952, from Odessa.
Aliki (ex-*Louis Joliet*)...	7,198	Livanos Bros. Maritime Co., Ltd., Piraeus (1947).	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Livanos Bros. Maritime Co. Ltd., Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Muroran Nov. 25, 1950, for Dairen; sailed Dairen Dec. 6, 1950; arrived Rotterdam Jan. 31, 1951; sailed Kawasaki June 5, 1951; arrived Dairen June 11, 1951; arrived Calcutta July 27, 1951, from Dairen; sailed Calcutta Aug. 12, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen Sept. 11, 1951; arrived Bombay Oct. 5, 1951.
Captain J. Matarangas (ex-*James L. Ackerson*).	7,240	Stavros S. Niarchos, care of North American Shipping & Trading Co., London (1947).	Carras, Ltd., Old Broad St., London; Tropis Co., Ltd., Piraeus.	544,506	288,000	Sailed Suez July 29, 1950, and Hakodate Sept. 15, 1950, en route from Stettin to Dairen; arrived Rotterdam Nov. 15, 1950, from Dairen.
Chryssi (ex-*Francisco Morazan*)	7,176	J. P. Goulandris Bros., Athens.....	Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc. New York; Petros J. Goulandris Sons, Athens.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Yokohama Nov. 22, 1950, for Dairen; arrived Copenhagen Feb. 2, 1951, from Dairen; sailed Moji Apr. 26, 1951, for Dairen; sailed Dairen May 7, 1951; arrived Aarhus June 29, 1951.
Costantis (ex-*Harry Leon Wilson*).	7,176	G. M. & D. Pateras, Piraeus (1947).	Pateras Bros., Pirasus; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Moji Feb. 6, 1951 for Dairen; arrived Bordeaux Apr. 9, 1951 from Dairen; sailed Kaoshuing June 23, 1952 for Tsingtao; passed Port Said Aug. 26 en route Tsingtao to Genoa.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Former United States merchant ships sold to Greek concerns on which the U. S. Federal Maritime Board (Maritime Administration) still holds mortgages and which have traded behind the Iron Curtain in China and Europe—July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1952—Continued

Name	Gross tons	To whom sold	Beneficial owner and registered owner	Sales price	Amount due (Apr. 9, 1952)	Voyage details
Dimosthenis Pantaleon (ex-*D. W. Harrington*).	7,176	P. D. & B. D. Pantaleon, Athens (1947).	George Nicolaou, Ltd., London; Dem Pantaleon Sons, Athens.	$544,506	$280,500	Sailed Piraeus Nov. 2, 1950 for Poti; sailed Novorossisk Nov. 14, 1950; arrived Baltimore Dec. 11, 1950; sailed Istanbul July 20, 1951 for Novorossisk; arrived Hull Aug. 15, 1951.
Dirphys (ex-*Frank Wiggins*).	7,176	Livanos Bros., Piraeus (1947).....	Vassilios J. Pateras and others, Piraeus; same.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Hirohata Apr. 25, 1951 for Dairen; sailed Dairen May 13, 1951; arrived Rotterdam July 3, 1951.
Eurymedon (ex-*Wm. D. Hoard*).	7,176	Panagis S. Antippas (1947).....	P. D. Marchessini & Co., Ltd., London; Pan D. Marchessini, Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Kossier May 23, 1950 for Dairen; arrived London Sept. 20, 1950 from Dairen; sailed Alexandria Dec. 15, 1952 for Novorossisk; sailed Novorossisk Dec. 29, 1952; arrived Hull Jan. 16, 1953.
Konistra (ex-*Edwin L. Godkin*).	7,198	Thomas N. Epiphaniades, Piraeus (1947).	Thomas N. Epiphaniades, care of Fanmaur Shipping & Trading Corp., 39 Broadway, New York, and Piraeus, Thomas N. Epiphaniades.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Hong Kong Sept. 3, 1950 for Dairen; arrived Haifa Oct. 23, 1950 from Dairen; sailed Kobe Apr. 2, 1951 for Dairen; arrived Antwerp June 7, 1951 from Dairen.
Maria G. Culucundis (ex-*W. W. McCracken*).	7,180	C. M. Culucundis, Athens (1946)..	George M. Culucundis, Athens; same.	544,506	255,000	Sailed Antilla Oct. 31, 1950; arrived Tsingtao Dec. 31, 1950; Arrived Moji Jan. 3, 1951.
Nedon (ex-*William W. Campbell*).	7,176	Livanos Bros., Piraeus (1947).....	S. Livanos & Co., Inc., 52 Broadway, New York; Eugenie Maritime Co., Ltd. Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Moji Apr. 27, 1951 for Dairen; sailed Dairen May 9, 1951 for Hamburg; sailed Hirohato Apr. 8, 1952; arrived Dairen Apr. 13, 1952; arrived Madras May 15, 1952 from Dairen; sailed Hamburg Oct. 23, 1952; arrived Taku Bar Jan. 15, 1953.
Nicolas (ex-*William N. Byers*).	7,176	Mevrophilippas & Pateras (1947)..	Ch. & E. Pateras, Ltd., London; Callipoe & Charalampos N. Paterns, Piraeus.	544,506	280,500	Sailed Karachi Aug. 18, 1950 for Dairen; arrived Liverpool Nov. 28, 1950; sailed London Dec. 20, 1950; arrived Dairen Mar. 14, 1951; arrived Rotterdam May 12, 1951.
Santorini (ex-*John F. Myers*).	7,176	George Sigalas & Son, Athens (1947).	Rothymnis & Kulukundis, Ltd., London; Mme. Cadio G. Sigalas & Others, Athens.	544,506	306,000	Sailed Hakodata Oct. 9, 1950; arrived Dairen Oct. 15, 1950; arrived Tokuyama Dec. 1, 1950; sailed Tsingtao Jan. 8, 1951; arrived Moji Jan. 18, 1951.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MORSE. Now, Mr. President, as my next item of committee business, I turn to the subject of labor-management relations in the United States. I wish to make a few comments on the award which has just been handed down to the railroad workers on the basis of the criterion of productivity.

Let the brakes fail to operate on a train, and the engine comes crashing through the Union Station, in Washington, D. C., and it becomes headlines all over the country and is the topic for commentators and editorial writers; but let 70,000 trains pull into Union Station and the brakes properly work, and one would have to have keener eyes than I to find any mention of it in the newspapers. That brings me to this point I wish to make, that on Wednesday of this week, Professor Guthrie, of the University of North Carolina, acting as a referee appointed by President Truman to compose a controversy affecting 1,200,000 railroad workers and 130 class one American railroads, handed down an award and effected a peaceful settlement under an arrangement which he had previously made with the parties to the dispute, that is, that they would accept as final and binding his decision in the matter. Here is the situation affecting this large number of railroad workers and all those important American railroads. There were affected some 19 labor organizations which, in the finest spirit and in accordance with the letter of the Railway Labor Act, adjusted a dispute that might very well have interrupted our transportation system by creating a nationwide railroad dispute, thereby inflicting tremendous damage to the economy of the United States and the war effort. What I submit, Mr. President, is that there was very litle headline mention of that in the newspapers throughout the country or on the radio, and certainly it has not become the subject of across-the-country editorial commendation.

In conclusion, let me say that I think it is a fine example of what I have been talking about for several years, namely, that far more important than labor legislation is the proper attitude on the part of labor and management as they approach the conference table, and the impartiality and the attitude of the representative of the Government who participates in an attempt to have the parties to a dispute or a controversy compose their differences in the American way. I congratulate Professor Guthrie, I congratulate the 19 labor organizations who were parties in the controversy, and I congratulate all of the 130 American railroads who became parties to the agreement.

Furthermore, I point out, Mr. President, that it is one of the rare recognitions in the field of labor settlements that give approval to the criterion of productivity. I happen to be one who feels that more attention should be paid to the criterion of productivity. I think labor makes a great mistake whenever it follows a policy based upon a make-work program rather than upon a policy of increasing productivity, when it is able to do so within the framework of decent working rules. I also believe American labor would gain much approval on the part of the American public if it would manifest a greater support of this criterion of productivity. In my view there is no answer to the fact that economically speaking, labor is entitled to enjoy a greater share of the income from the product of its labor when it cooperates with management in eliminating make-work schemes and accepting technological changes within an industry which increases rather than decreases the volume of production. I venture the suggestion that in the months immediately ahead, this award by Professor Guthrie is going to have significant repercussions in the whole field of labor negotiations, because it is positive, it is constructive, and it is sound economics.

THE RIGHT OF EACH STATE TO EQUAL SENATORIAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. President, I am not going to take the time to discuss in the detail what I wanted to—because of the hour—the constitutional principle of the right of a sovereign State to have, through its two Senators in the Senate, equal representation. I mentioned it in my speech of last Friday when I discussed the committee matter, and I shall postpone until next Friday a discussion of the constitutional authorities which in my judgment sustain my premise that, up until now, and as of now, more than one and a half million people in the State of Oregon have been denied for some 9 weeks equal representation in the Senate of the United States.

I simply reiterate the statement today and will make it a part of my committee report a week hence. But I suggest to any of my colleagues who might be interested in preparing themselves for a debate on the proposition that they refer to the "Framing of the Constitution," by Professor Max Farrand—1926—and familiarize themselves once again with the historic debates at the time the Constitution was framed and with what the Founding Fathers intended should be the functions, the rights, and the prerogatives of Members of the Senate.

I recognize that it takes time to act on such a resolution as that which I submitted on January 13 calling for an increase in the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by one Republican in order that the representative of the Independent Party might keep his position on those two committees in accordance with what he deems to be his seniority right in the Senate as supported by every precedent

in the history of the Senate save and except the lone one of 1871 when Sumner, of Massachusetts, was kicked off his committees by the then Republican Party, as I was by the Senate on January 13.

I know it is impossible, Mr. President, to be free from the criticism of those who do not want to face the principle of the issue involved. Twenty or twenty-five years from today, when the debates of this period over this committee fight are read—because the personalities will then be out of the picture—people will pause and reflect on the principle which was involved and on the final solution of the problem which should be reached by the Senate.

But to the people of Oregon I say at this desk this afternoon that the fact is they are being denied equal representation in the Senate of the United States. They have been denied equal representation for 9 weeks, and have been denied it by the majority party which has the votes to prevent it.

As I have previously indicated, the minority party has not been at all helpful about it. On January 13 only six Members of the Senate stood up and supported the contention of the junior Senator from Oregon with reference to equal rights in the Senate of the United States. But, gradually, Mr. President, more and more persons are beginning to understand the issue, and I shall continue, so far as I am concerned, to hold the issue to the principle involved.

I have been perfectly willing to give the Committee on Rules and Administration whatever reasonable time it needed to pass judgment and make a recommendation on the question. It is not very complex. The Senate either is or is not going to add one Republican to each one of those two committees. I should think it could be decided in an hour's discussion in committee, and I should think it could be decided in a couple of hours in the Senate. So far as the State of Oregon is concerned, it has a Republican administration, an overwhelming majority of Republicans in the State legislature, a Republican Governor, and a Republican United States Senator. I am hearing from many of the people with reference to this committee question, and I say to them that I think sufficient time has been allowed the Republicans to act on my resolution. If the Republicans in the Senate want to make a record of refusing to adopt that resolution, I think they should proceed with the business of doing so and let the people of Oregon be the judge as to whether they agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that they have been denied equal representation. As to the meaning of the Constitution and the opinions of the authorities, I shall cite them at some length next week.

I desire to say in closing, Mr. President, that I really think we should resolve this question on an impersonal and objective basis. There has been sufficient time for relaxation on the part of all concerned, and at an early date, I hope before next Friday, the Republican majority in the Senate will make up its mind as to whether, under rule XXIV, it wants to assign the junior Senator from Oregon, on the basis of what I have described as a garbage-can disposal principle, to committees, or whether it wants to go on record as not favoring what I think was the unfortunate precedent of 1871, but of sustaining the many precedents to the contrary before and since 1871. There are innumerable precedents of insurgents, or independents, or rebels, or whatever descriptive term one may care to use, who have followed a political course of action not pleasing to the majority, but who, nevertheless, were not denied their seniority rights to remain on committees on which they had previously served, though in some instances, as I have said, they lost their chairmanships, and in other instances were seated at the foot of the committee table so far as seniority was concerned.

I reiterate, Mr. President, for the benefit of my Democratic friends, that I think they are quite mistaken if they take the position that the Republican Party ought to yield majority control of the Committee on Armed Services and of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and let them be evenly balanced committees. I believe the majority party is entitled to a majority of members on each of the committees. Therefore, Mr. President, I think the solution which is proposed by my resolution and which the majority leader has indicated to me he thinks is an equitable one, namely, that one Republican should be added to each one of those committees and that the seniority rights of the junior Senator from Oregon be recognized by assigning him to those two committees, is a fair solution. I think the Senate ought to resolve this matter at a very early date, because, in my opinion, the people of my State are being denied, under the present hiatus, equal representation in the Senate of the United States, in accordance with their rights under the Constitution.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF COMMITTEES

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding as to my reasons for rejecting membership on an investigative subcommittee of the Finance Committee yesterday, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD, first, the Standard Rules of Procedure, as they have been adopted by other Senate committees, but which were rejected by the Finance Committee yesterday; also, such rules as were adopted, along with the proposed amendment to the adopted rules which I submitted and recommended as necessary to protect the subcommittee and its members.

First, I wish to incorporate in the RECORD the Standard Rules of Procedure which were adopted by the Senate Committee on Government Operations in establishing the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, dated January 14, 1953. These, according to my information, were recommended by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] as being the Standard Rules of Procedure which had been worked out on behalf of the legislative counsel and the Department of Justice and the Committee on Government Operations. These are the same rules under which that subcommittee is operating today. Those rules of procedure were rejected yesterday by the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULES OF PROCEDURE, SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

1. No major investigation shall be initiated without approval of a majority of the subcommittee or approval of the majority of the full Committee on Government Operations. However, preliminary inquiries may be initiated by the subcommittee staff with the approval of the chairman of the subcommittee.

2. Subpenas for attendance of witnesses and the production of records shall be issued by the subcommittee chairman or other members designated by him.

3. Executive hearings shall be held only with the approval of the chairman of the subcommittee. This authority may be delegated by the chairman to other members of the committee when necessary.

4. Public hearings shall be held only with the approval of the majority of the subcommittee or with the approval of a majority of the full committee.

5. An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings.

6. All testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released or used in public session without the approval of a majority of the subcommittee.

7. Any witness summoned to a public or executive hearing may be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing who shall be permitted while the witness is testifying to advise him of his legal rights.

8. Any person who is the subject of an investigation in public hearings may submit questions for the cross-examination of other witnesses called by the subcommittee by submitting such questions in writing to the chairman. With the consent of the majority of the subcommittee then present, these questions will be put to the witness by a member or counsel of the subcommittee.

9. Any witness desiring to make a prepared or written statement in executive or public hearings is required to file a copy of such statement with the counsel or chairman of the subcommittee 24 hours in advance of the hearing at which the statement is to be presented.

10. No report shall be made to the Senate or released to the public without the approval of the majority of the subcommittee or by a majority vote of the full committee.

Adopted January 14, 1953.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Next, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD the rules of procedure which were adopted by the Finance Committee as governing the subcommittee. These rules do not show the amendment to which I shall refer later.

There being no objection, the rules of procedure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings on said matters and to sit and act on them during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States, and without the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions as the subcommittee may determine and as approved by the whole committee.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

In the performance of its functions, the subcommittee may hold such hearings whether or not the United States Senate is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and may require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or by other lawful means to administer such oaths and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the subcommittee or by any member thereof designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Except as to the specific investigations herein authorized, no investigation shall be initiated or carried on without the approval of the whole committee. However, preliminary inquiries of matters involving possible wrongdoing by officials or others respecting the revenues of the United States leading from, or suggested by, studies and investigations of those matters herein specifically authorized may be initiated by the subcommittee.

Executive hearings shall be held only with the approval of the chairman of the subcommittee. This authority may be delegated by such chairman to other members of the subcommittee when necessary.

Public hearings shall be held only with the approval of the whole committee.

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings.

The subcommittee shall report its actions and recommendations to the whole committee and all testimony taken in executive session by the subcommittee and matters developed therein and actions, recommendations, and reports thereon shall not be released or disclosed without the approval of the whole committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Third, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD an amendment which I submitted to these tentative rules of procedure. The amendment reads:

Except that the full committee cannot prohibit any member of the committee from discharging his responsibility to disclose any case which he considers to have been a violation of the law.

That amendment was originally rejected. However, it was subsequently reamended, but in rewriting it the adopted version nullified the intent. I ask that the amendment as offered by me be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment as offered was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Except that the full committee cannot prohibit any member of the committee from discharging his responsibility to disclose any case which he considers to have been a violation of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, briefly, I may say that I am advised by others, including Members of the Congress, who have worked with such committees, that there are no precedents in the Senate whereby any subcommittees have been bound under the rules as they are outlined in this particular case. There has been some slight misunderstanding that possibly the question was one of trying to restrict me or some other member of the committee in perhaps what it was thought were our intentions, namely, to discuss on the floor of the Senate—or off the floor of the Senate—confidential matters which came to the subcommittee from income-tax returns. That was not at all the question, as any member of the Finance Committee will verify. That was not in controversy at all.

Furthermore, I point out that recent discussions of compromise settlements which I disclosed on the floor of the Senate are not covered, either in or out of any rules of the subcommittee. That information is available to anyone, particularly to any member of the press. If they know of any case, they can go to the Treasury Department to get details as to any compromise settlement which may have been made in the past. Those are established Treasury rules.

Mr. President, I desire to point out the results of this censorship as suggested, as the subcommittee is now set up.

Under this proposal, as it is now made, it is possible for the subcommittee, in its investigation, to develop a certain case against Mr. X who is employed in the Treasury Department. The subcommittee might unanimously decide that Mr. X was accepting bribes or was guilty of other criminal violations of the law. That could be reported to the full committee, but under the rule as adopted, if the full committee by a majority vote, voted "No" on the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee, the full committee could prevent any exposure of the charges which had been developed in the course of the investigation.

Under the rule as outlined, every member of the subcommittee or every member of the full committee would be honor bound never to discuss, either on or off the floor of the Senate, any of the facts developed. Although they may be in the position of thinking that Mr. X had accepted bribes and was conducting his office in an improper manner, yet they would be precluded from disclosing any information which had been developed in the subcommittee. The veto is all powerful.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Delaware to say that there is a proposal of a committee which seeks to exercise control on the floor of the Senate as to what a committee member can or cannot say in the public interest with reference to information which has been discovered through the medium of an investigation by a subcommittee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the information was discovered as a result of material which was developed and submitted to the subcommittee, if the full committee did not give permission, the members of the subcommittee would be precluded from coming to the floor of the Senate and reporting such information, or precluded from submitting the facts to the Attorney General or to the American people.

Mr. President, I am not questioning the good intentions of those who voted for the proposal; I think there are good arguments on both sides of the question, for I listened yesterday and heard many arguments on the subject; but we must not overlook the possibility that if we adopt this rule and if it is carried to the extreme and applied to all investigating committees of the Senate, the party in power could put the "lid" on any investigation of any irregularities occurring under its administration of the Government. I do not think we should establish such a precedent in the United States Senate. As I told the committee yesterday, I would never go along with any such position.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I say to the very able Senator from Delaware who has done such an excellent job of exposing corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau that I think he is 100 percent correct in refusing to serve on the subcommittee under the rule which has been adopted? We have adopted rules of procedure in our committee under both Democratic and Republican administrations, and we have found that they have worked very well. We have in no way attempted to question the right of any Senator, Democrat or Republican, to discuss what he thinks should be discussed on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Delaware for taking the action he has taken in removing himself from that subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

I am not questioning the motives of those who voted for the rule. There are many arguments for it, but its implications are dangerous. I do not think the American people would have any confidence in any subcommittee which was established to investigate irregularities on the part of any Government agency if the members of such subcommittee agreed that under certain circumstances, by a vote of eight Members of the United States Senate, they would keep their mouths shut, even if there were violations of the law involved.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Delaware, and I congratulate him for his candor and courage in resigning from any such subcommittee. Having served as a minority member on many committees in the past, I certainly would have resented the operation of any such rule as that which the Senator has been discussing. As a member of the majority I feel equally vehement about the matter. I do not think that we, as members of the majority party, should ever place ourselves in such a position that we could be accused of trying to censure any member of the minority. I think we should remain on a proper basis, so that Senators acting through the conviction of their consciences should have a right to discuss on the floor or off the floor of the Senate, or anywhere else, corruption or malfeasance wherever they discover it in the management of the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator. I am sure he is aware, because he has served on many committees, that other committees have access to tax returns if they wish to subpena them. I know of

no instance in the past in which I have violated that right or others have violated it. If there are any such instances, I should like to have them pointed out. We have not taken any advantage of any facts of a confidential nature which we have obtained.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not believe taxpayers who make confidential returns should have the information contained in such returns spread all over the country, unless there is an established violation. In securing such information from the Bureau of Internal Revenue it is understood that members of the committee will not disclose the information. If it should be independently developed in the committee, by a member of the committee, that there is anything unlawful in the return of the taxpayer, the member should not be barred from imparting knowledge to the public with respect to it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no recollection of any case in which the information so found has been misused.

But that was not the basis of the action of the committee. The whole question arose as to whether, by a majority vote of the full committee, the report submitted by the committee could be stopped. It was thoroughly understood in the committee that if such a report was voted upon negatively by a majority vote of the committee, no member of the subcommittee thereafter would be permitted to discuss either on or off the floor of the Senate the contents of the report, even though a member of the subcommittee was convinced, in his own mind, that there was involved an actual violation of the law.

I am sure that the present membership of the Finance Committee have no intentions to protect a law violator; but we may not always have the same membership.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Delaware would not quarrel with the point of view that the full committee has a right to tell the subcommittee that it will not authorize publications. That is one thing. But to tell individual members of the subcommittee that they cannot speak about it is altogether different.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree fully with that statement. The point is that the full committee wants the power to bind every member of the subcommittee not to refer to any information gained as a result of investigations or powers authorized by the full committee.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not believe the Senator from Delaware considers censorship by congressional action to be any better than censorship by Executive edict.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the subcommittee obtains knowledge which indicates that a public official is dishonest in carrying out his trust and the subcommittee fails to make the fact known to the Congress as a whole or to the people of the country, are not the members of the subcommittee just as guilty, in effect, of betraying the people who sent them to the Congress as is the official who is directly or indirectly shielded by the failure to report such malfeasance to the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That has always been my understanding, and it has been the basis of my objections to the past administration. They covered up some of the reports, and I felt they should have been acted upon prior to exposure.

Mr. AIKEN. The rule would cover up those reports.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. I question whether any Member of the United States Senate who has taken the oath of office as a Senator would have the right to join in a conspiracy in advance whereby there would be a possibility that he would sit tight with information which he thought disclosed a violation of law. I certainly would not do it, with or without a legal right.

Mr. AIKEN. A Senator has no such right, and I question the right of the majority of any committee to tie the tongue of any other member of the committee who has knowledge of violations of the law, and keep him from revealing them, so that they may be corrected and such disclosure may serve as a deterrent to other officials who perhaps are following the same course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Vermont is correct.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Delaware will permit me to do so, I should like to comment at this point because I believe we ought to make a record on this question today.

I would point out to the Senator from Delaware that it is one thing to propose a code of procedure for congressional investigations, such as is found in the Kefauver bill and in the Morse bill, and to provide a rule of committee against public disclosure in the so-called pretrial or early stages of an investigation, until all the facts are made of record and there is an opportunity to rebut them; and it is quite another thing to lay down a rule of finality which says that no Member of the Senate who serves on a committee or a subcommittee shall be privileged at any time to perform what he considers to be his senatorial duty, namely, to discuss publicly on the floor of the Senate a question which he thinks is of public concern, growing out of his work as a member of the committee. I agree with the statement by the Senator from South Dakota and also the implications and comments made by the Senator from Vermont, and by the Senator from Delaware, as well.

In the first place, I do not think any such rule could possibly have any binding effect on any Member of the Senate, because there would be no way to enforce it. Whenever a rule is made, the question must always be asked, in respect to the rule: What about its violation? Suppose Senator X, or the Senator from Delaware himself, serving on a subcommittee, became convinced, speaking hypothetically, that the subcommittee was trying to conceal a tremendous national scandal of maladministration. Does the Senator from Delaware think for a moment that the lips of Senator X would be sealed by any such rule as the Senator is now discussing from presenting the matter on the floor of the Senate; and, if he did discuss it, does the Senator think he would therefore be subjected, shall I say, to the application of the rule of the Senate under which Members of the Senate may pass judgment on the qualifications of their colleagues, and that such disclosure might be the basis for ousting the Member?

Such a suggestion is absurd, I suggest, because I think it is necessary to look at the relationship of the power of any Senate committee to the power of the Senate as a whole. The committee is the lesser in importance, and any power delegated to it is also lesser than the power of the Senate as a whole. There is one power on the floor of the Senate that in all our history has in no way been restricted. It will be a bad day for the American people if the time ever comes when an attempt is made to restrict it by such a rule as the Senator is now suggesting, namely, a rule of censorship to be imposed by a committee on the lips of any Member of the Senate in respect to any information he may gain as a committee member while carrying on his work as a committee member. Such action is unthinkable. Of course, if any attempt is ever made to impose such a rule, carrying with it some enforcement penalty, it must be fought, because the Senator from Delaware knows, as does the Senator from Oregon, that no man of honor in the Senate of the United States will violate any rule of any committee that goes to the subject matter of secrecy, unless he becomes convinced that something rotten is going on, and that he must, as the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from South Dakota have stated, live up to his oath as a Senator and perform his functions as a Senator, those functions being more important than his functions as a member of a Senate committee.

What I think is needed is the making of a legislative record on the point by the committee between one Senator and the other members of the committee. But I cannot believe any member of the committee would purport to lay down a rule that would have binding force and effect on any Member of the Senate to censor and seal his lips if, as a Member of the Senate, fulfilling the oath he took at the desk when he became a Member of the Senate, he believes that it has become his duty to tell the American people what he thinks the facts are about any matter that may arise.

Similar situations were encountered in the Committee on Armed Services time and time again when I was a member of that committee, when allegedly secret information was given the committee, and members of the committee were in honor bound, in the interest of protecting the security of the country, not to violate any security policies of the Committee on Armed Services. But sometimes the circumstances were such that we were satisfied, if certain conditions were not cleared up, it would be necessary to take the matter to the floor of the Senate. In such situations I never hesitated to tell the committee what my position would be. Sometimes I wonder if that is not one of the reasons why I am no longer a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for his comment. As I said before, I am not questioning the motives of those who supported this proposal. Arguments can be presented both ways. But the net result is that it would be theoretically possible—I do not say it would ever be done—to have the full committee by a mere majority vote stifle a report that a subcommittee might unanimously make, even though the subcommittee might be unanimous in its verdict that there was a violation of the law.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Delaware will hold the floor for a minute, because the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] desires me to yield, I should like to touch upon the last observation he made. Does the Senator from Delaware agree with me that it would be very wise if all committees of the Senate would constantly keep in mind the fact that matters which come before any committee of the Senate are not matters that involve business of the committee, but that the business before any committee of the Senate happens to be the business of the people of the United States, and the committee does not own such business?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. As the Senator from Delaware knows, at the time the Senate was organized and its committees were appointed, I very much desired to have the Senator from Delaware on the Special Investigating Committee because of the tremendously effective and excellent work he did over a period of time in exposing graft and corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I thought his handling of that investigation was a model for the handling of material of that nature.

As the Senator from Delaware knows, since the first of the year I have discussed with him a number of cases which appear to represent rather grossly improper conduct in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Senator from Delaware has been furnished some information with respect to some of the cases, although he himself has had much more information than we have given him. My committee has desisted from going into matters concerning corruption and fraud in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, because I had hoped the Senator from Delaware would head a subcommittee that would look into that matter.

On March 9, several days before the subcommittee was formed, I wrote to the chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. MILLIKIN] in regard to this matter. If the Senator from Delaware has no objection, I should like to insert the letter in the RECORD. Better still, I should like to read it into the RECORD. It is very brief. It reads as follows:

MARCH 9, 1953.

Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Senate Finance Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: My staff has accumulated considerable material on John B. Dunlap, who as you know was originally located with the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington and later frozen into a civil-service position in the Bureau in Texas, under the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

This material has been supplied to Senator WILLIAMS, for the reason that I understood that when he suggested coming on my Permanent Committee on Investigations, he was discouraged on the ground that he would head a subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee with full authority to go into tax fraud cases, etc. I have been rather disappointed to find that no such subcommittee has been appointed at this time. Therefore, I would appreciate knowing whether such a subcommittee is to be formed; if not, my committee will proceed to go into this matter.

For a number of reasons time is very important in this case. Therefore, I would appreciate hearing from you at your very earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the reply which I received from the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
March 12, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: With reference to your letter of March 9, 1953, regarding the appointment of a subcommittee by the Senate Finance Committee to investigate internal revenue matters.

Today the Senate Finance Committee authorized the appointment of such a subcommittee.

It will be appreciated if you will supply the committee with the material to which you refer in your letter.

Sincerely,

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I am sorry to hear that he is removing himself from the subcommittee. I would not do it. I would stay on the subcommittee and serve notice as to what I intended to do. I think I would recognize the old rule the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. TOBEY] whispered to me a moment ago, namely, that the whole is greater than any of its parts.

The Senator from Delaware has his duty as a Member of the Senate as a whole, it seems to me, to exercise what he thinks is a wise discretion as a member of the subcommittee. I have no doubt that the Senator from Delaware would never bring to the floor of the Senate any item of business transacted in the committee and make public disclosure of it unless he thought the public interest demanded it. I think it will be unfortunate if the Senator from Delaware leaves the subcommittee because the subcommittee is adopting a rule of which he does not approve. That is no justification for leaving the subcommittee. I would simply say, "Rule or no rule, I am going to stay here and fulfill my oath of office as a Senator. You can adopt all the censorship rules you wish; they will roll from my back like water."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not a question of leaving the full committee. Certainly I intend to remain on the full committee and exercise my rights as a Member of the United States Senate and as a member of the full committee. However, the subcommittee has not yet been organized. The subcommittee has been authorized on the basis which I have just stated, and I have rejected membership on the subcommittee. If I were to become a member of the subcommittee under the rules which have been outlined I would expect to follow them in good faith. I thought it was only fair to tell the committee in advance that I would not be bound by any such arbitrary rules.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Finance Committee and the Senator from Delaware may reconsider the tentative decisions which they have reached. During the past 2 years, the Senator from Delaware has rendered as great a public service to this Nation as any other Member of this body.

I never knew the Senator from Delaware to bring a case to the floor of the Senate which was not carefully checked. In every instance before he brought a case to the floor he not only allowed but solicited comment from those who might be adversely reflected upon. He gave full weight to their statements. In several cases which I discussed with him, though he was dealing with Democrats, I found him to be somewhat more lenient than I was.

The Senator from Delaware has made a magnificent record. Not only do we on our side of the aisle have great confidence in him, but the American public has great confidence in him. I very much hope that he will remain on the committee, and I very much hope that the committee will free him, as the previous Finance Committee freed him.

I take a great deal of pride in the fact that though the previous Congress was organized primarily by our side, we never imposed any roadblocks. I think the Senator from Delaware will agree with the statement that in any investigations which he made we allowed him complete freedom with the record, and complete freedom to make statements on the floor, as I believe he should have a right to do.

I am not trying to stir up intraparty strife on the other side of the aisle. However, the Senator from Delaware has convinced me and the American public that he is a completely honest man who calls the shots as he sees them, regardless of party affiliation, and regardless of whether the individuals concerned are important or unimportant. I very much hope that the Senator from Delaware will reconsider his decision, that he will serve on the subcommittee, and that the subcommittee will allow him freedom of action. I regard the Senator from Delaware as one of the finest citizens of this Republic.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Illinois very much. I assure him that I will not lose my interest, even though I am not on the subcommittee. Any information which may come to my hands will, after proper verification, be reported to the Senate and the people—let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senator from Delaware will not eliminate the possibility of his becoming a member of the subcommittee. I think the American people would be very much disappointed, indeed, if he were not a member of the subcommittee.

Apropos of what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has said about the subcommittee freeing the Senator from Delaware, I do not understand how any subcommittee can free a member whom it has no right to bind in the first place.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure my friend from Delaware that I am very happy to stand here today and argue in support of what I think are his committee rights.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1411) to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may read a brief statement which I have prepared with reference to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the interests of expanding the protection of Federal crop insurance to additional farmers and crops in my State and other States, I have introduced an amendment to the present legislation designed to accomplish this purpose.

Present legislation does not permit expansion of this important farm program beyond 1953, the current crop year. My amendment would authorize continued expansion of this program which can play a vital role in bringing stability to the Nation's agricultural economy. The amendment would permit expansion to include additional crops which do not now have the benefit of this all-risk insurance protection, such as peanuts, which are of considerable economic importance to many farmers in my State. Undoubtedly there are other crops of equal importance in other States which are not now insured by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and on which at least experimental efforts should be started.

My amendment also contemplates moving in the direction of more adequate protection and consequently larger premium income in some insurance counties by adding insurance on additional crops to the basic county program. For example, I have in mind that where a cotton program is operating successfully and peanuts are a significant part of the cash farm income in the county that insurance on peanuts might also be offered in that county. I am aware that the Corporation is currently experimenting with a multiple-crop insurance plan which does combine several crops under one coverage, but I believe that an alternative insurance which admittedly would cost the farmer more but under which he could insure his cotton and his peanuts separately might more adequately meet the insurance needs of some counties. This would also move in the direction of increasing the premium income of the Corporation in some counties, which is an important factor in connection with sound operations since the losses must be paid and insurance reserves built from this premium income.

I note in the annual report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to the Congress that during the past 2 years $42 million in losses were paid to insured farmers who through no fault of their own lost not only the profit that they hoped to obtain from their money and their work but also part or all of the money spent in the production effort. These $42 million are doubly significant when you realize that they were paid entirely from premiums that insured farmers had paid for their crop-investment insurance. Their value is far greater than a like number of dollars on the profit end or distributed in any other way than through an insurance operation. These indemnities by their very nature seek out the points of distress and damage in the farm economy.

As the farm program of the future is shaped by this Congress and those that follow, I feel that it is of great importance that the value of this crop-insurance program be clearly understood. To me, it is the foundation of a strong farm program because it protects the very base of the farming operation. Its protection is restricted to the cost of producing the crop or crops insured so it takes hold for the farmer when he is in a difficult financial position with little or nothing to sell. It bolsters his position in the difficult days so that he can put in another crop. Its value is not confined to the losses paid and the insurance protection provided for it is a remarkable credit asset both for the borrower and the lender. Through the collateral assignment which can be filed with a crop-insurance policy, the farmer who has been struck financial blows that make credit difficult or even impossible for him to secure otherwise can usually obtain credit to the extent of his crop protection. The crop-insurance policy protects not only the profit which the prosperous farmer can invest from previous crops but the capital borrowed in the effort to make a crop as well.

Private lending agencies and businessmen with whom farmers trade and from whom they obtain credit find that crop insurance is a bulwark of strength for their businesses when crop disasters strike. Consequently, local businessmen and lending agencies are becoming actively interested in the success and the future of the crop-insurance program in many counties. I can assure you that wherever crop disaster strikes that a similar interest on the part of local businessmen and lending agencies is likely to develop. Through crop insurance many farmers can now get credit from private sources which formerly could only be obtained by them through some kind of a Government emergency loan. Crop insurance provides a business method to guard against the need for emergency assistance that frequently follows in the wake of either crop or price failures. It does not protect profit—only what is spent in the effort to produce the food and fiber needed from our farms.

Those of us who have observed and experienced the far-reaching effects of depressions, which usually start first on our farms, should realize the importance of making sure that history does not repeat itself in this connection. Crop insurance can play a major role in guarding against this threat.

Crop insurance is for the common good—the farmer, the consumer, and the businessmen whose profits come either all or in part from farmers' income.

Consequently, until such time as private insurance finds it practical to offer such all-risk protection to our farmers, we should continue to provide at Government level a sound and expanding program of crop insurance. Experience shows that it is practical and good business for us to do so. The program is nonprofit. During the last 5-year period, premiums paid in have exceeded losses paid out. All the facts show that we have made a good and sound beginning, and that its continuation and growth are merited.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 23, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 20, 1953:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

John C. Doerfer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officer of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Henry C. Bruton

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 20, 1953:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Eugene H. Merrill, of Utah, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, facing the tasks of this new day, make us mindful that upon the free soil of this continent our fathers with holy toil reared a house of faith hallowed by Thy name. We would make our hearts, cleansed by Thy forgiving grace, a temple of Thy presence, knowing that only to the pure dost Thou grant the vision of Thy face. We come asking not that Thou wouldst give heed to the faltering petitions our lips frame, but that Thou wilt bend thine ear to the crying of our human need. We bring to the altar of prayer our inmost selves, cluttered and confused, where good and evil, the petty and the great, are so entwined. May the eternal immensities shame our little thoughts and ways. May the vision of what we might be convict us of what we are. In this creative day of human destiny may we not miss the things belonging to our peace and to the peace of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, March 20, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1362) for the relief of Rose Martin, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate the remainder of this week, in order to be able to accompany the body of my niece, Miss Mary McGurren, to North Dakota, for burial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and for the remainder of this week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations be allowed to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate; also that the Committee on Government Operations be allowed to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. In that connection, I urge Senators who are members of the Committee on Government Operations to go over to room 357, so that we may obtain a quorum and act on Reorganization Plan No. 1.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. AIKEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture was authorized to meet on Wednesday next, beginning at 2 o'clock, to hear Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6 months ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 15

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming

"Whereas the proposed Colorado River storage project and participating projects is the result of many years of investigations, thoroughly and ably conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation in cooperation with the State of Colorado, particularly its water conservation board, as well as in cooperation with the appropriate agencies and officials of the States of New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming; and

"Whereas conditions precedent to the authorization of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects have been performed in good faith by the State of Colorado, as well as by the other upper Colorado River Basin States, through the execution and ratification of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact, the creation of the Upper Colorado River Commission, and other acts; and

"Whereas the Colorado River storage project and participating projects will control the flow of the Colorado River in such a way as to assure fulfillment on the part of the United States of its water treaty obligations to Mexico and fulfillment on the part of the upper Colorado River Basin States of their water delivery obligations to the lower Colorado River Basin under the terms of the Colorado River Compact of 1922; and

"Whereas the Colorado River storage project and participating projects will enable the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming to make further considerable uses of water of the Colorado River system without liability to ruinous interruption that must otherwise be expected in the light of the historically erratic flow of the Colorado River and of the obligations mentioned in the immediately preceding paragraph of this preamble; and

"Whereas the welfare of the people of this State, the preservation of a sound and dynamic economy, and the interests of the United States require the authorization and the construction in due course of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to enact legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, in substantial accord with the recommendations of the Upper Colorado River Commission; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, as well as to the Members from Colorado in the Congress.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Utah relating to draft deferments and memorializing the President and the Congress to take such action as is necessary to avoid the drafting of young men of 18 and 19 years of age and to limit deferments of older men

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

"Whereas drafting of young men between the ages of 19 and 26 years is now taking place under selective-service laws and it appears that the age limit is to be reduced to include young men of the age of 18 years; and

"Whereas it appears under the present draft laws and the rules and regulations thereunder that many classes of exemptions are provided for, and especially deferments are provided for students, married men, farmers, and other classes; and

"Whereas it is the feeling and belief of the members of this legislature that the young men of the ages of 18 and 19 years should not be called upon to serve in the military service of this country while deferments are being freely granted and extended to the young men of the ages of 20 to 26 years, but that all young men of the ages of 20 through 26 years should be drafted before any young

men in the 18- and 19-year-old group: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the President and the Congress of the United States be called upon to, individually and collectively, enact appropriate legislation and rules and regulations to be promulgated thereunder, to strictly limit deferments for any reason for young men in the age group of 20 to 26 years, and to avoid so far as possible the drafting of young men of the ages of 18 and 19 years; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative in the United States Congress from the State of Utah."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 10

"*To the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to the Congress from Alaska; and to the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas in 1949 the Congress of the United States passed a statute known as the Alaska Public Works Act (63 Stat. 627); and

"Whereas the Congress there declares it to be its policy 'to foster the settlement and increase the permanent residents of Alaska, stimulate trade and industry, encourage internal commerce and private investment, develop Alaskan resources, and provide facilities for community life'; and

"Whereas the Congress intended that that policy should become effective through 'a program of useful public works'; and

"Whereas the Congress authorized the appropriation of $70 million to carry out that purpose; and

"Whereas under the provisions of the Alaska Public Works Act, the Territory and its political subdivisions would cover half that sum into the United States Treasury, through purchases of these useful public works; and

"Whereas in effectuating the purposes of this act, the Congress, in four fiscal years has appropriated less than 50 percent of the authorized program, specifically $29¼ million, or approximately an average of $7½ million per year; and

"Whereas the program has by its terms only 2 more years to run; and

"Whereas that time and the average appropriations to date will permit the act to expire without accomplishing its purpose of building the proposed useful public works; and

"Whereas the Territory and its communities are sorely in need of these public works and the financial assistance with which to build them; and

"Whereas the Territory and its communities have diligently complied with all of the conditions laid down for obtaining these public works; and

"Whereas after the adoption of the Alaska Public Works Act, the President declared an emergency based upon the United Nations action in Korea; and

"Whereas this emergency resulted in a vastly expanded military program in Alaska which intensified these conditions upon which this Alaska Public Works Act was predicated, increased the need for these public works, and by application proved the wisdom of the policy established; and

"Whereas a bill has been introduced into the 83d Congress (H. R. 2683), which provides for a 4-year time extension to the expiration date of the Alaska Public Works Act, which will permit the Congress to appropriate the authorized funds at the average annual rate of previous congressional appropriations.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that Congress will enact H. R. 2683 to provide for the orderly appropriation of funds to carry out the policy of the Congress, to build useful public works in Alaska, by extending the expiration date of the Alaskja Public Works Act to June 30, 1959.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Whereas labor disputes along the waterfront have, during the recent past, frequently interrupted ocean transportation service between the mainland of the United States and the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas the effect of these waterfront disputes have been to paralyze and impair the development of the economy of the Territory; and

"Whereas on January 7, 1953, the Honorable HUGH BUTLER, United States Senator from the State of Nebraska, introduced into the United States Senate a bill, S. 225, designed to prevent interruptions to ocean transportation service between the United States and its territories and possessions as a result of labor disputes; and

"Whereas the prompt passage of S. 225 by the Congress of the United States will promote the welfare and economic well-being of the people of the Territory of Hawaii: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-seventh Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby endorse the provisions of S. 225, introduced by Senator BUTLER, and earnestly request the early passage of this important legislation by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and to the Governor of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the board of governors of the West Virginia State Bar, Charleston, W. Va., relating to the eligibility of practicing attorneys for benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to the construction of a dam at Coyote Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial relating to the improvement and preservation of the fishing industry

"*To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there now exists an utmost urgency to the economy of the fishing industry in and about the city of Blaine, Wash., and the tributaries and harbor in said area in which the principal industry is that of fishing; and

"Whereas the number of fishing vessels is so great and the depth and breadth of the Blaine, Wash., harbor should be widened and deepened in order to provide adequate moorage and safety for the fishing fleet; and

"Whereas it is in the national interest that the progress of our fishing industry be borne in mind; and

"Whereas the deepening and enlarging of the Blaine, Wash., harbor is of great importance in order to provide adequate moorage facilities for fishing fleets; and

"Whereas there has been an increase of approximately 33⅓ percent of employees engaged in or related to the use of the Blaine port facilities; and

"Whereas approximately 695 different fishing vessels made approximately 3,500 trips into Blaine harbor to deliver fish during the 1952 fishing season; and

"Whereas for a long time the increased use of the harbor facilities has created a potential danger of fire; and

"Whereas the value of fishing boats and fishing equipment in the said Blaine harbor exceeds $1,500,000; and

"Whereas expansion by widening and deepening the said harbor is of primary importance to the development of the fishing industry in the northwest area of the United States; and

"Whereas numerous lives and property have been and are placed in great jeopardy, particularly during such times as there are storms, because of inadequate harbor facilities to accommodate the entire fishing fleet.

"Now, therefore, your memorialists respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation and make adequate appropriation for the development of the facilities for fishing fleet moorage in the Blaine harbor; and be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Washington congressional delegation."

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution petitioning and memorializing the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and to enact legislation to reduce the present excessively high tax rate

"Whereas the 21st amendment to the Constitution of the United States vests in the individual States control over the trade in and use of alcoholic beverages; and

"Whereas in the exercise of such control 46 States, including the State of Maryland have recognized the compelling demand for alcoholic beverages, and have enacted laws to protect the health, welfare, safety and morals of the people by allowing only those who are morally responsible to engage in the production and distribution of alcoholic beverages, and by strictly supervising such production and distribution; and

"Whereas the aforesaid 46 States have levied excise taxes on alcoholic beverages for the purposes of encouraging temperance, reimbursing the States for their costs in maintaining such strict supervision and control, and providing revenue; and in fixing the amount of these excises, States have sought an optimum figure which will achieve a balance between the three enumerated objectives; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has so substantially increased its excise tax on alcoholic beverages that the consumer price of such beverages has risen to several times their cost of production; and

"Whereas the result of such increase in consumer price has been to divert many sales from the controlled distribution system set up by the State of Maryland to the bootleg industry with an accompanying disregard for law, danger to the health of its

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

citizens, and loss of revenue to both State and Federal Governments; and

"Whereas it is the considered judgment that the Federal Government has raised its excises beyond the optimum level consistent with the objectives of taxation and control; and has taken from the State of Maryland the power to restore the proper balance; Therefore be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That in order to eliminate bootlegging, restore respect for law and order, and provide adequate revenues for both State and Federal Governments, that the General Assembly of Maryland does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to study the Federal liquor tax policy and enact legislation reducing the present excessively high tax rate; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be requested to send a copy of this joint resolution under the great seal of Maryland to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States from Maryland, the United States Senators from Maryland, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and the Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States."

INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] I present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of House bill 3986, authorizing an appropriation for the completion of the International Peace Garden. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 0-1

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 3986 authorizing an appropriation for the completion of the International Peace Garden

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

Whereas there has been established and is being maintained on the international boundary line between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, a park situated partly in North Dakota and partly in the Province of Manitoba and known as the International Peace Garden, which park has been established and is being maintained as a constant memorial to the peaceful relations between the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada and for the purpose of furthering international peace among the nations of the world; and

Whereas the Government of Canada is making substantial grants for the development of their section of the International Peace Garden; and

Whereas H. R. 3986, introduced in the 83d Congress of the United States and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, would authorize an appropriation for the purpose of completing the International Peace Garden in accordance with plans previously approved: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to give immediate and favorable consideration to H. R. 3986; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the North Dakota delegation in Congress.

DEVELOPMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN — CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to a plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin, the extension of the Rural Electrification Administration, and the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution M

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the creation of an overall integrated plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin, the extension of the benefits of the Rural Electrification Administration, and for the construction of the St. Lawrence Waterway

Whereas it is in the best interests of the citizens of this State and of the United States that the natural resources and power of this Nation be fully and efficiently utilized, and that the destruction and waste occasioned by repeated floods be halted; and

Whereas the attainment of these purposes requires that present programs for the development of the rivers, lakes, and harbors of this Nation be continuously expanded and improved, and requires that the available power distribution and production facilities be enlarged to extend service to many more persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and petitioned to enact suitable legislation for—

1. The creation of an overall integrated plan for the development of the natural resources and power, and for the efficient control of floods in the Missouri Basin;

2. The extension of the distribution systems and power-producing facilities of the Rural Electrification Administration; and

3. The joint construction and control by the United States and the Dominion of Canada of the St. Lawrence Waterway; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of State to the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the presiding officers of each of the Houses of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a series of resolutions adopted by the 40th annual convention of the Kansas Livestock Association, at Wichita, Kans., on March 14, 1953, relating to various agricultural problems.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT THE 40TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION IN WICHITA, KANS., MARCH 14, 1953

PASTURE IMPROVEMENT

We commend the various State and Federal experiment stations on their work in introducing and developing better varieties of grasses and legumes for the improvement of pastures. We urge the various stations conducting experimental brush and weed eradication to step up their work so that better and more economical means of eradication be found.

BUY-AMERICAN PLAN

We urge the continuation of the buy-American policy which has been carried in the appropriations for the military service for several years past. The Government is one of the biggest consumers of domestic food products and it is only fair that, except in the emergencies provided for, such purchases should be on the buy-American plan.

WORLD-TRADE POLICY

Resolved, That the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and equitable competition and must be done within the principle that has long been maintained—that foreign products, produced by underpaid foreign labor, shall not be admitted to our country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer or stockman or threaten serious financial injury to a domestic industry.

PURCHASES OF MEAT FOR THE MILITARY

We urge the Defense Department to make its beef-procurement regulations sufficiently flexible to cover weights and grades so the supply varies from time to time so that the Government can take advantage of the best possible buy at any given time and assist in stabilizing the market for particular grades and weights.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND FLOOD CONTROL

Soil and water are recognized as the State's most valuable natural resources. We recognize the need for flood control and urge that the United States Department of Agriculture be authorized to accelerate and intensify its program of soil-erosion control and flood prevention in its program of runoff and waterflow retardation throughout the State; that works necessary for those purposes be constructed as rapidly as possible; and that the State legislature give serious consideration to workable watershed legislation for Kansas. People whose property or other interests are acquired for reservoirs, floodways, and other soil- and water-control measures should be compensated to an extent at least equivalent to reestablishing them under similar circumstances.

PAROLES

We are opposed to convicted cattle thieves being paroled without serving at least part of their sentence.

VESICULAR EXANTHEMA CONTROL

As the United States Bureau of Animal Industry has released information stating

that the Bureau will soon prohibit the interstate movement of all swine and all unprocessed pork products from any State where vesicular exanthema (VE disease) is known or believed to exist, or from States that do not require the cooking of garbage or from States that fail to slaughter VE-infected or exposed swine within a period of 7 days following the determination of the existence of the disease.

Therefore, we urge the prompt, effective cooperation of the legislature and the Federal and State regulatory officials to eradicate and keep Kansas swine free from VE disease.

DESICCATED VACCINE

There is a vital need for desiccated Strain 19 Bang's vaccine to be packaged in multiple doses. The United States BAI has refused to allow it to be so packaged because of the promise, which has proven to be wrong, that it was a protection to the industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association again request the United States BAI to permit the packaging of desiccated Strain 19 Bang's vaccine in multiple doses.

NATIONAL LIVESTOCK AND MEAT BOARD

The National Livestock and Meat Board, since its inception, has conducted an intensive educational, promotional, and meat research program, and these activities have been and currently are financially supported by livestock producers and meat processors for the purpose of continually promoting and elevating the place of meat on the tables of the American consumer; there is ever-increasing competition for the consumers' food dollar: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association recommends that current contributions by livestock producers to the National Livestock and Meat Board be increased immediately from 25 cents per car to 50 cents per car, with the understanding a continuing and accelerated meat promotional research program will be aggressively pursued to stimulate an expanding demand for our products.

AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE ADVERTISING

We have appreciated the excellent job on meat advertising that the American Meat Institute has been carrying on for the past 12 years. We hope it will be continued and strengthened.

THE UNITED STATES SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

It is a recognized fact that the economy of our Nation or any nation is tied closely and almost inseparably with the agricultural and livestock interests.

We know also that neither agriculture nor livestock can or do prosper independently of each other.

Therefore, this association hereby wishes to commend our United States Secretary of Agriculture for the work he has done and is doing on behalf of the agricultural interests of the Nation.

We wish to extend to him our wholehearted cooperation.

APPRECIATION

We express sincere gratitude to all who have contributed to the success of this annual meeting; the Fourth National Bank of Wichita for their breakfast; the Producers and Texas Live Stock Marketing Association for their breakfast; to Berl Berry, Kansas City, Ford-Mercury-Lincoln distributor and Hereford breeder, Stanley, for entertaining the executive committee, officers, and directors of the association; the Wichita Livestock Marketing Interests for the stockmen dance; the press and radio for their generous and careful coverage; the city and State officials for their many courtesies; the speakers for their excellent contributions; and the staff of the Kansas Livestock Association for their efficient services.

Resolutions Committee: Lew Galloway, Wakeeney, chairman; J. Willard Olander, Kansas City, Mo.; Dan Jackson, Coldwater, Kans.; H. H. Colburn, Spearville, Kans; Larry Morgan, Goodland, Kans.; George Lemon, Pratt, Kans.; Roy Freeland, Topeka, Kans.; W. G. Robinson, Fort Scott, Kans.; Locke Theis, Englewood, Kans.; Taylor Jones, Holcomb, Kans.; James O. Greenleaf, Greensburg, Kans.; Phil Glunt, Maple Hill, Kans.; J. H. Salley, Liberal, Kans.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—TELEGRAM FROM WISCONSIN CONGRESS OF PARENTS AND TEACHERS, SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the current reorganization plan dealing with a Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I have received today a telegram from the president of the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers relative to the vital United States Children's Bureau.

Needless to say, I regard the work of the Children's Bureau as one of the most important being done in the Federal Government today because, obviously, it affects the entire future of our land as it looks after the needs of the citizens of tomorrow.

I present the telegram of Mrs. Joseph Born for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD in order that it might receive appropriate consideration in connection with the reorganization plan.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHEBOYGAN, WIS., *March 22, 1953.*

HON. SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate House, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Newton Leonard, president, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, calls attention to President Eisenhower's Reorganization Plan for a Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in which no mention is made of the United States Children's Bureau. Parent-Teacher Associations have always maintained close working relationship with this Bureau and have benefitted greatly by its services to children and their families. Any curtailment of the Bureau's functions would seriously hamper child welfare. We are concerned in the safeguarding of services of the Children's Bureau in a new Federal Department. On behalf of the 93,000 members of the Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers request your consideration.

Mrs. JOSEPH BORN,
President, Wisconsin Congress of Parents and Teachers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY (for Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 903. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof; with amendments (Rept. No. 123).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Marinella Talleti; with amendments (Rept. No. 127);

S. 613. A bill for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski; without amendment (Rept. No. 124);

H. R. 759. A bill for the relief of Hisami Yoshida; without amendment (Rept. No. 125); and

H. R. 861. A bill for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen; without amendment (Rept. No. 126).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Government Operations:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution; without amendment (Rept. No. 128).

CONTINUANCE OF STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO DEPOSIT OF SAVINGS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Defense, concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue the effect of the statutory provisions relating to the deposit of saving for members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes.

The bill relates to the right of enlisted personnel to ask for the return of funds deposited by them with the paymaster, such return to be made prior to the normal expiration of the enlistment period, if desired by the individual enlisted man or woman.

This authority now exists on a temporary basis. The bill would simply extend that authority so as to meet the needs of the thousands of enlisted men and women who are now serving with our military forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1422) to continue the effect of the statutory provisions relating to the deposit of savings for members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1413. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1414. A bill for the relief of Ignatz Mezei;

S. 1415. A bill to prohibit the practice of law by United States attorneys, and for other purposes; and

S. 1416. A bill for the relief of Vito Rizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1418. A bill for the relief of Linda Marlene Kolachny (Mariko Furue); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1419. A bill to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1420. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of certain lapsed national service life insurance policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1421. A bill for the relief of Nahi Youssef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1422. A bill to continue the effect of the statutory provisions relating to the deposit of savings for members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1423. A bill for the relief of Gus John Caras (Konstantinos Ioannis Karadimitris); and

S. 1424. A bill for the relief of John M. Fuller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1425. A bill for the relief of Eva Ruttkay;

S. 1426. A bill for the relief of Hajna Sepsi;

S. 1427. A bill for the relief of Anis Movafegh Han;

S. 1428. A bill for the relief of Serina Moser; and

S. 1429. A bill for the relief of Hans Schroeder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Ruth Johanna Heidenreich;

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Holly Layne Roberts (Mariko Uchiyama); and

S. 1432. A bill for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grahovac, and Nikola Maljkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 1433. A bill to extend the benefits of certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to the Arch Hurley Conservancy District, Tucumcari reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1434. A bill for the relief of William B. Baker; and

S. 1435. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bert I. Biedermann nee Ermenegilda Vittoria Cernecca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRISWOLD (by request):

S. 1436. A bill to establish a Federal Board of Hospitalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1437. A bill for the relief of Lew Shee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1438. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1439. A bill to require the armed services to utilize private American shipping services for the overseas transportation of commodities and civilian personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

PROCEDURE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 4 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am sorry to object, but I have made it an informal rule that I shall object to requests to speak during the morning hour for longer than 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to confine his remarks to 2 minutes?

Mr. TAFT. Unless we hold to some such rule, all speeches will be made during the morning hour.

Mr. CARLSON. The junior Senator from Kansas is glad to comply with the rule, because he thinks it is a good one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of propounding an inquiry to the majority leader.

The other day the majority leader announced that he intended to object in the future to any Senators speaking for more than 2 minutes until the morning hour had been concluded. The inquiry is, Who is to determine how long a Senator is to speak?

Mr. TAFT. If a Senator asks unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes, I shall make no objection. If he asks permission to speak for a longer time during the morning hour, I shall have to object. The Senator may amend his request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The question the Senator from Texas wishes to ask is this: Who is to keep the time? Since the Senator from Ohio placed his rule in effect I have heard some rather long 2-minute speeches. I made inquiry of the Parliamentarian, and found that no one was keeping time.

Mr. TAFT. I hope the Parliamentarian will keep time, and I trust that the Presiding Officer will enforce the terms of the unanimous-consent request without further suggestion from me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce that in the light of the understanding with the majority leader, in the future unanimous-consent requests to speak during the morning hour will be limited to 2 minutes, and the Parliamentarian will keep time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the announcement by the distinguished Vice President. I merely wish to reiterate that the minority desires to cooperate at all times when it can do so in good conscience.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 1349, TO AMEND TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO CREATE THE COURT OF CLAIMS AS A CONSTITUTIONAL COURT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvement in Judiciary Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 26, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1349, to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to create the Court of Claims as a constitutional court of the United States. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 961, TO ESTABLISH UNIFORM QUALIFICATIONS FOR JURORS IN THE FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, March 26, 1953, at 3 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 961, to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BERNARD A. BOOS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Bernard A. Boos, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota, vice Theodore B. Werner, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey, [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HOWARD C. BOTTS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Howard C. Botts, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio, vice Harold K. Claypool, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN F. RAPER, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, DISTRICT OF WYOMING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of John F. Raper, Jr., of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming, vice John J. Hickey, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LLOYD H. BURKE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Lloyd H. Burke, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Columbia, vice Chauncey F. Tramutolo, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consist of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 1 minute, in order that I may make a statement on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as the original sponsors of the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, which established the Voice of America and our comprehensive information and educational-exchange program, we feel called upon at this time to reaffirm our belief in the essential soundness of the basic aims and principles of the program.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I have recognized for a long time certain weaknesses and faults in both the content and administration of the Voice of America program. We believe that much needs to be done if the Voice is to achieve its maximum effectiveness. However, we are disturbed lest the general public may lose faith completely in undertakings of this type, and come to oppose all attempts to expand our efforts in the field of psychological warfare.

We are not prepared at this time to pass judgment upon detailed questions relating to the best administrative and organizational arrangement for our psychological warfare programs. We are prepared, however, to state our conviction that the United States must give top priority to the problem of explaining its basic aims and principles to the peoples of the world. The ideological struggle which is now going on could well prove to be the decisive battle between communism and freedom. Psychological warfare is a weapon we must seek to strengthen.

America has a great message to tell the world. It is not a message about our wealth and riches. It is basically a message regarding our fundamental beliefs and principles. The democratic concepts of liberty and equality, if properly presented, can play a great role in the fight against communism. Our task is that of finding new and better means of transmitting these concepts. The original ideas behind the Voice of America and the other phases of our foreign information program are still sound.

I submit this statement on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself.

VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES OF MR. PAUL VAN ZEELAND, FOREIGN MINISTER OF BELGIUM

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 or 3 minutes with regard to the recent visit to the United States and to Washington of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Belgium, Mr. Van Zeeland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the recent visit to the United States and to Washington of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Belgium, Mr. Paul Van Zeeland, gives me the opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues an interesting development growing out of World War I.

We all will recall that during World War I, under the leadership of former President Herbert Hoover, the American people set up a great relief organization called the Commission for the Relief of Belgium, the purpose of which was to take care of the population of Belgium during the German occupation. It will be recalled that there was a terrible food shortage, and the plight of all the Belgians, rich and poor, was a desperate one.

The performance of the Commission, which was made up of both Belgians and Americans, was most successful, and the participation in this important work has been a source of great gratification and pride to all of us who were privileged to have a part in it.

This great work was carried on, on a pay-as-you-go basis. There was created a revolving fund, which was financed originally partly by charity and partly by donations from the Belgian Government. All this indebtedness was ultimately paid off, and, as there was a margin of safety in the amount charged for the food, the operations ended with a substantial profit. This money, of course, belonged to the Belgian people and the King of the Belgians invited Mr. Hoover, who had originated the operation, to suggest what might be the best use to be made of this fund. Mr. Hoover advised that the money could best be dedicated to educational purposes.

After a series of negotiations in which I had the honor to participate, a capital donation was made to each of the four Universities of Brussels, Louvain, Liege and Ghent. Furthermore, parallel organizations were set up in Belgium and the United States to provide for exchange fellowships between the two countries. It was my experience with these fellowships which led to my enthusiasm for this kind of international exchange as avenues leading toward world understanding.

In June 1952 the Belgian-American Educational Foundation published a report entitled "The Contribution of the Belgian-American Foundation Toward the University Faculties." This report contains the names of former CRB fellows who are actually members of the faculties of the principal universities and schools in Belgium. It also includes the names of former CRB fellows who have become members of the Faculty of American Universities. In a summary at the conclusion this report says:

> To sum up there are 83 faculty members from Brussels, 75 from Louvain, 64 from Liege, 56 from Ghent, 23 from various other Belgian institutions, 22 teaching in American universities, and 9 in other countries. Since 10 of these persons are listed twice as teaching in more than 1 institution, this makes a total of 322 individuals.
>
> The total number of Belgians who have studied in the United States under the auspices of the BAEF being actually 653, this means that 49.5 percent are or have been at university level.
>
> Thirteen out of the three hundred and twenty-two above-listed faculty members have held office as rector: 5 at Brussels University, 5 at Ghent, 2 at Liege, and 1 at Louvain where the rector magnificus is appointed for life.

In March 1953 there was published by the foundation a similar report entitled "The Contribution of the Belgian American Educational Foundation to Public Life, National and International." This report, which I have just received, is so illuminating and inspiring that I ask unanimous consent to publish it in full at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report may be printed as requested.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It will be noted that the Honorable Paul Van Zeeland who has recently been our guest, is the No. 1 CRB fellow and was our first experiment. I can add with pardonable pride that he received his doctor of philosophy degree at the Princeton University Graduate School in 1921.

Mr. President, this record of the relationship between the United States and the brave little country of Belgium points the way to effective understanding and cooperation among all the freedom-loving countries of the World.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

EXHIBIT A

THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE BELGIAN AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION TO PUBLIC LIFE, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL

As our previous article on the contribution of the Belgian American Educational Foundation to university faculties met with favorable response, we have thought that it might be worthwhile to proceed along somewhat similar lines for the benefit of those who are fond of systematic listings or enjoy the innocent game of statistics. This time we are submitting to the readers of the alumni bulletin lists grouping the former CRB fellows who have had a political career or held jobs in international organizations.

With regard to the role played in Belgian politics, our listing enumerates seperately: the Ministers, the members of the Chamber of Representatives, the Senators.

MINISTERS

Edgard Blancquaert, Minister of Education, February-April 1939.

Vicomte Charles du Bus de Warnaffe, Minister of Communications, 1934–35; Minister of the Interior, 1935–36; Minister of Justice, 1937–38; 1945, and from December 1952.

Franz De Voghel, Minister of Finance, 1945–46.

Jules Duesberg, Minister of Education, 1939 (1947).

Albert De Smaele, Minister of Economic Affairs, 1945–46.

Gaston Eyskens, Minister of Finance, 1945 and 1947–49; Prime Minister, 1949–50; Minister of Economic Affairs, June-August 1950.

Paul Heymans, Minister of Economic Affairs, Middle Classes and Agriculture, 1938–39.

Adolphe Van Glabbeke, Minister of Interior, 1945; Minister of Justice, 1946; Minister of Public Health, 1949–50.

Jean Van Houtte, Minister of Finance, 1950–52; Prime Minister from January 15, 1952.

Paul van Zeeland, Cabinet Minister without portfolio, 1934; Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, 1935–37; Minister of State, 1948; Minister of Foreign Affairs and Foreign Trade from 1949.

Pierre Wigny, Minister of Colonies, 1947–50.

MEMBERS OF THE CHAMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES

Charles du Bus de Warnaffe from 1934.
Gaston Eyskens, from 1939.
Marc Somerhausen, 1925–29; 1932–36; 1946–47.
Adolphe Van Glabbeke from 1936.
Pierre Wigny, from 1949.

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

Paul Brien, 1936–37.
Pierre Depage, 1945–47.
Jacques Duchaine, 1946–49.
Jean Van Houtte, from 1949.
Paul van Zeeland, from 1946.

POSITIONS IN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Pierre Depage, secretary general, Permanent Commission of the International Red Cross, Geneva, 1947–49; superintendent in the field, Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, United Nations, Damascus (Syria), from 1949.

Albert De Smaele, president, International Authority for the Ruhr, Dusseldorf (Germany), from 1949.

Françoise Dony, research assistant, United Nations Information Office, New York, 1942–43; liaison officer, United Nations, New York, 1946–52.

Jacques Errera, Belgian adviser, Atomic Energy Commission, United Nations, New York, from 1947.

Gaston Eyskens, Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington, D. C., 1947–49; vice president, Economic and Social Council, and president, Economic Committee, United Nations Organization, 1951.

Paul Huygelen, social affairs officer, Laws and Regulations Section, Division of Narcotic Drugs, United Nations headquarters, New York, from 1951.

Edmond Janssens, economic affairs officer, Economic Stability and Development Division of the United Nations, New York, from 1952.

Michel Lorthioir, Organization for European Economic Cooperation, Paris, from 1948.

René Stinglhamber, director in the office of the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Palais de Chaillot, Paris, from 1951.

Jacques Torfs, economist and assist loan officer, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington, D. C.

Robert Triffin, chief, Exchange Control Division, International Monetary Fund, Washington, D. C., 1946–48; staff representative (of same) in Western Europe, 1948–51.

Louis Verhoestraete, chief, Maternal and Child Health Section, World Health Organization, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Marcel van Zeeland, manager, Bank of International Settlements, Basle (Switzerland), 1930–49; senior manager from 1949, treasurer general, International Red Cross, Geneva.

Paul van Zeeland, president, European Organization of Economic Cooperation, 1950. president, Committee of Ministers, Council of Europe, 1950. President, Council of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Presided in this capacity in the NATO Conferences held at Brussels in December 1950 and at Ottawa in September 1951. Vice president, International Council of the European movement.

If we examine the list of Ministers, we note that in 1945 four former CRB fellows happened to be at the same time members of the Belgian Cabinet: Charles du Bus de Warnaffe, Albert De Smaele, Gaston Eyskens, and Adolphe Van Glabbeke.

Among the 11 who held ministerial positions, 3 have occupied the post of Prime Minister of Belgium: Paul van Zeeland (1935–37), Gaston Eyskens (1949–50), Jean Van Houtte (from January 1952).

A striking fact is the relatively young age at which these three Prime Ministers took office: Mr. van Zeeland was 41, Messrs. Eyskens and Van Houtte were both 44 years old.

With regard to the academic field to which they belong, we note that out of the 11 Ministers 8 graduated in the humanities (mostly in law and economics), and only 3 in the sciences (2 engineers and 1 doctor of medicine). It is worth mentioning that 7 out of 11 in the Ministers group are or have been teaching in Belgian universities.

When one considers the whole list of names mentioned in the present article, the balance between the humanities and the sciences reflects a tendency toward a more logical equilibrium, the ratio being 14 versus 11 in the latter group.

J. VAN DER BELEN,
Secretary in Belgium of the BAEF.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Address delivered by the Belgian Ambassador to the United States upon the occasion of the presentation of a mural tapestry to the Hoover Library on War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Letter dated March 1, 1953, addressed to him by V. V. Harris, on the subject of Offshore Oil Reserves.

By Mr. LANGER:

Letter addressed to him by DeLona Lindsey, of Sunnyside, Wash., regarding Koch and Lincoln treatments for cancer.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address entitled "Freedom in Livestock Agriculture," delivered by A. P. Davies, director, department of livestock, American Meat Institute, Chicago, Ill., at annual convention of Kansas Livestock Association, Wichita, Kans., March 13, 1953.

Report and recommendations adopted by Kansas Livestock Association on March 14, 1953, and transmitted to Secretary of Agriculture Benson.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Offer of free medical service by Dr. Robert E. Lincoln, of Medford, Mass., in combating epidemic of infectious hepatitis, together with accompanying press clippings.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Soviet Antisemitism," delivered by Hon. Nathaniel P. Davis, former Ambassador to Hungary, at Temple Beth-El, Glens Falls, N. Y.

Article entitled "Negro Woman, 66, Is Named Mother of Year in Virginia," published in the Washington Post of March 21, 1953.

Article entitled "Bar Group Urges Alien Law Change," published in the New York Times of March 18, 1953.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Excerpt from broadcast by Walter Winchell on March 15, 1953, regarding Congressional Medal of Honor.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "They're Not Bigger Than the United States," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 22, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Address entitled "Slum Rehabilitation Through the Baltimore Plan—A Challenge to Business Interests," delivered by Guy T. O. Hollyday, of Baltimore, Md.

Address entitled "Atheist War on Religion," delivered by Father John L. Bazinet, of St. Mary's Seminary, at the cathedral in Baltimore, Md.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

The calendar under rule VIII is now in order.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarthy
Anderson	Griswold	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Murray
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bridges	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Md.	Holland	Potter
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Purtell
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jackson	Russell
Carlson	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Symington
Duff	Kuchel	Taft
Dworshak	Langer	Thye
Eastland	Lehman	Tobey
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Welker
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
Gillette	Maybank	
Goldwater	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent on official business. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is necessarily absent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar, under rule VIII, is now in order. The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 24) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Eric Anton Helfert was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has in the past on the call of the calendar requested that the bill go over. In his absence I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschok was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 152) for the relief of Fred P. Hines was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PHED VOSNIACOS

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to ask what the record discloses regarding the action taken on Senate bill 101, for the relief of Phed Vosniacos

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] objected, and the bill was passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Chair.

FRANCESCO CRACCHIOLO

The bill (S. 102) for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WILHELM ENGELBERT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I do not expect to object, in regard to Senate bill 153, the private bill for Mr. Wilhelm Engelbert, I wish merely to state that I spoke to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] about this bill some weeks ago and asked him to have it passed over pending my review of it. I have now studied this bill and find that on the basis of the committee's report and what further facts I have been able to gather, the man in question seems on the face of it to have been a confirmed Nazi and supporter of Adolf Hitler's regime in Germany. However, that was many years ago. I am a firm believer in the possibility of reformation, even of Nazis, even of Communists. I am less concerned with what a man was or did 20 or 15 or even 10 years ago, than with what he is or does now. I believe that our immigration law should contain clear provisions, which our present law does not, to forgive past membership in totalitarian organization in the case of individuals who have ceased to hold or to advocate totalitarian views. In the case of past membership in such organizations, I think the law should provide for a test as to the present beliefs of the individuals in question—a test of whether they do now, in fact, advocate totalitarian and subversive doctrines.

The present law does not contain any such provision. It contains a kind of formula admitting reformed members of the Communist Party, but is very vague as to other totalitarians. It establishes no requirement as to current beliefs of such former totalitarians. This defect in the present law, along with hundreds of other defects, needs to be cured.

However, I assume that the Judiciary Committee, even without the requirement or authorization of the law, has looked into the current views of Mr. Engelbert, the subject of Senate bill 153. I assume that the committee members have established to their satisfaction that he no longer holds subversive or totalitarian views. I do not suppose the committee would approve a private bill for him under other circumstances. Only on this assumption, do I withdraw my objection to the passage of this bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to assure my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New York, that the Judiciary Committee went very fully into this case. This man has been in the United States for 26 years. He is a poor man, and works in a restaurant. The committee was very careful in going into the case.

Mr. LEHMAN. It was on that basis that I withdrew objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The VICE PRESIDENT. Calendar No. 55, Senate bill 484, will be called at this time; it was inadvertently overlooked earlier in the call of the calendar.

The bill (S. 484) for the relief of J. Don Alexander was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) to amend rule XIII of the standing rules relative to motions to reconsider was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to the consideration at this time of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the resolution will be passed over.

ROSE MARTIN

The bill (H. R. 1362) for the relief of Rose Martin was announced as next in order.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized at this time to speak on another matter. I do not wish to object to the bill which was last called; but if the bill is to be considered at this time, I should like to be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to reserve the right to object to the bill, in order to be recognized at this time?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, Mr. President. Reserving the right to object, I wish to speak at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

DETECTION BY EL DORADO HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMUNIST FALSE PROPAGANDA MATERIAL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the advocates of communism never lose an opportunity to advance their sinister and subtle influence on our citizens.

Recently Miss Helen Bradford, an instructor in the El Dorado Senior High School, at El Dorado, Kans., advised me she had encouraged her class to carry on, as a project of the English class of the El Dorado High School senior class, correspondence with students in other nations, notably Japan and Germany.

One of the students accepted as his part of the project corresponding with a student in Japan. This Japanese student wrote a letter in which he enclosed

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a pamphlet concerning an incident which was highly critical of our Nation and its people, attempting to discredit the United States through sensational charges and innuendoes.

Miss Bradford, after reading the article, sent it to me, with a request that I have the material checked by the State Department to see if it was strictly communistic material.

On March 13 I received a reply from Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, in which he commends Miss Bradford and the high school students who sent this material to me for study.

Secretary Morton wrote in his letter to me:

The high-school students, who on receipt of the pamphlet suspected its malicious propaganda intent, and the teacher who forwarded it to you have shown an alertness which merits commendation. The Department of State had not prior to the receipt of your letter received a copy of the pamphlet, nor had it been informed that Japanese leftists were attempting to realize a propaganda advantage through an exchange of correspondence between high-school students in Japan and the United States. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the American Embassy at Tokyo.

Mr. President, I have no doubt that there are other high-school and college students in our Nation who are carrying on correspondence with students in foreign countries, which I think is most commendable. It is something that should be encouraged.

There is danger, however, that an effort will be made by Communists, where there is an opportunity, to get their material into the hands of our youth at this formative period of their life.

Personally, I am proud of the fact that the students and teachers in the El Dorado High School sensed this danger and had this material checked, and I sincerely hope that others in the Nation will take warning from this incident. Kansas is among the States with the fewest Communists in our Nation, and our citizens plan on keeping it that way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of these remarks a letter I received from the State Department. It is my hope that every school in the Nation will have an opportunity to read the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 13, 1953.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: I refer to your letter of February 28, 1953, to the Department of State in which you requested information on which to base a reply to a letter which you received from a teacher in your State who had sent you a copy of a pamphlet received by one of her students from a Japanese student in the course of an international exchange of correspondence.

The pamphlet deals with an incident which aroused considerable attention in the Japanese press for several months beginning in December 1952 but which has now ceased to be a prominent issue. Wataru Kaji, a leftist Japanese writer, made sensational charges to the effect that he had been captive from November 1951 until December 7, 1952, by United States intelligence agents and that he suffered mistreatment at their hands during the period of forced detention. Kaji's charges were obviously prompted by a desire on the part of Japanese leftists, particularly the Japan Communist Party, to create anti-American feeling among the Japanese public by showing that Kaji's detention since April 28, 1952, the effective date of the treaty of peace with Japan, was contrary both to Kaji's civil rights and to Japan's sovereign right of jurisdiction over its own nationals.

Kaji's charges were false. He was a Communist agent who had been arrested and detained prior to termination of the Occupation of Japan, but his claim that he had been held against his will since that time was not true. Fearing violence at the hands of the Communists, from whom he had apparently dissociated himself, and suffering as a result of poor health, he asked persons acquainted with him and his circumstances to furnish him shelter and medical aid after the Treaty of Peace with Japan became effective. When his health had improved, he was released at his own request, whereupon he was apparently persuaded by his former associates to launch his sensational accusations.

The American Embassy, on being informed of the charges, promptly released the statement that Kaji's allegations, especially his charge of mistreatment, were under active investigation by appropriate authorities, that if American personnel had mistreated him they would be dealt with justly, that the reason for Kaji's detention in 1951 was his involvement as a spy for a foreign power in Japan and that details of the case had been passed to the National Rural Police who were understood to be investigating the matter.

The Embassy's investigation revealed that Kaji had been held in an arrest status prior to April 28, 1952, on suspicion of espionage activities. Such an arrest was entirely proper during the occupation of Japan since Japan was under the control of the Allied Powers at that time. During this period Kaji admitted that he had been an active Communist intelligence agent. Because of his poor health Kaji requested from interested individuals, who were familiar with him and his condition, shelter and assistance after the effectuation of the treaty of peace with Japan. The assistance granted him was designed to furnish him shelter, lodging, and medical aid until such time as his health permitted him to make his own arrangements. He was not restricted as to intercourse with members of his family or friends. Japanese authorities were not informed that Kaji was being furnished this assistance because it was extended to him as a private individual and was humanitarian in nature without any apparent government concern at the time.

The pamphlet is unquestionably a propaganda effort of an obvious Communist-directed, anti-American slant. Its whole implication is that the United States has disregarded the human rights of a Japanese national and has coerced the Japanese Government into inventing a companion case for the purpose of linking Kaji with a Soviet espionage ring. Mitsuhashi, who is mentioned in the pamphlet in this connection, went on trial on February 7, 1953, charged with the illegal transmission of radio messages to the Soviet Union. Reports of his trial indicate that both Mitsuhashi and Kaji had been involved in espionage activities with certain members of the Soviet mission in Tokyo.

The Kaji-Yamada Relief Society appears to be a front organization for anti-American leftists. The Japan-Chinese Friendship Association is a better known organization whose principal aim is that of attempting to foster closer relations between Japan and Communist China.

It may be of interest that New York's Communist-line newspaper, Daily Worker, on February 17, 1953, carried an article captioned, "150 Japanese Writers Hit Pentagon's Spy Frameup." The article, of which I have enclosed a copy, repeats much of the material contained in the Kaji-Yamada Relief Society pamphlet and employs the same tactic of attempting to discredit the United States through sensational charges and innuendoes.

The high-school students, who on receipt of the pamphlet suspected its malicious propaganda intent, and the teacher who forwarded it to you have shown an alertness which merits commendation. The Department of State had not, prior to the receipt of your letter, received a copy of the pamphlet, nor had it been informed that Japanese leftists were attempting to realize a propaganda advantage through an exchange of correspondence between high-school students in Japan and the United States. I am bringing this matter to the attention of the American Embassy at Tokyo.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

ROSE MARTIN

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1362?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1362) for the relief of Rose Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on Friday, approximately 40 bills and other measures, as I recall, were reported by committees. Both the Republican calendar committee and the Democratic calendar committee feel that they have not had sufficient time even to look over these measures. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining measures on the calendar be passed over. The calendar will be called again next Monday, and at that time these measures will be before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the remaining measures on the calendar will be passed over.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF JOINT RESOLUTION EXTENDING TIME LIMITATION ON CERTAIN NATIONAL EMERGENCY STATUTES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is on the calendar a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 57, Calendar No. 105, to extend the time limitations on various national emergency statutes. I wish to have the joint resolution taken up either today or on Wednesday, because of the fact that it must be passed by April 1. It extends the affected statutes only 90 days, and further consideration will be given to the matter at a later time. I merely give notice of that fact. The remaining bills on the calendar probably can wait until next Monday, when the calendar will be called again.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, when Senate Joint Resolution 57, Calendar No. 105, is considered, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has asked me to manage that measure

on the floor, if any management is needed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Ohio merely giving notice that he will call up the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is correct.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am interested in a change which the conferees adopted in the school provision in the supplemental appropriation bill, under which provision for Virginia was eliminated. Does the majority leader know when the conference report on that bill is scheduled for action?

Mr. TAFT. No. It can be called up at any time. I have not yet been informed by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee as to when he will be ready to have the conference report considered; but, naturally, as a conference report on an appropriation bill, its consideration is in order at any time. I shall try to give the Senator from Virginia notice as to when it will be taken up.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I realize the status of such a report, and I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

J. Edward Lumbard, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York, vice Myles J. Lane, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

AIR FORCE—NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White to be brigadier general.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the nomination be passed over at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White to be major general.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I make the same request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION TEMPORARILY PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination be passed over temporarily, while the other nominations on the calendar are taken up and disposed of; after which, we shall return to this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be temporarily passed over.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward F. Howrey, to be Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1952, vice John Carson term expired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I wonder whether I may make an inquiry at this time with reference to the nomination of Edward F. Howrey to be a Federal Trade Commissioner?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTER in the chair). The Chair will state that the nomination of Mr. Howrey has been confirmed. It was confirmed earlier in the day.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was informed that the nominations would be taken up in sequence. Mr. Bohlen's nomination is the first one stated on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President has been notified of the confirmation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to place in the RECORD a portion of the testimony in connection with Mr. Howrey's nomination. I did not intend to oppose its confirmation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD tomorrow—because some of it must be gathered together first—certain portions of the testimony with reference to the nomination of Mr. Howrey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George E. MacKinnon to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Dermody for permanent appointment as commissioned ensign, effective January 27, 1953.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—CHARLES E. BOHLEN

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador to the Soviet Union comes before the Senate with the unanimous—15 to 0—approval of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BACKGROUND OF COMMITTEE REVIEW

That approval was not given lightly.

Mr. Bohlen's nomination was sent to the Senate February 27. On March 2, the committee heard Mr. Bohlen in executive session and questioned him at great length.

On March 5, the committee met in executive session with Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith for a general discussion of the world situation, with particular attention to developments in Russia.

General Smith at that time asked the committee to do everything possible to expedite confirmation of Mr. Bohlen's nomination. The committee tentatively scheduled a vote for March 10. On that day, however, at the request of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] the committee postponed action for a week. It should be noted that editing of the transcript of Mr. Bohlen's testimony had not been completed and was not available for consideration by the Senate on that date. Thus, the delay was necessary under the circumstances, regardless of the request of any Senator.

On March 18, the Committee heard Secretary of State Dulles testify on the nomination in executive session. On the same day, we again questioned Mr. Bohlen. It was only after this searching examination and consideration of the facts that the Committee voted 15 to 0 to report Mr. Bohlen's nomination favorably.

Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD a very challenging article entitled "The Affairs of Nations," written by Joseph C. Harsch, and published in

the Christian Science Monitor of March 20, 1953, wherein Mr. Harsch discusses Bohlen and Malenkov. I desire at this time to read merely a part of that article, which points up the urgency of the situation so graphically delineated to us by Gen. Bedell Smith. Mr. Harsch refers to George F. Kennán's earlier questioning of whether it might be wise to return to the post-World War I practice of having as little contact with the Russians as possible. Then he says:

Now, however, the situation has changed radically. Russian policy may have changed.

I may say parenthetically that the pronouncement by Malenkov within the past few days indicates quite clearly that something is in the wind. Let us hope that it is for the better, rather than for the worse.

Mr. Harsch continues:

The apparatus of the Russian state has been disturbed. What happens to it is of first importance. Thus there is room for extremely useful reporting. And Malenkov is not talking like Stalin, and there is need for the closest and most expert study and examination. The case for maintaining an American mission in Moscow has thus been revived at least temporarily.

At this time a few Members of the Senate have objected to the appointment of Charles E. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia in spite of the nomination by President Eisenhower and the urgent support of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AFFAIRS OF NATIONS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

BOHLEN AND MALENKOV

No western man can say at this moment whether there would be any useful result if the new head of the Russian state could have a private discussion with an American Ambassador in Moscow. It is only known that Georgi Malenkov, the man who is trying to wear the mantle of Stalin in Moscow, had delivered a second speech in which he apparently is trying to sound like a man of peace.

This second speech, the one delivered to the Russian Supreme Soviet, raised a number of questions difficult to answer. Was it really intended for foreign consumption as opposed to the Stalin funeral speech, which presumably was intended largely for domestic consumption?

What significance may there be in the fact that it was the first speech by the head of the Russian state since the war ended in which not only emphasis but content was wholly devoted to an alleged desire for peace, unmarred by any of the usual attacks on so-called warmongers, imperialists, etc.?

What importance, if any, is to be attributed to the special suggestion that outstanding problems could be settled by negotiation between the United States and Russia? Is this possibly a divisive move designed to try to draw the United States into two-sided talks with Moscow which would endanger the western alliance if only by raising in London and Paris memories of 1946, when they did fear that Washington and Moscow would divide the world at their expense?

No American Ambassador in Moscow could obtain immediate and certain answers to all these questions. But an Ambassador who knew the Russians and was known to them and who could speak their language fluently could very quickly obtain useful light on the matter. For example, if Malenkov were really in earnest about peace he would arrange to receive the American Ambassador and have a private talk.

And if the meeting did take place, an American Ambassador trained in the ways of the Russians would be able to detect either sincerity or falseness in any proposals Malenkov might make.

Such information would be of substantial value to Washington in making its assessments of the Malenkov speeches.

In lay theory a subordinate member of the American Embassy could serve just as well. In practice this is not the case. The Russians are sticky about prestige. It is more than unlikely that Malenkov would even consider receiving an American with lesser rank than that of Ambassador. And it is axiomatic that he would speak more freely to an Ambassador who knows the Russian language, and knew Stalin during the war, than to one who was new to the whole subject of Russia.

Until the passing of Stalin there was room for increasing doubt as to the value of maintaining an American Embassy in Moscow. Even George F. Kennan expressed that doubt and wondered, publicly, whether it might be wise to return to the post-World War I practice of having as little contact with the Russians as possible. Matters had reached such an impasse that the channels of diplomacy were unused and their existence had become a useless and sometimes even exasperating vestige of different times. Furthermore, Russian policy and the whole Russian behavior pattern were so fixed, rigid, and well known that there was little room left for useful reporting.

Now, however, the situation has changed radically. Russian policy may have changed. The apparatus of the Russian state has been disturbed. What happens to it is of first importance. Thus there is room for extremely useful reporting. And Malenkov is not talking like Stalin, and there is need for the closest and most expert study and examination. The case for maintaining an American mission in Moscow has thus been revived at least temporarily.

At this time a few Members of the Senate have objected to the appointment of Charles E. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia in spite of the nomination by President Eisenhower and the urgent support of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. The principal ground given for the objection is that Mr. Bohlen was associated with the foreign policy operations of the Roosevelt-Truman administrations.

The objection could be stated with equal validity against President Eisenhower himself or against Mr. Dulles. But Mr. Bohlen is the best qualified man to go to Moscow and determine whether there is any need for a Bohlen in Moscow. At a time when we are told it may be necessary to increase the military budget by some $20 billion to protect ourselves against Russia it might prove an economy to see what Mr. Bohlen could learn in Moscow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I prefer not to yield until I complete the reading of my prepared remarks, in order to preserve their continuity. After that, if there are any questions, I shall be glad to yield.

I review the committee's action in this much detail, Mr. President, because there has been some talk of an effort to shove this nomination through the Senate.

The record does not support such an assertion.

Mr. President, let us keep in mind the fact that it was on February 27 that the Senate received this nomination. We held our last meeting to consider the nomination on March 18.

The Bohlen nomination has been before the Senate for almost a month. It has been painstakingly considered. The time has come to vote.

THE TWO KEY QUESTIONS

There are two main questions involved. Do we want an Ambassador in Moscow at all; and if so, do we want Mr. Bohlen?

It is the unanimous opinion of the President—and I say that advisedly, because I was informed personally by the President—the Secretary of State, and the Foreign Relations Committee that the answer to both questions is "Yes."

One of the principal duties of any Ambassador, as emphasized in the article by Mr. Harsch, is to report, interpret, and analyze trends and events in the country to which he is accredited. A properly qualified Ambassador in Moscow can perform an extremely useful function in this respect.

According to Secretary of State Dulles, Mr. Bohlen is almost alone among our Foreign Service officers in possessing the requisite qualifications to a high degree. He holds the rank of career minister, the highest in the Foreign Service.

BOHLEN'S CAREER

He was born in Clayton, N. Y., in 1904, graduated from Harvard in 1927, and entered the Foreign Service in 1929, during a Republican administration. He has served in Prague, Paris, Moscow, Tokyo, and Washington, with three tours of duty in Moscow.

Throughout most of his career of 24 years, Mr. Bohlen has specialized in the Soviet Union and in communism. As is well known, he is fluent in the Russian language and in French. He is equally well versed in the intricacies of Communist doctrine and practice. The Secretary of State told the committee that Mr. Bohlen is "uniquely qualified" to be our Ambassador to Russia and is by far "the best available person we could think of" with the desired qualifications.

Mr. President, it is something of a commentary on our training program in this country that after 35 years of a Communist government in Russia, there are relatively so few experts on it. I hope we have a bigger stockpile of brains in regard to other countries of the world and that we will inaugurate an expanded training program with regard to Russia.

THE TWO CHARGES AGAINST BOHLEN

Mr. President, two objections have been raised against Mr. Bohlen. One is that he was connected with the previous administration and particularly that he served as President Roosevelt's interpreter at Yalta and as President Truman's interpreter at Potsdam.

The other is the charge that the FBI report of its investigation of Mr. Bohlen has not been properly evaluated and that there is something in the report which calls for the rejection of Mr. Bohlen's nomination.

NO PREVIOUS FIELD INVESTIGATION OF BOHLEN

Let me discuss the second charge first. It is a disturbing fact that despite Mr. Bohlen's long service in extremely sensitive positions, no full FBI field investigation had ever been made of him until it

was decided to nominate him to be Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

I questioned the Secretary of State as to how that could have happened, and he pointed out that—

> It did not come about under my administration * * * and you will have to call upon my predecessor to explain that.

Apparently, it was not the policy of previous administrations to have the FBI report on men in high positions.

The lack of such an investigation was, of course, promptly remedied by the present administration. I want to make that clear. There has been an FBI report, and I shall say more later with reference to it.

Indeed, one of the first actions of the Foreign Relations Committee this year was to approve a motion calling for a full FBI investigation of top Presidential nominations in the field of foreign relations.

COOPERATION BY SECRETARY OF STATE

The Secretary of State has been very cooperative with the Foreign Relations Committee in the development of our procedures with respect to such matters. While Mr. Bohlen's nomination was being considered by the committee, Mr. Dulles offered to make available to the chairman the FBI summary.

We must understand that an FBI report is sometimes very voluminous, and it is the practice to have a summary made of it, which goes to the Secretary of State.

The Secretary offered to give me this summary in order that I might evaluate the evidence. I had heard rumors, and I said to the Secretary, "I should prefer that you evaluate the report." I rather think Mr. President, that I was well advised in taking that position, although if I had evaluated the evidence, I might well have arrived at the same conclusion. I myself have practiced law for 30-odd years, and know the distinction between facts and mere hearsay and rumor. If I had come to the same conclusion regarding the report, I would be in the same position in which the Secretary is at this time. But the Secretary is responsible for this nominee.

As I shall develop later, three of the best men in the Foreign Service recommended him to the Secretary, and the President of the United States nominated him. The President of the United States knows him personally, having worked with him in Europe. I am not repeating hearsay as to what the President has said. Furthermore, I am authorized to say that since some of this furor started, the Attorney General of the United States has evaluated the FBI file and arrived at the same conclusion as that reached by Secretary Dulles. The report has thus been examined by two lawyers in the highest echelon in Government.

As I said, the Secretary of State offered to evaluate the summary himself for the committee, and I accepted the offer. No member of the committee offered any objection.

I should like to point out that the present Secretary of State is a skilled lawyer with 30 years' experience in the techniques of weighing and evaluating evidence and of separating fact from rumor.

SUMMARY BY MR. DULLES

What was the Secretary's judgment? I read from page 104 of the hearings:

> Secretary DULLES. There is no derogatory material whatsoever which questions the loyalty of Mr. Bohlen to the United States, or which suggests that he is not a good security risk, which suggests he is in any manner one who has leaked or been loose in his conversation or anything of that sort.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand that there is no definite concrete evidence or what a lawyer would consider proof of any dereliction?
>
> Secretary DULLES. Absolutely none whatsoever, not an iota.
>
> Senator TAFT. Do you think there is anything that creates even a prima facie case of such dereliction?
>
> Secretary DULLES. No; none whatsoever.

BOHLEN "A GOOD RISK"

A little later the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] asked the Secretary pointblank:

> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Do I understand you, then, to assure the committee that you believe Mr. Bohlen, based on the full field investigation and whatever you know about the situation, is a good security and loyalty risk?
>
> Secretary DULLES. Yes.

DULLES' RELATIONSHIP TO SECURITY OFFICER

I should like to quote further from the record:

> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Has your security office cleared this file for loyalty and security?
>
> Secretary DULLES. No. I told you that he said that in view of the fact that this file contained some derogatory information he did not wish to take the responsibility of clearance. He passed the matter up to me, which is the usual practice in such cases. I do not think that security officers, whose primary job is to raise doubts and find out suspicious circumstances, are the persons who should have final responsibility in matters of this kind. In important cases, such as this one, the task of final evaluation should be passed up to the senior officers.

THREE-MAN COMMITTEE APPROVED BOHLEN

I should like to say a few words about the procedure which was followed in connection with the selection of Mr. Bohlen. This is very important because of some of the suggestions that have been made.

Shortly after Mr. Dulles accepted the Secretaryship of State he appointed a committee of three former members of the Foreign Service to advise him on prospective appointments to top diplomatic posts. Such a step, he believed, would constitute a helpful safeguard against the possibility of unwise appointments and would be of untold assistance in making certain that the best possible people were recommended for certain difficult assignments.

Members of the Senate know the three members of the committee who have served in this capacity. I invite attention to the fact that they all have long and distinguished records in the Foreign Service. It is significant, I think, that such men as Joseph Grew, Norman Armour, and Hugh Gibson, who have a thorough knowledge of world affairs and the Foreign Service, unanimously agreed that Mr. Bohlen was uniquely qualified for the Moscow assignment.

Under the circumstances, we of the Foreign Relations Committee, had the responsibility of acting on the basis of the facts presented to us. This we proceeded to do. Yet I may say that, having heard that there was something else in the picture, I wrote letters to several Senators, asking them to submit to me any evidence of an adverse character. None was forthcoming.

SENATE'S CONSTITUTIONAL ROLE

It is well to recall the proper role of the Senate in a case of this kind.

The Constitution, in article II, section 2, says the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors." I have always construed that section to mean that the principal question to be determined by the Senate is whether or not a nominee is qualified. It is the function of the Senate to examine the nominee's qualifications coolly and judicially. In that connection, as I have said, I practiced law, in an active law business, in Federal and State courts for more than 30 years before coming to the Senate, and I have had something to do with evaluating evidence.

An ambassador is the representative of the President, and in the absence of overriding reasons to the contrary, the President is entitled to have the men of his choice as his representatives. In this case, as I have already said, the President not only knows the man personally, but has endorsed him.

OBJECTION TO BOHLEN ON YALTA GROUND

Now, Mr. President, let me refer briefly to the other objection to Mr. Bohlen; namely, that he was connected with the previous administrations and interpreted at Yalta and Potsdam for Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

Let me first point out that according to Mr. Bohlen, he was present at Yalta and Potsdam as an interpreter—a technician. Although he did serve to some extent in an advisory capacity, he states that he was by no means in a policymaking position. The responsibility for the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements rested squarely on President Roosevelt and President Truman, respectively.

Let me point out further that Mr. Bohlen will not be in a policymaking position after he gets to Moscow. Ambassadors in Moscow or anywhere else do not make policy, Mr. President. They carry out the policy which is made in Washington, and which is conveyed to them in instructions from the Secretary of State and the President.

BOHLEN HAD BEEN CONFIRMED UNANIMOUSLY AS COUNSELOR

Any objection to Mr. Bohlen on the grounds that he was at Yalta and Potsdam would have more weight if it had been raised in 1951 when Mr. Bohlen's nomination to be Counselor of the Department of State came before the Senate. His nomination was unanimously approved in 1951 as counselor, a position which involves policymaking at a very high level. Mr. Bohlen's connection with Yalta and Potsdam was as well known in 1951 as it is today; yet when his nomination came before the Senate in that year not a single voice was raised in dissent.

In 1948, during the Republican 80th Congress, Mr. Bohlen's nomination to be

MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a career minister was unanimously confirmed by the Senate.

In 1947, during the same Republican 80th Congress, his nomination to be a Foreign Service officer of class 1 was unanimously confirmed by the Senate.

Both of these actions occurred after the full details of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements were known. No Senator raised his voice against them. I hope that this Republican 83d Congress will give a Republican President at least as much support as the Republican 80th Congress gave a Democratic President.

Of course Mr. Bohlen served under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, not only at Yalta and Potsdam, but at other places and in various capacities. He has been in the Foreign Service, as I have said, since 1929, and therefore he has also served under President Hoover and Secretaries Stimson, Hull, Stettinius, Byrnes, and Marshall, as well as Acheson. Mr. Dulles says that Bohlen gave the same loyalty to each of them that he will give to President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. That is only what is expected of a Foreign Service officer.

EISENHOWER AND DULLES BOTH SERVED DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT

The American people are obviously not impressed by the argument that service under the previous administration automatically disqualifies one for service under the present administration. They gave an overwhelming majority of their votes last November to a man who had served with great distinction in positions of high responsibility. The present Secretary of State, who was confirmed unanimously by the Senate only 2 months ago, likewise successfully carried out important assignments under the previous administration.

WE CONFIRMED OTHER OFFICERS

In the past 2 months, the Senate has confirmed numerous other Foreign Service officers—all without objection—who had served in prior administrations. No question was raised about confirming George Allen as Ambassador to India, or John M. Cabot as Assistant Secretary of State, or James C. Dunn as Ambassador to Spain, or Ernest A. Gross as a representative to the U. N. General Assembly, or Douglas MacArthur 2d as counselor, or Karl L. Rankin as Ambassador to China, or William Sanders as alternate representative to the U. N. General Assembly. Yet every one of these men is a career Foreign Service officer, and some of them have been almost as intimately identified with the policies of the prior administration as has Mr. Bohlen.

Obviously we could never have a career service if we insisted upon changing it with every administration. We could never hope to develop experts who spend years studying the languages, the customs, and doctrines of faraway lands.

I wish Senators would read the record to see what has been said about Mr. Bohlen's aptitude, his ability to comprehend language and understand differences in the meanings of words—an attribute which is important in dealing with the Russians.

Mr. President, since this nomination was sent to the Senate the most momentous events have occurred in the Soviet Union and on the fringes of the Soviet bloc. No one can tell what these events portend.

CONCLUSION

It thus becomes doubly important to us to have a capable, expert Ambassador on the ground in Moscow to report and to interpret for us the events in the Soviet Union. According to our Secretary of State and the President, there is no question at all about Mr. Bohlen's ability to carry out this assignment extremely well—better, indeed, than anyone else who would be available.

That is a very significant statement. It is not mine alone; it is the judgment of those who are in a position to know.

Is there any question at all about Mr. Bohlen's character, his loyalty, and his discretion? We have the personal evaluation of the Secretary of State of the FBI report on that point, an evaluation which, I repeat, is concurred in by the Attorney General.

I sincerely hope the Senate will proceed promptly to confirm the nomination.

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILEY. I promised the Senator from Arkansas that I would yield first to him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that when I asked him to yield I was not trying to interfere with the continuity of his address. There was something he mentioned at that point about which I desired to inquire in order to make the record clear.

Mr. WILEY. I know the Senator had no other purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very glad the distinguished Senator said he would condescend to listen. I trust that he will also condescend to answer.

I simply wanted to inquire whether the testimony of Gen. Bedell Smith was in the record. I do not find it in the transcript of the hearings.

Mr. WILEY. It is not in the record of the hearings. He came before the committee and gave a word picture of the world situation. As I recall, he told us, in the course of his statement, how important it was that the committee act quickly on the nomination of Mr. Bohlen.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That was what I wanted to have clarified. That statement does not appear in the record.

Mr. WILEY. It is not in the printed record.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not appear from the record that he testified at that hearing.

Mr. WILEY. Neither does it appear that the President of the United States told me personally today——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that, but the Senator referred to the testimony of General Smith in connection with the pending nomination, and I did not find the testimony in the record.

Mr. WILEY. Let me interrupt at that point to say that if there is any question about it, I am sure the evidence was taken down in executive session, and that the transcript is in the possession of the committee. I do not believe there would be any objection to allowing the Senator to look into that part of it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not find it in the record, and I did not know whether it was available. The Senator from Wisconsin says, as I understand, that General Smith testified as to the urgency of filing this position. I did not understand the Senator to say whether General Smith testified with reference to the issue of Mr. Bohlen's qualifications or suitability for the position. Can the Senator tell us whether or not he testified on that point?

Mr. WILEY. My recollection is that he did.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is why I asked the Senator from Wisconsin to yield. I wanted to get the record clear. If General Smith did testify regarding this nomination, I think the Senate is entitled to the benefit of such testimony.

Mr. WILEY. I will have that point checked.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not disagreeing at all with the statement that this is an important position, and one which should be filled promptly. I subscribe fully to that view. However, I did not want the Senator's remarks to leave the implication that General Smith had testified regarding this nomination, if he had not done so. If he did so, I think his testimony should be made available to the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. I merely wish to make my position clear. Gen. Bedell Smith was called before the committee to give us a picture of world conditions. I have asked Mr. Wilcox to check the record.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will further yield, if General Smith testified as to the qualifications and fitness of Mr. Bohlen for this position, such testimony would carry considerable weight with me, because I have great confidence in General Smith. I simply wish to know if such testimony was given and, if so, whether or not it is available.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. It well may be brought out by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, but I wish to make the point succinctly. The fact remains, does it not, that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, after listening to Mr. Dulles at great length, and to the nominee, Mr. Bohlen, when the final vote came, voted 15 to 0? Every member of the committee voted in favor of the nomination. Is not that true?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from New Hampshire is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement now as to the action taken by the permanent investigating subcommittee this morning. We met in executive session to discuss the question of whether or not Mr. McLeod should be asked to appear before our committee. I believe it was unanimously agreed that there are a number of things which we desire to discuss with Mr. McLeod, but that if he were called now the very important matters which we desired to take up with him would be confused with the Bohlen nomination.

We feel that while our committee has a very great interest in the nomination,

the primary responsibility for passing upon it rests upon the Foreign Relations Committee. It was therefore unanimously agreed by the subcommittee that we would not ask Mr. McLeod to appear before us at this particular time. While the committee, as a committee, decided to take no formal action, it was indicated that several Senators would ask the Foreign Relations Committee to call Mr. McLeod and Mr. Dulles before that committee, put Mr. Dulles and Mr. McLeod under oath, and get to the bottom of this very confusing picture.

In a press conference Mr. Dulles indicated that he and Mr. McLeod fully agreed upon the clearance of Mr. Bohlen. The information which is very general among Senators is that this is not true, but that Mr. McLeod refused to clear Mr. Bohlen. Last week the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] made a speech on the floor of the Senate setting forth——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think there has been some confusion on the part of the Senate permanent investigating subcommittee with reference to the purpose of inviting Mr. McLeod to testify. It is my understanding from the chairman—and I should like to have it confirmed for the RECORD—that when he was invited to testify before the investigating subcommittee, the chairman had in mind interrogating Mr. McLeod about other matters, wholly unrelated to the Bohlen nomination. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. I may say that when Mr. McLeod was originally asked to appear, we had in mind going into a number of things.

First, there is serious question as to whether there should be an engineering survey of the file system. We have interviewed roughly 30 or 40 witnesses with regard to the filing system in the State Department. We wanted to discuss with Mr. McLeod the question as to which of those witnesses should be called before our committee, and which he would prefer to interview personally.

I have a great deal of respect for Mr. McLeod. However, after Mr. McLeod had been requested to appear on the question of files and other matters which I would rather not discuss on the floor, some Senators indicated that if Mr. McLeod appeared they would interrogate him on this confusing situation—on the question of whether or not he had refused to give clearance to Mr. Bohlen.

I think one of the functions of our committee—one which I hope we will undertake in the not too distant future—is to determine the question of just what authority the security officer has. Does he have the task of passing upon security and loyalty cases? If not, what is his job? If a case comes up, is it the task of Mr. McLeod to decide whether or not a man is a bad security risk or a bad loyalty risk? If not, what is the purpose of his job? That is one of the general subjects which we wish to go into. I assume that when we do so, even if it is after the Bohlen case has been disposed of, other Senators may wish to interrogate him in regard to the conflict between him and Mr. Dulles on the Bohlen case.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. To conform with what the Senator from Arkansas has said, let me say that the original purpose of calling Mr. McLeod was to go into matters unrelated to the Bohlen case. I feel, and I think other members of the subcommittee also feel, that as an investigating subcommittee we should leave this question to the Foreign Relations Committee. So I took a part in the Bohlen case, not as chairman of the investigating subcommittee, but as an individual Senator, I feel that I had a right to take an active part in it—the Bohlen case.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to make it clear for the RECORD that when Mr. McLeod was requested to appear, it was in connection with matters wholly unrelated to this nomination.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Subsequently controversy has arisen with reference to Mr. McLeod's position with regard to this appointment, and the position of Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State. There are those of us who are interested in knowing Mr. McLeod's views and having his testimony before reaching a final conclusion with respect to the issue now before the Senate. I am one of those who would like to have the benefit of his testimony, but I take the position here, as I did in the committee, that I do not believe it is the province of the Committee on Government Operations, broad as its powers of investigation are, to undertake to conduct an investigation of a nomination with respect to which another regularly established committee of this body has jurisdiction. That is the position I have taken.

I should like to have the benefit of Mr. McLeod's testimony. I think it is pertinent, and I believe we should have the benefit of it. I say very frankly that, in my opinion, we do Mr. Bohlen an injustice, we do Mr. McLeod an injustice, and we do ourselves an injustice if this controversy is not cleared up and the issue resolved so as to permit us to vote with knowledge of the facts. I am talking about knowledge of the facts, not rumors. There is too much rumor associated with this subject. There is one rumor which is serious in nature that should be cleared up. Therefore I trust that action will be taken so that the testimony can be clarified before we come to a final vote on the pending nomination.

I should like to say further, if the Senator from Wisconsin will indulge me——

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That it is my intention, if I can find it possible to do so, to vote in favor of the nomination. I cannot bring myself to oppose it on the grounds set forth by some persons. The very fact that Mr. Bohlen was associated with the former administration is not sufficient reason for me to oppose his nomination. It may be sufficient reason for other Senators to oppose it, and I do not quarrel with their right to do so on that basis.

I take the position that a part of the final responsibility—and I say this to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations—lies with the United States Senate.

Out of deference—and I would say that a great many times I have yielded to that deference on matters involving the confirmations of nominations, and I want to do it again—out of deference to the committee, I should like to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Bohlen's nomination, but I am not prepared to vote, as I should like to do, until we hear from the man who was appointed to perform a certain task, and who apparently has undertaken to fulfill the function of the office which was created by this session of Congress in order that he could perform it.

In view of the rumors and conflicting reports on the subject, which are abroad, I think the Senate is entitled to have the benefit of the testimony of Mr. McLeod before the issue is finally resolved.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for permitting me to make these extended remarks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the junior Senator from Wisconsin that I have the same high regard for Scotty McLeod that he has, and of his background and record. However, it has been my general understanding that even in the case of the Federal Bureau of Investigation itself, when investigations are made, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover himself—and I will say that I have the same high regard for Mr. Hoover—does not evaluate the reports and determine whether John Doe should be appointed or not appointed to an office; he feels that would be entirely outside his province and his responsibility. As I understand, his responsibility is to gather information and to make the information available to the appointing officer, so that the appointing officer may make his determination and evaluation of the situation based on the information furnished to him.

I would assume that within the Department of State to a considerable extent the same general procedure would be followed, namely, that Mr. McLeod would have the responsibility of making known to the responsible head of the Department the information which was gathered, that if there was detrimental information in existence he would call such information to the attention of the head of the department, and that the head of the department would make the final determination as to whether an appointment should be made or should not be made.

Mr. McCARTHY. In reply to the statement made by the distinguished Senator from California I should like to say that he points up the importance of having Mr. McLeod appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations and to have Mr. Bohlen also appear before the committee.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Senator from California says he assumes that the task of Mr. McLeod is not to evaluate the material but merely to pass it on to the Secretary of State. That is not the assumption many other Senators have. I believe for that reason Mr. McLeod should be called before the Committee on Foreign Relations and that we should find out what his tasks are.

As the Senator well knows—and I am not discussing anything at all that is secret—a rumor has been prevalent on the Hill that Mr. McLeod refused to give Mr. Bohlen security clearance. There is a rumor to the effect that Mr. McLeod felt so strongly about the matter that he went to the President about it. I do not know whether he did or not. I have not talked with Mr. McLeod about it. In fact, I have avoided talking to him about this subject, because I felt that the situation was such that it might result in the resignation or the removal of Mr. McLeod. That would be a great tragedy. I believe he is a completely honest and competent young man. He has been on the job for only 2 or 3 weeks and he has already removed approximately 20 or 30 individuals, whom I shall discuss in detail on Wednesday when I speak on the subject on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, in fairness to Mr. Bohlen, with the question of security hanging over his head, I think he should be interested in having it cleared up. Another very strong reason why Mr. McLeod should be called and interrogated in executive session of the Committee on Foreign Relations is that the security information is of such a nature that we cannot discuss it on the floor of the Senate without ourselves violating security. One of the matters, while not of the greatest importance, is nevertheless of such importance and of such a nature that we cannot discuss it on the floor of the Senate. If we did we ourselves would be violating security. I think Mr. Bohlen would agree with me that if the information in the files—some 16 pages of it—is correct, Moscow is the last place in the world to which he should be sent There might be other countries of the world to which he could be sent. But I am sure Mr. Bohlen would agree that if he goes to Moscow with this serious question hanging over his head, he will not have behind him the confidence of the Senators. I believe the question can be cleared up. There is no threat hanging over his head.

I believe his nomination will be confirmed by a sizable majority on Wednesday. I believe that the Truman Democrats—and I say Truman Democrats—who have supported the Acheson disastrous foreign policy must of necessity vote to confirm Mr. Bohlen's nomination, because, Mr. President, one who loves Mr. Acheson must love Mr. Bohlen. I have discussed this nomination with a great number of Republicans. Many of them feel that so far the President's batting average has been very high—and I agree with that feeling—and, even if it appears he is making a mistake in this case, they will hesitate to oppose him so early in his very difficult administration; and, therefore, some Republicans, while holding their noses, will vote to confirm the Bohlen nomination.

Therefore, Mr. President, there is no threat of a failure to confirm Mr. Bohlen's nomination hanging over anyone's head, and there is no threat of any security risk involved, inasmuch as we cannot discuss certain aspects of the case on the floor of the Senate. Therefore I think Mr. Bohlen should take steps to clear up the matter, I believe he should ask the Committee on Foreign Relations to call Mr. McLeod before it.

I may say, further—and I call this particularly to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee and that of the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]—that apparently Gen. Bedell Smith, the head of CIA, has a great deal of confidence in the so-called polygraph, which is the lie detector. I also have a great deal of respect for it. I have used it in my court in Wisconsin a great number of times. We have never forced anyone to submit to it, because to do so would be violating a person's constitutional rights, but we have allowed persons to submit to it when they asked to do so and when they felt that they were unjustly accused. I understand that Gen. Bedell Smith has great confidence in the polygraph and that he has used it in his work in CIA. I understand the FBI also has a similar mechanism which they use.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. In a moment. I would not favor any committee ever trying to force a man to submit himself to it; but in this case if he wants to do it, he should be allowed to do it. I understand the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations originally suggested that course of action, and that the opposition was led by—I am repeating only what I heard stated by members of the committee, but not in confidence—that the opposition was led by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and that there was no suggestion made to Mr. Bohlen that he submit to a lie detector test. If he had someone operate the polygraph in whom he had confidence, and if after he submitted to the test the result showed that the security information was false, so far as I am concerned I would be satisfied with that aspect of the case. I would still oppose his nomination, because I think we should not promote those in this administration who were part and parcel and heart of the Acheson disastrous, suicidal foreign-policy group.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to know whether the Senator from Wisconsin is aware of the fact that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is absolutely opposed to the polygraph, and regards it as of no possible use whatever, and that in fact he is the head of the opposition to the use of the polygraph.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that to the best of my knowledge he is incorrect in the statement he has just made. I have discussed the polygraph with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, although not in connection with the Bohlen case. Mr. Hoover does not have the same confidence in the lie detector that Mr. Bedell Smith has. However, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover employs a system under which the polygraph is used. The FBI is equipped to operate, and does operate, the lie detector.

I suggest that Mr. Bohlen, under the supervision of someone in whom he has confidence, go to the FBI and have a polygraph made. It would satisfy me completely, and I know it would satisfy General Smith completely, and it would satisfy a number of other Senators.

I repeat to the Senator from Ohio that, so far as I know, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is not opposed to the use of the polygraph. So far as I know, he does not have the confidence in it, however, that Mr. Smith has. I may say that I have complete confidence in it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Wisconsin is stating here that the final decision as to either loyalty or as to security risk should be made either by the FBI, in one case, or by the security officer who was appointed as such in the State Department? In the case of the State Department I refer to Mr. McLeod, the recently appointed security officer. Does the Senator from Wisconsin know whether Mr. McLeod is authorized to make the final decision as to loyalty and security, or whether it is made by the Secretary of State and by the President of the United States after they have had the evidence brought to their attention? That is the entire issue in this matter.

We all know Mr. McLeod. We have the greatest respect for him. He is as straight as a string. But Mr. McLeod's job was to do the same thing within the State Department that the FBI does when it investigates such matters.

Mr. McLeod was expected to bring any danger signals to the attention of the Secretary of State and the President of the United States. That is what Mr. McLeod did. The decision was made by the President of the United States and by the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the very able Senator from New Jersey makes an unqualified statement about what Mr. McLeod did. The Senator from New Jersey may be correct. However, I think he has been misled.

We know that Mr. Humelsine, Mr. McLeod's predecessor, had the task of passing upon loyalty and security matters. We know, for example, that in the Clubb case, which the Senator from New Jersey may recall, the Loyalty Board in the State Department decided that Mr. Clubb should be discharged. That was one of the few cases in which such a decision was reached. Mr. Humelsine said, when appearing before the Appropriations Committee, that his task was either to approve or to reject that decision. He approved it. I repeat that I am speaking now of Mr. McLeod's predecessor. After Mr. Humelsine decided that, on security and loyalty grounds, Mr. Clubb should not serve, Dean Acheson reversed his decision.

If Mr. Dulles has curbed the power of Mr. McLeod, if Mr. Dulles has provided

that Mr. McLeod can do only what the FBI is now doing, namely, merely transferring the information to Mr. Dulles, and that Mr. Dulles himself is the security agent or officer, then let us find that out.

But I do not think we should proceed on this nomination until the Foreign Relations Committee has had Mr. McLeod before it, and I believe that should be done in executive session, for some matters of a security nature should not be discussed in open session; we would not wish to have them discussed in open session.

The committee should decide for itself. I have confidence in the committee. I think the 15 members of the committee who approved the nomination of Mr. Bohlen were perhaps doing so on the basis of the testimony then in the record. However, now that rumors and information are so prevalent—every Senator has heard them or is aware of them—I can see no reason on God's earth why the committee should not have Mr. McLeod appear before it. The information he could give the committee would be of great use to it. Why keep it secret from the committee?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There is nothing secret. The Senator from Wisconsin has made quite a speech in connection with my question.

Mr. McCARTHY. I happen to have the floor, but I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

I may say that Mr. Humelsine was acting for the Secretary of State when these matters were brought to his attention. He was acting for the Secretary of State in determining on loyalty matters.

Mr. McLeod is not the Under Secretary of State. Mr. Donold Lourie is Under Secretary of State. After the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] made his speech the other day, I telephoned Mr. Lourie. I was told that Mr. McLeod brought these matters to the attention of the Secretary of State and the others in the group.

Mr. Lourie said that in a case such as this, Mr. McLeod's responsibility was merely to send up a red flag, so to speak, when he felt that certain things should be investigated. They did discuss these matters. Mr. Lourie discussed them, and the Secretary of State discussed them. Then Mr. Lourie went through these matters in detail himself. The Secretary of State went through the file, and took it to the President of the United States, as was his duty. The President of the United States went through it. All of them reached the same conclusion which our committee reached, namely, that there was nothing in the report on Mr. Bohlen questioning his loyalty or security.

That is what led me to vote in committee for confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. McCARTHY. In answer, let me say that what the Senator from New Jersey has said emphasizes the importance of having Mr. Dulles and Mr. McLeod testify under oath before the committee. The Senator from New Jersey tells us about a telephone call he has made to someone in the State Department. The able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has told us about a conversation he had with Bedell Smith. This matter is still completely up in the air. At least half the Senators on this floor are convinced that the security officer turned down Mr. Bohlen on security grounds.

There is nothing difficult or involved in having the committee call Mr. McLeod before it, put him under oath and have him testify, and also put Mr. Dulles under oath and have him testify, and then have the members of the committee return to the floor of the Senate and tell us what was said, without having anything deleted from the record.

I have great respect for Donold Lourie; I think he is a most competent man. But the references to his statements do not answer the question of whether Scott McLeod, the very able security officer, turned down Mr. Bohlen on security grounds.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] stated on the floor of Senate that Mr. Bohlen was so turned down on security grounds; and I have every reason to know that that is true, although I have not discussed the matter with Mr. McLeod personally.

So I say that the Senator from New Jersey could do a great service to the public by tomorrow having Mr. McLeod called before the committee. It would be no imposition upon him or upon Mr. Dulles; and then the committee could find out exactly what Mr. McLeod did.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the Senator from Wisconsin will yield to me for this purpose, I wish to make a statement which I have prepared with great care, after talking to the various persons involved. I should like to make the statement for the RECORD.

In his speech in the Senate on Friday, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] stated that Mr. McLeod, Security Officer of the State Department, had examined the report of an FBI investigation on Mr. Bohlen; and the Senator from Nevada then continued, as follows:

> On the basis of information thus furnished to him, Mr. President, Mr. McLeod concluded that he could not clear Mr. Bohlen. He reported this conclusion to the Secretary of State. I do not know, Mr. President, what the Secretary of State told the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I am confident that he did not tell the commitee that Mr. McLeod had reported to him that he, McLeod, could not clear Bohlen. The current understanding is that the Secretary of State told the Foreign Relations Committee the FBI report cleared Mr. Bohlen completely. If that is what he did say, he said it knowing that his own security chief, the man brought into the Department to do the job of cleaning out the Department, had reported that he could not clear Mr. Bohlen on the basis of the FBI report.

Mr. President, in that statement the Senator from Nevada is, in my opinion, in error. The Senator from Nevada was not aware of what Mr. Dulles did state to our committee. Mr. Dulles held back nothing.

The facts are as follows:

When Secretary Dulles appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee on Wednesday, March 18, 1953, he advised the committee that Mr. McLeod, the security officer of the Department, had not cleared Mr. Bohlen because he had found that the FBI report contained certain derogatory material, and for this reason he had brought the matter to the attention of the Secretary of State. He also brought it to the attention of the Under Secretary of State.

Secretary Dulles further stated to the committee that he had thereupon examined the report himself; that this disclosed that, while it contained certain derogatory material, it did not question the loyalty or security of Mr. Bohlen, but applied to other matters; that his examination led him to the conclusion that Mr. Bohlen was not shown to be a security or loyalty risk.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. Dulles not only advised the committee that the security officer of the Department had not cleared Mr. Bohlen, but replied as follows to a direct question on the subject by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]:

> Senator HICKENLOOPER. Has your security officer cleared this file for loyalty and security?
>
> Secretary DULLES. No. I told you that he said that in view of the fact that this file contained some derogatory information, he did not wish to take the responsibility of clearance. He passed the matter up to me, which is the usual practice in such cases. I do not think that security officers, whose primary job is to raise doubts and find out suspicious circumstances, are the persons who should have final responsibility in matters of this kind. In important cases, such as this one, the task of final evaluation should be passed up to the senior officers.

During the course of Mr. Dulles' testimony before the committee, he related the substance of the FBI report and the nature of the derogatory information which it contained and all of this was made the subject of questioning by members of the committee and replies by the Secretary.

Mr. President, I am one of those who participated in those discussions. I know what the matter was. After hearing all the testimony I decided the Secretary of State and the President were entitled to vote a confidence from us, because we knew that they had evaluated all this information and had expressed their confidence in Mr. Bohlen. I now yield to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nevada, provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin yields to the Senator from Nevada, with the understanding that he does not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. Does the Senator from New Jersey know that Mr. McLeod is the security officer for the State Department?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That he is the security officer?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I know that he has the function of getting for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the State Department the kind of information the FBI gets for the Government in general and that he exercises this function in the same general way. His job is to report danger signals to the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, and to those who have responsibility for making final decisions.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask the Senator whether he knows that Mr. McLeod is the security officer for the State Department.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not know just what the Senator means by that. We would have to define the term "security officer."

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from New Jersey not know as a matter of fact that Mr. McLeod is the security officer for the State Department?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Not in the sense in which the Senator from Nevada is suggesting, namely, that he has the final decision.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not asking the Senator for any sense. I am merely inquiring whether the Senator from New Jersey knows that Mr. McLeod is the security officer.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If that means that he has the final decision on questions of security and loyalty, my answer is, "No, he does not have such authority."

Mr. McCARRAN. I merely wish to state that under the law, as I believe the Senator knows, provision is made for a security officer for the State Department. Mr. McLeod was appointed to that position and is holding it now. I think he receives $15,000 a year. During that time, he has exercised his rights as security officer, and those rights have been agreed to by his principal, the Secretary of State. He has removed about 10 or 12 homosexuals from the State Department without any interference by the Secretary of State. Does the Senator from New Jersey know that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I can assume that he has done that. I also assume he had the approval of the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. Then, is the Senator from New Jersey contending that this security officer should not have been heard by the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am contending that, unless my information is entirely erroneous—and that would imply that the Secretary of State had told an untruth, which I do not admit—Mr. McLeod never made any statement turning down Mr. Bohlen. He called attention to certain things in the files which he thought should be considered. They were considered. The final decision on the case was made by the President of the United States himself. I do not think we can go to any higher authority than that.

There may be a question of authority. There may be a question implied in the Senator's statement about the authority of security officers. It may be that this authority will have to be defined more clearly. I am glad that this issue, as to who has the responsibility, in the final analysis, of determining who is a security or loyalty risk, has arisen. If, on all the facts, the Secretary of State and the President of the United States come to the conclusion that an individual is not a security or loyalty risk, I would question any position taken to the effect that a security officer, or anyone else, would or should have a higher authority.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have one more question, if I may ask it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should be very glad to have it. I think we ought to have this matter cleared up.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would it not have been good procedure for the Committee on Foreign Relations to have heard from the security officer in the State Department when this question, not of loyalty but of security on the part of this appointee, was raised so prominently?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In the light of the fact that the Secretary of State himself came back to us and explained what had gone on in the Department and told of the conversation with the security officer, we did not feel it necessary to question the Secretary's veracity and to call someone else. The Secretary, himself, came, and he was with us for more than 2 hours. All of us questioned him, and, after hearing him and hearing everything that had been presented—there was nothing left that had not been presented—we decided that we could vote unanimously for the confirmation of Mr. Bohlen's nomination.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding. It seemed to me it was important that the issue be presented as to whether the security officer should have the last word, or whether the President of the United States should have the last word in these matters.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey, I think that is a seriously important question, but, in this instance, the important question is not who should have the last word; the question is: Did Mr. McLeod turn down this appointee on security grounds?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me finish. As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator should know that before asking the Senate to vote upon the nomination, I think that, as of today, he would have to tell us he does not know what Mr. McLeod's functions are.

I think I must stand corrected in regard to a statement I just made. I think I said Mr. Humelsine, who was Mr. McLeod's predecessor, had jurisdiction to pass upon questions of security and loyalty. I am informed that that is to some extent incorrect, that Mr. Humelsine was not a personnel officer and passed on questions of security or loyalty, whereas Mr. McLeod has the additional function of being personnel officer. So, while Humelsine may not have had the job of passing upon both security and loyalty, Mr. McLeod has.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey this question, if I may: Is it correct that the FBI prepared a summary of the Bohlen file, a summary which omitted the names of informants, a summary which was to have been available to the Foreign Relations Committee, but which the Foreign Relations Committee never did examine; it merely ruled upon the basis of Mr. Dulles' memory?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I am correctly informed, we were advised by the Attorney General that the FBI files could be available to the chairman of the committee, but not to the entire committee. We had, however, the summary Mr. Dulles gave us. We had no reason to question his veracity, and he told us what the material was that had been under discussion. A great deal of this material is entirely clear and entirely positive. There are some things that we discussed which were not entirely clear.

Mr. McCARTHY. Apparently I did not make myself clear in the question I asked the Senator. I understand that the FBI took the voluminous file upon Mr. Bohlen and made a summary of that file—a summary for the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No; I do not know anything about that. We did not see it. It went to the State Department.

Mr. McCARTHY. I can assure the Senator a summary of the file was made, the summary is available, and I urge the Senator, a conscientious Senator that he is, to read it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have great respect for the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. He has been doing a great job for his State and for the country, and I think he could do a great service now by saying, "Let us see that summary." Let the Senator read it himself, rather than depend upon Mr. Dulles' memory.

The Senator from New Jersey says he has no reason to question the veracity of Mr. Dulles. Let us assume we have not. Let us assume that Mr. Dulles would not deliberately misinform the committee. Nevertheless, we know that Mr. Dulles, in a press conference, either directly stated or created the inference that he and Mr. McLeod were in complete agreement upon the security clearance of Mr. Bohlen. Many of us strongly feel that that is untrue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may merely cite the passage from his testimony which I think the Senator has.

Mr. McCARTHY. Many of us have reason to believe that Mr. McLeod felt so strongly about that that he went directly to the White House, and spent 2½ hours there. I do not know that to be true, but that is the rumor prevalent on the Hill, and if it is true, if Mr. McLeod felt so strongly about the statement of Mr. Dulles that he went directly to the White House, going over Mr. Dulles' head, that is in direct contradiction of what Mr. Dulles told the committee; and if Mr. Dulles' memory is bad on that point, then his memory must be extremely bad also as to what was in the files.

I personally think the members of the Foreign Relations Committee are sufficiently good as security risks that they can see the summary prepared by the FBI.

I urge the Senator from New Jersey, before he forces the Senate to vote, in

fairness to the Senate, to Mr. Bohlen, and to the country, that he and other Senators read that summary and call Mr. McLeod before the committee and get his story. There can be no reasonable objection to that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I read a moment ago from page 105 of the summary of the testimony, where Mr. Dulles answered a question by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as follows:

Has your security officer cleared this file for loyalty and security?

Secretary DULLES. No. I told you that he said that in view of the fact that this file contained some derogatory information, he did not wish to take the responsibility of clearance. He passed the matter up to me, which is the usual practice in such cases.

Mr. McCARTHY. We do not understand that to be the fact. We do not know whether it is true or not. That is what he told the committee. I voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dulles. I think his batting average, on the whole, has been rather high. I think he has been doing a relatively good job of foreign affairs in his office and a fairly good job of cleaning house, also. But when he makes a mistake, I do not think it is a question of a vote of confidence in him; it is a question of the Senate saying whether this man Bohlen's nomination should be or should not be confirmed.

I strongly urge the Senator from New Jersey to have Mr. McLeod called before the committee. If the Senator will personally examine not only the FBI file, but the summary, and will come back and tell the Senate that after examining the file and the summary he is satisfied with Mr. Bohlen, it will ease the minds of a great number of Senators.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. After hearing Mr. Dulles before our committee for over 2 hours, I am satisfied, and I would have great difficulty in joining with any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle in casting any doubt on the veracity of the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then, let me say we are casting doubt upon his memory, because there has been doubt cast upon it. Many Senators are in a state of utter confusion as to whether the nomination of Mr. Bohlen should or should not be confirmed. I have refrained from discussing the matter with Mr. McLeod. But I think the Senator from New Jersey should be able to come to the Senate tomorrow or Wednesday and tell us the facts.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho for a question.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a discussion took place a moment ago between the majority leader and the Senator from Wisconsin with reference to the use of a lie detector. Without making any statement whatsoever about Charles E. Bohlen, the nominee, I wish to assure my colleagues that I know without a doubt that the State Department, during the Truman regime, actually used the lie detector, and I think it cannot be further argued that there is any question about its being used there. I did not involve Mr. Bohlen.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that the polygraph or lie detector has been used extensively in the CIA, and it has been used under General Smith, and I understand that General Smith has considerable confidence in it.

I should like to make it clear that I would oppose ever forcing a man to come before a committee and submit himself to a lie-detector test. I think it would be an invasion of his constitutional rights; but where a question such as this has been raised, he should be allowed to clear himself.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin made reference to a state of confusion among Senators. I am one of those Senators who are in a state of confusion. It has seemed to me, in my confused and muddled brain, that we have on trial here a Republican Secretary of State, and, by inference, a Republican President. I should like to suggest that the Republican junior Senator from Wisconsin give this administration a chance and put the responsibility on it. That is my suggestion.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I may say, in answer to the very able Senator from Vermont, that I do not think the President is on trial today. I think the President of the United States is doing an excellent job. I think his batting average is very, very high, but I do not believe the Senate can shift its responsibility to the Executive and say that merely because we are of the same party as the President who has made the nomination we must go along blindly. Last fall, when I spoke to millions of people, I condemned some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for having done just that. I participated in various senatorial campaigns and pointed out that certain administration Senators were covering up, hiding, acting as rubber stamps, and blindly following a President because he happened to be of their own particular party.

I do not think that is the proper attitude for a Senator to take. I do not care whether a President is a Democrat or a Republican, when he has made a bad nomination I intend to oppose it on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there is any further demonstration on the part of the occupants of the galleries, the Chair will have to ask the Sergeant at Arms to clear the galleries.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in discussing the question with one of the Senators, the point came up as to the position of Gen. Bedell Smith in this matter. I have before me the record, and I shall read a part of it in order to indicate clearly what General Smith said. This was my question:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, General Smith, we are very happy to have you here, and perhaps you can discuss not only the situation upon which you are appearing here today, such information which you can get from the CIA, as the former head of it, but you can also give us some information on this subject that I think is important, and that is, if you have consulted with the Secretary, you probably have, whether or not action should be delayed on Mr. Bohlen's nomination, or whether it should be hurried up, and any consideration to go over until Tuesday.

I would like to get your judgment, if it is based upon the judgment of the Secretary and yourself, as to the advisability of hurrying up that confirmation, or delaying it in view of these world events.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with him and am glad to have a chance to mention this. We feel, in view of this crisis—

Meaning the world situation—

that everything possible should be done to expedite it.

Referring, of course, to confirming Mr. Bohlen's nomination.

The sooner we get in there, the better; because there is going to be a very unusual series of developments, one way or the other, and Mr. Bohlen, of course, is the man probably best qualified that we have at the present time, and available to go there and make reports during this critical period.

Mr. President, I invite attention again to that language "and Mr. Bohlen, of course, is the man probably best qualified that we have at the present time, and available to go there and make reports during this critical period."

So I think, Mr. President, this language confirms my former statement very clearly. In other words, my recollection was correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I trust the Senator understands that I am trying to be helpful——

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Arkansas has been very helpful.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In suggesting that the record supply information as to whether General Smith had given testimony regarding the Bohlen nomination. There does not appear to be a report on the nomination. The committee has made no formal report, has it? All that I have before me is the printed hearings; there is no written report.

Mr. WILEY. There is nothing except the record before us.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is all I have. I requested the committee report.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has the statement which the Chairman made.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know I have his statement, but I asked for a copy of the report, because I think it is pertinent, and that it should be a part of the record. This is something about which I had no information, and no other Senator, except possibly those on the committee, who have heard General Smith testify, had that information. This is why I desired to clarify for the record whether General Smith had testified and what he had said regarding the nomination.

I am not taking a position in opposition to the nomination. I am trying to ascertain whether there is any justification for opposing it, because there has been so much talk about it.

I may say to the Senator that upon the record of the testimony in the hearings as printed, I do not believe any Senator could find a reason to oppose confirmation of the nomination. What I

... MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

am trying to do is clear up the points that are in confusion and are causing confusion.

That is why I felt it would be to the advantage of all Senators—certainly it would be helpful to me—if we could have Mr. McLeod's testimony.

Since I came to the Chamber and since the Senator from Wisconsin began his address, information has come to me from what I believe to be a reliable source, that possibly if Mr. McLeod were to appear before the committee, his statement would clarify all the confusion and remove the doubt that now arises by reason of the rumors and statements which are being made, which possibly are not accurate.

I think that a great injustice will be done to Mr. Bohlen if the Senate proceeds to confirm his nomination in the present state of the record. I desire to vote for the confirmation of his nomination, and I have taken that position continuously, but the Senate should not proceed to confirm the nomination while allowing the rumors to stand and continue to circulate. It should be possible to obtain testimony that will dispel such rumors once and for all, and to let Mr. Bohlen take his position of service in Russia without any cloud or doubt in the minds of the American people.

I am not criticizing the committee; I have great respect for the committee; but I say that a great service could be done, not only to the President of the United States, but also to Mr. Bohlen himself, to the Senate, and to the country, if Mr. McLeod were called before the committee and given an opportunity to testify and resolve the doubts and dispel any rumor that may arise which is derogatory or injurious to Mr. Bohlen. I think every Member of the Senate would take Mr. McLeod's word; I would be glad to have his testimony.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Since I have the floor, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is not customary practice, in the case of nominations being reported by committees to the Senate, that a report be made in the same sense that a report is made when a bill is reported to the Senate. We do insist, certainly in the case of nominations if there is any controversy or objection, and many times when there is no controversy, on having the printed record of the hearings on the desk of each Senator, so that he may have an opportunity to discuss the nomination. Such a printed record is now available and has been available to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was not criticizing the committee. I was try to locate in the record General Smith's testimony, which I did not find. I thought there might be something in the report pertaining to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arkansas has performed a very useful service by asking the question, in view of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in mentioning General Smith's name.

Of course, the chairman has quite correctly said that General Smith had not come as a witness specifically on the Bohlen nomination, but on what we might call a general briefing on world affairs, and during the course of that time he had been interrogated by the chairman of the committee and gave the answer which has been quoted, which I think it is very helpful to have in the RECORD, and which the Senator from Wisconsin has now placed in the RECORD.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am just as anxious as is the Senator from California, perhaps a little more so, to have favorable testimony in the RECORD, so that Senators will not have to vote in doubt; and in order, also, that there may be established a record in which we can have faith and confidence in voting for the confirmation of the nomination, and not have any apprehension that hereafter some of the rumors will become revealed facts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that when the nomination first came before the committee, I was one who had some question in my mind relative to confirmation. As a matter of fact, I had joined with one other member of the committee in suggesting that the nomination go over for an additional period of time, so that certain inquiries which had been raised could be pursued, and certain information which had been requested might be brought to the attention of the committee.

This nomination was in no sense rushed through, because, as the chairman of the committee pointed out, it came up sometime ago, and considerable time elapsed before hearings were held. The Secretary of State came before the committee and made his evaluation and appraisal, and Mr. Bohlen came back for questioning by the committee.

In addition to what has already been stated on the floor today, if the distinguished Senator from Arkansas will look at page 105 of the committee hearings, he will discover that Secretary Dulles had this to say:

> There is nothing either in the knowledge of those of us who have known him personally in the past, and I might mention, incidentally, that I was talking to former Secretary of State, now Governor Byrnes, who called me up on a certain matter, and he said, "This appointment of Bohlen to Moscow is a fine appointment, and it must go through." He said, "I cannot think of anybody who is as uniquely qualified to fill that job as Mr. Bohlen is."

That is the end of the quotation of former Secretary Byrnes, who is now the Governor of South Carolina. I have very high confidence in and regard for Governor Byrnes. I think he is an outstanding American citizen. During World War II, as the distinguished Senator so well knows, he served his country in very important and responsible positions in the executive branch of the Government, and in this Chamber, and he is now the first citizen of his State. He is Governor of the great State of South Carolina. That fact carries a considerable amount of weight with me.

The Secretary also testified to the endorsement of a group of three distinguished gentlemen, former Foreign Service personnel, headed by Mr. Joseph Grew, a gentleman for whom I have the highest regard. Mr. Grew, who served as Under Secretary of State in the Republican administration, had served as Ambassador to Japan, and had had a long and distinguished career. Some of us felt it was a mistake to let him leave the Department, and appoint someone else to succeed him. It was said that Mr. Grew had made a favorable recommendation of Mr. Bohlen, and had made a suggestion of his assignment to Russia. Furthermore, the distinguished Under Secretary of State, General Bedell Smith, who has held high positions of responsibility in the Government, has come before the committee and has pointed out the importance of filling the post of Ambassador to Russia.

I say frankly to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I am one who has questioned whether we should maintain an ambassador in Moscow, because the Soviet Government has violated diplomatic usage by restricting our Ambassador to the confines of Moscow, whereas the Soviet Ambassador to the United States has free access to all parts of our country. I have felt that we have made a mistake by not saying very forthrightly to the Russians, "Normal diplomatic usage is for ambassadors to be able to travel throughout the country. That has been the accepted custom and practice from time immemorial. If you are going to place some restrictions on our Ambassador over there, the same restrictions will be placed on your Ambassador here."

If they were to exclude our Ambassador, as Mr. Kennan was excluded, I believe without any justifiable reason, we might make more of an impression on the Russians if we were to give their Ambassador his papers and send him home, thus placing the Ambassadors from the two countries on a quid pro quo basis.

However, it is felt that it is important to have an Ambassador to the Soviet Union. The State Department officials have come before us and have stated that they believe Mr. Bohlen, with his knowledge of Russian history, of the Russian Government, and of the Russian language, is better qualified than any other available person. I make that statement as one who had some very serious questions in his mind in the beginning. That representation had great weight with me.

It does not seem to me that under these circumstances either the Senate or the Foreign Relations Committee should be placed in the position of questioning the vericity of the Secretary of State. I have known Mr. Dulles for many years. I know him to be an outstanding American citizen who places the welfare of his country above everything else. He served in the previous administration when he felt he could be useful. He did an outstanding service in the negotiation of the treaty with Japan. He was a

close friend of the late great Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan. He also served as a Member of this body.

When he came before us, he was not speaking entirely from memory. If I am not mistaken, he brought some notes with him, though not the summary file. He gave us the facts as to what is involved, and gave us his evaluation of the situation. I did not feel that I wanted to take the position of questioning his veracity. I have no reason to do so. I know him to be an honorable man. I am certain that he would not knowingly mislead either the Foreign Relations Committee or the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I merely wished to make this statement to the Senator to show that at the start I was one who was not enthusiastic about the nomination. If I had had the power of appointment, which I did not have, very likely I would have selected someone else. But that is not the question before the Senate.

After all the facts were presented I then joined with my colleagues on the committee in the unanimous vote to report the nomination favorably to the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I trust the Senator is not implying that I am questioning the integrity of the Secretary of State.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is not. I merely wished to make that statement to clarify my position.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the statement of former Secretary Byrnes carries great weight. I am not questioning it. I am saying that on the record before the Senate the nomination should be confirmed; but certain doubt has arisen by reason of the fact that apparently there is a controversy. The rumor—if it may be called a rumor—is that there has been a violent controversy between the man selected by the Secretary to be the security officer of the Department of State and the Secretary himself as to what the files really show. I think the confusion could be cleared up if Mr. McLeod were called, and there would then be no doubt on the question.

I have already stated that I do not question the need for an Ambassador. I do not question the necessity for expediting confirmation of the nomination. I defer to the judgment of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State with reference to whether we should fill the position of Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Certainly if we are to fill it, I think there is reason to move along and get the job done.

If I correctly understand, we are not to vote on this nomination until Wednesday. If I am in error, I trust the Senator from California will correct me, inasmuch as he is a member of the majority party in control. If we are not to vote on the nomination until Wednesday, then no delay whatsoever would be entailed in obtaining and making available the testimony of Mr. McLeod. I believe that members of the majority would be performing a service to their party, to the country, and to the administration if they were to make an effort to dispel some of the doubt and criticism once and for all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there has been some discussion on the floor of the Senate today to the effect that nothing should be done until every Member of the Senate has had an opportunity to examine the FBI file or the summary file. The Senator from Arkansas did not make that statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I speak only for myself. I may disagree with some things which may be said by other Senators. I may disagree with the Senator from California. Those who may finally oppose this nomination may have different reasons from any which I might entertain.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is important to have as clear an understanding as possible with regard to all the facts and circumstances in connection with the security problems which are involved in dealing with files of this nature. Let me state my understanding with respect to such files. I note that the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. McCARRAN] is present in the Chamber. He has performed outstanding service to his country in varying capacities.

As I understand, in connection with the nominations which came before that committee over a period of years during Democratic administrations, the chairman of the committee was permitted to see a summary of the file, or perhaps even a more complete version than a summary of the file. However, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice had always taken the position that such examination should not extend beyond the chairman examining the file. Will the Senator from Nevada let me know if my understanding is correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator's understanding is correct with respect to later years. Formerly the FBI would not allow the files to be in the hands of any member of the committee. A member of the Department of Justice would come before the committee and read the FBI files, but we were not allowed to have them in our possession. Finally a compromise was reached between the Department of Justice, the FBI, and the Committee on the Judiciary; and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is now allowed to have all the FBI files; but no one else on the committee is allowed to have them. The chairman makes a report to the committee.

While I am answering the Senator's question, let me say that there is a difference between the FBI files and the summary. In connection with the FBI files which came to my attention, as a rule the summary was made up by the Department of Justice. Someone in the Department of Justice went through the FBI files and made up the summary. The summary is the first two or three pages of the record which is handed over. Sometimes one finds, on reading the entire file—as I always did—that the summary missed some things. The entire record will not be found in the summary. The summary is the boil-down of everything the FBI seems to have found.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thoroughly understand that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ascertain whether the question of the confirmation of the nomination is expected to come to a vote this afternoon, or whether it has been agreed to defer the vote until Wednesday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because the printed record was available to some Senators only this afternoon, although I think they could possibly have obtained copies on Saturday, and because many Senators have not had an opportunity to read the record, it is my understanding that, at the request of several Senators, the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], has agreed that the nomination go over until Wednesday.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That was my understanding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Other committee sessions were set for tomorrow, which made it difficult to have the Senate pass on the question tomorrow. Therefore it was agreed that it should go over until Wednesday.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from California, as well as that of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to an article which I read last Thursday. It was printed in the New York Journal-American. I shall read the article, and then I intend to ask a question with reference to it of both the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The article reads:

O. K. AS ENVOY ASSURED—SOVIET CREW TO FLY BOHLEN INTO MOSCOW

(By William P. Flythe)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—Charles E. "Chip" Bohlen was forced to agree today to have an unidentified Russian crew fly him into Moscow in an American plane in order to get to the Soviet Union as the new United States Ambassador.

That condition was laid down by the Russian Government when the State Department set the machinery in motion to rush Bohlen to his new post as soon as possible after his nomination is confirmed and he is sworn in.

Confirmation was assured following the unanimous approval of Bohlen by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His name goes before the Senate tomorrow, with the oath scheduled to be promptly administered at the State Department.

Every effort will be made to set a record for the flight so that an accredited Ambassador may at once begin negotiations with the new Russian regime on many vital questions.

A fast United States Air Force plane will fly him from Washington to a designated airport in Germany.

There a modern four-engined United States plane will be ready to take off with the Ambassador and his family for Moscow.

From that point onward the lives of Bohlen and his family will be in the hands of a Communist Russian plane crew. The window shades will be drawn so that the Bohlens will see nothing en route.

Immediately after Bohlen and his party leave the plane, a Russian crew will fly it back to Germany.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I should like to ask the Senator from California if that arrangement had been brought to the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and whether Mr. Bohlen agreed to it, and the State Department agreed to it. Does the Senator from California know how such an arrangement was made, whereby the American Ambassador to Moscow would be taken out of the hands of his own plane crew and put in the hands of a Russian crew, with the windows of the plane sealed so that he might not see anything en route?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I cannot answer the Senator's question. This is the first time I have heard of the particular article to which he refers. Secondly, I would say that it is not uncustomary for the Russians to insist, as they have in the past, that planes flying over Russian territory be flown by Russian crews. There may be an element of safety for the Ambassador involved, in that there may be some trigger-happy antiaircraft crews in the vicinity, as there have been trigger-happy airplane pilots on some occasions, and certainly the plane should not fly over fortifications or similar installations.

Mr. BRICKER. Will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that I do not know precisely the answer to his question, but I shall find what the answer is before Wednesday.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish that that matter could be investigated. Will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield further.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to say in passing that these people have shot down our aviators, they have imprisoned without cause our citizens, and they have persecuted Americans. Now this humiliation is piled on top.

Mr. President, the time has come for the State Department, the President of the United States, and the United States Senate to demand that our representatives in Russia be accorded the same treatment that Russian representatives are accorded in this country; that acts which humiliate and reflect on this great Republic must cease; and that unless they do we will withdraw our representatives in Russia and kick their representatives out of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio—I do not know whether he was in the Chamber when I was speaking a little while ago—that for a long time I have felt we should be on a strict quid pro quo basis with the Russians, and should insist that our Ambassador and diplomatic officials be extended the same normal diplomatic courtesies and perquisites and the ability to travel around the country which from time immemorial have been extended by every civilized nation in the world and even by some uncivilized nations. Personally I should be very much opposed to our permitting the restrictions upon our Ambassador to continue while we permit their representatives to enjoy the privileges which are normally accorded to diplomatic representatives.

I shall personally undertake to find out what the answer to the Senator's question is. Perhaps the Senator may be assuming that because the article was printed in a newspaper it represented a statement of fact. I do not know whether it is a fact or not.

Mr. BRICKER. I am not making any assumption. I am only calling it to the attention of the committee. I think that if either the State Department, or Mr. Bohlen himself has consented to such a humiliating suggestion, when the representatives of Russia may travel freely in this country, without windows of planes being sealed and the shades drawn, there should be a reconsideration of the whole relationship.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to point out, however, that I do not think it is an unusual practice, on a plane flying in the Soviet Union, to have the Russians place on the plane someone who is thoroughly acquainted with the Russian language, perhaps as an auxiliary radio operator, so that the crew of the plane may keep on course and not fly over areas over which they are not supposed to fly.

Mr. BRICKER. That is an entirely different situation from one in which the whole American crew is taken off an American plane and replaced by a Russian crew, with the occupants of the plane being taken to Moscow practically as prisoners of the plane crew. To my mind it is something that ought to be immediately investigated by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. We shall endeavor to get a very complete statement on the subject prior to Wednesday afternoon. I merely wanted to continue the discussion we had with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] earlier this afternoon.

The question has come up in the press and in some discussion which has been had as to whether each United States Senator should not have the right to examine the FBI files if he wanted to do so. I may say that that has never been the practice in the past. From what the former chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has stated—and I believe the former chairman will agree with me on this statement—during the last administration, on nominations for Federal judges or United States attorneys or United States marshals, and such other appointments as came before the Committee on the Judiciary, the prior administration took the position that while the summary of the file, and perhaps the file itself, would be made available to the chairman, it would be made available only to the chairman of the committee.

I believe that beyond the Committee on the Judiciary it was not the customary practice to make the FBI files available even to the chairman of the committee. So far as I know, the only committee which by statute has the right to examine FBI investigation files is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That is an unusual and somewhat unprecedented situation and it is because of the high security problems involved in the field of atomic energy. Therefore I do not think the suggestion as to each Senator having the right to examine the FBI files would be very practical. It would certainly be an unprecedented action.

I think I can say without fear of contradiction that any such proposal would not have the approval of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the FBI, because by the very nature of these files, particularly where we are dealing with informants—and some of them are undercover informants—we might very well destroy the entire value of the FBI organization in getting information in the future.

Furthermore, one way the Federal Bureau of Investigation is able to conduct its operations is to go to persons and request information—much of it of a very confidential nature—with the understanding that the names of the persons making the disclosures are not to be revealed.

So I think we would destroy—and I believe the viewpoint of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is that it would destroy—to a very considerable extent the usefulness of the Bureau and its work, if that were done.

I wish to make that statement to the Senate because of the discussion which has occurred both in the press and on the floor of the Senate. It seems to me that even a presentation of the summaries would to some degree do that, for if it were said, "Mr. XY-10 gave certain information," if that information were finally given out by tying the event to the nominee, we might just as well reveal the name of the informant, and, again, in my opinion, that would be highly damaging to the procedures of the FBI.

A little earlier I pointed out that Mr. Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have been very scrupulous in taking the position that it was not their task to place a final evaluation on the files or to make the determination as to whether a given person should be appointed or should not be appointed to a high position. They do have the responsibility, under the direction of the executive branch of the Government, of obtaining information, both that which is favorable and that which is derogatory, and of getting the information together into a file, and then making the file available to responsible officials of the Government.

But, Mr. President, if we are to have responsible government, we certainly must have confidence in some of our executive officials. The information collected has been made available to them. A high and responsible official of our government has made his appraisal and his evaluation of the information. It has been submitted to a responsible committee of the Senate. After hearing the information and the evaluation, the committee reported favorably on the nomination.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

SENATORS SHOULD SEE THE RECORD

Mr. MALONE. Some of us take rather seriously a vote on the question of confirming a nomination for so important a post as Russian Ambassador. We remember that over the years—in fact, within the past 6 years—we have had

before us the nominations of certain persons about whom the same thing was said, namely, that no report on them had ever been made by the FBI.

For instance, in that connection I may refer to the nomination of David Lilienthal.

Some of us believe that against most Americans there is no sound basis for suspicion; but we would like to know why it is that when in a man's record there is information which is unfavorable to him, individual Senators, Members of the Senate of the United States, are unable to see that information, but must vote blind to confirm his nomination.

Does the distinguished Senator from California believe it would be dangerous to allow individual Senators to examine the FBI file in this case?

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say is that it is the judgment of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and of the Attorney General that once we begin to pass out these files to a large number of persons, we could very well undermine the efforts of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in obtaining the type of information which it is important for the Bureau to obtain.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from California believe and does Mr. J. Edgar Hoover—with whom I have not discussed this matter, but whom I know very well—believe it would be dangerous to permit the 15 Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to make a confidential review of this file?

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator from Nevada is that if 15 members of the Foreign Relations Committee review the file, a similar situation could properly develop and a similar request could properly be made in a case of all the other Senate committees. So in the present case we are dealing, as we know, not only with one question, but also with the matter of precedent. We are faced with the old problem of what will happen when once the camel gets his nose under the tent. After it is done once, then what position will the executive branch of the Government be in, in the case of similar requests; will it then be able to deny to any other Senate committee information similar to that which has been given to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, inasmuch as the other committees feel, and properly so, that their roles are just as important in connection with domestic affairs as is the role of the Foreign Relations Committee in the field of foreign affairs?

So the executive branch of the Government is not faced with only one case.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Some of us are afraid that the procedure will not be confined to this one nomination, but that a precedent will be set and that a parade of nominees will come before us in the same way, to be confirmed as ambassadors to various other countries—men who have been serving under the old setup for the past 20 years or less.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that, of course, any Senator who feels that he does not wish to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen is at perfect liberty under the Constitution to vote against confirming the nomination; that is the prerogative of each one of us as a Senator of the United States.

When the nomination of Mr. Acheson came before the Senate some years ago, at the time when he was nominated to be Secretary of State, I was one of six Senators who voted against confirming the nomination; and I have no apologies to make for the vote I cast. I did not need to see an FBI file in order to do that, and I did not ask to see the FBI file.

So certainly no one can interfere with the individual prerogative of each Senator under the Constitution, in connection with the Senate's power of confirmation, to vote either for or against confirmation of a nomination.

All I say is that in the operation of our Government—and we now have a new administration, which took office on the 20th day of January—I believe that unless there is to be a breakdown in Government, it is necessary to have confidence in someone in the Government. Personally, I have great confidence in Dwight Eisenhower, as President of the United States. I also have great confidence in Mr. Dulles, his chief Cabinet officer, and a former Member of this body, as Secretary of State. When they send a nomination to the Senate; when we are informed that the State Department has had any derogatory information called to its attention by its chief security officer, and when representatives of the Department, including the Secretary of State himself, appear before the committee and evaluate the information to the committee; when we have the testimony of Walter Bedell Smith in regard to the ability of the nominee to serve as Ambassador at this particular time, in the particular place to which he has been nominated; when we have the approval of the former Secretary of State, Mr. Byrnes, now the Governor of South Carolina; when we have the distinguished former Under Secretary of State, Joseph Grew, who is greatly admired and respected by many of the Members of the Senate as being one of the best first men in matters of knowledge of our diplomatic fields and of our State Department, I say I do not think we can cast all that aside, and deal merely with rumors. If we deal only with rumors, I think we break down confidence in our Government, and we tend to repudiate the new administration, which has just taken office.

Personally, speaking for myself, I do not wish to do so on the basis of hearsay and rumors.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I think the distinguished Senator from California has made a very fine statement which would be endorsed by most of us, namely, that we like Dwight Eisenhower, and that, above all else, we want him to make a good President; we are for him, and we want to continue to be for him, but we also want to protect him as well as ourselves.

To go back to Mr. Acheson, let me say that I voted for his confirmation. When afterwards I was asked why I voted to confirm his nomination, I said, "Hiss would probably have been nominated to be Secretary of State if we had rejected the nomination of Mr. Acheson." As a matter of fact, Mr. Hiss was in good standing then with all but a few of us who were serving in the Senate at the time, who questioned many things which came before the Senate during that period.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether it would be out of line, in view of the fact that apparently there is no one on the Senate floor who has said the investigator cleared this man, and it is very well understood that the investigator did not so clear him—I do not think we are dealing in rumor.

I believe that several people know this to be a fact. Would it be out of line to ask the Secretary of State to let one Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee see this file and then tell the Senate of the United States he has seen it and that he recommends approval of his nomination.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I do not have the floor. I would like an answer, however.

Mr. WILEY. I am going to answer the question.

Mr. MALONE. I do not think I asked the Senator from Wisconsin. I asked the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the chairman of the committee, who could speak with more authority, as chairman of the committee, than I could.

Mr. WILEY. I think it was former Governor Smith who said, "Let's look at the record." As the record shows conclusively, the summation of this testimony was submitted to Secretary Dulles, 2 days before he testified before the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has also been submitted to the Attorney General. The Secretary was before the committee about 3 hours evaluating the evidence. He gave us three or four pieces of hearsay. Let us make it clear what the FBI examination is. Let us assume, for instance, that a Senator is investigating one of his opponents. He can say anything about him and it immediately goes down on the record. There is no proof.

We have the highest legal official in the Government clearing this appointment, saying in substance, "The evidence does not sustain the charge, nor is there any evidence that would interfere with the clearance of this man."

That is the judgment of Secretary Dulles. That is the judgment of the Attorney General. The nominee is also recommended, as stated by the distinguished Senator from California, by three of the finest men we have had in the Service. He is also recommended and approved by the President of the

MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

United States. I ask, whence come these rumors? I have already stated that, several weeks before we concluded the hearings, I heard that several Senators had made certain statements, and I wrote them personal letters, asking them to produce the evidence. Nothing was forthcoming. I think I may say who the Senators were. One was the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the other the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. We received no reply, and yet we spent almost a month on this nomination.

Mr. President, as so well stated by the distinguished Senator from California, we have courts in this country whose function it is to determine facts, to determine who is telling the truth. We let the courts determine facts. The powers of this Government, as someone has said, are divided among four branches—the legislative, the executive, the judicial, and a residuum in the States. The function of clearing this individual is in the highest official in the Government but one—the Secretary of State.

He evaluated this hearsay evidence. There is no one in this room who has ever amounted to anything, who, if he were investigated, would not have some derogatory remark made about him by some jealous person, some person whom he may have unintentionally injured, someone who is not particularly careful. Therefore, it is necessary that competent people evaluate and weigh these matters. It is also necessary that we have legal minds capable of distinguishing between solid testimony and mere hearsay, mere rumor, slander, and whatnot.

To me, Mr. President, the situation is very clear. The record speaks in no uncertain terms. No evidence is produced, but on the floor Senators talk about rumors. Is there any evidence in this case that anyone other than these two men within the Department have seen in the summation? Does any Senator want to admit that he has looked at this record? Is there anyone who has seen the FBI file? If so, let him stand up. Is there anyone who has seen the summation? Then it means that none of us is in a position competently to weigh the evidence, not having seen that which those whom the law says should weigh the evidence have seen. Otherwise, it means we are setting a pattern, the effect of which will be that every time someone is nominated it will not be necessary to produce testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee; all that would be necessary would be for a Senator to rise on the Senate floor to say, "There are some rumors about this man's character." We could then delay the nomination and we could call someone to appear before the committee.

Is there evidence that Mr. McLeod contradicts the testimony? Is there any evidence? If there is, I should like to have some Senator rise to say so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will stand up to say so.

Mr. WILEY. What does the Senator say?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say the Senator knows that the record before the Foreign Relations Committee shows that the security officer refused to clear Mr. Bohlen.

Mr. WILEY. I read the testimony contained in the record:

Senator HICKENLOOPER. Has your security office cleared this file for loyalty and security?

Secretary DULLES. No. I told you that he said that in view of the fact that this file contained some derogatory information, he did not wish to take the responsibility of clearance. He passed the matter up to me, which is the usual practice in such cases. I do not think that security officers, whose primary job is to raise doubts and find out suspicious circumstances, are the persons who should have final responsibility in matters of this kind. In important cases, such as this one, the task of final evaluation should be passed up to the senior officers.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] asked Mr. Dulles:

Do you think there is anything that creates even a prima facie case of such dereliction?

Secretary DULLES. No; none whatsoever.

Mr. Dulles continued:

I would say this: As in any case, where there is a warning signal, my security officer called this to my attention. He said:

"This is not a case which I can automatically pass because wherever there is derogatory information of this sort I think it is my duty to bring it to your personal attention."

Senator FERGUSON. Is it true that in your time certain people have been removed from the State Department because of security?

Secretary DULLES. Yes, sir.

So, Mr. President, I say that we are here challenging the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and, in the last analysis, the President of the United States.

Mr. MALONE and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WILEY. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin that some of us want to look at the record as he has so ably suggested that we are trying to find a basis upon which to support the administration; so I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, did he see the file, himself?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin believe that it would injure the sources of the information to have him, as chairman of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee, see the file?

Mr. WILEY. No. But, answering the Senator's question, assuming I had seen the file, and had arrived at the same conclusion as that of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General—which I probably would have—then I would be faced with the same challenge that is facing us here today. In other words, it is a question of evaluating the evidence. Someone has that obligation, and I say that person is the Secretary of State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that at least there would be one Senator on the Senate floor, then, who could say to his colleagues, "I have seen this file, and I approve this man." The Senator from Wisconsin cannot say that, can he?

Mr. WILEY. No.

Mr. MALONE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. I must say that I think I was well advised in not accepting the responsibility. Secretary Dulles said to me, "I have just received the summation. You can have it or I will evaluate it."

He read it and came before the committee, went through 3 or 4 items, and said they did not sustain, in his judgment, any charges which had been made, and that there was no definite or concrete proof as to them——

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that he is asking 95 other Senators to approve something which he has not himself seen but which a third party has brought to his attention and summarized before his committee, and as to which, perhaps, a liberal number of Senators, if not actually opposed, are suspicious.

All that has been asked is that the committee itself see the material and bring it to the floor and say, "We have seen this material and approve this nomination."

During the 6 years in which I have been a Member of the Senate, we have been confirming the nominations of men under a Democratic administration, and many of them later proved untrustworthy, if not actually dangerous.

I voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Secretary Acheson, and, as far as I know, he did nothing to which I could agree following confirmation.

I should like to say that I shall not vote to approve anyone else unless some Senator can stand on the Senate floor and say, "I have seen the file and I recommend his confirmation." There must be plenty of men in the United States of America who are fully qualified for such jobs and as to whom suspicion has not risen in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. WILEY. I must say that I do not believe that heretofore a procedure of this kind has been followed. I think that there was not an FBI report until the committee requested it. I do not recall—I may be wrong—that in the years I have served in the Senate the committee has had the Secretary of State come before it and evaluate an FBI report. I think that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. I should like only to point out that for many years, and especially in the 6 years in which I have been a Member of this august body, we have been asked to vote for the confirmation of nominations of such persons as Lilienthal. We could not get a report on Lilienthal. The FBI said it had not been asked for a report. We could not get the Secretary of State or the Presi-

dent to ask for a report. No Senator could stand on the floor and say that a member of the committee personally saw an FBI report on those men, and that they recommended that their nominations be confirmed.

We are starting out now with a new administration in which my people in Nevada trust implicitly, and perhaps 90 percent of the people of the United States trust it implicitly, and we are following the same old line—the Senators must vote to confirm or cast a cloud upon the administration. I believe that under the Constitution each individual Senator has a responsibility, otherwise why should Senate confirmation be required?

Mr. WILEY. I think that statement is diametrically opposed to what the Senator previously said.

Mr. MALONE. We are simply going along with the administration and not even looking at an FBI report. At least we have such a report now. Let at least one Senator see it.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think I can agree with that statement, because it is contrary to what the Senator previously said.

Mr. MALONE. I deny that statement. I have consistently said that at least one Senator must be able to stand here on the Senate floor and say: "I have seen the file on this man and I recommend that you vote to confirm his nomination." That is the least that the Foreign Relations Committee should do.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sure most of us want to uphold the judgment of the President and the men whom he has chosen in trying to work out an arrangement whereby peace can be obtained in this world. However, I am wondering if the distinguished chairman of the committee is satisfied with the record upon which we are being asked to vote.

We are being told that the security officer of the State Department was unwilling to take the responsibility of clearing the nomination of the man appointed to be Ambassador to Moscow, and the committee did not care to hear the man who did not want to take that responsibility, but chose to take the Secretary's evaluation. The committee itself did not care to look at the material and pass its own judgment upon it.

Would the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin have any objection to looking at the material and giving the Senate committee's judgment on it? Then, having looked at it, he could be in a position to say, "The committee is of the opinion that there is nothing to it," just as Mr. Dulles said, having looked at it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think the first suggestion that Mr. McLeod be called before the committee was made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] a few days ago. We had already reported the nomination. So far as I am personally concerned, I should be glad, if it is agreeable to the executive branch of the Government, that 1 or 2 Senators look over the report and evaluate the testimony it contains. That is perfectly all right. But where does it take us?

Let me use the analogy of a court. A court has jurisdiction to determine the truth. In this instance the Secretary of State has such jurisdiction. Perhaps in such cases as this we should go underneath and try to discover something, but we have never had any question about the veracity, the good judgment, or the ability of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State served the State Department in another capacity for years.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I do not want to inject partisan politics into the debate, but it seems to me we cannot ignore the fact that during the late campaign the subject of various persons having recommended Alger Hiss was raised. They had given character testimony when he was on trial, and I believe it was stated that Mr. John Foster Dulles had made a statement about him when he was named to a position with the Carnegie Institution.

I think it would be well, Mr. President, in regard to this tremendously important appointment, if the committee were in position to tell us that it had also appraised the material in the file. Would the Senator from Wisconsin object to looking at the material and letting the Senate know his judgment?

Mr. WILEY. As I said before, if it is agreeable to the executive branch of the Government, I have no objection whatever to designating one Senator from each party to examine the file.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that the Secretary of State, in appearing before our committee, not only evaluated what was in the file but cited to us every single instance in which there was anything which might cast any doubt, based upon rumor, gossip, anonymous statements, and everything else?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The committee had an opportunity to decide whether his evaluation was sufficient.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Alabama has made a very important contribution. As I think I previously suggested, the Secretary cited 3 or 4 instances of certain people giving hearsay evidence, and 1 spoke of having a sixth sense, and such stuff as that. The committee agreed fully that there was no substance to that sort of evidence. That was brought out very clearly in questioning the Secretary of State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the United States Senate has more than merely a responsibility to advise and consent to this nomination. If there is any doubt whatsoever with regard to whether Charles E. Bohlen would be a proper Ambassador to Moscow, the Senate should clear up that doubt for all time to the satisfaction of the American people, if it can be done. That is why it seems to me that the committee should take a look at the information available and be in a position to say that it has seen it, and that it is positive there is nothing in the file that would justify any doubt whatsoever.

I had hoped our Ambassador to Russia might be able to advance certain proposals which might bring about a peaceful settlement of the difficult problems that are threatening the free world today. Certainly I do not wish to be accused of being favorable to appeasing the Russians, but it seems to me most important that the Senate should clear up any doubt about the wisdom of the appointment, if it is possible to clear it up. That is why I think that if the committee should, in its wisdom, decide to consider the nomination further, it should look at the file and pass its own judgment on whether there is anything in the file which would justify the slightest inference that Mr. Bohlen would not be an appropriate, proper choice as Ambassador to Russia.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement regarding the procedure on the question before the Senate.

In the first place, as I understand, a suggestion has been made that Mr. Dulles be called before the Committee on Foreign Relations and be placed under oath. That has hardly been seriously supported. I think it is an uncalled for suggestion. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Dulles' statement not under oath is just as good as Mr. Dulles' statement under oath. Mr. Dulles did not say that Mr. McLeod had, as alleged, cleared the Bohlen file; he said very clearly that McLeod did not wish to take the responsibility of clearing it. So I think we can dismiss that proposal.

The second suggestion is that Mr. McLeod be called before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think it was first suggested that he be called before the Committee on Government Operations. It seems to me that to do that would be a serious infringement upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe that idea has been dropped.

It has now been suggested that the Committee on Foreign Relations call Mr. McLeod. I should be very much opposed to such a course as that. After all, we have before us a peculiar kind of question with reference to the file in the Bohlen case. Here is a file gathered by the FBI containing every kind of material with reference to what Mr. X, Mr. Y, and Mr. Z have said. It is a file which never should be published and put in general circulation. Just how far it could go among Senators without becoming a matter of general circulation is a question I cannot answer. Certainly the logic of the argument seems to be that it ought to be printed and placed on our desks, in which case, of course, it would be made available to the public. I think that that would be a serious mistake. It would in a sense destroy the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FBI. At least, it might raise wholly unjustified questions as to the character of men in this country, and result in the publication of allegations made by personal enemies.

So we come to the question: What shall we do with this file? As I see it, we must take somebody's appraisal of the file. If the executive department chooses Mr. Dulles as the person to give us the appraisal, I see no reason why we should not accept the appraisal by Mr. Dulles. I see no reason why we should proceed to call Mr. McLeod or Mr. Phlager, General Counsel of the State Department, who, I understand, has also seen the file, or any other person in the State Department.

I do regard with great favor the suggestion that a Senator or Senators should be appointed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine the file and give the Senate their appraisal. It is not that I have any distrust of the appraisal made by Mr. Dulles, but I myself have urged upon the Committee on Foreign Relations that they appoint 1 or 2 Senators for that purpose. As I have said, that is not at all because I distrust Mr. Dulles, but because I think the Senate has a constitutional duty of its own, namely, to confirm appointments, which is entirely independent of the appointing power. Therefore, it seems appropriate to me that we should obtain the appraisal of somebody approaching the question from the point of view of the Senate and its power of confirmation. I certainly would not oppose such a suggestion. It was made before the committee, and the committee rejected it. The committee felt that Mr. Dulles' appraisal was just as good as would be the appraisal of a Senator. Since the committee has made that decision, I acquiesce in it. So far as I am concerned, I certainly would not object to having the committee reconsider the decision and have its own appraisal made.

In my judgment, that is the limit of what should be done. I have no doubt that the committee can consider tomorrow morning whether they wish to take such action. No matter what the committee may decide, so far as I personally am concerned, I am prepared to take the appraisal made by Mr. Dulles. Therefore, I voted to confirm the nomination of Mr. Bohlen when the nomination was reported by the committee.

Mr. Dulles' appraisal was that not only did the file present no evidence of any wrongdoing, but I asked Mr. Dulles specifically, "Do you think there is anything that creates even a prima facie case of such dereliction?" Mr. Dulles said, "No, nothing whatsoever."

I am prepared to accept his appraisal. However, as a matter of theory, I think that in a case like that now pending, in which the Senate has a constitutional duty to perform in confirming a nomination, it would be far better practice if the Senate undertook to appoint 1 or 2 of its Members—Senators whose judgment other Senators would respect—to read the entire file.

So far as the future is concerned, I think I shall continue to insist on that position. The Committee on Foreign Relations having rejected the particular proposal I made, I am prepared to acquiesce in its action with respect to the nomination now before the Senate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. First, I may say that very few Senators are able to go beyond the work imposed on them by their own committees. Whenever we come into the Chamber to vote, we have always thought that we were entitled to ask the individual members of a committee which had passed on a bill or nomination whether they individually approved it, whether they had seen the witnesses and heard the evidence.

Therefore, I take it that most of the other Senators are in the same position I occupy when I say I am not able to pass individually on every bill or nomination. We ask our colleagues who have seen the witnesses and have heard the evidence, Is this a good bill, or is it not? Should this nomination be approved or not? And they should be able to answer from first-hand information.

I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if he himself has seen the file in question.

Mr. TAFT. No, I have not. No Senator has seen the file. That is the very point I was making.

The Senator compared this situation to having heard the evidence. This file is not evidence. The kind of information found in the FBI file is something that no man would dare to state as evidence on the witness stand. At any rate, it is not similar to the usual type of evidence. It is a kind of general collection of all kinds of statements. I do not believe it proper to call it evidence. I think I would like to have an appraisal made by someone as to what is contained in it—whether it is of no value or whether it is of value, whichever it may be.

In general, as a matter of practice, there ought to be an appraisal made by a member of the committee. I would not say that if there was an additional Senator who wanted to see it, he should not be given that privilege.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I have seen some of these files on particular persons. I presume that the senior Senator from Ohio has seen some of them. Often there is factual evidence in the files; it is not all hearsay. Is not that true?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MALONE. Then I simply wish to ask this question of the distinguished majority leader: When we vote, either yes or no, on the confirmation of a nomination that is very important to this administration, very important to the individual on whose nomination we are voting, and very important to the Senators casting their votes, in view of our past experience with Alger Hisses and Achesons; are not we entitled to know that at least one of our colleagues has seen the file and is satisfied with it?

Mr. TAFT. It is not important that every Senator see the FBI file. I do not think every Senator should see the FBI file.

Mr. MALONE. My question was, Is not every Senator casting his vote entitled to know that one of his colleagues has seen it and is satisfied with what he saw.

Mr. TAFT. That is the question. That is the issue.

Mr. MALONE. I ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio, as I asked the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] a while ago, Is it not important that some Senator in whom we have confidence see the file and say, "I have seen the file, and I approve of this man's nomination"?

Mr. TAFT. I have just said that. That was the whole tenor of my remarks.

Mr. MALONE. It was not what I understood to be the tenor of the Senator's last remark.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on page 105 of the hearings appears a statement by Secretary Dulles to which attention has been repeatedly drawn. There is another statement by him on page 104. I wish to put the two together and then address a query to the chairman of the committee.

On page 105 Mr. Dulles says:

> Secretary DULLES. No. I told you that he said that in view of the fact that this file contained some derogatory information, he did not wish to take the responsibility of clearance.

There the Secretary is saying that the file did contain some derogatory information.

On page 104 the Secretary says:

> There is no derogatory material whatsoever which questions the loyalty of Mr. Bohlen to the United States, or which suggests that he is not a good security risk, which suggests he is in any manner one who has leaked or been loose in his conversation or anything of that sort.

In other words, the Secretary has said that the file does contain some derogatory information, but at the same time he says it is not derogatory so far as concerns the question of the loyalty of Mr. Bohlen to the United States—

> or which suggests that he is not a good security risk, which suggests he is in any manner one who has leaked or has been loose in his conversation or anything of that sort.

I should like to have the chairman of the committee state, if he can, what the derogatory material related to. If it does not go to the question of security, or if it does not go to the question of loyalty, or if it is not something which implies that Mr. Bohlen leaked or has been loose in his conversation, or anything of that sort, then to what does it relate? Did the committee have any information as to the character of the derogatory information?

Mr. WILEY. I think I had better take the Senator aside and answer that question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. In a moment. That, it seems to me, would throw some light on the situation.

Mr. WILEY. That was not a facetious answer. In the judgment of the

Secretary, and I am sure in the judgment of those who listened to the rumor, it did not go to the question of loyalty or security.

Mr. CASE. Did it go to the question of his desirability or suitability as an ambassador?

Mr. WILEY. I am sure that if someone made a slanderous remark about the Senator from South Dakota it would have no effect whatever upon the question of security or loyalty, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. CASE. That might very well be; and it may very well be that this was a slanderous remark so far as Mr. Bohlen was concerned. But at least I should like to have the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on one point. If it did not relate to security or loyalty, but related to something else, was it of substantial character, so that the chairman thought it was really derogatory? If it was of no substance, if it was trash, why not make a flat statement to that effect?

Mr. WILEY. It was the judgment of the committee that there was no substance to it. As was stated by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], Secretary Dulles not only gave us his own evaluation, but he gave us a summation of the 4 or 5 slanderous remarks which other people had made about Mr. Bohlen. We agreed with the conclusion of the Secretary.

Mr. CASE. I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very much disturbed by the course of the present debate.

I think the Senator from South Dakota very rightly has brought out, in keeping with the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, that it is the duty of a Member of the Senate, if he is to fulfill his obligations as a Senator, before he gives advice and consent to any nomination which requires Senate confirmation to be advised as to the nature of the derogatory information. The Senator from Wisconsin says that the committee was satisfied that there was no substance to the charge. He goes on to say, if I understand him correctly, that this charge apparently was not made by 1 person, but by 3 or 4.

Mr. WILEY. There were 3 or 4 isolated instances.

Mr. MORSE. Involving 3 or 4——

Mr. WILEY. Rumors.

Mr. MORSE. As to the same act, or the same charge?

Mr. WILEY. No; and not at the same time. Some of them were years apart.

Mr. MORSE. I am also disturbed, I may say to the Senator from South Dakota, when the conclusion is advanced by the Senator from Wisconsin that the committee does not think the charges are a matter of substance. How do we know unless there is an investigation into the charges? I happen to be one who, on the basis of the information which I have received to date, feels that this nomination should be confirmed.

The Senator from South Dakota has pointed out that the Secretary of State admits in the committee's record that derogatory information is in the FBI file with respect to this nominee. I want the Senator from Wisconsin to correct me if I am mistaken. I have listened to all the comments of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I still do not understand the situation. Even though the charges may be separated in time, and as to nature, there are, nevertheless, three or four derogatory charges against this nominee. The Senator from South Dakota is trying to find out, if I correctly understand his question on the basis of a hypothetical, whether, if the charges were true, they are of such nature as to fall under one or more of the criteria which we have always applied in the history of the Senate when it comes to confirming nominations. The first criterion is that of character.

When we study confirmation cases—and I think I have studied every confirmation fight of record in the history of the United States Senate—we find that one of the criteria which repeats itself over and over again in such cases is that of character. Is he a man of good character? I want to know whether or not the alleged derogatory information about Bohlen reflects on the nominee's character. I should be very much surprised if it did, or that it could be substantiated, if it is of that nature.

The second criterion is that of loyalty to his country and to our form of government. We have applied it over and over again in the history of confirmation fights in the Senate. I judge from what the Secretary of State says that there is nothing in the file which reflects upon Mr. Bohlen's loyalty or upon him as being a good security risk. I take it he is cleared on that point.

The third criterion is whether or not he is a man of competence to carry out the President's policies—not competence to carry out what we might require, if we were an appointing authority. We do not have the power to appoint. We have only the power to give advice and consent. I think it is well established by the history of the advice-and-consent clause that it is language of limitation. It is subordinate language to the language of appointment in the Constitution. I judge that there is no question with respect to Mr. Bohlen on the score of competency.

Then, of course, there is the overall requirement that the nominee have no vested personal interest in the office, so that it could be said that he might be influenced in some way by pecuniary or other selfish interest.

Those are the four criteria, I submit, Mr. President. I have discussed them in years gone by on the floor of the Senate on several occasions. Those are the four criteria the Senate throughout its history has applied in confirmation cases. Therefore, let us run through them again.

Does the derogatory information go to Bohlen's character? If so, perhaps we should go into executive session with closed doors. Such a procedure is not unknown in the history of the Senate. Perhaps we should go into executive session with closed doors and discuss the matter officially rather than discuss it in the cloakrooms. All I have been able to find out from discussions in the cloakroom is that the derogatory information has something to do with Bohlen's character. I think Bohlen is entitled to be protected on that score. If there is any foundation in fact for it we should get at the facts and discuss the matter in executive session and stop talking about it in the cloakrooms. We should take up the question in executive session and there thrash it out, because of the four criteria there is only one that seems to me that has not been covered in the RECORD, and that one is character.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has stated the criteria or conditions toward which the Senate should look in considering nominees for confirmation. On the statement of the Secretary of State, loyalty and security were not involved. However, there was involved derogatory information. That could go to character or to ability, or might conceivably go to a man's personal honor in some respect.

Since the statement is before the Senate that there was derogatory information involved, it seems to the Senator from South Dakota that we ought to have some manner of defining and determining whether that derogatory information was of substance. The suggestion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that we go into executive session might not be out of order. It might very well be that the whole matter would vanish into thin air if some Senator on the committee could say that he personally looked at the files and found the matter to be trivial or sheer trash. However, there is certainly some confusion in the minds of some Senators. The Senator from South Dakota is wholly disposed to support the desire of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State in a matter like this. However, at the same time each Member of the Senate has certain responsibilities placed on him when he takes the oath of office, and he is entitled, it would seem to the junior Senator from South Dakota, to such information as is necessary for him to discharge his responsibility.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The President of the United States and a great many other distinguished men have spoken in the highest terms of the character of Mr. Bohlen. The President has known Mr. Bohlen personally. He has worked with him. Only today the President told me about the fine work Bohlen did in Paris. I believe the evidence before the committee shows that there were a hundred people of the highest type who spoke of Mr. Bohlen's fine character. There were a few others who threw in a little filth. If we are going to go into the business of trying to evaluate filth in cases of this kind, we will never accomplish anything.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee whether the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who were appraised of the filth, evaluated it as filth?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; they evaluated it as worthless.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to say in that connection that insofar as the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

hearings are concerned the question of derogatory remarks is contained in the two paragraphs which have been cited.

My esteemed colleague the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] asked Secretary Dulles:

Has your security office cleared this file for loyalty and security?

Secretary Dulles answered:

No. I told you that he said that in view of the fact that this file contained some derogatory information he did not wish to take the responsibility of clearance.

Again, as the Senator from South Dakota has called attention, on page 104, in the closing paragraph, Secretary Dulles stated:

There is no derogatory material whatsoever which questions the loyalty of Mr. Bohlen to the United States, or which suggests that he is not a good security risk, which suggests he is in any manner one who has leaked or been loose in his conversation or anything of that sort.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota has just asked whether the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations considered derogatory reports, which the esteemed chairman said were so few in number. We did, and our report is before the Senate. It is the unanimous report of the committee. We considered every one of them. Secretary Dulles outlined them to us. They were made by perhaps a half dozen persons among the hundred people or so who had been examined. I will give one example. I am not violating my responsibility as a Senator when I make the statement.

One of the derogatory reports—and it was a derogatory report, and Senators may evaluate it, along with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—concerned a person who said he possessed a sixth sense in addition to the five senses all of us possess. He said that due to his possessing this sixth sense he could look at a man and determine whether or not there was something immoral about him, or something pertaining to moral turpitude in the man's makeup, or some tendency on his part to take action that would not be accepted in good society as moral action. This man said that he looked at Mr. Bohlen and, with this sixth sense of his, he determined that Mr. Bohlen was a man who did have in the back of his mind such a tendency toward immorality as to make him unfit. That is one of the cases, one of the 6 or 7 reports we evaluated. There were 15 others which in our opinion did not constitute such dependable information as to justify an adverse report.

Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me very briefly?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I should like to say Mr. President, in connection with the subject before us, that there is a constitutional responsibility involved. The Constitution provides that the President of the United States "shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors."

There is no other authority that can nominate an ambassador except the President of the United States. He has sent this nomination to the Senate. Was it wise? That is a question we must determine as individual Senators. But he sent the nomination to the Senate. What did the Senate do with it? The Senate referred it to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so that we could initiate our constitutional responsibility. The Committee on Foreign Relations considered it and reported the nomination unanimously. That report is what is before us. The nomination is not now before the Foreign Relations Committee.

Some Senators have suggested that additional witnesses should be called before the committee. The committee does not have possession of the nomination anymore. It is before the Senate. The Senate can either vote to confirm the nomination, or it can vote to reject the nomination, or it can order the nomination recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further consideration. It can also order it recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to do thus and so. However, it is in the hands of the Senate at the present time.

Mr. President, I apologize for encroaching on the time of the Senator from South Dakota to such an extent, but in this time of tense world affairs I think it has been most unfortunate that a matter of this kind should have developed in the way it has. I am not criticizing any individual Senator for voting against confirmation of the nomination. Every Senator must follow his own conscience. No Senator is obliged to vote for confirmation. That is all right with me. If Senators wish to reflect on the President of the United States, or reflect on Secretary Dulles, that is their privilege. If Senators wish to reflect on the Foreign Relations Committee and wish to say that we are derelict in the performance of our duty and that we fail to perform our duty as assiduously and as thoroughly as some Senators think we should perform it, let the nomination be returned to the committee, in order that we may take further action.

But I do not think it is fair or just to anyone concerned, nor do I think it is in the best interests of the Senate of the United States, to have a precipitant debate, such as has occurred here, based on rumor here or there or on allegations from some irresponsible source.

I thank the Senator from South Dakota for yielding.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, however unfortunate it may be that this debate has occurred or that some delay has occurred in the taking of action on the question of confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, certainly it will be far more unfortunate for the Senate to confirm a nomination which should not be confirmed.

The very nature of the nomination now under consideration and the very nature of the times are such that the Senate should fully discharge its duties in connection with the confirmation of nominations.

If a matter which should govern the Senate's decision on a question of confirmation comes to the attention of the Senate, the Senate should take full cognizance of that matter, because a mistake would be far worse than delay.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. We have heard so much said—and truly said—this afternoon about the flood of rumors about the Bohlen nomination, that I should like to ask whether we should not change the title of the popular song, I Am Always Chasing Rainbows to I Am Always Chasing Rumors—as is occurring in the cloakrooms of the Senate today.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, many Senators are trying to determine, in connection with these matters, whether they are rumors or whether they are matters of substance. We desire to send an Ambassador to Russia free from the cloud of some unresolved derogatory information, so called.

I would not knowingly cast any vote to indicate a lack of confidence in either the President of the United States or the Secretary of State. They have my confidence; it rests upon the mutual respect that they will discharge their responsibilities and expect me to discharge mine. So, the question of confidence is not the purpose of any interrogation addressed by me to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

But in the face of the two contradictory statements in connection with the pending matter, it seemed to me that a question should be raised as to the nature of the derogatory information and whether it was of substance.

It seems to me that is a sound question, and one on which the Senate should have definite information, if it is possible for the Senate to obtain it.

The Senator from Iowa has referred to 1 of the 5 or 6 bits of derogatory information; and the presentation he has made would put it more or less in the character of the ridiculous. Perhaps that is all that could be said of the other 3 or 4 or 5 instances, whatever they were.

In any event, Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should not take umbrage at the fact that Senators have raised these natural questions. I am sure they are not intended to reflect on any member of the committee.

If the Senate should say, "We would like to have a little more information on this matter," that would not be the first time that such a situation developed in the Senate, and it would not be a reflection upon the work done by the Foreign Relations Committee. Nor would it be entirely without precedent for the Foreign Relations Committee itself, on its own initiative, to say, "There are some matters on which we should have more information," and for the committee then to proceed to obtain the information and make it available to the Senate. Certainly, that would not be the first time that has happened in the history of the United States Senate.

Certainly, Mr. President, we wish to do the proper thing, and we wish to do it

as promptly as possible. It was for the purpose of resolving these questions that I was prompted to ask the question I did ask. It was to facilitate getting a vote on the Bohlen nomination at the earliest possible time and with the largest majority possible.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota is doing the Senate a great favor by helping clear up this matter. I wish to say to him that we are faced with a little more than a rumor when we are told by responsible persons that Mr. Scott McLeod threatened to resign, following the testimony of the Secretary of State.

Furthermore, if the only derogatory material contained in the file on the nominee is that someone is said to have believed that the nominee looked like a potential criminal, certainly that is not information that a Senator of the United States could not properly obtain and inspect in order to clear up the situation regarding Mr. Bohlen. There must be more to it than that in order for the Secretary of State to refuse access to the Members of the Senate.

I should like to ask a question of the Senator from South Dakota, if he will permit me to do so. Is the Mr. Byrnes who has been referred to many times during the debate, Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina, the former Secretary of State?

Mr. CASE. I can only assume that it was Governor Byrnes who was referred to, because on page 105 of the hearing, the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, said:

> I was talking to the former Secretary of State, now Governor Byrnes, who called me up on a certain matter, and said—

And so forth. So I assume Mr. Dulles was referring to Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina, formerly Secretary of State.

Mr. MALONE. Was it not the former Senator Byrnes, who later was Secretary of State, and who now is the Governor of South Carolina, who, while Secretary of State, and upon his return from Yalta, made a national radio broadcast in which he affirmed that the proper procedure had been followed at Yalta, and that everything done there was for the best interest of this Nation?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I did not know that Secretary Byrnes made a radio address following his return from Yalta; but in all fairness to him, let me say that my definite recollection is that in his book Speaking Frankly he said he returned from Yalta to the United States with one of the admirals, prior to the conference between Stalin and Roosevelt which resulted in the secret agreement; and that Secretary Byrnes' knowledge regarding the so-called Yalta agreement did not develop until many months later, when he read in the newspapers that Russia was making certain claims, whereupon he called the White House and asked whether there was such an agreement; and, upon being advised that there was one, he asked that it be sent to the State Department so that he could know what secret agreements had been made.

So, Mr. President, in all fairness to Governor Byrnes, I think it should be stated that if he made a statement of the sort indicated by the Senator from Nevada immediately after his return from Yalta, that he made it in good faith, because he did not know about the agreement until many months later.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield further to me?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I may say that practically every Cabinet officer who has served in recent years has, following his Cabinet service, written a book in which he has denied having knowledge of much of what was done while he was in office—or he had disagreed with everything that turned out wrong and was overruled.

I do not want to cast any aspersions on former Secretary of State Byrnes; he at least finally righted himself and helped to defeat those responsible for our plight; but apparently he has now testified to the good character and efficiency of the nominee, Mr. Bohlen, who is nominated to be United States Ambassador to Russia; and now the Senate is asked to confirm the nomination on his recommendation.

Yet I understand that it was Mr. Byrnes, the present Governor of South Carolina, the former Secretary of State, who, without having sufficient knowledge, made a national radio speech at a time when practically every citizen of the United States was waiting to hear from him, because very serious questions had been raised as to the soundness of the commitments made at Yalta, and our people were waiting to hear Mr. Byrnes' opinion as to whether those commitments were proper or improper. At that time the substance of Mr. Byrnes' radio address, following the Yalta Conference—and following it by a very few days or weeks; I do not now recall the exact date—was to the effect that everything which was worked out at Yalta and all of the promises and commitments were proper and should be adhered to.

If Secretary Byrnes, or Governor Byrnes, as he is now, has not been advised of the report made by the security officer of the State Department or has not been advised of the FBI file, it may be that if he were so advised of the contents of the report or the contents of the file, he would change his mind, just as he did before, when he wrote his book, following his service as Secretary of State.

So I would say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that for 6 years such nominations have been submitted to us, or there have been submitted to us requests for appropriations for foreign activities, or we have been requested to take immediate action in passing so-called emergency bills, for it has been said that it is essential that we take action on them at once, and that the whole dynasty would fall if we did not act on them at once, that day or that week—whereas, as a matter of fact, the whole policy of the Roosevelt administration and the whole policy of the Truman administration were to deny to the Senate the information necessary for it to have in order to be sure that it was voting correctly on various nominations or various emergency measures.

At this time I am very much concerned about knowing whether our own administration is going to follow the same policy. It is not an auspicious start.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in concluding my remarks, let me say that it seems to me the suggestion made by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], may afford a practical solution of this matter, namely, that one or two members of the Foreign Relations Committee be designated to examine the file and personally pass upon the so-called derogatory information, and then be in a position, on their honor, as members of the committee and as Members of the Senate, to pass along their verdict to the committee, on the basis of what they actually saw in the files.

In that manner, the Senate would be discharging its full responsibility in the matter.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to make one or two suggestions to the Senator from South Dakota as a basis for asking him several questions.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I sat through practically all the hearings; I believe I missed 10 minutes of Mr. Dulles' testimony.

I have been greatly concerned about this matter. I believe there is some misconception which has gained a little currency this afternoon, and that is the misconception that positive proof is necessary in these matters.

I submit to the Senator from South Dakota that it is impossible to produce proof today as to what somebody will do next week or next year. That is the projection of guesswork, let us say, or judgment. We can prove today what somebody did today, or we can prove today what somebody did yesterday. But, for the purpose of fixing security risk or loyalty risk, the question of analysis, the question of what a person will probably do in the future, always has been and always will be a matter of speculation. Every time an employer hires someone to work for him he must evaluate the employee's past, and he must then guess what he might do in the future; he must guess whether he would be a loyal employee. It is impossible to produce proof today of what somebody will do tomorrow.

That is the great misconception that arises in connection with investigative files. The investigative file of an individual who is prospectively to be employed by the Government develops evidence of past actions or associations, in order that the evaluating officer may gain an idea of what the individual might possibly do in the future, or the risk some action of his might involve. We say frequently that, because there is no proof that an individual has done something wrongful in the past, we can be sure he will not do it in the future. There is nothing more fallacious.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I do not apply this to Mr. Bohlen, by any stretch of the imagination; but, by way of illustration, if a banker wants to hire a teller and he has the prospective employee investigated and the investigation shows that he never robbed any widows or orphans, that he never picked a pocket, that he was never a second-story artist who broke into rooms to steal, but it does show that he consistently and continually associated with thieves and crooks, robbers and bandits, is the banker going to project this showing into the future, and say, "Well, there is no proof that the man ever robbed a bank or an individual, and, merely because he had had association with thieves and scoundrels, that does not mean that I should not hire him as a teller and put him in charge of the depositors' money"?

That is a crude illustration, but it indicates the purpose of an investigative file which is to lay the background of personal history in order that the evaluator may determine whether an individual, going into a certain area of employment, might be a security risk or a loyalty risk. I hope we can lay the ghost of that argument. A security file, an investigative file, must be based on past activities and past associations, in order that the evaluating officer may have as broad a scope as possible in trying to make up his mind, in an effort to determine what somebody might do in the future. We are dealing with future possible action, not with any proof today of what somebody may do in the future, because it cannot be produced.

Mr. President, I sat through the hearing. I am sorry that my understanding of the testimony of the rumored derogatory allegations is not quite so succinct and clear as that of my colleagues. As I recall—and I think my memory is fairly clear—I do not remember that the Secretary analyzed specifically the particular instances of alleged derogatory rumor, or whatever it may be called, but they were more or less lumped together under a rather general statement that there were 4 or 5 instances of derogatory information in the file, and that he had evaluated them and decided, under his responsibility as Secretary, that they were not of sufficient import to cast any doubt or reflection upon the future loyalty or integrity or security risk of the nominee. Mr. President, I have not seen the file. I do not know of my own knowledge a single thing that is in the file. The Foreign Relations Committee elected not to have the file brought before it and examined by any individual member of the committee. The chairman elected to have the Secretary of State come before the committee and evaluate it, in his own judgment. Not having seen any allegations in the files, not having seen the alleged evidence, but having confidence in and high regard for the Secretary of State and the President of the United States, I asked the Secretary of State specifically whether, upon his responsibility, despite the fact that the security officer of the State Department had refused to clear this man, or said he would not or could not, the Secretary could assure us, after seeing all the evidence in the file, that he considered this man to be a good security and loyalty risk. When he said he did, and with the appointment by the President of the United States expressing confidence, it seemed to me that I had no other course than to sustain this appointment. It is entirely beside the point whether I would have sent Mr. Bohlen's name to the Senate. It is entirely beside the point whether I might or might not feel that Mr. Bohlen is a proper representative to be sent to Moscow. The only thing I have to go on is the statement of the Secretary of State, in whom I have confidence, as I have confidence in the President, that the Secretary has gone through the file and through the evidence, and it is his solemn assurance to us that Mr. Bohlen is not a security or loyalty risk. I have been denied, in effect, the right to see the file, and I make no complaint at this moment about that. But what I have indicated is what I have to rely on.

Mr. President, I believe that is the underlying situation involved here. I assure the Senator, if I had proof of any particular thing, I would give it to him.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, it has been impossible for the Senator from South Dakota to find a statement in the hearings to the effect that the Secretary of State said that he, himself, ever did go through the file.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I quote?

Mr. CASE. The only thing I find is that he went through the FBI report, the summary. He said, "I received, a day ago, a summary of the report of the FBI." Then, on page 106, in response to a question by the Senator from Iowa, he said:

> I do not know what you mean by clearing. I gave you my evaluation of the security report, the FBI report.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will read further down the page, I put it in this way:

> Well, may I put it another way? Do I understand you—
>
> Referring to the Secretary of State—
>
> then, to assure the committee that you believe Mr. Bohlen, based on the full field investigation and whatever you know about the situation, is a good security and loyalty risk?

Mr. Dulles replied, "Yes."

I consider that as being all-inclusive.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have found no statement to indicate that the Secretary read the file. The only statement I find is that he said he saw a summary of the report by the FBI and evaluated it.

Further, Mr. President, the question which the Senator from Iowa propounded, which went to loyalty and security, did not go to other features of the man's fitness for the position. The derogatory information apparently went to something other than loyalty or security risks. It is on that point that I feel the Senate could vote with considerably more confidence if some members of the committee had actually looked at the file and then stated, from the point of view of a Senator representing us, that the derogatory information is not substantial in character and is not important in our consideration of the question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I suggest to the Senator that the Secretary of State is, in fact, the security officer of the State Department? He is the head of that Department. The Secretary of State is the Under Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and every other officer in that Department, because he has the authority and responsibility, and, as a rule, he only delegates authority to under officers. So he has the responsibility, the power, and the authority to make determinations.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, if the word of the Secretary of State or the word of any other Cabinet head involved in a similar situation, were the only thing to be considered, there would be no justification for ever bringing a nomination to the Senate for confirmation.

Why bother with the process of confirmation if the opinion of the executive branch is not to be checked by the judgment of the Senate—and how judge without someone seeing the evidence for the Senate to evaluate from our point of view?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to make a very few remarks in my own time on this question. I had not expected to discuss the matter, but the debate this afternoon makes it, so far as I am concerned, important that I make a record in regard to certain points which have been discussed on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

It is my understanding that Mr. Bohlen is perhaps one of 3 or 4 outstanding authorities on the Soviet Union. In these critical days I think we had better have in Moscow as the Ambassador from the United States to Russia a man who knows something about Russia. That is why, Mr. President, I had assumed that this was an outstandingly fine nomination, and it has been my expectation, and it is still my hope, that I can vote to confirm the nominee.

The second point I want to make, Mr. President, is that it is also important that in our exercise of the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution, as a Senate, we follow a course of action that will send to Moscow a strong ambassador, not one who, in large measure, we have destroyed before we send him there.

We cannot erase the debate of this afternoon in the Senate of the United States which is written in indelible chalk on the blackboard of history. I think that debate places the duty on the Senate to go into more detail to ascertain what the facts are, so that if we confirm the nomination of Mr. Bohlen he will be sent to Moscow a strong man and not one who has been weakened in public opinion at home and abroad.

If we let this record stand, I respectfully submit we have done damage, so far as the international standing of our representative in Moscow is concerned, because we would have to say that the present status of the whole situation is one of suspended doubt.

The third point I want to make deals with what I think, as one Member of the Senate, is now the duty of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I sent a message to him say-

ing I was going to make some comments on his speech, and he very kindly came to my desk and said it was necessary for him to be at a conference, but that he would be perfectly satisfied for me to go ahead and make my comments in his absence. I do not agree with the Senator from Iowa that this matter is now in the hands of the Senate. It is true that in the earlier days of the Senate, when a committee brought a bill or a nomination to the floor of the Senate, it did not proceed further to discuss the bill or the nomination unless the matter was recommitted to the committee. But in recent years other precedents have been established in the Senate, and now, Mr. President, it is quite common for a Senate committee, particularly in the case of a nomination when problems have risen during the course of the debate on the floor with regard to the nominee, to give further consideration to that nominee without the matter being formally recommitted, although the procedure of recommittal is, of course, open to the Senate and is open to the committee for a request for recommittal.

The most recent case, in my recollection, is that of Anna Rosenberg. Her nomination came to the Senate and was placed on the calendar and was on the calendar for some days. There was a considerable amount of discussion in the cloakrooms by way of rumor. I shall have something to say about rumor in connection with my fourth point, Mr. President.

The Rosenberg case was on the calendar, and the Armed Services Committee, with no action by the Senate at all, decided to reconsider the nomination. The Rosenberg nomination was never recommitted to the Armed Services Committee. We actually held several days of hearings by way of reconsideration, Mr. President, of that case because of discussions and charges which had been talked about in the cloakrooms of the Senate.

So I say, most respectfully, to the junior Senator from Iowa that I think, on the basis of the discussion on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, in the interest of protecting Mr. Bohlen, and in the interest of sending an ambassador to Moscow in the strongest possible position, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate ought to give further consideration to this matter.

I understood, and I may have misunderstood, from the comments of the distinguished majority leader that he assumed that was exactly what was going to happen tomorrow morning—that the Foreign Relations Committee was going to have a further discussion of the Bohlen nomination tomorrow morning. I think the committee should do just that.

The fourth point I want to make, Mr. President, because it is easy to turn a phrase as a substitute for argument, that the suggestion that Senate substitute for the title of the old song, "Forever Chasing Rainbows," one which would read, "Forever Chasing Rumors," completely misses the point that now confronts the Senate in the Bohlen case. Such a humorous suggestion does not eliminate the problem, Mr. President, which has arisen as a result of rumors in respect to Mr. Bohlen. It so happens that when we are faced with the job of giving advice and consent to a nomination, and when rumors exist that will do a man great damage, we owe it to the nominee and to the country to track down those rumors and ascertain whether there is any substance in them. That happens to be our job.

We do not change it with a clever phrase, Mr. President. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has, I think, performed a service this afternoon when he pointed out in a very clear manner that the comment of the Secretary of State on the record is a comment which goes to loyalty and security. It is not a comment which goes to the other criteria which the Senate has always followed in the application of the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution.

When the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] pointed out that one item discussed with the committee was so-called derogatory information that had come from someone who thought he had a sixth sense, it was perfectly obvious that that person was a crackpot.

How reassuring it would be to the Senate if the Committee on Foreign Relations could advise us that they had had presented to them all the other derogatory information that was referred to by Mr. Dulles, but apparently, as I read the record, was never, in any detail, presented to the Committee on Foreign Relations by Mr. Dulles. All he did was to give the committee his assurance that there was no basis in fact for any of the derogatory information.

Let us consider the origin of a nomination under our system of Government. It comes from the executive branch. The advice-and-consent clause is one of the checks of the Constitution. There is not much of a check if we allow the executive branch, which sends a nomination to the Senate in the first place, simply to say, "We now second the motion. We nominated Bohlen; now we second the nomination by telling you that we would not have sent the nomination in the first place if we did not think it was a good one. We tell you that the derogatory information in the FBI file is not of any substance."

Under the checks and balances system, that is not good enough for me, because I think a duty rests upon the Committee on Foreign Relations to check for itself whether there is any basis in fact for the derogatory information. It should check for itself and ascertain whether the information is of the crackpot type which the junior Senator from Iowa referred to, when he said that some person had certain derogatory information in the Bohlen file, and he was the type of person who thought he had a sixth sense.

I do not know, from what the junior Senator from Iowa said, or from what anyone else has said, in this debate, or from anything in the record of the case, whether all the derogatory information in the FBI file was of the crackpot type. I am not clear as to whether the Secretary of State gave to the Committee on Foreign Relations a detailed account of what the derogatory information was.

I agree with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] that it is not necessary that there be in the FBI file clear proof in regard to every charge. Certainly there ought to be in the file enough to establish a prima facie case which could raise a justifiable doubt that would call for further investigation on the part of the committee.

That leads me to the fifth point I wish to make, namely, how we are going to get information under a system by which the executive branch sends a nomination to the Senate, and the executive branch, in turn, is protected, as it should be, by the separation-of-powers doctrine. This afternoon we have heard members of the Committee on Foreign Relations say in argument, and quite rightly, that they cannot demand the file; that they are in a position in which, after all, it is up to the executive branch, under the separation-of-powers doctrine, to determine what, if any, portion of the file they desire to allow the legislative branch to see.

I think that right is pretty well established in a long line of incidents, and also in some cases, throughout our history, bearing upon the matter of separation of powers. But also I think the precedents are legion for the legislative branch of government, when called upon to give its advice and consent to say to the executive branch, "Unfortunately some doubts have been raised, and we would like to have the cooperation of the executive branch, so that at least one or more of our Members can resolve the doubts to the satisfaction of the committee and of the whole Senate."

That is why I think the suggestion of the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], makes much sense. I understood him to say that tomorrow, when the Committee on Foreign Relations met, he would again present the proposal to have 1 or 2 members of the committee inspect the file which he had previously presented, and which proposal had been turned down, but which I now think would be a stronger proposal, in light of the debate which has occurred on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. I understood his proposal to be that the Committee on Foreign Relations select 1 or 2 Senators to represent the committee in a conference with the executive branch of the Government—with the President, if necessary, although I think it could be done through the Secretary of State—and ask for the privilege—and mark you, I used the word "privilege"—of inspecting the FBI file in toto.

In my judgment, unless other discussion here will strengthen his position, that procedure would be only fair to Bohlen, because I do not think Bohlen should be sent to Russia unless a record can be made in this confirmation debate that will so rebut the rumors, the arguments, and the charges about him that the country as a whole will be satisfied that the Senate, in giving its advice and consent, did not rely upon clearance by the executive branch of Government, but relied upon its own investigation. I do not believe there is any substitute for such action now.

MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Let me emphasize the point. I am not saying that the Committee on Foreign Relations has any right to see the file. I say that, under the circumstances, it ought to have 1 or 2 of its members, or a subcommittee of the full committee, ask the executive branch of the Government for the extension of a privilege which the executive branch can grant to the Senate committee in relation to its own administration of the separation-of-powers doctrine, as has been done in the past, and as I think would be done in this case.

The subcommittee could then consider such derogatory information in the FBI file, which apparently has nothing to do with loyalty and security, and, I judge, has nothing to do directly with competency, but apparently has something to do with character.

On the basis of such knowledge as I have of Mr. Bohlen, I am inclined to believe that when that kind of investigation is made by the Committee on Foreign Relations, he will be completely cleared. I think we owe that to him. Because I think the votes exist to confirm the nomination of Mr. Bohlen on the floor of the Senate, no matter what is said in debate, it would be very easy simply to say, "We have the votes and are going to confirm the nomination." But I say that is not fair to Bohlen now. I think the only fair procedure now would be to have the Committee on Foreign Relations do exactly what we on the Committee on Armed Services did in the Rosenberg case, when vicious rumors were circulated about Mrs. Rosenberg. In the Rosenberg case the committee went back into session and blew those rumors and charges into thin air, because there was no substantiation in fact for them. At that time, as my then colleagues on the Committee on Armed Services can testify on the floor this afternoon, if they care to, that was exactly my position—I said that we owed it to Mrs. Rosenberg. It was the only fair thing to do.

Mr. President, I say we owe the same consideration to Bohlen. Of course—and I speak now hypothetically—if in the exercise of our checks and balances under the advice and consent clause it should be found that all this derogatory information was not of the crackpot nature that the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] referred to, but that it did rest upon a prima facie case, then how glad we would be that we did not vote to confirm him merely because we had the votes. That would be the easy way out of what is becoming a very unpleasant debate over this nomination. Senators are mature persons. Once an issue is drawn we can face it. I say that the issue has now been drawn. To put it very bluntly, the issue is whether or not Mr. Bohlen possesses the character which qualifies him to receive confirmation of his nomination by the advice and consent of the Senate.

I for one am not going to accept Mr. Dulles' statement or the statement of anyone else in the executive branch of government, because I have no right now to substitute their judgment for my responsibility. That statement is also true with respect to the Foreign Relations Committee. Therefore I think the Foreign Relations Committee ought to give further consideration to this matter, and, as the majority leader suggested, it ought to appoint 1 or 2 of its Members to confer with the Secretary of State and ask for the privilege of seeing the FBI file—not a summary of it. I do not think that a summary is good enough now. The committee should ask the privilege of seeing the file. That privilege has been extended by cooperative arrangements in other cases in the past. On the basis of such a check, which I say is in keeping with the true meaning of the checks and balances of the Constitution, the committee should report to the Senate as to whether or not the nominee meets all the criteria. I do not know why there is discussion by the Secretary of State only of loyalty and security risks, because another criterion has been thrown into question. I think we ought to leave no room for doubt that, on the basis of each of the four historic tests, Mr. Bohlen is fully qualified to be Ambassador to Russia.

I refer to the criteria of character; competency and mental soundness to carry out the President's program; loyalty and security; and, lastly, the absence of any personal interest which might accrue to his personal benefit from the appointment itself.

I respectfully say to my friends on the Foreign Relations Committee that I think they now owe us an additional report, based not upon any statement from Secretary Dulles, but upon their own exercise of their senatorial prerogatives in carrying out the checks and balances of the Constitution.

PROPOSED DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in the very near future this body will consider a piece of proposed legislation which in my opinion is just as important as the question of whether or not Mr. Bohlen's nomination is to be confirmed by the United States Senate. That proposed legislation is what I wish to discuss briefly with the Senate. I beg the indulgence of the Senate for that purpose. I intend today to discuss one of the most important legislative measures to come before this body, namely, the plan to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am heartily and completely in favor of that plan.

I am in favor of it not only because the activities carried on by the Federal Security Agency are among the most vital functions performed by the Federal Government but because of the honor it will bestow upon the gracious and charming lady who now occupies the position of Federal Security Administrator and who hails from one of New Mexico's neighbors—the great State of Texas.

For the past 4 years, as chairman of the subcommittee which examined and passed on this Agency's budget requests, I have had the opportunity to examine closely the work being carried on by the Federal Security Agency.

For many more years before that I was vitally interested in the activities which that Agency represents in the fields of health, education, and welfare.

I know of no other department of Government which impinges more directly on the welfare of all the citizens of our Nation. I know of no better way of demonstrating the interest of the Congress of the United States in the welfare of all the citizens of our Nation than by giving Cabinet rank to the Agency chiefly concerned with the well-being, happiness, and security of the people as a whole.

Surely our human resources deserve consideration and stature equal to our farm resources or our business resources. And this, in essence, is behind our present proposal.

There was a time, not so long ago in our history, when that simple proposition was not, by any means, as fully accepted as it is today.

A review of the development of the Federal Security Agency during the past few years or so can be, I think, instructive, not only in showing the development of this concept but in illustrating the extent of the present programs and demonstrating why the proposal for Cabinet status for those in charge of these programs deserves immediate affirmative action.

It was nearly 16 years ago—several years before the creation of the Federal Security Agency—that the Social Security Act was passed.

There were, prior to the enactment of this legislation, Federal programs which were concerned, in the broadest sense, with the welfare of our population. Indeed, all Federal programs have as their ultimate aim the general welfare. However, I believe that I am safe in saying that the social-security legislation of 1935 was an especially significant milestone in our history, for it wrote into law the concept of continuing Federal interest in social security. Moreover, by rightfully singling out the aged, the needy blind, and dependent children as of particular concern to society, it set an important precedent—that the Nation recognized responsibility for the welfare of those who had served society well or, through no fault of their own, were dependent on society for their maintenance.

When the Federal Security Agency was established in 1939, the purpose was to bring together under one head the bulk of the programs of the Federal Government devoted to this concept of general welfare.

What are these programs? How have the people of the United States, through their Government, united to get the things they want for themselves and their children?

In the area of health—the protection of the health of one's neighborhood and of the Nation—there are the many, diverse, and highly important tasks of the 155-year-old Public Health Service.

Such problems as sanitation, venereal disease, tuberculosis, cancer, mental illness, quarantine, hospital construction,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

neurology, blindness, and other sicknesses are its daily concern. Through its own research and the Service's program of grants-in-aid for research to American universities, hospitals, and private research organizations, it is aiding in the struggle against illness and for a healthier, happier, and more productive America. Through grants to the States and in the form of technical assistance, demonstrations, and teamwork in fighting epidemics, the Service plays an irreplaceable role protecting the community against disease. Its quarantine service protects the Nation against epidemics from abroad. Its administration of the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act is aiding in the enormous job of adding thousands of needed beds to the Nation's hospitals. Its stream pollution, industrial health, and other health programs touch the lives, in some measure, of all of us.

In creating a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we will be providing the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and his aids with added strength for carrying out these important duties.

In the area of education, there is the job of the Office of Education, another great part of the Federal Security Agency. The roots of our Federal interest in education go back a long way—to 1867, just after the Civil War. That was the year in which the office was first established to "promote the cause of education throughout the country."

Through research in teaching problems, by advice and help to schools and teachers, through State authorities, and by financial aid for certain kinds of education, the Office of Education today continues to carry out that purpose. Federal funds, for example, have been going to land-grant colleges for almost 150 years. And most of our States today are receiving Federal funds for vocational education and training in farming, home economics, industry, and business.

I have mentioned social security as an important milestone in American history. How does the Nation's social-security program operate today?

Essentially, there are two lines of defense which the Federal Security Agency's social-security program maintains against human problems of security and survival. They are old-age and survivors insurance and public assistance.

Old-age and survivors insurance, by building up protection against loss of family income through old age or death, contributes not only to the stability of our economy but provides many millions of American citizens with a minimum security that contributes immeasurably to individual happiness, well-being, and, I have no doubt, as well to our general productivity.

Old-age and survivors insurance benefits need, of course, to be extended to many more hundreds of thousands of our working population. I am glad to note that the President contemplates submitting legislation designed to broaden the present social-security program. With our rapidly aging population, old-age security has become an increasingly serious national problem.

It seems clear to me that the creation of a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should give added impetus to such legislation and, by strengthening the hand of the present Federal Security Administrator, aid materially in the administration of such an extended program.

I am sure that no one will challenge the thought that the children of this country are our greatest national asset.

The new Department will continue to include the Children's Bureau, which, since its founding in 1912, has concerned itself with the health and welfare of our children. Some of its booklets, like Infant Care and Your Child From One To Six, have been read and pondered in hundreds of thousands of American homes and have aided millions of parents in rearing their children.

The great work of helping the States to furnish medical treatment to crippled children and of aiding children who lack real homes or who are neglected by their parents is surely one of the most important investments that we can make in the future of America.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, another unit of the proposed new Department, cooperates with the States in the vocational training and placement of the physically handicapped. This program—directly affecting human beings—will gain strength through the creation of a Department of Health, Education, and Security.

So, in my opinion, will the Food and Drug Administration, which protects American families by safeguarding the purity of our food, medicines, and cosmetics. With the Public Health Service, the Food and Drug Administration gives health protection to the millions of American consumers and contributes materially to the security and well-being of the American family.

The importance of the work of the Federal Security Agency—which will be carried on, and, I have no doubt, in the course of time will be strengthened by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—can perhaps be illustrated by a few figures.

Figures and statistics, in their own right, are cold. I would ask that we think of these figures in terms of people and of our human resources.

Think what it means in these terms when we make note of the fact that 4 out of 5 American jobs now have social-security protection and more than 5 million people are drawing monthly benefits under the system.

When we speak of public assistance, let us think what that term means to nearly 5 million persons—the needy blind, needy aged, dependent children, and the needy disabled who are benefiting from this agency program.

Leadership and guidance is being given, through the States, to some 28 million children enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools, including 3 million high school students in vocational education classes who receive direct aid from the Federal Government.

Think of the importance that this program takes on for the children and the parents of the children who benefit each day from their Government's interest in education.

Every buyer of every drug and everyone living under the health protections afforded by these programs is a witness to their Government's day-to-day efforts to produce a healthier, happier, and more productive America.

These are examples, and only examples, of statistical measurement of the work of this agency. The roots of these programs go deep, into the thousands of small towns and communities throughout the land. Their influence is felt by Americans in the farthest corners of the Nation.

This fact alone leads me to endorse the present proposal.

I am happy to support this bill to create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry on the job of conserving and strengthening our human resources.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 28, 35, and 39.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 21, 23, 26, 29, 34, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 45, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Capitol Buildings: For an additional amount for 'Capitol Buildings', $800."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", to remain available until expended, $13,000,000, of which $8,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to the contract authority granted by the Act of October 16, 1951 (65 Stat. 422)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert:

"THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', including employment without regard to the civil service and classification laws of an economic adviser to the President and a staff incidental thereto, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 42.

STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
CARL HAYDEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to inquire whether the Democratic managers on the part of the Senate signed the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] signed it. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was not in town. However, he was present at the conference that was held today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder whether I should notify the senior Senator from Arizona——

Mr. BRIDGES. All of us agreed on the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not quite clear in the report what provision was made for rural electrification and for the rural telephone program. I wonder whether the Senator from New Hampshire would give an explanation of it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad the question has been asked, because the distinguished Senator from North Dakota also asked me with reference to it.

When the bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives, there was no provision contained in it for either rural electrification or for the rural telephone program. The Senate, after hearings, and getting a budget estimate from the present Budget Director, deducted $15 million from the REA and gave it to the rural telephone program. Therefore, when the bill went to conference, it contained this addition by the Senate.

Then in the conference, where we had to reach a compromise, we reduced REA electrification funds by $15 million, but provided for only $10 million additional for the rural telephone program; in other words, in effect we rescinded $5 million of REA authorization.

So when the conference report went to the House for action, the reduction of $15 million in REA authority and the $10 million increase in telephone authority were rejected.

On two record votes, the House rejected both the conference compromise proposal and an amendment to increase the telephone program authority without a reduction in electrification authority.

Today the conferees on the part of the Senate met and reached a decision. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] that the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] was present at our meeting today, as was the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and at the meeting we decided unanimously to instruct the chairman of the committee to move that the Senate agree to the report and recede from the amendment on the part of the Senate, for the reason that the House had voted so decisively on the matter. This subject can be acted upon in a coming appropriation bill at a time when there is opportunity to explore it fully. Another reason for prompt action at this time, is that the measure before us carries appropriations for various Senate special committees and their employees, which will be without funds unless this supplement appropriation bill is acted upon very soon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it the intention of the distinguished chairman of the committee and of other members of the conference to have considered, in connection with the next supplemental appropriation bill, the needs of those interested in rural telephones and the needs of others who have made application in an attempt to meet such needs?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; to do so in the one which comes first, either the regular appropriation bill or the supplemental bill; and I have so informed the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who was one of the most ardent proponents of the telephone matter.

Mr. LEHMAN. So was I.

Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. In view of the fact that the House rejected the two amendments which were adopted by the Senate, what is the present status of the contingent fund for rural electrification?

Mr. BRIDGES. There is no change; it returns to its former status.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. According to the conference report, the conferees on the part of the Senate receded from Senate amendment numbered 39; and according to the statement on the part of the managers for the House, that amendment would appropriate $1,000,000 for grants to the Republic of the Philippines, as proposed by the House of Representatives.

The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee will recall that during the discussion of the proposed amendment with members of the committee, it was decided that because of the inadequacy of the information available to the committee at that time, action should be deferred until additional information could be made available by the Bureau of the Budget. Does the chairman of the committee recall that discussion?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes, I do. I may say that in the interim the new Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, sent up a budget justification, together with a request and a statement that the appropriation item was urgently needed. That occurred in the interim period between the Senate action and the conference with the House.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure I had no information which would indicate that the Bureau of the Budget was satisfied. I merely wish to point out that I have heard many rumors that—regardless of whether this matter is under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or comes under the provisions of the act—the Republic of the Philippines has absolute authority for supervising this hospitalization program I am serving notice that before the regular appropriation bill for 1954 is acted upon, I shall demand some information on that subject.

I may point out for the information of the chairman of the committee that I have before me a clipping from the Philippine Free Press of Manila, dated January 31, 1953, with the heading "Hospitalization Racket." I am sure that if the chairman of the committee will read this brief article he will agree with me that there is reason for doubt and suspicion on the part of the Appropriations Committee as to the desirability of this particular program.

As I have said, I do not know whether we have any jurisdiction or any authority, or whether the Veterans' Administration is compelled by law merely to transfer the funds, to be expended by the Republic of the Philippines.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the article under the heading "Hospitalization Racket."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSPITALIZATION RACKET

(By Filemon V. Tutay)

When investigators of the Police Affairs Division of the Philippine Constabulary first went to the Vis Medicatrix Naturae Clinic in Malabon, Rizal, sometime last October, they never suspected that they would stumble upon a complicated racket involving hospital benefits for war veterans. The constabulary agents were assigned by Capt. Jose del Rosario merely to check on reports that some patients at the clinic had the dangerous habit of firing their firearms inside the hospital when they got drunk. But in the process of investigation the agents found that many of the ailing war veterans, recorded as "in" on the charts of the clinic

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and supposed to be receiving medical treatment were somewhere else. They were not in the hospital.

One veteran who appeared in the records as a patient in the hospital turned out actually to be attending his classes in the College of Agriculture of the University of the Philippines in Los Baños, Laguna. In consideration for the use of their names on the hospital charts, the "absentee patients" received monthly allowances out of what the hospital collected for their supposed subsistence and medicines from the Philippine Veterans' Board.

When the agents submitted their report, their findings on the original complaint about the illegal discharge of firearms were ignored, while the portion of the report relating to the racket was immediately attended to. Lt. Col. Hospicio Tuazon, the new chief of the Police Affairs Division, ordered more men to work on the case. One team of agents was assigned to a round-the-clock surveillance of the V. M. N. clinic while another team was charged with gathering evidence on the illegal activities of the director.

After more than a month of intensive investigation, the constabulary operatives were able to assemble evidence sufficiently strong to warrant positive action. A raiding party was organized and just before noon on December 11, last, a strong force of agents with a security screen of heavily armed troops descended upon the suspected hospital. The raiders seized a large quantity of incriminating documents, including receipts for various sums allegedly received by patients from Dr. Alberto Bañas, owner, manager, and director of the clinic.

As established by the findings of the agents, the racket was operated in this manner. Under the Rogers Act, a war veteran certified as sick and therefore entitled to hospital benefits under the act, is authorized to collect ₱10 a day for subsistence and another ₱10 for his medical needs in accordance with the prescriptions of his physician. This provision proved a strong attraction to certain unscrupulous individuals. Veterans are made to appear as patients in a hospital, duly authorized by the Philippine Veterans Board to accept veteran patients, although actually they may be in their own homes in another part of the country.

At the end of each month, the hospital collected from the PVB the equivalent of the patients' subsistence and medicines, amounting to ₱600 a month per patient. (The PVB in turn collected from the United States Veterans' Administration.) From this amount, the absentee patient got his cut of ₱65 or more for doing nothing. But when some patients discovered that the hospitals were raking in profits of from ₱400 to ₱535 a month per patient, they demanded a bigger share. It was then that some of the smarter absentee patients were given a substantial increase in their allowances. Some patients, it was learned, collected as much as ₱200 a month for the use of their names on hospital charts.

To add to their cut some of the more enterprising patients acted as agents to contact veterans who might be in the provinces and not familiar with the racket. They later came to Manila only to sign some papers and signify their intention to take advantage of the hospital benefits offered in the Rogers Act. Then they returned to their own homes in the provinces and waited for their monthly allowance. Before the allowance was sent, however, the agents first deducted their commission, usually ₱20 to ₱40 a month.

At this writing, three criminal cases for estafa through falsification of public documents have been filed against Dr. Bañas, of the VMN clinic. In one case, he has already been convicted by Judge Bienvenido A. Tan of the Court of First Instance of Rizal, and sentenced to 4 years and 1 day in prison, and to pay a fine of ₱5,000. In imposing the sentence, Judge Tan said: "The court * * * could not fail to consider the fact that the act committed by the accused in this case is not only illegal but repugnant to the conscience of all law-abiding citizens, because it diverts the funds destined to destitute veterans for their invaluable services to their country as a partial token of appreciation of a grateful people, to serve the selfish interest of heartless individuals." Bañas appealed the decision. He stands charged in two similar cases before the Court of First Instance at Pasig.

Constabulary authorities believe that they have hardly scratched the surface of the racket. They are confident that numerous other estafa cases will be developed from the findings of government investigators. This will require the services of a special prosecutor to handle nothing else but cases involving the hospitalization racket. For this special assignment, Secretary of Justice Oscar Castelo designated Assistant Provincial Fiscal Jose Castillo, of Rizal, because of his familiarity with the background of the racket. Castillo handled the successful prosecution of the first case against Bañas.

In order to be better prepared for the job, Fiscal Castillo accompanied the constabulary agents when they raided the clinic of Dr. Jesus Crisologo in Quezon City on January 8. Here, as in the hospital of Dr. Bañas, the constabulary found telltale signs of irregularities and the raiders seized documentary evidence in the form of hospital charts and other papers.

The hospital of Dr. Crisologo was under contract with the Philippine Veterans Board to treat 30 veterans. At the time of the raid, however, 15 of the patients were out on pass. This was a violation of the provisions of the contract which limited pass leaves to 10 percent of the number of patients under treatment. Under the contract, only three patients could be out of the hospital at any one time.

As a result of the raid, constabulary authorities issued an alarm for the apprehension of guerrilla "Col." Justiniano Estrella, who was suspected of having connived with the hospital director in committing irregularities. Constabulary agents were able to intercept letters written by Estrella to other veterans persuading them to be hospitalized at the Crisologo clinic as a means of making money without having to work for it.

On the strength of evidence gathered by the constabulary, an information similar to that filed against Dr. Bañas has been filed before the Court of First Instance in Quezon City charging Dr. Crisologo with the crime of estafa through falsification of public documents. "Colonel" Estrella was named as coaccused in the case.

About 1 week following the raid in Quezon City, constabulary investigators swooped down on a clinic in Cavite City owned and operated by Dr. Rizalina Bautista-Poblete and her husband, Dr. Juan Poblete. Guerrilla Capt. Bienvenido Santos furnished the intelligence report which led to the raid. He complained to constabulary officials that while he was treated at the clinic for only a few days, it was made to appear in the records of the hospital that he was under treatment for long periods.

In a statement made before investigators of the constabulary and the United States Veterans' Administration, Santos alleged that he entered the Poblete clinic on May 8, 1952, but left the following day. He returned to the clinic on July 5, 1952, stayed for a while, and then left again. He came back every now and then, but never stayed in the clinic as a regular patient. During the intervals between his visits to the clinic, he said that he was never given any pass or furlough. He was not administered any treatment unless he went to the hospital, contrary to the records on his case.

The clinic of the Pobletes was under contract with the Philippine Veterans Board to treat 148 war veterans. This is probably the largest number of patients allowed any single hospital of the 34 under contract with the PVB. At this writing (Tuesday) cases, similar to those filed against Dr. Bañas and Dr. Crisologo, were still under study for filing against the operators of the Cavite City Clinic.

According to the findings of constabulary investigators, certain officials and employees of the Philippine Veterans Board will probably be involved before the whole mess is cleared up. It is pointed out that agents of the racketeering hospitals found no trouble in having the papers of applicants for hospitalization under the Rogers Act approved promptly by simply dealing with these officials and employees. Hospital owners have also complained that they could not collect from the PVB unless they shelled out to these mulcters. In making their collections for the hospitalization of war veterans, the hospital operators do not deal directly with the Manila office of the United States Veterans' Administration, which administers the Rogers hospitalization benefits to Filipino veterans, but with the PVB, which in turn collects from the USVA.

In this connection, it is significant to note that Maj. Gen. Guillermo B. Francisco, acting chairman of the Philippine Veterans Board, has asked for the investigation of PVB personnel reported to have enriched themselves in office. In his letter to Senator Lorenzo M. Tañada, chairman of the Senate Blue Ribbon Committee, General Francisco said that some PVB officials and employees have been reported to him as living beyond their legitimate means as government officials.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who is an ardent champion of economy and is also an ardent champion of what is right, that he has very ample grounds for making the statement he has made. However, none of the $1 million conferred in this bill will go for construction of hospitals; it is exclusively for medical expenses of veterans. When the regular Independent Offices appropriation bill comes along, there will be an opportunity to look into the matter; and it is the intention of the chairman of the committee to see that this matter is gone into completely and thoroughly. I believe the Senator from Idaho is absolutely correct in the position he takes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the chairman of the committee. I have absolutely no reason to oppose any appropriation in implementation of funds for the Republic of the Philippines for the hospitalization of veterans of World War II.

On the other hand, there is evidence that there have been abuses and exploitation, and that the veterans of the Republic of the Philippines who are intended to be the beneficiaries of this program are becoming the innocent victims of a hospitalization racket. Certainly it is our business to investigate before we make the appropriations for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the

LIBRARIES

Senate to House bill 3053, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 19, 1953.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 30, 31, 32, and 42 to the bill (H. R. 3053) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$28,000,000" in said amendment, insert "$24,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert ": *Provided*, That for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, and for the succeeding fiscal year, each local educational agency of a State, which provides free public education during such year for children who reside with a parent employed by the Department of Defense on Federal property, other than in the District of Columbia, situated within reasonable commuting distance from the school district of such agency but not within the same State, shall be entitled to payments under the provisions of section 3 (b) of Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to such children in the same manner as if such Federal property were situated in the same State as such agency.

That the House insists upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24 and 27, and that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 33.

The motion was agreed to.

CASUALTIES IN KOREA—CONTINUATION OF TRADE BETWEEN WESTERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND RUSSIA AND SATELLITE COUNTRIES—35,520 DEAD, NEARLY 500,000 INJURED, NOT INCLUDING LAST 15 MONTHS' NONBATTLE CASUALTIES.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, an Associated Press dispatch published today, dated at Seoul, Korea, on March 20, states, in part:

KOREA WAR BACK WHERE IT BEGAN ON 1,000TH DAY—TROOPS FIGHT ON IN FOG AND 2 INCHES OF RAIN

SEOUL, KOREA, March 20.—Today is the 1,000th day of the costly, inconclusive Korean war with the battle line in the middle of the Asiatic peninsula. That's just about where the boundary was when North Korean troops invaded South Korea to start the war June 25, 1950.

I also have before me a dispatch by the Chicago Tribune Press Service, from New York, on March 20, reading in part as follows:

CANADIAN U. N. GROUP AFFIRMS "SOFT" RED POLICY

(By Chesly Manly)

NEW YORK, March 20.—Canada's delegation to the United Nations today reaffirmed its policy of conciliating the Soviet Union, whose veto in the security council is the sole obstacle to the appointment of Lester B. Pearson, Canada's external affairs minister, as secretary general of the U. N.

Mr. President, a dispatch dated about March 4 said that when Russia was charged with trading with and sending war materials to Communist China, that Russia had said that of course she was sending such war materials to Communist China under a mutual assistance security pact with Communist China.

At that time—March 6—the junior Senator from Nevada inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the controlling paragraph of the pact between Russia and Communist China, reading: "The high contracting parties (Russia and China) agree to afford one another all possible economic assistance in the postwar period."

ENGLAND-RUSSIA MUTUAL ASSISTANCE PACT

He also placed the corresponding paragraph of the mutual security pact between England and Russia in the record, reading:

The high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war.

Ten or 12 years are yet to run on those pacts.

FRANCE-RUSSIA MUTUAL SECURITY PACT

The corresponding paragraph of the mutual security pact between France and Russia was also placed in the RECORD on March 6, reading:

The high contracting parties agree to render each other every possible economic assistance after the war.

These are independent pacts, and all of them are in good standing with no indication that either party to such pacts intends to ask for relief.

THE ATLANTIC MUTUAL SECURITY PACT

I also placed in the RECORD the corresponding paragraph of the mutual security pact—the Atlantic Pact—between the United States and 11 European nations, including France and Britain—reading in part: "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them, to promote conditions of stability and well being, and to encourage economic collaboration."

Of course, it is well known and understood that Britain has recognized Communist China to preserve and maintain her trade as usual between Singapore and Hong Kong and Communist China.

SURROUNDED BY MUTUAL SECURITY PACTS

Mr. President, we are entirely surrounded with mutual security pacts. Also we were served due notice of the avowed intentions of England and France to trade with Russia and other Iron Curtain countries.

There is also the information, which now is reliably reported, and no longer denied, that Britain has continually sent tin, rubber, and manufactured goods from Hong Kong and Singapore into Communist China, and that such shipments continue to be made.

NEARLY 100 TRADE PACTS

We also know and have known from the beginning of the Marshal plan aid that the 17 Marshall plan European nations continue to trade with Russia and the satellite nations, with whom they have approximately 100 separate and distinct trade pacts, including sending just about everything to any potential enemy that Russia needs to fight world war III with us.

THIRTY-TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND TWENTY DEAD—NEARLY 500,000 INJURED—NOT INCLUDING THE LAST 15 MONTHS' NEW BATTLE CASUALTIES

It is well known and recognized that there are but a token number of troops from the European nations fighting with the United States troops in Korea.

Mr. President, I submit for the RECORD a tabulation to and including March 18, 1953. The number of men killed in action to be 23,209—23,209 troops, mostly American; missing, assumed to be dead, 223; missing, with no knowledge on the part of the Defense Department as to where these men are—men about whom little doubt is entertained that they are dead—9,088; prisoners of war, 2,305; wounded in action, 95,246.

A total, Mr. President, including killed in action, missing, and assumed to be dead, and missing, with present whereabouts unknown and with no other available information, a total of 32,520.

The record for nonbattle hospitalized injuries the first 18 months of the war—July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1951—totaled 401,628, of whom 3,340 died of such injuries.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To March 18, 1953

Killed in action	23,209
Missing (dead)	223
Missing (don't know)	9,089
	32,520
Prisoners of war	2,305
Wounded in action	95,246
Men wounded and injured—nonbattle, injuries July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1951—first 18 months of the war	401,628
Men who died as a result of nonbattle injuries	3,340
Total dead or missing (don't know where they are)	35,860

NON-BATTLE-HOSPITALIZED INJURED FROM JANUARY 1, 1952, TO MARCH 18, 1953

Mr. MALONE. The National Defense Office was unable to give me the number of hospitalized injured and the number of deaths resulting from such injuries for the last 15 months of the "police action" in Korea.

I have been told that these figures will be available within a few days and will be furnished me.

DEATHS AND INJURIES—BATTLE AND NONBATTLE

Mr. President, I call attention again to the fact that the total deaths, as a result of this war, can be presumed to be 35,860 as of March 18, 1953.

There are, Mr. President, 95,246 injured in battle to and including March 18, 1953, and that there are 401,628 additional men classified as non-battle-hospitalized injured up to December 31, 1951. The number of non-battle-hospitalized injured from December 31, 1951,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to March 18, 1953, is yet to be reported—also the number of deaths resulting from such injuries.

FURTHER INFORMATION FORTHCOMING

Mr. President, these figures were just secured from the Secretary of National Defense Public Relations Office. Within a few days, I am promised the data, the number of nonbattle casualties from January 1, 1952, to March 18, 1953. They could give me no information now.

I have been told they do not have these figures compiled, but that they will have them within a few days, and I promise the Senate a full report when I receive them. I think it can safely be assumed that, since there were many more men fighting during the past 16 months than there were during the first 18 months, that the nonbattle casualties will be at least equally high.

Mr. President, I now desire to introduce a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

BRIDGE CANYON DAM AND INCIDENTAL WORKS IN MAIN STREAM OF COLORADO RIVER JUST ABOVE LAKE MEAD—THE LOWER BASIN STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, located just above Lake Mead formed by Hoover Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1438) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am introducing this bill for the construction of Bridge Canyon Dam, for the storage of water and for power development on the Colorado River.

This is the fourth of a series of dams in the lower basin of the Colorado River, and is about as large as the gigantic Hoover Dam, formerly Boulder Dam, begun in 1930 and completed in 1935.

THREE-QUARTERS OF A MILLION KILOWATTS ELECTRICAL ENERGY

The installation for Bridge Canyon, which is located just above the headwaters of Lake Mead, is estimated to cost $325,310,000, and would generate approximately 750,000 kilowatts of electrical energy, which is roughly equal to the output at Hoover Dam.

OUTPUT WOULD RELIEVE TIGHT POWER SUPPLY

Mr. President, the construction of the dam would relieve the tight power supply in southwestern United States for national defense, and would aid greatly in the extension of necessary defense projects.

TITANIUM—A CLEAR MATERIAL

For example, more power is needed by the titanium project, located at Henderson, Nev., which is the largest titanium plant in the world at this moment. Titanium is twice as strong as aluminum per pound, much stronger than steel per pound, it does not corrode, even in sea water, and has many other qualities which make it absolutely necessary for the national defense, including the construction of airplanes, guided missiles, and other war material.

AID DEVELOPMENT LOWER BASIN STATES

The construction of the dam would aid and extend industrial development of the lower basin States in accordance with a long-range plan envisioned in 1928, when the Boulder Dam Project Act was passed during the Coolidge administration.

President Hoover signed the first appropriation bill to construct that important project, without which it would have been problematical whether we could have produced enough critical magnesium and other war material to win World War II.

COST REPAID WITH INTEREST

The cost of the entire project—Bridge Canyon Dam—will be repaid with interest over a definite amortization period, under the precedent set in 1928 in the construction of Hoover—Boulder—Dam. Power now generated at Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams is all contracted for and is in use at a price that will return to the Government, on a definite amortization plan, money that was advanced for construction by the Government from 1931 to 1935.

SPECIFICATIONS, PURPOSE, AND COST OF THE DAMS

Under terms of the bill, a dam at Bridge Canyon would have a height above bedrock of 740 feet and would form a reservoir with a capacity of 3,720,000 acre-feet.

Power to be developed is estimated to be 750,000 kilowatts. Crest length of the dam would be 1,950 feet.

Total estimated cost of Bridge Canyon dam and power project, according to 1952 estimates, would be $325,310,000 and would be divided as follows: $224,604,000 for the dam and reservoir; $92,219,000 for the power plant, and $8,491,000 for the Coconino Dam and Reservoir on the Little Colorado for regulatory purposes.

Construction of the dam would make it possible to reduce storage space reserved in Lake Mead for flood control, thus increasing average available power head for the Hoover Dam plant.

The construction of the project under terms of his legislation would advance the interest of all the Colorado River lower-basin States and that Nevada could easily utilize one-third of the power to be generated in her growing national defense industries when it was ready for delivery. The construction of Bridge Canyon Dam would take 5 years following passage of legislation.

FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF COLORADO RIVER

The junior Senator from Nevada is ready to join in introducing further legislation that would see the construction of Glenn Canyon Dam immediately above Bridge Canyon.

CONCLUSION OF 25-YEAR PLAN

Mr. President, construction of these dams would mean conclusion of a 25-year plan, first projected in 1927, beamed at the industrial development of the lower-basin States on the Colorado River.

TIME IS OPPORTUNE

The time for the construction of this project is opportune. In fact, it is overdue, Mr. President, because the Southwestern States have utilized all of the low-cost power developed within their area, and the national defense potential of these States is limited only by the amount of low-cost power and water which can be developed, and it is one more step in the great industrial development of the Southwest.

Besides producing urgently needed electricity and storing and controlling the waters of the Colorado River, the Bridge Canyon Dam would serve many other valuable uses, not the least of which is controlling the silt which now flows into Lake Mead, back of Hoover Dam.

FIRM POWER

When Bridge and Glenn Canyon—just above Bridge—are both constructed, all of the power produced in the entire lower basin States, if properly integrated from Glenn, Bridge, Hoover, Davis, and Parker Dams, will be firm power.

AUTHORIZATION TO VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL (H. R. 3053) DURING ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, following the adjournment today, the enrolled bill (H. R. 3053), the second supplemental appropriation bill which has just been passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until next Wednesday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned until Wednesday, March 25, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 23, 1953:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Lloyd H. Burke, of California, to be United States attorney for the northern district of California, vice Chauncey F. Tramutolo, resigning.

John F. Raper, Jr., of Wyoming, to be United States attorney for the district of Wyoming, vice John J. Hickey, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Howard C. Botts, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio, vice Harold K. Claypool, term expired.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Bernard A. Boos, of South Dakota, to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota, vice Theodore B. Werner, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947, (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, 80th Congress, and Public Law 36, 80th Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be lieutenant colonel

Harvey C. Slocum, MC, O2267647.

To be captains

Lindsey D. Campbell, MC, O1916284.
Andrew E. Cyrus, Jr., MC, O937119.
Thomas P. Mullaney, Jr., MC, O1706003.
William H. Sewell, MC, O1745349.

To be first lieutenants

Paul Berger, JAGC, O999345.
Joseph S. Churan, DC, O983321.
Wade J. Dahood, JAGC, O2210938.
John P. Devlin, MSC, O749383.
Jay G. Hanson, DC, O2104363.
Carl W. Lusby, Jr., DC, O988533.
Paul G. Tobin, JAGC, O1822077.

To be second lieutenants

Robbie F. Cooper, ANC, N900237.
Ellen F. Gubics, ANC, N804877.
Eunice M. LeBlanc, ANC, N900355.
Elizabeth E. Lothian, ANC, N805154.
Bernard K. Muirenin, MSC, O1933349.
Peyton E. Pitts, MSC, O1933538.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutentant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Forrest D. Tignor, Jr., O1928559.
Philip J. Cahill, O1891015.

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of section 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Officer has been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenant

AIR FORCE

Rippetoe, David E., Jr., 24755A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23, 1953:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Edward F. Howrey, of Virginia, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1952.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

George E. MacKinnon to be United States attorney for district of Minnesota.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

John J. Dermody for permanent appointment as commissioned ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective January 27, 1953.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and wisdom, we thank Thee for the gift of this new day with its many opportunities for the culture of our souls and for helpfulness to our fellow men.

Show us how we may enhance the quality of our character and our service for all mankind. May it never be our primary concern to add days to our life but may we strive sincerely to add life to our days.

Grant that in our individual and national life we may be more fully aware of the vulnerable side of our nature. God forbid that we should ever presume that we can breast the storms and headwinds of temptation and evil with our own puny strength.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 19, 1953, was read and approved.

RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tomorrow to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ABSENCE OF HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to explain to the House the absence of Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, who is a member both of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Un-American Activities. He has been sent to San Francisco to conduct hearings, and this will account for his absence today and succeeding days during which hearings are being held.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today and 15 minutes on Wednesday next, following special orders heretofore entered for these days.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested and intrigued with the little bag of tea we got from the District of Columbia Home Rule Committee the other day. I do not know whether this presages another "Washington Tea Party" along the lines of the Boston Tea Party or not, but it certainly points up very effectively one very good reason why the people of the District of Columbia should have home rule, the question being, of course, taxation without representation. I think that and many other reasons contributes to our obligation to deal with home rule for the District this year. There is in the Senate a bill, S. 999, sponsored, I believe, by some 32 Members of that body, and I am sure there are comparable bills here in the House which should receive the serious attention of the committee, and we should go ahead and make a reality the right of the citizens of the District of Columbia to vote.

SENSIBLE TAX RELIEF PROPOSAL

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 14, 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago I introduced H. R. 3911, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to remove the limitations on the amount of medical and dental expenses which may be deducted, and including amounts paid for accident or health insurance or payments to prepayment cooperative or other health or medical service plans.

This bill does not embody any new ideas. Similar proposals have been offerred in this House before. That it is one which people generally consider worthwhile is attested to by the great amount of mail that has come to me since its introduction, strongly favoring the proposal.

It is my sincere hope that in its general review of our tax laws, and in its consideration of more equitable ways of distribution of the tax burden, that the Ways and Means Committee give this measure serious consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 14, 1953, entitled "A Sensible Tax Relief Proposal," which briefly but very clearly outlines the purpose and intent of my bill:

A SENSIBLE TAX RELIEF PROPOSAL

One of the soundest proposals to give tax relief to those who are most in need of it has been introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman OLIVER P. BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio. His bill would permit the deduction from taxable income of all medical expenses, including the cost of belonging to voluntary hospitalization and medical insurance plans.

At present only taxpayers past the age of 65 may deduct all their medical and hospital expenses. Those below that age may deduct only such expenses which are in excess of 5 percent of their gross incomes, which means that a taxpayer must run up a sizable bill for sickness and injury before he can obtain any tax relief.

BOLTON'S proposal might also be regarded as a health measure, since it would provide an inducement to people to join medical and hospitalization plans and to seek medical

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

care when they need it, without waiting too long. They would know that they would receive partial compensation for the expenses involved in the form of lower income taxes.

This bill is far preferable to any form of socialized medicine that could be devised. It makes better sense to have the Government encourage people to look after their own health and to help them finance the cost through income-tax relief, instead of taxing everybody to establish a system of supposedly free Government medicine.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tomorrow night, Tuesday, March 24, 1953, to file a report on House Joint Resolution 226.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

PROVIDING FOR THE INCORPORATION OF CERTAIN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3704) to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 1. Short title.
Sec. 2. Definitions.
Sec. 3. Purposes.
Sec. 4. General powers.
Sec. 5. Power of corporation to acquire its own shares.
Sec. 6. Dealing in real estate as corporate purpose.
Sec. 7. Defense of ultra vires.
Sec. 8. Corporate name.
Sec. 9. Reserved name.
Sec. 10. Registered office and registered agent.
Sec. 11. Change of registered office or registered agent.
Sec. 12. Registered agent as an agent for service.
Sec. 13. Authorized shares.
Sec. 14. Issuance of shares of preferred or special classes in series.
Sec. 15. Subscriptions for shares.
Sec. 16. Consideration for shares.
Sec. 17. Payment for shares.
Sec. 18. Determination of amount of stated capital.
Sec. 19. Expenses of organization, reorganization, and financing.
Sec. 20. Certificates representing shares.
Sec. 21. Issuance of fractional shares or scrip.
Sec. 22. Liability of subscribers and shareholders.
Sec. 23. Shareholders' preemptive rights.
Sec. 24. Bylaws.
Sec. 25. Meetings of shareholders.
Sec. 26. Notice of shareholders' meetings.
Sec. 27. Voting of shares.
Sec. 28. Closing of transfer books and fixing record date.
Sec. 29. Voting of shares by certain holders.
Sec. 30. Voting trust.
Sec. 31. Quorum of shareholders.
Sec. 32. Board of directors.
Sec. 33. Number and election of directors.
Sec. 34. Classification of directors.
Sec. 35. Vacancies.
Sec. 36. Quorum of directors.
Sec. 37. Executive committee.
Sec. 38. Place of directors' meetings.
Sec. 39. Notice of directors' meetings.
Sec. 40. Dividends.
Sec. 41. Dividends in partial liquidation.
Sec. 42. Liability of directors in certain cases.
Sec. 43. Officers.
Sec. 44. Removal of officers.
Sec. 45. Books and records.
Sec. 46. Incorporators.
Sec. 47. Articles of incorporation.
Sec. 48. Filing of articles of incorporation.
Sec. 49. Effect of issuance of certificate of incorporation.
Sec. 50. Requirement before commencing business.
Sec. 51. Organization meeting of directors.
Sec. 52. Right to amend articles of incorporation.
Sec. 53. Procedure to amend articles of incorporation before acceptance of subscriptions to shares.
Sec. 54. Procedure to amend articles of incorporation after acceptance of subscription to shares.
Sec. 55. When entitled to vote by classes.
Sec. 56. Articles of amendment.
Sec. 57. Filing of articles of amendment.
Sec. 58. Effect of certificate of amendment.
Sec. 59. Redemption and cancellation of shares.
Sec. 60. Cancellation of reacquired shares.
Sec. 61. Reduction of stated capital in certain cases.
Sec. 62. Reduction of stated capital (continued).
Sec. 63. Reduction of paid-in surplus.
Sec. 64. Procedure for merger.
Sec. 65. Procedure for consolidation.
Sec. 66. Meetings of shareholders.
Sec. 67. Approval by shareholders.
Sec. 68. Articles of merger or consolidation.
Sec. 69. Effective date of merger or consolidation.
Sec. 70. Effect of merger or consolidation.
Sec. 71. Merger or consolidation of domestic and foreign corporations.
Sec. 72. Merger of parent corporation and wholly owned subsidiary.
Sec. 73. Rights of dissenting shareholders.
Sec. 74. Sale, lease, exchange, or mortgage of assets in usual and regular course of business.
Sec. 75. Sale, lease, exchange, or mortgage of assets other than in usual and regular course of business.
Sec. 76. Rights of dissenting shareholders.
Sec. 77. Voluntary dissolution of corporation by its incorporators.
Sec. 78. Dissolution by consent of shareholders.
Sec. 79. Dissolution by act of corporation.
Sec. 80. Filing of statement of intent to dissolve.
Sec. 81. Effect of statement of intent to dissolve.
Sec. 82. Proceedings after filing of statement of intent to dissolve.
Sec. 83. Revocation by consent of shareholders of voluntary dissolution proceedings.
Sec. 84. Revocation by act of corporation of voluntary dissolution proceedings.
Sec. 85. Filing of statement of revocation of voluntary dissolution proceedings.
Sec. 86. Effect of statement of revocation of voluntary dissolution proceedings.
Sec. 87. Articles of dissolution.
Sec. 88. Filing of articles of dissolution.
Sec. 89. Involuntary dissolution.
Sec. 90. Venue and process.
Sec. 91. Jurisdiction of court to liquidate assets and business of corporation.
Sec. 92. Procedure in liquidation of corporation by court.
Sec. 93. Qualifications of receivers.
Sec. 94. Filing of claims in liquidation proceedings.
Sec. 95. Discontinuance of liquidation proceedings.
Sec. 96. Decree of involuntary dissolution.
Sec. 97. Filing of decree of dissolution.
Sec. 98. Survival of remedy after dissolution.
Sec. 99. Annual report of domestic corporation.
Sec. 100. Admission of foreign corporation.
Sec. 101. Powers of foreign corporation.
Sec. 102. Corporate name of foreign corpotion.
Sec. 103. Change of name by foreign corporation.
Sec. 104. Application for certificate of authority.
Sec. 105. Filing of documents on application for certificate of authority.
Sec. 106. Effect of certificate of authority.
Sec. 107. Registered office and registered agent of foreign corporation.
Sec. 108. Change of registered office or registered agent of foreign corporation.
Sec. 109. Service of process on foreign corpotion.
Sec. 110. Amendment to articles of incorpotion of foreign corporation.
Sec. 111. Merger of foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District.
Sec. 112. Amended certificate of authority.
Sec. 113. Annual report of foreign corporations.
Sec. 114. Withdrawal of foreign corporation.
Sec. 115. Filing of application for withdrawal.
Sec. 116. Revocation of certificate of authority.
Sec. 117. Issuance of certificate of revocation.
Sec. 118. Effect of revocation or withdrawal upon actions and contracts.
Sec. 119. Application to foreign corporations transacting business on the effective date of this act.
Sec. 120. Transacting business without certificate of authority.
Sec. 121. Commissioners; duties and functions.
Sec. 122. Fees, franchise and license taxes, and charges.
Sec. 123. Effect of failure to pay annual franchise tax or to file annual report.
Sec. 124. Proclamation of revocation.
Sec. 125. Penalty for carrying on business after issuance of proclamation.
Sec. 126. Correction of error in proclamation.
Sec. 127. Reservation of name of proclaimed corporation.
Sec. 128. Reinstatement of proclaimed corporations.
Sec. 129. Penalty for failure to file annual report on time.
Sec. 130. Penalty for failure to maintain registered office or registered agent.
Sec. 131. Effect of nonpayment of fees.
Sec. 132. Penalties; violation or failure a misdemeanor.
Sec. 133. Rights and immunities of witnesses.
Sec. 134. Monopolies and restraint of trade.
Sec. 135. Waiver of notice.
Sec. 136. Voting requirements of articles of incorporation.
Sec. 137. Informal action by shareholders.
Sec. 138. Appeal from Commissioners.
Sec. 139. Certificates and certified copies of certain documents.
Sec. 140. Unauthorized assumption of corporate powers.
Sec. 141. Forms to be furnished by Commissioners.

LIBRARIES

Sec. 142. Reincorporation or incorporation of existing corporations.
Sec. 143. Effect of filing articles of reincorporation or certificates of incorporation.
Sec. 144. Transfer of duties of Recorder of Deeds.
Sec. 145. Constitutionality.
Sec. 146. Right of repeal reserved.
Sec. 147. Time of taking effect.

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act shall be known and may be cited as the "District of Columbia Business Corporation Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in and for the purposes of this act unless the context otherwise requires—

(a) "Corporation" or "domestic corporation" means a corporation subject to the provisions of this act, except a foreign corporation.

(b) "Foreign corporation" means a corporation for profit organized under laws other than the laws of the District of Columbia and special acts of Congress.

(c) "Articles of incorporation" include the original articles of incorporation and all amendments thereto, and include articles of merger or consolidation.

(d) "Subscriber" means one who subscribes for shares in a corporation, whether before or after incorporation.

(e) "Incorporator" means one of the signers of the original articles of incorporation.

(f) "Shares" are the units into which the shareholders' right to participate in the control of the corporation, in its surplus or profits, or in the distribution of its assets, are divided.

(g) "Shareholder" means one who is a holder of record of shares in a corporation.

(h) "Authorized shares" means the aggregate number of shares of all classes, whether with or without par value, which the corporation is authorized to issue.

(i) Shares of its own stock belonging to a corporation shall be deemed to be "issued" shares, but not "outstanding" shares.

(j) "Stated capital" means, at any particular time, the sum of (1) the par value of all shares then issued having a par value and (2) the consideration received by the corporation for all shares then issued without par value, except such part thereof as may have been allocated otherwise than to stated capital in a manner permitted by law, and (3) such amounts not included in clauses (1) or (2) of this paragraph as may have been transferred to the stated capital account of the corporation, whether upon the issue of shares as a share dividend or otherwise, minus such formal reductions from said sum as may have been effected in a manner permitted by law.

(k) "Paid-in surplus" means all that part of the consideration received by the corporation for, or on account of, all shares issued which does not constitute stated capital, whether heretofore or hereafter created by (1) the receipt by the corporation, for, or on account of, the issuance of shares having a par value of consideration in excess of the par value of such shares or (2) the allocation of any part of the consideration received by the corporation for, or on account of, the issuance of shares in a manner permitted by law or (3) a reduction of stated capital under this act, minus such formal reductions of paid-in surplus as may have been effected in a manner permitted by law.

(l) "Net assets," for the purpose of determining the right of a corporation to purchase its own shares and of determining the right of a corporation to declare and pay dividends and the liabilities of directors therefor, shall not include shares of its own stock belonging to such corporation.

(m) "Registered office" means that office maintained by the corporation, the address of which is on file with the Commissioners.

(n) "Insolvent" means that the corporation is unable to pay its debts as they become due in the usual course of its business.

(o) "State" means any State, Territory, colony, dependency, or possession of the United States of America, or any foreign country.

(p) "Commissioners" means the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the agent or agents designated by them to perform any function vested in the Commissioners by this act.

(q) "District" means the District of Columbia.

(r) "The court," except where otherwise specified, means the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(s) "Business by a foreign corporation" means the transaction of some substantial part of its corporate business, continuous in its character and not merely casual or occasional, and shall not include the prosecution of litigations, collection of its debts, or the taking of security for the same, or the appointment of an agent for the solicitation of business not transacted in the District: *Provided*, That mere procurement of orders for the sale of personal property by means of telephonic communication, written correspondence, or solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District shall not constitute transacting business within the District: *And provided further*, That the sale of personal property to the United States shall not be considered transacting business within the District unless a contract for such sale is accepted by the seller within the District or such property is delivered from stock of the seller within the District for use within the District.

PURPOSES

SEC. 3. Corporations for profit may be organized under this act for any lawful purpose or purposes, except for the purpose of banking or insurance or the acceptance and execution of trusts, the operation of railroads, or building and loan associations: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to relieve any public-utility corporation incorporated or reincorporated under the provisions of this act from complying with all applicable provisions of the laws of the District of Columbia relating to such corporations.

GENERAL POWERS

SEC. 4. Each corporation shall have power:

(a) To have perpetual succession by its corporate name unless a limited period of duration is stated in its articles of incorporation.

(b) To sue and be sued, complain and defend, in its corporate name.

(c) To have a corporate seal, which may be altered at pleasure, and to use the same by causing it, or a facsimile thereof, to be impressed or affixed or in any other manner reproduced.

(d) To purchase, take, receive, lease, take by gift, devise, or bequest, or otherwise acquire, and to own, hold, improve, use, and otherwise deal in and with real or personal property, or any interest therein, wherever situated.

(e) To sell, convey, mortgage, pledge, lease, exchange, transfer, and otherwise dispose of all or any part of its property and assets.

(f) To lend money to, and otherwise assist, its employees, other than its officers and directors.

(g) To purchase, take, receive, subscribe for, or otherwise acquire, own, hold, vote, use, employ, sell, mortgage, loan, pledge, or otherwise dispose of, and otherwise use and deal in and with, shares or other interests in, or obligations of, other corporations organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, of foreign corporations, and of associations, partnerships, or individuals.

(h) To make contracts and incur liabilities; to borrow money at such rates of interest as the corporation may determine without regard to the restrictions of any usury law; to issue its notes, bonds, and other obligations; and to secure any of its obligations by mortgage or pledge of all or any of its property, franchises, and income. No corporation formed hereunder shall plead any statutes against usury in any court of law or equity in any suit instituted to enforce the payment of any bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness issued or assumed by it.

(i) To invest its surplus funds from time to time and to lend money for its corporate purposes, and to take and hold real and personal property as security for the payment of funds so invested or loaned.

(j) To conduct its business, carry on its operations, and have offices and exercise the powers granted by this act within and without the District of Columbia and to exercise in any State, Territory, district, colony, or possession of the United States, or in any foreign country the powers granted by this act, subject to the laws of such State, Territory, District, colony, or possession of the United States, or such foreign country.

(k) To elect or appoint officers and agents of the corporation, and to define their duties and fix the compensation.

(l) To make and alter bylaws, not inconsistent with its articles of incorporation or with the laws of the District of Columbia, for the administration and regulation of the affairs of the corporation.

(m) To make contributions to charitable organizations, and, in time of war, to transact any lawful business in aid of the United States.

(n) To cease its corporate activities and surrender its corporate franchise.

(o) To have and exercise all powers necessary or convenient to effect any or all of the purposes for which the corporation is formed.

(p) To indemnify any and all of its directors or officers or former directors or officers or any person who may have served at its request as a director or officer of another corporation in which it owns shares of capital stock or of which it is a creditor against expenses actually and necessarily incurred by them in connection with the defense of any action, suit, or proceeding in which they, or any of them, are made parties, or a party, by reason of being or having been directors or officers or a director or officer of the corporation, or of such other corporation, except in relation to matters as to which any such director or officer or former director or officer or person shall be adjudged in such action, suit, or proceeding to be liable for negligence or misconduct in the performance of duty. Such indemnification shall not be deemed exclusive of any other rights to which those indemnified may be entitled under any bylaw, agreement, vote of stockholders, or otherwise.

POWER OF CORPORATION TO ACQUIRE ITS OWN SHARES

SEC. 5. A corporation shall have power to purchase, take, receive, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, pledge, transfer, or otherwise dispose of its own shares: *Provided*, That it shall not purchase, either directly or indirectly, its own shares when its net assets are less than the sum of its stated capital, its paid-in surplus, any surplus arising from unrealized appreciation in value or revaluation of its assets and any surplus arising from surrender to the corporation of any of its shares, or when by so doing its net assets would be reduced below such sum. Notwithstanding the foregoing limitations, a corporation may purchase or otherwise acquire its own shares for the purpose of—

(a) eliminating fractional shares;

(b) collecting or compromising claims of the corporation or any indebtedness to the corporation;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(c) paying dissenting shareholders entitled to payment for their shares under the provisions of this act;

(d) effecting the retirement of its redeemable shares by redemption or by purchase at not to exceed the redemption price, but no redemption or purchase of redeemable shares shall be made which will reduce the remaining assets of the corporation below an amount sufficient to pay all debts and known liabilities of the corporation as they mature, except such debts and liabilities as have been otherwise adequately provided for, or which will reduce the net assets below the aggregate amount payable to the holders of shares having prior or equal rights to the assets of the corporation upon dissolution.

DEALING IN REAL ESTATE AS CORPORATE PURPOSE

SEC. 6. A corporation having among its purposes, as set forth in its articles of incorporation, that of acquiring, owning, using, conveying, and otherwise disposing of and dealing in real property or any interest therein, shall have power and authority so to do without limitation.

DEFENSE OF ULTRA VIRES

SEC. 7. No act of a corporation and no conveyance or transfer of real or personal property to or by a corporation shall be invalid by reason of the fact that the corporation was without capacity or power to do such act or to make or receive such conveyance or transfer, but such lack of capacity or power may be asserted—

(a) in a proceeding by a shareholder against the corporation to enjoin the doing of any act or acts or the transfer of real or personal property by or to the corporation. If the authorized acts or transfer sought to be enjoined are being, or are to be, performed or made pursuant to any contract to which the corporation is a party, the court may, if all of the parties to the contract are parties to the proceeding and if it deems the same to be equitable, set aside and enjoin the performance of such contract, and in so doing may allow to the corporation or to the other parties to the contract, as the case may be, compensation for the loss or damage sustained by either of them which may result from the action of the court in setting aside and enjoining the performance of such contract, but anticipated profits to be derived from the performance of the contract shall not be awarded by the court as a loss or damage sustained;

(b) in a proceeding by the corporation, whether acting directly or through a receiver, trustee, or other legal representative, or through shareholders in a representative suit, against the incumbent or former officers or directors of the corporation;

(c) in a proceeding by the Commissioners, as provided in this act, to dissolve the corporation, or in a proceeding by the Commissioners to enjoin the corporation from the transaction of unauthorized business.

CORPORATE NAME

SEC. 8. The corporate name—

(a) shall contain the word "corporation," "company," "incorporated," or "limited," or shall contain an abbreviation of one of such words;

(b) shall not contain any word or phrase which indicates or implies that it is organized for any purpose other than one or more of the purposes contained in its articles of incorporation;

(c) shall not be the same as, or deceptively similar to, the name of any domestic corporation, or that of any corporation organized under any act of Congress authorizing the formation of corporations under the laws of the District of Columbia, or that of any corporation created pursuant to any special act of Congress to transact business in the District of Columbia, or that of any foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District of Columbia, or a name the exclusive right to which is at the time reserved in the manner provided in this act.

RESERVED NAME

SEC. 9. (a) The exclusive right to the use of a corporate name may be reserved by—

(1) any person intending to organize a corporation under this act or any other act for the organization of a corporation under the laws of the District of Columbia;

(2) any corporation organized under this act proposing to change its name;

(3) any corporation organized under any law other than this act proposing to reincorporate under this act;

(4) any foreign corporation intending to make application for a certificate of authority to transact business in the District of Columbia;

(5) any foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District of Columbia and intending to change its name;

(6) any person intending to organize a foreign corporation and intending to have such corporation make application for a certificate of authority to transact business in the District of Columbia.

(b) The reservation shall be made by filing with the Commissioners an application to reserve a specified corporate name, executed by the applicant. If the Commissioners find that the name is available for corporate use, they shall reserve the same for the exclusive use of the applicant for a period of 60 days.

(c) The right to the exclusive use of a specified corporate name so reserved may be transferred to any other person or corporation by filing with the Commissioners a notice of such transfer, executed by the applicant for whom the name was reserved, and specifying the name and address of the transferee.

REGISTERED OFFICE AND REGISTERED AGENT

SEC. 10. Each corporation shall have and continuously maintain in the District of Columbia—

(a) a registered office which may be, but need not be, the same as its place of business;

(b) a registered agent, which agent may be either an individual resident in the District of Columbia whose business office is identical with such registered office, or a corporation authorized by the articles of incorporation to act as such agent and authorized to transact business in the District of Columbia having a business office identical with such registered office.

CHANGE OF REGISTERED OFFICE OR REGISTERED AGENT

SEC. 11. (a) A corporation may change its registered office or change its registered agent, or both, by filing with the Commissioners a statement setting forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the address, including street and number, if any, of its then registered office;

(3) if the address of its registered office be changed, the address, including street and number, if any, to which the registered office is to be changed;

(4) the name of its then registered agent;

(5) if its registered agent be changed, the name of its successor registered agent;

(6) that the address of its registered office and the address of the business office of its registered agent, as changed, will be identical; and

(7) that such change was authorized by resolution duly adopted by its board of directors or was authorized by an officer of the corporation duly empowered to make such change.

(b) Such statement shall be executed by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, and delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to the provisions of this act, they shall file such statement.

(c) The change of address of the registered office, or the change of registered agent, or both, as the case may be, shall become effective upon the filing of such statement by the Commissioners.

REGISTERED AGENT AS AN AGENT FOR SERVICE

SEC. 12. (a) The registered agent so appointed by a corporation shall be an agent of such corporation upon whom process against the corporation may be served, and upon whom any notice or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon the corporation may be served. Service of any process, notice, or demand upon a corporate agent, as such agent, may be had by delivering a copy of such process, notice, or demand to the president, vice president, the secretary, or an assistant secretary of such corporate agent.

(b) In the event a corporation shall fail to appoint or maintain a registered agent, then the Commissioners are hereby irrevocably appointed as an agent of such corporation upon whom any such process, notice, or demand may be served. Service on the Commissioners of any such process, notice, or demand shall be made by delivering to and leaving with them duplicate copies of such process, notice, or demand. In the event any such process, notice, or demand is served on the Commissioners, they shall immediately cause one of such copies thereof to be forwarded by registered mail, addressed to the corporation at its registered office. Any service so had on the Commissioners shall be returnable in not less than 30 days.

(c) The Commissioners shall keep a record of all processes, notices, and demands served upon them under this section, and shall record therein the time of such service and their action with respect thereto.

(d) Nothing herein contained shall limit or affect the right to serve any process, notice, or demand, required or permitted by law to be served upon a corporation in any other manner now or hereafter permitted by law.

AUTHORIZED SHARES

SEC. 13. (a) Each corporation shall have power to create and issue the number of shares stated in its articles of incorporation. Such shares may be divided into one or more classes, any or all of which classes may consist of shares with par value or shares without par value, with such designations, preferences, voting powers, special or relative rights and such limitations, restrictions, or qualifications thereof as shall be stated in the articles of incorporation. The articles of incorporation may limit or deny the voting power of the shares of any class.

(b) Without limiting the authority herein contained, a corporation, when so provided in its articles of incorporation, may issue shares of preferred or special classes—

(1) subject to the right of the corporation to redeem any of such shares at the price fixed by the articles of incorporation for the redemption thereof;

(2) entitling the holders thereof to cumulative or noncumulative dividends;

(3) having preference over any other class or classes of shares as to the payment of dividends;

(4) having preference as to the assets of the corporation over any other class or classes of shares upon the voluntary or involuntary liquidation of the corporation;

(5) convertible into shares of any other class: *Provided*, That shares without par value shall not be converted into shares with par value unless that part of the stated capital of the corporation represented by such shares without par value is, at the time of conversion, at least equal to the aggregate par value of the shares into which the shares without par value are to be converted.

ISSUANCE OF SHARES OF PREFERRED OR SPECIAL CLASSES IN SERIES

SEC. 14. (a) If the articles of incorporation so provide, the shares of any preferred or special class may be divided into and issued

in series. If the shares of any such class are to be issued in series, then each series shall be so designated as to distinguish the shares thereof from the shares of all other series and classes. Any or all of the series of any such class and the variations in the relative rights and preferences as between different series may be fixed and determined by the articles of incorporation: *Provided*, That all shares of the same class shall be identical except as to the following relative rights and preferences, in respect of any or all of which there may be variations between different series:

(1) The rate of dividend.

(2) The price at and the terms and conditions on which shares may be redeemed.

(3) The amount payable upon shares in event of involuntary liquidation.

(4) The amount payable upon shares in event of voluntary liquidation.

(5) Sinking-fund provisions for the redemption or purchase of shares.

(6) The terms and conditions on which shares may be converted, if the shares of any series are issued with the privilege of conversion.

(b) If the articles of incorporation shall expressly vest authority in the board of directors, then, to the extent that the articles of incorporation shall not have established series and fixed and determined in the variations in the relative rights and preferences as between series, the board of directors shall have authority to divide any or all of such classes into series and, without the limitations set forth in this section, fix and determine the relative rights and preferences of the shares of any series so established: *Provided*, That such authority of the board of directors shall be subject to such further limitations, if any, as are stated in the articles of incorporation and shall always be subject to the limitation that the board of directors shall not create a sinking fund in respect of any series unless provision for a sinking fund at least as beneficial to all issued and outstanding shares of the same class shall either then exist or be at the same time created.

(c) In order for the board of directors to establish a series, where authority so to do is contained in the articles of incorporation, the board of directors shall adopt a resolution setting forth the designation of the series and fixing and determining the relative rights and preferences thereof, or so much thereof as shall not be fixed and determined by the articles of incorporation.

(d) Prior to the issue of any shares of a series established by resolution adopted by the board of directors, the corporation shall file with the Commissioners a statement setting forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) a copy of the resolution establishing and designating the series, and fixing and determining the relative rights and preferences thereof;

(3) the date of adoption of such resolution;

(4) that such resolution was duly adopted by the board of directors.

(e) Such statement shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, and shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall, when all franchise taxes, fees, and charges have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) return the other duplicate original to the corporation or its representative.

(f) The duplicate original returned by the Commissioners shall be filed for record in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(g) Upon the filing of such statement by the Commissioners, the resolution establishing and designating the series and fixing and determining the relative rights and preferences thereof shall become effective.

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR SHARES

SEC. 15. (a) A subscription for shares of a corporation to be organized shall be irrevocable for a period of 6 months unless otherwise provided by the terms of the subscription agreement, or unless all of the subscribers consent to the revocation of such subscription.

(b) Unless otherwise provided in the subscription agreement, subscriptions for shares, whether made before or after the organization of a corporation, shall be paid in full at such time, or in such installments and at such times, as shall be determined by the board of directors. Any call made by the board of directors for payment on subscriptions shall be uniform as to all shares of the same class. In case of default in the payment of any installment or call when such payment is due, the corporation may proceed to collect the amount due in the same manner as any debt due the corporation. The bylaws may prescribe other penalties for failure to pay installments or calls that may become due, but no penalty working a forfeiture of the shares, or the amounts paid thereon, shall be declared as against any subscriber unless the amount due thereon shall remain unpaid for a period of 20 days after written demand has been made therefor. Such written demand shall be deemed to be made when deposited in the United States mail in a sealed envelope addressed to the subscriber at his last post-office address known to the corporation, with the postage thereon prepaid. In the event of the sale of any shares by reason of any forfeiture, the excess of proceeds realized over the amount due and unpaid on such shares shall be paid to the delinquent subscriber or to his legal representative.

CONSIDERATION FOR SHARES

SEC. 16. (a) Shares having a par value may be issued for such consideration, not less than the par value thereof, as shall be fixed from time to time by the board of directors.

(b) Shares without par value may be issued for such consideration as may be fixed from time to time by the board of directors unless the articles of incorporation reserve to the shareholders the right to fix the consideration. In the event that such right be reserved as to any shares, the shareholders shall, prior to the issuance of such shares, fix the consideration to be received for such shares, by a vote of the holders of a majority of all outstanding shares entitled to vote thereon.

(c) Shares of a corporation issued and thereafter acquired by it may be disposed of by the corporation for such consideration as may be fixed from time to time by the board of directors.

(d) That part of the surplus of a corporation which is transferred to stated capital upon the issuance of shares as a share dividend shall be deemed to be the consideration for the issuance of such shares.

(e) In the event of an exchange of issued shares having a par value for a different number of shares having the same aggregate par value, whether of the same or of a different class or classes, or in the event of a conversion of shares, or in the event of an exchange of shares with or without par value into the same or a different number of shares without par value, whether of the same or a different class or classes, the consideration for the shares so issued in exchange shall be deemed to be (1) the consideration originally received for the shares so exchanged or converted; and (2) that part of surplus, if any, transferred to stated capital upon the issuance of shares for the shares so exchanged or converted; and (3) any additional consideration paid to the corporation upon the issuance of shares for the shares so exchanged or converted.

PAYMENT FOR SHARES

SEC. 17. (a) The consideration for the issuance of shares may be paid, in whole or in part, in money, in other property, tangible or intangible, or in labor or services actually performed for the corporation. When payment of the consideration for which shares are to be issued, which, in the case of shares having a par value, shall be not less than the par value thereof, shall have been received by the corporation, such shares shall be deemed to be full paid and nonassessable.

(b) Neither promissory notes nor future services shall constitute payment or part payment for shares of a corporation.

(c) In the absence of fraud in the transaction, the judgment of the board of directors or the shareholders, as the case may be, as to the value of the consideration received for shares shall be conclusive.

DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF STATED CAPITAL

SEC. 18. (a) A corporation may determine that only a part of the consideration for which its shares may be issued, from time to time, shall be stated capital: *Provided*, That in the event of any such determination—

(1) if the shares issued shall consist wholly of shares having a par value, then the stated capital represented by such shares shall be not less than the aggregate par value of the shares so issued;

(2) if the shares issued shall consist wholly of shares without par value all of which shares have a preferential right in the assets of the corporation in the event of its involuntary liquidation, then the stated capital represented by such shares shall be not less than the aggregate preferential amount payable upon such shares in the event of involuntary liquidation;

(3) if the shares issued consist wholly of shares without par value, and none of such shares has a preferential right in the assets of the corporation in the event of its involuntary liquidation, then the stated capital represented by such shares shall be the total consideration received therefor less such part thereof as may be allocated to paid-in surplus;

(4) if the shares issued shall consist of several or all of the classes of shares enumerated in (a), (b), and (c) of this section, then the stated capital represented by such shares shall be not less than the aggregate par value of any shares so issued having a par value and the aggregate preferential amount payable upon any shares so issued without par value having a preferential right in the event of involuntary liquidation.

(b) In order to determine that only a part of the consideration for which shares without par value may be issued from time to time shall be stated capital, the board of directors shall adopt a resolution setting forth the part of such consideration allocated to stated capital and the part otherwise allocated, and expressing such allocation in dollars. If the board of directors shall not have determined (a) at the time of the issuance of any shares issued for cash, or (b) within 60 days after the issuance of any shares issued for labor or services actually performed for the corporation or issued for property other than cash, that only a part of the consideration for shares so issued shall be stated capital, then the stated capital of the corporation represented by such shares shall be an amount equal to the aggregate par value of all such shares having a par value, plus the consideration received for all such shares without par value.

(c) The stated capital of the corporation may be increased from time to time by resolution of the board of directors directing that all or a part of the paid-in or other surplus of the corporation be transferred to stated capital. The board of directors may

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

direct that the amount of the surplus so transferred shall be deemed to be stated capital in respect of any designated class of shares.

EXPENSES OF ORGANIZATION, REORGANIZATION, AND FINANCING

SEC. 19. The reasonable charges and expenses of organization or reorganization of a corporation and reasonable compensation for the sale or underwriting of its shares may be paid or allowed by such corporation out of the consideration received by it in payment for its shares without thereby rendering such shares not full paid and nonassessable.

CERTIFICATES REPRESENTING SHARES

SEC. 20. (a) The shares of a corporation shall be represented by certificates signed by the president or a vice president and the secretary or an assistant secretary and sealed with the seal of the corporation. Such seal may be a facsimile. Where such a certificate is countersigned by a transfer agent other than the corporation itself or an employee of the corporation, or by a transfer clerk and registered by a registrar, the signatures of the president or vice president and the secretary or assistant secretary upon such certificate may be facsimiles. In case any officer who has signed or whose facsimile signature has been placed upon such certificate shall have ceased to be such officer before such certificate is issued, it may be issued by the corporation with the same effect as if such officer had not ceased to hold such office at the date of its issue.

(b) Every certificate representing shares issued by a corporation which is authorized to issue shares the transferability of which is restricted or limited shall state upon the face or back thereof, in full or in the form of a summary, all of the limitations and restrictions upon the transferability thereof.

(c) Every certificate representing shares issued by a corporation which is authorized to issue shares of more than one class shall state upon the face or back thereof, in full or in the form of a summary, all of the designations, preferences, limitations, and relative rights of the shares of each class authorized to be issued, and, if the corporation is authorized to issue any preferred or special class in series, the variations in the relative rights and preferences between the shares of each such series so far as the same have been fixed and determined and the authority of the board of directors to fix and determine the relative rights and preferences of subsequent series.

(d) Each certificate representing shares shall also state—

(1) that the corporation is organized under the laws of the District of Columbia;

(2) the name of the person to whom issued;

(3) the number and class of shares which such certificate represents;

(4) the par value of each share represented by such certificate, or a statement that the shares are without par value.

(e) No certificate shall be issued for any share until such share is full paid.

ISSUANCE OF FRACTIONAL SHARES OR SCRIP

SEC. 21. A corporation may, but shall not be obliged to, issue a certificate for a fractional share, and, by action of its board of directors, may issue in lieu thereof scrip or other evidence of ownership, which shall entitle the holder to receive a certificate for a full share upon the surrender of such scrip or other evidence of ownership aggregating a full share, but which shall not, unless otherwise provided, entitle the holder to exercise any voting right, or to receive dividends thereon or to participate in any of the assets of the corporation in the event of liquidation. The board of directors may cause such scrip or evidence of ownership to be issued subject to the condition that it shall become void if not exchanged for certificates representing full shares before a specified date, or subject to the condition that the shares for which such scrip or evidence of ownership is exchangeable may be sold by the corporation and the proceeds thereof distributed to the holders of such scrip or evidence of ownership, or subject to any other conditions which the board of directors may deem advisable.

LIABILITY OF SUBSCRIBERS AND SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 22. (a) A holder of or subscriber to shares of a corporation shall be under no obligation to the corporation or its creditors with respect to such shares other than the obligation to pay to the corporation the full consideration for which said shares were issued or to be issued, which, as to shares having a par value, shall be not less than the par value thereof. Any person becoming an assignee or transferee of shares or of a subscription for shares in good faith and without knowledge or notice that the full consideration therefor has not been paid sha'l not be personally liable to the corporation or its creditors for any unpaid portion of such consideration.

(b) No person holding shares as executor, administrator, conservator, guardian, trustee, assignee for the benefit of creditors, or receiver shall be personally liable as a shareholder, but the estate and funds in the hands of said executor, administrator, conservator, guardian, trustee, assignee, or receiver shall be so liable. No pledgee or other holder of shares as collateral security shall be personally liable as a shareholder.

SHAREHOLDERS' PREEMPTIVE RIGHTS

SEC. 23. (a) The preemptive right of a shareholder to acquire additional shares of a corporation may be limited or denied to the extent provided in the articles of incorporation.

(b) Unless otherwise provided by its articles of incorporation, any corporation may issue and sell its shares to its employees or to the employees of any subsidiary corporation, without first offering such shares to its shareholders, for such consideration and upon such terms and conditions as shall be approved by the holders of two-thirds of its shares entitled to vote or by its board of directors pursuant to like approval of the shareholders.

BYLAWS

SEC. 24. The power to make, alter, amend, or repeal the bylaws of the corporation shall be vested in the board of directors unless reserved to the shareholders by the articles of incorporation. The bylaws may contain any provisions for the regulation and management of the affairs of the corporation not inconsistent with law or the articles of incorporation.

MEETINGS OF SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 25. (a) Meetings of shareholders may be held at such place within or without the District of Columbia as may be provided in the bylaws. In the absence of any such provision, all meetings shall be held at the registered office of the corporation.

(b) An annual meeting of the shareholders shall be held at such time as may be provided in the bylaws. Failure to hold the annual meeting at the designated time shall not work a forfeiture or dissolution of the corporation.

(c) Special meetings of the shareholders may be called by the president, the secretary, the board of directors, the holders of not less than one-fifth of all the outstanding shares entitled to vote, or by such other officers or persons as may be provided in the articles of incorporation or the bylaws.

NOTICE OF SHAREHOLDERS' MEETINGS

SEC. 26. Written or printed notice stating the place, day, and hour of the meeting, and, in case of a special meeting, the purpose or purposes for which the meeting is called, shall be delivered not less than 10 nor more than 50 days before the date of the meeting, either personally or by mail, by or at the direction of the president, the secretary, or the officer or person calling the meeting, to each shareholder of record entitled to vote at such meeting. If mailed, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when deposited in the United States mail addressed to the shareholder at his address as it appears on the records of the corporation, with postage thereon prepaid.

VOTING OF SHARES

SEC. 27. (a) Unless otherwise provided in the articles of incorporation, each outstanding share shall be entitled to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at a meeting of shareholders.

(b) Shares of its own stock belonging to a corporation shall not be voted, directly or indirectly, at any meeting and shall not be counted in determining the total number of outstanding shares at any given time, but shares of its own stock held by it in a fiduciary capacity may be voted and shall be counted in determining the total number of outstanding shares at any given time.

(c) A shareholder may vote either in person or by proxy executed in writing by the shareholder or by his duly authorized attorney in fact. No proxy shall be valid after 11 months from the date of its execution, unless otherwise provided in the proxy. Every proxy shall be revocable at the pleasure of the person executing it or his personal representatives or assigns; but the parties to a valid pledge or to an executory contract of sale may agree in writing as to which of them shall vote the stock pledged or sold until the contract of pledge or sale is fully executed.

(d) The articles of incorporation may provide that in all elections for directors every shareholder entitled to vote shall have the right to vote, in person or by proxy, the number of shares owned by him, for as many persons as there are directors to be elected, or to cumulate said shares, and give one candidate as many votes as the number of such directors multiplied by the number of his shares shall equal, or to distribute such votes on the same principle among any number of such candidates.

CLOSING OF TRANSFER BOOKS AND FIXING RECORD DATE

SEC. 28. For the purpose of determining shareholders entitled to notice of or to vote at any meeting of shareholders, or shareholders entitled to receive payment of any dividend, or in order to make a determination of shareholders for any other proper purpose, the board of directors of a corporation may provide that the stock-transfer books shall be closed for a stated period but not to exceed, in any case, 50 days. If the stock-transfer books shall be closed for the purpose of determining shareholders entitled to notice of or to vote at a meeting of shareholders, such books shall be closed for at least 10 days immediately preceding such meeting. In lieu of closing the stock-transfer books, the board of directors may fix in advance a date as the record date for any determination of shareholders, such date in any case to be not more than 50 days and, in case of a meeting of shareholders, not less than 10 days prior to the date on which the particular action, requiring such determination of shareholders, is to be taken. If the stock-transfer books are not closed and no record date is fixed for the determination of shareholders entitled to notice of or to vote at a meeting of shareholders, or shareholders entitled to receive payment of a dividend, the date on which notice of the meeting is mailed or the date on which the resolution of the board of directors declaring such dividend is adopted, as the case may be, shall be the record date for such determination of shareholders.

VOTING OF SHARES BY CERTAIN HOLDERS

SEC. 29. (a) Shares standing in the name of another corporation may be voted by such officer, agent, or proxy as the bylaws of such

corporation may prescribe, or, in the absence of such provision, as the board of directors of such corporation may determine.

(b) Shares standing in the name of a deceased person may be voted by his administrator or executor, either in person or by proxy. Shares standing in the name of a guardian, conservator, or trustee may be voted by such fiduciary, either in person or by proxy, but no guardian, conservator, or trustee shall be entitled, as such fiduciary, to vote shares held by him without a transfer of such shares into his name.

(c) Shares standing in the name of a receiver or a trustee in bankruptcy may be voted by such receiver or trustee, and shares held by or under the control of a receiver or a trustee in bankruptcy may be voted by such receiver or trustee without the transfer thereof into his name if authority so to do be contained in an appropriate order of the court by which such receiver or trustee in bankruptcy was appointed.

(d) Except as otherwise provided in section 27, a shareholder whose shares are pledged shall be entitled to vote such shares until the shares have been transferred into the name of the pledgee, and thereafter the pledgee shall be entitled to vote the shares so transferred.

VOTING TRUST

SEC. 30. Any number of shareholders of a corporation may create a voting trust for the purpose of conferring upon a trustee or trustees the right to vote or otherwise represent their shares, for a period of not to exceed 10 years, by entering into a written voting trust agreement specifying the terms and conditions of the voting trust, by depositing a counterpart of the agreement with the corporation at its registered office, and by transferring their shares to such trustee or trustees for the purposes of the agreement. The counterpart of the voting-trust agreement so deposited with the corporation shall be subject to the same right of examination by a shareholder of the corporation, in person or by agent or attorney, as is the record of shareholders of the corporation, and shall be subject to examination by any holder of a beneficial interest in the voting trust, either in person or by agent or attorney, at any reasonable time for any proper purpose. The trustee or trustees may execute and deliver to the transferors voting-trust certificates which shall be transferable in the same manner and with the same effect as certificates representing shares.

QUORUM OF SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 31. (a) Unless otherwise provided in the articles of incorporation or bylaws, a majority of the outstanding shares having voting power, represented in person or by proxy, shall constitute a quorum at a meeting of shareholders: *Provided*, That in no event shall a quorum consist of less than one-third of the outstanding shares having voting power.

(b) The shareholders present at a duly organized meeting may continue to do business until adjournment, notwithstanding the withdrawal of enough shareholders to leave less than a quorum.

(c) If a meeting cannot be organized because a quorum has not attended, those present may adjourn the meeting from time to time until a quorum is present when any business may be transacted that may have been transacted at the meeting as originally called.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 32. The business and affairs of a corporation shall be managed by a board of directors. Directors need not be shareholders in the corporation unless the articles of incorporation or bylaws so provide. The articles of incorporation or bylaws may prescribe other qualifications for directors.

NUMBER AND ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 33. The number of directors of a corporation shall not be less than three. Subject to such limitation, the number of directors shall be fixed by the bylaws, except as to the number constituting the first board of directors, which number shall be fixed by the articles of incorporation. The number of directors may be increased or decreased from time to time by amendment to the bylaws. In the absence of a bylaw fixing the number of directors, the number shall be the same as that stated in the articles of incorporation. The names and addresses of the members of the first board of directors shall be stated in the articles of incorporation. Such persons shall hold office until the first annual meeting of shareholders, or until their successors have been elected and qualified. At the first annual meeting of shareholders and at each annual meeting thereafter the shareholders shall elect directors to hold office until the next succeeding annual meeting, except as hereinafter provided. Each director shall hold office for the term for which he is elected or until his successor shall have been elected and qualified.

CLASSIFICATION OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 34. The bylaws may provide that the directors be divided into either 2 or 3 classes, each class to be as nearly equal in number as possible, the term of office of directors of the first class to expire at the first annual meeting of shareholders after their election, that of the second class to expire at the second annual meeting after their election, and that of the third class, if any, to expire at the third annual meeting after their election. At each annual meeting after such classification the number of directors equal to the number of the class whose term expires at the time of such meeting shall be elected to hold office until the second succeeding annual meeting, if there be 2 classes, or until the third succeeding annual meeting, if there be 3 classes. No classification of directors shall be effective prior to the first annual meeting of shareholders.

VACANCIES

SEC. 35. Any directorship to be filled by reason of an increase in the number of directors may be filled by election at an annual meeting or at a special meeting of shareholders entitled to vote called for that purpose. Any vacancy occurring in the board of directors for any cause other than by reason of an increase in the number of directors may be filled by the board of directors. A director elected to fill a vacancy shall be elected for the unexpired term of his predecessor in office.

QUORUM OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 36. A majority of the number of directors fixed by the bylaws, or in the absence of a bylaw fixing the number of directors, then of the number stated in the articles of incorporation, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business unless a greater number is required by the articles of incorporation or the bylaws. The act of the majority of the directors present at a meeting at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the board of directors, unless the act of a greater number is required by the articles of incorporation or the bylaws.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 37. If the bylaws so provide, the board of directors, by resolution adopted by a majority of the number of directors fixed by the bylaws, or in the absence of a bylaw fixing the number of directors, then of the number stated in the articles of incorporation, may designate two or more directors to constitute an executive committee, which committee, to the extent provided in such resolution or in the bylaws of the corporation shall have and may exercise all of the authority of the board of directors in the management of the business and affairs of the corporation; but the designation of such committee and the delegation thereto of authority shall not operate to relieve the board of directors, or any member thereof, of any responsibility imposed upon it or him by law.

PLACE OF DIRECTORS' MEETINGS

SEC. 38. Meetings of the board of directors, regular or special, may be held at such place within or without the District of Columbia as may be provided in the bylaws or by resolution adopted by a majority of the board of directors.

NOTICE OF DIRECTORS' MEETINGS

SEC. 39. Meetings of the board of directors shall be held upon such notice as is prescribed in the bylaws. Attendance of a director at a meeting shall constitute a waiver of notice of such meeting, except where a director attends a meeting for the express purpose of objecting to the transaction of any business because the meeting is not lawfully called or convened. Neither the business to be transacted at, nor the purpose of, any regular or special meeting of the board of directors need be specified in the notice or waiver of notice of such meeting.

DIVIDENDS

SEC. 40. The board of directors of a corporation may declare and the corporation may pay dividends on its outstanding shares in cash, property, or its own shares, subject to the following provisions:

(a) No dividend shall be declared or paid at a time when the corporation is insolvent or its net assets are less than its stated capital, or when payments thereof would render the corporation insolvent or reduce its net assets below its stated capital.

(b) Dividends may be paid out of paid-in surplus or surplus arising from the surrender to the corporation of any of its shares only upon shares having a preferential right to receive dividends, provided that the source of such dividends shall be disclosed to the shareholders receiving such dividends, concurrently with payment thereof. The limitations of this subparagraph shall not limit nor be deemed to conflict with the provisions of this act in respect of the distribution of assets as a liquidating dividend.

(c) If a dividend is declared payable in its own shares having a par value, such shares shall be issued at the par value thereof and there shall be transferred to stated capital at the time such dividend is paid, an amount of surplus equal to the aggregate par value of the shares to be issued as a dividend.

(d) If a dividend is declared payable in its own shares without par value, such shares shall be issued at such value as shall be fixed by the board of directors by resolution adopted at the time such dividend is declared, and there shall be transferred to stated capital at the time such dividend is paid, an amount of surplus equal to the aggregate value so fixed in respect of such shares. The amount per share transferred to stated capital shall be disclosed to the shareholders receiving such dividends, concurrently with payment thereof.

(e) A splitup or division of issued shares into a greater number of shares of the same class shall not be construed to be a share dividend within the meaning of this section.

(f) No dividend shall be declared or paid contrary to any restrictions contained in the articles of incorporation.

(g) Subject to any restrictions contained in its articles of incorporation, the directors of any corporation engaged in the exploitation of wasting assets may determine the net profits derived from the exploitation of such wasting assets without taking into consideration the depletion of such wasting assets resulting from lapse of time or from necessary consumption of such assets incidental to their exploitation and may pay dividends from the net profits so determined by the directors.

DIVIDENDS IN PARTIAL LIQUIDATION

SEC. 41. A corporation, from time to time, may distribute a portion of its assets, in cash or kind, to its shareholders as a liqui-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARY

dating dividend, in the following manner and subject to the following restrictions:

(a) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution recommending the payment of a liquidating dividend, specifying the class or classes of shareholders entitled thereto and the amount thereof, and directing that the question of such distribution be submitted to a vote at a meeting of shareholders, which may be either an annual or a special meeting.

(b) Written or printed notice stating that the purpose or one of the purposes of such meeting is to consider the question of such distribution shall be given to each shareholder of record entitled to vote within the time and in the manner provided in this act for the giving of notice of meetings of shareholders. If such meeting be an annual meeting, such purpose may be included in the notice of such meeting.

(c) At such meeting a vote of the shareholders entitled to vote shall be taken by classes on the question of the proposed distribution. The affirmative vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares of each class shall be required for the authorization of such distribution.

(d) No such distribution shall be made at a time when the corporation is insolvent or its net assets are less than its stated capital, or when such distribution would render the corporation insolvent or reduce its net assets below its stated capital.

(e) No such distribution shall be made to any class of shareholders unless all cumulative dividends accrued on preferred or special classes of shares entitled to preferential dividends shall have been fully paid.

(f) No such distribution shall be made to any class of shareholders which will reduce the remaining net assets below the aggregate preferential amount payable in event of voluntary liquidation to the holders of shares having preferential rights to the assets of the corporation in the event of liquidation.

(g) Each such distribution, when made, shall be identified as a liquidating dividend and the amount per share shall be disclosed to the shareholders receiving the same, concurrently with the payment thereof.

LIABILITY OF DIRECTORS IN CERTAIN CASES

SEC. 42. (a) In addition to any other liabilities imposed by law upon directors of a corporation—

(1) directors of a corporation who vote for or assent to the declaration of any dividend or other distribution of the assets of a corporation to its shareholders contrary to the provisions of this act, or contrary to any restrictions contained in the articles of incorporation, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such dividend which is paid or the value of such assets which are distributed in excess of the amount of such dividend or distribution which could have been paid or distributed without a violation of the provisions of this act or any restrictions in the articles of incorporation;

(2) the directors of a corporation who vote for or assent to the declaration of any dividend or other distribution of assets of a corporation to its shareholders which renders the corporation insolvent or reduces its net assets below its stated capital shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such dividend which is paid or the value of such assets which are distributed, to the extent that the corporation is thereby rendered insolvent or its net assets are reduced below its stated capital;

(3) the directors of a corporation who vote for or assent to any distribution of assets of a corporation to its shareholders during the liquidation of the corporation without an adequate provision for, or the payment and discharge of, all debts, obligations, and liabilities of the corporation shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such dividend which is paid or the value of such assets which are distributed, to the extent that such debts, obligations and liabilities of the corporation are not thereafter paid and discharged;

(4) the directors of a corporation who vote for or assent to the making of a loan to an officer or director of the corporation shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

(b) A director of a corporation who is present at a meeting of its board of directors at which action on any corporate matter is taken shall be conclusively presumed to have assented to the action taken unless his dissent shall be entered in the minutes of the meeting or unless he shall file his written dissent to such action with the person acting as the secretary of the meeting before the adjournment thereof or shall forward such dissent by registered mail to the secretary of the corporation immediately after the adjournment of the meeting. Such right to dissent shall not apply to a director who voted in favor of such action.

(c) A director shall not be liable under either subparagraph (1) or (2) of this section if he relied and acted in good faith upon a balance sheet and profit-and-loss statement of the corporation represented to him to be correct by the president or the officer of such corporation having charge of its books of account, or certified by an independent public or certified public accountant or firm of such accountants to fairly reflect the financial condition of such corporation, nor shall he be so liable if in good faith in determining the amount available for any such dividend or distribution he considered the assets to be of their book value.

(d) Any director against whom a claim shall be asserted under or pursuant to this section, and who shall be held liable thereon, shall be entitled to contribution from the other directors who are likewise liable thereon.

(e) Any director against whom a claim shall be asserted under or pursuant to this section for the improper declaration of a dividend or other distribution of assets of a corporation and who shall be held liable thereon, shall be entitled to contribution from the shareholders who knowingly accepted or received any such dividend or assets, in proportion to the amounts received by them, respectively.

OFFICERS

SEC. 43. (a) The officers of a corporation shall consist of a president, one or more vice presidents as may be prescribed by the bylaws, a secretary, and a treasurer, each of whom shall be elected by the board of directors at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the bylaws. Such other officers and assistant officers and agents as may be deemed necessary may be elected or appointed by the board of directors or chosen in such other manner as may be prescribed by the bylaws. If the bylaws so provide, any two or more offices may be held by the same person, except the offices of president and secretary.

(b) All officers and agents of the corporation, as between themselves and the corporation, shall have such authority and perform such duties in the management of the property and affairs of the corporation as may be provided in the bylaws, or as may be determined by resolution of the board of directors not inconsistent with the bylaws.

REMOVAL OF OFFICERS

SEC. 44. Any officer or agent elected or appointed by the board of directors may be removed by the board of directors whenever in its judgment the best interests of the corporation will be served thereby, but such removal shall be without prejudice to the contract rights, if any, of the person so removed.

BOOKS AND RECORDS

SEC. 45. (a) Each corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its shareholders and board of directors; and shall keep at its registered office or principal place of business, or at the office of its transfer agent or registrar, a record of its shareholders, giving the names and addresses of all shareholders and the number and class of the shares held by each.

(b) Any person or persons who shall be the holder or holders of record of at least 5 percent of all the outstanding shares of a corporation shall have the right to examine, in person, or by agent or attorney, at any reasonable time or times, for any proper purpose, its record of shareholders and to make extracts therefrom.

(c) A holder of a voting-trust certificate evidencing an interest in a voting trust conforming to the provisions of this act shall have the same rights as a shareholder to examine and make extracts from the record of shareholders of the corporation.

(d) If any person or persons holding in the aggregate 5 percent or more of all of the outstanding shares of a corporation shall present to any officer, director, or registered agent of the corporation a written request for a statement of its affairs, it shall be his duty to make or procure such a statement sworn to by the president or a vice president or by the treasurer or an assistant treasurer, embracing a particular account of its assets and liabilities in detail, and to have the same ready and on file at the registered office of the corporation, within 30 days after the presentation of such request. Such statement shall at all times during business hours be open to the inspection of any shareholder and he shall be entitled to copy the same.

(e) Any corporation whose officers or agents shall refuse to allow any such shareholder, entitled under the provisions of this section to examine the record of shareholders, or his agent or attorney, so to examine and make extracts from its record of shareholders, for any proper purpose, shall be liable to such shareholder in a penalty of $50, in addition to any other damages or remedy afforded him by law. It shall be a defense to any action for penalties under this section that the person suing therefor has within 2 years sold or offered for sale any list of shareholders of such corporation or any other corporation or has aided or abetted any person in procuring any list of shareholders for any such purpose, or has improperly used any information secured through any prior examination of the record of shareholders of such corporation or any other corporation.

(f) Nothing herein contained shall impair the power of any court of competent jurisdiction, upon proof by a shareholder of proper purpose, irrespective of the period of time during which such shareholder shall have been a shareholder of record, and irrespective of the number of shares held by him, to compel by mandamus or otherwise the production for examination by such shareholder of the books and records of account, minutes, and record of shareholders of a corporation.

INCORPORATORS

SEC. 46. Three or more natural persons of the age of 21 years or more may act as incorporators of a corporation by signing, verifying, and filing in duplicate in the office of the Commissioners articles of incorporation for such corporation.

ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

SEC. 47. The articles of incorporation shall set forth:

(a) The name of the corporation.

(b) The period of duration, which may be perpetual.

(c) The purpose or purposes for which the corporation is organized.

(d) The aggregate number of shares which the corporation shall have authority to issue; if said shares are to consist of one class only, the par value of each of said shares, or a statement that all of said shares are without

par value; or, if said shares are to be divided into classes, the number of shares of each class, and a statement of the par value of the shares of each such class or that such shares are to be without par value.

(e) If the shares are to be divided into classes, the designation of each class and a statement of the preferences, voting power, limitations, restrictions, qualifications, and the special or relative rights in respect of the shares of each class.

(f) The minimum amount of capital with which the corporation shall commence business shall be not less than $1,000.

(g) If the corporation is to issue the shares of any preferred or special class in series, then the designation of each series and a statement of the variations in the relative rights and preferences as between different series insofar as the same are to be fixed in the articles of incorporation, and a statement of any authority to be vested in the board of directors to establish series and fix and determine the variations in the relative rights and preferences as between series.

(h) Any provision limiting or denying to shareholders the preemptive right to acquire additional shares of the corporation.

(i) Any provision, not inconsistent with law, which the incorporators elect to set forth in the articles of incorporation for the regulation of the internal affairs of the corporation, including any provision which under this act is required or permitted to be set forth in the bylaws.

(j) The address, including street and number, if any, of its initial registered office, and the name of its initial registered agent at such address.

(k) The number of directors constituting the initial board of directors and the names and addresses, including street and number, if any, of the persons who are to serve as directors until the first annual meeting of shareholders or until their successors be elected and qualify.

(l) The name and address, including street and number, if any, of each incorporator.

It shall not be necessary to set forth in the articles of incorporation any of the corporate powers enumerated in this act. Whenever a provision of the articles of incorporation is inconsistent with a bylaw, the provision of the articles of incorporation shall be controlling.

FILING OF ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

SEC. 48. (a) Duplicate originals of the articles of incorporation shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that the articles of incorporation conform to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed" and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of incorporation to which they shall affix the other duplicate original.

(b) The certificate of incorporation, together with the duplicate original of the articles of incorporation affixed thereto by the Commissioners, shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

EFFECT OF ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

SEC. 49. Upon the issuance of the certificate of incorporation, the corporate existence shall begin, and such certificate of incorporation shall be conclusive evidence that all conditions precedent required to be performed by the incorporators have been complied with and that the corporation has been incorporated under this act, except as against the District of Columbia in a proceeding to cancel or revoke the certificate of incorporation.

REQUIREMENT BEFORE COMMENCING BUSINESS

SEC. 50. A corporation shall not transact any business or incur any indebtedness, except such as shall be incidental to its organization or to obtaining subscriptions to or payment for its shares, until at least the minimum amount of capital set forth in its articles of incorporation as the minimum amount of capital with which it will commence business has been fully paid in.

ORGANIZATION MEETING OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 51. After the issuance of the certificate of incorporation an organization meeting of the board of directors named in the articles of incorporation shall be held within the United States, at the call of a majority of the directors so named, for the purpose of adopting bylaws (unless the power to adopt bylaws has been reserved by the articles of incorporation to the shareholders, in which event the bylaws shall be adopted by the shareholders), electing officers, and the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting. The directors calling the meeting shall give at least 5 days' notice thereof by mail to each director so elected, which notice shall state the time and place of the meeting: *Provided, however*, That if all the directors shall waive notice in writing and fix a time and place for said organization meeting no notice shall be required of such meeting.

RIGHT TO AMEND ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

SEC. 52. A corporation may amend its articles of incorporation, from time to time, in any and as many respects as may be desired: *Provided*, That its articles of incorporation as amended contain only such provisions as might be lawfully contained in original articles of incorporation if made at the time of making such amendment, and, if a change in shares or the rights of shareholders, or an exchange, reclassification, or cancellation of shares or rights of shareholders is to be made, such provisions as may be necessary to effect such change, exchange, reclassification, or cancellation.

In particular, and without limitation upon such general power of amendment, a corporation may amend its articles of incorporation, from time to time, so as:

(a) To change its corporate name.

(b) To change its period of duration.

(c) To change, enlarge, or diminish its corporate purposes.

(d) To increase or decrease the aggregate number of shares, or shares of any class, which the corporation has authority to issue.

(e) To increase or decrease the par value of the authorized shares of any class having a par value, whether issued or unissued.

(f) To exchange, classify, reclassify, or cancel all or any part of its shares, whether issued or unissued.

(g) To change the designations of all or any part of its shares, whether issued or unissued, and to change the preferences, voting power, qualifications, limitations, restrictions, and the special or relative rights in respect of all or any part of its shares, whether issued or unissued.

(h) To divide any preferred or special class of shares, whether issued or unissued, into series and fix and determine the designations of such series and the variations in the relative rights and preferences as between the shares of such series.

(i) To authorize the board of directors to establish, out of authorized but unissued shares, series of any preferred or special class of shares and fix and determine the relative rights and preferences of the shares of any series so established.

(j) To authorize the board of directors to fix and determine the relative rights and preferences of the authorized but unissued shares of series theretofore established in respect of which either the relative rights and preferences have not been fixed and determined or the relative rights and preferences theretofore fixed and determined are to be changed.

(k) To revoke, diminish, or enlarge the authority of the board of directors to establish series out of authorized but unissued shares of any preferred or special class and fix and determine the relative rights and preferences of the shares of any series so established.

(l) To change shares having a par value, whether issued or unissued, into the same or a different number of shares without par value, and to change shares without par value, whether issued or unissued, into the same or a different number of shares having a par value.

(m) To change the share of any class, whether issued or unissued, and whether with or without par value, into a different number of shares of the same class or into the same or a different number of shares, either with or without par value, of other classes.

(n) To create new classes of shares having rights and preferences either prior and superior or subordinate and inferior to the shares of any class then authorized, whether issued or unissued.

(o) To limit, deny, or grant to shareholders of any class the preemptive right to subscribe for or acquire additional shares of the corporation, whether then or thereafter authorized.

PROCEDURE TO AMEND ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION BEFORE ACCEPTANCE OF SUBSCRIPTIONS TO SHARES

SEC. 53. Amendments to the articles of incorporation before any subscriptions to shares have been accepted by the board of directors shall be made in the following manner:

(a) Amended articles of incorporation modifying, changing, or altering the original articles of incorporation shall be signed by all of the living or competent incorporators who signed the original articles of incorporation, verified and filed in duplicate by the Commissioners. Such amended articles of incorporation shall contain only such provisions as might be lawfully contained in original articles of incorporation if made at the time of making such amended articles of incorporation.

(b) Such amended articles of incorporation shall be delivered in duplicate original to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such amended articles of incorporation conform to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed" and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) the other duplicate original returned by the Commissioners shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(c) Upon the issuance of the amended articles of incorporation, the amended articles of incorporation shall become effective and shall take the place of the original articles of incorporation.

PROCEDURE TO AMEND ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION AFTER ACCEPTANCE OF SUBSCRIPTION TO SHARES

SEC. 54. Amendments to the articles of incorporation shall be made in the following manner:

(a) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution setting forth the proposed amendment and directing that it be submitted to a vote at a meeting of shareholders, which may be either an annual or a special meeting.

(b) Written or printed notice setting forth the proposed amendment or a summary of the changes to be effected thereby shall be given to each shareholder of record entitled to vote at such meeting within the time and in the manner provided in this act for the giving of notice of meetings of shareholders. If the meeting be an annual meeting, the proposed amendment or such

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

summary shall be included in the notice of such annual meeting.

(c) At such meeting a vote of the shareholders entitled to vote shall be taken on the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment shall be adopted upon receiving the affirmative vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares entitled to vote, unless any class of shares is entitled to vote as a class in respect thereof, as hereinafter provided, in which event the proposed amendment shall be adopted upon receiving the affirmative vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares of each class of shares entitled to vote as a class in respect thereof and of the total outstanding shares entitled to vote.

(d) Any number of amendments may be submitted to the shareholders, and voted upon by them, at one meeting.

WHEN ENTITLED TO VOTE BY CLASSES

SEC. 55. The holders of the outstanding shares of a class whether by the provisions of the articles of incorporation such class of stock is entitled to vote or not shall be entitled to vote as a class upon a proposed amendment which would—

(a) Increase or decrease the aggregate number of authorized shares of such class.

(b) Increase or decrease the par value of the shares of such class.

(c) Effect an exchange, reclassification, or cancellation of all or part of the shares of such class.

(d) Effect an exchange, or create a right of exchange, of all or any part of the shares of another class into the shares of such class.

(e) Change the designations, preferences, limitations, voting, or relative rights of the shares of such class.

(f) Change the shares of such class having a par value into the same or a different number of shares without par value, or change the shares of such class without par value into the same or a different number of shares having a par value.

(g) Change the shares of such class, whether with or without par value, into a different number of shares of the same class, or into the same or a different number of shares, either with or without par value, of other classes.

(h) In the case of a preferred or special class of shares, divide the shares of such class into series and fix and determine the designations of such series and the variations in the relative rights and preferences between the shares of such series.

(i) Create a new class of shares having rights and preferences prior and superior to the shares of such class.

(j) Limit or deny the existing preemptive rights of the shares of such class.

ARTICLES OF AMENDMENT

SEC. 56. (a) The articles of amendment shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, and shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the amendment so adopted;

(3) the date of the adoption of the amendment by the shareholders;

(4) the number of shares outstanding, and the number of shares entitled to vote, and if the shares of any class are entitled to vote as a class, the designation of each such class and the number of outstanding shares thereof entitled to vote;

(5) the number of shares voted for and against such amendment, respectively, and, if the shares of any class are entitled to vote as a class, the number of shares of each such class voted for and against such amendment, respectively;

(6) if such amendment provides for an exchange, reclassification, or cancellation of issued shares, and if the manner in which the same shall be effected is not set forth in the amendment, then a statement of the manner in which the same shall be effected;

(7) if such amendment effects a change in the amount of stated capital, or paid-in surplus, or both, then a statement of the manner in which the same is effected and a statement, expressed in dollars, of the amount of stated capital and the amount of paid-in surplus as changed by such amendment.

(b) If issued shares without par value are changed into the same or a different number of shares having par value, the aggregate par value of the shares into which the shares without par value are changed shall not exceed the sum of (1) the amount of stated capital represented by such shares without par value, and (2) the amount of surplus, if any, transferred to stated capital on account of such change, and (3) any additional consideration paid for such shares with par value and allocated to stated capital.

FILING OF ARTICLES OF AMENDMENT

SEC. 57. (a) Duplicate originals of the articles of amendment shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that the articles of amendment conform to law, they shall, when all fees and taxes have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed" and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of amendment to which they shall affix the other duplicate original;

(b) The certificate of amendment with the duplicate original of the articles of amendment affixed thereto shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

EFFECT OF CERTIFICATE OF AMENDMENT

SEC. 58. (a) Upon the issuance of the certificate of amendment, the amendment shall become effective and the articles of incorporation shall be deemed to be amended accordingly.

(b) No amendment shall affect any existing cause of action in favor of or against such corporation, or any pending suit to which such corporation shall be a party, or the existing rights of persons other than shareholders; and, in the event the corporate name shall be changed by amendment, no suit brought by or against such corporation under its former name shall abate for that reason.

REDEMPTION AND CANCELLATION OF SHARES

SEC. 59. (a) If the articles of incorporation provide that redeemable shares redeemed, or purchased or otherwise acquired by the corporation, shall be canceled and shall not be reissued, then, in the event of such cancellation of shares, the stated capital of the corporation shall be deemed to be reduced by that part of the stated capital which was, at the time of such cancellation, represented by the shares so canceled.

(b) No redemption or purchase of redeemable shares shall be made which will reduce the remaining assets of the corporation below an amount sufficient to pay all debts and known liabilities of the corporation as they mature, except such debts and liabilities as have been otherwise adequately provided for, or which will reduce the net assets below the aggregate amount payable to the holders of shares having prior or equal rights to the assets of the corporation upon dissolution.

(c) When redeemable shares of a corporation have been canceled pursuant to the provisions of the articles of incorporation, a statement shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by the secretary or an assistant secretary, which statement shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the aggregate number of shares which the corporation had authority to issue, itemized by classes and series;

(3) the number of shares canceled, itemized by classes and series;

(4) the number of shares which the corporation has authority to issue, itemized by classes and series, after giving effect to such cancellation;

(5) a statement of the aggregate number of issued shares itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class, after giving effect to the cancellation;

(6) a statement, expressed in dollars, of the amount of the stated capital and the amount of paid-in surplus of the corporation after giving effect to such cancellation.

(d) Such statement shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed", and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) return the other duplicate original to the corporation or its representative.

(e) The duplicate original returned by the Commissioners shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(f) The filing of such statement by the Commissioners shall operate as an amendment to the articles of incorporation and shall reduce the number of shares of the class so canceled which the corporation is authorized to issue by the number of shares so canceled.

(g) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to forbid a reduction of authorized shares or a reduction of stated capital in any other manner permitted by this act.

CANCELLATION OF REACQUIRED SHARES

SEC. 60. (a) A corporation may at any time, by resolution of its board of directors, cancel all or any part of the shares of the corporation of any class reacquired by it through redemption, purchase, or otherwise, and in the event of such cancellation a statement of cancellation shall be filed as provided in this section. When any reacquired shares have been canceled by resolution of the board of directors, a statement shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by the secretary or assistant secretary, which statement shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the aggregate number of shares which the corporation has authority to issue, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class;

(3) the aggregate number of issued shares, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class before giving effect to such cancellation;

(4) the number of shares canceled, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class;

(5) a statement that the shares so canceled were canceled by a resolution duly adopted by the board of directors;

(6) the aggregate number of issued shares, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class, after giving effect to such cancellation;

(7) a statement, expressed in dollars, of the amount of the stated capital and the amount of the paid-in surplus of the corporation before giving effect to such cancellation;

(8) a statement, expressed in dollars, of the amount of the stated capital and the amount of the paid-in surplus of the corporation after giving effect to such cancellation.

(b) Such statement shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) the other duplicate original returned by the Commissioners shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(c) Upon the filing of such statement by the Commissioners, the stated capital of the corporation shall be deemed to be reduced by that part of the stated capital which was, at the time of such cancellation, represented by the shares so canceled and the shares so canceled shall be deemed to be authorized but unissued shares.

(d) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to forbid a cancellation of shares or a reduction of stated capital in any other manner permitted by this act.

REDUCTION OF STATED CAPITAL IN CERTAIN CASES

SEC. 61. (a) The reduction of the stated capital of a corporation where such reduction is not accompanied by an exchange, reclassification, or cancellation of shares, or by a reduction in the par value of issued shares, or by a reduction of the number of authorized shares of any class below the number of issued shares of that class, or by a redemption and cancellation of shares, may be made in the following manner:

(1) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution setting forth the amount of the proposed reduction and the manner in which the reduction shall be effected, and directing that the question of such reduction be submitted to a vote at a meeting of shareholders, which may be either an annual or a special meeting.

(2) Written or printed notice, stating that the purpose or one of the purposes of such meeting is to consider the question of reducing the stated capital of the corporation, shall be given to each shareholder of record entitled to vote within the time and in the manner provided in this act for the giving of notice of meetings of shareholders.

(3) At such meeting a vote of the shareholders entitled to vote shall be taken on the question of the proposed reduction of stated capital, which shall require for its adoption the affirmative vote of the holders of at least a majority of the outstanding shares entitled to vote.

(b) When a reduction of the stated capital of a corporation has been approved as provided in this section, a statement shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by the secretary or an assistant secretary, which statement shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) a copy of the resolution of the shareholders approving such reduction;

(3) the total number of shares outstanding and the number of shares entitled to vote;

(4) the number of shares voted for and against such reduction, respectively;

(5) a statement of the manner in which such reduction is effected, and a statement, expressed in dollars, of the amount of stated capital and the amount of paid-in surplus of the corporation adjusted to give effect to such reduction.

(c) Such statement shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed" and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) the other duplicate original returned by the Commissioners shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

SEC. 62. (a) No reduction of stated capital shall be made under the provisions of section 612 which would reduce the amount of the aggregate stated capital of the corporation to an amount less than the aggregate preferential amounts payable upon all issued shares having a preferential right in the assets of the corporation in the event of involuntary liquidation, plus the aggregate par value, after such reduction, of all issued shares having a par value but no preferential right in the assets of the corporation in the event of involuntary liquidation.

(b) The surplus, if any, created by or arising out of the reduction of the stated capital of a corporation shall be deemed to be paid-in surplus, except where such reduction is effected by the cancellation of its own shares belonging to the corporation, or by the redemption and cancellation of shares, in either of which events the paid-in surplus, if any, created by such reduction shall not exceed the amount by which the stated capital represented by such shares exceeded the cost thereof to the corporation.

REDUCTION OF PAID-IN SURPLUS

SEC. 63. A corporation may, by resolution of its board of directors, apply any part or all of its paid-in surplus to the payment of dividends as permitted by section 40 of this act, or to the distribution of liquidating dividends as permitted by section 41 of this act, to the payment of reasonable compensation for the sale or underwriting of its shares as permitted by section 19 of this act, the reduction or elimination of any deficit arising from operating or other losses or from diminution in value of its assets.

PROCEDURE FOR MERGER

SEC. 64. Any two or more domestic corporations may merge into one of such corporations in the following manner:

The board of directors of each corporation shall, by resolution adopted by a majority vote of the members of each such board, approve a plan of merger setting forth:

(a) The names of the corporations proposing to merge, and the name of the corporation into which they propose to merge, which is hereinafter designated as the surviving corporation.

(b) The terms and conditions of the proposed merger.

(c) The manner and basis of converting the shares of each merging corporation into shares or other securities or obligations of the surviving corporation.

(d) A statement of any changes in the articles of incorporation of the surviving corporation to be effected by such merger.

(e) Such other provisions with respect to the proposed merger as are deemed necessary or desirable.

PROCEDURE FOR CONSOLIDATION

SEC. 65. Any two or more domestic corporations may consolidate into a new corporation in the following manner:

The board of directors of each corporation, shall by a resolution adopted by a majority vote of the members of each such board, approve a plan of consolidation setting forth:

(a) The names of the corporations proposing to consolidate, and the name of the new corporation into which they propose to consolidate, which is hereinafter designated as the new corporation.

(b) The terms and conditions of the proposed consolidation.

(c) The manner and basis of converting the shares of each corporation into shares, or other securities, or obligations of the new corporation.

(d) With respect to the new corporation, all of the statements required to be set forth in articles of incorporation for corporations organized under this act.

(e) Such other provisions with respect to the proposed consolidation as are deemed necessary or desirable.

MEETINGS OF SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 66. The board of directors of each corporation, upon approving such plan of merger or plan of consolidation, shall, by resolution, direct that the plan be submitted to a vote at a meetting of shareholders, which may be either an annual or a special meeting. Written or printed notice shall be delivered not less than 20 days before such meeting, either personally or by mail, to each shareholder of record entitled to vote at such meeting. Such notice shall state the place, day, hour, and purpose of the meeting, and a copy or a summary of the plan of merger or plan of consolidation, as the case may be, shall be included in or enclosed with such notice.

APPROVAL BY SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 67. At each such meeting, a vote of the shareholders shall be taken on the proposed plan of merger or consolidation. The plan of merger or consolidation shall be approved upon receiving the affirmative vote of the holders of two-thirds of the outstanding shares of each corporation unless as to any of such corporations two or more classes of shares are issued in which event as to such corporation or corporations the plan of merger or consolidation shall be approved upon receiving the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares of each such class.

ARTICLES OF MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION

SEC. 68. (a) Upon such approval, articles of merger or articles of consolidation shall be executed in duplicate by each corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal of each corporation shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, and shall set forth—

(1) the plan of merger or the plan of consolidation;

(2) as to each corporation, the number of shares outstanding, and if there are two or more classes of shares issued, the designation of each such class and the number of shares thereof outstanding;

(3) as to each corporation, the number of shares voted for and against such plan respectively, and, if there are two or more classes of shares issued the number of shares of each such class voted for and against such plan, respectively.

(b) Such articles of merger or consolidation shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such articles of merger or consolidation conform to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as in this Act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "filed" and the month, days, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of merger or certificate of consolidation to which they shall attach the other duplicate original which shall then be filed for record in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION

SEC. 69. Upon the issuance of the certificate of merger or the certificate of consolidation by the Commissioners, the merger or consolidation shall be effected.

EFFECT OF MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION

SEC. 70. When such merger or consolidation has been effected:

(a) The several corporation parties to the plan of merger or consolidation shall be a single corporation, which, in the case of a merger, shall be that corporation designated in the plan of merger as the surviving corporation, and, in the case of a consolidation, shall be the new corporation provided for in the plan of consolidation.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(b) The separate existence of all corporations parties to the plan of merger or consolidation, except the surviving or new corporation, shall cease.

(c) Such surviving or new corporation, as the case may be, shall have all the rights, privileges, immunities, and powers and shall be subject to all the duties and liabilities of a corporation organized under this act.

(d) Such surviving or new corporation shall thereupon and thereafter possess all the rights, privileges, immunities, and franchises, as well of a public as a private nature, of each of the merging or consolidating corporations; and all property—real, personal, and mixed—and all debts due on whatever account, including subscriptions to shares, and all other choses in action, and all and every other interest, of or belonging to or due to each of the corporations so merged or consolidated, shall be taken and deemed to be transferred to and vested in such single corporation without further act or deed; and the title to any real estate, or any interest therein, vested in any of such corporations shall not revert or be in any way impaired by reason of such merger or consolidation.

(e) Such surviving or new corporation shall thenceforth be responsible and liable for all the liabilities and obligations of each of the corporations so merged or consolidated; and any claim existing or action or proceeding pending by or against any of such corporations may be prosecuted to judgment as if such merger or consolidation had not taken place, or such surviving or new corporation may be substituted in its place. Neither the rights of creditors nor any liens upon the property of any such corporation shall be impaired by such merger or consolidation.

(f) In the case of a merger, the articles of incorporation of the surviving corporation shall be deemed to be amended to the extent, if any, that changes in its articles of incorporation are stated in the articles of merger; and, in the case of a consolidation, the statements set forth in the articles of consolidation and which are required or permitted to be set forth in the articles of incorporation of corporations organized under this act shall be deemed to be the articles of incorporation of the new corporation.

(g) The aggregate amount of the net assets of the merging or consolidating corporations which was available for the payment of dividends immediately prior to such merger or consolidation, to the extent that the amount thereof is not transferred to stated capital by the issuance of shares or otherwise, shall continue to be available for the payment of dividends by such surviving or new corporation.

MERGER OR CONSOLIDATION OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

SEC. 71. One or more foreign corporations and one or more domestic corporations may be merged or consolidated if permitted by the laws of the State under which each such foreign corporation is organized:

(a) Each domestic corporation shall comply with the provisions of this act with respect to the merger or consolidation, as the case may be, of domestic corporations and each foreign corporation shall comply with the applicable provisions of the laws of the States under which it is organized.

(b) If the surviving or new corporation, as the case may be, is to be governed by the laws of any State other than the District of Columbia, it shall comply with the provisions of this act with respect to foreign corporations if it is to do business in the District of Columbia, and in every case it shall file with the Commissioners—

(1) an agreement that it may be served with process in the District of Columbia in any proceeding for the enforcement of any obligation of any domestic corporation which is a party to such merger or consolidation and in any proceeding for the enforcement of the rights of a dissenting shareholder of any such domestic corporation against the surviving or new corporation;

(2) an irrevocable appointment of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as its agent to accept service of process in any such proceeding; and

(3) an agreement that it will promptly pay to the dissenting shareholders of any such domestic corporation the amount, if any, to which they shall be entitled under the provisions of this act with respect to the rights of dissenting shareholders.

(c) The effect of such merger or consolidation shall be the same as in the case of the merger or consolidation of domestic corporations, if the surviving or new corporation is to be governed by the laws of the District of Columbia. If the surviving or new corporation is to be governed by the laws of any jurisdiction other than the District of Columbia, the effect of such merger or consolidation shall be the same as in the case of the merger or consolidation of domestic corporations except insofar as the laws of such other jurisdiction provide otherwise.

MERGER OF PARENT CORPORATION AND WHOLLY OWNED SUBSIDIARY

SEC. 72. (a) Any corporation now or hereafter organized under the provisions hereof or existing under the laws of the District of Columbia, for the purpose of carrying on any kind of business authorized by this act, owning all of the stock of any other corporation now or hereafter organized hereunder or existing under the laws of the District of Columbia, or now or hereafter organized under the laws of any other State of the United States of America if the laws under which said other corporation is formed shall permit a merger as herein provided, may file, in duplicate original with the Commissioners, a certificate of such ownership in its name and under its corporate seal, signed by its president or a vice president, and its secretary or assistant secretary, and setting forth a copy of the resolution of its board of directors to merge such other corporation, and to assume all of its obligations and the date of the adoption thereof. If the Commissioners find that such certificate of ownership conforms to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of ownership to which they shall affix the other duplicate original which certificate shall then be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(b) Upon the issuance of the certificate of ownership, the merger shall be effected and thereupon all of the estate, property, rights, privileges, and franchises of such other corporation shall vest in and be held and enjoyed by such parent corporation as fully and entirely and without change or diminution as the same were before held and enjoyed by such other corporation, and be managed and controlled by such parent corporation, and except as hereinafter in this section provided, in its name, but subject to all liabilities and obligations of such other corporation and the rights of all creditors thereof. The parent corporation shall not thereby acquire power to engage in any business, or to exercise any right, privilege, or franchise, of a kind which it could not lawfully engage in or exercise under the provisions of the law or laws by or pursuant to which such parent corporation is organized, or operates in the District of Columbia. The parent corporation shall be deemed to have assumed all of the obligations and liabilities of the merged corporation and shall be liable in the same manner as if it had itself incurred such liabilities and obligations. The parent corporation may relinquish its corporate name and assume in lieu thereof the name of the merged corporation, by including it in a provision to that effect in the resolution of merger adopted by the directors and set forth in the certificate of ownership, and upon the filing of such certificate the change of name shall be completed, with the same force and effect and subject to the same conditions and consequences as if such change had been accomplished by proceedings under the appropriate section of this act.

RIGHTS OF DISSENTING SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 73. (a) If a shareholder of a corporation which is a party to a merger or consolidation shall file with such corporation, prior to or at the meeting of shareholders at which the plan of merger or consolidation is submitted to a vote, a written objection to such plan of merger or consolidation, and shall not vote in favor thereof, and such shareholder, within 20 days after the merger or consolidation is effected, shall make written demand on the surviving or new corporation for payment of the fair value of his shares as of the day prior to the date on which the vote was taken approving the merger or consolidation, the surviving or new corporation shall pay to such shareholder, upon surrender of his certificate or certificates representing said shares, such fair value thereof. Such demand shall state the number and class of the shares owned by such dissenting shareholder. Any shareholder failing to make demand within the 20-day period shall be bound by the terms of the merger or consolidation.

(b) If within 30 days after the date on which such merger or consolidation was effected the value of such shares is agreed upon between the dissenting shareholder and the surviving or new corporation payment therefor shall be made within 90 days after the date on which such merger or consolidation was effected, upon the surrender of his certificate or certificates representing said shares. Upon payment of the agreed value the dissenting shareholder shall cease to have any interest in such shares or in the corporation.

(c) If within such period of 30 days the shareholder and the surviving or new corporation do not so agree, then the dissenting shareholder may, within 60 days after the expiration of the 30-day period, file a petition in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia, asking for a finding and determination of the fair value of such shares, and shall be entitled to judgment against the surviving or new corporation for the amount of such fair value as of the day prior to the date on which such vote was taken approving such merger or consolidation, together with interest thereon at the rate of 5 percent per annum to the date of such judgment. The judgment shall be payable only upon and simultaneously with the surrender to the surviving or new corporation of the certificate or certificates representing said shares. Upon payment of the judgment, the dissenting shareholder shall cease to have any interest in such shares or in the surviving or new corporation. Such shares may be held and disposed of by the surviving or new corporation as it may see fit. Unless the dissenting shareholder shall file such petition within the time herein limited, such shareholder and all persons claiming under him shall be bound by the terms of the merger or consolidation.

(d) The right of a dissenting shareholder to be paid the fair value of his shares as herein provided shall cease if and when the corporation shall abandon the merger or consolidation.

SALE, LEASE, EXCHANGE, OR MORTGAGE OF ASSETS IN USUAL AND REGULAR COURSE OF BUSINESS

SEC. 74. The sale, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge, or other disposition of less than all, or less than substantially all, the property and assets of a corporation, when made

in the usual and regular course of the business of the corporation, may be made upon such terms and conditions and for such considerations, which may consist in whole or in part, of money or property, real or personal, including shares of any other corporation, whether or not such other corporation be organized under the provisions of this act, as shall be authorized by its board of directors; and in such case no authorization or consent of the shareholders shall be required.

SALE, LEASE, EXCHANGE, OR MORTGAGE OF ASSETS OTHER THAN IN USUAL AND REGULAR COURSE OF BUSINESS

SEC. 75. A sale, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge, or other disposition of all, or substantially all, the property and assets, with or without the goodwill, of a corporation, may be made upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration, which may consist, in whole or in part, of money or property, real or personal, including shares of any other corporation, whether or not such other corporation be organized under the provisions of this act, as may be authorized in the following manner:

(a) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution recommending such sale, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge, or other disposition, and directing the submission thereof to a vote at a meeting of shareholders, which may be either an annual or a special meeting.

(b) Written or printed notice stating that the purpose, or one of the purposes, of such meeting is to consider the sale, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge, or other disposition of all, or substantially all, the property and assets of the corporation shall be given to each shareholder of record entitled to vote within the time and in the manner provided by this act for the giving of notice of meetings of shareholders.

(c) At such meetings the shareholders may authorize such sale, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge, or other disposition, and fix, or may authorize the board of directors to fix, any or all of the terms and conditions thereof and the consideration to be received by the corporation therefor. Such authorization shall require the affirmative vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares entitled to vote, unless there are two or more classes of stock issued and outstanding and entitled to vote, in which event such authorization shall require the affirmative vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares of each such class of shares issued and outstanding and entitled to vote.

(d) After such authorization by a vote of shareholders, the board of directors nevertheless, in its discretion, may abandon such sale, lease, exchange, mortgage, pledge, or other disposition of assets, subject to the rights of third parties under any contracts relating thereto, without further action or approval by shareholders.

RIGHTS OF DISSENTING SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 76. (a) If a shareholder shall file with the corporation, prior to or at the meeting of shareholders at which a sale or exchange of all or substantially all of the property and assets of a corporation is submitted to a vote, a written objection to such sale or exchange, and shall not vote in favor thereof, and such shareholder, within 20 days after the vote was taken, shall make written demand on the corporation for the payment to him of the fair value of his shares as of the day prior to the date on which the vote was taken, the corporation shall pay to such shareholder, upon surrender of his certificate or certificates representing said shares, such fair value thereof. Such demand shall state the number and class of the shares owned by such dissenting shareholder. Any shareholder failing to make demand within the 20-day period shall be bound by the terms of the sale or exchange.

(b) If, within 30 days after the date on which such vote was taken, the value of such shares is agreed upon between the dissenting shareholder and the corporation, the corporation shall make payment of the agreed value within 90 days after the date on which the vote was taken authorizing the sale or exchange, upon the surrender of his certificate or certificates representing said shares. Upon payment of the agreed value, the dissenting shareholder shall cease to have any interest in such shares or in the corporation.

(c) If within such period of 30 days the shareholder and the corporation do not so agree, then the dissenting shareholder may, within 60 days after the expiration of the 30-day period, file a petition in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia, asking for a finding and determination of the fair value of such shares, and shall be entitled to judgment against the corporation for the amount of such fair value as of the day prior to the date on which such vote was taken, together with interest thereon at the rate of 5 percent per annum to the date of such judgment. The judgment shall be payable only upon and simultaneously with the surrender to the corporation of the certificate or certificates representing said shares. Upon the payment of the judgment, the dissenting shareholder shall cease to have any interest in such shares or in the corporation. Unless the dissenting shareholder shall file such petition within the time herein limited, such shareholder and all persons claiming under him shall be bound by the terms of the sale or exchange.

VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION OF CORPORATION BY ITS INCORPORATORS

SEC. 77. A corporation which has not commenced business and which has not issued any shares may be voluntarily dissolved by its incorporators at any time within 1 year from the date of the issuance of its certificate of incorporation in the following manner:

(a) Articles of dissolution shall be executed in duplicate by a majority of the incorporators, and verified by them, and shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the date of issuance of its certificate of incorporation;

(3) that none of its shares have been issued;

(4) that the corporation has not commenced business;

(5) that the amount, if any, actually paid in on subscriptions to its shares, less any part thereof disbursed for necessary expenses, has been returned to those entitled thereto;

(6) that no debts of the corporation remain unpaid;

(7) that all the incorporators elect that the corporation be dissolved.

(b) Duplicate originals of the articles of dissolution shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that the articles of dissolution conform to law, they shall, when all franchise taxes, fees, and charges have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed" and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of dissolution to which they shall affix the other duplicate original which shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(c) Upon the issuance of such certificate of dissolution the existence of the corporation shall cease.

DISSOLUTION BY CONSENT OF SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 78. A corporation may be dissolved by the written consent of the holders of record of all of its outstanding shares in the following manner:

Upon the execution of such written consent by all the shareholders of record, a statement of intent to dissolve shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, which shall set forth and contain—

(a) The name of the corporation.

(b) The names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its officers.

(c) The names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its directors.

(d) A copy of the agreement signed by all shareholders of record of the corporation consenting to its dissolution.

(e) A statement that such agreement has been signed by all shareholders of record of the corporation or signed in their names by their attorneys thereunto duly authorized.

DISSOLUTION BY ACT OF CORPORATION

SEC. 79. A corporation may be dissolved by the act of the corporation in the following manner:

(a) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution recommending that the corporation be dissolved, and directing that the question of such dissolution be submitted to a vote at a meeting of shareholders, which may be either an annual or a special meeting.

(b) Written or printed notice stating that the purpose, or one of the purposes, of such meeting is to consider the advisability of dissolving the corporation, shall be given to each shareholder of record entitled to vote within the time and in the manner provided in this act for the giving of notice of meetings of shareholders.

(c) At such meeting a vote of the shareholders entitled to vote shall be taken on a resolution to dissolve the corporation, which shall require for its adoption the affirmative vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares entitled to vote.

(d) Upon the adoption of such resolution, a statement of intent to dissolve shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, which shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its officers;

(3) the names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its directors;

(4) a copy of the resolution of the shareholders authorizing the dissolution of the corporation;

(5) the number of shares outstanding and entitled to vote;

(6) the number of shares voted for and against the dissolution of the corporation.

FILING OF STATEMENT OF INTENT TO DISSOLVE

SEC. 80. Duplicate originals of the statement of intent to dissolve, whether by consent of shareholders or by act of the corporation, shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall, when all franchise taxes, fees, and charges have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(a) Endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed" and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof.

(b) File one of such duplicate originals in their office.

(c) The other duplicate original shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

EFFECT OF STATEMENT OF INTENT TO DISSOLVE

SEC. 81. Upon the filing by the Commissioners of a statement of intent to dissolve, whether by consent of shareholders or by act of the corporation, the corporation shall cease to carry on its business, except insofar as may be necessary for the proper winding up thereof.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

PROCEEDINGS AFTER FILING OF STATEMENT OF INTENT TO DISSOLVE

SEC. 82. After the filing by the Commissioner of a statement of intent to dissolve—

(a) The corporation shall proceed to collect its assets, convey and dispose of such of its properties as are not to be distributed in kind to its shareholders, pay, satisfy, and discharge its liabilities and obligations and do all other acts required to liquidate its business and affairs, and, after paying or adequately providing for the payment of all its obligations, distribute the remainder of its assets, either in cash or in kind, among its shareholders according to their respective rights and interests.

(b) The corporation, at any time during the liquidation of its business and affairs, may make application to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to have the liquidation continued under the supervision of the court as provided in this act.

REVOCATION BY CONSENT OF SHAREHOLDERS OF VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 83. By the written consent of the holders of record of all of its outstanding shares, a corporation may, at any time prior to the issuance of a certificate of dissolution by the Commissioners as hereinafter provided, revoke voluntary dissolution proceedings theretofore taken, in the following manner:

Upon the execution of such written consent by all the shareholders of record, a statement of revocation of voluntary dissolution proceedings shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, which shall set forth and contain—

(a) The name of the corporation.

(b) The names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its officers.

(c) The names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its directors.

(d) A copy of the agreement signed by all shareholders of record of the corporation revoking such voluntary dissolution proceedings.

(e) That such agreement is signed by all shareholders of record of the corporation or signed in their names by their attorneys thereunto duly authorized.

REVOCATION BY ACT OF CORPORATION OF VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 84. By the act of the corporation, a corporation may, at any time prior to the issuance of a certificate of dissolution by the Commissioners as hereinafter provided, revoke voluntary dissolution proceedings theretofore taken in the following manner:

(a) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution recommending that voluntary dissolution proceedings be revoked and directing that the question of such revocation be submitted to a vote at a meeting of shareholders.

(b) Written or printed notice stating that the purpose, or one of the purposes, of such meeting is to consider the advisability of revoking the voluntary dissolution proceedings, shall be given to each shareholder of record entitled to vote within the time and in the manner provided in this act for the giving of notice of meetings of shareholders.

(c) At such meeting a vote of the shareholders entitled to vote shall be taken on a resolution revoking the voluntary dissolution proceedings, which shall require for its adoption the affirmative vote of the holders of at least two-thirds of the outstanding shares entitled to vote.

(d) Upon the adoption of such resolution, a statement of revocation of voluntary dissolution proceedings shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, which shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its officers;

(3) the names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its directors;

(4) a copy of the resolution of the shareholders revoking the voluntary dissolution proceedings;

(5) the number of shares outstanding and entitled to vote;

(6) the number of shares voted for and against the revocation of the voluntary dissolution proceedings, respectively.

FILING OF STATEMENT OF REVOCATION OF VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 85. Duplicate originals of the statement of revocation of voluntary dissolution proceedings, whether by consent of shareholders or by act of the corporation, shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(a) Endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof.

(b) File one of such duplicate originals in their office.

(c) The other duplicate original shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

EFFECT OF STATEMENT OF REVOCATION OF VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 86. Upon the filing by the Commissioners of a statement of revocation of voluntary dissolution proceedings whether by consent of shareholders or by act of the corporation, the revocation of the voluntary dissolution proceedings shall become effective and the corporation may thereupon again carry on its business.

ARTICLES OF DISSOLUTION

SEC. 87. When all debts, liabilities, and obligations of the corporation have been paid and discharged, or adequate provision has been made therefor, and all of the remaining property and assets of the corporation have been distributed to its shareholders, articles of dissolution shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary which shall set forth—

(a) The name of the corporation.

(b) That the corporation has theretofore filed with the Commissioners a statement of intent to dissolve, and the date on which such statement was filed.

(c) That all debts, obligations, and liabilities of the corporation have been paid and discharged or that adequate provision has been made therefor.

(d) That all the remaining property and assets of the corporation have been distributed among its shareholders in accordance with their respective rights and interests.

(e) That there are no suits pending against the corporation in any court, or that adequate provision has been made for the satisfaction of any judgment, order, or decree which may be entered against it in any pending suit.

FILING OF ARTICLES OF DISSOLUTION

SEC. 88. (a) Duplicate originals of such articles of dissolution shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such articles of dissolution conform to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each such duplicate original the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of dissolution, to which they shall affix the other duplicate original.

(b) They shall return the certificate of dissolution, with a duplicate original of the articles of dissolution thereto affixed, which shall be filed for record in the office of the Recorder of Deeds. Upon the issuance of such certificate of dissolution the existence of the corporation shall cease, except for the purpose of suits, other proceedings, and appropriate corporate action by shareholders, directors, and officers as provided in this act.

INVOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION

SEC. 89. A corporation may be dissolved involuntarily by a decree of a court of equity in an action instituted by the Commissioners in the name of the District of Columbia, when it is made to appear to the court that—

(a) The franchise of the corporation was procured through fraud; or

(b) The corporation has continued to exceed or abuse the authority conferred upon it by this act; or

(c) The corporation has failed for 30 days to appoint and maintain a registered agent as provided in this act; or

(d) The corporation has failed for 30 days after change of its registered office or registered agent to file with the Commissioners a statement of such change.

VENUE AND PROCESS

SEC. 90. Every action for the involuntary dissolution of a corporation on the grounds hereinbefore provided shall be commenced by the Commissioners in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Summons shall issue and shall be served as in other civil actions. In case a return is made thereon that no officer or agent of such corporation can be found within the territorial limits of the District of Columbia, then the Commissioners shall cause publication to be made in some newspaper of general circulation published in the District of Columbia, containing a notice of the pendency of such action, the title of the court, the names of the parties thereto, and the date on or after which default may be entered. The Commissioners shall cause a copy of such notice to be mailed by registered mail to the corporation at its registered office within 10 days after the first publication thereof. The certificate of the Commissioners of the mailing of such notice shall be prima facie evidence thereof. Such notice shall be published at least once each week for 3 successive weeks, and the first publication thereof may begin at any time after the summons has been returned. Unless a corporation shall have been served with summons, no default shall be taken against it earlier than 30 days after the first publication of such notice. The cost of publication of such notice shall be paid by the Commissioners, unless the decree is against the corporation and such cost is collected from it.

JURISDICTION OF COURT TO LIQUIDATE ASSETS AND BUSINESS OF CORPORATION

SEC. 91. (a) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have full power to liquidate the assets and business of a corporation—

(1) upon application by a corporation which has filed a statement of intent to dissolve, as provided in this act, to have its liquidation continued under the supervision of the court;

(2) when an action has been commenced by the Commissioners to dissolve a corporation and it is made to appear that liquidation of its business and affairs should precede the entry of a decree of dissolution.

(b) Proceedings under this section shall be brought in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(c) It shall not be necessary to make shareholders parties to any such action or proceeding unless relief is sought against them personally.

PROCEDURE IN LIQUIDATION OF CORPORATION BY COURT

SEC. 92. (a) In proceedings to liquidate the assets and business of a corporation the court shall have power to issue injunctions, to appoint a receiver or receivers pendente lite with such powers and duties as the court, from time to time, may direct, and to take such other proceedings as may be requisite to preserve the corporate assets wherever situated, and carry on the business of the corporation until a full hearing can be had.

(b) After a hearing had upon such notice as the court may direct to be given to all parties to the proceedings and to any other parties in interest designated by the court, the court may appoint a liquidating receiver or receivers with authority to collect the assets of the corporation, including all amounts owing to the corporation by shareholders on account of any unpaid portion of the consideration for the issuance of shares. Such liquidating receiver or receivers shall have authority, subject to the order of the court, to sell, convey, and dispose of all or any part of the assets of the corporation wherever situated, either at public or private sale. The assets of the corporation or the proceeds resulting from a sale, conveyance, or other disposition thereof shall be applied to the expenses of such liquidation and to the payment of the liabilities and obligations of the corporation, and any remaining assets or proceeds shall be distributed among its shareholders according to their respective rights and interests. The order appointing such liquidating receiver or receivers shall state their powers and duties. Such powers and duties may be increased or diminished at any time during the proceedings.

(c) A receiver of a corporation appointed under the provisions of this section shall have authority to sue and defend in all courts in his own name as receiver of such corporation. The court appointing such receiver shall, for the purposes of this act, have exclusive jurisdiction of the corporation and its property, wherever situated.

QUALIFICATIONS OF RECEIVERS

SEC. 93. A receiver shall in all cases give such bond as the court may direct with such sureties as the court may require.

FILING OF CLAIMS IN LIQUIDATION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 94. In proceedings to liquidate the assets and business of a corporation the court may require all creditors of the corporation to file with the clerk of the court or with the receiver, in such form as the court may prescribe, proofs under oath of their respective claims. If the court requires the filing of claims it shall fix a date, which shall be not less than 4 months from the date of the order, as the last day for the filing of claims, and shall prescribe the notice that shall be given to creditors and claimants of the date so fixed. Prior to the date so fixed, the court may extend the time for the filing of claims. Creditors and claimants failing to file proofs of claim on or before the date so fixed may be barred, by order of the court, from participating in the distribution of the assets of the corporation.

DISCONTINUANCE OF LIQUIDATION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 95. The liquidation of the assets and business of a corporation may be discontinued at any time during the liquidation proceedings when it is made to appear to the court that cause for liquidation no longer exists. In such event the court shall dismiss the proceedings and direct the receiver to redeliver to the corporation all its remaining property and assets.

DECREE OF INVOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION

SEC. 96. In proceedings to liquidate the assets and business of a corporation, when the costs and expenses of such proceedings and all debts, obligations, and liabilities of the corporation shall have been paid and discharged and all of its remaining property and assets distributed to its shareholders, or in case its property and assets are not sufficient to satisfy and discharge such costs, expenses, debts, and obligations, all the property and assets have been applied so far as they will go to their payment, the court shall enter a decree dissolving the corporation, whereupon the existence of the corporation shall cease.

FILING OF DECREE OF DISSOLUTION

SEC. 97. In case the court shall enter a decree dissolving a corporation it shall be the duty of the clerk of such court to cause a certified copy of the decree to be filed with the Commissioners. No fee shall be charged by the Commissioners for the filing thereof.

SURVIVAL OF REMEDY AFTER DISSOLUTION

SEC. 98. The dissolution of a corporation either (1) by the issuance of a certificate of dissolution by the Commissioners, or (2) by proclamation of the Commissioners for failure to pay annual report fees or file annual reports as provided in the act, or (3) by expiration of its period of duration, shall not take away or impair any remedy available to or against such corporation, its directors, or shareholders, or any right or claim existing, or any liability incurred, prior to such dissolution if suit or other proceeding thereon is commenced within 2 years after the date of such dissolution. Any suit or proceeding by or against the corporation may be prosecuted or defended by the corporation in its corporate name. The shareholders, directors, and officers shall have power to take such corporate or other action as shall be appropriate to protect such remedy, right, or claim. If such corporation was dissolved by the expiration of its period of duration, such corporation may amend its articles of incorporation at any time during such period of 2 years so as to extend its period of duration.

ANNUAL REPORT OF DOMESTIC CORPORATION

SEC. 99. (a) Each corporation shall file with the Commissioners, on or before April 15 of each year, an annual report setting forth—

(1) the name of the corporation, the address, including street and number, if any, of its registered office in the District of Columbia, and the name of its registered agent at such address;

(2) the names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its directors and officers;

(3) a brief statement of the character of the business in which the corporation is actually engaged;

(4) a statement of the aggregate number of shares which the corporation has authority to issue, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class;

(5) a statement of the aggregate number of issued shares, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value and series, if any, within a class.

(b) Such annual report shall be made on forms prescribed and furnished by the Commissioners, and the information therein contained shall be given as of the date of the execution of the report.

(c) It shall be executed by the corporation by its president, vice president, secretary, assistant secretary, or treasurer, and verified by the officer executing the report, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed.

ADMISSION OF FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 100. A foreign corporation shall procure a certificate of authority from the Commissioners before it transacts business in the District, but no foreign corporation shall be entitled to procure a certificate of authority under this act to transact in the District the business of banking, insurance, assurance, benefit, indemnity, building and loan association, or the acceptance of savings deposits, such corporations being admitted to and shall do business in the District of Columbia pursuant to the laws relating to such business. A foreign corporation shall not be denied a certificate of authority by reason of the fact that the laws of the State under which such corporation is organized governing its organization and internal affairs differ from the laws of the District, and nothing in this act contained shall be construed to authorize the District to regulate the organization or the internal affairs of such corporation.

POWERS OF FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 101. No foreign corporation subject to the provisions of this act shall transact in the District any business for the conduct of which a domestic corporation may not be organized or which is prohibited to a domestic corporation. A foreign corporation which shall have received a certificate of authority under this act shall, until a certificate of revocation or of withdrawal shall have been issued as provided in this act, enjoy the same rights and privileges as, but no greater rights and privileges than, a domestic corporation organized for the purposes set forth in the application pursuant to which such certificate of authority is issued; and, except as in this act otherwise provided, shall be subject to the same duties, restrictions, penalties, and liabilities now or hereafter imposed upon a domestic corporation of like character.

CORPORATE NAME OF FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

SEC. 102. No certificate of authority shall be issued to a foreign corporation—

(a) Which has a name the same as, or deceptively similar to, the name of any domestic corporation, or that of any corporation organized under any act of Congress authorizing the formation of corporations under the laws of the District of Columbia, or that of any corporation created pursuant to any special act of Congress to transact business in the District of Columbia, or that of any foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District of Columbia, or a name the exclusive right to which is, at the time, reserved in the manner provided in this act.

(b) The name of which does not contain the word "corporation," "company," "incorporated," or "limited," or does not contain an abbreviation of one of said words, unless such corporation, for use in the District, adds at the end of its name one of such words or an abbreviation thereof.

CHANGE OF NAME BY FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 103. Whenever a foreign corporation which is admitted to transact business in the District shall change its name to one under which a certificate of authority to transact business in the District would not be granted to it on application therefor, the authority of such corporation to transact business in the District shall be suspended and it shall not thereafter transact any business in the District until it has changed its name to a name which is available to it under the laws of the District.

APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 104. A foreign corporation may procure a certificate of authority to transact business in the District by making application therefor to the Commissioners, which application shall set forth—

(a) The name of the corporation and the State under the laws of which it is organized.

(b) If the name of the corporation does not contain one of the words "corporation," "company," "incorporated," "limited," or does not contain an abbreviation of one of such words, then the name of the corporation with the word or abbreviation which it elects to add thereto for use in the District.

(c) The date of its incorporation and the period of its duration.

(d) The address, including street and number, if any, of its principal office in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

State under the laws of which it is organized.

(e) The address, including the street and number, if any, of its proposed registered office in the District, and the name of its proposed registered agent in the District at such address.

(f) The name or names of the State or States, if any, in which it is admitted or qualified to transact business.

(g) The purpose or purposes for which it was organized and which it proposes to pursue in the transaction of business in the District.

(h) The names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its directors and officers.

(i) A statement of the aggregate number of shares which it has authority to issue, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class.

(j) A statement of the aggregate number of its issued shares itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class.

(k) A statement of the amount of stated capital and the amount of paid-in surplus of the corporation, as defined in this act.

(l) Such additional information as may be necessary or appropriate in order to enable the Commissioners to determine whether such corporation is entitled to a certificate of authority to transact business in the District. Such application shall be made on forms prescribed and furnished by the Commissioners and shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary.

FILING OF DOCUMENTS ON APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 105. (a) There shall be delivered to the Commissioners (1) duplicate originals of the application of the corporation for a certificate of authority, and (2) a copy of its articles of incorporation and all amendments thereto, duly certified by the proper officer of the State wherein it is incorporated.

(b) If, according to law, a certificate of authority to transact business in the District shall be issued to such corporation, the Commissioners shall, when all fees and charges have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such documents the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file in their office one of such duplicate originals of the application and the copy of the articles of incorporation and amendments thereto;

(3) issue a certificate of authority to transact business in the District, to which they shall affix the other duplicate original application.

(c) The certificate of authority with the duplicate original of the application affixed thereto by the Commissioners shall be returned to the corporation or its representative.

EFFECT OF CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 106. Upon the issuance of a certificate of authority by the Commissioners, the corporation shall have the right to transact business in the District for those purposes set forth in its application, subject, however, to the right of the District to suspend or to revoke such right to transact business in the District as provided in this act.

REGISTERED OFFICE AND REGISTERED AGENT OF FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 107. (a) Each foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District shall have and continuously maintain in the District—

(1) a registered office which may be, but need not be, the same as its place of business in the District;

(2) a registered agent, which agent may be either an individual, resident in the District, whose business office is identical with such registered office, or a corporation authorized by its articles of incorporation to act as such agent and authorized to transact business in the District having a business office identical with such registered office.

(b) The address, including street and number, if any, of the initial registered office, and the name of the initial registered agent of each foreign corporation shall be as stated in its application for a certificate of authority to transact business in the District.

CHANGE OF REGISTERED OFFICE OR REGISTERED AGENT OF FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 108. (a) A foreign corporation may from time to time change the address of its registered office. A foreign corporation shall change its registered agent if the office of registered agent shall become vacant for any reason, or if its registered agent becomes disqualified or incapacitated to act, or if it revokes the appointment of its registered agent.

(b) A foreign corporation may change the address of its registered office or change its registered agent, or both, by filing with the Commissioners a statement setting forth—

(1) the name of the corporation;

(2) the address, including street and number, if any, of its then registered office;

(3) if the address of its registered office be changed, the address including street and number, if any, to which the registered office is to be changed;

(4) the name of its then registered agent;

(5) if its registered agent be changed, the name of its successor registered agent;

(6) that the address of its registered office and the address of the business office of its registered agent, as changed, will be identical;

(7) that such change was authorized by resolution duly adopted by the board of directors or was authorized by an officer of the corporation duly empowered to make such change.

(c) Such statement shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, and shall be delivered to the Commissioners. If the Commissioners find that such statement conforms to the provisions of this act, they shall—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) return the other duplicate original to the corporation or its representative.

(d) The change of address of the registered office, or the change of registered agent, or both, as the case may be, shall become effective upon the filing of such statement by the Commissioners.

SERVICE OF PROCESS ON FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 109. (a) Service of process in any suit, action, or proceeding, or service of any notice or demand required or permitted by law to be served on a foreign corporation, may be made on such corporation by service thereof on the registered agent of such corporation. Service of any such process, notice, or demand upon a corporate agent, as such agent, may be had by delivering a copy of such process, notice, or demand to the president, vice president, the secretary, or an assistant secretary of such corporate agent. During any period within which a foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District shall fail to appoint or maintain in the District a registered agent, or whenever any such registered agent cannot with reasonable diligence be found at the registered office in the District of such corporation, or whenever the certificate of authority of any foreign corporation shall be revoked, then and in every such case the Commissioners shall be an agent and representative of such foreign corporation upon whom any process, notice, or demand may be served. Service on the Commissioners of any such foreign corporation shall be made by delivering to and leaving with them, or with any clerk having charge of their office, duplicate copies of such process, notice, or demand. In the event any process, notice, or demand is served on the Commissioners, he shall immediately cause one of such copies to be forwarded by registered mail, addressed to such corporation at its principal office as the same appears in the records of the Commissioners. Any services so had on the Commissioners shall be returnable in not less than 30 days: *Provided, however,* That, if a period of less than or greater than 30 days is prescribed by law or by rules of a court in the District or the rules or regulations of any agency of the United States or of the District, such prescribed period shall govern.

(b) Nothing herein contained shall limit or affect the right to serve any process, notice, or demand required or permitted by law to be served upon a foreign corporation in any other manner now or hereafter permitted by law.

(c) The Commissioners shall keep a record of all processes, notices, and demands served upon them under this section, and shall record therein the time of such service and their action with reference thereto.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION OF FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 110. Whenever the articles of incorporation of a foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District are amended, such foreign corporation shall forthwith file with the Commissioners a copy of such amendment duly certified by the proper officer of the State under the laws of which such corporation is organized; but the filing thereof shall not of itself enlarge or alter the purpose or purposes which such corporation is authorized to pursue in the transaction of business in the District, nor authorize such corporation to transact business in the District under any other name than the name set forth in its certificate of authority.

MERGER OF FOREIGN CORPORATION AUTHORIZED TO TRANSACT BUSINESS IN THE DISTRICT

SEC. 111. Whenever a foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District shall be a party to a statutory merger permitted by the laws of the State under which it is organized, and such corporation shall be the surviving corporation, it shall forthwith file with the Commissioners a copy of the articles of merger duly certified by the proper officer of the State under the laws of which such statutory merger was effected; and it shall not be necessary for such corporation to procure either a new or amended certificate of authority to transact business in the District unless the name of such corporation be changed thereby or unless the corporation desires to pursue in the District other or additional purposes than those which it is then authorized to transact in the District.

AMENDED CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 112. (a) A foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District shall secure an amended certificate of authority in the event it changes its corporate name, or desires to pursue in the District other or additional purposes than those set forth in its prior application for a certificate of authority, by making application therefor to the Commissioners.

(b) The requirements in respect to the form and contents of such application, the manner of its execution, the filing of duplicate originals thereof with the Commissioners, the issuance of an amended certificate of authority and the effect thereof shall be the same as in the case of an original application for a certificate of authority.

ANNUAL REPORT OF FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

SEC. 113. Each foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District shall file on or before April 15 of each year with the Commissioners an annual report setting forth—

(a) The name of the corporation and the State under the laws of which it is organized.

(b) If the name of the corporation does not contain one of the words "corporation," "company," "incorporated," or "limited," or does not contain an abbreviation of one of such words, then the name of the corporation with the word or abbreviation which it has elected to add thereto for use in the District.

(c) The date of its incorporation and the period of its duration.

(d) The address, including street and number, if any, of its principal office in the State under the laws of which it is organized.

(e) The address, including street and number, if any of its registered office in the District, and the name of its registered agent at such address.

(f) The name or names of the State or States other than the District, if any, in which it is admitted or qualified to transact business.

(g) A brief statement of the character of the business in which it is actually engaged in the District.

(h) The names and respective addresses, including street and number, if any, of its directors and officers.

(i) A statement of the aggregate number of shares which the corporation has authority to issue, and the aggregate number of its issued shares, itemized by classes, par value of shares, shares without par value, and series, if any, within a class.

Such annual report shall be made on forms prescribed and furnished by the Commissioners and the information therein contained shall be given as of the date of the execution of the report. It shall be executed by the corporation by its president, vice president, secretary, assistant secretary, or treasurer, and verified by the officer making the report, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed.

WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN CORPORATION

SEC. 114. (a) A foreign corporation authorized to transact business in the District may withdraw from the District upon procuring from the Commissioners a certificate of withdrawal. In order to procure such certificate of withdrawal, such foreign corporation shall file with the Commissioners an application for withdrawal.

(b) The application for withdrawal shall set forth—

(1) the name of the corporation and the State under the laws of which it is organized;

(2) that it is not transacting business in the District;

(3) that it surrenders its authority to transact business in the District;

(4) that it revokes the authority of its registered agent in the District to accept service of process and consents that service of process in any suit, action, or proceeding based upon any cause of action arising in the District during the time it was authorized to transact business in the District may thereafter be made on such corporation by service thereof on the Commissioners;

(5) a post-office address to which the Commissioners may mail a copy of any process against the corporation that may be served on him;

(6) such information as may be necessary or appropriate in order to enable the Commissioners to determine and assess any unpaid fees payable by such foreign corporation as in this act prescribed.

(c) The application for withdrawal shall be made on forms prescribed and furnished by the Commissioners and shall be executed by the corporation by its president or a vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, or, if the corporation is in the hands of a receiver or trustee, the same shall be executed on behalf of the corporation by such receiver or trustee and verified by him.

FILING OF APPLICATION FOR WITHDRAWAL

SEC. 115. (a) Duplicate originals of such application for withdrawal shall be delivered to the Commissioners. Upon receipt thereof they shall examine the same, and, if they find that it conforms to the provisions of this act, they shall, when all fees and charges have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of withdrawal to which they shall affix the other duplicate original.

(b) The Commissioners shall return such certificate of withdrawal with a duplicate original of the application for withdrawal thereto affixed to the corporation or its representative. Upon the issuance of such certificate of withdrawal, the authority of the corporation to transact business in the District shall cease.

REVOCATION OF CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 116. The certificate of authority of a foreign corporation to transact business in the District may be revoked by the Commissioners when they find that—

(a) The certificate of authority of the corporation was procured through fraud practiced upon the District; or

(b) The corporation has continued to exceed or abuse the authority conferred upon it by this act; or

(c) The corporation has failed for a period of 90 days to pay any fees, charges, or penalties prescribed by this act; or

(d) The corporation has failed for 90 days to appoint and maintain a registered agent in the District; or

(e) The corporation has failed for 30 days after change of its registered office or registered agent to file with the Commissioners a statement of such change; or

(f) The corporation has failed to file its annual report as required by this act; or

(g) The corporation for a period of 2 years has not transacted any business in the District; or

(h) The corporation has failed to file with the Commissioners a duly authenticated copy of each amendment to its articles of incorporation within 30 days after such amendment becomes effective; or

(i) A misrepresentation has been made of any material matter in any application, report, affidavit, or other document submitted by such corporation pursuant to this act, in which event the Commissioners shall give not less than 30 days' notice forwarded by registered mail, addressed to such corporation at its principal office as the same appears in the records of the Commissioners or at its registered office in the District, of their intent to revoke the certificate of authority.

ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE OF REVOCATION

SEC. 117. (a) Upon revoking any such certificate of authority, the Commissioners shall—

(1) issue a certificate of revocation in duplicate;

(2) file one of such certificates in his office;

(3) mail to such corporation at it registered office in the District a notice of such revocation accompanied by one of such certificates.

(b) Upon the issuance of such certificate of revocation, the authority of the corporation to transact business in the District shall cease.

EFFECT OF REVOCATION OR WITHDRAWAL UPON ACTIONS AND CONTRACTS

SEC. 118. The revocation of certificate of authority or the voluntary withdrawal of a foreign corporation whereby its authority to do business in the District shall cease and be determined, shall not affect any action then pending, nor affect any right of action upon any contract made by the corporation in the District before such revocation or withdrawal, and, in any action upon any liability or obligation so incurred before the revocation or withdrawal, the process against the corporation may be served, after the filing thereof, upon the Commissioners.

APPLICATION TO FOREIGN CORPORATIONS TRANSACTING BUSINESS ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS ACT

SEC. 119. Foreign corporations transacting business in the District at the time this act takes effect for a purpose or purposes for which a certificate of authority is required under the provisions of this act shall, within 6 months after the effective date of this act, procure a certificate of authority and shall otherwise comply with all applicable provisions of this act. Failure to secure a certificate of authority within the time provided in this section shall subject the corporation to all the penalties, liabilities, and restrictions provided in this act for transacting business without a certificate of authority.

TRANSACTING BUSINESS WITHOUT CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 120. (a) No foreign corporation which is subject to the provisions of this act and which transacts business in the District without a certificate of authority shall be permitted to maintain an action at law or in equity in any court of the District until such corporation shall have obtained a certificate of authority. Nor shall an action at law or in equity be maintained in any court of the District by any successor or assignee of such corporation on any right, claim, or demand arising out of the transaction of business by such corporation in the District until a certificate of authority shall have been obtained by such corporation or by a corporation which has acquired all or substantially all of its assets.

(b) The failure of a foreign corporation to obtain a certificate of authority to transact business in the District shall not impair the validity of any contract or act of such corporation, and shall not prevent such corporation from defending any action at law or suit in equity in any court of the District.

(c) A foreign corporation which transacts business in the District without a certificate of authority shall be liable to the District, for the years or parts thereof during which it transacted business the District without a certificate of authority, in an amount equal to all fees and other charges which would have been imposed by this act upon such corporation had it duly applied for and received a certificate of authority to transact business in the District as required by this act and thereafter filed all reports required by this act; and in addition thereto it shall be liable for a penalty of not in excess of $500. The Commissioners shall bring proceedings to recover all amounts due the District under the provisions of this section. Such charges and penalties shall be paid to the District before any certificate of authority is issued to such foreign corporation.

COMMISSIONERS; DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS

SEC. 121. (a) The Commissioners shall be charged with the administration and enforcement of this act. Said Commissioners are authorized to employ such personnel as may be necessary for the administration of this act, within appropriations made by Congress. The compensation of such personnel shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN DIGITIZED

(b) The Commissioners may transfer any or all of the functions vested in them by this act to any agent designated by them pursuant to the provisions of this act, or to any office or agency established by them pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952.

(c) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall provide a distinctive official seal, which shall be the seal of the District of Columbia surrounded by a border in which shall appear such legend as the Commissioners may determine.

(d) Every certificate and other document or paper executed by the Commissioners, in pursuance of any authority conferred upon them by this act, and sealed with the seal prescribed by subsection (b) hereof, and all copies of such papers as well as of documents and other papers filed in accordance with the provisions of this act, when certified by them and authenticated by said seal, shall have the same force and effect as evidence as would the originals thereof in any action or proceeding in any court and before a public officer, or official body.

(e) The Commissioners are authorized to attend and participate in the meetings of national organizations of State officials having supervision over corporations, and of the committees thereof, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to defray the expenses of attendance at such meetings and to pay such annual dues or other fees as may be necessary to membership in said organizations. The Commissioners are further authorized to visit the corporation departments of the various States when in their judgment such visits are necessary or desirable in connection with the organization or proper conduct of any office or agency established by them.

(f) The Commissioners are authorized to make, modify, and enforce such regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, prescribe penalties for the violation of any such regulations not exceeding a fine of $300 or imprisonment for 90 days, or both, and to prescribe such forms and procedures for use in the conduct of the business of any office or agency established by them as they may deem appropriate.

FEES, FRANCHISE AND LICENSE TAXES, AND CHARGES

SEC. 122. (a) The Commissioners shall charge in accordance with the provisions of this act—

(1) fees for filing documents and issuing certificates;

(2) license fees;

(3) franchise taxes;

(4) miscellaneous charges.

(b) The Commissioners shall charge for—

(1) filing articles of incorporation, $20;

(2) filing amendment to articles of incorporation, $20;

(3) filing articles of merger or consolidation, $20;

(4) filing a statement of intent to dissolve, $5;

(5) filing articles of reincorporation, $20;

(6) filing articles of dissolution, $10;

(7) filing statement of change of address of registered office or change of registered agent, or both, $1;

(8) filing statement of the establishment of a series of shares, $5;

(9) filing an application of a foreign corporation for certificate of authority to transact business in the District and issuing a certificate of authority, $20;

(10) filing an application for reservation of a corporate name or for a renewal of reservation, $5;

(11) filing notice of transfer of a reserved corporate name, $5;

(12) filing an application of a foreign corporation for amended certificate of authority to transact business in the District and issuing an amended certificate of authority, $20;

(13) filing a copy of amendment to the articles of incorporation of a foreign corporation holding a certificate of authority to transact business in the District, $5;

(14) filing a copy of articles of merger of a foreign corporation holding a certificate of authority to transact business in the District, $20;

(15) filing an application for withdrawal of a foreign corporation and issuing a certificate of withdrawal, $5;

(16) filing application for reinstatement of a domestic or foreign corporation and issuing certificate of reinstatement, $50;

(17) filing any other statement or report, except an annual report, of a domestic or foreign corporation, $1;

(18) for indexing each document filed, except an annual report, of a domestic or a foreign corporation, $2;

(19) for furnishing a certified copy of any document, instrument, report, or paper relating to a corporation, $5.

(c) An initial license fee is hereby imposed as follows:

(1) Every domestic corporation upon the filing of its articles of incorporation shall pay, in addition to any other fees and charges imposed by this act, the sum of 2 cents for each authorized share of its capital stock up to and including 10,000 shares, and the sum of 1 cent for each additional authorized share up to and including 50,000 shares, and the sum of one-half of 1 cent for each additional authorized share in excess of 50,000 shares: *Provided*, That in any case in which the articles of incorporation, of a domestic corporation authorizes par value shares having a par value per share other than $100 per share, then, in respect to such shares only, the aggregate par value of all of such shares shall be divided by the figure 100 and the quotient so obtained shall be the number of shares for the purpose of the initial license tax as to such shares: *And provided further*, That in no case shall the initial license fee payable be less than $10.

(2) Every domestic corporation upon the filing of any amendment of its articles of incorporation effecting an increase of its authorized capital stock, in addition to any other fees and charges imposed by this act, a sum equal to the difference between the initial license fee computed at the rates provided in paragraph (b) (1) of this section on the total of the authorized number of shares, including the proposed increase and the initial license fee so computed on the total of the authorized number of shares excluding said increase: *Provided*, That in no case shall the sum payable be less than $10.

(3) For filing an agreement of consolidation or an agreement of merger, $20: *Provided*, That if the corporation created in the case of an agreement of consolidation, or the corporation surviving in the case of an agreement of merger shall be a domestic corporation, then in addition to any other fees and charges imposed by this act, a sum equal to the difference between the initial license fee computed at the rates provided in paragraph (b) (1) of this section upon the total of the authorized number of shares of the corporation created by such consolidation or surviving in the case of a merger and the initial license fee so computed upon the aggregate amount of the total authorized number of shares such of the constituent corporation as are domestic corporations: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the sum payable as an initial license fee be less than $20.

(d) Each foreign corporation authorized under the provisions of this act to do business in the District and each domestic corporation shall pay an annual report fee of $10, which sum shall be paid at the time of the filing of the annual report required of such corporations under the provisions of this act.

(e) All taxes, fees, and charges provided for in this act shall be paid to the Commissioners and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District.

EFFECT OF FAILURE TO PAY ANNUAL REPORT FEE OR TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 123. If any corporation incorporated or reincorporated under this act, or any foreign corporation having a certificate of authority issued under this act, shall for 2 consecutive years fail or refuse to pay any annual report fee or fees payable under this act, or fail or refuse to file any annual report as required by this act for 2 consecutive years, then, in the case of a domestic corporation, the articles of incorporation shall be void and all powers conferred upon such corporation are declared inoperative, and, in the case of a foreign corporation, the certificate of authority shall be revoked and all powers conferred thereunder shall be inoperative.

PROCLAMATION OF REVOCATION

SEC. 124. (a) On the second Monday in September of each year, the Commissioners shall issue a proclamation listing the names of all domestic corporations and all foreign corporations which have failed or refused to pay any annual report fee or fees or failed or refused to file any annual report as required by this act for 2 consecutive years next preceding June 30 in the year in which such proclamation is issued and upon the issuance of such proclamation the articles of incorporation or the certificate of authority, as the case may be, shall be void and all powers thereunder inoperative without further proceedings of any kind.

(b) The proclamation of the Commissioners shall be filed in their office and shall be published once during the month of September in each of two daily newspapers of general circulation in the District of Columbia. A certified copy of the proclamation shall be transmitted to the Recorder of Deeds and he shall cause notation of the fact of revocation to be made upon the articles of incorporation of each domestic corporation listed in said proclamation.

(c) Upon publication of the proclamation of revocation as provided in this act each domestic corporation listed in such proclamation shall be deemed to have been dissolved without further legal proceedings and each such corporation shall cease to carry on its business and shall proceed to collect its assets, convey and dispose of such of its properties as are not to be distributed in kind to its shareholders, pay, satisfy, and discharge its liabilities and obligations and do all other acts required to liquidate its business and affairs, and, after paying or adequately providing for the payment of all of its obligations, distribute the remainder of its assets, either in cash or in kind, among its shareholders according to their respective rights and interest.

(d) All domestic corporations the articles of incorporation of which are revoked by proclamation or the term of existence of which expires by limitation set forth in its articles of incorporation shall nevertheless be continued for the term of 3 years from the date of such revocation or expiration bodies corporate for the purpose of prosecuting and defending suits by or against them, and of enabling them gradually to collect their assets, convey and dispose of such of their properties as are not to be distributed in kind to their shareholders, pay, satisfy, and discharge their liabilities and obligations and do all other acts required to liquidate their business and affairs, and, after paying or adequately providing for the payment of all its obligations, to distribute the remainder of their assets, either in cash or in kind among their shareholders according to their respective rights and interests, but not for the purpose of continuing the business for which such corporation shall have been organized: *Provided, however*, That with respect to any action, suit, or proceeding begun or commenced by or against a corporation prior to such revocation or expiration and with respect to any

action, suit or proceeding begun or commenced by or against such corporation within 3 years after the date of such revocation or expiration, such corporation shall only for the purpose of such actions, suits, or proceedings so begun or commenced be continued bodies corporate beyond said 3-year period and until any judgments, orders, or decrees therein shall be fully executed.

PENALTY FOR CARRYING ON BUSINESS AFTER ISSUANCE OF PROCLAMATION

SEC. 125. Any corporation, person, or persons who shall exercise or attempt to exercise any powers under articles of incorporation of a domestic corporation or under a certificate of authority of a foreign corporation which has been revoked shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN PROCLAMATION

SEC. 126. Whenever it is established to the satisfaction of the Commissioners that any corporation named in said proclamation has not failed or refused to pay any annual report fee or file any annual report for 2 consecutive years, or has been inadvertently included in the list of corporations as so failing or refusing to pay annual report fees or file reports, the Commissioners are authorized to correct such mistake by issuing a proclamation to that effect and restoring the articles of incorporation or certificate of authority, as the case may be, into good standing with like effect as if such proclamation of revocation, as to such corporation, had not been issued.

RESERVATION OF NAME OF PROCLAIMED CORPORATION

SEC. 127. The Commissioners shall reserve the names of all corporations the articles of incorporation of which have been revoked and of all foreign corporations the certificates of authority of which have been revoked until December 31 of the year in which the proclamation of revocation was issued and no domestic corporation shall be formed nor the name of any such domestic corporation changed to a name the same as or deceptively similar to such reserved name nor shall any foreign corporation be authorized to do business under a name the same as or deceptively similar to such reserved name.

REINSTATEMENT OF PROCLAIMED CORPORATIONS

SEC. 128. Upon filing a petition for reinstatement by a proclaimed corporation accompanied by the filing of the delinquent reports, or payment of delinquent annual report fee or fees in full, or both, as the case may be, together with any penalties imposed by this act, and upon payment of the reinstatement fee provided by this act at any time after the date of the issuance of the proclamation, the Commissioners, if they find that all of the documents offered for filing conform to law, shall file them in their office and shall issue their certificate of reinstatement which shall have the effect of annulling the revocation proceedings theretofore taken as to such corporation and such corporation shall have such powers, rights, duties, and obligations as it had at the time of the issuance of the proclamation with the same force and effect as to such corporation as if the proclamation had not been issued.

PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE ANNUAL REPORT ON TIME

SEC. 129. Any corporation organized under this act or any foreign corporation having a certificate of authority under this act which fails or refuses to file the annual report required by this act to be filed on April 15 of each year shall pay a penalty of $25.

PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO MAINTAIN REGISTERED OFFICE OR REGISTERED AGENT

SEC. 130. Any corporation incorporated or reincorporated under this act, or any foreign corporation which has been issued a certificate of authority under this act, which fails or refuses to maintain a registered office or a registered agent in the District of Columbia, in accordance with the provisions of this act shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof by a court of competent jurisdiction shall be fined in an amount not exceeding $500.

EFFECT OF NONPAYMENT OF FEES

SEC. 131. (a) The Commissioners shall not file any articles, statements, certificates, reports, applications, notices, or other papers relating to any corporation, domestic or foreign, organized under or subject to the provisions of this act, until all fees and charges provided to be paid in connection therewith shall have been paid to him or while the corporation is in default in the payment of any fees, charges, or penalties herein provided to be paid by or assessed against it.

(b) No corporation required to pay a fee, charge, or penalty under this act shall maintain in the District of Columbia any action at law or suit in equity until all such fees, charges, and penalties have been paid in full.

PENALTIES; VIOLATION OR FAILURE A MISDEMEANOR

SEC. 132. Any person, or corporation, who violates any provision of this act, or fails to comply with any provision thereof, for which violation or failure no penalty is provided therein or elsewhere in the laws of the District of Columbia, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof by a court of competent jurisdiction shall be fined not exceeding $500 for each and every violation or failure.

RIGHTS AND IMMUNITIES OF WITNESSES

SEC. 133. No person shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, accounts, and papers in any proceeding based upon or growing out of any violation of the provisions of this act, on the ground or for the reason that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to penalty or forfeiture; but no person having so testified shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he may have testified or produced any documentary evidence: *Provided*, That no person so testifying shall be exempted from prosecution or punishment for perjury: *Provided further*, That the immunity hereby conferred shall extend only to a natural person who, in obedience to a subpena gives testimony under oath or produces evidence, documentary or otherwise, under oath.

MONOPOLIES AND RESTRAINT OF TRADE

SEC. 134. Nothing in this act shall be interpreted to authorize a corporation to do any act in violation of the common law or the statutes relating to the District of Columbia or of the United States with respect to monopolies and illegal restraint of trade.

WAIVER OF NOTICE

SEC. 135. Whenever any notice whatever is required to be given under the provisions of this act or under the provisions of the articles of incorporation or bylaws of any corporation, a waiver thereof in writing signed by the person or persons entitled to such notice, whether before or after the time stated therein, shall be deemed equivalent to the giving of such notice.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS OF ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION

SEC. 136. Whenever, with respect to any action to be taken by the shareholders of a corporation, the articles of incorporation require the vote or concurrence of the holders of a greater proportion of the shares, or of any class or series thereof, than required by this act with respect to such action, the provisions of the articles of incorporation shall control.

INFORMAL ACTION BY SHAREHOLDERS

SEC. 137. Any action required by this act to be taken at a meeting of the shareholders of a corporation, or any other action which may be taken at a meeting of the shareholders, may be taken without a meeting if a consent in writing, setting forth the action so taken, shall be signed by all of the shareholders entitled to vote with respect to the subject matter thereof. In the event that the action which is consented to is such as would have required the filing of a certificate under any section of this act, if such action had been voted upon by the shareholders at a meeting thereof, the certificate filed under such section shall state that written consent has been given hereunder, in lieu of stating that the shareholders have voted upon the corporate action in question, if such last-mentioned statement is required thereby.

APPEAL FROM COMMISSIONERS

SEC. 138. (a) If the Commissioners shall fail to approve any articles of incorporation, amendment, merger, consolidation, or dissolution, or any other document required by this act to be approved by the Commissioners before the same shall be filed in their office, they shall, within 10 days after the delivery thereof to them give written notice of their disapproval to the person or corporation, domestic or foreign, delivering the same, specifying the reasons therefor. From such disapproval such person or corporation may appeal to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, by filing with the clerk of such court a petition setting forth a copy of the articles or other document sought to be filed and a copy of the written disapproval thereof by the Commissioners; whereupon the matter shall be tried de novo by the court, and the court shall either sustain the action of the Commissioners or direct them to take such action as the court may deem proper.

(b) If the Commissioners shall revoke the certificate of authority to transact business in the District of any foreign corporation, pursuant to the provisions of this act, such foreign corporation may likewise appeal to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, by filing with the clerk of such court a petition setting forth a copy of its certificate of authority to transact business in the District and a copy of the notice of revocation given by the Commissioners; whereupon the matter shall be tried de novo by the court and the court shall either sustain the action of the Commissioners or direct them to take such action as the court may deem proper.

(c) Appeals from all final orders and judgments entered by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia under this section in review of any ruling or decision of the Commissioners may be taken to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by either party to the proceeding within 60 days after service on such party of a copy of the order or judgment of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

CERTIFICATES AND CERTIFIED COPIES OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO BE RECEIVED IN EVIDENCE

SEC. 139. All certificates issued by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of this act, and all copies of documents filed in their office in accordance with the provisions of this act when certified by them, shall be taken and received in all courts, public offices, and official bodies as prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated. A certificate by the Commissioners under the seal of their office, as to the existence or nonexistence of the facts relating to corporations which would not appear from a certified copy of any of the foregoing documents or certificates shall be taken and received in all courts, public offices, and official bodies as prima facie evidence of the existence or nonexistence of the acts therein stated.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

UNAUTHORIZED ASSUMPTION OF CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 140. All persons who assume to act as a corporation without authority so to do shall be jointly and severally liable for all debts and liabilities incurred or arising as a result thereof.

FORMS TO BE FURNISHED BY COMMISSIONERS

SEC. 141. All reports required by this act to be filed in the office of the Commissioners shall be made on forms which shall be prescribed and furnished by the Commissioners. Forms for all other documents to be filed in the office of the Commissioners shall be furnished by the Commissioners on request therefor, but the use thereof, unless otherwise specifically prescribed in this act, shall not be mandatory.

REINCORPORATION OR INCORPORATION OF EXISTING CORPORATIONS

SEC. 142. Any corporation which is either—

(1) organized and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia on the date this act takes effect and which is organized for profit and for a purpose or purposes authorized by this act; or

(2) created under the provisions of a special act of Congress to transact business in the District of Columbia for profit and for purposes authorized by this act;

may avail itself of the provisions of this act and may become reincorporated or incorporated hereunder in the following alternative manner:

I. Reincorporation

(a) The board of directors shall adopt a resolution declaring it advisable in the judgment of the board that the corporation should be reincorporated under the provisions of this act and further setting forth the following statements for articles of incorporation under this act:

(1) The name which the corporation elects to be reincorporated under and which shall contain the word "corporation", "company", "incorporated", or "limited", or shall contain an abbreviation of one of said words.

(2) The designation of the address, including street and number, if any, of its registered office in the District of Columbia; and the name of its registered agent at such address.

(3) The purpose or purposes for which the corporation was organized and which it will hereafter carry on.

(4) The aggregate number of shares which the corporation was authorized to issue and, if said shares were of one class only, the par value of such shares, or a statement that all were without par value, as the case may be; or if said shares were divided into classes, the number of shares of each class, if any, that have a par value and the par value of each share of each such class, and the number of shares of each class, if any, that are without par value.

(5) If the shares were divided into classes, the designation of each class and a statement of the preferences, qualifications, limitations, restrictions, and the special or relative rights in respect of the shares of each class and whether the shares of any class have full, limited, or no voting power.

(6) The number of directors of the corporation.

(7) Any other provisions, not inconsistent with law, or this act, for the regulation of the internal affairs of the corporation.

(8) That it elects to surrender its existing charter and to be reincorporated under and subject to the provisions of this act.

It shall not be necessary to set forth in the articles of reincorporation any of the corporate powers enumerated in this act.

(b) Written or printed notice setting forth the proposed articles of reincorporation or a summary thereof shall be given to each shareholder of record within the time and in the manner provided in this act for giving notice of meetings of shareholders.

(c) At such meeting a vote of the shareholders shall be taken on the proposed reincorporation and it shall be adopted upon receiving the affirmative vote of the holders of two-thirds of the outstanding shares unless two or more classes of shares are issued in which event it shall be adopted upon receiving the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the outstanding shares of each class issued.

(d) Upon receiving such approval, articles of reincorporation shall be executed in duplicate by the corporation by its president or vice president, and verified by him, and the corporate seal shall be thereto affixed, attested by its secretary or an assistant secretary, and delivered to the Commissioners.

(e) If the Commissioners find that the articles of reincorporation conform to law, they shall, when all fees and charges have been paid as in this act prescribed—

(1) endorse on each of such duplicate originals the word "Filed", and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) issue a certificate of reincorporation to which they shall attach the other duplicate original which shall be filed for record in the office of the Recorder of Deeds; or—

II. Incorporation

Effect of Filing Articles or Reincorporation

(a) By filing with the Commissioners a copy of its charter, or articles of incorporation, then in effect, certified by the secretary of said corporation, together with a certificate executed on behalf of the corporation by the president or a vice president and the secretary or the assistant secretary setting forth the following:

(1) The name of the corporation, which shall contain the word "corporation", "company", "incorporated", or "limited", or shall end with an abbreviation of one of said words.

(2) The designation of the address, including street and number, if any, of its registered office in the District of Columbia; and the name of its registered agent at such address.

(3) The purpose or purposes for which the corporation was organized and which it will hereafter carry on.

(4) The aggregate number of shares which the corporation was authorized to issue and, if said shares were of one class only, the par value of such shares, or a statement that all were without par value, as the case may be; or if said shares were divided into classes, the number of shares of each class, if any, that have a par value and the par value of each share of each such class, and the number of shares of each class, if any, that are without par value.

(5) If the shares were divided into classes, the designation of each class and a statement of the preferences, qualifications, limitations, restrictions, and the special or relative rights in respect of the shares of each class and whether the shares of any class have full, limited, or no voting power.

(6) The number of director of the corporation.

(7) Any other provisions, not inconsistent with law, or this act, for the regulation of the internal affairs of the corporation.

It shall not be necessary to set forth in such certificate any of the corporate powers enumerated in this act.

(b) A copy of a resolution of the board of directors certified to by the secretary of such corporation which shows that said board believes it advisable that the corporation should elect to avail itself of the provisions of this act and become incorporated hereunder.

(c) A certificate of the secretary of such corporation to the effect that such action by the corporation has been ratified and approved by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the outstanding shares of capital stock of such corporation entitled to vote.

(d) If the Commissioners find that such papers conform to law, they shall accept them for filing in the same manner as herein provided for the filing of articles of incorporation.

EFFECT OF FILING ARTICLES OF REINCORPORATION OR CERTIFICATES OF INCORPORATION

SEC. 143. Upon the issuance of articles of reincorporation or the certificate of incorporation by the Superintendent of Corporations the existence of the corporation shall be continued under this act and the corporation shall be entitled to and be possessed of all the privileges, franchises, and powers and subject to all the provisions of this act as fully and to the same extent as if such corporation had been originally incorporated under this act; and all privileges, franchises, and powers theretofore belonging to said corporation and all property, real, personal, and mixed, and all debts due on whatever account, and all choses in action, and all and every other interest of or belonging to or due such corporation shall be and the same are hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed and assured to such corporation with like effect and to all intents and purposes as if the same had been originally acquired through incorporation under this act: *Provided, however,* That any corporation thus reincorporating or incorporating under the provisions of this act shall be subject to all the contracts, debts, claims, duties, liabilities, and obligations of the corporations thus reincorporated or incorporated as if such reincorporation or incorporation had not taken place and neither the rights of creditors nor any liens upon the property of any such corporation shall be impaired by such reincorporation or incorporation. Such reincorporated or incorporated corporation shall not be subject to the payment of the initial franchise tax provided by this act.

TRANSFER OF DUTIES OF RECORDER OF DEEDS

SEC. 144. (a) All powers conferred and all duties imposed upon the Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia by any act of Congress in relation to the organization of corporations, the amendment of certificates of incorporation or charters of corporations, change in capital stock, change of name, reincorporation, dissolution, or other corporate action are on the effective date of this act hereby transferred to, imposed upon, and shall be exercised or performed by the Commissioners; and wherever the words "Recorder of Deeds" or other words denoting that officer appear in any of the acts of Congress relating to the organization of corporations under the laws of the District of Columbia, or to amendments to the certificate of incorporation or charter of any corporation organized and existing under any of such acts, or to changes of name, changes of capital stock, reincorporation, dissolution, or other corporate action of any such corporation, whether such words relate to the powers and duties of such officer in relation to organization of corporations under any such acts, or to any of the corporate acts hereinbefore enumerated or are used in connection with the imposition of obligations or duties or the conferring of rights or privileges upon corporations or other persons, such words shall be construed to mean the Commissioners. All fees and charges, except as hereinafter provided, now chargeable by the Recorder of Deeds for doing the work or performing the services hereby transferred to the Commissioners shall, after the effective date of this act, be chargeable by the Commissioners. On and after the effective date of this act all certificates of incorporation or charters for the organization of corporations under any act of Congress or for the amendment of any such certificate of incorporation or charter, changes in capital stock, reincorporation, dissolution, or other corporate action under any such act, shall be delivered to the Commissioners in duplicate original.

If the Commissioners find that any such document conforms to law, they shall, when all fees have been paid as prescribed by law—

(1) endorse on each such duplicate original the word "Filed," and the month, day, and year of the filing thereof;

(2) file one of such duplicate originals in their office;

(3) the other duplicate original returned by the Commissioners shall be recorded in the office of the Recorder of Deeds, and he shall charge the usual fee for recordation as for deeds of real estate.

(b) The filing of such document in the office of the Commissioners shall have the same force and effect as the recordation of lodging for recordation of certificates of incorporation and other corporate documents hereinbefore enumerated, formerly had in the office of the Recorder of Deeds.

(c) Upon the effective date of this act, the Commissioners shall take possession of all original books, papers, and records heretofore filed, recorded, used, or acquired by the Recorder of Deeds in the exercise of the powers and in the performance of the duties hereby transferred to the Commissioners, but nothing herein contained shall require the Recorder of Deeds to transfer any copies or transcripts of corporate papers that may constitute part of the records of his office.

CONSTITUTIONALITY

SEC. 145. The invalidity of any portion of this act shall not affect the validity of any other portion thereof which can be given effect without such invalid part.

RIGHT OF REPEAL RESERVED

SEC. 146. Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, or any part thereof, or any certificate of incorporation or certificate of authority issued pursuant to its provisions.

TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 147. This act shall take effect 180 days after the date of its approval, and thereafter no corporation eligible to be formed under this act shall be incorporated under any other act or statute now in force in the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 122, line 11, strike out the word "he" and insert in lieu thereof the word "they."

Page 156, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "Superintendent of Corporations" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Commissioners."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENALTIES IN CERTAIN CASES IN THE MUNICIPAL AND JUVENILE COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 1832) to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in all cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, the municipal court or the juvenile court, as the case may be, shall have power upon conviction to suspend the imposition of sentence or to impose sentence and suspend the execution thereof, if it should appear to the satisfaction of the court that the ends of justice and the best interests of the public and of the defendant would be served thereby. In each case of the imposition of sentence and the suspension of the execution thereof, the municipal court may, in its discretion, place the defendant on probation as provided by the act approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 864; sec. 24–102, D. C. Code, 1940), and the juvenile court may, in its discretion, place the defendant on probation as provided by the act approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 601; sec. 11–919, D. C. Code, 1940), by the act approved March 23, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 86; sec. 22–903, D. C. Code, 1940), or by the act approved February 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 807; sec. 31–307, D. C. Code, 1940), as the case may be.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 2277) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920 (41 Stat. 691), is hereby amended by striking out "Roosevelt Memorial Association" and inserting in lieu thereof "Theodore Roosevelt Association."

SEC. 2. Any law heretofore enacted by the Congress and now in effect which refers to said Roosevelt Memorial Association shall hereafter be deemed to refer to such association by its new name, Theodore Roosevelt Association.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3180) to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committe of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill? As I understand this, it is going to relieve a lot of property in the District of Columbia from taxation. This is a little different from what is being done in the several States and I would like to have it explained.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to explain the bill.

This bill provides for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property.

The purpose of this legislation is contained in part of a letter which is included herewith to the Chairman of the House District Committee from the President of the Board of Commissioners.

The Committee on the District of Columbia wrote an amendment into the bill which would exempt libraries and nonprofit organizations in the District of Columbia.

Section 3 of the bill was also amended so that in making a return for personal property other than household effects it would not be necessary to make such return under oath. The provision is made that such returns, now being made, may be done by merely signing the return as it is done under Federal law.

The purpose of the bill is to exempt from taxation certain tangible personal property. Generally speaking, the bill, if enacted into law, would exempt household belongings not held for use or used in any trade or business and not held for sale or rent. It would also exempt boats and the contents thereof not held for rent or sale and not held for use or used in a trade or business. There is a definition of the words "household belongings" contained in the bill and this definition would include furniture, clothing, jewelry, and so forth, ordinarily found in a home, but would exclude from the definition, and hence the exemption, automobiles and other motor vehicles.

The Commissioners believe that existing tax on the tangible personal property such as would be exempted if the bill were enacted should be repealed. The statute under which such property is now taxed is about 50 years old. While at the time such tax was levied it was a commonly accepted method of raising revenue, since that time the practice of raising revenue by the taxation of such tangible personal property has fallen into disuse in many tax jurisdictions. Such a tax is difficult to administer and as a result of this fact often results in inequities. For example, it puts the burden on the citizen to place a value upon property which may have been purchased many years prior, and the tax assessor has the duty of determining whether that value is proper. Such a method of taxation, predicated as it is upon opinion as to value, is manifestly unsound from a practical viewpoint. Because of honest differences of opinion between taxpayers and taxing authorities as to the value, much litigation has

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

arisen under the present District statute. As was hereinbefore stated, the taxation of household property was, at the time the District statute was enacted, a prevalent theory of taxation. At that time, however, there were few, if any, direct taxes upon income or other more equitable methods of taxation in existence. Since the enactment of the present District tax on tangible personal property, including household belongings, other and more equitable methods of taxation have been enacted into law. For example, in Public Law 76, 81st Congress, 1st session, approved May 27, 1949, District sales and use taxes were levied and increased alcoholic beverage taxes, and cigarette taxes were imposed to raise additional revenue. The amount of relief to District taxpayers if H. R. 3180 were enacted, would be comparatively insignificant when considered in the light of the additional revenue which has resulted, and will continue to result, due to the enactment of said Public Law 76. The assessing authorities have estimated that the decrease in revenue which would result from the enactment of this bill would be approximately $800,000 annually.

The Commissioners believe that the continuation of the tax on automobiles and other motor vehicles is proper. It is obvious that automobiles and other motor vehicles, being more or less constantly upon the public streets and highways, are for that reason distinct from other classes of tangible personal property, such as furniture, and that their selection for taxation while exempting certain other tangible personal property would be a classification which rests upon substantial differences.

The Commissioners are advised that the citizenry of the District is most anxious that the present tax on household belongings, and so forth, be repealed. The Commissioners themselves feel that the tax should be repealed and earnestly beseech the Congress to enact the bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, the Tax Assessor of the District of Columbia appeared before our committee and stated that it was probably true that about 1 out of 5 persons who should pay personal-property taxes pay that tax. He further stated that it was impossible under existing conditions and the limitations of the personnel of the Tax Assessor's office to make the collection of taxes from those who do not pay their taxes, to fully enforce this tax. He did say that if this same personnel—and I am addressing my remarks particularly to the gentleman from Kansas—were freed to pursue other avenues of revenue and their enforcement, that the full amount, and in excess of the full amount of $800,000, would be recouped.

I want to say to the gentleman from Kansas that recently the city of Baltimore, I am informed by one of our colleagues from Baltimore, repealed the personal-property tax upon household goods because of its obnoxiousness and the difficulty of enforcement. There are some States which provide for no personal-property tax on household goods. Some of those removals have been recent. I might say that when the matter of the enactment of a sales tax was before the District, certain pledges were made to the people of the District that if the sales tax became a law, that this tax upon personal property, household goods, would be removed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has just told us about the city of Baltimore. That applies to the city of Baltimore, and not the State of Maryland, as I understand. There are very, very few States that permit the exemption allowed in this bill. Neither the State of the gentleman from Minnesota nor my State of Kansas provide these exemptions. If it is a question of personnel that are required to collect these taxes, then why not provide personnel? But here we are talking about granting these exemptions because a sales tax has been imposed.

May I remind the gentleman that the sales tax in the District of Columbia is lower than in any State of the Union where there is a sales tax, because you have exemptions. Then when you come to the income tax the same thing applies. There are a few States that do not have an income tax. Those that do have an income tax have higher rates than those applied in the District of Columbia. I think the people of the District of Columbia are pretty well protected in regard to taxes and tax exemptions.

If it is a fact that only 1 out of 4 or 5 does pay this tax, under the act that is already on the statute books, then there is something wrong with the administration of the law. It is my opinion that they ought to pay taxes the same as the rest of us. I think it is rather unfair to bring a bill like this to the floor of the House concerning a city as wealthy as the city of Washington and then say the people in this city ought to be exempted from the so-called household taxes. We should be reminded that under the present law there is a $1,000 exemption before any tax is levied, so there is no real imposition on anyone. People who own less than $1,000 worth of personal property included in this legislation are not required to pay tax under the present law. If $800,000 is a correct figure in the amount of taxes collected, somebody is not performing his duty with respect to the collection of taxes, as I see it.

Does this bill have the approval of all the members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia? Did they all agree that this is right?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It had the overwhelming approval of the committee. There may have been one or two, I do not recall, who voted against the reporting of the bill, but it had the overwhelming approval of the entire Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not want to be the only one out of the whole membership of the House to object to the consideration of this bill. I do not think it ought to be approved. That is my opinion as a Member of this House.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman from Kansas is not the only Member that objects to this. It seems to me the people of the District should pay the same taxes we have to pay at home. If they collect only 1 out of 5, that is their trouble. We in Illinois collect every single personal-property tax. If the people do not pay it, their property is seized and sold.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand the parliamentary situation before the House, the gentleman from Minnesota has asked unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman states it accurately.

Mr. HARRIS. There is a reservation of objection before the House at the moment, as I understand. A reservation is to try to clarify a particular situation. I suggest to my colleagues on the committee that there are a number of Members on this side of the aisle who have expressed some very grave reservations on this issue. It occurred to me it might be advisable to go into the Committee of the Whole in order to debate the matter, in order to get the clear picture before the House for its consideration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3180) to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3180, with Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say I am in favor of this bill. If there are States that do not have enlightened tax laws exempting household property from personal taxes then they are far behind my great State of Ohio. We realized a generation ago in Ohio that it was simply impossible to have personal household property taxed as other property should be. We adjusted our laws accordingly and substituted other taxes.

Here in Washington, in this great community of transients, to talk about having enough inspectors to run around and find out the amount and value of household goods in every apartment and house in this vast community, to say that we are to have that sort of administration of this law is just talking through your hat. I certainly hope that we will

get away from the attempt to tax household property. It is utterly unenforcible efficiently throughout this community without a vast army of officials. If the question is what sort of tax should take its place that can be taken up in due course, but let us get away from a tax which the average person does not even know about, that can easily be evaded, that is almost impossible to administer fairly. It is a situation where you have a law that will not be obeyed because people simply do not understand it and do not believe in it. It is a law that would cost more to enforce effectively than the amount that could be collected. Therefore the thing to do is to pass this bill which exempts household property.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas just said that nearby Maryland had not done anything about the personal property tax on household furniture. He is not accurate about that. He said it was only in the city of Baltimore. In the district which I represent, nearby Montgomery County, in Maryland, we have done away with the enforcement of this personal property tax on household goods because we found it was unenforcible. We also had testimony before the committee that in those areas which were still insisting on this inequitable form of taxation they were enforcing it in an arbitrary fashion. To assess and levy taxes arbitrarily without any relation to the value of the property upon which the tax is levied is certainly an unfair method of taxation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand that the State of Maryland has exactly the same exemptions as are contained in this bill?

Mr. HYDE. In nearby Maryland we have a system of local legislation passed by the State legislature. In nearby Montgomery County they have no longer enforced the personal property tax on household goods because they found it was an inequitable and unfair tax and impossible of fair administration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But you do have the law on your statute books.

Mr. HYDE. We do have the law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But you do not enforce it; is that it?

Mr. HYDE. It is impossible to enforce it; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill which apparently is provoking quite a lot of interest, comes to us after consideration over quite a long period of time. I would refer you to the previous Congress, I think perhaps the 81st Congress, when we had an adjustment of the revenue problem of the District of Columbia. Many of you remember we had quite a fight on the question of a sales tax. I do not recall it at this time, but I am reminded, and the committee is reminded, that when we had the problem under consideration, one of the things promised to the taxpayers of the District of Columbia was that they would recommend a program to remove the personal property tax on household personal property. This recommendation was to be made on the basis that it was wholly inequitable; inequitable because it was almost impossible for the collectors to collect this tax. As I recall, the District gets about $800,000 annually out of this particular tax. Should there be an equitable application of this law, it would probably be many times that much, but the tax apparently applies generally or more so to the old-time, established residents of the District of Columbia. We have thousands and thousands of apartments here, rental properties, transients of all kinds, people coming in and leaving, and they say the problem is this, that by far the greater amount of the personal property in the District of Columbia is actually not exempt, but is not collectible.

I raised some question about this myself, and I did it in the committee with some of the witnesses. The question I raised was this: The long, long issue which we have had before us is the contribution of the Federal Government to the budget of the District of Columbia. A few years ago, in the 80th Congress, you will recall that we set a figure of the obligation for the District of Columbia, which would be $14 million out of the Federal Treasury, as the Federal contribution. This fiscal year the Committee on Appropriations did not recommend, neither did the House appropriate, the full $14 million authorized. I think it was $11 million in fact.

The question I raised was this: There are those who say the Federal Treasury ought to provide a greater share of the budget of the District of Columbia. At the same time they say that this particular type of tax should be eliminated. I raised the issue simply on the basis that it is not a practical situation to be coming to us at one time for reduced taxes, and at the same time saying, "Let us get more money out of the taxpayers."

I realize, on the other hand, the practical problem which the Commissioners have presented to us. That is, they are collecting a very small amount of this tax. Consequently, the costs of collection are so high that if they could apply that cost to the collection of taxes and a revision of their program some other way, they would make substantial savings of the amount lost. I was somewhat impressed with that. I was also impressed with the idea that the people, according to the report we had, were promised 2 years ago that if we imposed a 16-million-dollar-tax increase on the people of the District of Columbia, then we certainly would give them this $800,000 relief. I do not feel that I personally committed myself to it then, but, nevertheless, that is the record, and that is what they say. From that standpoint, I think there is some justification for the committee's action here. The one point that a lot of people bring up is whether or not boats down here on the Potomac River and in Washington Channel should be brought under this exemption. I have no idea how many of those boats would be exempt from this, but I do know that all personal property does not come under this exemption; and if any of these yachts could be considered as a part of a business, they would not come within the exemption provision.

I would like to yield to the chairman to explain that.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I intend to offer an amendment striking that from the bill. It escaped the attention of the subcommittee. I think they should not be exempt, and I shall offer an amendment to so provide.

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman that I think he would remove a lot of objection to this bill if such an amendment were proposed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Would not the gentleman agree that the question of the tax system of the District of Columbia is not the question before the House in this bill; this question is whether you are going to continue a tax which in its present form is utterly inequitable and which costs more to enforce than is returned to the District treasury.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not go along with that entirely, I may say to my colleague, the statement that the tax cannot be collected if they actually want to go out and collect it. It may be somewhat expensive, possibly more so than the average tax collection, but, nevertheless, I do understand that with so many apartment houses it is difficult to know who owns the personal property in them, and the same is true of the various rental properties, with the transients bringing their furniture in with them, taking it out, and other personal property likewise. From that standpoint, it is quite impractical.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if they classify property here for the purpose of applying the tax levy in the District of Columbia; is the property classified as to types?

Mr. HARRIS. There is some classification.

Mr. BAILEY. In my State of West Virginia we classify our property as to types, personal property, real estate, and so forth, and in the case of personal property we have a provision that the tax can never exceed 50 cents on a thousand dollars.

Mr. HARRIS. There will be a classification, I assure the gentleman, because there is a business classification of personal property already, automobiles, and so forth, which comes under a different category.

Mr. BAILEY. Automobiles would be in a separate classification and real estate likewise.

Mr. HARRIS. Real estate does have a separate classification from automobiles.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. I appreciate the statement made by the gentleman from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Arkansas but I would like to ask what procedure does the District follow in listing taxes?

Mr. HARRIS. In listing taxes?

Mr. DEANE. Yes, real estate or personal property.

Mr. HARRIS. They have the real estate listing on the books down at the tax collector's office, and they have a personal property listing just like any other place.

Mr. DEANE. Do they have certain tax lists for a certain section of the District or is it all centralized?

Mr. HARRIS. It is all centralized in the tax assessor's office; he has the overall authority for assessments. I think what the gentleman refers to is the listing of assessments.

Mr. DEANE. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. That comes under the assessor's office.

Mr. DEANE. The record indicates that approximately $800,000 of revenue is received under this tax. What does it cost to collect this $800,000?

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman from Minnesota answer that question?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I do not think we have any specifically itemized cost.

Mr. HARRIS. I would say it might be a little difficult to break that down, but the hearings reveal it is excessive.

Mr. DEANE. One other question. I appreciate the gentleman taking this time because it is a matter of some concern to a lot of us. Can the gentleman point out how many States have eliminated the collection of taxes on personal property?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, a member of the committee, to answer that question.

Mr. ABERNETHY. We were informed in committee that there were 26.

Mr. HARRIS. Twenty-six States.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Twenty-six States have exempted personal property.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think in those States where it does exist it is practically a dead-letter statute because I do not know of any place where they enforce it strictly because of the practical impossibility of enforcing it.

Mr. HARRIS. It is recognized in many jurisdictions as being a most inequitable tax because of the impracticability of collecting the tax on an overall basis.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. That is true in Connecticut. We repealed the law. Is jewelry and other personal property such as precious stones exempted from this bill?

Mr. HARRIS. They would be, yes; those that are considered to be personal property. Of course, not in business establishments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to appear to be the only one in opposition to this legislation. As I said a moment ago, if this House after due deliberation thinks this bill ought to be approved, very well, but I want to register my opposition to it.

I appreciate that we have a very good Committee on the District of Columbia. The members of that committee work long and hard in the performance of their duties and in carrying out their obligations that they assumed when they became members of the committee. They do not get any thanks from the House. They may get a little from the District, I do not know.

It seems rather strange to me that this committee comes to the House with a bill stating that we should approve this legislation taking certain property out from under taxation because of a promise we made some time ago when a sales tax was levied on the people of the District. Let me call attention to the fact that the sales tax in the District of Columbia is less than the sales tax in those States a sales tax is in effect, and there are not many States that do not have a sales tax. The same statement applies with respect to the income tax. The income-tax law of the District of Columbia is full of exemptions, and the tax is lighter than in all States, except those where they do not have an income-tax law at all. The same statement applies with respect to the real-estate taxes. You know that as well as I do. I do not want to be unfair to the people of the District of Columbia with respect to taxes, but I do make the statement that to pass this bill is inequitable and it should not be approved.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that I share his views. I regret that I will be unable to be present in the event of a roll call, but I would like to register my feeling that this seems to be inequitable and I believe that the Committee on the District of Columbia should give further study to it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement and I do hope to awaken the committee to some of the facts in the case. This probably would have been approved without discusson. But when you talk about this item of $800,000 being a small item, there is something wrong with respect to the collection of taxes. Of course, if you do not want to collect the taxes that is something else again. A Member spoke a moment ago about the fact that over in Maryland they do not collect it although it is on the statute books. If it is on the statute books you ought to collect it or repeal the statute. I do not see any other way of handling the matter. Now, you are going to come back here with legislation asking an increased amount to be contributed to the District of Columbia. You do one thing with your right hand while with your left hand you are going to exempt several million dollars worth of property from taxation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman have an apartment in the District of Columbia?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is the gentleman's personal property assessed?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, it is subject to the exemptions allowed under the present law. There is not very much personal property there. I do pay tax on an automobile in the District.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Does the gentleman know what percentage of the personal property in the District is assessed?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know. Someone said only a small amount is assessed. My criticism is that personal property in the District of Columbia ought to be assessed subject, of course, to the present exemptions on the statute book.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I ask the gentleman if this type of tax is collected on personal property in his own State?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It most certainly is, and here you have a population in the District of Columbia that almost equals half of the population of my own State, where we pay ten times the amount of personal taxes on personal property that you are going to exempt under this bill. If you want to approve it, that is all right with me. If the gentleman from Mississippi thinks it is good legislation he ought to support it. I am just expressing my own private opinion. I know he has gone over it more carefully than I have, I admit that, but I still think it is wrong and that is the reason I am opposing it. I am not trying to say that you are all wrong and I am all right, but I think it is wrong and I do not think it ought to be approved.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota, who I know has given this a great deal of consideration. He certainly would not bring it before the House if he did not think it was good legislation. I just disagree with him.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments. The gentleman referred awhile ago to the fact that his State had a tax upon personal property.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And I think the gentleman's State has, too; I may be wrong; is that correct?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The gentleman is partly correct. I think the current session of our State legislature is considering—I do not say they will—but they are considering at this time very strongly the possibility of removing the personal-property tax in Minnesota.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution on this subject matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I wanted to tell the gentleman that because I did not have the opportunity to do so prior to this. I think the gentleman does appreciate that there has been a change from the old personal property tax law in

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

many jurisdictions, and in many instances that tax has been removed, because it is paid over and over again on the bed that you sleep in, which people resent and I do not approve. And it is difficult of enforcement.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's statement is most persuasive, I will say, but I just suggest to him that during these present days, when we are trying to collect all of the taxes we can to take care of the debt that is right now pressing down on this country, that the more you lessen the tax here the more taxes you are going to take from the people throughout the country to help along with the expenses in the District of Columbia. I do not want to impose any more taxes on the people in this District than the people throughout the country, but I think they ought to be willing and glad to pay their share, and the more taxes you take off by legislation of this kind then the more the people in Minnesota and Kansas and other States are going to have to pay to make up for it.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Permit me to say to the gentleman that when we imposed the sales tax in the District of Columbia, which affected, of course, all of us, that sales tax, let me say to the gentleman, yielded this last fiscal year about $15 million, which is about $3 million more than the most optimistic estimate we had. Now, I would say, in light of the fact that we do have under the present law an exemption of $1,000 on personal household effects, that the average person here never does pay a tax, and of those who should pay, I am sorry to say, there are only about one out of four or five who do pay; therefore, in fairness and in the light of enlightened advancement in tax matters, the District Committee did feel that this tax should well be removed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My answer is that it is very unfair that one person pays his tax and about three or four do not pay. Again, I think that is a question of administration of the act as it now stands on our statute books.

I am informed the taxpayers of this country in the rather near future are going to be called upon to contribute $15 million or more to help carry the cost of running the government of the District of Columbia. It is my view that before we impose additional taxes on the people of this country to carry on the expenses of the Nation's Capital, we ought to see to it that the taxpayers of the District are contributing their share of the taxload—not more than their share, but only their share.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, we had before us the Corporation Counsel and the Assessor of the District of Columbia, and I think some of the statements they made to the committee are worth repeating.

The Counsel's first expression, as I remember it, was that it would take an army of inspectors to try to collect this tax. The Assessor went on to say that approximately $850,000 a year is realized. The tax was created by enactment in 1902, and it has not been revised since that time. In 1902 the $1,000 exemption for furniture was supposed to provide an exemption of normal house furnishings, but since that time the price of furnishings has gone up.

He said that if he could turn the personnel now engaged in collecting this $850,000 into other fields he thought they could collect that much or more from the collection of other taxes which are not now being fully collected.

The tax is equivalent to the amount which a levy of an additional 5 cents on the tax rate on real estate would yield. The sales tax is now raising approximately $15,700,000 a year.

He said, and I think this is significant because it is in line with the thinking of the gentleman from Kansas, that for 50 years during which the collection of this tax has been administered, it has been found impossible to collect more than 20 or 25 percent of the tax. The position of the gentleman from Kansas that if the tax that is collectible under the law cannot be collected, the law should be repealed is, I believe, a well-taken position. As it now stands, some taxpayers pay all they are supposed to pay, some pay part, and some pay none.

The method of collecting the tax is rather interesting. The law provides for an assessment. Actually the Assessor sends each potential taxpayer a schedule to be completed. He has found that he cannot, with the force at hand, actually inspect and assess all the property involved. Accordingly, if the potential taxpayer ignores the law and the Assessor's request for a schedule of his taxable property, the Assessor then arbitrarily fixes a tax on the personal property at approximately 10 percent of the value of the improvements on the real estate. They made a survey some years ago and learned that such an assessment would usually approximate the values of the property and furniture in homes. The Assessor now assesses arbitrarily, not in accordance with provisions of law, but as a practical matter, at about 10 percent of the value of the improvements plus 20 percent for a penalty for not filing the schedule.

I learned from the Assessor in answer to a question that some 9 out of 10 who are arbitrarily assessed and who are informed that they have the right thereafter to ask for an actual assessment do not avail themselves of that right, from which it is reasonable to estimate that 90 percent of those arbitrarily assessed are underassessed.

It seems to me we would do very well to repeal this law and, if it is necessary to tax personal property, we could enact a law on some basis under which we could assess an equitable tax and collect equitably from all those who should pay. I doubt that we can collect this tax, as it now stands, without, as the Assessor says, having an army of inspectors to go into each home and appraise or assess the personal property therein and, in addition to that, having a provision for a right of some kind to seal safety deposit boxes periodically so that all safe deposit boxes might be inspected in order to disclose taxable articles of jewelry or other articles of great value.

In relation to the collection of the taxes on jewelry he said that it was impossible to estimate how much jewelry escaped taxation. He has some basis of estimate by reason of the fact that when an inheritance tax becomes due the safe deposit box of the deceased person is sealed and opened only when a representative of the assessor's office is present. By learning what jewelry is in the safe deposit box and comparing it with the amount of tax that the deceased person has paid during his lifetime upon it the assessor can determine that an amazing amount of taxation on jewelry is not paid. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be a reasonable course to repeal this law and either supply more revenue under other existing laws or to rewrite the personal property tax law upon a basis upon which the tax may be collected equitably from all of those who are subject to it rather than from only 20 or 30 percent of those who are either caught by the assessor or sufficiently honest to volunteer payment.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph numbered "Second" of paragraph numbered 10 of section 6 of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 620, ch. 1352), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"Second. Household belongings located in any dwelling house or other place of abode, or in storage, not held for sale or rent and not held for use or used in any trade or business; boats and the contents thereof not held for sale or rent and not held for use or used in a trade or business. For the purposes of this section, the words "household belongings" shall include all libraries, school books, wearing apparel, family portraits, pictures, furniture, furnishings, rugs, silverware, china, glassware, musical instruments, radios, television sets, refrigerators, food, photographic equipment, bicycles, tools, clocks, watches, jewelry, and other articles of personal adornment, and other tangible personal property (excluding automobiles and other motor vehicles) ordinarily kept and used or held for use by the occupant of any dwelling house or other place of abode for the ordinary purposes of life. For the purposes of this section, the words 'trade or business' shall include the engaging in or carrying on of any trade, business, profession, vocation, calling, rental of property, commercial activity, and any other activity carried on or engaged in for livelihood or profit."

SEC. 2. Subparagraph numbered "Third" of paragraph numbered 10 of section 6 of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 620, ch. 1352), and subparagraph numbered "Fourth" of paragraph numbered 10 of section 6 of said act, as amended, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be applicable with respect to tax years or portions thereof beginning on and after July 1, 1951.

Committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike the word "Household" and insert the following: "Libraries of nonprofit organizations and household."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment:

On page 2, line 23, strike out all of section 3 and insert the following:

"SEC. 3. The fourth subparagraph of the first paragraph of section 6 of the act approved July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 618; sec. 47–1203, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), as amended, is amended as follows: (a) by striking so much of the first sentence as reads 'together with the rate of tax prescribed'; (b) by striking the word 'affidavit' where it appears in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'forms'; (c) by striking therefrom so much as reads 'and make and sign an affidavit to the truth thereof, as aforesaid, before the assessor or one of the other members of the said board of personal-tax appraisers, and the members of the said board are hereby authorized to administer such and all oaths in connection with their duties as assessor and appraisers without charge, or before any person authorized by law to administer oaths; and the address in the District of Columbia of the person, corporation, or company making affidavit shall in each case be given below his, its, or their signature,' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'which statement shall also contain, or be verified by, a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, such declaration to be signed by, and over the address in the District of Columbia of, said person, association, corporation, firm, company, executor, administrator, guardian, or trustee making the statement required hereby'; (d) by striking the word 'affidavit' in the third proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'statement.'

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall be applicable with respect to tax years or portions thereof beginning on and after the tax year beginning after the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota: After the word "business" on page 1, line 10, strike out the following words "boats and the contents thereof not held for sale or rent and not held for use or used in a trade or business."

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this merely is in line with the statement I made earlier that this had escaped the attention of the subcommittee as well as the full committee. There is no reason why these boats should be exempted from taxation in my opinion and my purpose is to strike that exemption out of the bill so that the boats here on the Potomac in the District of Columbia would be taxed. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3180) to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the Chair and my friend that a number of Members on both sides are having lunch with a very important gentleman. It is not for me to take the necessary steps, but I call attention to the fact that if necessary steps were taken, the rollcall vote could take place later in the day or on Wednesday. I simply make that observation. I realize that under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry I am trying to protect some Members who are away.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are about 20 Members, both Republicans and Democrats, attending that luncheon.

Mr. BONNER. It will be perfectly satisfactory to me to put the vote over.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on this bill may be put over until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tomorrow to file reports on S. 1110 and H. R. 4130.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION—DIRECTOR OF THE DISTRICT OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3425) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1951, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1951 (Public Law 37, 82d Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia to any position in any office or agency of the government of the District of Columbia, to which office or agency there may be transferred the functions of the Office of Civil Defense (authorized to be abolished by Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952), with the salary provided by law for such position, chargeable to the appropriation for the newly established office or agency: *Provided*, That during the tenure of his appointment such member so appointed shall be deemed to be a member of such Metropolitan Police Department or such Fire Department, as the case may be, for all purposes of rank, seniority, allowances, privileges and benefits, including retirement and disability benefits under the provisions of section 12 of the act approved September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 718–721), as amended, to the same extent as though the appointment had not been made, and at the termination of such appointment he shall be entitled to resume his status within the Metropolitan Police Department or Fire Department, as the case may be, which shall include any promotion in rank to which he may have become entitled: *Provided further*, That retirement and disability benefits and salary deductions shall be based on the salary of the rank or position held in the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department, as the case may be, prior to his appointment to such position in such office or agency succeeding to the functions of the Office of Civil Defense or the salary of the position or rank he would have attained in the Metropolitan Police Department or the Fire Department had his appointment to such position in such office or agency not been made, whichever is greater.

"SEC. 2. As used in this act the terms 'Metropolitan Police Department' and 'Fire Department' shall include, respectively, offices or agencies succeeding to the functions of such departments pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952.

"SEC. 3. This act shall take effect at such time as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall transfer the functions of the Office of Civil Defense of the District of Columbia to a newly established Office of Civil Defense or any other office or agency, pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 14, strike out "No." and insert No. 5."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "1952" and insert "1952."

Page 3, line 16, strike out "SEC. 3" and insert "SEC. 2."

Page 3, line 20, strike out "agnecy" and insert "agency."

Page 3, line 21, strike out the word "numbered" and "1952" and insert "number" and "1952."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I think in view of the importance of this bill some explanation should be made for the RECORD. I wonder if the gentleman from Nebraska would care to explain the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

This bill is made necessary because under the Reorganization Act the Office of Civilian Defense is done away with. We, by this bill, in effect recreate the office. It makes possible for one man in the Police Department to be head of Civilian Defense, or Civilian Defense Director for the District of Columbia without losing the pension retirement rights and other things that would go with it had he stayed on the police force. It merely continues a law that has been in effect before that this Congress passed. Because of the effect of the Reorganization Act, under which the District of Columbia Commissioners are working, it is necessary to reenact the law that we have had in operation heretofore.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3307) to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the purpose of this act is to protect the health and safety of the people of the District of Columbia from the menace of drug addiction and to afford an opportunity to the drug user for rehabilitation. The Congress intends that Federal criminal laws shall be enforced against drug users as well as other persons, and this act shall not be used to substitute treatment for punishment in cases of crime committed by drug users.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "drug user" means any person who habitually uses any habit-forming narcotic drugs so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is so far addicted to the use of such habit-forming narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

(2) The term "patient" means a person with respect to whom there has been filed with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia a statement as provided for in section 3.

FILING A STATEMENT

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever it appears to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia that any person within the District of Columbia, other than a person referred to in subsection (b), is a drug user, he may file with the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia a statement alleging that such person is a drug user and setting forth facts substantiating the allegation.

(b) The United States attorney may not file a statement under this section with respect to any person who is charged with a criminal offense, whether by indictment, by information, or by a proceeding in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, or who is under sentence for a criminal offense, whether he is serving the sentence, or is on probation or parole, or has been released on bond pending appeal.

COURT ORDER FOR EXAMINATION

SEC. 4. Upon the filing of such a statement, the court shall order the patient to appear before it for an examination by physicians pursuant to section 6 (a) of this act and for a hearing if required under section 7 of this act. The copy of the statement shall be served personally upon the patient.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL

SEC. 5. A patient shall have the right to the assistance of counsel at every stage of the judicial proceeding under this act. Before the court appoints physicians pursuant to section 6 of this act it shall advise the patient of his right to counsel and shall assign counsel to represent him if the patient is unable to obtain counsel.

EXAMINATIONS BY PHYSICIANS

SEC. 6. (a) When such a statement has been filed the court shall appoint 2 qualified physicians, 1 of whom shall be a psychiatrist, to examine the patient. Each physician shall, within such periods as the court may direct, file a written report of the examination, which shall include a statement of his conclusion as to whether the patient is a drug user.

(b) The counsel for the patient may inspect the reports of the examination. No such report and no evidence resulting from the personal examination of the patient or evidence offered by the patient shall be admissible against him in any judicial proceeding except a proceeding under this act.

WHEN HEARING IS REQUIRED

SEC. 7. If, in a report filed pursuant to section 5 of this act, either of the examining physicians states that the patient is a drug user, or that he is unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the refusal of the patient to submit to thorough examination, the court shall conduct a judicial hearing in the manner provided in section 8 of this act. If, on the basis of the reports filed, the court is not required to conduct such a hearing, it shall enter an order dismissing the proceeding under this act. If a hearing is deemed necessary, then such notice of hearing shall be served personally upon the patient to afford the said patient the opportunity to prepare for the hearing.

HEARING

SEC. 8. Upon the evidence introduced at a hearing held for that purpose the court shall determine whether the patient is a drug user. The hearing shall be conducted without a jury unless, before the hearing and within 15 days after the date on which the second report is filed pursuant to section 6 of this act, a jury is demanded by the patient or by the officer filing the statement. The patient may, after appointment or employment of counsel, waive a hearing and be committed directly to a hospital designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent. The rules of evidence applicable in judicial proceedings in the court are applicable to hearings pursuant to this section, including the right of the patient to present evidence in his own behalf and to subpena and cross-examine witnesses.

CONFINEMENT OF PATIENT

SEC. 9. If the court finds the patient to be a drug user it shall commit him to a hospital designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, and approved by the court, to be confined there for rehabilitation until released in accordance with section 10 of this act. The head of the hospital shall submit written reports, within such periods as the court may direct, but no longer than 6 months after the commitment and for successive intervals of time thereafter, and state reasons why the patient has not been released.

RELEASE OF PATIENT

SEC. 10. (a) when the head of the hospital to which the patient is committed and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, find that the patient appears to be no longer in need of rehabilitation, or has received maximum benefits, they shall give notice to the judge of the committing court, and the said patient shall be delivered to the said court, for such further action as the court may deem necessary and proper under the provisions of this act.

(b) The court, upon petition of the patient after confinement for 1 year, shall inquire into the refusal or failure of the head of the hospital to release him. If the court finds that the patient is no longer in need of care, treatment, guidance, or rehabilitation, or has received maximum benefits, it shall order the patient released, in accordance with the provisions of section 11 of this act.

PERIODIC EXAMINATION OF RELEASED PATIENTS

SEC. 11. For the 2 years after his release, the patient shall report to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, at such times and places as those officers, or officer require, but not more frequently than once each month, for a physical examination to determine whether the patient has again become a drug user. If the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or their designated agent, determine that the person examined is a drug user, they shall so notify the United States attorney for the District of Columbia who may then file a statement under section 3 of this act with respect to the person examined.

PATIENT NOT DEEMED A CRIMINAL

SEC. 12. The patient in any proceeding under this act shall not be deemed a criminal and the commitment of any such patient shall not be deemed a conviction.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 7, line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 13. This act shall become effective 6 months after the date of its approval."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3307 provides for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia. The narcotics problem in the District of Columbia is a very real and vital concern to all the people.

This is new legislation and could well be considered as a model for the several States.

The narcotics traffic in the District of Columbia has been large and vicious. It has destroyed the lives and economic power not only of the addicts but of their families.

In my opinion, these narcotic addicts are sick people. They ought not to be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

prosecuted and punished. The dope peddler is the one who needs to be punished, and there are criminal laws to take care of him. Many of these addicts need a helping hand, not a punishing whip, if they are to be cured of this vicious habit. The addict should not be forced to go through a criminal procedure as they do now in many States and suffer this stigma in order to get adequate treatment for their addiction.

The testimony before the committee revealed that there are more than 1,500 in the District with police records and with a history of using narcotics. There are probably another 2,000 who are using narcotics but who do not have police records.

In my opinion the individual under the influence of narcotics is not a safe person nor a good citizen and should not be permitted on our streets.

This bill has been carefully drawn. It had good hearings. The United States district attorney for the District of Columbia, the Corporation Counsel for the District, the Narcotics Bureau of the Treasury Department, and others assisted in the drawing of the several provisions in the proposed bill. The committee members took an active part in drawing the legislation.

Under the bill patients could either be treated at the Gallinger Hospital or sent to Lexington, Ky. Patients going to Lexington now go voluntarily, unless they are criminals, and they leave voluntarily. They often go not to be cured but to reduce the expensive narcotics habit from $25 or more per day to $1 or $2 a day.

If this legislation is adopted by the Congress, the patient will either be sent to a proper hospital or one of his choosing if the court approves, where he must take compulsory treatment which may average 6 months. He must then report back under the direction of the court for a period of 2 years or more to ascertain if he has really been cured. In my opinion this is good legislation. It could well be adopted by other States.

I list now a more detailed analysis of the legislation:

The purpose of this legislation is to establish and provide for the compulsory treatment of drug users in a manner similar to the treatment of alcoholics in the District of Columbia.

This is entirely new legislation and approach to the problem and every effort has been made to protect all civil rights of the drug users.

Provision is made for the drug users to be personally served when any statement has been filed alleging that the person is a drug user and there is a specific provision for the patient to have the right to the assistance of counsel at every step of the judicial proceedings under this act.

When the court conducts hearings and reviews the reports of examining physicians, one of whom must be a psychiatrist, the patient or his counsel will be able to question the examiners or the report of the examination.

The hearings shall be conducted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and may be held without a jury and the hearings must be held within 15 days after a report has been filed alleging the person to be a drug user. This provision will guarantee against prolonged delay and prevent injustices being done to persons who might be erroneously alleged to be drug users.

If, after a judicial hearing, the patient is found to be a drug user, the court may order the patient to be confined in an institution offering treatment for drug addicts provided such institution is approved by the authorities of the District of Columbia and the court. In order to insure prompt and adequate treatment of the drug addict the court may direct the head of the institution to which the patient is sent, to submit periodic reports on the progress made by the patient, and in no case shall there be an interval of more than 6 months before a report is made to the court concerning the patient.

Release of the patient is provided whenever the head of the institution and the proper agency of the District of Columbia find that the patient has received maximum medical and rehabilitation benefits, and in every case the court shall, at the end of 1 year's confinement of the patient, inquire specifically concerning his condition and the probable release of the patient.

It is further provided that for a period of 2 years after release the patient shall report to a designated agent of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and submit to examination to determine whether he has made further progress or may again be in need of treatment for his addiction to the use of drugs.

Subsection (b) of section 3 of the bill prohibits the filing of a statement under this act with respect to any person who is charged with a criminal offense, whether by indictment, by information, or by a proceeding in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, or who is under sentence for a criminal offense, whether he is serving the sentence, or is on probation or parole, or has been released on bond pending appeal. This provision was written into the act to prevent those awaiting trial on criminal charges or serving sentences to avail themselves of the provisions of this act and thereby avoid serving sentence as a result of their criminal activities or escape prosecution for criminal acts.

It is thought that this legislation may serve as a working model for similar legislation in the several States.

Police authorities have definite information on some 1,500 persons in the District of Columbia with police records of one type or another who are known drug users and they estimate that other drug users without any police record may reach a total of some 3,000 in the District of Columbia.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Corporation Counsel, and the United States attorney for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, it is my humble opinion that when this legislation becomes active it will be a constructive step in handling the vicious narcotics problem which exists in the District of Columbia. The States and communities may use it as a model. It is a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to vote favorably upon H. R. 3307.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. May I state to the House and to the people of the District of Columbia that they are quite fortunate in having a person of Dr. MILLER's prominence as a physician handling this matter. He and his subcommittee have worked hard on it. I think Dr. MILLER knows what he is talking about and he has put in a lot of time on this matter as well as performing his duties as chairman of the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the pending bill and I should like to take this occasion to commend our distinguished colleague from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] for the constant and devoted attention he has given to this highly important problem.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HYDE: Page 5, line 12, after the word "the", add the words "patient or the."

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am merely making it possible by this amendment for the court to commit the patient to a hospital of his own choosing, if the court should find that is advisable under all the circumstances. As the bill now reads the court is obliged to send the patient to a hospital picked by the Commissioners of the District or a designated agent. There are many cases where the patient might be perfectly ready, willing, and able to go to a hospital of his own choosing and where his family may want to have him sent to a particular hospital. This would make it possible for the court to commit the patient to the hospital of the patient's own choosing if the court felt that is advisable. In any event, it must be subject to the approval of the court.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I might say that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE] presented this amendment to the committee. There were no objections at the time although some of the members thought it was not necessary and therefore it was not included in the bill. We have no objection on this side and if there are no objections from the other side by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], we accept the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I know of no objection to the amendment, Mr. Speaker. This would seem to be a salutary provision if a patient were able to pay for his hospitalization and there should be a particular hospital that he might want to go to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTING SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE, UNITED STATES PARK POLICE, WHITE HOUSE POLICE, AND FIRE DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3795) to adjust the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953."

TITLE I—METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE

SEC. 101. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) or (c), the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force shall be at the rates set forth in the following table:

Grade	*Salary*
Chief of police	$12,000
Deputy chiefs	8,600
Inspectors	7,900
Captains	6,800
Lieutenants	6,300
Sergeants	5,800
Corporals	5,300
Private, class 4 (3 or more years' service)	4,800
Private, class 3 (2 or more but less than 3 years' service)	4,500
Private, class 2 (1 or more but less than 2 years' service)	4,250
Private, class 1 (less than 1 year's service)	4,000

All original appointments of privates shall be made at the annual basic salary of $4,000 and the first year of service shall be probationary.

(b) The annual basic salary of a private of any class of the force shall be increased by—

(1) $1,100, while he is assigned to duty as a detective sergeant;

(2) $500, while he is assigned to duty as a precinct detective;

(3) $300, while he is assigned to duty as a station clerk;

(4) $300, while he is assigned to duty as a probational detective; or

(5) $300, while he is assigned to duty as a motorcycle officer.

(c) Subject to approval of the Commissioners, the annual basic salary of a private of the Metropolitan Police force shall be increased by an amount not to exceed $400 while he is assigned to duty as a technician.

SEC. 102. (a) The annual basic salary of each officer and member of the Metropolitan Police force in a grade above that of private, class 3, except the Chief of Police, shall be increased by $120 at the beginning of the next pay period following each 5-year period of continuous service completed in such grade, including service in such grade rendered prior to the effective date of this Act: *Provided*, That in computing service rendered prior to such date by any individual in the grade of private, only service in such grade in excess of 5 years, shall be creditable in determining such increase or increases for any individual assigned to the grade of private, class 4, in the foregoing salary table. The annual basic salary of the Chief of Police shall be increased by $200 at the beginning of the next pay period following each 18-month period of continuous service completed in such grade including service in such grade rendered prior to the effective date of this act. For the purpose of this subsection, service in the grade of private of any class shall not be deemed to have been discontinued by reason of any assignment (with an accompanying increase in basic salary) pursuant to subsection (b) of section 101 of this act. An increase in basic salary under this subsection shall be known as a "longevity increase."

(b) Any officer or member who is promoted to a position in a higher grade in the foregoing salary table who is receiving one or more longevity increases under subsection (a) of this section, and whose basic salary, as increased by such longevity increases, exceeds the scheduled rate for such higher grade, shall, upon promotion, be entitled to the basic salary of such higher grade plus so many equivalent longevity increases as may be necessary to make his salary in such higher grade at least equal the salary he received before promotion, including longevity increases.

(c) Whenever any officer or member is demoted from any grade to a lower grade and such officer or member prior to such demotion was receiving one or more longevity increases, the Commissioners, in their discretion, may in demoting such officer or member fix his annual basic salary so as to exclude all such earned longevity increases or to include one or more of such earned longevity increases.

(d) The Chief of Police shall receive no more than four longevity increases and no other officer or member shall receive more than five longevity increases with respect to service rendered in any one grade.

(e) No officer or member shall be entitled to a longevity increase for a 5-year period of service unless he has maintained a rating of satisfactory or better for such period.

TITLE II—FIRE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 202. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be at the rates set forth in the following table:

Grade	*Salary*
Fire chief	$12,000
Deputy fire chiefs	8,600
Superintendent of machinery	8,600
Fire marshal	8,600
Battalion fire chiefs	7,900
Captains	6,800
Pilots	6,550
Marine engineers	6,550
Lieutenants	6,300
Sergeants	5,800
Assistant pilots	5,300
Assistant marine engineers	5,300
Inspectors	5,000
Private, class 4 (3 or more years' service)	4,800
Private, class 3 (2 or more but less than 3 years' service)	4,500
Private, class 2 (1 or more but less than 2 years' service)	4,250
Private, class 1 (less than 1 year's service)	4,000

All original appointments of privates shall be made at the annual basic salary of $4,000 and the first year of service shall be probationary.

(b) Subject to approval of the Commissioners, the annual basic salary of a private or an inspector of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be increased by an amount not to exceed $400 while he is assigned to duty as a technician.

SEC. 202. (a) The annual basic salary of each officer and member of the Fire Department in a grade above that of private, class 3, except the Fire Chief, shall be increased by $120 at the beginning of the next pay period following each 5-year period of continuous service completed in such grade, including service in such grade rendered prior to the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That in computing service rendered prior to such date by any individual in the grade of private, only service in such grade in excess of 5 years shall be creditable in determining such increase or increases for any individual assigned to the grade of private, class 4, in the foregoing salary table. For the purpose of this subsection, service shall not be deemed to have been discontinued by reason of any assignment (with an accompanying increase in salary) pursuant to subsection (b) of section 201 of this act. The annual basic salary of the Fire Chief shall be increased by $200 at the beginning of the next pay period following each 18-month period of continuous service completed in such grade including service in such grade rendered prior to the effective date of this act. An increase in basic salary under this subsection shall be known as a "longevity increase."

(b) Any officer or member who is promoted to a position in a higher grade in the foregoing salary table who is receiving one or more longevity increases under subsection (a) of this section, and whose basic salary, as increased by such longevity increases, exceeds the scheduled rate for such higher grade, shall, upon promotion, be entitled to the basic salary of such higher grade plus so many equivalent longevity increases as may be necessary to make his salary in such higher grade at least equal the salary he received before promotion, including longevity increases.

(c) Whenever any officer or member is demoted from any grade to a lower grade and such officer or member prior to such demotion was receiving one or more longevity increases, the Commissioners, in their discretion, may in demoting such officer or member fix his annual basic salary so as to exclude all such earned longevity increases or to include one or more of such earned longevity increases.

(d) The Fire Chief shall receive no more than four longevity increases and no other officer or member shall receive more than five longevity increases with respect to service rendered in any one grade.

(e) No officer or member shall be entitled to a longevity increase for a 5-year period of service unless he has maintained a rating of satisfactory or better for such period.

TITLE III—AUTOMATIC EQUALIZATION OF PENSIONS

SEC. 301. Notwithstanding section 6 of the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Force and Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930 (46 Stat. 841, ch. 783, D. C. Code, 1951 edition, sec. 4–505), each individual heretofore or hereafter retired from active service and entitled to receive a pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under the provisions of section 12 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved September 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 676), as amended, shall be entitled to receive, without making application therefor, with respect to each increase in salary granted by this act, or hereafter granted by law to which such individual would be entitled if he were in active service, an increase in his pension relief allowance or retirement compensation: *Provided*, That no such individual retired prior to the effective date of this act shall be entitled to any increase in pension relief allowance or retirement compensation based on longevity increases. Such increase shall be in an amount which bears the same ratio to such increase in salary as the amount of each

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

such individual's pension relief allowance or retirement compensation in effect on the day next preceding such salary increase bore to the salary to which he would have been entitled had he been in active service on the day next preceding such salary increase. Each increase in pension relief allowance or retirement compensation under this title resulting from an increase in salary shall take effect as of the first day of the first month following the effective date of such increase in salary.

SEC. 302. In computing the pension relief allowance or retirement compensation of any such individual retired before the effective date of this act as major and superintendent of police, assistant superintendent of police, chief engineer of the Fire Department or deputy chief engineer of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, such person shall, for the purposes of this act, be deemed to have retired as chief of police, deputy chief of police, fire chief or deputy fire chief, respectively.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. The annual basic salaries of officers and members of the United States Park Police shall be the same as the annual basic salaries (including longevity increases under section 102 of this act) provided for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force in corresponding or similar grades.

SEC. 402. Section 204 (b) of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to the salaries of the White House Police) is amended by inserting after "Metropolitan Police force" the following: "(including longevity increases provided by section 102 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1953)."

SEC. 403. The second sentence of subsection (e) of the first section of the act approved August 15, 1950, as amended by the act approved March 27, 1951 (Public Law 13, 82d Cong.) is amended by striking therefrom "(one three-hundred-and-sixtieth of his annual basic salary)."

SEC. 404. (a) The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) The first three sections and section 5 of the act of May 27, 1924, as amended (Public Law 148, 68th Cong.);

(2) The first three sections of the act of July 1, 1930, as amended (D. C. Code, secs. 4-106, 4-405, 4-801);

(3) Act of May 5, 1944 (Public Law 297, 78th Cong.);

(4) Act of July 3, 1945 (Public Law 122, 79th Cong.);

(5) Act of July 14, 1945, as amended (Public Law 151, 79th Cong.);

(6) Act of December 28, 1945 (Public Law 278, 79th Cong.);

(7) Act of June 19, 1946 (Public Law 417, 79th Cong.);

(8) Act of July 5, 1946 (Public Law 491, 79th Cong.);

(9) First two sections of the act of June 30, 1949 (Public Law 151, 81st Cong.);

(10) Section 4 of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 195, 82d Cong.); and

(11) Subsection (a) of the first section of the act of October 25, 1951 (Public Law 207, 82d Cong.).

(b) All laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SEC. 405. (a) For all pay computation purposes affecting employees covered by this act, basic per annum rates of compensation established by this act shall be regarded as payment for employment during 52 basic administrative workweeks.

(b) Whenever for any such purpose it is necessary to convert a basic annual rate established by this act to a basic biweekly, weekly, or daily rate, the following rules shall govern:

(A) An annual rate shall be divided by 52 or 26 as the case may be, to derive a weekly or biweekly rate; or

(B) A weekly or biweekly rate shall be divided by 5 or 10, as the case may be, to derive a daily rate.

All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

(c) For all officers and employees referred to in this act, each pay period shall cover two administrative workweeks.

SEC. 406. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to promulgate such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 407. This act shall take effect on such day as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall determine which is not later than the second Sunday following the expiration of 15 days after the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "$1,100" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,300."

Page 2, following line 17, insert:

"Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall apply to any officer below the grade of lieutenant."

Page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike "in the grade of private of any class."

Page 3, line 23, insert after "subsection (b)" the words "or subsection (c)."

Page 5, in the salary grades under "Battalion fire chiefs..... 7,900", insert the following:

"Assistant superintendent of machinery..... 7,900
"Deputy fire marshal..... 7,900"

Page 6, line 10, following the sentence ending with the word "table", insert the following new sentence: "For the purpose of this subsection, service shall not be deemed to have been discontinued by reason of any assignment (with an accompanying increase in salary) pursuant to subsection (b) of section 201 of this act."

Page 8, line 20, strike out "*Provided*, That no such individual retired prior to the effective date of this act shall be entitled to any increase in pension relief allowance or retirement compensation based on longevity increases."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I think this is rather an important proposal we have before us. I suggest the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] might explain the bill briefly. In fact, we have talked about taxes around here, and this bill increases the salaries of a great many people in the District of Columbia, and I think we should have some explanation of it.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the privilege today of introducing H. R. 3795. That bill, in part, takes care of a very serious situation that we now have confronting us in the District of Columbia. That situation is the manning of our police force and our fire force, and keeping those men on the job. After all, the Congress of the United States is the custodian of the District of Columbia. It is up to us to see that this Government is run in a fashion that we want it run. It is up to us to provide the proper instrumentalities to provide a good government. The Committee on the District of Columbia has this responsibility in the House, and we duly report the problems that we have to you, the Members of the House. Today the District of Columbia Police force is understaffed by almost 300 members. The reason we are understaffed, and the reason we have crime creeping into the District at the rapidity that it is, is due to the fact that we cannot get new members to serve on the police force for the pay, $3,400 as a beginning wage. Men with families cannot afford to become a member of the police force and serve as policemen.

The subcommittee members were very dutiful in their attendance. All the police and firemen officers who wished to testify before our committee did testify. We had the president of the Police and Fire Association, as well as the Chief of Police and the Acting Fire Chief. Those men are for the bill, because they have the problem of trying to man the staff without suitable numbers.

Therefore, we had two bills that were presented. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia had a bill which called for a starting pay of $3,750. Then the association had a bill which called for a beginning pay of $4,250. I met with them, along with the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], and we tried to work out some compromise that we thought would be acceptable to all parties concerned. That is why we show in H. R. 3795 a starting pay of the police officer at $4,000. I would like to remind the Members that almost 75 percent of the numbers of the police force at the present time are trying to hold down two jobs in order to make ends meet, so that they can provide their families with the proper necessities of life.

You will notice in the bill that the Chief of the Police Department and also the Chief of the Fire Department do not receive any compensation other than their yearly increment. We do take care of the private, though, who is the first-class man who gets the job, and graduate him after 4 years' service to the sum of $4,800. I feel that when we get a man who is willing to stay on the force and be a good man he should have increments and incentive to stay on the job and thus become a good policeman, which the Chief must have if he is to have the kind of city we wish to have. The same holds good for our Fire Department.

So to the Members who have looked over this report or bill, I will be glad to answer any question I can or try to explain any provision that you may be in doubt about. I do urge, though, that you Members here in Congress realize that the responsibility for the District is ours, and we must take into consideration the fact that it is hard to get the manpower, especially for the police force, manpower that they need, because they have a precarious job and lots of hard work. I call your attention to the fact that during the last inauguration, the one 4 years ago, and the one 8 years ago the men put in a great deal of overtime, and they were not compensated a penny for that overtime. Neither our firemen nor policemen are compensated in any way for the overtime work they have to do. To fulfill our obligation we must fill up the complement needed in the police force and firemen to give good

service, and to do that we must provide an increase in pay to make the work attractive.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The gentleman is quite right in all that he says about this legislation. It is perfectly obvious that a policeman in the city of Washington must work a 6-day week subject to 7-day call, subject to be shot at, subject to all kinds of overtime work, and has a much more difficult task than the man who works a 5-day week only. It is no wonder they want an increase; I think they should have it and I think the bill must be passed.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said with reference to the need for this increase in salary for the members of the Police Department. We had before our subcommittee testimony from the Chief of Police and various other members of the police force; and as he has already stated to you, we have the figures, and the hearings there will show how many of these men find it necessary to supplement their earnings as members of the police force by getting work in their off hours and holding down two jobs. We also have in the hearings before the subcommittee testimony as to how many of the wives of members of the police force have also found it necessary to supplement the family income by leaving their homes and going out to jobs, to work here in the District of Columbia.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. KEARNS] has said, the authorized strength of the police force is 2,290 members. At the present time there is a shortage of almost 300. They tell us the reason for that shortage is that the pay is not sufficiently attractive to enable them to keep the force up to the authorized strength. Right now we are having what might be called a serious wave of violent crimes, serious crimes here in the District of Columbia, and they need to build the force up to the authorized strength, but the testimony before the subcommittee showed that they could not build up to the authorized strength with the salaries that are now being paid, for they must compete here in the District of Columbia with all the various other governmental agencies and private industry. In addition to the question of pay they have also the question of the hazard that goes with the job and the hours of work connected with it. My own opinion is that the presence of a uniformed policeman on the beat is a great deterrent to the would-be criminal. We ought to have this strength filled up immediately. After having served on the District Committee and on this particular subcommittee for a number of years, I am convinced that this legislation is most important for the safety of the people of the District of Columbia and is vitally necessary for proper law enforcement and observance.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Would the gentleman from Georgia be willing to inform the Members that in his belief we tried to get all aspects of this legislation from members of both the Police Department and Fire Department so that we are well informed as to the type of legislation we are considering and writing here?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes. All were invited to these hearings. We undertook to get the opinions, views, and suggestions of all persons concerned, including various officials and citizens. We had before us not only the officials of the Police and Fire Departments but we had the Commissioners, we had the Corporation Counsel and we had private citizens all there giving their views and opinions regarding these matters.

We held extensive public hearings, after which we had executive sessions to thrash the matter out. This is the result of all the hearings and work that was done and, in my opinion, it is worthy legislation and deserves the support of all Members of the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the membership of the House should commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] who is now addressing the House and other members of the committee for the efforts they have put forth and the time they have spent in dealing with this terrifically important problem. In spite of all we do for the District of Columbia, unfortunately the city of Washington ranks extremely high as compared with other cities of the country with respect to crime. So the gentleman is to be commended as well as every other member of that committee for the splendid work they are doing in attempting to deal with this important problem.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Kansas very much for his remarks.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, on January 15 a Pennsylvania Railroad passenger train plowed through the guard rail into the Union Station concourse. First on hand to lend aid to the injured and to bring order out of chaos were the men in blue. Fortunately, there were few injuries. But while attention was focused on the train wreck something more serious happened. A tremendous explosion occurred in the building of the Standard Tire & Battery Co., located on H Street NE. When the smoke and fumes died away 46 Washington firemen, including the Chief of the Fire Department, lay injured in the street. Heroic actions too numerous to mention saved human life. And again fortune smiled. Thirty-two of those injured firemen have returned to duty, 14 remain on sick leave, and only 1, Chief Engineer Sutton, remains hospitalized. God was kind to our smoke eaters on that day.

I cite this instance as an outstanding illustration of the hazards the Washington firemen and policemen face in the discharge of their duty. In the Police Department, during the year 1951, 432 officers received injuries in the line of duty which caused them to lose 3,895 days of work. Nineteen fifty-two was a good year—no policemen were killed. But other years tell a different story. Sometimes the cop on the beat stops the lead of a trigger-happy criminal. This happened out in Silver Spring, Md., recently. Sometimes, in apprehending speed-crazed drivers, a police motorcycle skids or a scout car crashes, and hastily summoned ambulance surgeons sadly shake their heads over still, mutilated figures sprawling in the streets. And then a happily married wife suddenly learns she is a widow and gleeful, carefree children suddenly find themselves fatherless.

The records of the fire and police departments here in the Nation's Capital tell tales of courage and heroism equaled only on the fields of battle in the time of war. They also tell tales of tragedy and horror and death. We are wont to take our policemen and firemen for granted. When we see them in their trim blue uniforms we feel a sense of security. We also experience a sense of pride in their bearing and their conduct. To show our appreciation we occasionally contribute a dollar when they ask us to the Boys Clubs which the police sponsor. But few of us actually know our men in blue as men and as human beings. How many of our citizens could tell us how much a policeman or fireman receives in wages? How many could tell us about their working conditions and their hours of work? I am in an unusual position here. Many of these men are my constituents—my neighbors. They live in my congressional district. I know them as friends and I have made it my business to know many of their problems.

The measure we are considering here today deals with one of the most important of those problems. They, like millions of others in all walks of life, have been seriously affected by inflation. Their salaries have not kept pace with the tremendous increase in living costs. In most occupations wages are more in line with increasing costs. But we have amazingly neglected our public servants. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the welfare of our policemen and firemen is the concern of every citizen. We cannot and will not obtain the kind of protection we want and expect by neglecting those able protectors who serve us. We must take prompt steps to see that they receive adequate compensation and good working conditions in recognition of the splendid services they have and are rendering. Policemen and firemen in the Nation's Capital should and must receive a salary equal to that of any other police and fire force in the United States. The bill under consideration today does not give them that equality, but it is a step in the right direction and we can come before this House at another time to make up the difference. They deserve nothing less from an appreciative Congress and public.

Mr. Speaker, the lot of a policeman or fireman is not an easy one. They are constantly exposed to danger. The fireman must be constantly alert against poisonous gases, falling timbers, fire-weakened floors, and explosions. The policeman must be on guard against many hazards. He must also know how to deal with hardened criminals and yet at the same time know how to handle stiff-shirt diplomats. One day he may

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN IRRADIATED

be in contact with tough riff-raff; another day he may be on school traffic duty to guide our kids safely across dangerous thoroughfares. I have watched him at the latter task. His kindness and gentleness never ceases to amaze me. One of the finest tributes that can be paid the cop on the school traffic beat is to say truthfully that the children love him.

We in these august Halls of the House of Representatives have only to recall what these men in blue have done for our communities and our homes and our children to be convinced of the justice of this measure we are considering today. When we cast our votes for the bill we will have the knowledge that when we go to sleep tonight the lights in the firehouses and police precincts will be burning more brightly; that the men we have made happier will be watching over us and our dear ones while we slumber.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3655) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3655, with Mr. HOEVEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the older Members of the Congress and the new Members who have joined us recently have read the papers enough to know that we have a real menace here in the Nation's Capital known as the after-hour clubs, also labeled as bottle clubs.

My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] wrote a crime bill which this House considered and passed. He reintroduced the bill again this year. In that bill he had a section known as section 404 which dealt with this situation specifically. I asked him if I could use that section of his bill in order to introduce it as a special piece of legislation so that we could cope with the problems we have confronting us at the present time, and he kindly consented to let me do so.

I doubt whether many Members of Congress realize that these so-called bottle clubs, the after-hours clubs, open up when all legitimate places are forced to close by the law of the District. That time is 2 o'clock on week days and 12 midnight on Saturdays.

If many of the Members of Congress wish to be honest about it, I am sure they would say that many of their constituents who come into the Nation's Capital at various times have been admitted to some of these places, with the result that very unsatisfactory situations have developed.

These clubs are not orthodox in any way. They are an entity unto themselves. They are a law unto themselves. They operate as they choose to operate without any restriction whatsoever.

Further, the police force in the District does not have any opportunity to go into their places and established any kind of routine regulation, even as to how the place should operate. Also, they are not under the sanitary laws of the District or any of the health provisions in the District of Columbia code. So I say to you Members, who I know are liberal in many cases, although some are more rigid, that we have a situation here that should be corrected.

We have at the present time 24 of these nuisance clubs, as I would like to term them, running in the District.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman says there are 24 of them running. They are running illegally, I take it?

Mr. KEARNS. That is correct, sir.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. And the police apparently know how many there are?

Mr. KEARNS. I got the figures from the police.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Why do they not close them?

Mr. KEARNS. Because the police have no right to go in there to try to close them.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. If it is illegal, there must be a way to do it, if they are operating in violation of the law.

Mr. KEARNS. Oh, no; they are not operating in violation of the law, for this reason: They do not pretend—I will use the word pretend—to sell liquor. They operate on a consumption basis. When a man goes in there they charge him a dollar and a quarter for a membership. I do not know whether it is for a night or for a longer period. Then the man is supposed to have his own bottle when he goes in there.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Let me say this, then. If you license them, or if this bill in its present form, with the committee amendments, should pass, do you suppose any of them would bother to get a license, if they can operate free and easy without it?

Mr. KEARNS. No, sir; they cannot stay in business, because they would have to take out a license and would have to close at 2 a. m. during the week and at 12 o'clock midnight on Saturday.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Is a committee amendment going to be offered to strike out the section which requires that they close at 2 a. m.?

Mr. KEARNS. No, sir. All the committee amendments that we have considered in committee are properly incorporated in the report.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Under this bill the so-called clip joint could not get a license unless the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board grants it to them, which we think under this legislation they are not going to do.

Mr. KEARNS. Does that satisfy the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No; if they do not get a license and if they are going to operate just like they do now.

Mr. KEARNS. Perhaps I can explain it to the gentleman this way. The reason they cannot operate is because they would have to pay a fee which is stipulated in this bill at $200, and the police would have the right to go into the places. They did not have that right before because they did not even have to take out a license. All they took out was a realty permit, which cost 50 cents, to open up a building and start business. They had no sort of liquor license and no sort of approval from the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board whatsoever. Do not get confused with the legitimate clubs, either. We have no provision in this bill which hurts clubs like the Eagles or the Moose or the Elks, or any of those clubs which operate under a permit from the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board and under its provisions. Those clubs are licensed. In other words, they close at 2 a. m. during the week and at 12 o'clock midnight on Saturday.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. What do these legitimate clubs have to pay for a license?

Mr. KEARNS. The legitimate clubs, up to this time, that run a bar and sell liquor, pay $450.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Will this bill reduce their fee to $200?

Mr. KEARNS. It does not reduce their fee at all. But it does cover clubs like the Touch Down Club and the Variety Club, or any of those clubs that have a social membership. They now have no licensed club and the police cannot enter that kind of club to see how they operate and how they conduct business.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think the gentleman's motives are of the best, and all that sort of thing, but it seems to me if you make this fee $200 you are giving these clip joints a reduced fee, whereas you are making the legitimate people, or the people who have been legitimate, pay a higher fee. I do not go along with that.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman, I think, is confused between sales and consumption. Most of the social clubs do not have a bar of their own.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No; but the gentleman knows, as I do, that people would not go there if they could not get liquor,

because the people who patronize them are people who leave the places that are forced to close at 2 a. m., and they go there knowing that they can be served liquor. The gentleman knows as I do that most of them do not carry liquor there with them. If the fellow who leaves the club at 2 o'clock had a bottle in his pocket and wanted to have a drink, he probably would go home to drink, or go somewhere else. He would not go to a bottle club. That is merely a subterfuge to get the people in there.

Mr. KEARNS. If the gentleman would read the report.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I have read the report.

Mr. KEARNS. As to clubs, we will say like the Variety Club, which operates down at the Willard Hotel, they do not dispense any liquor other than during the hours when the hotel license permits them to sell liquor.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman. I am not after those clubs any more than he is. I am still trying to find out if this law is going to do anything with these clip joints except to give them a license to operate as clip joints for a fee of $200 a year.

Mr. KEARNS. Perhaps I can explain to the gentleman. They will not operate or even attempt to take out a license, because there would be no advantage in taking out the license because when 2 o'clock in the morning comes around they will not be able to sell any liquor. All their take is when they get some fellow coming in who will go in there and pay a dollar and a quarter to get in, and if he does not have any liquor, they will sell it to him after 2 o'clock. That will all be out after this bill is enacted.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. May I say to the gentleman, if this forces them to close at the same time that the legitimate operators have to close, I am all for it. That is what I am after.

Mr. KEARNS. I can assure the gentleman that this has the support of Police Chief Murray and the police department, and that once we give them the tools to work with these places will be put out of business. As soon as the President signs the bill they will be gone.

I would like to say, in conclusion, I would appreciate the serious consideration of the Members of Congress pertaining to this legislation. I do not think it is the will of the Members here to be unduly strict with people. I think we are all good, law-abiding citizens. We have a situation today in Washington with these nuisance clubs, these after-hours clubs, that is a real disgrace to the Nation's Capital. I would appreciate the support of all Members who would like to eliminate this condition in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The very purpose of this legislation is to put the clip joints absolutely out of business?

Mr. KEARNS. The distinguished chairman is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. They cannot get a license from the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, we hope.

Mr. KEARNS. We know that, from what we hear.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Because they cannot qualify.

Another thing that should be understood is that this legislation does not relax in any manner, shape, or form on the opening and closing hours of the legitimate taverns, saloons, or whatever you call them.

Mr. KEARNS. I would like to explain to the chairman, however, that in the past the police could not go into any club at all, because they have no right to enter that club without a warrant. It is private property. Now, with a license in the legitimate clubs, they still can go in there and see that they are carrying on as they should, and we will have better law and order in our legitimate clubs, which we have not had in the past, because it is possible for some of them not to be so highly standardized in their conduct.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I understand the gentleman to say that there is language in this act which will permit the police to check on the clip joint that is operating without a license, which power they did not have before; is that correct?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes; because the place would be operating with a license, and they could not enter heretofore because they did not have a license.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. But under this new act they can enter there anyway?

Mr. KEARNS. They have to take out a license to do any business.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. And if they do not, they are in direct violation, and the police can close them?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes. From here on all the police has to do is knock on the door and go in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the motive behind the introduction of this bill and the motive behind the introduction of the original bill from which it was taken was not to enable these so-called bottle clubs or clip joints to operate or to have a legitimate method of staying in business. The motive which prompted the introduction of this legislation was this: These places have been recognized by the police, by the courts, and by the citizens of the District of Columbia as being breeding places for crime. They are not operated as legitimate clubs. They are operated under a subterfuge that they are legitimate clubs, that they are set up and operated as benevolent or educational institutions. The truth is there is nothing benevolent or educational about them. The people who set them up and operate them do it for the money there is in it. They cannot operate at a profit at all during the hours when legitimate clubs are open, or when restaurants or other places which operate under the ABC are open. They therefore operate when all these legitimate and law-abiding places have closed. The person who then wants to drink at later hours, as a last resort asks a taxicab to carry him to one of these spots, or if he knows where they are located he can go there himself. Anyone who has a dollar and a quarter in his pocket or whatever the entrance fee is, can go there, be admitted, and stay and drink as long as he sees fit. They have been breeding places for much crime, and much viloation of law of a serious nature has arisen among the people who are habitues of these places. After-hours clubs have reached the point where they are a real menace to the safety of the residents of the District of Columbia. It is because of that that our committee investigated the criminal conditions and came up with this provision in the last Congress, and it is the same motive which prompted the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], chairman of the subcommittee this year, to offer this bill.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I was a Member of the House in June 1951, when legislation similar to this was adopted. Can the gentleman refresh my recollection as to what happened in connection with that bill? Did the House pass the bill and the other body fail to concur?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. The bill passed the House in 1951, went to the Senate, but it was never taken up in the Senate and acted upon.

Mr. HALE. Does the legislation do in substance the same as that which passed the House in 1951?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes; it is in substance the same.

We had before this subcommittee this year and also in the last Congress the Corporation Counsel; we had the United States district attorney there; we have had the Chief of Police, we have had the commissioners of the District there, and all have earnestly collaborated in the preparation of this legislation. None of them and none of the members of the subcommittee are in the slightest degree interested in setting up a method through which these bottle clubs or so-called clip joints may operate.

The motive and purpose behind this legislation is to put these places out of business, and those who have to deal with them have assured us that this legislation will do that. I am convinced myself that it will, and if we ever expect to put them out of business I think we shall have to enact this legislation or substantially this legislation in order to do it.

The bill provides a two-pronged method of handling this situation; the first is that they are not allowed to operate at all without getting a license from the ABC Board. They can operate now without such a license. I think it is of the utmost importance that everyone realize that these places operate now without any license, without any supervision whatsoever; they merely go through the subterfuge of procuring a charter maybe in Delaware, maybe in Virginia, Maryland, or some other place, under the designation of a benevolent or educational club, and they come in here and set up business, and they are not required to get a license under existing laws here in the District of Columbia; they are not subject to the supervision of the ABC Board, and they are not subject to the supervision of any branch or

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

agency of government here; so they operate in an unrestricted manner, and the result has been that they have thrived and done a profitable business here, and that crime has grown and flourished by reason of their existence. The first prong of this remedy is that they cannot hereafter operate when this legislation becomes law without getting a license from the ABC Board; they will operate under that board and be subject to supervision by that board, and it will fix the hours during which they may operate. There is no inducement for the average customer to go there before regular places have closed up, and since they cannot operate longer than the regular places, they will dry up, they will have no patronage; and the result will be that they will dry up. That is one prong of the relief which this grants. The other is that they may be closed as a nuisance; if they violate the law they may be immediately closed as a nuisance; so we have this method of providing against the operation of these clubs. They can ask for a license. If they do not secure a license and operate without it, they are violating the law, of course, and the subject can be handled through that method. If they do secure a license, they are then under the supervision of the ABC Board and if they do not operate according to law and the regulations their license will be canceled and they will be out of business. If they violate the law in any respect they are subject to being abolished as a nuisance by the courts.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman feel as I do, with the assurances of Chief Murray, that they will not even attempt to take out a license?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think the great majority of them will make no effort to obtain a license. There may be one or two who might try to obtain it but I do not believe they will have enough patronage to stay in business and I think it will result in all of them being put out of business.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, it seems kind of silly, does it not, to say that these so-called bottle clubs are not controllable, therefore we are going to license them. Why not pass an act that puts these bottle clubs completely out of business instead of coming in here through the back door and saying: We are going to license them upon the payment of $200. If you are going to license them, why do you not make it $500?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, who has given this subject matter a great deal of study and whose interest in cleaning up the situation in Washington is to be greatly commended.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas that efforts have been made to put them out of business ever since I have been a Member of the House and probably ever since the gentleman from Kansas has been a Member, with no success. The people who have to deal with this matter have reached the conclusion that this is the most feasible manner to put them out of business. There is nobody connected with this legislation who wants them to stay in business, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman mean by that statement that an act has been passed by this Congress putting them out of business, and the act has been violated; is that it?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Or does the gentleman mean Congress will not pass such an act?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman that when the matter was under discussion originally in the last Congress we prepared a bill the drastic effect of which was to prevent them from operating at all. The Corporation Counsel has stated that if we pass this bill it will mean that you will put out of business at the same time, all of the legitimate clubs because there is no way to distinguish and separate between those clubs which are designated as legitimate clubs, such as the gentleman has heard mentioned here today, the Elks, the Eagles, and the various other clubs, you cannot distinguish between them and these so-called bottle clubs in such a manner as to put the bottle clubs out of business and not put the others out of business. That is the difficulty here, and that is what we have to hurdle when we pass a bill putting them out of business—period.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, there is no reason why any of them should run until 2 o'clock in the morning. I realize there may be a difference of opinion on that, but I do not think any outfit of this kind should run to the wee small hours of the morning, especially Sunday morning. It seems to me rather strange that you have to pass an act licensing them and in the same breadth say that by requiring a license we shall put them out of business. Furthermore, why do you fix this fee of $200 in place of at least $500?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, may I say to the gentleman that there appeared before the subcommittee a representative of the Arts Clubs, I believe it was called, who said that if they charged them more than the fee that is fixed in this, they could not continue to exist. Probably the gentleman from Pennsylvania could enlighten the gentleman from Kansas as to the name of that club. I have forgotten, but you may recall the gentleman from the Arts Club who was there. The Artist Club, I believe it was.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It makes it appear that because the Artist Club cannot pay more than $200, then these people should not pay more, is that it?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; not that.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. The influence of this legislation would have some effect upon these clubs, because the officers of this club testified at the hearing, and here we have now the president and the secretary resigning and saying that new officers should be elected, or they should dissolve their charter, because obviously they are not interested in taking out a license and operating. I hope this will be the forerunner of many occasions where these clubs will not attempt to operate.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman mentioned 24 clubs.

Mr. KEARNS. That they do not call legitimate. They are the ones that are the outright violators. The police may come in at 3 o'clock if they have cause to enter and shut them up, but by next Tuesday they have a new address and they are operating again. It is a case of chasing them all over town.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Ohio. If they are presently violating the law, why cannot they be prosecuted? That is rather difficult to understand.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say this, that the police have made strenuous efforts to put them out of business. Then, of course, for a policeman to get in, he must get in without the operator knowing that he is a policeman. The gentleman, being an attorney, knows that for a case to stand up in court they must have proof that liquor has been sold, and the way they get it is they get some policeman who is not known to go in and see the sale made and have enough, definite, positive proof, that there was a sale of liquor made; that the man who bought it was not a member. The method which they have had to follow has been cumbersome; it has been slow. Many times they have been unable to get the information to establish a conviction, and they have not been able to cope with it on that basis. The mere fact that they have made honest, bona fide efforts to close these clubs with the machinery which the law now permits, and the fact that they have flourished here throughout the months and years convinces me that more effective means must be devised if they are to be closed up, and that is why I am for this legislation. I do not want to license a liquor selling place any more than the gentleman from Kansas does, but unless we devise some means here other than those which now exist you are going to see these clubs continue to flourish as breeding places of crime, just as they now do and have in the past.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the whole confusion here is between sale and consumption. The gentleman asks Why do we not have a law here to just put them out of business, rather than licensing them, regardless of anything?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is difficult to understand why we cannot do it. Of course, the so-called bottle clubs ought to be put out of business once and for all.

Mr. KEARNS. Right today they operate under the code that they have, which is a code of their own, and they do not sell liquor supposedly. The police cannot go in there unless there is a crime committed; you have to have a murder or a brawl of some kind before the police can establish law and order. Those are your laws and regulations of the bottle

clubs of the District. So, the only thing we do in this legislation is just make it impossible for them to operate, and I do hope the gentleman will understand that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It seems to me it discloses a terrific weakness on the part of the administration of law in the District that we have to handle them in this manner, especially when we are confronted with the figures that more hard liquor is consumed in the city of Washington than any other city of the United States of comparative size.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill, as I understand it, permits so-called bottle clubs to sell liquor as late as 2 a. m. on weekdays and until midnight Saturday night. These bottle clubs, as everyone knows, constitute one of the worst crime-breeding places in the District. They ought not to be allowed to stay in business. Surely there must be some way to get rid of them without saying, in substance, you can stay in business if you buy a license and thereby permit the police to check once in a while.

Mr. Chairman, the situation in the District of Columbia with respect to liquor consumption is disgraceful. According to a statement reported in one of our Washington papers some time ago, the city of Washington is soaking up three times as much liquor as the national per capita average.

The population of the District of Columbia has decreased 1 percent since the war. The percentage of jail drunks has increased more than 33 percent during the same period. Seventy percent of all jail cases and 77 percent of the District's criminal court cases are on drunkenness charges. That is a pretty poor example for the people in the Nation's Capital to set for people in other parts of the country.

An upswing in drinking is also reflected in the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board figures. The number of all kinds of liquor licenses has soared in 5 years to almost 2,400. According to a recent statement furnished the press, the number of admissions for intoxication in the jails has doubled in 5 years. During the last year more than 40,000 persons were arrested for drunkenness in the District.

Mr. Chairman, instead of extending and expanding the sale of liquor in the District of Columbia and everywhere else, we should be curbing it. I just do not see how the approval of legislation of this kind will help the situation. I say this notwithstanding the best intentions on the part of the committee for recommending the bill for approval.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to make particularly clear this situation of having these so-called after-hours clubs close up at the same time everybody else closes. When this bill was being debated in 1951 I offered an amendment which seemed to me to be a very simple one. It said in effect that no club should operate in the city of Washington any later than any class C licensee, which simply means that if the hour of closing was 2 o'clock then everybody had to close at 2 o'clock.

The House was kind enough to adopt that amendment and it became part of the bill. I see on page 2 of the present legislation substantially the same language as was in my amendment of 1951, but then the committee proposes, I understand, to strike that language from line 5 through line 11. Is that correct?

Mr. KEARNS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Then you propose to deal with the problem by substituting certain language on page 6 at line 20. Is that correct?

Mr. KEARNS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The only difference I see between the language that is used on page 2, which was the language substantially that I used, and the language of the committee amendment, is that the language on page 2 spells it out in very clear and simple language and says:

> The Commissioners shall not authorize the consumption on such premises of any beverages at any time when the sale of beverages is prohibited to a holder of a retailer's license, class C—

And so forth. This other language, although it is a little devious, comes down to this. It says:

> or in any place to which the public is invited * * * at a time when the sale of such alcoholic beverages on the premises is prohibited by this act.

This is an amendment to the Liquor Act, as I understand it. This bill substantially is an amendment to the present liquor legislation?

Mr. KEARNS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. This new language on page 6 will have the effect of prohibiting any place from staying open after 2 o'clock?

Mr. KEARNS. That is correct.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is what I am interested in, because I think the way to close these bottle clubs is to make them conform. As I have said before, their clientele is largely people who are turned out of the legitimate places by the 2 o'clock closing hour.

While I do not know anything about it first hand I would suggest that by 2 o'clock when they are seeking another place they are in the position or in a situation where they will easily be taken advantage of. That is why there has been so much crime in these after-hours clubs and robberies and so on of people who were in a befuddled condition. So what you are proposing to do in effect then is to make every club in Washington observe the same closing hours, is that true, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KEARNS. That is true—except the private clubs.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The private clubs can still stay open later than 2 o'clock?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes; but they cannot sell liquor.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. But they cannot sell liquor?

Mr. KEARNS. That is right.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. What is the advantage of them staying open?

Mr. KEARNS. I do not know. You will have to go and find out about that.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. In other words, you are going right back to the same situation. I want to say to you I am going to ask for a vote on this amendment if that is the case because you are going to get back in the same situation you are in now if a private club can stay open after hours and the people who patronize them, these illegitimate people, you have differentiated between legitimate and illegitimate, are going to find ways and means of procuring liquor for them and you are not going to clean up anything unless you spell out in the law that they have to close up at the same time as the fellow who pays a big fee. You are going to have the same kind of crime and corruption and the same number of robberies and the same people rolled out in the alleys that you are having now because if you give them a license to stay open it is not going to be very difficult indeed for a policeman to find out just where the customer came by the bottle that he may have on his table drinking from.

Mr. KEARNS. We had better not find that condition.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well do you mean you are going to prohibit them drinking there?

Mr. KEARNS. I do not think the police are going to be a party to it whatsoever. They are as anxious to get rid of this situation as you are.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I think the simplest and easiest way is to close them up at 2 o'clock. Practically every other city in the country has a closing hour and I see no reason why Washington should not have a closing hour.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his direct approach to this problem. It seems to me we have gone too far already with the idea of trying to approach or attack illegality by licensing. We have seen that has not worked at all in the matter of gambling and in reducing or controlling the gambling activities throughout our country in any way. I certainly see no reason to believe that a license approach to this problem would be nearly as effective as the clear-cut measure which the gentleman from Ohio had in the bill previously.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time, unless the gentleman from Massachusetts desires time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever heard of a bottle club. We do not have bottle clubs in my section of the country. I have heard them today called a menace to society and an incentive to crime and illegal and clip joints. Perhaps they should be termed "passion pits." But one of the things that strikes me is why did the committee in its amendment on page 4 cut the license fee from $500 to $200? Another thing comes to my mind. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, a private club could not sell after

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

2 o'clock but then they can remain open as late as they desire. I understand from reading the newspaper columns we have in the shadow of our beautiful Capitol dome a very plush club to which the hierarchy of the Republican Party from all over the country come and stay. It would be interesting to know what they breed there. Is this club allowed to remain open all night? In what category does the club fall? Perhaps the gentleman can answer my question.

Mr. KEARNS. That is very easy to answer. They have a class C license there. They must close the same as anyone else, if they have a bar, who sells liquor. They cannot stay open after 2 o'clock through the week or 12 o'clock midnight on Saturday. It is a licensed place. They have a class C license.

I do want to bring out here a point that I feel people are overlooking. We are taking a step to get rid of unorthodox groups of clubs and we are not trying to penalize the legitimate places which under the laws of the District of Columbia and under our national laws are clubs which have functioned for years and years and years even during prohibition days when they remained open. Why should they be penalized now? We must consider that. Here we have the Variety Club, which has spent over $91,000 just for benevolent and charitable things in the District of Columbia. They are to be commended.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a minute?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not care what particular club it is or what political party or what private individual may have organized it, but the class C licensee must close at 2 o'clock. However, there is language in this bill on page 6, line 20, which says: "or in any place to which the public is invited." Some of the clubs under discussion do not invite the public. So, even though they be class C licensees, they would not have to close.

Mr. KEARNS. Oh, yes. However, we do have this situation: Very large restaurants, in the hotels, for instance, have a situation where on Sunday the Ohio Society or the Pennsylvania Society or any other reputable society can hire one of the rooms and they can bring bottles there and have their dinner and a party and stay as long as they want to.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. But does the class C licensee have to close his place?

Mr. KEARNS. The class C licensee has to close his place, and he must close at 2 o'clock sharp during the week, every morning at that time.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. What about the hotel dining rooms on Saturday nights?

Mr. KEARNS. Saturday night at a quarter to 12 they have to go around and pick up the glasses. They are not allowed to have glasses on the table even.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. But they do not close.

Mr. KEARNS. They cannot dispense any liquor. If somebody orders a sandwich, they can sit there and eat it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. But why should these private clubs be allowed to stay open? They cannot stay open if they are treated as a class C licensee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–107), is amended by striking out the period following the word "morals" at the end of the first paragraph thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", and the Commissioners are further authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations not inconsistent with this act as they may deem necessary to properly and adequately control the consumption of alcoholic beverages on premises licensed under paragraph (1) of section 11 of this act, with specific authority to prescribe the hours during which alcoholic beverages may be consumed on such premises and to forbid the consumption on Sundays, but the Commissioners shall not authorize the consumption on such premises of any beverages at any time when the sale of beverages is prohibited to a holder of a retailer's license, class C, or of any beverages, other than light wines and beer, on Sundays, and such consumption is hereby prohibited."

SEC. 2. Section 9 (a) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–109 (a)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"It shall be unlawful for any person operating any premises where food, nonalcoholic beverages, or entertainment are sold or provided for compensation, and where facilities are especially provided and service is rendered for the consumption of alcoholic beverages, who does not possess a license under this act, to permit the consumption of such alcoholic beverages on such premises."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–110), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. The Board is authorized to issue licenses to individuals, partnerships, or corporations, but not to unincorporated associations, on application duly made therefor, for the manufacture, sale, offer for sale, consumption on premises of clubs where food, nonalcoholic beverages, or entertainment are sold or provided for compensation, or solicitation of orders for sale of alcoholic beverages within the District of Columbia. The Board shall keep a full record of all applications for licenses, and of all recommendations for and remonstrances against the granting of licenses and of the action taken thereon."

SEC. 4. Section 11 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–111), is amended by striking out the word "eleven" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the word "twelve," and by adding immediately before the last paragraph thereof the following new subsection:

"(l) Consumption license for a club: Such a license shall be issued only for a club. The word 'club' within the meaning of this paragraph is a corporation for the promotion of some common object (not including corporations organized or conducted for any commercial or business purpose, or for money profit), owning, hiring, or leasing a building or space in a building of such extent and character as in the judgment of the Board may be suitable and adequate for the reasonable and comfortable use and accommodations of its members and their guests; and the affairs and management of such corporation are conducted by a board of directors, executive committee, or similar body chosen by the members at least once each calendar year, and no officer, agent, or employee of the club is paid, directly or indirectly, or receives in the form of salary or other compensation, any profit from the conduct and operation of the club beyond the amount of such salary as may be fixed and voted by the members or by its directors or other governing body. No license shall be issued to a club which has not been established for at least 3 months immediately prior to the making of the application for such license. Such a license shall authorize the holder thereof to permit consumption of alcoholic beverages on such parts of the licensed premises as may be approved by the Board. The annual fee for such a license shall be $500."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 14 (b) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–115 (b)), is amended to read as follows: "Before granting a license under section 11 (l) of this act or a retailer's license, except a retailer's license class E or class F, the Board shall give notice by advertisement published once a week and for at least 2 weeks in some newspaper of general circulation published in the District of Columbia."

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 14 (c) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–115 (c)), is amended by striking out the words "or class D" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", class D or a license issued under section 11 (l) of this act."

SEC. 7. Section 20 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–121), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"No person being the holder of a license issued under section 11 (l) of this act shall permit on the licensed premises the consumption of alcoholic beverages, with the exception of beer and light wines, by any person under the age of 21 years, or permit the consumption of beer and light wines by any person under the age of 18 years; or the consumption of any beverage by any intoxicated person, or any person of notoriously intemperate habits, or any person who appears to be intoxicated; and ignorance of the age of any such minor shall not be a defense to any action instituted under this section. No licensee shall be liable to any person for damages claimed to arise from refusal to permit the consumption of any beverage on any premise licensed under section 11 (l) of this act."

SEC. 8. Section 28 (a) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25–128 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 28. (a) No person shall in the District of Columbia drink any alcoholic beverage in any street, alley, park, or parking; or in any vehicle in or upon the same; or in or upon any premises where food, nonalcoholic beverages, or entertainment are sold or provided for compensation not licensed under this act; or in any place to which the public is invited for which a license has not been issued hereunder permitting the sale and consumption of such alcoholic beverage upon such premises except premises licensed under section 11 (l) of this act; or in any place (for which a retailer's license class C, D, or a license under section (11) (l) of this act has been issued) at a time when the sale of such alcoholic beverage or the consumption of the same on the premises is prohibited by this act or by the regulations promulgated thereunder. No such person shall be drunk or intoxicated in any street, alley, park, or parking; or in any vehicle in or upon the same or in any place to which the public is invited or at any public gathering and no person anywhere shall be drunk or intoxicated and disturb the peace of any person."

SEC. 9. Section 29 (a) of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as

amended (D. C. Code, sec. 25-129 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 29 (a) A search warrant may be issued by any judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia or by a United States Commissioner for the District of Columbia when any alcoholic beverages are manufactured for sale, kept for sale, sold, or consumed in violation of the provisions of this act, and any such alcoholic beverages and any other property designed for use in connection with such unlawful manufacture for sale, keeping for sale, selling, or consumption may be seized thereunder, and shall be subject to such disposition as the court may make thereof, and such alcoholic beverages may be taken on the warrant from any house or other place in which it is concealed."

SEC. 10. The District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 41. (a) Any building, ground, premises, or place where any intoxicating beverage is manufactured, sold, kept for sale, or permitted to be consumed in violation of this act is hereby declared to be a nuisance, and may be enjoined and abated as hereinafter provided.

"(b) An action to enjoin any nuisance defined in subsection (a) of this section may be brought in the name of the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia, or any of his assistants, in the municipal court of the District of Columbia against any person conducting or maintaining such nuisance or knowingly permitting such nuisance to be conducted or maintained. If it is made to appear, by affidavits or otherwise, to the satisfaction of the court that such nuisance exists, a temporary writ of injunction, without bond, shall forthwith issue restraining the defendant from continuing or permitting the continuance of such nuisance until the conclusion of the trial. It shall not be necessary for the court to find the building, ground, premises, or place was being unlawfully used as aforesaid at the time of the hearing, but on finding that the material allegations of the complaint are true, the court shall enter an order restraining the defendant from manufacturing, selling, keeping for sale, or permitting to be consumed any alcoholic beverage in violation of this act. When an injunction, either temporary or permanent, has been granted, it shall be binding on the defendant throughout the District of Columbia. Upon final judgment of the court ordering such nuisance to be abated, the court may order that the defendant, or anyone claiming under him, shall not occupy or use, for a period of 1 year thereafter, the building, ground, premises, or place upon which the nuisance existed, but the court may, in its discretion, permit the defendant to occupy and use the said building, ground, premises, or place, if the defendant shall give bond with sufficient security to be approved by the court, in the penal and liquidated sum of not less than $500 nor more than $1,000, payable to the District of Columbia, and conditioned that intoxicating beverages will not thereafter be manufactured, sold, kept for sale, or permitted to be consumed in or upon the building, ground, premises, or place in violation of this act.

"(c) In the case of the violation of any injunction, temporary or permanent, rendered pursuant to the provisions of this section, the court may summarily try and punish the defendants. The proceedings for punishment for contempt shall be commenced by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants filing with the court an information under oath, setting out the alleged offense constituting the violation, whereupon the court shall forthwith cause a warrant to issue under which the defendants shall be arrested. The trial may be had upon affidavits or either party may demand the production and oral examination of the witnesses. Any person found guilty of contempt under the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 11. Sections 2 and 8 of this act shall take effect 60 days after the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "premises", strike out the balance of line 5, all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment we have been discussing, and this is the language that spells out exactly what I think most of us want to do. That is, to force these clubs to quit selling liquor at the same time that the class C licensees have to quit selling it; namely, at 2 a. m.

It has been brought out in the debate already that they do not have to close at 2 o'clock, but they have to stop selling liquor. They have to quit at the same time that everybody else does. I do not see why we should not prohibit the Commissioners from making exceptions to the law. I do not see any reason why we cannot spell it out, because if you do not do that you are going to have the same trouble we have now except you are going to have these clubs legalized, and you are going to make it more difficult, in my opinion, if you delete this language, to enforce the order that they quit selling liquor at 2 a. m.

I will admit that there is language they want to insert on page 6, but I do not think that language is as clear, I do not think it is as plain, or I do not think it is as easily understandable; I think if you really want to stop it—and I believe every Member of the House does—if you want to stop these breeding places of crime in their tracks you are going to have to treat them as you treat everybody else who dispenses liquor within the confines of the District of Columbia. I do not think you ought to give them a special privilege; and I do not see, since most clubs have been referred to as legitimate clubs, I do not see how you are going to penalize them, because the gentleman must admit that most of them have a Class C license, and they are, therefore, under the law when selling liquor at the hours prescribed.

I will agree with the gentleman that you can get at this problem probably better by licensing these so-called after-hours clubs, but let us not have them after-hours clubs any more; let us have any club that wants to sell liquor a club that has to comply with the laws that are on the books and that is treated exactly and strictly like every other club. I think you are going out of your way, Mr. Chairman, to be charitable to them by giving them a license. Do not give them an unlimited privilege. They will be operated by unscrupulous people. Do not allow them privileges you do not allow the legitimate operators.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I hope the gentleman will bear in mind that the 100 legitimate clubs I spoke of do not have any license whatsoever now, because they are membership clubs and only members have bottles there of their own which they consume on the premises. After this bill becomes law nobody can sell whether it be a private club or otherwise, after the closing hours prescribed by the ABC Board at the discretion of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. What is wrong with the language on page 2, then?

Mr. KEARNS. If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. I follow the gentleman on his objections to page 2, but let us bear this in mind: Right today we must aid the police, and I am trying to get passed some type of legislation which will be a tool in their hands. Members of the committee from both sides of the aisle are sincere in their efforts and I hope the Members will bear with us as we try to work this program out. Let us put it into effect and see how it works. If we have complaints later that it should be amended we can amend the law, but let us get something started.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I could have gone along entirely with the gentleman if the Corporation Counsel's office downtown had not been so bitterly opposed to this language 2 years ago, and I cannot help but feel that there must be some sort of ulterior reason why they would object to having it spelled out. I do not know that there is, but it does not do any harm to have it spelled out. I think if they are sincere, I do not see that there is anything objectionable.

Mr. KEARNS. I can assure the gentleman that we have gone into this thing thoroughly and carefully. We have had them all before us, and we have talked to them like Dutch uncles. If these people do not stand up, if they do not go along and try to do the thing we propose we can call them to account later.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman is sincere, I appreciate that, but I still feel that this language on page 2 is vital to the bill and vital to the enforcement of it, and I feel that it ought to stay in. When the amendment is voted on I shall ask for a division.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say for the benefit of the House that when this bill was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania on March 3, it contained the language which is now in controversy, and the members of the subcommittee would have been glad for that language to stay in there. I am not going to take it on myself to champion the cause of any kind of club, legitimate or illegitimate, where liquor is consumed or where it is sold. I am not a member of any of them, I do not frequent any of them and I do not drink whisky or any kind of intoxicating beverage. So I am not the champion of any place that sells liquor or any place where it is consumed.

All of us who were members of the subcommittee were interested in closing out these illegitimate clubs. So when we reached this provision in the bill as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

we considered it, the various law enforcement agencies had their representatives there, among them the corporation counsel; and we on the subcommittee were told that if this language stays in it will have the effect of closing the Army and Navy Club, for instance, at 2 o'clock during the week and at 12 o'clock on Saturday nights and it will remain closed until the next day. They told us that this language would not permit any other construction, that it would close them all, good, bad, and indifferent, under the class C license until the next day.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What particular harm would there be if you do close them all at 2 o'clock?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As far as I am concerned, none, and, as I said previously, I am not the champion of any of them.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman from Georgia is sincere in wanting to do the right thing about this, but there is too much argument here about closing. This does not say anything about closing. It says you cannot consume any more intoxicating liquor after 2 o'clock, that none shall be offered for consumption. They can stay open until daylight and by that time the patrons will probably be sober enough to go home. This says they cannot sell any more whisky or intoxicating beverages after 2 o'clock. I am not a prohibitionist or anything of that kind, but I do not see anything wrong with the provision in the bill which says that after 2 o'clock they cannot sell any more.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This does not say that. It forbids the consumption, not the sale. Consumption is what is involved.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. It amounts to the same thing. You cannot drink any more.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think there is quite a difference between sale on the one hand and consumption on the other.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. May I say that the closing of clubs like the Army and Navy Club and the country club would close off the recreational facilities for families who are temporarily in the District and have nowhere to go. It would have a very bad effect.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman mean after 2 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. ALLEN of California. No; I mean on Sunday.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And after 12 o'clock on Saturday night?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I mean Sunday noon when the kids are out swimming or playing tennis.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This amendment does not keep the youngsters from playing tennis or anything like that on Sunday, does it?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This relates to the keeping of the clubhouse open and the consumption of intoxicating beverages which are involved here. The difficulty is this: With the language in the bill there will be a difficulty. As I said, nobody on the subcommittee objects to this language. We had it in there when the bill was under consideration. The Corporation Counsel and these other law-enforcement agency representatives said that this is going to go much further than to merely close these illegitimate bottle clubs, that it is going to apply to every one of the clubs which are regarded as being legitimate because they cannot issue one set of regulations for them and another set for these bottle clubs. That is why this amendment was adopted striking this language out.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, having for several years tried to deal with these things with every bit of the machinery which the law allows and being unsuccessful in their efforts—they are flourishing today just as much as ever—certainly it is worthwhile to try out this legislation which all of these law-enforcement agencies say will deal with the situation. Let us give it a try. If it does not work, Congress will be in session and we can amend it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 34, noes 19.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 17, strike out "$500" and insert in lieu thereof "$200."

Page 6, line 15, strike out all after the semicolon to the end of the sentence in line 20 and insert the following: "or in any place to which the public is invited (for which a license under this act has been issued) at a time when the sale of such alcoholic beverages on the premises is prohibited by this act or by the regulations promulgated thereunder, or in any place for which a license under section 11 (1) of this act has been issued at a time when the consumption of such alcoholic beverages on the premises is prohibited by the regulations promulgated under this act."

Page 9, line 13, strike out the word "shall" and insert in lieu thereof the word "may."

Page 9, following line 23, insert the following:

"SEC. 11. Section 3 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking therefrom clause (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(f) (1) The word "Board" means the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board created by this act or the office, offices, agency, or agencies succeeding to its functions pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952.

"'(2) The term "Corporation Counsel" means the Corporation Counsel or the officer or officers succeeding to his functions pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952.'"

Page 9, line 24, strike "SEC. 11" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 12."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOEVEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3655) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the first committee amendment on page 2.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The balance of the committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after the word "premises", strike out down to and including all of line 11.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. KEARNS. If the gentleman will withhold his point of order for a moment, Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will submit it.

Mr. KEARNS. During the discussion this afternoon, at the request of the other side we withheld the vote on certain legislation and carried it over as the first order of business on Wednesday. May I ask the gentleman if he would be considerate enough to withhold his objection to the vote on this amendment so that it may come up as the second order of business when we meet on Wednesday next?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that will not jeopardize the gentleman's rights.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, further proceedings in connection with the amendment and the bill will be postponed until Wednesday next.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the District of Columbia has no further business for today.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, am I correct in saying that the second order of business on Wednesday next will be a rollcall on this amendment

The SPEAKER. Not a rollcall; it will be a vote on the amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order that a quorum was not present, and under those circumstances the rollcall is automatic. I will not agree to any withholding of it unless there is a rollcall, because a rollcall is automatic. I think the Speaker will agree that a quorum is not present now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is mistaken in his impression. Today a rollcall would be automatic, but not on Wednesday, unless the House so orders.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not want to agree to anything like that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. It has already been agreed to. The gentleman has forfeited any rights he might have. I am very sorry if he did not understand the situation.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday, March 26, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

HOPE AIRFIELD

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, March 20, 1953, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE, made a speech in that body across the Capitol in which extensive reference was made to the reactivation and utilization by the Air Force of existing facilities on a base at Hope, Ark., in my district. He read into the RECORD a letter which he received from the mayor of the city of Hope, and the president of the Hope Chamber of Commerce. He included in the RECORD a memorandum, which was sent with the letter, giving statistical information as to the availability of facilities to accommodate such a project, all of which, of course, is true.

The Senator had just completed what he referred to as a major speech, and went into a session of his committee of the Independent Party. As one of the first items of his committee work, he stated that he wished to take up a little problem in Arkansas, and thus followed his discussion of the utilization of the Hope Air Base. I have not had any occasion to discuss it with him.

While I appreciate the interest the Senator has shown in the utilization of this project, with which I am in thorough accord, I would not want the RECORD to imply that his Independent Party is the only one interested in the reactivation and the utilization of this large air base in the public interest. We have heard a great deal in the last few months about "the public's interest, economy in Government, and the savings to the taxpayers of this country" by Democrats and Republicans as well. What we all hope to see is the actual accomplishment of these objectives in providing for adequate national security.

This project affects the people of my district, and quite naturally I am tremendously interested in it. Hope is the county seat of Hempstead County, Ark. It is my native county and I have very warm and close ties to the people of the county. Certainly they are interested in the appropriate and proper utilization of this base by the Air Force. The surrounding communities throughout the south and southwestern part of our State have become intensely interested.

This interest does not stem only from a personal desire, Mr. Speaker, but these people are taxpayers and they, too, are interested in economy in Government and saving on these huge expansion programs wherever and whenever it is possible.

To be sure we are all committed to an adequate national defense program in the interest of our own security. Everyone realizes full well that it is costly. At the same time, we are all committed to a program of economy and it is economy to utilize, whenever possible, facilities that we have available.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time of the House in further explanation of this problem and to fully explain and clarify the record.

In the early part of World War II, the Government established the Southwestern Proving Ground in my native county, a few miles north of this city of Hope. The Government took over nearly 60,000 acres of the finest land in the heart of the county, including half of the community where I was born and reared. This project was used in the testing of all kinds of explosives, shells, large and small, and various types of bombs.

In connection with this proving ground, this large airport was constructed. It was not the usual type of light construction for training purposes, and so forth, but substantial construction to accommodate the heaviest of our bombers and all kinds of aircraft.

This airport cost the taxpayers of this country several millions of dollars. There is included with it some 2,000 acres of land. There are 3 runways of thick concrete construction, with a most substantial foundation—more than 1 mile in length—150 feet in width, appropriate taxiways and a large permanent hangar, constructed of brick and steel. It was constructed as a permanent facility for heavy use. It took a lot of money of the taxpayers to pay for it.

After the war, Mr. Speaker, the proving ground was closed out, and I might say parenthetically, this area was left in a disparagingly depreciated economic condition—and that is putting it mildly.

This huge, costly airport was abandoned and turned over to the city of Hope, under the Surplus Property Act, for $1. Though the city has kept it up and it is in excellent condition, it has laid there idle during these years.

Following the outbreak of the Korean war, when we found ourselves again so wholly unprepared, an expansion program was undertaken by all of our services and appropriately so. Beginning in 1950, the Air Force developed over a period of time a tremendous expansion program throughout the country. All kinds of projects for coordinating program, costing billions of dollars, have been programed.

While I appreciate the fact that all airports constructed in World War II could not possibly be used to any advantage, because of their type of construction, we have, I think, appropriately raised the question of why these especially large, well constructed and permanent facilities, are not being used in connection with this program instead of going out into broad new areas and starting from scratch. The people of this area see this costly project laying out there every day. They know what it is and they have a right to raise the question as to why such a project is not used to good advantage when it is already available. Certainly a subtantial nucleus so valuable, which could be made available, without the cost of 1 cent to the Government, could be utilized advantageously and at a savings to the taxpayers.

The fact that the Senator referred to this in his speech last Friday was not the first time the Air Force has been importuned and urged to consider the appropriate utilization of these facilities.

Some 2 years ago, when the Air Force was considering its expansion program, I urged that they consider the appropriate use of this facility. I was told that investigation of the possible use of this airbase was made and perhaps it was, Mr. Speaker, but if it was, no one in the area of the airport knew about any investigation made of its use. In fact, it appears that regardless of the apparent savings that might be made that all these projects must be within the vicinity of the large cities, which policy I question seriously.

During the course of this planning program there were several times that I took steps in calling to the attention the advantages that could be realized by using such available and established projects.

A few weeks ago, the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, directed a review of all of these projects in the planning and development stages for our expansion program. One of the nationally known commentators, Mr. Frank Edwards, over his Mutual network program, called attention to the fact that economy in this program of ours could be made by utilizing well constructed and permanent projects already in existence. He referred, as an example, to the availability of this airport at Hope, Ark.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize I am not qualified to tell our Air Force where and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN DIGITIZED

what type of projects they should develop, that will provide for us the kind of programs and the security which we must have. I am convinced, however, that this is a strategic location, quite accessible to our programs and for the purposes of these programs.

Consequently, on March 3, 1953, I directed a letter to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, calling to his attention the availability of this big military airport. I referred to the new airports and airport facilities being constructed under our national defense program from the ground up. I again explained that our people wanted to know why this expensive airport, which is idle, is not being utilized in our expansion program, at a savings no doubt of millions of dollars. I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks a copy of the letter to the Secretary, together with other letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I wrote a similar letter to the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Talbott, and also, to our colleague and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. JOHN TABER, and our colleague, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. DEWEY SHORT. I felt that I should again bring this to the attention of the appropriate parties, who are in positions of leadership and thus responsibilities in connection with such matters.

It is, in my opinion, sound procedure to take advantage of any existing facility that is suitable to the program that we must have for the preservation of our freedom.

There have been several editorials written in a number of the leading daily newspapers throughout this area. Not only the paper at Hope, but at Texarkana, nearby, and at Prescott, Nashville, Camden, Magnolia, and other prominent places. They are all familiar with this project and contend that in the interest of economy, the Government should make use of this unused facility. They have written strong editorials in support of it.

Now it is quite strange and most interesting that about the only reason the Air Force gives in justification for not utilizing this facility is that they have got to have a large city for these projects, in order that the personnel can be absorbed properly in the community. While I fully realize the desirability and the necessity of community facilities in connection with any project, the position of the Air Force in this instance is most absurd.

We had a conference with officials of the Air Force this morning at the Pentagon. The amazing position they take which seems to permeate the entire organization, and especially the operational department, is not what facility might be available for utilization in the expansion program but how big is the area in the immediate vicinity. While they said it was not an ironclad policy but it was a rule-of-thumb that a certain size installation comparable to one wing had to be in the vicinity of some city with a minimum of 35,000 population. If it were to be a facility comparable to a two-wing operation, the community had to have a minimum of 55,000 population. This was the first time I had ever heard of such requirement of the Air Force for any such facility.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, it is the position of the Air Force, which I think is an arbitrary one that every area in this country is ruled out of consideration unless it was one of the larger populated metropolitan centers. I am sure this statement of policy or rule-of-thumb will be quite interesting to all of the areas of the United States, with a population of less than 35,000.

On the other hand the City of Hope, Ark., has a population of almost 10,000 people; within 15 miles is Prescott, Ark., with nearly 5,000; within 20 miles to the north is the city of Nashville, with a population of 4,000; and then to the west is the city of Texarkana, within 35 miles and a population of 40,000.

The community of Hope itself, absorbed and took care of some 1,500 families in connection with the Southwestern Proving Ground project during the recent World War. The only such facilities constructed by the Government at that time was some 23 or more fine homes for the Officer personnel. These houses are there and available. There are several adjoining towns within a few miles which have since increased available facilities and provide ample means of absorbing any personnel and the families that would come into the community for such a project.

Everyone in this House, Mr. Speaker, knows that to establish projects of any substantial size near the big cities will require this Government to furnish the community facilities even the schools for the children. Housing and various types of accommodations are obviously critical in these large metropolitan centers.

I firmly believe that their most recent excuse is no excuse at all. I have been very close to this problem for years—all during World War II and since. I think a more thorough investigation would be justified.

I think we should know more about the suitability of this expensive project for an appropriate utilization in connection with our defense program.

I am therefore, Mr. Speaker, today introducing a resolution which would authorize and direct the House Armed Services Committee, which has legislative jurisdiction over our military establishments, to make an investigation as to the advisability of the use of these facilities in the public interest and in support of our national defense program. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of this House, has said, that it certainly seems like a situation where they—the Air Force—could save a sizable sum of money by using what they have. We are entitled to know the facts and a report in this manner would obviously develop the actual situation.

I shall ask the Rules Committee to report this resolution and I feel sure the Armed Services Committee in carrying out its responsibilities would want to develop this question in the interest of the public, as well as economy in our efforts for a well established and sound defense program.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 3, 1953.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense, the Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As Secretary of our Defense Establishment you have the primary responsibility for our national security and the expenditures of the major part of our Federal budget. You, with President Eisenhower, are committed to an economy program in connection with our national defense activities. We know you are making every effort to reduce expenditures where possible.

New airports and airport facilities are being constructed under our national defense program. You propose a huge development in the vicinity of Little Rock, Ark., as well as other places in the Southwest. You have just received a letter from the Honorable John L. Wilson, mayor of Hope, Ark., with reference to the utilization of the airport near that city which cost several millions of dollars in World War II. My people want to know why this expensive airport, which is idle, is not being utilized in this program, thereby saving many millions of dollars of the taxpayers that would be necessary to construct new facilities out and out.

This airport was constructed in World War II to accommodate the heaviest of our bombers. It is still intact and has been kept up by the city of Hope. It has three concrete runways, 150 feet wide and more than a mile long. There is available a huge brick and steel building with suitable equipment, aprons, and taxiways. The city owns 2,000 acres in this airport and is offering to make it available to the Government for utilization without cost.

The city of Hope and community could and will absorb all the personnel that will be necessary at such a bomber base as you propose to construct in the Southwest.

Mr. Frank Edwards, nationally known commentator, Mutual Broadcasting Co., has given this nationwide publicity and appropriately so, because of the saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the country. I understand he has discussed it with your Air Force people and the only excuse given for not utilizing the air base is the question of the community not being able to absorb the necessary personnel and their families. I should like to remind you that in World War II this community absorbed and took care of 5,000 people in the construction and operation of the Southwest Proving Ground. It can and will do it again with, I believe, much lesser outlay than will be required at some other bases you propose to spend so much for the needed facilities. This fine sturdy and well-constructed airport but built by the taxpayers' money for World War II and why not use it in the interest of the program, economy, and operation and a saving to the taxpayers.

I join with the people in that area in bringing this to your attention, urging your consideration and an immediate reply.

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I wish to thank you for your letter of the 3d in connection with the Air Force base near Hope, Ark. I am asking the subcommittee that handles military construction to look into this matter.

It certainly seems to sound like a situation where they could save a sizable sum of money by using what they have.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN TABER, *Chairman.*

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1953.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HARRIS: This is in response to your letter of March 3, urging utilization by the Air Force of airport facilities at Hope, Ark.

Initial responsibility for selection and development of Air Force bases rests with the Department of the Air Force. Accordingly, I have referred your letter, as well as the one on the same subject addressed to me by the mayor of Hope, Ark., which you mentioned, to Secretary Talbott, so that he may know of your interest in this matter.

You may be assured that full consideration will be given to the arguments you have presented. I have asked Secretary Talbott to communicate with you directly and because of my interest in this important matter, have requested that he furnish me a copy of his reply.

Sincerely,

C. E. WILSON.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a very unpleasant task when you are compelled to make some derogatory remarks about people from your home State. I regret that is my task today. I am having to bring the name of a distinguished gentleman from the State of Tennessee into the RECORD. Due to the fact that I think it is absolutely necessary that the taxpayers of the United States get 100 percent value out of the tax dollar, it is necessary that I bring this to the attention of the House of Representatives.

If there ever was a time when we need to cut expenses everywhere we can, to balance the budget and to reduce taxes, it is today. People throughout the country are clamoring at the Members of Congress to do exactly that. Being one Member that has voted against tax increases in the last two sessions of Congress, I do not think I could uphold the oath as a Member of Congress for three terms unless I expose those who are trying to hoodwink the taxpayers of this Government. It so happens, Mr. Speaker, that in the State of Tennessee there are two men, two corporations I should say, that make garbage disposal trucks. There are only two concerns in the United States that make multiple containers for refuse. One of them is known as the Dempster Dumpster. The corporation is owned primarily by George Dempster who is the mayor of Knoxville. I have the privilege of knowing George Dempster personally. He spoke at my home town of Lawrenceburg, Tenn., at a Rotary Club ladies' night, and speaking of somebody that gave the Republicans the devil, he did a wonderful job, but the trouble was it was after the election. The other corporation is known as Brooks Equipment. I do not know Mr. Brooks. But I am speaking as a representative of the people in my district in order that we might bring this to your attention in the hope that something can be done to save the taxpayers some money.

Some 3 years ago it came to my attention that there were certain people over in the Pentagon who have been writing specifications where no concern in the United States could bid on garbage-disposal invitations except Dempster. I do not think that is right because in my opinion, anytime anyone does business with this Government, they should have competition in their bidding so that we might save the taxpayers a little money through competitive bidding. I call this to the attention of various members in the Pentagon Building. On different occasions, of course, the specifications were reworded where Brooks and Dempster both could bid. Two years ago on one contract we saved $120,000. That contact was with the Marine Corps. So for some 3 years I have been watching the specifications and every time an invitation to bid was issued I would ask that it be changed so that they could have competition in the bidding and not have a monopoly bid. Last year they promised they would discontinue to issue monopoly specifications. They claimed they were going to let the Army engineers draw up the specifications and pass them on to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps for approval so that no concern could have a monopoly in bidding on truck refuse multiple containers, better known to us as garbage-disposal units. On December 27, 1951, they wrote the specifications but it so happened that at that time there were no bids open. There were no invitations for bids. Then again on August 1, 1952, they issued a specification known as military T 11663 A. This specification was drawn up by Colonel Hafto's office over in the Corps of Engineers. Mr. Walter Bonnett was the author of it I understand. I am not saying that anyone has been bribed in this Government of ours in these particular incidents. I just want to give you the facts that I know because I could not prove any willful wrongdoing. But I will say this. There has been some conniving, by whom, I do not know. But I think it should be cut out. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the name Dempster Dumpster is not mentioned in this military specification but this specification is so drawn that no one in the United States can bid on this garbage disposal except Dempster Dumpster. On March 20 this year an invitation was issued for bids on Navy No. 809. It was supposed to be let on the 20th of March. The delivery price on this article was supposed to be $385,911.53. I contacted Colonel Sloan, our naval liaison at the naval liaison office, who called it to the attention of the Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps. To date that contract has not been given to anyone. It has not been opened. But that is only $358,000. On March 30 of this month there is another bid coming up. It is Army Engineering No. 1118453A367 which bid will amount to over a million dollars. What I am calling to the attention of the House is the fact that no one can bid on this order except George Dempster of Knoxville, Tenn. To me it is rather strange they issue the specifications so they can only receive a monopolistic bid.

On page 2 of the military specification, "T 1163A," under paragraph 3.7, "Hoist-haul unit," here is some of the fine print:

> The hoisting mechanism shall be so designed and balanced on the truck chassis as to operate independently of any auxiliary jack.

It so happens that Dempster Dumpster has a patent on their product which excludes the jack. Therefore no one else can bid.

Then, on page 3, there is another little line like this:

> The top door area shall not be less than 80 percent of the largest horizontal cross-sectional area of the container.

Dempster has a patent on this. Even though it is 79 percent of the door area, no one could qualify to bid on this, because Dempster has the patent, and they are the only ones in the United States who can qualify.

On page 3, here is another one of these fine-line specifications:

> The discharge opening area shall be not less than 90 percent of the largest horizontal cross-sectional area of the container.

It so happens that Dempster has the patent on that—90 percent and above. No one else can bid under that proviso.

All the way through the specifications there are provisions which only describes the Dempster Dumpster.

I like to see money come to Tennessee. I like to see as much as possible come there. There are only two concerns in the United States that make these garbage disposals. Both of them are in Knoxville, Tenn. Both of them went into business at about the same time. But we must be on the alert and save the taxpayers every dollar possible. Of course, when it comes down to garbage-disposal trucks, they must come from Tennessee, because no other concerns make them except the two in Tennessee. But what I do not like to see is someone in the Pentagon approve a specification where no one except George Dempster can bid because of prohibitive clauses in the specifications; regardless of the price, which the Government sets, at $368,000, George Dempster can say $500,000, and there is nothing we can do except to pay, because his is the only concern in the United States that can comply with the specifications.

I do not like monopolies. They are unhealthy for the country. I do not think the Government should connive, draw up specifications where there cannot be competition. It is nice for the man who is doing the selling, but it is unhealthy for the taxpayers of the Nation. I do not think I would be doing my duty to my people if I did not bring this matter to the attention of the Congress. As I say, I am not accusing anyone of accepting or paying a bribe, but I do say that in my opinion there is some conniving going on.

I called this to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services. I talked to Mr. Courtney, one of the attorneys. He suggested that I bring it to the attention of the House, after talking with the Navy about it. I am bringing it to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

your attention, in the hope that we can protect the taxpayers by cutting out such monopolistic tactics as some people, not only in Tennessee, but in the Pentagon, willfully and knowingly condone such tactics.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on Armed Services of the House will check into this with the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and will come up with some solution whereby we can save the taxpayers some money. If there is one thing we need to do in this country, it is to see that the overburdened taxpayers are given some relief, some reduction of taxes.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Wednesday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

THE MASSACHUSETTS TEXTILE INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, my request is plain and urgent.

I ask that a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee be authorized to look into the Defense Department's textile procurement policies to determine if the requirements of defense manpower policy No. 4, as amended, are being sabotaged by an agency of our Government.

And, in doing so, I hope that this administration will not continue to ignore the jobless textile workers of Massachusetts who, to this moment, have been considered as expendable by the Federal Government.

For several years now Washington has turned a deaf ear to the labor-surplus plight of New England's textile industry, which is centered in Massachusetts.

Perhaps the weight of sectional politics had something to do with this dangerous indifference toward a very serious problem.

Now, with a new lineup, perhaps our thousands of unemployed may be heard and helped. Instead of point 4 for Africa, we want the terms of defense manpower policy No. 4 applied to rescue our unemployed millworkers from destitution.

On November 28, 1952, an amended Munitions Board instruction provided that 80-hour plants—those working not more than two shifts—would only have to meet the average price paid on competitive bid awards, instead of the lowest bid in order to get priority. And the reason for this change, stripped of all evasive language, was to provide relief to suplus-labor areas.

Four months have passed.

Nothing has been done.

Those of our mills that have not closed down or sold out are working less than 80 hours per week.

In the Greater Lawrence, Mass., area—population 130,000—between ten thousand and eleven thousand were out of work during January 1953.

This figure is not just seasonal.

Since June 1949, more than $33 million have supported the community in the form of bread-and-butter unemployment benefits.

Similar conditions have prevailed for several years in other Massachusetts textile cities like Lowell, Fall River, and New Bedford.

And still the Department of Defense continues to drag its feet in carrying out the orders for textile procurement in those areas that are fighting for economic survival.

Why? Why?

That is what we want to know.

Blundering delays by the Defense Department might be forgiven, but not any conspiracy to shift the economy of any region merely to suit its own convenience or to reward legislative friends of the past.

That is what we demand to find out by calling defense officials before an Armed Forces Subcommittee, where they can be questioned in public.

Another disturbing question arises concerning the $54 million worth of such textile procurement contracts to be let out during the present fiscal year. As far as we can penetrate the fog enveloping procurement, only $9 million had been spent by early February. How is the remaining $45 million to be accounted for? The refusal on the part of the Defense Department to be clear and specific on this point cannot be excused on the ground that this information is top secret.

Potential enemies know the number of men and women we have in uniform, and from that they can deduce the amount of textile goods needed to clothe them. So why is there any need for a smokescreen, if procurement officials are living up to the law?

Only 3 months remain in this fiscal year, yet we see no visible sign of the set-aside contracts for textiles that were supposed to be awarded as some measure of assistance to the few areas that are going through a depression in the midst of a boom.

The Federal Government cannot sidestep its obligation to help these areas. We insist that textile contracts be awarded—according to the law—to plants that are operating less than 80 hours a week. Not only from now on but to make up for the recent months during which the Government failed to fulfill this legal requirement.

The Defense Department is faced with mounting public criticism of its failures in several fields.

The only way to correct this bureaucratic slow-motion is to put defense officials on the carpet, where we can probe for and extract the facts that will scare them into constructive action.

I ask, therefore, that the Armed Services Committee of the House examine the whole question of textile procurement for the military at once.

GREATER LAWRENCE JOINT BOARD,
TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA,
Lawrence, Mass., March 19, 1953.

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It should not be necessary for me to outline in detail the economic conditions of certain parts of New England, particularly those sections with heavy concentrations of the textile industry, such as Lawrence, Mass.

Because I believe most strongly that the ills of the textile industry run a good deal deeper than appears on the surface, I urge you to bring this matter to the floor of the Congress with the suggestion that a committee be set up to investigate thoroughly the textile industry in New England, with a view to giving concrete help in solving their problem. Although the placing of defense orders will give relief, it will only be of a temporary nature. Something must be done to solve the problem of the New England textile industry on a more permanent basis, thus giving its workers some security and help in maintaining an economic balance comparable to workers in other industries and in other sections of the country.

I believe that an investigation will show that wage differentials and man-hour productivity are by no means the entire answer to the problem. The textile industry in the past 3 or 4 years has been going through a revolutionary change, mostly due to the introduction of man-made fibers such as Dacron, Orlon, Vicara, Dynel, and Acrilan.

These fibers are being manufactured by a number of our large and powerful chemical companies. They are in short supply and with not enough of the raw materials to meet the demands, tremendous pressure could be put on those companies which for one reason or another are not in favorable positions with these large chemical companies.

It seems to me that with proper Government intervention a more equitable distribution of the available raw materials could be agreed upon, which I feel sure would bring a great measure of relief to many New England companies. I feel certain that an investigation will show that it is the worsted end of the textile industry which is being hit hardest, for it is this division of the industry which manufactures the fabrics for suitings and dress goods which is being pressed by the synthetic and blended fabrics.

I believe such a committee should also investigate the amount of worsted cloth being imported into this country which is depriving our textile workers of much needed work. Recently while in New York City, I visited several department stores and was

amazed to see rack after rack with thousands of suits and topcoats bearing imported labels, mostly from Great Britain.

We have approximately one and one quarter million textile workers in this country, and I believe they have a right to expect their Government to give earnest consideration to their problems which have reached such serious proportions.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR W. BROWN,
Director, Greater Lawrence Area.

THE HONORABLE LYNDON JOHNSON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include two speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, only a few weeks ago, I had the pleasure of attending a special luncheon meeting of the Texas delegation. It was held to honor the distinguished Democratic leader of the Senate—that great Texan, LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

At that meeting, which was attended by the Governor of our State, we presented LYNDON JOHNSON with a plaque signed by every member of the delegation. On that plaque, we inscribed these sentiments:

TO LYNDON B. JOHNSON, DEMOCRATIC LEADER, UNITED STATES SENATE; A PROGRESSIVE AND PRACTICAL PUBLIC SERVANT; A LEGISLATOR OF VISION AND JUDGMENT; A FAITHFUL TEXAN AND LOYAL FRIEND:

We, the Texas delegation of the 83d Congress, proudly salute you as one who has attained the heights of Senate leadership through brilliant and patriotic service at an age younger than any other man in history. You have brought honor to our State, our Nation, and our people. This the 13th day of February 1953.

I think most of us would subscribe to those sentiments—certainly all of us here who worked with LYNDON JOHNSON when he was a member of this body. We Texans are proud of the honor he has brought to our State. We know that the honor flows from the service he has performed and is performing for Texas and the Nation.

However, I think I have a special reason for pride in LYNDON JOHNSON. It is due to the fact that I have known him practically all his life. I have watched him grow from a teen-aged boy playing on the grounds of the State Capitol at Austin into one of the great statesmen of our day.

When I first entered the State legislature in 1921, I was assigned as a desk mate to his father—the late Sam Johnson. It was a stroke of good fortune that affected the course of my entire life.

I found myself in contact with a truly remarkable man—a man of courage and conviction whose wise counsel and sound judgment was a beacon lighting the way to safe passage through stormy seas. Nothing finer could have happened to a fledgling legislator.

It did not take too long to discover that this truly remarkable man had produced a truly remarkable son. As he grew to maturity, I found him to be a man mature beyond his years—steadfast and loyal—devoted to principle.

I have come to depend upon him as I once depended upon his father. Looking back, I would say unhesitatingly that the Johnson family has a royalty interest in anything good I have done in my life.

When LYNDON JOHNSON was elected to the Senate, I predicted that he would be his party's floor leader before his first term had expired. He fulfilled that prediction. He became the assistant Democratic floor leader in his third year and the Democratic floor leader in his fifth. His colleagues recognized his unusual qualities almost at once.

He has more than justified their confidence.

Although he is the youngest floor leader in Senate history, he has succeeded in putting together a smooth-working team without parallel. In the committee assignments, he combined maturity and experience with youth and vigor.

The result has been a Senate Democratic minority which is harmonious—which is not torn by dissensions—which works together in mutual trust and respect. It is a minority which can work constructively for the country—not just obstructively in the hope of reelection.

Recently, LYNDON JOHNSON has delivered two speeches which are worthy of the attention of every Member of this House.

In the first, he discussed the problems that face a minority party that seeks to work as a constructive, responsible group of men and women.

In the second, he discussed the problems of defense that our Nation must face in this age of dictators.

There is a common bond that ties these two speeches together. It is the thought that we live in a time where the politics of irresponsibility is the politics of disaster. It is the thought that the minority must be more than a carping critic—it must be a party that works as earnestly as the majority for the preservation of the Nation.

He recognizes the frightening problems which burden the shoulders of our President and warns against the petty partisanship that would add to those burdens. He pledges his support when the President goes before Congress with the difficult decisions that are right for our country.

Mr. Speaker, these two speeches are important documents—declarations of policy which merit the attention of every American. So that they may be read and studied, I ask that they be included at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks:

SPEECH OF HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, BEFORE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DINNER, NEW YORK CITY, SATURDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 14, 1953

Fellow Democrats, we are meeting tonight to dedicate ourselves to the future.

As a political party, we have lost a national election. But we have not lost our determination to serve the American people. With that will and determination, even if we are a minority, we are an undefeated party.

In the last campaign, we presented to our fellow Americans a candidate who stirred millions of people by talking sense, in words that will never be forgotten.

Behind those great Americans—Adlai Stevenson and John Sparkman—the Democratic Party mobilized for a clean and honorable fight. We lost—and under world conditions probably it was inevitable. But we have maintained, and we will maintain, our place in the hearts of the people as the one truly national party.

For more than a century and a half, the Democratic Party has occupied a special position in American life. It has been the one party big enough and strong enough to unite Americans from all walks of life and from all sections of the United States.

Even today, the Democratic Party can be found vital and aggressive, in every part of America. North, South, East, and West—in the strongest bulwarks of Republicanism—Democrats are actively at work rallying the people.

It is only in periods when the Democratic Party appears to lose its character as a national party that it suffers setbacks. It is only when the voices of a few pressure groups drown out all other voices that the Democratic Party loses.

The American people will never long tolerate a political party dominated exclusively—nor one that appears to be dominated—by any special group—be it labor, capital, farm, North, South, East, or West.

All are entitled to proper representation. None are entitled to complete control.

In the Senate, we have done our job by welding together experience and youthful vigor; seniority and new talent. The Senate Democrats have established themselves not on the basis of sectionalism but on the basis of working for the whole Nation.

As a minority, we now face new problems. We also face new temptations.

There are two courses open to a minority party. It can indulge in the politics of partisanship, or it can remain true to the politics of responsibility.

The first course is tempting to the weak, but ultimately would be rejected by the American people. The second course is difficult, but is the one road upon which we can offer leadership to the American people that will be accepted.

As Americans, we are facing grave problems.

The clouds of economic distress are forming on the horizon. Already our farmers feel the pinch of recession. The issues of war or peace—and therefore of life and death—loom larger and more menacing with every passing day.

The politics of partisanship may entice some to trade upon the distress of the American people. Against such partisanship, we must firmly close our ranks.

Our dedication must be to the politics of responsibility—to a statesmanship which is based upon the realization that we cannot survive unless our country survives.

No course will be successful unless that thought becomes our guiding star.

The role of a minority party is to hammer out a program that will solve the problems of America—not just to obstruct the work of the majority party. The American people will place their confidence in a party which seeks honestly to serve them.

There is before us a great opportunity.

It is to work for America—to be a constructive opposition, not an obstructive minority—to act as statesmen dedicated to the national welfare, instead of political opportunism.

In the measure of our service to the American people, they will have confidence in us. In the measure we serve our Nation, our Nation will permit us to serve.

As a national party—as a party devoted to responsibility—we will march forward to victory. But it must be not just victory for the Democratic Party. It must be a victory for America.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Fellow Democrats, fellow Americans, our duties and our obligations are clear. We have lost power and office. But, we have maintained the right to fight for the American people.

Let us dedicate ourselves to future achievement and victory.

SPEECH OF HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, OF TEXAS, DELIVERED ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE, MARCH 16, 1953

Mr. President, within the last week, the world has witnessed two of the most brutal and unprovoked acts in modern times.

Two aircraft—one belonging to the United States and the other to Great Britain—have been shot down in cold blood. They were attacked—without provocation—while flying on routine, nonbelligerent missions.

It would serve no purpose for anyone to use these incidents as a springboard for a hysterical dive into panic. They are serious—indeed grave. We have been brought face to face with the only too evident reality that our Nation could be thrust into total war in a matter of hours.

A show of firmness and unity on our part may convince the Communists who attacked our men that there must be reparations and that the present reckless course must end.

However, regardless of the outcome we cannot afford to ignore the clear warning of the past 3 days. We can refuse to learn this clear lesson only at the peril of our lives and our liberties.

These incidents may serve to awaken us to the full magnitude of our danger. If we awaken in time, we can count ourselves fortunate. For it is only such an awakening that will save us from the threatened destruction that hangs over our heads.

We are now paying the price for the years of complacency and ease we shared together, the years in which we blindly shut our eyes to the realities that surround us. The price is bitter. It may be the price paid by the householder who checks his insurance only when the flames leap out of the basement and lick at the rafters.

There have been many years of such complacency—years in which we decided it was too expensive to pay the premiums on our insurance against aggression.

They began in 1945 when we demobilized the mightiest army the world has ever known with a haste that was neither prudent nor economical.

They continued through 1946, 1947, and 1948, when we peddled our military equipment as surplus at a fraction of its cost without regard to the future.

They reached their high point when the funds appropriated by Congress to build a 70-group Air Force were impounded.

They were summed up in the pre-Korea era when the needs of defense were placed second to the objective of convincing the country that military budgets could be slashed without weakening our preparedness.

The complacency—which was shared generally—continued even after the Korean war had spelled out its grim warning to democracy. Even then, officials persisted in trying to sell our vital synthetic rubber plants—our only reliable source of this material so crucial to military operations.

There were those who warned against this course of weakness and folly. There were those who refused to believe that it was more important to live in luxury than to preserve the liberties which we enjoy for our children and their children.

Among those were the members of the Senate Preparedness Committee—the group of which I had the honor of the chairmanship during the last two Congresses. It was a fine committee—a committee all of whose members worked to strengthen our defenses without regard to politics.

In our very first report—issued on September 6, 1950—we warned against the "siesta psychology" that pervaded our defense program. Just 2 months later—November 11, 1950—we cautioned that "paperwork preparedness is only flimsy protection against the threat we face."

And yet, 1 year later—November 29, 1951—a survey of the facts compelled us to report that complacency still ruled the defense program.

"Deliveries on defense hard goods—planes, tanks, ships, and guns—have fallen dangerously behind schedule" we said, in our 35th report. "And as those deliveries have fallen behind, so too has our capacity to fortify the strength of our allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization."

A few months later—March 20, 1952—the Preparedness Committee summed up the mobilization program in the following words:

"The objective has been ample supplies of both butter and guns. The result has been a small number of guns and a great amount of butter with a considerable number of lollipops thrown in."

On June 17, 1952, in our 39th report, we presented a summary of the views of the military commanders upon whom we rely for the defense of our country. I would like to quote one paragraph from that report:

"They (our military commanders) do not believe we have the strength we need; they do not believe we will have the strength we need unless we raise our sights at once and raise them drastically."

A few weeks later—on August 23, 1952—we reported that America has "lost the right to claim unquestioned mastery of the air. America is behind in the very weapon in which we should have unchallenged supremacy."

Mr. President, the situation was perfectly clear. The story was outlined in the reports of the Senate Preparedness Committee. It is available now and was available then when so many of the crucial decisions were made.

And yet, the clear warnings were met only with "stretchouts" and "cutbacks." Our preparedness program was "stretched out" and our defense production was "cutback."

"Stretchout" and "cutback"—two of the most dangerous phrases in the English language today.

The real tragedy of our time is not that we lacked the ability to bring ourselves to the necessary level of military strength. The real tragedy is that we lacked the will to use the ability.

I have not reviewed the history of the last few years merely to rake over the ashes of the dead past. I have reviewed the past only because it points the way to the present and the future.

The lesson of the past is inescapable. We cannot have military strength by trimming our defense program to our desires for ease and luxury.

There is still another lesson to be drawn from the history of the post-World War II world. It is that we cannot have freedom unless we are willing and able to defend it.

Have we learned those lessons?

There are many who even now advance the slogans "balance the budget," "reduce taxes," "cut back military production," "stretch out the defense program" as the solution to all our ills. They would trim our defense program to what they consider the needs of our budget rather than trimming our budget to the needs of the defense program.

It may be that we can balance the budget, reduce taxes, cut back military production, and stretch out the defense program. But if we do so and at the same time relegate our defense needs to a second priority, it will be at the peril of our lives and our liberties.

There are some who insist that we cannot afford the kind of defense program that will guarantee our survival. I am no economist—no expert in fiscal policy.

But I do know that the one thing we cannot afford is a defense program that is inadequate—a defense program too small to safeguard our liberties.

We cannot, of course, afford waste because in total war the margin of waste could well be the margin between defeat and victory. No one has fought harder than I against military waste, but our objective should be to cut out the waste and institute efficiency—not to weaken our defenses on the excuse that some of our generals do not use their money and their authority prudently. Our goal is the preservation of America as a free Nation. If we lost sight of that goal, we will lose not just our money but our liberties.

The Communist pilots who shot down our plane and the British plane were merely the forerunners of the future. There will be other incidents; there will be other acts of provocation; if they continue we must—sooner or later—face the supreme test.

Are we ready to meet that test?

Our President faces responsibilities that are frightening. He must make the decisions that will determine the course of the future—that will decide whether we survive as a free nation or succumb to the aggressors.

Thus far, he has had very little time to assess the situation and come to the necessary conclusions. But as many Members of Congress know, there are facts and figures on his desk which cannot be avoided and which I know he does not want to avoid. Soon—only too soon—the Congress and the people must reckon with those facts and those figures.

I believe the President should be told that he will have the support of the Congress no matter how difficult the decisions that must be made. I should like for him to think, with justification, that Americans will back him—not as Republicans and not as Democrats—but as Americans who place the salvation of their Nation above all else.

He has the responsibility for leadership because he is the commander in chief. In calm, measured words, the people must have the facts—the facts upon which decisions can be based. I hope that when the time comes the President and the Congress can meet together to work out the answers to the basic question before us.

Does an aggressor nation have the planes and the weapons with which the United States can be attacked at any and every point?

Does an aggressor nation have a stockpile of atomic bombs that could be used to strike at every American city?

Do we have a defensive force adequate to beat off an attack?

Do we have a force that could deliver devastating counterblows against an enemy or have we placed our faith in equipment that is obsolete?

How much time do we have before an aggressor nation will be up to its peak strength?

Is our military force large enough to keep pace with the buildup of the aggressor or should we be building more?

There are answers to all of those questions, and they are not pleasant answers. But they must be faced. The alternative is to drift helplessly into extinction.

We live in the age of the totalitarians—an age in which war is total, victory is total, and defeat is total. It is also the age of the atomic bomb—an age in which the first battle may decide the war.

We cannot wait to decide upon a course of action after the bombs begin to fall. We must decide now—now while there may still be time.

We do not know how much time still remains. That is the factor that is out of our hands—the factor that we cannot control.

We can appropriate money, mobilize manpower, and step up production. But we cannot appropriate 1 minute, mobilize 1 hour, or step up the number of days.

We must use our time, and use it wisely. Whatever we waste can never be recovered.

Furthermore, there is only one yardstick by which the size of our defense program should be measured. It should be no smaller than the force needed to defend our lives and our liberties. Anything smaller is waste—tragic waste that we cannot afford.

I sympathize deeply with those who wish to introduce more economy and more efficiency into our Armed Forces. No one has fought harder than I for those goals.

We can have greater economy and efficiency. But we must not permit our zeal to lead us into the false economy of weakening our defense structure in what may well be the hour of our greatest need.

I am not speaking as a partisan nor do I think this is a partisan subject. The reports of the Senate Preparedness Committee were signed by all members—both Democrats and Republicans.

The American people are looking for leadership to defend their country. They do not care whether that leadership comes from Democrats or Republicans as long as it is effective.

We are past the stage where we can afford partisan bickering. We must discard trivialities and petty arguments. It is far more important to determine how we will get out of this situation than how we got into it.

We are in it. We must look to the past only insofar as it is a guide for the future.

We can, if we wish, exhaust our strength and squander our substance through partisan quarrels that serve only to set American against American. We can, if we wish, use our time and our energy in searching the records of the past for minute details that will pin down the blame for our present situation.

Personally, I would rather concentrate our strength and mobilize our substance against the Soviet enemy who threatens our lives and our liberties. Personally, I think we will find that there is enough blame for all of us to share. It would be better if we were all to concede the errors of the past without further divisive argument and proceed to work toward the only worthwhile goal—the defense of our country.

Mr. President, the incidents in the airspace over Germany were but the handwriting on the wall. They indicate clearly the shape of the future. If we are incapable of understanding that future we have no one to blame but ourselves.

It would be tragic were we to be caught unprepared—with defenses that were inadequate and forces incapable of delivering a counterblow. It would be even more tragic if we were caught unprepared simply because of timidity—simply because we hid from the facts.

There may still be time—time to arm—time to arouse ourselves to the defense of our lives and liberties. Let us seize that time. Let us use it to forge defenses so strong that freedom will triumph over the designs of the aggressor and guide mankind throughout eternity.

SMALL BUSINESS MUST BE ALERT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on small business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the silhouette of a Trojan horse has just appeared on the horizon. At least, if we can believe what has been printed in such journals as the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal, a package deal for abolishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been wheeled up before the struggling citadel of small business.

The initial attack by those opposed to small business was relatively clear cut. It was simply "Let's abolish the RFC." True, this proposition was falsely labeled with the popular brand "economy." But, anyone who cares to examine the facts knows, first, the RFC brings in a net revenue to the Treasury each year; and, second, the assets of the RFC could not be liquidated quickly without great loss of the public's money.

As a result, the simple proposal of abolishment was readily recognized for what it is and hence began to lose some of its political flavor. It is the type of situation in which the opponents of the RFC were too readily recognized as being either ignorant of the facts or against small business.

ARE THOSE ASKING FOR END OF RFC AND SDPA FRIENDS OF THE LITTLE FELLOWS?

Now, as I stated before, a Trojan horse has appeared. In the guise of a peaceful and friendly gesture, it seems that consideration is being given to a brand new agency—just to help small business. Of course, the plan calls for abolishing the RFC and the SDPA. But, its proponents assure us that the new agency will be even better.

From the press reports, it is not clear whether the new agency is to be allowed to make new loans or whether this important function is to be handled by the Federal Reserve banks. Let me just point out that the Federal Reserve banks as well as their members can make loans to small business now. What reason do we have to expect them to change their attitude or their practices?

You might be interested to know that the RFC used to rely upon the Federal Reserve banks to perform certain necessary fiscal services for them. However, in the interest of economy and efficiency, this practice was abandoned. The House Appropriations Committee in its report on the general appropriation bill of 1951 gave recognition to the economy advantages of having the RFC handle these services itself and went on to state that "the committee believes"—these services—"can just as well be handled by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," as by the Federal Reserve bank system.

If we all favor making sound loans to small-business men, who cannot get the money from private sources, how can any of us favor the elimination of an agency which has performed such a valuable service over several decades and which is able to continue to do that job or anything else that Congress sees fit to have it do for small business. If the "new package" is just a change in name, then it is a useless and expensive deception. To thousands of businessmen and disaster victims in the United States, the name Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a highly respected label. They were saved by an agency by that name. How many big and little banks in the United States can we name who were not saved by the RFC during the depression, how many disaster victims have been restored to decent living and business conditions, and how many able small-business men have had an opportunity to perform important roles in the defense effort—all because of the services of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I am not opposed to change when it promises democratic progress. But, I am opposed to deception and confusion wrapped in a fancy package to the disadvantage of small business.

THANK YOU, GENERAL MELOY; YOU BET WE'RE TEAMMATES

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I received one of the nicest letters it has been my pleasure to receive since returning from Korea to take my seat in this distinguished House of Representatives.

The letter is from a wounded veteran of Korea, one of the first American officers to hit the line against the Reds in June of 1950. The letter is from Maj. Gen. G. S. Meloy, Jr., commanding general of the infantry center at Fort Benning, Ga., the most outstanding training headquarters of the ground forces in the world.

It is a pleasure to list below an idea as it is about to hit the silk, Mr. Speaker. General Meloy's letter follows:

HEADQUARTERS,
THE INFANTRY CENTER,
Fort Benning, Ga., March 19, 1953.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SIEMINSKI: Thanks for your note about the contact you made with the Department of Defense reference the Korean graduating ceremonies. We were contacted immediately after your visit, I believe, and are all set to record the program. I still feel your idea has tremendous possibilities and will be of great service to both countries. As I am telling the graduating class, we are teammates and it's certainly essential to have teammates understand each other.

We certainly enjoyed your visit with us, and if the time and occasion comes up again, come on back. We would like to show you more and at greater leisure.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

G. S. MELOY, Jr.,
Major General, USA, Commanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. CHURCH and to include certain extraneous material.

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM).

Mr. MORANO and to include an article on alcoholism.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. COUDERT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND in the Appendix and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON in two separate instances, in one to include a letter and in the other a resolution.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HOWELL in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LYLE and include an article.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in two instances, in one to include certain testimony given by Mr. George Meany before the Committee on Education and Labor; and in the second to include a statement by Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the CIO, before the Committee on Education and Labor, regarding amendments to the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947.

Mr. THORNBERRY and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER and include an interesting article.

Mr. BEAMER.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN).

Mr. BENDER in four instances.

Mr. HOPE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER in two instances.

Mr. YORTY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY and to include a statement on the illicit drug traffic, notwithstanding the fact that the Public Printer estimates the extra cost will be $252.

Mr. MACK of Illinois in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. KEAN (at the request of Mr. WOLVERTON).

Mr. BROWNSON (at the request of Mr. REES of Kansas) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of California in two instances.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include a resolution from the Nebraska Legislature.

Mr. FOUNTAIN and to include a sermon.

Mr. HESELTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAILEY and to include a letter to the Tariff Commission.

Mr. SIEMINSKI.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for Monday, March 23, 1953, on account of illness in family.

Mr. SCRIVNER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. HRUSKA (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. FRAZIER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), until April 3, on account of official committee business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, March 25, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

566. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U. S. C. 1811) (H. Doc. No. 109); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

567. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 6, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Savannah Harbor, Ga., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way at this time; particularly to providing a turning basin above Seaboard Air Line Railroad bridge, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on April 25, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 110); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

568. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to continue the effect of the statutory provisions relating to the deposit of savings for members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

569. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

570. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

571. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on contracts negotiated under section 302 (c) (10) during the 6 months ending December 31, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 152, 81st Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

572. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to continue in effect certain provisions of section 6 of the act of February 4, 1887, as amended, relating to military traffic in time of war or threatened war, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

573. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

574. A letter from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Alfredo Herrera-Arriaga, A-8082496, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 19, 1953, the following bill was reported on March 20, 1953:

Mr. KEARNS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3655. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2368. A bill for the relief of Richard E. Rughaase; with amendment (Rept. No. 201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 4143. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 4144. A bill to clarify the status of mining claims in areas held under an oil and gas prospecting permit or lease and to encourage the exploration and development of fissionable source minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4145. A bill to provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe work places and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 4146. A bill to amend section 8 (a) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 so as to provide that the Tennessee Valley Authority shall continue to maintain its principal office at Knoxville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 4147. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4148. A bill to repeal certain provisions of law which impose requirements and limitations with respect to appointments,

promotions, and other personnel transactions in or outside the competitive civil service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. R. 4149. A bill to create a commission to be known as the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 4150. A bill providing that 5 percent of the revenues from the national forests may be expended by local governmental units for developing, operating, and maintaining national forest recreational resources and areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4151. A bill to extend for 1 year the wage credits for certain military service under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, and to provide for lump-sum death payments on behalf of any individual whose death occurred while in military service and who is reinterred; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4152. A bill to extend the time for exemption from income taxes for certain members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4153. A bill to extend the benefits of certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to the Arch Hurley conservancy district, Tucumcari reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4154. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to deductions from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4155. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that certain chronic and tropical diseases becoming manifest within 2 years after separation from active service shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4156. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 a year the amount of gross income which may be received by certain dependents without causing the taxpayer to lose the income-tax exemptions for such dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4157. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4158. A bill to extend for 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans for the purpose of making available in any area or region credit formerly made available to such area or region by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4159. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 4160. A bill to provide for a waiver of premiums under the social-security program and thereby preserving the insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, to provide for rehabilitation of the disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4161. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the gain from the sale of a residence by a taxpayer who has attained the age of 65 shall be excluded from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4162. A bill to amend section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to extend for 4 years the authority of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop insurance program into additional counties; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 4163. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4164. A bill to authorize members and certain former members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear certain decorations tendered them by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 4165. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to the issuance of certificates of public convenience and necessity, and relating to railway property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 4166. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, of losses caused by abnormally high water levels; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 4167. A bill to create a commission to be known as the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4168. A bill to readjust, in certain cases, the salaries of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 4169. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4170. A bill to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 4171. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 4172. A bill to amend section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to treat as securities those contracts for the purchase or lease of equipment which are not to be fully performed within 1 year from the dates on which they are made; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the recent wave of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and in the persecution of Roman Catholics behind the Iron Curtain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to voting in the Armed Forces, and urging the various State legislatures to take action to encourage and facilitate voting by members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. Res. 184. Resolution directing the Committee on Armed Services to investigate the advisability of utilizing the airport at Hope, Ark., in connection with the current program of construction and conversion of public works for military purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural gas rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress for legislation whereby aliens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations may, prior to their being shipped overseas, be granted United States citizenship, as was the practice during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing Congress for the payment by the Federal Government of a Federal old-age pension of $100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural gas rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress for legislation whereby aliens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations may, prior to their being shipped overseas, be granted United States citizenship as was the practice during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the quota of immigrants from Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation whereby certain mothers and fathers may be granted United States citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress for the payment of Federal old-age pension of $100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOVRE: Memorial of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to renew the present International Wheat Agreement which expires July 31, 1953, and renegotiate said world agreement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature requesting the establishment of an additional international gate at Nogales, Ariz., and urging the Congress to appropriate the sum of $170,000 for the purpose of establishing additional border inspection facilities at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature requesting Congress to allow welfare recipients to earn $50 a month without deduction from assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to allow welfare recipients to earn $50 a month without deduction from assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make an investigation and take such action as it deems necessary to facilitate and expedite the administration of the public land laws and that such action be taken as shall be deemed necessary in order to accomplish the results intended under the provisions of said public land laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, etc.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until certain debatable issues have been resolved; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the withdrawal of Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the creation of an overall integrated plan for the development of the Missouri Basin, the extension of the benefits of the Rural Electrification Administration, and for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to draft deferments and to take such action as is necessary to avoid the drafting of young men of 18 and 19 years of age and to limit deferments of older men; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation to readjust the boundaries of the Olympic National Park so as to restore the private land and road along the north shore of Quinalt Lake and River to the administration of the agency or agencies under whose jurisdiction it existed prior to the proclamation of January 4, 1940; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation to make adequate appropriation for the development of the facilities for fishing fleet moorage in the Blaine Harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds for construction of the proposed Metlakatla-Walden Point road on Annette Island; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging enactment of H. R. 2683, to extend the Alaska Public Works Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to adopt adequate measures to provide security clearance covering travel to and from Alaska toward expediting clearance procedures of the Immigration Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation abolishing fish traps from the waters of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, for prompt action of S. 225, designed to prevent interruptions to ocean transportation service between the United States and its territories and possessions as a result of labor disputes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES (by request):

H. R. 4173. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Jose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4174. A bill for the relief of Gary and Sherry Meisels, formerly Johann and Gertrude Gruenzangl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4175. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Logan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 4176. A bill for the relief of Encracio Nunez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4177. A bill for the relief of Frank S. Aquilina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 4178. A bill for the relief of Celia Herskovits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4179. A bill for the relief of Francesco Cupelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 4180. A bill for the relief of the village of Roseau, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4181. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Szabo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4182. A bill for the relief of Kuo Lum Leong (Way Ping Leong); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4183. A bill for the relief of Phillip Ronald Mack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4184. A bill for the relief of Michele Bennici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4185. A bill for the relief of John G. Zeros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4186. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4187. A bill for the relief of Battista Rosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Pieter Mathias Pennings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4189. A bill for the relief of Joseph Andrew O'Neill (Masanobu Tateda) and Mary Rita O'Neill (Miyo Terayama); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4190. A bill for the relief of Marie Fernande Yvette Leschzenier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4191. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Donald B. Billedeaux; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4192. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nikó Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 4193. A bill for the relief of Luigo Ginese Belluomini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4194. A bill for the relief of Edith Marion Kempthorne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4195. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Verrecchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4196. A bill for the relief of Mary Goodyear Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 4197. A bill for the relief of Bertram P. Tomkins and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

100. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the governing body of the city of Clifton, N. J., requesting the Federal Government to consider carefully economic problems with the thought in mind that the tariff on woolen products and fabrics be raised in order to permit industry in this country to compete with foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

101. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary of the West Virginia State Bar, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation permitting practicing attorneys to become eligible for benefits under the Social Security Act and a tax-deferment pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

102. Also, petition of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting against the vicious and inhuman activities of the Soviet tyrants; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

103. Also, petition of the National Defense League of America Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to initiating action to cause immediate withdrawal of the United States membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

104. Also, petition of A. R. McCrae, and others, of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

105. Also, petition of M. I. Henry, and others, of Winter Park, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

106. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Glissor, and others, of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, proposed social security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1953

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Reverend Cliff R. Johnson, Th. D., pastor of the Westminster Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, it is a long, long trek from the jungle where in the symbolic shadows of the forest men made their laws to fit their superstitions to this august Chamber where in dignity, freedom, and wisdom the affairs of men and the laws of the Nation may be determined.

By Thy hand, Thou hast brought us from the jungle here. Sometimes we frighten ourselves by the awareness of how close we yet remain to the law of tooth and claw. The beasts of our natures still crouch ever near to leap upon our moral and spiritual weakness.

Help us as a people, and as legislators, O God, to remember that the moral heights we have painfully climbed may be maintained only as in humility we call upon Thee. Our greatest hope is that Thou hast given us the capacity to call Thee by name.

Let there be something of an air of holiness to fill this room; grant that it may breathe not alone an atmosphere of pressing legislative necessity but also of spiritual and moral commitment. Let Thy particular blessing rest upon these men as again they must assume the responsibility of taking our lives into their hands on this day. We make our prayer in the name of Him who gave His life into the hands of men for the redemption of the world, even Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 23, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 23, 1953, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1832. An act to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes;

H. R. 3307. An act to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3425. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1951;

H. R. 3704. An act to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 3795. An act to adjust the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of the 23d instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT, on March 24, 1953, signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 3053) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2, 1953 (H. DOC. NO. 111)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, the message just received from the President of the United States may be laid before the Senate and read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in legislative session, the Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will now read.

The legislative clerk read the message. (For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). As in legislative session, the message, together with the reorganization plan, will be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCCARTHY, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. GRISWOLD. Madam President, today, March 25, is independence day in Greece. It is their Fourth of July.

Independence day celebrations are great events in the annals of all nations, but the celebration of Greek independence day is of particular significance to Americans because the idea of independence, as understood in the West, originated with the great ancestors of the present-day Greeks. Of the many noble ideas which ancient Greece bequeathed to the West, the idea of independence, the love of freedom and liberty, seems to be the noblest and purest of them all. These worthy descendants of the ancient Greeks, who unfurled the flag of revolt against their oppressors in 1821 and cast off the invaders' unwelcome yoke, have, in recent years, declared to the world that in the course of many centuries they have not lost any of the qualities that had made their ancestors great. During 7 strenuous years of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

fighting, often against heavy odds, they proved their case; they demonstrated to the West that the modern Greeks are true sons of those courageous ancient Greeks. They have retained their independence.

We Americans have always had most sympathetic feeling toward the Greek people. I am glad to say that both our Government and our people have always been most generous in extending aid to Greece in every possible way. I say this because I speak from some experience. I had the honor to be the administrator of our Greek aid program during its first year. Being in Greece I came to know the Greeks intimately. I had daily contact with them, and came to appreciate deeply their fine qualities. They are intelligent, they are courageous—and they are true friends. Exactly 5 years ago today I spoke at the Greek Independence Day celebration in Athens. I was delighted to join them then, and I am equally glad today to join not only the Greeks but also all Americans of Greek ancestry in the celebration of Greek Independence Day.

Mr. IVES. Madam President, today, March 25, marks the 132d anniversary of the independence of Greece. In this connection I have prepared a statement which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks. And following the statement, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter by Mr. Harry Papps, which appears in this morning's issue of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE 132D ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE, MARCH 25, 1953

Greece—the cradle of democracy from earliest days—celebrates the anniversary of her independence on March 25. One hundred and thirty-two years ago, in 1821, Greek liberators under the leadership of Archbishop Germanos of Petras, evicted the Turkish rulers of their homeland. Since that event, March 25 has been commemorated not only by the Greek people and by those of Greek ancestry, but by all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world as Greek Independence Day.

Greece's centuries of culture—its contributions in the fields of architecture, philosophy, art, and literature—have formed the cornerstone of our present western civilization. In these times we are fortunate to have the heritage that Greece has bestowed upon us, especially the appreciation and love of liberty and the knowledge of the ways of free men.

Greco-American friendship is one of many years standing. America has always offered a helping hand in times of difficulties. When the Greek countryside was overrun by the Fascist armies and later when Greece was faced by Communist tyranny, the United States was able to help materially in regaining Greece's cherished independence.

Greece has once again taken her place—rightfully and proudly—among the free nations of the world. Today, we are assured of a dependable, loyal ally. Despite the proximity of powerful Russia to her borders, Greece continues as a steadfast friend.

On this commemoration of the anniversary of Greek independence, I extend my felicitations to all my fellow citizens of Greek origin. I rejoice that the ties between the two countries are so strong and so enduring.

[From the Washington Post of March 25, 1953]

FIGHTERS FOR FREEDOM

May I proudly salute the valiant people of Greece on March 25, Greek Independence Day. I know that I am expressing the sentiments of many Americans who know the Greek people both here and in Greece.

As an American I have always been inspired by Greece's great contributions to our civilization and way of life.

Greece has always shown itself as a dependable friend and ally of America. In Korea, Greek soldiers and American soldiers have been fighting and dying together since June 1950, in the struggle for freedom and independence of the people of Korea.

I know of the love and respect the people of Greece have for the people of America. I wish to assure our American people that the people of Greece are sincerely grateful to us for the aid that America has been contributing for Greece's reconstruction.

Greece has always shown the world that it is willing to fight and die as free men for freedom and independence. If necessary, Greece will fight, bleed, and die as long as it is on America's side.

HARRY PAPPS.

NEW YORK.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, I desire to express my deep appreciation and respect for Greece and the people of Greece on this anniversary of Greek independence. Time will not permit me to make a lengthy speech. I am limited to 2 minutes. However, I join other Senators in pointing to the fact that Greece was the cradle of democracy. I wish for the Greek people many more such anniversaries and I commend them for the determination and the resourcefulness with which they continue to resist the powerful forces of the aggressor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for 3 minutes on the subject of Greek independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, I must object to any speech of more than 2 minutes. I announced that rule, and I have objected to other Senators speaking for more than 2 minutes, and I must object now.

Mr. LEHMAN. Madam President, I did not know of the rule. I think it is a perfectly good rule, and I do not object to it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I prepared with regard to the 132d anniversary today of the recovery of freedom and independence by the Greek people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN ON THE 132D ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Today marks the 132d anniversary of the recovery of freedom and independence by the Greek people, and the reemergence, after a pause of centuries, of the Greek nation. That was in 1821, and that event was heralded throughout the earth by freedom-loving mankind, by all who recognized the tremendous debt which the cause of freedom and democracy owed to the mighty men of ancient Greece.

The idea of freedom and democracy is inseparable from the history of ancient Greece. Today, in freedom's present crisis, Greece again stands in the forefront of the defenders and supporters of freedom's cause.

Nor has Greece's service in the eternal struggle for liberty been confined to her glorious past and the embattled present. Down through the years, the plains and hills of this storied land have been a battleground—in World War I, in World War II, and at present.

In partial recognition of these facts of history, as well as in recognition of the realities of the present world struggle, President Truman, in 1947, initiated the bold doctrine that now bears his name, and issued orders for the practical steps which preserved the independence of Greece against the threat of Communist subversion, and the grip of civil war. In the years since, the Marshall plan, ECA, and the point 4 program have helped to shore up the economy of Greece and to provide technical assistance and cooperation in the rehabilitation and expansion of the Greek economy.

I learned to know and admire the Greek people through my long and close association with them during the years I was Director General of UNRRA.

Today, Greece is still faced with serious economic problems. The problem of refugees and of surplus population still beset that noble land.

The United States must do its share in providing a haven for a reasonable number of those who can well leave Greece and become useful citizens here. We must continue to assist the Greek economy in other ways, while continuing the program of military cooperation through NATO and the defense assistance program. I know that Greece is doing its part in the collective effort of building up the strength of the Atlantic-Mediterranean community and of the free world generally.

In this way the United States is doing its part to preserve Greece and other free nations from the evil threat of totalitarianism and tyranny. In this way, we help make it possible for the Greek people to contribute their share, in the valiant traditions of the Greek people, to the defense of freedom, and its promotion everywhere in the world.

Americans of Greek descent can well be proud on this day of the glory of ancient Greece, and of the valor of the modern nation which is the heir, along with our own country, of those mighty traditions of the past.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is absent on official business, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by the Senator from Minnesota on Greek Independence Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Senator HUMPHREY)

Few nations of the world can celebrate their independence day with as much pride of achievement as the people of Greece, for few nations have had to pay so high a price to maintain their freedom and their national existence. The tragic fate that has pursued the Greek people during the past 2,000 years, a fate of continual struggle against foreign invaders attempting to subjugate them, has continued to pursue them in our own days. Twice within a single decade Greece has been ravaged by war. Its people have experienced the twin scourges of our age, nazism and communism, in their most brutal forms.

Through it all, at the cost of unmentionable suffering, the Greek people have shown how much freedom means to them. In 1940, they accomplished the incredible feat of driving off the attacking forces of Mussolini,

which had previously been regarded as much superior to their own. Even through the bitter years of the occupation, Greeks harassed the Axis forces wherever they could and thus effectively aided the allied cause.

Liberation from Nazi rule, unfortunately, did not mean the end of suffering for the people of Greece. Almost immediately they were threatened by a new equally formidable foe: the forces of Communist imperialism. Years of strife and devastation had to be endured before the Communists gave up their struggle. But the Greek people again showed their courage and their will to be free against overwhelming odds. With the assistance of the American people, they were given the tools and they finished the job.

Now that Greece finally enjoys relative peace, the free world community, whose battles it fought, must continue to do all that is in its power to help compensate Greece for its grievous losses. Nothing can be done, of course, to make whole the untold loss of lives which almost every Greek family experienced. But while the dead cannot be returned, the living can. We must, therefore, continue to press for the return of the 28,000 Greek children kidnapped by the Communists during the civil war. In the economic field, we must continue to help Greece restore its battered industry and agriculture. Much has already been accomplished in recent years. Much can be still accomplished through continuation of the mutual-security program.

Finally, we must help find a solution to Greece's overpopulation problem through the resettlement of excess population in various parts of the world. As our contribution to such a resettlement program, we should end the discriminatory formula in our present immigration law under which immigration from Greece is restricted to an insignificant number. The present absurd practice of declaring tens of thousands of quota numbers forfeited annually simply because the countries to which they are assigned are not interested in using them must be discontinued and a more equitable system under which natives are given a fair chance to qualify for immigration within the overall field must be substituted.

Knowing that the people of Greece will always do their part, I am confident that Greece will soon occupy an ever-stronger position in the community of free nations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes to discuss the anniversary of Greek independence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, today is being celebrated by many good Americans in Virginia and elsewhere in the United States as the anniversary of the date in 1924 when Greece, the land of their forefathers, became a Republic.

I think it is appropriate to offer congratulations on this occasion not only because of the common interest which now exists among nations which enjoy a democratic form of government, but also because of the important contribution which ancient Greece made to our heritage of political and religious freedom.

Five hundred years before the birth of Christ the city state of Athens experimented with the plan of government which we now call democracy. That experiment was based on the assumption that each individual citizen was important and that the government should be conducted for his benefit, rather than that of a single ruler or a limited class claiming the privileges of nobility.

That system was developed and nurtured by the Romans, who added to the Greek idea an organized body of laws; and by the Anglo-Saxons who, in Magna Carta and other great documents, laid the foundation for our Declaration of Independence and Constitution.

Ancient Greece fell as an independent empire partly because of the internal corruption of its idealistically conceived government and partly because the area controlled by the city state of Athens was never organized on an empire basis; but it was the transplanted seeds of that Greek democracy which caused a host of volunteers, including such Englishmen as Lord Byron, to volunteer in the fight for Greek independence which started in 1821 and culminated a century later. It was that same love of personal freedom which caused Daniel Webster to say:

With suffering Greece, now is the crisis of her fate—her great, it may be, her last struggle. Sir, while we sit here deliberating, her destiny may be decided. The Greeks, contending with ruthless oppressors, turn their eyes to us, and invoke us by their ancestors, by their slaughtered wives and children, by their own blood, poured out like water, by the hetacombs of dead they have heaped up as it were to heaven, they invoke, they implore of us some cheering sound, some look of sympathy, some token of passionate regard.

They look to us as the great Republic of the earth—and they ask us by our common faith, whether we can forget that they are struggling, as we once struggled, for what we now so happily enjoy? I cannot say, sir, that they will succeed: That rests with Heaven. But for myself, sir, if I should hear that they have failed—that their last phalanx had sunk beneath the Turkish scimitar, that the flames of their last city had sunk in its ashes, and that naught remained but the wide melancholy waste where Greece once was, I should still reflect, with the most heartfelt satisfaction, that I have asked you, in the name of seven millions of free men, that you would give them at least the cheering of one friendly voice.

It is because we believed that the Greeks loved their personal freedom that we first provided aid to Greece in her fight against communism which finally, under the leadership of the great General Van Fleet, she won. Later we included Greece in a liberal way in the economic rehabilitation benefits of the Marshall plan. When debate starts shortly in the Congress on a bill to authorize funds for military aid, no Member of Congress will question the inclusion of Greece, whose volunteer detachments have fought with such valor against the Communists in Korea.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, the United States has enjoyed friendly relations with many countries but with none have they been warmer or more fruitful than with Greece.

Most of the things for which we now fight—the principles in which we believe, the rule of the majority, the rights of the individual, indeed, democracy itself, have been derived from ancient Greece.

And in recent years the interdependence of the United States and Greece has become increasingly obvious as we have united in the common struggle for freedom.

It is thus most appropriate that we here today salute the Kingdom of Greece on the occasion of the 132d anniversary of Greece's glorious war of independence.

Mr. FREAR. Madam President, few nations have contributed so much to the world as Greece. In art and literature, in science and in philosophy, it is to the ancient Greeks that the world turns to find some of their most perfect examples and most perfect forms. To America, one of the most significant achievements of ancient Greece is the work of its great thinker, Aristotle; for, somewhere in that vast monument of philosophy and knowledge which is Aristotle's there lay the seeds of American democracy.

For this truly great legacy from ancient Greece, the gratitude of America has never been wanting. When in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, Greece, inspired by the regeneration of democracy in the Western World, rebelled against her centuries-old oppressor, and boldly fought and heroically won her independence, America hailed with unabated enthusiasm the rebirth of the Greek nation. In the House of Representatives, one Member made a moving plea at the outset of the revolution for aid to the beleagured Greeks. Observing that the feeling of sympathy for Greece was deep and universal throughout America, he declared:

We have seen with great pain * * * the bloody contests that have desolated the regions of the other hemisphere, and we have rejoiced at every success of the Grecian arms.

One year later President James Monroe, whose personal feeling for the cause of Greek independence was far more intense than revealed by these restrained sentiments, declared in his memorable message to Congress in December 1823:

There is good cause to believe * * * that Greece will become again an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.

During that sanguinary era of the Greek war for independence, America was only a small nation, regarded by the powers of Europe as of little consequence. Our support for Greece in her cause—a cause of liberty very dear to our hearts—could, therefore, be only moral support. In more recent years, however, our strength as a world power has grown immensely, and likewise, there has also been the enlargement of our responsibility as a democratic nation. Today, we are more than guardians of our own freedom; we are, in a very real sense, guardians of democracy and freedom the world over.

Foremost among those nations who have had a helping hand from America has been Greece. Resolute and affirmative action taken by America during the critical days of 1947 helped the Greeks to preserve their independence from being subverted by communism. Since those fateful days of war and suffering, when Greek liberty hung in the balance, Greece has arisen to a new state of stability and security.

On this anniversary day of Greek independence, it is fitting, therefore, that every American call to mind the precious legacies of ancient Greece which have in all their greatness formed so significant a part of our American

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

civilization. On this occasion, it is also fitting that once again both America and Greece renew their lasting friendship and together proclaim to the world their firm dedication to the cause of democracy, freedom and independence.

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement on Greek Independence Day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

The men of the West have always fought for certain ideals of freedom and independence of which the ancient civilization of Greece was the fountainhead. We all are fully aware of the legacy of classical Greece to the West, but perhaps not all of us know how the Greeks of modern times have had to struggle to regain that liberty which was the ideal of their ancestors.

During most of modern times the Greeks were deprived of their national independence. Fortunately, however, they kept alive their ideals of liberty and of freedom, and in 1821 staged a revolt which led to their eventual political independence.

All Americans will join with thousands of persons of Greek lineage in the celebration of Greek Independence Day March 25 and express their heatfelt gratitude for the invaluable contributions which Greek-Americans have made to America's greatness.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. IVES and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, before suggesting the absence of a quorum and proceeding with the debate, if any Senators have matters to place in the RECORD, with the usual limitation of 2 minutes on speeches, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in legislative session?

Mr. TAFT. As in legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY FOR PEOPLES OF THE NETHERLANDS, GREAT BRITAIN, AND BELGIUM IN FLOOD DISASTER

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting, in response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, expressing sympathy for the peoples of the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Belgium in the disaster suffered by them, responses from the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON TIN OPERATIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report on tin operations, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the extension by proclamation of the Olympic National Park, of January 4, 1940, includes within its boundaries the corridor north of Quinalt Lake and River and the highway therein known as the North Shore Road; and

"Whereas this extension of boundaries brings within the jurisdiction of the National Park Administration a considerable area of land owned by bona fide settlers together with the only road affording entry into and egress from the homes of these settlers, some of which were settled as early as 1888; and

"Whereas the land in question does not belong to the Olympic National Park nor to the United States, but belongs to private citizens who hold it by virtue of patents granted by the United States; and

"Whereas no timberland owned by the United States or the State of Washington is involved in this area which contains approximately 4,000 acres, of which 2,500 acres are potentially tillable; and

"Whereas the area is now the permanent residence of 177 people who enjoy electric lights, telephone service, rural free delivery mail, and bus service for children to an accredited high school; and

"Whereas the National Park Service could, at its discretion, isolate the residents of the area by its failure to maintain a road: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to speedily enact legislation to readjust the boundaries of the Olympic National Park so as to restore the private land and road along the north shore of Quinalt Lake and River to the administration of the agency or agencies under whose jurisdiction it existed prior to the proclamation of January 4, 1940; and

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Secretary of the Interior, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Washington."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 21

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; the Congress of the United States; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas the people of Alaska are generally in sympathy with the security provisions of the McCarran immigration law, and keenly realize the need for close scrutiny of all persons entering the United States and for strict security regulations pertaining thereto; and

"Whereas the McCarran immigration law actually weakens the national security by applying restrictions on aliens only when they leave Alaska thus tending to confine them in the Territory where the United States has many secret and vital defense installations and should have only the most loyal and devoted citizens near them; and

"Whereas during World War II the military officials applied travel controls which permitted easy egress from Alaska but subjected those who sought to enter Alaska to desirability tests to exclude those who were for any reason deemed undesirable security risks; and

"Whereas under existing provisions of the law, anyone having attained entry into the United States by any means whatever has free access to Alaska, regardless of the un-American political philosophy or of being an undesirable security risk; and

"Whereas the McCarran immigration law notwithstanding, aliens cannot enter Alaska legally without undergoing immigration inspection; and

"Whereas we American citizen residents of Alaska in quest of statehood and equal civil, political, economic, and related rights, protest the unintended use of Alaska as a collecting point for undesirables; and

"Whereas the McCarran immigration law provisions create undue hardship on physically and mentally ill American citizens residing in Alaska who, with their attendants, must enter the zone of the interior for medical treatment or confinement; and

"Whereas the procedures adopted by United States immigration officials at terminal points in the United States, while not haphazard nor inefficient, are carried out without consideration of the best interests or convenience of those persons entering or reentering the United States; and

"Whereas study should be made of methods of expediting the clearance process for those persons traveling to and from Alaska who have adequate identification, possibly accomplishing this end by deputizing specific members of the transportation company crew or staff so that clearance may be accomplished by them en route.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully prays that the Congress of the United States, at its present session, adopt adequate measures to provide security clearance for people both entering and leaving Alaska and to expedite the clearance procedures of the United States immigration.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relating to a reduction of the Federal excise tax on distilled spirits; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCARRAN on March 18, 1953, p. 2034, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relating to a stabilized market for the products of domestic mines; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCARRAN on March 16, 1953, p. 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCARRAN on March 16, 1953, p. 1961, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the City of Pasadena, Calif., relating to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp honoring the 65th anniversary of the City of Pasadena Tournament of Roses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Indio, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for

adequate hospitalization for needy and ill veterans of the United States forces; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial relating to the establishment of an Air Force Academy in Arizona

"To the President and Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents—

"That there is a need for an Air Force Academy comparable to the United States Military and Naval Academies to train career officers for the Air Force because of the tremendous growth of that service in the interest of national defense has long been recognized. In 1948 the Secretary of Defense and in 1949 the National Military Establishment's Service Academy Board recommended that an Air Force Academy be established on the same basis as the Military and Naval Academies for the training of future officers of that branch of service. In 1951 United States Representative CARL VINSON introduced H. R. 4574, to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy at an estimated cost of $171 million. Prior to 1951 legislation was introduced in both Houses of Congress to establish an Air Force Academy.

"That Arizona is particularly suited as a site for an Air Force Academy is shown by its possession of the following important attributes: (1) A climate providing ideal all-year flying conditions, as evidenced by an average wind velocity of about 7 miles per hour, an annual average of possible sunshine of about 84 percent, an annual average of about 3,739 sunshine-hours per year, and a low yearly average relative humidity of about 38 percent; (2) the low cost of acquisition and preparation of land; (3) outstanding educational facilities, including the University of Arizona at Tucson, Arizona State College at Tempe, Arizona State College at Flagstaff, junior colleges, public and private high schools and preparatory schools, and many public and private grade schools; (4) adequate housing facilities, with all modern utilities and ample public accommodations; (5) excellent cultural facilities, including churches, libraries, and museums; (6) transportation facilities by rail, motor carrier, and air, including numerous airports, airlines, and air-force installations; (7) outstanding recreational facilities of all kinds, both indoor and outdoor; and (8) numerous thriving communities with populations of from 10,000 to 250,000.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently requests—

"That the President and the Congress give earnest consideration to the early construction of an Air Force Academy at a suitable location in the State of Arizona."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 12

"Memorial requesting Congress to allow welfare recipients to earn $50 a month without deduction from assistance

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Under the provisions of the Federal law relating to welfare assistance any State permitting a recipient, other than a blind person, to earn as much as $50 a month without deduction from the assistance granted would be declared out of conformity.

"It would be of benefit to the recipients of welfare assistance and to the general public if recipients were allowed to earn as much as $50 a month without deduction from the assistance granted.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"That the Congress adopt an amendment to the Federal law relating to welfare assistance that would permit the States to allow a recipient of old-age assistance, dependent children assistance, or general assistance to earn up to $50 a month without having a deduction made from his welfare grant."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. THYE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to Federal taxes on gasoline and motor fuel

"Whereas the cost of constructing and maintaining our highway system in Minnesota is mounting at an alarming rate and because revenues for said purpose and derived primarily from gasoline, motor fuel, and license plate taxes; and

"Whereas the tax on gasoline and motor fuel was originally a prerogative exercised by the States to the exclusion of the Federal Government who later intruded into this field of taxation by a levy of a cent and one-half, thus reducing by this amount what the State could levy; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has by section 489 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (26 U. S. C., sec. 3412) again increased the tax on gasoline and motor fuel to 2 cents per gallon, thus further jeopardizing possible State levies on gasoline and motor fuel and causing a serious menace to this State and her local subdivisions; and

"Whereas our county system of highways except as supported by the gasoline and motor-fuel tax must depend upon a tax on real and personal property now reaching extremely high rates: Wherefore be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring) strongly urge upon the Congress of the United States to refrain from further taxation on gasoline and motor fuel and that the existing tax be forthwith repealed; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to each member of the Minnesota delegation in Congress.

"Adopted by the senate this 17th day of March 1953.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved March 20, 1953.

"ELMER ANDERSON,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed March 20, 1953.

"Mrs. MIKE HOLM,
"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to support measures promoting fair prices for agricultural commodities in the national interest

"Whereas the continuing upward trend in farm-operating costs and the downward trend in farm prices threaten acute distress to farmers in this area; and

"Whereas the Government has again called on farmers to meet huge production goals in the interest of the national defense and welfare, and to build up surpluses of food in the national interest which in the absence of further supporting action will depress prices further, and thus penalize farmers for patriotic effort; and

"Whereas only two Minnesota crops, wheat and corn, are treated as basic commodities under the present law; and

"Whereas designation of oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities for mandatory price supports under the law would tend to balance farm production, and help prevent unneeded surpluses; and

"Whereas perishable farm products, such as milk, meat, butter, and eggs, make up approximately 70 percent of the cash farm income of Minnesota farmers, and these commodities are without adequate price protection; and

"Whereas younger farmers are already in financial difficulty and it has become difficult for young men to start farming with today's high costs and uncertain outlook; and

"Whereas a farm depression would have a serious effect upon the entire national economy; and

"Whereas legislation has been introduced in Congress to improve and make permanent the farm price-support laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States be requested to do all in their power to improve and make permanent a farm price-support program, by—

"First, extending price supports to include oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities;

"Second, attempting to provide a balanced system of price supports for perishable products, including hogs, beef cattle, milk, poultry, and eggs, returning producers of these important products parity for their work and investment;

"Third, providing, whenever practical, self-regulated and self-financed price-support programs;

"Fourth, providing an incentive system of price supports on commodities in short supply to encourage production shifts without acreage controls;

"Fifth, taking steps to protect and expand markets at home and abroad for farm products, including the consideration of the International Wheat Agreement;

"Sixth, to expand greatly research for farm production and marketing, especially in ways to reduce the spread between farm and retail prices for farm products, so as to safeguard the farmer's total income;

"Seventh, to permit family farm ownership and operation by providing an adequate and available supply of long-term, low-interest credit;

"Eighth, using a system of democratically elected farmer committees to carry out the operations of all possible parts of the farm program;

"Ninth, encouraging more soil conservation so as to meet the needs of the Nation without depleting our agricultural resources and productive capacity;

"Tenth, recognizing that as a strong Nation we must have food to win and hold allies, to provide that when farm products are purchased for such use the farmer should not get less than the support price; and

"Eleventh, providing for adequate crop storage facilities so that the loan program is freely available to all farmers; all to the end that agriculture may continue to meet the ever-increasing food demands of our Nation, without jeopardizing the farmers' economic position; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"JOHN A. HARTLE,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"ARNCHER NELSEN,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, the 9th day of March 1953.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate, the 17th day of March 1953.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved, March 20, 1953.

"C. ELMER ANDERSON,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I present for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota, relating to a limitation of imports of foreign agricultural products. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution D

Concurrent resolution to memorialize Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States to limit influx of foreign agricultural products

Whereas farm income in the United States has declined considerably the past 2 years due to drought and other causes; and

Whereas large quantities of foreign agricultural products have been allowed by the United States Department of Agriculture to move into domestic markets, thereby contributing to the general depression of farm prices, and in the case of grain, depressing prices to less than support price: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That we do hereby memorialize and petition Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture to take such action as will be effective to prevent undesirable influx of those foreign agricultural products which are produced in surplus in the United States; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Presiding Officer of each House of Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to the members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress.

C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
WALTER BUBEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GASOLINE TAXATION—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Nebraska Legislature, relating to gasoline taxation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Legislative Resolution 17

Resolution re withdrawal of Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation

Whereas the Federal Government now levies an excise tax of 2 cents per gallon on gasoline in addition to other automotive excise taxes, and all revenue from these taxes is credited to the general fund of the Federal Government and none of such taxes are applied directly to the highway program; and

Whereas every State in this Nation must rely on the gasoline tax as a principal source of highway revenue, in order to finance an adequate, modern highway system so essential to the defense and welfare of this Nation; and

Whereas the several States find themselves with highway systems in critical condition which cannot be rebuilt because the cost of rebuilding is in excess of the anticipated income from highway user taxes available to the States; and

Whereas the increase of highway user taxes is, of necessity, limited because of the burden of the Federal tax on the motor vehicle owner on the fuel he uses on the highway; and

Whereas the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of gasoline taxation would enable the States to increase their highway revenue without placing an additional burden on the motor vehicle owner, and such withdrawal would still permit the Federal Government to have sufficient revenue from automotive taxes to more than permit the continuation of Federal highway aid: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in Sixty-fifth Session Assembled:

1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation providing for the withdrawal of the Federal Government from the field of an excise tax on gasoline.

2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the Legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

3. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the clerk of each State Legislature asking for their support and the adoption of similar resolutions.

CHARLES J. WARNER,
President of the Legislature.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a series of resolutions adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on a variety of subjects, as follows:

Resolutions memorializing the Congress to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges, etc.;

Resolutions memorializing the Congress to pass antipoll tax legislation;

Resolutions memorializing the Congress for legislation whereby aliens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations may, prior to their being shipped overseas, be granted United States citizenship, as was the practice during World War II;

Resolutions memorializing the Congress to pass antilynching legislation;

Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof;

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein;

Resolutions memorializing the Congress for the payment of a Federal old-age pension of $100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65; and

Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural gas rates.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In the house of representatives, adopted March 3, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted in concurrence March 9, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.)

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would remove payment of poll tax as a prerequisite to the right to vote in elections; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress,

and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted March 3, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted in concurrence March 9, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress for legislation whereby aliens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations may, prior to their being shipped overseas, be granted United States citizenship, as was the practice during World War II

"Whereas many persons who are serving in the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea are resident aliens desirous of embracing United States citizenship: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation whereby said aliens may be granted United States citizenship, prior to their being shipped overseas; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted March 11, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to pass anti-lynching legislation

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation seeking to make it a federal offense for any person to engage in the crime of lynching; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted March 3, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted in concurrence, March 9 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the two foregoing resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof

"Whereas Italy is now receiving aid under the Marshall plan; and

"Whereas Italy is acting in consort with the free nations; and

"Whereas Italy has succeeded in freeing itself from the domination of Communist countries; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the President of the United States and the Congress to instruct the delegates to the United Nations to propose the membership of Italy in the United Nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted March 3, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted in concurrence March 9, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein

"Whereas the present political division of Ireland whereby a part thereof is subject to British rule is not in keeping with the principles of self-determination and is not based on the racial, economic or historical background of the people of Ireland: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts recommends that the Congress of the United States be urged to use its influence to abrogate the present political division of Ireland, and to protest the presence of British troops in that country; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted March 4, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted in concurrence March 9, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the two foregoing resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

To the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress for the payment by the Federal Government of a Federal old-age pension of $100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to provide for the payment by the Federal Government of an old-age pension in the amount of $100 monthly to all persons who have attained age 65; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted February 26, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted in concurrence March 9, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural-gas rates

"Whereas the amount expended for the consumption of natural gas for industrial and household purposes will constitute one of the largest items of expenditure in the economy of our Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the competitive position of Massachusetts industry and the economic welfare of millions of families will be in varying degrees affected by the cost of natural gas: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to recommend that the Federal Power Commission take such action in relation to the transmission of natural gas into Massachusetts and its intrastate distribution as will insure the lowest possible rate for domestic and commercial users; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the State secretary send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress, to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth, and to the Federal Power Commission.

"In the house of representatives, adopted March 3, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted in concurrence March 9, 1953.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FALLING FARM INCOME—PETITION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the petition of the National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., on March 15, 1953, relating to the falling farm income.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP FALLING FARM INCOME

National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact at this session legislation to stop the disaster-threatening drop in farm family incomes and purchasing power including:

(a) Definite mandatory legislation to protect the returns of family farmers on any agricultural commodity from dropping below 100 percent of a fair parity price. As a minimum in this session of Congress we urge enactment of legislation that will—

(1) Extend at least until 1957 90 percent parity price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, and other basics.

(2) Expand mandatory 90 percent of parity price supports to rye, flax, barley, oats, grain sorghum, soybeans, dry edible beans, and cottonseed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(3) Continue the present method of calculating parity prices of basic commodities and to extend this system to all other commodities, especially those listed in (2) above.

(4) Provide mandatory parity-level price supports or other full parity income support program to milk and other dairy products, livestock, eggs, poultry, and other perishables.

(b) Establishment of a special investigating committee, board, or commission to determine whether or not recent drops in price received by farmers, while retail prices paid by consumers remain high, have been the result of a conspiracy on the part of processors and middlemen and other monopolistic purchasing and marketing practices, and

2. Petition the President of the United States to send a special message to the Congress reiterating his support of 100 percent of parity for farm income and prices and his support for enactment of parity level farm income and price supports and recommending enactment of such legislation at an early date.

We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

A. Working family farmers are becoming increasingly concerned that existing farm price support programs may be allowed to expire before improved legislation has been adopted to replace them.

B. A reasoned, considered, and orderly discussion of a long range national food and farm program would be more likely if conducted in an atmosphere of relative security than if it must be conducted under the economic gun of falling farm incomes and farm price declines occurring in the face of an early termination of price support legislation.

C. The old familiar economic scissors is cutting farmers down again. Real income per person on farms in 1953 is expected to be one-third lower than 5 years ago. The purchasing power of farm families will be lower than in any year since before World War II. Farmers' share of the national income in 1953 is now forecast to be the lowest in our national history. Lower even than in 1932. Farm people are 15 percent of the population and will probably receive less than 6 percent of national income in 1953.

D. Meanwhile, farm operating costs in 1953 will be record high, above 1952; 29 percent above 1948; more than twice as high as just before World War II; and almost 6 times as high as 1932.

E. Farmers are the only large group in the population whose income and purchasing power and whose share of the national income has been dropping.

Interest rates received by bankers on short-term paper are up 124 percent—more than double since 1947.

The purchasing power, in constant dollars, of the dividends paid by corporations to their stockholders has increased 20 percent in the same period.

Corporate profits have increased 38 percent since 1947.

And, the purchasing power of the average weekly earnings of manufacturing workers has increased by 19 percent in 5 years.

Meanwhile, farm family purchasing power has gone down—down by 26 percent—in the last 5 years with another 10 percent drop expected this year.

F. Only 1 out of 6 full-time family farmers have a purchasing power equivalent to that of the average nonfarm family. Only 1 out of 4 have an income from labor, management, and return on investment equal to the purchasing power of the average manufacture-worker from labor alone. More than 1,500,000 full-time farm families had cash family income below $1,000 in 1949, of those 707,000 had incomes less than $480.

G. Falling farm income and farm family purchasing power is of direct concern to everyone in the Nation, not just to farm people alone. In addition to the 24 million people on farms, the level of farm production and income directly affects 6 million workers (plus their dependents) who are producing goods and services for sale to farmers and 9 million workers (and their dependents) who process and distribute farm commodities. If farm income drops, some of the 6 million lose their jobs; when farm production drops, some of the 9 million lose their jobs.

This leads the way down into national depression. Average per person annual income on farms dropped from $264 in 1919, to $207 in 1920, to $116 in 1921. Industrial workers income hit bottom a year later in 1922, 40 points below 1920. Exactly the same pattern occurred again from 1928 to 1933; and again in 1937–38. Is that where we are headed again?

H. Industrial prices are held up by administrative devices, while industrial production is cut when farm demand and purchasing power drop. That is what has happened time and time again. Farmers try to maintain their production and the result is falling prices and greatly reduced farm incomes.

I. In the past, for example 1929–32, farmers were able to maintain production. Farm production in 1932 was actually 4 percent greater than in 1929. Industrial production was cut by 47 percent. Farm prices fell by 68 percent. Now and in future years, however, farm production cannot be maintained in the face of such drops in income owing to the extremely high, inflexible cash-cost of production and the need for purchasing fertilizer, chemicals, oil, power, and machinery from off the farm for cash.

J. Forty years ago an average farm family could have lost its farm cash operating expenses for 9 years in a row before wiping out their investment in land and buildings. Now the investment, on the average, would be wiped out in only 4 years. Even if farm families were willing to accept, for family living, a purchasing power no greater than they had in 1932, and were able to reduce cash costs by 10 percent from 1952, the income available from sale of products would fall almost $4 billion short of covering depreciation on the present stock of operating capital if agricultural prices are allowed to drop to 75 percent of the 1952 level.

K. Present high level farm production, even temporarily, can be maintained only by protecting a parity level of farm prices or by accepting intolerably deep cuts in farm family living standards, or by using up and not replacing the present working capital of power, machinery, and equipment. Only by maintaining full parity prices can high production be maintained over the long run.

L. Only by the early enactment of mandatory high level farm price support legislation of the type recommended in 1 above can stabilized farm markets be reestablished. Continued uncertainties and confusion resulting from official criticism of existing price programs and the search for ways to eliminate them has contributed materially to present weak markets. Farm prices have dropped 15 percent since January 1951; almost one-half of this drop has occurred in the last 4 months. This is further illustrated by the weakness which characterized the dairy markets in the weeks preceding the dairy price support announcement. In the long run, elimination, destruction, or weakening of the price-support program will destroy farm family income, drastically threaten abundant farm production, and lead to the imposition of a drastic scarcity situation.

We commend the following Senators and Congressmen who have introduced bills in the Congress, which, if enacted, would improve the farm price support legislation: Senators YOUNG, KERR, THYE, BEALL, MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, EASTLAND, and RUSSELL, Congressmen LOVRE, WICKERSHAM, SMITH of Mississippi, ABERNETHY, PASSMAN, MCMILLAN, H. CARL ANDERSEN, KRUEGER, and BURDICK.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 3062. A bill to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 130); and

H. R. 3073. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 131).

By Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 129).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1410. A bill to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948; with an amendment (Rept. No. 132).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1440. A bill for the relief of Paolo Danesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1441. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to provide for payment of overtime compensation to substitute employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1442. A bill to amend section 202 (e) of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over persons and facilities engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy to foreign countries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1443. A bill for the relief of Jose Deang; and

S. 1444 (by request). A bill relating to the rendition of musical compositions on coin-operated machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1445. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Hardy Waters; and

S. 1446. A bill for the relief of Larry Eugene Lynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 1447. A bill for the relief of Zafiro Konstantinou Dioleti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1448. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1449. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the composition of claims commissions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. HUNT) (by request):

S. 1450. A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1451. A bill to increase the statute of limitations for offenses not capital from 3 years to 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1452. A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1453. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act so as to clarify the meaning of the term "outside buyer of poultry, eggs, cream, or milk, in their raw or natural state"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1454. A bill to promote the rehabilitation of the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of Indians, North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1455. A bill for the relief of Francisco Alvarez Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1456. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize a permanent annual appropriation for the maintenance and operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory," approved May 7, 1928, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1457. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1458. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits, until July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 1459. A bill to provide that the judges of the Court of Military Appeals shall hold office during good behavior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1460. A bill providing for the granting of an easement for an access road to Stanley A. Williams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 1461. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1462. A bill for the relief of Yoshihiko Nishikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION IN CERTAIN SALES OF ELECTRIC ENERGY

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the proper committee, and for further study, a bill which would amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over persons and facilities engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy to foreign countries.

The amendment would clarify the intention of the Congress to confine foreign commerce in electric energy to supervision under section 202 (e) of the Federal Power Act, and to exclude it from regulation under other provisions of the act. It would affirm the incidental intention to preserve the power of a State to regulate electric sales and service within its borders and to safeguard its own resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1442) to amend section 202 (e) of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over persons and facilities engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy to foreign countries, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ACTIVE-DUTY STATUS FOR PROPERTY AND DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers.

The bill is the same as Senate 1393, which passed the Senate on July 3, 1952, but which was not considered by the House prior to adjournment.

The bill seeks to retain a procedure with respect to property and disbursing officers of the National Guard which has been in operation since World War II, and which has proven eminently satisfactory not only to the individual disbursing officers but to the Federal Government as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1450) to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. HUNT) (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

INCREASE OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 3282 of title 18, United States Code, which relates to an increase in the statute of limitations for offenses not capital. In connection with the bill I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why Shield Crooks?" which appeared in the March 7, 1953, issue of Collier's magazine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1451) to increase the statute of limitations for offenses not capital from 3 years to 5 years, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The editorial presented by Mr. BUTLER of Maryland is as follows:

WHY SHIELD CROOKS?

The 3-year Federal statute of limitations has run out in the famous case of the million-dollar robbery of Brink's, Inc., and the potentially perfect crime has moved a step closer to perfection.

A Federal grand jury in Boston decided, with apparent wisdom, that an indictment was not warranted because of a lack of "complete, positive information." There is reason to believe, from the events that preceded the end of this time limit, that complete and positive information might eventually have been secured.

It is true that the statute of limitations in the State of Massachusetts still has 3 years to go, and that the local investigation will probably continue. The FBI will continue to work on the case and turn over any findings to the Massachusetts police. But the Brink's robbers may not be punished for their crime even if they are tracked down. Quite possibly, the criminals have fled the United States. If they picked their refuge shrewdly, they are safe from arrest, because some countries, even though they will turn over to us a man wanted for a Federal offense, will not let us get our hands on one sought by a State.

This is not the first time that we have had occasion to object to Federal laws which hamper thorough investigation into crimes and balk the apprehension of their perpetrators. For example, we have stated our belief that it was a perversion of justice when Alger Hiss, because of the statute of limitations, was permitted to stand trial on the comparatively minor charge of perjury rather than on the charge from which the perjury arose.

Now we see once again, in a crime against a corporation rather than against the Nation, a case in which the machinery of Federal law enforcement is stalled by what seems an undue concern for the rights of the accused.

We do not believe that we are advocating cruel and unusual punishment when we suggest that Congress alter the national laws to a point where the agencies of enforcement are given at least an equal chance against the clever criminal—whether traitor, murderer, robber, or whatever—who today is shielded by the calendar under the assumption that an accused person is handicapped in presenting his defense because a few years have passed since the crime was committed.

SETTLEMENT OF PROBLEMS AFFECTING BOUNDARY WATERS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. IVES submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the International Joint Commission was created by the "Treaty Between the United States and Great Britain Relating to Boundary Waters," signed January

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

11, 1909, and proclaimed May 13, 1910, and given authority to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all questions affecting the boundary waters between the United States and Canada, and all questions involving the rights, obligations, or interests, of either in relation to the other, or to the inhabitants of the other, along their common frontier; and

Whereas, clothed with this authority, the International Joint Commission has dealt with a wide variety of problems affecting the boundary waters between the United States and Canada, with the predominant aim of maintaining the boundary waters at equitable levels to serve the interests of all those affected; and

Whereas, in the maintenance of such water levels in the interests of the economy and welfare of the common frontier, the International Joint Commission has from time to time established or authorized international boards of control which function at various points along the boundary waters, but these boards of control lack the necessary overall coordination of their activities; and

Whereas a prolonged cycle of abnormally high levels of the boundary water over which the International Joint Commission has jurisdiction has created critical conditions throughout the entire area, causing extensive and severe damage both to the United States and Canada, and to the property of their citizens; and

Whereas no comprehensive plan exists to deal with this problem, either in the international boundary waters of the Great Lakes or in Lake Michigan, which though an integral part of the Great Lakes system is wholly contained within the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate hereby requests and urges the President of the United States to refer the problem of the abnormally high levels of the boundary waters between the United States and Canada to the International Joint Commission, as provided in Article IX of the "Treaty Between the United States and Great Britain Relating to Boundary Waters," signed January 11, 1909, and proclaimed May 13, 1910, requesting the International Joint Commission (1) to conduct such studies and investigations as may be necessary to determine the levels of the waters in the boundary waters within its jurisdiction which will most equitably serve the rights, obligations, and interests of the United States and Canada and their inhabitants, particularly with respect to commerce, industry, navigation, power development, agriculture, natural resources, and residential use, (2) to submit to the Governments of the United States and Canada plans for the establishment of an International Great Lakes Board of Control to coordinate the actions and decisions of all boards of control so that the water levels of the boundary waters may be maintained at the most equitable levels, within established ranges, which may be possible, and (3) to submit recommendations for such control structures or other works as may be necessary to accomplish that result.

SEC. 2. The United States section of the International Joint Commission is hereby authorized to conduct studies and investigations of the water level of Lake Michigan concurrently with, and similar to, those studies and investigations called for by the first section of this resolution, and to submit to the International Joint Commission recommendations for the establishment of a Lake Michigan Board of Control to function as an integral unit of the International Great Lakes Board of Control in coordinating the control of the water levels of the boundary waters.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 1832. An act to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes;

H. R. 3307. An act to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3425. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1951;

H. R. 3704. An act to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 3795. An act to adjust the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN TAX COURT DECISIONS—CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, on March 20, 1953, from the Committee on the Judiciary, there was submitted to the Senate a report accompanying the bill (S. 984) making provision for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions. The report number is 116, and the calendar number is 111. Because I have determined that the report contains clerical errors, I ask unanimous consent that the report may be withdrawn for correction. The corrections have been made, and I now submit the corrected report, and request that it be printed under the same report and calendar numbers, so that there will be no delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Address delivered by Senator DANIEL on St. Patrick's Day in Charleston, S. C.

Article entitled "Interior Department Eases Congress' Fear of Land Grab," published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Foreword by him and a report on studies with the Lincoln bacteriophage, published in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

By Mr. BYRD:

Article regarding Virginia's right-to-work law, written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of March 17, 1953.

Article entitled "Our Billion-Dollar Bureaucracy Overseas," written by Holman Harvey, and published in the Reader's Digest.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address delivered by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics, Georgetown University, and president of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at the international convention of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, in Philadelphia, on August 16, 1952.

Statement of the principles and objectives of the Bank-Share Owners Advisory League, issued by J. Ross Humphries, president, Central National Bank in Chicago.

Statement on background, world relationships, and United States goals, and some observations on desirable policy, prepared by Mr. Morton Bodfish and Mr. Homer Hoyt of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association of Chicago.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Address delivered by the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs in Washington, D. C., on March 21, 1953.

Address delivered by Miss Helen G. Irwin, president of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, at Washington, D. C., on March 21, 1953; and a biographical sketch of Miss Irwin.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Whom We Shall Welcome," delivered by Philip B. Perlman, former Solicitor General of the United States and Chairman of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization, before the fifth National Conference on Civil Liberties.

Article entitled "The McCarran Law and AHEPA's Supreme President," written by Peter N. Mantzoros, editor of the Chicago PNYX, published in the Chicago PNYX of March 14, 1953.

An editorial entitled "Executive Files," published in the Washington Post of March 25, 1953, editorial entitled "McCarthy and Confusion," published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 25, 1953, and editorial entitled "The Bohlen Affair," published in the New York Times of March 25, 1953, all relating to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

Letter entitled "United States and Iran," written by Henry F. Grady, former United States Ambassador, and published in the Washington Post of March 20, 1953.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Final report of special Federal grand jury in the Miami division of the southern district of Florida, dealing with the investigation of crime; an article entitled "Crime Probe Here May Have Sparked National 'Cleanup,'" published in the Miami Daily News of March 12, 1953; and an article entitled "Tax Official Says Jury's Charge False," published in the Miami Daily News of March 12, 1953.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Statement made on March 18, 1953, by George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C., before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce relative to nomination of Edward F. Howrie to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Editorial entitled "Mr. Bowles Valedictory," published in the New York Times of March 23, 1953; and article entitled "Bowles Leaving His Mark in India," written by Robert Trumbull, and published in the New York Times of March 23, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Whose Life for a Life?" published in the Washington Daily News of March 21, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Article entitled "Southland's Contribution to Area Has Been Great," dealing with the production of newsprint paper in Texas, published in the Lufkin Daily News of March 22, 1953.

By Mr. YOUNG:

Article entitled "Farm Policy Not Merely Political Sop for Votes," written by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, and published in the San Francisco Examiner of March 20, 1953.

By Mr. GRISWOLD:

Article entitled "A Farmer Goes to Washington," relating to Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson and his attitude toward farm problems, published in the March 1953 issue of Nebraska Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Three editorials in regard to the importance of the third naval aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class being build in Massachusetts: (1) Editorial entitled "Jobs for 5,500," published in the Boston American of March 14, 1953; (2) editorial entitled "Work for Fore River," published in the Boston Post of March 14, 1953; and (3) editorial entitled "Carrier for Quincy," published in the Boston Traveler of March 13, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Subsidies in the Open," published in the Washington Post of March 24, 1953.

By Mr. DANIEL:

Letter on the subject of labor and the tidelands issue, addressed to him by G. G. Cullom, of Denison, Tex., under date of February 24, 1953.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Article relating to the findings of the Conservation of Human Resources Project, published in the New York Times of March 21, 1953.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Platform declaration on the American Merchant Marine, by the Mississippi Valley Association.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Statement on Virginia agriculture and foreign trade, by Mrs. Colt MacLean, of Leesburg, Va.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "A Big Barn Door to Lock Now," dealing with the making of law by treaty, published in the Richmond News Leader on March 19, 1953.

MARYLAND DAY—319TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. BEALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. BEALL. Madam President, today, March 25, is Maryland Day, marking the 319th anniversary of the founding of the State which I have the honor in part to represent.

Since the arrival of the *Ark* and the *Dove* at St. Clements Island on March 25, 1634, Maryland has made many contributions to this Nation, and it is not without cause that our State is known as the Free State. In these days of religious persecutions and intolerance, of unwarranted and unjustified attacks on the loyalty and integrity of individuals, it seems to me of particular importance that we should remember that the first act of religious toleration was adopted by the Maryland colonists in 1649.

At that time Maryland was the only place in the world granting religious freedom and this new idea was to be later incorporated into our Constitution as a part of the Bill of Rights—that unique instrument protecting civil liberties.

We of Maryland are proud that this concept of individual freedom was adopted by the original 13 States and that today the enjoyment of religious freedom is one of the tests of a true democracy.

Unfortunately, there are places in this world today where religious freedom is not permitted. Freedom is always threatened, especially religious freedom, and we should frequently recall, and reaffirm our faith in, the ideals which are the basis of our democracy.

Later this afternoon the Members of the Senate will undoubtedly act on a particular nomination which is now pending. Unfortunately, the nominee's character has been unfairly attacked. The integrity of our Secretary of State, and indirectly that of our President, has been questioned. By our votes today we in the Senate can reaffirm our faith in democracy governed by law as opposed to government by men, who, at times, do not show either respect for, or an understanding of, the human liberties our Constitution protects.

We in Maryland have been faithful to the traditions of individual freedom established by the early colonists. We are proudly known as the Free State. That is why we Marylanders observe this day. We observe March 25 as the anniversary of the founding of our State which gave the world a new concept of human liberties.

Madam President, there are present in the gallery today a number of ladies from Maryland who join my colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and myself in celebrating the 319th anniversary of the founding of Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, at a later time I shall make some brief remarks in connection with the nomination of Mr. Charles Bohlen. At this time I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleague [Mr. BEALL] a few moments ago in commemoration of the 319th anniversary of the founding of the Free State of Maryland. I also join in a hearty welcome to the lovely Maryland ladies who are present today in the galleries of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes with reference to an insertion which I intend to make in the RECORD.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Madam President, on Monday, March 23, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, issued a statement at an official meeting of the Organization of American States, Pan American Union, in Washington.

It was a significant statement, the gist of which was to the effect of carrying out good international relations with Pan America, hemispheric solidarity as a matter of importance and policy. The Secretary spoke of the profits that were to be derived by that class of relations. He speaks of how the artists, musicians, and writers of Latin America contribute to our culture, how Latin American statesmen, jurists, and men of other professions have greatly promoted the science of human relations. He calls attention to the fact that the Organization of American States reflects the highest aspirations of our people—the hemisphere—for peace, liberty, and wellbeing. He also speaks of its success in establishing a system of cooperation for security and welfare.

The statement of the Secretary, in my opinion, is both laudable and noble. However, I wish the fine Secretary had given some thought and expression to the need of this country to cooperate with Latin America in bringing about the development of the resources of the hemisphere, economic betterment in the hemisphere, and the raising of standards of living of the hemisphere. Standards of living in Latin America or elsewhere cannot be brought about unless the innumerable resources of the countries of Latin America are developed. They have not been touched and I believe that as a general policy it would be to the interest of all of the noble desires of the Secretary if this country would cooperate and try to bring about in an orderly way the advancement of the great natural wealth that is now not contributing one iota either to the grand aspirations as enunciated by the Secretary, or to the standards of living of the countries which he was addressing. Progress has been made and I am happy to read and hear the fine words of our new Secretary.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Secretary issued on the date indicated may be inserted in the body of the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES AT PROTOCOLARY SESSION OF COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, PAN AMERICAN UNION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MONDAY, MARCH 23, 1953

I am happy to meet with this distinguished group of representatives of the American Republics. Our Council, where all of our 21 countries meet as equals, symbolizes the unity and fraternity of our inter-American fellowship.

This fellowship holds a special place in the international relations of the United States. Hemispheric solidarity was our earliest major foreign policy and it remains central with us. Today, that solidarity is illustrated by this building in which we meet and by what goes on within it.

I have on many occasions, notably at Assemblies of the United Nations, and at the Japanese Peace Conference, enjoyed and profited by the opportunity of working with representatives of your countries. Now, as Secretary of State, I shall have an even wider and more continuous opportunity.

The profit which we derive from that relationship relates not merely to our fellowship in time of war as comrades in arms. We also profit from the achievements of the peoples of Latin America in many fields of endeavor. The artists, musicians and writers of Latin America contribute greatly to our culture. Your statesmen, jurists and men of other professions have greatly promoted the science of human relations. As a lawyer, who has long devoted himself to international affairs, I have studied with admiration and advantage the work of your international lawyers and the doctrines of inter-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

national law which they have espoused, and which the civilized world has largely accepted.

The Organization of American States constitutes one of the outstanding achievements in the history of our 21 countries. It reflects the highest aspirations of our people for peace, liberty and well-being. In its manifold activities, it gives expression to the political, economic and cultural aspects of our national lives. Finally, its success in establishing a system of cooperation for security and welfare cannot fail to strengthen our faith that an equally effective and beneficial relationship may be established among all the nations of the world. That is indeed the purpose of the United Nations, a purpose to which we all subscribe.

Because the United Nations does not yet realize all the hopes of its founders, and because abuse of the veto power has weakened its capacity to provide security, it is necessary to have regional collective security organizations. The first and most embracing of such regional associations is that which was created by the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance concluded at Rio de Janeiro in 1947. I well recall the struggle at San Francisco to eliminate from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the clause which would have prevented, or at least given the Soviet Union a veto power over, such a regional and collective security arrangement as was created by the Rio Pact. For that result, the late Senator Vandenberg, one of your great friends, is entitled to lasting recognition.

It is good that, at San Francisco, we opened the way to regional associations for collective security despite the strong objection of the Soviet Union. That prime objector of 1945 has now become a source of grave danger. That danger makes it vital that there be intimate and strong Pan American solidarity. We must demonstrate in terms of the lives of our peoples that the free nations can provide a better way of life. Also we must strengthen our capacity to defend ourselves from a foe that can attack both from without and from within—by open aggression or by subversion. Subversion, we should remember, has been the preferred method which has already brought some 800,000,000 people into bondage, which is degrading and which denies the spiritual nature of man.

You may be confident that the Government of the United States will seek to do its part to invigorate the spirit of solidarity and cooperation, which has joined our people in the past, and on the continuance of which the future of human dignity so largely depends.

I can assure you that President Eisenhower has a deep interest in the development of good relations between our nations. His interest in NATO and in Korea is matched by his interest in the Americas. I recall his visit to Brazil and Mexico when he was Chief of Staff. He and I often talk together about hemispheric solidarity and I can say with assurance that it is the purpose of this administration to pursue with increased vigor and effectiveness the development of relations of mutual trust and respect with our sister Republics.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE NEXT 2 WEEKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished majority leader, I wonder whether he is in a position to give the Senate a statement of what he plans as a program for the Senate next week.

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, in the first place, after the Bohlen nomination is disposed of, the Senate will have before it Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, dealing with the establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Then there will be taken up the bill extending certain emergency powers which, in the absence of further legislation, will expire on April 1. The bill would extend the powers until July 1. I do not believe the consideration of those measures will take long.

Then there is the so-called tidelands bill, which is soon to be reported by the committee.

Next week the Senate will meet on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday. An adjournment will be taken on Thursday evening until the following Monday after Easter. I have told a number of Senators that, while there will be a session on Monday after Easter, I will guarantee that no important business will be transacted on that day, so that it will not be necessary to return until Tuesday. The Senate will meet on Tuesday, however, and proceed with the consideration of the tidelands bill, and sessions will be held every day until that bill is disposed of.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What does the Senator from Ohio plan with respect to sessions this week?

Mr. TAFT. This week, after today, the Senate will meet on Friday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

USE OF SOVIET AIRMEN TO FLY CHARLES E. BOHLEN TO MOSCOW

Mr. BRICKER. Madam President, on Monday, I had printed in the RECORD a news article to the effect that Mr. Bohlen, the new Ambassador to Russia, if his nomination is confirmed, would go from Germany to Moscow in a sealed plane with a Russian crew. I have before me a copy of a letter which was addressed to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, by the Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton, to the effect that there will be a Russian navigator on the plane, along with a Russian radio man, but the American crew will remain. In the letter Mr. Morton states:

> No blackout procedures, such as window coverings or other special measures, have been taken in the past.

He is not definite in regard to what will be done at this time or in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 24, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In response to your inquiry concerning transportation procedures which will be involved in the travel of Ambassador-designate Bohlen from Washington to Moscow, it is contemplated that Mr. Bohlen will travel by commercial airline from Washington to Wiesbaden, Germany, and from Wiesbaden to Moscow, via Berlin, will, in accordance with the practice of the last several years, use a United States Air Force plane. The latter will carry its regular American crew, which will be supplemented from Berlin to Moscow and return by a navigator and a radio man provided by the Soviet authorities, also in accordance with the practice of the last several years. No blackout procedures, such as window coverings or other special measures have been taken in the past. The plane flies nonstop from Berlin to Moscow and is not sealed.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SWEARING IN OF WILLIAM RUFUS KING AS VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HILL. Madam President, on yesterday, in Matanzas, Cuba, the Alabama Historical Association and the Academia de la Historia de Cuba joined hands in a ceremony commemorating the 100th anniversary of the swearing in of William Rufus King as Vice President of the United States. This great Alabamian and great American was administered the oath of office as Vice President at Matanzas on March 24, 1853, under the authority of a special act of Congress.

At the ceremony a memorial plaque was unveiled by Mr. Laurence B. Tipton and Mr. DeVane King Jones, both of Alabama, and both collateral descendants of William Rufus King; and the principal address was delivered by Mr. Henry P. Johnston, of Birmingham, Ala., also a collateral descendant of Mr. King.

The other members of the party from Alabama attending the ceremony were Mr. and Mrs. Henry P. Johnston, Mr. and Mrs. DeVane King Jones, Mr. Laurence T. Tipton, Mr. Porter King, Mrs. Charles P. Johnston, Mr. and Mrs. Hill Ferguson, Mr. and Mrs. Comer Jennings, Mr. and Mrs. T. C. King, Mrs. Evelyn King Wheeler, Mr. and Mrs. Julian Lamar.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered on this occasion by Mr. Henry P. Johnston; also to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief sketch of the life of William Rufus King, former Vice President of the United States; and also to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article telling of the plans for the ceremonies, which was published in the Birmingham News, of Birmingham, Ala., on last Sunday, March 22.

I should like to add that I regret that the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is unavoidably detained today on public business, and cannot be here. Rufus King was born in North Carolina, in Sampson County. He served in the North Carolina Legislature; he was prosecuting attorney for the circuit in which he lived; and for 5 years he served in the United States Congress as a Representative from the State of North Carolina. The distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] wished very much to be here today to join us in paying tribute to Mr. King. North Carolina rightly shares Alabama's pride in him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, in connection with the same ceremony commemorating the 100th anniversary

of the swearing in of William Rufus King as Vice President of the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the address delivered on that occasion by Mr. Thomas W. Palmer, representing the Alabama Historical Association, and also the address delivered on the same occasion by Mr. Emeterio S. Santovenia, president of the Cuban Historical Society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEY. Madam President, I wish to associate myself with the two distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN] in paying tribute to William R. King. Vice President King was born in North Carolina, and rendered distinguished public service in that State. I also wish to associate myself with my junior colleague from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is not present today, but who would like to say, if he were here, that we in North Carolina esteem most highly William Rufus King and the great career he achieved for himself and the great service he rendered to his State and in later years to his Nation.

I may say that William R. King is the only Vice President who was born in North Carolina. Three Presidents of the United States were born in North Carolina. Later they left the State and went elsewhere, but they still got a good start in North Carolina. Those Presidents were Andrew Jackson, Andrew Jackson, and James K. Polk. In Raleigh, the capital city of North Carolina, is erected a statute to these three men commemorating the service they rendered to the State of North Carolina before they left it and the greater service they rendered to the Nation after they left North Carolina. It so happens that each of them later went to Tennessee.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about William Rufus King, as published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer, on January 21, 1940.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, on Saturday, March 21, the University of Florida, at Gainesville, celebrated its 100th anniversary. It was a great and glorious occasion for all Floridians. On that day and on that occasion a great Floridian by the name of James A. Van Fleet was also honored. He was referred to as Florida's No. 1 citizen; and the speech which he gave on that occasion was indeed an inspiration to all of us who heard him. His speech was impressive because it came from a general who has had more experience in the actual fighting of communism than has any other man in or out of public life today. In the dark days of 1947–48, General Van Fleet was the instrument around whom the anti-Communist forces gathered, in Turkey, in Greece, and all over Eastern Europe. Under his leadership and guidance, the Greek and Turkish nations rallied and saved themselves from communism, and today they stand as strong bulwarks against the forces of communism. As we all know, General Van Fleet rendered great service to the cause of freedom as the leader of the United Nations forces in Korea. He demonstrated in Korea, as he has elsewhere, his great ability as a tactician, a leader and soldier in the highest meaning of that word.

General Van Fleet speaks today from the deep well of his knowledge, when he advises us as to how we should treat the Communists. We should keep in mind that here is an experienced man who knows what we are up against. It is for that reason that I am proud to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech which he made on the 21st of March, which dealt with the free world's relations with the Communists. I commend the speech to the attention of every Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEMAND OF BANKERS FOR HIGHER INTEREST RATES ON THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. MURRAY. Madam President, one of the most important issues facing the Federal Government today is whether or not it should go along with the desires of bankers for higher interest payments on the Federal debt.

Early in February of this year, in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George M. Humphrey, I pointed out that a recent refinancing of Treasury Department certificates would seriously increase the interest burden that must be carried by American taxpayers. I estimated that this one refinancing operation alone would cost American taxpayers an additional $34 million—twice as much money as would be needed each year to finance all the new medical education required in this country.

In a reply dated February 24, the Secretary of the Treasury confirmed this estimate. His letter states—and I quote:

> The computed annual interest charge on the new securities is about $34 million more than the annual charge on the maturing certificates.

The Secretary's letter also contained a number of other interesting facts and observations.

However, because his communication left a few matters somewhat unclear, I have written again to the Secretary of the Treasury and asked for his clarification of four points.

The first point is whether or not the Treasury Department has definitely embarked upon a policy of favoring higher interest payments on the Federal debt.

The second question is whether or not the Treasury Department views with equanimity the daily reports on the sharp decreases in the prices of long-term United States Government bonds.

The third question is whether or not credit is becoming tighter throughout the American economy.

The fourth question relates to the total figures on the outstanding marketable Federal debt which will mature during 1953 and the years immediately following.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the correspondence with the Secretary of the Treasury to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 12, 1953.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your very informative letter of February 24, in response to the questions I submitted to you earlier in February.

Your letter confirmed my own estimate that the additional annual interest charge on the new securities would be about $34 million more than the annual charge on the maturing certificates.

I am somewhat puzzled, however, by your observation that the higher rates of interest which you offered on these obligations "were in line with prevailing market rates." This might be interpreted by some as indicating that the Treasury Department had no policy on interest rates and that the interest paid on new obligations was to be left 100 percent to the interplay of market forces. Yet the Treasury Department is itself an extremely important participant in the market rather than a passive and innocent bystander.

Your letter also points out that interest rates began to rise before the new administration took office. This might be construed as meaning that the Treasury Department, under the new administration, has no policy of its own but is merely the automatic victim of policies developed under the previous administration.

It would seem to me that some clarification would be desirable. Would it not be correct to infer from the various actions that have been taken and statements that have been made that the Treasury Department has embarked upon a policy of favoring higher interest payments on the public debt?

In asking this question, I am entirely aware that such a policy can be pursued slowly and cautiously rather than recklessly. I am entirely aware that some would maintain that a policy of higher interest payments is needed to prevent or control inflation. I am not at this moment attempting to debate the wisdom of such a policy, but am merely interested in obtaining a more clear conception of the present policy of the Treasury Department.

As a companion question, I would like to ask what your reactions are to the sharp decreases in the prices of long-term United States Government bonds? The papers these days carry such headlines as "United States Bonds Plumb New Low Levels." Is this a situation which, in your judgment, should be viewed with equanimity?

In my previous communication, I also inquired as to the effect of the increased rates on Treasury obligations on the cost and availability of credit to farmers, businessmen, homeowners, and other borrowers. In your reply, you indicated that there were several factors affecting the cost and availability of credit. At this moment, therefore, I should like to pursue this matter merely by inquiring whether or not it is true that the cost of credit of various types is becoming higher and whether or not it is true that many types of credit are becoming less available. Once again, my inquiry is of a purely factual nature. I know that you and your colleagues follow these trends very closely and I am anxious to learn from

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

you just what is happening with respect to this phase of the American economy.

I should also appreciate a more specific tabulation on the outstanding marketable public debt that will mature during the remainder of 1953 and during each of the following 3 years. The tabulation included in your letter of February 24 excludes, as you indicate, the 91-day Treasury bills and the tax anticipation bills. As a result, the tabulation gives a very incomplete picture of the total refinancing activity of the Department. Would it not be possible to include both of these items in one complete table?

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senator.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 24, 1953.

Hon. JAMES MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I am glad to reply to your letter of February 12, with the hope that I might be able to explain the recent refunding operations of the Treasury, which resulted in the exchange on February 15 of approximately $8,734,000,000 maturing 1⅞ percent 1-year certificates, for $8,114,000,000 of 2¼ percent 1-year certificates, and $620 million of 2½ percent 5-year and 10-months Treasury bonds. Thus, only $134 million of the $8,868,000,000 maturity was presented by holders for cash redemption.

As your letter states, the computed annual interest charge on the new securities is about $34 million more than the annual charge on the maturing certificates. This increase is attributable to two factors, first, an increase in market rates of interest since the maturing certificates were issued a year ago, and second, the extension of a part of the public debt into longer maturities.

The rates of interest carried by the new issues were not arbitrary, but were in line with prevailing market rates. The 1⅞ percent interest rate on the maturing certificates was fixed a year ago and since then rates of interest generally have increased, particularly in the short-term area. For example, the 91-day Treasury bill rate increased from about 1½ percent in February of 1952 to about 2¼ percent in December and is now close to 2 percent. Interest rates rose before this administration took office.

In considering the Treasury's refunding operation on February 15, another point is that for many years prior thereto, it had been necessary for the Treasury to rely heavily—too heavily—for the success of its financing operations on the support of the Federal Reserve. Even with the higher interest rates put on short-term Treasury securities in 1952, the securities were not sufficiently attractive to investors as is evidenced by the fact that it was necessary for the Federal Reserve System to purchase over $2,100 million of the maturing Treasury certificates in order to effect the refunding operations. Moreover, the cash redemptions of the maturing issues during this period amounted to over $1,800 million, indicating that many holders of the maturing securities were not interested in the new issues. These heavy cash redemptions did not result in an interest saving but, on the contrary, caused serious drains on the Treasury's cash balance which had to be compensated for through subsequent borrowing at increasing rates of interest.

While virtually all Treasury financing during the past few years, until the recent one, had to be supported through Federal Reserve open market operations, in contrast, the recent refunding operations of February 15 was accomplished without any Federal Reserve support whatever. In the long run this policy will be least inflationary and help maintain a sound currency system and the purchasing power of the dollar. The most expensive way to finance is one that causes inflation.

I believe the foregoing answers questions 1 and 2. With reference to questions 3 and 4, the cost and availability of credit to farmers, businessmen, homeowners, and other possible borrowers will be affected by several money market factors, including the demand for and availability of credit, rather than by the rates of interest paid on the February 15 refunding operations.

In reply to your fifth question, I am summarizing below the outstanding marketable public debt that will mature during the remainder of 1953, and during 1954, 1955, and 1956. These figures are exclusive of $17,200,000,000 of 91-day Treasury bills of which about $1,300,000,000 are refinanced weekly on a competitive bid basis and $4,500,000,000 tax anticipation bills which mature in March and June of this year.

Maturing in calendar year	Yearly amount	Percent
	Millions	
1953	$27,115	21.4
1954	27,299	21.5
1955	14,265	11.3
1956	2,238	1.8
Total	70,917	56.0
After 1956	55,814	44.0
Total marketable debt outstanding exclusive of Treasury bills	126,731	100.0

It is to be noted that more than a fifth of all the marketable debt outstanding (exclusive of the Treasury Bills) matures during the remaining 10½ months of 1953, and that 56 percent of such debt matures during the next 4 years.

The refinancing of the marketable debt as it falls due is only a part of the whole debt management problem. In addition to the marketable debt, there is approximately $77½ billion of non-marketable debt outstanding, i. e., savings bonds and savings notes, of which approximately $31 billion matures during the next 4 years. This debt is of a demand nature and could present difficulties to the Treasury under some conditions.

The concentration of such large debt maturities in the short-term period just ahead presents some real problems and we believe the refunding operations should be dealt with so as to provide a more balanced debt structure. This program undoubtedly will raise many questions of the type referred to in your letter but in the long run will strengthen the economy and place the finances of the Government on a sounder basis.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

FEBRUARY 12, 1953.

The Honorable GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Many Members of the Senate have been extremely concerned over the published reports about the terms upon which the Treasury Department has just refinanced nearly $9 billion in certificates of indebtedness.

As a result of this operation, it would seem that your policy of higher interest rates has raised interest charges on this portion of the public debt by at least $34 million a year.

In other words, instead of paying 1⅞ percent on the total sum, you have now worked out a plan whereby you are committed to pay 2⅛ percent on most of it and 2½ percent on the remainder, an increase ranging from three-eighths to five-eighths of 1 percent. This would seem to be a total interest payment of $197 million a year as contrasted with $163 million previously—an increase of $34 million or 20 percent.

This is a rather surprising action in the direction of unnecessary spending on the part of an administration which has promised to cut down expenses.

Over the next 4 years it would seem that this one refinancing venture alone would cost the taxpayers $136 million. This extra and totally unnecessary payment to the bankers would by itself amount to twice as much money as would be needed to finance for the next 6 years all the new medical education required in this country.

In view of the importance of this matter, I would therefore greatly appreciate it if you could supply me with your answers to the following questions:

1. What is the Treasury Department's calculation as to the additional interest payments that will be required by this recent refinancing action?

2. Over the course of the next 4 years, what is your estimate as to the total cost of the handling of this portion of the public debt?

3. What effect will actions of this type have upon increasing the cost of credit to farmers, businessmen, homeowners and other possible borrowers?

4. What effect will actions of this type have upon the availability of credit to farmers, businessmen, homeowners and other possible borrowers?

5. What portion of the marketable public debt now outstanding will have to be refinanced during the rest of 1953? during 1954? during 1955? during 1956?

Your cooperation in this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

PROPOSED GRADUATED EXCISE TAX ON CIGARETTES

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, today hearings have begun before the House Ways and Means Committee on House bill 1417, a bill proposing a graduated excise tax on cigarettes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement in opposition to House bill 1417, together with a letter, enclosing table No. 4, from Joseph H. Freehill, Director, Office of Price Stabilization, under date of March 18, 1953.

There being no objection, the statement, letter, and table No. 4, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All of us are vitally interested in American agriculture. We are genuinely and seriously concerned with the decline of farm commodity prices which began in 1952. Fortunately, for the State which I represent, Kentucky, tobacco prices have remained relatively firm. Unfortunately, however, there is pending before the Congress a bill, H. R. 1417, which threatens to disrupt the tobacco program. The imminence of this danger to an important segment of our economy clearly warrants discussion of the issue now.

At the present moment, this tax assessment is levied upon the basis of volume and not on the basis of price. We have had a flat tax and not an ad valorem or graduated tax. Governmental revenues have been substantial, yet tobacco growers have prospered in spite of the enormity of the tax levy.

H. R. 1417 proposes a graduated tax designed to subsidize the manufacturers of cheap cigarettes. Tobacco growers know from experience that cheap cigarettes mean cheap tobacco. Many Members of the Congress have come to the same conclusion. Every Senator and every Congressman from a State producing cigarette tobacco is opposed to an ad valorem cigarette excise tax.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The knowledge of tobacco growers, acquired by experience in the market place, is adequately supported by published facts. Cigarette production costs are no longer secret documents. At my request, a consolidated cost analysis of the 2 types of cigarettes has been made by 1 of the administrative agencies. This comprehensive survey will be filed with the Ways and Means Committee and will there be published for the first time.

This cigarette cost analysis proves conclusively that tobacco is the only flexible cost of any consequence in the manufacture of a cigarette. Cheap cigarettes can be made only with cheap tobacco. Cheap cigarettes can be made only at the expense of tobacco growers.

Cheap cigarettes are manufactured out of rolled tobacco stems and out of the common grades of leaf tobacco. Tobacco growers receive only half as much money per pound for the tobacco used in cheap cigarettes.

A graduated tax would result in the sale of cheap cigarettes at a retail price advantage of 5 cents a package. This would divert cigarette production from the standard-quality brands to the cheap cigarettes using cheap tobacco and tobacco stems. The Treasury Department estimates that a graduated tax would boost the sale of cheap cigarettes from their present 1.2-percent share of the market to some figure between 10 percent and 25 percent of cigarette output. The effect upon tobacco growers would be disastrous, and the Treasury has testified today before the committee that an important loss of revenue will result.

It has been argued that the cheap cigarette is the poor man's cigarette and that the present uniform tax discriminates against the poor man. Today that argument has lost all of its validity. Today the standard brand is the poor man's cigarette. The rich smoke premium-quality cigarettes. King-size cigarettes alone, which generally sell at a premium price, account for a very substantial part of total cigarette output.

Today the graduated cigarette-tax fight is neither between the small manufacturer and the large manufacturer nor between the poor man and the rich man. Today the dispute is between the American tobacco grower, who knows that cheap cigarettes mean cheap tobacco, and the advocates of cheap cigarettes, who are seeking what amounts to a subsidy. Today the issue is between those who are concerned with preservation of governmental revenues and those who seek an economic advantage as manufacturers through means of a graduated cigarette tax.

The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by the 80th Congress and the 81st Congress, has served to protect the economic welfare of tobacco growers without a consequent financial risk of loss to the Government of the United States. The tobacco program has worked, and worked well. No other commodity program can make an equally valid claim to complete success.

In 1952 farm commodity prices began to decline. The Secretary of Agriculture has wisely resolved to review all of our farm programs. Pending the completion of this study, it would be utter folly to modify an industry-tax structure which has been uniform since 1864. We should not now tamper with a successful farm program.

On April 24, 1948, at a hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a witness from Kentucky summarized the views of the tobacco industry, saying: "Today, with a single voice, growers and all of their representatives urge you to hew closely to the program which you have created for them, to a program which to them is a magna carta of economic salvation, with a heritage and a promise comparable only to our Bill of Rights."

The 80th Congress heeded that advice. The 81st Congress heeded that advice. In 1948, with former Senator Barkley, later Vice President, I introduced the amendment which became law which guarantees to tobacco growers without limitation a support price equal to 90 percent of parity. To scrap the program or to tamper with the program now would be to ignore its history of success, its repeated approval by the Congress, and its promise of continuing a performance as the best long-range farm program ever designed for any commodity.

The graduated cigarette tax is sponsored solely by a select group of manufacturers who seek what amounts to a subsidization of their products. Opposed to them, on the other hand, are the advocates of quality cigarettes; more than 750,000 farm families producing cigarette tobacco; every trade association, cooperative, and Congressmen representing tobacco growers; and also all of those persons, too, who are vitally concerned with preservation of a major source of our governmental revenues. I urge you to heed the advice of tobacco growers and to rebuff the efforts of a select group of manufacturers to acquire a preferred position in an important American industry.

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1953.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: Your office has requested information regarding leaf costs of standard- and economy-brand cigarettes. We are submitting below relevant information from the Cigarette Manufacturers Survey made by the Office of Price Stabilization in December 1951. This survey was designed to ascertain cost changes in the manufacture of cigarettes from April–June 1950 to April–June 1951 for the leading brand of each of the eight major manufacturers. As we cannot divulge individual company data, the following table is a consolidation of data for these brands produced by six major manufacturers: Lucky Strike, Camel, Chesterfield, Old Gold, Philip Morris, Marlboro, Raleigh, Kools, Herbert Tareyton, Pall Mall, Fatima, Embassy, Dunhill, and Wings. The last-named brand is the only economy brand for which full information was returned in the survey.

Costs per 1,000 cigarettes are given below and include a projection for 1952. At the time the survey was made data for 1951 crop burley tobacco were not yet available.

Item	1950, April–June	1951, April–June	1952 projection
Leaf	1.8354	1.9057	1.9425
Other material, labor, etc.	.4381	.4888	.4975
Total factory cost	2.2735	2.3945	2.4400
Advertising	.2218	.2592	.2638
Administration and selling	.1724	.1836	.1836
Total cost	2.6677	2.8373	2.8874

These costs indicate the unit costs per cost sheet. It should be noted that leaf cost includes leaf expense and import duty and reflect the costing procedure regularly used by each individual company. The cost projection is based on the same cigarette weight and blend as in the earlier periods.

A comparison of leaf costs shows that purchases in the year ending June 30, 1952, were 4.9 cents per 1,000 cigarettes above purchases during the year ending June 30, 1951. This is the difference in acquisition costs on a green-leaf basis (i. e., auction floor basis) exclusive of the cost of transportation and processing.

With reference to leaf costs of standard brands versus economy brands we do not possess great detail. However, in addition to the data supplied by Brown & Williamson for Wings cigarettes as noted above we have incomplete information for other economy brands. Although no strict comparison between leaf costs of standard and economy brands can be made from these data, the relationship between the two is generally the same as shown in the enclosed OPA study. In table 4 of this study we have encircled the leaf costs for standard and economy brands in 1941 and 1942.

We trust that this information is of value to you. Please call on us if we can be of any further assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH H. FREEHILL.

TABLE 4.—*Cigarette manufacturers: Weighted average net selling price and costs per thousand, by type of cigarette, 1941 and 1942*

Item	Type of cigarette					
	All types [1]		Standard brand—regular size		Economy brand—regular size	
	1941	1942	1941	1942	1941	1942
AMOUNT (PER THOUSAND)						
1. Net selling price	$5.5962	$5.6751	$5.7419	$5.7767	$4.4328	$4.5306
Factory costs:						
Raw materials:						
2. Leaf tobacco [2]	.0671	1.0093	1.0518	1.1516	.4804	.4906
3. Casing	.0289	.0307	.0265	.0283	.0356	.0356
4. Total raw materials	1.0160	1.7300	1.0780	1.1799	.5160	.5262
5. Wrapping	.1625	.1569	.1585	.1522	.1469	.1512
6. Labor	.0751	.0840	.0747	.0832	.0672	.0850
7. Factory overhead	.0551	.0528	.0509	.0472	.0534	.0508
8. Total factory cost	1.3087	1.4232	1.3624	1.4615	.7835	.8332
9. Revenue stamps [3]	3.2800	3.2943	3.2800	3.2950	3.2800	3.2900
10. Freight and shipping expense	.0555	.0385	.0542	.0574	.0602	.0634
11. Total factory and shipping cost	4.6142	4.7760	4.6966	4.8139	4.1037	4.1866
12. Gross margin	.9820	.8991	1.0753	.9628	.3291	.3440
Selling, general and administrative expense:						
13. Advertising	.2693	.2348	.2991	.2449	.1401	.0974
14. Selling and administrative expense	.1244	.1035	.1228	.0995	.1472	.1546
15. Total selling, administrative expense	.4137	.3383	.4219	.3444	.2873	.2520
16. Total cost	5.0279	5.1143	5.0685	5.1583	4.3910	4.4386
17. Net margin	.5683	.5008	.6534	.6184	.0418	.0920

[1] Includes standard and economy brand cigarettes of all types—regular and king size, plain and mentholated.
[2] Leaf costs do not include interest charges.
[3] In 1942 revenue stamps were $3.25 per thousand cigarettes for 10 months and $3.30 per thousand cigarettes for 2 months.

TABLE 4.—*Cigarette manufacturers: Weighted average net selling price and costs per thousand, by type of cigarette, 1941 and 1942*—Continued

Item	Type of cigarette					
	All types		Standard brand—regular size		Economy brand—regular size	
	1941	1942	1941	1942	1941	1942
PERCENT OF NET SELLING PRICE						
1. Net selling price	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Factory costs:						
Raw materials:						
2. Leaf tobacco [2]	17.6	18.4	18.3	19.9	10.8	10.8
3. Casing	.5	.5	.5	.5	.8	.8
4. Total raw materials	18.1	19.9	18.8	20.4	11.6	11.6
5. Wrapping	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.7	3.3	3.3
6. Labor	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.9
7. Factory overhead	1.0	.9	.9	.8	1.4	1.6
8. Total factory cost	23.3	25.1	23.8	25.3	17.8	18.4
9. Revenue stamps [3]	58.1	58.0	56.6	57.0	73.3	72.6
10. Freight and shipping expense	1.0	1.0	.9	1.0	1.4	1.4
11. Total factory and shipping cost	82.4	84.1	81.3	83.3	92.5	92.4
12. Gross margin	17.6	15.9	18.7	16.7	7.5	7.6
Selling, general and administrative expense:						
13. Advertising	5.2	4.1	5.2	4.3	3.2	2.1
14. Selling and administrative expense	2.2	1.8	2.1	1.7	3.3	3.4
15. Total selling and administrative expense	7.4	5.9	7.3	6.0	6.5	5.5
16. Total cost	89.8	90.0	88.6	89.3	99.0	97.9
17. Net margin	10.2	10.0	11.4	10.7	1.0	2.1
18. Number of cigarettes sold (in billions)	[4] 198.39	[4] 225.42	165.0	193.1	16.73	13.17
19. Number of brands	17	21	6	6	5	5
20. Number of companies	9	9	6	6	5	5

[2] Leaf costs do not include interest charges.
[3] In 1942 revenue stamps were $3.25 per thousand cigarettes for 10 months and $3.80 per thousand cigarettes for 2 months.
[4] Represents approximately 92 and 88 percent of all cigarettes manufactured in 1941 and 1942, respectively.

Source: OPA Accounting Department Studies.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. BOHLEN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	McCarthy
Anderson	Green	McClellan
Barrett	Griswold	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bennett	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bricker	Hennings	Murray
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bush	Hill	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kerr	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworshak	Kuchel	Taft
Eastland	Lehman	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Welker
Frear	Mansfield	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
Gillette	Maybank	Young
Goldwater	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is absent on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I desire to make a brief report on the examination of the FBI's files in connection with the nomination of Mr. Bohlen. The examination was made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and myself.

In the first place, after the demand made by a number of Senators on the floor that the files be examined in behalf of the committee, the committee met yesterday morning and decided that it would comply with the request of those Senators. So it asked the Secretary of State to permit two Senators, whom the committee would select, to examine the files. Accordingly, the Senator from Alabama and I were appointed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to examine the files.

We went to the State Department at 2 o'clock yesterday afternoon and spent the afternoon there. We read the entire summary of the FBI files on Mr. Bohlen. That summary is the document upon which the Secretary of State based his evaluation. The question arose as to whether we should see the raw files of the FBI as well as the summary. That question has been debated in the Senate. In the first instance, we read the summary, which contains 25 or 30 pages as to which it was said that 16 pages contained derogatory information.

I am advised that the files themselves contain probably 80 percent favorable information, and in the summary all the derogatory information was included.

I thought we should see the raw files. I called and talked to Mr. Hoover about it. He assured me, in the first place, that everything of any importance which in any way adversely reflected on Mr. Bohlen was fully set forth in the summary and that there was nothing of importance that was not in the summary. He said the FBI always prepares a summary, but that in this case he had taken special care, and that he could give me his word that there was nothing in the raw files that was not in the summary.

Furthermore, Madam President, I found that no one other than Mr. Hoover has ever seen anything except the summary. The Secretary of State himself has seen nothing except the summary, and his evaluation was made on the summary. The security officer, Mr. McLeod, made the statement that he had seen nothing except the summary, and that the summary contained everything he had brought to the attention of the Secretary of State.

Under those circumstances, I finally concluded that it was not desirable to insist upon an inspection of the raw files. The FBI and the Attorney General are very much opposed to anyone's examining the raw files. They think it would lead gradually to a complete exposure of inferences, and so forth, which are contained in the files but are not always in the summary, and that if the names of informants were given it would break down the entire FBI operation. They believe they should have the right to prepare a summary for other Executive departments and for the Congress, and that we should accept their good faith in preparing such a summary.

I read the summary through, and after doing so, I would have asked very strenuously to see the raw files if there were anything in the summary which seemed to be ambiguous or in any way incomplete or which suggested that something which might be in the raw files was omitted; or, at least, I would have asked to see a portion of the testimony of the informants. But I could not find in the summary anything of that nature. The information seemed to be complete. The Senator from Alabama agreed with me that we would not raise the question of insisting on an inspection of the raw files themselves.

So far as I know, no suggestion has been made by anyone that there is in the files anything which is not fully covered in the summary. The so-called 16 pages of derogatory information relate to entirely separate matters. The greater part of it consists of statements

of persons who disagree with Mr. Bohlen's principles with respect to foreign policy. They think he played perhaps a larger part than others played in the Yalta conversations and that he was closer to Mr. Acheson than they would like. In other words, they were statements of political differences with Mr. Bohlen.

So far as I remember, there was no one who did not end up by saying that although he disagreed politically, he had full confidence in the character, the morality, and the general standing and reputation of Mr. Bohlen.

There was no suggestion anywhere by anyone reflecting on the loyalty of Mr. Bohlen in any way, or any association by him with communism or support of communism or even tolerance of communism.

When it comes to the question of whether there is any reason to think that Mr. Bohlen is in any way a security risk, such testimony as there is on that subject relates solely to the fact that Mr. Bohlen has at times been friendly with and has entertained at his home persons who are considered by the investigators or by the Department as bad security risks.

I could not find in the summary testimony anything which seemed to me to raise even a prima facie case or to supply any prima facie evidence that Mr. Bohlen had in any way ever done anything which would make him a bad security risk. The associations he had were those which anyone might have had with persons who were friends of many other people, who may have stayed overnight, or for the weekend, at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Bohlen. But in all the summary I could see nothing which could create the most remote guilt-by-association accusation that could be thought of.

There was not any suggestion that would, in my opinion, create even a prima facie case or a prima facie charge of any ill-doing on the part of Mr. Bohlen.

So I myself came to the conclusion that Mr. Bohlen was a completely good security risk in every respect, and I am glad so to report to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The summary which the Senator from Ohio reviewed, along with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], as I understand from the statement which has just been made by the distinguished majority leader, was a summary prepared by the FBI, and not by the State Department.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. It was prepared by the FBI. The State Department has never seen the raw files. They have some of the matter in the raw files in their own files to which the FBI was given full access, and included in its report. I wanted to be sure of that.

I may say, also, that Mr. Hoover told me that there are different kinds of checks by the FBI. He also told me that in this case a complete and full field investigation was made of Mr. Bohlen.

He told me further that the summary contained everything that could be of any interest regarding, or in any way reflected upon, Mr. Bohlen's character or morality.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So the distinguished majority leader and the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] had made available to them the identical record and information upon which Secretary Dulles has testified, and upon which he assured the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Senate that there was nothing to justify not clearing Mr. Bohlen either as to loyalty or as a security risk for the position for which he has been nominated?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Going one step further, because of the publicity about Mr. McLeod, I obtained from him a statement that he knew of nothing which, in his opinion, insofar as it might have differed, if it did differ, with the opinion of Mr. Dulles—and as to that I do not know—was not based upon exactly the same material, to which he had had access. He had access to no other material than that which Mr. Dulles, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself had, and upon which we have based our judgment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In view of circumstances as they developed, and without the benefit of the additional information that has come to light, and without a check by the two Senators, in whom I have great confidence, I felt that Mr. McLeod should be called, and that the question as to his differing with the Secretary of State should be cleared up. Whether or not he should be called, I am not in the best position to say; but I do say that, on the basis of the record, the report of the distinguished majority leader tends very much to remove any cloud of doubt as to Mr. Bohlen's fitness, from the standpoint of loyalty or security, to fill the position to which he has been appointed. Whether or not he be the choice of Members of the Senate individually is beside the point. The question is on the confirmation of his nomination. Unless there is a justifiable question from the standpoint of doubt as to loyalty or security, I feel constrained to vote for confirmation of nominations sent to the Senate by the Executive, unless I have personal knowledge of my own upon which to base a different decision.

My whole interest in this matter has been founded on the hope that we could clear up the question, so that there would not remain sufficient doubt to warrant our opposing confirmation, and that we would not permit the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be confirmed under a cloud of suspicion based upon the feeling that a thorough check and investigation had not been made. Under the circumstances, I think we owed it to Mr. Bohlen to have the records and the summary checked by others, in view of reports, rumors, and statements which intimated that possibly the subject had not been given a proper check or sufficient consideration.

Mr. TAFT. Madam President, I think I should add that on the favorable side of the question dozens of leading citizens of the country testified in support of Mr. Bohlen. I have probably concentrated undue attention on the testimony of a very few witnesses.

As to Mr. McLeod, he is the security officer. There may be others in the Department who appraised Mr. Bohlen differently. But when the head of the department himself has undertaken to make an appraisal, I do not think we ought to call before the committee all his subordinates.

I do not consider it would be improper to say that we had with us during our investigation the chief counsel of the Department of State, Mr. Phlager, of San Francisco, who is an attorney of very high standing. He was present during the time when we were examining the files. He himself reached exactly the same conclusion as that reached by Mr. Dulles, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and myself.

Perhaps three or four persons have talked to Mr. Dulles about this matter. I do not believe we ought to ask each one for his individual appraisal of the particular files. I have felt—and this statement indicates no lack of confidence in Mr. Dulles—that Congress has the constitutional duty to exercise its own judgment in some form, or through its agents, and is not necessarily called upon to rely on the executive branch for obtaining information. I think the Executive should make available to Congress, if Congress desires it, the information upon which the executive department bases its conclusions.

In respect to the raw files, we simply suspended any action as to them. I came to the conclusion that in this case I had obtained everything I desired from the files, anyway. However, I did not undertake to waive the right of Congress to see the files affecting other cases, if Congress should desire to see them.

I simply say to Senators that I do not believe, from the inspection I made of the files, they would get one other fact if they saw the raw files in this particular case. But we have retained our right to an examination of the raw files, if we have that right, if the question ever has to be fought.

Mr. GORE and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am in sympathy with the position taken by the distinguished majority leader. I wish to compliment him upon the responsible, courageous position and action he has taken in this matter.

However, so much has been said about the unavailability of the so-called raw files of the FBI to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that I think it is incumbent upon me to state that some years ago, as a member of a select committee appointed by the House of Representatives, I not only saw a few so-called raw files of the FBI, but I examined dozens of them. While this debate has been under way, statements have been made to me on the floor of the Senate by two Senators that they also have had access to raw files.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I am satisfied with the statement made by the distinguished majority leader, which, as I understand, is concurred in by the junior Senator from Alabama. In fact, I was satisfied with the statement made by the Secretary of State. But I do not in any way endorse any attitude that the Congress of the United States does not have a right to see a raw file, so long as its confidence is guaranteed and protected.

Mr. TAFT. In the case of the atomic energy law, because of an express provision contained in the act, the Executive has never contested the right of Congress to look at a raw file pertaining to atomic energy. It seems to be understood that Congress has access to full information. I know of various similar cases. However, I do know that Mr. Hoover has always fought to the last ditch before he would ever turn over a raw file, and he will turn it over only on an order of the President. In this particular case, I saw no reason to try to overcome his reluctance. I sympathize with him, because if he admitted the principle that the files were always open in every way and in every case, I think he would probably destroy the FBI before the case was ended.

Mr. CASE and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I feel that in this instance the Senate is acting under its constitutional responsibility with respect to advice and consent. Under the procedure adopted, it will be confirmation by the Senate, and not confirmation by a Cabinet department. The Senator from South Dakota does not feel that this procedure would be necessary in every case; but when a question arises, as it did in this particular case, and charges are made, such as those which were made in this case, with respect to the attitude of the security officer, it seems to me that the suggestion of the distinguished majority leader, that members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations obtain their own confirmation of certain facts, rather than rely upon a Cabinet department, is sound. The statement which has been made will result, I personally believe, in Mr. Bohlen's being able to accept his appointment without any cloud, and with considerably greater strength than would have been the case had this procedure not been followed.

Therefore, I feel that a very desirable purpose has been served, and I appreciate the statement of the majority leader.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to commend highly the majority leader for his report and for the great contribution I think he has made to sound procedures in the Senate in connection with the confirmation of nominations. I would that the Foreign Relations Committee had in the first instance taken the majority leader's suggestion that a subcommittee of one or two be assigned to inspect the file upon the basis of which the Secretary of State made his recommendation to the committee, because I think the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from South Dakota put the problem very clearly when they stated, in effect, that after all, the obligation and responsibility of the Senate in giving advice and consent cannot be met by substituting for its action the recommendation of the executive branch of the Government, which in the first instance makes the nomination.

I think the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Alabama, in giving the Senate this factual report of what they found in the file, have also made it possible to send to Moscow a man who will be in a strong position, rather than one whose position would have been greatly weakened, in my judgment, if we had confirmed the nomination last Monday merely on the basis of the recommendation of the Secretary of State.

As one Member of the Senate, I highly compliment the Senator from Ohio for the grand job he has done in this instance.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Madam President, the Senator from Maryland is very reluctant to disagree with or take issue with the distinguished Senators who have just spoken.

I have carefully followed the debate with respect to Mr. Charles Bohlen, and after reviewing the extensive testimony, have concluded that I shall vote for his confirmation as Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. My vote is not to be construed as a vote for an individual because, frankly, I would prefer to see someone other than Mr. Bohlen as our Ambassador in Moscow. My dispassionate vote, however, is predicated upon the principle that the processes of sound and efficient government must not be wantonly disturbed. Someone in authority must appropriately and irrevocably evaluate information concerning nominees for major posts. This is truly a function and responsibility of the executive branch of our Government.

In this case, as I understand the record, the officer primarily charged with that duty felt that certain unsubstantiated derogatory information contained in the FBI summary should not be appraised by him, and he accordingly referred the entire matter to higher authority, his immediate superior, the Secretary of the State. Mr. Dulles apparently was reluctant to make a decision without the concurrence of the President of the United States. After a conference with the President, the Secretary of State felt that Mr. Bohlen is a good security risk, and that his loyalty is unquestioned. Mr. Dulles has also asserted that Mr. Bohlen is not one to leak sensitive information or to speak freely of Government business. The hearings before the committee would seem to indicate that this procedure is not inconsistent with our usual practices.

I was somewhat alarmed to learn that the Foreign Relations Committee had designated two of its members, the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, to study the FBI summary, and we may conclude from their findings that all essential facts and evidence have been fully considered. This represents what I consider a slight but serious departure from our traditional procedure, and I hope that we have not established an unwise and dangerous precedent. I say this because such a practice could lead to indiscriminate examinations of FBI files, which could be very unfortunate, even if accomplished by Senators, since these files admittedly contain much that is based on mere rumor, gossip, and hearsay. In addition, such a procedure could manifestly subject any nominee, no matter how good he or she might be, to public embarrassment to the extent of making it extremely difficult to recruit worthy people for public service.

Not being a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I hesitate to make this statement, and no criticism of the committee or its distinguished members is intended. To me, this is a matter of principle with grave import. In this instance, I very strongly feel that, in view of the fact that the duty of evaluation has been entrusted to the Secretary of State, we should respect his appraisal of Mr. Bohlen. Only on the basis of positive evidence not previously submitted or considered could we possibly refuse to accept Mr. Dulles' evaluation and assurances. Otherwise, our whole system will be seriously impaired, and we will be faced with the situation of revealing information concerning a person's life which may not have even the slightest substantiation in fact. Such revelations could ultimately destroy the effectiveness of the FBI.

My vote for Mr. Bohlen, as I have said, is not a vote for him personally. It is a vote to uphold what I deem to be the best possible system for selecting our public servants, and I am a firm believer in the orderly process and feel that a vote in opposition to the appointment would be a vote to weaken the fundamentals of our Government and the principles of justice.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I do not care to comment at great length on this situation. I have listened attentively to what the distinguished majority leader has said in his main statement, as well as in the replies he has made to various questions put to him.

I subscribe to all the distinguished majority leader has said with reference to the study which we made of the summary of the FBI file at the State Department yesterday, and with relation to our conversation with Mr. Dulles and Mr. Phlager, as well as the statement obtained from the security officer, Mr. McLeod.

As the Senator from Ohio has said, the so-called summary was 25 or 30 pages in length, of single-spaced typewriting. The Senator from Ohio made reference to the fact that about 16 pages related to what might be called derogatory remarks. He stated that those derogatory remarks or parts of the record were set out rather fully. It might be stated that the remaining 10 or 12 or 15 pages consisted of lists of names of some of the most distinguished persons in the country who had been closely associated with Mr. Bohlen in various

capacities. No summary of their testimony was given. There was merely the statement that all of them testified to his character, his reputation, his integrity, his honesty, and his ability. It was also set forth that their statements contained no suggestion of anything derogatory.

It may be thought that the file is a little overbalanced by reason of the fact that 16 pages are devoted to what might be referred to as derogatory material; but the reason that portion of the file was so long, as the Senator from Ohio pointed out, was the fact that the material was set forth in detail.

I certainly join with the Senator from Ohio in what he has said, to the effect that there was no suggestion in the summary to raise a prima facie question with respect to anything wrong with the character, integrity, or honesty of Mr. Bohlen. I will go further. There was nothing which in my judgment would cause any reasonable person to conclude that a suspicion had been raised. There was not a single instance of a charge against Mr. Bohlen, or any incident which could be cited against him.

The only thing which might raise a suspicion at all, as the Senator from Ohio stated, was the fact that during his long public service Mr. Bohlen has at various times been friendly with and has associated with persons, perhaps incidental associates at his work, or friends visiting in his home, who were suspected of being bad security risks. But there was no association that ever pointed the finger of suspicion at Mr. Bohlen.

Personally, I was satisfied with the presentation which the Secretary of State had made to the Committee on Foreign Relations. He told us that it was a summarization. I would say that based upon what we saw yesterday and what I heard and all the information which was made available to us, the Secretary of State made a very fine and fair presentation to the Committee on Foreign Relations, upon which the action of the committee was based in the beginning.

The Senator from Ohio has pointed out that there were a number of statements in the summary. As a matter of fact, most of the 16 pages were taken up by statements of persons who differed with Mr. Bohlen in some views or in some things that he had done. But in every instance such persons would end up by saying, "He is a man of good character, integrity, and unquestioned loyalty to the Government of the United States."

Mr. McCARRAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps I misunderstood the Senator from Alabama. Did the Senator say that he had talked to the security officer?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Nevada may not have been in the Chamber when the distinguished majority leader stated that he obtained a written statement from the security officer.

Mr. McCARRAN. From Mr. McLeod?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. The statement was to the effect that he had turned over to the Secretary of State all the evidence which had come to him; that he had transmitted to the Secretary of State everything which had come to him.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that written statement did Mr. McLeod state that he had receded from his position of refusing to endorse or approve Mr. Bohlen?

Mr. TAFT. Approve whom?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I caught the question. The Senator from Nevada inquires whether Mr. McLeod had receded from his position of declining to approve. No, that point was not mentioned at all. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of State explained to us, when he made the original presentation to the committee, that he was the one who was responsible for evaluating this material. This may be an inference on my part, and perhaps I should not state it; but, based upon what the Secretary of State stated about his responsibility and his having done the evaluating, and the statement that Mr. McLeod had made available to him all the information that had come to Mr. McLeod, I gathered that the Secretary of State was doing the job which he felt it was his to do; namely, that he had evaluated the information, and that there was never any question about anyone else's reaching a decision in the case.

Madam President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President—[laughter]. Sometimes changes in the occupancy of the chair take place quickly, before they are detected.

Mr. President, it was my pleasure as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to hear Mr. Bohlen's testimony. I realize that the answers which he gave to some of the questions were not answers which would please everyone around the committee table. I assume such a happening is beyond hope of attainment. However, what impressed me about Mr. Bohlen was the fact that he spoke out clearly his own opinions and his own beliefs, while at the same time admitting that there was room for disagreement.

I may say that we had before us yesterday a nominee to another office, a gentleman from Virginia, who took a somewhat opposite viewpoint from that taken by Mr. Bohlen with respect to some questions under discusison. But I admired the gentleman because he spoke up and stated clearly what he believed. The transcript of that testimony will be available to Senators within the next few days. As between the two gentlemen, it demonstrates the fact that there is room in this country for differences of opinion. What I liked about these two men is that they stated what they thought about the matter under discussion. Each one, in effect, said, "I do not believe the same way he does on some things, but at the same time I will say to you that he is a good man."

Having seen Mr. Bohlen—and I hardly know the man, and I certainly have no interest in him—I believe the President of the United States, operating through the Secretary of State, has selected an able person to represent personally the President of the United States in one of the important capitals of the world.

While I do not believe we had any direct evidence on this point, it is my understanding that the President of the United States is not wholly unacquainted with Mr. Bohlen. I think he knows him, and has been in conferences with him at different places during the past several years, I am certain that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State were both satisfied when they submitted his name to the Senate that he would make a good representative of the United States at Moscow at this very important time in the history of the world.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am glad, as I would be in any case, to find what I consider a complete absence of anything that would point the finger of suspicion toward the nominee, who, if his nomination is confirmed by this body—as I am confident it will be—will represent us in one of the important capitals of the world today. I am very glad to join with the distinguished majority leader in what he has said.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the Senator from Alabama has stated that he had an offer of a statement from Mr. McLeod, the Security Officer, regarding Mr. Bohlen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say that we do not have that statement in our possession. We inquired about Mr. McLeod, because we were particularly eager to know the manner in which the subject had been handled in the Department of State.

I am sorry the distinguished majority leader has left the Chamber for a moment, but, if I recall correctly, he suggested that if we could get from Mr. McLeod a statement as to whether or not he had available to him any information except that which had been made available to the Secretary of State, we would like to know about it. The Secretary of State immediately called Mr. McLeod who wrote such a memorandum addressed to the Secretary of State and sent it to him. We saw it. It was over Mr. McLeod's signature.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That statement does not go to the merits of the case?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is merely a statement by Mr. McLeod to the effect that he made available to the Secretary of State all the information he had in his possession.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The statement in no way goes to the merits of the situation, namely, whether Mr. Bohlen is qualified or not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all. I believe the majority leader brought out that point.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood the Senator from Alabama to say that a statement was made by Mr. McLeod with respect to what is the real issue; and since the Senator from Alabama has stated that some other information was to be made available to the Senate, I thought the McLeod statement would also be made available.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no; I was speaking about another case entirely, which was taken up by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It involves another appointment, which was before our committee yesterday. I commented

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

on the fact that we had differences of opinion expressed before the committee. The second case involved another person.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am one of the Senators who made the request that Mr. McLeod should be heard. It was my own wish, and without my knowing that anyone else would make the same request. What the committee has done carries a great deal of weight with this body, I am certain, and of course it carries a great deal of weight with me. However, the question as to whether or not there was a controversy between Mr. McLeod and his superior, the Secretary of State, certainly has not been cleared up. That is a matter that addresses itself to the administration, so far as I know. As I view the matter, if they wish to leave it as it is, that is all right with me. But there does seem to be something a little mysterious—I do not know what it is—about the unavailability of Mr. McLeod.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator from Arkansas will recall, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] commented on that matter a few minutes ago.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to repeat what I said before, namely, that all I wanted from Mr. McLeod was a statement of any opinion that he might have formed. All the information that was available to him was available to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and myself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. TAFT. So I asked Mr. McLeod for that statement of opinion. Whether it was given over the telephone, I do not know; but, at any rate, the statement was finally reduced to writing. It relates to the summary of the report. Whether there was some difference between Mr. McLeod and Mr. Dulles, I do not know.

As I have indicated, I would very strongly oppose the calling of subordinates in a department to give testimony about matters with which they might differ with their superior. I think at least three other subordinates of Mr. Dulles also evaluated this testimony. Are we to call all of them? Certainly that is the direction in which we go, once we begin on such a course.

So I do not wish to call Mr. McLeod about such matters of difference of opinion, so long as I have available to me every bit of information Mr. McLeod had. Having that information, I certainly wanted to form my own judgment, and not rely upon that of Mr. McLeod or that of Mr. Dulles.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Let me say that I was certainly willing to accept the judgment of the Secretary of State, because he is one of the country's most distinguished lawyers; and I was perfectly willing to accept his analysis when he appeared before the committee. However, it was felt that it was better for two members of the Foreign Relations Committee to examine the material.

When I undertook to read the summary yesterday, I read it on my own account, for the purpose of forming my own judgment, without reference to what Mr. McLeod or what Mr. Dulles or what anyone else may have thought about it. The statement I have made here is based upon my own conclusion, after having read every single word of the long transcript or summary of the FBI report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I want it forever understood that I do not subscribe to, neither shall I be bound by, the philosophy or proposed rule that simply because a person is a subordinate in a Government department, Congress, if it wishes to, has no right to call him as a witness and have him testify.

Whenever we are expected to vote some of the taxpayers' money to pay persons to serve in the employ of the Government, if the Chief Executive then says that we shall be denied the right to question such a person about the service and the duty he performs, I wish to state now to the Senator from Alabama and to everyone else that I wholly disagree. If the time ever comes when I feel that it is proper and necessary for us to have the testimony of such a person, I shall insist that he be present and testify. I shall never agree to any other course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator from Arkansas does not understand that I made any such suggestion at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the implication of the statements which have been made, I wholly disagree with it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have not implied that at all. I have said that the Secretary of State told us that it was his responsibility to make the evaluation, and that any evaluation would have to be made by him or by an Under Secretary acting for him.

I also tried to make clear that when I went there, I was not relying upon anyone's statement. I was relying upon what was in the file and upon all the information we could get.

As the able majority leader has said, we wanted to do that, because there was a rumored difference of opinion between Mr. McLeod and Mr. Dulles. So we wanted access to all the information Mr. McLeod had, and also to all the information Mr. Dulles had. We were assured that we did have it; and the report we have given here is our individual decision, arrived at after seeing all the evidence that either Mr. McLeod or Mr. Dulles saw.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say that, from the beginning, when Mr. Bohlen's name was first submitted, I knew of no reason why I should oppose the confirmation of his nomination. I have never sought to find a reason other than in the ordinary course of the performance of my duty as a Member of this body. I have hoped that everything I have said and every suggestion I have made would be constructive, to the end that we would clear up this matter, and not have the nomination confirmed with a cloud upon this man and a big question as to why we did not look into these matters.

The committee's approach to this question may have been a better approach than the one I made with reference to hearing Mr. McLeod. But since there has been made available to two members of the committee the complete record upon which judgment has been formed I am fairly well satisfied that the nomination of Mr. Bohlen should be confirmed.

However, I did not wish to sit in this Chamber and remain silent when I though I heard the implication that the executive branch of the Government had a right to say that we could not have the benefit of the testimony of an Assistant Secretary or of a subordinate whenever the Senate felt it was necessary to have the benefit of such testimony in order to acquaint itself with the facts upon which it must act in either a legislative or an executive capacity. I did not want to subscribe to such a position.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Frivolous Attack on Bohlen," published in the Montgomery, Ala., Advertiser of March 18.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRIVOLOUS ATTACK ON BOHLEN

President Eisenhower owed Charles (Chip) Bohlen nothing politically. He appointed him to be Ambassador to Moscow for one reason—his evidently excellent qualifications. The opposition to his confirmation in the Senate appears frivolous and spiteful.

Expert in both the history and language of Russia, Bohlen, a career diplomat, acted as interpreter for both Roosevelt at Yalta and Truman at Potsdam. In his Senate testimony, Bohlen refused to assail Yalta as a deal accounting for the sum of our miseries and woes. Those two facts have made him unacceptable to some Senators.

As we have said often before, it wouldn't have made any difference what kind of agreements were made with Russia at Yalta since Russia would not have abided by them; and in those days we were not prepared to safeguard agreements with force.

Always it should be remembered that whatever Roosevelt conceded to Stalin at Yalta was conceded to guarantee Russia's participation in the war against Japan. And the reason Roosevelt was intent upon Russia's participation was a reason no American could quarrel with—he was bent on sparing the lives of as many American soldiers as possible.

There were, as we understand it from the published testimony of Admiral Zacharias, three intelligence reports estimating what it would take to knock Japan out of the war at the time of Yalta. Two of these held that Japan remained capable of a long and bitter war. Roosevelt was bent on sparing America's fighting men an Asiatic Normandy. Had he failed to get Russia's commitment to play her part he would have been taxed with a great failure.

Roosevelt had no way to know that Japan would be knocked out 6 days after Russia's entrance into the war.

No one today is raising sand about the Roosevelt-Eisenhower deal with Admiral Darlan. A lot of Americans are around and kicking today because of the Darlan deal.

No one today is raising sand with the lion Winston Churchill about Yalta, although he was there the very same as Roosevelt.

The things which laid Stalin's conquests open to him were the American people who demanded that all the boys be brought back at once, leaving the equipment to rust where it was, and the Congressmen and Senators who used their influence to get certain boys back home ahead of others.

The opposition to Bohlen is an incident of the posthumous war on Roosevelt, the same as the unwise constitutional amendment prohibiting a third term for a President.

The opposition to Bohlen is now sagging, but it will remain a discredit to its authors after it has collapsed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on last Friday I made a statement on the floor of the Senate, and I would repeat that statement today. Every expression in that statement has stood the acid test. Every expression in that statement is worthy of consideration at this time.

Mr. President, what is involved here? It has been stated on the floor of the Senate that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State are on trial here. Nothing is further from the truth. The law which was enacted by Congress is on trial here.

What gave rise to the service of Mr. McLeod? By what authority does he act? Under what law was he appointed? What were his prerogatives under the law? The section of the law bearing on the official existence of Mr. McLeod is not lengthy, and I beg leave to read it, although I have not heard it referred to during this entire discussion. Mr. McLeod came into existence as a public official in the State Department by dint and force of the law I now read, and by nothing else:

SEC. 104. (b) There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, to be headed by an Administrator (with an appropriate title to be designated by the Secretary of State), with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

I repeat "with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State."

The Administrator shall be a citizen of the United States, qualified by experience, and shall maintain close liaison—

I call the Senate's attention to this—

and shall maintain close liaison with the appropriate committees of Congress in order that they may be advised regarding the administration of this Act by consular officers. He shall be charged with——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to finish the quotation.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, this act is the McCarran Act, dealing with immigration and its enforcement by consular officers; so that particular section obviously has no reference to security within the State Department. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon, the language speaks for itself. I do not have to speak for it. I read it again:

There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Security—

What does that mean? Does it mean that the Department of State would have nothing to do with it?

Mr. TAFT. The provision relates to security enforced by consular officers under the Immigration Act. The power to deal with immigration matters is granted, and is reposed in whoever fills that job. But the reference to committees of Congress relates solely to the consular officers provided for. It is supposed to be a general act.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator is able to find any consolation in the interpretation he now applies to the law, he is welcome to it. But the office held by Mr. McLeod is a security office created by law for the purpose of maintaining the internal security of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Nevada does not think, does he, that the Assistant Secretary in question is any different from any other Assistant Secretary? He is still a subordinate. He is under the establishment of the Secretary of State and is a subordinate of the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCARRAN. The law does not even say he is a Secretary. The Senator evidently has not read the law.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; it says he shall have the rank and perquisites of an Assistant Secretary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. TAFT. Even an Assistant Secretary is simply a subordinate of the Secretary of State.

Mr. McCARRAN. Well and good. Let us take the Senator's interpretation. The security officer was given certain prerogatives when he was appointed. Let me read the press release which was issued on February 25:

The Department of State today announced the appointment of Mr. Robert Walter Scott McLeod, of Concord, N. H., Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. Mr. McLeod, a former member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and administrative assistant to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, is cutting short his vacation to assume his new duties on March 2.

Now, listen to this:

Mr. McLeod will have responsibility for security and consular affairs as well as—

What? The Department ordered something that was not even in the law, because McLeod, as I am advised, demanded that, before he would take the place, he must have control over personnel. So here in the press release we find:

Mr. McLeod will have responsibility for security and consular affairs as well as personnel.

What more was said about this? There was an Assistant Secretary of State, who gave the release to the press, and I now hold in my hand the Manchester Union Leader, quoting Assistant Secretary Carl W. McCardle who announced the appointment—that is, the appointment of McLeod—and said:

If there is anything that needs cleaning up, he will clean it up.

What authority was conferred upon this security officer? "If there is anything that needs cleaning up, he will clean it up." The first time that he ran up against something, he was stopped dead in his tracks.

Let us see what else was put out to the press by the State Department on that occasion. I quote from the Washington Star of February 25, 1953—I am not going to read it all, but merely excerpts:

Assistant Secretary Carl W. McCardle announced McLeod's appointment as administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, as the first step in reorganization of the Department. He said the appointment made a change in departmental structure, giving higher rank to the man—

"Giving higher rank"—

to the man responsible for security affairs.

To what does this security provision relate? Only to consular affairs? Only to remote propositions? No, indeed. It covers security within the State Department itself, the security of the United States of America, a question which for months, if not for years, had been tossed around in this very body—the question of what was going on in the State Department, and who was handling it.

Ah, Mr. McLeod was put in office because of his training, his experience, his ability, and his integrity, let me say.

As Mr. McCardle explained, Mr. McLeod will head "a kind of new superstructure of security in the State Department."

Is it suggested that the law did not intend to protect the Nation's security? What did the Secretary of State have in mind when he appointed Mr. McLeod? Merely security within his own Department? He was turning over the security responsibility to a responsible individual, a man of his own party, of his own choosing, a man who had the ability to clean up, if there was anything to clean.

Then, again, in this interview or release it was stated:

"Mr. McLeod will have full responsibility for the security of personnel both at home and abroad," Mr. McCardle added. He said: "The new administrator will run down all cases about whom questions have arisen or will arise, and will carefully screen all applications for security purposes."

If he is not a security officer, what is he?

What I come to is this: Why is it that the man entrusted with this important responsibility has never been heard from by the committee with whom he was by law supposed to be in constant liaison? Why have we been afraid to call him before some committee? I do not know it to be a fact, but I understand the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] had, on 1, 2, or 3 occasions, asked for the presence of Mr. McLeod. But Mr. McLeod never showed up before a committee of the Senate, with the committees of which the law said he should maintain constant liaison.

There is no one on trial here. The law is on trial. We created this office by statute. We created it for a lofty purpose, namely, the security of America. Now when we are about to vote, shall we say that the very law we created shall not be enforced? How can we ask others to enforce the law when we ourselves refuse to recognize it? Why not call Mr. McLeod and see if there was a difference between him and the Secretary of State? Maybe the Secretary of State was correct; maybe Mr. McLeod was correct. If Mr. McLeod was correct, he, as the security officer, was responsible.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that as he opened his remarks I understood him to say that he would stand on the speech which he made on Friday, March 20, which appears in the RECORD, beginning at page 2155.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I invite the distinguished Senator's attention to language which I shall read from the first page of his remarks, as follows:

I do not know, Mr. President, what the Secretary of State told the Committee on Foreign Relations; but I am confident he did not tell the committee that Mr. McLeod had reported to him that he, McLeod, did not clear Bohlen. The current understanding is that the Secretary of State told the Foreign Relations Committee the FBI report cleared Mr. Bohlen completely. If that is what he did say, he said it knowing that his own security chief, the man brought into the Department to do the job of cleaning out the Department, had reported he could not clear Mr. Bohlen, on the basis of the FBI report.

Then the Senator continued with his speech.

All I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada for whom I have very great respect and who has rendered distinguished service in this body, is that I think he starts from a wrong premise, because the fact of the matter is that Mr. Dulles very clearly indicated to the committee that Mr. McLeod had come to him and said that, on the basis of certain information in the files, he did not feel that he could take the responsibility of clearing Mr. Bohlen, and, therefore, called this specific information to the attention of the Secretary of State.

I think the distinguished Senator from Nevada, perhaps inadvertently, did a very grave injustice to the Secretary of State by implying in his speech of last Friday that it was not so, because if the distinguished Senator will look at the hearings on the Bohlen nomination, page 105, he will find that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] said:

Has your security officer cleared this file for loyalty and security?

Secretary DULLES. No. I told you he said that in view of the fact that this file did contain some derogatory information, he did not wish to take the responsibility of clearance.

So I think it is perfectly clear, both in the statements of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who heard the testimony, which the Senator from Nevada did not hear, and in the printed record of the committee, that Mr. Dulles made no such assertion, and any implication that he did is an entirely wrong premise on which the Senator based his speech, in part at least, last Friday.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I based my speech on the fact that I had heard nothing the Secretary of State had said that implied his security officer had turned down this nominee. I do not know it now, notwithstanding the reading by the able Senator from California. My understanding is—and the only thing I can get is understanding—that the security officer acted in this case; it came to him in due process; he acted upon it and turned it down after he had read the FBI report. That causes me to go on to another phase of the matter.

I have heard discussion after discussion of the FBI summary. Mr. President, I have handled too many FBI reports to be misled by the matter of summary. I do not mean to use the word "misled" offensively at all. As a rule, as to all FBI reports which I have had in my hands as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, a summary was prepared by the Department of Justice. The FBI report was made by the FBI and turned over to the Department of Justice, and for convenience they made a summary of it. I do not know whether this summary was made by that method.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada further yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the majority leader of the Senate, and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, the nominee of the Senator's party for Vice President last year, covered that situation very well. The Senator from Ohio specifically inquired whether the summary accurately represented the raw files, and he not only had assurance from the Attorney General of the United States that it did, but he had assurance from the Director of the FBI that the summary did correctly represent the material in the raw files.

I do not know what files in the past the Senator from Nevada has examined, whether they were from some other department, or whether the FBI had a chance to recheck to see whether the summary properly represented the raw files, but I do know that the Senator from Ohio, out of a superabundance of caution, perhaps, did make the inquiry of the Attorney General of the United States and of the Director of the FBI, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, to make certain that the summary did represent all the material contained in the raw files, and was given the assurance that it did.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very gald to know that. I regret that I may not have been on the floor when the Senator from Ohio made that statement. I am glad to know those assurances were given to him. I do not question it. A moment ago the point was raised, and I understand the Senator from Ohio said, or implied, that the raw files were never turned over to anyone. I do not know that he said that; it was stated to me on the floor that he had said it.

Mr. President, I say, frankly, that raw files are turned over. They are turned over to the chairman of the committee having a nomination in hand. I have had dozens of them in my possession and have taken them home and have used them for Sunday reading. Some of them were voluminous; others were very brief. But the raw files are turned over.

When I raised the question of the difference between the summary and the files themselves, I did not question the veracity of the summary at all. What I am leading up to—and I shall have concluded very shortly—is that the Senate, from all I can learn, will undoubtedly confirm the nomination. But the law has not been complied with. Unless the law is complied with, I do not know of what avail it is. The law provides that the matter shall be in the hands of the security officer, not to say that he should not take the matter up with his superior, but the security officer, charged with the responsibility in this case, has refused to approve the nomination.

Why was he not brought before a committee of the Senate? Why was he not brought before the Committee on Foreign Relations? Why was he not brought before some committee in order that he might tell his story, if there was a story, or that he might say, "What the Secretary of State has stated is all that I know"?

At least, a responsible Under Secretary of State, drawing $15,000 a year, a man whose nomination was confirmed by the Senate, should be brought before a committee of this body to state his reasons for refusing until this very hour—until this very hour, I repeat, to approve this nomination.

If the security officer selected by the Secretary of State refused to approve the nomination, why did he refuse to do so? Why does not the Senate know?

I do not think I would be fair unless I returned to the statute. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] questioned me while I was reading the law. For that reason, I might be charged with omitting the reading of some portions of the statute. So in order to be fair, I think I should read all of it:

The administrator shall be a citizen of the United States, qualified by experience, and shall maintain close liaison with the appropriate committees of Congress in order that they may be advised regarding the administration of this act by consular officers.

I draw the attention of the Senate to the following:

He shall be charged with any and all responsibility and authority in the administration of the Bureau and of this act which are conferred on the Secretary of State—

Mind you, Mr. President, he is given the rank of Assistant Secretary of State for the purpose of carrying out such duties "as may be delegated to him by the Secretary of State or which may be prescribed by the Secretary of State."

What was delegated to him by the Secretary of State? I have read it from the press release issued by the Secretary's office that day.

Mr. McLeod will have full responsibility for the security of personnel both at home and abroad.

Then to the press Mr. McCardle stated that the new administrator "will run down all cases about whom questions have arisen or will arise, and will carefully screen all applicants for security purposes."

Again, Mr. McCardle, speaking for the Secretary of State, said that Mr. McLeod "will head a kind of new superstructure of security in the State Department."

The superstructure seems to have been wilting. It is too bad that the superstructure did not stand up longer.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to

me for a moment, so that I may reply to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to answer in one respect the argument of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. The point I wish to make is that nothing in the act referred to makes Mr. McLeod any different from any other subordinate of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State has full responsibility. I have stated before why I myself think we should not call a subordinate when the head of the department himself chooses to do the testifying for the Department.

I wish to answer the suggestion that in some way Congress has conferred on Mr. McLeod special power that is different from that conferred on other subordinates. In the first place, this office is created under the immigration law, and wherever reference is made to "this act," the reference is to the Immigration Act—not that I think that that makes a great difference.

There is hereby established in the Department of State a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs—

Why are those two divisions placed together? Because immigration is generally managed by consular officers—

to be headed by an Administrator (with an appropriate title to be designated by the Secretary of State) with rank and compensation equal to that of an Assistant Secretary of State.

He is, in effect, an Assistant Secretary of State.

The Administrator shall be a citizen of the United States, qualified by experience, and shall maintain close liaison with the appropriate committees of Congress in order that they may be advised regarding the administration of this Act—

The Immigration Act—

by consular officers.

That has no relation whatsoever to the present situation.

He shall be charged with any and all responsibility and authority in the administration of the Bureau and of this Act—

The Immigration Act—

which are conferred on the Secretary of State as may be delegated to him by the Secretary of State or which may be prescribed by the Secretary of State. He shall also perform such other duties as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

The only point I wish to make is that Mr. McLeod is a complete subordinate of the Secretary of State. I do not believe there is anything in the act which would justify the application of any different principle to his case than to that of any other subordinate in the Department.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Nevada, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Ohio if it was under the act which the Senator has read, and which I also read, that Mr. McLeod was appointed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. McLeod fills the office created by this act. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield briefly to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to have been suggested that if there should be a difference in evaluation of the FBI report between that made by the security officer and that made by the Secretary of State, then a duty devolves upon the Senate to reconcile that difference, or, perhaps, indeed, to have the opinion of the security officer.

It seems to me that there are grave dangers in such an argument. First, if there is to be made of record the testimony of the security officer, it will parade into this body all the opinions and all the innuendos which, by policy, the FBI does not wish to have drawn here.

Second, it seems to me that it would strike very strongly at the prestige, jurisdiction, and very capacity of the executive departments to do business.

I know that I have made a long statement, but it seems to me that this is a grave matter of policy.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky. I have agreed with such views ever since Mr. Glavis was called before a committee in my father's day to testify against Mr. Ballinger, in the Pinchot-Ballinger case. From that day to this it has always seemed to me unwise practice. As chairman of a committee, I would not want to call a subordinate in order to check on a superior officer.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Ohio an act of 1949 in relation to the State Department. This is what is stated in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the legislation then proposed:

The resolution is important in another respect. Section 3 vests the authority for the conduct of foreign relations of the United States in the Secretary of State, subject to the President. It transfers to him certain authority now exercised, under statute, by the Director General of the Foreign Service and certain other officers within the State Department.

It is the opinion of both the State Department and of the Hoover commission that the vesting of authority, by statute, in subordinate officials, which makes them relatively independent of the Secretary, leaves lines of responsibility unclear and tends to result in bad administration. That is also the view of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan kindly state from what he is reading?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am reading from the report on the Foreign Service Act of 1949. Sections 3 and 4 provide as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of State, or such person or persons designated by him, notwithstanding the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999) or any other law, except where authority is vested in the President of the United States, shall, under the authority of the President, administer, coordinate, and direct the Foreign Service of the United States. Any provisions in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, or in any other law, vesting authority in the "Assistant Secretary of State for Administration," the "Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of the Administration of the Department," the "Director General," the "Board of Examiners for the Foreign Service," or any other reference with respect thereto, are hereby amended to vest such authority in the Secretary of State.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of State may promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the functions now or hereafter vested in the Secretary of State or the Department of State, and he may delegate authority to perform any of such functions to officers and employees under his direction and supervision.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is the Senator reading from the statute of 1946?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am reading from the act of 1949, the act reorganizing the State Department.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was reading from the statute of 1952.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I am wondering whether or not it was the intent of the legislative body, when it did not amend or change this statute, which placed the responsibility first upon the President of the United States and then upon the Secretary of State, that all authority, so far as the Foreign Service is concerned, should be in the President and the Secretary of State, by virtue of this act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator propound that question to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before I yield, I must have a guaranty of my right to the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire may yield without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Michigan would be entirely correct were it not for the fact that Congress enacted an entirely new provision of law in 1952.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then is the Senator from Nevada of the opinion that when we passed that particular law in 1952 it constituted a repeal of the language which I have read, so far as it applies to the security officer?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sorry that I cannot agree with the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on January 18, 1949, the Senate of the United States voted on the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. I was 1 of 6 Senators who voted against confirmation of Mr. Acheson.

I stated that at that time I believed—

The eligibility of the man who occupies the post of Secretary of State should be beyond any doubt. In my opinion, Acheson does not meet that test.

I said then:

Throughout my services in the Senate, I have made it the policy to resolve any doubts

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

in favor of my country rather than to gamble with my country's future.

I told the Senate that—

I hope my doubts regarding Mr. Acheson will not be justified with the events of passing time (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 1, p. 707).

The passage of events resolved the doubts in the minds of the American people concerning Mr. Acheson. The record proves that our country would have been better off without his services as Secretary of State.

Once again I find myself among a small minority of Senators opposing a nomination for a high position in our Government. It is not a happy experience. It is not a popular thing to do. If I wanted to be popular, I would join the parade for Bohlen and I would be patted on the back by the great majority of the press and the commentators. But sometimes we must do the unpopular thing because it is the right thing to do.

There has been a great deal of confusion concerning the appointment which is now before the Senate, but in my mind the issue is crystal clear. I opposed Dean Acheson because I felt his conduct of foreign affairs would injure the United States. It would be incredible for me to support his lieutenant, Charles E. Bohlen, for a vital post in a new Republican administration.

It was my belief that in November 1952, the American people repudiated the Truman-Acheson foreign policy and instructed the Republican Party to proceed vigorously and forthrightly to solve our differences with the Russians.

I am sorry that the administration should select for the very important and vital post of ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics a man who has been completely identified with the disastrous foreign policy of the previous administration.

To me it is a tragic admission that among 158 million Americans it has been impossible to select a better qualified man.

I have not had the benefit of hearing the testimony of this appointee before the Foreign Relations Committee. No one in the administration has presented me with any cogent reason why only this individual should be selected for this sensitive position in the diplomatic service.

In the absence of some overwhelming considerations, therefore, I must conclude that the appointment of Charles Bohlen to be Ambassador to Moscow would be unwise. I must vote against his confirmation.

Testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am informed that Charles Bohlen defended the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam agreements as well as the Truman-Acheson foreign policy record.

I remember the morning after that testimony. I picked up a very reliable newspaper, the Baltimore Sun, of Tuesday, March 3, 1953, which I hold in my hand. The streamer headline across the page is, "Bohlen Backs Yalta Pacts and Truman Foreign Policy."

The subhead is, "Choice as Soviet Envoy Also Defends Acheson at Senate Group Hearing."

When I read those headlines and read the succeeding story, I wonder why we should be considering the nomination of Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia—a man who was part and parcel of the foreign policy which has proved so disastrous to this country.

It seems necessary to review what went on at Yalta to put this nomination in its proper focus.

At Yalta, the United States representative formally consented to the abandonment of the legal, constitutional Government of Poland. Yet, this Government had been the first to fight Hitler. Its young pilots had played an indispensable part in the Battle of Britain. The great army of free Poland under General Anders had sacrificed so much on the slopes of Monte Cassino. Its internal resistance army fought steadfastly throughout the war against the Nazis and was the sole such force in Europe to produce not a single Quisling.

At Yalta, the United States representatives swung their support and recognition from this legitimate Polish Government to Moscow's stooges of the so-called Lublin Committee. They were only a counterfeit grouping of lifelong Comintern agents. They had no support in the Polish population and no standing in international public opinion. By this sellout, the Yalta Conference sealed the fate of Poland.

If we refer to Mr. Stettinius' book, and if we refer to many of the other works of that historic period, we find that Charles Bohlen was present at most of the meetings. Sometimes he was the only man who could speak Russian. He sat in on all the conferences. If we approve the nomination of Mr. Bohlen we put the seal of approval on the sellout of Poland, and we slap in the face every citizen of Polish descent in this Nation and every freeman in this country.

To approve Bohlen as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, after his brazen defense of Yalta is a slap across the face of every anti-Communist Pole or citizen of Polish descent in the world. This includes the great majority of Poles inside Poland, millions of exiles, and several million of our own fellow citizens.

I know how these people react to the appointment of Mr. Bohlen. I hold dozens of letters, and I have scores of others on my desk, which I have received from individuals and from organizations, in all parts of the country, who have personally experienced the tyranny of Communist aggression. These people are bitterly disappointed at the Bohlen nomination and warn us of the psychological effect this appointment may have on people now living behind the Iron Curtain.

The hope of the free world lies in the restoration of integrity and honesty in the conduct of American foreign policy. When Bohlen, the exponent of appeasement and containment is elevated to the vital role of Ambassador to Moscow, the cause of freedom suffers the world over. The yearnings of freemen behind the Iron Curtain to overthrow their masters are stifled.

At Yalta, the United States and Britain agreed to the forcible repatriation of Soviet subjects. Those who believed in individual liberty were betrayed and by force delivered into the hands of the ruthless masters of the Kremlin. As a result, American, British, and French soldiers sent hundreds of thousands of anti-Communists to death or enslavement in Siberia.

At Yalta, the Soviet Union was granted a special position in Manchuria which meant the strategic outflanking of China and the opportunity of arming and guiding the Chinese Communists. This in the end meant the Communist conquest of China.

At Yalta, the Soviet Union was given the southern half of Sakhalin, control over North Korea, and sovereignty over the Kuriles, and neighboring islands. The present control of the southern half of the Sakhalin Islands, the Kuriles, and the neighboring islands by the Russians is a dagger pointed at the heart of Japan. The after effects of this treaty now jeopardize the security of American fighting men in Korea. What our armed services won by shedding their blood in the war with Japan, our inept diplomats squandered away.

Mr. President, what would be our situation in the world today, would we be in the middle of a great war in Korea, and would American boys be dying in Korea if we had had better minds, stronger hands, and clearer vision at Yalta?

All of this, as well as the agreements on Manchuria, was done behind the back of our ally, China. Free China had been fighting Japan since 1931, and, under Chiang Kai-shek, had remained firm in friendship with us.

Mr. President, three times the Japanese made attempts to make a deal with China, which would have taken China out of the war, and each time China refused and remained a steadfast ally. Then we sold her down the river at Yalta.

These were the crudest of power deals. They were without any justification in diplomacy, international law, geography, common sense, or the interest of American security.

The deal on Korea, which grew out of these conferences, was a betrayal of Synghman Rhee and the democratic Koreans. This made inevitable future Communist aggression designed to take over all of that country.

The position acquired by the Soviet Union in the Kuriles together with its domination of Manchuria, Sakhalin and North Korea, is a permanent and paralyzing strategic threat to Japan. It poses great danger to Alaska and Canada, and thus to the security of the United States.

Let me say to the people who live along the Pacific Coast and generally in the Pacific Northwest: "Look over that agreement; look over the situation and see what it means." Mr. President, I have received a great many letters and a great many telegrams from people in that section of the country. I know how they are starting to think.

The confirmation of Bohlen by the Senate, after his statements, is thus a seal of approval on these shocking sacrifices of American and allied interests. It is an affront to Chiang Kai-shek,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Synghman Rhee, and to all anti-Communists throughout Asia and all the world.

The verbal agreements reached by these conferences contained pious words about democracy, individual rights and so on. Yet these agreements did not contain a single safeguard of democracy or national independence. Either these pious words were a cynical counterfeit, deliberately introduced in order to disguise the real meaning of the deals, or they were an example of incredible diplomatic stupidity.

Neither now nor earlier has Bohlen made any criticism of the Truman-Acheson course in the Far East, which has resulted in the Korean war and the loss of China. Like Acheson, he stood by his friend Alger Hiss, and he has gone along consistently with the Service-Vincent crew in the State Department.

I am therefore compelled to conclude that Mr. Bohlen gave these policies his wholehearted endorsement. In statements before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the nominee clearly stated that if he found himself in disagreement with the policies of his Government he would resign. Yet he did not resign during the Truman-Acheson regime. His long and uninterrupted service over the past years indicates his unswerving support of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy.

The theory of a career service in the State Department is that its members should be technically trained, experienced, non-partisan, and devoted solely to the general interest of their country. To develop such a service in all branches of Government is clearly in the national interest. It is fitting to reward outstanding members of the career service with major appointments.

But Bohlen has shown himself lacking as a genuine career service officer. He is a partisan, an active partisan of the policy—in particular the foreign policy—of the Truman-Acheson wing of the Democratic Party. It is just that policy which the people of this country repudiated last November. In the face of that repudiation it is fantastic that a spokesman and defender of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy should be considered for this critical position.

Mr. Bohlen was an obedient and faithful subordinate to a White House that all but ruined this country. Mr. Truman even now sings Mr. Bohlen's praises.

To this day, I have never been able to find a scrap of a letter, a shred of a document, a whisper of conversation, or anything else that showed that Mr. Bohlen had opinions in foreign policy that were in any way contrary to what his masters were doing.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I should like to finish my remarks before yielding. After I have concluded my remarks, I shall be very glad to yield.

The record shows that there were State Department employees and Foreign Service officers who had doubts about the conduct of foreign affairs. They were speedily isolated as in the case of Angus Ward.

When I come to examine just exactly what Mr. Bohlen's qualifications are for this most important assignment, I am told two things: First, that he can read, write, and speak Russian; and second that he is experienced. That is a rather slim endorsement. It is such an endorsement as one always hears cited. So far as Mr. Bohlen's linguistic talents are concerned, they are harped on to such an extent that one would think that he and Mr. Kennan are the only Americans who are competent to handle the Russian language.

Mr. President, we have as chargé d'affaires, as the No. 1 man in our Embassy in Moscow, Mr. Jacob Beam, who has a long record of service in the State Department. He, too, speaks Russian. He, too, can write Russian. He, too, can read Russian. I understand that he is just as fluent in the Russian language as is Mr. Bohlen. I am inclined to feel that he, along with the subordinates in the Embassy at Moscow, is just as capable as Mr. Bohlen when it comes to speaking, writing, and reading Russian. Therefore from that standpoint I do not think we need Mr. Bohlen very much.

Why the rush to see Mr. Bohlen sent to Moscow as our Russian expert? I venture to say that a term of self-appointed experts in Moscow comprising George Kennan, Charles Bohlen, and the whole State Department crew would achieve or understand little more than Jacob Beam and his aides. Only a mind reader could properly analyze the words and actions of those in the Kremlin, and it is rare that our envoy sees anyone whose mind is worth reading. Personally, I think one realistic, patriotic, anti-Communist American could handle the Russians better than a boatload of Acheson's holdovers could.

It seems to me we have overdramatized the indispensability of this particular member of our Foreign Service. I believe we have overestimated Bohlen's powers of diplomacy, especially in these days of hard realities. In Moscow, one's movements are rigidly circumscribed, and official dealings are with underlings who know little and say less. How, then, is Mr. Bohlen to use his extraordinary powers?

Is he clairvoyant with respect to the Russian leaders? If so, his powers totally failed him in his previous dealings with the Communist leaders.

Since Mr. Bohlen professes to be a great Russian expert, to know the Russian mind, the language, and so forth, how did it happen he did not realize at Yalta, that we were being taken for a ride?

Now let us consider Mr. Bohlen's experience, about which we have heard so much. So far as Mr. Bohlen's experience is concerned, I believe it was in the capacity of an accessory before and after the fact. Mr. Bohlen has had a great deal of experience, it is true; but I oppose the confirmation of his nomination primarily because in every instance in which he gained his experience—the experience which we are told is the reason why he was nominated to be our Ambassador to Russia—the United States of America, my country and your country, lost in the diplomatic negotiations. Every time Mr. Bohlen gained the experience from which he gained his reputation, the United States of America and the rest of the free world lost. So it was desired to put an "experienced failure," from the point of view of our country and the rest of the free world, in the most delicate diplomatic spot in the world. I can only conclude that Mr. Bohlen is an "experienced failure," and the record of his experience which is touted so highly is the record of tragedy for America.

I have constantly asked for an enumeration of the experiences in which Mr. Bohlen participated, where the United States gained.

I find that in most every diplomatic horse trade at which Mr. Bohlen was present, the Russians got the fat mare and the United States ended up with the spavined nag.

Some strange reasons have been advanced as to why Mr. Bohlen should be sent on this present vital assignment. The strangest of all is that given by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, according to the New York Times of March 19, 1953.

I assume that the New York Times printed an accurate account. According to the article in the New York Times Mr. Dulles "emphasizes that the Ambassador to Russia was not in a policymaking position, whereas Mr. Bohlen in his present post of Counselor of the State Department is in a job that involves very high level policymaking."

The implication in this statement is that the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Moscow is a reflection on his ability. It is, in reality, a device to remove him from the job of Counselor and to isolate him in Moscow. It seems to me that if Mr. Dulles does not desire Mr. Bohlen to be Counselor in the State Department, he should adopt the old-fashioned and direct American approach of firing him, and should not send him on a "Mission to Moscow."

Mr. President, it is pleasant when I can agree with certain of the editorial writers of American newspapers, and in this instance I wish to agree with the editorial writers of the New York Times. In their evaluation of the statement that the Ambassador to Moscow is not a policymaker, they are undoubtedly correct.

An editorial dated March 20, 1953, in the New York Times, stated:

> This argument ought not to fool many people. An ambassador in an important post ought to be capable of advising on policies whether or not he actually does so. An ambassador, even in these days of mechanical communication, is not merely a human motion picture camera or a human tape recorder. He has to evaluate what he sees. In the case of Russia, his evaluations are of supreme importance.

I have said that as far as I am concerned, Mr. Bohlen is an apologist for the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. Those who favor Mr. Bohlen have stated that I am in error. From whence comes Mr. Bohlen's support? I hold in my hand quotations from the Washington Post strongly defending Mr. Bohlen, just as strongly as the Post defended Acheson and Truman. I have before

me quotations from the New Republic, which has never deviated from the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. They endorse the nomination without reservation.

Now, Mr. President, let us consider the position of some of the commentators and columnists. It is very interesting that many of the same commentators and columnists in the United States who demanded that the Members of the United States Senate carefully consider the qualifications, status, and background of Mr. Charles Wilson before his nomination to be a member of the President's Cabinet was confirmed—those commentators and columnists said it was the duty of the Senate to do so. They now say it is none of the Senate's business to look into the qualifications and background of Charles Bohlen. Of course, Mr. President, there is an old New England maxim:

> What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

The memory of these commentators and columnists is very short. Only a short time ago they indignantly demanded that the Senate carefully look into the fitness of Mr. Charles Wilson to be Secretary of Defense; but now they say it is a crime for the Senate to take action which would interfere, so they say, with proper international relations on the part of the United States; they say it would be a crime for the Senate to do, in the case of the nomination now pending, the same thing they insisted the Senate should do in the case of another nomination of a member of the President's Cabinet.

The only conclusion that an intelligent person can draw from this attitude is that these papers and these individuals believe that Bohlen will carry on in the Truman-Acheson tradition.

Mr. President, I am glad the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], is in the Chamber at this time. I am about to make a statement which I do not like to make, but I wish him to listen to it.

First, I wish to quote the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Wisconsin, as his remarks appear on page 2189 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> As I shall develop later, three of the best men in the Foreign Service recommended him to the Secretary, and the President of the United States nominated him.

I quote further from the same page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and this quotation continues on the following page, page 2189:

> Shortly after Mr. Dulles accepted the Secretaryship of State he appointed a committee of three former members of the Foreign Service to advise him on prospective appointments to top diplomatic posts. Such a step, he believed, would constitute a helpful safeguard against the possibility of unwise appointments and would be of untold assistance in making certain that the best possible people were recommended for certain difficult assignments.
>
> Members of the Senate know the three members of the committee who have served in this capacity. I invite attention to the fact that they all have long and distinguished records in the Foreign Service. It is significant, I think, that such men as Joseph Grew, Norman Armour, and Hugh Gibson, who have a thorough knowledge of world affairs and the Foreign Service, unanimously agreed that Mr. Bohlen was uniquely qualified for the Moscow assignment.

Mr. President, I know the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I like him. I respect him. But I do not believe the Senator from Wisconsin wants statements such as the ones I have just read to appear in the RECORD, when the statements are not correct.

The only 1 of the 3 persons there enumerated with whom I personally could get in touch was Hugh Gibson, a great career diplomat. Hugh Gibson has suffered a heart attack, and he is now in a Washington hotel. I contacted him through a man by the name of Schwartz, who is Mr. Gibson's personal counsel and attorney, and who was there in the room with Mr. Gibson. I could not go visit Mr. Gibson; but I talked on the telephone to Mr. Schwartz, who talked with Mr. Gibson, who was in bed in his hotel room. I asked if Mr. Gibson and the two other men mentioned approved Mr. Bohlen for the position to which he has been nominated. Mr. Gibson's answer was "No"; he said that Mr. Bohlen's name was only casually mentioned, if it was mentioned at all, and that they were not called upon to approve Bohlen, and neither did they approve Bohlen.

So I am sorry to say to the Senate that part of the testimony is in error. If Senators plan to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen on the basis of Mr. Bohlen's endorsement by a committee of 3 of the great, top diplomats of our country's modern history, Senators should realize that at least 1 of those men tells me that that is not a fact.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall yield when I conclude my remarks, at which time I shall be glad to discuss this matter with the Senator from Wisconsin. Perhaps I should show him the courtesy of yielding to him now, but I should like to conclude my remarks.

Mr. WILEY. However, an inference has been made——

Mr. BRIDGES. I paid a great tribute to the Senator from Wisconsin; I said I respect him and have great affection for him and that I do not think he intended to mislead the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think the Senator from New Hampshire meant to mislead the Senate either, but he did.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then let us settle the matter now.

Mr. WILEY. Let me ask this question of the Senator from New Hampshire: How many voices did the Senator from New Hampshire go through before he got the voice of the man in the bathtub?

Mr. BRIDGES. I quoted the counsel, Mr. Schwartz.

Mr. WILEY. I have said that the Secretary of State said that he picked the best man for this position. Therefore, where are we? The Senator from New Hampshire has quoted a man who said he spoke to a man who was sick. On the other hand, we have the testimony of the next to the highest man in the Government, who said that he submitted this matter to three of the most distinguished career diplomats of our country, and that they endorsed Mr. Bohlen as their choice.

The Senator from New Hampshire and I may differ, but we need not differ about the source of our information. Mine comes from the Secretary of State. The information the Senator from New Hampshire has comes from a Mr. Schwartz.

The point is not that the Senator from New Hampshire is a liar or that I am a liar; the point is that someone seems to be a liar.

Mr. BRIDGES. I talked with Mr. Schwartz, who, I understand, is an able attorney, and is counsel to Hugh Gibson. I talked to the attorney for Mr. Gibson, who talked to Mr. Gibson. I stated the exact manner in which I obtained the information.

I give the Senator credit for having gotten his information correctly, and I yield to no one in my respect for him. But I told exactly how I got my story; and I stand on it, as the Senator stands on his. Perhaps it is one of those things; perhaps those gentlemen should be called before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to find out who is right, the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. It is not a question of the Senator's being right or of my being right; it is a question of looking at the record. If the Senator will do that, he will see that what I said was correct. He will find that it has been said time and time again that these three men were appointed, that they were consulted by the Secretary of State, and that they suggested this man as the best man. That is the only issue. It is not that the Senator would falsify; and I trust that he would not think I would falsify.

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly do not.

Mr. WILEY. But it is a little like the man who said he was looking over the telephone at a fellow who said he was sitting in the bathtub. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. I am quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by an authority, a distinguished Senator from Wisconsin by the name of WILEY. I told him I checked that speech. I credit him with the utmost sincerity in what he has said, though I think he is mistaken.

Mr. President, I have many times before stood on the Senate floor and spoken out against measures supported by an overwhelming number of my colleagues.

Later events have shown the correctness of my position. I say this not with immodesty but with pride.

Then, as now, I must rely on my conscience and judgment to decide the issue.

I expect without question that Mr. Bohlen will be confirmed by the Senate. I expect his vote will be overwhelming.

I have before, upon taking an unpopular stand, been widely criticized. I can remember standing on my feet in 1937, advocating an embargo on scrap iron and steel intended for Japan. I saw then the great and powerful Roosevelt

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

administration steamroller and plow under the 16 Republicans who then constituted the minority on the Senate floor. But who was right? Was it the administration and the Senators who operated the steamroller? Or was the Senator from New Hampshire right? Within a short time afterward, the scrap iron and steel which reached Japan came back in the bodies of Americans.

I can remember that in 1937 I stood on the floor of the United States Senate to oppose the Neutrality Act. There were but six Senators who stood up to fight against that measure. Why did they oppose it? Because they did not believe that peace could be achieved through domestic legislation. We were criticized; we were abused; we were ridiculed; but six men stood on the floor of the Senate to oppose the Neutrality Act. Less than 2 years afterward, the same President, the same administration, the same Senators who opposed us changed their attitude and asked for the repeal of the Neutrality Act.

In 1945 I supported the measure providing aid for Turkey. I fought for it in the Appropriations Committee, as certain Senators now on the floor of the Senate will remember. I heard an Assistant Secretary of State present very ably and forcefully the case for an appropriation of $400 million with which to stop the spread of communism in Greece and Turkey. I supported that, because it was sound. A great majority of the Senators supported it. After the representatives of the State Department had presented their testimony, what happened? The same Assistant Secretary of State, of the same State Department, on the same day, before the same committee, turned to me, since I happened to be chairman of the committee, and said to me, "Mr. Chairman, may we take up one other measure?" I said, "Certainly." What did they request? As the official records of the Appropriations Committee will show, they then requested $25 million for the purpose of continuing the shipment of lend-lease materials to Russia. That was the policy. That is what they did. In one breath they wanted $400 million for the purpose of stopping the spread of communism in Greece and Turkey—which I favored, as did most of the other Senators—and in the next breath they wanted $25 million with which to continue the shipment of lend-lease materials to Russia. Is it a matter of wonder that I scrutinize closely some of the requests which come to the Senate from the State Department?

Mr. President, I desire now to speak for a moment about Republican regularity, a subject about which much has been said. I yield to no one in my regularity as a Republican. I have been in the Senate nearly 17 years, longer than any other member of my party now serving here. I will match my regularity as a Republican against that of any other Republican now in the Senate. Mr. President, let us not talk about party regularity. I supported my party in the recent campaign. I am proud of the record made by my party in that campaign. I support the President of the United States. I have supported him in most instances. I shall support him in times to come. But when my convictions tell me to follow a certain course of action I intend to follow it. I think the first man who would agree that that should be the duty of those in the legislative branch as well as of those in the executive branch would be the present President of the United States. When Senators are asked to advise and consent to appointments, "advice" means sound advice; it does not mean the use of a rubber stamp.

No, Mr. President, I am not a crusader. Nevertheless, I am not going to be swayed in my position by the mere fact of its unpopularity or because I may be the object of abuse. All I would have to do in order to become popular would be to come before the Senate and say, "I have made a mistake. I am going to vote to confirm the nomination of Charles Bohlen." Then everything would be fine, everything would be wonderful. But, Mr. President, it is sometimes necessary to do the unpopular thing, because it is the right thing.

When the vote on this nomination is taken today, I expect to see most of my Democratic colleagues vote for Mr. Bohlen. Why? Because they believed in the Acheson-Truman foreign policy. What will Mr. Bohlen's appointment mean? In my judgment it will mean a continuation of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy. I know the steamroller is going to roll; I know that those of us who oppose this nomination will be defeated. But I take off my hat and bow in praise to those Members of the U. S. Senate who, in spite of the fact that they know they are going to be steamrollered and defeated, are nevertheless willing to stand up on a great issue.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The emphasis is placed on Mr. Bohlen's experience in Russia in connection with his appointment to be Ambassador to Russia, is it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. MALONE. I notice that on page 1 of the hearing on March 2, 1953, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, in answer to a question, Mr. Bohlen said:

> I was in Moscow in 1938, 1939, and 1940. In the winter of 1941 I was assigned to the Embassy in Japan, and was there until Pearl Harbor.

On page 3 of the hearing, in answer to a question whether he had acted simply as an interpreter, Mr. Bohlen answered as follows:

> Senator, might I say this, that I was also an assistant to the Secretary of State at Yalta, and I had a certain advisory capacity, but almost exclusively in regard to European matters. My whole experience, except for the short tour of duty in Japan, has been in the European area of our foreign relations.

How does the Senator from New Hampshire match those two statements?

Mr. BRIDGES. I cannot match them. It would be difficult to match them.

Mr. MALONE. While we are discussing the State Department, of which Mr. Bohlen has been an integral part, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire a question. I was not a Member of the Senate when this country was shipping scrap iron and steel to Japan, but I was a member of a couple of veterans' organizations who were screaming about such shipments and received only a "horselaugh," generally speaking, while such shipments were going to Japan through the Golden Gate. But did not the State Department defend making Marshall-plan aid available to Russia when it was first proposed?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. And Russia rejected it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that is a correct statement.

Mr. MALONE. Then the only proper conclusion would be, since no one in the State Department, of which Mr. Bohlen was an integral part, raised his voice against it, that there was general agreement in the State Department that Russia should be given Marshall-plan aid.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that assumption is correct.

Mr. MALONE. So far back as the establishment of the Export-Import Bank, was there not a letter written by the President, approved by the State Department, to the effect that the Export-Import Bank had been established to aid Russia?

Mr. BRIDGES. That statement was made. That was certainly not my interpretation of the purpose, but I know that statement was bandied about.

Mr. MALONE. There was a letter written by the President of the United States, stating that that was, at least, a part of the purpose?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada make that letter a part of the RECORD?

Mr. MALONE. Yes. I think it would be well to make it a part of the RECORD.

Mr. President, how can we reconcile the fact that the President of the United States says Mr. Bohlen is the best qualified man to represent the United States in the Russian capital, with the fact that, as the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has already stated, Mr. Bohlen has been connected with the losing side of conferences, so far as the United States is concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator that it is said that Mr. Bohlen should be appointed because he is the best experienced man in America for the position, but I say to the Members of the Senate, and to the people of the country, that his experience has been at the cost of America and the free world. Every time he gained experience America lost.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if, in other words, it is not like raising the salary of the cashier of a bank when most of his loans proved to be losses to the bank.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that I agree that this is a poor time, after the successful Republican campaign of 1952, simply to whitewash certain persons connected with the previous administration and promote them to the highest possible positions under the new administration.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have listened to the discussion this afternoon on this most important nomination. I assure you, Mr. President, that it is not a pleasant task to disagree with the President, with the distinguished majority leader, or with other eminent Members of this great legislative body, but that is exactly what I am prompted to do.

I have concluded that, in good conscience, I am forced to vote "Nay" on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Moscow. I realize that I am in the minority, probably only a small minority, but it is not a willful minority.

So far as I am concerned, it is a matter of conscience which each of us has to weigh.

I must confess I would feel myself in a peculiar position if I should approve this nomination of a man whom I consider to be an apologist for what has happened in the past resulting from our foreign policy. He was a man who was a counselor to those who, in my judgment, were responsible for much of the criticism on the part of the people of this Nation as to what happened, and I cannot bring myself today to defend or condone one who defends the secret agreements which have resulted in disaster for many free peoples of the world.

While my experience in Washington in this field is somewhat limited, I feel that I have sufficient information to convince me that the American people were not told the truth as to what transpired while this man was in an advisory or policy-making position.

If Mr. Bohlen had disagreed with the conduct of foreign affairs in the past he has yet to make public any bill of particulars as to his specific disagreements. To the contrary, the record shows that he endorsed, implemented, and even today is defending the very policies repudiated by the American people not many months ago.

I do not have the benefit of executive testimony before the fine Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, but if my information is correct I can discern that Mr. Bohlen now states that the foreign policy of the United States was not containment and that he believes that the foreign policy which has been followed should be continued.

If Mr. Bohlen's only qualification is his knowledge of the Russian language, then, in my humble opinion, he is not competent to fill the position. If he has been a director in the policy decisions which have been so disastrous to free people, then, to my way of thinking, he should not be endorsed, and I cannot vote to confirm him. When he is challenged on policy he claims he was merely an interpreter. When he is challenged as to his qualifications he seems to become a policy expert. I only know that somewhere our misguided foreign policy has proved disastrous and we traded away the victories which our soldiers had won on the field of battle. And we are in the midst of a bloody war in Korea.

Mr. President, I therefore feel that if I should vote to confirm this nomination I would be surrendering some of my convictions and views which I hold as against results of the disastrous foreign policy heretofore pursued. I prefer to state my views on this openly and forthrightly. I cannot and will not vote "aye" with tongue in cheek.

I realize in all candor that probably the politically popular and easy thing to do would be to go along, but in the interest of my Nation, that I cannot do. I shall not vote to confirm this nomination.

Mr. President, as part of my remarks, I should like to have printed in the RECORD an article written by the eminent David Lawrence entitled, "Hiss, Bohlen, and Stettinius," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 24, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISS, BOHLEN, AND STETTINIUS—VOLUME BY FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE IS QUOTED ON ROLE CONVICTED PERJURER PLAYED AT YALTA

(By David Lawrence)

Charles E. Bohlen may be the man the President and the Secretary of State think is qualified to go to Moscow at this time as the American ambassador because he speaks Russian and has some diplomatic experience, but a lot of Americans will wonder if someone else who was not entangled in the controversies of the previous administration might better have been chosen.

For the record of the part that Alger Hiss played at Yalta as given by Mr. Bohlen in his testimony either indicates that the late Edward R. Stettinius, in his book on Yalta, made a faulty presentation or that Mr. Bohlen is much more concerned with minimizing the part played by Alger Hiss than in giving the same picture that Stettinius did.

At the outset of his testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Bohlen said the Stettinius book "is a scrupulously accurate account of what actually transpired at Yalta." But what Mr. Bohlen said later on isn't quite in accord with what the Stettinius book indicates.

Thus, Mr. Bohlen says Mr. Hiss dealt with United Nations affairs at Yalta "and confined his activities to that." Mr. Bohlen emphasized that Mr. Hiss wasn't present at the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin meetings, but he seems not to have recognized the powerful role Hiss played as an adviser to President Roosevelt through Secretary of State Stettinius. Thus, Mr. Stettinius in his book writes of the Yalta Conference:

"The next morning at 10:30 Harriman, Matthews, Hiss, Bohlen, and I met with the President on the sun porch overlooking the sea, to review our proposals for the Conference agenda."

Senator KNOWLAND—reading from the Stettinius book—at this point in the hearing remarked that there were other references to Mr. Hiss "but that at least would seem to indicate that he did more than merely sit in on these large plenary meetings."

Mr. Bohlen said he thought the question asked him was about the participation by Mr. Hiss in the private meetings between Roosevelt and Stalin, and Senator KNOWLAND reminded him that the committee wanted to know more about the role that Hiss actually played at Yalta. It was then Mr. Bohlen said:

"Hiss was there, as an adviser to the Secretary of State, not there as an adviser to President Roosevelt direct, and at these meetings my recollection is that Hiss' part in it dealt virtually exclusively with the United Nations' business, which was, of course, a very big subject."

Secretary Stettinius in his book, on the other hand, speaks of reviewing with Matthews, Hiss, and Foote on his way to Yalta "the questions reserved for subsequent discussion with the President at Yalta.

"1, the establishment of a European High Commission composed of Great Britain, the Soviet Union, France, and the United States; 2, the treatment of Germany; 3, the Polish question; 4, relations between UNRRA and the Soviet Government; 5, the rights of American representatives on the Allied Control Commissions for Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary; 6, Iran; 7, China; 8, the Turkish Straits question; 9, international trusteeships."

Writing about the consideration of the Polish boundary, Mr. Stettinius says: "During one adjournment that afternoon the President asked me to get a lawyer to consult with him over the wording of the Polish boundary statement. I called Alger Hiss and while the two of us were trying to work out a solution for the President, Roosevelt suddenly looked up at us and said, 'I've got it'."

He speaks of "asking Hiss to do a quick summary of the State Department memorandum on the trusteeship issue," which he showed to Churchill and "seemed to satisfy him."

Mr. Stettinius had unbounded confidence in Alger Hiss, and the latter was in a position still—if he wished—to tell the other side what was happening on the inside of the American delegation. Mr. Stettinius in his book, published in November 1949, notwithstanding the disclosures in the first Hiss trial, says he "always had reason to believe that Hiss acted honorably and patriotically." He adds:

"Shortly after I became Under Secretary of State—October 1943—with the approval of the President and Mr. Hull, I called on the FBI to conduct a security examination of the State Department. Assistant Secretary of State G. Howland Shaw served as liaison with the FBI during this examination. I never heard of any questioning of Mr. Hiss' loyalty from any one inside or outside of the State Department or from the FBI during my term of service in the Department."

Mr. Stettinius is dead. Mr. Shaw is available to clarify the situation—in fact, Secretary Acheson appointed him recently on a special panel to review the case of John Carter Vincent, who by a 3-to-2 vote had been declared ineligible for loyalty reasons by President Truman's loyalty review board.

What are the facts? Whittaker Chambers in his book says he told about Hiss in 1939 to Assistant Secretary of State Adolph Berle, who talked to President Roosevelt about it, and the latter pooh-poohed it. Then in 1941 the FBI took up the trail against Hiss. What was in the FBI file from 1941 on? Certainly all that Chambers later testified to must have been in that file, and hence there must have been some failure of the FBI information to reach Mr. Shaw or Mr. Stettinius, or both, in 1943. It's a mystery that ought to be cleared up because, if the State Department high officials can be duped once, they can be duped again, just as the officials of the British Foreign Office have been duped by Communist agents in recent years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to ask the Senator from Kansas a question or two. The Senator from Kansas is not only a distinguished public figure, but he is also a distinguished and an able lawyer. He is familiar with the canons of ethics to which reputable lawyers subscribe. I wish to ask the Senator if it is not one of the fundamental principles which guide reputable lawyers that where there is substantial doubt in their minds as to the ethics or propriety of an act which they are asked to do, they do not do it. If there is substantial doubt, they resolve the doubt in favor of the ethics, rather than perform an act which may be unethical, do they not?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I answer the distinguished Senator from Iowa by saying that that is the conduct of a good lawyer. I am sure that good lawyers follow that principle. In all conscience I cannot in this instance support a man with whose views and with the results of whose foreign policies I disagree.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator from Kansas will yield further, I may say that, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, although I was not at the meeting when the actual vote was taken upon the polling, I permitted my vote to be cast to report this nomination to the Senate. That made the committee vote unanimous. At that time I made a statement that I was voting as I did for the purpose of bringing the nomination to the floor of the Senate for action; that my vote did not mean approval or disapproval of the appointment; and that I was reserving my right to decide until I had had every opportunity to canvass the field and secure all the information which the committee made available to me and to which I had access.

I did not make up my mind until after the meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations today. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Kansas that this nomination will be overwhelmingly approved by the Senate, but it will not be approved with my vote.

I have not had an opportunity to consider this matter from all sides. I shall not trespass on the time of the Senator from Kansas or of other Senators by delineating all the reasons that have been or will be discussed by both sides, pro and con. But, based upon what I know and based upon whatever judgment I possess, I cannot advise the President of the United States to make this appointment; and being unable to advise him to make the appointment, I cannot consent. As I view the situation, I think the nomination is not in the best interests of our country.

A moment ago I heard the address by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is a party regular and one of the most outstanding Republicans we have had in generations. I believe my own party regularity to be in the upper brackets. Certainly there is no one in this Chamber who has higher respect for the President of the United States or for the Secretary of State than I have. I have voted for the confirmation of other nominations, which in some cases have been of individuals whom perhaps, for various reasons, I would not have picked for appointment. However, I thought the interests of the country were served by supporting the appointments.

In this case, I do not so believe. Regardless of whether only 2 or 3 Senators vote against the confirmation of this nomination, I shall be one who will oppose the nomination. I shall do so with all due respect to the President and to the Secretary of State, and as one who has the greatest possible desire to aid this administration in every way on foreign and domestic questions. I cannot bring myself, in good conscience, to approve the nomination.

So, after this lengthy statement, my question to the Senator from Kansas is: Does he object if I join with him in not voting to confirm the nomination? [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa: Let your conscience be your guide. That is the position of the senior Senator from Kansas on this question. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his observation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I do not desire to take the time to make a long address, but I want my position to be clear. I desire the Senator to know that I have reached my final opinion only today, since I have had made available to me all the information that apparently will be made available to me. I have tried to obtain access to every bit of information that could be made available, and, based upon the whole record, I shall vote against confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to have the Senator from Kansas yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The Senator from Iowa a little while ago read an excerpt from the RECORD, which was a statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to the effect that a committee of three, consisting of Norman Armour, Joseph Grew, and Hugh Gibson, all known to be outstanding diplomats and career men, had passed upon Mr. Bohlen's nomination.

At page 103 of the hearings, I noticed that the Secretary of State testified to this effect:

> They unanimously concurred in the view that Mr. Bohlen was uniquely qualified for this particular position.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] stated to the Senate a little while ago that he had telephoned to Mr. Hugh Gibson and had talked to him through an intermediary, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Gibson's attorney—because Mr. Gibson had had a heart attack—and had obtained the answer that Mr. Gibson had not passed upon Mr. Bohlen.

I think the cleavage in the testimony is not only sharp, but is of real moment to the Senate. It cannot be passed off by a remark couched in a facetious phrase by the Senator from Wisconsin about talking to a man in a bathtub, because the Senator from New Hampshire is a man of character, and we are entitled to believe that when he talked to Mr. Schwartz, the attorney for Mr. Hugh Gibson, and received the answer which he did receive, that was a statement of fact.

If Mr. Gibson did not approve a nomination, what about Mr. Grew and what about Mr. Norman Armour? I want to know something about that, because I think it is of the utmost importance to ascertain whether a committee of three diplomats, who were uniquely situated, unanimously concurred in the view that Mr. Bohlen was the best man for the position to which he has been appointed. I do not believe the Senate ought to bypass that question without at least giving it another look.

While I am about it, and if the Senator from Kansas will yield further, I desire to raise one other question.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield, provided that I retain the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The name of Mr. Bohlen was before the Senate in 1951.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, is the Senator from Illinois still addressing questions to me, or may I take my seat?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; the Senator had better stand for a while. [Laughter.]

I find no document in the Committee on Foreign Relations—at least, I have not been able to discover it—with respect to whether there was a hearing in 1951 when Mr. Bohlen became counselor of the State Department. However, on March 12, 1951, the question of the confirmation of his nomination came before the Senate, and the nomination was confirmed. That was 6 years and 1 month after Yalta. Of course, we had an opportunity to speak on the matter at that time. No one who was informed, no one who had immediate identity with the question, namely, the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, evidently suggested to the Senate that we ought to go into the matter and obtain some refreshment as to what occurred in the Senate in those days. Being somewhat of a freshman here in those days, I did not know that it was my particular province to do so, but I do think there ought to be a little light on that subject before we conclude our deliberations on this nomination.

Now I should ask my question——

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that probably the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, can throw some light on that question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The particular question is this: Does the Senator from Iowa now know whether or not there was a committee of career diplomats who actually did concur in and recommend the nomination of Mr. Bohlen? Has the Senator from Iowa, since the hearings in his committee were closed, come into possession of other information which would throw new light on that subject?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have had no direct contact with any of the three gentlemen whom the Senator from Illinois has mentioned. Therefore I do not know what their personal statements would be. The only direct and positive evidence I have upon which I can rely is the statement quoted in the record of the Foreign Relations Committee. I do not know what the gentleman would say if directly contacted, so I am sorry I cannot enlighten the Senator on that point.

Further in answer to the Senator's question, let me say that there are various types of jobs. For a certain type of job a man might be approved. For another job he might be considered not so well qualified, in the public interest. So the mere fact that an individual is con-

firmed at one time for a certain job does not automatically carry life membership in the lodge of confirmation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, for 20 years the American people have been tasting nothing but the dregs of defeat—the defeat of such fundamental concepts as loyalty, honor, and duty.

We have passed through two black decades, and history will write large the names of those who sold out this country at the diplomatic tables at home and abroad.

Where statesmen should have been working for us, traitors and their dupes connived against us. Where patriots should have fought, cowards fled the enemy or joined his camp.

The names of Hiss, Lattimore, and Acheson have become synonymous with defeat, disgrace, and dishonor.

But there is such a thing as victory.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will not yield until I finish. I shall be glad to yield then.

Finally last fall the American people became so sick of the entire sorry mess that they voted by an overwhelming majority that we clean out Washington lock, stock, and barrel.

During last fall's campaign, I spoke to perhaps more people than any other man in the United States—with the exception of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON. Over a period of 2 months I spoke in practically every State in the Union—sometimes speaking as often as 3 or 4 times in 1 day. I listened to the speeches of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON, as well as to the speeches of a great number of other Republicans. We promised the American people that if they would elect Eisenhower and NIXON and a Republican Congress three major things would be accomplished.

No. 1. We would bring an honorable end to the Korean war.

No. 2. We would work toward a financially solvent America—toward a balanced budget and lower taxes.

No. 3. We would clean out the mess in Washington, especially in the State Department and get rid of all of Acheson's architects for disaster.

As one old deal Democrat used to say: "Let's look at the record." Let us see whether we have to the best of our ability fulfilled those three promises.

First, let us examine campaign promise No. 1—namely, that we would bring an honorable end to the Korean war. As the Senate knows, prior to the inauguration, our 7th Fleet was under orders to protect the long exposed Communist coastline—to shore up the Communist defenses along their exposed flank. As President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message, our 7th Fleet was required to serve as a defensive arm of Communist China.

President Eisenhower immediately took steps to repeal this treasonable order and correct a disgraceful situation. He also provided for a step-up in the training of South Korean soldiers so that the people of Asia could do some of their own fighting and dying in the struggle for freedom. This they were willing to do. This they had asked to do. This they had never been given a chance to do. This action on the part of President Eisenhower should speed the day of victory in Asia with less agony, blood, and tears for America.

President Eisenhower has pointed out that the war cannot be won overnight. Other very able military leaders have stated that the Korean war was won when Malik suggested and Acheson engineered the truce talks in Korea—those truce talks which allowed the Communists to build up their strength to such a great extent. Suffice it to say that the campaign promise of President Eisenhower and other Republicans is being well kept insofar as Korea is concerned.

Now we pass on to point No. 2—the promise to work toward a balanced budget and lower taxes. Some progress is being made in that direction, despite a tremendous legacy of unpaid bills left by the Truman administration. It is not generally known that when President Eisenhower took office, the previous administration had run up unpaid bills of between eighty and eighty-five billion dollars. The new administration cannot refuse to pay those bills. We must get the money to pay them off. This makes the problem of any immediate tax reduction difficult beyond words.

Eisenhower found himself in the position of a father who returns home after years of absence and finds that a spendthrift and irresponsible son has run up bills wherever possible.

It is impossible to know at this time how much of the 80 to 85 billions we must pay in 1953, how much in 1954, and how much in 1955.

We must, of course, pay Truman's bills. This makes the task of balancing the budget extremely difficult. However, with the cooperation of the Congress and the new administration much progress toward a balanced budget is being made.

As to point No. 3—the task of scrubbing, flushing, and washing clean the foul mess that the Truman-Acheson crowd left in Washington—some considerable progress is being made. The new Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, has turned his back upon a sizeable number of the Acheson gang who have been found at every time and place where disaster struck America and success came to Communist Russia.

Mr. Dulles has cooperated fully with our Senate Investigating Committee in our first major inquiry—the investigation of the State Department's International Information Program. It is certainly unique and encouraging to find a Secretary of State willing to cooperate with the Congress in rooting out those who have been half loyal or disloyal to America and those who because of incompetence were being used by the enemies of this country. The new Secretary should be commended for having brought into the State Department as head of the Security Division an outstanding American, Scott McLeod, who has such an excellent record in the FBI and who to date has been doing a splendid job as Security Officer. For example, McLeod has caused the removal of Benjamin Buttenweiser, the man in whose home Alger Hiss was harbored between his two trials involving treason and who was holding one of the top positions in the Office of the High Commissioner in Germany. He caused the removal of a $50 a day consultant, Margaret Carter, former wife of William D. Carter, the son of E. C. Carter, who headed the Communist-controlled IPR, which was described by the committee so ably headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as the cover shop of Soviet espionage. E. C. Carter also labored with Owen Lattimore to shape Acheson's Far Eastern policy. So we can give Mr. McLeod credit for that removal.

Another individual who has been ordered home and is, I understand, to be discharged, is Charles Thayer, the former head of the Voice of America, whose activities as head of the Voice are well known to the Senate.

I do not relish the task which I must perform today—the task of calling attention to what I think is a grave and inexcusable mistake on the part of our Secretary of State—the selection of Charles Bohlen as our Ambassador to Russia.

I would dishonor the confidence of people who elected me and the 31,000,000 Americans who put the Republican Party in power if I did not speak out and oppose the nomination of Bohlen—if I did not put together the history of the part Bohlen played in formulating that foreign policy which played directly into the hands of international communism—that foreign policy which was so overwhelmingly rejected by the American people.

In 1950 and again in 1952 I spent a great deal of time campaigning against Senators who placed party above country and who took the position that no matter what Truman did and no matter how wrong or how bad for this country his decisions were, they had to back him up because he happened to belong to their political party.

I campaigned against those New Deal-Truman Senators who felt that regardless of the cost to the Nation they had to blind the eyes and close the ears of the American people to the fact that we were rapidly getting a government of, by, and for Communists, crooks, and cronies. If the day comes that we, the Republican Party, follow that same course which we so vigorously condemned, then it will indeed be a black day for America and the world.

We want no Lattimores in our Republican Party. But what is more important, if any are found, we want no Tydings whitewash of them. We want no Republican Amerasia, but if one is found it must be exposed, regardless of how much our own party may bleed because of the exposure.

We must put country above party, and if we make a mistake we Republicans must admit it and rectify it as soon as possible.

Such a mistake was the nomination of Bohlen as Ambassador to Moscow.

We have time to correct that mistake and show the American people that we

will never keep in power men who played an important role in selling out the people of Europe and Asia to the Soviet dictatorship.

President Eisenhower, burdened with work and pressed for time, has had little opportunity to study the complete record of Bohlen. I am sure that President Eisenhower who campaigned against the treason of Yalta is not aware of the fact that Bohlen within the past few days has stated before the committee that the Yalta agreement was "the best attempt that could have been made under the circumstances"—page 113, hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

As we review the record of Yalta, let us keep in mind Bohlen's defense of this betrayal of our two great allies. Let us keep in mind also the words of the man who was our Ambassador to Poland at that time, Arthur Bliss Lane, who said:

> As I looked at the document [the Yalta agreement] I could not believe my eyes. Every line spoke a complete surrender to Stalin.

In view of the fact that the official truth of what happened at Teheran and Yalta is still a deep secret, it is difficult to separate the happenings at Teheran from those at Yalta. We must, therefore, judge the finished product as it emerged from Yalta and was confirmed by Truman at Potsdam.

Bohlen was at Roosevelt's left hand at Teheran and Yalta and at Truman's left hand at Potsdam.

At Yalta we gave to Soviet Russia 60,000 square miles of Polish territory. For the first time in United States history, the United States Government ceded territory of one nation to another, without the consent of the nation whose territory was being given away. Nor did our Government submit the so-called agreement to the United States Senate. As to the infamy of this surrender to communism, Bohlen has this to say:

> I have never been able to see afterward that you could have done much more that would have been of benefit to Poland or the Polish people. (P. 113 of the printed hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

Neither the Polish Government in exile, which our Government then recognized, nor the Polish people were consulted as to the cession of the 60,000 square miles of Polish territory. Nor did we consult the Yugoslav Government in exile, which we then recognized, whether Tito was an acceptable chief of state to replace King Peter, then the head of that government. Furthermore, the Yugoslav people were not consulted as to whether they desired their country to be communized.

The Yalta agreement contained two major provisions insofar as China was concerned: First, surrender of Manchuria to Russia; second, arrangements for the United States to arm and equip a Russian army. At the time of the Yalta agreement, Chiang Kai-shek was not informed that we were offering control of Chinese territory to Stalin. The loss of Manchuria meant that the Chinese Communists were given a gateway to Russian arms and supplies in their war against him.

In return for those concessions, Stalin promised to enter the Pacific war at some undetermined time. Admiral Leahy and other military men have made it clear that Stalin's entrance into the Pacific war was not necessary at that time since Japan had already made overtures for peace.

The Yalta agreement was confirmed at Potsdam by Truman against the urgent advice of 50 of the Army's top intelligence officers. On April 31, 1945, 3 months before the Potsdam conference, those 50 high-ranking Army officers advised as follows:

> The entry of Soviet Russia into the Asiatic war would be a political event of world-shaking importance, the ill effect of which would be felt for decades to come * * * (it) would destroy America's position in Asia quite as effectively as our position is now destroyed in Europe east of the Elbe and beyond the Adriatic.
>
> If Russia enters the Asiatic war, China will certainly lose her independence, to become the Poland of Asia; Korea, the Asiatic Rumania; Manchukuo, the Soviet Bulgaria. Whether more than a nominal China will exist after the impact of the Russian armies is felt is very doubtful. Chiang may well have to depart and a Chinese Soviet government may be installed in Nanking which we would have to recognize.
>
> To take a line of action which would save few lives now, and only a little time—at an unpredictable cost in lives, treasure, and honor in the future—and simultaneously destroy our ally China, would be an act of treachery that would make the Atlantic Charter and our hopes for world peace a tragic farce.
>
> Under no circumstances should we pay the Soviet Union to destroy China. This would certainly injure the material and moral position of the United States in Asia. (Russell committee hearings, pt. 4, June 21, 1951, p. 2916.)

Thus the treason which Hiss advised at Yalta was confirmed and brought to full bloom at Potsdam, against the advice of Army intelligence.

Mr. President, in this connection let me recall some of the material in James Forrestal's diary, in which he said he had been told by Joseph Grew that Bohlen and his group were attempting to prolong the Japanese war. Without using his exact words, let me say that what he said, as well as I can remember it, was that they were refusing to clarify the terms of unconditional surrender so that Russia could get into that war.

But Bohlen says:

> Given the circumstances, the best attempt that could have been made under the circumstances was made at Yalta. (P. 113, hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate, March 2 and 18, 1953.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at this point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield, although I prefer not to do much yielding until I conclude my remarks.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I appreciate that. Let me say that, in fairness, I believe it should be pointed out that that matter was called to the attention of the committee and to the attention of Mr. Bohlen a the time when he testified before the committee, and the information before us was that Mr. Bohlen categorically denied that he had made any such statement, and I understand that Mr. Grew had also denied that he has any recollection of making any such statement to Mr. Forrestal.

Unfortunately, Mr. Forrestal, for whom I had great respect—as I am sure most of the other Members of this body had—is dead, but, at least, that is the testimony before our committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from California.

As I understand the stories which I get from the newspapers, Mr. Grew was not called before the committee. He did make the statement, according to the press reports, that at this time he does not remember that particular conversation with Bohlen.

Mr. President, let me say that I had great respect for Jim Forrestal. He was one of the men who was hounded to death by the Communists of this Nation. He was murdered, I feel, just as definitely as if he had been thrown by the Communists out of that 16th-story window; he was murdered by their hounding.

I can think of no reason why Jim Forrestal would put in his diary a statement that Charles Bohlen was attempting to prolong the Japanese war unless that was the truth.

I do not know how good Mr. Grew's memory is; but I may say to the Senator from California that if Mr. Bohlen did not do as Mr. Forrestal said he did, then Mr. Bohlen was speaking out of character, because we find that his entire history is one of complete, wholehearted, 100-percent cooperation with the Acheson-Hiss-Truman regime. Never once has Bohlen played out of line; he has gone along 100 percent, even to the point of defending, before the Foreign Relations Committee, everything they did.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, I do not think Mr. Forrestal either said or even implied that he had talked with Mr. Bohlen and that Mr. Bohlen had made any such suggestion. As I recall, he said that at some gathering—I believe it was a recital which was given in honor of Mr. Grew—Mr. Grew had made some such remark; but I merely wish to reiterate for the RECORD that Mr. Bohlen categorically denies that he ever said anything of the kind or had any such thought in mind. Mr. Grew himself has done likewise, and has indicated that he has no recollection of ever having told Mr. Forrestal that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask whether the Senator from California or any other member of the Foreign Relations Committe has picked up a telephone and called Mr. Grew and asked him about this matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; but I should like to get an answer to the question I have asked.

Mr. FERGUSON. In answer to that question, I can read a letter which I received from Joseph Grew in regard to this matter:

> Referring to our telephone talk this morning, I hope you will not fail to read in its entirety chapter XXXVI, The Emperor of Japan and Japan's Surrender, on page 1406, in volume II, of my book, Turbulent Era.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

That chapter expresses as clearly as possible my attitude with regard to Japan's surrender, the Emperor of Japan, and the Potsdam proclamation, and there is not very much that I could add to it.

With regard to the comment in Jim Forrestal's diary of July 6, 1945, it is quite possible that I expressed to Forrestal my fear that the proposed Potsdam proclamation to Japan would be ditched by people who accompanied the President to the Potsdam Conference but I have no recollection whatever of having mentioned Bohlen in that connection. Frankly, I do not now remember (and that was 8 years ago) just what position Bohlen took on the point at issue.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from Michigan very much.

Mr. President, weighing this matter in the way that an ordinary spectator would, I may point out that Mr. Forrestal, as we know, kept a diary; he wrote in it every day the things of importance which occurred on that day. When he returned to his office or to his home, he made a notation that he had talked to Grew, and that Grew said Bohlen was one of those attempting to prolong the Japanese war so that Russia could enter the war. It would seem logical that that occurred.

But let us assume that Grew made no such statement. The fact remains that the war with Japan was prolonged in order to allow Communist Russia to become a participant. We gave Communist Russia the two principal ports of Manchuria. We gave Communist Russia the sole important railway across Manchuria. In other words, we delivered all Manchuria to Communist Russia, in order to persuade Russia to come into that war. We armed and equipped Russia's army in that area, and that was done by the Bohlen group in the State Department.

Even if Grew did not make this statement to Forrestal, we know that Bohlen never raised his voice against the course of action I have just mentioned. It is part and parcel of all his activities.

Mr. President, let us consider who this man Bohlen is. He entered the Foreign Service of the State Department in 1929, and served in various minor capacities.

He was a nobody, unknown outside the Foreign Service until he fell under the eager eyes of Averell Harriman, that elusive statesman of the half world, who was Ambassador to Moscow.

This man Harriman has a consistent record as a guy who hits only to left field.

His admiration for everything Russian is unrivaled outside the confines of the Communist Party, and Harriman seems to be the man who started Charles Bohlen along the road to fame and Yalta.

As an authority for this statement, I cite that bubbling press agent of the New Deal, Robert Sherwood, who deserted the Broadway footlights to dramatize and popularize the Roosevelt administration.

In his book Roosevelt and Hopkins, on page 774, Sherwood says:

> During these days at Cairo, Hopkins formed a friendship with Charles E. Bohlen, a young State Department career man who has been brought along by Harriman from the Embassy in Moscow because of his fluency in the Russian language.

Sherwood then quotes Bohlen as defending the "cooky pushers" in the State Department.

Therefore, Bohlen the interpreter, as early as 1943, had learned to defend his State Department before important politicians such as Hopkins.

Sherwood writes further:

> Bohlen gave so vigorous and intelligent a defense of the State Department and explanation of the hopeless handicaps under which its personnel often must work, that Hopkins subsequently persuaded the President to appoint Bohlen to a post in the White House where he would act as a liaison officer with the State Department, thereby filling a really long-felt want.

From then on—

Sherwood continues—

> Bohlen's star was very much in the ascendant and he later became Counselor of the Department under Secretary Marshall.

Our Bohlen shifted into high gear only when Harriman and Hopkins approved him.

On the basis of history, what American can take pride in being elevated by such men as Harriman and Hopkins—those two great Republicans.

But Bohlen was made an official member of the team which called the signals for the betrayal of millions of men and women in Europe and Asia.

I defy anyone to prove that Bohlen ever deserted that team after they promoted him from a benchwarmer to the varsity squad.

Bohlen also has been less than frank regarding Alger Hiss, his coworker at Yalta.

Despite the fact that Bohlen last week told the Foreign Relations Committee he knew Hiss only slightly, they were together days at a time working on the team that sold our allies down the river.

Now Bohlen seeks to defend that same gang of sell-out artists by minimizing Hiss' role at Yalta.

Stettinius, in his book, Roosevelt and the Russians, on page 31, states:

> Hiss performed brilliantly throughout the Dumbarton Oaks conversation, the Yalta conference.

Stettinius then devotes 12 pages to the Yalta accomplishments of Hiss and the part this traitor took in setting State Department policy on the following major points:

> The treatment of Germany; the Polish question; relations between UNRRA and the Soviet Government; Iran; China and international trusteeships.

At that time, our Secretary of State had none of Bohlen's blushing modesty regarding the importance of Alger Hiss at Yalta.

Only last week Bohlen, though candidate for one of our most vital ambassador posts in the world casually brushed aside the role of Hiss by stating:

> But from what I saw of Mr. Hiss' activities at Yalta, he confined himself to problems of the United Nations, the voting formula, and to matters pertaining to the establishment of the United Nations.

Only last week Bohlen still played coy regarding his own role in the diplomatic intrigues of the New Deal gang. Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Bohlen said:

> Senator, I have testified and I repeat again, that my primary function there (at Yalta) was that of an interpreter for the President. I think you will find that in Secretary Stettinius' book on the conference.

Mr. Dulles also has said that Bohlen was only an interpreter of the Russian language meekly chattering on the sidelines at Yalta as millions of human beings were placed on the auction block and sold to Stalin.

In an executive session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 18, Senator MANSFIELD asked the Secretary of State:

> Would you say that Mr. Bohlen was a policymaker at Yalta and Teheran or just an interpreter?

Secretary Dulles replied:

> My understanding is that he was only an interpreter. I was not there, but he was still only an interpreter when I first met him later and he did not emerge into what I regard as a policymaking position until, I would say, some time about 1946.

Mr. President, I do not accuse Secretary Dulles of knowingly falsifying the record. He is an extremely busy man, having taken over a tremendously important task; but, when he is in error, I think we must call it to the attention of the Senate. I may say I am sure the error was an honest one on his part, but I think we should turn to the book by Mr. Stettinius to see what Stettinius had to say about Bohlen, and as to whether Bohlen was merely an interpreter.

I quote from the book Roosevelt and the Russians, written by the late Mr. Stettinius. On page 103, the Secretary of State wrote of Bohlen at Yalta:

> Bohlen, however, was more than a professional interpreter. He was an expert, as well, on substantive matters.

This interpreter also had persuasive and winning ways despite his self-proclaimed shyness. Sherwood verifies this in dealing with the 1945 meetings in Moscow when we suddenly find that it was Bohlen who suggested to the President that Harry Hopkins fly to the Kremlin to talk to Joe Stalin—page 885. In other words, this man, who was merely an interpreter for the President of the United States, said, "Mr. President, send Harry Hopkins to Moscow." According to Mr. Stettinius, he did that—proving that he was a very unusual interpreter.

This interpreter also got a free ride to Moscow according to Sherwood. On the evening of May 26, Sherwood writes—page 887:

> The first meeting in the Kremlin was at 8 p. m. Present were: Stalin, Molotov, and Pavlov and Hopkins, Harriman and Bohlen.

According to Sherwood who obtained the minutes of this conference, Hopkins and Stalin saw eye to eye on selling Poland down the river. Sherwood said:

> Mr. Hopkins stated that the United States would desire a Poland friendly to the Soviet Union and in fact desired to see friendly countries all along the Soviet borders.

In 1953, we know that Hopkins' desire was more than granted.

But 8 years later we find Bohlen in his appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee coming up with a brand new interpretation of the rather simple word "friendly."

Last week Bohlen said:

The Russian word "friendly" does not mean what we mean. It is not a question of difference in language, Senator, it is a question to the Russians, as events have shown, that anything that is not subservient to them is not friendly.

But search as we will, we shall not find Bohlen worrying about that fatal word "friendly" in 1945 at a conference which he himself suggested.

Long before Bohlen appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee to quarrel with the dictionary, history has shown the damage was done. Ask the millions of suffering human beings in Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, China, and other nations.

While we are on this word "friendly", let us take a look at how the Russian Foreign Office interpreted the word as far as Bohlen is concerned.

I have in my office the affidavit of Igor Bogolepov, for 20 years an official of the Soviet Foreign Office. Bogolepov fled the Russian dictatorship during the war and has testified many times before congressional committees and military agencies since he arrived here last year.

As Councilor of the Soviet Foreign Office, Bogolepov had access to top secret Russian information files and read Bohlen's secret reports when the latter was in Moscow between 1939–41.

Bogolepov states:

The secret correspondence of the American Embassy in Moscow was photostated and was available in the Soviet Foreign Office and it is in this way I remember having read some of the reports signed by Mr. Charles Bohlen and sent to the State Department in Washington.

It became known to me that of all the senior personnel in the United States Embassy in Moscow, only one person, Ambassador Laurence Steinhardt, was listed as neutral and one person, Loy Henderson, was listed as hostile by Soviet authorities. The rest of the officers of the Embassy, including Charles Bohlen, were evidently considered friendly.

Bogolepov further states:

It must be noted that all foreign diplomats in Moscow in my time were divided into three categories: hostile, neutral, and friendly.

Being friendly did not mean that a person was necessarily a Soviet agent or connected with the Soviet Secret Service and I wish to make that point perfectly clear.

But we must consider that when the name of an alien appeared on the list as a friendly person, it could mean that he might be considered by the Soviet Secret Service as a possible source of information and as a channel for the infiltration of inaccurate information concerning the Soviet Union into the Western World.

That is the other definition of "friendly," and Bohlen was considered by Moscow to be "friendly."

I wonder how the interpreter Bohlen interprets that.

There are many contradictions surrounding this nomination.

One of the puzzling contradictions involved is the question of whether the job of Ambassador to Moscow is important.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] apparently feels that the job is relatively unimportant. I understand he got this impression partly from that part of the testimony of Mr. Dulles which was deleted from the printed record. Why it was deleted I do not know.

However, in that part of the record which was not deleted and appears in printed form, the following is found:

Question by Senator HUMPHREY: Mr. Secretary, in reference to your evaluation of the Embassy post in Moscow, do you call that an important assignment?

Answer by Secretary Dulles: I consider that it is one of the most important assignments that we have.

Again, on page 103 of the same report, Dulles says:

The only persons we could think of who was qualified to play that role which might be extremely important and might affect the welfare and the security of the United States and world peace was Mr. Bohlen.

The average American would say he considers this post one of the most important in our whole diplomatic service. With this I agree.

In the year 1953 the scales of freedom versus slavery are delicately balanced. An intelligent Ambassador in Moscow who has a record of facing up to the Soviets would be worth his weight in gold. But he who helped abandon millions of people to the Soviet tyrants at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam does not belong in our Embassy in Moscow representing the United States.

On another point, I feel that our Secretary of State is completely misinformed on Bohlen's usefulness as an expert on communism.

Mr. Dulles told the Foreign Relations Committee on page 103 of the report that he favored Bohlen's appointment to Moscow on the grounds of "his unique capacity to understand Soviet communism."

But three pages later we find the following exchange:

Senator FULBRIGHT. I was curious when you said that you disagreed with certain policies with which Mr. Bohlen has been identified, as to what, in particular, you had in mind. I suppose you referred to political policy and that you questioned whether he should be in a policymaking position?

Secretary DULLES. Well, I think he has in the past been identified with what I would call and have called the containment policy.

Containment is a big word which grew out of the Groton vocabulary of the Hiss-Acheson gang.

In terms of reality, containment was the policy that delivered millions of free men and women to serfdom and death.

I am willing to accept Mr. Dulles' statement that Bohlen subscribed to this ruinous containment policy of Acheson, Lattimore, and Hiss.

But does this mean that Bohlen has a "unique capacity," to use Mr. Dulles' words to "understand Soviet communism"?

Did Bohlen have a "unique capacity" to understand Soviet communism back in 1945 when he played a part in the sellout of Poland, China, and other nations?

Another Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, in his book, Memoirs, foresaw this "containment" policy as far back as the fall of 1944.

In his book, on page 1459, Hull said that at that time, 9 years ago, the State Department was "beginning to get indications that the Russians were about to drive hard bargains in their armistice agreements with Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania which would give them something in the nature of control over those countries."

Hull also said that in 1944 the year before Yalta, he cabled Harriman in Moscow warnings along this line and "raised most serious doubts with regard to future long-range Soviet policy."

Despite those warnings, Harriman and Bohlen took part in the Yalta Conference 6 months later and meekly agreed to the most tragic destruction of friendly nations in the history of American diplomacy.

Three months later, in Moscow, Hopkins, accompanied by Bohlen, sat down with Stalin and reaffirmed the surrender of Poland to the Soviet dictatorship.

This "unique capacity," of which Mr. Dulles speaks in regard to his nominee Bohlen, was not supported by a great American diplomat, Arthur Bliss Lane, former Ambassador to Poland.

In his book I Saw Poland Betrayed, Lane writes, on page 80, of his reaction when he first saw the Yalta agreement:

As I glanced over it, I could not believe my eyes. To me, almost every line spoke of a surrender to Stalin.

Our former Ambassador to Poland, who resigned and came home, also had no illusions as to the important people involved in the betrayal at Yalta. On page 79 of the same book, Lane states that among Stettinius' principal advisers at Yalta were H. Freeman Matthews and Charles E. Bohlen.

I cannot ignore those words of a veteran dipomat who was on the scene and who knew then that Bohlen was not just an interpreter.

This is only part of the record.

This record comes from the mouths and from the statements not alone of Republicans, but from such faithful New Dealers as Hopkins and Sherwood, as well as Stettinius and others.

It is an ugly record of the great betrayal.

On the basis of this record, whatever else may happen, Bohlen's name should be rejected.

In these grim days when we battle for survival—when we fight for life itself—we can ill afford ambassadors who retreat before the enemy. Nowhere in Bohlen's history do we find even a scintilla of evidence that he ever stood up and fought international communism.

This Nation cannot afford to place in a position of power a man who is either so blind that he cannot recognize the enemy or who for reasons of expediency or cowardice fails to measure up to his job.

I would like to quote from the book of William C. Bullitt, who also went to Moscow, who came back from his mission a wise and thoughtful man. He said:

We have little time. "After the event even a fool is wise," wrote Homer in the Iliad. On all the statesmen and peoples of the world, but especially on us, the people of the United States, there is today a terrible obligation to be wise before the event. After the next world war * * * there may be no after.

Those are thoughtful words. We must weigh them well.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Today we want no part of a man who was part of the Acheson betrayal team.

We want no part of this "chip" off the old block of Yalta.

Aside from the fact that Bohlen can speak Russian, I can find no reason why he should be sent to Moscow to represent Americans. The reason, simply stated, why he should not be sent to Moscow is that he has always been a very willing, enthusiastic, and active part and parcel of the Acheson-Vincent-Lattimore-Service clique which was overwhelmingly rejected by 31 million Americans last fall.

The Republicans are in control of the Senate because in November the voters repudiated the Acheson-Hiss sellout of America. In November 31,000,000 people told us to clean house. That meant to get rid of Acheson's lieutenants, including the Bohlens.

I should add, however, that I have no hope that Bohlen will be defeated.

Mr. President, we face an unusual situation in the Senate today. Today those who are loudest in their praise of Bohlen are those who have never been able to find anything wrong with the Acheson foreign policy, nor could they find anything good about Eisenhower's policies, when Eisenhower ran for election last fall. The more left wing the Truman Democrat, the greater seems to be his love for Bohlen. I am not referring to the very able Democrats on the other side of the aisle, but I am referring to the left-wing Truman Democrats. If they loved Acheson, they must love Bohlen. If they loved Stevenson and Truman, they must love Bohlen. It is clear, therefore, that every Truman Democrat, down to the very last man, will vote for the confirmation of Bohlen's nomination.

Unfortunately, a sizable number of the good Democrats, as distinct from the Truman Democrats, will also vote for him for the same reason that a great many of my Republican colleagues will vote for Bohlen—namely, because they apparently feel that we should not reject a nominee of the new President at this early date.

This picture leaves me deeply disturbed.

We Senators, upon whose shoulders rests a tremendous responsibility, are about to make a very, very grievous mistake which many of us will live to regret.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Earlier this afternoon there was a colloquy between the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to a very distinguished committee of career diplomats about a supposedly——

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator from Illinois, when he refers to the Senator from Wisconsin, to state whether he is speaking of the senior or the junior Senator from Wisconsin, because it happens that I differ very strongly with my respected colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. I hope the Senator will make clear to which Senator from Wisconsin he is referring.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I express my deep regret. I refer to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the very distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

The question arose because the testimony before the committee and because a statement made in the record of the committee was to the effect that a committee consisting of Hugh Gibson, Norman Armour, and Joseph Grew, all of whom are well known to the country and to the Congress, and all of whom are well known in diplomatic circles, concurred unanimously in the nomination of Bohlen to be Ambassador to Moscow. I suppose there was some question as to the authentic nature of the information which was recited by the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. BRIDGES] in his speech a little while ago because he said he had talked to Mr. Hugh Gibson through an intermediary, Mr. Gibson's lawyer, Mr. Schwartz.

Frankly, I talked to Mr. Hugh Gibson within the last 30 minutes. If anyone wishes to do so, he can locate Mr. Gibson at the Mayflower Hotel, apartment 527. He was in the hands of a physician when I called him, but he thought the matter was of sufficient importance to come to the telephone himself.

I have known Hugh Gibson for a long time. He now says he did not desire to put the Secretary of State in a bad light or to reflect upon his good faith, because the fact of the matter is that he probably has been so busy and has been so beset by people that it would have been strange indeed if he had not forgotten some of the things that probably were not noted at the time, particularly if they happened several months ago.

Mr. Gibson stated—and I asked him whether I might make this statement on the floor—that he had actually met Mr. Bohlen once and had shaken hands with him once; that, as a matter of fact, he, Mr. Grew, and Mr. Armour were not asked to pass upon Mr. Bohlen; and that it might have been an impertinence had they volunteered any information with respect to Mr. Bohlen.

He said it had been made plain to them that their opinions had been sought with respect to the posts at Bonn, Madrid, Rome, and one or two other capitals; but in the instant case, namely, the vacancy at Moscow, they were not actually asked, so he had made no recommendation whatsoever. He could not speak for Mr. Norman Armour, and he did not undertake to speak for Mr. Joseph Grew.

It seems to me that that is a very important item, because, knowing Mr. Gibson as I do, and as I think other Senators do, I would attach extraordinary weight to testimony of that kind, and it would be persuasive upon me in voting upon the nomination of Mr. Bohlen.

Frankly, I find myself in an uncertain frame of mind at the moment. It seems to me that the matter definitely ought to be cleared. Mr. Grew is in the country and, if Mr. Norman Armour is in the country, we ought to ascertain beyond all doubt what their opinions and viewpoints are. I have ascertained for myself the attitude and viewpoint of Mr. Gibson, because he is available, even though he is under the care of a physician at the present time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield on condition that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is important that this matter be clarified, and that we take a minute or two on the floor to do so.

As I understand, one of the first questions which was raised by the distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], arose when he called attention to the fact that in the statement of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee there had been certain information regarding a committee of three. While I am sure that no reflection was being cast upon the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I think it is important at this time that we read into the RECORD from page 103 of the hearings the following testimony by Mr. Dulles:

> The suggestion that he might be appointed was submitted to a group of three extremely distinguished former members of the Foreign Service, one of whom was Mr. Joseph Grew—all of them, I believe, Republicans—and of long Foreign Service tradition, and who commanded the respect of the Foreign Service, and I believe command the respect of this committee and of the Senate, to advise with respect to prospective appointments.
>
> They unanimously concurred in the view that Mr. Bohlen was uniquely qualified for this particular position.
>
> We furthermore knew that as recently as 1951, 2 years ago, the Senate had unanimously confirmed Mr. Bohlen for a very high policy-making post, namely that of counselor.

In sequence I wished to place that in the RECORD to show that there was ample justification for the speech made by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, for he certainly would not knowingly mislead the Senate.

Immediately when this colloquy took place on the floor I went to the telephone and called the Department of State. I personally talked with Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State. I said to him, "This difference of opinion has arisen on the floor of the Senate during the debate." I said, "The statement was made by the distinguished Senator from New Hamshire that he had talked with a man who, I believe, was the attorney for Mr. Gibson, and who had reported that Mr. Gibson had not concurred in any such recommendation."

I said, "I think it is extremely important that the record be carefully checked, because it is entirely possible that the committee of three may have met. There may have been a situation in which Mr. Gibson was taken ill, as sometimes happens even in a committee of the Senate. He may have authorized his associates

to go ahead and conduct some investigations, and perhaps only two of them concurred in this endorsement."

I said, "There may have been a perfectly honest mistake made."

Mr. Dulles said to me, "I am quite certain that I have seen a letter which was signed by the three gentlemen referred to. The information, I believe, is classified as to all their recommendations, but I will examine it and I will call you back."

He called me back. He said, "I have the letter before me. It is signed by the three persons referred to, and I will send it to you."

I hold the letter in my hand. It is on the official stationery of the Department of State. It is dated January 29, 1953. It is a memorandum addressed to the Secretary from Messrs. Grew, Gibson, and Armour. At the bottom of the page, in ink, are what purport to be the signatures of the three gentlemen referred to. I am not personally familiar with the signatures of those three gentlemen, but the memorandum is signed Joseph C. Grew, Hugh Gibson, and Norman Armour.

In it they make certain recommendations with respect to various posts, which information, as I say, I am not at liberty to place in the RECORD, as the Senate will, I think, fully understand and appreciate.

Attached to the memorandum is a long list of diplomatic posts. When we turn to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics there appears the name of Charles Bohlen.

How this misunderstanding has developed I do not know, but I do say that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was amply justified in making the statement which he made on the floor of the Senate. I believe, in the light of this evidence, that the Secretary of State in good faith made the statement which he made to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I could not believe that Mr. Dulles would knowingly make a misstatement to the Foreign Relations Committee and, by so doing, deceive the United States Senate.

Certainly, based upon this information, Mr. Dulles was amply justified in testifying the way he did, and the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was amply justified in making the speech on the floor of the Senate which he made.

I agreed with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] that I would not trespass upon his time, but I thought this matter was of such importance that I should take the responsibility of trying to clarify the matter so far as it could be clarified. I have gone to the highest authority. I have presented the facts as they appeared to be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield, if he has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] still has the floor.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am glad to yield. I did promise the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] that I would yield the floor at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, I do not wish unnecessarily to labor the point involved here, but, if I may be permitted to do so, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from California whether Mr. Bohlen's name actually appears in the letter itself, rather than in a printed attached memorandum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that his name appears on the attached memorandum, but the letter itself refers to the attached memorandum. A great number of diplomatic posts appear on the list, some of which have been filled and some of which have not yet been filled.

Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, without reading, an article entitled "Grew Supports Confirmation of Bohlen as Ambassador," written by Edward F. Ryan and published in the Washington Post of March 15, 1953.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREW SUPPORTS CONFIRMATION OF BOHLEN AS AMBASSADOR

(By Edward F. Ryan)

Former Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew, in a letter to Senator HOMER FERGUSON (Republican, Michigan), has urged approval of Charles (Chip) Bohlen as United States Ambassador to Russia on the ground that he is the best possible man to have in Moscow at this critical time.

"He knows the Russians well and speaks the language thoroughly," Grew wrote. "I think we would make a great mistake to deprive ourselves of his expert service at this juncture, no matter what phases his thinking may have passed through in light of other circumstances and other conditions in times past.

"There is no shadow of doubt in my mind that he is the right man and the best man for the job just now."

Grew's letter, written Friday, was released yesterday with Senator FERGUSON'S consent in the midst of a sharp Republican scuffle over President Eisenhower's nomination of Bohlen to the Moscow post. Bohlen is slated to return for further questioning by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Tuesday. FERGUSON said he wants to question Bohlen further about his participation in the Yalta Conference, where he served as a Russian-language interpreter for President Roosevelt.

FERGUSON emphasized he has taken no position up to now on the Bohlen nomination.

Bohlen, counselor of the State Department and one of its leading experts on Russia, has been criticized by some Republican Senators, notably STYLES BRIDGES of New Hampshire and JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY of Wisconsin, on the ground that his association with former Secretary of State Dean Acheson made him a defender of the Democratic administration's foreign policies. BRIDGES reported some high officials in the Eisenhower administration have been urged to persuade the President to withdraw the nomination. But he indicated yesterday he would make no such recommendation to Mr. Eisenhower at Monday's White House meeting of congressional leaders unless asked for his views.

Majority Leader ROBERT A. TAFT of Ohio, who has supported the Bohlen nomination from the outset, said he wouldn't raise the question of withdrawing it in the Monday conference with Mr. Eisenhower.

FERGUSON said he feels the State Department should reclassify a "top secret" text of a message sent in 1944 to President Roosevelt so that Bohlen can be quizzed about it. The message was sent from Moscow, December 14, 1944, by W. Averell Harriman, then Ambassador to Russia.

Grew's letter to FERGUSON also undertook to remove the impression given in a passage in the diary of the late Defense Secretary James V. Forrestal that Bohlen was one of a group which opposed ending the war with Japan before Russia could get into the war in the Pacific.

His letter called FERGUSON'S attention to a chapter in Grew's book, Turbulent Era, dealing with the surrender of Japan.

The cited chapter described Grew's efforts as Acting Secretary of State in May 1945 to persuade President Truman to issue a statement then that would encourage the Japanese to quit fighting by assuring them they could surrender and retain their Emperor.

In answer to a specific question from FERGUSON, Grew said he had no recollection of Bohlen ever opposing a surrender invitation to Japan before Russia could enter the Pacific war.

Forrestal in his diary entry for July 6, 1945, wrote that Grew was afraid that the proposed Presidential message to Japan "would be ditched on the way over to the Potsdam Conference by people who accompany the President—Bohlen among others—who reflect the view that we cannot afford to hold out any clarification of the terms to Japan which could be construed as a desire to get the Japanese war over with before Russia has an opportunity to enter."

Last night Grew had this to say in addition to his letter to FERGUSON:

"A careful reading of Forrestal's comment (on page 74 of his diaries) would indicate that the comment about Bohlen, which is between dashes, might well have been a side comment on the part of Forrestal himself, not necesarily attributed to me. Certainly I have no recollection of having mentioned Bohlen's name in that connection."

In his letter to FERGUSON, Bohlen summarized the issue raised by the Forrestal diary this way: "It is quite possible that I expressed to Forrestal my fear that the proposed Potsdam Proclamation to Japan would be ditched by people who accompanied the President to the Potsdam Conference. I have no recollection whatever of having mentioned Bohlen in this connection. Frankly, I do not now remember * * * just what position Bohlen took on the point at issue. Bohlen was formerly a member of my staff at Tokyo (when Grew was Ambassador) and I had and have a very high opinion of his ability."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield; but, first let me suggest that I think the Senator from Illinois is a fairly good security risk, and I think he should be allowed to see the letter, so that there may be no question about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Wisconsin is suggesting that my veracity should be questioned on the floor of the Senate. Let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that this is the first time that has happened. I happen to be acting as majority leader. I am serving as chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, and I would not misrepresent to the Senate the facts which I have endeavored in all conscience to obtain, and which I have presented to the Senate in order to clear what may have been a very honest difference of opinion. If the Senator from Wisconsin thinks it is necessary for the Senator from Illinois to verify what I have told the Senate, he is welcome to do so. However, I undertook the responsibility of assuring Mr. Dulles that this information would be treated as security information; but, of course, if the Senator from Illinois has any doubt as to what I have said, or if any other Senator has any doubt, I

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

shall be glad to allow such Senators to examine the information in my possession.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my friend from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The Senator from California need not become so excited. This is a matter of great importance. The Senator from California has a letter. I have no idea what is in the letter. I do not doubt that the Senator from California has told us the truth. There can be no question about that. I have great respect for the Senator from California. I think he is one of our most able Senators.

Nevertheless, we have a conflicting picture, one in which the Secretary of State says that three men unanimously endorsed Mr. Bohlen. One of the three talked with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and said, "That is not true." Under the circumstances, while I have no doubt whatever about what the Senator from California has said, I can see no reason on earth why the Senator from Illinois should not know all about what is in the letter, so that we may have the entire picture.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for and confidence in the Senator from California. I have no desire to see the letter. I am only too delighted to take his word for it. But here is a rather interesting conflict which somewhow brings in all the aspects of a mystery thriller.

I talked with Hugh Gibson 30 minutes ago in his apartment at the Mayflower Hotel. In all grace and kindliness he disclaimed that he ever concurred in the recommendation. At the same time he expressed his complete good faith in the Secretary of State. So do I. The Secretary of State is a much harassed man, with a very difficult job at the present time. On the other hand, we have a very sharp conflict of testimony. It does seem to me that the question should be resolved and that we ought to know just exactly what the situation is. So I find myself in a frame of doubt at the present time. It is a matter of transcendent importance.

Mr. President, I am one of those who traveled over the country and addressed great gatherings of people in the interest of party victory, belabored the Yalta agreement, addressed myself assiduously to the 1,100-page document known as the China white paper, and sought always to gain authentic information for the edification and persuasion of the people of the United States in an hour of political contest.

I seek light on this subject. I want to be sure that the man who is to represent us at Moscow is one in whom the people of the Nation and the Senate can have abiding confidence. After all, it is our responsibility. He will not go to Moscow unless we confirm his nomination. So the final responsibility rests with this body.

I think it is rather unfortunate that this controversy should have arisen. I have no doubt that our friends on the other side of the aisle are enjoying it hugely. [Laughter.] I think the matter should be amicably resolved. On the other hand, I am determined, for myself, to make sure that I have all the facts before me and that I can justify what I do with at least one segment of the Nation, consisting of about 9 million people, who are encompassed within the boundaries of the great State of Illinois. I have a particular responsibility to them, and I expect to fulfill it as best I can.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from California if he would describe more fully the contents of the letter and state whether he knows that the memorandum is a part of the letter, and whether he could give us a more complete picture of the situation. As of now, we know there is a letter which is signed by Mr. Gibson. We know that he has stated he did not recommend Mr. Bohlen. I want to make sure that the document is a part of the letter, by reference or otherwise. I do not question the word of the Senator from California. I merely want to have the complete picture of the letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from California for that purpose?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say to the Senator from Wisconsin is that the information was turned over to me under the restrictions I mentioned. I do not feel at liberty to detail any of the paragraphs in the letter, because there is a great deal of information in it regarding the appointment of potential ambassadors to various countries which might be of value to someone, or might be very embarrassing if some changes were made.

All I can say is that the letter, which is what purports to be a letter over the signature of three persons, is labeled "Memorandum to the Secretary. From Messrs. Grew, Gibson, and Armour." It contains several paragraphs, in which there are lists of various people and recommendations. Attached to the letter is a list of a considerable number of assignments, some of which, from rapidly going through them, I recognize as having already been made since the new administration has taken office.

As I turn alphabetically to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the name of Charles Bohlen is included in this rather long list which I should say includes perhaps 30 or 40 assignments.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I ask the Senator from California whether, from a reading of the letter, he is personally convinced—forgetting now what Mr. Dulles told the Senator—that that document was attached to and made a part of the correspondence?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin that unless by deceit or fraud or otherwise one list of names had been deliberately substituted for another list, I believe that it is a part of the letter to which I have referred.

So far as I can see, the list was not stapled to the letter. The list was not included in the body of the letter. What it appears to be is a list which I might call an appendix, which was sent along presumably with the letter which was addressed to Mr. Dulles.

I cannot testify as to the authenticity of the signatures. I do not know whether in the operations of this committee of three they might have met and discussed a great many of these things. Mr. Gibson might have become sick. He might have authorized his colleagues to act in his stead. Sometimes in committees of the Senate a Senator will leave a proxy with the chairman. I do not know whether that is involved in this situation. The only reason I thought it was necessary that the subject be cleared up was that it should be made manifest that the distinguished chairman of the committee had ample reason in his speech to say what he said. Furthermore, I wanted to be sure that the Senate clearly understood that, inadvertently or otherwise, Mr. Dulles had not made a misstatement of fact. All I am saying is that, based on this letter and the attached memorandum which came to Mr. Dulles, he was amply justified in testifying as he did before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Insofar as one individual Senator could do so, within a matter of minutes on the floor of the Senate, I have endeavored to give what I think is the best source in order to bring the facts to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that I do not at all question the honesty or truthfulness of Mr. Dulles. I believe he told the committee that he thought these three men had unanimously endorsed Mr. Bohlen. We do have a letter, with a document attached to it. We do know that many of Mr. Acheson's lieutenants are still in the State Department. I should like to know whether the Senator from California, forgetting about his reliance upon anything Mr. Dulles told him, by looking at the letter can tell us that the endorsement of Bohlen was attached to the letter. First of all, I understand that Mr. Gibson did not sign any letter in which Bohlen's name was mentioned.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Secondly, I understand that he did not sign any document.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Apparently none of them did; but all of them, Mr. Grew, Mr. Armour, and Mr. Gibson, signed the same letter.

Mr. McCARTHY. Could the Senator from California, without violating his agreement with Mr. Dulles, read the part of the letter which refers to the attached document on which Mr. Bohlen's name is listed? If the Senator feels he cannot do it I will not insist.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I would not feel at liberty to do so, because at the top in pencil is inscribed: "Secret Security File." I would not feel that I had the authority at this time to read from a paragraph of the letter. The Senator, with his experience in the Marine Corps, knows, as those of us who served in other branches of the armed services know, that if a document is classified all the material contained in it is classified.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to ask one more question of

the Senator from California. In view of Mr. Gibson's statement to the Senator from Illinois that he did not endorse Mr. Bohlen, in view of the fact that there is nothing in the letter to indicate that he did endorse him, except the typewritten sheet attached to it, and in view of the fact that apparently Mr. Dulles relied upon what he thought was the unanimous endorsement of apparently three outstanding men, does not the Senator from California believe that before a vote is taken on the nomination he should check to find out whether Mr. Grew and the other gentlemen endorsed Mr. Bohlen, whether Mr. Gibson knows about the list, and what all the circumstances are?

I think it is very important. As I say, I do not question the Senator's right to take the position he has taken. I certainly do not question his interpretation of the letter. But it has now been established regardless of whether Mr. Gibson knew of the list on which Mr. Bohlen's name appears, that Mr. Gibson has stated, "I did not endorse Bohlen."

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I can say is that Mr. Dulles, the Secretary of State, or any other responsible official of the State Department, receiving this letter with the information it contains and the document attached to it, would have every reason to believe that the letter and the document were tied together.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me ask the Senator a further question. In view of the positive statement of Mr. Gibson that he did not endorse Mr. Bohlen, and the positive statement on the part of Mr. Dulles that Mr. Gibson did, plus this document which in itself means nothing unless we can establish that it was originally attached to the letter, does not the Senator from California think that before a vote is forced—and I know the Senator from California can force a vote, he has the votes to do it—he should assign himself the task of contacting Joseph Grew and asking him about the matter?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am sure Mr. Dulles will be as interested in running down this situation as any Senator will be.

Speaking as one United States Senator, let me say that when a nomination comes from the President of the United States and goes to the desk of the President of the Senate, and bears the signature "Dwight D. Eisenhower," I do not want to have to call in a handwriting expert to see whether it is the signature of Dwight Eisenhower. When a letter comes to the Senate from the Department of State, from a responsible officer of that Department, I do not want to have to call in a handwriting expert to determine whether a forgery has been committed. If we have so destroyed confidence in men who have been selected to hold high places in the Government of the United States, God help us; God help us if that is the basis upon which we have to operate.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from California that apparently I conceive my duty as a Senator of the United States in a somewhat different light than does the Senator from California. When the Senate is charged with the obligation of confirming or rejecting the nomination of a certain person, I think we should run down all the information about that person we can before we vote to confirm the nomination.

The mere fact that Dwight Eisenhower nominates Bohlen does not, to me, mean that we should blindly confirm the nomination. If that were true, there would be no reason for providing for confirmation by the Senate.

The Senator from California spoke about getting a handwriting expert. We have the positive testimony of a very reputable man, Mr. Gibson, who says he had nothing to do with approving the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen. Mr. Gibson said he met Bohlen only once, and that he knows nothing about him.

It has been urged upon the Senate that the Senate should confirm the nomination of Bohlen because Mr. Gibson and the other two gentlemen unanimously picked Bohlen and approved him. It is now clear that any such approval was not unanimous.

If I were in the position of the Senator from California, I would not endorse Bohlen and would not vote for confirmation of his nomination until I found what was rotten in Denmark and ascertained whether a certain signature was bad, and all else about this matter. I do not think that this is an incorrect attitude to take in the case of the nomination of a man who would be sent as our Ambassador to Moscow, a most responsible post—a man who for 26 years has not once raised his voice against communism.

I do not think this is a time for levity. I take my position on this matter very seriously.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call for order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair respectfully states that no applause or indications of approval or disapproval are allowed in the Senate Chamber.

The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator from California knows that I have not suggested that a handwriting expert be called to identify the signature of Dwight Eisenhower. I campaigned more for Dwight Eisenhower than perhaps any other Senator in this Chamber did. I would campaign for him again. I think his batting average is extremely high. I think he will bring more order out of the chaos we have had in the past than could anyone else we have seen for a long time. However, when Dwight Eisenhower nominates a man who I think is not suited for appointment, I will fight that nomination with all the power and strength I have; and I hope the Senator from California will not indulge in levity about this matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have not indulged in levity. I think this is a very serious situation. But I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that Senators can honestly differ on this floor, and that is a proper procedure in the Senate of the United States.

However, the interest in the security of our country of Senators whose vote on this matter may be contrary to that of the Senator from Wisconsin is no less than his; and our devotion to our country is no less than his. If we also feel that serious issues of policy are here involved and if we also feel that we have an obligation to develop the facts, I think our obligation is no less than that of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me urge upon the Senator from California, in whom I have great confidence and who I think is one of the most able Members of this body, that I believe the request I make of him is a reasonable one, namely, that he take it upon himself to check with the other two members of the three-man committee, and find out what they have to say about this nomination. I think we should know that before we vote on the question of confirmation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me, in order that I may ask several questions of the Senator from California, if it is understood that the Senator from Wisconsin will not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. McCARTHY. With that understanding, I am glad to yield, of course.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask my good friend, the Senator from California, several questions by way of identifying the incorporation by reference, if any, of the memorandum in the body of the letter. I appreciate the fact that the Senator from California does not feel free to read from the body of the letter, but I think we can accomplish the same objective and can obtain the same information for the benefit of the Senate if the Senator from California will answer the following questions:

First, does the Senator from California now state to the Senate that in the body of the letter there is a reference, by the signatories thereto, to a memorandum attached thereto?

Mr. KNOWLAND. To the best of the knowledge and belief of the Senator from California, that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Second, does the Senator from California now state to the Senate that in the body of the letter there is language which refers to the attached memorandum in such form that in the opinion of the Senator from California the only conclusion to be drawn from the letter is that the signatories unanimously recommend for foreign post the names of the men appearing in the memorandum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the way the Senator from California would interpret the letter, with the attached document.

Mr. MORSE. Third, is it now the statement of the Senator from California to the Senate that, on the basis of the language in the body of the letter referring to the attached memorandum and on the basis of the list of names on the attached memorandum, one of which

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

is the name of Charles Bohlen, assigned to the ambassadorship of Russia——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Recommended for it.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, recommended for the ambassadorship to Russia—is it the conclusion of the Senator from California that these signatories knowingly and intentionally endorsed Charles Bohlem for the ambassadorship to Russia?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that I would so interpret it. If the letter with the attached memorandum had come to the Senator from Oregon, I believe he would so interpret it. If the letter with the same attached memorandum came to the Secretary of State, I believe he would so interpret it.

If between the time when the letter was signed and the time when it was delivered to the Secretary of State, someone substituted, unbeknown to the men who signed the letter, a different list, of course that would present a different situation. But we have no evidence that that has been done, nor, I take it, does the Senator from Oregon have evidence that that has been done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that we do have evidence; we have the statement of Mr. Gibson that he had nothing to do with Mr. Bohlen.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON Previously the Senator from Wisconsin asked whether anyone had talked to Mr. Grew in regard to the statement which appears in the Forrestal diary. Now the matter of such an endorsement has been brought up again. Previously I read into the RECORD only a part of the letter which referred to the Forrestal diary. At this time I should like to read into the RECORD the remainder of the letter, because it may be pertinent at this point.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that should be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. The letter is dated March 12, 1953, and is on the letterhead of Joseph C. Grew, 2840 Woodland Drive, Washington 8, D. C. I read:

> Bohlen was formerly a member of my staff in Tokyo and I had and have a very high opinion of his ability. I doubt if any American Ambassador could accomplish much constructive work in Moscow just now, but I do think that Bohlen is the best possible man to have there at this critical time. He knows the Russians well and speaks the language thoroughly and I think we would make a great mistake to deprive ourselves of his expert service at this juncture no matter what phases his thinking may have passed through in light of other circumstances and other conditions in times past. There is no shadow of doubt in my mind that he is the right man and the best man for the job just now.
>
> With warm regards to you and Mrs. Ferguson,
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOE GREW.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator very much. I yield the floor.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have been waiting for about an hour. I do not think I can conclude my remarks by the time our distinguished majority leader desires to suspend the session for the day. But I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from New York to permit him to address the Senate upon the pending question, with the understanding that I shall have the floor at the next regular session of the Senate. The Senator from New York tells me he has a very brief speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho requests unanimous consent that he may yield to the junior Senator from New York to permit him to present a brief address, with the understanding that the Senator from Idaho shall have the floor when the Senate next convenes. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished Senator from New York how long his speech will take?

Mr. LEHMAN. Not over 10 minutes. It is a very brief statement.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Idaho is granted, and it is so ordered. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot finish the discussion this afternoon. Therefore, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York, I shall move an adjournment of the Senate until Friday next, at 12 o'clock.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I had not expected to speak on this nomination tonight. But, as I listened to the debate this afternoon, all the indignation which has been building up within me during the past weeks and months came out. What is happening today is incredible. But it is only a part of what has been happening for many months. From the Halls of Congress a poison has been spreading throughout our land.

The man whose confirmation as Ambassador to Russia is before us, Mr. Charles Bohlen, entered the United States Foreign Service as a young man. He has been in Government service for 26 years. During all that time he has served his country with great ability and with outstanding devotion.

Mr. President, during all those years there has never been a blemish on his record. There has never been any reflection on his loyalty, his integrity, or his character; and yet, on the basis of flimsy rumor, this fine public servant has in recent days been pilloried and assailed; his character has been placed under suspicion, and his usefulness in the service of his country, of course, has been tremendously lessened.

Mr. President, what has been attempted in the case of Mr. Bohlen is merely a pattern—the same pattern that has been followed against many other loyal, devoted, honest Americans. Some of them were thus attacked because they stood for progressive government—they were so-called New Dealers who were attacked because they were symbols of the recent past. Others were assaulted because they were convenient victims who could not fight back; and still others because they had criticized the attackers and had had the courage to fight for civil rights and the civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution which long have been the most treasured tradition of our American life. This weapon of smear and attack is being widely used to subvert the exercise of the rights of free speech, free assembly, and the free association of men and women in law-abiding activities. But what is particularly dangerous, Mr. President, this weapon is being currently used to fill men with fear and to make them afraid to oppose the viewpoint and even the slanders of certain self-appointed and self-designated defenders of the security of the United States.

I was very happy, indeed, to hear the distinguished majority leader report this morning that, when he sought to inspect the raw files of the FBI on Mr. Bohlen, he was told that such raw files were not shown to anyone. The majority leader received a summary of the FBI files on Mr. Bohlen, a summary whose accuracy was vouched for by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, and by others.

But I am glad the majority leader did not press his desire to inspect the raw files of the FBI. Those files obviously contained innumerable documents, many of anonymous character, hearsay, gossip, and pure rumor along with substantial material. The FBI should never show those raw files to anyone outside the executive branch of Government.

Mr. President, I understand that every communication received by the FBI is put into a file. I am glad to learn that the FBI has a policy of not turning over the raw files to any Member of Congress.

I am frank to say that I was disturbed and surprised when the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, stated today that he had received—I am not sure whether he said hundreds or scores or dozens of such files for his perusal. He expressed satisfaction, because they gave him happy Sunday reading. I do not want to misquote the Senator, but I believe those were the words he used.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I will yield if the Senator wants to correct what I have just said.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not say "happy" Sunday reading. If I wanted to have happy reading on Sunday, I would be reading my Bible.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then I shall withdraw the word "happy," but the description "Sunday reading" stands.

Mr. President, I do not think the raw files of the FBI should be Sunday reading for anyone who is not an authorized member of the executive department. I reflect on no one when I make the statement that those raw files should not be placed in the hands of anyone in the legislative branch of the Government. I repeat, that I reflect on no one when I say that no Member of Congress should have the right to inspect anonymous information or charges against any citizen of this country, gathered in the confidential files of the FBI or any other police agency.

Mr. President, I have heard men occupying very responsible positions in our Government complain that they could

not secure qualified subordinates to serve in their departments because of the low salaries paid to Government employees. I do not subscribe to that thesis. In past years many men and women have shown their willingness to make great personal and financial sacrifices in order to serve their country. But I know that there is now considerable difficulty in getting qualified men to serve. I think the explanation of that situation is quite obvious. I believe that what has happened in recent years has served to convince many decent, patriotic, loyal Americans that it would be making too great a sacrifice to subject themselves to vilification and to false accusations, frequently under the cloak of congressional immunity. Against all these things, Mr. President, they have no opportunity of defending themselves.

I think, Mr. President, we had a very, very clear example of such vilification in the speech of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] this afternoon, when he made incredible charges against a great American, Averell Harriman, whom the Senator from Wisconsin virtually accused of being disloyal to his country, and of being sympathetic to the Communist cause.

I repeat that Averell Harriman is a very great American. I know of no man who is more loyal or more devoted, or who has been more eager to serve his country, or who has been more effective in the service of his country than Averell Harriman. Yet these unfounded accusations by Senator McCARTHY lie against Averell Harriman today in the record of the United States Senate. I think it is an outrage.

I want to say to the Senate, Mr. President, that Averell Harriman is only one of many loyal Americans mentioned in the speech of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. None of these individuals have adequate means of defending themselves.

When I heard some of the names mentioned, I rose and asked to be permitted to interrogate the Senator from Wisconsin. Oh, no; that would not do; he was unwilling to subject himself to interrogation.

But, at this moment, Mr. President, I am going to confine myself to the case of Averell Harriman. There have been many quotations from the diary of the late Secretary of Defense Forrestal. I, too, want to quote from his diary. I shall quote Mr. Forrestal in high praise of Averell Harriman, in praise of Mr. Harriman for his deep insight and appreciation of the aggressive designs of Soviet Russia. My first quotation is a note from the Forrestal diary of April 20, 1945, when the European war was approaching its end. It is as follows:

I saw Averell Harriman, the American Ambassador to Russia, last night. He stated his strong apprehensions as to the future of our relations with Russia unless our entire attitude toward them became characterized by much greater firmness. • • • He said the outward thrust of communism was not dead, and that we might well have to face an ideological warfare just as vigorous as fascism or nazism.

The second quotation, Mr. President, which I shall read, is from a note from the Forrestal diary of May 11, 1945:

Harriman said he thought it was important that we determine our policy as to a strong or weak China; that if China continued weak, Russian influence would move in quickly and toward ultimate domination. He said there could be no illusion about anything such as a "free China" once the Russians got in; that the two or three hundred millions in that country would march when the Kremlin ordered.

Mr. President, this wise statesman, Mr. Averell Harriman, was warning us against Communist Russia long before some of the persons who are now attacking Harriman were at all aware that the Communist menace existed.

It is about time the American people called a halt to the unfounded, unfair, and vicious attacks on loyal and devoted men and women in this country, whether they be in public service or not—men and women who have been doing their full and unselfish duty toward their country and toward their fellow men.

Mr. President, all my life I have urged young people to go into the service of their Government. I did so because I thought there was no higher or more noble service one could render, save to defend his country on the field of battle, than to serve his country in peacetime.

I have never regretted leaving my own business 25 years ago to go into public service. So I have urged hundreds of young people to do the same.

But, Mr. President, I am beginning to wonder. I am beginning to doubt whether I any longer have the right to encourage men to go into public service when all they can expect to receive is calumny and accusations of treason if their honest opinions sometime later prove to have been incorrect. And they can be subjected to attack and vilification if they do something which is a bit unorthodox or which does not meet the views or standards of a small group of men who would mold every one in their narrow and reactionary image. They must know that these days public servants are subject to sweeping accusations and charges by those who would like to stifle all freedom of speech and freedom of thought.

Unless there is a change in the present climate, we shall have in the Government service none but persons who are willing to say "Yes" to anything. We shall have no one of courage. They will all be worried about what is going to happen 2 years, 5 years, or 10 years hence, when opinions expressed by them honestly, sincerely, and after careful thought may have been proved to have been unwise.

I want to believe in the public service. I want to believe in the fairness of those who are responsible for directing and supporting the public service. But I cannot help expressing my deep concern about what has been happening, and what is happening right now, about what happened today on the floor of the Senate, when men are blasted without chance of defense, without cause, and without justification. I think one of the greatest dangers confronting the American public today and one of the most frightening is that some men are trying to use the weapons of fear and terror upon other men, in order to break down their resistance, their will, and their courage to oppose.

I hope we shall find an answer to this question soon. It is not only the individuals who are victims of these procedures who suffer, but also the country as a whole.

I shall vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen because I think nothing has been shown save that he has been a loyal, honest, devoted, and good public servant of his country.

PROPOSED TIDELANDS LEGISLATION

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter I have written to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] concerning the tidelands issue, particularly with reference to the views of the Senator from Louisiana on the issue of the so-called Continental Shelf, which is not included in Senate Joint Resolution 13, which was introduced by the Senator from Florida and 39 other Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 20, 1953.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I regret that our efforts to pass tidelands legislation have taken an unfortunate turn which now threatens to prevent the passage of any such legislation during this Congress. I am referring to the insistence on the part of the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior that a quitclaim bill should include a so-called title III, placing all jurisdiction, control, taxing power, and police power in the Federal Government and denying any right or consideration whatsoever to the States beyond their historic boundaries. You know, of course, that previous tidelands bills either completely eliminated any reference to the Continental Shelf or provided that the States would have police power, taxing power, and 37½ percent of all bonuses, rentals, and royalties derived from the oil production on the Continental Shelf beyond their historic boundaries.

The present administration proposal is diametrically opposed to the position taken by the House of Representatives on two previous occasions. It is diametrically opposed to the traditional policy of this Nation insofar as public lands are concerned.

The production of offshore oil does not partake of the nature of marine travel on the high seas, nor that of commercial fishing. I am enclosing a copy of a pamphlet published by one of the leading oil companies presently engaged in the exploration of offshore oil in the Gulf of Mexico. This pamphlet demonstrates the great use of manpower which must necessarily come from the adjacent States. Most important of all, it demonstrates the enormous cost of drilling wells in the open sea. It also demonstrates the amphibious nature of the operation. It shows, for example, that a drilling operation in the sea entails vast quantities of supplies stacked on land nearby. It entails tank farms for fresh water to support the drilling opera-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tion and for the storage of oil ashore after successful exploration. It demonstrates the need of a fleet of trucks and automobiles on shore to support the operation. This publication also shows the need of ships and small boats working back and forth between the shore and the operation, and indicates in some small measure the extent to which the local economy ashore must support all of these operations.

On the average there are 200 men directly engaged in locating and drilling a single well. This number rapidly multiplies as further operations are undertaken. Our State governments have an obligation toward such men. We should supply the courts for adjudication of differences that arise among them. This is far preferable to a court organized and appointed by a Federal dictator at additional expense. There should be a body of law to administer for domestic affairs. This body of law should be one enacted by a representative government in which these steadily increasing numbers of men will have the right to participate, rather than a Federal administrator. There should be the power to administer local jurisdiction, such as the power of service of process upon a law violator.

I submit that it is more simple and in keeping with our process of government that the local sheriff should take a small boat to a drilling rig to subpena a husband who refuses to support his destitute wife and children than it would be to use the extradition process to compel a citizen to return from a Federal territory. If a man is fired, he should have the benefit of unemployment compensation, provided by State law, rather than enacting a Federal body of law for this limited purpose or setting up a Federal bureaucrat to proclaim edicts that might suit his purposes, with expensive administrative agencies to administer such edicts.

Most States provide certain measures of hospitalization for the security of certain of their citizens in the event of sickness, both physical and mental. It is appropriate that the State services should be available to the men who would develop our offshore resources. Someone should undertake the burden of requiring workmen's compensation for an injured workman, and it should properly be under a body of law enacted by representative domestic government at the State level.

It is the State that must undertake to educate all of their children, to provide police protection, to provide for their health and sanitation, to care for the indigent, to provide all of the various welfare services which are becoming increasingly burdensome. It is the State which must in many instances care for their aged parents to whom these men owe support, and it is the local government which must provide the innumerable services that so many of us have taken for granted.

All of these considerations are of little concern to the National Government more than a thousand miles away. They are of vital concern in the immediate locality. The votes of these men are insignificant in affecting the outcome of a nationwide election. They are enormously important and perhaps decisive in local and State elections. Thus, the voice of these citizens in influencing their own destiny would necessarily be loud in local affairs, while it would partake of the nature of an unheard whisper in the nationwide picture. In communities of my State, such as Morgan City, Golden Meadow, Lake Charles, Grand Isle, Buras, and even New Orleans, the interest in orderly and proper administration of this area will be extremely high. In Chicago, Ill., or New York City, perhaps no one will know that it is even going on.

It is such consideration as these that have so clearly proved in Western States that the States should exercise police power over vast expanses of federally owned lands in those areas. It is considerations such as I have here outlined that have convinced our National Government that the boundaries of the United States should be identical with the boundaries of the States.

The historic policy of this Nation has been to permit the States to receive 37½ percent of all revenues derived from mineral production on Federal lands within their borders. Another 52½ percent has gone to the reclamation fund and 10 percent to administration. Thus, it has been the policy that revenues from mineral production on Federal lands have been directed to the support of the local governments and to the further development of such lands. The 37½ percent has been based upon the theory that the States, having the burden to provide local services of government to the citizens who worked on those properties should receive revenue to support those services and generally to help develop those States where the revenue was produced. Accordingly even those who propose that the Federal Government should own the submerged lands within the 3-mile limit have never gone so far in their demands as to propose that the Federal Government should receive all the revenue. If the principle is accepted that these lands be regarded as a part of the State for purposes of police power and administration of the needs of the people in those areas, then it is obvious that the same considerations that have caused the States to derive almost the entire benefit of revenues produced on Federal lands within their boundaries come into play.

If the application of this principle would mean that Louisiana and Texas would be enriched beyond reason, I for one would not insist upon it. On the other hand, short of demonstrating that the States would be compensated beyond reason for the services that they perform for their citizens, there is no basis for limiting the income that the States would receive from such lands.

The alternative to permitting the States to share in the revenues produced from such land will inevitably lead to further impoverishment of State government and the further need of Federal aid. Eventually those of us who desire to support the rights of the States having been reduced to a stature where we must seek Federal aid on every turn could ourselves be receptive listeners to those who suggest that we take the revenues of other States for "all the people" of the Nation.

I would be the first to agree that some of the points discussed in this letter may be before you for the first time. For that reason, I would be entirely willing to leave the entire question of the outer Continental Shelf for an immediate study of the Congress, while we passed the Holland bill which has been thrice passed by the Congress, a bill which the President repeatedly stated he would sign.

I hope that you will join with me in limiting our bill to the sound constitutional principles embodied in the Holland bill and reserve for the States the opportunity to make their case for police power, taxing power, and a share in the revenues of offshore submerged lands on the outer Continental Shelf, rather than support some unconsidered, illogical scheme of expanded Federal powers out of keeping with the traditions of this Nation.

With every good wish, I am;

Sincerely yours,

RUSSELL B. LONG.

LIMITATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORTS

As in legislative session,

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on February 27 I introduced a bill to place a quota limitation on imports of residual fuel oil. I pointed out that the prevailing policy, which places no restriction whatsoever on the amount of this surplus waste oil that may be brought into this country from foreign refineries, is contrary to the basic concept of the Trade Agreements Act, in that it tolerates continuing injury to the American coal industry and to other segments of the domestic economy. Statistics were presented as evidence of foreign residual oil's usurpation of coal's markets and the consequent decline in coal production, with growing unemployment in mining, railroading, and allied industries.

The 129 million barrels of residual oil imported into the United States in 1952 were sufficient to displace 31 million tons of coal. In the first 2 months of 1953, residual oil was imported into this country at the rate of about 470,000 barrels per day, which in a year would amount to the equivalent of more than 41 million tons of coal. That figure is some 9 percent of the total production of bituminous coal for the full 12 months of 1952. Unless this Congress acts without delay to remedy the situation, the coal industry simply cannot uphold its end of the economic structure, nor can it be in a state of readiness for its part in an all-out militarization program that would be necessary for the security of the Nation. Coal mines were hit hard by the record amount of residual imports that flooded east coast fuel markets in 1952, but many of the principal victims held out in hopes that some adjustment would be forthcoming. Now that the destructive momentum of the inflow is being widened by ever-increasing torrents, even the stronger mines are finding it impossible to hold out much longer. Each week brings news of more shutdowns, more layoffs. Production in some of the great coal fields in my home State of Kentucky has dropped off by as much as 25 percent under the corresponding period of last year. In the first 31 days of this year the shipping mines of our neighboring State of Illinois experienced a drop of 18 percent. These are by no means isolated cases. The coal areas of West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and other producing States also report increasing losses.

It is true that there are other factors detrimentally affecting coal's position, yet it is doubtful that coal output for 1953 would drop a single ton under last year's production if this domestic fuel were serving in place of the foreign residual oil usurping coal's markets at the present time. Railroad consumption of coal has continued downward with the increasing number of diesel-electric locomotives that are put into service; but the railroad industry still takes in the neighborhood of 40 million tons of bituminous coal per year. Even this traditionally great coal market, however, does not equal the tonnage currently being displaced by the inflow of foreign residual oil. The retail market has felt the effects of the spreading network of pipelines that carry natural gas to many sections of the country which were once exclusive coal customers; but coal is still used in approximately 14 million dwellings in the United States. Exports of coal to European countries are on the decline as British and continental mines strive to push

production schedules as high as possible; but in only 4 other years were exports higher than they are at the present time.

Offsetting the downward trend in these markets, the steel industry in this country used more coal in January and February than ever before, and an all-time record is almost certain to be set by year's end. The same is true for the chemical industry, which is using more coal in each succeeding year. And the same report would be applicable to the electric utilities were it not for the unfair competition of the residual oil from abroad. Coal has always been the principal source of electric power. In 1945 it was responsible for 81 percent of all the electricity generated by fuels. At that time oil's share was 5 percent. But in 1951, the last year for which complete records are available, coal produced only 68 percent of the total—a decline of 13 percentage points—while oil had more than doubled its 1945 percentage. Oil's gains at the expense of coal are considerably more pronounced in those States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean and which are immediately accessible to the tankers from South America.

Some significant examples in respect to individual States were presented in my discussion before the Senate last month, but perhaps these statistics for the Nation as a whole will serve to accentuate the deleterious impact of the imports on the economy of our coal industry. Coal began its drop and oil began its climb in the utilities market in 1946, the year that floods of foreign residual oil began to sweep into the eastern seaboard. The facts of the case—facts which must be recognized by this Congress—are that foreign residual oil can be and is being dumped into east-coast generating stations and into other heavy industrial plants at whatever price is necessary to deprive coal of that business.

The history of the fantastic fluctuations of foreign residual oil shows that since 1946 there has been a 64.4-percent price rise in light fuel oil at New York Harbor and a 70-percent rise in diesel oil; but for residual oil the increase has been a mere 13.6 percent. In fact, while light fuel oil is higher than at any other time during this period—save for a span in the latter part of last year—and diesel oil also holds at its top price, residual oil is now selling at one-third less than its previous high and far below the price level of the past 2 years. The answer, obviously, is that residual oil from foreign refineries is being dumped at whatever the market will bring, with no semblance of economic laws entering into the picture.

Not only is foreign residual oil produced without a cost tag, but it can be hauled in by the producers themselves without regard to actual transportation costs, or at rates that do not in any way conform to charges that are a prerequisite to the maintenance of wage levels established for our own maritime fleet. When oil is shipped from United States gulf ports to the Atlantic seaboard, the cargo must be carried in American vessels. But ships of any flag at all may be engaged in the transportation of oil from foreign ports. Cheap wages make for cheap haulage, but they are not in conformity with the high standards adopted in the United States and supposedly encouraged in our dealings with other nationalities. While a few underpaid foreign seamen are engaged in transporting the alien surplus fuel, American railroaders—like American coal miners—are being laid off because that alien fuel is going into the markets which they would normally serve.

Ocean transportation rates on residual oil from the Netherlands Antilles to ports north of Cape Hatteras dropped from $1.40 per barrel in January of last year to 43 cents in October—a drop of 69 percent at the same time that American railroads were being granted a general increase in freight rates. How can shippers afford to make such a reduction? Is it because of nonunion labor sailing under foreign flags? Or is it because the integrated oil companies are able to shift costs in such a way as to make shipping losses on residual oil chargeable to the profitable grades of petroleum products in this effort to establish an exclusive market for fuel on the east coast?

A mine union official has said that every time a quarter-million-ton tanker ties up at an American dock, it brings job discharges for 63 American miners for a full year. Thomas Kennedy, vice president of the United Mine Workers of America, realizing how foreign residual oil prices can be fixed to fit the circumstances, said recently that the coal industry could not compete with this surplus product from foreign refineries even if the miner worked for no wages at all. He referred to the flood of foreign residual oil as one of the greatest problems confronting the mining people and other residents of coal-producing areas.

Mr. Kennedy spoke at a meeting of the Foreign Oil Policy Committee held in Washington on March 4. That meeting was attended by management and labor representatives of anthracite, bituminous coal, domestic oil, railroads, and small business interests whose very livelihoods have been seriously affected by the floods of residual oil from abroad. The committee agreed unanimously that this excessive importation jeopardized both the military and domestic economy of the Nation, and that Congress should take action immediately to rectify the situation. I have pledged myself to assist in carrying out these objectives, and there has been encouraging response from other members of the Senate. I am certain that a growing number of my distinguished colleagues will join in formulating remedial legislation, particularly after the detrimental impact of the imports is more fully understood.

The tables which I presented to the Senate on February 27 offered undeniable statistical evidence of how much miners and railroad workers are losing in wages. The 1952 losses to coal miners suffered at the hands of the oil importers came to more than $77 million. For railroaders, the loss aggregated more than $43 million. And the gross deficit sustained by the bituminous coal industry was some 152 million American dollars.

I submit that it is inane to permit a foreign waste product to sabotage an industry upon which we must depend so heavily for future fuel supplies. That our domestic supplies of petroleum and natural gas will become increasingly scarce in the years ahead is no longer hypothetical. Proved petroleum reserves are estimated at 30 million barrels, or a 15-year supply at present rate of production. There are evidences of additional reserves that will undoubtedly extend the period of availability, but manifestly the long-range future of our domestic supplies of oil is surrounded with uncertainties. Proved natural gas reserves measure 180 trillion cubic feet. Figured at last year's 8-trillion-cubic-foot rate of consumption, our supply would last a little more than 20 years. Undoubtedly there are other stores of recoverable reserves yet to be found, but how long they can replace the depleted reservoirs is problematical. Gas consumption—which has more than doubled in less than a decade—continues to increase at a spectacular rate.

Proponents of an oil-import program rest their case on the contention that the country needs outside petroleum sources to supplement its own production and reserves. The theory is that some imports will be required to supplement domestic oil production, at least until we are ready to—or forced to—make up for our petroleum deficits by producing gasoline and other products synthetically from coal. But there is no justification for admitting into this country a fuel that competes with coal on the pretense that there is a need for it. Our one-and-a-quarter-trillion-ton coal reserve would immediately dispute any such contention.

Strangely enough, however, it is not the petroleum products that we supposedly need which are being shipped into this country in such large quantities from foreign sources. About 98 percent of the crude from which our residual oil imports are derived currently comes from Venezuela, and most of it is processed in the Netherlands Antilles Islands of Aruba and Curacao. A Bureau of Mines breakdown of the total exports of these countries reveals the anomaly of the argument that our oil imports policy is coordinated with supplies needed.

In 1951 the United States took 48 percent of the residual oil imports from Venezuela and the Netherlands Antilles, but only 4 percent of all the other refined products. The 1951 statistics also indicate that for every barrel of gasoline or light heating oils produced for export in these South American countries, 1.7 barrels of the heavy residual oil are produced for export, and approximately one-half of the total output of this residue is dropped on the east coast of the United States in the heavy industrial fuel market. This market has thus become, to a marked degree, the dumping ground for the extraordinary output of this refinery byproduct.

A pertinent comment on the subject is contained in a recent letter to the chair-

man of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by J. Ed Warren, Deputy Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for Defense. Here is a quotation from that letter:

> While it would be contrary to the national interest to prohibit all petroleum imports, it would also be contrary to the national interest to encourage vast quantities of petroleum products without any restrictions and in unlimited quantities.

It is very definitely against the interest of the Nation as a whole as well as against the coal industry and its employees, the railroad industry and its employees, and the coal and shipping communities of Kentucky and other coal States. There can be no disputing the fact that the United States would find itself in a critically precarious position if it should suddenly become involved in an all-out war and the coal industry had meanwhile deteriorated to a point where it lacked facilities and manpower to meet accelerated demands. From 1938—the year preceding the outbreak of World War II—through 1944, America's bituminous coal requirements increased by 75 percent. Had the industry been unable to supply these needs, there is no telling how long victory for the Allies would have been delayed, for coal is a necessary ingredient in the making of steel and is the base material for many of our explosives, in addition to performing its customary functions as a source of heat and power. Fortunately, in the last war, time was on our side, and the coal industry had ample opportunity to expand capacity. Kentucky mines, for instance, had produced 38½ million tons of coal in 1938; in 1945 the figure was 69½ million. But if today's fighting in Korea is extended, or if one of the many hostile incidents taking place in and over West Germany should erupt into international conflict, it is extremely doubtful that we would be given a 7-year respite to launch our major campaigns.

Obviously the coal industry must be maintained on an alert basis for any emergency. Yet this Government, in failing to protect this vital industry from the inequitable competition of foreign residual oil, disregards the policy recommendations of several defense agencies.

Looking back to the early part of the Korean conflict, we find that several Government agencies, understanding the necessity of taking extraordinary precautions to guarantee America's fuel supply, issued directives calling attention to prevailing and projected conditions in this regard. Dr. Arno C. Fieldner, chief fuels technologist at the United States Bureau of Mines, cautioned that another war would create a petroleum shortage and necessite numerous conversions to coal in both industrial and domestic use. He pointed out that the coal industry, then producing at a per annum rate of about 500 million tons, would have to be capable of taking on a 50 percent overload in time of emergency.

The National Securities Resources Board warned the country's railroads that a large number of coal-burning steam locomotives should be kept in readiness for service in the event of war.

The Munitions Board, in a memorandum to the Department of Defense, recommended that because of the extraordinary demands of the war economy for oil and gas, coal should be used in preference to other fuel by military installations and military-sponsored industrial facilities.

But even if, as we all hope and pray, the United States is successful in avoiding another world war, there is still ample reason for insisting that the industry remain healthy and capable of greatly expanding production in order to fulfill its peacetime duties.

Long-term fuel studies published in recent months predict an era of unprecedented gains in demand for coal in the years ahead. Most fuel experts are agreed that the level of consumption will reach the 800 million mark by 1975—a 70-percent increase over last year. Others, looking still further ahead, foresee that by the close of the century the Nation will be drawing on bituminous coal at the rate of 2½ billion tons per year to meet energy needs.

To enable the coal industry to carry the major burden of supplying projected energy demands of the Nation in the ensuing years, there will—in the next two decades—be need for about 700 million tons of new annual capacity, of which 300 million tons will be to replace output of mines depleted or economically unsound. To develop this capacity will require an investment of $7 to $10 billion.

These figures have been based on the theory that in the interim years the coal industry will be able to conduct its business in open markets without hindrance of unfair competition from a surplus foreign waste product. Unless the industry is given this opportunity, not only will mines now being flooded by foreign oil greatly augment the amount of needed new annual capacity, but lost markets will result in the weakening of the industry's financial standing to such an extent that capital will not be available for the required investments. And a discouraged and impoverished labor force will have been forced to leave the coal fields because their jobs were washed away by the tide of residual oil imports.

I ask the Senate to protect American labor and to safeguard our fuel supply by enacting S. 1092, thereby limiting residual oil imports to 5 percent of the total domestic demand for residual oil in the corresponding calendar quarter of the preceding year. Unless the prevailing unfair condition is checked, the inflow may be steadily increased until the last ton of industrial coal has been displaced in east coast markets.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter S. Robertson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Ford Q. Elvidge of Washington, to be Governor of Guam.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as in executive session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned until Friday, March 27, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 25, 1953:

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Samuel Spencer, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of section 224, the Armed Forces Reserve Act (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.), which provides that commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps on July 9, 1952, who agree in writing to have their current appointment continued for an indefinite term will be given an appointment for an indefinite term in lieu of their current 5-year appointments:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, O101888.
Maj. Gen. Edward Sedley Bres, O121208.
Maj. Gen. Arthur Hazelton Carter, O140789.
Maj. Gen. James Bell Cress, O138001.
Maj. Gen. William Joseph Donovan, O102383.
Maj. Gen. William Henry Draper, Jr., O148333.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Francis Farrell, O227201.
Maj. Gen. Carl Raymond Gray, Jr., O129452.
Maj. Gen. Patrick Jay Hurley, O165692.
Maj. Gen. Ralph Maxwell Immell, O156458.
Maj. Gen. Harry Hubbard Johnson, O172820.
Maj. Gen. Frank Edward Lowe, O170395.
Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, O106101.
Maj. Gen. Edward White Smith, O129155.
Maj. Gen. Leif John Sverdrup, O129029.
Maj. Gen. Harry Hawkins Vaughan, O205101.
Maj. Gen. John Francis Williams, O176690.
Maj. Gen. Robert Wilbar Wilson, O233644.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Donald Bennett Adams, O167951.
Brig. Gen. Wayne Russell Allen, O171232.
Brig. Gen. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452.
Brig. Gen. Hugh Barclay, O402854.
Brig. Gen. Frank Frederick Bell, O173171.
Brig. Gen. Frank Brown Berry, O166083.
Brig. Gen. Carroll Owen Bickelhaupt, O165181.
Brig. Gen. Ralph Gates Boyd, O208104.
Brig. Gen. Clarence Lemar Burpee, O423085.
Brig. Gen. Robert West Chamberlin, O279810.
Brig. Gen. Edwin Norman Clark, O397337.

Brig. Gen. Robert Hunter Clarkson, O495357.
Brig. Gen. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., O223635.
Brig. Gen. James Alexander Crothers, O189962.
Brig. Gen. Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr., O234688.
Brig. Gen. Carlton Spencer Dargusch, O246180.
Brig. Gen. Robert Charles Dean, O327502.
Brig. Gen. John Ross Delafield, O134416.
Brig. Gen. Brice Pursell Disque, O164274.
Brig. Gen. Georges Frederic Doriot, O423479.
Brig. Gen. Henry Russell Drowne, Jr., O136725.
Brig. Gen. John Bettes Dunlap, O301107.
Brig. Gen. Ken Reed Dyke, O510143.
Brig. Gen. Daniel Collier Elkin, O397970.
Brig. Gen. Edward Arthur Evans, O122172.
Brig. Gen. Charles Birdsall Ferris, O213192.
Brig. Gen. Charles Lyn Fox, O154765.
Brig. Gen. James Calvin Frank, O289883.
Brig. Gen. Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304.
Brig. Gen. Robert Joshua Gill, O501560.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Rodman Goethals, O219439.
Brig. Gen. Harold Leroy Goss, O201505.
Brig. Gen. Edward Samuel Greenbaum, O132915.
Brig. Gen. Robert Dinwiddie Groves, O129915.
Brig. Gen. Clement Bates Ellery Harts, O241711.
Brig. Gen. Ernest Henry Hawkwood, O218920.
Brig. Gen. John David Higgins, O152349.
Brig. Gen. Maurice Hirsch, O554761.
Brig. Gen. Gordon Cloyd Hollar, O245649.
Brig. Gen. Julius Cecil Holmes, O107660.
Brig. Gen. Whitfield Jack, O267915.
Brig. Gen. Ephraim Franklin Jeffe, O138243.
Brig. Gen. William Rodes Jesse, O190287.
Brig. Gen. Bernhard Alfred Johnson, O166223.
Brig. Gen. Edwin Whiting Jones, O105161.
Brig. Gen. Kenneth Barnard Keating, O901848.
Brig. Gen. Henry Kirksey Kellogg, O286132.
Brig. Gen. Francis Rusher Kerr, O232181.
Brig. Gen. John Reed Kilpatrick, O167001.
Brig. Gen. Rudolph Charles Kuldell, O900427.
Brig. Gen. Norman Miller Lack, O163445.
Brig. Gen. Andrew Frank McIntyre, O271317.
Brig. Gen. Ralph Hendricks McKee, O234931.
Brig. Gen. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285.
Brig. Gen. Richard Leeson McNelly, O256304.
Brig. Gen. William Claire Menninger, O503932.
Brig. Gen. Hugh Meglone Milton II, O154541.
Brig. Gen. John Williams Morgan, O140899.
Brig. Gen. William Robert Clayton Morrison, O322448.
Brig. Gen. Harry Paul Newton, O123053.
Brig. Gen. Henry Carlton Newton, O104029.
Brig. Gen. John Joseph O'Brien, O430087.
Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, O199581.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Henry Osborn, O426878.
Brig. Gen. Ralph Albert Palladino, O232912.
Brig. Gen. Washington Platt, O139395.
Brig. Gen. Russell Archibald Ramsey, O215596.
Brig. Gen. Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, O399712.
Brig. Gen. Francis J. Reichmann, O219282.
Brig. Gen. Henry Joseph Reilly, O103718.
Brig. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Riter, O189468.
Brig. Gen. James Thomas Roberts, O220864.
Brig. Gen. Francis Willard Rollins, O165029.
Brig. Gen. Charles Eskridge Saltzman, O275984.
Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, O208338.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf, O190484.
Brig. Gen. Harry Hodges Semmes, O900733.
Brig. Gen. Henry Alden Shaw, O166022.
Brig. Gen. John Henry Sherburne, O156004.
Brig. Gen. Conrad Edwin Snow, O400511.
Brig. Gen. Oscar Nathaniel Solbert, O224371.
Brig. Gen. Albert Hummel Stackpole, O103158.
Brig. Gen. Carl Ferinand Steinhoff, O245045.
Brig. Gen. Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, O371507.
Brig. Gen. William Miles Stokes, Jr., O166391.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Smith Strong, Jr., O414433.
Brig. Gen. Carl Thomas Sutherland, O258676.
Brig. Gen. John Thomas Taylor, O114805.
Brig. Gen. Telford Taylor, O918566.
Brig. Gen. Samuel Morgan Thomas, O230963.
Brig. Gen. Lamar Tooze, O107927.
Brig. Gen. Kenneth Castle Townson, O163716.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Edison Troland, O115989.
Brig. Gen. Morris Carlton Troper, O902843.
Brig. Gen. Alfred Girard Tuckerman, O181648.
Brig. Gen. Elbert Parr Tuttle, O135785.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Harold Vreeland, Jr., O115042.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Marshall Warren, O266247.
Brig. Gen. Arthur Pope Watson, O181573.
Brig. Gen. Richard Seabury Whitcomb, O164276.
Brig. Gen. Lawrence Harley Whiting, O207522.
Brig. Gen. L. Kemper Williams, O125140.
Brig. Gen. William James Williamson, O911246.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Bayne Wilson, O900244.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose blessed Son identified for us the true way of life and always walked in it, inspire us daily with the urge, the faith, and the courage to follow and walk in that same way.

Grant that we may be ready to challenge, with the inexhaustible and invincible resources of Thy divine wisdom and strength, every difficult human problem which we may encounter.

May we be numbered among those courageous souls who fear man and circumstances and hard experiences so little because they fear God so much.

Show us how we may hasten the coming of that glorious day when every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that the Christ is the Lord to the glory of God. Give us the assurance that nothing can ever separate us from Thy love.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 23, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 14, 1953:

H. R. 2332. An act to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

On March 23, 1953:

H. R. 2466. An act to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (ch. 460, 64 Stat. 336), as amended, which authorizes free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MARCH 24, 1953.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on March 23, 1953, the Clerk yesterday received from the Secretary of the Senate a message reflecting the action taken by that body on the bill (H. R. 3053) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," and amendments thereto, which message is attached herewith.

Very truly yours,

LYLE O. SNADER,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3053) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments numbered 24 and 27; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate recedes from amendment numbered 33 to the above-entitled bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin; and

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, March 23, he signed the following enrolled bills of the House:

On March 23, 1953:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin.

On March 24, 1953:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganizations in the Department of Agriculture.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 is designed to make it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to simplify and improve the internal organization of the Department of Agriculture. It is substantially in accord with the recommendations made in 1949 by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

With certain exceptions, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 transfers to the Secretary of Agriculture the functions now vested by law in other officers, and in the agencies and employees, of the Department. It allows the Secretary to authorize any other officer, agency, or employee of the Department to perform any function vested in the Secretary. He is directed to utilize this delegation authority in such a way as to further certain objectives set forth in the reorganization plan. Those objectives are to simplify and make effective the operation of the Department of Agriculture, to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions. Further, to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary, he is required to give appropriate advance public notice and to afford appropriate opportunity for interested persons and groups to present to the Department of Agriculture their views on such proposed delegations of the Secretary as involve assignments of major functions or major groups of functions to major constituent organizational units of the Department or their officers.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 will permit the establishment of a clearer line of responsibility and authority from the President through the Secretary of Agriculture down to the lowest level of operations in the Department. It will make the Secretary responsible under law for activities within his Department for which he is now in fact held accountable by the President, the Congress, and the public. Also, it will enable the Secretary, from time to time, to adjust the organization of the Department in order to achieve continuous improvement in operations to meet changing conditions.

The Congress has in the past repeatedly followed the sound policy of vesting functions directly in department heads so that they can be held accountable for the performance of their agencies. In acting upon recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the Congress approved, in 1949 and 1950, a series of statutes and reorganization plans which applied that policy to all the executive departments except the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture. While some laws vest important functions directly in the Secretary of Agriculture, others place major functions in subordinate officers and agencies of the Department. By transferring to the Secretary the latter functions, with certain exceptions, the reorganization plan corrects the present patchwork assignment of statutory functions in the Department.

The functions excepted from transfer to the Secretary are the functions of hearing examiners under the Administrative Procedure Act; of the corporations of the Department, including their boards of directors and officers; of the Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and of the Farm Credit Administration and the banks, corporations, and associations supervised by it.

The exception of the hearing examiners is in accordance with the intent of the Administrative Procedure Act, and is consistent with the status of hearing examiners in other departments and agencies.

The corporations of the Department, together with their boards of directors and officers, are excepted because they have a different legal status than other constituent agencies of the Department. Bodies corporate have independent legal personalities and act in their own name rather than in the name of the Department of Agriculture or of the United States.

The same reasons which prompt the exception of the corporations of the Department make desirable the exception of the entities supervised by the Farm Credit Administration. The Farm Credit Administration itself is also excepted, since it is anticipated that general legislation covering this field will be recommended to the Congress.

The Department of Agriculture now has only one Assistant Secretary. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 provides the Secretary with two more Assistant Secretaries and an Administrative Assistant Secretary to aid him in supervising the Department. The Assistant Secretaries will be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrative Assistant Secretary will be appointed under the classified civil service by the Secretary, with the approval of the President. These methods of appointment are similar to those prevailing in other executive departments.

The Secretary will prescribe the functions to be performed by these new assistants. It is his intention to have the new Assistant Secretaries aid him in providing closer policy and program supervision over the Department of Agriculture, and to have the new Administrative Assistant Secretary perform substantially the same role as that performed by the Administrative Assistant Secretaries in other departments. Thus, the new officers will assist the Secretary in giving continuous attention to matters which are essential for the most efficient and economical operation of the Department.

The Secretary of Agriculture has advised me that the two new offices of Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and the one new office of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, provided for in the reorganization plan, will merely replace existing positions in the Department, and that hence the creation of these offices will not result in any net increase in the personnel in the Department of Agriculture. He has further advised me that both the number of officers and employees in the Office of the Secretary and the aggregate of their salaries will be less than those existing prior to January 1, 1953.

The Secretary of Agriculture, aided by the Interim Agricultural Advisory Committee, has been studying the organization and functions of the Department of Agriculture. Recently the Secretary rearranged the organizational units of the Department so as to form (in addition to the Office of the Solicitor and a reorganized Foreign Agricultural Service) four major groups of agencies, each with a supervising head to whom the agencies within the group report. By so doing, the Secretary sought both to reduce the number of separate officials reporting to him and to improve coordination within the Department. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 will make it possible for the Secretary to make further internal adjustments within the Department as study and experience identify opportunities for improvement. It will thus further the better management of the affairs of the Department of Agriculture.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I have found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of reorganizations made thereby, provisions for the appointment and compensation of two Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture and an Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

Reductions in expenditures will result from reorganizations of the Department of Agriculture made possible by the taking effect of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, but such reductions cannot be itemized at this time.

I recommend that the Congress allow the accompanying reorganization plan to become effective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1953.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1953

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, March 25, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Subject to the exceptions

specified in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture all functions not now vested in him of all other officers, and of all agencies and employees, of the Department of Agriculture.

(b) This section shall not apply to the functions vested by the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001 et seq.) in hearing examiners employed by the Department of Agriculture nor to the functions of (1) corporations of the Department of Agriculture, (2) the boards of directors and officers of such corporations, (3) the Advisory Board of the Commodity Credit Corporation, or (4) the Farm Credit Administration or any agency, officer, or entity of, under, or subject to the supervision of the said administration.

SEC. 2. Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture: Two additional Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each such Assistant Secretary shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, prescribe and each shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of executive departments.

SEC. 3. Administrative Assistant Secretary: An Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of Agriculture under the classified civil service, and shall perform such functions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, prescribe. The provisions of the item numbered (1) of the third proviso under the heading "General Provisions" appearing in Chapter XI of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, approved June 5, 1952 (66 Stat. 121), are hereby made applicable to the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 4. Delegation of functions: (a) The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of Agriculture of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

(b) To the extent that the carrying out of subsection (a) of this section involves the assignment of major functions or major groups of functions to major constituent organizational units of the Department of Agriculture, now or hereafter existing, or to the heads or other officers thereof, and to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary, he shall give appropriate advance public notice of delegations of functions proposed to be made by him and shall afford appropriate opportunity for interested persons and groups to place before the Department of Agriculture their views with respect to such proposed delegations.

(c) In carrying out subsection (a) of this section the Secretary shall seek to simplify and make efficient the operation of the Department of Agriculture, to place the administration of farm programs close to the State and local levels, and to adapt the administration of the programs of the Department to regional, State, and local conditions.

SEC. 5. Incidental transfers: The Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of Agriculture of any of the records, property, and personnel affected by this reorganization plan and such transfers of unexpended balances (available or to be made available for use in connection with any affected function or agency) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of such Department, as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this reorganization plan; but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made.

FLOOD DISASTER IN EUROPE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 24, 1953.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On February 12, 1953, the House considered and agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 "That the Congress on behalf of the people of the United States expresses its deep sympathy, affection, and concern for the peoples of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium, whose countries have been ravaged by disaster, its admiration for their courage in adversity, and its hope for the early restoration of their homes and livelihoods." At the direction of the Secretary of State, signed originals of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 were presented by the American Ambassadors at The Hague, London, and Brussels to the appropriate officials of the Governments of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium.

In response to the presentation of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 by the American Ambassador to the Netherlands, the President of the First Chamber of the Netherlands States General and the President of the Second Chamber of the Netherlands States General addressed to Ambassador Chapin a message of appreciation to be conveyed to the President of the United States Senate. A photostatic copy of this message is enclosed.

This message included the text of a resolution passed unanimously by the Second Chamber of the Netherlands States General expressing gratitude to all peoples who sent or offered their help to the Netherlands. The text of this resolution is also enclosed.

In response to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12, delivered to the United Kingdom by our Ambassador, the British Foreign Secretary wrote the American Ambassador the following letter:

"MY DEAR AMBASSADOR: My colleagues and I were deeply touched by the concurrent resolution of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, which you were kind enough to send me under cover of your letter of the 19th February.

"The sympathy of the Congress and the people of the United States not only reaffirms the strength of the ties which exist between our two nations, but is a strong comfort and consolation to my countrymen in this time of affliction.

"Yours sincerely,

"ANTHONY EDEN."

The delivery of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 12 by the American Ambassador in Brussels was responded to by the following letter from the Chief of Protocol of the Belgian Ministry Affairs:

"Mr. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of the document dated February 25, 1953, No. 793, by which Your Excellency transmitted a resolution voted by the Senate of the United States of America, expressing to the Belgian people the sympathy of the American people after the floods which have devastated the coasts of Belgium.

"I have forwarded this message to the President of the Chamber of Representatives, asking him to communicate it to his colleague of the Senate.

"Thanking Your Excellency for sending me this document, I take this occasion to renew the assurance of my highest consideration.

"MOUCHET BATTEFORT DE LAUBESPIN,
"The Chief of Protocol
"(For the Minister of Foreign Affairs)."

The Department is pleased to transmit these responses from the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and Belgium.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

(Enclosures: 1. Letter from Presidents of the First and Second Chambers of the Netherlands States General. 2. Resolution of thanks by the Second Chamber.)

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for 30 minutes tomorrow be transferred to Thursday, April 22, following any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that is designed to secure a dignified, adequate old-age pension for all of our elder citizens, and which will be uniform in all States. Every person who has been a citizen for 10 years or more, and has reached the age of 65 years will be qualified to receive a pension of $100 per month. It will operate on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Both political parties made the improvement of the Social Security Act a campaign issue. The Republicans in their platform made reference to a pay-as-you-go pension system. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee has said:

> It has been apparent for a long time that our social-security system has reeked with inadequacy and other faults. As I see it, we will have to come to a truly pay-as-you-go system, leading perhaps to a universal coverage.

Millions of people in the United States are still not covered under the Social Security Act. In fact only about 27 percent of persons aged 65 or over receive social-security pensions. The rest of them are either not qualified or prefer to keep on in the labor market. The number of our people over 65 is increasing. They are at an age where they cannot do much, if any, hard work, and are excluded from many types of employment. Yet they are expected to eke out a living on their present meager means. Actuarial findings of insurance companies indicate that out of 100 men at the age of 25 years, 54 of them at age 65 will be broke or dependent, and subject to privation and worry.

Our older citizens deserve our best consideration. We should provide an adequate national pension for them which will permit them to live their declining years with dignity and comfort. This they cannot do under present conditions

and most programs. Canada has adopted a national pension after years of consideration of the problem. Certainly we in the United States can be as forward looking.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 132d anniversary of Greek independence. That day in 1821, when the Greek people threw out the Turkish invaders, sounded the death knell of the Ottoman empire. By their bravery, the Greek people exposed the myth of Ottoman invincibility and, one by one, the nations of the Balkan Peninsula followed the example of their valiant neighbors and brought liberty back to that part of the globe.

As the news of the successful uprising in Greece spread throughout the world, it served as a source of inspiration to captive peoples everywhere. The revolutions that shook South America and forced the Spaniards to withdraw to their own land undoubtedly gained their impetus from the Greek war of liberation.

Greece, the birthplace of democracy, blazed the way for the 19th century movement toward the independence and the self-determination of peoples, as Greece has always led the crusade for freedom.

Since 436 B. C. when democratic Athens went to the aid of Corcyra, to our own day when Greek troops are fighting against the Communist forces in Korea, the people of Greece have fought tyranny whenever it has appeared.

When Greece won her independence in 1821, the Greek Senate appealed to the United States for aid. The people of the United States, led by President Monroe and Daniel Webster, promptly responded. This partnership in the cause of freedom is but one of the things that has bound the people of Greece and America.

The men and women who came here from Greece as immigrants greatly enriched our land. Americans of Greek descent figure prominently in all fields of our national life.

In the present struggle against world communism, we know that the people of Greece are among our stanchest allies. Following the policies set down by President Truman in his aid to Greece program, we shall continue to stand by that courageous nation. In addition, let me assure my fellow Americans of Greek descent and the people of Greece, that we here have not forgotten about the victims of Greece's stand against Communist aggression.

We shall continue to do all we can to bring about the repatriation of the 3,000 Greek soldiers and of the thousands of Greek children still imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain. On this day of jubilation, those thousands are a grim reminder that the fight for liberty still goes on.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1952, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was born; the people of Puerto Rico commenced living under a constitution of their own adoption; self-government became operative in Puerto Rico.

This important event was the result and culmination of Public Law 600, 81st Congress, and Joint Resolution 447, 82d Congress. Within the terms of compact embodied in the first of these measures, Puerto Rico adopted a constitution and organized a constitutional government; the second ratified the constitution adopted by the people of Puerto Rico, subject to stipulations which were later accepted by the people of Puerto Rico. Thereupon, the Constitution of Puerto Rico became effective and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico became a reality. Thus, for the first time in approximately 500 years of its history, Puerto Rico became fully self-governing in all matters not locally inapplicable.

Obviously, this is a matter of great prestige to the United States in its position of leadership with the nations of the world.

On March 20, 1953 our Ambassador to the United Nations, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., addressed a communication to the Secretary General of the United Nations stating, on behalf of our Government, that the United States has decided to cease reporting on Puerto Rico as a non-self-governing area within the political jurisdiction of the United States. This is of significance to the world as well as to the United States and Puerto Rico, and I feel that this communication should be brought to the attention of every Member of the Congress. Accordingly, I include this communication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 20, 1953.*

His Excellency TRYGVE LIE,
Secretary General of the United Nations, New York, N. Y.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the United States representative's note U. N.-1727/89, dated January 19, 1953, notifying you that as a result of the entry into force on July 25, 1952, of the new constitution establishing the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Government has decided to cease to transmit information on Puerto Rico under article 73 (e) of the Charter.

The attainment by the people of Puerto Rico of their new commonwealth status is a most significant step. This is the kind of progress to self-government contemplated by the United Nations Charter. This is the democratic pattern of the free world—of goals set and hopes realized. The people of Puerto Rico expressed their view by resolution at their constitutional convention in the following words: "Thus we attain the goal of complete self-government, the last vestiges of colonialism having disappeared in the principle of compact, and we enter into an era of new developments in democratic civilization."

I invite your attention in particular to the enclosed letter of Governor Munoz Marin of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which after requesting the termination of the transmittal of information under article 73 (e), with respect to Puerto Rico, and after recounting the development of the island's political progress, he says: "The people of Puerto Rico are firm supporters of the United Nations and this great organization may confidently rely upon us for a continuation of that good will."

Let me add that the people of Puerto Rico at this moment are proudly cooperating to the utmost in the United Nations effort to repel aggression in Korea. The men of Puerto Rico who are bearing the hardships of battle with other United Nations troops have, by their courage and determination, demonstrated their strong love for freedom.

There are enclosed for the information of the members of the United Nations the following documents in compliance with the terms of resolution 222 (III) of the General Assembly:

1. Text of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

2. Memorandum by the Government of the United States of America concerning the cessation of transmission of information under article 73 (e) of the Charter with regard to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

3. Copy of the letter dated January 17, 1953, from the Governor of Puerto Rico to the President of the United States.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Ambassador.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 20]

Andrews	Gamble	Moulder
Barden	Green	Norblad
Blatnik	Hale	Poulson
Boykin	Haley	Price
Campbell	Heller	Rabaut
Cannon	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Carnahan	Holifield	Scrivner
Celler	Hruska	Shelley
Chelf	Jackson	Staggers
Clardy	Judd	Taylor
Corbett	Klein	Trimble
Crosser	Krueger	Walter
Dingell	Lesinski	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Magnuson	Wilson, Tex.
Frazier	Morrison	Withers

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of passage of the bill (H. R. 3180) to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members who were not on the floor when the debate took place the other day, may I ask at this time whether the bill could be read so the membership of the House might thoroughly understand the question that is before the House?

The SPEAKER. Of course, it can be read by unanimous consent at this stage.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be reread.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if it would not satisfy the gentleman's purpose to have reported whatever is in controversy?

Mr. BONNER. I may say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned the whole matter is in controversy. There have been certain amendments to the bill that the Members should know about and they should have knowledge of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. This bill has to do, as I am sure we understand, with the matter of exempting from taxation certain personal property, household personal property, located in the District of Columbia. It has been in the papers, many of us heard the debate and that has been printed in the RECORD. Much as I respect the gentleman's position, I cannot see where any good purpose will be served by reading the bill.

Mr. BONNER. It is a short bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 148, noes 58.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and seventy-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER. The further unfinished business is the question on the committee amendment to H. R. 3655, on which a separate vote was demanded. Without objection the Clerk will again report the committee amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "premises", strike out all down to and including line 11.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Many of the Members who are here today were not here when this bill was being debated, and I wonder whether it would be permissible to ask that the six lines that the amendment seeks to strike be read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the matter stricken out.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 5, after "premises", strike out the following: "and to forbid the consumption on Sundays, but the Commissioners shall not authorize the consumption on such premises of any beverages at any time when the sale of beverages is prohibited to a holder of a retailer's license, class C, or of any beverages, other than light wines and beer, on Sundays, and such consumption is hereby prohibited."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION WORK ON THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to permit the performance within the United States Capitol Grounds of any excavation, temporary construction, or other work that may be necessary for construction of a national headquarters building for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, American Federation of Labor, at the northwest corner of D Street and Louisiana Avenue NW.: *Provided*, That no permanent construction shall extend within the United States Capitol Grounds.

SEC. 2. The United States shall not incur any expense or liability whatsoever, under or by reason of this joint resolution, or be liable under any claim of any nature or kind that may arise from anything that may be connected with or grow out of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. No work shall be performed within the Capitol Grounds pursuant to this joint resolution until the Architect of the Capitol shall have been furnished with such assurances as he may deem necessary that all areas within such grounds, disturbed by reason of such construction, shall be restored to their original condition without expense to the United States; and all work within the Capitol Grounds herein authorized shall be performed under conditions satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 229, to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works.

The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, an A. F. of L. affiliate, owns a tract of land situated at the northwest corner of D Street and Louisiana Avenue NW., in Washington, D. C., adjacent to the Continental Hotel. The property was purchased for the purpose of constructing a building thereon to be used as the union's headquarters.

In order that construction of the building may proceed, it is necessary for the contractor to make certain excavations, including the placement of temporary sheathing, and otherwise to work within the area of the Capitol grounds immediately adjacent to the new building site and approximately 2 or 3 feet beyond the boundary line of the site.

The Architect of the Capitol informed the committee that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and its contractor, would be required to furnish him with such assurances as he may deem necessary that all areas within the Capitol grounds disturbed by reason of the contemplated construction would be restored to its original condition and without expense to the United States.

The committee has been advised, further, that all of the proposed work will be carried to completion under conditions satisfactory to the Architect of the Capitol and that no permanent construction will extend within the Capitol grounds. The committee was given assurance that the United States will not incur any expense or liability whatso-

over by reason of the construction work contemplated, or be liable under any claim of any kind which may arise in connection with the erection of the building on this site.

The excavation work was started and is now temporarily suspended pending congressional authorization to the Architect of the Capitol as set forth in House Joint Resolution 229.

In view of this situation, I strongly urged immediate favorable action on House Joint Resolution 229.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I introduced the resolution which has just been under consideration—House Joint Resolution 229—at the request of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters-Chauffeurs-Warehousemen and Helpers, affiliated with the A. F. of L. It is a most important bill to the officers and membership of this union.

The Teamsters Union is now engaged in constructing a five-story national headquarters office building at D Street and Louisiana Avenue Northwest, in the District of Columbia. In order to erect this building it is necessary that the union temporarily go 2 or 3 feet onto the Capitol Grounds and dig a trench on Government property so that sheathing can be put in place for pouring the concrete foundation of this new building.

The temporary use of the Government property requires, under existing law, that the union secure the approval of Congress. To grant the union that approval is the purpose of this bill.

The union agrees that the occupancy of the Government property will be brief and that any land used will be restored to its original condition without expense to the Government. No part of the permanent building will be on Government land.

The Architect of the Capitol, Mr. David Lynn, agrees this is appropriate legislation and in a letter to me, recommends its passage. I submitted this resolution to the House Public Works Committee yesterday and it was unanimously approved by that committee.

I have conferred with both the majority and minority leadership of the House, and they have no objection to the consideration of this resolution at this time in order that the Teamsters Union will not be delayed in continuing the construction of their new headquarters building in the District of Columbia, which, when completed, I am sure, will be a worthy addition to the fine architecture of this beautiful city.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CONTINUATION OF THE PRESENT EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 186 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3853) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3853. It is an open rule, and provides for 1 hour of general debate.

H. R. 3853 is a measure which will continue until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency certain provisions of the criminal statutes which pertain to the penalty for espionage and sabotage. The present law expires on April 1, 1953.

The vote in the committee and in the Committee on Rules was unanimous. I see no need for extended debate on this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statement of the gentleman from New York. I know of no objection to the rule or to the bill itself, and I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3853) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3853, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, this bill was considered by Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on the Judiciary. It was favorably reported by that subcommittee unanimously, and was later reported to the House unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary.

Generally speaking, offenses against national security are divided into two classes for purposes of punishment—that is wartime and peacetime. Different punishments are provided if the particular act is committed in peace rather than in war. But, we are now in a situation which is neither war nor peace. We are in a period which has been proclaimed by the President to be a state of emergency. It is felt that these particular offenses should carry the same punishment in this emergency period that normally they would have in time of war. Last year, on July 13, 1952, a bill was approved to continue these wartime punishments for the duration of the national emergency plus 6 months, or April 30, 1953, whichever was the earlier date. In a very few days, this law will expire, and unless the Congress continues these wartime powers and punishments, which the Department of Defense considers so very important at this time, we will find that several major crimes against our national security, such as espionage, sabotage, and offenses of that nature must be treated under a peacetime status instead of a state of emergency or wartime.

The purpose of this particular bill is to extend for the duration of the emergency, plus 6 months, the present acts and the punishments relating to crimes such as gathering or delivering defense information to a foreign government, the destruction of war materials, the production of defective war materials, and offenses of that nature.

The committee feels it is most important that in this time of emergency, the punishments now provided under the law for these offenses be continued through the period of the present emergency plus 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, there is no request for time on this side. It is felt that in this time of emergency, when we are threatened from within and without, this measure should be extended.

I therefore yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 105 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 2151 of such title the following new item:

"2157. Temporary extension of sections 2153 and 2154."

SEC. 2. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 105 thereof, immediately after section 2156, a

new section, to be designated as section 2157, as follows:

"§ 2157. Temporary extension of sections 2153 and 2154

"(a) The provisions of sections 2153 and 2154 of this title, as amended and extended by section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333), in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2912, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), and acts of the kind giving rise to legal consequences and penalties under any of these provisions when performed during a state of war shall give rise to the same legal consequences and penalties when they are performed during the period above provided for.

"(b) Effective for the period above provided for, the words 'conduct of war' as used in section 2151 are extended to include defense activities.

"(c) Effective for the period above provided for, the words 'carrying on the war' as used in section 2153 and 2154 are extended to include defense activities wherever they appear therein."

SEC. 2. Chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 791 of such title the following new item:

"798. Temporary extension of section 794."

SEC. 4. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 37 thereof immediately after section 797 a new section, to be designated as section 798, as follows:

"§ 798. Temporary extension of section 794

"The provisions of section 794 of this title, as amended and extended by section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333), in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2912, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), and acts of the kind giving rise to legal consequences and penalties under section 794 when performed during a state of war shall give rise to the same legal consequences and penalties when they are performed during the period above provided for."

SEC. 5. Chapter 115 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 2391 of such title the following new item:

"2391. Temporary extension of section 2388."

SEC. 6. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 115 thereof, immediately after section 2390, a new section, to be designated as section 2391, as follows:

"§ 2391. Temporary extension of section 2388

"The provisions of section 2388 of this title, as amended and extended by section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333), in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2912, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), and acts of the kind giving rise to legal consequences and penalties under section 2388 when performed during a state of war shall give rise to the same legal consequences and penalties when they are performed during the period above provided for."

SEC. 7. Section 1 (a) (29) of the Emergency War Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 333) is hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3853) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, pursuant to House Resolution 186, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF THE EMERGENCY POWERS CONTINUATION ACT

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 188 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this rule, too, is a 1-hour open rule; it provides for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226. Whereas the previous bill was one pertaining to the criminal statutes, the bill made in order by the pending rule pertains to certain civilian emergency war statutes, and while the previous bill extended the time this one cuts the time during which certain civilian emergency war powers shall be in effect. It does extend the expiration date for a 3-month period, I understand, to wind up activities under those particular statutes.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no controversy about this measure. I have no requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, with Mr. BENDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois is entitled to 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] to 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in the early part of last year the President transmitted to the Congress a request that certain powers be given to the Executive for the period of national emergency and 6 months thereafter. After due consideration of that request by the Committee on the Judiciary, it was felt there should be a time limitation upon the powers to be granted. When the bill passed the House it was limited to July 1, 1953, because there were a great number of pieces of legislation involved and several members of the committee and Members of the House felt that some of them should be made permanent and others dropped altogether. After the passage of the bill in the Senate, and it was considered in conference, the date of expiration was moved up to April 1, 1953. It was felt and hoped that prior to April 1, 1953, further study could be made of the various items included to the point where they would no longer be considered emergency items and could be either dropped or made permanent legislation.

In the meanwhile there has been a change of administration, and a change in the heads of a great many of the departments involved. As a result, the Department of Defense and the other departments concerned have not had sufficient time, they believe, to prepare proper recommendations to the Congress. Some of the reports on individual items have already been sent to the Congress and are now being worked upon by the various committees.

Included in the act as it was passed last year were some 45 statutory provisions. In this new resolution, House Joint Resolution 226, six of those statutory provisions have been dropped as no longer necessary. The present resolu-

tion includes 39 statutory provisions, 31 of which relate to the Department of Defense and 8 relate to other departments.

The officials and representatives of the Department of Defense, and members of our committee who are thoroughly familiar with this type of legislation, are of the opinion if the Congress grants the additional 3 months requested for the departments and the congressional committees to complete their study and preparation of these bills, within that period the particular items involved will have been disposed of by appropriate legislation and the need for emergency legislation such as this will have been eliminated.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] was chairman of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary last year that gave considerable study and held numerous hearings and investigations of these matters. He is thoroughly familiar with their nature. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Ohio feels that the 3 months requested is necessary in order to complete the work that was undertaken last year and believes that this will be sufficient time to complete the study and enact necessary legislation.

In my opinion, there is no reason why House Joint Resolution 226 should not be passed at this time. It was approved by the subcommittee unanimously; it was reported by the full Committee on the Judiciary unanimously, and we are asking today that the Congress give 3 additional months beyond the April 1 time limit to complete legislative action on these 45 statutory provisions included in the resolution now under consideration.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Kentucky has very well stated, this is legislation of a temporary nature and provides only for the extension of these necessary statutory powers for an additional 3 months for the purpose of enabling the various departments and agencies of the Government to bring before the several standing committees of the Congress legislation which would extend many of these statutes beyond that 3 months' period which we are asking now.

I feel that the administration has not been derelict in its duty in not bringing legislation for the individual statutory extensions before the appropriate committees earlier. I feel it is perfectly proper that we keep these statutes in effect until each standing committee has had an opportunity to have a full and complete hearing, and determine which statutes should be allowed to expire and which should be continued in effect.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 226 is one of these resolutions that has come out of the Committee on the Judiciary again this year and, as has been stated, it was given considerable study and thought at the last session of the Congress. The subcommittee, headed by our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION], has this year given the matter considerable study and thought, and, as he stated, the subcommittee and the full Committee on the Judiciary are unanimously in favor of this joint resolution. They are in favor of the extension until July 1, 1953.

While we are talking now on matters of a national emergency nature, may I say, Mr. Chairman, that the Defense Department would have us believe that all of the billions being spent to provide national security are a military secret.

"Don't ask why so much money is needed or where it goes; just appropriate it," seems to be the theme song of the Pentagon.

Maybe that is to cover up the fact that some of the funds just got lost.

At any rate, many of us cannot figure out why the Air Force cannot use its own planes instead of depending upon a civilian airlift.

The war in Korea is nearing the 3-year mark. The Congress has been most generous in providing funds for the military; in fact, almost at the level of spending for World War II. Two and a half years should be enough time for the Air Force to have sufficient transport planes to do a ferry job between California and Korea. But it appears that they have to hitchhike at a price.

Unfortunately, it took a tragedy to unmask this inexcusable lack of planning and function.

A March 20 AP report from Oakland, Calif., reported that "A 4-engine transport carrying some 35 crewmen and soldiers from Roswell, N. Mex., crashed in flames south of here today, killing all aboard."

The Transocean Airlines cargo plane was operated by a civilian crew. "Transocean is the world's largest nonscheduled carrier. Its headquarters are in Oakland. Transocean planes have flown thousands of military personnel and tons of supplies from the west coast to Korea."

Who was at fault? Why are there so many of these accidents? What can we do to prevent others? These serious questions must be our first concern.

But behind them is another nagging puzzle: Why cannot the Air Force handle this military transport airlift itself without depending upon private carriers?

They have the money and the men in abundance.

It cannot be claimed that all these resources are being fully and usefully employed under the present circumstances.

Even an amateur would reason that much practical experience could be gained if the Air Force took full responsibility for all the airlift operations on the route to Korea without calling for civilian help. If it cannot do this limited job, it will not be prepared to handle air transport on a global scale if war should come.

I have high respect for the Air Force, its personnel, and its accomplishments. Considering the lethal cargo it could deliver to the nerve centers of the Soviet Union, it may be that our air arm is a major factor in deterring the Communists from wholesale aggression.

The purpose of my criticism is not to tear down but to build up.

We want to see the Air Force become better than it is.

Why it should have to rely upon leased-out planes and civilian crews for the main-line run to Korea is a mystery, and we have had too many hush-hush situations in the defense setup. I hope that we can get a straightforward and commonsense explanation. If we do not, then the Department of the Air Force is due for a complete overhaul.

Lives are too precious to be wasted by poor planning, private arrangements, or any blunder that tries to hide behind the cloak of military secrecy.

The American people who are paying the whole bill with their hard-earned money and their sons have a right to know what is responsible for the series of disasters involving the Air Force.

The most recent one at Oakland, Calif., strains our patience.

Just why were Air Force personnel being transported to Korea by a private carrier and a civilian crew?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON], and ask unanimous consent that she may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

QUEEN MARY OF ENGLAND

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, last evening a very great personage slipped quietly across the threshold of the Unseen. Last evening Queen Mary of England died. We shall not see her counterpart again.

Having visited for brief moments with the granddaughter she adored, sleep came to her, and in that sleep her soul went free.

Queen Mary of England! A symbol to all her beloved people of strength, of honor, of integrity. A woman of magnificent courage, of firmness, of tenderness. Austere in outward appearance, her gaiety and above all, her humor permeated the Empire, now known as the Commonwealth.

It would seem that all sorrows were visited upon Queen Mary during the long years of her unswerving service to England and her far-flung frontiers. Undismayed by these, she carried her head high with an unfaltering faith. Hers was the hand that reached out in strength to all her loved ones in their need—hers was the heart that in its own grief gave comfort to each in turn.

Mr. Chairman, women everywhere revered Queen Mary. Womanhood down the ages has been enriched by her life and living. That she has come to the end of her days is but the inevitable working of the Universal Law. We know more certainly each day that—

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;
Never was time it was not; End and Beginning are dreams.
Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;
Death hath not touched it all, dead though the house of it seems.

Nay, but as one who layeth
His worn-out robes away,
And taking new ones, sayeth
"These will I wear today!"
So putteth by the spirit
Lightly its robe of flesh,
And passeth to inherit
A residence afresh.

I am reminded of some very beautiful words of James Martineau—

We seem to have given her back to thee, dear God, who gavest her to us. Yet, as Thou didst not lose her in the giving, so we have not lost her by her return. Not as the world giveth; givest Thou, O Lover of Souls! What Thou givest, Thou takest not away. For what is Thine is ours always, for we are Thine. And life is eternal; and love is immortal; and earth is only a horizon; and a horizon is nothing save the limit of our sight.

May the Infinite bless the gallant soul of the woman we have known as England's Queen Mary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 330) is hereby amended by deleting the date "April 1, 1953" wherever it appears therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1953."

SEC. 2. The amendment contained in section 1 of this joint resolution shall not apply with respect to the statutes referred to in sections 1 (a) (8), 1 (a) (30), 1 (b) (1), 1 (b) (3), 2 (a), and 2 (b) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BENDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950, pursuant to House Resolution 188, he reported the joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 185) providing for the consideration of H. R. 3780, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3780) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is a 1 hour open rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 3780 which would extend the Missing Persons Act from April 1, 1953, to July 1, 1954. The Missing Persons Act has to do with the allotments and insurance of those who are missing, principally those missing in the Korean war, and it gives authority and direction to the Department heads to act in a sort of guardianship capacity with regard to their dependents. The need for it is obvious, and I think the feeling is unanimous on it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on this side, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. I think it is a very necessary piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3780) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3780, with Mrs. ST. GEORGE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we should dispose of this piece of legislation in very few minutes. There is little I can add to what was said when we adopted the rule.

I merely want to point out to the Members that in 1942 the Congress passed the Missing Persons Act, and it remained in effect until 1947. It was revived in 1948 by the Selective Service Act of that year, and it has been extended at various times by various acts until April 1, 1953.

Mr. Chairman, the general purpose of the Missing Persons Act was that the heads of the various executive departments should continue to credit and pay up the insurance, modify or allow dependency allotments in such manner as they themselves might determine, as long as the men in the service were missing. In short, the departments assumed the responsibility of guardianship for these missing persons.

This law has rendered great service to all those men who were missing in action, not only in World War II but during the present Korean conflict, but unless we pass this legislation today the law would expire on April 1, a little over a week from now. I am happy to say the Senate has already passed a similar bill, almost identical except as to the date of termination, extending the act until February 1, 1954. The House bill extends the act until July 1, 1954, but in our committee we amended the title to end the act on February 1, 1954, in order to conform with the Senate bill. That would expedite action.

I am sorry to say that 11,399 members of our Armed Forces, in the different branches, are currently being carried as captured or missing, as a result of the Korean hostilities.

It is impossible to estimate the accurate cost of this legislation because of the vicissitudes and fortunes of war, but the Department of the Army itself—that was chosen by the Defense Department as the representative to carry out this law—did develop data between the period of January 1 and June 30, 1952, as illustrative of the cost under current conditions. These data show that the cost was $9,607,097 for that period, the first 6 months of last year. Representatives of the Department of Defense who appeared before us in recent hearings told us that the most accurate estimate they could make as to the cost for all of the military services would be in the neighborhood of $20 million annually.

This particular measure, extending the date of the Missing Persons Act, is very much needed. There was no opposition to it from either the Department or our committee. The bill was reported unanimously, and I trust the House will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill. It is urgent legislation. The bill, as amended by the Armed Services Committee, extends the Missing Persons Act until February 1, 1954. It also incorporates certain language changes made in the present law by Public Law 450, 82d Congress.

The latest report of the Department of Defense shows that we have 11,399 members of the Armed Forces currently missing in action, or captured, as a result of the Korean hostilities. Unless this legislation is extended, it will expire on April 1, 1953. If the Congress should allow this to happen, there will no longer be any statutory authority for the heads of the executive departments to continue to credit the pay accounts, with pay and

allowances, of our military servicemen who are missing in action.

I do not have to explain to the Members what a terrible hardship this would bring to the dependents of these men. We cannot permit this to happen.

This legislation is not new to the Congress. The missing-in-action statute was originally enacted in 1942 and remained in effect until 1947. It was revived by the Selective Service Act of 1948 and has been extended by various acts until April 1, 1953.

The dependents of those who are missing in action have perhaps the greatest cross to bear of all dependents of servicemen fighting overseas. For they must go on, day after day, with no word from their loved ones, not knowing whether they are alive or dead. If the Communist aggressor in Korea would abide by the rules of the Geneva Convention—by the rules of humane warfare—their burden could be made lighter. These rules would require this hostile force to advise the United Nations Command of the names of those persons who had been captured. Since only one list of persons has been furnished to us—and that only a short time after the beginning of the Korean hostilities, the majority of all persons missing must be categorized as missing in action, since we have no way of knowing whether they are alive or dead, or in the hands of the enemy.

If only the International Red Cross was allowed to inspect the Communist prisoner-of-war camps, some comfort could be transmitted to the unfortunate dependents of those missing in action. The Communists will do none of these things and so these dependents must wait with heavy hearts for some word from their servicemen.

A grateful Nation can do no less than try to assist these dependents by crediting the pay accounts of those who are in a missing status. In this way, allotments can continue, or can be made, or modified, to financially assist those who remain at home and wait.

The Department of Defense has indicated that the Missing Persons Act should be revised and enacted as permanent legislation, but the subject is complicated and requires extensive study. Such a study is currently being conducted within the Department of Defense. However, in the interim, we must continue this very worthwhile law. I believe the terminal date of February 1, 1954, gives adequate time for the Department and the Bureau of the Budget to conduct this study and propose new legislation to the Congress.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this measure is very important. The great tragedy of war is the casualty list. In the Korean war, the painful duty of carrying the casualty lists is made complicated by the failure of the enemy to cooperate. Undoubtedly, many of our missing-in-action casualties are alive today, and we fervently hope will be returned to us in time, to their homes, and their loved ones. In the meantime, the problems connected with the handling of pay and allowances are multiplied.

This act will permit the continuation of normal pay and allowances to those missing in action. It is estimated that this cost $9,607,097 for the period of January 1 to June 30, 1952, and that the cost for all military services will approximate $20 million annually. Accounts carried under this act totaled 467 officers, 18 warrant officers, and 9,547 enlisted men.

We must pass this act to continue in effect this law. We must not break faith with those who are making the sacrifice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Missing Persons Act (ch. 166, secs. 1–12, 14, and 15, 56 Stat. 143–147), as amended (ch. 828, 56 Stat. 1092–1093; ch. 371, 58 Stat. 679–682; ch. 70, 61 Stat. 96; ch. 356, 65 Stat. 207) as extended by section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 608), and as it read before the enactment of Public Laws 313 and 450, 82d Congress, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (58 Stat. 679) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force."

(b) Section 6 (56 Stat. 145) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy or is interned in a neutral country" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force or is interned in a foreign country."

(c) Section 9 (58 Stat. 681) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force" and by deleting "such enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "such hostile force."

(d) Section 12 (65 Stat. 207) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force."

(e) Section 14 (56 Stat. 147) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. The provisions of this act applicable to persons captured by a hostile force shall also apply to any person beleagured or besieged by a hostile force."

(f) Section 15 (56 Stat. 147, 1093) is amended by deleting everything following the words "and shall remain in effect until" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1954."

SEC. 2. Section 1 (a) (7) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (ch. 570, 66 Stat. 331) is repealed without effect upon rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or actions taken thereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 23, strike out "July 1, 1954" and insert "February 1, 1954."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3780) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, pursuant to House Resolution 165, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, a similar bill to H. R. 3780.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Missing Persons Act (ch. 166, secs. 1–12, 14, and 15; 56 Stat. 143–147), as amended (ch. 828, 56 Stat. 1092–1093; ch. 371, 58 Stat. 679–682; ch. 70, 61 Stat. 96; ch. 356, 65 Stat. 207), as extended by section 4 (e) of the act of June 24, 1948 (62 Stat. 608), and as it read before the enactment of Public Laws 313 and 450, 82d Congress, is further amended as follows:

(a) Section 2 (58 Stat. 679) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force."

(b) Section 6 (56 Stat. 145) is amended by deleting "in the hands of an enemy or is interned in a neutral country" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force or is interned in a foreign country."

(c) Section 9 (58 Stat. 681) is amended by deleting "in the lands of an enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "in the hands of a hostile force" and by deleting "such enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "such hostile force."

(d) Section 12 (65 Stat. 207) is amended by deleting "interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy" and inserting in lieu thereof "interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force."

(e) Section 14 (56 Stat. 147) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 14. The provisions of this act applicable to persons captured by a hostile force shall also apply to any person beleaguered or besieged by a hostile force."

(f) Section 15 (56 Stat. 147, 1093) is amended by deleting everything following the words "and shall remain in effect until" and inserting in lieu thereof "February 1, 1954."

SEC. 2. Section 1 (a) (7) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (ch. 570, 66 Stat. 331) is repealed without effect upon rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or actions taken thereunder.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 3780 was passed were vacated.

ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for 1 hour general debate and the Rules Committee in this instance saw fit to insert a provision waiving points of order because the aspects of the legislative bill perhaps affects an appropriation. H. R. 4130 is a bill amending title 5 of the Defense Appropriations Act and would remove a restriction written into the law in reference to the use of certain appropriated funds having to do with the Arnold Engineering Development Center authorized by the Congress in 1949.

This development center is a wind tunnel experimental proposition made along very supermodern lines for the testing of aircraft missiles and supersonic range. The legislation which is before the House now would remove the restriction written into the law previously because the Committee on the Armed Services feels it is no longer necessary or good to have it remain in the law. I think the feeling on this is unanimous. I have no further request for time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that this restriction upon the use of funds for this purpose was not considered either by the Armed Services Committee or by the Appropriations Committee but arose on the floor last year during the consideration of the armed services appropriation bill and was in the form of a restriction prohibiting the expenditure of funds for this project. It was debated at considerable length and adopted.

I had some question about the matter when it came before the Rules Committee because as the provision was on an appropriation bill I questioned the matter of jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to take it up; however, I inquired of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and ascertained that he has consulted with the Appropriations Committee and that this provision is agreeable to that committee. There was no objection to it in the Rules Committee. As far as I know the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee both approve the legislation.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the H. R. 4130, with Mr. NICHOLSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 4130 is to repeal a provision in the fiscal 1953 Defense Appropriation Act, which denied funds, beyond March 31, 1953, for the payment to ARO, Inc., a corporation which was selected by the Department of the Air Force to manage a highly complicated and very expensive installation, now known as the Arnold Engineering Development Center, located at Tullahoma, Tenn.

For the benefit of the new Members of the House, and to refresh the memory of the Members who were here last year, I want to point out that a highly complicated and very expensive research and development installation had been authorized by the House Committee on Armed Services during the 81st Congress. Approximately $170 million in authorizations and appropriations were granted by the Congress to construct this facility. The Air Force was given the overall responsibility for the facility since its main function was the testing of aircraft and component parts and guided missiles at speeds far in excess of the speed of sound. As a matter of fact, there is no other comparable facility in the United States and, so far as we know, it is not duplicated any place in the world. It includes some of the largest wind tunnels ever constructed and it also includes some very complicated engine test facilities, which we captured from the Germans during World War II and brought to this country. They are being reassembled at this facility.

The Air Force not having within its own Department the technical capacity to operate this complex facility, contracted with the newly created corporation, known as ARO, Inc., to take over the management and direction of the facility, and I want to point out that this corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of the engineering firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., of St. Louis, Mo., which engineering firm had the contract for the preparation of all of the detailed plans and specifications for this facility.

The new management corporation has operated on a percentage fee which fee is directly related to the cost involved. Since it assumed management for this facility, ARO, Inc., has had the responsibility of recruiting a vast array of highly skilled technicians and scientists who will operate the various mechanisms which are being constructed. These people have been recruited from all over the United States and some have come from foreign nations. About 1,000 of them have been employed and they represent a very high degree of performance in the field of scientific research and development. In performing its managerial duties, ARO, Inc., on the basis of its fee of 3½ percent, has received the sum of only $118,000 over a period of 2 years and 9 months and of this gross fee only $31,500 has been net to the corporation.

In spite of the foregoing facts, there were those who attacked the integrity and capabilities of ARO, Inc., and the parent firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., during debate on the fiscal 1953 Defense Appropriation bill. At that time, I opposed on the floor of this House that restrictive rider, not because Mr. Jack Sverdrup, of the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel Inc., was a citizen of my native State of Missouri, but because I sincerely felt that the attack was wholly unfounded. A handful of Members stood with me in that fight but we lost.

After the House had completed its action on the bill, Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., who had been denied a hearing in the House before the adverse action was taken, requested and received the opportunity to present their side of the case before a Senate subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator O'Mahoney. That subcommittee included, among others, Senator SALTONSTALL, who is presently the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Our committee report summarizes the findings of the Senate subcommittee but for the moment I merely want to say that that Senate subcommittee unanimously voted to reject the restrictive rider which had been added by the House. Subsequently, the entire Senate rejected the rider. But we were in the waning days of the Congress when the conferees, after extensive argument over this restrictive rider, finally agreed to the House provisions. As a result, the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc. and its subsidiary corporation, ARO, Inc., stood convicted by the Congress of the most serious improprieties. So far as I am concerned, and I now state it publicly on the floor of this House, that was a most irresponsible action on the part of the last Congress.

What about the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc.? Are they a bunch of fly-by-nights, or are they responsible people?

I want to say to the Members that I have known Mr. Jack Sverdrup for 25 years. He came to this country from

Norway at the age of 16. He enlisted as a private in the United States Army in 1918, served until 1919, when he received a commission as a second lieutenant in the field artillery. He attended Augsberg College in Minnesota and is a graduate engineer of the University of Minnesota. He subsequently served with the Minnesota State Highway Department, the Missouri State Highway Department, and rose through the ranks to become bridge engineer of the Missouri State Highway Department.

In 1928, Jack Sverdrup founded the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., Mr. Parcel having previously taught at the University of Illinois and the University of Minnesota, and he is the author of several standard engineering text books.

Before the entrance of the United States in World War II, Jack Sverdrup, as a civilian, was engaged to lay out our air routes through the Pacific. These airfields later became the United States air route through the war theaters of the South and Southwest Pacific. In May of 1942, he was appointed a colonel in the Army of the United States. He became a brigadier general in May of 1944 and a major general in January of 1945. He served in the Southwest Pacific under General MacArthur throughout the war, and I need not point out to this body that General MacArthur would not have selected Jack Sverdrup as a major general to command the entire Engineer Construction Command for General Headquarters of the Southwest Pacific area if he had not been a man of integrity and great capability.

Finally, I want to say, in behalf of Jack Sverdrup, that he participated in 6 military campaigns in the Pacific for which battle stars were awarded, during which time he was awarded the Legion of Merit, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart. So, let no man question his integrity, or his patriotism.

As to the capability of this firm, I think the fact that it has been the principal engineering firm in approximately $1 billion worth of construction in the United States speaks for itself.

When the new Secretary of the Air Force was appointed one of his first acts was to review this situation with reference to Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., and its subsidiary, ARO, Inc. He had the advantage of other surveys and investigations which had been made subsequent to the restrictive action of the Congress last year. These included the report of the Air Inspector General of last December, the report of an independent group of scientists and educators of last December, and the report of last June of the General Accounting Office. The General Accounting Office found no evidence of fraud or impropriety on the part of ARO, Inc., and the other two agencies fully supported the action of the Air Force in employing ARO, Inc., to manage the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

The Secretary, Mr. Talbott, personally inspected the situation at Tullahoma. On his return to Washington he thought that he had an interim solution which would not necessitate any congressional action prior to consideration of the fiscal 1954 defense appropriation bill. There is a solution, but that solution would require Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., through ARO, Inc., to operate the Center without any fee whatsoever for a period of 4 months. The firm is perfectly willing to do this, but there is a much more serious aspect to the situation. As I have pointed out, approximately 1,000 highly skilled technicians and scientists have been recruited. How long do you think we can hold these people beyond March 31, which is the date when all funds are shut off for the payment of ARO, Inc., unless we take some affirmative action to reverse the action of the Congress last year. The Secretary of the Air Force stated to the committee yesterday that, in his opinion, we will lose a very substantial number of these highly skilled people unless we take immediate action. That is the principal reason why this bill is before the House today. In that connection I want to point out that it is impossible under the current legislative situation for the House Appropriations Committee to take action in this matter. The recent supplemental appropriation bill was passed before it was realized how acute this situation had really become. Nevertheless Air Force Secretary Talbott, on March 10, 1953, wrote to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee enclosing suggested legislation which is identical to the bill now before us. Since it was impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to act, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] handed the proposed bill to me and has since written to me advising me of this situation and suggesting that the Armed Services Committee take such action as it deemed necessary.

In view of the fact that the engineering firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., is located in St. Louis, Mo., there may be those who do not fully understand this situation and who may have some feeling that I have initiated this action. I want to make it crystal clear that I have not initiated the action but have been governed solely by the position of the Secretary of the Air Force and the fact that it was impossible for the House Committee on Appropriations to consider the matter at this time.

Yesterday the full House Committee on Armed Services held a hearing on H. R. 4130 and after listening to and questioning of Congressmen EVINS and SUTTON, of Tennessee, Secretary of the Air Force Talbott and his Special Assistant, Mr. Garder, and General Sverdrup, we unanimously reported the bill. The Rules Committee considerately and wisely granted us a rule for its immediate consideration for unless we enact this legislation by next Tuesday, our national defense will suffer a severe blow and millions of dollars of the taxpayers dollars will be irrecoverably lost.

I hope the House will follow the unanimous report of the Committee on the Armed Services, the suggestions of the Committee on Appropriations, and the action of the Rules Committee, and will be no less emphatic in correcting an action which never should have occurred.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SHORT] has clearly covered all the facts pertinent to this bill.

I might add that the Armed Services Committee yesterday, after most careful investigation, concluded the proper thing for the House to do would be to repeal the rider that was placed on the appropriation bill during the last Congress.

In the 81st Congress the House Committee on Armed Services considered two legislative proposals, both of which were subsequently enacted into law. As a result of these two laws, total authorizations in the amount of $169,500,000 were granted for the establishment of the Air Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn. Appropriations in the same amount were made by the Congress, in recognition of the vital part which this proposed facility would play in our national defense program.

The Air Force was given primary responsibility for the establishment and operation of this facility and proceeded to obtain an engineering firm which had the capability to construct this very complicated establishment. The Air Force, after considering numerous engineering firms, selected the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., of St. Louis, Mo., to prepare the plans and specifications, following which the Corps of Army Engineers represented the Government in contracting for the construction.

Having provided for the physical construction involved, the next problem facing the Air Force was the manner in which the installation was to be operated. Obviously a Government installation of this nature is a nonprofit operation and it is so complicated that none of the military services have uniformed personnel who have the technical capabilities to supervise and operate a scientific laboratory of this magnitude. As a result, the Air Force sought a private firm for this purpose. Since the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., had prepared the detailed plans and specifications for the construction it seemed reasonable that this firm would be well equipped to direct and supervise this operation. Following this decision, a management corporation known as ARO, Inc., was created and it is now a wholly-owned subsidiary of Sverdrup & Parcel. The parent corporation has furnished many of its most highly skilled personnel to ARO, Inc., to insure the proper operation of the facility and on the basis of the record to date I can find no justification for the criticism which has been made of the manner in which ARO, Inc., has discharged its management and operation responsibilities.

Since ARO, Inc., contracted for the management of this facility it has been responsible for the recruiting and paying of the numerous highly skilled employees who have been recruited throughout the Nation and from abroad, there now being approximately 1,000 of those employees. The Government reimburses this corporation on an actual cost basis and the corporation is in turn paid for its services by receiving a stipulated fee of 3½ percent of the cost. Over the past 2 years and 9 months the total gross fee paid to the corporation has

been $118,000. Of this amount only $31,500 has been a net earning to the corporation. Out of the total sum of $118,000 approximately $33,000 had to be paid for items such as interest on borrowed money, to operate the plant and other nondeductible items, and more than $53,000 has been paid in taxes to the Government. So you see that in the final analysis the net earnings of ARO, Inc., for the management and direction of the Arnold Engineering Development Center have been small indeed. They represent a net fee of about $15,000 per year for slightly less than 3 years of management services. The Secretary of the Air Force has advised us that while there are literally thousands of defense contracts for research and development which are identical to or similar to the present contract, that he knows of no other case where the management services have been obtained for a fee as low as 3½ percent.

So here we are, faced with this situation. We have authorized and are building a highly complicated research and development center which is vital to our national defense and for which we have already pledged almost $170 million of the taxpayer's funds. However, in the waning days of the last Congress, and without according a hearing to this management firm, this body took the position that this management corporation was irresponsible, incompetent, and wholly unworthy of the management of this great research facility. For my part our position is wholly untenable. I am fully satisfied with the subsequent investigations and hearings, including that by the House Committee on Armed Services on March 24, 1953, that the action of the House in adopting this restrictive appropriation rider last year was wholly unfounded. We now have the opportunity to correct that mistake and we should promptly do so.

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take 5 minutes, because I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], our chairman, has covered this subject well. In fact, he covered it well in the last Congress. Unwisely, this House did not heed his advice at that time.

This facility is not only a wind-tunnel facility that we have erected in Tennessee. We had only one engine-testing facility in the whole United States at the end of this war. At the end of War II we were far behind in the field of basic research in the field of speed, supersonic and hyposonic. So we initiated the unitary plan of wind tunnels, so that we could coordinate this field in research and not have it scattered all over the country, and coordinate the intensive research necessary, which includes physics and chemistry. The top scientists in this field are very hard to secure and today still are very scarce and will remain so for some time.

This facility was placed in Tennessee for basic research for the Air Force. There were only a few places in the country where we could possibly place these facilities, due to the fact that we must have available immediately tremendous kilowatt power. You simply cannot operate a wind tunnel otherwise. You cannot operate engine-testing facilities without it. And this is the only facility we do have of this character. We captured from the Germans a supersonic wind tunnel. France took one of them and we took the other one, and we moved it to this country. And we learned how far behind we were in the development of these facilities.

Our Congress wisely adopted the policy of setting up these facilities for research so that we would have the most superior Air Force in the world, which we have today, thank God, and we cannot have it without these facilities.

We do not have the technical personnel in the Air Force to operate them. We did not have it in the Government. So we had to go out and ask somebody to do this job. We went out and asked a reputable concern, a man of the highest character. Unfortunately, he was attacked on the floor of this House. This man served in the service of his country not only in the First World War but also in the Second World War and the record speaks for itself. I hope that the House will adopt this measure speedily, and I certainly hope that the Senate will wisely adopt the measure; because if we do not we are going to destroy and disintegrate this whole force of scientific personnel, and where we will ever get them from again I do not know; they simply will not be available, because you cannot secure aerodynamic engineers in this country today, and that is what you have got to have if you expect to remain in a superior position in air power. This is the heart of our air power and must continue uninterrupted.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. EVINS. Let me thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, and may I also commend him for the diligent work which he and other members of the Committee on the Armed Services have put forth in the bringing of this bill to the House at this time.

This measure, as the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has so well stated, is designed to repeal a legislative rider on the appropriation act—namely, that portion of title V of the Appropriations Act of 1953 which relates to the restriction on payment of funds to ARO, Inc., for operation of the AEDC.

On Tuesday, last, the Committee on Armed Services unanimously reported—and properly so—the pending bill to repeal this existing legislation. In the event this legislation ban and rider is not lifted prior to March 31 of this year the operation of a great defense installation will come to a standstill.

As Representative of the district in which this great defense facility, namely, the Arnold Engineering Development Center, is located and representative of the people most directly affected by action which the Congress may take in this matter, I think it is appropriate that we should have a brief recital of the history of the AEDC and of its operations.

The Arnold Engineering Development Center, referred to as AEDC, is a United States Air Force facility to provide testing and evaluation of supersonic aircraft, guided missiles, and aircraft engines of all types. As a wind tunnel and jet-engine testing facility AEDC is destined to become the largest facility of its kind in the United States; so far as we know, in the world.

ARO, Inc., Arnold Research Organization, is a Tennessee corporation organized at the request of the Air Force to operate the AEDC as a contract operator.

Following the recommendation of legislation to create this great center by the Committee on Armed Services of the House, and following the enactment of this legislation into law, the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense located this project in Tennessee for a multiplicity of reasons.

I might mention the necessity for, first, an abundance of electric power; and, second, an abundance of patriotic labor as being highly necessary for the successful operation of this important defense installation.

In addition, the area is rather interior in location and, therefore, is considered ideal for security reasons.

The State of Tennessee gave to the Air Force some 33,000 acres of land for this purpose—an area already developed as the location of a former Tennessee State Guard campsite.

President Truman flew to Tennessee 2 years ago and dedicated this great project which is located in Coffee and Franklin Counties, near Tullahoma, Tenn., in the district which I am honored to represent.

The AEDC has been progressing splendidly since its establishment with only a few minor initial interruptions. ARO, Inc., which has served as a contract operator for this project, has supervised and aided in the growth of this great center from a planned paper project to a great defense installation which is now far advanced in its development.

The importance of this installation to the Nation's defense has been repeatedly expressed by top Air Force and Defense personnel. It has been stressed by members of both political parties and both administrations. It is a vital defense installation highly essential to the future security and defense of our country.

Because of the highly scientific and technical nature of its operation the Air Force wants the project run by civilians under contract with the Government. ARO, Inc., was chosen for this purpose. A contract operation of this nature has been determined by the Air Force to be the best method, the most feasible method, for operating this great testing laboratory.

ARO has recruited some very excellent and skilled personnel to operate this center—scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians who can perform this work—who are not always easy to attract. It is this personnel, which the Air Force insists, and rightly so, should not be lost, but retained.

I repeat, the Air Force wants this facility operated by civilians under contract. The Air Force has made this determination. I am not in a position to disagree with the wisdom of the decision of the Air Force in this matter.

I should like to point out that at the time the legislative rider was adopted in the 1953 Appropriations Act, I stated at that time my position on the matter in debate on the floor. Not being a member of the Appropriations Committee, I expressed the hope that no action would be taken that would impede the progress or in any way jeopardize the fullest development of this great air center located in the district which I represent.

During the period of time that has elapsed, extensive studies of the operation of the AEDC and ARO have been made. We have had a new look at ARO as a contract operator.

The inspector general of the Air Force has made an investigation into the situation and the inspector general has come up with a report giving ARO a clean bill of health. There are numerous details in the inspector general's report, including the conclusion that ARO's organization structure is essentially sound, that the educational and experience background of key personnel are excellent, that the engineer-training program was effective in building up a well-qualified and integrated work force, and that ARO's accomplishments were commensurate with the expenditure of funds under its contract, and that the payments to ARO were not unreasonable.

The General Accounting Office has also made an investigation of ARO at the request of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. Although the report points up a few questionable items—matters in the realm of opinion and judgment—the conclusions reached are that there was no illegality and no wrongdoing, and further, that there was no evidence developed which would indicate that there were any actions taken in connection with the project under any condition other than proper motives.

In other words, the Comptroller General and the GAO also gave the operation a clean bill of health—and, as we all know, the GAO is very efficient and it is difficult for any operation to successfully pass the surveying eye of a General Accounting Office investigation.

In addition, a civilian industry and education advisory board—a nonprofit civilian board—has on two separate occasions had an investigation and evaluation of the performance of ARO as a contract operator. And, in each instance, this civilian advisory board has also given ARO a clean bill of health and has reestablished the position of the Air Force in this matter.

The previous Democratic administration recommended ARO as a responsible contract operator in this connection.

The new Republican administration has taken a new and fresh look at the entire situation, and the Republican administration is also recommending the continuance of ARO as a contract operator for this important defense facility.

It thus appears that this operation has been amply investigated and has bipartisan support; and in view of the results of these investigations and of the position of the Air Force in the matter, I feel that the Armed Services Committee should be commended and congratulated for its unanimous favorable report of action in this connection.

It is the considered opinion of the Air Force that this great project—now well advanced—should not be disrupted but should go forward. Time is of the essence, gentlemen, the world situation is critical. We must get on with the job.

Without repeal of this rider the program cannot go forward at this time. Not only officials of the Air Force and our defense personnel, but the people of the District whom I represent are greatly concerned about this matter. We are at a standstill. We are witnessing here today another example of the difficulty which the Congress gets itself into when the Appropriations Committee endeavors to write legislation.

It will be recalled that the Congress recently passed another bill repealing a rider on the Appropriations Act affecting the Navy Department. Here we have another rider—in this instance affecting the Air Force. This provision was recommended as has been stated by our former House colleague—now Senator GORE, from my State—a former member of the House Appropriations Committee. I should like to repeat a statement which I was pleased to make on Tuesday before the House Armed Services Committee—namely, that I have a high regard for Senator GORE, but that I certainly reserve the right to disagree with him, and I do so in this instance as this matter is so vital to the people whom I represent and so vital to the Nation's defense.

I repeat, time is of the essence. I trust that the House will vote favorably and adopt the pending bill in order that we may lift and repeal this restrictive legislative rider. Let us remove the uncertainty which exists with respect to the future of this most vital and important defense installation.

Let us pass this bill and go forward.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Will my colleague state what, in his opinion, the situation would be in case this contract under the provision becomes invalid as of the end of this month?

Mr. EVINS. The morale factor would be very bad. For some time there has been a great deal of uncertainty in the area of the center as to whether or not the life of this organization is to be continued. Many highly skilled personnel have been recruited for this work, and if they are not to be paid we will lose the services of many skilled technicians and scientists and others. The project would be set back and, I feel, its growth and progress impaired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would like to say is that some 10 months ago when this rider was before this body, I joined the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], now chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, in asking that the House delete this rider from the appropriation bill. The reason I asked for the deletion was because I believed that every man should have his day in court, so to speak, and at that time, of course, this corporation had not had a chance to present their views before any committee. There had been several charges preferred against it, but at no time had they been heard on these charges. For that reason I voted against the rider we now have in the appropriation bill.

Since that time, Mr. Chairman, there have been several investigations not only by the Air Force but by the General Accounting Office and various other organizations with reference to this Tennessee project. Everyone who has investigated has given the corporation a clean bill of health. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly supporting this bill, because who am I to say that the Air Force is wrong and the General Accounting Office is wrong as well as the other people who have investigated this project? With the reputation this corporation has, who am I to say that they are not qualified to operate AEDC?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think the committee acted properly in reporting this unanimously. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, particularly in view of the fact that the gentleman who recommended this for the Air Force was Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Harold Stuart, of Oklahoma. I appreciate his name being cleared, too.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from the Committee on Armed Services. We appreciate the fact that the Air Force brought this great project down to our State of Tennessee, when it was first allocated.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question my distinguished colleague from the Fifth District of Tennessee asked my colleague from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] about what the results would be should this bill not be passed, I believe that we would lose at least 1,000 technicians from the project that we now have. The type of technicians we have at AEDC cannot be replaced by the average man on the street. They are scientists. Once we lose them they are gone and they are difficult to replace. This, plus the fact that there are many millions of dollars the Government would lose, plus the fact that the project would be set back several months, when it is needed so badly in our defense program.

I hope the committee and the House will go along with the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Rules and we who have looked into the matter and support this bill wholeheartedly.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been explained very thoroughly and very convincingly, especially by our chairman the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I want to emphasize one or two things that have been touched on

and one thing that has not been touched on in this discussion.

Let me emphasize, as others have, the fact that this is another good illustration of the futility of putting riders on appropriation bills. When these riders are placed on appropriation bills they have not been adequately covered by hearings. What sounds like a plausible explanation of the situation and a plausible answer to the problem, in the form of a rider, has met us face to face three times in this Congress already. In each case legislation was required to remove the bad effect of the rider. It shows that we should not permit these riders to be tacked onto these bills without prior hearings of the problem, at least by one of the legislative committees.

One thing that I think has not been referred to here and that might be of interest to the Members is the lurking idea of some Members that I talked to who have not read the hearings that this great project we are talking about might be a duplication, in part, of similar facilities somewhere else. We have them at Langley Field, we have the great Ames Laboratory in California. It was my thought that perhaps there would be a duplication of the work done in those laboratories. I asked several of the gentlemen testifying whether there was any duplication of this project in any similar installation in the United States and they all answered emphatically there was not. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] explained, this is a supersonic wind tunnel. There is nothing like it in the United States; perhaps not in the world. We are lucky we have it.

The great symbol of power today in the world in the military field is air power. That is the symbol in the Navy, and it is the symbol in the Air Force. If we can keep this operation going, it means that the air superiority we are hoping to attain very shortly will be ours, and our protection will be that much greater. All of you have heard the comments by the Chief of the Air Force many times that in some types of planes we are losing our superiority. The way to keep and increase that superiority is to keep this tremendous installation down in Tennessee going as it is now operating.

What would happen if the project is abandoned, has been asked here several times. Let me point out that following the World War we had some very interesting and rather exhaustive hearings in the Committee on Military Affairs with some scientists. They thought the development of science in the atomic field was going to wither away, and these men came all the way from Alamogordo, N. Mex., to appear before our committee and try to emphasize to us that if we did not lay down a program where these scientists could look at it and see there was an opportunity for them to carry on their scientific studies and researches and make their contributions, scientific research would wither and die. There were a group of them there following the hearing and during the hearing on the atomic-control bill. Scientists, so they tell us, are a sort of odd, temperamental people, and if these people down in Tennessee in the ARO project have any uncertainty about the continuation of this project, they will go back to private industry or go back in the educational field. Just yesterday I talked to a man, an engineer, and he pointed out to me that industry is searching the country over for scientists. They are 25 percent short of scientific men whom they need for the development of industry. He was talking to me about a bill to screen that type of manpower in the event they were taken into the armed services. So I would like to stress as much as I can that if we want to retain the superiar air power which is ours today, and make it still greater, and make America still more secure, we will pass this bill and allow this project to have the continuity which will make it a success. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the rider was passed. No witness appeared in any hearing in any phase of this problem who testified that something wrong, or illegal, or crooked had been done. Yet now they propose to cut this project off at the pockets, which could kill the most fantastic project of its kind in existence.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the repeal of a rider which was attached to the military appropriation bill last year. I agree with the great majority of the Members of the House that usually these riders—far-reaching riders on appropriation bills—are a mistake. I think this matter, which is before us today, should have originally been handled by the legislative Committee on Armed Forces. In my judgment, the House made a mistake in adopting the rider.

I doubt that all Members of the House understand what we are doing here today because I doubt that all Members have had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the situation. Many Members will recall the controversy over this matter last year. I do not recall all the details of the ARO controversy, but I have no disposition to question the good faith of anyone. The Air Force, the Army, and the Navy have generally run their own installations in the past. This is the first and only major departure in the Air Force of which I know. This is the situation: The Air Force makes a contract with a private concern called ARO to run the installation, ARO providing the personnel and management. We have established overall personnel ceilings in an effort to try to reduce civilian personnel in the Armed Forces, but ARO personnel will not be affected thereby. These people will not be added to the list of people who are on the Federal payroll. From now on you will find that in the list of personnel on the Government payroll thousands of people who will be employed at this laboratory will not be listed as Government personnel. They will be hidden, so to speak. I do not mean hidden in a dishonest way, but they will be hidden. If the Air Force should run the machine shops and other large and complicated facilities by contract, industry would get out and do the work and hire the people and pay them, and we in Congress would give them a lump-sum appropriation. It may be a good thing. I am going to vote for this repeal, but I am just telling you that we are taking a significant step, although perhaps a necessary step. The issue raises a policy question. For that reason, I thought the matter ought to be studied by the legislative Committee on Armed Services rather than be handled as a rider on an appropriation bill.

Under the contract system there will be no ceiling on salaries at the facility except as provided in the contract. The head of ARO can draw more money than the Secretary of the Air Force or the President of the United States, as far as that is concerned, unless there is some restriction in law or in the contract of which I do not know.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course the president of ARO is serving without pay. He draws no salary whatever. While I agree with the gentleman that each branch of the armed services usually conducts its own work, the gentleman is well aware of the fact that because of the peculiar nature of this project, the highly technical aspects of it, not only the Air Force but no branch of the armed services, no branch of the Government is capable of carrying out this research and development work.

Mr. MAHON. That may be true. The gentleman has made a greater study of the problem than I have and I have great respect for his judgment. I believe General Farrell is now being paid $30,000 as the top man on this project.

Mr. SHORT. Yes. There was one salary of that amount, but the president of ARO is serving without pay.

Mr. MAHON. But the man who runs that laboratory gets $30,000 a year.

Mr. SHORT. He gets $30,000, and he could get $60,000 if he were in private industry.

Mr. MAHON. I know that General Farrell is a highly capable man. I am not saying that he should not get it, but what I am saying is that the contract holder is footloose and fancyfree to hire any people he wants to hire and pay them any salary he wants to pay. It is wholly up to the discretion of the Air Force in negotiating the contract, and the Congress does not get into the picture except in providing a lump-sum appropriation for operating the plant. Of course, Congress can control the lump-sum appropriation. If we ran all our Federal installations that way it would change the picture. You could take half a million people off the payroll of the Government today by appropriating a lump sum and contracting with industry to run the various facilities. That might be a good thing. I am just raising the question of broad policy of government which is involved.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The point that the gentleman stresses is the fact of how

you are going to operate these facilities. I have high respect for the gentleman's opinion, but we are faced with this situation: how to operate this highly technical tool with men who can demand and get twice as much salary as we can pay.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman raises a valid point. Of course if we should determine that the contract policy is wrong we should have the courage to raise the pay of highly qualified personnel in the Air Force.

Mr. DURHAM. I might point out something that happened this morning. A boy has been hired by industry. Just this morning they hired him at twice the salary we pay here. I do not know how we are going to replace him. What are we going to do? We are operating the atomic energy plant practically on the basis on which we are operating this. Are you going to let the Army, Navy, and Air Force take over the scientists of the country and try to conduct this basic research? If you do, you will be making a most clossal failure.

Mr. MAHON. I have merely raised a point which I thought should be raised in connection with this bill. I hope the committee has made the proper determination.

Now, let us face the facts.

After ARO has run this multimillion dollar project for, let us say, 5 years, it will have an undue advantage over the Government when contracts are renewed from time to time. I think the point is obvious. The Government could hardly refuse to renew the ARO contract because there would be no other qualified bidder. I hope the Armed Forces Committee has thoroughly explored this aspect of the matter. On the face of the thing it would seem that the Government would soon lose much of its bargaining power.

Mr. DURHAM. Just at that point, the NACA has been running other facilities.

Mr. MAHON. The NACA has been running its own facility.

Mr. DURHAM. That is a Government facility run by a civilian agency, it is not an Army agency installation.

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. And it has done a good job. You could bring it under Government operation and build up one of the most colossal Government agencies in this country, but the whole theory of this thing is to bring private enterprise into this picture so we can get some efficiency and not run into all these dead ends.

Mr. MAHON. That may be the way to get it, and it could be that we should fully explore the possibility of running many of our military installations on a contract basis with private industry.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman has had extensive experience with appropriations for defense. Does the gentleman feel that if this installation were run by the Air Corps it would be more economical or that it would cost more money? Please understand that it would be personally satisfactory with me for the Air Force to run this base, but some decision must be made. This uncertainty as to the future operation of this installation cannot be continued.

Mr. MAHON. I could not say, with certainty. It could be that a private operation would be cheaper. The principal question which I raise is one of policy.

Mr. EVINS. It would be a more cumbersome operation, and they would have to have the same type of men running it.

Mr. MAHON. That may be. I felt that the policy question should be raised. I shall vote to repeal the rider.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the resolution pending before the Committee.

In the first place I think we should remember that this is a contract negotiated by the previous administration; that since the new administration has taken over it has been reviewed in great detail.

Mr. Talbott, the present Secretary for Air, appeared before our committee, as did his chief of research and development, or whatever his title may be. They reviewed the contract as it had been made by their predecessors. I do not believe it would be necessary to convince anyone that they had no reason to justify the contract made by their predecessors. There are but a few sources to contact for services such as this, pure research, organizations such as Westinghouse, General Electric, and other great research organizations of the country. They had been original suppliers in the building of this institution, and it was not thought they should receive the contract. In any event, they endorsed the contract.

I will agree with my colleague from Texas that on the policy of contracting I would not agree that it would be a good policy to contract for standard services such as repair, maintenance, and things of that kind; but when it comes to basic research you have an entirely different question. I do not know how you are ever going to get men qualified in basic research who would be willing in the first instance to work at Government salaries when so much better salaries are available to them in industry, and the great advantage to these scientists of being connected with the large engineering organizations, such as in this case now being used by that organization in the case of ARO, or being connected with Westinghouse working on a Government contract even for a subsidiary corporation. The moment they secure connection with a great nationwide organization their career is fixed; they know that their career is stable and that if this one thing should ever play out there is other work available.

It was testified that many of these highly skilled men are temperamental and some of them not too practical as businessmen, and they look for a position where their thoughts will be free for them to devote themselves entirely to technical things on which they are working. It has proved successful in connection with atomic energy. I happen to serve on that committee as well as on the Committee on Armed Services.

Now, this idea, that they could pay anything they want, I do not believe is quite correct. The contract is negotiated every year. It is true it is based in reference to what the future expenditures of operation might be, on what was required for operating the previous year, but the contract is subject to renegotiation. After the money is paid the Government still has the opportunity to recoup for any excess profits or for any extraordinary or extravagant expenditures. So that there is definite control on the part of the Government.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I appreciate what the gentleman said, particularly with reference to the question of a contract that must be negotiated annually. Is there any other provision other than the renegotiation approach whereby the Armed Services Committee of the House or the Senate would have any opportunity to know anything about the details of an annual contract before it is negotiated without having to resort later, if necessary, to the question of renegotiation?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not know that there is any provision that would apply to a contract of this kind. In connection with the reactivation of a plant and a contract then being entered into for operation, it would have to be resubmitted. But you do have direct control of renegotiations in connection with it.

Mr. Chairman, this is a highly important matter. It was testified before our committee that so far as is known this is the only installation of its kind in the world. There is nowhere else in the world an organization of this kind for research and development in connection with aircraft. Some of the machinery there is at least twice as large as anything of a comparable nature known to exist anywhere else in the world.

We have here a provision which cuts off the money for ARO on the 31st of March. You have $100 million invested. There is not a single word in this provision as to what you are going to do with that $100 million plant. Are you going to close it up and disband the personnel and have no way to operate or manage something so highly essential to the aviation industry and to the progress of these supersonic speeds? I think it is highly essential that the House take action to remove the restriction which was placed in an appropriation bill. I will not belabor the point of passing restrictive provisions or substantive legislation on appropriation bills where they are offered on the floor of the House and considered under a very limited time for debate, with no opportunity for the committee to develop the facts.

I think the main thing here is that administrations have changed. An entire new administration of the Air Force has come in. The new Secretary of the Air Force has had no responsibility for issuing the contract and now he wholeheartedly defends the contract as made by his predecessors. That is a very wholesome thing, in my opinion. I was very glad to see that these gentlemen who have taken over from our Democratic administration were objective about it and that they recognize the welfare of the country requires this provision be removed. I hope it will be without delay.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953 (66 Stat. 530), as reads: "*Provided*, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, unless Congress shall have directed otherwise," is hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. NICHOLSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, pursuant to House Resolution 187, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 89 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs with reference to (1) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has performed its functions of studying the various tribes, bands, and groups of Indians to determine their qualifications for management of their own affairs without further supervision of the Federal Government; (2) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has fulfilled its obligations of trust as the agency of the Federal Government charged with the guardianship of Indian property; (3) the adequacy of law and regulations to assure the faithful performance of trust in the exchange, lease, or sale of surface or subsurface interests in or title to real property or disposition of personal property of Indian wards.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, including (1) a list of the tribes, bands, or groups of Indians found to be qualified for full management of their own affairs; (2) legislative proposals designed to promote the earliest practicable termination of all Federal supervision and control over Indians; (3) a listing of functions now carried on by the Bureau of Indian Affairs which may be discontinued or transferred to other agencies of the Federal Government or to the States; (4) names of States where further operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be discontinued; (5) recommended legislation for removal of legal disability of Indians by reason of guardianship by the Federal Government; (6) findings concerning transactions involving the exchange, lease, or sale of lands or interests in lands belonging to Indian wards, with specific findings as to such transactions in the States of Oregon and Washington.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any other member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 24, after "wards", strike out "with specific findings as to such transactions in the States of Oregon and Washington."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "its Territories, and possessions."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is practically identical in every way to a resolution which was passed by this House in June of last year. The investigation authorized and directed by the resolution passed at that time was begun by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but no hearings were held, and the report made by the committee, while it is an excellent volume, is very little more than a catalog of the statistics concerning Indians and the Indian problems, which are stated.

The Secretary of the Interior recently gave an expression of his views on the various problems involved in administering the affairs of the Indians. One of the paragraphs in that statement reads in part as follows:

Federal responsibility for administering the affairs of individual Indian tribes should be terminated as rapidly as the circumstances of each tribe will permit.

In order to prepare the legislation necessary to carry out that and other parts of the announced policy regarding Indians, a complete and full study of the subject must be made. This is not an investigation. There is no witch-hunt type of thing involved in this resolution. It is a study of a problem which has faced this country for some years, and which must be resolved.

At the present time there are approximately 300,000 Indians in this country. We are presently employing 12,000 people to administer their affairs, at an annual cost of some $83 million. It is vital not only that this expense be stopped but that as many of these people as possible be given their full and free citizenship in this country.

The pending resolution also directs the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to make a full and complete inquiry into land transactions involving lands belonging to Indians. During 1951 some transactions in Indian timberlands in the State of Oregon and Washington appeared to be irregular, to say the least. It is important that complete information regarding those transactions, or similar deals in other States, be obtained.

Practically the same resolution has been introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] and was sponsored in the last Congress by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules reported this resolution unanimously. We thought it might present an opportunity to save us some money.

I have no desire to consume any time discussing the resolution, and yield back my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend section 8 (a) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 so as to provide that the Tennessee Valley Authority shall continue to maintain its principal office at Knoxville, Tenn.

My proposed amendment to the act reads as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) The corporation shall maintain its principal office in the immediate vicinity of Knoxville, Tenn. The corporation shall be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the eastern judicial district of Tennessee within the meaning of the laws of the United States relating to the venue of civil suits.

Tennessee Valley Authority was created as a corporation by the Congress on May 18, 1933. The stated purpose of the act was to maintain and operate the properties then owned by the United

States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, Ala., in the interest of the national defense and for agricultural and industrial development, and to improve navigation in the Tennessee River and to control the destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee River and Mississippi River basins.

The act provided that the corporation should be held to be an inhabitant and resident of the northern judicial district of Alabama. However, Tennessee Valley Authority has always maintained its principal offices at Knoxville, Tenn.

On March 19, 1953, the general manager of TVA at Knoxville announced to a committee of the Knoxville Chamber of Commerce that the TVA board of directors and managerial staffs now located in Knoxville and Chattanooga will move to Muscle Shoals about 18 months from now and that about 500 office employees will make the transfer.

The general manager further stated that a lease has been arranged for an office building which is to be erected adjacent to the Wilson Dam Reservation, which will be completed in the summer of 1954. That the following offices will move from Knoxville: Board of directors, general manager, and the headquarters of the divisions of finance, law, personnel, agricultural relations, regional studies, and reservoir properties. Moving from Chattanooga will be headquarters office of the division of health and safety, with about 35 employees.

Thus, it will be readily seen that if this plan is carried into effect approximately 500 families who have been residents of Knoxville, Tenn., for many years, and most of whom own their homes in Knoxville, will be required to move to Muscle Shoals, Ala.

It was announced that the contemplated office building would be a 7-story structure containing 120,000 square feet of usable space, and that the lease would be for 20 years with TVA holding an option to purchase.

The announcement by John Oliver, the general manager, contained the further provision:

> TVA will do everything it can, within the limits of its authority and consistent with sound management, to help employees get relocated. TVA will work with the Muscle Shoals community to get school, transportation, and other facilities expanded if necessary. Decisions on housing, of course, must finally be made by each individual.

I respectfully submit that there is no justification for this action. These people are citizens of Knoxville, Tenn. They have always engaged in community and welfare work such as Red Cross drives, Community Chest and educational programs. They own their homes and would have to sell their homes at a great sacrifice if 300 or 400 homes were placed on the market at about the same time.

The school plants of the city of Knoxville and of Knox County have been enlarged and vast sums of money spent to take care of the education of the children of these welcome employees of TVA.

It is certainly not in the interest of national defense to create an acute housing shortage at Muscle Shoals, Ala., and to require the building of 500 homes and the enlargement of educational facilities.

TVA is logically associated throughout the Nation with the State of Tennessee, although it serves a seven-State area. The reason for this association is apparent from the following figures.

There are 14 major TVA dams in Tennessee; and only three in Alabama. The two new dams under construction are in Tennessee.

There are 6 major TVA steam plants in Tennessee and 3 under construction; only 2 steam plants in Alabama with 1 under construction.

Eight hundred and sixty-five thousand customers are served by TVA electricity in Tennessee through municipalities and cooperatives; only 143,000 in Alabama.

The income by TVA from power revenues in the calendar year 1952 in the State of Tennessee was $72 million; in Alabama, $15 million.

The net TVA plant investment in power facilities as of June 30, 1952, in Tennessee was $477,273,095; in Alabama, $157,725,455.

At the time TVA took over the Government reservation at Muscle Shoals, Ala., I am informed that there were about 200 dwellings on the property. In 1950 these dwelling houses were declared surplus by TVA and sold at public auction for something over $100,000, with the requirement that the houses be moved off the Government property, which was done.

I requested the Tennessee Valley Authority to furnish me with a copy of whatever contract or agreement they had in respect to the proposed new office building at Muscle Shoals, Ala. A copy of this agreement has been furnished to me by TVA.

The agreement bears date, March 10, 1953, and is between Wallace S. Pitts, Sr., and TVA.

Its pertinent provisions are that TVA proposes to declare surplus 30½ acres of land located in Colbert County, Ala., a part of the Wilson Dam Reservation, and that Pitts, the contractor, proposes to bid personally, or through a corporation to be formed by him, for said site at the auction sale an initial bid $26,000, and in the event of other bids to continue to raise the bid in an amount not to exceed $60,000. Then in the event Pitts becomes the owner of this piece of land, he proposes to erect thereon an office building for occupancy by TVA.

Section 4 of the contract provides that Pitts shall cause to be formed an Alabama corporation and it is contemplated that the financing of the erection of the office building will be with New York Life Insurance Co. and certain banks in Alabama. The building is to be leased to TVA for a term of 20 years.

The agreement provides that—

> TVA will pay a base rental in equal quarterly installments in such amount as will, during the 20-year term of the lease—
>
> 1. Will amortize a principal sum of $3,140,000 (plus that part of the cost of the site, if any, which is in excess of $26,000, but such excess for this purpose shall not be more than $34,000;
>
> 2. Pay interest on unamortized principal balances at the rate of 4 percent per annum; provided, that during the first 10 years of lease term, the base quarterly rental payments shall be uniformly increased by such amount as will amortize a principal sum of $580,000, and pay interest on unamortized principal balances at the rate of 4 percent per annum during said 4-year period.

It is further provided that in addition to the base monthly rental specified, TVA shall pay all ad valorem taxes and assessments lawfully levied against the premises and premiums on insurance and shall maintain the premises in good and tenable repair.

It is further provided that at any time during the term of the lease, TVA shall have the option to purchase the leased premises, the base purchase price being placed at $3,720,000 plus that part of the cost of the site, if any, which is in excess of $26,000, not to exceed $34,000, less such part thereof as has been amortized by TVA's base rental premiums.

In the event the option to purchase is not exercised until the end of the term of the lease, the property shall be conveyed to TVA upon expiration of the lease and payment of the final base rental installment.

The agreement contains the following provision:

> The lease shall contain a provision that it shall be deemed to contain, as if fully set forth herein, all the provisions required by section 104 of the Renegotiation Act of 1951.

In addition to urging passage of the bill, which I have introduced, I shall ask the Appropriations Committee to incorporate in the current appropriations bill at the appropriate place in connection with the TVA current appropriation substantially the following language:

> *Provided, however,* no part of the funds herein appropriated or any corporate funds of Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for the purpose of defraying the cost of moving the administrative offices of Tennessee Valley Authority from Knoxville, Tenn., or for the payment of rental of a proposed new office building not yet erected at or near Muscle Shoals, Ala.

MAPLE SIRUP

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Indians along the shores of Mille Lacs Lake taught the early Minnesota settlers to make maple sirup, the sap run has come to be one of the first signs of spring in our State.

This week Members of the Minnesota delegation received a welcome reminder of the maple sirup harvest—a bottle of pure maple sirup from the Holbert Bros., of Onamia, Minn., in my district.

Attractively packaged as Old Grand Mom, this sirup represents the finest skills of old and new methods of bringing a great natural product to the dinner table. Since the Indians first boiled the sap gathered from the maple forests while the snow is still deep to quicken the flow, modern science has blended with age-old experience in improving nature's valuable food.

During my visit to the Department of Agriculture's Northeast Regional Laboratory in Philadelphia with the agriculture appropriations subcommittee last weekend, I was pleasantly surprised to

find this product from my district held up as a prime example of the latest in maple-sirup making. The experts regard it as a fine demonstration of what can be done to bring the enjoyment of pure maple sirup to more and more people.

I was shown maple-sugar cubes from the Holbert Bros. which bring the essence of the sap gathered in the maple forests into concentrated form without losing the rich, natural flavor and sweetness. Modern methods and a natural product combine to make Minnesota's maple sirup the equal of the finest produced anywhere.

The maple-sirup industry is unique to the American Continent and from its beginnings in early New England it has been carried on in family traditions. In my district people everywhere in the sugar-maple areas join in boiling the sap and making the sirup in their own ways.

As an industry, maple-sirup production is growing in importance with each new advance made by our scientists to improve the techniques without ever sacrificing the natural values of the clear, sweet sap which runs from the pierced trees each spring. The Holbert Bros. represent the aggressive and forward-looking Minnesota sirup industry and the merits of their product can be attested to by the Minnesota delegation privileged to receive this finest of maple sirups.

It takes almost 35 gallons of sap gathered painstakingly to the sap house to make 1 gallon of pure sirup. The sap is gathered by hand from the buckets and taken to the sap house in a tank drawn by horses through the still heavy snow.

Maple-sirup making is a pioneer industry and the gathering of sap is still the colorful experience it was in its oldest days. Yet the industry utilizes the most modern improvements and best in modern packaging to bring its product to the family buyer.

This is a good example of what can be done to open new opportunities for the products of our farms and forests. The Department of Agriculture has expressed its appreciation for the cooperation of the Holbert Bros. in carrying forward the best scientific advances in the maple-sirup industry.

It is good to know that new methods help to bring us all of the best in one of nature's own products. Once again Americans show their unique ability to use the old and the new together for better living.

If you visit Minnesota when the "sap's running" be sure so see all of the excitement of maple-sirup-making time.

PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the House and Senate of the Minnesota State Legislature have passed a joint resolution memorializing the Congress to take active steps to improve and make permanent our price-support program. These recommendations are worthy of the serious consideration of every Member of the Congress since this 11-point program is prompted by firsthand knowledge of the farm situation at home.

Resolution 5

Joint resolution memorializing the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States to support measures promoting fair prices for agricultural commodities in the national interest

Whereas the continuing upward trend in farm-operating costs and the downward trend in farm prices threaten acute distress to farmers in this area; and

Whereas the Government has again called on farmers to meet huge production goals in the interest of the national defense and welfare, and to build up surpluses of food in the national interest which in the absence of further supporting action will depress prices further, and thus penalize farmers for patriotic effort; and

Whereas only two Minnesota crops, wheat and corn, are treated as basic commodities under the present law; and

Whereas designation of oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities for mandatory price supports under the law would tend to balance farm production, and help prevent unneeded surpluses; and

Whereas perishable farm products such as milk, meat, butter, and eggs make up approximately 70 percent of the cash farm income of Minnesota farmers and these commodities are without adequate price protection; and

Whereas younger farmers are already in financial difficulty and it has become difficult for young men to start farming with today's high costs and uncertain outlook, and

Whereas a farm depression would have a serious effect upon the entire national economy; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced in Congress to improve and make permanent the farm-price-support laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Congress of the United States, be requested to do all in their power to improve and make permanent a farm-price-support program; by

First, extending price supports to include oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities; and

Second, attempting to provide a balanced system of price supports for perishable products, including hogs, beef cattle, milk, poultry, and eggs, returning producers of these important products parity for their work and investment; and

Third, providing whenever practical, self-regulated and self-financed price-support programs; and

Fourth, providing an incentive system of price supports on commodities in short supply to encourage production shifts without acreage controls; and

Fifth, taking steps to protect and expand markets at home and abroad for farm products, including the consideration of the International Wheat Agreement; and

Sixth, to expand greatly research for farm production and marketing, especially in ways to reduce the spread between farm and retail prices for farm products, so as to safeguard the farmer's total income; and

Seventh, to permit family farm ownership and operation by providing an adequate and available supply of long-term, low-interest credit; and

Eighth, using a system of democratically elected farmer committees to carry out the operations of all possible parts of the farm program; and

Ninth, encouraging more soil conservation so as to meet the needs of the Nation without depleting our agricultural resources and productive capacity; and

Tenth, recognizing that as a strong Nation we must have food to win and hold allies, to provide that when farm products are purchased for such use the farmer should not get less than the support price; and

Eleventh, providing for adequate crop storage facilities so that the loan program is freely available to all farmers;

All to the end that agriculture may continue to meet the ever-increasing food demands of our Nation, without jeopardizing the farmers' economic position; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

JOHN A. HARTLE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ANCHER NELSEN,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives, the 9th day of March 1953.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate, the 17th day of March 1953.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Approved March 20, 1953.

C. E. ANDERSON,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed March 20, 1953.

MRS. MIKE HOLM,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

A HAVEN FOR IRON CURTAIN ESCAPEES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, all of us applaud the escape of the six who prefer freedom from Czechoslovakia by the sensational passenger airplane exploit under the leadership of Helmut Cermiak, an engineer, and M. Slovak, the pilot. We have similarly applauded other sensational escapes, some, like that of the young Polish pilot who flew a Russian MIG to Denmark, of inestimable aid to free world defense and security. These escapes are a tremendous blow to the Communists and their satellites. We want them continued, but are we offering the escapees a real haven? The nonpreference Czechoslovak immigration quota into the United States is mortgaged ahead to the year 2000.

Those escapees from behind the Iron Curtain who have been crowding into West Berlin by the thousands since the Communists have been trying to seal off the East from the West zone of Germany, are living under the grave difficulties of crowded refugee camps far beyond the capacity of West Berlin to maintain. West Berlin is now receiving almost 1,500 refugees a day. The situation is such that Mayor Reuter, of West Berlin, is here on a money-raising mission for their relief.

Only adequate immigration opportunities can give these escapees from behind the Iron Curtain a fair haven. The number is not unmanageable. There are 15,000 escapees, other than East zone

Germans (who have German nationality), from behind the Iron Curtain in West Europe. But resettlement by immigration will not work if we do not take our fair share as we did with the displaced persons. The displaced-persons law permitted the admission of political refugees; there is now no such provision on the books. Such legislation should be high on the congressional agenda as a must. This agenda is the responsibility of the administration and of our congressional leadership. The Judiciary Committee could take prompt action on this matter, as there is no trouble in getting up the necessary legislation as soon as it gets the green light for this session.

NATIONAL GENERAL STAFF SYSTEM

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DAYTON, OHIO: FROM DOOMED CITY TO FORTUNATE VALLEY

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago today my home town of Dayton, Ohio, was at the darkest moment in its entire history. The waters of the Miami, Stillwater, and Mad Rivers raged through the streets. During the days that Dayton and many other communities in the Miami Valley were under water, great fires raged unchecked and added to the destruction and loss of life. When the waters receded, 300 lives had been lost and property damage exceeded $100 million.

Many people claimed that Dayton and the Miami Valley could never recover from this distaster, that never again would the area be out of danger from similar floods. Ten years later this threat had been removed forever—removed through the efforts of the people themselves. The secret of the achievement was cooperation. All the citizens of the Miami Valley worked steadfastly for the group as a whole in cooperation with each other, recognizing that what is good for one is good for the other and never losing sight of the fact the future of any group lies in the hands of all the people and not just a selective few.

I feel that the lesson learned in those harrowing days of the flood itself, and the years which followed is one which should serve not only the people of my district, but all the people of our great Nation, as an example of what men and women can accomplish when they work together with an unconquerable spirit toward a common goal.

I remember those dark and frightening days well. My father owned a grocery store at the corner of Broadway and Riverview. Although the water did not come into the store itself, it was surging in the street just out the door. Best of all I remember the long, tense hours we all worked to distribute my father's grocery stock to as many families who were without food as we could reach.

The record of flood control in the Miami Valley and the establishment of the Conservancy District is an epic in American history. It is also a tribute to the pioneering spirit of the people of the Miami Valley and the men who led the flood-control movement, men such as Col. Edward A. Deeds, John H. Patterson, Arthur E. Morgan, John A. McMahon, Judge Horace S. Oakley, and many, many others.

I would like to briefly outline how cooperation changed Dayton from the "Doomed City" to the "Fortunate Valley."

The Dayton of 1913 was a city of character. Although the population was a mixture of people from New England, Bavaria, Pennsylvania, and the South, with a touch of Irish, Slav, and Negro, it had elements of homogeneity and of a common spirit which gave it some of the characteristics of a village with a long history in which the people were neighbors. It was a city of greatly varied home-owned industries, nearly all of which had originated and developed there. Life in the narrow valley was prosperous, but constantly subject to one menace—that of flood. The pioneer towns of the valley had barely begun their development when, in the month of March 1805, a flood occurred which probably was not exceeded in size until the disaster of March 1913. After the flood a levee was built along the river by the new settlers which was washed away in 1828 by another flood. Although the levee system was enlarged through the years, it was again breached in 1847. As the cities grew larger, flood damage increased. The floods of 1866, 1897, and 1898 and the lesser ones during the intervening years finally stirred the city government of Dayton. Plans for flood control were made and remade as the years passed. Finally, in the spring of 1913 all formalities were completed, finances were arranged, contracts were let, the construction equipment was erected, and the work was to start the following week, when the great flood of 1913 burst upon the valley. When it was past, the contractor's equipment was a wreck in midchannel.

However, failure to have the construction completed in time was not a disaster since the flood of 1913 was more than 2½ times as great as that against which protection had been planned.

The flood itself is history. The storm began on March 23. By March 25 the water was overflowing unprotected lands in the north part of Dayton and finally the muddy waters spilled over the top of the levees into the city. By morning on the 26th, the floodwater in Dayton had reached its crest, about 10 feet deep in the main section of the city. From then it fell slowly.

That so few people did lose their lives is witness to the generally widespread initiative, resourcefulness, and courageous self-reliance of the people of the valley. As soon as the nature of the catastrophe became known, local citizens went to work at rescue and relief, without instruction or direction, as though each one were the person individually responsible for saving life. Stories of individual heroism are legion. Naturally, the National Cash Register factory, with its organization ready for work, was the biggest of the relief stations. It was unharmed by water, and it had so extensive a plant that it was the logical place to house a large number of people. Heat, water, shelter, were all at hand, and a start on the food problem was made. John H. Patterson, with his drive and executive ability, organized the relief work in the southern part of the city. In the northern part, an equally fine job was done by a citizen-organized group.

At best, the structure of local government is adequate for only the usual activities. The floodwaters in effect washed away the relatively weak city government, and its functions were taken over by forceful men who quickly created or adapted organizations to serve the immediate need, or by outside State or Federal agencies. Among a people without democratic traditions, the situation might have led to efforts to gain permanent control of city affairs. In fact, however, these emergency agencies were created on the spot or were brought in from outside, served their short-time purposes, and then disappeared, leaving civil processes and authority in control.

Because of the physical setup of National Cash Register Co. and because John H. Patterson, the founder and owner, was a master of system, organization and effective leadership, Mr. Patterson assumed control of the situation. On March 28, a number of citizens met with Gen. George H. Wood, of the Ohio National Guard, and communicated with Governor Cox, who went through the form of creating a Citizens' Relief Committee. Mr. Patterson was appointed president, and W. F. Bippus, secretary and treasurer. All orders signed by Mr. Patterson were honored by all the posts of the National Guard.

Too many Daytonians to name gave able assistance as members of this committee. The National Guard, the Red Cross, and the Citizens' Relief Committee worked hand in hand to bring order out of chaos. On May 6, the period of emergency administration for Dayton was at an end. Martial law was suspended by Governor Cox and the civil government resumed its usual functions, although the Red Cross and Citizens' Committee continued to be of service.

I go into this emergency government period to prove that controls and dictatorlike authority can be inaugurated and as easily abandoned when the need is over.

Even before martial law had been lifted, the people of Dayton had organized to prevent the threat of future tragedies. Five committees were set up to work along with the city government. They were flood prevention, finance, public improvement, sanitation and traffic.

The finance committee began a whirlwind campaign to raise $2,000,000 to apply toward flood prevention, and Arthur E. Morgan was engaged to take charge of flood-prevention investigations. An open meeting was held and a final accounting showed contributions of $2,130,000 from 23,000 subscribers. This flood-prevention fund financed the preparation of plans and the other essential expenses for about 4 years, until proceeds from bond issues were available. Thereupon 10 percent was reserved for possible further needs, and about 83 percent was turned back to the subscribers. This, you will admit, is an unusual history for a contributed fund. As Mr. Patterson withdrew from active leadership, Col. Edward A. Deeds, then vice president of NCR, became the spearhead of the project. He went up and down the valley speaking untiringly on the need for adequate flood control.

In addition to surveys and studies on which the engineering plans were to be based, and the actual development of those plans, the group was also engaged in working out the general structure of flood-control legislation. When the general outline was prepared, it was turned over to a legal staff, headed by John A. MacMahon, to be cast into suitable legal form. The Ohio conservancy bill, which he drafted in close cooperation with Arthur Morgan and others, was one of the first in the field, but nevertheless extremely sound. Its soundness was attested by the fact that it withstood prolonged and vigorous attack in the State and Federal courts. All through the process of drafting the conservancy bill and its tests in the courts, Judge O. B. Brown and his associate, Alfred Swift Frank, carried the legal work of the district.

On January 19, 1914, the conservancy bill was introduced into the Ohio House by Representative Victor Vonderheide, of Dayton. After some hesitation on the part of the house, the bill was passed with the emergency clause and became part of the laws of Ohio on February 7. While the conservancy bill was on its way through the legislature, the legal staff of the district was preparing to circulate a petition for the establishment of a conservancy district. On February 18, 1914, the petition, with far more than the required signatures, was filed in the common pleas court of Montgomery County. On June 28, 1915, after long legal battles, the conservancy court declared the Miami Conservancy District organized. The court appointed Edward Deeds, Henry M. Allen, of Troy, and Gordon S. Rentschler, of Hamilton, as directors. Colonel Deeds, who became president of the board, donated the Miami Conservancy Building to be "an outward and visible sign of inward and spiritual strength" in order to encourage those citizens who were beginning to lose heart in the project. The building had the desired effect since the citizens plunged even more vigorously into their fight to protect their homes from this threat of flood.

Plans for actual construction began. While the legal hearings on appraisals and bids were underway, plans for the financing through the sale of bonds were completed. Fifteen million dollars of serial bonds were issued. Then, only 5 years after the flood, in January of 1918 actual work began. It is one of the shortest periods recorded among similar projects. In April of 1923 announcement was made of the completion of the work included in the official plan.

Just 10 years earlier the people of the valley were cleaning the mud out of their houses and were wondering what would be the future of an area subject to such a threat. In no other great flood-control project in America, aside perhaps from the one on the Mississippi, had construction work even been begun within 10 years of the time of the disaster which brought it about. The expenditure had been about $30,000,000.

However, it is not the actual dollars spent that make this project significant. It is the fact that the people themselves without financial help from the Federal Government worked together and personally provided the funds to make their valley safe.

The Miami Conservancy District, through its pioneering, not only succeeded in its direct aims but wrote another chapter in the history of rugged American individualism.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLARDY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] be excused from the House this week. They are in California as members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities conducting hearings on the west coast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

A PROPOSED CHIEF OF INFANTRY FOR THE MILITARY FORCES

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to develop in the days ahead one important concept which, implemented, I think will add to the security of the Nation and to a fuller understanding of one aspect of foreign affairs.

I intend to develop the theme of having a chief of infantry for our ground forces.

I think circumstances in Korea have shown clearly that only that ground which the foot soldier holds does civil government control.

If this Nation had appreciated that fact during World War II it might have realized that the enforcement power of our covenants extends to the end of our bayonet.

I shall develop this idea of a chief of infantry, Mr. Speaker, in the days ahead.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the so-called submerged or tidelands oil bill, reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

MONETARY POLICIES OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the turn of things as they relate to our economy and insofar as they concern our monetary affairs. I know there is a great deal going on right now affecting economic conditions. I know the sincere desire of people in responsible positions of government and outside of government for a stable economy. I share their views. We need a stable economy, and we need a stable dollar. I do not share the views of those who believe that we should make the dollar worth a great deal more so quickly and so suddenly. I think our number one must problem is to stabilize the dollar where it is, and then take a look and discreetly go from there.

Recently the Federal Reserve Board issued orders and caused to be put into effect certain practices that have resulted in an increase in the interest rates. The increase in interest rates on short-term Government obligations, certificates, and bills, has caused other interest rates to go up. This has had a tremendous effect on our economy as a whole. For instance, Government bonds have gone down in value, until they went to 99, 98, 97, 96, 95, 94, and on yesterday they dropped below 94. That is the first time since World War I when such a situation has existed. After World War I, many of us remember that Government bonds went down even lower than 93. They went down to 80, and in some of the remote sections of our country, where they did not have access to quick information, they went down as low as 76. Those bonds were very quickly bought up by people who were traveling over the country buying them, and shortly thereafter they went back to par. The people of our country were aroused and disturbed by that, and when an emergency

came on, about 1938, the early part of 1939, one of the first things this Congress considered before the Ways and Means Committee in determining a good way to finance the emergency which we could see approaching us, was to determine a good way to protect the people against losses on the purchase of bonds which they had bought and would buy in order to carry on the national defense program, which was this very problem. I was before the Ways and Means Committee, and other Members of Congress went before the Ways and Means Committee, and we told about this cheating on Government bonds, and we asked the committee to do something to stop it in the future; that we did not want that to occur in America again; that people who patriotically bought bonds should not be compelled to sell those bonds at a great loss; the Government should not permit them to sell those bonds or cause them to sell those bonds at a great loss; that it was absolutely wrong. All right. They decided we would not have any such thing as that to happen again. They arranged for E, F, and G bonds, and the Federal Reserve Open Markets Committee protected the bond market, so they would not go below par. That protection continued until the last year or two, but then the peg was taken out by the Federal Reserve Board through the Open Market Committees that they dominated, and bonds were allowed to go down again. That is the same situation facing us now which faced us after World War I, and something which we were determined to guard against.

Now, why are these bonds permitted to go down? Of course, the idea is to raise interest rates. Well, why raise interest rates? We are told that is the way to make the dollar worth more; that we have a 50-cent dollar, and we will make it worth more. Well, how much more valuable do we want to make it? Do we want to make it a 75-cent dollar? If we do, that means it will require 50 percent more labor, 50 percent more services, 50 percent more farm products and 50 percent more goods to pay the dollar that is created on these debts. How high do you want this dollar? Do you want it to go back to 1939 where it was 100 cents? If you do, in effect you double the value of the debts of this Nation. At one time in 1920, the farmers of this country borrowed money to make crops like cotton, corn, and wheat, when the prices of those products were very high. Cotton was about 40 cents a pound and the others were at a comparable price. But everything went down so much that when the time came to pay those debts cotton was worth one-fourth that much, and the other products in proportion. So they had to pay four times the same kind of dollars to pay those debts. We do not want that to occur again. It broke the country, absolutely broke the country. We do not want that to happen any more. But if you double the value of the dollar it will happen. So we do not want the dollar to go down any more in value; we want to stabilize the dollar and maintain it as a stabilized dollar, but we must first determine how much that dollar should be before making it too valuable too quickly.

In 1919 and 1920 before the great boom and bust certain things happened to which I want to invite your attention. I have before me certain charts. They were not prepared by any particular economist or any person who had a personal axe to grind or personal idea to sell; they were prepared by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. They are Federal Reserve charts on bank credit, money rates, and business, put out in September 1952. On page 42 of this book of charts I find the short-term interest rates chart commencing from the early part of 1919 down to 1950. You will notice that the short-term interest rates went up real fast before the boom and bust in 1920 and 1921. The rediscount rates of the Federal Reserve banks went way up and they reached the top and then there was a bust. You know what happened to the country; the country went through a wringer; people lost their homes by the thousands and tens of thousands, their businesses went broke and everything else. Then the rediscount rate went way down, took a nosedive; short term money rates went way down; the country got stabilized again. Then in 1927 and 1928 they started up again, the boom and bust just like it was in 1919, exactly the same way, the same change in interest rates until in October 1929, October, there was another bust, a boom and bust exactly like there was in 1919 and 1920. All right; now I concede to any person the right to make one mistake; we all make mistakes, we cannot help that, we are subject to mistakes, and under certain conditions and circumstances possibly the second mistake might be tolerated and the person not be condemned for making it. But now, then, we are starting out on the same thing the third time, doing the same identical thing that largely contributed to and caused the boom and bust of 1919 and 1920, and the boom and bust of 1929 and 1930; we are doing exactly the same thing today. Who is doing it? The Federal Reserve Board.

The Federal Reserve Board—composed of 7 members appointed for 14-year terms—has enough power over monetary affairs that Congress has given to the Federal Reserve Board, that they have more weight and effect on the economy of this Nation than this entire Congress has. Let me say that again: Those seven members of the Federal Reserve Board have enough power and weight to accomplish more on the economy of this Nation than this entire Congress can accomplish, whether we have an annual budget of $40 billion or $120 billion; the Federal Reserve Board has more power than this Congress has, and this Congress has given them that power. They determine whether we have good times or hard times. The administration in power is responsible if this Board is permitted to cause this country to be wrecked.

I am of the opinion that we should determine from the Federal Reserve Board where they are going, what are their objectives, how far do they expect to go. We ought to find out what they are doing, because they are following the same pattern that has caused the booms and busts in this country; and if they are starting out on the same road now we want to know it and we ought to be able to take some of that power away from them that they are using and exercising, which can only result in something happening that we do not want to happen any more.

WHAT HAPPENED IN ENGLAND

In the fall of 1951 the Banking and Currency Committee of the House visited England and other Western European countries. We visited the financial leaders of those countries and we discussed financial policies with them. While we were there under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, Hon. BRENT SPENCE, we had a conference for one whole afternoon with Chancellor Richard A. Butler of England. He had just gone into office. He outlined to us his program and projected to us what he expected to do in England. Many of us thought then: We do not know what it will do for England but it certainly would ruin the United States. Many of us openly expressed ourselves. He went ahead and carried out that policy. Of course, he was not asking us for advice and we were not trying to give him any.

What was his policy? Just the same as the Federal Reserve Board has started here—raising the rediscount rates at Federal Reserve banks, making money harder to get and causing commercial banks to increase their rates, just exactly what they are doing here. Now, I do not know whether it will have the same effect here or not. It has had it twice before, we know that.

I have in my hand here an article that appeared in Business Week of March 14, 1953, commencing on page 30. I am going to insert this complete article in the RECORD. The heading of the article is: "Trying Hard Money on Britain—It Has Been Tough on Businessmen and Resulted in a 30-Percent Drop in the Stock Market and a Cash Squeeze on Small Firms, but the Shakeup Has Restored Competitiveness and Labor Discipline." All right.

You will find in here that the interest rates were forced up on commercial banks from 3 to 5 percent, the rediscount rate went up, Government bonds went down, just exactly what is happening here in the United States.

The article is as follows:

TRYING HARD MONEY ON BRITAIN—IT'S BEEN TOUGH ON BUSINESSMEN: A 30-PERCENT DROP IN THE STOCK MARKET AND A CASH SQUEEZE ON SMALL FIRMS BUT THE SHAKEOUT HAS RESTORED COMPETITIVENESS, LABOR DISCIPLINE

Ever since the Churchill government took office early in November 1952, it has been using monetary policy to squeeze inflation out of the British economy. In charge of this operation is Chancellor Richard A. Butler, who has been in Washington for talks with Treasury Secretary George M. Humphrey, the man chosen by President Eisenhower to give the United States economy a dose of similar hard-money medicine.

Butler wasn't here to talk only about monetary matters. He had a larger problem on his mind—how to get Britain and the sterling area on a sounder footing via a policy of trade not aid (Business Week, February 21, 1953, p. 25.) But during the talks Humphrey may well have picked up a tip or two on what to expect, especially by

way of business reaction, when a democratic government shifts to a hard money policy after a long period of easy money. For Butler has been through the mill for some 16 months, though in a country where economic conditions are somewhat different from here.

NEW APPROACH

When the Conservatives took over from Labor they introduced something new in postwar British financial policy—the deliberate use of interest rates and credit management to curb inflation. There's no doubt that the policy has transformed the economic climate in Britain. Today inflationary pressures are pretty well gone, the work pace has quickened in most industries, and there has been a perceptible revival of competition in Britain—all without any increase in unemployment. Although a lot of businessmen have been hurt in the process, most of them are satisfied today that British business is in far healthier shape than it was a year ago. And they give the hard-money policy credit for getting Britain out of the foreign-exchange jam it was in last year.

SLUMP

True, part of the change in the economic climate was brought on by last year's textile slump and by the trouble Britain began to meet in export markets. But Butler used monetary policy to accelerate the adjustments that were forced on the British economy by these two developments, whereas the Socialists undoubtedly would have softened the blows by easy credit and cheap money.

For a while, British businessmen were badly shaken. Instead of the easier times they had expected under a Conservative government, they faced the heaviest pressure since the war. Many businessmen even wished that Labor's hated controls would return to replace the tough monetary policy imposed by the Conservatives. The record shows that Chancellor Butler put on a squeeze that was plenty tough for business.

QUICK MOVE

Once in office, Butler didn't waste any time in applying a stiff dose of monetary medicine. He took two steps immediately: (1) He raised the Bank of England's rediscount rate from 2 percent to 2½ percent; and (2) £1-billion of Treasury bills held by the banks were funded into bonds. The second move reduced the liquid assets of the commercial banks from 39 percent of deposits to 31 percent, automatically enforced restrictions on bank loans.

Within 6 months from the time Churchill took office, industrial stocks in Britain had slumped 15 percent, long-term government securities 10 percent. Then, in March, the bank rate was raised again, this time to 4 percent. By midyear industrial stocks had dropped another 15 percent.

WIDE EFFECT

Meanwhile, the impact of Butler's policy had spread from the financial community to British business in general. The commercial banks were nearly panicked by the slump in government bonds. On top of that they were being pressed by the Bank of England to tighten up their loan policies. So the banks pressed their customers for quick repayment and for additional security. At the same time they reduced agreed borrowing limits and boosted loan rates. The average rate on loans went up from 3 percent to 5 percent.

The bigger British companies were able to resist demands for repayment. And they found enough working capital by streamlining inventories and trimming off marginal expenditures. But medium and small firms felt the full force of the financial squeeze. They were stampeded into inventory liquidation. Materials and components that had been stockpiled during years of shortages were sold out in a rush.

In order to get cash to repay the banks, thousands of local stores throughout Britain stopped buying radios, TV sets, and bicycles, sold their stocks at cut prices. The same thing happened in the case of stores handling clothing, shoes, and household goods.

EXCESS-PROFITS TAX

Meanwhile, Butler's budget brought more bad news for British business. Instead of an expected tax cut, business got an excess-profits levy on American lines. The only tax relief went to the low and middle income brackets. This made many businessmen hopping mad, produced real discontent within the Conservative Party.

PRESSURE EASES

Then, after midyear, the financial pressure eased up some. On the one hand, Butler felt that his monetary policy plus drastic import cuts had already achieved one of his main goals—strengthening the pound in world currency markets. On the other, Butler feared that too tight a monetary squeeze might produce a serious recession in Britain.

So the Government intervened directly in the textile slump by placing big defense contracts ahead of schedule. At the same time, the Treasury began to run a cash deficit because defense spending was heavier than it had planned.

After midyear, the Treasury also allowed the banks to increase their liquid assets again. These assets rose from 31 percent in March to 38 percent in September. And bank deposits, which had dropped for a while, rose by the end of December to a postwar high.

MARKET RISES

It was the stock market that probably gained the most when Butler eased up his monetary policy at midyear. The market rose gradually again, and yields dropped from their former high levels. After a slump of 30 percent, industrial stocks rose by about 20 percent between mid 1952 and February this year. Medium-term Government securities, which had yielded 3.7 percent before the Conservatives came to power, rose to 4.3 percent in May 1952, then dropped to 4 percent by February.

Business in general gained only slight relief from this easing of policy. For the Government swept up all the additional credit. The story is told in two figures: In calendar 1952 the Government borrowed £400 million more than in 1951; business borrowed £300 million less in 1952 than in the previous year. Actually, bank loans to business dropped by 10 percent in 1952.

What's more, even after midyear the high cost of bank advances forced the continued clearance of inventories not only by retailers but by wholesalers and manufacturers as well.

SHAKY ON CASH

Inventory liquidations throughout 1952 prevent monetary pressure from being disastrous for more than a few firms. But a large part of British business is still in a shaky cash position. That has brought on a booming new business in credit insurance—covering against nonpayment of trade debts. The funds are provided by a group of big insurance companies.

Today bills aren't being paid in Britain as promptly as they were. Even some of the big-name British companies don't pay their bills until they have had two or three reminders. They are quite ready to let the suppliers battle with creditors and the banks.

DEBT COSTS UP

The government, of course, has had to pay a price for its tough money policy. The interest that it pays on the national debt has risen by 20 percent. This will add £100 million to this year's budget.

As the biggest holders of government securities, the British commercial banks were hard hit at first. But since midyear they have recovered their capital losses and made good profits from higher loan rates. In fact, all the banks reported higher profits from 1952 than from 1951. One bank was able to raise its dividend, something that hasn't happened in Britain since the mid-1930's.

FEELING THE SQUEEZE

Business profits as a whole felt the impact of the monetary squeeze—though not too seriously. Net profits before taxes for calendar 1952 were 11 percent above 1951. Still, the 1951 gain over 1950 had been 24 percent and profits for the fourth quarter of 1952 were actually below the previous year.

What's more, total profits don't tell the whole story. Profits of industries such as aircraft, machinery, engineering, and construction materials were all up as a result of higher government spending on defense and housing. But profits in textiles, clothing, shoes, and other consumer goods all dropped fairly sharply. Retail stores barely held their own, after a steady rise over several years.

It's clear that if Butler maintains his hard money policy, profits in 1953 will show a real drop.

COMPETITION

Overall, a hard money policy has meant new troubles for British business. It has ended seven fat years and finished the days of easy finance within British companies. But for the most part the growing competitive pressure has pleased efficient firms and worried only the inefficient.

Almost every British industrialist is delighted by the way the new climate has restored plant discipline and cut down political abuse of "capitalists." Several unions have recently made statements urging their members to help management raise output and cut costs. They have even declared that profits are essential to maintain equipment. That's such a novel line for British unions to take that British management is willing to believe that the squeeze may bring better times.

TAX RELIEF

However, taxation is one area where British business is asking for relief. Business spokesmen are pressing the Government hard to cut its spending and to clear the way for tax cuts. Invariably they argue that unless business taxes are cut, British industry cannot even maintain its equipment.

Chancellor Butler must decide on this tax question before his April budget. And the betting in London is that business will get some kind of break on taxes. But there's no expectation at all that monetary policy will be eased. In fact, it's possible that Butler will tighten the credit screw again to cut down domestic consumption and make more goods available for export.

I want you to read that article, and then I want you to read another article which, incidentally, also appeared in Business Week, although I do not know the exact date of its appearance. I happen to have a reprint. I saw the article when it came out in Business Week. It discloses information about our debts that we should know about. It is a very interesting article, and I hope all of you will read it. It states that the Federal Government owes about $267 billion; the State and local debt about $30 billion; private debt, corporations, $195 billion; individuals, $135 billion—a total of $627 billion. That is our debt here in America.

How much will it mean to the people of America if you increase interest rates 1 percent? That means $6,270,000,000 a year extra that you will have to pay, and that is just increasing the interest rate 1 percent on existing debts. If you increase the interest rate one-half of 1 percent it is three billion plus just on what we already owe.

The article is as follows:

PROSPERITY IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: HOW DEEPLY IN DEBT ARE WE?

How prosperous are the people of the United States? Previous messages in this special series have answered this question in part by recording the progress—relatively slow progress—we have made in increasing both the income and the wealth per person in the United States of America.

This fourth and concluding piece of the special series deal with the extent to which our prosperity should be discounted because it has been accompanied by an increasing volume of debt. Many correspondents have suggested to us that an individual or a nation can temporarily increase prosperity by borrowing, but in so doing lives on both borrowed goods and borrowed time. Our purpose here is solely to throw light on the question of whether or not we are now in that unenviable position.

On January 1, 1963, the total debt of the United States Government and of its citizens was $627 billion, as shown in the table below. On its face a debt of this magnitude, which represents about $3,900 of debt for each person, suggests that we are heavily debt ridden.

Total debt, public and private

Federal Government debt	$267,000,000,000
State and local debt	30,000,000,000
Private debt:	
Corporations	195,000,000,000
Individuals	135,000,000,000
	627,000,000,000

The burden of our debts, however, does not depend simply on their size. It depends in much more decisive degree on our capacity to carry the load successfully. This capacity, in turn, is partly a matter of attitude, and attitudes defy objective measurement. A community that gets very jittery about its debts has less capacity to carry its burden successfully than one that does not. But the accurate measurement of jitters, present or prospective, still remains to be mastered.

CAPACITY TO CARRY THE DEBT LOAD

Nonetheless, it is possible to throw some light on our capacity to carry the debt burden by studying key economic elements that can be measured with some degree of accuracy. The following paragraphs indicate how some of these key economic elements stand:

Compared with our national income, the total volume of our debts, public and private, is still well below the level of 1929, when it proved to be too big for the good of the country. Our total debt is now 113 percent greater than the national income, whereas in 1929 it was 146 percent greater.

There are several other cheering facts about our debts. One is a sharp decline in interest rates, which makes the cost of carrying our debts relatively much less than it was in 1929. It took 8 percent of our total national income to carry our debts in 1929; it takes only about 5 percent of the income today.

MORE CHEERING FACTS

We also have much more ready cash now than in 1929. Today individuals and corporations hold a total of $269 billion in cash or its equivalent which is almost twice as much as the portion of private short-term debt (about $140 billion) that is subject to sudden demand for payment.

Many students of the subject cite the relative low cost of carrying our debts and the large volume of cash on hand, and reach the comfortable conclusion that our debt burden is nothing to worry about. In further support of this view they emphasize the fact that no important part of our debt is owed abroad. Hence, they reason there is not the danger, so conspicuous in Britain since the end of World War II, that our economy will be upset by the necessity of making heavy debt payments to other countries.

SOME DANGERS OF PRESENT DEBT

However, the nature of our debts presents dangers that it would be foolish to ignore. This is true of both the debt of $267 billion owed by the Federal Government to its citizens and the $330 billion in private debts owed by some citizens and corporations to others.

Public debt can be a dangerous kind of debt because Government has the power to print money or to create its equivalent by expanding bank credit. Of the $215 billion that the Federal Government borrowed during World War II, over $90 billion was borrowed from banks. This was the largest single contributor to the inflation of prices that since the war has robbed the dollar of about half of its purchasing power, and thereby robbed the buyers of Government bonds of about half the purchasing power these bonds were supposed to represent.

If, as is quite possible, a new emergency should again require the Federal Government to borrow heavily while its debt remains so high, it is doubtful that the public would be avid to buy its bonds. Hence, the Government might again be forced to resort to the inflationary process of relying on bank credit.

Private debts can be dangerous if the people take on new debts more rapidly than is justified by the growth of business or by their ability to repay. Last year bank loans were increased by the imposing sum of about $6½ billion, which represents an increase of about 11 percent in total loans outstanding. This is almost twice as much as the increase in the volume of business over the same period. Installment credit for consumers increased by $3 billion last year, again an increase in debt about twice as great as the increase in business volume in the fields where the credit was used. It is also the fastest rate of such growth in our history.

CONSTRUCTIVE USE OF CREDIT

So long as the expansion of credit does no more than keep pace with expansion in the volume of business, the expansion is constructive. Also, when credit is expanded to acquire resources and equipment that will enlarge the volume of business a little later, that use is clearly constructive. But when private credit expansion begins to run ahead of business growth, it is time for us to be heads up. Such credit expansion courts price inflation. It also creates a forced draft under business so that, if credit is cut off, there may be a painful drop.

To give a summary answer to the question: Is the level of debt in the United States a danger to our prosperity?—the answer seems to be, "Not at the moment." We owe nothing abroad. The interest burden on present debt is relatively small, and we appear to have the resources to handle the short-term debt. Yet both the total amount of debt and the recent rapid increase in total private debt, especially the latter, are enough to signal for caution. We need restraint on the part of business and consumers to avoid expanding private borrowing at an excessive rate. The Federal debt needs to be reduced and put in more manageable form. If these things are done, we can proceed to build a sound prosperity.

Do you not think it is a good time for us to pay off a number of these debts with what they call the cheap dollar before we begin to make the dollar too expensive? Yes; let us stabilize the dollar where it is, but let us—particularly the Federal Government—pay off some of these debts while we can do it with this low-priced dollar. It will be in the interest of our economy to do that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PATMAN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the Government bonds go down to a rate that compares with 3 percent—the 20-year bonds—they will have to go down to 92. If they go down to compare with the 3¼-percent bond—we are told that is where the Federal Reserve Board is aiming, 3¼ percent interest on Government bonds—that means these bonds will go down to 88. Do you want that done? That is the direction in which they are going.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. They have also reduced the margin rate on the stock market from 75 to 50 percent. I know the gentleman can make some very interesting observations on that, but I remember some years ago when they did that, they did it to get the public, the suckers, into the market, and then they unloaded on them about 9 months later.

Mr. PATMAN. It sounds like 1927 and 1928, preceding the last and most devastating boom and bust, when hard times and the Hoover depression hit us at the same time.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. An observation might be made of the fact that during our years of survival from Pearl Harbor to the end of the war our dollar was worth nothing in a sense. We gave our products of survival away under lend-lease. When that was finished we converted our dollar from nothing to over 50 cents, if you wish, to make not goods available but money available so that others could buy our goods. To me that seems like progress, when you look at it in a transitional sense from war to trade and peace.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

About this speculative incentive, the gentleman is exactly right. That is encouraging speculation. Why, if the Federal Reserve wants to stop inflation, which they claim—I claim we are going over the inflation hill now, and I think the Federal Reserve feels that way and they want to relax, but why start on speculation? Why let the speculators in the stock market get the benefit of Government credit? Why not use it for the people in a more constructive way?

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Business is planning capital outlays in 1953 above the record 1952 rates, according to a survey of capital budgets conducted during February and early March by the United States Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission. This survey indicates that if present programs materialize, new plant and equipment expenditures in 1953 will total $27 billion, compared with outlays of $26.5 billion in 1952 and $25.5 billion in 1951.

This is very interesting and encouraging information. It is contained in a

news release by the United States Department of Commerce on business capital expenditures in 1953. However, if the Federal Reserve Board's policy of increasing interest rates continues, it is possible that many of these expenditures will not be made. It is perfectly natural for higher interest rates to discourage capital expenditures. As optimistic as this report is, we should not overlook the fact that higher interest can change the good outlook entirely and cause us to face a bad situation instead of a good situation.

WOMAN'S ARMY CORPS TRAINING CENTER

The SPEAKER. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House today a matter which has been brought strongly to my attention in the past few days.

On March 12, I addressed the House concerning the proposal to transfer the Women's Army Corps Training Center from Fort Lee, Va., to Fort McClellan, Ala. At that time I read to the House a telegram I had sent to Secretary of Defense Wilson urging him to reconsider this move on the grounds that it is just one of the many illustrations of wastefulness on the part of the military.

Before and since that time, I have been endeavoring to get information to substantiate my claim that this proposal is too costly to be considered at this time in view of our promises to effect reductions in our Federal budget.

I have dealt with the authorities at Fort Lee, Va., and they have been most cooperative, although naturally limited by the restrictions imposed by the Army. I requested certain information from the commanding general at Fort Lee on March 10, which information was needed to evaluate the feasibility of the Wacs remaining at Fort Lee. The following day I was informed by the officials at Fort Lee that the information I desired was classified and therefore it was being forwarded to me through regular Army channels.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to say to the gentleman that he is talking about a matter which affects the district I represent. I would simply like to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with the fact that construction at Fort McClellan to facilitate the removal from Fort Lee is underway now, and supposed to be completed in December of this year.

Mr. ABBITT. I understand it is 16 percent completed as of this date.

Mr. ROBERTS. I would like to further ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that extensive hearings were held on this matter in May and June of 1951, also in May and June of 1952, before the Committee on Armed Services, in which it was revealed by the military that the existing facilities at Fort Lee were not adequate, and that even if the Wacs were removed, the testimony showed that Fort Lee would have to have additional expansion to take care of expansion in the Quartermaster Corps.

Mr. ABBITT. I might inform the gentleman that I have gone into that matter previously very thoroughly. We have been informed reliably that the facilities at Fort Lee are adequate and could amply take care of what they have now, and will be sufficient to take care of what is contemplated that Fort McClellan will take care of. Not only this but my further information is that nothing further is contemplated by the Quartermaster Corps by way of expansion at Fort Lee in the foreseeable future. Those facilities at Lee have been renovated. While they are not as fancy buildings as they might be if they were built new, they will take care of the situation.

Not only that, the Army has no idea what it will cost to erect these facilities at Fort McClellan. When they say $11,000,000, they merely reach up into thin air and pick some figure. It is estimated now it will cost far beyond any such figure as that.

Further, it is highly doubtful that they will complete it any time near December of this year, and when it is completed it will take care of only several hundred more than can be adequately taken care of at Fort Lee.

Mr. ROBERTS. May I ask the gentleman if he read the hearings in June of 1951 and 1952?

Mr. ABBITT. I have been over those hearings. May I suggest to the gentleman that I have only 5 minutes, and he can take his own time and not take all of my time. I do not mean to be discourteous toward him at all, but I am sure he can get whatever time he needs here to go forward with that point. I should like to proceed with my statement.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman, but may I make this statement. I will certainly be glad to argue this matter with the gentleman in the proper forum. However, I do not think this is the proper forum to discuss transferring the Wacs from Fort Lee to Fort McClellan.

Mr. ABBITT. To continue with my statement, although I have called the officials here several times, I have yet to receive the desired information through the regular Army channels but have been informed over the telephone that it will be forthcoming.

Needless to say, however, I have secured the information from sources higher than the Department of the Army, but had it been necessary for me to wait for the regular Army channels to supply it, I do not know when it would be forthcoming.

It is interesting, too, to realize that shortly after I was informed that the information was classified and therefore could not be given me at the lower level, part of the information was released by a public relations officer of the Army to the press and carried in all the interested newspapers for the whole world to see; and it is also interesting to know that the information so released was only that part of the requested information that would tend to back up the prior decision of the Army to remove the Wacs to Fort McClellan. It makes me wonder just how far the Army is willing to go to substantiate a decision that they have made and to try to prevent a reversal of same even though it develops that they were wrong in the first instance, and the reversal is justified.

To me it is an illustration of the kind of cumbersome procedure we have in our defense setup, and I hope that by bringing it out in public, at least some improvements can be made.

Here we find that restrictions are placed by the Army on information which might readily have been given out at the local level, except for these restrictions, and then is withheld at the upper echelon and released only when it suits their purpose, and then only that part of the information that suits their purpose and backs up their prior action.

I would like to place this as an illustration of the way our military operates and to offer this as an example of why more scrutiny should be given to the defense budgets which are presented us with the request of quick approval. All items should be looked into with an eye to saving money where money can be saved, to getting rid of the fat, and no longer approving items just because certain people request them. I contend that this is one of the places where reductions in our Federal budget could be effected if proper consideration were given to the facilities which are at hand and are available at the various places in the country without constructing new facilities at a cost of millions of dollars at this time when balancing our budget is so essential to the Nation's economy.

It seems to me that our experiences of the past should at least provide us with some commonsense understanding on matters of this kind. We have twice in the past 12 years built up our military forces after they have been allowed to dwindle following our great wars. In both instances rather than making use of some of the facilities we had available, the military services have gone out and purchased large tracts of land and built new facilities. We in Congress have not questioned this too much, feeling that it is important that we give as much support as possible to our military leaders in these times of trouble.

There was certainly some justification for this prior to the beginning of World War II. At that time we had allowed our military facilities to drop off to practically nothing during the depression. We spent billions of dollars building bases throughout the country and these, of course, were built in some places at a tremendous increase in price. However, we tend to overlook things like this in times of need. We were caught with little preparedness and it was necessary to get those things we needed as soon as possible. However, 1940 was more than 20 years after World War I and there was certainly more justification for such an outlook then than there is now, only 8 years after World War II.

It is hard for me, and I might add, many of our citizens, to understand how we built our military program up to such heights in World War II only to have the Armed Forces come back less than 5 years

later and tell us they are again in need of facilities. In many places in our country we have military installations built in World War II which are now unused, although we have allowed the military in the last few years to construct the same kind of facilities still of a temporary nature. It seems that the Army gets a joy out of moving around over the country and the taxpayers are taken for the ride.

I am firmly convinced that some of these conditions should be corrected, but this is not the principal reason why I am addressing the House today. I just want to take this opportunity of bringing to your attention the trend of military thinking which seems to follow the principle that only that information which is to the advantage of the military is released wherever there is a question in which two sides are presented.

If we listen to the Army they, no doubt, would tell us that within the next few years all of our present facilities would be out of date and eventually would have to be replaced. This seems to be the argument given for the transfer of the WAC Training Center at this time. The WAC has become a permanent part of the Army and therefore needs a permanent home, of course, but that does not mean that new and costly facilities must be provided or that they must be moved away from their present location. We are in a real emergency, both abroad and at home. We are facing the communistic threat. The one last hope of the free people of this world is America and if we are to meet the challenge we must keep our economy strong and dynamic for if we collapse inwardly never again would our people know and experience freedom as we do. The public debt today is over $266 billion. We are operating this year in the red and it is the hope of many of us that soon we will be able to at least balance our budget, and it is just such items as this that must be cut out if we are to achieve that goal because we cannot longer continue operating on borrowed money and still maintain a free and strong economy.

If the Armed Forces could convince me that it is more economical to house the Wacs at Fort McClellan, and that such economies would result over a period of years, I would not be raising the objections that I have to this move; or, if the Army could give assurances that there is to be an expansion of the Quartermaster Training Command at Fort Lee in the foreseeable future as well as a real need for the facilities now being used by the WAC at Fort Lee, there would not be as convincing an argument against it. But this is not the case. The only reason this decision has been made, in my opinion, is because the Army feels that now, with high budgets and easy money, it would be more to their advantage to make such a request today than it would in the next few years with the purse strings of the Federal Treasury likely to be drawn tighter.

I realize, too, that this decision was made sometime ago during the days of the past administration, but our people have been told that reductions can be expected and I contend that this is one of the places where such reductions ought to be made.

I do know and I feel that if we are ever going to start giving our people economy in government, now is the time we should begin. Our Federal budget is increasing year after year and our military budget is now running 58 percent of our total expenditures. We, as Members of Congress, cannot go minutely into every item in the military budget, but it certainly seems to me that we should get away from the idea that the military budget is untouchable and that no economies can be found therein. If we contend that economy can be practiced in other departments of the Government and that cuts can be made here and there in services rendered by those who spend far less than the military, then it is only logical to assume that there is some padding in the military budget as well.

I, for one, would like to go on record as saying that we should begin to question the blank checks we have been giving in these forms of authorizations and appropriations, especially in cases where it is not of an immediate essential nature.

I feel very strongly about the question of balancing our budget and I feel that we owe it to the American people to bring our expenditures down to within a reasonable point of normalcy. While we cannot look at the budget of pre-World War II days as a guide, we certainly cannot expect to keep spending at the rate we have been doing since the end of World War II. Preparedness is one thing—provided it is achieved—but it seems to me there is more talk today of our not being prepared than there is from those who say that we are. Thus it would seem to me that spending money is not always a guaranty that we are getting what we need in the way of preparedness.

The billions that we are spending around the world and here at home are going for naught unless we can see results from the moneys we have spent. The only way we will ever get those results is to get at those things which are nearest home and go from there on to the greater things. We see waste here in Washington and we can point to an eight- or ten-billion-dollar budget deficit and say it should be reduced but few of us would know how to just knock off that much and apply it down the line. The way to get economy is to hit at individual items and this proposal to build a permanent training center at this time when adequate facilities are available is not in the best interest of economy.

I would like to call on the Secretary of Defense, as I have done, and upon the other leaders to reconsider these proposals which have been made by the past administration and to have them evaluated in terms of an economy program.

We have here presented an opportunity to find out the real attitude of the present administration toward achieving economy in the armed services as it will be necessary to cut every bit of the "fat" out of the defense expenditures regardless of amounts if the budget is to be balanced.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. BEAMER), on account of official business.

Mr. FISHER (at the request of Mr. LYLE), for an indefinite period, on account of a death in the family.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS TRAINING CENTER

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, while I am not thoroughly prepared to answer the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT], I think I can do so in a general way.

Too often some of us are inclined to jump on the military in the name of economy when a decision is made which runs counter to our personal wishes. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, has just charged the Defense Department with lack of economy, in its decision made many months ago and concurred in by the Armed Services Committee, to transfer the WAC Training Center from Fort Lee, Va., to Fort McClellan, Ala. The gentleman is in error in his statement since the move is in the interest of economy and efficiency as shown by the hearings on this matter which were held in June of 1951 and in 1952. The Department of Defense came in and was asked for its considered opinion on this matter. The testimony shows that extensive investigations were conducted as to available places where the Wacs might go. It appears in the record of hearings that during World War II, these patriotic girls in the WAC Corps had been kicked around from pillar to post, and had undergone training at 4 or 5 different places in the country. Also that the greatest percentage of these girls, who enlisted in the Women's Army Corps came from down in the Southeast, and the Government would save millions of dollars in transportation alone.

Extensive preparations have been made to give the Wacs a permanent home. I am cognizant of the fact that the gentleman a few days ago made the statement on the floor that this move was not in the interest of economy. Well, I fail to see the economy in the gentleman's proposal to cancel out a contract that is 16 percent completed, when the record will bear me out that the Army testified before the Committee on Armed Services that there was not room at Fort Lee for the Wacs. Even if the Wacs were removed from Fort Lee, there would not be enough room to take care of the proposed expansion in the Quartermaster Corps at Fort Lee.

To go just a little bit further into this proposition, the thing was thoroughly thrashed out in the committee. Questions from both sides of the aisle were

asked in the committee, and I understand that action was unanimous in favor of this transfer in the meeting of the Committee on Armed Services. I would simply like to say to the gentleman from my understanding of the proposition that the vacancy he will have at Fort Lee will be more than taken care of by the proposed expansion in the Quartermaster Corps. I would like further to say to him that this thing is not a jumped-up proposition. It has been considered now for a period of over 2 years, considerable sums of money have been spent, and the program is well under way.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTS. I yield.

Mr. ABBITT. I wonder where the gentleman got his information, or did he mean to infer that in the foreseeable future, the facilities now occupied by the Wacs or available for such additional Wacs as may be needed will be used by the other units at Lee.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will say to the gentleman that I took my information from reading the hearings. That is the highest and best evidence, I think.

Mr. ABBITT. I do not remember that testimony.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will be glad to furnish it to the gentleman at his convenience.

Mr. ABBITT. I do know that the present Secretary of Defense, who I trust is interested in some economy at this time, has through his office given me the information to the effect that the facilities will not be used in the foreseeable future.

Mr. ROBERTS. The WAC barracks are not exactly built along the same lines as barracks for male troops, and to expend the money that has been spent down there in preparing for this transfer, and to simply cancel it out would be the worst kind of false economy. My distinguished friend speaks in the name of economy and yet the suggestion he makes in the light of funds already expended would cost the taxpayers millions of dollars, and would hamper seriously the development of the Women's Army Corps.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENTLEY in two instances, in one to include the text of a speech made on March 23 by Secretary of Agriculture Benson, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $231,

Mr. ANGELL in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances, in one to include an article from the Foreign Service magazine by Admiral Zacharias, and in the other an editorial from the Herald Tribune.

Mr. RADWAN in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. JAVITS in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and include an editorial.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON and include a letter.

Mr. MORANO and include biographical material of a constituent of his and an address made by Mr. Stanley Griffith.

Mr. MASON and include an editorial that clarifies the present position of the majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and its chairman on H. R. 1 and corrects a generally false impression.

Mr. KEATING in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE in the Appendix in six instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY and to include a resolution.

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. SIKES and to include an address.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include extraneous data.

Mr. LANTAFF and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include certain recommendations by Walter Reuther with reference to amendments to the National Labor Relations Act of 1947.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an article by Mr. Stokes appearing in the Washington Star.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEANE and to include extraneous newspaper matter.

Mr. SUTTON.

Mr. FINE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an address by the Honorable KENNETH ROBERTS.

Mr. DINGELL (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska on the subject of Puerto Rico Makes Progress.

Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. GUBSER and to include an article.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $210.

Mr. FALLON and Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT and to include a statement.

Mr. ROBERTS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK).

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 23, 1953:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin.

On March 24, 1953:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 26, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

575. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

576. A letter from the Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report on tin operations for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1952, pursuant to Public Law 125, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

577. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into interstate civil-defense compacts"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

578. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting two publications entitled, "Production of Electric Energy, Capacity of Generating Plants, 1951" and "Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1951"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

579. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled 'An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries,' relative to the composition of claims commissions"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

580. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 23, 1953, the following bills were reported on March 24, 1953:

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4130. A bill to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 185. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3780, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 186. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3853, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 187. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4130, a bill to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 188. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 226, joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 89. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to conduct an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; with amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the House Calendar.

[*Submitted March 25, 1953*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLVERTON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2347. A bill to permit continued exercise, until 6 months after termination of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, of certain powers, relating to preferences or priorities in the transportation of traffic, under sections 1 (15) and 420 of the Interstate Commerce Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of William Robert DeGrafft; with amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Gary Matthew Stevens (Kazuo Omiya); without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Cecile Lorraine Vincent; with amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Norma Jean Whitten; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4198. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 4199. A bill to establish a Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4200. A bill to provide that time spent as a civilian internee during World War II shall be considered as active service in determining priority for induction into the Armed Forces of medical, dental, and allied specialists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4201. A bill relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4202. A bill to amend section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, so as to provide that benefits thereunder shall be available to certain members of the Philippine Scouts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 4203. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that, for the purpose of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, retirement age shall be 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By MR. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 4204. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4205. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4206. A bill to allow widows, widowers, heads of household and certain other persons to deduct for income-tax purposes amounts paid in providing for the care of children and other dependents under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 4207. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 4208. A bill to abolish the action for alienation of affections in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4209. A bill to provide that the Navy shall continue to maintain a clothing factory at Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4210. A bill to exempt admissions to moving-picture theaters from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 4211. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 4212. A bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4213. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4214. A bill to continue the effect of the statutory provisions relating to the deposit of savings for members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4215. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the Federal Security Administrator shall, under certain circumstances, disclose the current address of husbands and parents who have deserted their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4216. A bill to provide for the arrangement of the stars in the union of the flag after the admission of the 49th State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 4217. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special air-mail postage stamp in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Wright brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk, N. C.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4218. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4219. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4220. A bill to amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, so as to increase and make mandatory the prison sentences to be imposed upon second and subsequent offenders under the narcotics laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4221. A bill to authorize the employment by the United States of aliens who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4222. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 4223. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Capt. Samuel Chester Reid; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4224. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4225. A bill to permit deduction for income-tax purposes of certain expenses actually incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4226. A bill to regulate the operation and conduct of commercial parking of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 4227. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4228. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Ute Indians asserted in Court of claims case No. 47568 and to provide for the administration of the lands and moneys paid or to be paid Indians in settlement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE (by request):

H. R. 4229. A bill to change the name of the Polycultural Institution of America to Polycultural University of America, to grant a congressional charter to such university, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4230. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4231. A bill to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between the period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4232. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

My Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4233. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 85. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observation at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Comimttee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. Con. Res. 87. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. Res. 189. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to discharge of committees; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the Congress of the United States to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to pass anti-poll-tax legislation; to the Committee on House Administrator.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress of the United States to urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural gas rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to pass anti-lynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress for legislation whereby aliens serving in the Armed Forces of the United States while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations may, prior to their being shipped overseas, be granted United States citizenship, as was the practice during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature to Congress for the payment by the Federal Government of a Federal old-age pension of $100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado to consider legislation allowing a Federal income tax deduction for certain military, Air Force, and naval reservists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, to enact legislation authorizing the Colorado River storage project and participating projects in the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, for the granting to the States of all minerals and mineral rights in deposits in certain public lands belonging to the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to protest the present political division of Ireland and the presence of British troops therein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to instruct delegates to the United Nations to propose Italy as a member thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to urge the Federal Power Commission to insure that Massachusetts obtains the lowest possible natural gas rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to pass antilynching legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to pass legislation to provide free mailing privileges to all persons or organizations sending letters or merchandise to persons serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States, while engaged in hostilities under the flag of the United Nations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts for the payment by the Federal Government of a Federal old-age pension of $100 monthly for all persons who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relating to the establishment of an Air Force Academy in Arizona; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to consider legislation allowing a Federal income-tax deduction for certain military, Air Force and naval reservists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with respect to Federal taxes on gasoline and motor fuel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to limiting influx of foreign agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4234. A bill for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altoboelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4235. A bill for the relief of Edward Zepp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

H. R. 4236. A bill for the relief of Nahi Youssef; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4237. A bill for the relief of Osjasz Hersh Brakamajer (Sam Brakamayer), Rysa Margolit Brakamajer, and Mosher Brakamajer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONDON:

H. R. 4238. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Adele Vence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 4239. A bill for the relief of Arthur E. Jefferson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 4240. A bill for the relief of Arturo Ordonez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4241. A bill for the relief of Oscar Neumann, Mrs. Magdalena Neumann, and Judith Gabrielle Neumann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosa Barroso De Orozco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4243. A bill for the relief of Kuo Lum Leong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4244. A bill for the relief of Ara Giragos Farajian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of Louis Rizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of Light Liang-liang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 4247. A bill for the relief of William R. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of Albertas Bauras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PILLION:

H. R. 4250. A bill for the relief of Lester H. Kroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4251. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cosciani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 4252. A bill for the relief of Geralda Lillo and Karl Heinz Lillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of Walter Adolphus Burke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4254. A bill for the relief of Aneta Popa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 4255. A bill for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of Magda Manoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMALL:

H. R. 4257. A bill for the relief of Willmore Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 4258. A bill for the relief of Katharina Steinbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4259. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Spencer C. Clark for extra compensation for Sunday, holiday, and overtime services performed between 1929 and 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

107. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the New Jersey Association of Nurserymen recording its vigorous opposition to the proposed changes relating to peat moss balls, and its support of additional restrictions governing such importations due to the ever present danger of introducing new and dangerous pests to the United States of America and the increased danger that would result if the regulations of quarantine No. 37 were modified as now proposed by the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

108. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the National Defense League of America, Inc., to the end that the Congress of the United States of America as the duly elected Representatives of all the people of this Republic, initiate action to cause immediate withdrawal of this Republic's membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

109. Also, resolution adopted by Board of National Trustees of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution that Constitution Day be reestablished and the resolution by Congress signed by the President on February 29, 1952, creating Citizenship Day, be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

110. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city clerk, city of Indio, Calif., to provide funds for adequate hospitalization for the needy and ill veterans of the United States Forces; to the Committee on Appropriations.

111. Also, petition of Edith Johnson, and others, Brockton Townsend Club No. 5, Brockton, Mass., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

112. Also, petition of Mrs. E. E. McNeely, and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

113. Also, petition of William G. Loehr, and others, of Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

114. Also, petition of Lithuanian Democratic Club, Inc., of Newark, N. J., requesting enactment of legislation to amend the social-security laws allowing payment of benefits to everyone in covered employment upon their having attained the age of 60 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

115. Also, petition of Ibrahim Velutini, President, Caracas, Venezuela, relative to legislation which would tend to reduce the importation of Venezuelan petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that we may go forth in the hours of this day with a more adventurous and steadfast faith in Thee and in the ultimate triumph of the true and the good.

We humbly confess that we so frequently allow our faith to become eclipsed by doubt and by difficulties which seem insurmountable.

Help us to understand that if our faith is to be vital and strong, then we must cultivate it and guard it, for eternal vigilance is the price of faith as truly as it is the price of freedom.

Hear us for the sake of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tomorrow in which to file a report on the bill H. R. 4198.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REDUCTION OF MILITARY DOCTORS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by Mr. John G. Norris in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Post says that Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson has ordered a 9-percent cut in the number of Army, Navy, and Air Force doctors. I only hope that he is right in ordering that cut and that the doctors are not needed. Our forces in Korea apparently have had a shortage of arms and ammunition, but they have had the most excellent medical care, which is of great importance.

There seems to be an effort to make cuts in the medical personnel in the Veterans' Administration. There again, we are responsible for the veterans who have been wounded and who have given

their health and strength for us. One of our first duties is to provide the very best medical and hospital care for them. Men are taken out of their usual civilian routine of life and away from their civilian occupations and thrown into combat. During their war service in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, many have lost their jobs and their health. They certainly should, as far as possible, be brought back to health and rehabilitated. The very least we can do is to provide the best medical and rehabilitation care for them.

WILSON ORDERS 9-PERCENT CUT IN NUMBER OF MILITARY DOCTORS

(By John G. Norris)

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson has ordered a 9-percent slash in Army, Navy, and Air Force doctors and proposes skeletonizing 4 or 5 of the 7 Army divisions in this country.

Pentagon officials said that Wilson feels that with 750,000 young soldiers leaving the service this year after 2-year draft periods, combat units in this Nation's mobile reserve can well be cut to as much as half strength. The new veterans, many of them fresh from Korean combat, would be available for quick recall to fill out the divisions in case of any new war, he argues.

Army chiefs oppose his plan and the plan still is not resolved. Wilson, however, is known to be pressing for approximately a 10-percent cut in the present 3,500,000-man-plus armed services.

The doctor cut, however, already has received a go-ahead signal from Wilson. It will mean lower draft calls for physicians, and reducing the number in the Armed Forces from the present 13,300 to about 11,900.

A spokesman for the Armed Forces Medical Policy Council said it already had instructions to lower the ratio of doctors from 3.7 to 3.5 per thousand and will call for only 1,200 instead of 1,800 young medical men in the second quarter of calendar 1953. There has been no discussion on cutting the number of dentists and veterinarians to be called.

Wilson's plans to reduce the Armed Forces to something like 3,300,000 would require about 600 fewer doctors and lower draft calls. Even so, the Defense Department still will need to induct medical men, and has sent to the Bureau of the Budget legislation to extend the special doctors' draft until 1955.

Pentagon spokesmen also said yesterday that, in accordance with long standing plans, draft calls will taper off after July 1.

Only 450,000 men will be needed from selective service during the fiscal year beginning in July—an average of 37,500 a month. This compares with 53,000 monthly now and 47,000 last fall. The reason, however, is that heavy calls now are necessary to replace the heavy monthly inductions right after Korea. Later, calls were lowered and the number of men required to replace those leaving the service next fall and winter after 20- to 24-month draft periods will be less. (Many men returning from Korea are released ahead of the required 2-year draft tour.)

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

EUROPEAN UNITY COMES A STEP CLOSER TO PRACTICAL REALIZATION

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein an article from the Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, as the result of a trip to Europe in the summer of 1949, I reported in some detail to this House on October 13 of that year the story of the first meeting of the Council of Europe at Strasbourg. At that historic meeting 12 nations explored the possibility of forming some kind of union or confederation for their mutual defense and benefit. This first meeting was immeasurably exciting, reminding one of the accounts of our own Constitutional Convention, which was a forerunner of the union of the Colonies and the drafting of the Constitution of the United States.

Anyone making comparison of these two amazing efforts to bring together people of different backgrounds must be aware of the fact that in the case of the American Colonies they had just been successful in a war of independence. In the case of Strasbourg, although the European nations, too, had recently united and waged successful war against a powerful enemy, there was little in their history but bitterness, suspicion, and periodic war with each other. Add to this the fact that they did not speak a common language, and one sees that the situation they faced in seeking some form of unity was very difficult indeed.

Mr. Speaker, on the 15th of this month there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, over a Strasbourg dateline, a most interesting story of what has just taken place there, 4½ years after that first epoch-making meeting in the late summer of 1949. It is an exciting story, giving the stirring news that "at the end of 4 days' debate the draft treaty was approved by a vote of 50 to 0 with 5 abstentions."

The treaty referred to is a European constitution to link six nations in a supranational political federation. The nations are France, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, West Germany, and Italy. The ayes included German Christian Democrats and French Centrists, Italian rightwingers, and Belgian leftwingers. It was a remarkable and an unexpected vote, one which all thoughtful people the world over should herald with joy. Surely it brings an increasing hope for European unity, a step toward a free world.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the Herald Tribune article:

SIX-NATION CONSTITUTION—STRASBOURG VOTE ON DRAFT TREATY IS FIRM STEP TO EUROPEAN UNITY

STRASBOURG.—For 4 years now European parliamentarians, politicians, and ministers have been regularly sweeping in and out of this fine old Alsatian city in the name of Europe unity. They have had about the same effect as a gentle tide that recedes and leaves the shore a little damp, soon to dry out, but otherwise unchanged.

Last week in Strasbourg it was different. The difference was one of vitality, of a sense of purpose and direction, and most of all a feeling of achievement—that at last something solid had happened in Strasbourg. It was the final debate and amending of what is technically known as the "Draft Treaty Embodying the Statute of the European Community"—in more familiar terms, a European constitution to link six nations in a supranational political federation. The nations are France, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, West Germany, and Italy.

To parliamentarians and newspaper correspondents this crest of feeling and sense of progress seemed to be born not so much of the moment as out of the long and seemingly useless hours spent here in the past.

Others, arriving here for the first time to view the final ceremonies attending the voting, found the atmosphere a marked surprise.

"It's like Dr. Johnson's remark about the dog walking on its hind legs," one Strasbourg first-timer said. "It is not done well, but you are surprised to find it done at all."

THE DIFFERENCES

What is different about this new European constitution as opposed, say, to the 1949 model, the Council of Europe Treaty.

In a sense the differences are more inherent than they are apparent. You can look at this new draft constitution of 116 articles, and you can say, "This means nothing," or "That is impractical," or "This won't work."

On the other hand, you can also say about the same articles and the same ideas, "This is workable," or "This might grow into something."

Where the Council of Europe statute sets up a confederation of 15 countries and rather rigidly defines the competence of the assembly of that federation by the principle of unanimous endorsement, the six-nation constitution is more flexible in both directions.

For example, article 81 of the constitution states: "The community shall establish progressively a common market among member states, based on free movement of goods, capital, and persons." In conjunction with this article 50 states: "The community shall enact legislation in the cases provided for in the present statute."

It can be argued that this is vague, but equally it can be argued that with skill and hard work this can be as vital and dynamic a constitutional provision as the general clause of the American Constitution, from which the powers of the American Congress evolve. It can be seen that the parliamentary machinery, and the reserve powers of governments to delay, block, or hamper legislation can render the constitution null if not void, but equally it could work the other way.

VOTE IS 50 TO 0

At the end of 4 days' debate the draft was approved by a vote of 50 to 0 with 5 abstentions. The ayes included German Christian Democrats and French Centrists, Italian rightwingers and Belgium leftwingers. It was a remarkable and an unexpected vote, but the reason in hindsight seems to be that everybody had been working to the same ideal if not the same ideas.

When all was said and done, and when the French De Gaullists had argued against the Dutch Liberals, the result was a sharpening of the work rather than its diffusion.

The debates took place in the Council of Europe Building, a long, white structure, which, if not a distinguished piece of architecture, is nevertheless one of the most pleasant and efficient buildings of its kind.

The assembly hall is excellent acoustically and visually. The lounges are comfortable and the press facilities first class. This physical fact, plus the excellent cuisine of Strasbourg and its blend of French-German speech, culture, and background, has been an important magnet these last 4 years.

THE ROLE OF FOOD

"The way to European unity is through the stomach," a German remarked over a meal of pate de fois gras and Coq au Reisling.

Whatever the substance of the remark, it is certainly true that the Strasbourg habit is one that parliamentarians from all over Europe unanimously have enjoyed, whatever the importance of the work they have done here.

Now these men who have debated and approved the draft of a new constitution feel a sense of accomplishment as well. They left here in a remarkably determined mood, for the most part, to keep the heat on their governments at home and not let their good work strangle in the slow mechanics of government ratification.

AID FOR MIDDLE INCOME HOUSING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide $3 billion in credit to middle income housing and to guarantee an interest rate of 4 percent. I do this by providing that Fannie May, the Federal National Mortgage Association, shall have authority to repurchase mortgages placed on middle income housing under section 207 of the National Housing Act, which is housing for rental, and under section 213, cooperative housing, all for middle income families.

Mr. Speaker, there are still 28 million units in the United States under rent control. This shows that in the big city there is a great housing emergency; in fact, people are moving out of the big cities and going to smaller places—those who can afford to buy homes. The whole FHA and VA picture shows that we put some $38 billion—I repeat that figure—$38 billion into more than 6 million individual mortgages, into credit backing for home ownership. I think the least we can do is to put $3 billion, 10 percent of that, into credit to back up city apartment dwellers who today are moving out of cities because they cannot find apartments to rent within their means.

This is private enterprise; it is nothing but the underwriting of 4 percent mortgage money in the traditional way in which the Government has done it. I believe it is a duty which the Congress urgently owes the American people.

THE COFFEE RACKET

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with coffee prices now at or scraping $1 a pound, housewives of this country are entitled to know who is doing what to whom and why.

There is no question in my mind but what speculation has played a part, perhaps a major part, in this victimizing of housewives and the consuming public.

But it is also my opinion that the Government, through ECA so-called foreign aid, also contributed to this gouging of consumers.

On March 29, 1950, I pointed out here in the well of this House, that the ECA, in 1949, purchased 61,000,000 pounds of coffee at a cost of more than $16,000,000 for shipment to foreigners.

I contend that this fantastic coffee deal on the part of the ECA helped speculators pry the lid off coffee prices and everyone knows these prices have never been the same since.

A committee of the other body has investigated coffee prices but as far as I know there has been no effort to ascertain why, in the name of food relief for foreigners, the ECA used more than $16,000,000 of the taxpayers money to buy 61,000,000 pounds of coffee to give away to foreigners.

Mr. Speaker, even at this late date some committee of this House ought to ascertain why the ECA bought this coffee and to what extent this deal aided the speculators in skyrocketing the price of coffee.

THE ECONOMY OF THE UNITED STATES — AGRICULTURE — OUR FISCAL POLICY

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the course of human events has placed the United States in a position of world leadership. Our ability to utilize our position to better the economic situation in the rest of the world will depend upon a thorough understanding of our own economy.

The economy of the United States has given our people the highest standard of living of any nation in the world. We have a little over 6 percent of the world's population and produce approximately 25 percent of the world's goods. Due to the fact that we have a greater per man production, we also have a greater turnover of money in trade channels and with a production of 25 percent of the world's goods we generate 45 percent of the income of the world in terms of dollars.

With this tremendous buying power, we consume about 50 percent of the world's mineral production such as lead, copper, zinc, manganese, coal, petroleum, and so forth. Therefore, we find that the prosperity of the world is largely dependent upon the buying power of our American economy and if we wish to help the world into a new era, the most important step in operating our own economy is to keep it solvent, productive and prosperous.

In the year 1952, the United States had a national income of $291 billion. We obtained this income in two ways. First, by producing a certain number of units of goods and services; and second, by multiplying this production by the 1952 price level. Many of our theorists forget that we must maintain our production and price level if we are to retain the $291 billion of national income.

If we permit a 10-percent drop in our price level, we will lose $29 billion of income. In like manner, if we lose 10 percent of our production we will also lose $29 billion of income. Our first step then in maintaining a prosperous and solvent United States is to maintain both our production and our price level.

In the year 1952 we spent about 96 percent of our income in supporting our domestic economy and about 4 percent was used to buy products imported from the rest of the world. There has been a lot of propaganda during the past 6 months to initiate a program of trade, not aid, to help the rest of the world. Under this program our tariffs are to be reduced so as to make room for cheap imports from other nations.

Let us examine this type of program. I have pointed out that 96 percent of our income in 1952 was utilized in the domestic market and 4 percent to buy imports. If we expand our domestic production 10 percent, we affect 96 percent of our national income. If we expand our imports 10 percent, we affect an expansion of only 4 percent of our national income. Stated in another way, the ratio of our economy in terms of domestic trade and foreign trade is 24 to 1 in favor of domestic expansion.

Expansion of our domestic production and income will automatically increase our needs for more imports of materials in short supply. This is not true of an expansion in our imports of cheap materials. Expansion of our imports could easily break down our price level 10 percent, if these imports are permitted to come in below our American cost level. If such a reduction in our price took place we would lose $29 billion or far more than any possible benefit we could obtain through the expansion in imports.

In my opinion we have no right to force any American producer to go out of business because of imports produced with a lower wage level and a lower tax level. In helping the world in the past, we have brought about $270 billion of national debt. At the present time the American producer has to pay approximately 25 percent of the national income to the Federal Treasury. Producers in other lands do not have to support the costs of our Government.

For example, here is an illustration. Companies producing aluminum have to pay 6 cents per pound to the Federal Government in taxes for the privilege of producing in the United States. In all fairness to these producers, an import fee or excise tax of 6 cents per pound is merely a matter of equity and fair treatment for our own source of production and income.

Our American economy has had indirect price supports since its beginning, the first session of Congress having passed a tariff act as a source of Federal revenue and as a protection against exploitation of our markets. Free trade in addition to meaning a loss of revenue from import fees also means to remove all protection for our price level.

The effect of such a step should be self-evident. The United Nations released a report which states that the

annual income of two-thirds of the world's population is $200 per capita. Free trade would mean that our price level would have to be determined by the average buying power of the rest of the world.

In the United States the average industrial wage is sufficient to make each worker a potential buyer of an automobile. Two-thirds of the world's population with an average annual income of $200 cannot pay the operating costs of driving the automobile if we give them one as a gift.

It has long been recognized that the rest of the world has been short of food. Free trade would mean the flow of food to the United States, forcing other nations to do without. Instead of helping them we would force them to starve while our own producer would have to suffer lower prices. Lower prices in the United States would mean national bankruptcy and this in turn would destroy the only remaining foundation for world recovery.

Another factor we must remember in addition to our national debt is our private debt. Domestic producers have had to buy and use materials on an American wage and cost level. These materials have been used in expanding our factories, farms, and mines. Yes, these costs have also gone into homes, the mortgage in many cases underwritten by the Government.

In 1939, our total public and private debt was $185 billion. In 1952, this total reached $540 billion. This debt cannot be repaid out of a price level determined by slave labor in many nations of the world.

Unless we wish to have our Nation go into an economic collapse we must recognize realities. Free trade will destroy our price level. We must, therefore, find some other solution and I feel that we can find an answer to our trade with other nations while at the same time protecting our own producer and, of greater importance, our national income.

The answer to our trade problem is equity of trade. We should at all times stand ready to pay the world a comparative price for imports which we need to supplement our own economy.

For example, Congress in 1948 passed the Sugar Act. Under this act, through quotas and duties we protect our domestic sugar producer and at the same time we permit sugar imports, equal to about 70 percent of our needs to come in from other nations at a fair price to them.

Wool could be used in a similar illustration. We import about 70 percent of our requirements. Assuming that 60 cents per pound is the American cost level, no wool should be permitted to come in for less than 60 cents. On the other hand, we should be willing to pay a comparable price for imported wool, thus creating the dollar exchange for other nations to buy an equivalent amount of our goods.

As a Member of Congress, I have taken an oath to protect the welfare of the American people. I do not feel that I have the right to permit the passage of legislation which will destroy some American industry and thus create a market for imports from nations with a low wage and cost level. To me these little producers have a right to protection and if permitted to continue they may some day be large industries. Under free trade we would automatically set the stage for a few large industries to take advantage of their position in world markets, while the many small businesses in the United States would be forced to close.

Our income depends upon two factors, production and price. Displacement of our production through imports or the breaking down of our price level will mean a loss of national income and in turn a bankrupt nation. I, as a Member of Congress am not going to vote for legislation which will destroy our income and our economy.

THE AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

The drop in farm prices has again sent fear through our agricultural sections. It should send fear into the hearts of every American. Constant falling farm prices indicate that we are again heading into a depression. Let us not shut our eyes to that fact.

The Members of Congress should be asking themselves the question, Can we stand another depression and win the battle against communistic aggression? I think most of you will say we cannot permit it to happen. But it is happening in the same way that we had a depression in 1920, in 1929, in 1938, and in 1949. What prevents us from taking the steps to prevent this recurrence of low farm prices?

In my opinion, it is the lack of understanding on the part of society. The citizens of this great Nation and many of our business leaders do not realize the importance of agriculture. Let me briefly point out to you the real meaning of this drop in farm prices.

On January 1, 1952, the agricultural industry had a capital investment of $168 billion. This total is approximately four times the capital investment in our railroads, our steel industry and our automobile industry. In spite of this huge capital investment our business leaders do not look upon agriculture as an industry. Therefore, they are unwilling to concede that the agricultural industry in order to operate efficiently and to expand as a foundation for the future growth of the United States must have a price for its production which will permit it to operate with the same profit which other industries expect as their natural right.

Since the 1938 Farm Act was written, the price which the farmer is entitled to receive has been designated by Congress as parity. Parity in business terms means the cost of production plus a profit which is equal to the average of all other industries in the United States.

Opposition to such legislation has been widespread and again I wish to state it is due to lack of understanding. If society realized that parity prices for our agricultural production is a must in any program of prosperity and economic expansion and that farm income is the foundation which supports and protects the markets for our industrial production and the wages of our workers, this opposition would vanish.

Briefly here are the facts. The agricultural industry is our basic industry and our agricultural production times our agricultural price level is the source of our national income. For the past 30 years each $1 of gross farm production has resulted in $7 of national income. To be exact, in the period 1929 to 1952, inclusive, the ratio has been $7.06 of national income for each $1 of gross farm income. The ratio is irrefutable and unless we recognize its importance, we will fail to take the steps to prevent another depression.

Our business leaders in discussing the drop in farm prices do not realize that our national income is going to drop $7 for each $1 that farm income has fallen off. Because of this seven times turn of gross farm income into national income, we must stop thinking in terms of the costs of farm price supports. We should be thinking of the loss the Nation will suffer.

Let me illustrate. In the period 1930–41, because the United States did not maintain the 1929 farm price level, we took a loss of over $500 billion of national income.

In 1948–49, we had what some folks call a recession. The record reveals that the United States lost $20 billion of income which we would have had if 1948 farm prices had prevailed. The record is clear in its proof of this loss. In the last quarter of 1948 our level of national income was $234.3 billion. By the last quarter of 1949 it had dropped to $214.2 billion.

The loss was entirely due to the drop in farm income of about $3 billion. The wage level of our industrial workers from 1948 to 1949 was raised 5 cents per hour. Therefore, the loss cannot be blamed on lower wages. In spite of this raise of 5 cents per hour labor had to take its cut. The cut came in a drop in our industrial payrolls. Enough men had to be laid off either entirely or part time to make the adjustment to meet the drop in national income of $20 billion.

Our total industrial production in 1949 was cut back 9 percent below the 1948 level and this in terms of 1948 national income was equal to $20 billion. The amazing thing about it all is that our economists in Government and business have failed to mention this loss of $20 billion and called it a slight recession.

Of interest to me is the comment of eastern newspapers regarding the drop in cattle prices. They hail the drop with delight and think in terms of cheap meat. They fail to realize that the loss in gross farm income as a result of lower cattle prices will force a loss of seven times that amount in national income. Yes, it may be the first step into another depression, a depression that may exceed the terrible conditions of unemployment which we experienced in the thirties.

What can Congress do to prevent a depression? We can take steps to restore our farm-price structure and stop this unnecessary danger of economic collapse. We can demand that those who administer our farm program take the positive steps which need to be taken to not only make the 90-percent price supports effective but in addition to yield 100 percent and thus restore the foundation for the national income we will need to balance the budget and meet our obligations.

The first step in getting the proper administration in my opinion is to demand a full-fledged investigation of the cost of living. The unwarranted cry of high-living costs cannot be substantiated.

In 1939 the American public spent 21.8 percent of its income for food. The percentage of national income spent for food in 1951 and 1952 was also 21.8 percent. The point I wish to drive home is that in the turn of farm income into national income, the cost of living does not decrease when farm prices drop. It is true that those who retain their jobs in a depression have a lower living cost for food and other items. But, if they had to pay the taxes to keep those who are disemployed as the result of lower farm prices they would have an increase in their cost of living. For example, in 1932 with farm prices at their low point since 1929, it required 27 percent of the national income to pay the food bill in the United States.

The second reason why an investigation to explode this fallacy of high costs of living is necessary, is to head off a move to bring in cheap products from other nations. Our economists talk about these cheap imports in terms of efficiency of foreign producers when in fact it is the results of low wages and lower taxes.

The American farmer is the most efficient in terms of per man production in the entire world. Because of his efficiency the American people need spend only 21.8 percent of their income for food as compared to 70 percent in Europe and over 90 percent in India and China.

The facts are that because of this low food cost in the United States the American people have about 78 percent of their income to spend for cars, radios, television, vacations and those things which make up our American standard of living. The people of other nations are lucky if they have enough left to buy a bicycle.

To illustrate the efficiency of the American farmer let me make this point. Since 1929 the per man production of the average worker in the agricultural industry has exceeded that of the average industrial worker with the advantage of management and mass production.

It is lucky for all of us that this has been the case. Over 70 percent of all goods sold at retail are made up of food, beverage, shoes, clothing and tobacco. It follows that 70 percent of all labor in the United States is engaged in producing, processing and distributing farm products. To reduce farm prices means to reduce directly the dollar income of every step in the movement of farm products through our economy.

Farm price supports are in reality a support for our national income and a support for the future growth of our economy. We cannot expand to any greater extent than the foundation built for expansion by the agricultural industry.

In denying the farmer a parity price for his production, we deny ourselves the national income we need for prosperity and economic growth. Once that message is driven home, we will be glad to spend a few dollars to protect our entire Nation against economic collapse.

It is time to face realities before it is too late.

OUR FISCAL POLICIES

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I would like to make a few comments upon our fiscal policies. During the 1952 political campaign, the Republican Party promised the people, that if elected, we would balance the budget and bring about tax reduction.

The matter of balancing the budget can be set out in very simple terms. We must cut back appropriations to meet the tax revenue or we must increase the tax revenue to meet the appropriations.

I am concerned, however, with the economic factors which enter into the problem of having a sound fiscal policy. In the year 1952 we had a national income of $291 billion. The Federal revenue represented about 25 percent of this total.

Tax levies, in many cases, are at a very high level and there is not much incentive left for many of our corporations to expand their dollar volume. Many corporations have had a reduction in their net income, or income after taxes, even though their volume of production has increased since 1950.

The problem that I want to call to your attention is the matter of national income. My committee is meeting day after day discussing various appropriations. Supposing that after a few months we agree on total appropriations, what assurance do you and I have that the money will be available?

Let us assume that during the next 12 months the price level for our production falls off 20 percent. This will mean a drop of $58 billion in national income. On the basis of tax levies representing 25 percent of the national income this would mean a loss of $14.5 billion in tax revenue. Our supposedly balanced budget would vanish in thin air.

Due to the fact that most of our tax revenue depends upon income, a drop of $58 billion in our national income would mean a much greater loss than $14.5 billion as losses are deducted from operating income.

Since 1946, we have had an increase of approximately $130 billion in our private debt. This debt was created in the expansion of our productive economy. Some money was spent in building factories at an American cost level for wages and materials. Other sums were spent for farm buildings, farm equipment, factory equipment, homes, and Government construction.

The cost of this borrowed capital must be met out of income and in the event that our price level dropped 20 percent, this cost would have to be met out of a reduced income and the loss to our Federal Treasury would pyramid.

In case of a price drop, we would have unemployment and the Government would have to pay unemployment compensation out of an empty Treasury. The Government has guaranteed the repayment of billions of dollars of housing loans. These loans will have to be guaranteed out of an empty Treasury. The point I wish to make is that these past obligations will add to the deficit brought about by the drop in our price level and the loss of national income.

Of course, we can assume that the price drop will not come. But what assurance have you and I, as Members of Congress, that the price drop will not take place? The answer is none unless we take the steps to stabilize our prices at a level which will assure the continuation of the $291 billion of national income.

In the period from March 1951 to the present, the price of 35 leading raw materials—Associated Press Index, 1926, as 100—has dropped 17 percent. What assurance have we that it will not drop another 17 percent in the next 2 years? We have none.

Our situation as representatives of the people of the United States forces us to answer this question, How can we talk about balancing the budget or reducing the taxes when we do not have the slightest idea of what our national income is going to be 12 months from now? Are we not just as helpless as babes in the woods?

What can we do about it? is the next question. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, gives Congress the right to coin money, regulate the value thereof and to regulate foreign and domestic commerce. The matter of our price level falls directly into the problem of regulating dollar values. We cannot have a stable dollar unless we have price stability.

Our first step in balancing the budget should be price stabilization as an assurance that we will have the income upon which to levy the taxes we need. There is no question about our ability to produce and if we take the steps to stabilize our price level there need be no doubt as to the income we can create by our production.

What steps can we take? We can through price supports, patterned after the price supports for agriculture stabilize our price level for basic raw materials from our farms and mines at the American cost level. This in turn will support the national income and the market for our production and support the price of these raw materials at the proper level as they move through our economic cycle to the consumer level.

These price supports should be looked upon as a support of our national income and as the support for our fiscal policies.

You have the right to ask, What will it cost? Supposing a program of stabilizing our raw-material prices brought about a loss of $3 billion a year? To charge this off against a national income of $291 billion would still leave us with $288 billion of national income.

The next question which I would like to ask is, Would it not be good business to spend $3 billion to protect ourselves against loss of the $58 billion I have mentioned or against a loss of $150 billion of national income if we should fall back to 1939 price levels?

Our experience with farm-price supports would indicate that the cost is small, indeed, compared to the benefits we would receive.

If we as a nation can appropriate $50 billion a year in military equipment to protect us against a possible war, why should we argue about an economic step

which will assure us of the income with which to pay for the war materials and at the same time protect us against the economic collapse that would destroy our ability to defend ourselves?

Finally, I want to repeat, at the present time the Congress of the United States has no assurance that we will continue to have the present price and income level. In fact, there are many indications today which indicate that we are headed for lower prices.

Should lower prices force our income downward, all our glib promises of a balanced budget will not be met. We will have less taxes, but the reduction will come about through inability to pay rather than a lower tax levy.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOSMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which I am quite certain will meet with the approval of every person affected. The bill would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in respect to pesticides.

At present, the law is quite hazy and cumbersome. It does not protect the health of the people as it was designed to do, but places a millstone around the neck of industry whether it be farming, or manufacturing. During the last 3 months I have held numerous conferences with representatives of the Food and Drug Administration, the chemical industry and the manufacturing industry. The outcome of these meetings is the bill which I have introduced.

During the 82d Congress, I was a member of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food. The hearings and investigations confirmed my opinion that the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act needed to be changed.

First of all, the act can be broken into three separate sections—food, pesticides, and cosmetics. I feel it is very necessary to offer three amendments making these three sections and and have found the pesticide-section amendment should be offered first so it can be used as a model for the other two.

All of the people connected with pesticides, from the manufacturer to the consumer, have been contacted so they could present their views. I have drafted a bill which meets with the approval of all. They have assured me that the bill will adequately cover each aspect and duly protect the health of the people.

CIVIL SERVICE REGISTERS

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was announced by Mr. Philip Young, new Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, that eligibility lists for 1,700 postmaster jobs have been discarded and that new examinations were scheduled. This announcement has the effect of breaking two campaign promises with a single blow.

Mr. Young's announcement to discard civil-service registers comes only a few days after taking his oath of office. The result of his decision will cost the taxpayers $200,000 or more for the new examinations. In some cases, it required a year for the civil-service examiners to complete their work. To throw out 1,700 registers is not the economy that the American people have been promised. It is spoils system politics and a step toward breaking down civil-service system.

Mr. Young and the administration cannot escape blame for this unwise decision. Again, all the rosy promises are disappearing into the air. This time it is on civil service and again on economy.

On this matter I have no interest whatever in party politics. Our Republican friends will soon learn that this type of political patronage does not make political friends. My concern is for good government and to protect and strengthen the merit system and to stop this kind of wasteful spending.

I believe the civil-service system needs improvement. The administration is entitled to have and to control all policy-making jobs. But where is the line to be drawn? Is the civil-service system to be wrecked under the guise of improving it?

I am sure the people do not want a return to spoils system politics. I am equally sure they want to stop the inefficiency and waste which results from the action Mr. Young has taken.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest, with all the vigor I possess, against the arrangement entered into a day or two ago by the leaders of this administration to kill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This is the first public criticism I have made of the new administration. It has been my feeling that in a spirit of fairness, it should be allowed to fashion its policies without continual harrassment about minor matters. And, I might state that I will continue to follow that course. However, I will not follow it to the point of seeing the destruction of the policies and programs of this Government designed to aid and benefit the average people of America. The destruction of a great program may be brought by a policy of neglect, or a policy of boring from within, or by direct assault. If it be the purpose of this administration to abolish RFC, I hope it will adopt the method of the direct assault so that the American people may be informed of the trend of thinking of those who mutilate the body.

In this particular field, the cat is out of the bag. The administration has made its objective clear. It is apparently willing to substitute high interest rates and hard terms for the fairly liberal lending policy, through which RFC accomplished its good over the period of its 21 years.

To me it is unthinkable that this administration would kill, or even cripple, an agency that has done so much to strengthen the fabric of our free-enterprise system.

Not only has the RFC not cost the American taxpayer any money, but instead, according to its chairman, Mr. McDonald, it has earned for him nearly $1 billion.

I do not believe the American public will welcome this proposed action as being good business on the part of the "business" administration which was promised them.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for today be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

IMPORTATION OF GLASSWARE AND RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, since coming to Congress I have made several speeches about the importation of cheap glassware, urging its stoppage or, at least, its severe curtailment. I have had assurance by the House Ways and Means Committee of previous Congresses that this would be done, but as yet nothing has. It has now come to the point where something will have to be done for the protection of the glass industry and its workers in this Nation.

I am calling on this committee again to take steps to stop the importation of this cheap glass. Glassmaking is one of the oldest and finest industries of America, and it should be preserved and protected. The only way to do it is to stop flooding our country with cheap glassware made in other nations.

While we are on the subject of importation, I want to remind this body that for the past 2 years I have spoken against the importation of cheap residual fuel oil into the United States. This is doing a vast amount of damage to our own coal industry and is putting many of our people out of work. In my own Second District of West Virginia, and generally throughout the Nation where the coal industry is one of the most active industries, the situation is critical.

As the result of selfish and greedy actions on the part of 2 or 3 large oil companies whose profits are tremendous from the importation of cheap residual oil, miners are laid off work and their families are suffering from lack of food, shelter, and clothing. From coal springs most of our defense productions. If mines are in real danger, you can rest assured the economy of the Nation will be in jeopardy.

I feel it is high time this activity is stopped. This matter is so vital, I believe something must be done now. If it is not done, personally I feel I will be forced—in the best interest of the worthy people of my district and State—to vote against the whole reciprocal trade program, with the hope that it will be voted down completely and returned to committee, so that the committee will be forced to bring forth something for the protection of the coal miners and glassworkers. I feel we are in desperate need of a good, workable reciprocal trade program and believe it is within the jurisdiction of our Ways and Means Committee to make the necessary adjustments. I am appealing to this committee in behalf of the segment of several hundred thousands of coal miners and glass workers and their families, making up a bloc of several millions. This is a vital segment of American society and one of the basic foundations of our real industrial empire.

We have an escape clause and I believe this should be put into effect by the proper agency. The Tariff Commission has constantly refused to do so or take into consideration any damage. It has now come to a point where Congress must do something. Believe me, I shall do everything within my power to expand world trade on a sound basis, but I am opposed to importing unemployment and starvation wages, and in order to avoid this we must have a workable escape clause.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the press, as often happens, is somewhat confusing. It is difficult for the average individual, such as is the Member from the 4th District of Michigan, to learn just what is going on.

Yesterday I noticed on the front page of one of the Washington papers the statement that Chrysler was reducing the price of automobiles. Other information coming out of Detroit, the automobile center of the world, indicates that other dealers are having trouble selling their cars. That would seem to indicate that the individual has less purchasing power than he had last fall.

Then this morning—it was this morning or last night—there was a statement in the press that Mr. Lodge our man in the U. N. was to have built for his use a $300,000 home in New York so he would be handy to U. N.

I wonder if Uncle Sam has more dollars to spend than has the taxpayers. Whether with spending $300,000 for a home for our U. N. representative will help lower taxes and balance the budget. If he keeps on spending, I wonder if my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would tell me if ever the taxpayers are going "broke."

When I came down here I made the mistake of thinking the Government would be "busted" if it continued to spend more than its income. Then I found I was mistaken about that. That as long as the taxpayer has a nickel in his pocket Uncle Sam is all right, because we can just reach in and take it out and continue to tax and spend until the taxpayer goes "broke."

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT AND TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 4199, to establish a Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade. This is offered as a constructive, concrete step in furthering the program of trade, not aid.

The 14-man bipartisan Commission is patterned after the Hoover Commission and is composed of 6 members from private life, and 4 from the executive branch of the Government appointed by the President, 2 Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President, and 2 Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

The duty of the Commission is to study the restrictions, hazards, and impediments inhibiting overseas investment, trade, and commerce and to recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs calculated to eliminate or minimize such trade and investment barriers.

The objective of the study is to create a climate in which the natural forces of the free enterprise system can operate unhampered to promote productivity, internal stability, a higher standard of living, and a greater capacity to resist aggression in the free countries of the world.

The bill, which is quite brief, reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the dynamic competitive free-enterprise system which has flourished in the United States can raise standards of living and promote internal strength and stability in other free countries, thereby increasing their capacity to resist aggression, stimulating international trade, and contributing to the growth of free economic and political institutions. These goals can be achieved in large measure through encouraging and facilitating the investment of private capital in other free countries to develop their resources and improve their productivity. Numerous impediments now exist, however, which inhibit the investment of private capital and the conduct of trade and commerce throughout the free world. It is the purpose of this act to discover ways to overcome these obstacles and make the fullest use of free private enterprise, subject to proper restraints to prevent overreaching and unfair exploitation, in promoting mutual security, economic vigor, and individual liberty in the free world.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION; DUTIES

SEC. 2. (a) Commission established: There is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Duties of Commission: In conformity with the findings and in furtherance of the purpose declared in section 1, the Commission, after a complete study and investigation, shall formulate and recommend to the President and the Congress specific programs and policies calculated to encourage and facilitate the investment of private capital in free countries outside the United States, and the conduct of trade and commerce in such countries, and between such countries and other free countries, including the United States. The Commission shall give particular attention to developing programs and policies calculated to eliminate or minimize the restrictions, hazards, and other impediments, foreign and domestic (including monopolistic and restrictive trade practices) which inhibit such investment, trade, and commerce, and to provide incentives for such investment, trade, and commerce.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

(1) Ten appointed by the President of the United States, four from the executive branch of the Government, and six from private life;

(2) Two Members of the Senate appointed by the Vice President; and

(3) Two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker.

(b) Political affiliation: Of each class of members, not more than one-half shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any, as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have the power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

CERTAIN LAWS INAPPLICABLE TO COMMISSION AND ITS STAFF

SEC. 8. The service of any person as a member of the Commission, the service of any other person with the Commission, and the employment of any person by the Commission, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such person within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Committees: The Commission may create such committees of its members with such powers and duties as may be delegated thereto.

(b) Hearings and sessions: The Commission, or any committee thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such committee may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before any committee thereof.

(c) Obtaining official data: The Commission, or any committee thereof, is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, or any committee thereof, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or of the committee concerned.

(d) Subpena power: The Commission, or any committee thereof, shall have power to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Commission or committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

EXPIRATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 11. The Commission shall cease to exist on June 30, 1955.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman's bill is of great interest, of course, to me as I am sure to every other member of the committee, and touches on a problem of the greatest moment to our country and is tied up with the whole slogan as the gentleman just said of, "Trade not aid." The question I would like to ask the gentleman is this. We have had a number of commissions in this field. They have not been congressional commissions or commissions of this character, but they have been commissions. I would like to mention to the gentleman the names of some of them. We have had the International Development Advisory Board which, if memory serves me, in either 1950 or 1951 developed quite a report on this very subject. We have also had the Mutual Security Advisory Board, which only in February of this year under the distinguished chairmanship of Daniel Bell, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, issued the famous Bell report which is on the table now. I understand that the President has now appointed the former Ambassador to Great Britain, Lewis Douglas, to set up a commission to go into the very same subject. Now here are at least three. Those were preceded by the famous Gray committee and the Gray report and so on. I am sure the gentleman is thoroughly acquainted with all that. I think what the gentleman needs to deal with, if he will permit my saying so, is that with the normal feeling here as the gentleman and I so well know, where our Members want to look with a rather critical eye on all new commissions, in view of this record of commissions that have already functioned and are in contemplation now, I think the gentlemen needs to make very clear where this particular idea of the gentlemen fits, and why it is needed now in view of all of these other activities. I hope the gentleman understands that I say that only to lead his thoughts in a direction which may get him results, and I do not at all intend my remarks to be critical. I compliment the gentleman on his understanding of the fact that this is perhaps the keystone of all American foreign policy.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, and the question he raises is one that I did intend to deal with later on in my remarks. However, since he has raised the question of other activities in this general field, I think it is appropriate now to refer briefly to these other activities.

I am aware of the work that the gentleman has referred to, the Gray report, the so-called Rockefeller report on Partners in Progress, and the Bell report, although the latter report I have not examined carefully. I might mention there are some additional activities in this field, notably a report prepared for the President's committee for financing foreign trade in April of 1951 entitled "Obstacles To Direct Foreign Investment." That was a committee headed by Winthrop Aldrich, as I recall it.

I have before me the report of that committee, the National Industrial Conference Board report. In addition to that, there are related activities of committees of the Congress. I do not propose to give a bibliography of all of those activities. A little later I want to point out that there is presently a study underway, on which a report is required by the Mutual Security Act of 1952. But before I go into that I would like to read, so that it will be a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the duties of this Commission known as the Commission on Overseas Investment and Trade.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to review briefly the interest I have had in this particular subject, which extends over a number of years. Then I want to review briefly the progress that has been made in this field in recent legislation. Then I propose to point out, if I may, how the congressional Commission, established by this bill, would be more likely to solve these difficulties which have beset us over a period of years than can ever be done either by a committee of private citizens without any governmental standing whatever, or by any agency or group of agencies within the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I first became interested in this means of improving the climate for foreign investments when I listened to the President's inaugural message over 4 years ago, and listened particularly to that passage called the point 4 program. The technical assistance of

Government experts in the field of public sanitation, in agricultural-extension work, which has become the point 4 program, is only a part of what the language of that statement envisaged. The purpose was to make available to the underdeveloped areas of the world the advantages of the American free-enterprise system, the know-how, the industrial techniques and the methods whereby the American people have been able to develop the natural resources of this continent so as to produce a standard of living higher than has ever been known in the world's history before, in any part of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the program of making available to underdeveloped areas the advantages of the American production system can only be carried out in part by providing technical experts through Government funds such as has been the limited program through the point 4 or the technical assistance program. I say to you that the industrial methods of the United States will normally be exported to these underdeveloped areas if restraints upon the investment of capital abroad are removed and the enterprising courageous spirit of the American business community is permitted to operate to develop the national resources of these underdeveloped areas.

With that capital, of necessity, must go the know-how. I think it is wholly unrealistic to expect to export the know-how without the capital. There is no motive for American businessmen to make their trade practices and industrial secrets available to foreign competitors if there is no return for them. To send experts in industrial methods to foreign countries to develop their competitors' industries just does not make sense, but when the American business enterprise invests its funds in foreign activities the know-how automatically goes with the capital.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this interest in the so-called point 4 program I prepared a bill early in 1949, much like the bill H. R. 4199, just introduced. I discussed this proposal with a former boss of mine, if you please, the Honorable James Mead, now a member of the Federal Trade Commission, formerly a Member of this body and a Senator from the State of New York. Senator Mead was chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee at the time I was its chief counsel. I asked Senator Mead to present this idea to the White House. My letter to Senator Mead is dated February 28, 1949.

March 1, 1949, Senator Mead took the bill and a suggested agenda of studies for the commission to the White House and presented it to President Truman. President Truman thanked Senator Mead for his interest, but nothing happened until about 3 months later. Senator Mead got a letter dated May 24, 1949, from Mr. Steelman advising him that they were glad of Senator Mead's interest but that they felt the matter was being taken care of.

April 23, 1951, I introduced H. R. 3798 in the 82d Congress, 1st session, a bill of import very similar to H. R. 4199 of this Congress. At that time I discussed the subject at some length under a special order of the House.

I was unable to obtain hearings directly upon that bill by the Foreign Affairs Committee to which the bill was referred. However, I appeared before that committee during the hearings on the Mutual Security Act of 1951, urging my bill as an amendment. In my testimony I incorporated a great number of communications I had received from persons regarded as informed in the fields of foreign policy and foreign economic affairs. That testimony will be found in the hearings on the Mutual Security bill of 1951 before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 20, 1951, at pages 777 to 831.

In support of this proposal there also appeared a representative of the Detroit Board of Commerce urging favorable action on my bill.

When the mutual security bill was reported out of the Foreign Affairs Committee it contained some language inserted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] urging that the act be administered in such a way as to break down barriers and impediments to investment.

During the floor debate on the mutual security bill on August 16, 1951, I offered the provisions of H. R. 3798 as an amendment to H. R. 5113. My remarks on that amendment will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 8, pages 10179–10180 for that day. I may say that no one spoke against my amendment, yet, on a division in the Committee of the Whole, the amendment was defeated by a vote of 63 to 126. I may say that only one Democrat, as I recall it, stood up in favor of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a distinguished and valuable member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman for his persistence in attempting to see that some kind of legislation such as he is now discussing is finally proposed to the House. I think he has in mind something that is quite important.

The question that arises in my mind, however, is this: Can we expect that those who are interested in foreign investments will invest unless there is a sound, stable political climate in respect to nations where capital is needed? We cannot guarantee the political climate in those countries. That to me is the nub of the situation.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin. I recall that when I spoke before on this subject he was very helpful and cooperative. I would like to answer his question which, of course, is a very difficult one, by saying that fundamentally the control of the affairs of any country is in the hands of its citizens, not in the United States Government. Where you have unstable governments obviously you do not have a favorable climate for the investment of funds of private citizens. But let me say to the gentleman, and ask him if he does not agree with me, where economic conditions are improved and stabilized under a free-enterprise economy, the political stability of that country is improved and its actions are more likely to be responsible and sound.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Of course, we have the age-old question, Which came first, the chicken or the egg? We have had the argument likewise in reference to the question the gentleman is discussing: Are we going to have sound investment opportunities where there is a sound political climate first or are we going to establish the sound political climate, then make the investments? It is one of those things that you go round and round on.

The gentleman, I know, will be interested in a conversation I had with a member of one of the embassies who said to me: "Mr. SMITH, we just cannot develop a private-enterprise economy in our country. We do not have the money."

In other words, they would like to come to this country and get all the money they possibly can for the development of private enterprise and business, but there is no way for them to start. They are one of these countries which is not able to say to the investor: We can guarantee a sound political climate and you need have no worry about getting your money back plus interest thereon. In other words, there will be a safe investment for you.

He cannot do that because there is instability within the country, yet they appreciate the need for money to develop a sound economy.

Mr. MEADER. I think the gentleman has put his finger on one of the serious impediments to investments overseas. That is precisely the subject matter of the work of the Commission that I propose. I suggest that we get together the best minds in the country, to study these problems and to see whether or not some intelligent progress can be made in the field the gentleman is speaking of as well as in other fields where there are unusual hazards and risks in engaging either in investment or trade.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to say this: I hope that it is going to be possible for us to consider that kind of legislation because it affords a great opportunity for this country from the standpoint of securing peace through sound business propositions without investment in the military program. I think the gentleman has something that we should all think about.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I am glad to yield to my colleague on the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. LANTAFF. I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan on the legislation he has introduced. I think he did answer the need for such a Commission as this when the point was raised as to political instability. Especially is this Commission needed in view of the statement by President Eisenhower that he wanted to develop a program of trade and not aid. It seems to me imperative that such a Commission as this not only goes into the political climate that our American industry will have to operate

under overseas but also in the way that the State Department will be helpful. I think the gentleman will recall of businessmen overseas complaining about the fact that they did not receive the proper consideration from some of our United States officials, and I think it is because we did not have an overall policy to help businessmen throughout the world. I also believe that such a Commission might well be the means whereby private industry could eventually take over the point 4 program and accomplish through private enterprise the same purposes we are accomplishing with the point 4 program today. Certainly private enterprise has done that in South America, and I think, with the encouragement that such a Commission as the gentleman proposes can give them, through working with and helping out with the other governments, that private enterprise can eventually take over in that field and save the taxpayers millions of dollars.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, and I would also like to thank him for the support he gave me in this effort when I sought to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1952. The gentleman has been very helpful in the work of the Committee on Government Operations. The gentleman from Florida and I both had an opportunity to see and hear some of these problems of American businessmen overseas at firsthand in connection with an overseas investigation of the Bonner committee in 1951.

What has occurred on this idea since it was originally proposed? In the Mutual Security Act of 1951 the principle was endorsed. Section 516 of that act, approved by the President on October 10, 1951, is entitled "Encouragement of Free Enterprise."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend as part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD the section just referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Section 516 reads as follows:

SEC. 516. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that this act shall be administered in such a way as (1) to eliminate the barriers to, and provide the incentives for, a steadily increased participation of free private enterprise in developing the resources of foreign countries consistent with the policies of this act, (2) to the extent that it is feasible and does not interfere with the achievement of the purposes set forth in this act, to discourage the cartel and monopolistic business practices prevailing in certain countries receiving aid under this act which result in restricting production and increasing prices, and to encourage where suitable competition and productivity, and (3) to encourage where suitable the development and strengthening of the free labor union movements as the collective bargaining agencies of labor within such countries.

Now, that pronouncement, in my mind was nothing more than a broad declaration of purposes. It did not specify any steps to be taken or activities to be entered into to accomplish the encouragement of private capital investment overseas.

When the Mutual Security Act of 1952 came up I again appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on April 28, 1952. My statement appears on pages 869 to 882 of the hearings.

Let me say that some progress was made when the Mutual Security Act of 1952 was passed. Not only was the principle of encouraging private investment overseas reaffirmed, but specific steps were ordered to be taken by various agencies in the executive branch of the Government to accomplish that objective.

The Secretary of State, the Mutual Security Director, the Technical Cooperation Administration, and the Department of Commerce were ordered to carry out certain specific functions calculated to enhance the opportunities for private capital investments in foreign areas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of section 514 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952 be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

(k) Amend section 516 by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 516." and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsections:

"(b) To accomplish the purpose of clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, under the coordination of the Director for Mutual Security, the Mutual Security Agency, cooperating with private business groups and governmental agencies to the fullest extent possible, shall encourage a greater participation by private capital in the guaranty program and shall develop broad criteria to facilitate such participation, including programs consistent with the purposes of the act for international development.

"(c) The Department of Commerce shall, in cooperation with such groups and agencies (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or deceased and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director for Mutual Security.

"(d) The Department of State, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government concerned with private investment abroad, and taking into account the study and recommendations described in subsection (c) of this section, shall accelerate a program of negotiating treaties of commerce and trade, or other temporary arrangements where more suitable or expeditious, which shall include provisions to encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to countries participating in programs under this act.

"(e) The Technical Cooperation Administration, taking into account the study and recommendations described in subsection (c) of this section, shall encourage and facilitate a greater participation by private industrial groups or agencies in private contracts awarded by the Administration, and shall, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and the Mutual Security Agency, find and draw the attention of private enterprise to opportunities for investment and development in underdeveloped areas.

"(f) The reports required by section 518 of this act shall include detailed information on the implementation of this section."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize one of those provisions, namely, section (c), which reads as follows:

(c) The Department of Commerce shall, in cooperation with such groups and agencies (including the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), conduct a thorough study of the legal and other impediments, foreign and local, to private investment abroad, and the methods and means whereby those impediments can be removed or decreased and shall make recommendations thereon to the Director for Mutual Security.

In other words, the Department of Commerce has been ordered to make a study of a character similar to that provided by H. R. 4199,

I have made a personal investigation of what the Department of Commerce is doing. They have a group of about 12 people under the leadership of Carlton Wood in the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce who have been carrying out the responsibilities directed by the section which I have just read. In essence, they are carrying on two activities. The first is to assemble from the geographical area desks all information on the laws, the customs, and the conditions in the various countries overseas affecting the desirability of investing capital in those countries. I think the collection and publication of that information will be useful even if nothing further is done.

Second, they conducted a survey of about 300 American business firms seeking to elicit from those firms information concerning their own experience in the investment of capital overseas and to learn from them why further investment was not made.

That survey was conducted not by questionnaire but by personal interviews. Representatives from the field offices of the Department of Commerce, called upon these firms and then reported the results of the discussions. Those reports are now being collected and analyzed, and will be very interesting, I am sure. No one can tell today when that report will be available. My best guess from the information I have received is that it will not be available until the month of June.

This activity is all very useful, but I think I can demonstrate to the Members of the House that the hands of any executive agency are tied. I would like to refer to the question raised by the gentleman from Florida as one illustration. American businessmen have complained that the personnel of the Foreign Service of the Department of State have not been helpful and cooperative in meeting problems they face in conducting business overseas. If the Department of Commerce finds that the personnel of the Foreign Service have been indifferent or hostile to American business activities abroad, would the Department of Commerce dare so to accuse and criticize its sister department, the Department of State? Would it dare, despite the order in section (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952 which I have just read, to tell the Department of State what it ought to do to encourage its personnel to be more helpful to American business interests abroad? I say to you there will be a first rate interagency ruckus if the Department of Commerce is frank and forthright about the attitude of the

Department of State, toward American business abroad.

Again, let us assume, as I think it is safe to assume, that one of the obstacles to the investment of private funds overseas is the inconvertibility of currencies and the inability to get dollars back, either as earnings or capital. Now suppose the Department of Commerce is compelled to come to the conclusion that this is a serious obstacle to investment of private capital overseas, and suppose it is further convinced that more progress in solving the problem could have been made by the responsible agencies than has been made. Let us say that the International Bank and Monetary Fund, an international agency, the Department of Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of State, all have some responsibility with respect to the stabilization and convertibility of currencies. Let us say also that foreign governments have some responsibility in this respect. Does it lie in the mouth of the Department of Commerce to intrude in the field of these other agencies and criticize their activities or inactivity in the past, and tell them how they should conduct themselves in the future?

I assert that the Department of Commerce has its hands tied in making a forthright, frank, and penetrating statement concerning these high-level policy matters. Let us take another example. Let us assume, and I think it is safe to assume, that double taxation—taxation abroad and taxation again in the United States of income from investments overseas—is a serious obstacle to the further investment of private capital. Let us assume that tariff barriers are an obstacle to investment and trade overseas. Would the Bureau of Internal Revenue or the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate care to have the Department of Commerce tell them what tax and revenue policies should be?

The examples I have given in these three fields—and there are many others—illustrate the weakness and the inability of any agency in the executive branch of the Government to deal forthrightly and completely with a problem of this magnitude. An independent commission composed of representatives from the executive branch of the Government, representatives from the Congress, and, most of all, representatives from private life, could deal with these questions without equivocation and without embarrassment. A new commission with stature derived from an act of Congress would have an independent status, free from responsibility for the mistaken policies or the inactivities of the past. It should have no hesitancy in criticizing forthrightly where criticism is due. It should have no hesitation to make recommendations to the President and to the Congress in policy-making fields. In fact, the Commission is ordered to make such recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, in support of the general idea of expanding investment overseas, I call attention to the recent statement of the American Farm Bureau Federation. Politics with respect to international affairs were adopted by the delegates to the 34th annual convention in December 1952. This statement is extremely well expressed and takes a broad point of view on international affairs. It is not limited to just agricultural matters, and, in my judgment, is very forward looking.

The opening paragraph of the statement of the Farm Bureau on International Affairs is as follows:

> The challenge to America is to exert the necessary leadership for successfully directing its capabilities to the maintenance of freedom and peace. The United States must demonstrate to the world that a dynamic, expanding, competitive capitalism is the true way to the more abundant life, that thoughtful people everywhere are seeking. For capitalism to be dynamic and expanding, capital must be allowed to flow freely. This requires world trade and world investment, with governments involved encouraging private investment and stimulating trade as an outlet for the increasing productivity of the world's farms and factories. This approach requires systematic abandonment of policies directed toward restriction of the production and distribution of goods and services throughout the free world.

On page 2 of this statement there is a paragraph advocating the creation of a bipartisan study commission similar to that proposed in my bill, H. R. 4199. It reads:

> Because of the urgency of getting this job under way and the complexity of the problem we recommend that an adequately financed bipartisan Commission be created by the Congress and given the task of preparing specific proposals setting forth the role of the United States in developing and expanding the free world economy.

I think I should say at this point that this statement made in December 1952 by the Farm Bureau Federation had no specific reference to the bill I have introduced in this Congress or the bill I introduced in the previous Congress.

I might say also, having spoken with representatives of the Farm Bureau, that they have in mind an investigation encompassing more than the specific task entrusted to the Commission proposed in H. R. 4199. However, the statements in and of themselves put the Farm Bureau on record not only in favor of encouraging investments in overseas areas but in favor of the idea of a Commission attacking these complex problems and recommending proposals to the President and the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Unfortunately, I have not heard all the gentleman's remarks, but I wonder if he has discussed the resolution recently adopted by the United Nations with reference to the nationalization of their industries.

Mr. MEADER. No. I did not discuss it.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman I am sure knows that very recently some 47 countries of the United Nations adopted a resolution providing that they can at any time nationalize their industries. It was not necessary that they should adopt such resolution, because of course they could do so. The significant thing was that they adopted any such resolution at all. The United States opposed it, but the United States was the one nation to oppose it in the United Nations. I ask the gentleman, How can you ever provide a climate for foreign investments if such monstrosities as the United Nations continue to enact resolutions doing anything to establish a climate favorable to American investments?

Mr. MEADER. Well, I would rather not discuss the United Nations at length. I have only a few minutes left. I would rather the gentleman directed his attention to the proposal that I am making, that we have an American bipartisan Commission to study this problem. I agree that a great many things have been done, not only by international organizations but by foreign governments which, instead of encouraging the free enterprise system, have seemed to encourage the socialistic system.

Mr. Speaker, in discussing the subject of private investment overseas during debate on the Mutual Security Act of 1952, I set forth figures summarizing investment of private capital overseas. Under permission previously granted I incorporate these figures and excerpts from my remarks accompanying them at this point in my remarks:

> Since the commencement of World War II, in lend-lease, in surplus property, gifts, and abandonments, in UNRRA and other rehabilitation programs, in the Marshall plan aid, and now in mutual assistance, the taxpayers of this country have contributed well over $100 billion to other nations. In contrast with that, the Department of Commerce estimates that total American overseas private investments are in the neighborhood of $13 billion. It is my belief that the private dollar invested abroad goes much further toward sound and lasting development of the areas where it is invested than the tax dollar handled on a government-to-government basis. Furthermore, the dollar privately invested does not cost the taxpayer anything. On the contrary, it relieves the tax burden because it creates wealth and broadens the tax base.
>
> In spite of the fact that high taxes in the United States have contributed an element of pressure toward encouraging American citizens to make investments overseas, statistics of the Department of Commerce conclusively prove that the private investment of American capital overseas since World War II has been pitifully small.
>
> Figures I obtained today demonstrate this point. I include a table showing these figures at this point in my remarks:
>
> "AMERICAN OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT
>
> "MAY 21, 1952.
>
> "Estimated figures from Office of Business Economics, Department of Commerce. These figures are taken from a survey made by the Department in 1943 and brought up to date. A new survey is expected to be published in a few months. The new figures may be quite different from the ones given below. However, this is the best estimate at present.
>
> *"United States direct investments in foreign countries (direct meaning United States private investment in controlled enterprises)*

"End of 1945 (end of war) total investments	$8,369,000,000
End of 1950 total investments	13,550,000,000
Increase	5,181,000,000
End of 1951	[1] 14,850,000,000
Increase over 1950	1,300,000,000"

[1] The 1951 figures are rough estimates.

"Breakdown of increase (1945–50) between Western Hemisphere and rest of world

"WESTERN HEMISPHERE

"Canadian investments:	
1945–49	$900,000,000
1950	500,000,000
Total	1,400,000,000
Latin American investments:	
1945–49	1,800,000,000
1950	270,000,000
Total	2,070,000,000
Total	3,470,000,000
Rest of world	1,711,000,000
Total	5,181,000,000
Breakdown by industry:	
Petroleum:	
1950	4,072,000,000
1945	1,538,000,000
Increase	2,534,000,000"

It should be noted from the above figures that an average of something less than $1 billion a year has been added to private overseas investment. It should also be noted that this $1 billion includes reinvested earnings from overseas capital. To the extent that we can increase the flow of new capital from the United States into overseas private investments, we will contribute toward the bridging of the dollar gap and alleviate the pressure for Government-financed foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a report entitled "Program for Increasing Private Investment in Foreign Countries," prepared for the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the Mutual Security Agency, dated December 18, 1952, by August Maffry, vice president of the Irving Trust Co., of New York City. I read this report with considerable interest. Under permission previously granted, I incorporate the conclusion of this report at this point in my remarks:

The problem of increasing American private investment abroad presents massive difficulties. It will yield to action by the United States Government in the short run only by the application of radical inducements with particular reference to noncontrolling investments in foreign securities by individuals and institutions. In the absence of such radical measures, the problem becomes one of bits and pieces to be attacked on many fronts by many agencies by many techniques. Results will be slow in coming, but the effort must be continued and intensified. There is no plausible way other than the stimulation of private investment to assist friendly foreign countries to achieve balanced economic development.

I wrote Mr. Maffry and sent to him my statement of April 23, 1951, urging the creation of a commission to aid overseas investment. I received a very enthusiastic reply from him which I incorporate at this point in my remarks:

BOMBAY, INDIA, *January 20, 1953.*

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MEADER: Your letter of January 7 has been forwarded to me from New York.

I have read your speech on An Affirmative American Foreign Policy and find it excellent in all respects. The proposal for a Commission on Aid to Underdeveloped Foreign Areas is as good today as it was when you put it forward. I would suggest only that such a Commission, if formed, concentrate on the private-capital phase of the point 4 program. This I see as the big unsolved problem of our international economic relations; the technical-assistance phase of the program seems to be on a fairly sound footing.

As you will have seen from my recent report to TCA, I am convinced that the stimulation of private investment abroad is a really formidable task. All the more reason why our best talents should be brought to bear on it, as you suggest. I am particularly impressed with the possibilities of a mixed Commission composed of representatives of Congress, of the executive branch, and the public, especially business and finance. Furthermore, enough spade work has been done these past 2 years to permit a Commission to proceed without much further study to the formulation of an agreed program.

If you renew your proposals in the 83d Congress as you intend and if I can be of any assistance, you have only to call on me. My two visits to the Far East within the year (on private business) have strengthened my conviction that an infusion of private enterprise in Asian countries would yield great benefits to them and to us. How to get it, that is the question. As matters stand, there is little or no new private foreign capital coming in.

Thank you for writing to me. I wish you all success on your affirmative approach to the problem of the underdeveloped countries.

Sincerely,

AUGUST MAFFRY.

Mr. Speaker, as I judge the sentiment of the American people, there is a growing demand that the United States and friendly free nations take the initiative in the cold ideological war with Communist totalitarianism.

The past administration's policy of containment, their defensive attitude waiting for Russia's next move, their statements during the campaign that our foreign policy was decided not in the United States but in Moscow, were rejected by the American people at the polls last November.

The American people clearly want and are entitled to something better than watchful waiting and a pouring out of their substance through tax funds in an effort merely to hold the line against Communist imperialism.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we assume the offensive, that we announce worthy goals and take positive action toward achieving them. This administration and the American people have endorsed this policy in general terms.

The effective offensive against totalitarianism is the practical demonstration—not just oratory—that men free to work out their own livelihoods can and do out-produce slave citizens. The free-competitive economy, the doctrine of abundance through mass production, through new ideas and new methods, the flexible society curbed only by the intrinsic merit of man, subject to governmental rules of fair play, has flourished in America, as nowhere else. What greater benefit could we confer on receptive peoples presently unable to exploit their natural resources and to raise their standard of living and promote their internal strength and stability than to export our system of equal economic opportunity? How better export that system than through the encouragement and facilitation of the overseas investment of private capital and the expansion of trade and commerce?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

THE STORY OF THE PLACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a significant ceremony took place on January 29, last, when the Washington Sesquicentennial Commission placed a bronze plaque inside the marble railing in front of the beautiful Supreme Court Building which marks the spot where First and A Streets formerly met—a spot that is now the site of the Supreme Court Building.

The ceremony commemorated the fact that from December 13, 1815, through March 3, 1819, the Congress of the United States met here in what was known as the old brick Capitol pending reconstruction of the Capitol Building which had been damaged by the British. It was here also that President James Monroe was inaugurated in front of the building, thus starting the custom of public inaugurals.

Honoring this occasion, Mr. Speaker, was a favorite son of Ohio, the Honorable Harold H. Burton, Justice of the Supreme Court whose friendship I have long cherished. Sometime before he had been asked by Chief Justice Vinson to make an investigation of the history of this location. This history, so charmingly told by Justice Burton, has now been published in a brief statement which will delight history lovers. It is entitled "The Story of the Place" and traces the history of the site through its nine contrasting periods. He writes:

Places, like people, have personalities. They also have careers. The site of the Supreme Court Building in Washington is as rich in historical interests as it is now radiant in architectural symmetry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include Justice Burton's colorful story herewith so that as many people as possible may have the privilege of knowing about a site on the Hill which is one of our notable landmarks.

And I ask that it may be printed in connection with my speech today notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit by a few hundred words.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

THE STORY OF THE PLACE WHERE FIRST AND A STREETS FORMERLY MET AT WHAT IS NOW THE SITE OF THE SUPREME COURT BUILDING

(By Harold H. Burton, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, in cooperation with Thomas E. Waggaman, marshal of the Supreme Court of the United States)

Places, like people, have personalities. They also have careers. The site of the Supreme Court Building in Washington is as rich in historical interest as it is now radiant

in architectural symmetry. Its colorful career falls into nine contrasting periods.

I. BEFORE 1790 CAME CENTURIES OF SERENITY

Let us begin with Capitol Hill as it was in 1550 and as it had been for centuries before that. No human being other than an occasional Indian had seen the Hill, much less visited its crest at sundown and from there watched the sun set across the still waters and the blue ridge to the west. The hilltop was covered with oak trees. The marshy land below it was filled with sycamores, silver poplars, and alders. From the north, a nameless brook wound its way through the woods and westerly to the river. To the south another brook bubbled from a spring. The tourists of that day were the deer, the bears, the raccoons, and the wild turkeys. The permanent residents were the gray squirrels—predecessors of those that today enjoy their prescriptive rights to the hollow tree trunks on the Capitol Plaza. The Hill of that day was known only to the animals, to the Indians, and to God. It was a quiet place that lent itself to inspiration.

By 1650 a trail had been blazed from the settlements in the north to the Indian village near the falls of the Potomac. Capt. John Smith and others, paddling up from the south, had reached those falls by canoe. Lord Baltimore had claimed the area under a proprietary grant from Charles I of England. It was all in a province named Maryland, in honor of Queen Henrietta Maria.

In another hundred years commerce had begun to flow from the trading center at Bladensburg to Georgetown and thence to Alexandria. Title to the land was vested in private ownership. Some of the properties were known as manors. They produced tobacco and corn. Before 1790 the manor which included The Hill had been inherited by Daniel Carroll, of Duddington. It extended approximately from what today is L Street on the north of the Capitol to N Street on the south, between Third Street on the west, and Third Street on the east.[1] The brook that flowed from the north across the foot of the hill had been named Goose Creek. Later it was to be renamed Tiber Creek and flow into the canal where now we see Constitution Avenue. The brook that bubbled down to the Anacostia River had been named St. James Creek. Later it was destined to be the St. James Canal. The Hill was in the very center of this Carroll property. It was known as Jenkins Hill and no one dreamed that it might become a point of interest to the world.

II. 1790–1815 BROUGHT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO THE HILL

Late in 1788 the new Constitution for the United States of America gave the world a new guaranty of freedom. In it was article I, section 8, pregnant with destiny for the Hill. That clause gave Congress power to "exercise exclusive legislation * * * over such district (not exceeding 10 miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States."

In 1790, such a district, 10 miles square, centered around the Hill, was recommended by President Washington and his adviser, Maj. Charles Pierre L'Enfant, as the seat of that new government. Promptly Maryland, Virginia, and the Congress concurred. The hand of history wrote fast. In 1791 a cornerstone of the District was laid in what is now Alexandria, Va. The diagonal axis of the square extending due north located about one-third of the District west of the Potomac in Virginia and two-thirds of it east of the Potomac in Maryland. The President named three Commissioners for its government. They were David Stuart, of Virginia, Daniel Carroll, of Maryland, and Thomas Johnson, also of Maryland. Carroll had been a Member of the Constitutional Convention of 1787. He was not, however, the Daniel Carroll, of Duddington, who owned Jenkins Hill. Thomas Johnson had been a Member of the Continental Congress and the first Governor of Maryland. Later he was to sit as an Associate Justice on the Supreme Court of the United States.

In 1791 they named this District of Destiny the Territory of Columbia and that part of the District which lay west of the Potomac soon was ceded back to Virginia. The remaining two-thirds is the District of Columbia as we know it today. The Commissioners required a small area within the District to be laid out in streets and squares. They named that area the city of Washington. Its streets, running due east and west, were to be lettered alphabetically, in two series, to the north and south from the Capitol Grounds. Similarly, those running due north and south were to be numbered consecutively, in two series, to the east and west from the same point. Major L'Enfant located the site for the Nation's Capitol on Jenkins Hill. On the same map he located First Street NE. Likewise he identified, as Square No. 728, the area on First Street extending north from East Capitol Street to A Street. The adjoining triangular plot extending to the north, from A Street to Maryland Avenue, he numbered 727.[2] This land was soon to be appraised at 6 cents per front foot.

By 1793, with elaborate Masonic ceremony, the cornerstone of the northern section of the Capitol Building was laid on Capitol Hill. The Capitol resembled but little the structure we know today. It had no dome. It had neither of its present wings. It consisted of the two rectangular structures that today constitute the elements immediately north and south of the dome. Congress and the Supreme Court met in those buildings. There Jefferson and Madison were each twice inaugurated as President.

Residences sprang up in the neighborhood. Then, during Madison's second term, came the War of 1812. On August 24, 1814, the British invaded Washington. Marching from Bladensburg down what is now Maryland Avenue, they met little opposition. It is said, however, that, as they reached 2d Street, at least one shot was fired at them. It killed the British general's horse and, in retaliation, the house from which the shot had come was burned by the invaders. They also seriously damaged with fire both of the buildings that constituted the Capitol.

III. 1815–19 PRODUCED THE BRICK CAPITOL

The British withdrew as suddenly as they had come. The Government of the United States returned to Washington. The President and Mrs. Madison moved into the Octagon House at 18th Street and New York Avenue NW. The 13th Congress convened, on September 19, 1814, in special session, at Blodgett's "Great Hotel" at 7th and 8th Streets between E and F Streets NW. September 21 the House of Representatives defeated, 54 to 83, a proposal to remove the seat of Government from the District. Somewhat later the Senate took similar action, the immediate need being for a temporary Capitol Building. Fate led the way to the vacant southeast corner of 1st and A Streets NE., where there bloomed a flower garden. To the east of it was Walker's (or Tunnicliffes' Hotel. Anxious to retain the seat of Government in Washington, a group of citizens promptly raised, by private subscription, $25,000. This proved to be enough to buy this corner and to build there a temporary Capitol.[3]

July 4, 1815, its cornerstone was laid. The structure rose to three stories. The Senate Chamber was on the ground floor. The Hall of the House of Representatives was on the floor above. Congress approved the building and occupied it, paying for its use $1,650 a year which represented 6 percent on the investment, plus $150 for insurance. Congress paid $5,000 more for furnishings, including the later famous red leather chairs for the Senators. December 4, 1815, the 14th Congress met briefly at Blodgett's Hotel but, by December 13, both Houses of Congress were in the new brick Capitol. Vice President Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, having passed away, the Presiding Officer of the Senate was its President pro tempore, Senator John Gaillard, of South Carolina. The Speaker of the House was Henry Clay of Kentucky. The 15th Congress, throughout its life, also met in the brick Capitol, adjourning sine die March 3, 1819. The Presiding Officer of the Senate for that session was Vice President Daniel D. Tompkins, of New York. The Speaker of the House again was Henry Clay, of Kentucky.[4]

In December, 1819, the 16th Congress convened in the newly rebuilt and permanent Capitol Building on the crest of the hill. Its reconstruction had been made possible by a $500,000 loan to the Government from the Washington banks. The Supreme Court preceded Congress in its return to the permanent Capitol. There the Court met in the semicircular room on the ground floor under the Senate Chamber.

The most unique incident that had occurred in the brick Capitol, while Congress occupied it, was connected with the inauguration of President Monroe and Vice President Tompkins, March 4, 1817. The advance arrangements for the ceremony conformed

[1] Within that area, the Duddington mansion house was completed in about 1797. For more than a century it was to stand between First and Second Streets, SE., near E Street. The neighborhood became known as Carroll Springs. Its location is roughly indicated now by that of Carroll Street, which extends one block, from First to Second Street, SE., between Streets C and D. The house at the southeast corner of First and C Streets is still marked Duddington Place. A later development was that of the Carroll Row Houses, on the site of the Congressional Library. Their presence is not now commemorated unless it be in the name of the Carroll Arms Hotel on First Street NE., several blocks to the north. At the south end of the Carroll property and reaching to the Anacostia River, there was developed a sparsely settled area called Carrollsburg. Its name survives at Carrollsburg Place, which extends from M Street to N Street SW., in the block just west of South Capitol Street.

[2] A Street then opened directly into First Street. Its north side followed the line now marked by the north wall of the north wing of the Supreme Court Building. Its south side followed a line which now would pass through that wing between its fourth and fifth windows from the north.

[3] The largest subscriber was Daniel Carroll, of Duddington. The next largest was Thomas Law. Like Carroll, he was a substantial property owner. He also was a brother of Lord Ellenborough, Lord Chief Justice of the King's Bench of England. I Bryan, a History of the National Capital (1914); Busey, Pictures of the City of Washington in the Past (1898), 129.

[4] In the brick Capitol during these two Congresses were heard many leaders of their day. Among these were Senator Rufus King, of New York, later an unsuccessful candidate for President of the United States; Representative Philip P. Barbour, of Virginia, later a Justice of the Supreme Court; John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, later Vice President of the United States; William Henry Harrison, of Ohio, later President of the United States; John McLean, of Ohio, later a Justice of the Supreme Court; John Randolph, of Virginia, later a Senator from that State; John Tyler, of Virginia, later President of the United States; and Daniel Webster, then representing New Hampshire but later to become Secretary of State and a Senator from Massachusetts.

largely to previous custom, except that, instead of holding the ceremony in the small Senate Chamber, the plan was to move the red leather Senate chairs into the Hall of the House of Representatives. However, the Speaker of the House had not been consulted and, when confronted with the plan, Henry Clay objected, particularly to the presence of the Senate chairs in the House of Representatives. The arrangements were quickly changed. Vice President Tompkins was inducted into office in the Senate Chamber and there made his response, but President-elect Monroe was taken out of doors to a temporary portico which had been erected on First Street, directly in front of the building. There in the presence of the general public, the oath of office was administered to him by Chief Justice Marshall. There the President delivered his inaugural address and thus set the precedent for public inaugurals.[8]

[8] An echo of this was heard in the Senate 20 years later, preceding the inauguration of President Van Buren. Clay was then a Senator and inquired why it was that the Senate, rather than the House of Representatives, had the exclusive care of administering the Presidential oath. He recalled the incident at the old brick Capitol, in 1817, and furnished what is probably our most authentic account of it. His colloquy of February 28, 1837, is reported in vol. 13, pt. 1, of Gales and Seaton's Register of Debates in Congress, 24th Cong., 2d sess., at 992, as follows:

"The President pro tempore presented a letter from the President-elect of the United States, informing the Senate that he would be ready to take the usual oath of office on Saturday, March 4, at 12 o'clock, noon, at such place and in such manner as the Senate might designate.

"Mr. Grundy (of Tennessee) offered a resolution for the appointment of a committee of arrangements, to make the requisite preparations for administering the oath to the President-elect of the United States.

"Mr. Clay (of Kentucky) said he would like to inquire whether precedents had been examined on this subject. He was aware that the Senate had always had a peculiar agency in this business; but he was not aware why the Senate should act upon it any more than the House, or why it was not a joint concern. He remembered that, on the first election of Mr. Monroe, the committee of the Senate applied to him, as Speaker of the House, for the use of the Chamber of the House; and he had told them that he would put the Chamber in order for the use of the Senate, but the control of it he did not feel authorized to surrender. They wished also to bring in the fine red chairs of the Senate, but he told them it could not be done; the plain democratic chairs of the House were more becoming. The consequence was that Mr. Monroe, instead of taking the oath within doors, took it outside, in the open air, in front of the Capitol. Mr. C. mentioned this for the purpose of making the inquiry, what was the practice, and on what it was founded, and why the Senate had the exclusive care of administering the oath.

"Mr. Grundy said the committee had found no authority but several precedents, which were in strict accordance with the proposition now proposed to be made. He did not recollect any instance in which the House had participated in it; and, in fact, the House, as such, had no existence, their term having expired on the preceding day. The committee had examined three cases of more modern date, and had found nothing in opposition to the practice proposed. If the committee could not get into the House, they could go out of doors.

"The resolution was adopted, and the Chair was authorized to appoint the above-named committee of three members."

IV. 1819–24 BROUGHT THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

When Congress returned to the permanent Capitol, it crowded out the circuit court for the District of Columbia. That court, in turn, was allotted space vacated in the brick Capitol. There it met from 1819 to 1824. Pressure from the local bar induced it to move downtown to Judiciary Square, where it occupied space in the new city hall at the head of what is now John Marshall Place.

V. FROM ABOUT 1824 TO 1861 THE SITE WAS USED FOR A LODGINGHOUSE, INCLUDING AN OCCUPANCY BY JOHN C. CALHOUN—1849–50

Some time after the old brick Capitol ceased to be used by the circuit court it was converted into a lodginghouse. In 1841 we find H. V. Hill advertising furnished rooms for rent. Several Members of Congress lived there.[6] It housed two clubs for young men. Its most prominent tenant was Senator John C. Calhoun, from South Carolina. Formerly Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and twice Vice President, he was completing 40 years of public service. There Senator Calhoun lived, largely alone, from 1849 until his death at the age of 68, on Sunday, March 31, 1850. It was there that his political opponent, but personal friend, Senator Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, came to cheer him during his final days.

VI. FROM 1861 TO 1868 THE SITE WAS OCCUPIED BY THE CAPITOL PRISON

After an interval, during part of which the building was used as a public school, the site at First and A Streets NE., passed into the sixth period of its career. In the spring of 1861 the old brick Capitol was converted into a Federal military prison. It was known as the Capitol Prison. A high wall was built around the prison yard on the east. The prison was used for state prisoners rather than for violators of military discipline. During its first 4 months only 15 prisoners were sent there. Soon, however, arrests became so numerous that two houses in the adjoining block to the south were used to house the overflow. At one time 1,004 prisoners are said to have been crowded in. Among its notorious inmates were the Confederate spies Rose Greenhow and Belle Boyd. Capt. Henry Wirz, former commandant of the Andersonville Confederate military prison, was another. He was hanged in the prison yard November 10, 1865, and at least three others are said to have been executed there.

VII. FROM ABOUT 1867 TO 1921 THE SITE AGAIN BECAME RESIDENTIAL; IT INCLUDED THE RESIDENCE OF JUSTICE FIELD FROM 1869 TO 1899

In May 1867, the Old Brick Capitol property and its grounds were sold for $20,000 to George T. Brown, Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. With financial aid from Senator Lyman Trumbull, of Illinois, he remodeled and converted the building into three large row houses. They were four stories high and faced First Street on the southeast corner of the A Street intersection. Known as Trumbull Row, Nos. 21, 23, and 25, they provided convenient and desirable living quarters.

The most famous occupant of these houses was Justice Stephen J. Field, of the Supreme Court of the United States. Appointed to that Court in 1863, he spent much time on the Pacific coast in performance of his duties as a circuit justice. However, in 1870 or 1871, he established his residence in Trumbull Row. He occupied the house at the southerly end of the row which had been acquired by one or more of his brothers, Cyrus, David Dudley, and Henry.[7] He built an addition to it and provided a large reception room on the first floor. His library of 3,000 volumes was on the second floor. There he followed a tireless schedule that began at 7 o'clock each morning. At the age of 82 he died there on Sunday, April 9, 1899. This was nearly 2 years after he had submitted his resignation from the Court to take effect December 1, 1897, closing the longest term of office ever served on that Court—34 years 8 months and 20 days.[8]

[6] Representatives William H. Brockenborough, of Florida; Reuben Chapman, of Alabama; Joseph A. Woodward, of South Carolina; and Isaac E. Morse, of Louisiana, are among those reported to have lived there in the 1840's.

VIII. FROM 1921 TO 1928 THE SITE WAS THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE NATIONAL WOMAN'S PARTY

Mrs. Alva Belmont (Mrs. Oliver Hazard Perry Belmont), having acquired the Old Brick Capitol property, presented it to the National Woman's Party as a permanent headquarters for their crusade for equal rights for women. Known as No. 21 First Street NE., it was cherished by that organization not only as a headquarters but as an historical shrine. They embellished the grounds with a garden. When, in 1928, this site was selected for the Supreme Court Building, the National Woman's Party opposed the selection because it meant the removal of their historic building. The Senate adopted a resolution favoring the retention of their building and the abandonment of the proposal to build the Supreme Court Building there. However, Case No. 1911 in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia resulted in the condemnation of the property and an award to the National Woman's Party of substantially $300,000 as just compensation for the taking of it.[9] The party thereupon moved to its present headquarters in the historic mansion on the northwest corner of Constitution Avenue (old B Street) and Second Street NE.

IX. SINCE 1928 THE SITE HAS BEEN SET ASIDE FOR THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Completed in 1935, the Supreme Court Building, designed by Cass Gilbert, Sr., Cass Gilbert, Jr., and John R. Rockart, stands where First and A Streets formerly met. The site is now known as No. 1 First Street NE. The Supreme Court Building provides a fitting climax. Magnificent in design, its central element reflects the proportions of the Parthenon of Athens. Significant as a symbol of the independence of the judiciary, it honors an historic spot. Inspirational in its message of "Equal justice under law," it expresses in fitting form the faith of our fathers.

PRINCIPAL REFERENCES

Washington: A Not Too Serious History, by George Rothwell Brown (1930).

Pictures of the City of Washington in the Past, by Samuel C. Busey (1898).

The National Capital: Its Architecture, Art, and History, by George C. Hazelton, Jr. (1902).

A History of the National Capital, by W. B. Bryan, volumes I and II (1914).

John C. Calhoun, by Margaret L. Coit (1950).

[7] Cyrus W. Field was the projector of the first Atlantic cable. David Dudley Field was the author of the Code of Civil Procedure adopted by New York and followed by many Western States. For many years the four brothers met annually with Justice Field at this house to celebrate the birthday of David Dudley Field on February 13.

[8] There also once stood in this block a historic home on East Capitol Street occupied by Capt. William Easby, a veteran of the Battle of Bladensburg in 1814. It was built in 1750 by Daniel Carroll and came into the ownership of the Easby family in about 1824.

[9] The parcel acquired from the National Woman's Party was the largest one in the site. The condemnation awards for the entire site came to $1,768,141.

Stephen J. Field, Craftsman of the Law, by Carl B. Swisher (1930).

Proctor's Washington, by John Clagett Proctor (1949).

Captains and Mariners of Early Maryland, by Raphael Semmes (1937).

Equal Rights, volume XIV, pages 153, 157, 163, 231, 371 (1928).

Final Report of the United States Supreme Court Building Commission, Senate Document No. 88 (76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939)).

In Civil War days, John Hitz, the first Swiss consul general to the United States, and great-grandfather of Justice Harold Hitz Burton, and of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, maintained his home and his consulate at 29 A Street SE., within what is now the Capitol Plaza, opposite the Congressional Library. At his death in 1864 President Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward attended his funeral services at that residence.

THE SUBMERGED LANDS CONTROVERSY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this House is on the eve of considering the submerged lands controversy once again.

Before the debate and before the air becomes fogged with the bitterness, misinformation, and exaggerations invariably generated by this topic, I would like to lay before my colleagues for their calm consideration some of the facts related to this issue—facts vital to its determination.

So there may be no question as to my motives, let me say that I represent the 18th Congressional District of California. Within the limits of that district lies the city of Long Beach, my home.

This city presently has hundreds of millions of dollars at stake in the action of this body respecting the submerged lands. Its future stake can best be illustrated by stating that, at the present time, untapped oil resources in the submerged lands within the city's boundaries are estimated at four times the present assessed valuation of the entire city. So, both as a citizen of Long Beach and as its representative in Congress, I have a definite and close interest in the controversy.

However, as an American citizen, in common with each and every other of my fellow Americans, I have an even more particular and vital interest in it, namely: Is my National Government to continue in the historic American tradition of functioning as a government of delegated powers, reserving and preserving to the State and local governments all those functions which adequately can be discharged at these levels, closer and more responsive to the will of the people, or are we to propel ourselves down the road of centralization of powers in a few hands—hands very remote from our citizens. This road, traveled by other nations, has led to deprivation of individual liberty, slavery to an all-powerful state, dictatorship, desperation, and despair.

For in truth and in fact, the submerged lands controversy, stripped to its essence and bared of extraneous and irrelevant attributes sought to be attached to it—to confuse and sugar coat it—is no more than another attempt by the advocates of big, powerful, all-consuming, centralized Federal Government to move toward that tragic goal.

I truly believe that many well-meaning people have been taken in and duped by the big-government advocates. It is my purpose to state the issue in its true perspective, now, while the atmosphere still is clear and unturbulent. I shall explain the background of the controversy and answer some of the false charges and misleading propaganda that advocates of Federal control of the submerged lands have spread.

Here are the facts back of this controversy:

The colonial charters, of what later became the Thirteen Original States, granted those colonies not only the land and the waters thereon, but also the sea for a distance ranging from 3 miles to 20 leagues, about 60 miles. When these colonies formed the United States of America, their seaward boundaries became fixed at 3 miles. Later, as new States were created out of the wild lands of the West, they were admitted into the Union on an equal footing—in all respects—with the original States.

The seaward boundaries of coastal States were fixed at the 3-mile limit, except in the case of Texas and the west coast of Florida, where the seaward boundary was 3 marine leagues, or about 10½ miles.

The unsettled territory of most of these States, however, was recognized as Federal and became the public domain, over which the States had jurisdictional sovereignty, but not title. It is important to remember this point, namely, there has never been a question that actual, legal title to lands regarded as within the public domain rests in the Federal Government, and that such title was derived directly from the British sovereign on the declaration of our independence.

The Federal Government did not specifically lay claim to the navigable streams and lakes, the harbors, and the tidelands and ocean outside the 3-mile limit. It is important to remember these additional points: First, the title to these was generally recognized as belonging to the States, as derived from the British sovereign; second, this title was subject only to the regulation of navigation by the Federal Government, a power also derived from the previous sovereign.

Instances have occurred in the past where claim was made that these submerged lands were a part of the public domain and therefore belonged to the Federal Government. However, no less than 52 decisions of the United States Supreme Court, dating as far back as 1844, have involved State ownership of filled lands made from tidal swamps and shallow water along the coast—each and every one of these decisions upheld ownership in these lands by the States.

That is the way things stood in 1936. Oil had been discovered some years before under the submerged lands of southern California. It was being produced in ever-increasing quantities under leases from the State. These leases, under the carefully drawn model resource conservation statutes of the State of California, provided a high royalty return to the people of California.

Some individuals and companies, failing to get State leases and well aware of the much reduced 12½ percent royalty provisions of oil leases issued by the Federal Government, had made application for Federal leases on the basis that the submerged lands were owned by the Federal Government. In every case, their applications were rejected.

Mr. Harold Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior, ruled in 1933 that such claims must be rejected. He cited one of these 52 United States Supreme Court decisions, stating:

> Such title to the shore and lands under water is regarded as incidental to the sovereignty of the States * * * and cannot be retained or granted out to individuals by the United States.

Suddenly in 1936, however, Mr. Ickes changed his mind. On January 16 of that year, a Mr. C. A. Weigel filed an application for a Federal oil lease on an under-water oil field, located at Huntington Beach, Calif., which was already operating under the State lease. Mr. Ickes reversed the long-settled policy of the Interior Department and allowed this and other subsequent applications to stand open in his files. Why did Mr. Ickes change his mind? Why did he suddenly choose to ignore these 52 United States Supreme Court decisions?

His only answer was that he had "made a mistake" when he ruled that the States held title to these lands.

Of course, when Mr. Ickes' "change of mind" was announced, applications for other Federal leases to tidelands began to pour in. None of these lease applications was granted, but Mr. Ickes began urging legislative or judicial action to declare the oil-bearing submerged lands to be Federal property.

In April 1937 a bill was introduced in the Senate for this purpose. A similar Senate joint resolution passed the Senate that year and was reported out by the House Judiciary Committee in 1938. However, it died with the end of the 75th Congress. Similar legislation was introduced in the 76th Congress in 1939. By this time the people of the coastal States had become awakened to the fact that more than oil under the submerged lands was involved. They recognized that such legislation would cloud the titles to all filled lands and their improvements along the coasts, the inland lakes, and the navigable streams of any State. As a consequence, legislation was introduced not to fix title in the Federal Government but to affirm titles of submerged coastal lands and inland navigable waterways to the States.

Such legislation gained momentum in each following Congress. It had the backing of the attorneys general of 46 States. This legislation finally passed both Houses of Congress in 1946, but was vetoed by Mr. Truman.

However, while this State-ownership legislation was pending before the Congress—and it had a good chance of passage—the Federal-control advocates succeeded in getting the Department of Justice to step in and prop up Mr. Ickes'

claims. In 1945 former Attorney General Biddle caused a suit to be filed in the Federal District Court of Southern California against an oil company operating off the California coast under State lease, claiming the lands on behalf of the Federal Government.

This suit was later dropped and a new suit was initiated against the State of California and carried directly to the United States Supreme Court. This new suit claimed that all persons who held title or leases from the State of California on submerged lands were trespassers against the rights of the United States.

The Supreme Court's decision in the California tidelands case, handed down on June 23, 1947, was a most astonishing one. In a 6 to 2 opinion, the Court ruled—despite 52 precedents—that the question of ownership of the submerged coastal lands out to the 3-mile limit had never been previously settled and that California did not own these lands. The decision did not say, however, that the Federal Government owned the submerged lands, but that, because of the needs for national defense, it had paramount rights and dominion over them. The ruling left the door open for Congress to decide the actual ownership.

Similar original United States Supreme Court suits were immediately brought against Texas and Louisiana, where development of oil and gas under State leases had already begun beneath the shadow waters of the Gulf of Mexico, both within the State boundaries and in the Continental Shelf beyond. The Texas and Louisiana decisions were handed down in 1950 and were similar to the California decision.

The production of oil and gas off the California coast has continued under a series of stipulations between the State and Federal Governments, the proceeds being impounded until the question of ownership is settled. But the Texas and Louisiana decisions completely stopped the further development of oil and gas deposits off those coasts at a time when the oil was badly needed for domestic and defense purposes.

The 82d Congress saw a rash of tidelands legislation—some for Federal ownership, some for State ownership, and some to allow interim oil and gas development pending final settlement of the ownership. This House, in July 1951, passed by 265 to 109, a bill to confirm and establish State titles to submerged lands within the State's historic boundaries and to confirm Federal ownership of the Continental Shelf with Federal leasing of its oil deposits.

The Senate, in 1952, passed with a much smaller majority, a bill establishing the State's title to the submerged lands within their boundaries, but not touching on the ownership of the Continental Shelf. The House accepted this bill, but again Mr. Truman vetoed it.

Tidelands bills of all sorts have been introduced during this 83d Congress. A bill known as the Graham bill has been carefully drafted by the Judiciary Committee. It meticulously protects the proper provinces of the Federal Government, while confirming the ownership of the States in these submarginal lands. I hope my colleagues will swiftly make it law.

Before leaving the historical background phases of the controversy, however, I must point out that the doctrine of Federal "paramount rights" and "dominion," enunciated in the Supreme Court's California tidelands decision, has implications far beyond control of the submerged lands and the valuable oil deposits under them. If the Federal Government, because of the needs of national defense, can claim the submerged coastal lands on these grounds, it could, on the same basis, expropriate any other lands or natural resources within our country. This is a dangerous concept and will not be remedied by State-ownership legislation. It will, and must be, our constant duty to insure that the doctrine is never perverted to the derogation of our liberties.

Now, I would like to turn to a few of the many false charges and the misleading propaganda spread by the advocates of Federal ownership, and analyze them with you to determine their merit.

Take, for instance, the charge that "the oil lobby is behind the drive for State ownership of submerged lands." Let us see what the true fact is:

The true fact is that the so-called oil lobby has supported not State ownership, but has supported the very legislation sought by the Truman administration to establish Federal control. In testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, during the 1951 submerged-lands hearings, oil-industry representatives endorsed the O'Mahoney-Anderson bill, providing for permanent Federal control. Mr. Truman urged the passage of this measure, in his veto message on the Holland bill in 1952.

The drive for State-ownership legislation has come from the States themselves and their political subdivisions—not from any oil lobby. Since 1938, a total of 205 State and local officials have gone on record with the committees of Congress urging passage of the State-ownership legislation. Included in these endorsers of State ownership were 45 individual Governors and 74 different State attorneys general. Major support for State ownership has come from a great many respected national organizations, such as the National Association of Attorneys General, the American Bar Association, the American Association of Port Authorities, and the American Municipal Association, which represents 10,150 municipalities throughout our land.

Now take a look at another false charge—that the word "tidelands" has been used by State-ownership advocates to deceive the people. The truth is that State and local representatives have never claimed that tidelands in the strict sense—that is, the part of the seashore washed by the ebb and flow of the tide—is involved. The States' representatives properly described the issue as affecting submerged lands. Newspaper practice of using labels for issues has resulted in the common reference of the submerged-lands dispute as the tidelands matter. This approach by Federal-control advocates simply demonstrates and exemplifies the ingenuity of their efforts to confuse this issue in the minds of the American people.

Next let us see what the truth is of the false charge by Federal-control advocates that the Supreme Court has never held that the States own these lands. The truth is that State ownership of the submerged lands was affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States 52 times and by the lower Federal and State courts 244 times prior to the astounding decision in the California case. Even in that decision the Supreme Court admitted that many times it "used language strong enough to indicate that it then believed the States not only owned tidelands and the soil under inland navigable waters but also owned soil under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

Even Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes in 1933 stated that settled law was as follows:

> Title to the soil underneath the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California and the land may not be appropriated except by the authority of the State.

My colleagues, it was only after oil was discovered in large quantities that the Federal Government changed its position and tried to confiscate these lands.

Again, advocates of Federal ownership have attempted to lull the American people into a false feeling of security by spreading the misconception that the title of the States to lands beneath inland navigable waters is not endangered by the Federal-ownership doctrine. The contrary is true. The very brief filed by the Federal Government in the suit against California attacked as "unsound" and "erroneous" the rule that States owned the lands beneath their inland navigable waterways. In the California decision the Court itself said California had only a "qualified ownership" of such lands.

Further, the Supreme Court has held that the Great Lakes are open seas, governed by the same rules of law as lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea.

Federal officials may promise that they would never attempt to confiscate lands beneath inland navigable waterways, but the Supreme Court has ruled that such acts cannot bind the Federal Government. What credence can be given such promises boldly made at the very time the Federal Government completely reversed its position on State ownership to take away the coastal submerged lands of the States?

Next, I want to examine for you the argument that the Federal Government must take over this oil for national defense. Let us remember that this Government of ours is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and that not only is the sanctity of the individual guaranteed by the Constitution, but also the sanctity of his rights to his property. It is a revolutionary doctrine to say that the Federal Government can confiscate resources necessary to national defense. The Constitution permits the Federal Government to condemn the property it needs, but requires that just compensation be paid the owner. The wisdom of the Founding

Fathers did not give it the power to confiscate State or privately owned property for any purpose.

The claim that this oil will be available for national defense only if the Federal Government owns it is pure and simple nonsense. It has been under State ownership and control that the oil was discovered, developed, and made available to the people and the Government of our land. I challenge anyone to show me one single instance where one single barrel of oil has been denied the Federal Government from the submerged lands.

But if that not be enough to dispel any belief that the Federal Government must take this oil for national defense, let me say this: That in June 1952, in the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings, the Interior Department and the General Services Administration even stated that they planned to declare these submerged lands surplus to the needs of any Federal agencies.

Just prior to his election, President Eisenhower, in October 1952, stated that State ownership would in no way interfere with the national defense needs. And I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, who have so profusely spread their admiration and support for the President of the United States of America in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—to match their words with deeds and heed our President's recommendations and desires with respect to this very important issue.

Next, what is there to the charge that only three selfish States are involved in this submerged lands controversy? It is plainly and simply another attempt to obscure the true facts that all 48 States are involved. It is true that only three States, California, Texas, and Louisiana, have been sued. But the Interior Department has attempted to seize the coastal submerged lands in Washington, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida—without even suing them. Further, Mr. Truman's executive order, allegedly creating a naval petroleum reserve—if it has any legal force or effect whatsoever—applies to the submerged lands of all 21 coastal States, not just California, Texas, and Louisiana.

The strange and dangerous doctrine of paramount rights, by which the Federal Government has attempted to seize these submerged lands, is so revolutionary and so far-reaching that the sovereignty and the property rights of all 48 States are threatened. Even the constitutional protection guaranteed to private property is endangered. All natural resources everywhere could be nationalized under this doctrine. And, my colleagues, those are not my words. They are the words of the resolutions of the American Bar Association and of the National Association of Attorneys General of the 48 States of the United States of America.

I do not wish to hold this floor indefinitely to answer the endless, baseless charges of the Federal-control advocates. However, there are three additional specific charges that should be explained in order fully to clear the air for deliberation on the Graham bill.

There is a charge that the States are trying to steal these lands and that to restore them would be a gift.

Nothing could be further from the facts. The Supreme Court itself in the California case specifically pointed out that Congress has the constitutional power and right to restore unquestioned State ownership to these lands. The States are scrupulously adhering to constitutional procedures by petitioning the Congress to restore their rights. To describe such proper legal procedure as a steal undermines respect for our legal system.

Obviously, that false charge is calculated to arouse emotions and confuse the true issue. From their inception, the States have, without challenge, owned, used, and improved these lands until the very recent past. To restore that ownership can, by no stretch of the imagination, be called either a gift or a steal. A more appropriate word would be "justice."

Federal ownership advocates have gone so far afield as to try to involve the question of education in the submerged lands issue. They tell us that Federal control is necessary to provide oil for education.

The truth is that neither the Federal Government, the State governments, or the local governments have the constitutional power to confiscate anything for any purpose, however worthy. That is one of the fundamental protections written into the Constitution on which our system of Government is based.

Furthermore, any revenues that would be available for education would be of such an infinitesimal amount as to make this argument ridiculous in the extreme. Last month the Library of Congress reported that if all revenues from the submerged lands oil became available for education—every penny of them—it would amount to less than one-half of one percent of present educational expenditures.

Those advocating oil for education have raised false hopes on the part of educators in order to gain their powerful support for Federal control. Actually, oil for education has nothing whatsoever to do with the basic issue—ownership of submerged lands—and is, at best, a shimmering illusion.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this explanation of the background of the submerged lands controversy, and this exposure of some of the false and misleading charges and propaganda that it has generated, will serve to resolve the issue in the minds of some who may be coming to grips with it for the first time.

I hope all will realize that this issue is not one between Republicans and Democrats. Nor is it one between a few States favored in their natural resources and the remainder of the States of our land. Nor is it one involving the education of our children. I hope all will realize that, stripped to its fundamentals, it is a contest between those who believe in preserving State, local, and private rights, by limiting the powers of Federal Government, and those who would give the Federal Government unlimited power over the people and the resources of the Nation.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, when the 82d Congress renewed and extended the 1951 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Members of the Congress were shocked by the revelation that the State Department at the 1945 Geneva Convention had abrogated to itself the express right of the Congress to make treaties.

Now that we have legislation pending in the Congress to amend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which will be up for renewal in this session of Congress, we find the State Department meddling in affairs that are strictly the business of the Congress.

The following news release from the Oil Daily under date of March 18 should be a warning to Members of Congress interested in limiting the increasing imports of residual fuel oil:

NEW YORK, March 18.—A top State Department official, recently appointed by President Eisenhower, came out strongly today against sharp cutbacks in residual fuel oil imports proposed by a score of Congressmen.

John M. Cabot, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, told a joint meeting of the Export Managers Club and the Export Advertising Association here, that passage of such legislation would "prejudice our interests throughout the Americas."

Taking note of more than 20 bills in Congress to reduce residual imports to 5 percent of the domestic demand for each calendar quarter of the previous year, Cabot said:

"I am not going to describe to you at length what is likely to happen if one of these bills should pass; you yourselves will readily appreciate that if we should thus break an international commitment, it will not only damage your business in Venezuela but also prejudice our interests throughout the Americas."

THOMAS H. MACDONALD

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in an endeavor to assess things in their own proper perspective during the years I have been in Congress and select those things that we have done which have contributed best to the peace, happiness, and welfare of our people at home, my mind reverts to the progress that has been made by the Congress, in the provision of primary highways, farm-to-market roads, and city streets.

The planning of this highway system and its construction and maintenance has had a profound influence on the economy of our country.

The change from the seasonally impassable roads of 1914, the year I came to Congress, to our present system of all-weather highways of 1953 has required the investment of public funds in large amounts.

It has not just happened as a matter of course, as many would seem to take

for granted. It has happened because of the initial teamwork of the Federal Government with the sovereign States as laid down in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1916 and its subsequent amendments. It has happened because of the teamwork of the Federal Government with the sovereign States and their counties and cities as spelled out in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 and its subsequent amendments.

In this systematic creation of our Federal-aid highway systems of primary highways, farm-to-market roads, and urban streets now reaching some 677,000 miles there is one man who has continuously served this Congress and the executive branch of our Government as their guide and counselor since the expanded program took effect in 1919. Through his quiet honesty both in engineering and intellectual judgments and in the economical expenditures of great sums of public moneys authorized and appropriated by the Congress, he has earned those immeasurable gratitudes that come to but few public servants. He has earned the respect of all who have counseled with him from our country. He has been honored by many from foreign lands who have been astonished and heartened by the teamwork which has created our American Federal-aid highway systems.

Thomas H. MacDonald, our first Commissioner of Public Roads, is the man of whom I speak.

On his retirement on April 1, 1953, after 34 continuous years of strenuous service in the interest and welfare of his country, he richly deserves the distinction of having followed one of the primary precepts of our first great American engineer, George Washington, whose wise engineering counsel was to "let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

As a token of the esteem with which all of the Members of Congress hold this great American civil engineer and administrator, I ask that the following short biography of his life be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as an inspiration and guide for all public servants and especially for those young American engineers who propose to dedicate their lives, to the best of their ability, to the service of their country:

THOMAS H. MACDONALD

Thomas H. MacDonald has directed the work of the Federal road-building organization since 1919, first as Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads, and since 1939 as Commissioner of Public Roads. The organization is now the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce. He has been responsible for administration of Federal highway funds since shortly after the beginning of Federal participation in highway matters on a national scale. He has greatly influenced the formulation of national highway policy and given skilled direction to the plan of Federal-State cooperation in highway improvement.

Mr. MacDonald was born July 23, 1881, near Leadville, Colo., but moved to Iowa with his parents in 1884. His elementary education was received in the public schools of Montezuma, Iowa. After studying 1 year at Iowa State Teachers' College, he matriculated at Iowa State College, receiving the degree bachelor of civil engineering in 1904.

While an undergraduate and at a time when there was little interest in highways, he showed an interest in highway engineering—an interest that was to guide his entire life. At the suggestion of Dean Marston, a noted teacher and leader in engineering, he undertook for his thesis a study of the highway needs of farmers and the force required to pull a wagon over different types of roads.

In 1904 the Iowa Legislature appointed the Iowa State College (as an institution) a highway commission to make investigations of highways and methods for their improvement. Mr. MacDonald was employed as assistant professor of civil engineering in charge of road investigations, and in 1907 was made State highway engineer.

The Iowa highway law was revised in 1913, providing a three-man commission having power to coordinate road building throughout the State. Mr. MacDonald was appointed chief engineer by this commission, and where previously he had been able only to suggest improvements and provide standard plans, he was now able to make his guidance really effective.

Before the end of his 15-year connection with the commission, Iowa had become one of the first States in the Middle West to establish a statewide system of main roads, and about a third of the designated 6,400-mile network had been permanently graded, drained, and bridged. The next step—hard-surfacing the system—had been planned and was about to get under way when Mr. MacDonald was called to Washington to become Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads. He has remained at the helm of the Federal Government's roadbuilding agency since that time.

At the time of his appointment to take charge of the Bureau of Public Roads in 1919 plans were being developed for administering the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916 which marks the beginning of Federal assistance to the States in highway improvement.

He immediately sought the advice and assistance of State officials, acting through the American Association of State Highway Officials, in developing Federal-aid procedure and has consistently followed this practice in the development of highway policies, specifications, and standards. When he took office the plan of Federal-State cooperation was an untried venture. It has been successful beyond all expectations. When it was initiated there were no surfaced roads interconnecting the large cities of the country. Industries were located alongside the rail terminals. The farmer was isolated from city life. Federal assistance to the States launched them upon programs that have made a complete change in all of these conditions.

Twice during Mr. MacDonald's early career his future as a highway official hung in the balance. A change in only a few votes would have resulted in legislation that probably would have ended his highway career. In 1917 when the Iowa highway commission was beginning to make real progress on a State system, a bill was introduced in the legislature to abolish the commission and place State responsibility for highways with an appointed commission. In 2 days' debate on amendments there were 5 votes 54 to 54. A change of one vote would have ended the position from which he was selected to go to Washington 2 years later.

Within 2 years after his arrival in Washington his future was again in doubt. It was generally agreed that Federal-aid highway legislation needed revision but there were two distinct schools of thought as to the plan to follow. One group of considerable strength favored the creation of a Federal highway commission, thereby abolishing Mr. MacDonald's position. Mr. MacDonald favored continued cooperation with the States but with amendment of the law to require concentration of funds on a selected system of main highways, a plan supported by highway people. This viewpoint, now demonstrated to have been a wise one, prevailed.

The Federal-aid highway system was authorized in 1921 and the Bureau began its work of bringing the States into agreement on a coordinated system to serve the entire country. Differing views as to where routes should cross State lines produced difficult problems but all were solved.

In connection with designation of the Federal-aid system, inquiry was made of the War Department as to which of the highways were considered to be of principal strategic importance in event of war. It was desired to include those roads of greatest importance to national defense in the system being selected. The War Department submitted a map approved by General Pershing. The routes shown on the map were included in the system and were improved in the following years. On numerous other occasions Mr. MacDonald has requested the advice of defense officials and has been guided by their recommendations.

In 1924 the Bureau placed special emphasis on elimination of the hazard at railroad grade crossings and urged the States to adopt grade-crossing elimination programs. Thousands of crossings have been eliminated in the Federal-aid program.

Mr. MacDonald was one of the small group instrumental in establishing the highway research board of the National Research Council in 1919. He has served as ex-officio member of the executive committee of the board since its first meeting in 1923, and has been an active participant in the broad research program of the board that has had great impact on highway development.

In 1924 Mr. MacDonald was designated Chairman of the Joint Board on Interstate Highways appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture at the request of the American Association of State Highway Officials. The Board was composed of 3 Federal and 21 State representatives. Through a series of national and regional meetings, agreement of all the States was obtained on routes to comprise the "U. S." numbered system of highways, thereby eliminating the great confusion that had previously existed in route designation, mapping, and marking of routes. The Board also developed the system of standard informational, warning, and danger signs now in use on all highways throughout the country. The Board eliminated the chaos and confusion that had existed in highway designation and marking without the aid of legislation or compulsory action. Its recommendations are now accepted by all highway agencies.

An early policy of the Bureau with regard to standards for Federal-aid highway construction has been highly successful. Instead of announcing design standards, specifications, and administrative and technical processes to be used on Federal-aid work, the Bureau sought to have these developed by committees of the American Association of State Highway Officials. The Bureau has membership on all committees, each of which is composed of men of outstanding ability in the particular field. The standards produced are now voluntarily applied by practically all highway agencies.

Administration of Federal aid to the States is the primary function of Mr. MacDonald's organization, but it has numerous other duties. These include supervision of construction of roads in national forests, national parks, and other Federal areas and of repair and reconstruction of highways damaged by major floods. During the depression a large construction program was conducted to provide relief from unemployment. During the war the Bureau enlisted the aid of State highway departments in the rapid construction of highways to serve

defense establishments of various kinds. At the same time it undertook one of the world's best known highway projects, construction of the Alaska Highway. Mr. MacDonald personally directed the major steps in accomplishing this work.

The Bureau has been a strong believer that money invested in highway research will bring big returns through more durable and better highways. It has sought to find answers to many different technical problems as they arose. Results obtained in the research studies are applied on highway work generally throughout the country.

The work under Mr. MacDonald's direction is not limited to the United States. For a number of years the Bureau has supervised the expenditure of funds authorized to aid the countries of Central America in building the Inter-American Highway. Under various legislative authorizations it has furnished staffs of engineers to aid the governments of the Philippines, Turkey, Ethiopia, Bolivia, Liberia, and other countries in building modern highways. Mr. MacDonald has been a strong advocate of highway improvement as a necessity in the solution of economic difficulties throughout the world. He regards the progress being made in countries such as Turkey and Ethiopia, as confirmation of this belief. His personal interest in furthering highway improvement in countries that suffer from lack of transport has resulted in many engineers of other countries coming to the United States and obtaining instruction in highway methods. The assistance obtained from State highway departments has been an important feature in training visitors.

He has been a prolific writer on all phases of highway improvement. In recent years his papers have been directed toward the widespread highway deficiencies and the urgency of their correction.

Mr. MacDonald has received numerous honorary awards during his career. He was awarded the honorary degree doctor of engineering and the Marston medal for achievement in engineering by Iowa State College; holds the Cross of the Legion of Honor from the Government of France; invested by the King of Norway as Knight of the First Class of the Order of St. Olav; appointed foreign member of Masarykova Akademie Prace by the prewar Government of Czechoslovakia; awarded Medal of Merit for outstanding service during World War II. He has represented the United States and headed delegations at numerous foreign conferences and gatherings. He is honorary member of the American Society of Civil Engineers and the Institute of Traffic Engineers; member executive committee of American Association of State Highway Officials; executive committee, Highway Research Board; chairman, Committee on Program and Planning of the President's Highway Safety Conference; member of the National Safety Council, American Planning and Civic Association, and Beta Theta Pi and Tau Beta Pi.

PROPOSED CHANGE IN MILITARY ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BROOKS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time today to express myself briefly with reference to a newspaper article appearing in the morning press. The newspaper article deals with the proposed change in the military organization of the country, and it has a statement in one portion which gives me a great deal of cause for concern as it will give cause for concern to many others throughout the country.

The program is not formulated, and therefore I speak with the idea that perhaps we can help point the way, on Capitol Hill, and avoid some of the mistakes in the future that the Defense Department has made in the past.

The statement to which I refer in part reads as follows:

Pentagon officials said that Wilson—

That is, Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson—

feels that with 750,000 young soldiers leaving the service this year after 2-year draft periods, combat units in this Nation's mobile reserve can well be cut as much as half strength. The new veterans, many of them fresh from Korean combat, would be available for quick recall to fill out the divisions in case of any new war, he argues. * * * Army chiefs oppose his plan and the plan still is not resolved.

Of course I am in favor of reducing our Armed Forces to the limit of national safety. I am also in favor of eliminating waste and extravagance and the misapplication of public funds in this, as well as every other branch of government. As chairman of a subcommittee which wrote the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, commonly known as the magna carta of the Reserves, I want to say that this measure sets forth in law the methods for handling reserves in the future. The measure was passed after extensive hearings by the subcommittee of which I was chairman. It is intended to iron out inequities among the reserves and to prevent a repetition of the scandalous manner in which the reserves were recalled to active service when Korea first broke upon a troubled world.

This law provides that in the event of a recall of the reservists in the future, the President of the United States must declare a national emergency. Then, after he makes a declaration of a national emergency, the Congress shall set the number of reserves which may be called into active service by the Defense Department.

I read a portion of the law. Section 233 (b) (1) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act states:

In time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, in the Ready Reserve of any reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty involuntarily for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months; *Provided*, That Congress shall determine the number of members of the reserve components necessary for the national security to be ordered to active duty, pursuant to this subsection prior to the exercise of the authority contained in this subsection.

Mr. Speaker, that section was written into the law, and the subsequent sections to which I am going to refer in just a moment, was written into the law because of difficulties which we had encountered in mobilizing our reserves when Korea came. Our committee wrote and reported unanimously an interim report on the manner in which reserves should be recalled to active duty in the armed services, and as a result of that fact we hoped to establish a definite means by which in the event of other emergencies a mobilization could occur without the hardships and the inequities, and the unfairnesses, and the scandals which were brought about in the disorganized method of the recalling of our reserves, and I might mention that the report was a unanimous report.

I read:

As a result of this administrative failure on the part of the Armed Forces the Nation has been treated to the spectacle of serious inequities being perpetrated daily throughout the country. Inactive reservists who were grandfathers with grown children were involuntarily called to duty while nonveteran youngsters remained at home as members of the Organized Reserve. Enlisted men with multiple dependents, one with 10 children, were involuntarily ordered to duty while single men remained behind because of their membership in an organized unit. Reservists were picked out of college and ordered to report for active duty in a matter of days while their draft-protected nonveteran schoolmates continued to safely lounge on the campus.

I am not going to quote further from that report, but I do want again to emphasize that one of the difficulties there was the plan of the Defense Department to call a man back to active duty on the basis of prior service and on no other consideration. As a result men with many children, men with many dependents, men who were advanced in age, were called over men who were of the proper age and men who had no dependents whatsoever, and great hardships were visited upon the country.

In addition to this fact, the Congress went as far as was possible to prevent an inequitable, unfair, disorganized, recall of reserves in the future. Under section 233 of the Reserve Act, the Congress set up a policy which should be pursued by the Pentagon in recalling reserves, and the Pentagon agreed to the terms of this section. Under this section, consideration must be given in the recall of reserves to, first, the duration and nature of previous service; second, family responsibilities; third, the employment conditions of the recalled reservists.

I hope that nothing in the plan of the Secretary of Defense is intended in any way to wipe out the policy enacted by Congress last year in reference to an orderly and equitable recall of reserves in future emergencies, and especially do I state that no plan approved by the Pentagon must in any way attempt to infringe upon the authority of Congress to designate the number of reserves which can be recalled in future emergencies.

Mr. Speaker, I favor a greater equality of the burdens of citizenship. A man who serves 2 years under the draft and in Korea should not continually be subject to recall in every passing emergency. Others should help bear the burdens of military service. New men should be given a chance to serve. This is my idea and it is the mandate of Congress—it is the law.

This statement which apparently sets forth the views of the Secretary is calculated to bring great worry and concern to the minds of almost a million

families in America today. It is calculated to arouse resentment in the minds of veterans everywhere that the rule in America is to saddle upon the back of the veteran who has done his part the obligation of going to the defense of his country again and again while others remain at home enjoying the advantages earned and maintained by the sweat, toil, and blood of others in the defense of the country.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I want to compliment very highly my able and distinguished colleague from Louisiana for his usual keenness of perception in matters relating to the national defense. We all recognize in him one of the outstanding members of a most important committee, the Committee on the Armed Services. I think he has rendered a real contribution by his statement here today. I, too, have viewed with considerable apprehension the statement attributed to the Secretary of Defense. If we view it only from a purely defense standpoint it is a dangerous omen because we all recognize the fact that if we skeletonize existing divisions that are within the zone of the interior we are going to be putting ourselves at least in part back where we were when we started the buildup of our national defense after the Korean war began. We all know that if a division is not up to strength before the division has any military value it must be brought up to strength, then trained with its new replacements so that it can function as a unit. That certainly is going to result in delays and in a lessening of the Nation's military strength. Then, as my friend has pointed out and of utmost importance, is the fact that this plan would place in double jeopardy those men who have already gone through the hell of Korea and I do not think the Congress wants that as long as there is any way to avoid it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I may say to my distinguished friend, whose kind remarks I appreciate very deeply, that I do not believe the Secretary of Defense wants it. I am perfectly willing to believe that the quotation does not properly represent his views. I was over there in Korea with a subcommittee last fall. I did not have the opportunity of going immediately up to the front lines myself, but there are Members right here before me who were there and saw the hell those men in Korea are going through today. If after 2 years' service, a large part of which is on foreign soil and a part of it in Korea on the fighting front, they are to be called again and again and again because they are battle-trained combat veterans in Korea, we are pursuing a wrong philosophy. I believe in equality of military obligations and in a greater—not less—sharing of the burden of the defense of our Nation.

Mr. SIKES. I have seen much that the new Secretary of Defense is doing which I think is commendable and I join the gentleman in the hope this quotation is not an accurate one and that the policy is one that will not be pursued by the Secretary and the Department of Defense.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House, to revise and extend my remarks and to include several telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that at the present time world peace hangs in delicate balance. These are uncertain times with the ever-present threat from the Kremlin. Everyone knows that when hostilities began in Korea we were woefully unprepared and we have paid a terrible price in men and materials because of those who were persuasive enough to reduce our defenses to the dangerous level which they reached.

All of us are familiar with the economy pledges of the new administration. However, it is my conviction that to curtail employment in any activity connected with our national defense is questionable.

I have learned that it is the plan of the Department of the Navy to cut civilian employment in 11 shipyards by 3,000 persons. The majority of the personnel involved are production employees and skilled mechanics. Further, while a total of 11 shipyards are involved, approximately 500 of the 3,000 are to be dismissed from 1 shipyard, and that is the one in my congressional district at Boston, Mass. They have a fixed figure of 211 to be dismissed by April 30, and a tentative figure of 300 to be dismissed by May 31.

In my talks with Navy personnel, I have learned that the shipyards that are going to be affected the most are the Boston shipyard, the San Diego shipyard, the Portland shipyard—I do not know whether that is Portland, Maine, or Portland, Oreg.—and the Mare Island shipyard. I have also been informed that while there is going to be a layoff of 511 men in the Boston shipyard, the Brooklyn shipyard still needs skilled personnel. Boston is a short 200 sea miles from the Port of New York. It does not seem equitable to me that the shipyard in Brooklyn should have so much work while the Boston shipyard is forced to take such a drastic cut. I realize that a large carrier is being built in Brooklyn at the present time, but I should think it would be of great advantage to the Navy, itself, if they have any craft other than this large aircraft carrier being built there, that they send it to the Boston shipyard where we have such a complete staff of trained and skilled personnel.

It appears to me that with 11 shipyards involved, the reductions in force should be on a more equitable basis. With this thought in mind, I wish to insert a copy of the release by the Navy Department, a copy of a telegram received by me from the national commander of the Federal Employees Veterans' Association at Watertown, Mass., and a copy of my telegram of today to Secretary of the Navy Robert B. Anderson.

Today, I am introducing a resolution calling for a special committee of seven Members of the House of Representatives to investigate employment conditions at the various shipyards and to determine if there is a fair distribution of workloads which will insure employment for qualified personnel on an equal basis throughout the United States. We are all affected and I trust that I shall have the support of my colleagues.

[Release 272–53, March 24, 1953]

NAVY TO CUT CIVILIAN HELP AT SHIPYARDS BY 3,000

Civilian employment at naval shipyards will be reduced by about 3,000 prior to May 31, 1953, the Navy said today. Personnel in 10 yards in the United States and 1 in Hawaii will be affected by the cut.

The reductions are being made to carry out the recently announced policy of reducing civilian employment in the Military Establishment.

According to the Bureau of Ships, approximately 137,000 civilians are now employed in the 11 yards. The new top will be approximately 134,000. Some of the reduction will be accomplished through normal attrition.

Details of the cuts in rolls for individual yards are not available at this time.

WATERTOWN, MASS., *March 25, 1953.*

Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Federal Employees Veteran Association of the Boston Naval Shipyard Post request an immediate investigation of the personnel cut at the Boston naval shipyard of over 500 employees. Any false economy move at this time is endangering the country. The majority of people involved in this layoff are production employees and skilled mechanics. An immediate reply will be appreciated.

KENNETH T. LYONS,
National Commander, Federal Employees Veterans' Association.

MARCH 26, 1953.

Hon. ROBERT B. ANDERSON,
Secretary of the Navy,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.:

It is my understanding that as a result of directives by Secretary of Defense Wilson the Navy anticipates a reduction by May 31 of about 3,000 skilled mechanics and production workers in 10 naval districts in the United States. Of this reduction of 3,000 I am informed that 500 will be laid off at the Boston Navy Yard alone. This appears to be a grossly unfair percentage of the total amount and an injustice to the workers at the Boston Navy Yard. If there must be a cut in the interest of economy it should be on a more equitable basis and I shall certainly appreciate a prompt and thorough investigation to protect the interests of the Boston Workers.

Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.

PLIGHT OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss the plight of the small-business man and independent business in this country. I am just a little disturbed about proposals in Congress that I be-

lieve will be detrimental to independent business, and particularly small business.

In 1936 an act was passed known as the Robinson-Patman Act. My name was used more as a vehicle. It was intended to meet a real demand for legislation that would help the small man have an equal opportunity in business.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION

The committee that I happened to be chairman of, having been selected for that place in 1935 by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable Joseph Byrnes, Speaker of the House at that time, disclosed that many of the large concerns, especially some of the interstate chain stores, were not only competing, which was all right with the independent businessmen—no one can complain against clean competition—but they had certain special privileges and unearned benefits and favoritism that the little man did not receive from the same sellers and manufacturers. Therefore, it was necessary for Congress to step in and pass a law not to give the little man an unfair advantage over the big man, not to condemn the big man, not to condemn or legislate against bigness because it was big—that was not the object at all—but only to give the little man the same fair opportunity that the big man had under exactly the same circumstances, to prevent the little fellow from being discriminated against. You cannot imagine anything being fairer than that.

So the law was passed. It was known as the Robinson-Patman Act, and it was signed June 19, 1936. It is now almost 17 years old. I believe it has been very helpful to the little man, just to give him equality of opportunity. In other words, if he orders from a seller, a manufacturer, the same quantity under the same terms and conditions as the big man who has a unit across the street in competition with him ordered, he would receive the same price—the same price; that is all it said—under the same and similar circumstances.

MISLEADING NAMES

I do not think anybody can complain about that. But there are bills pending in the Congress that would absolutely destroy that very fair law. I refer to these bills, some of which are called basic point bills and some clarification bills and so on. They have different fronts and names which they use. But, in each case the result will be to destroy the principle, which, as I have just stated to you, was enacted into the law by the bill to which I have just referred. How do they approach this? I will tell you how. As the law was written in 1936, if this little man had reason to believe that General Foods or General Electric, or any other big manufacturing concern had sold to the big man across the street, to his competitor across the street at a price lower than he was getting under the same circumstances, and he filed a complaint with the Federal Trade Commission, the burden of proof was on that big man to show that he had not done it; that he had dealt with him exactly the same as he had dealt with the little man. The burden of the proof, therefore, is on him to show it. Now he is the only person who can assume that burden of proof. Obviously, the little fellow cannot do that. He has no national representative, he does not have lawyers all over the country, and he does not have detectives and, therefore, has no way of getting up the proof. So the big man is the only one who is in a position to assume that burden of proof and show it. I know it is said, "Why, this is putting the burden of proof on a man and it is obnoxious to our system of government to put the burden of proof on a person." I want to answer that proposition. It is not obnoxious and it is perfectly reasonable for the simple reason that this fellow cannot be put in jail for it; he cannot be fined for it. Only a cease-and-desist order can be issued by reason of his proof. Therefore, it is perfectly reasonable to require him to make that proof. That is really the meat in the coconut on this whole deal. They are trying to shift the burden of proof. If you do that, the little man cannot assume it. He does not have a chance in the world. He will be right back where he was before 1936, before the law was put on the statute books. I want to ask the Members of Congress to watch these bills. They are destructive of the rights of small-business men who are seeking to keep and preserve equality only—equality of opportunity in business. He is not asking for any special rights. He is not asking for favoritism. He is not asking for anything except a square deal and a fair opportunity in open competition with the biggest concern in the world. He is not objecting to that. Now, the little people in this country are not crushed by the big ones because of fair competition. They can meet fair competition. They have proven they can meet it in any city and in any State in the United States, but if you give the big man an unfair weapon to use, and you permit the big man to get special discounts and rebates that the little fellow cannot get, then you are just permitting the little man to be destroyed. That is all in the world the laws we now have were enacted to do—to give the little man that same fair opportunity to exist in business.

Independent business in this country, I think, is very important. It is the backbone of our country and we must preserve it. It is being attacked and brutally attacked, and not directly—you will never hear any argument said against what I have said—no argument is made like that at all. It will be approached at a tangent by saying that this basing point should be changed. Nobody understands the basing-point proposition except those who have given it special consideration and have a special reason to know something about the basing point. So under the guise of changing the basing point law, which no one will concern himself about unless he is on the committee that is charged with that duty. The membership generally will not study that basing point law. But under the guise of changing the basing point rule, they are making changes that will destroy the little man by giving the big man the weapon to destroy him. That is exactly what it means.

"CLARIFICATION"

Another weapon they will use will be called clarification of the Robinson-Patman law. They say, "Let us clarify it. You cannot understand it." They can understand it. That is the reason they want to clarify it. The courts have spoken on it. The Federal Trade Commission for 16 years has spoken on it. They know exactly what it will do. They want to clarify it out of existence. That is what they are trying to do. Under the guise of clarification, under the guise of the basing-point law, they try to change this basic law. I invite the attention of the Members of Congress to that fact in the hope that careful consideration and study will be given to these measures that are calculated to destroy a law that was intended for the preservation of the small-business men.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL GROCERS ON WEAKENING THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

I am inserting herewith the resolution that was passed by the National Association of Retail Grocers on preserving the Robinson-Patman Act. It is as follows:

Whereas—

1. There has been introduced into the Senate and House of Representatives of the 83d Congress S. 540 and H. R. 635 for the purpose of amending the Robinson-Patman Act; and

2. This bill, if enacted into law, would allow manufacturers and suppliers to discriminate in price, services, and facilities against independent grocers beyond that point which is now permitted; and

3. For 3 years individuals and groups opposing the Robinson-Patman Act have persistently endeavored to weaken seriously the protection now afforded to independent business under the act; and

4. If this more recent attempt succeeds the way will be open for giving discriminatory price concessions and trade advantages to large favored buyers, thereby injuring the ability of independent grocers to compete with large corporate chain organizations; and

5. Independent grocers are desirous of nothing more than preserving the Robinson-Patman Act in its present form and maintaining the conditions under which the principles of free and fair competition can continue to make our economy the most efficient and productive in the world.

Resolved, That the National Association of Retail Grocers reaffirm its strong support of the Robinson-Patman Act in its present form.

Further resolved, That the National Association of Retail Grocers do hereby reassert its opposition to any effort to repeal or weaken this law, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to all Members of Congress.

FASHIONABLE TO LAMBASTE ANTITRUST LAWS

I am inserting herewith an article by the Honorable Stephen J. Spingarn, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, that appeared in the National Association of Retail Druggists Journal, March 16, 1953, concerning antimonopoly legislation. It is a very interesting article, worthy of serious consideration and study, and is as follows:

ANTIMONOPOLY LEGISLATION—IT IS FASHIONABLE TO LAMBASTE ANTITRUST LAWS

(By Stephen J. Spingarn, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission)

It's quite fashionable these days to lambaste the antitrust laws. One popular approach is to talk about the vagueness and uncertainty of the laws. Often this is accompanied with a plea for making reasonableness the test of violation which means that every case would be considered by the

courts in its own particular setting. How this would make the laws any more certain and less vague has never been clear to me.

Another approach is to say that the antitrust laws are utterly unsuited to modern big business and ought to be thrown out. But this is heady, revolutionary stuff which hasn't gone far yet. The more measured step—but with the same end in mind—is to talk about the obvious conflict in the antitrust laws. For example, in a recent article in The Saturday Evening Post, the Chairman of the Board of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, Mr. Robert E. Wilson, said that the Sherman Act requires competition, and the Robinson-Patman Act tells competitors not to compete too much. Mr. Wilson presumably thinks that something ought to be done about it.

Actually, the Robinson-Patman Act is the direct product of years of experience under the Sherman and Clayton Acts. The Sherman Act of 1890 was framed in terms of the common law rule against restraint of trade, but the accent was upon the prohibition of conspiracy and the prevention of monopoly. Actually, the dominant purpose was the maintenance of the competitive system as the regulator of economic activity. The Clayton Act came along in 1914 to single out and outlaw in specific terms certain trade practices which Congress regarded as serious hazards to the functioning of a competitive economy. Then in 1936 Congress, as the result of an investigation and report by the Federal Trade Commission, congressional studies, and the pleas of small and independent business, passed the Robinson-Patman Act. Again the purpose was to protect the integrity of the competitive process. This time it was done in terms of outlawing certain abuses of private price-making destructive to the maintenance of the free and open market.

Critics who claim to see a conflict between the two pieces of legislation like to make price differences the thing that is aimed at in the Robinson-Patman Act. They make price differences and price discrimination—the actual phrase in the act—synonymous. But looked at in terms of function, the whole matter falls into focus. The bead is drawn upon a substantial injury to competition, that is the real violation. Price differences in themselves are neither good nor bad, neither lawful nor unlawful. It is only when price differences occur under the conditions specified in the act, when they thwart the regulatory processes of the market, that they run into trouble. Then they become price discrimination and violate the act.

Viewed in these terms, the task of differentiating between lawful price differences and unlawful price discrimination presents problems in administration but they are not unsurmountable. At the outset, the pricing of commodities that do not enter the stream of commerce among the States falls outside the act. Second, different prices for the same commodity are allowable, if the products sold are of different grades or qualities. Third, even if the products are of the same grade and quality, price differences are lawful if the purchasers are not in competition with each other. Fourth, even if the purchasers are in competition, the Robinson-Patman Act is not applicable unless there may be substantial injury to competition. And even then, if the maker of prices can show that the difference in price does not exceed the difference in costs which he has incurred in serving his customers who are in competition, his actions do not fall within the orbit of the statute. The residuum from these exceptions constitutes the area of unlawful price differences or price discrimination.

Placed in its setting, the rationale of the Robinson-Patman Act stands out boldly. In effect, it says that private business cannot play favorites in the competitive struggle. Clearly, to allow a manufacturer arbitrarily to fix different prices for a commodity of like grade and quality between customers who are in competition, constitutes private regulation of the market. It enables the seller at his pleasure to give advantages to preferred customers and to impose handicaps upon those who have incurred his disfavor. It puts in his hands the power to dictate who shall succeed and who shall fail in the competitive game. And it is precisely this role which, under the antitrust acts, public policy has decreed should be reserved to the free and open market.

The Robinson-Patman Act attempts to impose a practical and flexible standard in a modern industrial organization whose variety and complexity can only stagger the imagination. In most industries, buyers and sellers alike differ greatly in size, in the scope of their operations, in the economic power which they can wield in the market place. A multiple price structure for a single commodity, based upon function or use, is a commonplace in many industries. In some instances, as in the sale of raw milk for fluid use and butter or cheese, the practice has the sanction of State and Federal law. Elsewhere, as in the oil industry, a highly dynamic technology has resulted in a sprawling array of joint products whose costs, in practice, are allocated in terms of their respective capacities to carry the burden. In effect what this amounts to is a subsidy of one product by another. Yet the practice has attained respectability through long-standing custom and the sheer necessity for working out some practical formula for bringing products to market.

In the sale of drugs and some other products, the nationally advertised brand, as opposed to the house brand, presents another industrial facet of amazing intricacy and complexity. Here often the essential difference in the commodities is the factor of public acceptability achieved through national advertising. Does it follow that, in spite of what any laboratory test will show, it is a mercantile fact of life that the unlabeled or house brand is something inferior? Yet the plain truth, and we know it, is that the buying public does not treat the two products as identical; and a price differential has been recognized in mercantile practice—and by the courts—as a condition essential to the survival of the independents.

And this is only the beginning. The myriad of trade usages such as classification of customers, discounts for quantity, and the like are convenient and useful devices in the ordinary running of a business. Yet they can be—and sometimes are—made instruments for playing favorites. The task in the administration of the Robinson-Patman Act is to assess these pricing devices in the light of the competitive norms established in the antitrust laws. This is not an easy job.

It is this very complexity in the economic problems which dsturbs me about H. R. 635 and S. 540 (introduced in the 83d Cong.) for permanently adding another ingredient to the broth—the so-called good-faith clause, which would make good-faith meeting of competition a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination even though the effect were to injure or destroy competition. If the enforcement agency must probe corporate intent as well, the job may be well beyond human control. Indeed, in many realms of the law, the courts have found the attempt to read the minds of individuals to ascertain intent so unrewarding that they have taken the short cut of saying that a person presumes the consequences or probable consequences of his act. And in terms of the basic function of the antitrust laws, good or bad intent is irrelevant. It is the result that is important. If industrial conduct undermines the integrity of the competitive process, it should be stopped. This is the basic philosophy that underlies both the Sherman Act and the Robinson-Patman Act.

FOR KEFAUVER BILL

The Robinson-Patman Act is a true antitrust law. Let's keep it that way. In fact, let's improve it by putting the good-faith defense in its proper context—a defense to be considered but not one that overcomes a showing of probable injury or destruction of competition. The Kefauver amendment of 1951 to Senator McCARRAN'S bill in the last Congress (S. 719, 82d Cong., which was identical with the current McCarran bill, S. 540, 83d Cong.) would do just that. It deserves the support of every small and independent businessman.

PLOTTERS OF MONOPOLY

The Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists of March 2, 1953, contains an interesting article on Plotters of Monopoly Scheme To Discard Antitrust Statutes—Official Document Reveals Intention—Submitted Report Full of Falsehoods. It commences at page 330 of the association's publication, and is as follows:

PLOTTERS OF MONOPOLY SCHEME TO DISCARD ANTITRUST STATUTES—OFFICIAL DOCUMENT REVEALS INTENTION—SUBMITTED REPORT FULL OF FALSEHOODS

Spokesmen for the gigantic industrial and financial corporations have often declared it is absurd to charge that monopolistic combinations seek to wreck the system of small business in the United States. Yet evidence to the contrary is available. For 15 cents the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D. C., will send you a summary of a report submitted to the United States Department of Commerce by a group of business leaders of America (most of them are identified with very big firms). The title of the report is "Effective Competition," and it was released on December 18, 1952.

Effective Competition proposes a scheme to scrap the antitrust laws and the obvious purpose of the report is to delude the public to favor cutthroat competition in the market place. It amounts to a vicious attack on the system of small business and it carries the imprimatur of the United States Department of Commerce.

The committee responsible for the report includes John L. Collyer, chairman of the board and president of the B. F. Goodrich Co.; Ralph J. Cordiner, president of the General Electric Co.; Harlow H. Curtice, executive vice president of the General Motors Corp.; Frank R. Danton, vice chairman of the board of the Mellon National Bank and Trust Co.; Benjamin F. Fairless, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp.; G. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange; Crawford H. Greenewalt, president of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co.; Eugene Holman, president of the Standard Oil Co. (N. J.); Charles R. Hook, chairman of the Armco Steel Corp.; G. M. Humphrey, chairman of the board of the M. A. Hanna Co.; Donald B. Lourie, president of the Quaker Oats Co.; John L. McCaffrey, president of the International Harvester Co.; T. S. Peterson, president of the Standard Oil Co. (Calif.); Gwilym A. Price, president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp.; Edgar M. Queeny, chairman of the board of the Monsanto Chemical Corp.; Clarence B. Randal, president of the Inland Steel Co.; Thomas J. Watson, Jr., president of the International Business Machine Corp. (and others). The report they submitted to the United States Department of Commerce is almost unbelievable in that in essence it is a proposal that the President of the United States usurp the authority of Congress to nullify laws which were enacted in accordance with the procedures of the Constitution.

The report of the business moguls calls for complete wreckage of the antitrust laws. Then there is a proposed nostrum. It is in the form of a new rule of reason. The new

rule of reason is to be defined in accordance with an explicit standard (effective competition).

"Effective competition" is a pleasant phrase and, if undefined, it would appear to be unobjectionable. But the report has defined the phrase. Proposing this phrase as the ultimate and sole test of future antitrust policy, the report has offered two alternative definitions which are to apply in conjuncture. Both definitions provide purely negative tests of monopoly, and should there ever be any monopoly which would not be excused by the first definition, it would surely be excused by the second.

The first definition of "effective competition" is simply "ceaseless striving among competitors, all endeavoring to expand their share of the market—and the total size of the market, as well—by producing relatively more and better goods and services at relatively lower prices."

"Competitors," as conceived by the business moguls, include almost all business firms that go after the consumer's dollar. As a specific example offered by the report, the manufacturers of aluminum are held out to be competitors of the manufacturers of steel, copper, zinc, lead, tin, wood, textiles, plastics, paper, clay, glass, leather, and cork.

With competition so conceived, there could be very few actual or potential cases of monopoly which would fail to pass the test of effective competition. Even the most complete monopoly must and does put forth some efforts which pass for ceaseless striving. Moreover, the inevitable growth factors would pass any monopoly by the rest of this test—save only the monopoly in a declining industry, such as horse-drawn vehicles and steam-powered locomotives.

The second definition of "effective competition" offered by the industrial and financial tycoons in the report they submitted is even more amazing. It is simply "that business rivalry, existing and potential, which tends over a period of years to serve the public interest in (a) providing alternatives and thus giving opportunities for freedom of choice of goods and services; and (b) not restricting the opportunity for others to engage in such competition."

It taxes the imagination to conceive of a monopoly so broad and complete that there would not be, outside the control of the monopoly, alternative goods or services on which consumers might spend their dollars; and it is equally difficult to imagine a monopoly so broad and complete that it restricted the opportunity for others to produce and sell some other goods or services.

The target of the business moguls is overwhelmingly section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. The report contains 10 summary recommendations, of which 6 are aimed at destruction of what now remains of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Robinson-Patman Act is specific and definite and, although the Supreme Court ruled most of its effect out of existence by its recent decision in the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana case, it is still most important to small business of all the antitrust laws. It was passed to create the kind of competition in which the most efficient firms, and not inevitably the biggest firms, would win out in the competitive struggle. Hence the statute which restrains abuse of power and tends to force big firms to compete with small firms on the basis of efficiency and low prices emerges as the legislation most hated by the gigantic industrial and financial corporations.

The recommendations in the report for doing away with the Robinson-Patman Act are based upon false assertions which certain segments of big business have widely publicized during the past few years. For example, the report asserts that under the Robinson-Patman Act "price reductions are ruled illegal if they may possibly injure competitors of the seller or the buyer."

And again the report asserts "the Robinson-Patman Act tends to prevent any price competition that might injure a competitor."

These statements are false and deliberately false. Every businessman knows that the Robinson-Patman Act in no way restrains any business, big or small, from making price reductions. Under this law any business firm may reduce its prices as much as it likes and as often as it likes; and any firm may reduce prices for the purpose and with the result of taking business away from competitors and thereby injuring competitors. The Robinson-Patman Act is concerned only with price discrimination—a practice by which large firms abuse their size to take advantage of smaller firms.

Section 2 of the Clayton Act was enacted and subsequently the Robinson-Patman Act was enacted, only after many years of disastrous experience with discriminatory methods of pricing. Most of the high concentration of business which characterizes the field of production today was attained in the days before there were any laws to prevent these practices. The facts show that big sellers have used the high prices they are able to get in many, scattered markets to subsidize their competition against small sellers in particular markets. And the result has been that small firms were either destroyed or driven into merger.

The facts also show that wherever there has been discrimination, big buyers have received price advantages in excess of the sellers' cost savings in serving those buyers. When it became apparent that a few large chains were bringing about a wholesale destruction of independent firms in the distribution field, and that the growth of monopoly in this field would duplicate that already attained in the production field, Congress took action to insure small sellers a measure of protection and to insure small buyers equal treatment—insofar as equal treatment is justified by optimum efficiency in the business system.

Where prices are discriminatory neither the spirit nor the letter of the Robinson-Patman Act objects to the low price; the objection is to the high prices which put small buyers to an unfair disadvantage or which are used to "subsidize" selective price cutting against small sellers.

The business moguls in their report repeat another tired old propaganda tune. And it repeats this tune with monotonous repetition. It is the tune to the effect that the Sherman Act requires hard competition while the Robinson-Patman Act requires soft competition and hence the Robinson-Patman Act is inconsistent with the Sherman Act.

Do the business moguls actually believe that the Robinson-Patman Act creates soft competition? Then in the event they do, they have concocted the world's strangest and most contradictory set of recommendations. For all of their other recommendations invariably bless monopoly and propose abolishing all laws interfering with monopoly.

Surveying their recommendations as a whole, it is seen that the tycoons of industry and finance have proposed abolishing only those antitrust laws which are in some degree effective against monopoly. It is only such laws that are even discussed. As to those phases of legislation which are notoriously ineffective, the report is silent. It is well known that new monopoly problems have become prominent since the present antitrust laws were passed, and that experience has proved these laws to contain serious gaps in other respects. The report is silent on these matters, too. Apparently the writers were so busy thinking up ways for escaping the antitrust laws that they overlooked the possibility of taking a broad view of antitrust problems.

A competitive climate which serves small business, a competitive climate wherein small firms can actively compete on the basis of efficiency and wherein new firms can readily enter into the capitalist adventure, also serves consumers with more and better goods and services at lower prices. And we think such a climate serves the Nation in wholesome social ways.

The Robinson-Patman Act is not inconsistent with the Sherman Act. On the contrary, the Robinson-Patman Act is a necessary specific for the practices which the more general language of the Sherman Act forbids in principle. Price discrimination, which the Robinson-Patman Act restrains, is an abuse of size. It is a practice which gives advantages to larger firms over smaller firms, and the advantages increase in proportion to the size of the competitors. If sufficient abuse of the practice is permitted, the practice can be used by inefficient large firms to destroy more efficient small firms. Hence, discrimination without any restraint inevitably results in the destruction of smaller firms and the progressive centralization of business in the hands of fewer firms, until ultimate monopoly is reached.

Another of the purposes of the Sherman Act is to condemn all artificial restraints upon the price mechanism, particularly those restraints which hold prices above the supply and demand level. There again, the Robinson-Patman Act accomplishes, insofar as it is enforced, what the Sherman Act too frequently only aims to accomplish.

The business moguls know these facts:

1. That unrestricted price discrimination creates a competition which is impossibly hard for small business and supersoft for big business.

2. That the more price discrimination is limited by the rules of competition, the harder competition becomes for big business and small business equally.

3. The harder the competition becomes, the more the highly advertised efficiency of big business is proved to be exaggerated and frequently completely false.

The central lie of the report is that business moguls pretend to be concerned with fostering competition, when actually their aim is to rationalize monopoly and to reverse this Nation's historic antitrust policy. But beyond that, the report contains an uncommon number of deliberately false statements, misleading statements, twisted half-truths, facts presented in contexts where they never occurred, and so on. When the big-business sponsors of this report try to sell their products or services to the public, there are bounds beyond which they cannot go to present false or distorted claims for their products or services. There are specific laws to restrain them, and to restrain all businessmen. There are, of course, no laws to prohibit false and misleading claims to sell the public political ideas for commercial advantage. The bounds of common decency should and must, however, impose some self-restraint to self-seeking in this field. The report, Effective Competition, goes far beyond the bounds of common decency.

The authors of Effective Competition cannot speak for fully 98 percent of the business firms of the United States. It seems self-evident, moreover, that the report does not express the considered views of many of the men in whose name it has been written. Surely these men know that the policy recommended in that report would lead to disaster for all businesses, small and big. It is also true that disaster would befall small business first.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is under attack notwithstanding it has saved thousands of small independent businesses that could not have existed without the aid given by this agency.

I am inserting herewith a letter received from Mr. R. J. Sims, president of

the Clinchfield Concrete Co., Inc., of Kingsport, Tenn., concerning this matter. It is as follows:

CLINCHFIELD CONCRETE CO., INC.,
Kingsport, Tenn., March 4, 1953.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Representative From Texas, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Our company falls into the classification of small business and this letter is written to you in hopes that you will not do anything to disturb the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I have seen in our newspapers a considerable number of statements usually attributed to Senator BYRD, of Virginia, about abolishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In our city of Kingsport I know several large firms who owe their entire economic life to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It is practically impossible to secure a capitalizing loan of any amount from a commercial bank. In 1947 I was instrumental in borrowing for three companies in which I was interested, a total of $225,000. These loans have now all been paid off with the exception of one, which has a balance of $15,642.33. These companies are functioning now on a sound basis. Without the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's help they would never have been brought into existence in any form. These 3 companies employ approximately 125 people. They are doing an annual business of about $1½ million a year. They are paying all their bills and their taxes. Although there is very little left over for the stockholders, they have made a worthwhile contribution to this community in the last few years.

As you probably know, this section of Tennessee is Republican in attitude and actuality. The Honorable CARROLL REECE is the Representative to Congress from this district, but regardless of politics we feel that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has in the past and is at the present making a worthwhile contribution to the small-business men of our country. It is the one governmental agency that you can go to and get a straight answer in a reasonable length of time.

We send you this letter asking that you do nothing to disturb this setup, unless it is to advance this good cause.

Sincerely yours,
CLINCHFIELD CONCRETE CO., INC.,
R. J. SIMS, *President.*

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

(Thereupon, at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p. m., the House stood in recess for 10 minutes.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.

QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE—CASE OF MICHAEL WILSON ET AL. v. LOEW'S INCORPORATED ET AL.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana will state the question of privilege.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, several members, former members, and employees of the Committee on Un-American Activities have been subpenaed to appear on Monday, March 30, and Tuesday, March 31, 1953, in Los Angeles, Calif., to testify as witnesses and give their depositions in the case of Michael Wilson et al. against Loew's Incorporated et al., a private civil action for damages and injunction pending in the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles, in which certain Members, former Members, and employees of the House are named as parties defendant and are charged with conspiring against the plaintiffs in said case to the detriment of the plaintiffs. Under the precedents of the House, these Members, former Members, and employees are unable to comply with the subpenas without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 190) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Harold H. Velde, of Illinois; Donald L. Jackson, of California; Francir E. Walter, of Pennsylvania; Morgan M. Moulder, of Missouri; Clyde Doyle, of California; and James B. Frazier, Jr., of Tennessee, all Representatives in the Congress of the United States; and Louis J. Russell and William Wheeler, employees of the House of Representatives, have been by subpenas commanded to appear on Monday and Tuesday, March 30 and 31, 1953, in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and to testify and give their depositions in the case of *Michael Wilson et al.* v. *Loew's Incorporated et al.*, an action pending in the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the County of Los Angeles; and

Whereas the complaint in the aforesaid case of *Michael Wilson et al.* v. *Loew's Incorporated et al.*, lists among the parties defendant therein John S. Wood, Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Harold E. Velde, Barnard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, Charles E. Potter, Louis J. Russell, and William Wheeler; and

Whereas part III of said complaint reads as follows:

"At all times herein mentioned defendant John S. Wood was the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives; defendants Francis E. Walter, Morgan M. Moulder, Clyde Doyle, James B. Frazier, Harold E. Velde, Barnard W. Kearney, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter were members of the said committee; Louis J. Russell was senior investigator of said committee; William Wheeler was an investigator of said committee and 41 Doe, 42 Doe, 43 Doe, 44 Doe, 45 Doe, 46 Doe, 47 Doe, 48 Doe, 49 Doe, and 50 Doe were representatives of said committee.

"At all times mentioned herein and with respect to the matters hereinafter alleged the defendants named in the preceding paragraph acted both in their official capacity with relation to said House Committee on Un-American Activities and individually in nonofficial capacities"; and

Whereas part V of said complaint contains an allegation that "on and prior to March 1951 and continuously thereafter defendants herein and each of them conspired together and agreed with each other to blacklist and to refuse employment to and exclude from employment in the motion-picture industry all employees and persons seeking employment in the motion-picture industry who had been or thereafter were subpenaed as witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives * * *"; and

Whereas article I, section 6, of the Constitution of the United States provides: "They (the Senators and Representatives) shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same; * * * and for any speech or debate in either House, they (the Senators and Representatives) shall not be questioned in any other place"; and

Whereas the service of such process upon Members of this House during their attendance while the Congress is in session might deprive the district which each respectively represents of his voice and vote; and

Whereas the service of such subpenas and summons upon Members of the House of Representatives who are members of a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives, and the service of such subpenas and summons upon employees of the House of Representatives serving on the staff of a duly constituted committee of the House of Representatives, will hamper and delay if not completely obstruct the work of such committee, its members, and its staff employees in their official capacities; and

Whereas it appears by reason of allegations made in the complaint in the said case of *Michael Wilson, et al.* v. *Loew's Incorporated, et al.*, and by reason of the said processes hereinbefore mentioned the rights and privileges of the House of Representatives may be infringed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is hereby authorized and directed to investigate and consider whether the service of the processes aforementioned purporting to command Members, former Members, and employees of this House to appear and testify invades the rights and privileges of the House of Representatives; and whether in the complaint of the aforementioned case of *Michael Wilson, et al.* v. *Loew's Incorporated et al.*, the allegations that Members, former Members, and employees of the House of Representatives acting in their official capacities as members of a committee of the said House conspired against the plaintiffs in such action to the detriment of such plaintiffs, and any and all other allegations in the said complaint reflecting upon Members, former Members, and employees of this House and their actions in their representative and official capacities, invade the rights and privileges of the House of Representatives. The committee may report at any time on the matters herein committed to it, and until the committee shall report and the House shall grant its consent in the premises the aforementioned Members, former Members, and employees shall refrain from responding to the subpenas or summons served upon them.

The committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman or by any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The committee is authorized to incur all expenses necessary for the purposes hereof, including but not limited to expenses of travel and subsistence, employment of counsel and other persons to assist the committee or subcommittee, and if deemed advisable by the committee, to employ counsel to represent any and all of the Members, former Members, and employees of the House of Representatives named as parties defendant in the aforementioned action of *Michael Wilson et al.* v. *Loew's Inc. et al.*, and such expenses shall be paid from the Contingent Fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers authorized

by said committee and signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on House Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the Superior Court of the State of California in and for the county of Los Angeles as a respectful answer to the subpenas of the said court addressed to the aforementioned Members, former Members, and employees of the House of Representatives, or any of them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I think probably a few words in explanation of the resolution and the reason for its being here are in order at this time, in spite of the fact that the resolution for the most part speaks for itself.

By way of explanation, as most of us know, certain members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and employees of that committee are presently in the State of California conducting certain investigations as a part of their operation as a standing committee of the House of Representatives. They are there in their official capacity as members of the committee and employees of the committee, and as Members of the House of Representatives and employees of the House of Representatives. They are there, furthermore, by direction of the House of Representatives, and they are there on official business as evidenced by the action taken in the House yesterday excusing them from attendance here by reason of their performance of official duties in California at this time.

The suit that has been filed in the State courts of California arises out of certain alleged conduct, or activities, or operations, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the 82d Congress. Enough has been included in the resolution, I think, to indicate the nature of the suit which is, as I understand, one for damages asserted against certain corporations and private individuals, and likewise against Members of the House of Representatives and employees of the House of Representatives, admittedly by the provisions of the complaint itself involving them in the conduct of their official duty.

If you noted the reading of the resolution it is clear that the privileges of the House are infringed by this action. The purpose of this resolution is to avoid the immediate effect of the action sought to be taken in California and at the same time to direct the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives to make a thorough study and investigation of the whole matter and report to the House of Representatives with respect to it and other matters of like character that may arise in the future.

I have spoken of the fact that the complaint recognizes the official character of the conduct and actions of Members of the House of Representatives and the employees of the committee. The Constitution provides that, as recited in the resolution:

They—

Referring to the Senators and Representatives—

shall in all cases except treason, felony, and breach of the peace be privileged from arrest during their attendance on the session of their respective Houses, and in going to and returning from the same.

It is further provided:

That for any speech or debate in either House they—

Referring to the Senators and Representatives—

shall not be questioned in any other place.

Through the years that language has been construed to mean more than the speech or statement made here within the four walls of the House of Representatives; it has been construed to include the conduct of Members and their statements in connection with their activities as Members of the House of Representatives. As a result, it seems clear to me that under the provisions of the Constitution itself the adoption of the resolution which was presented is certainly in order.

Let us assume that any regular standing committee of the House of Representatives should conduct a hearing and any one of us were there as a Member of the House in his official capacity. Let us further assume that this Member saw fit to elicit certain information from a witness by questions and as a result of that questioning the witness, employed by someone, subsequently lost his job. Is the Member of the House of Representatives to be held accountable and haled into court on a suit for damages for his participation in the operations of that committee as a member of the committee and as Members of the House of Representatives? To me it seems clear that no such action can be taken under the Constitution.

Furthermore, this committee that is presently in California is there on official business for the House of Representatives and as a part of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Everyone recognizes the investigatory process as a part of the legislative process. So, under the rules creating the committee and under long established precedents, the members of that committee and their employees are there operating and acting as an arm of the House of Representatives.

To me it seems very clear that if a civil suit for damages can be filed and summonses served on Members of the House of Representatives who are there present, followed by subpenas requiring them to attend and give testimony as witnesses on deposition, as is pointed out in the resolution, then the work of the committee could be completely obstructed, since conceivably the questioning of the Members of the House of Representatives who are presently there could be carried on interminably, and the work of the committee stopped. Certainly, the Constitution never contemplated that sort of interference with the conduct of the affairs of the Congress of the United States.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything further about this resolution except to state again that the maintenance of the status quo is involved subject to a study and determination by our Committee on the Judiciary properly staffed to inquire into the whole matter and to determine just what should properly be done on all sides.

As we all know, from time to time Members of the House of Representatives are subpenaed to appear as witnesses in civil or criminal actions here in the District of Columbia and invariably before the Member of the House is permitted to go down there and testify he presents here a resolution very similar to this and obtains permission of the House of Representatives to appear and so testify. Of course that itself is in recognition of the necessity of the presence, and the right of a Member of Congress to be present, here for the sessions in order to carry on with his responsibilities to the people he represents and to carry on with others the necessary work of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the resolution here is a proper course of action, and the only wise course of action, for the House to take on this occasion, having in mind the circumstances of this particular case. This resolution was considered by the leadership on both sides, by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. It was the unanimous opinion of those present, Speaker MARTIN, former Speaker RAYBURN, Majority Leader HALLECK, myself, my good friend from Illinois [Mr. REED], and my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. For the House to take any other action would be fraught with danger, for otherwise there is nothing to stop any number of suits being filed against enough Members of the House, and in summoning them, to impair the efficiency of the House of Representatives or the Senate to act and function as legislative bodies. The members of the Committee on Un-American Activities are out in California in the performance of their official duties. While there they have been summoned. I assume it is a summons from the plaintiff to have them appear for the purpose of giving depositions. However, that is immaterial; they are out there on official business, and committees of this body are the arms of the House of Representatives. A committee of the House of Representatives is an agent, or, as some say, a servant of the House of Representatives. They are now out there officially; they are summoned, and there is no question but what that seriously interferes with their ability to perform their duties as Members of this body. On Monday a very important bill is going to come up in the House of Representatives. The people throughout the country are very much interested one way or the other. They should be here, and a summons of this kind would interfere with such Members performing their duties. I refer to that simply as an illustration of a situation that now confronts the members of that particular committee.

In this resolution there is authority to the Committee on the Judiciary to hire counsel to defend any Member or former Member or members of the staff named as a defendant in the suit in California. The reason for that is this: We are not clear as to whether or not the

Attorney General will be able to represent Members of the House or members of the committee staff in a suit arising out of a performance of their official duties. A section of the law, as I understand, permits the Attorney General to represent officers of the House of Representatives, and whether or not the chairman of the committee and members of the committee are officers is a legal question to be resolved. I would personally be inclined to think that they are not, but my opinion here has no bearing on the outcome of such a question. The Speaker, for example, is an officer of the House of Representatives, as are others who are officially elected, but whether or not the chairman of the committee or the members of the committee, simply because they are elected by the House, are officers within the meaning of the law is a question for the courts. Naturally, we want to see that the present Members of the House of Representatives and former Members and members of the staff, present and past, are represented by able counsel and not compelled to defend themselves at their own expense, and that provision in this resolution is put in there in order to meet that situation. Of course, the Committee on the Judiciary will look into it and cover that angle, and I have no doubt that the Attorney General will take the proper action. This resolution, as you will note, authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to look into this particular matter and to advise the House of Representatives. The House has always cooperated with the courts, and the House always will be cooperative with the courts, but, on other hand, we must always have regard for the protection of our own privileges and our own integrity and our own rights, and that includes the privileges and the integrity and the rights of individual Members. The privileges and immunities of the legislative body and its Members have been jealously guarded and protected since early times, and must be continuously defended and safeguarded in order for our system of government to endure.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join with everything my distinguished friend from Indiana, the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK], has said, and again reiterate that this resolution represents the view of the leadership of both the Republican and the Democratic parties.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. May I make a clarifying remark. I think the RECORD ought to show the extreme danger of the precedent which would be created by what is sought to be done in California, because the California proceeding is a sort of open-end process. If it is applicable to a certain number of members of one committee, some other court could proceed to issue similar subpenas applicable to another committee, and so on until the House could actually be deprived by concert of action of a quorum for the purpose of transacting business. I think it is very different from the case of an individual who is subpenaed here in the District of Columbia for a given situation, where the House is the judge as to whether or not that one individual should respond to the subpena. I think the precedent is a most dangerous one, and that the resolution should be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking my friend from Indiana if he will announce the program for next week, if he is prepared to do so.

Mr. HALLECK. As I indicated last week, we expect to bring up the bill from the Committee on the Judiciary sometimes called the submerged lands bill, and other times the public lands bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. And by some of us the bill that will take away from the people of the entire country billions of dollars.

Mr. HALLECK. By some; yes.

The bill is to be reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The Rules Committee has been given until midnight Saturday night to file a rule. I anticipate that rule will be granted. Without undertaking to dictate to either the Judiciary Committee or the Rules Committee, I trust that the rule will provide for such hours of general debate, after the adoption of the rule on Monday, that the general debate could be concluded on Monday. Then we would expect to start reading the bill for amendment. We might read the first section on Monday. Then on Tuesday we would read the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Monday and Tuesday being Jewish holidays, as I previously announced, there will be no record votes on Monday or Tuesday unless someone should perchance undertake to have a record vote on the adoption of the rule, but I trust that will not happen because I think everyone recognizes that this is a matter that must be considered and disposed of in the House of Representatives.

My guess and my hope would be that we could conclude the reading of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule on Tuesday, which would bring the vote on final passage of the bill or on any amendments that might be adopted or on the motion to recommit on Wednesday.

As to any further program, I understand the Committee on Agriculture has reported a bill which has to do with certain support-price arrangements on tobacco grown in certain areas. If a rule were granted on that measure so that we could get it up and dispose of it on Wednesday, I would be inclined to put that bill on the program.

Also, there is a bill that has been reported or may be reported from the Committee on Armed Services having to do with the appointment of an assistant or deputy in the Central Intelligence Agency. If a rule is granted on that, we might dispose of that on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand the administration is very anxious to get that bill through as quickly as possible because they want to fill that position.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, of course, is referring to the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. That is the situation, as I understand it. I think the bill was redrafted. At one time last week it looked as if we might be able to bring it up this week, but something happened which required some redrafting of the bill. As I understand it, it has been redrafted and very likely it can come up for action next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand this relates to the Deputy Chief of the CIA—the Central Intelligence Agency, to authorize military men to be appointed. You will recall that we did authorize a chief to be appointed 2 or 3 years ago when Gen. Bedell Smith was appointed.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the amendment is to make sure that two military men—the Chief and Deputy Chief—cannot be appointed at the same time. I am acquainted with it, and I can assure the gentleman from Indiana I am only too glad to cooperate in every way possible to get the bill through before the Easter recess, because they are very anxious to make the appointment. We all ought to be concerned about that, and we, of course, are all interested in having the necessary heads of this agency appointed. It is of vital importance to the country.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman for his very fine offer of cooperation in trying to get the matter expedited.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Going back to the submerged oil lands legislation, you are providing for a vote on that on Wednesday for final passage?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. May I remind the distinguished gentleman from Indiana that that is also a holiday throughout the mine-field country. Most of the Members of Congress representing mining districts have agreed to go back to their districts and make speeches on that day. What solution does the gentleman from Indiana have for that?

Mr. HALLECK. That has been called to my attention. As the gentleman from West Virginia knows, and as the gentleman from Massachusetts also knows, he has done the same as I have. We try as best we can to adjust the affairs of the House of Representatives to meet the necessities of the individual Members in the very sort of matter that the gentleman from West Virginia mentions.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to remind the gentleman from Indiana that this is the first time that a request of this nature has been made by anybody from the mine field section of the country.

Mr. HALLECK. As I have said to certain of the other Members who have spoken to me about that, nothing would please me more than to try to adjust the legislative program so that each and every Member would suffer no inconvenience. But at the time I made the announcement that we would have the vote on Wednesday, the matter had not been brought to my attention. Also, there is the overall desire of all the Members to get to their homes or other places for Easter. That also has had to be taken into consideration.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am always happy to yield to my distinguished colleague. In fact, may I say I am honored when the gentleman asks me to yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I state for the benefit both of the leadership on the majority and minority sides that yesterday I introduced a clean bill, H. R. 4918, having reference to the matter of the submerged lands. In addition to what the majority leader has stated, we hope to have finished by tomorrow night the report so that it will be available at the document room on Saturday morning so that the Members can get both a copy of the bill and a copy of the report and familiarize themselves with this bill and the report so that we will be all set to go on Monday morning.

Mr. HALLECK. May I remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania to get permission to file that report, if he has not already done so?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have already done so. I thank the gentleman.

THE SO-CALLED TIDELANDS OIL ISSUE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in welter of words that have beclouded the so-called tidelands oil issue, I think it eminently fitting and desirable that all of us here bring to bear upon the matter the light of reason and the wisdom of sober thinking.

At the beginning of this Congress, I had anticipated, in the view of past experience, that we would be called upon to give serious consideration to some form of a bill which would purport to confirm and establish the titles of the States to the lands —and their concomitant resources—beneath the navigable waters within State boundaries.

Through some magic of phraseology, or perhaps by deliberate attempts to delude, the question implicit in such a bill has familiarly become known as the tidelands issue.

At the outset, I wish to demur from the propriety of such designation, and at the risk of seeming somewhat elementary, I should like to begin my remarks upon this vital subject with a definition of terms.

As those of us in this body who have been exposed to the ramifications of the legal subject called real property know, the term "tidelands" has a specific connotation in the law. Appropriately defined, this term means the strip of land, somewhat indefinite of measurement, that is submerged when the tide is at its flood and accessible for pedestrian locomotion when it is at its ebb—to the water's edge. I do not know how I can better describe it in layman's language.

Now the land described within the compass of such definition, contrary to popular belief, is not involved in any manner, shape or form in the bitter controversy which has raged in the past few years between the Federal Government and certain of our sovereign States. At no time to my knowledge has anyone, officially or otherwise, claimed title to such lands on behalf of the Federal Government. Like any other novice in the law of real property, I concede that the States have a valid and vested title to and in the tidelands adjacent to and contiguous to their individual seacoasts. So far as I know and am able to ascertain the responsible agencies of the Federal Government have never raised any question concerning the validity of such title.

Furthermore, and again so far as I have been able to learn, the Federal Government and none of its responsible agencies, have ever asserted any title or dominion over the so-called inland waters—by which I mean the coastal indentations in the form of river mouths, bays, protected harbors, and such bodies of water commonly designated as lakes and ponds—as distinguished from open water generally designated as the "sea."

For over 100 years, the Supreme Court of the United States, in conformity with our basic law of real property, has consistently held, and I believe rightly so, that tidelands and inland waters are part of the land masses of the respective States in the Union.

The area in controversy between certain of our sovereign States and the Federal Government, therefore, is neither the tidelands nor the inland waters. It is, rather, a different area more aptly described as the "marginal sea," and beyond such underwater acreage, the indefinite expanse of submerged land known as the Continental Shelf.

The marginal sea area is that land which lies seaward of the low-tide mark of the tidelands and which extends outward to the so-called 3-mile limit. To those of us who remember the enforcement problems of the noble experiment of prohibition, the 3-mile limit is a term of definite sovereign connotation, and never during the period of prohibition—which, incidentally, was almost coterminus with the last lengthy period of Republican administration of the Federal Government—was there any question raised about the enforcement jurisdiction of Federal agencies in the 3-mile marginal sea area. Since jurisdiction is one of the attributes of sovereignty, it is more than difficult now for my poor intellect to grasp the arguments of those who contend that suddenly this area of marginal sea is one which belongs exclusively to the sovereign States. What trespassers our Federal Coast Guardsmen were from 1918 to 1933.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that it is this area, and this area alone—the marginal sea—which the Supreme Court declared to be under the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the United States and to which the Federal Government possessed paramount rights of title. It so decided first in the California case in 1947, and again the Louisiana and Texas cases in 1950, and I may point out that the issue was decided in the type of suit for which the Supreme Court was expressly established as the appropriate forum by our Constitution.

Were the issue not so momentous, I would hardly advert to the contention that the United States does not have jurisdiction and control over the submerged area described as the Continental Shelf. Yet, I understand that Louisiana and Texas assert ownership for varying distances over 20 miles seaward. As far back as 1945, President Truman issued a proclamation to the effect that the seabed, the subsoil, and the resources of the Continental Shelf appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control. Obviously, the area involved is one which would be governed by the rules of international law, and so far as I know, no foreign sovereignty has ever challenged the force and effect of the proclamation.

The edge of the North American continent, its shelf, extends for varying lengths, up to nearly 300 miles, into the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico. This shelf is but the normal and natural extension of the marginal sea area, and the precise point of the Supreme Court opinion in the California decision was that California never had any title to the marginal sea area. What it did say was that—

> We decide for the reasons we have stated that California is not the owner of the 3-mile belt along its coast, and that the Federal Government, rather than the State, has paramount right in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil.

This conclusion was based upon the irrefutable logic that the National Government not only had acquired the strip, but had from the time of the foundation of the Republic exercised functions of protection and control over such area. In other words, the Court said that if the Federal Government had continually exercised such dominion, it was inseparable from sovereignty, and therefore, the rights and powers of the sovereign were paramount in the area.

I submit that the Supreme Court's decision is the best and soundest authoritative determination of the contest between the States and the Federal Government in this matter. The law suits in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases were argued by eminent and distinguished constitutional lawyers, and so far as the law is concerned, there can be no further question as to the supremacy of the National Government over the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf.

Since 1946, however, the Congress has been called upon to change the state of the law by legislative and executive action, and, in effect, reverse the Supreme Court on a basic question of international law. In that year, and again last year, the President vetoed joint resolutions which had for their purport the alleged confirmation and establishment of lands within State boundaries under navigable waters. By such joint resolutions, the Congress sought to quitclaim to the States title to the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf, and to confirm in the States a title which the Supreme Court ruled they never had. In the light of the law governing the controversy, such proposed legislation was nothing more than an outright attempt to make a grand gift of one of our most precious national resources to the several States.

The proposed legislation even had a disarming title. To my mind, it would appear to be an impossibility to confirm and establish titles where, according to the law of the land, none ever existed. By the same token, it would be, perhaps, a gracious but nonetheless empty gesture to confirm the titles of the States to tideland and inland waters, but such gesture is unnecessary because I for one have been unable to find any person or any court, including the Supreme Court, which disputes the titles of the States in those areas.

I happen to come from a great coastal State, a State which was a foremost maritime power before this great Nation was established. The draggers and fishermen of my native Massachusetts perhaps know more about the value and extent of our Atlantic Continental Shelf than any of us here. The waters over it are the scene of their perilous and arduous daily labors. I doubt if you could find one of them who would have the slightest misapprehension as to the sovereign power which exercises dominion, control, police powers, and, incidentally, rescue operations over the entire area. As a citizen of Boston and Massachusetts, I have no qualms about a predatory or octopuslike Federal Government despoiling my fair city and State of her tidelands or inland waters. For over a century, the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that such areas are within control and jurisdiction of the States, and it reaffirmed its holding in the recent controversial cases with emphasis.

I would be naive and disingenuous, however, if I did not admit at this point that, so far as is known, there is no oil in the marginal sea off the coast of Massachusetts. I also confess to some knowledge about the distinction between res judicata and stare decisis lest my brethren from States which were not parties to the Supreme Court cases should remind me that determinations of the rights of California, Louisiana, and Texas are not binding upon, let us say, Florida or Oregon.

But undoubtedly, the nub of the question is oil.

Geologists and soil experts and petroleum explorers have assured us that the resources under coastal waters are worth an estimated $40 billions. The Supreme Court has held that the title to the land from which this black gold can be extracted does not belong to the States whose shores are washed by the waters covering it. Prior to the Supreme Court decisions, the States which had legitimately leased tideland areas to private oil companies began to lease marginal sea areas offshore, and enrich the State treasuries with royalty payments.

After the Supreme Court decisions, however, it became rather obvious that revenue from leases made by parties which had no legal right to the status of lessors properly belonged to the party which, by virtue of legal ownership, could execute valid leases.

That party, I submit, by virtue of adjudication of the highest tribunal in the Nation, is the Federal Government.

No single State or group of States should be allowed to profit at the expense of the Nation as a whole. Our natural resources are part of the inheritance of all of our people. Sectionalism has no place in the decision of such grave and weighty questions. Oil is our prime defense weapon, and we are already become an oil-importing nation. Since the locale of the resources in question is governed by rules of international law, the Federal Government alone is recognized as the sovereignty which can validly and legitimately exercise dominion and control over it.

The Congress is one of the three powerful instruments of government through which that sovereignty is exercised. We who compose the Congress are also trustees of our vast national resources. There is no such thing as a tidelands issue. The question is whether, as a coordinate branch of the Federal Government, we shall sustain the rule of law laid down by the Supreme Court; whether, as trustees for all of the people, we shall preserve part of their birthright; or whether, in dereliction of our duty, we shall acquiesce in the unholy scheme by which the wealth in trust for the many shall, by legislative fiat, be channeled into the pockets of the few.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KEARNEY and to include an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include Winston Churchill's tribute to Queen Mary of England.

Mr. GEORGE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include an editorial.

Mr. MASON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WESTLAND and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include recommendations by Mr. Walter Reuther in regard to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOLAND and to include an address by Hon. THOMAS J. DODD.

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. RODINO) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana in three instances.

Mr. PERKINS and to include an editorial appearing in the Courier-Journal.

Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. REAMS and to include a letter.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. REAMS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $1,000.

Mr. MULTER and to include an address by James P. Warburg, notwithstanding the estimated additional cost will be $294.

Mr. POULSON (at the request of Mr. HOSMER) in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN PELT and to include an editorial.

Mr. DURHAM (at the request of Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana) and to include a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee by Mr. Lonier.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FARRINGTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO and to include an editorial.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO), for Monday, March 30, and Tuesday, March 31, on account of the Passover holiday.

Mr. VINSON, for 15 days, commencing Monday, March 30, 1953, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 30, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

581. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the 43d Annual Report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1952, pursuant to the act of June 15, 1916, entitled "An act to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

582. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

583. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 23, 1953, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of central Florida waterways, including the St. Johns, Kissimmee, and Oklawaha Rivers, Fla., and other connecting and adjoining waterways, with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and water conservation, all authorized by the river and harbor acts approved on August 30, 1935, and on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

584. A letter from the clerk, United States District Court, Territory of Alaska, transmitting the interim report of the grand jury for the Territory of Alaska, Third Division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4260. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4261. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4262. A bill to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4263. A bill to amend section 212 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to authorize the issuance of immigration visas to and the admission of certain aliens inadmissible under section 212 (a) (9) of such act where extenuating circumstances exist with respect to such inadmissibility; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. R. 4265. A bill to retrocede to the State of Maryland exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within its boundaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GENTRY:

H. R. 4266. A bill to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to amount in controversy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4267. A bill to permit donation of commodities under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 without regard to the order of priority specified therein; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4268. A bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 4269. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4270. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 4271. A bill to authorize a program of loans and other financial aids to assist in the provision of housing for families of moderate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 4272. A bill to repeal those provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 which reduce the amount of a railroad annuity or pension where the individual or his spouse is (or on proper application would be) entitled to certain insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 4273. A bill to provide that widows of members of the Armed Forces who die during the period of Korean hostilities shall be entitled to exhaust their entitlement to education and training under the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 4274. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, so as to give the States more responsibility and authority in labor management conciliatory objectives; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 4275. A bill to provide that a minister may exclude from gross income that part of his compensation which is paid to him in lieu of furnishing him a dwelling house; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4276. A bill to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4277. A bill to provide for the health and protection of the citizens of the United States from harmful chemical additives in pesticides; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4278. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interefere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4279. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution providing for participation in the Fourth of July, 1953, observance at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Res. 191. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the relative workload at the shipyards in the various naval districts of the United States, in order to determine whether certain proposed reductions in personnel are equitable and efficient; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Res. 192. Resolution declaring that the development and maintenance of a strong and well-balanced American merchant marine is being hampered and restricted contrary to established Government policy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. R. 4280. A bill for the relief of William Branch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4281. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Drina Sinovcic and Vincence (Vincent) Sinovcic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 4283. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 4284. A bill for the relief of Amleto Rambelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4285. A bill for the relief of Arthur Staveley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 4286. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Steven Giannoucos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4287. A bill for the relief of Charlyne Roe Ann Berlanga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4288. A bill for the relief of Rosario Piacentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 4289. A bill for the relief of Gene Parnell Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4290. A bill for the relief of Tamara and Nicholai Thkun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4291. A bill for the relief of Binen Zawiszynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4292. A bill for the relief of Clayton Holmes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 4293. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain improvements on national forest land in Arizona to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

116. By Mr. HILLELSON: Petition of Frank J. McCann, and 15 others, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will reduce the tax burden caused by the payment of 32 cents out of every dollar earned by the average American; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Harry W. Putnam and sundry residents of Massachusetts urging enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 27, 1953

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord of our pilgrim years, the day returns and brings us the round of its concerns and duties. As in Thy sight Thy servants serve here in posts of high public office, make them solemnly conscious that their attitudes, their words, and their acts are not just their own, but that they go out from this Chamber, set as a light on a hill, to influence and to mold the whole structure of human relationships around this sad and weary world. Help those who here stand as the representatives of freedom in all things to be masters of themselves that they may be the servants of others. In these times of tension and strain preserve us from minding or magnifying little slights and stings, or giving them. Keep us calm in temper, clear in mind, sound of heart, in spite of ingratitude, meanness, or even treachery. In these crucial and creative days, enable us, we pray Thee, to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee our God. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 25, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3180. An act to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property;

H. R. 3855. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3853. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950;

H. R. 4130. An act to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953;

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today, in order to attend a funeral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, because I will be absent on official business of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate on those days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I ask unanimous consent that, after today, I may be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate for the next 10 days, for the purpose of proceeding to the west coast on a waterfront investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SCHOEPPEL was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week because of official business incident to the holding of hearings by a subcommittee of the Select Small Business Committee.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary dealing with constitutional amendments was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. POTTER, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigating waterfront racketeering and port security, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the Senate is now in executive session, and that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that, without the Senator from Idaho losing the floor, the Senate proceed, as in legislative session, with the matters which would ordinarily be dealt with in the morning hour.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the transaction of such routine business as may be presented, the clerk call the nominations on the Executive Calendar other than the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, which is under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CHARLES J. ABARNO AND OTHERS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF PERFORMANCE AND PAYMENT BONDS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN COAST GUARD CONTRACTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATIONS ENTITLED "PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY, CAPACITY OF GENERATING PLANTS, 1951" AND "CONSUMPTION OF FUEL FOR PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY, 1951"

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of that Commission's newly issued publications entitled "Production of Electric Energy, Capacity of Generating Plants, 1951" and "Consumption of Fuel for Production of Electric Energy, 1951" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of sundry aliens whose deportation had been suspended from lists heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

A letter from the chief Scout executive, Boy Scouts of America, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Boy Scouts of America for the year 1952

(with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INTERIM REPORT OF GRAND JURY, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

A letter from the foreman, grand jury of the United States District Court, Anchorage, Alaska, transmitting an interim report of the grand jury, United States District Court, Third Division, Territory of Alaska (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider legislation allowing a Federal income-tax deduction for certain military, Air Force, and naval reservists

"Whereas all components of the military, Air Force, and Naval Reserve of the United States are an integral part of the national defense effort; and

"Whereas military, Air Force, and Naval Reservists desire to increase their respective skills in order to better serve their country in time of emergency, and devote time and energy to this pursuit; and

"Whereas many reservists lose time from their civilian employment without pay in order to attend training sessions and temporary tours of duty in order to further increase military, Air Force, and Navy skills; and

"Whereas Federal income-tax relief to reservists would greatly bolster active participation in Reserve components and provide many more trained personnel to occupy a skilled post in the Armed Forces in event of a national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to initiate legislation that would allow a deduction up to $800 from Federal income-tax returns of all military, Air Force, and naval reservists receiving pay for inactive training and temporary tours of duty not exceeding 30 days; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of the memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of this State.

"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.

"GORDON ABBOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Senate Joint Memorial 17

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission on Fine Arts to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson

"Whereas Kit Carson was a pioneer of the western part of the United States, an intrepid scout, and a great patriot; and

"Whereas Kit Carson is worthy to be honored and remembered by present-day Americans as a worthy example of devotion to duty and devotion to country: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That this general assembly respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commission on Fine Arts cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, the Commission on Fine Arts, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

"GORDON ABBOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relating to Federal gasoline taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. THYE on March 25, 1953, p. 2266, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the National Defense League of America, Washington, D. C., signed by John Milton DeWitt Kyle, national president, praying for action by the Senate to cause immediate withdrawal of the United States from membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Memorial 9

"Memorial requesting the formulation of a plan for cooperation in the development of ground water supplies on Indian reservations in central and southern Arizona

"To the President of the United States, the Department of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Of the estimated total of 1,200,000 irrigated acres under cultivation in Arizona in 1952, over 800,000 acres, or almost 70 percent, derive their principal source of water from ground water supplies.

"Of Arizona's 72,000,000 acres only about 2 percent is agricultural land, one-half of which is privately owned. Almost 20,000,000 acres, or 27 percent, are Indian reservation lands.

"Most of the irrigated lands deriving their principal source of water from ground water supplies are situated in the great central valley of Arizona in Maricopa, Pinal, and Pima Counties.

"A survey made by the Phoenix area office of the office of Indian affairs shows a possibility of developing approximately 400,000 acres of Indian reservation lands in the central valley of Arizona through the installation of pumps and the use of ground water supplies. Much of this land is near or adjacent to the presently developed irrigated acreage and in the same geological basin.

"Studies made by the United States Geological Survey and the State of Arizona establish that the water tables in the central valley of Arizona are lowering and in most instances the declines in the water table are steady and persistent.

"Proposals have been made by the Indian tribes involved and the Phoenix area office of the office of Indian affairs to develop considerable additional acreage on the reservations in the central valley of Arizona through the medium of development leases to non-Indian lessees. Additional withdrawals from the ground water basin supplying this area on the scale proposed would constitute a serious threat to the existing agricultural economy of the State, would not be a permanent development of Indian reservation lands, by reason of the resultant competition for existing limited ground water supplies and would not, therefore, add materially to the permanent economic welfare of the Indian nor enable the Indian to immediately farm the land himself. So long as the possibility of this type of development of reservation lands exists, it will be impossible to secure passage of adequate legislation regulating the withdrawal of ground water in the affected areas. It is recognized, however, that the normal development of land by the Indians themselves would not seriously interfere with any policy of water control.

"The State of Arizona has just completed a study of the underground water resources of the State, and legislation designed to control further development in a large part of the central valley will undoubtedly be introduced as soon as a decision by the State supreme court in a pending case is announced.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona urgently requests:

"That those agencies of the United States Government directly concerned with this problem recognize its significance by adoption of a statement of policy for the guidance and assistance of the legislature in its future deliberations, and indicate their willingness to cooperate with the State of Arizona in effecting an orderly withdrawal of existing ground water supplies."

PROTEST AGAINST TRANSFER OF TVA OFFICES AND PERSONNEL FROM TENNESSEE TO ALABAMA—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Resolution No. 37, adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee, protesting against transfer of the offices and personnel of the Tennessee Valley Authority from the State of Tennessee to the State of Alabama.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 37

Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the legislature that the TVA is contemplating moving offices to Muscle Shoals, Ala., and a large portion of its personnel from the State of Tennessee and into the State of Alabama: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Tennessee go on record as opposing the removal of any of the offices or personnel from the State of Tennessee and the offices remain in Knoxville and

Chattanooga as originally set up; be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk be instructed to mail copies of the resolution to the Members of the United States Congress and Senate from Tennessee.

JAMES L. BOMAR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION—JOINT RESOLUTION OF TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of Tennessee, memorializing the Congress to retain the Small Defense Plants Administration as a separate and independent agency.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 33

Whereas small-business firms from all parts of the country have complained to Congress they are not able to get defense contracts without adequate financial backing, and, on the other hand, are not able to get financial backing without defense contracts; and

Whereas there was created by Congress on July 31, 1951, the Small Defense Plants Administration, the principal functions of which, as prescribed by Congress, are to see to it that: (1) Small business gets its fair share of defense contracts; (2) it receives a fair share of critical materials; and (3) it gets the financial and technical assistance needed to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian activities; and

Whereas it was the expressed intention of Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense program, and that small business be maintained as a vital part of the national economy, and thereby preserve and promote small-business enterprises throughout the United States of America; and

Whereas it is the sense of this body that small business is the life essence of American industry and should be well preserved, protected, and encouraged: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Tennessee (the House concurring therein), That we hereby approve and endorse the Small Defense Plants Administration as greatly beneficial and successful for the purposes for which it was created, and memorialize and petition Congress, through our Senators and Representatives in that body, to retain this agency as a separate independent agency as an aid and benefit to small business as well as any other essential industry to the defense program and protection of our national economy; be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this house is directed to furnish each member of the Tennessee delegation in the Congress a copy of this resolution and urge upon them the enactment of Senate bill 753 now pending, providing for the retention of the Small Defense Plants Administration, originally created by amendment in the 82d Congress by section 714 to the National Production Act of 1950.

Adopted March 11, 1953.

JARED MADDUX,
Speaker of the Senate.
JAMES L. BOMAR,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Approved:
FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

CONSTRUCTION OF TUTTLE CREEK DAM ON BIG BLUE RIVER, KANS.—RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Kansas, favoring immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River, in Kansas, until certain debatable issues have been resolved.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 19

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until certain debatable issues have been resolved

Whereas during recent years studies and research in flood-control methods have evolved new theories and practices for the effective and economical control of flood water; and

Whereas the construction of said Tuttle Creek Dam may not control flood waters to a measure commensurate with the cost and damages occasioned by and resulting from such construction; and

Whereas the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas, in conjunction with the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, recommends that the said Tuttle Creek Dam should not be constructed and that more modern methods of flood control should be initiated for the prevention of flood damage on the Kansas River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and memorialize the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas until debatable issues have been resolved, as recommended in the report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States.

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate and was adopted by that body March 9, 1953.

FRED HALL,
President of the Senate.
SIDNEY MARGARET GARDINER,
Secretary of the Senate.

PETITIONS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have received 14 petitions of the board of directors of the National Farmers Union at a recent meeting in Denver. I have read them with great interest and find myself in complete sympathy and agreement with their contents. I understand that they have been sent directly to the President, and I am writing to urge that insofar as they lie within the administration's province the administration accept and put them into action. I now ask unanimous consent that the 14 petitions be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, in order that all Members of Congress who are concerned with the problem confronting the Nation's farmers may have them readily available.

There being no objection, the petitions were received, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"I. STOP FALLING FARM INCOME

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby—

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact at this session legislation to stop the disaster-threatening drop in farm-family incomes and purchasing power including—

"(a) Definite mandatory legislation to protect the returns of family farmers on any agricultural commodity from dropping below 100 percent of a fair parity price. As a minimum in this session of Congress we urge enactment of legislation that will—

"(1) Extend at least until 1957 90 percent parity price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, and other basics.

"(2) Expand mandatory 90 percent of parity price supports to rye, flax, barley, oats, grain sorghum, soybeans, dry edible beans, and cottonseed.

"(3) Continue the present method of calculating parity prices of basic commodities and to extend this system to all other commodities, especially those listed in (2) above.

"(4) Provide mandatory parity-level price supports or other full parity income support program to milk and other dairy products, livestock, eggs, poultry, and other perishables.

"(b) Establishment of a special investigating committee, board, or commission to determine whether or not recent drops in price received by farmers, while retail prices paid by consumers remain high, have been the result of a conspiracy on the part of processors and middlemen and other monopolistic purchasing and marketing practices; and

"2. Petition the President of the United States to send a special message to the Congress reiterating his support of 100 percent of parity for farm income and prices and his support for enactment of parity-level farm income and price supports and recommending enactment of such legislation at an early date.

"We are making recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. Working family farmers are becoming increasingly concerned that existing farm price support programs may be allowed to expire before improved legislation has been adopted to replace them.

"B. A reasoned, considered, and orderly discussion of a long-range national food and farm program would be more likely if conducted in an atmosphere of relative security than if it must be conducted under the economic gun of failing farm incomes and farm price declines occurring in the face of an early termination of price support legislation.

"C. The old familiar economic scissors is cutting farmers down again. Real income per person on farms in 1953 is expected to be one-third lower than 5 years ago. The purchasing power of farm families will be lower than in any year since before World War II. Farmers' share of the national income in 1953 is now forecasted to be the lowest in our national history. Lower even than in 1932. Farm people are 15 percent of the population and will probably receive less than 6 percent of national income in 1953.

"D. Meanwhile, farm-operating costs in 1953 will be record high, above 1952; 29 per-

cent above 1948; more than twice as high as just before World War II; and almost six times as high as in 1932.

"E. Farmers are the only large group in the population whose income and purchasing power and whose share of the national income has been dropping.

"Interest rates received by bankers on short-term paper are up 124 percent—more than double since 1947.

"The purchasing power, in constant dollars, of the dividends paid by corporations to their stockholders has increased 20 percent in the same period.

"Corporate profits have increased 38 percent since 1947.

"And the purchasing power of the average weekly earnings of manufacturing workers has increased by 19 percent in 5 years.

"Meanwhile, farm-family purchasing power has gone down—down by 26 percent—in the last 5 years, with another 10-percent drop expected this year.

"F. Only 1 out of 6 full-time family farmers have a purchasing power equivalent to that of the average nonfarm family. Only 1 out of 4 have an income from labor, management, and return on investment equal to the purchasing power of the average manufacture worker from labor alone. More than 1,500,000 full-time farm families had cash family income below $1,000 in 1949; of those, 707,000 had incomes less than $480.

"G. Falling farm income and farm-family purchasing power is of direct concern to everyone in the Nation, not just to farm people alone. In addition to the 24 million people on farms, the level of farm production and income directly affects 6 million workers (plus their dependents) who are producing goods and services for sale to farmers, and 9 million workers (and their dependents) who process and distribute farm commodities. If farm income drops, some of the 6 million lose their jobs; when farm production drops, some of the 9 million lose their jobs.

"This leads the way down into national depression. Average per-person annual income on farms dropped from $264 in 1919, to $207 in 1920, to $116 in 1921. Industrial workers' income hit bottom a year later in 1922, 40 points below 1920. Exactly the same pattern occurred again from 1928 to 1933; and again in 1937–38. Is that where we are headed again?

"H. Industrial prices are held up by administrative devices, while industrial production is cut when farm demand and purchasing power drops. That is what has happened time and time again. Farmers try to maintain their production and the result is falling prices and greatly reduced farm incomes.

"I. In the past, for example 1929–32, farmers were able to maintain production. Farm production in 1932 was actually 4 percent greater than in 1929. Industrial production was cut by 47 percent. Farm prices fell by 68 percent. Now and in future years, however, farm production cannot be maintained in the face of such drops in income owing to the extremely high, inflexible cash cost of production and the need for purchasing fertilizer, chemicals, oil, power, and machinery from off the farm for cash.

"J. Forty years ago an average farm family could have lost its farm-cash-operating expenses for 9 years in a row before wiping out their investment in land and buildings. Now the investment, on the average, would be wiped out in only 4 years. Even if farm families were willing to accept for family living a purchasing power no greater than they had in 1932, and were able to reduce cash costs by 10 percent from 1952, the income available from sale of products would fall almost $4 billion short of covering depreciation on the present stock of operating capital if agricultural prices are allowed to drop to 75 percent of the 1952 level.

"K. Present high level of farm production, even temporarily, can be maintained only by protecting a parity level of farm prices or by accepting intolerably deep cuts in farm-family living standards, or by using up and not replacing the present working capital of power, machinery, and equipment. Only by maintaining full-parity prices can high production be maintained over the long run.

"L. Only by the early enactment of mandatory high-level farm price-support legislation of the type recommended in 1 above can stabilized farm markets be reestablished. Continued uncertainties and confusion resulting from official criticism of existing price programs and the search for ways to eliminate them has contributed materially to present weak markets. Farm prices have dropped 15 percent since January 1951; almost one-half of this drop has occurred in the last 4 months. This is further illustrated by the weakness which characterized the dairy markets in the weeks preceding the dairy price-support announcement. In the long run, elimination, destruction, or weakening of the price-support program will destroy farm-family income, drastically threaten abundant farm production, and lead to the imposition of a drastic scarcity situation.

"We commend the following Senators and Congressmen who have introduced bills in the Congress which, if enacted, would improve the farm price-support legislation: Senators YOUNG, KERR, THYE, BEALL, MANSFIELD, HUMPHREY, EASTLAND, and RUSSELL; Congressmen LOVRE, WICKERSHAM, SMITH of Mississippi, ABERNETHY, PASSMAN, MCMILLAN, H. CARL ANDERSEN, KRUEGER, and BURDICK.

"II. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION CREDIT LOANS

"The National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions, the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will authorize and direct the establishment, as a supplement to the agricultural conservation pratices and Soil Conservation Service activities, of an Agricultural Conservation Credit Loan program that will greatly increase the availability to farmers at low interest rates 12 to 20-year loans that will enable them to undertake farm improvements and adopt farm practices that will contribute to greater agricultural soil and water conservation and, thereby, allow the Nation to move at a much faster rate than now toward a permanently and increasingly abundant agricultural production, recognizing that such a loan program will not be of value if farm price support legislation is not maintained and improved, and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States, at an early date, to send a message to the Congress (a) urging the enactment of such legislation and (b) expressing his determination to approve such legislation if enacted by Congress.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. The Nation is currently using up and losing farm soil structure and nutrients and its water resources at a faster rate than they are being built up.

"B. The total cost of adopting the farm improvements and improved practices needed to establish a permanent agriculture is so large that, even if there were no continued drain on farm resources, a period of 120 years would be required to reach the goal, if the present annual rate of adoption is not speeded up.

"C. We are convinced that the general public should assume its share of this cost through an expansion of the ACP and SCS programs. However, a great deal of the investment cost must and can be met by farmers themselves if adequate credit adapted to conservation needs of family farms can be made available.

"D. The income-increasing potentialities of soil conserving practices and installations are not all installed simultaneously and the benefits become available over a period of years, not immediately. This requires a type of credit that has the nature of a drawing account and can be repaid over a period of up to 15 or 20 years. Currently credit resources to meet this need of family farmers is almost totally lacking.

"We commend the Senate and House Agricultural Committees for having initiated staff studies looking toward congressional consideration of agricultural conservation credit legislation. Particularly we commend the following Senators and Congressmen for the personal interest they have taken in pushing such legislation toward formal consideration by the Congress: Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, AIKEN, of Vermont, and ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and Congressmen LOVRE, of South Dakota, and HOPE, of Kansas, and POAGE, of Texas.

"III. EXTENSION OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

"The National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact, at this session of Congress, legislation to authorize the Department of Agriculture to continue to expand the Federal Crop Insurance program, on the present basis, each year, to additional counties not now served, and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States, at an early date, to send a message to the Congress (a) urging the enactment of such legislation and (b) expressing his determination to approve such legislation if enacted by the Congress.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. The present law which authorizes the annual expansion of the experimental crop insurance program to additional counties will expire on December 31, 1953, if not renewed prior to that date.

"B. The experience with Federal crop insurance operations over the past 6 years has been highly successful in the approximately 800 counties now served. This service should be made available to farmers in the remaining 2,200 counties and should be expanded to cover additional crops.

"C. It is our deep conviction that the payment by the Federal Government of necessary administrative costs is fully warranted by the contribution made by the program to the broad national public interest in maintaining the basis for fulfilling future national needs for an increasingly abundant production of food and fiber as well as for maintaining farm purchasing power as a contribution toward an expanding national economy.

"D. Federal crop insurance provides a means whereby the whole people can protect themselves, as well as farmers, against the economic shocks of natural disasters such as insects, flood, drought, and plant epidemics without the costly expedient of huge relief expenditures after disaster has struck.

"E. It is our deep conviction that the Federal crop insurance program should continue to cover all risks involved. The type of coverage provided in an all risk crop insurance policy is not comparable to any single risk coverage provided by private insurance companies and therefore is not competitive. For example, an analysis of hail insurance sales in several States established the fact that hail insurance sales increased as crop insurance participation expanded.

"We commend Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, and Congressman HILL, of Colorado, and MARSHALL, of Minnesota, for the personal interest they have taken in pushing this proposed legislation toward formal consideration in the Congress.

"V. FULL CONSUMPTION OF ABUNDANT FARM PRODUCTION

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby—

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact additional legislation to expand domestic and foreign consumption of farm commodities that can be and are produced in abundance. Such legislation should include:

"A. Enactment of the international food-reserve resolution that has been introduced in the Senate.

"B. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture and Commodity Credit Corporation to extend loans to farmers and farmers' cooperatives to build expanded storage and processing facilities for perishable farm commodities to be used in conjunction with price-supporting loans and purchase agreements on such commodities held in on-farm or farmers' cooperative storage facilities.

"C. A food-allotment plan to subsidize adequate diets for low-income consumers in the United States and other countries.

"D. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize parity payments and other nonwasteful methods of price support, particularly for such perishable commodities as, for example, butter, to the end that this butter will be used for human consumption rather than piling up in warehouses for eventual disposition in a soap vat.

"E. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake necessary action to develop and maintain a fully adequate safety reserve of all food and fiber commodities, including storable processed products of perishable farm commodities, and to protect the farmer from price-depressing effects of such reserves and to charge the cost of the program, as it properly should be, to national security and defense, not to farm programs; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct the departments and agencies of the executive branch to exercise the discretionary power they have under existing legislation to the end of encouraging full consumption of abundant agricultural production while protecting farmers from below-parity incomes or subjecting farmers to the degrading specter of being forced into a scarcity system of production through actions of the type outlined above. We also urge the President to send a message to the Congress stating his belief in abundant farm production, parity farm incomes, and the desirability of promoting full consumption, particularly better diets for low-income consumers, and recommending adoption of the legislation outlined above. For example, the President should direct the Defense Department and other Government agencies to put special effort on utilizing greater quantities of farm commodities in temporary surplus, such as beef, butter, and edible fats and oil at present.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. We are absolutely opposed to starvation and malnutrition and undernutrition in a nation of actual abundance and a world of potential abundance.

"2. We believe that the main opposition to a workable system of getting abundant land resources and farm production together with hungry people results from a doctrinaire blindness to the realities of the world we live in. We do not view as insurmountable such obstacles as currency inconvertibility, trade barriers, export and import quotas, tariffs, and other vested interests. All of these can be geared into a system of workable international economic cooperation.

"3. It is a matter of deep conviction with us that working family farmers in this and other countries should be encouraged in every way to maintain and improve their land and water resources and to produce a balanced abundance which public policy will also insure will be used to benefit mankind, both in our own country and in foreign lands.

"4. We view with alarm the increasing official tendency to put exclusive reliance for solution of these problems on the private-profit, manager-administered market, both domestically and internationally.

"5. While we believe a strong military defense is necessary, American food will win more people to our beliefs in democracy and the dignity of man than will a similar expenditure for guns and military hardware.

"6. As far back as Biblical times it has been known that, in order to have enough food at all times, it was necessary to build reserves in times of good crops to draw on during the lean years. This principle is even more important today when the defense of the free world may be at stake. The billions spent for weapons of war will not be very effective if we do not have adequate food and fiber supplies to sustain our fighting force, our civilian population, and, if necessary, assist our allies with food and fiber. Even in the cold-war period communism probably can more effectively be kept from spreading by alleviating hunger in food-shortage areas than by the threat of weapons of war.

"We specifically commend Senators MURRAY and YOUNG for their personal interest and efforts in behalf of the development and introduction of the international food-reserve resolution.

"VIII. FARM HOME WATER SUPPLY LOANS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that would authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to extend loans at low rates of interest to farm homeowners without adequate indoor running water for the purpose of installing such systems, including adequate bathing and sewage-disposal facilities.

"We make this recommendation for the following reasons:

"1. We believe that adequate credit facilities for this purpose are almost totally lacking.

"2. It is a deep conviction with us that working farm families are entitled to be able to earn for themselves, within their incomes, a standard for the necessities and conveniences of life equivalent to those available to comparable families living in urban areas.

"We commend the efforts of Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, and the late Congressman Reid Murray, of Wisconsin, for their personal efforts in this regard.

"IX. AMERICAN FOOD AND AMERICA'S ALLIES

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the executive branch to purchase with defense funds United States farm commodities for use in raising the dietary standards of our allied armies fighting in Korea and elsewhere around the world, and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct the civilian and military authorities of the executive branch henceforth in their military-procurement activities to purchase food for the troops of our Allies whose armies are suffering malnutrition to the end that military-assistance funds will be used to purchase United States produced farm commodities for shipment and contribution to the soldiers of allied armies fighting shoulder to shoulder with United States servicemen, and that the funds so expended will be charged against defense appropriations rather than being charged against the cost of farm programs.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. The soldiers of other armies fighting at our side can no more carry out their duty than could ours without adequate diets of nutritious food. Yet millions of South Korean soldiers are now incapacitated by undernutrition.

"2. We believe it to be morally indefensible to have butter and other food commodities go to waste in this country while allied soldiers go hungry and fall from the ranks because of the lack of food.

"3. It is widely reported that the developing farm-income crisis is due to the development of at least a temporary surplus of supplies of food beyond domestic and foreign demands. This would indicate that the diversion of such temporary surpluses to friendly military personnel would not unduly restrict domestic United States food supplies.

"X. APPROPRIATIONS FOR CARRYING OUT FEDERAL FARM PROGRAMS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will provide sufficient funds to maintain the services of Federal farm programs at the present level except as follows:

"(a) The agricultural conservation practices program should be expanded.

"(b) An increase is justified in the funds made available to Soil Conservation Service.

"(c) Sufficient funds should be made available to make possible the expansion of Federal crop insurance into additional counties and crops as provided by law.

"(d) The loan authorizations and funds for farm and home management supervisory assistance of Farmers Home Administration should be greatly increased to more nearly fill the expressed need for these services.

"(e) Loan authorizations and administrative funds of the Rural Electrification Administration should be increased to meet farmers' increasing demand for electric power and to speed up the rate of progress in the rural telephone loan program.

"(f) Funds provided for the school lunch program should be increased commensurate with increased school enrollments, the rising cost of food and operation, and to match the increased financial participation of States, counties, and school districts.

"(g) Increased funds should be appropriated to expand marketing research studies and service to reduce marketing margins and spreads; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to send a message to the Congress pointing out the vital contribution of farm programs to national welfare, prosperity, and security; recognizing the already heavy reductions made in these appropriations over the past 12 years; and urging the enactment of legislation along the lines outlined above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. The present farm program has been a cumulative development through the democratic process over the Nation's entire history to fill needs of the whole people for an assured continuous and increasing abundance of food and fiber and for a prosperous agricultural population on family farms.

"B. It is our deep conviction that destruction or reduction in the scope of these programs will be more costly to the Nation in lost production, farm-relief measures, and wasted resources than would the small increased Federal expenditure that their continuance on an adequate basis would require.

"C. The beginning stages of what may well become a deepening farm-income crisis is not the time to weaken or destroy already existing farm programs. Rather, the course of wisdom is to improve and strengthen them, particularly at a time of heightened world tension when we do not know at what moment greatly increased production may be demanded of our farms and the farm people.

"D. Existing uncertainties are heightened by the fact the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee of the Congress is being required to consider this proposed appropriation without benefit of specific recommendations from the executive branch. This situation should be corrected immediately.

"E. We are seriously concerned and troubled by reports that the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations has employed a staff of 75 officials of industry, business, and finance (whose names are kept secret from the public, but whose chairman is known to be a private utility executive) to prepare official recommendations on the appropriations for farm programs. As a minimum, the names and industrial affiliations of these people should be made known to the public.

"F. The spread between farm price and retail price paid by consumers is now increasing at a rapid rate.

"G. The Nation is fully able to afford the Government expenditures we have recommended for the agricultural agencies. The gross national production is currently at a record level, about twice as high as only 10 years ago. Just in the past 30 months production increased from an annual rate of $284 billion to $360 billion, an increase greater than the total annual budget of the Federal Government. Less than 2 cents of each dollar of Government expenditure is devoted to the farm programs. When you consider the inflationary effects of scarce farm production, the appropriate question is, Can we afford to spend less to assure our future food supply?

"XI. PRESERVATION OF COOPERATIVE RURAL ELECTRIC AND TELEPHONE LOANS PROGRAM AND ADEQUATE PROVISION FOR PUBLIC POWER DEVELOPMENT

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States (1) to further expand the scope of cooperative rural electric and telephone loan programs and the public power development policy, and (2) to reject all proposed legislation and reorganization plans that would have the effect of (a) reducing the ability of farmer-owned and controlled cooperatives to obtain sufficient direct Government loans to expand their facilities including transmission lines and generating plants, to meet farmers' increasing needs for electric power and telephone service, or (b) of reducing the untrammeled access of such cooperatives to low-cost publicly generated power, or (c) to slow down the rate of expansion of public power development, or (d) prevent the public erection of transmission lines to load centers of municipalities, cooperatives, and other preferential customers who use the power on a cost basis, or (e) to sell or otherwise transfer public power facilities to private profit utilities; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct all departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government to promote the objectives of 1 (1) above and to refrain from the actions that would contribute to the adverse developments listed in 1 (2) above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. A massive, well-financed attack intended to get REA cooperatives under the control of private power companies and to wipe out public power development is now out in the open. The Power Trust, with the assistance of one farm organization, is making a frontal attack on public power. Their strategy is to block REA cooperatives from having direct access to adequate, dependable, and low-cost wholesale power.

"B. Modern family farming is solidly grounded upon an increasing use of electric power. Presently available facilities are inadequate to meet increasing needs.

"C. To meet increasing farm electric-power needs, farmers' electric cooperative require a heavying-up of existing systems; to do so will require considerable additional investment for which REA loans should be available.

"D. If the power trust effort to drive a wedge between farmers' electric cooperatives and the source of power succeeds, they can drive the cooperatives to bankruptcy and enhance their own private profits from low-cost, publicly generated power through increased rates to cooperatives.

"E. Progress in developing the rural telephone program has been stalled owing to lack of funds which were exhausted at the middle of the fiscal year.

"F. We view with profound misgivings the proposals that have been made by some big-business executives that public-power projects should be donated to high-income taxpayers. There is a grave risk that if the power trust wins the first rounds to destroy REA co-ops, they will then be in a position to win round two and take over completely.

"XII. POLICY FORMULATION AND ADMINISTRATION BY FARMER-ELECTED COMMITTEES

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States (1) to broadened application of the principle of farmer-planned and farmer-operated farm programs within the executive branch; it being clearly understood that this principle means actual policy development for an administration of farm programs (rather than advisory consultation) by democratically elected farmer, county, and community committeemen, and (2) to prevent the taking of any additional steps within the executive branch that would further weaken the application of this principle, and

"2. Petitions the Congress of the United States (1) to enact legislation to increase the control by farmers themselves over policy development and administration of farm programs, by mandatory provisions requiring by law that major farm programs such as the crop-insurance program, CCC price-support loans and purchase agreements be administered through the agency of democratically elected farmer committees. And (2) to reject any plan for reorganizing the executive branch of the Government that would result in eliminating the farmer-elected committees or removing important functions from their supervision.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. It is our deep conviction that development and use of democratically elected farmer committees in the planning and administration of important programs was one of history's important advances in broadening the application of democratic ideals of Government.

"2. Farmers themselves, better than any full-time paid employees on State or Federal payrolls, know how to adopt Federal nationwide procedures and policies to fit the circumstances of farming in local communities and counties.

"3. Preservation and broadening of the farmer administration of farm programs is the one sure way to prevent the development of political partisanship in these agencies because under this system the program will be administered by neighbors selected in free democratic elections, not by strangers appointed by authoritative officials in faraway cities.

"4. Merely advisory committees, particularly if made up largely of processors, bankers, and middlemen, should have a valuable but not centrally important place in the determination and administration of farm policies. There is both an opportunity and a tendency to use committees of this type as window dressing and as a means of bypassing the usual farm organizational and congressional democratic procedures. We shall continue our policy of full cooperation with the executive branch of the Government in urging our officials and members to participate in any capacity, including advisory committees, in which we are invited. However, we want it to be quite clear that we do not consider advisory committees of the type recently consulted by the Department of Agriculture as an adequate substitute for consultation wtih duly elected farm-organization officials, nor for the already-established system of democratically elected farmer committees. Moreover, we view with alarm the announced policy of the executive branch to consult with only those people whose financial position is such that they can pay their own travel expenses between their home and Washington. Continuation of this policy can only result in giving increased influence over farm policy to bankers, processors, middlemen, manufacturers, rich farmers, and those with access to organizational or business-concern expense accounts. With farm incomes expected to be 10 percent lower in 1953 than in 1952, many working-family farmers, particularly those who live in States at considerable distances from Washington, D. C., cannot afford to pay, from their own meager resources, the heavy expense of travel and hotel living.

"XIII. OPPOSE REORGANIZATION OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States to direct the executive branch of the Government to refrain from any actions or recommendations that would result in transferring the Farm Credit Administration outside the Department of Agriculture, or placing the several institutions of the farm-credit system under an interlocking, self-perpetuating structure of Federal and district boards beyond the control of borrowers and potential borrowers and of the general public through normal democratic processes, or placing new and unnecessary Federal excise or other taxes on these institutions or their member organizations; and

"2. Petitions the Congress of the United States to reject any proposed legislation or reorganization plans of the type described in 1 above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. The institutions of the Federal farm-credit system such as the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, and the intermediate credit banks, as well as the Farm Credit Administration itself, were established to perform a nationwide service to the Nation as a whole—in the interest of the general public as well as farmers; to potential borrowers and loan applicants as well as present borrowers of the system; to family-type working farmers as well as bankers, mortgage departments of insurance companies, and career Government employees.

"2. A period in which we seem to be moving into a deepening farm crisis with farm income falling at a much more rapid rate than farm costs, when private credit restrictions are tightening up, when interest rates on both short- and long-term farm

loans are rising seems to us to be a very unwise time to remove the farm-credit system from control by all farmers and the public generally through usual democratic processes.

"3. Proposed legislation was introduced in bill form in the last session of Congress that would effectively turn over control of the farm-credit system to just such an interlocking, self-perpetuating structure of boards as described above, such boards to be selected in such a manner that career Government employees, private bankers, and finance men, and, to some extent, present borrowers could obtain and retain permanently complete and independent authority.

"4. Such a reorganization of the farm-credit system would be tantamount to the turning over, scotfree, to a private clique of a great national public asset.

"5. Under such circumstances it would not be unreasonable, in our judgment, to expect that the private control structure would then operate the system to tighten credit requirements and raise interest rates so as to present less competition to private banks and to increase the dividend returns to those individuals who happen to own stock in the institutions at the time of the reorganization.

"6. Farm-credit policies should be geared into other national agricultural policies to make the greatest contribution to public welfare. This coordination can be most effectively brought about if farm-credit agencies are under the same supervision as other farm programs.

"XIV. PRESERVE INTEGRITY OF NATIONAL SOIL-CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to preserve the organizational integrity of the agricultural conservation payments program and the Soil Conservation Service and to appropriate increased funds to broaden the scope of these necessary, effective, and highly efficient programs through which are expressed the Nation's interest and the public concern to preserve and improve the soil and water resources of the Nation; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States (1) to direct the executive branch of the Government to refrain from any action contrary to the objectives stated in 1, above, and (2) to use the prestige and authority of his office to further these objectives.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. We are deeply convinced that the agricultural soil- and water-conservation programs of the Federal Government can most efficiently and effectively be managed in the years ahead through the integrated and coordinated activity of the democratically elected farmers' committee, to whom the ACP is assigned by law, and the governing bodies of local soil-conservation districts under State laws.

"B. The Soil Conservation Service as presently organized is a highly trained and technically skillful corps of agricultural soil and water engineers with a high morale and the requisite flexibility of personnel assignment to provide scientific technical assistance to local soil-conservation districts and individual farms in development of long-term soil-conservation plans in a highly competent manner. It would be extremely wasteful and, in our judgment, most unwise to tear down this great reservoir of technical competence that has been slowly built up over the past 20 years.

"C. The farm-to-farm, neighbor-to-neighbor approach to encouragement of soil and water conservation made possible through the conduct of the ACP program by part-time farmer-elected community committeemen is an effective combination of education, financial assistance, and friendly persuasion for which no adequate substitute can be found, if the objective is, as we are convinced it should be, to encourage the widest possible adoption of soil- and water-conserving measures on the privately owned farms of the Nation.

"D. Direct encouragement and assistance to farmers to adopt conservational methods of farming does not lend itself to administration by usual methods employed by general educational agencies, but rather partake of an action and service nature. It is our deep conviction that it will be an inconvenience to farmers and a hindrance to faster progress toward a permanently productive agriculture if Federal conservation programs for privately owned farmland are divorced from production and income-support programs in the States and counties.

"E. As a matter of deep conviction, we believe that loading the State agricultural extension services with the action-and-service-type Government operations would unduly hamper and render less effective the educational programs now carried out by the extension services."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"IV. INTERNATIONAL WHEAT AGREEMENT

"The National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States of America to direct the United States delegate now engaged in negotiations with other nations looking toward a renewal of the International Wheat Agreement (a) to demonstrate a greater determination to develop a renewed agreement; (b) to exercise a more positive role in the negotiations; and (c) to bring the negotiations to an early agreement as nearly as possible along the lines recommended by the organizational and the congressional wheat agreement advisory committees; and

"2. Petitions the Senate of the United States to ratify such renewed International Wheat Agreement as may be negotiated and agreed upon by the participating nations.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. We are becoming increasingly concerned that no signs of progress toward renewal of the International Wheat Agreement have been evidenced, although the negotiations have been under way since January 30, 1953.

"B. Not all members of the organizational and congressional wheat agreement advisory committees have been kept informed through proper channels of the progress or lack of progress toward a satisfactory extension of the agreement.

"C. It is our understanding that the United States delegate was not directed by the executive branch to follow the negotiational strategy recommended by the organizational and congressional advisory committees.

"D. Failure to negotiate and ratify renewal of the International Wheat Agreement would, by eliminating an assured market for at least 255 million bushels of wheat produced by farmers in the United States, develop chaos in the wheat market, put an unnecessary and dangerous burden on wheat and other grain price-support programs, and contribute additional fuel to the consuming fire of the currently deepening farm income crisis."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"VI. WATERSHEDS, FLOOD PREVENTION, AND CONSERVATION WORKS

"National Farmers Union board of directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the President of the United States (a) to submit to Congress a reorganization plan that will transfer the civil works functions of the Army Engineers to the Department of Interior and transfer the Bureau of Land Management and the agricultural functions of the Bureau of Reclamation to the Department of Agriculture and (b) to send a message to Congress recommending the enactment of legislation to fill the present gap in national soil conservation flood-prevention flood-control programs; namely the lack of authority for anyone to build small flood-prevention installations on the upstream and watersheds, and

"2. Petitions the Congress of the United States (a) to adopt at this session the bills now before it to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts with local governmental bodies to assist them to develop and establish small water retention and other flood-prevention installations in the upstream watersheds of the Nation, and (b) to approve a reorganization plan recommended in 1 (a) above and reject any plan contrary to this.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"A. Critical reports of several congressional committees during the past 2 years are solid evidence of the ineptitude, duplicity, and inefficiency in the civil works of Army Engineers, as presently organized.

"B. Flood prevention and harbor and waterway improvements are largely civilian, not military, in nature.

"C. Under existing law, large appropriations and broad authority has been extended to the executive branch to build levees, dams, and other works to control floods after they have developed; the ACP and SCS programs have been developed to hold water on the land where it falls and conserve the soil; but practically no provision has been made for the large and important area between the farm itself and the lower stretches of the largest streams.

"D. We are convinced that these problems will never be fully solved until it is approached on a fully coordinated river valley basin basis such as TVA and the proposed MVA. However, we are also convinced that we must not allow all of our small watersheds to wash away prior to the time that a fully coordinated approach can be put into effect.

"E. The present ratio of Federal expenditure is about $100 for flood control to $1 for flood prevention. This ratio should be evened up by filling the gap on small watersheds.

"We commend Senator JOHNSON of Texas and Congressmen POAGE and CURTIS, as well as the entire membership of the House Committee on Agriculture for their efforts on this proposed legislation."

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"VII. FISCAL POLICY AND INTEREST RATES

"National Farmers Union Board of Directors, composed of State Farmers Union presidents, meeting in Denver, Colo., March 15, 1953, hereby:

"1. Petitions the Congress of the United States to give careful attention to legislation concerned with fiscal and monetary policy of the Federal Government with a view to enacting amendments that will result in lowering the general rate of interest charged and the availability of funds for all types of credit and to reject all proposals that will result in increasing the rate of interest or decreasing the availability of credit funds for production and economic expansion; and

"2. Petitions the President of the United States to direct all of the departments and agencies of Government to be guided in all their actions by the principles indicated in 1 above.

"We are making these recommendations for the following reasons:

"1. We are seriously and profoundly alarmed to witness the continuing rise of interest rates on all different types of loans

in our economy. Interest rates on prime commercial paper have more than doubled since 1947. The average interest rate on AAA corporate bonds is higher than at any time since before World War II. The rate of interest on taxable Government bonds set a modern record high in February 1953. And the interest rate on short-term Treasury bills is almost nine times higher now than it was only 14 years ago.

"2. We are impressed by the evident manner in which high interest rates on borrowed funds in the underdeveloped nations of the world has almost entirely blocked any sort of economic progress in those countries. We hope we will not allow this to develop in our country.

"3. We are concerned that rising interest rates discourage expansion of plant capacity, render many proposed capital investments potentially unprofitable, raise the cost of living for consumers and reduce their expenditures, tend to increase the amount of hoarding and discourage consumption, and in many other ways have a retarding effect upon economic expansion and bring about a reduced rate of economic development which brings in its train mounting unemployment, reduced consumer incomes, and artificial scarcities of manufactured items and artificial surpluses of food, fabrics, and other items.

"4. It is rapidly becoming obvious that rising interest rates and increasing scarcity of credit in other areas of the national economy are quickly passed on to the field of farm credit. Interest rates on both short- and long-term farm loans is increasing. Newly recorded farm mortgage interest rates averaged 4.5 percent in 1951; 4.75 percent in 1952. Two of the 12 Federal land banks found it necessary to raise their rates during 1952. Rising interest rates and increasing stringency of available funds can only increase the severe problems already generated by falling farm income and rising farm cash costs of production.

"5. We are fully convinced that the national welfare and security should no more be executed on the cross of high interest rates and credit scarcity than on a cross of gold. The purpose of the credit system is to facilitate the smooth operation of an expanding national economy. Public policy should be framed to keep it working that way."

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 134).

ELIZABETH A. REILLY—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth A. Reilly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 94), reported by Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth A. Reilly, widow of Sylvester Reilly, an employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WALTER QUARLES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution, to pay a gratuity to Walter Quarles.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 95), reported by Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Walter Quarles, widower of Mattie Quarles, an employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 133)

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, with amendments in the nature of a substitute, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be placed on the Legislative Calendar.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent that the committee may submit its report early next week, and, at such time as the report may be ready, any minority views which members holding such views may desire to make to the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the printed hearings be ready at the time the report is submitted to the Senate?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is advised that the hearings will probably be ready on Tuesday next; if not, on the day following.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is it intended that the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution before the printed hearings are available?

Mr. CORDON. As I said to the Senator from New Mexico, the printed hearings will be available probably on Tuesday, or at least by Wednesday. My understanding is that it is not contemplated that the joint resolution will be taken up for consideration before Wednesday.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will further yield, I think it is only fair that the printed hearings be available to the Senate at least 1 day before the debate begins in the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Oregon feel certain that the hearings will be available by Tuesday?

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MALONE. May we have it understood that if the printed hearings are not available on Tuesday, they will be made available at least 1 day before the debate begins?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I can make no such deal. So far as the joint resolution is concerned, we propose to take it up on Wednesday. I shall do everything to see that the printed hearings are on the desks of Senators just as soon as possible.

This question has been before the Senate for a long time. I have told many Senators that we would proceed as rapidly as possible. On the earnest request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I have agreed not to take up the joint resolution on Monday. Possibly we could not reach it on Monday any way, because other matters must be considered first. However, I give notice that not later than Wednesday I shall move to make the joint resolution the unfinished business. I have every reason to believe that the hearings will be available long before that.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that the debate will last for probably a week or 10 days; so the presentation of the subject by those in favor of the measure can be made, and I am sure that the fact that the hearings are not available will not seriously interfere with the program. The Senator from Nevada himself will have plenty of time to present his statement after the printed hearings become available.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, this question involves public lands in a considerable number of States. It is quite possible that this subject would be considered a great deal more important in such States than in the State of Ohio. Members of the Senate who live in the so-called public-land States desire an opportunity to review the record, because it is rather voluminous, and much new information has been developed in the hearings which was not available to the Senate in prior debates.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair invites the attention of Senators to the fact that under the informal rule recently adopted, as enunciated by the majority leader [Mr. TAFT], 2 minutes was to be the limit on any speech or remarks made during the morning hour. If the Senator from Oregon wishes to exceed that limit he should request unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent to make a brief statement with reference to the joint resolution, which statement may conceivably take a little longer than 2 minutes. However, I shall endeavor to keep within 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 3 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the joint resolution is reported to the Senate with an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 13, commonly termed the Holland joint resolution. It embodies the philosophy of the Holland measure. The method adopted, of reporting an amendment in the nature of a substitute, is due to the numerous perfecting amendments throughout the joint resolution, and the necessity for some major changes and additions.

The only way in which the joint resolution in anywise differs from the philosophy and purpose of the Holland measure is that it recommends that the Congress confirm the jurisdiction and control by the United States with respect to the land and the subsoil of the continental shelf outside the statutory boundaries of the adjacent States.

I should like to say further for the benefit of Senators who are present, particularly members of the committee, that there are available at this time transcripts or galley proofs of the hearings so that Senators who desire to utilize the intervening time in the study of the hearings can obtain the transcript or the galley proof at the committee room.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have no disposition unduly to delay this matter, but I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Nevada. We must have the hearings before us and we must have some opportunity to examine them. Questions were raised in the hearings which had not been raised previously. Some very interesting testimony was developed in the hearings which was not given in prior hearings. So the printed hearings will be very useful. We must have an opportunity to examine the hearings, and also to examine the majority report and any minority views which may be filed. Unless we have the hearings and an opportunity to examine them, I do not think we can save very much time. We would have to rely on the old hearings; and when the new hearings became available, we would have to make use of them.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Prior to the time the discussion of the joint resolution begins, I think I should say that the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was compelled to spend a good deal of time in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. During that time, it fell to my lot to participate in the discussion in the committee. I would not want the joint resolution as reported by the distinguished Senator from Oregon to be presented without expressing the appreciation of all members of the committee for the very splendid way in which he conducted the hearings. He was uniformly fair. We have enjoyed very much working with him. I hope we may continue in the same spirit, and that we will not proceed to rapidly to a discussion of the joint resolution. I think we should have an oportunity to examine the hearings. I am sure the Senator from Oregon hopes there will be such an opportunity.

Mr. CORDON. I express my appreciation for the very complimentary remarks made by the Senator from New Mexico.

The Senate should have an opportunity to advise itself before the debate. I realize that this is a situation in which perhaps an exception may have to be made, for a day or so. I regret the exception, even to that extent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] that the report of the committee, and minority views, on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) may be submitted early next week? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 3 minutes in order to make a further statement with respect to the so-called tidelands joint resolution, and to cover certain material to which I neglected to refer in my previous statement, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed at the conclusion of my previous statement on the same subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] that he may proceed for not more than 3 minutes and that his statement be printed as a part of his previous statement on the same subject? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, when the hearings were in progress on Senate Joint Resolution 13, departments of the Government representing the administration appeared before the committee and requested that in any measure reported by the committee there be included a title dealing with and providing for the mechanics of the administration by the Government of the subsoil and sea bed of the outer portion of the Continental Shelf, or that portion lying beyond the statutory boundary lines of the States.

The committee went into the subject and endeavored to meet the request. It made a considerable study of the subject, and encountered some serious legal questions because of the peculiar political and legal status of the portion of the Continental Shelf adverted to.

The committee felt that the portion of the bill consisting of titles I and II, comprehending the Holland bill, be reported at this time, but that further study should be given to the matter of implementing the Presidential proclamation and, we hope, its confirmation by Congress.

In order to do that, Mr. President, the bill was divided into two sections. I wish to make a public statement now to assure my colleagues in the Senate that the committee is going forward immediately with the consideration of the second, or additional, problem involved, and it is the view of the acting chairman in considering the matter that a report on it should be made to the Senate at the earliest possible moment so that an appropriate measure may have consideration and be passed by Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1463. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces depicting the Hoover Dam; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1464. A bill for the relief of Maria Zarrabe; and

S. 1465. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille (Swett) Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1466. A bill for the relief of Shizue Araki Mraz; and

S. 1467. A bill for the relief of Patrick Devine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1468. A bill to require that the motto "In God We Trust" appear on all postage stamps printed after June 30, 1953; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. POTTER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Pier Luigi Broghesi Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1470. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers and doctors engaged in the practice of their professions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1471. A bill for the relief of Patrick Devine; and

S. 1472. A bill for the relief of Krikor V. Goekjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1473. A bill to authorize loans to owners of housing accommodations on farms for the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of adequate facilities for providing and using water in such accommodations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1474. A bill authorizing the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of President James Buchanan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1475. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Kiraga; and

S. 1476. A bill for the relief of Henry Baranczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1477. A bill for the relief of Gerhard Nicklaus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1478. A bill for the relief of Chung Keun Lee (Thung Kuen Lee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1479. A bill for the relief of Antonio Silva De Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1480. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1481. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever"; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1482. A bill to provide that all United States postage stamps bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1483 (by request). A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Scott; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1484. A bill to provide for the reinstatement or reissuance of certain national service life insurance policies, and for other purposes; and

S. 1485. A bill to increase the rates of compensation payable to veterans for service-connected disability or death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1486. A bill for the relief of Robert J. McGarry;

S. 1487. A bill for the relief of Vera Ivanovich;

S. 1488. A bill for the relief of Gerda Graupner; and

S. 1489. A bill for the relief of Hella Wolter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1490. A bill for the relief of David Maisel (David Majzel) and Bertha Maisel (Berta Pieschansky Majzel); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1491. A bill to provide for the revision of the public land laws in order to provide for orderly use, improvement, and development of the Federal lands and to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the Federal range, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1492. A bill to require the establishment of adequate provisions relating to the appointment or retention of certain female Reserve personnel with minor or dependent children; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENDRICKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union for the year 1953, to be held in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taxation and borrowing powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF MOTTO "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON POSTAGE STAMPS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I introduce for reference to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee a bill, which authorizes and directs the Postmaster General of the United States to engrave the motto "In God We Trust" on all United States postage.

It is only fitting and proper, especially in these critical years, that we manifest our divine belief in all things at all times, and the inclusion of the motto "In God We Trust" on all of our postage is therefore another manifestation of our consciousness of His omnipotence.

I have discussed the proposed legislation with the Postmaster General and he indicated his wholehearted endorsement of the bill, as I am sure all who are Members of this group will do likewise.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1468) to require that the motto "In God We Trust" appear on all postage stamps printed after June 30, 1953, introduced by Mr. POTTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PIER LUIGI BORGHESI STEWART

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I introduced for appropriate reference a bill which, for the purposes of stated sections of the Immigration and Nationality Act, would hold and consider the minor child, Pier Luigi Borghesi Stewart, to be the natural-born alien child of Clarence Eugene and Fannie Jordan Stewart, citizens of the United States.

Mr. and Mrs. Stewart, well known to me, have adopted a baby in Italy, where Mr. Stewart is presently stationed on a business assignment. As an adopted child, the baby comes under the nonpreference immigration quota and therefore would not be eligible for immigration into the United States for a number of years. This special relief bill would enable Mr. and Mrs. Stewart to bring their adopted child with them upon their return to this country.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1469) for the relief of Pier Luigi Borghesi Stewart, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PATRICK DEVINE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Patrick Devine. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1471) for the relief of Patrick Devine, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

James J. Devine, who is serving with the Navy at Yokohama, Japan, and living there with his wife, has taken into his home a 3-year-old boy of mixed Japanese and American blood. The child was placed with the Devines by Our Lady of Lourdes Orphanage in Japan.

At the expiration of his enlistment in August 1953, James J. Devine and Mrs. Devine plan to return to the United States, and they desire to bring the child with them as their son.

The bill would give the child, Patrick Devine, the status of a natural-born alien child of CT/1C and Mrs. James J. Devine and would so entitle the child to entry into and citizenship in the United States.

James J. Devine is from Hartford, Conn. Mrs. Devine, who served 4½ years in the WAVES, is from Portsmouth, Ohio.

KRIKOR V. GOEKJIAN

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Krikor V. Goekjian. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1472) for the relief of Krikor V. Goekjian, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. BRICKER is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BRICKER

The bill would grant permanent residence status to Krikor V. Goekjian, a young man of Greek citizenship and Armenian ancestry. He is a resident of Shaker Heights, Ohio, and presently a student at Syracuse University, where he is in his senior year. He holds a full-tuition scholarship there.

Throughout his life in Greece, Ethiopia, and Cyprus, Krikor V. Goekjian has come under the influence of many Americans. The principal of the school he attended for 6 years on Cyprus was an American. In Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, Goekjian worked under Americans in the Foreign Economic Administration. Later he worked for 2½ years as private secretary to the Director of Public Health in the Ethiopian Ministry of the Interior—also an American.

PARTICIPATION IN OBSERVANCE OF FOURTH OF JULY 1953 AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. MARTIN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States shall participate in the Fourth of July 1953 commemorative observance of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., and the rededication of the Nation to the principles upon which the United States was founded. The Congress further requests the President of the United States and the Governors of the several States and Territories to be present on this occasion. Further it is the hope of the Congress that this shall become an annual pilgrimage to the historic grounds where our independence was proclaimed.

There is authorized to attend and participate on behalf of the Congress of the United States a member from each State in the Senate and the House of Representatives, such members to be selected on the basis of seniority. The necessary travel expenses of any Member of Congress incidental to the performance of duties and responsibilities hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the particular House of Congress of which such Member is a Member.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 3180. An act to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain tangible personal property; and

H. R. 3655. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act so as to provide for the control of the consumption of alcoholic beverages in certain clubs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3853. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to continuing the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4130. An act to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Address delivered by Senator TAFT at Washington, D. C., on March 8, 1953, before the National Leadership Conference for the State of Israel Bonds.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Address delivered by Senator DOUGLAS at meeting of all faiths in Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1953.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address delivered by Senator MORSE at reunion of oldtimers at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, on March 20, 1953.

Article written by Marquis Childs dealing with the disposition of surplus commodities, together with a statement on the subject prepared by Senator DOUGLAS.

By Mr. FREAR:

Washington Birthday address delivered by Robert Silliman Hillyer before the Governor and the State Legislature of Delaware.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Sermon preached on March 22, 1953, by Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., on the subject "Anchors That Hold."

By Mr. HUNT:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. C. C. Browning, president of the Wyoming Congress, a branch of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, dealing with the proposed Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Editorial entitled "Emergency Controls" published in the Washington Post of March 27, 1953.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Broad Attack on Farm Problem," written by Lowell Mellett, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 12, 1953.

By Mr. LONG:

Editorial entitled "Leftwingers Would Undermine the President on the Tidelands," published in the Shreveport Times of March 15, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Resolutions relating to United States responsibility for world leadership, adopted by American Association for the United Nations.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Editorial entitled "Flood Control," published in the Texarkana Gazette, Thursday, March 12, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Security and Freedom," written by A. Blair Knapp, president of Denison University.

By Mr. BUSH:

Editorial entitled "Tax 'Reform'—More Revenue," written by David Lawrence, and published in the U. S. News & World Report, March 27, 1953.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Article entitled "Federal Construction Contract Bill," published in the March 1953 issue of the Qualified Contractor.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Rebuilding the CEA," published in the March 21 issue of Business Week.

Article entitled "West Can Beat Peking-Moscow Team in Asia: Hold in Korea, Indochina; Use Chiang Forces," published in the March 23 issue of Newsweek magazine.

WAGE AND PRICE FREEZE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there appears in this morning's issue of the New York Times an editorial entitled "Wage and Price Freeze," which analyzes succinctly and most effectively the present economic controls situation where wages and prices are concerned. It is so excellent that I ask to have it incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAGE AND PRICE FREEZE

Having just brought to an end the last vestige of direct Federal controls over prices, President Eisenhower has been notably unenthusiastic about congressional suggestions for continuing his authority to impose controls after expiration of the present law. However, he has now stated through an administration spokesman that if Congress wishes to give him the right to place a freeze on wages and prices in case of emergency, such a measure "would be acceptable." We think the President has been wise to make this concession.

Since early in the month the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been considering three main alternatives: (1) authorization of a 90-day freeze if serious dislocations to the national economic stability are threatened; (2) enactment of a full-fledged standby price and wage control law which would permit the President in event of emergency to put into effect a system of controls similar to those in the expiring Defense Production Act, and would even keep a skeleton staff on hand in case of need; (3) no legislation at all, which seems to be the course the administration would prefer, relying on the ability of Congress to move quickly in an emergency to enact whatever control legislation might then be considered necessary.

We think the experience of the inflationary price increases that immediately followed the Korean crisis indicates the wisdom of taking speedy action in such an emergency. There is certainly no inconsistency in being determined, as President Eisenhower is, to keep the economy as free as possible and in being ready to control it if through extraneous circumstances it should threaten suddenly to get completely out of hand.

This does not mean that there is any real necessity for a detailed standby control law The 90-day freeze period would give Congress enough time to adopt the necessary legislation, thus accomplishing the same result. It is impossible to foresee exactly what the circumstances will be in the event reimposition of price and wage controls becomes necessary; and, as Acting Defense Mobilization Director Flemming stated in his testimony, a previously enacted comprehensive standby program "might prove impractical in that it might not be responsive to the actual conditions existing at the time of the emergency." Furthermore, the very existence of such legislation on the books could help keep alive constant pressure to put it to use before it was really needed. Passage of the legislation authorizing the President to impose a freeze seems to be a sensible compromise, in the spirit of a free economy but with the precautionary foresight necessitated by the critical nature of our times.

THE KAMCHATKA AIRPLANE INCIDENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a few days ago on the floor of the Senate, I called attention to what seemed to me to be an obvious misstatement by the Air Force of the reasons for the flight of one of our aircraft which was attacked off the Kamchatka Peninsula. I was not at liberty to reveal the sources of my information, but I made quite plain that the airplane was not there for the purposes stated in the Air Force release.

Since that time I have received a press release from a meeting of the Meteorological Society held in Atlantic City, N. J. By the way, "meteorologist" is derived from the Greek and means "weatherman," and the meeting in Atlantic City was a meeting of the professional weathermen of the Nation. It included representatives from the United States Weather Bureau, the Air Force air weather service, the Navy's weather service ,and other organizations. They substantiate and support completely my information with regard to the falsity of the press release as given out by the Air Force.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement of the meteorologists printed in the RECORD at this point; and at the same time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Deceiving the People," published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USUAL WEATHER FLIGHT 360 MILES FROM MIG ATTACK

(By Wadsworth Likely)

WASHINGTON.—If that actually was a weather reconnaissance plane on a routine flight at which Russian MIG's recently shot off Kamchatka Peninsula, it was at least 360 miles off course, Science Service has learned.

The routine Loon Dog weather flight, flown out of Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska, since 1949 turns back close to Attu in the Aleutians, a point 360 miles almost due east from the point 25 miles off the Soviet coast where the attack took place.

This confirmed doubts expressed unofficially at a meeting in Atlantic City, N. J., of the Nation's top weathermen that the RB-50 plane was actually on a routine weather reconnaissance as claimed by the Air Force.

Meteorologists of the United States Weather Bureau, the Air Force Air Weather Service, and the Navy's Weather Service attending the meeting of the American Meteorological Society all scoffed at the Air Force's explanation of the reason for the big reconnaissance bomber's presence just 25 miles

off the Soviet coast of Kamchatka. They pointed out that no routine weather observations are received from that area, that RB-50's are not used as weather reconnaissance planes, and that weather reconnaissance planes are not armed.

The routine weather flight from Alaska which comes nearest the point of attack is that called Loon Dog. This has been flown almost daily since about 1949. It was last described in the Air Force Air Weather Service's Letter 55-12 of March 1952. It goes from Eielson to Nome to 53° north and 171° east, to St. Paul Island, to Bethel Island, and back to Eielson at Fairbanks. The RB-50 was attacked at 53° north and 161° east—10°, or about 360 miles, farther west than the farthest west point on Loon Dog flight.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, declared on the Senate floor that the official Air Force version of the reason for the presence of the plane so close to Soviet territory was preposterous.

There is an alternative flight called Loon Echo. It goes from Anchorage, out to Attu, then back. A plane on this flight would also be 360 to 400 miles off course if it got to the point where the RB-50 was attacked.

The belief was expressed to Science Service that, while navigation is difficult in the Alaskan-Aleutian area, it isn't that bad.

[From the Washington Post of March 27, 1953]

DECEIVING THE PEOPLE

Senator FLANDERS has raised an extremely serious moral issue respecting the assorted protests over the most recent plane incident near Siberia. The question is simply whether the American people are being told the truth.

According to the Air Force account—backed by the State Department protest which the Russians rejected—an American B-50 bomber was attacked by a Russian MIG fighter some 25 miles off the Siberian coast. Technically, this may have been the case. But Senator FLANDERS charged that the American B-50 was not there on a routine weather mission, as the Air Force maintained. Most weather flights, he noted, do not go within 400 miles of Kamchatka.

Now, in the kind of cold war we have been fighting, border violations by both sides have been fairly frequent. Russian reconnaissance planes have been reported over Alaska, and it would be surprising, indeed, if we were not similarly conducting reconnaissance over Soviet territory. Sometimes the flights have resulted in incidents, as in the Baltic several years ago; sometimes they have gone officially unnoticed. These operations may well be a necessary concomitant of the cold war, just as certain clandestine psychological activities have been accepted.

What is objectionable is the pose of injured innocence when our hand is called in such operations. This has nothing to do with the definition of borders in international law—a point on which we must, of course, maintain our rights. But it has a great deal to do with the confidence of the people in the integrity of their own Government. What would be the reaction, for example, if we should become embroiled in a shooting war as the result of such an incident and Americans learned that their own Government had been waging what Senator FLANDERS called psychological warfare on the people of the United States?

As Senator FLANDERS observed, there are two honest and honorable courses, assuming that such episodes will continue. One is for the Air Force and the State Department to tell the truth. The other is to say nothing. Certainly both Congress and the public have a right to insist that their own Government will not deliberately deceive them.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a statement which I have prepared on the 132d anniversary of the declaration of the Greek War of Independence.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25, 1953

March 25 marked the 132d anniversary of the declaration of the Greek War of Independence.

One hundred and thirty-two years ago on that day the Archbishop of Patras, Germanos, raised the flag of Greek insurrection and blessed the struggle of the Hellenes for regaining their national independence.

The gallant deeds of such heroes of the Greek War of Independence as Canaris, Kolocotronis, Miaoulis, and Karaiskakis, were comparable to those of the great heroes of antiquity; Leonidas, Miltiades, and Themistocles and gave additional proof that the modern Greeks are genuine descendants of their glorious ancestors.

Again in recent times the Greeks have shown their great devotion to the Hellenic ideals of freedom and dignity of the individual. When the Nazi and Fascist forces of darkness attacked Greece, the gallant Hellenes defended their freedom and independence most heroically and were the first to exploit the myth of Axis invincibility when they routed Mussolini's vaunted legions. And when later the Communist threat reared its ugly head within Greece the gallant Balkan country spared no effort or sacrifice in defending its freedom. A Greek contingent is now fighting violently in Korea for world freedom, and the participation of Greece in NATO preparations for the defense of the free world clearly indicates the determination of the Hellenes to help deter further Communist imperialist aggression.

These are some of the reasons why we rejoice on the occasion of this auspicious anniversary of the Greek War of Independence, and we send greetings and felicitations to the gallant people of Greece, as well as to our Americans of Hellenic descent who have contributed so much to the progress and welfare of America.

TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION WORK ON CAPITOL GROUNDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 229.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, similar joint resolutions were introduced in the House and in the Senate. The House has already acted on its joint resolution. The Committee on Public Works of the Senate unanimously reported a similar joint resolution, which is Senate Joint Resolution 59. A labor organization wishes to erect a permanent national headquarters on land adjacent to Federal land. There is the danger of some subsidence, and the desire is to fully protect the Government of the United States. If the joint resolution is not passed the erection of the building may be held up for some time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania to say that the joint resolution is now on the Senate Calendar?

Mr. MARTIN. A similar Senate joint resolution is now on the Senate Calendar. The joint resolution which is now before the Senate was passed by the House. In order to facilitate matters, I ask that the Senate act on the House joint resolution, which is the same as the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Are the joint resolutions identical in language?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; and the Senate joint resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 229) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which briefly clarifies the situation a little further.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 59

Inquiries have been made of the Committee on Public Works as to the relation of section 2 of the bill which relieves the United States from any liability, claim, or expense arising from the proposed work, to the provisions of the Tort Claims Act, Tucker Act, and other legislation under which the United States may be sued. I should like to make it clear that section 2 of this bill is intended to remove all possibility that the United States may be sued in this instance under the authority of the latter statutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 59 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 59 is indefinitely postponed.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with the unanimous consent agreement, I ask that the Senate proceed with the consideration of nominations on the Executive Calendar other than that of Mr. Bohlen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar following the Bohlen nomination.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Edward Lumbard to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter S. Robertson to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

GUAM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ford Q. Elvidge to be Governor of Guam.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the three nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmations forthwith.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Wilson L. Townsend, of Maryland, to be a member of the board of directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATION OF CHARLES E. BOHLEN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Barrett	Ellender	Johnson, Tex.
Beall	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Bennett	Flanders	Kefauver
Bricker	Frear	Kennedy
Bridges	Fulbright	Kerr
Bush	Gillette	Kilgore
Butler, Md.	Goldwater	Knowland
Butler, Nebr.	Gore	Kuchel
Byrd	Green	Lehman
Capehart	Griswold	Long
Carlson	Hayden	Magnuson
Case	Hendrickson	Malone
Chavez	Hennings	Mansfield
Cooper	Hickenlooper	Martin
Cordon	Hill	Maybank
Daniel	Hoey	McCarran
Dirksen	Holland	McCarthy
Douglas	Hunt	McClellan
Duff	Ives	Millikin
Dworshak	Jackson	Morse
Mundt	Saltonstall	Thye
Murray	Schoeppel	Tobey
Neely	Smathers	Watkins
Pastore	Smith, Maine	Welker
Payne	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
Potter	Sparkman	Williams
Purtell	Stennis	Young
Robertson	Symington	
Russell	Taft	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is absent on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], are absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Idaho that I have in my hand communications from Mr. Joseph C. Grew, speaking for himself and Mr. Norman Armour, who is in New Jersey at the present time, and a statement from Mr. Hugh Gibson, with regard to their respective understandings of the so-called three-man group who were asked to advise on diplomatic appointments. I ask the Senator whether he would prefer to yield to me, to enable me to insert these communications in the RECORD now, or would prefer to have me wait until he finishes his remarks. I shall do as the Senator requests.

Mr. WELKER. I should be very glad to have the Senator insert them now; but I do want to make reference to Hugh Gibson's statement later on in the course of my remarks.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in light of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I will make a brief explanation and read these communications into the RECORD in order that they may be before the Senate during the debate today.

I may say that because of a committee meeting I was, unfortunately, unable to be present throughout the entire session of the Senate on Wednesday. At that time there was a hearing of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Following that meeting I returned to the Senate, at which time the question of Mr. Gibson's statement was being discussed.

As Mr. Gibson, Mr. Grew, and Mr. Armour all happen to be close personal friends of mine, I immediately called Mr. Gibson and then Mr. Grew. On the same evening Mr. Grew called Mr. Armour in New Jersey. Mr. Armour later called me at my apartment at the Wardman Park Hotel. During the past 2 days I have been discussing this whole question with these gentlemen. I said to them that I did not wish to quote any of them on the floor of the Senate, but that I would be very happy, if they saw fit to send me communications regarding this matter, to read the communications to the Senate in order that the position of each of them could be understood. Therefore, with the consent of the Senator from Idaho, I shall read the communications.

First, Mr. President, I shall read a letter, which I hold in my hand, from Hon. Joseph C. Grew, dated March 26, 1953, addressed to me. The letter reads:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 26, 1953.*

Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am glad to have had our telephone talks today because I should like to do anything possible to clear up the misunderstandings regarding the Bohlen appointment. As Hugh Gibson, Norman Armour, and I kept no records of our discussions when asked by the Secretary of State to suggest the names of Foreign Service officers for appointment to vacant diplomatic posts, we must rely on our individual recollections of what transpired.

My recollection, which is fully shared by Norman Armour, with whom I have today talked on the telephone, is that we were given to understand that Bohlen was being favorably considered by the Secretary of State for the Embassy in Moscow. Armour and I each said that we thought Bohlen the best possible man for the job. His name was therefore placed on our list, which we submitted to Mr. Dulles with a letter signed by all of us when our work was finished.

In order to make the list complete, we entered in it the names of 3 or 4 nonservice people whose selection for certain posts we were informed had already been decided upon. We, however, made it clear to Mr. Dulles that we were not competent to recommend noncareer appointments. We entered Bohlen's name on the list as a Foreign Service officer.

As you have already talked to Gibson and have learned his understanding of the facts, I do not need to speak for him.

It will be a great satisfaction to all of us to have this whole problem cleared up.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW.

As I said, I talked with Mr. Gibson, and yesterday morning I called him again. He asked me whether I would lunch with him at the Mayflower, which I did. I spent 2 hours with him; but, as in the case of Mr. Grew, I told him I should prefer not to endeavor to quote him on the floor of the Senate, but I did ask him whether he would be good enough to send me a statement of what he had said to me, and of what his understanding was of the conference with the Secretary of State. I now have in my hand a letter from Hugh Gibson enclosing a memorandum entitled "Memorandum to Senator SMITH of New Jersey."

I shall first read for the RECORD his letter, then I shall read the memorandum. I have known Mr. Gibson very well. I have known him since World

War I, so he addresses me informally, "Dear Alec." His letter reads:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 26, 1953.*

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEC: I am sorry it has taken so long to prepare the memorandum which I promised to send you this afternoon. However, I hope it will meet your wishes.

At the risk of being repetitious I would like to emphasize what I told you today that when you read the memorandum on the floor of the Senate—

I may say in that connection that I read to him the excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which he was mentioned—

I would be most grateful if you would make it abundantly clear that I have asked you to stress the fact that I want it clearly understood that while my memory may differ from statements which have been made on the subject, I particularly wish that this should not be considered to impugn the good faith and integrity of those who have made statements with which I cannot express full agreement. When I came down here in January it was with a desire to be helpful to Foster Dulles, for whom I have a long-standing friendship, affection, and respect, and I should be deeply distressed if any differences which have since arisen should lead to misinterpretation reflecting upon him or anybody else.

I am very grateful to you for having taken time today to go into this so fully with me, and I am sure that your intervention will help to clear the atmosphere.

Yours,

HUGH GIBSON.

Mr. Gibson asked me if I would read that letter in connection with his statement, so that his approach would be thoroughly understood by everyone. The memorandum, dated March 26, 1953, reads:

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR SMITH FROM HUGH GIBSON

MARCH 26, 1953.

On Saturday, January 24, as I was preparing to leave for New York en route to Canada, I was requested by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, to take part, together with Mr. Norman Armour and Mr. Joseph C. Grew, in advising the Secretary on some diplomatic appointments. I was glad to do this because of my longstanding friendship for him and I canceled my travel arrangements and reported to him on the morning of Monday, January 26, together with Mr. Armour and Mr. Grew.

The Secretary received us in his office and laid out for us the work he had in mind. He indicated seven vacancies which he considered should be filled first before his departure later in the week.

He then stated that a certain number of posts, namely, London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, and Bonn had already been settled, and that we were not to concern ourselves with them. He added, as I recall, that he intended to send Mr. Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to Moscow. I recall that Mr. Grew, under whom Mr. Bohlen had served, and also Mr. Armour, expressed their strong approval. I did not feel qualified to express an opinion, to recommend or oppose, as I hardly knew Mr. Bohlen personally, having met him only three times casually.

We worked for 4 days, and on Thursday, January 29, we submitted to the Secretary the list of 7 recommendations he had requested. This was supplemented by a list of all diplomatic posts and opposite each post was placed the name of a possible diplomatic service candidate. Among these appeared the names of those whom the Secretary had informed us he had decided to appoint, including Mr. Bohlen. Having refrained from comment when the Secretary informed us verbally of his intention to appoint Mr. Bohlen, I saw no purpose in raising difficulties any more than in the case of Mr. Aldrich or Mrs. Luce.

In acceding to the request of my friend, the Secretary of State, to assist in making lists of candidates for appointments to Foreign Service posts, and placing my past experience and personal acquaintance with some of the candidates at his disposal, I never lost sight of the fact that I was merely offering him my advice to facilitate his task of making the final decisions for which he as Secretary of State would alone be responsible.

As I have stated, Mr. President, our conversation was at some length; I was unwilling to quote any of the gentlemen, because my memory might have been faulty, and, therefore, I requested that they put in writing the messages they wished to give to the Senate as to their position.

I wish to thank the Senator from Idaho for permitting me to insert these items in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield briefly to me?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two recent editorials concerning the appointment of Mr. Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. The views expressed in these editorials are consistent with my statement on the floor of the Senate on Wednesday, March 25, 1953.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun of March 24, 1953]

ACCORDING TO PLAN

Everything that the administration and its supporters in the Senate have done up to now about the Bohlen appointment has been in accord with the principles laid down in President Eisenhower's state of the Union address to Congress on February 2.

In that message the President took the position that the primary responsibility for keeping out the disloyal and the dangerous rests squarely on the executive branch of the Government. His further explanation that the executive branch invited disorder and confusion when it so conducted itself as to require policing by another arm of the Government seemed to imply that he would prefer not to have Congress interfere in a purely executive function.

The President went on to insist that he was determined to meet the responsibility of the Executive for security and that he had instructed all agencies to initiate programs to this end. He also declared that the measures to be taken would have two purposes: First, "to make certain that this Nation's security is not jeopardized by false servants," and second, "to clear the atmosphere of that unreasoned suspicion that accepts rumor and gossip as substitutes for evidence."

The Bohlen appointment has been handled strictly in accordance with these principles. Mr. Dulles had all necessary investigations of Mr. Bohlen's fitness made, and then accepted the responsibility for the appointee's loyalty and discretion. The President, as head of the executive branch, backed him up but took the precaution to consult the Attorney General, who was of the same mind as Mr. Dulles. All this was in consonance with President Eisenhower's declaration as to the duty of the executive branch.

Having assumed full responsibility, the President and Mr. Dulles have stood their ground firmly when challenged by a few members of the Senate. This is in accordance with the President's idea that if the executive branch of the Government acts it is only likely to confuse things to have the legislative branch step in and try to go over the same ground. Fortunately, Senator TAFT and most of the other Republican leaders in the Senate have stood by the administration on this matter, with the result that the principle is by way of gaining acceptance.

Finally, it should be noted that while taking all necessary precautions, Secretary Dulles refused to be moved in his judgment on Mr. Bohlen by rumor or suspicion. He made up his mind by reference to what he considers evidence. Whether he reached the proper conclusion on the evidence, those who have not seen the record cannot know. But it may at least be said that if the rules laid down by the President in February are to have any validity, it is Secretary Dulles who is the man to make the decisions.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1953]

MR. BOHLEN'S FILE

There is no denying that a certain risk is involved in permitting even Senators TAFT and SPARKMAN to read the FBI summary of the Charles E. Bohlen file. For despite Secretary Dulles' disclaimers, it sets a precedent of a sort. It will not be as easy as Mr. Dulles seems to think to take the position that it is all right to do this for Messrs. TAFT and SPARKMAN, but that a similar request from say, Senator MCCARTHY, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, can be refused. It is essential, however, that the information from the FBI files not be made available to everybody who asks to see it. This would be one sure way of destroying the FBI and wrecking the reputation of many an innocent person.

If there are these disadvantages, however, there are also compensating benefits in the Bohlen case.

One of these benefits is to nail Senator MCCARTHY to the mast. He has been implying that he has seen the Bohlen file, or at least that he knows what is in it. He has also said that the evidence in the file disqualifies Mr. Bohlen. Only last week he was saying that President Eisenhower would withdraw the Bohlen nomination if he would read the file.

Now Senators TAFT and SPARKMAN have read the summary. J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, has assured them that the summary faithfully reflects the contents of the file itself. On this basis, the Senators have stated that Mr. Dulles gave a complete and accurate report of the summary to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee before that group voted unanimously to recommend the Bohlen nomination.

So where does this leave Senator MCCARTHY and those Senators who trail along with him? Very much out on the limb, it would seem. In this instance, the question narrows down to whether one is going to believe Senator MCCARTHY or whether one is going to believe President Eisenhower, the Secretary of State, the Foreign Relations Committee, Senators Taft and Sparkman, and J. Edgar Hoover.

Most of the people who heretofore have been willing to believe anything Senator MCCARTHY said also have confidence at least in Senator TAFT and Mr. Hoover. Perhaps in the future these people will not be so quick to believe that a charge is true merely because Senator MCCARTHY makes it.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I approach my task today without a written statement, with merely a few notes, and with a frank belief in my heart that perhaps I am unqualified to discuss foreign relations. I have all the respect in the world for our distinguished Foreign

Relations Committee. I have no animosity against any member of that great committee. I have never met Charles Bohlen. I would not know him if he should stand by my side at this moment. But, Mr. President, I have given great thought to the question before the Senate, which has caused me many sleepless hours, and I feel that I should make a few remarks consistent with the thoughts which have come to me.

Mr. President, I regretted last Wednesday that tempers seemed to get a little hot. Personalities probably were indulged in, but let me say to my colleagues that this is no time to become angry or to abuse each other. I may say to those on the opposite side of the aisle that if they are getting any hilarity out of the debate on this side of the aisle, they may well enjoy——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. WELKER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to assure the Senator from Idaho that so far as the Senator from Texas is concerned, he is not gleeful; he is not getting any hilarity out of what is taking place. The Senator from Texas is sad in this hour——

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am not going to make a speech, but I want to disabuse the Senator's mind that any Member on this side of the aisle is happy about the question which is raised on his side of the aisle.

Mr. WELKER. I happen to be of a different mind, and I merely want to say that if any Senators on the other side of the aisle are enjoying this little debate, we shall be happy to take them on in November of 1954. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I approach this task, as I say, realizing that I shall be classed as a diehard, a reactionary, a dissenter, one who wants to destroy the fine leadership of one of the greatest Presidents in the history of our land.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I want to see our President succeed, as I want to see John Foster Dulles succeed. I shall do everything in my power to help in promoting that result.

But, let me say, Mr. President, that as to those of us who have risen to speak on this side of the aisle, I defy anyone to name any person or group of persons who campaigned harder than did those of us who now see fit to dissent in connection with this nomination. It certainly involves not a personal problem; it is a problem which is deep in the heart of every one of us.

I am very sorry, Mr. President, that the security and loyalty angle of this subject had to be brought to the floor of the Senate. I am quite convinced that the distinguished Senator who is now presiding, the well-loved President pro tempore, had nothing to do with that, nor did I. I want to assure Senators that that question was brought up first by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY]. Then came the subsequent appointment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and our distinguished majority leader to evaluate the FBI file. One may well draw conclusions from the evaluation. It may be that I would have evaluated it differently, because I happen to be a lawyer who has tried many cases. I accept the evaluation placed upon the file by those two Senators. I have no difference with them upon that point. I do want to make plain that in my remarks I am not referring to security and loyalty, and I hope that no Members of the Senate will see fit to hide behind that aspect of the case so that they may cast votes to confirm the nomination of a man who many of us think should not be sent as our Ambassador to Moscow.

Mr. President, accusations are easily made and are very, very difficult to disprove. From the State of Idaho, which is not too large, I have received a tremendous number of telegrams and letters. I have them here with me, if any Senators want to see them. I do not care to read them. The American people are thinking of what we are doing here today, Mr. President, and a great number are making known their thoughts to those who represent them.

I am mindful, Mr. President, of the fact that there will be only a handful of dissenters with respect to this nomination. It is always very easy to go along with the crowd, but it takes quite a bit of nerve to stand up and say, "I think we should dissent." To go along with 95 other Senators is the easy way out, but it is really difficult to stand up and state our case and be one of 5, 6, 7, or 10. I assure the Senate that when I dissent, I do it in a spirit of trying to help my country and trying to be a good Senator of the United States while I work for the State which sent me here.

I have, I might state at this time, received no communication from my State asking me to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Charles Bohlen.

Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so aptly stated a few days ago, the fundamental basis of our Republic is the system of checks and balances. The advice and consent which we have to give with reference to the nomination of any man appointed to a position is something of a really serious nature. Certainly the Founding Fathers must have had some reason for providing for it in the Constitution. That is the reason why I have thought so seriously upon this matter. Should I advise that Charles Bohlen be our Ambassador to Moscow, and if I should so advise, should I cast my vote of consent? My answer has to be "No," for reasons which I hope to bring out.

Mr. President, in my heart I feel I have a duty to perform, as do the President of the United States and John Foster Dulles. If I am derelict in that duty, I do not deserve to be on the floor of the Senate, nor do I wish to serve in it. I am convinced that the people of my State would never send me back to the Senate if I were derelict in performing my solemn duty under the oath I took as a United States Senator.

As the able and distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] stated the other day, when he was acting majority leader, certainly there is always room on the floor of the United States Senate for honest differences of opinion. With that statement I wholeheartedly agree because if a time should come when there never would be disagreement on this floor, it would be a very sad and dark day for our Republic.

No one questions the integrity or prerogatives of our President and our Secretary of State. Each represents the highest form of the American tradition of public honor. But I must say that I came to the United States Senate wellnigh solely because I had campaigned strenuously against the foreign policy of the prior administration. I campaigned against Dean Acheson, against the Yalta agreement, and all other agreements that have caused us the headaches we now suffer. I could not return to my home State and say that I voted to confirm the nomination of a man who still justifies and defends Yalta. I could never go back and expect to have the confidence of the people who gave me the great honor of sitting in this body. That is why I rise and tell the Senate, without malice, without rancor, and without bitterness, the reasons why I must oppose this nomination.

I think that every Senator should have and should exercise some independence of judgment. Why? Because in the case of this very nomination we are considering a man who it is expected will occupy one of the most sensitive posts and positions in the Foreign Service, namely, the position of Ambassador to Russia, at the most dangerous time in our history. We must pass—indeed, it is our solemn obligation to the American people to pass—the most careful and searching judgment on any such vital appointment.

I am sorry that it is necessary to have this debate. Certainly many Americans are alarmed about it. I may say that certainly many Russians are happy about it. In fairness to the nominee, I must also say that I feel that, by virtue of this debate, regardless of its outcome, we have, in effect, destroyed his effectiveness wherever he might serve the Republic as an Ambassador. I cannot for a moment believe that he will now have the power he ought to have if he goes to Russia after the debate we are having in the Senate. But I shall not compromise on the theory of advice and consent. I think it is fundamental and proper for the Senate to discuss this matter.

Perhaps it has been said that we who oppose this nomination want to harass and destroy career diplomats. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am no authority upon career diplomats. I have met only one, a man by the name of Loy Henderson, whom I admire very much. I wonder why he was not chosen from the career service to be sent to Moscow, because he impressed me, and many others, as being a man who would be feared by Communists and who would fight them down to the last ditch.

As I have said, my campaign was primarily against the Department of State and against agreements such as Yalta. That is how I came into politics. It is impossible for me, therefore, to agree that we should send to Russia a man who sat at Yalta, whose theories have carried great weight, and who still defends that infamous agreement. He has never varied in his basic approval of

policies that the American people, by the largest vote in history, overwhelmingly rejected last November. He has never wavered in his philosophy with respect to those policies nor has he ever said anything about changing it.

Last year I had the honor of campaigning all over the Nation. I can recall, among other trips, a 16½-hour flight from Elko, Nev., to the grand ballroom of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York. I really got to see America, and I saw it from every angle. I talked about Yalta, and I talked about foreign policy as I understood it. I promised hundreds of thousands of people, in small crowds and large crowds, at whistlestops and in great cities, that if General Eisenhower were elected President, the State Department would be cleaned out from top to bottom, and there would be a genuine new approach—an approach in the direction of a policy which the American people could respect and could and would admire.

How will it be possible to accomplish such a basic transition through the nomination of a man who sat at Yalta? Certainly there was an unholy mess in the State Department. Mr. "Chip" Bohlen, as he is known by his friends, has been in the Department a great many years, through the threat of depression, through the threat of of war, through World War II, during an uneasy peace and another threatened depression, then the so-called Korean police action, and now the dilemma we face today. I am told that perhaps he should not, being a career diplomat, stand up and be heard upon the issues of the day.

Coming from the faraway State of Idaho, I can think of a man who has not been a career diplomat, but who has been, and is, a great American and a great soldier, and who now is out of work. On behalf of the people whom I, in part represent, I would like to suggest that General Van Fleet should be sent to Russia to represent the American people, and thus show Russia that we really mean business, because the Kremlin appreciates only one thing, and that is evidence of a force that is greater than that of the Kremlin.

I cannot help thinking that if the nomination of Mr. Bohlen is confirmed, we will be sending far from a strong man to Russia. Perhaps all the things that have been said about him are not true. But, as I said a moment ago, I believe any effectiveness he might have had has been destroyed and ruined, and that the American people are not going to have the confidence in him they should have.

The Kremlin rulers respect only an opposition of strength. They have been outtalking and outmaneuvering our great country for all these years. Witness the truce talks in Korea today. Is anyone proud of that dubious accomplishment? Certainly not.

I certainly think that if General Van Fleet is not the man for the post, then the strongest man in the State Department should be sent to Russia, a man in whom the American people will have all the confidence in the world. I have cited one such man in Loy Henderson. I thought the American people in 1952 voted out the philosophy of a foreign policy that has carried us through 20 years of dilemma. Yet, in my humble opinion, by virtue of this nomination, I think we would be giving right back to the American people that which they thought they had voted out.

Mr. Bohlen has stated that he would faithfully discharge his duties as Ambassador to Russia. But, Mr. President, I should like to ask some questions. Going back to the agreements made at Yalta and other agreements which made slaves out of some of our friends, I should like to ask the American people, What is the thinking of the millions upon millions of captive people beyond the Iron Curtain today, when they see a representative of the State Department who sat in at all those meetings go into one of the most crucial positions in the world? Does it give them hope? Does it give them faith for the future? I think not, Mr. President.

We have heard a great deal of talk to the effect that this nomination should not be contested, because it is not a nomination to a particularly responsible position. I do not concur in that argument. I think it certainly is the most important position in the Foreign Service today to be filled by our Secretary of State.

After 20 years with the prior administration, does Mr. Bohlen have the proper spirit? Does he have the change of heart which is necessary to give us the forthright, strong foreign policy and representation which we need in Moscow today? Let me quote some statements by Mr. Dulles. On January 12 my able friend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was examining into the qualifications of John Foster Dulles to be Secretary of State. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is one of the greatest cross-examiners I have ever heard in the field of law, and in debate on the floor of this body. He asked the following question:

> Mr. Secretary, have you in mind any specific changes you would want to bring about in the State Department?

This is the answer of John Foster Dulles:

> Well, I think the change that is most needed is a change of heart. You have got the machinery, but the spirit is the thing that counts. It is the spirit, and not the letter, as you know, which according to the Bible is the very important thing.

Again I ask, does Mr. Bohlen represent a change of heart and spirit? Does he represent the kind of thinking and conviction which reaffirm the spirit in which the American people voted last November? I think not.

Mr. President, if ever we needed firmness in foreign policy, it is now. The State Department must stand up and fight for a change for America. Within the shadow of this Capitol at this time there are printing presses spewing out Communist literature for the Soviet Embassy and for the Communist Party. Does anyone think for a moment that Charles Bohlen or any other representative of this country would receive such consideration in Moscow? Not a bit of it. If anyone thinks I am fooling, let him cross-examine me a little with respect to Communist printing presses operating not only in Washington, D. C., but throughout this country. Does not this suggest that we need firmness today?

I have mentioned printing presses which have been spewing out Communist propaganda. In a moment I shall invite attention to certain pamphlets which have been printed for the Soviet Embassy and for the satellite countries. The operators of those printing presses are not only receiving money from Communist sources, but are receiving Government contracts, paid for by the taxpayers of the United States. That is why I say we should have an appointment to Moscow which represents a change of heart and a change in spirit.

I really do not care what the columnists have to say about me and how I vote. I have only one hope, and that is that when I leave here my people will say that I tried to do a good job. I do not want to hurt "Chip" Bohlen. I do not want to offend any member of the Foreign Relations Committee or anyone else. I do not want to hurt or embarrass my administration. However, I felt it was my duty to discuss with my colleagues the problems which have been on the minds of all of us for so many hours.

I was the first man to stand up on the floor of the United States Senate and defend an able Cabinet member, Ezra Taft Benson, when he was assailed—and I really mean assailed. I was the first one, for many days, to stand up and fight for a nominee of our great President. I will be the first to stand up and go down the line for our President when I feel he is right; but I feel that I owe a duty to myself and to my State. When I feel that a President has made a mistake in an appointment, I shall oppose that appointment.

No doubt in my short term in the Senate I shall have to differ again with the President. I hope not. It would be wholesome and wonderful if all 96 Senators could agree, and if we could vote with no dissension whatsoever. But it would be far from wholesome and wonderful if such condition was based upon an absence of individual conviction.

We come back to the question of party regularity. I have been classed by certain columnists as being a member of a certain segment of the Republican Party which desires to destroy it. I should like to have some of those columnists look into the RECORD. There is not a man sitting in the United States Senate on the Republican side of the aisle who has a better record for party regularity than has the junior Senator from Idaho, save and except my distinguished and able colleague, HENRY DWORSHAK, from my own State. His percentage of party regularity is 95, and mine is 94. I want to hear no more slander to the effect that I want to destroy the Republican Party. I am a regular Republican when the Republicans are right; but when I am honestly convinced that they are wrong I certainly must differ, as would the President or anyone else.

I do not think the President of the United States wants yes-men around him. I know him well enough, from my brief acquaintance, to appreciate that he admires people who stand up and try to explain their position, whether or not

he agrees with it. I shall continue to vote in accordance with my conscience as long as I am a Member of this body. When I cannot vote according to my conscience the people of Idaho will be doing me a great favor, and will be doing the State a great favor, by sending me back to the practice of law in Idaho.

Mr. President, it has been said here that Mr. Bohlen is one of the profound men when it comes to a knowledge of Russian philosophy and communism. The proponents of the pending nomination have advanced the argument that he is outstanding, and perhaps the only candidate in America qualified for the post of Ambassador to the Soviet Union. Our decision to give the advice and consent of the Senate to his appointment must be based upon his fitness and his own record.

I am mindful of the fact that it is very easy to find some mistakes in a man's public career. Heaven knows, I do not know how many mistakes I have made on the floor of the Senate, and so long as I serve here I shall probably continue to make some mistakes. But I cannot agree with those who describe Mr. Bohlen as the only man qualified for this post. I cannot agree with those who say that he will play no more than a mechanical role. I feel that Mr. Bohlen must have ability to judge; he must have fitness to evaluate; and his capacity to understand may decide for all of us the issue of war or peace.

In deciding how to vote on the nomination we must ask ourselves this question: Does Charles Bohlen understand the meaning of Communist policy, theory, and practice?

I am told that he is an expert on the Russian language and that he is profound in his knowledge of it. Mr. President, I have known of some very famous people who served overseas who have used competent interpreters when the circumstances required.

Does Charles Bohlen know the enemy? Does he understand what the aims of the Communists are? Does he have a thorough knowledge of the philosophy of communism? If he does, he has the basic qualifications, certainly, to be our Ambassador to Russia. If he does not have such knowledge, in my opinion, he is unfit and lacking in qualifications for the post to which he has been nominated.

As I have said many times, the Constitution places on us not only the vital task of giving our consent to the nomination, but the equally vital one of giving our advice.

The great volume of evidence presented so far shows that Mr. Bohlen does not have all the qualifications that have been argued by the proponents of the nomination. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] placed in the RECORD facts which should have brought about, in my opinion, the withdrawal of the nomination. That is not all, Mr. President. There is other evidense also.

It is very easy, as I say, to pick out little mistakes made by a man, but I shall present certain evidence for what it may be worth. Judging the weight of the evidence and its credibility is in the hands of my colleagues, not in mine, but I shall give it to the Senate for what it may be worth, and to get it off my chest. I intend to give the Senate a little evidence today about Mr. Bohlen with respect to his so-called profound knowledge of communism. In 1948 the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives was making an overall study of Communist theory and practice, as a part of its effort to promote the enactment of anti-Communist legislation. The groundwork laid by the committee in the Eightieth Congress resulted finally in the enactment of the Internal Security Act of 1950. As a part of its work the committee sought evidence to show that the Communist Party was not a legal political party, but a revolutionary party which seeks to advance its program by the use of force and violence to destroy the existing government and its institutions.

It is natural that in making that study the committee should turn to the State Department for information on the world Communist movement. The Department of State, with its responsibility of promoting the interests of the free world, was the logical center for information on what Communist theory and practice meant to the world as a whole. On January 12, 1948, the chairman of the committee wrote to the Secretary of State and asked, among other things, for "example of resort to force and violence by Communist parties in various countries."

The committee pointed out in its letter that it wanted to establish the fact that the Communist Party is an "organization which writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States."

On February 2, 1948, a most startling reply came to the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was over the signature of Charles Bohlen, this indispensable man, this man who, it is argued, is the best qualified man to send to Moscow, all of which has prompted me to say many times that if this man is so indispensable what a tragedy it would be for America if he should happen to die.

This is the answer which Charles Bohlen made to the letter, in 1948. Keep in mind, Mr. President, that the China revolution was going on at that time. People were being murdered and slaughtered by the thousands—yes, by the hundreds of thousands. This is his reply:

> The information you seek is not susceptible to documentary proof.

The fact is, of course, that it would be a monumental task to find any standard work by a top Communist leader from Marx to Stalin which did not in very express terms advocate force and violence as a necessary tool of Communist seizure of power. As the original manifesto of Marx and Engels stated, Communists "openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."

Mr. Bohlen was not very profound at that time, Mr. President. He said he had no documentary evidence to offer.

Communist literature printed right here in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, when our boys are being slaughtered in Korea, could give hundreds of examples of their theory of overthrowing our country by force and violence, as I expect to show the Senate in a moment. The Communist literature is full of repetition and restatement of this basic philosophy of the Red terror. It would take no researcher of exceptional ability—one, let us say, who is considered as the most highly qualified expert on Russia—to cover dozens of pages with quotations from the demigods of communism expounding their devotion to force and violence as the sole means that communism can use to come to power. Of course, the best evidence is the practice of force and violence by the Communists. This is not in the realm of theory any longer, but in the practical realm of historic fact. It is not imaginable that a schoolboy with one semester of history should not be able to give several examples of the resort to force and violence by the Communists. Here are the major ones:

WORLD WAR I AND AFTER

The Russian revolution, the Communist revolution in Germany, the Communist revolution in Hungary, the Communist revolution in China.

WORLD WAR II AND AFTER

The Communist seizure of power in Yugoslavia, the Communist seizure of power in Bulgaria, the Communist seizure of power in Hungary, the Communist seizure of power in Poland, the Communist revolution in China, the Communist revolt in Greece, the destruction of Czechoslovakia.

This, Mr. President, is documentary evidence. I hold in my hand, and any Senator may ask for and see them, bulletin after bulletin of Communist filth and propaganda printed right here in the Nation's Capital, with picture after picture of violent revolution, of hundreds of people killed and murdered lying in the streets. Proudly these documents speak of "the great revolution that saved the common man." I invite my colleagues to look at them.

"Chip" Bohlen made a mistake on that one, Mr. President. He could provide no documentary evidence for a congressional committee. I am charitable when I say he made a mistake. As I have repeatedly stated, in a public service extending for 20 years or more it is very easy to let one's foot slip, but I am calling to the attention of my colleagues a failure of Mr. Bohlen's which cannot be gotten around.

In one of his works, Karl Marx stated his philosophy even more forcefully:

> Combat or death; bloody struggle or extinction. It is thus that the question is irresistibly put.

To this let us add the voice of Lenin. From the hundreds of pages of his writings let me quote these words:

> The replacement of the bourgeois by the proletarian state is impossible without revolution.

Why, Mr. Bohlen, if you had such profound knowledge of Russia, did you not instantly cite some of these quotations? It did not take me long to find them and I have never been in Russia, nor do I speak the Russian language.

Quoting from Lenin again:

To deny or overlook civil wars would mean becoming a victim of the most hopeless opportunism and abandoning the social revolution.

Lenin went on to say:

It is well known that in the long run the problems of social life are decided by the class struggle in its bitterest, sharpest form, namely, in the form of civil war.

Mr. President, that is some of the documentary evidence which was overlooked by Mr. Bohlen in 1948. The amount of documentary evidence which I have presented at this time can very easily be expanded; I could continue to do so for hours, in going through the speeches of Lenin, Stalin, Foster, and many others, if anyone would care to listen.

Mr. President, the few quotations I have cited are only a drop taken from the floodwaters of Communist writings. They are the keystones of Communist philosophy. A person who is not familiar with all of them cannot understand Soviet Russia. Can we accept as the outstanding expert on Russia a man who tells us that there is no documentary evidence that communism means force and violence? I, for one, cannot.

Mr. President, I realize that those of us who are opposing confirmation of this nomination are playing a losing ball game; I realize that there is no chance to defeat confirmation of the nomination. However, I believe that these brief remarks will make a few persons think for a change, about communism.

Mr. President, the issue is not settled here. The volume of documentary evidence about communism is not confined to books. The story of communism has been the story of force and violence. Communism was conceived in blood. It feeds on blood. It wants to destroy all that is good in this world. It wants to destroy religion. So I could go on and on, in stating the evils of communism.

How did communism come to Russia? Of course, as almost everyone knows, it came by force and violence. Why did not Mr. Bohlen know about that? Every schoolchild in the United States knows of it. If Mr. Bohlen did know, what prevented him from citing it as an example of Communist force and violence? After all, the Communist record is written plainly in history, and the Russian revolution is known to every schoolchild in America.

So what prevented Mr. Bohlen from citing those things as examples of Communist force and violence? There was no reason to fear offending Russia, for the Soviet Government has publicly admitted, and with considerable pride, that it was conceived by force and violence. Countless books and other publications circulated in the United States by the Soviet Union tell us of that event. Copies of those books have been sent to the State Department, and are easily accessible to Mr. Bohlen and to anyone else connected with the Department. At least seven copies of the book to which I have referred have been in the Library of Congress, which is where I obtained the copy I examined. This, too, Mr. President, is documentary evidence.

However, this is not the full story; far from it. I ask the indulgence of the Senate while I review some of the milestones in the Communist history of force and violence which have occurred so rapidly during the past 20 years when Mr. Bohlen was in the State Department:

At the end of World War II there was a major Communist revolution in Germany, with armed conflict spread over the entire land. Fighting continued for months in the industrial areas. The end of the war also saw a Communist revolution in Hungary, where the Reds were able to seize power, for a time, by means of force and violence. That, too, Mr. President, is documentary evidence.

World War II saw the expansion of Communist terrorism over all of Eastern Europe. Yugoslavia fell to Communist force and violence. So did Poland. So did Bulgaria. So did Hungary. So did Rumania.

Mr. President, all these incidents are history. Where was Mr. Bohlen, the "outstanding expert on Soviet Russia," while all that was going on?

Let us not forget the outstanding work done by the Congress of the United States by means of the Greek-Turkish aid program, which was enacted months before Mr. Bohlen told the committee he knew nothing about Communist force and violence.

In China the revolution raged for well over two decades. While Mr. Bohlen was signing his name to a letter disclaiming all knowledge by documentary proof of Communist force and violence, what happened to China? The Red armies were advancing there, sealing the doom of that great, free nation.

Could Mr. Bohlen have been so unaware of that; or did he share the view—held by so many of his associates—that the Red terror in China was merely an agrarian reform movement?

All those things happened before the date on which Mr. Bohlen's letter was sent. Each of them is a matter of historic record. Each of them is an integral part of Communist and Russian history. And yet Charles Bohlen could tell a congressional committee that he could cite no documentary evidence that communism means force and violence.

Mr. President, you and my other colleagues have been most kind in listening to me. I am about to conclude. However, before doing so, I wish to state once again that in voting on this nomination I shall be voting according to my conscience. Each one of us, if he is to be sincere, must vote strictly in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience.

I wish to address my closing remarks to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I have no better friend in the Senate than that able man. I believe he will admit that he knows I am trying to speak from the depths of my heart, in the firm conviction that I should tell the American people why I shall vote "Nay" upon this nomination.

The senior Senator from New Jersey has placed in the RECORD certain letters from Mr. Grew, Mr. Gibson, and Mr. Armour, with respect to an explanation as to why there was a conflict in the testimony given in the debate on last Wednesday—a conflict in testimony which certainly did not do very much in favor of the nomination. That conflict made the American people, or, at least, those who have communicated with me, wonder how such slipshod testimony and debate could occur.

In connection with that matter, I merely wish to say at this time that there appeared in the Boston Post of yesterday, March 26, an article by John Kelso, the Boston Post's Washington correspondent, in which he gives the substance of an interview he had with Mr. Gibson. I trust that my colleagues will bear with me for a few minutes while I read a part of the article into the record. I shall be brief.

I now read from the article:

Hugh Gibson, the New York business tycoon and retired senior foreign service diplomat, whose name figured in an acrimonious Senate wrangle during the afternoon—

The afternoon of Wednesday, March 25—

said flatly tonight, "I couldn't recommend Bohlen for anything—I don't know him well enough.

"I only met him once, and then only very briefly," said the 70-year-old intimate of ex-President Herbert Hoover, "so I cannot conceive of going into a fandango over him."

Of course, Mr. President, you remember the debate between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and our distinguished President pro tempore, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] about the testimony of "the man in the bathtub," and so forth.

I read further from the article published in the Boston Post on yesterday, March 26:

Gibson told this reporter tonight—

That would be the evening of March 25, the dateline of the article—

"Apparently there was the grandest lot of shenanigans about words and meanings on the floor of the Senate you ever heard of.

"As I recall it, though, the day I talked with Mr. Dulles, together with Mr. Grew and Mr. Armour, Dulles told us that certain appointments had already been made—those from London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, and Moscow."

Mr. President, was Mr. Gibson right when he gave that interview? Or who was wrong in the debate on Wednesday afternoon? How under the sun could Mr. Gibson ever give his approval to the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be our Ambassador to Moscow, when Mr. Gibson said, according to the interview from which I have been quoting, that the post at Moscow had already been filled?

I read further from the article:

"Well," Gibson said, "it now comes out that we recommended Bohlen. We certainly did not. At least, I did not. We certainly didn't consider the names of the persons down for the jobs in those places I mentioned—London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, and Moscow."

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks by saying there has been doubt in my mind and in my heart with respect to the nominee. Whenever there is a doubt in my heart, I am going to resolve it in favor of my country. I shall always practice and follow that philosophy.

I certainly appreciate the courtesy of my colleagues in listening to me during the time I have spoken.

Mr. President, my vote on the question of confirmation of the pending nomination shall be "nay"—based upon the reasons I have stated here.

However, Mr. President, let me state now that if the nomination of Mr. Bohlen is confirmed, as it seems certain will be the case, he will have, when he serves as our Ambassador to Soviet Russia, my entire cooperation.

I thank the Senate for its courtesy in listening to me.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to commend the Senator from Idaho for what I consider a very impressive, very dignified, and very splendid address supporting the position he has taken in this matter.

I wish him to understand thoroughly from me that, although I do not share his position, and although I shall not vote as he has announced he will vote on the nomination, I respect his vote as much as I know he respects mine. The Senator from Idaho has convinced me of his sincerity.

I have talked to him before, and I wish again to make it perfectly clear that I believe that each one of us has the duty of voting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience.

I wish to say that in placing the two letters and the memorandum in the RECORD earlier today, namely, the letters from Mr. Grew and Mr. Gibson, and also the memorandum from Mr. Gibson—I did so after requesting them to make their own statements about the matter rather than attempting to quote them. There have been so many different interpretations of their views that I did not wish to try to quote them.

I did not wish to attempt to state that Mr. Gibson either approved or disapproved Mr. Bohlen for the ambassadorship. As a matter of fact, in the memorandum from him, he did not take a position. He simply said he did not know Mr. Bohlen well enough to feel qualified to express an opinion, inasmuch as he hardly knew Mr. Bohlen personally, having met him only three times casually, and thus he felt he could not pass on him one way or the other.

There was confusion as between the ordinary career nominations and the non-career nominations such as those of Mr. Dillon, to be our Ambassador to Paris, and Mrs. Luce, to be our Ambassador to Italy, and other nominations of that nature, which the Secretary of State said he had asked those gentlemen about, but which were not necessarily decided upon on the basis of their opinion. There was a difference of opinion between Mr. Grew and Mr. Gibson as to whether it was intended to include in that classification the nomination of Mr. Bohlen. That matter is pointed out in the letters, and I hope the RECORD will make it clear. I do not take issue with anything said by the distinguished Senator. He is entitled to his interpretation, as I am entitled to mine. I hope we can all feel that we have endeavored in the very best spirit to debate this question before it goes to a vote.

Again, I thank the Senator for yielding to me before he began his remarks for the purpose of inserting the communications.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New Jersey, could not have made me happier than he has done by paying me this personal tribute. I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a series of letters and telegrams which I have received relative to the nomination of Mr. Bohlen as Ambassador to Moscow.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO, NEV., *March 25, 1953.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We hope that you will oppose Bohlen's nomination as Ambassador to Moscow. Inasmuch as Mr. Bohlen was an associate of Alger Hiss and his type in the former administration we do not consider him as having the confidence of the American people to handle situations in Russia. Over 30 million people voted to get Truman, Acheson, and their group out of office, so why reinstall the very same ones. Of all the competent people in this country there certainly must be one who could replace him, do a better job, have a clear record and have the confidence of the American people. If Bohlen was so capable why wasn't he able to persuade Alger Hiss to benefit our side and if not able to accomplish that—why didn't he expose Alger Hiss for what he was. He surely knew what was going on and if he didn't, he'll be of very little good to us over there now when things are much worse.

Our side would win, Mr. MALONE, if you could convert just one-fifth as many in the Senate as I talked out of voting for your out-of-town opponent in the elections. And I didn't have to do much more talking than tell them of his being a newcomer to Nevada.

So do hope you will vote against Bohlen's nomination and bring a few more along with you.

Very sincerely yours,
FLORENCE HOFFMANN.
CHARLES B. HOFFMANN.

RENO, NEV., *March 26, 1953.*

Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

In reference to the Bohlen confirmation, seems the leftwingers didn't do so well for us. Why not give the other side a chance?

Mrs. ROBERT FLICK.
Mrs. GENEVEIA KIMPTON.

RENO, NEV., *March 26, 1953.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Have followed closely all arguments pro and con on Bohlen. We are against his confirmation.

Mrs. P. PHILLIPS,
KAREN PHILLIPS.

RENO, NEV., *March 26, 1953.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We and many of our friends are definitely opposed to the confirmation of Bohlen for Ambassador to Russia. In these serious times it would seem to us there should be some man in this country able to handle the affairs in this delicate position who has not been involved in such frightful blunders as Yalta, and who has been so closely associated with the administration of the past 20 years.

HELEN and ROY CROSS.

LAS VEGAS, NEV., *March 26, 1953.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Vigorously urge your opposition to confirmation of Bohlen. Regards.

AL CAHLAN.

MARLBORO, N. H., *March 25, 1953.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONE: It certainly does not seem wise to confirm Mr. Bohlen, whose collaboration has been responsible for the sellouts which are the cause of so many American dead lying today in their graves. Besides having had the decidedly wrong slant with the Russians as a trainee with the Truman-Acheson gang, his confirmation will be misunderstood by the Russians as an O. K. for more of the same old give-away trading.

The American people want none of this same gang. The main proving ground is right in Washington. If America is to be saved, something better than business-as-usual must possess the Senate. This war, excessive taxation, and inflation (which were tools calculated to ruin us and make us dependent and helpless) are all but indications of how far we have been sold down the river. This trend must be stopped. And I cannot see how the way to do it is by confirming men favorable to Senators LEHMAN and HUBERT HUMPHREY. I hope you will see that we must make clean sweeping. It is indeed every Senator's duty to advise the President by this means as I see it (as Senator BARKLEY has said). If Mr. Eisenhower is the man he should be and that Americans expect him to be, he will accept this advice as a godsend from the Senators. This unnecessary and unholy mess which has bereaved so many millions of American homes is not to be played along with. It is to be gotten out of, and certainly Mr. Bohlen does not merit either the honor nor has he the probable desired qualifications except to be agreeable to the Russians. I hope you will not confirm Mr. Bohlen.

Most sincerely yours,
JUDSON N. WALKER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 26, 1953.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Am concerned about Bohlen's appointment. Consider it unwarranted and unforgivable. Please do what you can to prevent it.

Mrs. G. B. SANDERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 26, 1953.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Greatly appreciate your courageous stand in opposition to Bohlen's appointment. American public certainly disillusioned at continued evidence unfriendly influences in high places. Even if you lose battle it is well worth fighting and you can be sure of heartfelt support from all real citizens.

GEORGE S. MONTGOMERY, Jr.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 26, 1953.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Am concerned about Bohlen's appointment. Consider it unwarranted and unforgivable. Please do what you can to prevent it.

Mrs. W. E. CLARK.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 26, 1953.*
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.:

Am concerned about Bohlen's appointment. Consider it unwarranted and unforgivable. Please do what you can to prevent it.

Mrs. ELIZABETH S. COWLES.

NORFOLK, CONN., *March 26, 1953.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building.

Grateful congratulations on your wise position in opposing Bohlen appointment.

Mrs. NATHALIE PALMER FABRIZIO.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the question before the Senate today is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? The duty of the Senate to advise and consent to a nomination, or to refuse its advice and consent, is a constitutional duty resting upon each and every Senator. Article II, section 2, of the Constitution, describing the powers of the President, says: "and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors."

The function of an ambassador is not defined by the Congress through a statutory definition, nor is an ambassador a statutory officer. He is a constitutional officer. In international law, our ambassador is considered to be the personal representative of the President of the United States. He is, in effect, the hand of the President, or, let us say, the President's personal representative to a foreign nation.

One of the chief questions which has come into the debate on this floor in regard to the confirmation of this particular appointment is whether, by voting to confirm Mr. Bohlen, we would be approving what he has done in the past and the role he has played in our foreign relations. Did he have anything to do with the Yalta and Teheran agreements? If he did, was his conduct then such that a Senator could vote for his confirmation at this time? In the mind of the Senator from Michigan, there is no doubt that this is a question upon which reasonable minds may differ. I take it for granted, and I realize, that each Senator in the casting of this vote is basing his vote upon an analysis of the facts, and in the light of his conscience.

This, of course, requires us, when these questions are raised, to analyze what was done at Yalta and Teheran, and what was confirmed at Potsdam. After reading and analyzing those actions, I have no great difficulty in concluding that what was done by the United States at Yalta was not, in my opinion, good either for the United States of America or for the rest of the free world. There has never been a serious question in my mind but that the action taken at Yalta violated the very fundamentals of the Atlantic Charter of August 1941, at which time this Government and Great Britain undertook "to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world," declaring that "they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

I believe that the Yalta agreement violated our previous treaty, the Nine Power Pact with China. In that pact, in 1922, we had agreed to respect the sovereignty and territorial and administrative integrity of China. The Yalta agreement violated one of the very fundamentals of this country's foreign policy by giving to a foreign power a paramount position in Manchuria. For almost half a century the possibility of the loss of these rights of China was regarded by the United States as a major threat to peace in the Far East. This was for almost half a century the major concern of American diplomacy in the Far East; and the actual loss of China's integrity was the first cause of World War II, so far as it related to the Pacific. The Yalta agreement violated this principle, and its effect was to repudiate the efforts of Hay, Knox, Hughes, Stimson, and Hull to safeguard the independence of China and to maintain peace in the Pacific. No one can dispute the fact that this principle is necessary for the maintenance of peace in the Pacific. The war in Korea, today, is sufficient evidence that the decision reached at Yalta in violation of this principle was not beneficial to America. It was the cause of the war in Korea and of the loss of China.

Now, Mr. President, let us look at the Yalta agreement. First, let us consider certain provisions of that agreement regarding the Far East. I read:

> The leaders of the three great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated, the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies.

The agreement then stated the conditions imposed upon the territory of China, who was an ally of the United States, both China and America being then at war with Japan. China was not even present or represented at Yalta. Then the agreement provided:

> The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence [of China] on advice of Marshal Stalin.

To carry out the agreement in relation to Russia's position in the Far East and China, the Yalta agreement further declared:

> The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

In other words, Mr. President, we were making an agreement with Russia which concerned the integrity and the sovereignty of one of our allies in the Far East, namely, China, to give away, in violation of the very fundamental principles for which we were fighting in the Pacific, certain territory and rights, provided that Russia came into the war.

Mr. President, in the agreement at Yalta it is stated that these concessions were conditioned upon Russia coming into the war. Ambassador Harriman stated, in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, sitting jointly, known as the MacArthur hearings, that that was a condition. However, if we examine the original memorandum which was sent from our Embassy in Moscow by Mr. Harriman to the President of the United States, it will be found that there is no condition whatever in that memorandum; but that condition was demanded by Russia before she would enter into the war. Those were the political aims of the Soviet Union, and the instrument drawn up at Yalta, in violation of the very fundamental principles of American foreign policy, enabled Russia to achieve them.

Are we talking about the long dead past? No, Mr. President; we are talking about something which has extended itself into the living present. We are talking about something that will extend itself into the future. Therefore, what we say about the Yalta agreement and other agreements is not concerned with the dead coals of the past, but something which is alive today; and unless we, the representatives of the United States Government, and the representatives of the free world condemn what was done at Yalta, the evil effects will continue in the future.

We know that mistakes in foreign policy are costly. I do not suppose there has ever been a time in history when errors in foreign policy could affect the lives of so many persons, because what we do is of worldwide consequence rather than merely of consequence to America. So we cannot condone mistakes; we must be ready to see mistakes and to face them.

Mr. President, what were the principal things done at Yalta with respect to the Far East? We were to guarantee Russia the warm-water ports of Darien and Port Arthur and domination of the Manchurian railroad. This gave Russia extraterritorial rights in Manchuria, and, in fact, control of Manchuria.

There are some persons who even now contend that this was not a secret agreement. The agreement, so far as it related to the Far East, was signed on February 11, 1945, at Yalta, with the personal signatures of the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Prime Minister of Russia. It was not made public in the United States at that time. It was made public simultaneously in London, Moscow, and Washington on February 11, 1946, 1 year later. The heads of the Chinese Government did not know of the agreement until June 1945.

It has been stated that the reason for not giving this information to the Chinese Government, which was so vitally affected, was that we were at war, but we gave it to them in June when we were still at war and when Russia was not yet a party to the war. I have never considered that there was any valid reason why China should not have been notified immediately.

We made certain agreements with the Chinese at Cairo in November of 1943, when Russia was not present, but those agreements concerned not Russia, but the enemy of both China and the United States of America.

There is no doubt that we have violated agreements we had made with Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo. There are those who would argue that what we did at Yalta, as far as China was concerned, was affirmed and agreed to by the Nationalist Government of China in a treaty with the Soviet Union.

An examination of the record of the hearings in this particular matter will disclose editorials indicating that it was a great thing for Russia and China to make the treaty which was made in 1945, indicating that China had freely agreed to carry out the terms of the Yalta agreement, and that what was done by the United States of America was of no concern, because China later agreed voluntarily to carry out each and every one of the terms, in the treaty with the U. S. S. R.

It must be remembered that the Yalta agreement was not disclosed to the Chinese Government until June 1945, although the Cairo Conference was in November 1943, and the Yalta agreement was made in February 1945.

Mr. President, let us look at the facts as to why there was a treaty. Let us look at the facts as to how China was forced to make a treaty. I want to read the agreement, because in it we agreed with China that she would not lose her rights so far as Manchuria and certain other places were concerned.

The Cairo Conference reached an agreement as follows:

The three great allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion. It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed. The aforesaid three great powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent.

Let us look at the record, and at the statements of Walter S. Robertson, of Virginia, who was an economic adviser to the State Department from May of 1943 until 1946, and who was sent to China as the counselor of economic affairs with the rank of Minister.

I asked him this question:

You think, then, that we agreed, that is, America agreed, at Yalta, so far as the Far East was concerned, and Manchuria, to give certain rights to China which she was entitled to under the Cairo agreement? You believe that at Yalta we agreed to give Russia, and insisted upon her having certain rights in Manchuria which violated—

Mr. Robertson's reply was—

which violated our pledge at Cairo.

I asked him if he cared to name those rights, and he replied:

Well, I think that we violated it in two ways as far as China was concerned, and one terrific way so far as we were concerned. The Dairen and Port Arthur, and that is the only open port, and the railroads, the communications of the country were given to Russia. They were given to them under an agreement where you had a joint operation, but it was always a Russian overtopper for the Chinese, so we gave Russia the grip on the communications in that country which, in effect was, in my opinion, complete control of it, and it proved exactly that way. China never had any sovereignty over Manchuria, after the Russians swept in there, of any kind or description. The Russians would not even let China use Dairen and the Chinese railroads to transport troops to take over after the surrender from the Japanese under the Potsdam Declaration. There was never 1 second from the time that the Russians moved into Manchuria where the Chinese had the slightest ability to carry out their rights; so, coming back we reimposed extra extraterritoriality upon Manchuria, transferred it from the Japanese to the Russians. The Russians had originally gotten it from the Chinese, and all of it at one time belonged to China. The Japanese were there. It was their base of expansion, and we thought that expansion there was a threat to our interests, an infringement upon the sovereignty of China, and as they expanded we protested all the time, so we, from the standpoint of the Chinese, in effect, reimposed extraterritoriality which violated the treaty with China, in January 1943, renouncing it. That is No. 1.

I think he meant November 1943.

No. 2, I think, from the other standpoint that the Chinese thought in any event that we had pledged the return to Manchuria by them at the end of the war, and they thought it was an open violation of the solemn agreement made there.

In connection with the treaty between China and Russia, I asked Mr. Robertson this question:

How do you account for the fact that China finally made the treaty with Russia?

He replied:

We forced her.

I asked him:

You figure that we did force her?

His reply was:

They first said they would not send emissaries. We were putting tremendous pressure on China to send these emissaries there, and when they got there all of the details of this agreement had been spelled out for them. Well, now, China was in the position of she had nowhere else to turn. She was in a desperate condition. All of her industries were destroyed, her commerce was destroyed, her transportation was destroyed, her agricultural land had had three armies living off them for 8 years, and she was rent by the civil war, and it was nowhere that China had any chance of getting help except from us.

Meaning from the United States of America.

I then asked:

Then this Government—

Meaning the United States Government—

did put pressure on China to have the Yalta agreement carried out?

Mr. Robertson replied:

Yes, indeed, we did; yes, indeed, we did.

It is claimed that China voluntarily confirmed Yalta in the treaty with the U. S. S. R.—but now we learn that the United States Government forced China into that treaty. It is also enlightening to have Mr. Robertson's testimony in regard to what happened when the news got to China of this Yalta agreement between the United States and Russia. The testimony is as follows:

Senator KNOWLAND. Was it indicated subsequent to that time that the President of the Republic of China himself had been shocked when he got the news?

Remember, it was not until June 1945 that it was learned that this agreement was made secretly in February 1945.

Mr. ROBERTSON. My knowledge of that situation was given to me by the Ambassador himself. He said he hit the ceiling.

Meaning that the Generalissimo of China hit the ceiling. During these hearings Mr. Robertson testified:

In 1943 we signed the solemn treaty with China renouncing extraterritoriality.

In the summer of that same year we ipso facto made China one of the five great powers of the world, with full responsibility for carrying on the war and organizing the peace, and we gave China a seat on the Security Council equal to our own, and then in Cairo, in December of that year, we specifically pledged to Chiang Kai-shek to return Manchuria, by name, to China at the end of the war.

Well, now, that was when we needed China desperately.

Then, 14 months later at Yalta, in February 1945, when it was thought necessary to bring, by some, Russia into the war which was proceeding.

Now, we granted that despite the fact that we were fighting the war ourselves, because we thought that the Japanese there were a threat to us, despite the fact that we had renounced by solemn treaty extraterritoriality, despite the fact that we had specifically pledged to Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo in December 1943, the return of Manchuria to China, and we granted that without the knowledge or the consent of China—the Chinese Government knew nothing about it whatsoever—and we were pledged there to carry out those terms unconditionally, so that with or without Chinese consent that was a deal.

Mr. President, that was a witness who was present in China, who had knowledge before the fact, and who has within the last week given before the Committee on Foreign Relations the testimony to which I have referred. So we have one person who is speaking from personal knowledge of what the Yalta agreement meant, and the effect it has had upon the world.

Mr. Robertson continued as follows:

T. V. Soong and another Chinese whose name I cannot remember went; he stayed some 2 weeks, if I remember correctly, and he returned to Chungking, and he said he would not sign that treaty, that no Chinese could sign it, and ever look another one in the face, and he finally as prime minister to keep from signing the treaty; he did not go back to Moscow.

Wang Shih-Chieh, who was the foreign minister, was sent in his place, and he signed the treaty, and every term of that treaty, according to our best information, had been worked out at Yalta without any consultation whatsoever with the Chinese, and so.

That witness was confirmed by the Senate today as an Assistant Secretary of State.

Let us look at only one European aspect of the Yalta agreement. Mr. Bohlen was an interpreter and adviser at Yalta. He was Under Secretary of State. What did we do to Poland at Yalta when the Polish Government was not present but in London directing its forces who were

fighting in the air and on land as our allies? We established a new government in Poland. We consented to the elimination of the Polish Government in exile in London. The brave sons of Poland were going forth to help America and her allies. We consented to the establishment of a new government in Poland. We consented to the elimination of the Polish Government in exile in London.

There was a conversation between Mr. Hopkins and Stalin when Mr. Bohlen was present.

While we were doing business with the bona fide Polish Government in exile in London, we were selling them down the river to a Soviet puppet government, the Lublin committee. I shall show, from Mr. Sherwood's book, what we did about putting any of those who were in the London government in the Lublin government, which was the committee which Russia wanted to dominate all of Poland. Mr. Bohlen was present at this conversation as related by Mr. Sherwood.

I quote Harry Hopkins as related in the Sherwood book:

> Mr. Hopkins replied that, as far as the United States Government was concerned, we had no interest in seeing anyone connected with the present Polish Government in London involved in the new provisional government of Poland, and he did not personally believe that the British had any such idea.

In other words, we found that in Mr. Bohlen's presence Mr. Hopkins was saying, with respect to the government of one of our allies in exile in London, "We will go along with the Soviets and create a new puppet government to take over the Polish people."

The same idea is repeated in the book on page 910. I had better read the paragraph:

> His [Stalin's] reply to that was that he would take into consideration Russia's opinion, as well as America's opinion, and that it was the Russian forces that had liberated Poland, and said if they did not gain the victory in Poland with such a great loss of Russian life, nobody would be talking about a new Poland. He said several times that he blamed the British for conniving with the London Poles.

Let us look at another aspect of the Yalta agreement. As I have said, if this agreement were not still a living thing, presented to us today and extending into our future, there would be little use of discussing it here. But I believe that it is something that is alive today—something which penetrates the lives of all Americans and of all the free peoples of the world. It greatly concerns those who have been forced behind the Iron Curtain.

What did we do about the territory beyond the Curzon line, in violation of the Atlantic Charter? The United Nations and Russia, as parties to the Atlantic Charter, agreed to everything in the charter.

We established the Curzon line as the Polish east boundary, and this certainly violated the Atlantic Charter. We agreed to free elections in Poland and the other satellite countries. Will anyone now contend, who has any knowledge of communism, that Russia would be a party to a free election? It does not take an expert on the Soviet Union to know that a free election to the Soviet Union is not a free election as we in this country would understand it. We agreed with Russia to give her Poland as a friendly nation. Is a "friendly nation" to Russia such as we in this country understand a friendly nation to be?

Could anyone who claimed to be an expert, who claimed to understand communism or the U. S. S. R., believe that when the Soviet Union was talking about a free election, and using the term "friendly nation," it meant the same thing as we understand by the term "free election," and the term "friendly nation?"

Russia now considers the slave puppet government on her border in Poland, as well as the other satellites, friendly nations. However, we know that while they must be friendly to Russia, so far as the people are concerned they are desirous of becoming free, as we understand the word. They want free elections, as we understand the term, but they are not permitted to have them.

Let us look at the statement of Ambassador Harriman, to see what he was thinking at almost the same time. He was our Ambassador and he was present, as Mr. Bohlen says, when the secret agreements at Yalta were entered into.

Let us look at what the late James Forrestal, former Secretary of Defense, had to say in his diary just a few months after the Yalta agreement. He said:

> I had a meeting in my office this morning with Ambassador Harriman, Admiral Edwards (Vice Adm. Richard S. Edwards, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations), Vice Admiral Cooke (Charles M. Cooke, Jr., Chief of Staff to Admiral King). Mr. Harriman said he thought it was time to come to a conclusion about the necessity for the early entrance of Russia into the Japanese war. He said he was satisfied they were determined to come in it because of their requirements in the Far East. (He described the territorial concessions made at Yalta.) He said the Russians, he believed, much more greatly feared a separate peace by ourselves with Japan than any fear of ourselves about their concluding such an arrangement. He said he thought it was important that we determine our policy as to a strong or weak China, that if China continued weak Russian influence would move in quickly and toward ultimate domination. He said that there would be no illusion about anything such as a "free China" once the Russians got in, that the two or three hundred millions in that country would march when the Kremlin ordered.

That was in May of 1945, a few months after February 1945, when we made the agreement at Yalta giving Russia the very domination which was then being discussed. The same situation was true with respect to Poland and all the other satellites. They were taken over; and once Russia got the upper hand, there was no more freedom.

This same thing would and did apply to the so-called friendly Poland under the domination of Russia.

The man whose name is now under consideration for confirmation says that we did not change conditions at Yalta. But is it not true that we did permit by our agreements, and without protest, the changes made in the countries surrounding Russia, including Poland, Czechoslovakia, and, in fact, China, and the other satellites?

He says it would have come out the same way. Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference in morality, so far as a moral question is concerned, in agreeing to something immoral to be done and not protesting its being done. Here was an agreement.

Mr. Harriman was Ambassador to Russia at this time. Mr. Bohlen was an expert on Russia. They were the only two other Americans present when the far-eastern agreement was made in relation to China.

I have never agreed that the record shows Russia ever demanded as a condition for entrance into the war against Japan the concessions which were made to her. The original telegram from Mr. Harriman, as Ambassador to Russia, to the President in December 1944, at the most, sets out the concessions as the political aims of Russia in the Far East and not as a condition precedent to their joining the war against Japan.

The record in this case shows that Mr. Bohlen was connected with these fundamental errors of judgment. He professes to be an expert on communism, but says he was at most an adviser. We cannot afford errors of judgment on our foreign policy. That is why the people have placed Dwight Eisenhower in office as President and why the Senate has confirmed John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. Errors in foreign policy today cost American lives and lives of our allies, and a tax burden that the American public will be unable to carry, and burdens which other free people will be unable to carry.

This is the background against which we must consider the Bohlen nomination. We must determine whether he played a major role or a significant part in these and other decisions which have caused so much suffering and tyranny in the world, the cost of which cannot yet be determined.

The question boils down to whether he was merely an interpreter or whether he was an adviser who contributed to the making of these infamous agreements. Mr. Bohlen justifies these agreements, and defends them, on the grounds of military expediency and says he was just carrying out orders.

In the light of these facts, Mr. Joseph C. Grew, a Foreign Service officer for many years, but now retired, says:

> No matter what phases his thinking may have passed through in light of other circumstances and other conditions in times past, there is no shadow of doubt in my mind that he is the right man and the best man for the job just now.

Mr. President, I realize that we have in this country a Foreign Service which, in effect, takes the place of civil service in our international activities abroad. We have set up in relation to our foreign activities, a continuing Government service whose duty is to help advise and help the President of the United States in conducting his foreign relations without regard to party. However, there is always involved the question of ability to carry out the policy as made by the President, or those who make it on the

advice of the President. I think it is a good thing to have a Foreign Service and career diplomats. I think it is well worth while. But, certainly we do not want to perpetuate errors of the past. Only those who can properly represent the administration in power and can help to carry out its policies should be continued in office. I believe that the actions of every man and woman are based on his past. That is life itself. The question is, Is Mr. Bohlen so fixed in the errors of the past that he cannot represent the President of the United States as his personal representative in Russia?

As I said, Joseph C. Grew, who was a Foreign Service officer for many years and an able and distinguished Ambassador, believes when he writes me to the effect that regardless of other circumstances and other conditions of the past there is no shadow of doubt in his mind that Mr. Bohlen is the right man for the job at this time.

This particular post as Ambassador to Soviet Russia is not a policy position, we have been told; that it is at most a mirror for the President of the United States. The question we must all decide is whether or not the images reflected by Mr. Bohlen in this mirror for the President of the United States will be true and accurate, or whether they will be tarnished and changed by previous opinions and vested interests in errors of the past.

I think that if they related to what took place at Yalta, if they related to what took place at Teheran—yes, if they related to what took place in the mission to China to consolidate the Communist and Nationalist Governments of China, and the consequent loss of China, we might expect that one could draw the reasonable inference that the mirror would reflect former thinking.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if I am mistaken I hope the Senator from Michigan will correct me. However, my understanding is that either before the Committee on Foreign Relations or before another committee, Mr. Bohlen has within the past 3 days approved of the Yalta agreement. Am I correct in that statement? Does the Senator have such information?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have some information on the subject. I do not think I can answer the Senator's question categorically from the record.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I formed a very definite opinion of Mr. Bohlen's position. It was to the effect that he felt that from hindsight the Yalta agreement was a mistake; that in two important respects it was a mistake. However, he defended the good faith and the actions of those who made the agreement. I believe that was the substance of his testimony. He thought from the information they had at that time the judgment of those who made the agreement was correct. He felt that in the light of subsequent developments it was a mistake. However, he felt that they could not be blamed for it. I do not agree with him, but that was his position.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is what I understand it to be from the record. I do not agree with Mr. Bohlen either.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. My understanding was that he said in substance that it was the best that could be done at the time.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is an accurate statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding. I did not hear him make it, but I understood that that was his statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Which, to my way of thinking, is by Mr. Bohlen a reaffirmation of his position at the time the Yalta agreement was brought about. One may sugar-coat it if he wants to do so, and say that now he has reformed and that now he is penitent, but it does not sound like that to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, Mr. President. My purpose in spending so much time on these agreements, in pointing out why I think they were so evil, was not to attempt in any way to sugar-coat or take away the responsibility of Mr. Bohlen insofar as the agreements are concerned. As I have just said, if he were to interpret or to act as a mirror, if he were to send back to the President of the United States reflections which would be looked upon as interpretations of the agreements, I would not trust the mirror, for I would think it would be so faulty that it could not be used.

But today I do not see that the present post of our Ambassador to Moscow is such that he could do anything except carry out the policy which he was instructed to carry out. In this connection I think it is only fair to quote Mr. Bohlen himself, for at the hearing I questioned him along this particular line. Of course, Mr. President, one way to know what a man believes is to ask him about it and allow him to answer, and, during the time he is answering, to watch his demeanor.

So, Mr. President, I wish to state that when Mr. Bohlen appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, I questioned him; and I now state his answers:

Mr. BOHLEN. I consider the role of the Ambassador as one to carry out the instructions he receives. No Ambassador has a policy-making decision. I would have the right of recommendation and suggestion but no power of decision.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you feel that in view of what has happened in the past, as a policymaker or as an adviser, your opinion would not be colored on the question of a new policy?

Mr. BOHLEN. I do not think so, no; because I conceive, as I did then, that the function of a professional Foreign Service officer, or an Ambassador for that matter, is that of an executor of policy.

He does not determine policy. Policy is determined by the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, and the people legally established to be his advisers—for instance, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and their military advisers. I doubt that any two persons would have to have total 100 percent agreement with every policy, and I do not think people are made that way. I was not 100 percent in agreement with many of the things I saw during the war, but I know this much, that my duty and my oath of office made it perfectly plain that I carry out the policies laid down by the constituted authorities of the United States.

If I disagree so deeply with them, I always have the prospect of resignation.

Mr. President, in my opinion, there are too few Government officials who resign when they are of the opinion that they cannot agree in principle to the policies they are asked to carry out. The difficulty is that sometimes such officials look upon the posts they hold as mere jobs, and not as public service and public trusts. If they regard them as public service for the good of the entire United States, there will be more resignations from policy-executing positions, when those who hold such positions cannot agree with the policies they are asked to execute.

I shall quote further from the testimony given by Mr. Bohlen before the Foreign Relations Committee. I then said to him:

Senator FERGUSON. You have the right to resign.

Mr. BOHLEN. The right to resign, but I do not anticipate anything of that nature.

The function of an Ambassador is, first of all, to report to his Government the situation in the country as he sees it, based on the information he obtains; the second one is to carry out the instructions that he receives from the Secretary of State.

Senator FERGUSON. Do you not think, then, that he would have any vested interest in error that would influence his judgment?

Mr. BOHLEN. No, sir.

Mr. President, the President of the United States believes that, notwithstanding Mr. Bohlen's connections with former administrations' errors in foreign policy, he can act as an Ambassador to the U. S. S. R. and as the President's personal representative, to perform such functions as the President desires him to perform—not in carrying out the functions of a statutory official, but in carrying out the functions of a constitutional official.

Congress has conferred no duties upon an Ambassador. He performs the duties the President wishes him to perform in connection with the President's foreign policy.

Therefore, I have come to the conclusion that I should vote to allow the President of the United States, in this particular case, and under the particular circumstances, to name Charles E. Bohlen as his personal representative. I will, therefore, vote in favor of confirmation of this nomination.

But I do not consider that my vote in favor of confirmation of this nomination will in any way approve or condone the nominee's actions, or the actions of our Government, at Yalta or the other wartime conferences. I still vigorously condemn these mistakes for their serious effect upon our lives today and into tomorrow. Only by seeing these mistakes clearly can we move to correct and lessen their effect on civilization.

Mr. President, I believe the desire of the President of the United States is to have a new, firm, consistent foreign policy, and I believe he will attempt to carry it out in that way. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, the President may have this man to help carry out the policy in the case of this particular mission, that of our Ambassador to Russia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, after listening to my genial and distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], who addressed the Senate a short time ago, I am reminded of olden days, when I lived in a little town in Illinois, and when, along with a subscription to the local newspaper, one received a lovely chromo, or chromolithograph, and for 98 cents additional received a gold frame for it. For many years that humble piece of art hung in our kitchen, and I suppose it was the first piece of art with which I became acquainted. It showed a little group in the Colosseum in Rome, with a man with a white beard and dressed in a white tunic in the center. Each one in the group was supplicating Heaven just before the lions came out and enriched the spectacle. The title was "The Last Christian Martyrs."

I later discovered that the picture also had a Latin title, which, if I recall correctly, was "Morituri Salutamis," which is translated as "We who are about to die salute you." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, this will not be the first time, or the last time, either, when—as the result of a vote—I shall "die" on the floor of the Senate—and, of course, I may state that during my service in the House of Representatives I had similar experiences.

So, although I extend my personal sympathy and commiseration to the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I wish to tell him not to feel discouraged or gloomy today.

It runs in my mind that long ago Jacob said to the Lord, "O Lord, let me not die without suffering or illness."

Mr. President, how are we to go through this adventure of service in the United States Senate without a little agony now and then, whether it be political or otherwise? [Laughter.] There has to be something to act as savor and leaven for this great adventure. So I do not approach it from the standpoint of feeling badly about it, ethereally speaking.

My good friend the Senator from Texas raised a question about hilarity. Mr. President, I know of no hilarity in my soul; today I am neither happy nor unhappy about the approaching vote on the nomination of Mr. Charles Bohlen. It is a matter of duty. I believe that the one who most properly and most correctly discharges his duty in that connection is our great majority leader, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. We have never seen BOB TAFT interpret his duty in terms of whether he is happy or unhappy about it. He knows what his duty is, and he does it; and that is all that is necessary.

So I am going to perform my duty, and it will be a long time from now before I will even have opportunity to probe my soul and my spirit to find out whether I was happy or unhappy about it. It is merely a duty, and I want to do it; and I want to approach it as simply as I know how. Let me say to "BOB" TAFT, if I can be familiar for a moment, that his brother Charlie some years ago made a speech to the Federation of Women's Clubs. I read it in the RECORD, and for a time one line of it made me furious. The first line in Charlie's speech was, "Nothing will ever be simple again." That really infuriated me, because I thought, surely, there is a way of reducing this or any other problem to a very simple common denominator. But I am not insensible of the fact that this rather big, bewildering, sprawling, labyrinthian Government of ours, with its multitude of functions, is not quite so simple. So I try to reduce it to simplicity as best I know how.

First, let me put aside what I think are the general considerations. I have a great affection for the President of the United States. I did my level utmost in Chicago to prevent his nomination—and I would do it all over again. I do not apologize to anybody for it. But I think he is a great character. He has a sense of sportsmanship and a quality of fairness, and I believe the President of the United States would be ashamed of a Senator if he had a conviction and did not stand up to express it. I cannot imagine a great President having any other attitude than that.

I have affection for John Foster Dulles, our Secretary of State. He is a great spiritual character, he is a great churchman in his own right, and he is a fine international lawyer. I learned to know him years ago, and my affection for him has increased with the lapse of years. But if I disagree with him, I think the Secretary of State would think unkindly of me, indeed, might consider it moral cowardice on my part, if I failed to utter my conviction and failed to express my responsibility as a Member of the Congress and of the Senate.

I am going to approach my vote on the pending nomination in just that simple fashion, and as I do so, let me remind my colleagues that once this nomination is confirmed, we will never get it back, it will not be recalled. When the heat was on Dean Acheson and the voices of the people of America were raised to crescendo to have him impeached, I thought, I wonder if the nomination can be brought back. Can it be reviewed after it has left this body? The Supreme Court said, "No." There are cases on that point. So this is a solemn business, Mr. President. We will never get it back, once it is done. If it is a mistake, we will have to live with it. And so it ill becomes us, of course, to be anything but sporting and fair and we must be entirely without venality and malice and willfulness.

It did not make me feel very happy to have a Member of this body quoted in the press recently to the effect that there were a few willful Members in the Senate. I had made up my mind on the question at that time, but I resent being called willful. I do not care who uses that language, whether it is a Member of the Senate or anybody else. I have reached an age of discretion. I have reached—God willing—an age of restraint, and so I hope we will not demean each other at a moment when we have a solemn responsibility by saying that some Member of the Senate is willful, or that some group is willful.

Mr. President, there was a President who, a good many years ago, referred to a group in the Senate as "willful and irreconcilable." Perhaps they were: But they went over the country and carried the gospel and made that President eat his words before he got through. We cannot afford to have that kind of attitude in the Senate. Senators have fought other nominations, in other days. A few nights ago I was much interested when I read what Henry Clay said on the floor of the Senate about the nomination of Martin Van Buren to be Ambassador of the United States to Great Britain. There were a number of reasons why Clay opposed him, but the one that really entranced me was, as he said on this floor, that Martin Van Buren had espoused a political philosophy which called for the dismissal of people from the public service because of their politics. It was at that time that William L. Marcy, the Senator from New York, took the floor and coined the expression, "To the victor belong the spoils of the enemy." That was the first time it was uttered in the Senate, in 1832.

Other nominations, I assume, will be opposed; this will be neither the first one nor the last one.

An important consideration is, how much good will, how much confidence, will go with Mr. Bohlen if he becomes our emissary to Moscow? We know how the people feel about the Yalta agreement and that enters into the question of confidence. We cannot get away from it.

First of all, Mr. President, we made a recital in our platform of 1952. I am one of those who believe that a platform is a covenant with the people. That is a borrowed phrase. It came from the Democratic platform of 1932. In their platform, I may admonish Senators on the other side, it was said, "a party platform is a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept." The only trouble is that, 30 days afterward, the Democratic Party threw it out the window, and it has not been discovered from that day to this. But nonetheless a platform is a covenant to be kept with the people. And, in the covenant, in 1952, we said:

> The Government of the United States, under Republican leadership, will repudiate all commitments contained in secret understandings, such as those at Yalta, which aid Communist enslavements.

I campaigned on that platform, as did the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], whose fighting qualities and militant attributes I like. Herman, I love you. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] also campaigned on that platform. I was in 25 of the States in 1952, and I campaigned at that time with most of the Senators who are now present. And what a great and enriching privilege it really was.

I have approved and voted for all the President's nominations to his Cabinet, and I do not lightly, of course, oppose the pending nomination. My attitude toward the nomination is a matter of conviction with me. And it is impersonal. I know "Chip" Bohlen. He is a very charming and affable person. I know Mrs. Bohlen. We first met in Philadelphia a good many years ago in the course of a so-called seminar, when there was a national radio hookup. He was there, I was there, Clare Luce was there, Harold Stassen was there. We fairly made the welkin ring that night,

and I think we solved every domestic and international problem under the canopy of heaven. We had a grand visit, and I was fairly entranced when I heard Mr. Bohlen mesh a whole string of unrelated consonants into something that must have been intelligible in the Russian language. It cannot be denied that he is a great linguist; he is charming, he is personable, and I am confident that he is able. But there is something more than that that challenges our attention. We have to think of him as associated with an incident in our time and generation, and on that ground I intend to vote against the confirmation of his nomination.

Most of the attention has been given to what he will do when he gets over on the other side. I am more interested in the amount of American confidence that goes with him when he leaves for Moscow. The first line of defense in this country is not on the Rhine, it is not on the Yangtze, it is not in Indochina or Korea: the first line is here in America. It lies in our productive strength. It lies in the emotional and moral and spiritual harmony of the American people; and when that goes, then it would not make any difference if we sent St. Peter to Moscow, our line would be lacking in a very important element. So, what about the American people?

The Yalta agreement was one of the things we talked about in the campaign. I do not want to go back on what we said in our platform, and I will not go back on it. We said we would repudiate that agreement. We mentioned it specifically. There is no guesswork about it, there is no equivocation about the language. I accept it as a part of the political platform of my party, and so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to go back on it, because if it is repudiated, then we lose a great and vital and potential force. Do not be concerned about November 1954, my brethren. The issues will probably be altogether different by that time. But the one thing we have got to do is to hew to the line of moral conviction, we must never let it go out to the American people that we solemnly said one thing and that we so quickly threw it overboard, because that would be our undoing.

So we repudiated Yalta. We should have repudiated it, and should stand by that commitment for reasons best described by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Last week, Mr. President, we celebrated the 100th anniversary of the signing of the treaty with Riga. Everyone concurred in that treaty. But we asked no Pole to attend the Yalta Conference. There Poland was simply carved up and eviscerated, without a single Pole being present. I disavow it. I want no part of that kind of morality. I think the least a person can do is to repudiate, reject, and disavow anything like that. It took 2 years and 1 month for the State Department to get its message out in mimeographed form and signed, to show what had happened at Yalta. There we solemnly agreed to carve up Poland and take one-third of the Polish population and hand them over to the Soviet Union, into the brutal and bloody bosom of Stalin. That is where they are today, along with other Polish people. We have to repudiate that agreement.

I want to say to my friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that I think he has rendered great service in laboring with the documentation of that record. I think it was necessary, and it was a very constructive public service.

If Senators will read the Rape of Poland, they will find on page 96 the deal was made in the presence of Averell Harriman and Molotov. Churchill said the deal was made at Cairo, and was ratified at Yalta. We cannot escape the record.

When it comes to China, there were no Chinese at Yalta. It became our bitter responsibility to tell them afterward. We agreed formally in writing to inform them and get their concurrence.

As we read the protocol, what do we find? We find one little sentence, the language of which we used in a number of specifications in that protocol. Here it is:

> The preeminent interest of the Soviet Union in this port will be safeguarded.

That is what Hopkins, Harriman, and Stettinius agreed to; that is what Hiss agreed to, and "Chip" Bohlen was there. Do not forget it—Russia's preeminent interest in Port Arthur, Dairen, the China and Eastern Railroad, and the Manchurian Railroad shall be safeguarded.

We finally closed the door which John Hay and William McKinley opened 55 years ago. We closed it, and, furthermore, we agreed to keep it closed. There is the solemn language, in all its naked brutality, to haunt us.

There is no need of further laboring Yalta. It has been treated eloquently on this floor, and I see no reason why I should further labor it. But I come to the crux of it now. If we are going to disavow Yalta, how can we accept the architect? If the architecture must be rejected, how can we accept the architect? If we reject the structure, how can we accept the builder? If we reject the stone, how can we accept the man who hewed and fashioned the stone?

The Senator from Michigan said, and I hope I quote him correctly, that this is not a post with policy power. I am amazed that an ambassador and minister plenipotentiary does not have some policy power. On the executive calendar we see the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

If he has no policy power, we can send anyone there. If he has no policy power, maybe a clerk or a good administrator would do.

But that is not the crux of the matter, in my judgment. The Senator from Michigan said Mr. Bohlen will play no major role. That, in my judgment, is inconsequential. The dimension or the degree of his responsibility at Yalta is of no moment, although the record indicates that he was not only an interpreter, but was also an adviser. What is of importance to me—and this is the reason why I shall vote against confirmation—is that he has been associated with one of the greatest disasters in American diplomatic history. He has been associated with one of the greatest diplomatic failures in the history of the world. He has had emotional association with it and intellectual identity with it. He was there. How much he was there is not of any moment. He was there and was a part of it. If we are going to repudiate Yalta, then we should repudiate every one of the Yalta men.

Mr. President, would we vote for Harry Hopkins if his nomination were before us? Would we vote for Harriman? Would we vote for Hiss? Not I.

I do not put "Chip" Bohlen in that class, Mr. President. I like him. I think he is a man of character. But he was there; he had an association with the conference. How can we repudiate Yalta in one breath and say in the next breath that he has been cleansed and that, psychologically, it is of no moment? It is a psychological value with which we are dealing today. Do not forget that the mistakes of the past are the traps of the future. Once we have made a blunder and followed through, we have to defend it. That has been the logic of the State Department. Go back and read the white paper on China, containing 1,100 pages. It is very edifying. It is the greatest apologia in American history. When the Yalta mistake was made, the State Department had to defend it; they had to go through with it. There was no going back. What will Mr. Bohlen do in Moscow when this matter comes up? Will he do an about-face? Certainly not, if he is true to what he thinks are the key human instincts which we all have. The defense of Yalta becomes a trap into which we shall fall in the days ahead. We have got to divest ourselves of it.

Whether "Chip" Bohlen served under Franklin Roosevelt or Harry Truman is of no moment. I think he began his career under President Hoover. But that is not a matter that should have any consideration, because Bohlen is a career diplomat. Whether he disavowed Yalta or not is of no great moment. I am thinking of the psychological impact of this nomination upon the thinking of the American people in an hour of distress and anxiety.

I do not like to have my people at home read the newspapers and say, "Well, I see that our Senator voted to confirm the nomination of a man who was associated with Yalta, actively and otherwise. Are they not going to do what they promised to do prior to November? Are they not going to give us a little new life, new vitality, and new viewpoint?"

"Chip" Bohlen was at Yalta. If he were my brother, I would take the same attitude I am expressing in the Senate this afternoon. He was associated with the failure.

Mr. President, in the language of Missouri, the tail has to go with the hide. I reject Yalta, so I reject Yalta men. If I see "Chip" Bohlen around, I am sure there will be no change or alteration in the personal esteem and sentiment I cherish for him. But he was associated with something that was characterized by William C. Bullitt, a former Ambassador to Russia, as one of the most unnecessary, disgraceful, and potentially

disastrous documents ever to be signed by a President of the United States. That was what "Bill" Bullitt said with respect to the Yalta protocol.

"Chip" Bohlen, good fellow that he is, was at Yalta. That is unfortunate, but we are thinking of the people and of the impact of his nomination upon the folks back home.

Do not forget that while the people of the Nation were voting into office a Republican President, a Republican Senate, and a Republican House, they were voting out of office an administration, and all that went with it, that had somehow left them faint and weary in their convictions. They wanted to have clear thinking. Here was a chance to cleanse the temple.

I am sorry I have become hortatory about this matter. I am speaking, I hope, mainly for myself, because it is the business of each Senator how he votes. I am merely stating the simple premises by which I have come to my conclusion.

I may say to my good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], "be not weary in well doing," because in my opinion we have a good function to perform. Besides, what kind of Senate would this be, what kind of country would this be, if there were no dissonance of spirit? There is one place where there is no dissonance, and that is Russia. God forbid that the Senate of the United States should reach the stage where we would all think through the same medium, through the same funnel, as it were, and all come up with the same conclusion. That would not be worthy of America. Let conscience and conviction have free play. Let heart and mind speak. While we are thinking about the man who goes as our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, let us think also of how much of the confidence of the American people will go with him. I should have preferred that someone else had been nominated.

So, while I reaffirm my affection for the President and my support of him and of Secretary Dulles, I cannot go along, and I will not go along with this nomination. I must let my convictions speak.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, it seems to me there is one point that could be appropriately added at this time to the discussion in regard to the confirmation of Mr. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia. I believe this point needs to be made clear, and I should like to discuss it briefly, based on my experience of a little more than 1 year as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece in 1947 and 1948.

I feel that the people of the United States should know that we are not today being asked to confirm the nomination of a man who will formulate our Russian policy. Ambassadors to foreign countries are in large part reporters of what they see, hear, and feel in their particular outposts. By force of circumstance, our international policies must be made in Washington, and in the hectic world in which we live today, those policies must be made by the President of the United States. He requires help. He requires advice, and he needs intelligent reports from the different embassies scattered all over the globe.

The development of international policy involves proper consideration of our military strength, our economic strength, and the international political situation.

An Ambassador can be useful, but he cannot formulate international policies. Anyone who feels that an Ambassador can do this does not understand the operations of the State Department, and certainly he does not understand the character and mentality of Mr. Dulles or the outstanding ability of President Eisenhower.

I did not fully understand this situation when I arrived in Greece in the summer of 1947. I had been accustomed to making decisions, and I expected in Greece to make more decisions than I actually did. When I began to see the full picture of what we were attempting in Greece, I saw that the decisions to be made depended greatly upon what was happening in Yugoslavia, in Turkey, and throughout the whole Middle East; but they also depended upon what was occurring in Germany and in China. Necessarily, the major decisions needed to be made by our Government in Washington.

By the traditions of the State Department, Ambassadors report to Washington and ask for instructions. I believe this tradition has been carried too far and that Ambassadors are not being given enough authority. I am hoping that Mr. Dulles will change this situation.

I remember well an early initiation which I received. A so-called political crisis occurred in Greece and the then Ambassador to that country and I, as head of the Military and Economic Aid Mission, held a conference to decide what our attitude should be. We were in full agreement and reached a decision. I rose and started to leave the room, making the remark that I would visit with a few men whom I knew quite well. But the Ambassador amazed me by saying that he would report our conversation to the State Department and ask for advice. I thought we had reached a decision and were ready for action, but I found that that is not the way the State Department operates.

In major matters, however, it is absolutely necessary that the decisions be made here in Washington.

Again referring to my experience in Greece, in the early days of my mission the military people in my group were equipping and assisting in training the Greek army. In the early fall of that year, I recommended that they be given additional authority so that they could also advise the Greek army in the field of operations. This was a major change in the foreign policy of the United States Government, and, very properly, the State Department, to whom I sent this advice, took it up at the highest level with the Chiefs of Staff and with the President, and it was only after a serious investigation and approval by the National Security Council that the plan was approved. A decision of that type was a considerable change in our policies and required the approval of the highest authorities in our Government. No Ambassador and no chief of any mission should on his own authority make changes of that type.

Based on my experience, I can assure the Members of the Senate and the people of the United States that if Mr. Bohlen is confirmed as Ambassador, he will not be formulating our policies in connection with Russia.

In the Senate of the United States there are many men who will have much more to do with our Russian foreign policy than Mr. Bohlen can possibly have. Our distinguished majority leader, the able leader of the minority in this body, the chairman and the senior members of the Foreign Relations Committee, of the Appropriations Committee, of the Armed Services Committee, all of these men will have much to do with it by their official actions and by their advice; they will have much more to do with formulating our Russian policies than can possibly be done by any Ambassador residing in Moscow.

We are fortunate to have as President of the United States a man who fully understands the international situation. He will need the advice of his extremely able Secretary of State; and those of us who have visited with Mr. Dulles are constantly amazed by his great knowledge, by his grasp of the details of the different international treaties, and by his vision and imagination in international matters.

In formulating our policy with Russia the President will undoubtedly require the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff. He will undoubtedly consult with our Under Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, who has both a knowledge of our military strength and an extensive knowledge of Russia based on his experience as Ambassador to that country. The President of the United States will also need a full knowledge of our economic strength, which certainly he can get from other members of his Cabinet. He will, of course, need reports from an intelligent Ambassador in Moscow; but I say again that the policies will be established by one man and one man only, the President of the United States.

The new administration has sent a new and able Ambassador to Great Britain in the person of Mr. Aldrich. But actually the same situation prevails there. Our policies with respect to Great Britain will not be established by Mr. Aldrich; and I believe that fact is well proved by the recent visit to this country of Mr. Eden and Mr. Butler, who came here to visit directly with the President, with the Secretary of State, with the Secretary of the Treasury, and other important men in the new administration.

The new administration has sent a new Ambassador to France, in the person of Mr. Dillon; but the same situation prevails there. He will not formulate our policies with respect to France; and I believe that fact is proved by the circumstance that this very day we have visiting in this country the Premier and the Foreign Minister of France, who are meeting directly with the President, with our Secretary of State, and with other United States officials.

The decisions to be made in regard to our relations with Russia are the most important decisions that our administration will make. Reports will be coming into the State Department from Korea, from Japan, from Formosa, from India, from Iran, from all over Europe, and, of course, from Moscow.

There is only one place where the reports reaching our Government can be coordinated, and that is in Washington.

I personally believe it is best to appoint American businessmen or American political leaders to the important Embassies. The Foreign Service serves a very useful purpose in advising these Ambassadors. In other countries, the Ambassadors publicly meet and visit with businessmen and with political leaders in all walks of life. In Moscow, as I understand, that is not possible. Perhaps the best man we can send to Moscow is one who speaks the Russian language and can pick up some information by virtue of his knowledge of Russia and its language.

Certain Senators feel that they must vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen because he had some part in the so-called Truman-Acheson foreign policies.

The viewpoint is understandable to those of us who have gone through the recent political campaign, but I wish to point out—and this is directed to my Republican brethren—that the 1952 election is over. I believe it safe even for a freshman Senator to advise his fellow Republicans that Mr. Truman will not be the Democratic candidate for President in 1956.

In view of the fact that our Democratic colleagues did not mention Mr. Acheson's name at their recent national convention, I think it fairly safe to assume that Mr. Acheson will not be the Democratic candidate for President in 1956.

It is proper for a party in opposition to bring to light the mistakes of the administration in power, but I cannot believe there is much to be gained by us, as Republicans, from rattling the old bones of the Truman-Acheson administration. We must be thinking, instead, of how we can best serve the people of the United States.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, these are times that try men's souls. Decisions do not come easy. Facts are very elusive.

I have listened to and read everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate for and against Mr. Bohlen. I have likewise read many newspaper articles about this nomination.

At first it occurred to me that possibly the President had made a bad appointment. I continually thought until yesterday that possibly the President, due to the great amount of work before him each day and the pressure under which any President must operate, had not given the thought and consideration to the Bohlen nomination which he might otherwise have given. I first thought that he might have left the selection to others and that they, in their enthusiasm for one who had been in the Department for twenty-odd years, had recommended Mr. Bohlen to the President.

However, Members of the Senate—and rightfully so—called the Bohlen matter to the attention not only of the Senate but of the President and the American people.

This gave the President the opportunity to reconsider the entire Bohlen matter. I am certain the President did reconsider.

I was convinced that the President had fully and thoroughly considered all aspects of the Bohlen nomination when the President yesterday said he knew Mr. Bohlen; had visited in Mr. Bohlen's home; knew Mr. Bohlen's family; had played golf with Mr. Bohlen; and that he was satisfied that Mr. Bohlen was the best qualified man to represent the President in Moscow.

I am certain that he reconsidered the nomination after Members of this body called to the President's attention and to the attention of the American people certain circumstances involved in the career record of Mr. Bohlen.

Therefore, I shall vote for Mr. Bohlen's nomination with the knowledge that the President has had ample opportunity to reconsider his nomination and with the knowledge that the American people have been informed of the entire history and background of Mr. Bohlen.

The responsibility of serving the American people well in Moscow is now up to the President, the Secretary of State, and Mr. Bohlen himself. They will have my full cooperation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, day before yesterday I made a brief impromptu statement with respect to the pending nomination. There was some misunderstanding about one statement which I made. Some Members have come to me and asked me what I meant when I said that I waited until after the meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee on the morning of day before yesterday. They have interpreted my statement as indicating that some particular thing occurred in the Foreign Relations Committee day before yesterday which finally resolved my doubts.

I wish to make it clear that such is not the case. What I meant was that I waited until all the avenues of information had been explored, which included the final meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee on the morning of the day before yesterday. That was the last function, the last hearing, the last presentation. I waited until it was all over. I wish to dispel any misinterpretation which may have been current as a result of my statement day before yesterday.

Mr. President, let me give a little further amplification of my reasons—many important reasons—for voting against Mr. Bohlen's nomination. As I said the other day, I have the utmost respect for the President and for the Secretary of State. I have known them both for a long time. Nothing would be more pleasing to me than to be able to support every action they take administratively. It is not easy, especially for a Republican who has been on the losing side nationally for a great many years—ever since his political life began—to vote against a nomination of this kind. I make no criticism of the attitude of any other Member of this body. Every Senator must rationalize or act in accordance with the way in which the facts appeal to him. I give each Senator full credit for acting sincerely and according to his own conscience.

Mr. President, not only last year, but 2 years before that, and 4 years before that, I, too, went up and down the States of the United States. I condemned the sellout at Yalta with all the force I could command. I not only condemned it, but I condemned the judgment of the men who, as I have said time and again, in their stupidity brought these diplomatic disasters to the United States and sorrow to the world, at a time when we had hoped to have peace. I said to my people in Iowa and I said to people in other sections of the United States that, so far as I am concerned, those who had any substantial part in the nefarious operations at Yalta must go, and that I would do everything I could in my power to see that they did go.

Mr. President, in my judgment the President and Mr. Dulles do not approve of the secret Yalta agreements with regard to the disposal of the property of other nations in various parts of the world. I am sure they do not agree and that they do not condone, and, in fact, that they condemn, the agreements. By the same token, I am convinced that the President and Mr. Dulles do not believe that Mr. Bohlen had an influential part in reaching the momentous decisions at Yalta. I believe they are convinced that Mr. Bohlen did not have such a part.

But in reading the RECORD, not only of the past few days, but what Mr. Bohlen has stated time and time again, beginning in 1946, it appears that he has defended his activities at Yalta, he has defended almost in terms of a brilliant diplomatic victory what I consider to be a diplomatic disaster, and he has criticized severely those who have criticized what was done at Yalta. I know in my own mind at least that at Yalta he was one of the motivating influences which laid out the pattern on which those agreements were made. I am certain that he was one of the men who was convinced that we must get Russia into the war by any possible means, and therefore he was one of the important experts who guided the destiny of this country at the time. I am convinced of that, Mr. President. I am sorry I cannot agree with other Senators who are not so convinced, or who are convinced the other way; but that is my conviction.

I have said to the people of my own State and to the people of the Nation as a whole that we must have no one in a responsible position who took part in bringing about the disasters in the late days and at the close of the war.

I do not criticize anyone else, but I could not in my own mind and in my own conscience vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, because I would be in the position of having promised one thing to the people to whom I talked last year and doing the opposite at the first opportunity to act upon the proposition. I could not bring myself to do that.

Mr. President, much argument has been had on the floor and various reasons have been presented. I do not necessarily associate myself with any of them, and I do not necessarily disassociate myself from any of them.

There may be some other reasons which, cumulatively, strengthen my conviction that I should vote against this nomination, but it is good and sufficient at this time for me to say that I have pledged my word, on the public platform and otherwise, that I would do all I could to rid our Government and its officialdom from the canker of the Yalta stupidity and of those who had anything to do with it. Therefore, when the time comes to vote, I shall vote to keep my word as I understand I have given it to the people, and I shall, though with great regret, have to vote against the nomination, because I believe it is the only thing I can do.

Mr. President, I do not follow the philosophy that Mr. Bohlen is the only man in the United States who is able to represent the United States at Moscow. I have never followed the indispensable-man theory; I do not believe in it. I believe there are many men in this country who are fully capable of giving us adequate representation in Moscow. But that is beside the point. Were it not for the fact that honorable conduct demands that I vote my own conviction, I could very well rationalize. Had I said nothing last fall or over the past years, had I not been critical of those who led us into this diplomatic trap, had I said nothing about it, had I not pledged my word that I would do my best to sanitize the diplomatic situation if it could be done, then I might easily rationalize and say that, because the heads of our Government desire to appoint this individual, I will go along and place the responsibility on them. But I am only assuming this afternoon the responsibility in conscience that I believe is mine, and which I believe is mine alone to exercise; and, therefore, with the deep regret that I must do so, I shall vote "nay" on this nomination.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the senior Senator from South Dakota has taken no part in this debate up to this time. I have been trying to do my best to winnow the wheat from the chaff, to try to add up the arguments on both sides and to arrive at a decision which I consider to be both consistent and constructive.

It happens that the senior Senator from South Dakota was a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; as a member of the majority of the Foreign Affairs Committee during the 80th Congress, when action by our committee at that time, and for the first time, forced the then Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, over his bitter resistance, to give the American public its first glimpse as to what actually was contained in the Yalta agreement. He had come to the House, as the body of the Congress which first passes upon appropriation bills, and to the committee of Congress which deals with foreign affairs, to present to us his request for appropriations for what was then known as Greek-Turkish aid, a program which I thought to be wise then and which I now think was wise, a program which, as I look backward, has served the American people well.

Secretary Acheson had come to us asking for funds to implement the program. The Republican majority of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs decided in a one-party caucus that while in the main our committee would go along with the program, it provided an opportunity to decide whether or not American foreign policy shall be determined in the open or in secret, and whether or not Members of Congress and the country had a right to know anything about the Yalta agreement, which everyone was then discussing, but which no one in Congress then really knew anything about.

Action by our committee was held up for about 2 weeks, until finally, reluctantly, Secretary of State Acheson said he would disclose the terms of the Yalta agreement. The first disclosure was then made, and subsequent disclosures have been made since, until now pretty well most of the public knows most of what was done at Yalta.

The Senator from South Dakota has been more or less quarreling with that Yalta agreement from that early day, and the more he learned about it, the more violently he began to quarrel with its conclusions. Its secret commitments were what I consider to be an outright betrayal, not only of American interests, but of the interests of the entire free world.

Consequently, now being confronted with a decision, as each Senator is confronted, to give his advice and to grant his consent to the Executive on the appointment of an ambassador, I must ask myself some questions.

Does it mean anything in the Constitution of the United States when it says the Senate is to advise and to consent to nominations, or does it mean nothing at all? I am one who believes that the Constitution of the United States does not contain superfluous language, but that everything written in the Constitution was written therein for a purpose. I believe all of us have a responsibility as Senators when we are confronted with the challenge of what it is that we are going to advise and what it is to which we are going to give our consent as executive appointments are made. Since we have this responsibility, we should measure up to it courageously and with clear convictions. Just as the Secretary of State has a responsibility to suggest to the President, and the President to suggest to us, the names of persons for important posts, each one of us has a responsibility vested in the Constitution, in conformity with his own conviction, and in consonance with his own position, to try to give intelligently that advice and to grant thoughtfully that consent.

I believe the Senator from Iowa is correct when he says the easy thing, the gracious thing, and the politic thing to do, the thing that all of us would like to do because we so admire our President and because we have confidence in him and because we have confidence in his Secretary of State, would be freely and willingly, and without much thought, simply to grant the consent unanimously and to convey vicariously the advice, "Anything you suggest, sir, will be all right with us."

However, Mr. President, I do not believe that would be as American in character as it would be pleasing in practice. I think we have a greater responsibility. In the long run I believe the President and the Secretary of State will serve the country better if they discover that there are in this body some who will say, "We have this responsibility; and, if necessary, we are going to vote against our party and against those in its leadership in order to carry out what we believe to be our sincere convictions." I believe they like that kind of attitude. I think that type of advice will serve them better.

It seems to me that some of us who are associated with the opposition to the pending nomination may find ourselves, 2 weeks or 3 weeks or 4 weeks later, vigorously, vehemently, and courageously pounding the tom toms for an administration measure which will be opposed by other Republicans, who now are associated with the President's point of view. I hope that is true. I believe that is good Republicanism and good Americanism. I believe it is a wholesomely refreshing change from the situation in the past 20 years, when there was too much of the rubber stamp, too much acceptance of the theory that "the king can do no wrong," when in my opinion there were too many who were willing to go along, rather than to riffle the water, too many who were anxious not to run the risk of encountering the displeasure of a strong Executive.

There are those who say, "It is nice to go along with the White House." I hope to do so in the future many, many times. I hope very frequently to express myself in conformity with the views asserted by the President and the Secretary of State. I hope to be able to do that perhaps 85 percent, 90 percent, or 95 percent of the time.

However, when the President and his Secretary of State arrive at decisions in regard to matters on which a Senator is expected to grant or to withhold consent, I shall exercise my right of opposing those that I believe to be wrong, and I shall exercise that right just as strongly as I shall exercise it in supporting those that I believe to be correct and justified.

I make this statement, Mr. President, without any desire to influence any of my colleagues, without any desire other than to state for the record the reasons for the vote I shall cast on this nomination.

It is easy to be misunderstood in this debate. There have been rumors in the cloakrooms and hints and innuendos around the floor. I know Chip Bohlen; and in voting as I expect to vote, my vote will not mean that I am trying to validate or justify any of the rumors I have heard.

Those who have seen the files of the FBI must assume the responsibility of interpreting what they have seen in those files. I have not seen them. Those who have seen the raw files and who have evaluated them carefully are men of high repute, men for whom I have great admiration. They have the responsibility for the decisions they

have made in reaching conclusions about the files which they have seen. I, myself, am not passing on anything contained in a file which I have not seen. My vote has nothing to do with the questions of security or loyalty insofar as they may reflect upon Chip Bohlen. My vote will not go to matters of his character as reflected in files which I have not seen.

My vote will be cast in part on a matter which has been referred to ad infinitum and ad nauseam in this debate, namely, Yalta. Some Senators have said that we discussed Yalta in 1952; but, Mr. President, I believe we shall be discussing Yalta in the future, too, because it was a tremendous turning point in history; and from the day when we first smoked out, over the entire opposition of the then State Department—then including, I assume, Chip Bohlen; and that action was taken in the 80th Congress—and from the moment when we finally gained the point that Congress has a right at least to have a keyhole look at what is in the Yalta agreement, from then until now I have become increasingly disillusioned about what I have learned about the contents of the Yalta agreement and about the persons who were at Yalta.

It happens that at that time I was chairman of a committee, on which I served along with the present distinguished occupant of the chair, our distinguished Vice President, who, I know, today at least wishes he could be here on the floor of the Senate discussing these matters, instead of holding the distinguished office of Vice President. At that time we had an opportunity to go into various matters in regard to the persons who were at Yalta. One of the authors of the Yalta agreement will not be given the post of Ambassador to Moscow, Mr. President, because he is now in the Federal penitentiary. I refer to Alger Hiss. Part of the work he did was to bring into being the things which are contained in the Yalta agreement.

Please understand me correctly, Mr. President. I make no association between Alger Hiss and Chip Bohlen. The one is a Communist. No one has alleged or hinted, even by innuendo, that the other is. But the point I make, Mr. President, is that we need clear-headed, stout-hearted men in the post at Moscow. Chip Bohlen, who was at Yalta with Hiss, either did not see or did not comprehend, or lacked the power to convince his superiors about the bloody work which was being undertaken at the crossroads by some of the subversive influences at Yalta, including Alger Hiss and a little coterie of four other men whom he had so skillfully trained at Malta for 2 weeks, as they prepared the agenda for the sellout at Yalta.

Certainly, Mr. President, having discussed that matter up and down and throughout the length and breadth of our land, in campaign time and out of it, I see no way by which I can say with honesty and conviction to the President of the United States, "My advice is that this man, who did not see or did not comprehend or did not protest vigorously at Yalta, should be made our Ambassador to Moscow."

I say that with every regard for his ability, his social graces, his education, his patriotism, and his heritage, and without any regard, as I have said, for the talk we have heard bandied around the cloakrooms. But I say that because it seems to me, Mr. President, that a career officer in the Foreign Service is supposed to be a policy-forming man, insofar as giving suggestions to his chiefs is concerned. If there is any place in the world where today we need a policy-forming man, one who can make some suggestions and can give us a new sense of direction and can change capitulations into success, it certainly is with regard to our foreign policy with regard to Russia.

I am sure that anything Chip Bohlen has to offer has been offered long ago. He has been in the Foreign Service all these years. Since 1944 he has been in high office in the State Department. For many years he was chief of the desk which deals with Russian affairs. If he has good advice to give, Mr. President, it has long since been given and rejected. If he has had no good advice to give, he will think of nothing new on this *n*th visit that he makes to Moscow. And we need something new; we need something better; we need something more constructive; and we need a foreign policy toward Russian communism which will cease to capitulate to communism and will cease to lead us into wars like Korea and to the brink of wars in other areas of the world. I am sure Bohlen has tried hard. I think he basically is a fine American.

But I point out, Mr. President, in the cruel light of logic, 1 of 2 things must be true: Either Chip Bohlen as an expert in Russian affairs was wrong in his policies, because our policies have been wrong—nobody in all this debate has said, "Well, I think we ought to vote for Chip Bohlen, because our Russian policies are so good, and he is a man who talks Russian, and has been talking to us wisely about Russian policy." Nobody has said that, that I have read, that I have ever heard. I have not read that in the printed testimony. The Secretary of State does not believe that, because he thinks we ought to have a change in our foreign policy; and I agree with him, and I think he is going to bring some splendid constructive changes.

But I point out, Mr. President, that either Bohlen's advice on Russian affairs has been wrong or he is so weak an advocate that his advice has not been followed. I do not care which horn of the dilemma I am compelled to take. If his advice is bad, if it has been bad, I do not want him representing me in Moscow. If his advice is good, but if he is so weak an advocate, so puerile a persuader, so ineffective a proponent for a point of view that for many years he has not been able to sell something fine and constructive and positive and peace-preserving and communism-defeating to the preceding administration or to Congress, I doubt whether he has recently taken any courses on "How to win friends and influence human behavior," which will now enable him to sell what he could not sell during the past two decades.

So I find myself unable to advise, with my lone vote, the President or the Secretary of State, "This is your man," because it seems to me that logic dictates that in some place and in some way he failed in his position; either he failed to map out and bring in and provide good, sound policy suggestions, or, if he did that—and he may have; I do not know—he failed to make suggestions which were convincing enough and persuasive enough to have them adopted, either by the preceding administration, or even to have them presented so far as I know to our present Foreign Relations Committee here in the Senate of the United States.

And so, Mr. President, I say that, simply, but so that my friends at home and in America will know why it is that I am voting against Chip Bohlen. I cannot even say I am voting against Chip Bohlen reluctantly. I do so with confidence in my conviction that I am casting a vote which is correct. I disagree with the President reluctantly. I disagree with the Secretary of State reluctantly. I expect to have to disagree with both some time again. But simply because reluctance is involved, it seems to me, is no reason that we should vacate the responsibilities which we have. And, as I say, I am sure that many of my associates, now, in good conscience, who are voting "yea" on this, on some other issue will vote "nay," when I am voting with the President, and that they will then grant to me what I now grant to them, complete acceptance of their sincere position. Each of us has lived with Yalta a little bit differently. Each of us has had a little different relationship with some of the nefarious characters who sneaked and crept across the Yalta horizon—in my contacts with Alger Hiss, my realization of how hard it was to extract the first glimpse of information out of Yalta, my information of the close cohesion of the then State Department team, each like a member of a Chinese tong, trying to keep anybody outside the State Department clique from knowing what was in the nefarious agreement that has begun to pay off in America; it has led me to disapprove of those who helped shape that section of our foreign policy. There must be others better able and better qualified than Mr. Bohlen, for this important position which he undertakes.

Let me say but one other thing, Mr. President, in disagreement with what some have said here. I believe Chip Bohlen is going to be a better ambassador because of this debate than if we had not had it. I know he is going to be confirmed. He is going to be overwhelmingly confirmed. I cherish the hope that our great gathering of Democratic friends, who, in such near unanimity will vote for Bohlen today, will continue with equal unanimity to vote for the policies of Eisenhower and Dulles, as they come down to us from week to week and month to month. I think that would be fine. But I am not at all disturbed because we have had this ventilating of our disagreements here on the Senate floor. Because some have said, "I am for Chip," some have said, "I am against Chip today." I do not think that that is at all going to weaken him in his capacity in Moscow. If those of us who fear his advice has either been wrong or impotent are in

error, and he does help formulate new and fine and valuable and constructive foreign policy, he will do it, not because of any ability to sell Malenkov and the Politburo ideas, but because of an ability to pick up information and bring it back and help direct the thinking of those who shape foreign policy here. I think, Mr. President, it is good that we have had this debate. I think it is good for two basic reasons. I think it is good that the rest of the world knows that when we meet in the Senate of the United States it is not a meeting of the Czechoslovakian Parliament or of the Presidium in Moscow, where newspapers report "The executive has spoken, and the legislators have automatically and unanimously echoed 'yea'."

That is not going to happen, Mr. President, with a Republican Congress and a Republican Executive, and I am sure that on most issues, in order to avoid unanimity, we are not even going to have to call upon the ever-willing and available Member of our new third party. [Laughter.] I think we are going to find others, on many issues, who will be willing to see to it that the news does not go out that here in the United States a legislative body is simply a unanimous body, even as far as the majority is concerned. I think that is good for the country to understand, and for the world to know, that we are going to have a screening process here, that there are differences of opinion, that men may disagree without becoming disagreeable, that those who agree one day may disagree the next, and then may agree again the third day; that each tries to arrive at a verdict on the basis of the evidence available. I think that is wonderful news, and I hope the Voice of America broadcasts it to the world, that after a bitter, grueling debate, the Ambassador to Moscow was confirmed by an overwhelming vote—which he surely will be—and that a small handful of what may well be dubbed "die-hards, and willful men"—I suppose we will be so-called—voted in opposition. I think it is good. I hope we have more of it. And I think it is good for a second reason, Mr. President, and that is, I think it good now for the country, here, to know that Republican majorities working with a Republican Executive are thoughtful, analytical, and, I hope, a reasonable majority; but they are not majorities that are whiplashed into action, that can be pushed around, so that it can be decided on Monday what they will be expected to do on Friday; that Republican majorities are majorities that can be persuaded by reason, and which have a proclivity to cooperation, and which are reasonably open to logical arguments. But I think it is good for the country to know that rubber-stamp government in America died when President Eisenhower took office, and that we are not going to have—and I am sure we are not going to have from our distinguished majority leader—pleas that the Republican majority support a particular point of view because of blind partisanship. With all his capacity of logic, with his great ability to think things through, he probably will persuade us many times against our will, but not because he says, "This is the thing to do, because you belong to the same club or the same team or the same party."

I think that is a refreshing deviation from something which has been occurring, in my opinion, alarmingly for 2 decades, something which, as a member of the minority, I criticized frequently among the members on the other side during our last two administrations, and on which, in simple honesty, I am sure I have not changed my position, now that I am a member of a majority, which I hope will long continue to maintain its majority position in America for many, many years.

Also, Mr. President, I think this debate will have a salutary effect on Mr. Bohlen after his confirmation and while he is in Russia. Chip Bohlen will know that here in the Senate he is being carefully watched by some who voted against his confirmation but who wish him well. He knows our skepticisms and our reasons for them. He knows our doubts and what gave rise to them. He knows he can expect from us friendly but also firm and constructive criticism if his activities prove ineffective or ill-advised. He knows, also, that we shall join in supporting him in any programs, plans, or policies which give promise to weaken communism and give fresh hope and strength to the free world and a promise of peace for all mankind.

So, Mr. President, without trying to persuade anyone, I want my vote to be understood. I want to be understood as one who expects to support the man whom I consider a great President, for whom I did a considerable amount of work in the campaign, and a Secretary of State who, I think, has started out splendidly. I find no fault with any of his early policy decisions. I hope he becomes one of our great American Secretaries of State. I say that because it seems to me that in good conscience and in clear consistence, I must support a policy which I began to enunciate in the Republican 80th Congress and by so doing vote against Chip Bohlen for the reasons I have given.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have followed the debate, pro and con, to the best of my ability. I have studied all the testimony I have been able to find relating to the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Russia, and I cannot find that Mr. Bohlen is guilty, from the mere fact that he has been employed in the State Department, or from the mere fact that he was in attendance at Yalta. I condemned Yalta in the past campaign.

I have condemned the reaction of our State Department and our administrative officials of the Government who were present at the Yalta Conference. I shall not go into detail as to why I condemned the Yalta agreement. That has been very ably discussed on both sides of the issue. But I cannot find that Mr. Bohlen is guilty by the mere fact that he has been employed in our diplomatic service. Surely, Mr. President, a man who has served mankind all his adult years, as President Eisenhower has, could not in any sense have overlooked any facts in the record of Mr. Bohlen, if there were any facts which show that Mr. Bohlen has been responsible for any of the shortcomings of the Yalta agreement.

I have reached my conclusion after having studied all the facts, knowing that the Foreign Relations Committee, after a lengthy study, finally agreed and voted unanimously to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, though it is true that one member of the committee withdrew his support of Mr. Bohlen after the Foreign Relations Committee approved his nomination. Later, when there was some question as to what might be contained in the FBI files concerning Mr. Bohlen, two distinguished Members of this body, the majority leader [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], examined the FBI files and reported to us that they did not find within those files any justification for rejecting the nomination of Mr. Bohlen. Considering that fact and the fact that Mr. Dulles, our Secretary of State, a great international lawyer, who has served his country and the Government so well has found nothing in the FBI files that would convince him that the nomination of Mr. Bohlen should be rejected, it is my pleasure, Mr. President, to support and to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Russia.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, many Senators have expressed a desire to vote. Some of them have told me that they hoped we might have a vote because they would like to leave town over the weekend. If any Senator has any remarks on the subject, I hope they will be brief. I do not want to cut anyone off.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I desire to give my reasons why I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Bohlen, and I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD a brief statement giving my reasons.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

I intend to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Charles Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia. In casting my vote for Mr. Bohlen I want it understood that I am in nowise approving all of his views on foreign policy and his argument made before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate in support of the actions of President Roosevelt at Yalta and the other conferences where international executive agreements were entered into by the President.

I am accepting at face value the explanation of Secretary Dulles that Mr. Bohlen will not be in a policy-forming position when he is made Ambassador—that he will be simply acting as a career diplomat who is sent to observe and learn what he can in Russia and report what he learns to the Secretary of State and President of the United States, and that on the positive side his duties are to carry such messages as this Government wants conveyed to the Government of Russia.

I have read carefully Mr. Bohlen's statement to the committee supporting the Yalta agreement. The argument is far from convincing. The Yalta agreement was to all intents and purposes a treaty which, under the Constitution, should have been submitted to the Senate of the United States for approval or disapproval. That there were in such agreement some matters which were proper to be disposed of in executive agreement does not alter that fact.

It is my considered opinion that the failure on the part of Presidents Roosevelt and Truman to observe the Constitution of the United States has been a heavy contributing factor to our international troubles and emergence of Russia as a dire threat to the peace of the world. Framers of the Constitution wisely provided a check on the actions of the President in making treaties. It may be inconvenient at times for Presidents to submit agreements which are in effect treaties, to the Senate, but that inconvenience, great as it may be considered at the time, should not outweigh the very real need for a check on the President as provided in the Constitution.

I believe Mr. Bohlen has the technical qualifications for the position of Ambassador. Nothing has been brought to the attention of the Senate which would indicate that he is in any sense disloyal to his country. Neither has there been any competent evidence, so far as I know, that indicates that he is a bad security risk. President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, seem to be convinced that he is the best possible man available for the job. I want to cooperate in helping the new administration to carry out its policies. Under the circumstances I can see no good reason why I should not vote to approve Mr. Bohlen. On the other hand, there are strong reasons why a vote of approval should be given.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Griswold	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smathers
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Kuchel	Symington
Ellender	Lehman	Taft
Ferguson	Long	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
Gillette	Martin	Wiley
Goldwater	Maybank	Williams
Gore	McCarran	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, it was my intention to address the Senate this afternoon on the subject of the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be United States Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But I wanted to cooperate with the distinguished majority leader, who was desirous to have a vote as early as possible. Thus, I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD, immediately preceding the vote, the remarks I had intended to offer for the consideration of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

With some reluctance, I am casting my vote for the confirmation of Charles E. Bohlen as Ambassador to Russia.

It is not merely "blind" faith to follow the leadership of the President of the United States in an Executive nomination. President Eisenhower and his associates have all the facts on Mr. Bohlen, and they have repeatedly reaffirmed their faith in their interpretation of these facts. The basic issue, then, is this:

Does the Senate have faith that intelligent and intellectually honest men in the executive branch know whether a nominee to high office is capable of carrying out his duties in a loyal and efficient manner? My own answer is that I must have that faith, or I greatly weaken my confidence in orderly government and substitute instead a philosophy which subscribes to an improvisation of our constitutional system. As a Senator, with many legislative duties to perform, I have not the time to do all the President's investigating for him in the matter of Executive nominations, nor is it within my jurisdiction so to do.

Mr. Bohlen was at Yalta, and he later testified to the Senate, "We tried to do the best we could with what I think were the instrumentalities available to President Roosevelt." He is evidently not a security risk, even in the eyes of his most vigorous opponents. Thus, my reluctance to support his confirmation wholeheartedly is based solely upon his previous associations with, and acquiescence in, the worst aspects of the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policy, especially when one considers that former Ambassador George Kennan did not allow his position as a Foreign Service career officer to stop him from sounding off publicly against Secretary Dulles' opinions of the old foreign policy of containment.

Torn as I am, my decision to vote for confirmation is rooted in my abiding faith in government by law and order, within the spirit of the Constitution, a belief in a government of laws rather than a government of men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics?

Mr. TAFT and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] would each vote "yea."

I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is absent on official business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—74

Anderson	Griswold	Millikin
Barrett	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hendrickson	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bush	Hill	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Payne
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Hunt	Purtell
Capehart	Ives	Robertson
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kerr	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Symington
Ellender	Kuchel	Taft
Ferguson	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Long	Tobey
Frear	Magnuson	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Gore	Maybank	Young
Green	McClellan	

NAYS—13

Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Malone	Welker
Dworshak	McCarran	
Goldwater	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	George	Langer
Clements	Humphrey	Monroney
Daniel	Jenner	Smith, N. C.

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of this nomination.

NOMINATIONS FOR PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have lie on the desk a group of officers' promotions below the rank of general officer or flag officer. I also send to the desk and ask to have printed on the Executive Calendar a group of flag and general officer promotions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be received. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The nominations reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, or held at the desk, are as follows:

Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army; placed on the calendar;

Maj. Gen. Julius Ochs Adler, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve

commissioned officers of the Army; placed on the calendar;

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Air University, with rank of lieutenant general; placed on the calendar;

Lt. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force; placed on the calendar;

Brig. Gen. Leonard Ewing Thomas, and sundry other officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force; placed on the calendar.

Thomas Gabriel Hepner, and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force; ordered to be held at the desk.

David A. Broad, and sundry other officers for permanent appointment in the Navy; and

Norma C. Furtos, and sundry other officers for permanent promotion in the Navy; ordered to be held at the desk.

Vice Adm. Francis S. Low, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Western Sea Frontier, and commander, Pacific Reserve Fleet;

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations);

Vice Adm. James Pike, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as United States naval deputy commander in chief, Mediterranean;

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie, United States Navy to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air);

Rear Adm. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics); and

William O. Brice, and sundry other officers for permanent and temporary appointment in the Marine Corps; placed on the calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed immediately following the list of officers a brief statement which I shall not read, but which is explanatory of the promotions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from South Dakota would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services when it is proposed to bring up for consideration the list of Reserve officers which he has just submitted?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague and committeeman that I intend to bring them up when the Executive Calendar is considered on Monday.

Mr. CASE. I thank the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

The majority of these nominations consists of 374 names ranging from commissioned warrant officer to commander in the Navy or major in the Air Force. I ask that these names not be printed in the Executive Calendar, but be permitted to lie on the Vice President's desk for examination by Members of the Senate until the next call of the Executive Calendar.

The remaining nominations consist of names of 197 flag and general officers, and I request that their names be printed in the Executive Calendar.

Of this number, only 21 actual promotions are involved—2 brigadier generals and 3 colonels from the Reserve components of the Army and Air Force, 6 brigadier generals and 9 colonels in the Marine Corps, and 1 rear admiral from the Navy.

The remaining 176 include 5 transfers of 3-star officers from one 3-star position to another of equal rank, and 171 reappointments of general officers in the Army and Air Force Reserve.

The reappointment of these 171 Reserve officers involves no promotion or advance in grade—the individuals already hold the grades to which they are being nominated.

However, present commissions were granted to them under the terms of the National Defense Act of 1916, which limited such appointments to periods of 5 years as contrasted with the indefinite-term appointments used by the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve.

In an effort to standardize the methods of appointment in the various Reserve components the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 did away with the 5-year Army and Air Force Reserve commission and required that such appointments be made for an indefinite term. It is this requirement of the law which accounts for the substantial number of these names now before the Senate for consideration.

I think it would be helpful at this point in the record to insert the pertinent provisions of section 224 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act. The language reads as follows:

"SEC. 224. After the date of enactment of this act, all appointments of Reserve officers shall be for an indefinite term. * * * Each such officer not holding an appointment for an indefinite term on the date of enactment of this act shall be given an opportunity for an indefinite term in lieu of his current appointment if such officer, after written notification by competent authority which shall be given within 6 months from the effective date of this act, shall agree in writing to have his current appointment continued for an indefinite term."

With respect to the qualifications of the officers recommended for indefinite term Reserve appointments, I wish to make it perfectly clear that these individuals are already holding commissions in the identical ranks, but that their present commissions terminate either on April 1 or at the end of a 5-year period. The transition from the 5-year appointment to the indefinite term appointment is purely for the purpose of complying with the Armed Forces Reserve Act and was not intended by the Congress to be a device for reexamining the qualifications of all of the officers of the Reserve and National Guard of the Army and the Air Force.

With respect to what happens if these nominations are not confirmed, it is difficult to give a specific reply inasmuch as the Department of the Army informs us that the effects vary in each individual case.

An officer currently serving on active duty with an AUS appointment would not be adversely affected except that he would lose his Reserve status.

A Reserve officer not on active duty, for example a major general commanding a Reserve division, would lose all status as an officer on April 1.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONTINUANCE OF EFFECTIVENESS OF MISSING PERSONS ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954, which was to amend the title so as to read: "An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senate passed Senate bill 1229, a bill to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954. By mistake the Senate omitted to correct the title of the bill. The House has corrected the title, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader if he intends to press for a vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1 today?

Mr. TAFT. No. The program today will be to dispose merely of Senate Joint Resolution 57, dealing with emergency powers. On Monday we shall have morning business and a call of the calendar, and then take up Reorganization Plan No. 1, relating to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I think that will probably be all. There may be a few other matters of minor importance. On Wednesday we hope to proceed with the tidelands bill.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S HOPE TO INSPIRE SPIRITUAL REAWAKENING IN AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, not long ago I heard one of the great women of the world say, "It is a time for greatness." May I paraphrase that statement and say that it is time for great leadership. America is blessed by having a man at the helm who is demonstrating by his daily living the leadership which we need.

Yesterday he was asked by the press regarding his position on the Bohlen nomination. He frankly told the press that Bohlen was his choice, that he knew him, had visited with him, and had played golf with him. He stated that he felt he was the best man for the job. Then someone asked him, "What do you think of the opposition?"

He said, "It is the right of the opposition to think as it will."

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks an article entitled "What the President Wants," written by Stanley High, and published in the April 1953 issue of the Reader's Digest. In

the heading above the title of the article there is the following:

Above and beyond politics, Dwight Eisenhower hopes to inspire a spiritual reawakening in America.

That to me is the new leadership.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT THE PRESIDENT WANTS

(By Stanley High)

In the vast flow of words that have been written about Dwight Eisenhower, one aspect has received little attention, his long-time hopes and purposes for America. Better than administrative policies or legislative prescriptions, those hopes and purposes reveal the stature and character of the man we elected President. They are a guide to what, above and beyond politics, may take place during his Presidency. His commitment to them is deeper and more determined than to any partisan objectives, and he believes they are the terms by which, in history, his administration will have to pass muster.

There is nothing off the record in what the President himself calls his long thoughts about America. They are the plainest thread that runs through all his speeches. They are the most frequently recurring theme of his conversations. He has made them the solemn basis of his charge to the men and women he has called to be on his team.

By some current standards, the President is old fashioned in what he most deeply believes. He is as out of date as the copybook maxims he stressed in his campaign:

"Honesty is the best policy"; "He that goes a-borrowing, goes a-sorrowing"; "A man is known by the company he keeps"; "Birds of a feather flock together"; "A penny saved is a penny earned."

Perhaps these homilies have not recently been fashionable in Washington, or elsewhere, but who can read them without feeling that it would have been good for all of us if they had been?

In today's atmosphere of pseudointellectualism, the President's profoundest beliefs perhaps seem corny. He is no doubt corny when he talks, as he has, about "the extraordinary virtues" of his parents; of the fact that they were thrifty, economical, honest; of the lusty influence of the Bible in their lives; of "how I sat at my mother's knee"; of the story of Abraham Lincoln walking miles to return a few cents he had overcharged a customer that day in the store.

The extent to which these homely virtues are out of date is proof to the President of what has happened to this country. He believes that what has been wrong with the American Government is only symptomatic of things gone wrong in America and with Americans. He knows the symptoms require immediate treatment. He believes the cure requires basic changes in American thought and direction. These changes will produce political and economic consequences. But they are not, themselves, political or economic. They are moral and spiritual.

In one preconvention conversation General Eisenhower remarked: "From the way I'm talking and from what I'd like to see happen, it looks as though I should have been a preacher." In a nonecclesiastical sense, it is a preacher's job he has cut out for himself.

What President Eisenhower wants for America is a revival of religious faith that will produce a rededication to religious values and conduct. He wants this, first, because he is a religious man. He is not outwardly pious, and he seldom talks about religion in personal terms. I do not know how he prays or how often. But from his unembarrassed expressions of belief in prayer, I am sure that he does pray. I do not know how often he reads the red-leather Bible he keeps by his bed. But from his familiarity with the scriptures, I am sure he reads it. His regular attendance at church is not because of his public position. It is a lifetime habit, and it is more to him than a formal, Sunday gesture.

The inaugural service of worship was not, as has hitherto always been the case, limited to the President-elect and his family. His Cabinet members and advisers were expected to be there with their families. They were—180 of them.

He has said that in selecting the members of his Cabinet he wanted to find out not only what their abilities were but what, as men, they were dedicated to. And his inauguration prayer, written in longhand after that morning's service of worship, was not alone for himself but for "my future associates * * * that Thou wilt make full and complete our dedication."

The President's top associates can have little doubt about the spiritual purposes to which he believes his administration must be dedicated. On January 12 he called his Cabinet and chief assistants into a preinaugural conference in New York. When they were seated at luncheon together, the President-elect arose at the head of the table. He expressed confidence in the capacities of the people assembled there. He felt they were among the best America could provide for the job ahead. But he was sure they would agree with him that, for even the best, the job ahead was too big to undertake without the help of Almighty God. He then turned to his Secretary of Agriculture, EZRA BENSON, and asked him, a prominent Mormon, to lead them all in prayer.

But it is not only because he is personally religious that the President gives first importance to the reviving of religious faith. He believes that the "godly virtues"—those extolled in the copybook maxims—account for America's beginning, its growth in strength, material well-being, and social progress. He believes that, except in a renewal of that faith and those virtues, there is no answer for the future.

"You can't explain free government in any other terms than religious. The Founding Fathers had to refer to the Creator in order to make their revolutionary experiment make sense; it was because 'all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights' that men could dare to be free. They wrote their religious faith into our founding documents, stamped their trust in God on the faces of their coins and currency, and put it boldly at the base of our institutions. And when they drew up their bold Bill of Rights, where did they put freedom of worship? First, in the cornerstone position. That was no accident."

Before and during the campaign Eisenhower frequently talked about the strength America must have if our freedom is to be preserved and extended. In his three kinds of strength, he insisted that the spiritual should come first, not as a possible climax after the economic and military.

"Our forefathers proved," he said, "that only a people strong in godliness is a people strong enough to overcome tyranny and make themselves and others free. Today, it is ours to prove that our own faith, perpetually renewed, is equal to the challenge of today's tyrants."

At one point in the campaign, some of his associates were a little concerned by what they regarded as too much religion in his politics. Lest he be accused of overdoing it, they urged him for a few speeches to skip the spiritual note. At that proposal the general was first puzzled and then irritated. "Gentlemen," he told them sharply, "you misjudge the American people."

"I am sure of one thing," he has said. "There is a great spiritual yearning, a hunger among the people of this country. And I meet more and more people who are not ashamed to express it."

In the political sense, General Eisenhower had no ambition for the Presidency. In the political sense, he now has no ambition simply to go through 4 or 8 years and thence into history as the 34th President of the United States. He does, however, have one consuming ambition: He is determined to use his influence and his office to help make this period a spiritual turning point in America, and thereby to recover the strength, the values, and the conduct which a vital faith produces in a people.

For such a new era much more will be required than the President's own dedication, more than his declarations and example—powerful and, in recent history, unprecedented as such White House leadership will be.

A great deal will be required of all Americans who believe as the President believes and who want, for themselves and America, what he wants. It is not too soon for these Americans to make it clear that, for them, last November 4 was more than just another election, and that the man they elected must not be cut down to the size and shape of partisan politics.

EXTENSION OF TIME LIMITATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 105, Senate Joint Resolution 57.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 57) to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on April 1, 1953, the Emergency Powers Continuation Act will expire unless Senate Joint Resolution 57, which has for its purpose the continuation of the act beyond that date until July 1, 1953, is enacted. We have received, and there has been inserted in the RECORD, a letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, and also excerpts with respect to the various powers which we hope will be extended by the Congress at this time. That material was printed in the RECORD of March 13, 1953, and I assume that all Senators have read it. However, I think it would be well, drawing upon the text of that letter, to explain the joint resolution.

I may add that the House of Representatives has passed House Joint Resolution 226, which is the companion resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 57 would, with certain exceptions, extend from April 1, 1953, to July 1, 1953, those emergency powers which were previously extended by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act—Public Law 450, 82d Congress.

On February 19, 1952, the President transmitted to the Congress a draft of

the Emergency Powers Continuation Act to extend certain emergency powers for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, and for 6 months thereafter, in order to insure the continuation of those powers during the period of international tension while the Nation was mobilizing for defense. The Congress after hearings approved the Emergency Powers Continuation Act and extended the authority under 45 statutory provisions until April 1, 1953, rather than for the full period requested, which was for the duration of the present national emergency plus 6 months. The reason for so limiting the extension is stated in the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary on House Joint Resolution 477—House Report No. 2041, 82d Congress—as follows:

> The committee was chiefly interested in satisfying itself that there was justification for continuing the provisions until such time as the Government agencies concerned could seek, before the proper congressional committees, legislation either on a permanent basis or for a further extension on a temporary basis.

At the time of the congressional hearings it was felt by the committee that such legislation could easily be obtained by April 1, 1953.

In consonance with the expressed desire of the House Judiciary Committee, as stated above, the agencies of the Government desiring the continuation of the statutory provisions concerned have prepared and submitted to the Congress, or are in the process of preparing, separate drafts of legislation for the consideration of the appropriate committees which would amend, extend, or make permanent the various emergency powers for which there is a continuing need.

Since the enactment of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act there has been a delay which probably was not anticipated when the date of April 1, 1953, was selected. This delay was caused by a change in administration of the Government and a concurrent change in the appointed officials of the Department of Defense, with the natural requirement of a review of all pending programs by the new officials. Such a review, of course, has included a study of the emergency powers. As a result, not all of the individual items of proposed legislation are in a form ready for submission to the Congress. Moreover, as to those bills which have been introduced in the Congress, action by the committee concerned has been delayed pending decision by the appropriate executive branch officials as to the desirability of continuing the various powers. In view of that situation, it is not likely that any appreciable number of individual bills will be enacted into law by April 1, 1953.

Senate Joint Resolution 57 is but a temporary expedient and will not alter the affected authorities, except as to the date of the termination of their effectiveness, and is intended only to give the responsible departments sufficient time in which to make their presentations to Congress. I point out to Senators that last Friday the Senate passed, under the able management of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] the extension of one of the powers sought to be extended by this joint resolution; and proposed extensions of other powers are on the calendar today under separate legislative headings.

Proposed for the 90-day extension under the joint resolution are 31 provisions of law of primary concern to the Department of Defense. There are also included for temporary extension 8 provisions of law affecting other agencies of the Government which the Bureau of the Budget has requested the Department of Defense to include in this joint resolution, so as to permit the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make proper representations to the Congress for continuation or for permanent provisions to replace the temporary provisions affecting their departments. The joint resolution would, by section 2 thereof, exclude from the effect of its temporary extension 6 provisions of law dealt with by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act. Four of those provisions of law have been repealed; 1 of them has been amended so as not to be covered by the extension contained in the Emergency Powers Continuation Act; and 1 of them is no longer needed because of changed conditions.

Mr. President, when this matter came before the Committee on the Judiciary last Wednesday the chairman of the committee appointed a subcommittee of three members, of which I am the chairman, to study the proposal and to report back to the full committee. I met with the interested parties from the Department of Defense and have studied the various proposals. I have not, however, asked for a detailed justification of each item, for two reasons:

First. Each of these items has been in effect for many years. All of them were minutely examined by Congress at the time of the extension of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act of last year. In addition, a review of each one was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1953.

Second. Each of these items is now or will be in the immediate future the subject of inquiry of the standing committee to which it is referred.

The Committee on the Judiciary unanimously reported the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the House has passed a joint resolution which is word for word identical with Senate Joint Resolution 57, now under consideration. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion; that Senate Joint Resolution 57 be indefinitely postponed; and that the Chair now lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 226.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is that the same joint resolution which the distinguished Senator from Maryland has discussed?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Yes. It is exactly the same, word for word. The House has already passed House Joint Resolution 226. The two joint resolutions are identical.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In that connection, I believe Senators should know that when a similar joint resolution was passed the last time by the Senate it provided for an additional extension of 6 months. That provision was stricken out by the House. Therefore, what is proposed to be done today is merely to put back in the joint resolution what was contained in it when it was passed by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct. The joint resolution would extend the emergency powers to July 1, 1953, in order to give various committees of Congress time to examine the powers in detail and to bring appropriate legislation to the floor for enactment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary was unanimous in reporting the resolution, as I understand.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It was unanimous.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the requests of the Senator from Ohio?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950, which was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 57 will be indefinitely postponed.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the adjournment period, bills and joint resolutions found duly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, first I should like to inquire whether the distinguished majority leader has had transacted all the business he has in mind for today?

Mr. TAFT. All the business I had in mind has been transacted, and I shall return in a few minutes to hear the Senator's committee report.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very delighted to have him hear my report. First, I wanted to make sure that the business for today had been transacted.

Mr. President, before I deliver my major speech so far as the Independent Party is concerned, this afternoon I want to take up a few committee matters as a member of the committee of the whole.

First, I wish to comment on the problem of the Independent Party, with respect to cloakroom discussion of the so-called seating issue.

When the Independent Party respectfully suggested that a section of the Senate should be designated as the Independent Party section, the representative of that party did not feel that any great state issue had been raised, or that the suggestion should create any major problem in the Senate. The Independent Party was satisfied that its representative was not asking to have the Washington Monument moved or to have the Capitol dome cut down. He simply made the suggestion—and did so quite respectfully, I thought—that, for good and valid reasons, a section of the floor of the Senate should be set aside for the Independent Party, as a matter or right.

But, lo and behold, Mr. President, after I made the suggestion I discovered that I was about to engage in negotiations which made some of the highly complex labor negotiations in my professional experience look very simple indeed. Letters had to be written. In fact, a letter was drafted for the Independent Party, and it was suggested that its representative follow the form of that letter in writing to the Rules Committee. But the Independent Party representative did not oblige in the premises.

The Independent Party representative did write a letter to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but on his own terms. Without taking time to read the letter, Mr. President, because now the letter is out of date, the representative of the Independent Party requests unanimous consent that his letter, under date of March 24, 1953, to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 24, 1953.

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: I am sure that you and the other members of the Rules Committee are aware of the fact that I have expressed a desire on the floor of the Senate to move my Senate seat from the Republican side of the aisle to the last row of the Democratic side. It is my desire to have my desk placed at the end of that row.

I have discussed the matter with both majority and minority leaders, and they do not have any personal objections to my moving my seat. As I understand it, the minority leader has discussed the matter with the Democratic policy committee, and the members of that committee have no objections, but seem to be of the opinion that under rule XXXIV of the Senate, it is a matter which falls to the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

Therefore, Senator JOHNSON suggested that I take the matter up with you. I told him I would be very glad to do that, but I wished to make clear that under rule XXXIV I do not think the Rules Committee would have jurisdiction to deny to a representative of the Independent Party the right to occupy a desk space on the floor of the Senate not presently occupied by either one of the major parties. By that I mean that I do not think the Rules Committee would have the right to require the representative of the Independent Party or of any other minority party to sit in any specific spot on the floor of the Senate, if the representative or representatives of that party desired to sit somewhere else and by so doing would not in any way interfere with already established rights or interests of one of the major parties. I make that point on the basis of the constitutional guarantee that each State is entitled to equal representation in the Senate, and that it automatically follows that its elected representatives are entitled to sit in accordance with party membership at desk locations in the Senate set aside for members of that party, in accordance with Senate agreement and policy.

Thus, if my party had 3 or 4 members, instead of 1, it would be obvious that we would be entitled to have an area of the floor of the Senate set aside as the Independent Party side of the Senate as a matter of right in keeping with the equal-representation principle.

Therefore, as I explained to Senator JOHNSON, I do not feel that my desire in this matter places upon me any obligation to make any request to the Rules Committee for the right to sit in a separate area on the Senate floor designated for the Independent Party.

However, I do think that under rule XXXIV I should clear with the Rules Committee in respect to the question as to whether or not the space for my desk which I am asking for would in any way interfere with any vested interest of rights now possessed by anyone else or any other party in said space. As I indicated in my speech on the floor of the Senate last Friday when I discussed this matter, I think the Independent Party as a matter of senatorial courtesy is entitled to sit wherever it wants to on the floor of the Senate, provided it does not seek to interfere with established seating rights of any other Member of the Senate.

Therefore, I would appreciate it very much if you would take this matter up with the Rules Committee and advise them of my desire to move my seat to a space on the floor of the Senate not now occupied by either Republicans or Democrats.

I take it for granted that as a matter of senatorial courtesy no question can or will be raised as to my right to move my seat as a member of the Independent Party to such a space on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in essence, the letter points out that under the equal-rights provision of the Constitution, insofar as the rights of a sovereign State in the Senate of the United States are concerned, the representative of the Independent Party did not recognize in the Committee on Rules and Administration any jurisdiction to designate by mandate where any minority party in the Senate shall sit. But in the letter, as a reading of it will show, the Independent Party took the position that all it needed to do was to ascertain from the Committee on Rules and Administration whether a given number of square feet on the floor of the Senate was being occupied by a representative of any other party; and if it was not occupied by a representative of any other party, and if that square footage comprised, architecturally, space designed for occupation by a Senator's chair and desk, then the Independent Party had a right to direct the Sergeant at Arms to move to that spot the desk and chair of the representative of the Independent Party.

I take that position, Mr. President, because I believe we had better never establish the precedent that the Committee on Rules and Administration has a right to tell the representative of any minority party where he must sit on the floor of the Senate, for if we ever accept that principle, there are many places on the floor of the Senate where one might be ordered to sit, although he might not care to sit there.

But, Mr. President, I hope I am a sufficiently good lawyer to recognize that if that power were granted, once it were granted, there would not be much that one could do about its exercise by a Committee on Rules and Administration which might rather arbitrarily and capriciously engage in the exercise of discretion. I could direct the eyes of my colleagues to very many places on the floor of the Senate where I believe they would agree with me—and I am now talking about a principle—that, if a Committee on Rules and Administration should ever be recognized as having the power to tell a Senator that he would have to sit there, it would not be very desirable to sit there, for instance, in one of the corners. Or for example, who would appreciate having to sit at the Official Reporters' table if a Rules Committee should so direct?

However, if the Committee on Rules and Administration is ever recognized as having the power to issue such an order, and if you, Mr. President, ever were in the minority, as I am, you would be in a fine fix, would you not?

Of course, I did not walk into that trap in respect to an alleged jurisdictional power of the Rules Committee, as my letter will show. Although there has been much discussion about the letter, I stand on the premises of the letter.

But even after the letter was received, Mr. President, there was an inclination on the part of my good colleagues to try to work out some arrangement with the Independent Party. I believe it would have been worked out except for an event which occurred the day before yesterday. I refer to a column published in the Washington Times-Herald. I shall read only the part which refers to me, and shall not read the part which refers to my colleagues, although in fairness to them I wish to answer the part which refers to them.

The references to me in the column do not bother me. It does not bother me to read what is said about me in that column, for, contrary to the opinion of the author of the column, my hide is quite thick in respect to what he wrote about me.

The article states, in part:

WASHINGTON, March 24.—Senator WAYNE MORSE, the political zip, the whatizit from Oregon, has asked permission to switch his seat from the Republican side of the Senate Chamber to the Democratic side. He told Senate leaders he wished to make the change for personal reasons.

I'll say the reasons were personal.

The odd Oregonian begged to be moved because, thick in the hide as he is, he couldn't take it any longer.

Ever since he ran out on the Republican Party, under whose standard he was elected, MORSE has called himself an Independent. But he continued to occupy his front row seat on the GOP side of the Senate floor.

Loyal Republicans didn't want him there because they felt he was giving the GOP side a bad name. But it isn't practical to take a duly-elected Senator by the scruff and pitch him from one side to the other. So they resorted to other methods to make life miserable for the deserter.

They started a whispering campaign.

But it wasn't the kind of whispering campaign you might imagine. The whispering was done within earshot of the victim.

The last paragraph of the article—and in a moment I shall return to the intervening portions—reads as follows:

At last it became too much even for the most insulted man in Congress.

MORSE pleaded for permission to move.

Mr. President, that is funny, so far as I am concerned, and the entire article would be funny if it did not do a grave injustice to two colleagues. The article then went on to quote, supposedly, but completely without any basis whatsoever in fact, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

I wish to say that the quotations imputed to those Senators in the article are completely beyond my knowledge, and I am satisfied they have no basis in fact. The entire article is written on the assumption that I overheard the remarks which these two Senators are supposed to have made about me from time to time.

Mr. President, I fight fairly, so far as my intentions are concerned. If any of my fighting could ever be interpreted as being unfair or as violating the rules of good sportsmanship, at least it could never be charged that the dereliction on my part was intentional. I may have great differences with a colleague in the Senate—and, unfortunately, with a few of them personal differences have developed, and I regret very much that situation, and it saddens me; but, Mr. President, I wish to say there is absolutely no basis in fact for the quotations attributed to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], insofar as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned. At no time did I ever hear either one of those two gentlemen ever say what is quoted in the article. Even when men are against me, I propose to do what I can to protect them when I think they are unfairly attacked.

The only one of these two gentlemen who has spoken to me about the matter is the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. I told him that never did I hear him make any such statements as are imputed to him in this article, and that I intended to say so on the floor of the Senate.

I have not talked to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], but, in fairness to him, I want to say for the record that I have never heard the Senator from New York make any such statement as is attributed to him. I also desire to say, in fairness to the Senator from New York, that I know of nothing that would indicate that he has ever had any intention or desire to move me from my seat in the Senate of the United States. It is true that the Senator from New York and I have some personal differences, and I regret them. They are of his making, not mine. But irrespective of what the personal differences are, I have a great admiration for the Senator from New York, and when I see unfair statements about him published in the press, linked to my name, I shall always do what I can to correct such statements by making a statement of fact.

In view of what I consider to be this great injustice to these two Senators, and in view of the fact that, since this great "seat issue" has arisen, a considerable number of my friends on the Republican side of the aisle have come to me to urge that I not move my seat, I am not going to go into any detail other than to say that I appreciate the sincerity of their statements and the sincerity of the friendship which they have expressed to me in making the statements. But in the light of that situation, and because of the misrepresentation in the newspaper article to which I referred, and the wrong which I think was done to two of my colleagues by imputing to them statements they never made, I wish to say here publicly what I have said to the Republican leader and to the minority leader that, as for now, we will postpone the matter of moving the seat until I can discuss the contents of my letter with the Committee on Rules and Administration; and I am confident I can discuss with that committee what I think are some of the broader implications that have now resulted from my raising this issue in the first instance.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that the rules of the Senate need to be modified so that the kind of doubt as to what prerogatives and powers exist in the Committee on Rules and Administration in respect to Senators themselves, as distinguished from the powers and prerogatives of that committee in respect to other personnel of the Senate, can be cleared up, because, when we consider rule XXXIV it is very easy to read into it, as some of my colleagues have done, that the Committee on Rules and Administration has the same prerogatives and powers over Senators that it has over page boys, clerks, and personnel of the corridors, the restaurant personnel, and all the other employees of the Senate. I do not accept that view, Mr. President; because, under the equal-representation rights of a State in the Senate there are certain inherent rights of a Senator with which no committee of the Senate may possibly interfere. They are not subject to the power of the Senate as such, but they spring from the inherent rights of the sovereign State a Senator represents in the Senate of the United States, and no combination of Senators has the power to infringe upon the sovereign rights of a State, manifested through the representation of one of its Senators.

Later this afternoon I shall discuss in some detail the historical development of the equal-representation right of a sovereign State in the Senate of the United States, and relate it to another issue which concerns the Independent Party, namely, its right to assignment to committees in the Senate of the United States. But, with that explanation—knowing full well that those who want to misinterpret it will misinterpret it—I wish to say that for the time being I shall postpone final action on the seat issue and remain at this desk. I shall stay here until I feel that sufficient time has elapsed to correct the injustices done the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] by the newspaper article I have referred to. I do not want the impression to go abroad that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] conspired to drive me from this side of the aisle. That is an injustice to them because they did not do so. Also, I want opportunity to discuss the broader implications of this issue with the Committee on Rules and Administration, and to discuss it further with Republicans who want me to remain in my present seat. So we will hold in suspension the question of moving the seat of the Independent Party.

THE LUCE PUBLICATIONS

Mr. President, the next item I desire to take up as a committee item in the work of the Independent Party is the quality of journalism which characterizes the Luce publication—L-u-c-e, I want to make it clear, Mr. President, although it might be spelled l-o-o-s-e, too. Of course, I refer to the house organ of the Eisenhower administration, Time magazine. I refer to that publication as a house organ which follows the journalistic practice of reputation assassination by use of snide, ad hominem adjectives. It is not even clever journalism. It is not ethical journalism. It is dirty journalism, so typical of Time magazine. It was applied—and I say it with a sense of humor—to the junior Senator from Oregon in the issue of Time magazine for March 23. In making these comments today, Mr. President, I am aware that they may not do the junior Senator from Oregon any good; indeed, they could do him a lot of harm, for anyone who has ever picked a fight with a powerful medium of misinformation such as Time magazine, or with any yellow newspaper in America, has learned that such publications always have the last word, and that they will get you if they can. Their belt of scalps is pretty long and full. But, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oregon does not care about that, so long as he is satisfied he is right and so long as he is satisfied that the public should be warned about such things, because he intends to continue, as he has throughout his public life, to advocate what he believes to be for the public interest. The public ought to be told that the dirty journalistic tactics of the Luce publications include deceit by language forms designed to destroy the reputation of people whom the particular periodical is out to get. That is why we read the kind of story we read in the March 23 issue of Time magazine with regard to the junior Senator from Oregon.

I was rather pleased to find the subconscious confession on the part of the editor of Time magazine when, in one sentence, he said: "Then he rose and yammered about what the New York

Times politely called a variety of subjects."

The reference of Time magazine in its article to the New York Times amused me. I have observed that when one deletes from Time magazine the heavy-handed wisecracks and attempts at the use of snide insulting adjectives all that is left in most stories is a rewrite of news articles which have been very well written in the New York Times. Except for their rewriting of New York Times news stories the writers in Time magazine apparently try to outdo each other in the cleverness of their pinpricks, and in dipping their pens in the blood of public officials who they know follow a course of action which does not bend the knee to the reactionary philosophy of the Luce publications. That comprises really the journalistic endeavor of the editors of Time. Whatever meat they get into the sheet they simply insert by way of a rewrite from the New York Times and then becloud it with their attempts at reputation assassination.

Well, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I would not mention it at all if it were not for the sad effects I think this kind of journalism has on American public opinion. It is surprising to know that many persons seem to think that if they read it in Time it must be so. I say to the American people, "If you read it in Time, do not take it with a grain of salt; use the whole saltshaker," because I have known of so many incidents, Mr. President, about which I know all the facts, and then I read Time magazine's account, and I have great difficulty in recognizing that I am reading about the same incident. If one reads this particular issue of Time he will find a good example of my point.

So I say, Mr. President, that so far as I am concerned, I would not answer Time magazine because of any personal considerations, but I make this point simply because I think the reading public is entitled to have someone, at least, who dares to stand up and say that Time magazine is not a good representative of accurate journalism.

Thomas Jefferson, as I recall, answered that kind of journalism very well. I shall not take the time, because of the lateness of the hour, to read his comments on the kind of journalism represented by Time magazine but I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed at this point in my remarks some excerpts from Edward Boykin's book entitled "The Wisdom of Thomas Jefferson." Jefferson's comments on disreputable journalism are worth reviewing whenever one reads such articles as the one I have referred to in Time magazine and which is so typical of the journalism of that periodical.

The words are found on pages 143 to 145 of the book, under the heading "How to Conduct a Newspaper."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO CONDUCT A NEWSPAPER

To your request of my opinion of the manner in which a newspaper should be conducted, so as to be most useful, I should answer, "by restraining to true facts and sound principles only." Yet I fear such a paper would find few subscribers. It is a melancholy truth, that a suppression of the press could not more completely deprive the Nation of its benefits, than is done by its abandoned prostitution to falsehood. Nothing can now be believed which is seen in a newspaper. Truth itself becomes suspicious by being put into that polluted vehicle. The real extent of this state of misinformation is known only to those who are in situations to confront facts within their knowledge with the lies of the day. I really look with commiseration over the great body of my fellow citizens, who, reading newspapers, live and die in the belief that they have known something of what has been passing in the world in their time; whereas the accounts they have read in newspapers are just as true a history of any other period as of the present, except that the real names of the day are affixed to their fables. General facts may indeed be collected from them, such as that Europe is not at war, that Bonaparte has been a successful warrior, that he has subjected a great portion of Europe to his will, etc., but no details can be relied on. I will add, that the man who never looks into a newspaper is better informed than he who reads them; inasmuch as he who knows nothing is nearer to truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors. He who reads nothing will still learn the great facts, and the details are all false.

Perhaps an editor might begin a reformation in some such way as this. Divide his paper into four chapters, heading the first, Truths; second, Probabilities; third, Possibilities; fourth, Lies. The first chapter would be very short, as it would contain a little more than authentic papers, and information from such sources, as the editor would be willing to risk his own reputation for their truth. The second would contain what, from a mature consideration of all circumstances, his judgment should conclude to be probably true. This, however, should rather contain too little than too much. The third and fourth should be professedly for those readers who would rather have lies for their money than the blank paper they would occupy.

Such an editor too, would have to set his face against the demoralising practice of feeding the public mind habitually on slander, and the depravity of taste which this nauseous ailment includes.

Defamation is becoming a necessary of life; insomuch that a dish of tea in the morning or evening cannot be digested without this stimulant. Even those who do not believe these abominations, still read them with complaisance to their auditors, and instead of the abhorrence and indignation which should fill a virtuous mind, betray a secret pleasure in the possibility that some may believe them, though they do not themselves. It seems to escape them, that it is not he who prints, but he who pays for printing a slander, who is its real author.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD another profound statement of wisdom by Thomas Jefferson on the newspaper and journalistic problem, which, interestingly enough, existed in the time of Jefferson as it exists today. One would think that over all the years the journalistic profession would have washed itself up a little bit, but the accounts of Jefferson, who recognized that it was as dirty then as it is now, are a pretty sad commentary on some forms of journalism. So I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, other statements of Thomas Jefferson under the heading "A Truthful Press Essential for Good Government."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRUTHFUL PRESS ESSENTIAL FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

No experiment can be more interesting than that we are now trying and which we trust will end in establishing the fact that man may be governed by reason and truth. Our first object should therefore be to leave open to him all the avenues to truth. The most effectual hitherto found is the freedom of the press. It is therefore the first shut up by those who fear the investigation of their actions. The firmness with which the people have withstood the late abuses of the press, the discernment they have manifested between truth and falsehood, show that they may safely be trusted to hear everything, true and false, and to form a correct judgment between them. As little is it necessary to impose on their senses or dazzle their minds by pomp, splendor, or forms. Instead of this artificial, how much surer is that real respect which results from the use of their reason, and the habit of bringing everything to the test of commonsense.

I hold it therefore certain that to open the doors of truth and to fortify the habit of testing everything by reason are the most effectual manacles we can rivet on the hands of our successors to prevent their manacling the people with their own consent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is another excerpt from Jefferson to which I think it is well to refer at this time. It is to be found on page 176 of this book, and is headed "Calumny in Public Life Should Not Be Answered." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALUMNY IN PUBLIC LIFE SHOULD NOT BE ANSWERED

At a very early period of my life, I determined never to put a sentence into any newspaper. I have religiously adhered to the resolution through my life, and have great reason to be contented with it. Were I to undertake to answer all the calumnies of the newspapers, it would be more than all my own time, and that of 20 aids could effect. I have thought it better to trust to the justice of my countrymen, that they would judge me by what they see of my conduct on the stage where they have placed me, and what they knew of me before the epoch since which a particular party has supposed it might answer some views of theirs to villify me in the public eye. Some, I know, will not reflect how apocryphal is the testimony of enemies so palpably betraying the views with which they give it. But this is an injury to which duty requires everyone to submit whom the public think proper to call into its councils. Though I have made up my mind not to suffer calumny to disturb my tranquillity, yet I retain all my sensibilities for the approbation of the good and just.

I laid it down as a law to myself, to take no notice of the thousand calumnies issued against me, but to trust my character to my own conduct, and the good sense and candor of my fellow citizens.

My rule of life has been never to harass the public with fendings and provings of personal slanders. * * * I have ever trusted to the justice and consideration of my fellow citizens, and have no reason to repent it, or to change my course.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, Mr. President, I recognize that there are great exceptions to what might be interpreted as

a rather general blanket condemnation which the junior Senator from Oregon has made against the journalistic profession today. To be fair about it, I say, in all honesty, that I think the exceptions really are so numerous that they are the rule, which is proved by the exceptions. By that I simply mean that there do not have to be very many rotten apples in the journalistic barrel to injure the contents of the entire barrel. Of course, qualitatively, a few powerful periodicals and newspapers can do much more harm than a much larger number of good periodicals and newspapers, adhering to the standards of journalistic ethics can do good. That is the point I want to make. Too frequently it is the few but powerful media of public information, through the press and the periodicals, that color public opinion for a given time and destroy the reputation of good men. Of the good and right, ethical newspapers and periodicals in America I would not start to name one, because I would be doing injustice to many others by not mentioning them. But I have sought today, Mr. President, only to dare to mention critically a powerful publication source known as a Luce publications, to which I referred as the house organ of the Eisenhower administration, as representing the kind of inaccurate journalism which I think at the present time is doing a great injury to American public opinion.

INFORMATION AS TO INCOME OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS

As my next item of business today, I wish to discuss a comment I made a couple of Fridays ago, when I discussed on the floor of the Senate my desire to elicit from my colleagues in the Senate support for a bill I have introduced for the past several years, calling for the publication in January of each year of information as to the sources and the amounts of incomes of public officials receiving salaries of $10,000 or more. I have had a hard time with that bill. I have had a terribly hard time with it, in the sense that I have not been able to have any hearings held on it. The bill seems to be one of the untouchables.

As the representative of the Independent Party, I have the same personal judgment—and it is personal to me—as to why I cannot get any action on it as I expressed a few days ago, when I tried to have the Senate include, in a resolution that sought to investigate for subversive activities the employees of the Senate, Senators themselves.

An interesting point about that defeat is the many people from whom I have heard, who, like me, could not see any reason why Senators should not be investigated if Senate employees were to be investigated; who, like me, could not see any logical reason at all why, if the purpose of the investigation is to protect the security of the country—and the reason given for the investigation is that Senate employees have access to security information—the same procedure should not be followed in the case of Senators, because they also have access to security information. These people who have written and talked to me agree that we have no right to take a holier-than-thou attitude here in the Senate and exclude Senators from being investigated.

I should be surprised if there were any security risks in the Senate among Senators, but it all depends on what is meant by subversive organizations, which I think should be subject to investigation by the Investigation Committee itself. However, I should like to see a list of memberships of the various organizations to which all Members of the Senate belong, or to which they have belonged in the past, and then let the public decide, once that kind of information was fully disclosed, whether or not it might have any bearing upon the security risks the people may run, even with elected officials.

I have indicated that I was for this kind of an investigation; in fact, I have volunteered that it shall apply to my office, including the Senator from Oregon, and I thought it would be only fair to apply it to Senators if it is to apply to employees.

So I am as much at a loss as to why I could not get support for that proposal as I am as to why I cannot get support for the bill to have Members of Congress and other public officials who receive salaries of $10,000 or more a year required to publish, at the first of each year, the sources and the amounts of their income.

Some news from Kansas came over the ticker tape today which I think further illustrates my point. I mentioned the Kansas situation the other day, when my good friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] was so disturbed about the fact that some high-placed Democrats were taking annual accumulated leave money. He announced that the appropriate Senate committee would investigate those high Democrats. I said that I thought that should be done. I am all for it. I said I would stand shoulder to shoulder with the Senator with respect to that matter.

I then expressed to the Senator from Kansas my wish that he would give me some support in the matter of publishing the incomes and sources of income of public officials. I called his attention to the fact that my bill covered the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

I further called his attention to the fact that although he was very much concerned about the mess in Washington, I was somewhat interested in the mess in Kansas, because I thought it was a rather sad and unfortunate circumstance, and disturbing to the confidence of the American people in our political system, that the head of the Republican National Committee should find himself confronting a legislative investigation for what was at least alleged to be—I do not know what the facts are—conduct that might find him somewhat involved with the laws of Kansas. I still do not know all the facts, but I again call attention to the ticker tape as evidence which I think justifies my continuing to fight in the Senate for early hearings and ultimate passage of my bill, which would require disclosure of the amounts and sources of income. I think it would have an inhibitory effect on tempted people.

I read the news item from the ticker tape, as follows:

In its findings, based on a 10-day inquiry, the committee said:

"Your committee is constrained to the view that while there is doubt there was a violation of the letter of the law, the committee is firmly convinced that there has been a violation of the spirit of the law.

"The protection which it (the lobbying law) was designed to afford for the people of this State was deliberately and intentionally frustrated by Wes Roberts and Edgar Bennett."

Bennett is grand master of the Ancient Order of United Workmen, an insurance order which engaged Roberts to sell the building to the State.

The committee report, presented to both houses of the 1953 legislature which had ordered the investigation, said:

1. Roberts did not register as a legislative agent.

2. Roberts was employed by the AOUW for the principal purpose of effecting the sale of the AOUW building to the State.

3. That from the inception of such employment it was known to Bennett and Roberts that such sale could be accomplished only through an act of the legislature.

4. That the AOUW had an interest in the sale and purchase of the building on the State sanatorium grounds at Norton, Kans., separate and apart from the interest of the people of Kansas.

5. That Roberts approached and met with members of the State board of social welfare for the purpose of securing from the board its official recommendation to the house ways and means committee during the 1951 session that the AOUW building be purchased by the State.

6. That Roberts approached the chairman of the ways and means committee during the 1951 legislature and made inquiry concerning possible consideration of a proposal to make the purchase. From this conversation the chairman took it for granted that Roberts was representing the State.

I have another similar news-ticker item on the Kansas mess, this one being from the United Press. I ask unanimous consent that, without my reading it, it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA.—A State legislative investigating committee charged today that Republican National Chairman C. Wesley Roberts "deliberately and intentionally frustrated" the law of Kansas.

The committee, in a report of its investigation, said Roberts violated at least the spirit of the law when he helped negotiate the sale of a $110,000 hospital building to the State, although he was not registered as a lobbyist.

The committee said there "is doubt that there was a violation of the letter of the law."

But it said, "There has been a violation of the spirit of the law and the protection which it was designed to afford to the people of this State was deliberately and intentionally frustrated by Wes Roberts and Edgar Bennett."

Bennett is grand master of the Ancient Order of United Workmen, a fraternal insurance order which in 1951 sold to the State a hospital building it erected in 1928 at Norton, Kans., on State-owned ground.

Roberts got an $11,000 fee for his part in the transaction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the conclusion I would draw is that there is needed on the statute books a disclosure law which, before the fact, will

protect the public from conduct that may bring a great party or a public body into disrepute. I am sad about the Kansas mess. It may be asked, "Why are you sad? You no longer belong to the Republican Party." But I do belong to the country. I am as sad about this as I was not so long ago when a Democratic national chairman was also involved in what I heard referred to on this side of the aisle in such terms as "shenanigans," "corruption," and "dealings of disrepute." I think it is a very sad thing when the chairman of the national committee of either party follows a course of action which shakes the confidence of the American people and causes more and more of them to say, "What is the matter with politicians?" I say there is nothing the matter with the overwhelming majority of them, from the standpoint of ethical standards.

Mr. President, this does not make very pleasant reading. I again recommend to the Senate early hearings on my bill, because I believe legislation such as that would be helpful. I do not say that it would end the evil. I simply say that it would be helpful as a preventive so far as the financial operations of public officials are concerned when such operations tend to bring discredit either upon a great party or upon the Government as a whole.

My bill is Senate bill 334, and I highly recommend it again today.

EQUAL REPRESENTATION OF STATES IN THE SENATE

I now turn to the last item of committee business which I wish to discuss today as a member of the Committee of the Whole. It deals with a relatively brief discussion of the subject of equal representation of States in the Senate. On this subject my text is the Constitution of the United States.

It is often necessary to return to our basic charter and the history of its provisions. This is so because we are prone to forget the emergencies which shaped the instruments and principles of government under which we operate today. We are disposed to take for granted the institutions established by our forefathers and to ignore the reasons for their adoption and the purposes they were designed to serve.

The provisions of the Constitution cannot be separated so lightly from their historical bases. For it is a compact which harmonized conflicting contentions and interests. It must be read and applied with full regard to the promises which made its adoption possible.

Article I, section 3, provides:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State * * * for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

Article V provides in part:

> No State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

The simple historical truth is that without those provisions the Constitution of the United States would not have been adopted in 1789.

This is the unanimous conclusion of the historians of the Convention.

So, Professor Farrand in the Framing of the Constitution, Yale University Press, 1926, observes:

> So on June 27, when Rutledge made the motion, the Convention voted unanimously to proceed at once to the resolutions involving "the most fundamental points, the rules of suffrages in the two branches" (p. 93).
>
> * * * * * *
>
> When the Convention finally got at the question of proportional representation, nearly 3 weeks were spent in reaching a conclusion. More than once any satisfactory solution of the difficulty seemed impossible, and the Convention was on the point of breaking up. Gouverneur Morris afterward said that "the fate of America was suspended by a hair" (p. 94).
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Sunday intervened, and the first thing on Monday morning, July 2, the question was put on giving to each State an equal vote in the Upper House. The vote was a tie, 5 States being in the affirmative, 5 in the negative, and 1 divided (p. 96).
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The Convention was now at a standstill. After 1 or 2 suggestions were made that did not asem to meet with any particular approval, General Pinckney proposed a committee of 1 from each State to try and devise a compromise * * * the Convention generally approved and voted for the proposal by a large majority (pp. 97–98).
>
> * * * * * *
>
> On July 5, the compromise committee presented its report, recommending two propositions "on condition that both shall be generally adopted." The substance of these proposals was: 1. That in the first branch each State should have one representative for every 40,000 inhabitants, counting three-fifths of the slaves, and that money-bills should originate in the first branch and should not be amended by the second branch. 2. That in the second branch each State should have an equal vote. Immediately the debate broke forth again and recriminations were indulged in (p. 99).
>
> On Monday morning, July 16, the whole compromise was adopted (p. 104).
>
> * * * * * *
>
> This is the great compromise of the convention and of the Constitution. None other is to be placed quite in comparison with it. There have been many misunderstandings of it and many false interpretations placed upon it, but with the detailed sequence of events that has just been given it seems as if the main points should be clear. The important feature of the compromise was that in the upper house of the legislature each State should have an equal vote (p. 105).
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The great compromise gave the small States an equal vote in only one branch of the legislature, but it was enough to reconcile them to the new plan, and they became warmer and warmer advocates of a strong national government (p. 113).
>
> * * * * * *
>
> When the great compromise was adopted, many of the delegates had supposed that the voting in that house would be by States, but since the main point of equality of representation had been gained, there was little objection to allowing the members to vote individually. Three members from each State threatened to make the ultimate number of members in the second branch too large, and after it was decided in favor of two members, it was readily agreed that they should vote "per capita," Maryland only being found in the negative (pp. 121–122).

Charles and Mary Beard, The Rise of American Civilization, MacMillan, 1931, volume I, pages 317–318 concur, as follows:

> In its final form the Constitution, so far as the structure of the Government was concerned, was a bundle of compromises. It was more. It was a mosaic of second choices accepted in the interest of union and the substantial benefits to flow from union.
>
> One of the compromises, fundamental in character, occupies a high place in treatises on the Constitution; that was the adjustment between large and small States. * * * And through many exciting sessions the debate over this issue ran on fiercely.
>
> More than one dissolution seemed imminent. * * * In the end they agreed upon a national legislature of two houses; in the Senate, with greater powers and dignity, the aspirations of the States were to be satisfied by equal representations.

Then we see another expert historical authority in the work of Norton—The Constitution of the United States, Little, Brown, 1930, page 17. In his annotation to article I, section 3, Norton wrote:

> The provision for two Senators from each State, regardless of size or population, while population was to determine the number of members in the House of Representatives, was agreed to so that the smaller States might not be overborne in both Houses of Congress by the votes of the larger States. Besides, it was desired that the States as political organizations be represented in Congress. So at loggerheads over this were the large States and the small States that more than once the Constitutional Convention was at the point of breaking up * * * Lord Bryce says that the Americans invented this plan of having one House represent the people directly on the basis of population, and the other (the Senate) represent the States on the basis of State equality as autonomous communities. He believes that it was this device which made federation possible in the United States.

That, Mr. President, is what Norton says on the issue which I raise this afternoon. It follows that these keystone clauses must be given full effect.

The principle embodied in the great compromise is that there shall be equal representation for each State in the Senate.

Mr. President, there can be no argument about degrees of equality. There are no degrees of equality. Equality either exists or it does not exist. For it to exist in the Senate of the United States the representatives of each State must be accorded the same rights as every other Senator. Rules governing the service of Senators must be applied with uniformity. I repeat that, Mr. President. Rules governing the service of Senators must be applied with uniformity. Whenever they are not so applied there is not equal representation in the Senate in accordance with the guaranty of the Constitution to every sovereign State in this land.

Lacking that, equality—the equality without which the Constitution would not have been promulgated and ratified—cannot be said to exist.

The assignment of Senators must follow rules of uniform application.

On January 13 and again on March 13, I described the history of the rules for the assignment of Senators to committees. It was demonstrated that with only one lapse in 1871, the rule of senior-

ity has been inflexibly applied and that no Senator has been involuntarily removed in violation of his seniority from a committee on which he has served. It has not happened since 1871, and it did not happen before then.

Mr. President, if you tell me that the equal-representation principle of the Constitution has been lived up to in the Senate, to the benefit of a million and a half people of the great sovereign State of Oregon, I will tell you to look at the record. It just "t'aint so." The Senate is going to hear me weekly on this proposition, Mr. President, from now until Doomsday, if I am here that long, fighting for a million and a half people of the State of Oregon, for their equal representation in the Senate through their junior Senator, whom they have elected to represent them in part.

What other Senators may think of the junior Senator from Oregon is beside the point, because the people and not the Senators have sent me to this body, and the people of my State, I am confident, will return me, too. I know whereof I speak, as the mounting mail day by day coming into my office shows. The people of my State know that a Republican majority in the Senate has denied to them equal representation in the Senate. The Republican Party within the State of Oregon will hear about it from the people of Oregon.

I know my people, Mr. President, and I know just how impersonal they can be on a great issue. This is an impersonal issue. This issue has not anything to do with WAYNE MORSE as WAYNE MORSE. This issue has to do with whether or not the Republican Party can justify to more than a million and a half people in the State of Oregon the laying down of a precedent on January 13 of this year, which denies to the people of my State equal representation in the Senate.

Weeks have gone by, Mr. President, and dust has been gathering on my resolution in the Committee on Rules and Administration, with no evidence having been given to me to date of any attempt to discuss my resolution, which calls for protecting the rights of a million and a half people in the sovereign State of Oregon and assuring them equal representation in the Senate.

Oh, Mr. President, I know that on January 13, in answer to a question, it was stated on the floor of the Senate that probably it would take a long time to consider the resolution, and many Senators laughed. But the people of Oregon are not laughing about it, Mr. President. As increasing millions of people across the country come to understand the abstract principle of constitutional law which the Senator from Oregon discussed on January 13, and which he has continued to discuss Friday after Friday since January 13, they are going to realize what its import is.

Oh, Mr. President, I am going about the country these days, and in every State into which I go—and every speech I give is a public forum speech—one of the first questions asked is about the committee fight. There is a notable reaction on the part of the people when they come to grips with the point the junior Senator from Oregon is making this afternoon. They say, "What do you mean when you say it has not been done since 1871?"

I say, "I mean exactly that."

They know it not only violates the equal representation rights under the Constitution, but it also violates the rule of the playground; namely, the rule of fair play.

I have not been very kind to the Democratic side of the aisle about this matter, in the sense that I have pointed out to them that, as a minority party, they had the clear moral responsibility, in my judgment, of protecting minority rights on the floor of the Senate by acceding to what the majority leader was willing to accept on January 13, namely, the adding of 1 Republican Member to the Armed Services Committee and 1 Republican member to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so that the representative of the Independent Party could remain on those two committees, thus not upsetting the many years of seniority precedents of the Senate. That is why I have said in some speeches that I did not intend to let the Democratic Party "off the hook" on this matter, either, because it was the minority leader, speaking for the Democratic side of the aisle, who on January 13 objected to the immediate consideration of my resolution which, if adopted, would have prevented what I consider to be this violation of equal representation in the Senate of the United States.

But that does not excuse the Republican Party, Mr. President, because on January 13 and at every session since then, the Republican Members of the Senate have sat here with votes sufficient to adopt the resolution. Here again we hear interesting rationalizations about why the majority party does not do it. Some of its members say to me, "But, Wayne, it is necessary to get along with the minority. We have to do business with them; we have to work out understandings with them. Just because we have the votes is no justification for beating the minority over the head with them."

Mr. President, I must confess that I have been so politically naive that I never have been able to understand that language; it is political Chinese to me. You will note, Mr. President, that the first part of their premise is irreconcilable with the second part, for the first part of their premise, figuratively speaking with a hand on my shoulder, they tell me, "Don't rock the boat. We will work this out some way, at some time."

How much time do they need? Should not 10 weeks have been sufficient time? I should think so, for that is a long time during which to deny to 1½ million people, the inhabitants of a great, sovereign State, their full representation in the Senate of the United States.

In a few minutes I shall close my speech today with a specific announcement about what my next step in this fight will be, for I intend to serve due notice; I intend to be fair about it.

I do not intend "to take it lying down," Mr. President, because 1½ million people in the State of Oregon do not expect me "to take it lying down," and I am going to be true to them.

I might add to the history of the seniority rule in the Senate by observing that there are now sitting in the Senate of the United States three Senators whose seniority rights were observed in their assignments to committees, despite the fact that in 1948 and in 1952 they campaigned against the nominees of their parties. So we have to add the action taken in the case of those three Senators to the long list of precedents which heretofore I have cited in my speeches about what has happened since 1871 in building up the record, in which a single exception cannot be found to the fact that all insurgents, liberals, rebels, independents, or whatever one may choose to call them, who have bolted their parties in various degrees, have not received discipline in the Senate, from the standpoint of having their seniority rights, earned on the floor of the Senate, taken from them. We had to wait for the Republican Party in 1953 to do it, Mr. President; and I do not think that was to its credit.

I do not contend that the seniority system for committee assignments is perfect. I do assert that in 164 years no better plan has been devised. It certainly insures that the representation of each State shall be equal, for the rule requires uniformity in the treatment of each Senator. At any time I shall be willing to join in a resolution proposing the modification of the seniority rule in the Senate. I have so advocated in the past, including my advocacy of a change which would call for the election of the chairmen of committees, instead of having them become chairmen by means of seniority. However, my position is that the treatment shall be uniform, that the rule shall then become applicable to all, that no one Senator shall be singled out for different treatment.

Whenever a Senator is singled out for different treatment, the equal representation principle of the Constitution is violated, because Senators do not sit in the Senate as individuals, although we get in the habit of personifying or personalizing our jobs. However, we as individuals have nothing to do with the matter of service in the Senate. We are but vehicles of sovereignty; we are but spokesmen of sovereignty. For a short period of time we simply are entrusted with the obligation of protecting the sovereign rights of the people of our sovereign States. We must be impersonal about it if we are to live up to the spirit, the intent, and—yes—the letter of the Constitution.

On January 13 this body denied to the State of Oregon its equal representation in the Senate, to which I contend it was entitled by the Constitution of the United States, when this body laid down the application of a policy not consonant with the seniority policies of the Senate, and singled out the representative of one State, and said to him, "You will receive different treatment." Mr. President, there is no equality about it; there is no uniformity about it; there is no basis for reconciliation with what was done on January 13 with the sovereign right of the State of Oregon to receive equal representation, through its junior Senator, in the Senate of the United States.

Senators can rationalize about it all they wish; they can alibi about it all they wish. They can try to fall behind the alibi which was given to the press, namely, that the junior Senator from Oregon said he did not want to be assigned by the Republicans. However, Mr. President, such rationalizations do not come anywhere near meeting me on the issue.

Of course, I said I did not wish to be assigned by the Republicans or by the Democrats. I said I wished to be assigned by the Senate, because I can read the rule and rule XXIV says that is the way the assignment shall be made. Implied in that rule, and in every other rule of the Senate is the principle of equality and uniformity of treatment. Senators cannot get away from it; I do not intend to let them. They cannot have one rule for the junior Senator from Oregon and another rule for 95 other Senators, and live up to the requirement that there shall be equal representation of the people of Oregon in the Senate of the United States through its junior Senator. Oh, I know it will take a long time, to get that abstract principle of government understood; but I can be patient, too, and I intend to use every legitimate device at my command, in the Senate, parliamentarily speaking, to focus attention on it.

I refused to waive the reading of the Journal in the Senate a few days ago, and I was very frank in stating my reason. I wanted to focus attention on the fact that equal representation was not being given in the Senate. I took that action in that instance because the parliamentary courtesy had not been extended to the junior Senator from Oregon of having an opportunity to study a bill. So far as I can recall, that courtesy has always been extended to every other Member of the Senate, when there was no emergency that called for the immediate passage of a bill on the unanimous-consent calendar. All I asked for was that the bill go over until the next calendar day, so I could study it. That request was denied, in spite of the fact that I had said, with complete politeness and, I think, dignity, on the floor of the Senate, that while I might be completely wrong about my suspicions regarding the bill, I sought time to study it, and the admission was obtained from the proponent of the bill that it did not have to be passed until April 1. We have had another calendar day since then, when it could have been passed.

So I had to demonstrate my position, as I shall demonstrate it in the future—Mr. President, mark you this—time and time again, if necessary. When I feel that rules are being applied against the representative of the people of the State of Oregon in a nonuniform and unequal way, then I will use the rules of the Senate to direct the attention of the Senate to the rights of each Member of the Senate. Let me tell you, Mr. President, you have not seen anything yet when it comes to this matter of applying rules, if it is necessary to do it in that way. Criticism will not stop me, ostracism will not stop me; because, in my judgment, there is a principle involved in this fight, and I am going to make the record on this principle. Adjectives are not going to stop me. We are going to find out, before this question is settled, whether the Republican majority in this body wants to apply the rules equally and uniformly, without discrimination, among the Senators as the vehicles of State sovereignty, or whether it wants to discriminate against a sovereign State merely because it has a representative who does not hesitate to dare to stand for what he thinks is right, although it may be unpopular at the moment. I think the Republican majority is going to learn something about what is popular and what is not popular, too, once the people come to understand the principle involved.

I would point out, Mr. President, to the Senate this afternoon that every provision, line, and phrase of the Constitution of the United States is subject to amendment under the procedures prescribed by article 5 except one: that providing that "no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate."

The Senate cannot amend that section of the Constitution without the consent of each and every State. That is how basic this principle is. We are here dealing with the principle that, had it not been adopted, the Constitution of the United States would have been nonexistent, and the Union, say the historians, would never have come into being.

Certainly the Senate should be most circumspect to avoid doing by omission, inaction, or so-called party machinery what cannot be done even by amendment to the Constitution.

It is perfectly clear from the law that the term "suffrage" may not be narrowly construed. The case of *Smith* v. *Allwright* (321 U. S. 649 (1949)), I think is a striking argument by way of analogy in support of this phase, and only of this phase, of my argument. It goes to a matter of definition, to a definitive phase.

It declared that the guaranties of the 14th amendment, and the 15th amendment giving protection to vote regardless of race or color, applied not merely to the right to vote in the general election in Texas but also extended to the Democratic primary. The Court reasoned that this was so because in Texas the Democratic primary is usually dispositive of the final result in the general election. Moreover, the Court held that the primary had such official status under State law and procedure that exclusion from the primary by the party was tantamount to State action.

Describing its earlier decisions, the Court said:

> This Court went on to announce that to deny a vote in a primary was a mere refusal of party membership with which the State need have no concern, loc. cit. at 55, while for a State to deny a vote in the general election on the ground of race or color violated the Constitution.

In announcing its new rule the Court stated:

> It may now be taken as a postulate that the right to vote in such a primary for the nomination of candidates without discrimination by the State, like the right to vote in a general election, is a right secured by the Constitution.
>
> * * * * *
>
> When primaries become a part of the machinery for choosing officials, State and national, as they have here, the same tests to determine the character of discrimination or abridgment should be applied to the primary as are applied to the general election.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The United States is a constitutional democracy. Its organic law grants to all citizens a right to participate in the choice of elected officials without restriction by any State because of race. This grant to the people of the opportunity for choice is not to be nullified by a State through casting its electoral process in a form which permits a private organization to practice racial discrimination in the election. Constitutional rights would be of little value if they could be thus indirectly denied.

Mr. President, you might ask, what does the decision, having to do with the election laws of Texas, have to do with any of the rules or bylaws of the Senate in respect to equal representation? Let me try to show what I think is clearly the analogous connection.

I think the analogy is twofold. In the first place, the case stands for the proposition that the protection of the right to vote extends to all procedures which make the right to vote meaningful. And secondly, the delegation of power over electoral machinery to a political party does not relieve the Government of its constitutional obligations.

So it is clear that "suffrage" must include participation in all of the provisions which provide and shape the final selection to ballot. And the Senate may not shuffle off its constitutional obligation by permitting party caucuses to select the membership of its committees.

Mr. President, you have heard me say many times on the floor of the Senate that we cannot separate substantive rights from procedural rights. I am applying it analogously, to what I think is a comparable situation. We cannot separate the substantive rights of the people of the State of Oregon on the floor of the Senate through their vehicle of sovereignty, their junior Senator, from the procedures of the Senate. It cannot be done. It was tried on January 13, and the effect has been wrongful and in violation of equality of suffrage in the Senate, equality of representation in the Senate.

I say, Mr. President, that the Senate may not shuffle off its constitutional obligations by permitting party caucuses to select the membership of its committees.

I would recommend to the Senate some pertinent dictum in the Supreme Court's decision in *Coyle* v. *Oklahoma* (221 U. S. 559, 580 (1911)):

> The constitutional equality of the States is essential to the harmonious operation of the scheme upon which the Republic was organized. When that equality disappears we may remain a free people, but the Union will not be the Union of the Constitution.

I say, Mr. President, that when the Senate follows the principle which it adopted on January 13 of this year, in contradiction of the long-established seniority rights of Members of this body for decades gone by, it violated the rights

of equal representation in the Senate of the United States by the sovereign people of a sovereign State, my State.

It is within the Senate's power to rectify its earlier error by adopting Senate Resolution 32, which would maintain majority control of the Armed Services and Labor Committees and also continue the junior Senator's membership on those committees in recognition of his seniority as a representative of his State.

That resolution has been lodged in the Rules Committee for 2½ months. I think it is time, Mr. President, to get it out of the Committee and vote it up or down on the floor of the Senate. Let us get on with making the RECORD, and and then let us go on, depending on what that record is, with the next step.

So I serve notice today, Mr. President, that a week from today I shall offer the following resolution, if, in the meantime, action has not been taken by the Senate on the other resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and hereby is, discharged of further consideration of Senate Resolution 32, temporarily increasing the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare, and the amendment proposed thereto.

I think that is not only the fair thing to do, but I owe it to the people of my State. That amounts to 11 weeks of time allowed the Committee on Rules and Administration to pass on this matter, and it is difficult for me to believe that the majority leader, when on January 13 he said, in effect, that it would take some time to pass on the resolution, thought that 11 weeks was not adequate time. I mention it as no threat, because I do not threaten; I simply say what I am going to do. I say, Mr. President, that I shall offer that resolution a week from today.

My attention has just been called to the fact that next Friday is Good Friday, and the Senate will not then be in session. So I shall offer it on the following Monday.

I want the RECORD to show, Mr. President, what the parliamentary situation will be when I offer the resolution.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEES FROM A SUBJECT

Paragraph 2 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate provides that—

All * * * motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of a subject, and all subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over 1 day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Except by unanimous consent, the resolution cannot be brought up for consideration until the first morning hour following an adjournment of the Senate, and as distinguished from recesses.

Immediately following the order for introduction of concurrent and other resolutions, if reached, the resolution will be laid before the Senate by the Presiding Officer and the question will be on agreeing to the resolution, which is debatable. It is subject to certain motions, under rule XXII, which have precedence in the following order, namely: first, to lay on the table; second, postpone indefinitely; third, postpone to a day certain; fourth, to refer; and fifth, to amend. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

If the resolution has not been acted upon or disposed of by the end of the morning hour, which is 2 hours after the meeting of the Senate, it is placed on the Senate Calendar, whether or not there is unfinished business to be laid down at that time. The rules of procedure governing the consideration of bills on the calendar are then applicable to the resolution; that is a motion can only be gotten up for consideration by a majority vote of the Senators voting, a quorum, of course, being present. Such a motion at that time is debatable without limitation, subject, however, to the presentation of a cloture motion thereon. In the event the motion to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is agreed to, the question of agreeing to the resolution itself is debatable. If the resolution to discharge the committee is agreed to by the Senate, the resolution itself is placed upon the calendar and, under rule XXVI, cannot be taken up for consideration until another legislative day. The same procedure is required to secure consideration of the resolution as was the case with the resolution to discharge the committee.

The motion to take up the resolution is debatable, and if it is agreed to, the resolution itself is debatable and subject to amendment as in the case of any other resolution. Debate is unlimited except in case a cloture motion should be presented on the resolution and adopted by the Senate, which vote must be by two-thirds of the entire membership of the Senate. Unless cloture has been adopted, a resolution could be superseded at any time by a majority vote of the Senate to take up any other matter except a privileged matter.

Mr. President, I have set forth in detail the parliamentary situation which would be created, because I want all those opposed to me on this matter to have available to them in ready form information about the parliamentary barriers they may construct if they want to. I have set it forth also, Mr. President, so that they are thereby served notice that I am familiar with the parliamentary situation which will be created by the filing of my motion, and I am perfectly willing to let that parliamentary procedure run its course, with full notice. It does not make any difference what parliamentary tactics some Senators may want to use against the junior Senator from Oregon with respect to this matter. His fight for equal representation for the people of the State of Oregon is not going to be stopped by parliamentary difficulties.

So in a very friendly spirit I close my committee work of the Independent Party this afternoon by repeating a bit of advice I gave to my colleagues 2 weeks ago, when I said, "You ought to relax. You must come to grips with this situation sooner or later. You will have to make up your minds whether you are going to assign the junior Senator from Oregon to committees on the basis of a garbage-can-disposal principle, or whether you are going to assign him to his committees in keeping with all the historic precedents of the Senate since 1871, in respect to his seniority rights."

"It is your record," I say to the Republicans in the Senate today. "You, the Republican Party, are writing the record on this matter."

To the Democrats I say, "You ought to rededicate yourselves to the Jeffersonian principle of protecting minority rights." You ought to recognize all, Republicans and Democrats and Independents, alike, that when you begin to trample minority rights on the floor of the greatest parliamentary body in the world, you are doing a great injustice to the sovereign rights of a free people in every sovereign State of the United States.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE'S speech,

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my rights to the floor.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I had hoped to have an opportunity this afternoon to speak against Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. Obviously it is now going over until Monday, at which time I shall not be able to be present, in view of the fact that I am on the Small Business Committee, which will be holding hearings in California. I had wished to state my opposition to it. It does not follow the Hoover Commission recommendations. In essence, it is the same plan which was voted down in 1950. It would create a gigantic superstructure, and a greater bureaucracy. In principle the plan is just as bad now as it was then, even though the personalities have changed somewhat. Even though the principal personality is now a charming, gracious, and able lady, nonetheless the principle is the same.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a statement in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMATHERS

I realize the futility of the Senators attempting to oppose the final passage of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. For it is already clear it will be adopted by an overwhelming vote. However, I think, for the record it should be made clear that some few of us do oppose it and for the following reasons:

First, this proposed reorganization plan does not conform to the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission; many of the general public, many doctors, and even some Senators are laboring under that illusion. A brief look at the record, however, shows that the Hoover Commission recommended that there be created a separate Department of Health and at no time, nor in any place, did the Commission recommend the lumping together of health, education, and welfare into one single department. If we look at the report of the hearings on the Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950, on page 17, we find where the senior Senator of New Jersey, in his statement said this,

and I quote: "The Hoover Commission did recommend the establishment of a Cabinet department embracing education, security, and Indian affairs. It also recommended the establishment of a United Medical Administration as a separate agency embracing the functions of public health services and overlapping hospital programs of several Government agencies."

In this connection, the Hoover Commission report on medical activities found that "only the creation of the United Medical Administration can remedy the weaknesses of the present organization and give the leadership urgently needed."

On page 37 of the hearing on the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 there is submitted by Dr. Shearon the report of the task force on Federal medical services. A letter of transmittal dated March 5, Washington, D. C., signed by Herbert Hoover, Chairman, follows:

"The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
"The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

"DEAR SIRS: In accordance with Public Law 162, approved July 7, 1947, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government submits to the Congress herewith a supplemental report on the medical services of the Federal Government.

"The Commission's own report on Federal medical services is submitted to the Congress separately.

"Faithfully,

"HERBERT HOOVER,
"*Chairman.*"

"SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON AN INDEPENDENT MEDICAL AGENCY

"Proposal to set up a United Medical Service Organization as an independent administration, reporting to the President, instead of as a bureau of a department of health, education, and security: As our committee had been instructed to assume that any consolidated health organization would be a part of a new Cabinet-level department embracing health, education, and security, which the Commission would recommend, our main report contained on page I the following statement: 'The above instructions excluded from our consideration the question as to whether a separate Cabinet department would be established for health alone, as urged by professional groups. However, should this be done, the organization which we are proposing would be adapted to such plan with only a few changes in nomenclature.'

"Thus, we answer in the affirmative the question as to whether the organization which we originally designated as the National Bureau of Health, could function as an independent department or agency.

"It remains to consider whether such an alternative would be preferable. This question has been fully considered by our committee, and we have reached the conclusion that such an independent organization would be preferable to placing this function in a larger department, as the Commission originally proposed.

"In favoring this, we recognize that such an organization would create some additional problems. For example, the administration of health and welfare require close coordination in certain areas. Their separation would require an adjustment of the dual functions of the Children's Bureau and of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. These, however, can be solved without undue difficulty.

"The advantages of an independent agency are:

"(a) The health agency, if submerged within a multipurpose department, would be more likely to find its health functions impeded by collateral considerations pertaining to welfare and insurance.

"(b) Appropriations for health should, if possible, be clearly identified as such and not confused with those for social security, welfare, or other social programs.

"(c) Other departments, such as the Armed Forces, using the medical service agency would be concerned only with its health functions as such and would thus be protected from any collateral and irrelevant considerations having to do with welfare, social security, etc."

Those who drafted the Hoover Commission reports on Federal medical practices always enunciated one underlying theme—a fear of putting together in one department the welfare programs and the health programs. They could see in such a coalition the possibility of eventual socialized medicine. It was stated in the debates of 1950 on this same reorganization plan over and over again that there was great danger in the lumping together of these two departments.

The American Medical Association, in 1950, was violently opposed to putting these two departments under the same head. An examination of the hearings on Reorganization Plan 27 of 1950 reveals on page 86 the statement by Louis H. Bauer on behalf of the American Medical Association the following:

"Within recent years, this represents the fourth time we of the medical profession have presented to the Congress our judgment as to the inadvisability of creating an executive department in which would be associated or combined health, educational, and welfare functions."

On page 88, Dr. Bauer again expressed his disapproval of this program and made the final statement:

"They would all combine in the executive department functions relating to health, welfare, education, and social security. We feel it would not advance adequate and proper Federal programs to stimulate improvements in the health of the citizens of our country, but it would tend to subordinate health problems to those related to other aspects of our national welfare, and that would be quite unfortunate."

Now I know that the proponents of the present reorganization plan state that the American Medical Association is now for this plan. However, it seems as though the American Medical Association only decided to be for this plan after they had been paid a personal visit by President Eisenhower and when he assured them that they were in no danger. We all know of the President's great charm and persuasive ability, but I frankly believe that the doctors are already beginning to regret the fact that they so quickly yielded to the persuasions of the President. On page 26 of the hearings of the 1953 reorganization plan, Dr. Doenges quoted Dr. Bauer as he spoke to the delegates of the American Medical Association and he said Dr. Bauer said this: "But, gentlemen, this is going to be adopted regardless of what we do."

The implication is clear that, well, it was going to be adopted anyway so why should they oppose it.

I personally think the medical profession will regret their retreat from their long stand in opposition. The Dentists Association is still opposed to this plan, although I am examining the record of the hearings before the Senate which lasted 2 hours and 15 minutes, and there is not any evidence of how the dental profession stands. In the hearings on the reorganization plan of 1950 we find on page 107 that Dr. Harold Gal- made this statement:

"Let me make it clear at this point that the American Dental Association has no opposition to the elevation of the Federal Security Agency to Cabinet status, but it believes that the elevation of that agency with the health organizations of the Government as a component part of the new department is inconsistent with the health needs of this country."

Now the proposal for reorganization of the Federal Security Agency was offered in 1950 by the Democrats sought to lump together under one Cabinet head the department of health, education and welfare. It was bitterly opposed by the then minority party, the now majority party. The leadership stated at that time that this was an open invitation to socialism. In 1950 the proposal was also opposed by many of the Democratic Party. All of us who opposed it at that time feared that it would do more evil than good, would open the doorway to eventual socialized medicine. From the hearings as they appeared in the 1950 report, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Ohio stated he did not like that proposal because he felt the health department would be dominated by the welfare department. He had no objection, as I read his testimony, to lumping all these departments together under one Cabinet head but he apparently felt that there was not enough autonomy given to the health department. The Senior Senator from New Jersey, the junior Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and other Senators, rather openly stated their opposition to the proposal to lump together health, education and welfare. The same reasons on which they based their opinions in 1950, I based mine. I voted against it in 1950 more as a matter of principle than of personality. Of course, Oscar Ewing didn't do anything to help the passage of the Reorganization Plan of 1950. But arguments used against the plan of 1950 were made on the premise that it was dangerous and socialistic to put health in with the department of welfare.

As I look at this present reorganization proposal of 1953, I see no basic difference in this plan and that of 1950. The only difference to me is that under the present proposal there is to be a special Administrative Assistant to the Under Secretary who will be directly in charge of health and who can deal directly with the Cabinet members. In the 1950 proposal, the Surgeon General was authorized to deal directly with the Secretary himself. So I don't believe there is any basic difference in these reorganization plans. I hear many Senators say that they were afraid of Oscar Ewing, but not afraid of Mrs. Hobby. Certainly that can well be true for who could be afraid of Mrs. Hobby, as gracious and lovely as she is. However, is Mrs. Hobby to hold this Cabinet job forever? Who will succeed her? The Republicans must realize the Democrats will not be out for as long as 20 years, and, indeed, it will sound a little flat to hear them holler about socialism in 1957 after they have voted for this plan in 1953.

I feel confident that once this plan is put into effect, the doctors who had given it their reluctant approval, will discover they have been sold a bill of goods; they will realize they will never have an independent department of health. They will wish they had not deserted the stand which they had taken in previous years on this proposal.

Another reason why I oppose this present reorganization plan is that there is no evidence it will result in any savings to the taxpayers. As a matter of fact, Mr. Dodge, Director of the Budget Bureau, testified that the cost of the new Cabinet officer and assistants would result in $32,500 a year. This, mind you, is just the salaries of the Secretary and assistants. It does not include new employees that will have to go to work for the Secretary and the assistants. There is no evidence that by lumping three departments together more efficiency will result, or a better program of health, of education, of welfare, will result. The only conclusion that can be practically drawn is that a new superstructure of bureaucracy will be erected over the departments which now already exist, that there will be expense added to the cost of government, that the welfare department being so much larger than the other departments will soon dominate them all and that Mrs. Hobby will have Cabinent rank with all the privileges, emoluments, and the prestige, that goes with that lofty position.

In summary, I feel that by coalescing the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare under one department, will endanger the independence of each one. We are opening the gateway to the road to socialized medicine and if we do that today because of the beliefs of Mrs. Hobby, how do we know that we are not creating the structure and machinery which will enable it to be brought about by one of her successors?

We are not following the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and we are adding expense to the Government at a time when we have just finished telling the people of America that we all would work for less bureaucracy and less expense. Therefore, Mr. President, I shall continue to oppose this reorganization plan, for if it does not come to a yea-or-nay vote, my opposition will hereby at least be on the record.

APPOINTMENT OR RETENTION OF CERTAIN FEMALE RESERVE PERSONNEL WITH MINOR OR DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I rise to acquaint my colleagues with the story of a remarkable young woman, whose diverse talents, high idealism, and strong sense of duty to her country for too long have been wasted—and are being wasted—by a shortsighted personnel policy sponsored by the Department of Defense.

The history of this lost service is embodied in the case of ex-Army Major Alba Martinelli Thompson, of East Orange, N. J., but it applies to many unheralded women who have lost the opportunity to serve their Nation for one basic reason—they become mothers.

This able young woman, the wife of an Army officer, gave birth to her first-born after World War II was concluded, and after she had served the Army brilliantly in many capacities, particularly in Korea, where she had acquired an intimate knowledge of both the language and conditions in that torn country.

Mr. President, when Major Martinelli joined the ranks of this other kind of army—the vaster and, I dare say, more important army of mothers—she was involuntarily discharged from the Women's Army Corps.

Now Major Martinelli, from my knowledge of her excellent character, would be the last woman on this earth to shirk the duties of this old army which she joined in motherhood. She made that clear in her testimony before a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate last year—testimony which, I am certain, was a strong factor in convincing the Senate that my proposed legislation in the last Congress was a necessary directive to the Department of Defense. My amendments to the Reserve Act, incidentally, were not finally adopted by the Congress as a whole.

Major Martinelli had this to say, in part:

> I propose simply that experienced womanpower be stockpiled, maintained, and cataloged in a standby Reserve from which the Nation could draw in the event our very homes were threatened with destruction.
>
> Practically no expense to the Government is involved. This would seem to be a practical and economical measure.
>
> It cannot be denied that any organization comprised exclusively of women must face the inescapable facts that a great many of its young women will marry and will become mothers.
>
> This is not to say that motherhood renders them a complete loss to the service, no more than having children makes them a liability in the business and labor world.
>
> A realistic attack of this problem would have faced the irrefutable facts and would have brought into being regulations which safeguard health, provide for pregnancy leaves, and protect seniority and retirement benefits.
>
> Most important of all, a conscious attempt would be made to utilize to the fullest extent possible the invaluable training and skills of these women, so that the richest return on a considerable national investment should be realized.
>
> None of these things has been accomplished by the Army.
>
> It is evidently easier to discard this wealth than it is to work out an equitable set of rules governing servicewomen with minor children.
>
> All of these women could have been, and should have been, utilized within the continental limits of the United States where their knowledge and experience is in such short supply.
>
> It was evidently easier to discharge them than it was to draw up realistic regulations to continue them in service. Easier, perhaps, but certainly not cheaper.
>
> We are all the poorer because their talents willingly offered are not available to the armed services.
>
> How long we shall be able to afford such uneconomical and unwise handling of personnel is a moot question.

Mr. President, the bill which I offer today is simple. It would put a premium on the services of capable women—enlisted women as well as officers—who feel that they can do their job in periods of emergency and should not be penalized because they happen to be mothers.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference my bill proposing amendments to the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

The bill (S. 1492) to require the establishment of adequate provisions relating to the appointment or retention of certain female Reserve personnel with minor or dependent children, introduced by Mr. Hendrickson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I had the honor of being chairman of a subcommittee which conducted hearings last year on the reserve bill. I was very much impressed by the ability of Major Martinelli, and I thought then that there was much merit to the argument she made that Reserve officers and enlisted personnel should be retained, even though they may be mothers, whenever ways can be worked out whereby they can be of service to their country.

I can not help realizing that if we are forced into another world war, it will undoubtedly be a total war for all our people. I believe it is shortsighted for the Armed Services to refuse to recognize that women of the ability of Major Martinelli are willing to serve and can serve their country very ably in the event we are forced into all out war.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the junior Senator from Louisiana. I believe he recalls distinctly the testimony of Major Martinelli and her demeanor, high character, and fitness for her work. I am certain that the Senator from Louisiana will agree with me that Major Martinelli made a marvelous record in the Army of the United States.

Mr. LONG. I certainly do agree with the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I think the Senator from Louisiana will probably recall also that he agreed with me to take my amendment to conference.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct. The amendment was lost in conference. I suspect that it was lost partially because there was so much resistance from the Pentagon. However, I believe the amendment had merit. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will be successful in obtaining early hearings on the bill, and that we will have the privilege of voting on it.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 30, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

John Roger Lewis, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Raymond Blattenberger, of Pennsylvania, to be Public Printer.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the remainder of the term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1955.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Ray M. Gidney, of Ohio, to be Comptroller of the Currency, in place of Preston Delano, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Walter S. Robertson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles E. Bohlen, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Edward Lumbard to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York.

GUAM

Ford Q. Elvidge, of Washington, to be Governor of Guam.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 27, 1953:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Wilson L. Townsend, of Maryland, member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1953

Dr. Joseph Simonson, executive secretary, division of public relations, National Lutheran Council, New York City, offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, O Lord God, in this important hour. We come in the calm confidence that no hopes or fears of man are foreign to Thee. Therefore, we dare believe that Thou art interested in what we think, say, and do here in the United States Senate. Conform us to Thy will, Heavenly Father, and to purposes and decisions which honor Thy name and help our fellow men. Only then will we be sure that any lasting good can come from our being here. Preserve us from the pettiness of small things in this great hour. Show us that we need fear no one or nothing—except Thee, O God.

Grant that Thy guidance may so illuminate and direct us here that no disappointed hopes for good shall follow in the wake of this day's session. To that end we commend into Thy hands the Vice President, the Senators, and all the officers of this legislative body, as well as the millions of Americans they represent. Into Thy hands we commend our Nation and its welfare. Into Thy hands we place our world.

In the name of Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 27, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954;

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CHAVEZ were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week because of official business.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the subcommittee investigating waterfront racketeering of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Improvement of Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

On request of Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Ammunition of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to sit for the next hour.

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, last Saturday, March 28, was the 75th birthday anniversary of my very distinguished colleague the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I know that all Senators join me at this time in extending to him very hearty and very sincere, though perforce belated, congratulations and best wishes. His service to his State and to his country has been unusually outstanding; and in this connection and at this point in my remarks I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of editorials which appeared in last Saturday's issues of the New York Times and the Washington Post, yesterday's issue of the New York Post, and this morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 28, 1953]

SENATOR LEHMAN'S BIRTHDAY

Herbert H. Lehman, who reaches his 75th birthday today, has had three careers: one in private business, which he relinquished a quarter of a century ago; one in philanthropic enterprises, which goes back to the early days of his youth; one in public service, during which he has been successively lieutenant governor and governor of the State of New York, a director of relief and rehabilitation for the State Department, Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and United States Senator.

To all that he has done he brought a keen intelligence, a humane spirit, and an urgent sense of responsibility. He has been a politician in the sense that he has voted and acted as a Democrat, and in his ability to be elected and reelected, but his public career dignifies an abused word. There was little artfulness in his four campaigns for the governorship or in his campaigns for the Senate. All he had to do was to present his record, his plans, and his hopes in the quiet and persuasive manner natural to him. He inspires trust. One may disagree with some of his views but never with his principles. When these are involved he will break with party, as he did when he opposed the Roosevelt Supreme Court plan.

His senatorial term has nearly 4 years to run. It is a pleasure to note that his health and energy are unimpaired. He is needed where he is, and good wishes for him are good wishes for his constituents and his country.

[From the Washington Post of March 28, 1953]

HERBERT LEHMAN: 75

Along with countless friends and fellow-citizens, we felicitate Herbert H. Lehman today on his 75th birthday. Senator LEHMAN is an ardent Democrat. But he is an American first, and his idea of being an American is enshrined in the Bill of Rights, and is, moreover, expressed in his humanitarian impulses. He has maintained an honorable and high-minded appreciation of the duties and responsibilities of a public official in a lifetime of service. His 10 years as Governor of New York were a model of efficient and progressive administration, and he gave to his work a painstaking and conscientious devotion which won him the regard of all New Yorkers regardless of party. May he have many more years of service to America and to the cause of freedom.

[From the New York Post of March 29, 1953]

TOAST TO A FIGHTING LIBERAL

We affectionately salute HERBERT LEHMAN on his 75th birthday. Too many people in public life grow weary, cynical, and indifferent to human suffering in their latter years; LEHMAN'S passion for justice and freedom seems to have grown more intense with the years. He was a good Governor; he has been a great Senator. Amid the timidity and irresolution that characterize so many men in Washington, he has conscientiously raised his voice on every momentous issue. No man has spoken out more forthrightly against the McCarthy madness; few have tried as hard as he has to make the Democratic Party fulfill its civil-rights pledges. No man is more deserving of the warm good wishes of American liberals.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 30, 1953]

MR. LEHMAN'S BIRTHDAY PRESENT

One must assume that the new study which Mrs. Lehman gave to her husband for a present on his 75th birthday was not an invitation to work; for over a long and successful career the Senator has shown himself one of the most indefatigable of men. As a place where mementoes of his years of public service may be stored, it will undoubtedly be well used. Few have gathered in more richly the fruits of experience. The quietness of the new study, moreover, may beguile him; though the arena of toil and conflict, where good causes have stood in need of a stout advocate, has been where he was most often found.

At 75 Senator LEHMAN is in the enviable position of a man who has served with disinterested zeal and can look back without self-reproach on accomplishments of a high order. His advice to youth at this milestone is to shape for themselves the kind of government they believe to be good; and he is young himself in following this injunction.

A large public must wish for him many years to enjoy his new study—not as a place of retreat but as a place where fresh resolves are formed and new tasks undertaken.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 115)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on the operations of the Department of State under section 2 of Public Law 584, 79th Congress, as required by that law.

The enclosed report contains a summary of developments under the program during the 1952 calendar year. It also includes texts of executive agreements concluded with foreign governments pursuant to this legislation, as well as listings of names of both American and foreign recipients of grants, a detailed statement on expenditures, various statistical tables, and other information concerning the operations of this program during the 1952 calendar year.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1953.*

(Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Administration during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 501 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO CRIMINAL SANCTIONS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, recommending, for the information of the Senate, enactment of legislation amending section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to change the criminal sanctions contained therein so that violations of the Communications Act will constitute, except in case of a subsequent violation of the same section of the act, a misdemeanor rather than a felony; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution requesting Members of Congress to support the agricultural conservation program

"Whereas the topsoil of the Nation is one of its most important resources; and

"Whereas for the past 17 years the United States Department of Agriculture, through the agricultural conservation program, has done much to maintain and rebuild soils and also to make farmers and the public in general more aware of the need for such preservation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and the house of representatives:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to continue the agricultural conservation program; and

"2. That the secretary of state be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture, and our congressional delegation.

"CONSUELO N. BAILEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"JOSEPH B. JOHNSON,
"President of the Senate.

"Approved March 25, 1953.

"LEE E. EMERSON,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 16

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for distribution of revenue derived from the development of oil and gas deposits of the United States to the several States and the District of Columbia for purposes of education

"Whereas oil and gas values under the Continental Shelf surounding the United States amount to some $70 billion; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has judicially determined that these oil and gas deposits belong to all the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States certain proposals popularly known as the Anderson and Hill bills, which provide for distribution of the royalty derived from development of these oil and gas deposits among the 48 States of the United States and the District of Columbia for school purposes on the basis of school population with equitable provision being made for the special claims of the 4 coastal States adjacent to said deposits; and

"Whereas the State of Colorado, which presently faces a serious financial problem in meeting the cost of educating the children of Colorado, would receive over the years some $70 million of revenue under the provisions of the said Anderson and Hill bills: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 39th General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the House of Representatives concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact the said Anderson and Hill bills; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be immediately forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Colorado of the Congress of the United States.

"GORDON ALLOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"DAVID A. HAMIL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"LEE MATTIES,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Califorina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to requesting the Congress of the United States to adopt and submit an amendment to the Constitution pertaining to treaties and executive agreements

"Whereas it is essential to the welfare of the people of this Nation that the Constitution of the United States be amended to clarify its provisions regarding the effect of treaties with foreign powers upon domestic matters and also as to the making of executive agreements; and

"Whereas Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 has been introduced in the 83d Congress the text of which reads:

"'Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and executive agreements

"'*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein),* That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"' "ARTICLE —

"' "SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which denies or abridges any right enumerated in this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"' "SEC. 2. No treaty shall authorize or permit any foreign power or any international organization to supervise, control, or adjudicate rights of citizens of the United States within the United States enumerated in this Constitution or any other matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

"' "SEC. 3. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through the enactment of appropriate legislation by the Congress.

"' "SEC. 4. All executive or other agreements between the President and any international organization, foreign power, or official thereof shall be made only in the manner and to the extent to be prescribed by law. Such agreements shall be subject to the limitations proposed on treaties, or the making of treaties, by this article.

"' "SEC. 5. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"' "SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested and urged to adopt Senate Joint Resolution No. 1; and be it further

"Resolved That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the

House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial relating to the Interstate Commerce Act

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"A movement is under way to induce the Congress to repeal section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"Arizona and its sister States depend upon the transportation system to keep in movement the flow of goods between the States.

"The economy of the State of Arizona is to a very large extent dependent upon the reasonableness of its freight costs. The long-haul and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act has protected Arizona and its intermountain neighbors against rate discrimination since 1915. The continuance of this protection is of vital concern to Arizona.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress leave in status quo section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, in the interests of equity and well-established need."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, and to the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Representatives in Congress from Montana, requesting passage of legislation and a supplemental appropriation to provide adequate facilities and operating funds so that veterans in need of treatment for tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric conditions, and domiciliary care can obtain treatment in Veterans' Administration facilities in Montana

"Whereas there were less than 20,000 veterans in the State of Montana following World War I, and the Government provided at that time approximately 435 hospital beds for these veterans. Following World War II, with over 78,000 veterans in Montana, the Government provided 365 hospital beds in Montana, and today, with the Korean conflict in existence, we anticipate at least an additional 10,000 to 15,000 veterans in Montana, or a total of approximately 88,000 veterans in this State, with still 365 hospital beds, of which no more than 250 can be utilized because of lack of personnel; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States, by appropriate legislation, has acknowledged responsibility for the care of disabled veterans whether they be mental, tubercular, general medical, or domiciliary type; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration in the State of Montana has had to forego the treatment of eligible veterans, and the State of Montana taxpayers are being required to pay for the care and treatment of psychiatric cases in Warm Springs, tubercular cases in Galen, and domiciliary cases at Columbia Falls, Montana Soldiers' Home (domiciliary home), when, in fact, Congress has passed laws and has taxed the people of the United States, and in particular, the people of Montana, for the care and treatment for which the State of Montana is now being forced to pay because of reduction in Veterans' Administration facilities and services in Montana; and

"Whereas with more veterans in Montana than ever before, Montana naturally needs more hospital beds; however, Congress saw fit to reduce the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration by $40 million on July 5, 1952. This tremendous reduction in appropriations has reduced the funds available in Montana by $92,500 quarterly. This reduction has adversely affected the use of medical consultants, medical supplies, services, prosthetics, etc., (including beneficiary travel), medical fee-basis funds, medical examinations, and treatments, dental-fee funds—examinations and treatments of local doctors. Both inpatient and outpatient services to Montana veterans have been radically curtailed. In Montana today, there are no Veterans' Administration facilities set up to care for veterans in need of treatment for tubercular, neuropsychiatric, and those veterans in need of domiciliary care. Veterans' Administration medical personnel in Montana, inadequate for years, has been cut by 25 positions in the last quarter of 1952, therefore affecting number of admissions to VA hospitals in Montana. Medical outpatient service has been cut by one-third and dental outpatient service has been reduced by 80 percent; leaving four-fifths of Montana's veterans without outpatient service, as provided by law; and

"Whereas the State of Montana is now being forced to spend many thousands of dollars for the care and treatment of these veterans at Montana institutions and hospitals due to the failure on the part of the Veterans' Administration to care for Montana veterans in Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby petition the Congress of the United States of America for the passage of legislation and provision of a supplemental appropriation, which will provide adequate Veterans' Administration facilities in Montana; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the secretary of the State of Montana, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART and the Honorable LEE METCALF, Congressmen from Montana, and that they be requested to use all honorable means within their power to bring about the enactment of necessary legislation.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"President of the Senate.
"LOU E. BREETE,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Memorial 15

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would establish an American Foreign Legion

"Whereas the demands upon American manhood resulting from the many and scattered campaigns against communism have deprived the young men of America of their rights to obtain an early education and from establishing their homes while they are still young; and

"Whereas many persons of other nations of the world would join the fight against communism but are unable to do so since their homelands are not members of the United Nations, or such homelands are unable to sustain adequate armed forces; and

"Whereas there are many armies in the field which are fighting against communism with arms and supplies furnished by the United States but with no control over such armies by United States commanders; and

"Whereas a chance would be given to such eager young men of other nations to join the fight against communism and this country could gain some control over such persons in the field by forming and maintaining an American Foreign Legion: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation establishing an American Foreign Legion which would be open to applicants from any country of the world, within reasonable security measures; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the proper officers of Congress and to the President of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 11th day of March 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Memorial 7

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that the first $1,000 of personal income shall be exempt from taxation by the Federal Government

"Whereas the country is passing through a period of heavy inflation resulting in higher prices on basic necessities, thus placing a tremendous burden upon persons receiving small incomes; and

"Whereas the $600 tax exemption on personal income provided by the income tax laws has become completely inadequate in the light of such heavy inflation to relieve any burden placed by inflation upon such low-income groups: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation which would amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide that the first $1,000 of personal income shall be exempt from taxation by the Federal Government; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the proper officer of the Congress of the United States and to the President of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk."

Two resolutions of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"Senate Memorial 9

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide a system which would permit persons absent from this country on election day to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States

"Whereas many persons are absent from the United States on Presidential election days through no fault of their own; and

"Whereas such persons are either in the service of their beloved country or upon important business missions which are absolutely necessary for the economic health of this country; and

"Whereas the present role in which this country is cast in the fields of international politics will result in an increasing number of such persons being absent from the United States on the day their President and Vice President are elected; and

"Whereas the persons absent from this country and unable to vote on election day would desire very much to participate in such elections; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has the power to provide for a system of absentee voting which affects national officers of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation which would establish a system of absentee voting for persons who are absent from the United States on election day so that such absent persons may vote for their President and Vice President; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the President of the United States.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 3d day of March 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

"Senate Memorial 8

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for a system of absentee voting which would permit persons who are absent from their home States on any presidential election day to vote for their President and Vice President

"Whereas since this Nation has essentially a transient population, many people are absent from their home States on the day the President of this country is elected; and

"Whereas many States do not now have any system of absentee balloting which results in disenfranchisement for thousands of people upon every Presidential election day; and

"Whereas since the ability to vote by every single person in a State is the nucleus of any democracy and nation dedicated to self-government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation establishing a system of absentee voting whereby persons absent from their home States on any Presidential election day may, nevertheless, vote for their President and Vice President; and be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this memorial be duly presented to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

"TIBO J. CHAVEZ,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate."

A resolution of the Senate of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Memorial 4

"To the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Senate of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the cost of food, clothing, and other commodities necessary to sustain life are much higher in Alaska than in the continental United States; and

"Whereas the United States Government has already recognized this fact by granting a 25-percent cost-of-living salary increase to Federal employees in Alaska; and

"Whereas this action on the part of the United States Government grants relief to only a portion of the population of Alaska; and

"Whereas the entire population of Alaska need some tax relief in order to increase the general standard of living in Alaska.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States amend the Federal income-tax laws to provide that Alaskan taxpayers receive a $1,200 personal exemption and a $900 exemption for each dependent."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 12

"To the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska, and to the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully submits that—

"Whereas from the principle that the United States cannot be sued without its consent the general rule has been derived, and adhered to constantly, that agencies and instrumentalities of the United States are not subject to garnishment for moneys due their employees; and

"Whereas such a rule not only makes it difficult for creditors to reach lawful claims, but also frequently deprives a creditor from any recourse whatever in realizing on his claim; and

"Whereas there are many instances where individuals have left non-Government employment to work for the United States with the sole purpose of avoiding payment of their just debts; and

"Whereas a rule which exempts from attachment the pay of Federal employees is grossly unfair and discriminatory, since the wages of non-Government employees who perform work identical with that of employees of the Federal Government, and often in the same location, are subject to attachment by garnishment of the employer.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st regular session assembled, respectfully requests that appropriate legislation be enacted authorizing the attachment of moneys owed by Federal agencies and instrumentalities to their employees.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

Passed by the senate February 20, 1953.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relating to an immediate appropriation for the construction of that portion of the central Arizona project known as the Bridge Canyon Dam and Bridge Canyon powerplant; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCARRAN on March 18, 1953, p. 2034, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the California Petroleum Distributors Association, Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the limitation of imports of crude oil or petroleum products; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the St. Paul Association of Commerce, St. Paul, Minn., favoring the enactment of legislation to revise Federal civil-service laws to permit replacement of Government employees in certain classifications with qualified personnel; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Five resolutions adopted by the National Sojourners, at Baltimore, Md., relating to world government distribution of U. S. S. R. information bulletins; the Genocide Convention; the UNESCO pamphlets entitled "Toward World Understanding," and sovereignty over Antarctic; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Three resolutions adopted by the National Sojourners, at Baltimore, Md., relating to the constitutional amendment regarding treaties and executive agreements; the flying of the United Nations flag, and the so-called McCarran-Walter immigration bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Boston, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation authorizing the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Joseph Lee, Sr., father of the American playground, and so forth; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the city of Pasadena, Calif., favoring prompt action by the Congress to alleviate flood hazards to portions of the city of Pasadena; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXCISE TAXES ON COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada. It is Assembly Joint Resolution No. 29, memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise taxes on communications services.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 29

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise taxes on communications services

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Nevada has been giving and is continuing to give study to the effect of the tax burden on utility services; and

Whereas Congress has recognized the special burden created by excise taxes on public utility services by the recent elimination of such tax on electrical energy and reduction of the tax on domestic telegraph communications; and

Whereas communication services cannot be considered in the class of a luxury, yet are taxed higher than most luxuries, thus discriminating against the use of communication services; and

Whereas the Federal excise taxes on communications were initially levied or greatly increased during World War II to help defray war costs and to discourage unnecessary use of communication facilities; and

Whereas all such taxes are discriminatory against the long distance user of communication services, and against sections of the country far removed from centers of population for the reason that the tax is calculated as a percentage of the communication charge; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That in their opinion the present excise taxes on communication services are inimical to the maintenance of a reasonably priced and nondiscriminatory public communication service and that, accordingly, the excise taxes on communication services should be repealed or greatly reduced; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President of the Senate of the United States of America, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of America, each of the United States Senators from the State of Nevada, and the Member of Congress from the State of Nevada.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

LANDS OF HOKE COUNTY, N. C., FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of North Carolina, requesting the

United States Government not to take any further lands of Hoke County, N. C., for defense purposes, as set forth in the joint resolution, which is duly certified by Hon. Thad Eure, secretary of state of North Carolina, under date of March 26, 1953. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint Resolution 25

Joint resolution requesting the United States Government not to take any further lands of Hoke County for defense purposes

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States and the Defense Department of the United States a plan to take some 50,000 additional acres of land from Hoke County; and

Whereas the United States Government has taken some 92,000 acres of land from Hoke County for the purpose of enlarging Fort Bragg; and

Whereas the United States Government now proposes to take an additional 50,000 acres of land from Hoke County, upon which some 400 families live, for the purpose of having a corridor between Fort Bragg and Camp Mackall; and

Whereas the North Carolina Sanatorium for treatment of tuberculosis, at McCain, N. C., Hoke County, consisting of a hospital of 600 patients ill with tuberculosis, 366 employees and (in most instances) their families, and such service facilities as the power house, laundry, etc., is located within the area seriously affected by the United States Government proposal to take additional acreage from Hoke County but not included in the present proposal; and

Whereas the area sought by the United States Army encroaches upon sanatorium property in such a way that the institution comes to occupy an acute angle, almost a peninsula, within the military reservation, adjacent to the "impact" or target area, where the shells will be detonated at each firing; and

Whereas the basis of treatment of tuberculosis is rest; the proposal will block traffic on route 211, because the road crosses the path of fire, defeating the State's regional arrangement for sanatorium care; and if the Army plan goes through, the sanatorium would rapidly lose its effectiveness as a treatment center; and

Whereas relocation of the sanatorium in more congenital surroundings would at current costs of $15,000 per bed amount to $9 million exclusive of site, housing of employees, etc.

Whereas if said 50,000 acres of land is taken, it will in effect practically destroy Hoke County as a governmental unit, and in addition thereto, an unusual hardship would be visited upon the 400 families whose lands are proposed to be taken; and that said lands proposed to be taken are fine farm lands and most of the owners of said lands have been natives of Hoke County since its creation, or are descendants thereof: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring):

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of North Carolina does hereby respectfully request the United States Government not to take further lands from Hoke County, and in particular not to take said lands of Hoke County for the corridor proposed to be made between Fort Bragg and Camp Mackall.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be sent to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of War, and to the North Carolina Members of Congress.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its adoption.

JOINT MEMORIALS OF OREGON STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], I present three joint memorials adopted by the Oregon State Legislature and sent to me for presentation to the Senate and printing in the RECORD.

The first deals with a situation in Tillamook Bay in the State of Oregon, involving the Bayocean Peninsula, where the sea is very rapidly washing away approximately $2.5 million dollars' worth of homes and capital investments.

There is a great deal of feeling on the part of the Oregon Legislature, which I believe to be entirely justified, that the Federal Government should cooperate, through the Corps of Army Engineers, in building whatever walls and revetments and other protective installations which may be necessary to stop this great loss.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 2

To the Honorable the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America; to the Honorable the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America; and to the Honorable Senators and Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America from Oregon:

We, your memorialists, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the Bayocean Peninsula guarding the entrance to the Tillamook Bay area is on the verge of complete obliteration by the eroding action of the sea; and

Whereas the entire Tillamook Bay area, protected for generations by the Bayocean Peninsula, serving as a buffer or natural dike from the rampaging waves and storms of the sea; and

Whereas the oysterbed industry in Tillamook Bay, representing a $2,500,000 capital investment, is being covered and destroyed by sand and silt swept in by the sea; and

Whereas the Port of Bay City, with a cash investment of $2,100,000 principal and interest of taxpayers' moneys, and whose activities, including the operation of the port ebbing tidal waters, the flow through the old channel has lessened considerably, and as a result the 18-foot deep inlet serving as the Tillamook Bay area's commercial outlet to the sea is threatened with coverage by silt due to the decrease of the scouring action of the lessened tidal flow; and

Whereas even the existence of the city of Tillamook and several little hamlets on the eastern shore of the bay, due to their low elevation above sea level, would constantly live under the threat of combinations of high tide and westerly storms as the result of the obliteration of Bayocean Peninsula; and

Whereas the entire future economy of Tillamook County will suffer through loss of real property taxes, payroll income, and income taxes paid to the State and Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That this 47th Legislative Assembly, in regular session assembled, urges the Congress of the United States to consider this as an emergency and to take immediate steps following the report of the United States Corps of Engineers, now being processed to provide funds to start construction forthwith; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable the Secretary of Defense of the United States of America; to the Honorable the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America; the Honorable GUY CORDON, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; the Honorable SAM COON, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; and the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. The second joint memorial adopted by the Legislature of Oregon deals with the so-called Bricker joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution relating to treaty-making powers. I ask unanimous consent that the joint memorial be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 3

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, and to the Honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress of the United States of America from Oregon:

We, your memorialists, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas it is essential to protect the rights of American citizens against the dangers of treaty law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That this 47th Legislative Assembly in regular session assembled recommends to the Congress of the United States for consideration an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in respect of the treaty-making powers, reading as follows:

"A provision of a treaty which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated powers in the absence of such treaty"; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate of the United States, and to all Members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the third joint memorial adopted by the Oregon Legislature, deals with the problem of deepening the channel from Portland, Oreg., to the mouth of the Columbia River, so as to give to that great port the necessary depth of channel to meet its ocean transport needs. I ask unani-

mous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 5

To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent as follows:

Whereas the United States Army Engineers, North Pacific division, have submitted to the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors a report recommending modification of the existing project in order that the channel depth of the Columbia River at its mouth may be increased from the present authorized 40 feet to a depth of 48 feet and adequate width provided in order to eliminate shipping delays and existing hazards; and

Whereas the ship channel in the Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., to the mouth has not been continuously maintained to the project depth and width and that such lack of adequate maintenance has resulted in navigational difficulties to the detriment of commercial and industrial waterborne commerce by limiting the feasible draft of oceangoing vessels using these rivers; and

Whereas such restrictions adversely affect the livelihood of the citizens in commercial, industrial, and agricultural pursuits, not only in the area immediately adjacent to the rivers but also in the much larger area of the Willamette Valley and the great inland empire; and

Whereas the funds expended by the Corps of Engineers for maintenance of the Columbia and Willamette River Channels and the mouth of the Columbia River have been insufficient to continuously maintain the authorized project width and depths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That this, the 47th Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, hereby does petition the Senate of the United States of America and the House of Representatives of the United States of America to approve and expeditiously appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, to implement the report of the engineers above referred to, in order that a channel of 48 feet in depth and adequate width may be created at the Columbia River entrance; be it further

Resolved, That these bodies take such action as may be appropriate in order that the channel of the Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., be continuously maintained at the project dimensions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable GUY CORDON, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, United States Senator from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable SAM COON, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Representative in Congress from the State of Oregon; to the United States congressional Committee on Rivers and Harbors; and to the Board of United States Army Engineers appointed to investigate and approve such projects.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SENATE, AND LEGISLATURE OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a number of resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Legislature of the State of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code providing for taxes upon the sale of toilet preparations and upon the sale of wallets, ladies' handbags, and similar handbags and similar articles

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas under the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code, a tax of 10 percent is imposed upon the sales price of perfumes, toilet waters, toilet powders, and similar substances; and

"Whereas under the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code, a tax of 20 percent is imposed upon the sales price of wallets, handbags, pocketbooks, and other similar articles; and

"Whereas the above taxes are levied and collected without regard to the ability of the purchaser of such substances and goods to pay such a tax; and

"Whereas such taxes are a direct burden upon the business economy of this country and unfair to persons of low income: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to repeal the provisions of law imposing such taxes; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

"House Memorial 4

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt pensions or moneys received from labor union funds from taxation by the Federal Government

"Whereas the working man and woman of America is being burdened by high taxation, and that to alleviate some of this burden, the Congress of the United States should enact remedial legislation; and

"Whereas the expenses incurred by workers are not now exempt or deductible as expenses from income taxes; and

"Whereas expenses incurred by parents for the care of minor children, while said parents are employed, are not deductible from income taxes; and

"Whereas coal miners now receiving pensions from the welfare fund of the United Mine Workers of America are taxed on moneys received as pensions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twenty-first Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such remedial legislation as may be necessary to permit the deduction from income taxes of expenses incurred for travel to and from work, expenses incurred by working mothers and fathers for the care and maintenance of minor children, and to exempt from income taxes remuneration received by coal miners in the form of miner's pension; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be furnished to each House of Congress and the appropriate officers thereof."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 19

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 397 introduced in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, constituting the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district

"Whereas the increase in population and economic activity in the State of New Mexico has resulted in excessive administration burdens for the customs collection district to which the State of New Mexico is presently attached; and

"Whereas for efficient customs administration it is desirable and feasible to constitute the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district; and

"Whereas there has been introduced into the 1st session of the 83d Congress Senate bill No. 397 which if enacted would constitute the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district with ports of entry at Columbus and Antelope Wells, and with headquarters at Deming, all in the State of New Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact Senate bill No. 397 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress constituting the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district with ports of entry at Columbus and Antelope Wells and with headquarters at Deming in the State of New Mexico; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States and to the New Mexico congressional delegation relating to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to effect a change in the method of electing the President and the Vice President of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the present system of election of the President and the Vice President of the United States by the electoral college is an anachronism in the 20th century; and

"Whereas the present system is undemocratic in that it allows the possibility of the election of a President with a minority of the popular vote, and this has been the case in three presidential elections in this country; and

"Whereas reform in the method of electing the President and Vice President is urgently needed; and

"Whereas it is necessary to protect the right of the people of the sovereign States to have their votes adequately reflected in such presidential elections: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation to provide that a proposed constitutional amendment be submitted to the sovereign States to abolish the electoral college; to provide that each State retain the same number of electoral votes as it has Senators and Representatives in the United States Congress; and to provide that the electoral vote in each State for the President and the Vice President be cast in proportion to the number of popular votes cast for each candidate in such election; be it further

"Resolved, That an enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives as well as to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in the United States Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial by the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to remove the prohibition in section I of the compact between the United States and the State of New Mexico relating to the sale, barter, etc., of intoxicating liquor in New Mexico to Indians

"Whereas section I of the compact between the United States of America and the State of New Mexico provides a prohibition against the sale, barter, or giving of intoxicating liquors to Indians, and the introduction of such liquors into the Indian country; and

"Whereas it is felt that the Indians of this State are now capable of engaging in the sale, barter, or receipt of intoxicating liquors: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby, memorialized to enact adequate legislation to remove the restriction contained in section I of the compact between the United States of America and the State of New Mexico, which provides a prohibition against the sale, barter, or giving of intoxicating liquors to Indians; be it further

"Resolved, That an enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be sent to each of the representatives from New Mexico in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 12

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Agua Negra, the Cebolla, the Sapello, and the Manuelitas Creeks, in Mora and San Miguel Counties, N. Mex.: (1) A dam on the Coyote River, near Black Lakes, N. Mex.; (2) a dam on the Lujan Canon Creek, above Chacon, N. Mex.; (3) a dam on the Cleveland Lake, near Cleveland, N. Mex.; (4) a dam on the Cebolla Creek, below Rociada, N. Mex.; (5) a dam on the Sapello Creek, near San Ignacio, N. Mex.

"Whereas 1,800 families living in this area of small-income farms lose their crops and labor every year for the lack of water-storage facilities to carry over the drought period, between June 15 and July 15 of each year; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams an adequate water supply can be provided, and thereby benefit 1,800 families to the point of sufficient incomes to maintain their families, make the area a prosperous farming community, and an asset to the State; and

"Whereas investigation and research show that these dams can be constructed very economically due to the fact that they are small; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams a normal flow of water can be maintained on the creeks the year round, making fishing and hunting another asset for the benefit of all the people of the State of New Mexico and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take proper action toward the construction of the aforementioned dams, to the end that future loss of crops and farm labor and distress among the families of the small-income farmers be relieved; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forthwith sent to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress.

"TIBO J. CHAVES,
"President of the Senate.
"NATALIE S. BUCK,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 11th day of March 1953.

"EDWIN L. MECHEM,
"Governor, State of Mexico."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"House Memorial 9

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States of America, regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Agua Negra, the Cebolla, the Sapello, and the Manuelitas, creeks, in Mora and San Miguel Counties, N. Mex.: (1) A dam on the Coyote River, near Black Lakes, N. Mex.; (2) a dam on the Lujan Canon Creek, above Chacon, N. Mex.; (3) a dam on the Cleveland Lake, near Cleveland, N. Mex.; (4) a dam on the Cebolla Creek, near Ledoux, N. Mex.; (5) a dam on the Manuelita Creek, below Rociada, N. Mex.; (6) a dam on the Sapello Creek, near San Ignacio, N. Mex.

"Whereas 1,800 families living in this area of small-income farms lose their crops and labor every year for the lack of having facilities of water storage to carry over the drought period, between June 15 and July 15, of each year; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams an adequate water supply can be provided, and thereby benefit 1,800 families to the point of a sufficient income to maintain their families, make the area a prosperous farming community, and an asset to the State; and

"Whereas investigation and research show that these dams can be constructed very economically due to the fact that they are small; and

"Whereas by the construction of such dams a normal flow of water can be maintained on the creeks the year around, making fishing and hunting another asset for the benefit of all the people of the State of New Mexico and the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take the proper action toward the construction of the aforementioned dams, to the end that future loss of crops and farm labor and distress among the families of the small-income farmer be relieved; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith sent, respectively, to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress."

"House Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction of a water storage reservoir to be known as the Nambe Dam and to be located on the Nambe River within the Pojoaque Soil Conservation District, New Mexico

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the United States Geological Survey, the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the New Mexico State Association of Soil Conservation Districts, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the United States Department of the Interior, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Farmers Home Administration, the United States Forest Service, the United States Bureau of Land Management, the United States Park Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the New Mexico State Lands Office, the New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the New Mexico Highway Department, the All Pueblo Council and the Pojoaque Soil Conservation District have recommended the construction of a water storage reservoir to be located above the Nambe Falls on the Nambe River, N. Mex.; and

"Whereas the construction of such reservoir has been in the planning stages for at least 30 years; and

"Whereas such a storage reservoir is necessary for the storage of water and for irrigation and flood control; and

"Whereas the cost of such reservoir has been estimated by the above named agencies to be $218,700; and

"Whereas the cost of such reservoir is minor when compared with the immediate need for such reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation providing for the construction of a water storage reservoir to be known as Nambe Dam and to be located above the crest of the Nambe Falls on the Nambe River within the Pojoaque Soil Conservation District, New Mexico; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to each of the agencies named herein."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing two joint resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 13

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to grant to the State of New Mexico for the benefit of the Museum of New Mexico 500,000 acres of public lands of the United States within the State of New Mexico

"Whereas the Museum of New Mexico is an important educational and scientific institution which was inadvertently omitted from the original group of State institutions given land grants by the act of Congress of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557); and

"Whereas such museum conserves and houses invaluable collections of the greatest cultural importance in the fields of archeology, ethnology, history, and art; is charged

with the duty of excavating and studying ancient ruins for the benefit of the museum, the preservation of archeological sites in New Mexico and the publication of investigations of the same; repairs and maintains various historic sites and State monuments, performs in part a national duty for the people of the United States in helping to preserve numerous archeological landmarks on the public domain; maintains an extensive research library in the foregoing fields and operates numerous branch museums in various communities of the State of New Mexico: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is requested to enact a law granting to the Museum of New Mexico 500,000 acres of public land situated in the State of New Mexico, notwithstanding such lands are now or may hereafter be embraced within a grazing district authorized under the act of Congress of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269).

"SEC. 2. That the lands requested to be granted shall be held by the State under the same restrictions and limitations as those granted by the Enabling Act of June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 557).

"SEC. 3. Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forthwith sent to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 16

"'Joint memorial to the President and Congress of the United States relating to Indians

"Whereas the State of New Mexico has, since its admission to the Union, had a large Indian population, most of whom are wards of the United States living upon reservations supervised and controlled by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas New Mexico became a part of the United States more than 100 years ago; and

"Whereas this legislature does not feel that the Indians living within this State have been given proper opportunity to secure proper education and to achieve any sort of economic independence; and that the United States has not assumed its full responsibility in this regard; and

"Whereas the Indians of this State have demonstrated conclusively that they are loyal subjects of the United States and have served with valor and distinction in the Armed Forces of the United States and that they are persons who, when given the opportunity, readily respond to our educational and self-improvement opportunities; and

"Whereas the welfare, not only of the Indians, but of the State of New Mexico and the United States will be best served by changing the method of education and treatment of the Indian to develop his independence, initiative, and economic stability; and

"Whereas within the State of New Mexico the different Indian tribes have adequate amounts of land which cannot be developed because of the lack of necessary modern equipment and because of the unavailability of the necessary funds with which to purchase said equipment: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Senators, and Representatives of New Mexico in the United States Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs be memorialized as follows, to wit:

"1. To provide educational facilities for all Indians of a quality and character of the type now being enjoyed by the students in the public school system of the State of New Mexico.

"2. That such educational facilities be provided for the Indians at or near their homes in similar manner to that provided by the public schools of the State of New Mexico.

"3. That steps be taken to the end that the Indian people be educated in vocations and occupations suitable to their needs and wherever possible unappropriated waters adjacent to Indian reservations be diverted through proper irrigation to the end that the agricultural and livestock potential of the Indian be increased to further his economic self-sufficiency through agriculture and stock raising.

"4. That there be speeded a complete lifting of the restrictions imposed on the Indians as wards of the United States so that their initiative will be cultivated and that they be assimilated as full citizens with all rights, responsibilities, and privileges thereof at the earliest possible time.

"5. That the Congress, in cooperation with the Interior Department, make a survey designed to make available, under a self-liquidating plan, to the Indians such equipment as they might need to reclaim their lands and promote modern farming, livestock, and other industries.

"6. *Be it further resolved,* That enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in the United States Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs."

To the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 9

"Joint memorial memorializing Congress to refrain from passage of United States Senate bill No. 281, giving the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over the discontinuance of intrastate railroad services

"Whereas there has been introduced for consideration by the 1st session of the 83d Congress, Senate bill No. 281, giving the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over the discontinuance of intrastate railroad services, in certain instances; and

"Whereas this proposed legislation is clearly an infringement upon the sovereign rights of the various States of the Union; and

"Whereas such legislation, if enacted, would clearly violate the spirit, if not the letter, of the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is memorialized to justify the faith placed in its Members by the electorate, by refraining from enacting into law said Senate bill No. 281 of the 1st session of the 83d Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this memorial be submitted to the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of New Mexico's delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.)

"Senate Joint Memorial 14

"Joint memorial memorializing the Interstate Commerce Commission to expedite hearings now pending and render a decision equalizing freight rates in the southwest region, including New Mexico

"Whereas New Mexico has been and is now suffering from high and discriminatory freight rates to the detriment of development of the natural resources of the State; and

"Whereas new industry is vital to the economic development of the State and the well-being of its people; and

"Whereas it is difficult if not impossible to attract new industry under the existing high freight rate structure with which the State is burdened; and

"Whereas hearings are now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning freight rates in the Southwest region: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and it hereby is, memorialized to expedite the hearings now pending and render a decision equalizing freight rates for this region; and be it further

"Resolved, That enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation to appropriate moneys for the construction of Los Esteros Dam on the Pecos River in Guadalupe County, N. Mex., for flood control, power, and reservoir

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers has approved the construction of a dam at the Los Esteros Damsite for the purposes of flood and sediment control; and

"Whereas there is a great and urgent public need for the construction of said Los Esteros Dam to prevent the destruction of farmlands by flood, to impound waters needed for existing irrigation projects which is otherwise lost in spring run-offs, and other beneficial uses; and

"Whereas the present unrestrained flow of the Pecos River above existing reservoir structures on said river causes the movement of silt into said reservoirs and thus reduces the usefulness of said reservoirs and will ultimately destroy completely said exiting reservoirs, as storage basins; and

"Whereas the construction of said Los Esteros Dam would eliminate seasonal turbidity during seasonal run-off periods and eliminate excess salinity during protracted dry seasons and eliminate further bank cutting and loss of land caued by flood stages of said Pecos River: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is petitioned to authorize the appropriation and transfer of such amount of moneys from the general fund of the Treasury to the reclamation fund as the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War report to the Congress as the amount of the total cost of the Los Esteros Dam and Reservoir on the Pecos River, N. Mex., and that Congress authorize the construction of the Los Esteros Dam and Reservoir by the United States Corps of Engineers for the purposes of controlling floods, regulating the flow of the Pecos River, providing for storage and for delivery of stored waters, and for other beneficial uses; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of New Mexico."

THOS J. CHAVES,
President of the Senate.
NATALIE S. BUCK,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
ALVIN STOCKTON,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
LILBURN C. HOMAN,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTIONS OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted by the stockholders of the Farmers Union Central Exchange, Inc., at their annual meeting in St. Paul, Minn., on March 5, relating to the commodity loan program, farm policy and parity, and the completion of certain multipurpose dam projects.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY STOCKHOLDERS AT 22D ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., MARCH 5, 1953

"*Resolved*, That this meeting records its support of the commodity loan program and agricultural conservation payments for soil conservation; and

"*Resolved further*, That we believe that farmer-elected community committeemen should have responsible participation in the administration of farm programs; and

"*Resolved further*, That we favor further development of Federal crop insurance so that farmers will have the opportunity to protect their investment in producing the Nation's food and fiber."

"FARM POLICY AND PARITY

"We are in agreement with many leaders in the major phases of our national life—political, economic, social, and religious, that the family-type farm must be preserved and protected.

"When the farmer raises food and fiber he is subjected to enormous risks and uncertainties, both in the yield and the price of his crops. In the national interest these risks must be taken. But it is neither fair nor economically possible in this day and age for the farmer alone to bear the burden of these risks.

"Hence, during the past 20 years we have developed the principle of parity income and parity prices for farmers and legislation has been enacted designed to make parity prices for farmers a reality.

"The method of computing parity should provide equitable relationships as between commodities and as between the farm and nonfarm portions of our population.

"The method of computation may change as conditions change, but the goal of 100 percent parity prices for all farm products should not change. It should be a permanent national policy, not something that shifts with the winds of political pressure.

"Farmers are now suffering in a terrific economic squeeze between rising costs and falling farm prices. The present law giving price supports for basic commodities at 90 percent of parity will expire in 1954. It was supported during the recent political campaign by both parties and their candidates for President. It was recognized as a legal and moral commitment.

"Therefore, we are amazed and dismayed to see that the law is now being administered with obvious reluctance and seeming antagonism.

"We call for the fulfillment of preelection promises so as to end the fear and uncertainty of the present and what will happen after 1954.

"We call for a policy of disaster prevention, not disaster relief; for price safeguards for both perishable and nonperishable crops.

"Our stand is for 100-percent parity."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"CERTIFICATE OF RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY STOCKHOLDERS AT 22D ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., MARCH 5, 1953

"Whereas we as farmers view with fear the reports in newspapers and over the radio on the probable changes to be made in the Rural Electrification Administration, Rural Telephone Administration, and public-power programs affecting millions of farmers and farmer-owned power-distributing and generating co-ops; and

"Whereas we believe these bipartisan programs which have so helped agriculture to provide the greatest abundance of food and fiber production this Nation has ever known should be strengthened and not weakened; and

"Whereas due to lack of sufficient power in many areas of the country at the present time, together with constantly increasing demands for electric energy by farmers and other consumers, it behooves us to seek more low-cost power-generating facilities; and

"Whereas since hydroelectric power generated by multipurpose dam projects providing power, flood control, irrigation, recreational facilities, and wildlife conservation areas have proven to be very successful under a regional-development basis, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be urged to complete with all speed all such multipurpose dam projects by providing the necessary construction and administrative funds; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we again ask the Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps to participate with the Canadian Government in the immediate construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River seaway."

INCREASE OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION—RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 257, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by Local 257, Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, St. Paul, Minn., favoring an increase in the Federal Income Tax exemption from $600 to $1,500.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF
RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS,
St. Paul, Minn., March 13, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The membership of this Lodge No. 257, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks adopted the following resolution at our last regular meeting held on March the 3d, 1953.

Resolution: "Be it resolved that Local 257 favors raising the Federal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,500."

The membership feel that big business is constantly requesting tax relief and receiving certain tax relief under many loopholes but the worker still has to carry the full load, therefore some consideration should be given the worker. Trusting that you will give your support to any bill giving relief to the average wage earner and attempt to introduce such legislation, at the earliest opportunity, I remain.

Sincerely and fraternally.

WARREN J. KOPPY,
Recording Secretary, Local Lodge 257.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL INCOME TAXES—LETTER FROM UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, ELY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Steve Marn, recording secretary, Local 1664, United Steelworkers of America, of Ely, Minn., relating to a reduction in Federal income taxes.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION NO. 1664,
Ely, Minn., March 12, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting held on March 8, 1953, by Local 1664, United Steelworkers of America, the possible reduction of Federal income taxes was discussed at length and the following action was unanimously approved. That if Federal income taxes are to be reduced, the amount of exemption allowed each dependent be raised from the present figure of $600 instead of a percentage decrease. We feel that the small-wage earner needs tax relief more than any other group and the increase of exemption for each dependent would be most equitable. Your careful consideration of this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

STEVE MARN,
Recording Secretary.

P. S.—We are 100 percent in back of you on the tidelands oil issue. Keep up the good work.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTER FROM MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from George W. Lawson, secretary of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn., relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,
St. Paul, Minn., March 12, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The executive council of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor at its meeting held on March 7 adopted a motion supporting your position on the St. Lawrence Waterway, and I was instructed to notify you of this action.

Sincerely yours,

GEO. W. LAWSON,
Secretary, Minnesota State Federation of Labor.

PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS' UNION LOCALS OF MINNESOTA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by three Farmers Union locals in Minnesota—the Farmers Union, Local 228, Roseau County, the Normania Farmers Union of Yellow Medicine County, and the St. James Farmers Union, Local 308, favoring an expanded and improved price-support program.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALOL, MINN.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We, the members of the Farmers Union Hay Creek, Local No. 228 (130 dues-paying farmer families), of Roseau County, Minn., present the following resolution:

"Whereas the security of thousands of farmers is threatened by inflexible farm costs and flexible farm prices; and

"Whereas this not only endangers farm families, the jobs and living standards of workers, the prosperity of small independent business, but our entire national economy; and

"Whereas President Eisenhower told farmers:

" 'I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair, full share of the national income * * * a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity * * * but full parity.'

"Therefore we urge you to immediately take such actions as present legislation permits to support the income of livestock producers and to also outline a program to Congress which will assure family farmers that the President's statement on full parity will be realized with regard to all farm products.

"Further, we want our own elected farmer committees to administer all our farm programs, not county agents who have unsavory connections and alliances with anti-farm and antiparity organizations."

Respectfully yours,

MRS. TILFORD WICKLANDER,
Secretary.

NORMAN W. WAHLSTROM,
Chairman.

MARCH 16, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: We the members of the Normania Farmers Union, Yellow Medicine County, urge you to do all in your power to have legislation passed immediately which will support prices of farm commodities including perishables at 100 percent of parity to prevent a farm-led and farm-fed depression. We also urge you to support and vote for the oil for education bill. These resolutions were unanimously passed by the Normania Farmers Union, No. 24, consisting of 125 farm families.

ORRELL LOUSNESS,
President, Hanley Falls, Minn.
JOHN G. ANDERSON,
Secretary, Cottonwood, Minn.

We, the undersigned members of the St. James Farmers Union Local 308, resolve that you take immediate action to write an expanded and improved price support law into the statutes. There should be several improvements:

1. Support basic commodities beyond the expiration date, December 31, 1954, and include oats, rye, barley, flax, and soybeans as basic commodities.

2. Take action to stabilize the price of beef and pork. We feel that the cattle market has already been allowed to go far too low, and that a lot of farmers are going to be a long time recovering from the loss they are taking on cattle this year.

3. Take action to support perishables, so that the diversified farmer would have protection along with the grain farmer.

PUBLIC DAMS—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF MINNESOTA VALLEY COOPERATIVE LIGHT AND POWER ASSOCIATION, CHIPPEWA, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association, of Chippewa, Minn., relating to public dams, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA VALLEY COOPERATIVE LIGHT AND POWER ASSOCIATION,
Montevideo, Minn., March 30, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

HON. SENATOR HUMPHREY: At a regular meeting of the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association, Montevideo, Minn., which was held on March 19, 1953, the following resolution was adopted:

Motion made by Albert Windingstad, seconded by Alfred Reishus, that—

"Whereas it has been reported that certain members of the Presidential Cabinet have suggested that the big public dams of the Federal Government be sold by the Government: Now be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Minnesota Valley Cooperative Light and Power Association express their opposition to the sale of any public dams, as being contrary to the public welfare of the Nation, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators, THYE and HUMPHREY, and Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN."

Very truly yours,

OSCAR W. SWANSON,
Manager.

DISTRIBUTION OF MISSOURI RIVER POWER—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the Minnesota Electric Cooperative, held recently in St. Paul, Minn., relating to the distribution of Missouri River power in Minnesota, and the St. Lawrence seaway, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution 1

"Whereas 20 cooperative and three power companies in Minnesota have developed a joint plan whereby Missouri River hydroelectric power may be made available in their respective service areas and delivered to the load centers of all preferred customers within the marketing area of the Bureau in the State; said plan being for construction of a 230,000-volt system by the Bureau of Reclamation and for full utilization of existing facilities owned by the cooperatives and the power companies for subtransmission of power to the load centers of the preferred customers; and

"Whereas we believe the plan to be economically sound, and to be consistent with the objectives and the purpose of the members of this association: Be it

"*Resolved*, That Minnesota Electric Cooperative does hereby endorse the plan and the agreement that has been made by the 20 cooperatives and the three power companies for delivery and distribution of Missouri River power in the areas in Minnesota affected by the agreement; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the 9 Congressmen and to the 2 Senators, THYE and HUMPHREY."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution 4

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway development will provide a vital and economical transportation facility and electric power for defense and for farm and industrial production; and

"Whereas the area involved has vastly increased its demand for electric power as it seeks to meet the needs of the area and the national economy; and

"Whereas the demand for such transportation and electrical development is pressing and urgent, and should be met: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Minnesota Electric Cooperative Association does insistently request the Congress of the United States at its present session to enact legislation for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway, in cooperation with the Canadian Government, and in accordance with the statement of policy heretofore adopted by this association as to the development of such natural resources; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be immediately forwarded to each Member of the Congress, and to such other public officials as may be interested in or have responsibility for expediting this development."

RESOLUTIONS OF MEMBERS OF BROWN COUNTY REA COOPERATIVE, SLEEPY EYE, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, three resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the members of the Brown County REA Cooperative, held on March 12, 1953, in Sleepy Eye, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Whereas it is imperative that rural electric cooperatives have the right to construct and operate generating plants and transmission lines; and

"Whereas it has been proven by history that the very economic foundation of the rural electric cooperatives is dependent upon an adequate power supply at reasonable rates, and that it was only through the construction of generating and transmission facilities by a few cooperatives to serve as a self-controlled yardstick as to reasonableness of rates, that the economic welfare of the electric cooperatives throughout the United States has been protected; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has, in the past, recognized this right: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Brown County REA assembled at their annual meeting, That we urge the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate to support legislation, to protect and defend the right and opportunity of the cooperatives to construct and operate generating plants and transmission lines; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge Congress to appropriate adequate funds for this purpose; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota."

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the rural electric cooperatives of Minnesota have, with commercial power companies, presented a plan for joint use of all available electric facilities to Congress for the distribution of Missouri Valley electric power to cooperatives and municipalities; and

"Whereas such joint plan is impossible without the construction of Government-owned 230-kilovolt transmission lines from Fargo, N. Dak., to Fort Randall through western Minnesota; and

"Whereas the commercial power companies have declared to committees of Congress the impossibility to such companies to finance and construct said 230-kilovolt lines for distribution of Missouri Valley power to cooperatives and municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be requested to provide the funds necessary for construction of 230-kilovolt lines through western Minnesota; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Minnesota."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas the farmers and the townspeople of the State of Minnesota feel that the development of the St. Lawrence waterway would be of an economic benefit to the State of Minnesota and to the entire Nation; and

"Whereas there is presently pending in the Congress of the United States bills for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway: Now, therefore be it

"Resolved by the members of the Brown County Rural Electrification Association at their annual meeting, That we urge the Members of the House of Representatives and Senate to support legislation to provide for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each and every Member of the Congress of the United States in the State of Minnesota."

PRICE SUPPORTS—RESOLUTION OF FARMERS OF NORMAN, MAHNOMEN, POLK, AND CLAY COUNTIES, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by 700 farmers of the counties of Norman, Mahnomen, Polk, and Clay, Minnesota, in a meeting on March 9, 1953, relating to price supports.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT FARM MEETING, ADA, MINN., MARCH 9, 1953

Whereas, The increasing pressure of rising operating costs and declining farm prices makes it very essential that Congress take action to extend and strengthen the farm price support laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress take action at this session to—

1. Enact a system of price supports to assure full parity income on all major farm production, including perishables, based upon a realistic parity formula, and

2. To retain the system of democratically elected farmer PMA committeemen, to continue handling of ACP conservation payments through the PMA committees, and to increase appropriations for the ACP program; and be it further

Resolved, That the 700 Norman, Mahnomen, Polk and Clay County farmers assembled at this meeting instruct the secretary of the meeting, Lloyd Mickelson, to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

LLOYD MICKELSON, *Secretary.*

AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT—DEFINITION OF EMPLOYEE—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA POULTRY, BUTTER, AND EGG ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Minnesota Poultry, Butter, and Egg Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of "employee."

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE, MINNESOTA POULTRY, BUTTER, AND EGG ASSOCIATION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., MARCH 10, 1953

Whereas the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor has seen fit to follow the concept of "dependency as a matter of economic reality" in administering the wage-and-hour law; and

Whereas under this concept an employer could be held liable for retroactive overtime covering the employees of an independent contractor if the Wage and Hour Division considered that this contractor depended on this employer for a substantial part of his income; and

Whereas Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, has introduced in the United States Senate S. 471, "A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of employee"; and

Whereas the enactment of this legislation is vital to all employers in the poultry, butter, and egg industry who use independent contractors and contract truckers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Minnesota Poultry, Butter, and Egg Association go on record as favoring the Capehart bill, S. 471, and instruct the secretary of the association to send a copy of this resolution to each of the members of the association and request that they write their Congressmen and Senators and urge them to support this bill.

H. G. MALLON,
President.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 30, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1229) to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1493. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1494. A bill to provide that time spent as a civilian internee during World War II shall be considered as active service in determining priority for induction into the Armed Forces of medical, dental, and allied specialists; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1495. A bill to establish a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States to provide maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. NEELY, Mr. BEALL, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 1496. A bill to increase the authorized amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia to an amount equal to 25 percent of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1497. A bill for the relief of Sebouh Amirian and Christine Amirian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 1498. A bill to amend section 81, National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, and 176), to provide for the organization of the National Guard Bureau, and to define the responsibilities, functions and duties of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1499. A bill for the relief of Carl A. Annis, Wayne C. Cranney, and Leslie O. Yarwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of permittees living on Indian lands, Oahe Dam and Reservoir project, South Dakota, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY (by request):

S. 1501. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits; and

S. 1502. A bill to extend the records and reports provision of the Interstate Commerce Act to persons furnishing locomotives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOBEY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BRIDGES (by request):

S. 1503. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to furnish memorial markers commemorating certain deceased members of

the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1504. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rev. Pang Wha Il; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1505. A bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. AIKEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1506. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1507. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1508. A bill for the relief of Borivoje Vulich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1509. A bill to facilitate the administration of the national forests; to provide for the orderly use, improvement, and development thereof; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent thereon; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1510. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of March 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 465), as amended, to certain lands in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1511. A bill for the relief of Tamami Kusuda; and

S. 1512. A bill for the relief of Esther Cornelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution to establish the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is being introduced simultaneously in the House of Representatives today by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, to amend the Immigration and Naturalization Act of 1952 in a minor respect in order to provide relief from deportation to illegally entered aliens who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States in the Korean conflict, in World War II, or otherwise for a period of 3 years. I ask unanimous consent that a joint statement being issued by myself and Representative CELLER be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1493) to authorize the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN, is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN AND REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER ON INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

We are today introducing a bill to permit veterans who have served honorably in the Korean conflict in the armed services of the United States but who originally entered the United States illegally to be relieved from deportation and be allowed to remain in the United States at the discretion of the Attorney General.

We are proposing an amendment to that section of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 which provides for suspension of deportation, applying that suspension to a number of veterans who have nobly served the United States but who have remained in the United States in technical defiance of the law. Most of them came over to this country as seamen and jumped ship. They were drafted or enlisted in the armed services and served honorably and in some cases with great distinction, and are now, despite their services and sacrifices in the cause of the United States, being served with orders of deportation. The present law is so restrictive that no discretion is given to the Attorney General to suspend deportation in these cases. The entire section dealing with suspension of deportation needs to be drastically rewritten in order to be in accord with the traditions of the United States. Legislation is now being drafted which would accomplish this among many other sweeping changes in our present immigration law. However, pending the introduction of this bill and congressional consideration of this overall legislation, we feel that prompt relief should be provided in this restricted group of cases which, according to our information, does not include more than 100 individuals. Some of the cases that have come to us are truly appealing, including some veterans who have received high decorations for bravery and gallantry in Korea and elsewhere.

During their stay in the United States, they have abided by all our laws and have shown every indication of being good citizen material. If they have violated any law, suspension of deportation would not apply.

This legislation would only apply to the following classes of veterans:

(a) Those who have served in World War II.

(b) Those who have served in the combat Zone in Korea.

(c) Those who have served for periods aggregating 3 years or more in the armed services of the United States.

They must be certified to have served honorably and to have been honorably separated from the services. It then comes within the discretion of the Attorney General whether to suspend deportation. No such discretionary authority is now vested in him.

MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR WIVES AND INFANTS OF ENLISTED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at the request of the American Legion, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States to provide maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency. I think the bill is of major importance, and should receive prompt consideration by the Congress.

I take this opportunity to point out that it is but one more proof of the fact that the Legion concerns itself primarily not with the needs of veterans, although it does discharge that obligation too, but that first and foremost, it continues to think of and to suggest programs designed to meet the needs of the men and women still in uniform, still on the fighting front.

I have said I am introducing the bill by request, and I am. But let there be no misunderstanding. Upon occasion that phrase is taken to mean that the person introducing proposed legislation is not committing himself to its support. In this case, I want it clearly understood that I am glad to comply with the request of the Legion because this is a bill which I wholeheartedly support. In effect, it calls for the reenactment of a program which I helped sponsor during World War II, and which at that time, proved eminently worthwhile. The bill proposes a reenactment of that wartime program modified so as to fit today's circumstances and designed to assure our fighting men that the wives and children they have left at home will be given that necessary medical care which they themselves would have striven to provide had they not been called to fight our battles. It is little enough for us to do for the members of our Armed Forces. It is an obligation we owe them. It is a program, the soundness of which we have already proved. It is a bill which should receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Legion requesting the introduction of this bill, together with a resolution on the subject adopted at the last national convention of the Legion. I ask that both be set forth in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1495) to establish a program of grants-in-aid to States to provide maternity and infant care for the wives and infants of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter and resolution presented by Mr. MURRAY are as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Enclosed please find copy of Resolution No. 156, adopted at our national convention on the subject of emergency maternity and infant care for servicemen's dependents, etc.

I also enclose typewritten draft of a suggested form of bill which, in our opinion, would carry out the purpose of resolution No. 156, and we would appreciate it if you could see your way clear to introduce a bill for us at your early convenience.

Thanking you for your consideration, and with kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

CHILD WELFARE—EMERGENCY MATERNITY AND INFANT CARE FOR SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS

Whereas, during World War II a system of Emergency Maternity and Infant Care (known as EMIC) was established to provide needed service for the families of enlisted men; and

Whereas, reports from the departments show that there is again a need to provide such maternity and infant care service for the families of men now entering or reentering military service; and

Whereas, the 33d national convention meeting in Miami, Fla., recommend the enactment of an EMIC program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the establishment of an Emergency Maternity and Infant Care program similar to the program operated during World War II, with due consideration given to correcting any inequities which the experience developed during World War II may have revealed.

ANNUAL FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the authorized amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia to an amount equal to 25 percent of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia.

On March 2, 1953, I addressed the Senate on this matter, and attempted to point out that such a proposal would be fair and equitable in meeting what I consider an obligation on the part of the United States to share to a greater extent in the expense of maintaining the Federal City.

I am hopeful that the proposed legislation will receive favorable consideration at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1496) to increase the authorized amount of the annual Federal payment to the District of Columbia to an amount equal to 25 percent of the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO REVOCATION OF AMENDMENT OF CERTIFICATES AND PERMITS OF WATER CARRIERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission under certain conditions to revoke or amend certificates and permits of water carriers. The bill is part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1501) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke, amend, or suspend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

The bill was introduced by request in my capacity as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and is similar to the bill, S. 2364, which was reported favorably by this committee after extensive hearings last year.

The need for the bill, which would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission under certain conditions to revoke or amend certificates and permits of water carriers, arises because part III of the Interstate Commerce Act does not now provide revocation authority and procedure such as are found in part II and part IV with reference to motor carriers and freight forwarders, respectively. The United States Supreme Court, in *United States* v. *Seatrain Lines, Inc.* (329 U. S. 424), has indicated that the Commission is without authority to revoke water carrier certificates or permits in whole or in part, once they have become effective and the time fixed for requesting rehearing or reconsideration has passed.

The bill would place water carriers in a position similar to that of other carriers. It would provide the means for a more flexible and equitable control over the supply of domestic water transportation than is now possible.

The present lack of revocation authority as to water carriers has become important because a considerable number of the prewar operators have found it impracticable or inexpedient to resume operations since the close of World War II. Consequently, existing water-carrier service in some important areas is far below the prewar service. The Interstate Commerce Commission has reported that about one-fourth of the presently outstanding water-carrier operating authorities are not being used and that in some instances this condition has persisted for some time.

It has been further stated by the Commission that the traffic and revenues of carriers on the inland waterways have improved substantially; but that the coastwise and intercoastal carriers, hampered by constantly rising terminal handling costs, continue virtually as marginal operators. Package-freight service no longer exists on the Great Lakes and less-than-bargeload service has all but disappeared from the other inland waterways. A few carriers are said to be experimenting with various devices and projects for the improvement or resumption of these services, but little tangible progress has been made thus far.

Dormant or unused operating rights could be a major cause of this condition, because the existence of such outstanding certificates and permits may be revived at any time, causing an adverse effect upon old and new operators. The Commission points out that the existence of these dormant operating authorities also makes it difficult to determine to what extent duplicating new authorities should be granted considering the danger of an eventual surplus of competitive service which might be injurious to both the carriers and the general public.

For these reasons the Commission, beginning in 1947, and in its subsequent annual reports to the Congress, has recommended that "part III of the act be amended by adding after section 312 a new section (213a) containing provisions for revocations of water carrier certificates or permits." Accordingly, the Commission at the hearings before this committee generally supported the purpose of S. 2364, but suggested certain amendments for consideration. The Commission's general position on this matter was stated as follows:

"Although water carriers should have reasonable protection against loss of their operating rights where abnormal or special conditions have hindered resumption or continuance of operations, we do not believe it to be in the public interest that certificates and permits be held indefinitely regardless of the reasons for their nonuse. We believe that we should have authority to determine upon the facts of each case whether operating rights should be revoked for nonuse."

The principal changes suggested by the Commission were designed to make it clear that the revocation authority would be made contingent upon "willful" failure to engage in or continue service, since it is recognized that the nature of water carriage and the size of equipment used is such as to make it impracticable for some water carriers to provide service at all times to all ports within the scope of their operation authorities. The other revisions proposed were to make the language and terms of the bill conform more closely with the comparable revocation provisions of part II and part IV of the act.

Other witnesses testifying in support of this bill emphasized the need of the Interstate Commerce Commission having discretionary authority which would enable it to take into account "extenuating circumstances" and to exercise such authority in the event of a "willful" failure to operate. The principal opponent of this bill argues against any revocation authority. He contended that nobody is being "hurt" by the existence of dormant water carrier certificates and that, considering rapid changes in the water transportation industry and with increasing rail freight rates, "it could well be that an unprofitable water freight today will become profitable this year or next, with the result that adequate transportation services will be provided by present holders of certificates or permits."

As other witnesses have pointed out, it would appear that the bill should provide reasonable protection of the operating authorities of water carriers who may be compelled, by the force of economic circumstances, to curtail or cease their operations temporarily. The suggestions made in this regard have been taken into account in the bill.

EXTENSION OF RECORDS AND REPORTS PROVISION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO PERSONS FURNISHING LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, by request, I also introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend the records and reports provision of the Interstate Commerce Act to persons furnishing locomotives. This bill is likewise a part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1502) to extend the records and reports provision of the Interstate Commerce Act to persons furnishing locomotives, introduced by Mr. TOBEY (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Mr. TOBEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

The bill was introduced, by request, in my capacity as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is part of the legislative program of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and is similar to the bill, S. 2353, on which extensive hearings were held last year by the committee.

As the law now stands, persons furnishing cars or protective service must grant access by the Interstate Commerce Commission or its agents to the records, accounts, and other documents which pertain to the cars or protective service so furnished. The law also authorizes the Commission to prescribe the forms of all records, accounts, and memoranda which it is authorized to inspect and copy. Furthermore, the ICC is authorized to require such reports as it may deem necessary and may require persons furnishing such cars or protective service to submit their records, accounts, and other documents for inspection or copying to any of its authorized agents upon demand.

No new regulatory problem nor any significant extension of regulatory authority is dealt with in this bill. It simply extends the ICC's authority to require information about relations between railroads and the suppliers of freight cars to the same relations with suppliers of locomotives. The legislation has become necessary now because railroads have in recent years been using the same kind of leasing arrangements for their locomotives that they previously used in supplying themselves with cars. If relative degrees of importance can be assigned, it would seem even more necessary to cover locomotive-leasing practices than such practices in regard to the furnishing of freight cars.

For some reason a misconception about this bill developed at last year's hearings. A couple of committee members assumed that the bill gave the Commission powers to control the arrangements between railroad and lessor, making it necessary to get ICC approval before entering into such equipment lease arrangements.

This is not the case. In fact, the carriers themselves would not be affected at all. It is simply a matter of informing the Commission of certain matters in connection with the leasing arrangements. The person supplying the locomotives would be the one required to make any reports, not the railroad. As Commissioner Mahaffie pointed out, there have been no objections at all about the way this requirement has worked out as it concerns the supplying of cars, and there is no reason that there should be any with regard to locomotives.

It simply boils down to the commonsense fact that the Commission should be appraised of details concerning any arrangement whereby the railroads do not own their own equipment.

It should be noted, by the way, that the railroads (the AAR) did not even bother to testify on this legislation last year.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1953

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1505) to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to make the Farm Credit Administration an independent establishment of the Federal Government; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The analysis presented by Mr. AIKEN is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1953

The principal purpose of the bill is to provide for increased borrower participation in management of the Farm Credit Administration. While the Administration would remain in the Department of Agriculture, it would be made subject to the supervision of a new Federal Farm Credit Board, rather than the Secretary as at present. The Board would consist of 13 members. One member would be appointed from each of the 12 farm credit districts by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among nominations submitted, respectively, by (1) the national farm loan associations, (2) the production credit associations, and (3) the cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the bank for cooperatives, of the district. The thirteenth member would be designated by the Secretary. The functions of the Administration would be carried out by a Governor of the Farm Credit Administration appointed, and subject to general supervision, by the Board.

In each district 3 of the 4 district board directors now appointed by the Governor of the Administration would be elected as provided in section 15 by (1) the national farm loan associations, (2) the production credit associations, and (3) the cooperatives which are stockholders or subscribers to the guaranty fund of the regional bank for cooperatives respectively, whenever the investment of the United States in the Land Bank, the production credit associations, and the bank for cooperatives, respectively, for the district, falls below a level of about one-third of their respective capital, surplus, reserves, and guaranty fund. Under present conditions the national farm loan associations and the production credit associations in all 12 districts would each be entitled to elect an additional director under this provision.

In addition, the bill would—

1. Abolish the offices of Land Bank Commissioner, Production Credit Commissioner, Cooperative Bank Commissioner, and Intermediate Credit Commissioner.

2. Transfer the Division of Cooperative Marketing to the Agricultural Research Administration.

3. Provide for payment to the United States of a return on its investment, if any, in the various land banks, production credit corporations, and banks for cooperatives as set out in sections 10, 11, 12, and 13. At present the United States owns no stock in any of the land banks. The production-credit corporations are wholly owned by the United States.

4. Permit production-credit associations under certain circumstances to raise additional capital by sale of a new class C stock to investors and production-credit corporations.

Within 1 year after its appointment the Federal Farm Credit Board would recommend such additional changes as might be necessary to carry out the purpose of the bill.

AMENDMENT OF SECURITIES ACT AND SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT RELATING TO NATURAL MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to release the stranglehold which the Securities and Exchange Commission now has on the mining and other important industries.

The mining industry is a speculative business, and every mine is a financial risk until large bodies of ore have been blocked out. Discovering and blocking out the valuable ore is a long, expensive, and financially hazardous process.

After the valuable ore has been blocked out, speculative funds are not needed, but until the mineral deposit has been developed, venture capital must be available. Unless securities can be sold to raise venture capital to finance the discovering and development of strategic and critical metals, our national-defense effort will be seriously jeopardized.

The Securities and Exchange Commission was created by Congress to perform a useful function in preventing fraud and deliberate misrepresentation of facts to investors by requiring that the truth be told to the public before an offering of stock could be made.

But the Commission continually goes far beyond the functions Congress intended it to perform when, before allowing stock to be sold, it arbitrarily attempts to determine the ultimate feasibility of the enterprise. The success of a mine cannot be determined until the very work which is to be financed through the sale of securities has been completed.

Until expensive exploration has been done, there is no way to tell the depth or width of a vein, yet the Securities and Exchange Commission often assumes the authority to arbitrarily rule on the feasibility of the mine and to prevent the sale of stock on the strength of their ruling. In this way, private venture capital is prevented from flowing into the mining industry, and without it undetermined amounts of mineral wealth lie undiscovered and undeveloped.

Furthermore, the mining industry suffers additional injuries when hearings are called, or official statements are made by the Commission, before a proper investigation has been made, indicating fraud or lack of feasibility. This procedure has the effect of scaring the potential investor, then even if the enterprise seeking a permit to sell stock is completely cleared, its reputation is besmirched and the only recourse is to give up the project, because, Mr. President, although new venture capital must be given every encouragement in order to finance development of the strategic and

critical minerals of this Nation, the Securities and Exchange Commission has practically paralyzed the private capital market and this situation must be cured at once.

The Securities and Exchange Commission, legislating through the medium of its rule-making power, has seriously hurt the mining industry, and retarded many worthwhile developments in other fields. If this Nation is to keep up the production of strategic and critical minerals necessary for national security, private capital must be readily available and the regulation for sale of securities must be done in the manner authorized by the Congress and not by the tyrannical methods of the Commission. This abuse of the power granted by Congress must be stopped.

Mr. President, in order to promote the cause of national defense by helping the mining industry to get necessary working capital, I introduce the bill, to be referred to the proper committee, to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933 and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1506) to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph as follows:

"(12) Any security the issuer of which is engaged in the exploration and development of natural mineral resources: *Provided*, That the issuer shall file with the Securities and Exchange Commission, before a public offering is made, a written statement containing substantially the following information: The full name and complete mailing address of (a) the issuer, (b) the directors and officers of the issuer, (c) the person by or on behalf of whom the offering is to be made, and (d) the principal underwriter of the securities to be offered; the title and amount of the security to be offered; the amount of the offering and of the underwriting discounts and commission; the date of the proposed offering; the States in which it is proposed to sell the security; the purpose for which the net proceeds are to be used; and three copies of every written communication, advertisement, or radio broadcast to be delivered thereafter to investors by the issuer or the principal underwriter of any such security to more than twenty-five persons."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 19 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) When in possession of written evidence and facts which, in the opinion of the Commission clearly justify an investigation for the enforcement of this title, and upon its written order, any member of the Commission, or any officer or officers designated by it, is empowered to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents which the Commission deems relevant or material to the inquiry. Such hearings and investigations as may be required shall be held in such place or places as the Commission may designate, but no witness shall be required by subpena to appear at a place outside the Federal judicial district in which he may reside without his consent."

SEC. 3. Subsection (a) of section 20 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in section 8 of this title, the Commission shall investigate only such violations of the provisions of this title or of any rule or regulation prescribed under authority thereof, as shall be based upon a written complaint of a person outside the staff of the Commission setting forth material facts and circumstances showing that a substantial violation has occurred or is about to occur, and the Commission may thereupon, if in its opinion the public interest will thereby be served, authorize an investigation by written order, and a copy of such order and written complaint shall be made available promptly to the person subject to the investigation."

SEC. 4. Section 21 of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended by adding thereto a new sentence to read as follows: "Any person who is under investigation and who shall testify in such hearings or in any preliminary investigation shall be permitted to obtain at cost a copy of his testimony and to be represented by counsel."

SEC. 5. Section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection as follows:

"(d) No provision of this title shall apply to, or be deemed to include, any market place or facilities for the purchase and sale of securities of an issuer engaged exclusively in the exploitation, development, or operation of mines, or in the exploitation, development, and production of oil, gas, or other natural mineral resources."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Location Act—the 1872 mining claim legislation—is the last resort of the prospector or small miner.

It is the only chance for the man who is willing to work, to take his grubstake into the mountains and deserts—and to locate his claim, filing only with the county clerk for a small fee—and then owning his ground as long as he does $100's worth of work a year in the development of his property.

Let us remove the handicaps and barriers so that he may develop the mineral deposits of this Nation.

REVISION AND REPRINT OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized and directed to revise, by bringing up to date, the pamphlet entitled "Our American Government," as set out in House Document 465, 79th Congress.

SEC. 2. Such revised pamphlet shall be printed as a Senate document, and there be printed 100,000 additional copies of which 24,750 copies shall be for the use of the Senate; 66,150 copies for the use of the House of Representatives; 3,100 for the Senate Document Room and 6,000 for the House Document Room.

CHANGE IN NAME OF ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL ASSOCIATION TO THEODORE ROOSEVELT ASSOCIATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2277) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such Association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I am advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be appropriate to have the bill considered by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Letter regarding a military deficit, written by Senator JACKSON to the President of the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Statement on political investigations of universities issued by the Princeton University Chapter, American Association of University Professors.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "A Glorious Gamble," written by the Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 29, 1953.

Statement issued by certain mayors of American cities dealing with offshore oil lands.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Bricker Presses Vital Safeguard," published in the Ashtabula (Ohio) Star-Beacon of March 23, 1953.

Editorial entitled "The Question of Treaties," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 26, 1953.

NEED FOR A NEW BRAND OF DIPLOMACY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am proud to count among my good friends Prof. Charles Roger Hicks, of the department of history and and political science of the University of Nevada. Professor Hicks and I maintain a correspondence which is not, I am sorry to say, regular, but which is always, to me, enlightening.

Professor Hicks has written me a letter—he wrote it on St. Patrick's Day—which expresses so well and so forcefully feelings which I have myself held for a long time, that I want to take this opportunity to endorse and underline what he has written. The letter is short, all on one page, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
Reno, Nev., March 17, 1953.

Senator PAT MCCARRAN.

ESTEEMED FRIEND: Generally speaking, the following proposition holds true: At the time we, as a nation, were physically weak, we were diplomatically strong; and since we

have been physically strong, we have been diplomatically weak.

The period of our physical weakness and diplomatic strength ended with the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. Since then we have been appeased and pussyfooted into two great World Wars and into the present Korean mess.

It is time to act our age. It is time to revert to shirt-sleeve and big-stick diplomacy. It is time to resume our old custom of calling a spade a spade. It is time again to stand up for principles of right and decency in our relations with foreign powers. It is time to take the initiative away from the Russians. It is time to encourage President Eisenhower in the firm policy with which he started his regime and to take steps to prevent him from falling before the specious arguments of the Acheson crew. It is time to give full and complete support to Chiang Kai-shek, time to blockade the China coast and time to bomb across the Yalu.

Appeasement always leads to war. Positive action has, in times past, prevented wars; and may prevent another all-out and wide-spread conflict. Russia respects force alone. Russia will start a war, a war to the finish, when she thinks the omens to be favorable—and not before. If Russia is bluffing, let us call her bluff; if she is serious in her menacing actions then let us see to it that she throws down the gauntlet, and have an end to persiflage, insults, and to devious maneuvers. If there must be war let us have war and an eventual end to the drain on our resources and manpower. Be sure that the God of Hosts will be with us and against the malevolent gods of the Kremlin.

For God's sake, for our country's sake, and for the sake of our children let us act as if we had some guts.

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES ROGER HICKS.

Mr. MALONE subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that earlier today my colleague [Mr. MCCARRAN] had printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the necessity for a strong foreign policy, written by Mr. Charles Roger Hicks, professor of the department of history and political science of the University of Nevada. I received from Professor Hicks a similar letter in which he applies to the subject of foreign policy considerable common sense, which has been a rare commodity in the city of Washington for some time.

I had intended to present the letter from Professor Hicks to the Senate, but, inasmuch as my colleague has had printed the one received by him, I shall content myself with this brief statement.

COMPARISON OF COMPENSATION OF AMERICAN AND ALIEN SEAMEN

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an unsolicited letter which I have received from a Marine chief engineer. The letter is extremely interesting, because the writer enclosed three hypothetical wage vouchers to illustrate how alien seamen fare better than American citizens, from the standpoint of take-home pay for a given amount of work.

These computations show that for an equal amount of work, an unmarried American citizen seaman would receive $411 in take-home pay, an American citizen seaman, married, would receive $433.50, and an alien seaman would receive $495.87.

Perhaps these figures do not mean very much, and I do not offer them as proof of anything at all, but I think some of my colleagues may be very much interested in them. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and the three vouchers attached may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and vouchers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.,
East Lynn, Mass., March 11, 1953.

The Honorable Mr. MCCARRAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In spite of all the criticisms and that some Members of the 83d Congress will try to introduce amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act, I admire the principles behind such legislation.

I, as a seaman, naturally have heard pro and con discussions as to the justification of this act; but I have also heard more remarks from immigration officers in favor of than against. For example, "Now we have something to work on" said by immigration officers in reference to crew members that are aliens during entry after a vessel has returned from a foreign voyage. It is very interesting to listen to the answers from alien seamen when they are asked, "How did you originally enter the United States?" The usual answer is, "I jumped ship."

In reference to the law that all seamen must be screened, I not only think it was a very wise move and a protective measure against subversive activities; but I also have found that most seamen that had clear records did not object to this screening. What loyal American would?

I have enclosed three imaginary wage vouchers to illustrate how nonresident aliens are benefited under the present income tax laws. Many of these aliens are full-fledged union members that have full protection from their union. Many are very militant union members and take very active parts in unionism aboard our ships. I might add that it is not easy to take, one as a citizen being obligated to their demands and then still have to abide by our income tax laws, and they contribute practically nothing for the privilege of living by United States standards. Of course, there are some aliens that have the proper attitude by giving a mailing address and then are subject to our income tax laws. This, of course, is with the idea in mind of obtaining citizenship papers more easily.

The imaginary vouchers are made up of typical cases illustrating a married man with one child, a single man, and a nonresident alien giving their basic salary and the approximate amount of overtime earned, which is governed by union contracts; giving the exemption of $1.40 per day to nonresident alien seamen that citizens are not entitled to; and giving the taxes that citizens are subjected to. It is quite obvious why nonresident aliens do not want to declare a resident address.

Forgive me for taking your valuable time, but I feel that a man of your integrity and ideals, of protect America, is of the caliber to have this unjust tax condition brought before the Congress when they battle the tax reduction.

Again, I want to congratulate you on your ideals that you must have had in mind to foster the McCarran-Walter Act.

I remain,
Sincerely yours,

I. H. RINKER,
Chief Engineer, S. S. "Gateway City."
Z. M. DUNN,
Master.

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.—WAGE VOUCHER

Date: January 30, 1951.
Vessel: *Gateway City.* Port, New York. Voyage: 53.
Name: John Doe. S. S. No. 9. Rating able-bodied seaman.
Wages from January 1 to January 30; 30 days; rate, $302.32.
Bonus: From January 12 to January 21; 10 days; rate par day, $2.50.
Overtime: 100 hours; rate, $1.87.
Gross amount, $514.32.

INFORMATION, SOCIAL-SECURITY AND WITHHOLDING RECORDS

Total wages, bonus and overtime, $514.32.
Subsistence allowance: Number of days, 30.
Rate per day, $1, equals $30.
Old-age benefits tax, 1½ percent of gross earnings, $8.16.
U.I.— /10 of 1 percent of $2.16.
Withholding tax (number of exemptions, 3), $70.50.
Gross earnings: $544.32.
Total deductions, $80.82.
Balance due, $433.50.
Received payment in full.

JOHN DOE,
Payee.

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.—WAGE VOUCHER

Date: January 30, 1953.
Vessel: *Gateway City.* Port: New York. Voyage: 53.
Name: John Doe. S. S. No. 5. Rating: Able-bodied seaman.
Wages from January 1 to January 30; 30 days; rate: $302.32.
Bonus: From January 12 to January 21; 10 days; rate per day, $2.50.
Overtime: 100 hours; rate, $1.87.
Gross amount: $514.32.

INFORMATION, SOCIAL-SECURITY AND WITHHOLDING RECORDS

Total wages, bonus, and overtime, $514.32.
Subsistence allowance: Number of days, 30.
Rate per day, $1, equals $30.
Gross earnings: $544.32.
Calculation nonresident alien tax: 5 days pay, United States waters, $50.39.
Wages earned in United States: 10 hours overtime, $18.70.
Exemption ($1.40), $42.
Taxable: $27.09.
Thirty percent of taxable: $8.13.
Old-age benefits tax (1½ percent of gross earnings), $8.16.
U.I.— /10 of 1 percent of gross earnings, $2.16.
Nonresident alien tax, line 18, $8.13.
Total deductions: $18.45.
Balance due: $495.87.
Received payment in full.

JOHN DOE,
Payee.

WATERMAN STEAMSHIP CORP.—WAGE VOUCHER

Date: January 30, 1953.
Vessel: *Gateway City.* Port: New York. Voyage: 53.
Name: John Doe, S. S. No. 4: Rating: Able-bodied seaman.
Wages from January 1 to January 30; 30 days; rate, $302.32.
Bonus: From January 12 to January 21; 10 days; rate per day: $2.50.
Overtime: 100 hours; rate, $1.87.
Gross amount: $514.32.

INFORMATION SOCIAL-SECURITY AND WITHHOLDING RECORDS

Total wages, bonus and overtime, $514.32.
Subsistence allowance: Number days, 30.
Rate per day: $1 equals $30.
Gross earnings, $544.32.
Old-age-benefits tax (1½ percent gross earnings), $8.16.
U. I.— /10 of 1 percent of gross earnings, $2.16.
Withholding tax (number exemptions, 1), $93.

Total deductions, $103.32.
Balance due, $411.
Received payment in full.

JOHN DOE,
Payee.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before proceeding with the calendar, which I understand is the next order of business, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], be authorized to address the Senate at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the distinguished majority leader thinks I should do so, I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Potter
Case	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
Goldwater	Martin	Wiley
Gore	Maybank	Williams
Green	McCarran	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SMITH of Maine in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on Friday, March 20, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] stated to the Senate his reasons for not accepting the offered chairmanship of a proposed subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The purpose of the proposed subcommittee was to finish the unfinished business of a subcommittee of the same committee which during the 82d Congress conducted investigations of irregularities and corruption in Federal tax matters and to make sufficient investigation of leads which might develop out of the unfinished business, so that the whole committee might be in position to determine whether new investigations should be undertaken.

When speaking of the whole committee in matters involving decision it should be noted that a lawful minimum effective quorum is eight members actually present. It should also be kept in mind that there is a total of 15 members on the Senate Finance Committee; that the members of any subcommittee have the opportunity to vote as members of the whole committee; that a minimum voting majority can range from 5 to 8 votes, depending upon the number of votes cast.

The Senator from Delaware was a member of the subcommittee which operated during the 82d Congress and the Senate Committee on Finance wanted him to be a member and chairman of the proposed new subcommittee.

The Senator from Delaware does not quarrel with the purpose of the proposed subcommittee. He does not quarrel with the implementing powers which would be granted the proposed subcommittee.

The issue as defined by the Senator from Delaware which confronted the Senate Committee on Finance is exceedingly simple.

It was whether that committee should empower a single member of the proposed subcommittee, acting on his own judgment and without the approval of the majority of the subcommittee or of the whole committee, ranging from 5 to 8 members, to disclose confidential information developed by the proposed subcommittee or the whole committee if that member, on his own independent judgment, should come to the conclusion that such information showed a violation of law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Colorado care to yield at this time and at other times when he raises certain points about which I should like to inquire?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am particularly anxious to yield to the Senator from Delaware, and I wish he would keep some notes and then make his inquiries at the conclusion of my remarks. However, if he decides that he must make inquiry as I proceed with my remarks, I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall wait until the Senator has concluded his remarks.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The Senate Committee on Finance refused to grant that privilege.

There is the whole issue.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the Senator from Delaware of March 20 and the debate thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of March 20 and the ensuing debate appear in the Appendix under the heading "Rules of Procedure of Finance Committee.")

Mr. MILLIKIN. But there have been suggestions by persons knowing nothing of the facts to the effect—and I emphasize not by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—that the refusal of the Senate Finance Committee to grant the privilege desired by the Senator from Delaware is pursuant to some oppressive or ulterior purpose.

I cannot hope to change the opinions of those who would soothe gnawing evil in their own hearts by ascribing it to others, nor can I hope to set straight congenital declaimers of error. But I do think that I am warranted in stating for those who are interested and who are without blinding bias why there should be explicit rules for the operations of the proposed subcommittee, why the proposed grants of power to the proposed subcommittee are ample, and why the Senate Committee on Finance would be derelict in its duty if it did not include the rule which meets with the objection of the Senator from Delaware.

During the 82d Congress, indications of corruption and gross irregularities in the Federal Revenue Service caused the Senate Finance Committee to set up a subcommittee to look into the situation. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It did not operate under formal rules. From time to time the subcommittee requested the whole committee to grant needed powers and these were generously granted.

The operations of the subcommittee confirmed and exceeded the suspicions of corruption and irregularities in the Federal Revenue Service. The credit is largely due to the intelligent and indefatigable labors and dedicated zeal of the Senator from Delaware, who has earned and received the gratitude of his colleagues and the Nation.

The subcommittee's work was unfinished at the end of the 82d Congress. Material and leads were in hand which deserved further exploration. Therefore, the Senator from Delaware during the present session of Congress outlined the nature of the unfinished business to the whole Senate Committee on Finance, which was of the unanimous opinion that the job should be finished, and was unanimously willing that a new subcommittee should be set up, with the Senator from Delaware as its chairman.

At this point let me emphasize that the Senate Finance Committee, with the exception noted, has not been an investigator of crime and has not operated

through subcommittees. With the exception noted, it has been thought advisable that hearings and the business of the committee should be conducted by the whole committee. Considering the importance of matters within the jurisdiction of the whole committee, such as taxation, social security, reciprocal trade, customs regulation, and veterans' benefits, it has been thought advisable that each member should have direct, firsthand opportunity, as a part of an unsplintered team, to acquaint himself thoroughly with proposed legislation covering such matters.

Subcommittees have been a part of the normal operations of other committees, and doubtless there has been good reason for them.

The fact that the Senate Committee on Finance, with the exception noted, has not used subcommittees is mentioned to underline the further fact that when, during the preceding session of Congress, the subcommittee predecessor to the proposed subcommittee was authorized, there were no formal rules ready for use defining or regulating its powers and duties. Necessary backing and powers were given by the whole committee as needed and as requested by the subcommittee.

When the subcommittee was set up during the 82d Congress, there was no suggestion that it should be considered as more than a temporary arrangement for dealing with a situation which it was hoped would be of limited size. The shocking magnitude of subsequent developments was unguessed at that time.

The informal, problem-by-problem-as-it-arose method whereby the whole committee powered the subcommittee seemed at the time to be appropriate for the initial purpose. I venture the personal opinion that had we known what we were getting into, the relations of the whole committee and the subcommittee would have been covered from the beginning by more formal and precise arrangements.

But when in this session of the Congress, it became apparent that the job as to a sizable number of matters had not been finished, and that the creation of a new subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] seemed advisable to complete the unfinished work and possibly to follow other leads suggested by that work, the time seemed to have come for setting out more explicitly, and in advance, the job of the subcommittee, its powers and duties. It was also in mind that the enlargement of the whole committee from 13 to 15 members might call for more frequent use of subcommittees in other directions.

It does not take a member of this body long to learn that he, as well as the Senate collectively, is constantly accompanied by an inseparable companion. His name is "Precedent," and his countenance and being are often judged to be ugly or benign depending upon whether he beams or frowns upon individual or collective ambitions as they may change from day to day. He is a helpful fellow or can be a monster, depending on how he has been shaped in the past and upon how we shape him as we go along. He is well worthy of our never flagging attention.

The Senate Finance Committee felt that for precedent values, rules were better than no rules. It felt that rules could, and that the proposed rules did, give generous amplitude of power to men like the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and could protect against possible future abuse by members who might come on the committee in the future and who might have a lesser sense of proper responsibility and restraint. It was felt that clearer definition of rights and duties was owing to the members of the proposed subcommittee, as well as to the other members of the whole committee. It should not be forgotten that the committee as a whole and every member of it are not free of responsibility for the actions of a subcommittee.

So let us examine without delay the powers and the restrictions for the proposed new subcommittee. This, I am confident, will demonstrate the falsity of any suggestion that the proposed rules would hobble the proper activities of the proposed subcommittee. It will also show the exact point of difference between the whole committee and the Senator from Delaware.

The proposed rules are as follows:

On motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, the Senate Committee on Finance hereby establishes a subcommittee consisting of the following members—

Three spaces are left, as will appear in the RECORD, because members' names have not been filled in, inasmuch as the members of the subcommittee have not yet been formally appointed—

which subcommittee is hereby authorized to conduct studies and investigations of, and to report on, the following matters and such other matters as may from time to time be authorized by the whole committee.

There the specific subject matters are to be set forth. That has not yet been done, because the determination of the exact wording of the subject matters has not been completed. .

The subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings on said matters and to sit and act on them during the present Congress at such times and places within the continental United States, and without the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions as the subcommittee may determine and as approved by the whole committee.

In the performance of its functions, the subcommittee may hold such hearings whether or not the United States Senate is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and may require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or by other lawful means, to administer such oaths and to take such testimony as it—

The subcommittee—

deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the subcommittee or by any member thereof designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Except as to the specific investigations herein authorized, no investigation shall be initiated or carried on without the approval of the whole committee. However, preliminary inquiries of matters involving possible wrongdoing by officials or others respecting the revenues of the United States leading from, or suggested by, studies and investigations of those matters herein specifically authorized, may be initiated by the subcommittee.

Executive hearings shall be held only with the approval of the Chairman of the subcommittee. This authority may be delegated by such Chairman to other members of the subcommittee when necessary.

Public hearings shall be held only with the approval of the whole committee.

I interject to say that was included as a precaution to avoid conflicts of hearings between the subcommittee and the whole committee. The whole committee was willing to leave it out, and to depend on informal adjustment of the problem if it should ever arise.

An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of the testimony of all witnesses in executive and public hearings.

The subcommittee shall report its actions and recommendations to the whole committee and all testimony taken in executive session by the subcommittee and matters developed therein and actions, recommendations and reports thereon shall not be released or disclosed without the approval of the whole committee, except that the full committee shall not prohibit any member of the committee from discharging his responsibility to disclose any case which he considers to have been a violation of the law and not involving information derived from the executive activities of the subcommittee or of the whole committee.

It will be observed that authority was to be given to make studies, investigations, and reports on matters to be specifically described.

For obvious reasons, these specific matters should not now be set out in the RECORD or discussed on the Senate floor, but they were explained by the Senator from Delaware to the whole committee in executive sessions.

And the point I wish to emphasize is that the whole committee was willing that the proposed subcommittee should be empowered to go into every specific item of unfinished business proposed for further investigation by the Senator from Delaware.

So far no hampering, no smothering, no obstruction.

It will be noted that the members of the proposed subcommittee are not named in the draft of the proposed rules I have read to the Senate. I have also explained that.

The whole committee understood that the Senator from Delaware was to be a member, and was to be chairman.

According to custom, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] had submitted to the chairman the name of the member from the minority. The chairman was prepared to appoint a third member.

I assure you, Mr. President, that no member of the proposed subcommittee would have been unfriendly to the Senator from Delaware or to the pursuit of the objectives of the subcommittee.

I have been referring to the functions. Now let us look at the powers to be granted the proposed subcommittee for the performance of its functions.

First, there is authority to hold hearings on the unfinished business to which I have referred, during the present session of Congress and at such times and

places within the continental United States, as the subcommittee might determine, and also authority to hold hearings without the continental United States, its territories and possessions, as the subcommittee might determine and with the approval of the whole committee.

Would anyone say that this is a niggling, hampering grant of authority? The Senator from Delaware does not say so.

It was proposed by the whole committee that the contemplated subcommittee might attend to its business whether or not the Senate was in session, had recessed, or adjourned.

Within its broad grant of jurisdiction, the proposed subcommittee could require the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, by subpena or other lawful means. The proposed subcommittees could administer oaths and take such testimony as it deemed necessary.

Under the signature of its chairman, or any member of the subcommittee designated by him, subpenas might issue and be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

No one understanding the meaning and implication of these various powers would say that they were reluctant cheese parings offered by a whole committee bent upon starving a subcommittee it was about to create. The Senator from Delaware does not say so. In fact, he has expressed satisfaction with these various powers. And why not? They give to the proposed subcommittee advance, blanket powers of enormous magnitude which the predecessor subcommittee had to request from the whole committee as the need for them developed.

Then it was originally specified that, except as to the specific investigations to which I have referred as unfinished business, no further investigation would be initiated or carried on without the approval of the whole committee.

At this point, I may say that the opinion seemed to be general in the committee that as to new matters—matters not within the category of specified unfinished business—and especially matters which might come to the attention of the proposed subcommittee involving dereliction, not to be expected and not suspicioned, under the present administration, the Treasury, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Justice Department, and such other agencies as might share responsibility in any particular case of that kind, should be given fair opportunity to clean house on their own steam and under their own initiative.

But at the same time it was well understood that if such new matters were to develop and were brought to the attention of the new administration, and it did not move with expedition or efficiency, the whole committee would not surrender its own proper interest.

Is this a hampering or unfair attitude? The Senator from Delaware has not said so. In fact, I have read a newspaper story crediting the Senator from Delaware with a statement to the effect that the new administration should be given fair opportunity to keep its own house clean.

I did not have to read the newspapers to find this out.

During our first conversations this year regarding the proposed new subcommittee which we were discussing, the Senator from Delaware told me that this was his attitude.

It was suggested by the Senator from Delaware that the study of specified matters of unfinished business might develop leads into other matters which the subcommittee had not previously considered; that it might be an excessive restriction if the rules did not permit preliminary inquiries of sufficient scope to put the subcommittee in position to know whether leads of that kind should be dropped, or whether authority of the whole committee should be requested to go further.

Authority to make such preliminary inquiries was provided.

There was no hampering, no obstruction in these matters. And the Senator from Delaware did not say there was.

We then come to the proposed provision which raises the whole objection of the Senator from Delaware, and the whole issue.

I shall read it:

> The subcommittee shall report its actions and recommendations to the whole committee and all testimony taken in executive session by the subcommittee and matters developed therein, and actions, recommendations, and reports thereon, shall not be released or disclosed without the approval of the whole committee, except that the full committee shall not prohibit any member of the committee from discharging his responsibility to disclose any case which he considers to have been a violation of law and not involving information derived from the executive activities of the subcommittee or of the whole committee.

The Senator from Delaware was not content with that part of the proposed rule which I have read which requires consent of the whole committee (a majority of the whole committee) prior to making disclosure of executive matters before the subcommittee.

The Senator from Delaware proposed language in the rule which, if unmodified, would have allowed any member of the committee, without more, without any approval other than his own, to disclose anything developed in executive session which he might consider to have been a violation of the law.

The whole committee would not accept the Senator's amendment to that effect. It modified the Senator's amendment by limiting it to information not derived from the executive activities of the subcommittee or of the whole committee.

There is the issue in its completely revealing simplicity. That is the only issue. The Senator from Delaware does not assert any other issue.

It is not important to the present inquiry that the whole committee authorized inclusion in the proposed rules of language defining the right of witnesses to have counsel.

Not having his way, the Senator from Delaware told the committee he would not serve on the proposed subcommittee and would not be its chairman. He has stated his reasons to the whole committee and to the Senate. I deeply regret his decision.

The Senator from Delaware is unwilling to yield in these matters to a majority of the whole committee. He asserts a principle which is so deep and moving with him that it will not defer to any contrary or modifying human judgment.

There is no charge by the Senator from Delaware—he was careful to avoid a charge—that the proposed rules are of shifting or shifty expediency to fit the present membership—or any part of it—of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The meanings of terms such as "executive," "executive session," "executive processes," and "executive proceedings," are understood by Members of Congress and those who are familiar with its operations. But perhaps some explanation should be given for the benefit of others.

In order to legislate properly it is obvious that the committees of Congress which process legislation should have the information justifying whatever may be their actions.

Much information which comes before a committee is of such a nature that it can, and indeed should be, received without confidence in open hearings. Much of it by its nature is private and confidential and, if the legislative process is to be protected, should be received in confidence.

This kind of confidential information is developed by and considered in what are called executive sessions, processes, or proceedings of a committee or subcommittees, and the gathering of it may be aided by appropriate power such as the right to subpena witnesses and documents and the right to administer oaths.

The examinations before committees and subcommittees, acting in their executive capacity, are not public although the public interest may require later disclosure by public hearings, or otherwise.

So that we can better judge whether a single member of the committee or subcommittee in possession of confidential information developed in the manner which has been described, should be allowed on his own judgment to disclose it, let us see what that information might be.

Let us also remember always that there is not the faintest suggestion that a Senator should be restrained in disclosing confidential or other information which he has learned on his own.

Whether or not under those circumstances he will disclose is up to him and it is not now relevant to discuss various opinions as to the ethics which should govern decisions of that kind.

The proposed subcommittee might well receive information regarding the collection of revenue which may also be before administrative officials who are preparing action, administrative or judicial, to collect what they believe is due the Government. They may be preparing criminal actions. The same information may also be before grand juries which, by the way, also act in what we call executive session.

It certainly is not necessary to labor the point that premature disclosure by a talkative Senator justifying under the

rule proposed by the Senator from Delaware—and such a Senator would be the sole judge as to whether he should keep in the clutch between his mouth and his brain—might warn criminals to prepare alibis, to secrete their assets, or to flee from justice.

There might well be matters before the proposed subcommittee warranting inquiries as to the assets of a citizen, as to how he gets his income, as to what is in his bank account, or safe deposit box, as to what is being held or secreted by him or others for him.

Premature disclosure by someone acting under the rule proposed by the Senator from Delaware, acting on his sole, irreviewable judgment that there has been a violation of law, might give opportunity for the removal of property in which the Revenue Department might have a very real and important interest.

The talkative Senator might have been completely mistaken and any kind of disclosure in such cases might violate an individual's right of privacy in his personal affairs which in this country is supposed to remain private unless the overriding public interest requires exposure.

Mr. President, at this moment all over the United States of America hundreds of courts are sitting to determine what is the law and what is a violation of the law. At this very moment there are hundreds of juries all over the United States trying to determine what are the facts which raise the questions of law.

In other words, no single person can claim infallibility as to what is a violation of law.

It is not improbable that the proposed subcommittee might have written statements of oral declarations from informers in cases where, as a practical matter, information could not be compelled, where the informants are free of suspicion of being involved in crime and would talk only on the pledge of confidence.

I do not wish to be lurid about it but irresponsible disclosure of that kind of information—and this is possible under the proposed Williams rule—might subject the informant to all kinds of unjust and injurious harassments, indeed, might jeopardize his life. It is not entirely novel to learn that witnesses have been exterminated.

The committee must pass on certain nominations for office in the Federal Government. There might be FBI reports to be examined.

As all of those know who have looked at such reports, they contain many matters which are not proven, which rest on far-removed hearsay, empty tittle tattle, or vicious gossip.

The release of such information by a Senator, acting carelessly under the proposal of the Senator from Delaware, could be destructive of the well-earned, good reputation of the citizen. And this could be done without a scintilla of legitimate public interest.

It may well be that personal income-tax returns will be examined by such a subcommittee. Such returns may also involve the citizen's personal and private affairs and his right to keep them to himself. They, on their faces, or when all of the facts are known, may not show the slightest evidence of income-tax evasion or of legitimate public interest.

Their mistaken disclosure by some Senator acting under the rule proposed by the Senator from Delaware, which gives ample room for misjudgment as well as sound judgment, for precipitate, unfounded conclusions, as well as those which are well based, for reckless guesses; yes, even false pretense of violation of law as an excuse for sensationalism or a headline, could serve no overriding public purpose, could only embarrass or injure needlessly the citizen by violation of his right of privacy in his personal affairs.

A little further attention to the matter of income-tax returns which might come before the committee or the proposed subcommittee.

The Congress considers those returns so much an essential part of the proper privacy of the citizen that it has passed a law providing that their wrongful revelation by any officer or employee of the United States is a criminal offense.

It is my understanding that Members of Congress are not considered as officers or employees of the United States and that, therefore, this law is not applicable to them.

I am not making a point that improper revelation by a Member of Congress of what is in an income-tax return would be a criminal offense.

I am not pressing any technicality. I am not urging sterile legalisms. I am simply showing an instance, carrying its own healthy hints, of congressional solicitude for the protection of the proper privacy of the citizen.

The Congress has been very careful to limit the rights of committees of Congress to ask for income-tax returns. They may be supplied only upon the request of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives—not a subcommittee thereof—or the Committee on Finance of the Senate—not a subcommittee thereof—or by a select committee of the Senate or House—not a subcommittee thereof—specially authorized to investigate returns by a resolution of the Senate or House, or a joint committee so authorized by concurrent resolution.

Under the law a return can only be furnished these committees for consideration in executive session which further emphasizes the congressional view in these particular matters of the privacy and confidence attending such documents.

Then it is provided that any relevant or useful information thus obtained may be submitted to the Senate or the House or to both the Senate and the House—mark you, please, not by a subcommittee, not by some individual acting on his own—but only by the committees which I have described.

There we dealt with returns made by the citizen to the executive branch of the Government. Here we deal with matters which the citizen and Federal agencies may supply to a committee or a subcommittee and which may be as private and confidential in their real substance—perhaps even more so—as is an individual income-tax return.

But nothing that I knew of requires that when we are making rules for our own conduct we adopt proposals that might encourage or permit official irresponsibility in our dealings with the people we are supposed to serve.

The Senate Finance Committee has not fallen into that error.

Now let me say a few words on the nature of subcommittees. Again the facts are well known to Members of the Congress and those acquainted with congressional operations.

A subcommittee is no more than the creature of the whole committee. It is an instrumentality for performing, on behalf of the whole committee, certain tasks delegated to it by the whole committee. By rule or other appropriate action it is always subject to the control of the whole committee.

A subcommittee may try to lift itself out of its subordinate position by tugging at its own bootstraps. But we need not give face to ludicrous posturings of that kind.

Manifestly to permit a subcommittee to usurp the functions of the whole committee would defeat the intention of the Reorganization Act to create standing committees with assigned fields of activity. And manifestly, also, the successful seizure by subcommittees of powers not delegated to them by the whole committees could be carried to a point where necessary distinctions would disappear and vital legislative processes of Congress would be thrown into disastrous confusion.

In his statement to the Senate, the Senator from Delaware referred to what he terms "standard rules of procedure." The point was that the proposed rules of the Senate Finance Committee are less generous than what he terms "the standard rules." The so-called standard rules govern only in those committees which adopt them. They have never been established by the Senate as rules to govern subcommittees.

The Senator from Delaware must have thought that what he termed "standard rules of procedure" for the control of a subcommittee are relevant to his situation. But this is not the case.

Those rules do not contain a single provision authorizing an individual member of a subcommittee to proceed on his own initiative and judgment to disclose matters received in confidence in executive sessions.

Far from it, they in fact expressly repudiate the very right that the Senator from Delaware seems to argue would be conferred upon him if those rules were to be adopted by the Senate Finance Committee.

Paragraph 6 of those rules states that—

> All testimony taken in executive session shall be kept secret and will not be released or used in public without the approval of a majority of the subcommittee.

Note the requirement of a majority of the subcommittee.

Paragraph 10 of those rules is as follows:

> 10. No reports shall be made to the Senate or released to the public without the approval of the majority of the subcommittee, or the majority of the full committee.

Note again the words "majority of the subcommittee or the majority of the full committee."

The Senator from Delaware repels the substance of this rule.

The Senator from Delaware says in effect, "I alone, in my own judgment, as a matter of principle binding upon myself, insist upon retaining to myself, regardless of what the majority of the subcommittee or the whole committee may say, the right to release, use or report confidential information which I alone may conclude conceals or represents a violation of law."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I had intended to wait until the Senator had concluded his statement, but I thought it should be made clear whether the Senator is giving his interpretation of my remarks.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have stated my interpretation of the effect of what the Senator from Delaware said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to have that made clear.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very glad that the Senator from Delaware has cleared up the matter. I opened that portion of my remarks by saying, "The Senator from Delaware says in effect."

Thus this part of the arguments of the Senator from Delaware, so heavily relied upon by him, is not only bootless from his own standpoint but is condemnatory of his own arguments.

There you have it, my colleagues: Shall a single member of this body on his own judgment be authorized to disclose confidential information developed by or in executive proceedings of the whole committee, or of a subcommittee, regardless of what a majority of the members of those committees do or do not think about it?

To the Senator from Delaware and the Senate Finance Committee, this is a matter of principle.

We are not making a special rule for or against the Senator from Delaware. We are making a general rule binding alike on the Senator from Delaware and those who would serve with him and those unknown persons in the future charged with similar responsibility.

The Senator from Delaware, I respectfully suggest, reflecting on the sizable grants of power under which he has operated and those proposed, reflecting on the feelings of trust which have existed for him in the committee, should be the last person in the world to say, in effect, "When I see what I believe is a violation of law developed by or considered in executive session, I want to make and abide by my own rules, regardless of what the majority of the subcommittee or the majority of the whole committee might think, regardless of whether this would create a precedent for those who might serve on this committee in the future who might not have a dependable sense of responsibility."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the Senator from Delaware was good enough to say that he would withhold his questions until I had concluded. I asked him to do so. I dislike yielding to any other Senator, but, if the Senator from New Hampshire insists, I shall do so.

Mr. TOBEY. Speaking for myself, I merely wished to comment that I have spoken with a great many persons throughout the country, and have had correspondence with many more, all of whom have praised this fine man, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], who has done such a magnificent job for the country in showing up crooks. For example, take the case of the man named Nunan. Since the Senator from Delaware has shown him up, Nunan has been indicted on 15 different counts.

I suggest that instead of criticizing JOHN WILLIAMS, the Committee on Finance and the entire Senate ought to get together and give him a degree, summa cum laude.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That has already been done in the remarks that have been made.

Mr. TOBEY. There will be more remarks made. They bear repetition.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There will be repetition.

What are the principles which moved the Senate Finance Committee in denying this right to the Senator from Delaware? What does it offer in the alternative?

The committee says that confidential matters received by a subcommittee or the whole committee in its executive operations are not to be disclosed except upon the approval of a majority of the whole committee.

Why? Because in doing it this way, protection through the sobering action of a majority of the whole committee, at least 8 out of 15, is given to the citizen's right to be protected against smearing, unfounded suspicion, and unwarranted invasion of his personal privacy than in reposing the power of decision in a single Senator who may turn out to be a person of fabulous wisdom and judgment or a plain rattlehead.

The right of the citizen to be protected against wrongful invasion of his proper privacy is so securely founded that it has the protection of the fourth and fifth amendments of the Constitution.

True, the technicalities of these amendments may be somewhat more relaxed in congressional operations than in courts of justice. But unless we would tyrannize we will never depart from their spirit which puts a radiant shine on our system of government and on citizenship in the United States of America.

We violate rights which were earned on American battlefields when we adopt rules making it easy either for well-meaning misjudgment or evil motive, or irresponsibility, to destroy the citizen's good name and the privacy of his papers and effects.

The Senate Committee on Finance has respect, affection, and admiration for the Senator from Delaware. It does not believe that he will abuse the sizable powers which are proposed to be given to him. But it has also said, "We shall not exempt him from the wholesome safeguards of the proposed rule, not because we distrust him but because, among other things, the power may not always reside in a Senator of his fineness of character."

I hope the Senator from Delaware changes his mind. Come back home, Senator, the light is in the window.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before asking any questions I should like to make it very clear that the Senator from Colorado was correct when he said that there was no disagreement between the Finance Committee and myself as to the extent of the powers which were given to the subcommittee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I said so in my main remarks.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado is correct. I should like to ask him a couple of questions on another point.

First, in order to clarify the RECORD, I should like to ask this question: In the past 2 years, or during the period in which the Senator from Delaware has been a Member of the Senate, can the Senator from Colorado think of a single case which I have disclosed on the floor of the Senate that was in violation of any rule of the Finance Committee or of the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that I have never made an analysis of the cases which he has disclosed. I have assumed that he was acting as an honorable man, and that has been sufficient for me. When he has disclosed matters which might have been revealed in confidence, I have assumed that he was disclosing matters with respect to which he received information on his own.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado pointed out—and I disagree slightly with him, if my understanding of his statement is correct—that perhaps the Senator from Delaware was trying to set himself up as a one-man power and bypass all committees. Is it not correct that I said I was perfectly agreeable to submit to the Finance Committee all subjects prior to disclosure in the Senate? However, if the Finance Committee should differ with the recommendations of the Senator from Delaware, or if it should differ with the recommendations of what might conceivably be a unanimous report of the subcommittee, the report having been submitted, and the Finance Committee having voted "no," from that time on, if any member of the committee felt that a violation of law was involved, only then, and only at that point, would I ask that individual members be released. Is not that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not remember having heard the proposal spelled out with such explicitness; but the Senator's end point, which he has consistently maintained, was that, after all the discussion was over, after all the things which the Senator has just detailed had been done, he retained unto himself, if he thought there was a violation of law, the right to disclose information devel-

oped in an executive session of the subcommittee or of the full committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Has such a rule been invoked with respect to any other investigating committee which has been established by the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That I cannot say. However, the so-called standard rules, on which the Senator relies, destroy his own case. At least a majority of the subcommittee must prevail in order to enable any member to do the things which the Senator wants to do on his own responsibility.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado is in error, because the standard rules of procedure provide that a report may be made to the Senate by a majority vote of either the full committee or a subcommittee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Finance Committee struck out the word "or" and left the matter of making a report with the full commitee alone.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The proposal to vest full power in the subcommittee was not accepted by the Finance Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The point the junior Senator from Colorado makes is that all the fuss which the distinguished Senator from Delaware has made with respect to the rules relates to the provision which requires the vote of a majority of the subcommittee or the full committee; but the Senator from Delaware insists on using his own judgment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. The Senator from Colorado is slightly in error. I asked the Senator from Colorado whether or not the Senator from Delaware was in error when he pointed out the example. Suppose that in the course of an investigation it would be possible for the subcommittee to develop what it considered to be charges of bribery or improper influence peddling against Mr. X who was working in the Treasury Department. The subcommittee might be unanimous in its opinion that the particular official should be exposed and reported to the Department of Justice. The subcommittee might make a unanimous report to the full Finance Committee. Under the rules adopted by the Finance Committee would it not be possible for the Finance Committee to veto any disclosure by the subcommittee, even though it was unanimous in its report?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would be possible; but that is off the point, so far as the point has been delineated by the Senator from Delaware. He is not taking a case of unanimous decision by the subcommittee, or a decision by a majority of the subcommittee. He bases his case on his own exclusive judgment, regardless of whether anyone agrees with him or not. The Senator from Delaware says, in effect, "If I think there is a violation of law I am at liberty to disclose it, even though the rest of the committee may be against me."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe the Senator from Colorado is quoting what he thinks is the position of the Senator from Delaware, however, he overlooks the broad implication of his rules.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask the Senator from Delaware if that is his position?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator from Delaware ready to say that he will act on the basis of the decision of a majority of the subcommittee or of the full committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am ready to act on the basis that either the full committee or the subcommittee has prior rights. I am ready to act under the same rules of procedure as were adopted by the other committees. The Senator from Colorado voted for several investigating committees since the first day of January and every single one of these committees are acting on the rules which you reject, namely that after the full committee or the subcommittee has had a chance to act and fails, then each member of the committee is free to act independently. Even this freedom of action is requested only in cases where actual violations of law are involved.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Delaware must know what kind of a trap he is falling into.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me finish.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Very well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say that we should adopt the standard rules of procedure. The Senator from Colorado protested them, and they were rejected. The standard rules of procedure provide that a report may be made to the Senate either by a majority vote of the full committee or a majority vote of a subcommittee. They go further. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], who is chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, stated on the floor that there was nothing in the rules of his committee which prohibited, in the final result, any member of the committee from disclosing what he considered to be fraud.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is chairman of another investigating committee. He is present in the Chamber. His committee is operating under the same rule. If there are any rules applicable to any Senate committee which restrict the individual members of the committee from disclosing what they consider to be fraud, I should like to have the Senator from Colorado or some other Senator point them out.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The standard rules, on which the Senator relies, do not give any individual Senator that right. They give the right to a majority of a subcommittee or a majority of the full committee.

I now again ask the Senator, Would he abide by a rule putting the power in the majority of the subcommittee or the majority of the full committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will abide by the standard rules which the Senate Committee on Finance rejected—the same rules as interpreted by every Member of the Senate who served on the Committee on Government Operations. There are many members of investigating committees present in the Chamber. If I am in error in my statement regarding their rules, let them rise and correct me. I repeat, there has never been an occasion in connection with any committee on which any member has agreed in advance, or has been asked to agree in advance, that in the event the majority of the full committee should disagree with him, he would not file a minority report disclosing a charge which he thinks involves a violation of law. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] is present. He has served as chairman of an investigating committee and can take exception to that statement if I am in error.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is exactly what the standard rules provide. They provide that there must be a majority vote of the subcommittee or of the full committee. I again ask the Senator, without qualifications as to interpretation, and without qualifications as to what may happen in other committees, will he abide by the majority decision of the subcommittee or the full committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will so far as making an official report to the Senate is concerned. The Senator from Delaware will never abide by any rule which calls upon him to agree in advance that under certain circumstances he will withhold what he considers to be damaging evidence against any individual solely because a majority of the committee decides otherwise. No Member of the Senate on any other subcommittee has ever been asked to do so. If I am in error, let the Senator from Colorado point out the error.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Delaware is in error because he has now defined the issue exactly as I have stated it to be.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very sorry that I find myself in complete disagreement with the Senator from Colorado. I ask again if I am in error. I have served on committees previously. I have served on committees with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is also present in the Chamber. I recognize the importance of executive meetings. I do not believe any Member of the Senate will say that I have unduly violated the trust of executive meetings. However, I have yet to hear of any committee of Congress that has ever been established which, by majority vote, could forever bind any Member of the Senate from disclosing what he considered to be a crime. If the Senator from Colorado differs with me, I hope he will speak out. If we carry that rule to an extreme, would it not be theoretically possible, if such a rule were adopted for all subcommittees and investigating committees, for the political party in power to place a majority on the subcommittee and forevermore block any disclosure of corruption under any administration?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is true; and it is equally true that under the Williams rule some irresponsible addlepate acting on his own responsibility could disclose the deepest confidences developed in a committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I cannot quarrel with the statement of the Senator from Colorado if he does not have confidence in my discretion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that question has not arisen. It did not arise at any time. I specifically and very

carefully excluded that point. If we are going to talk about confidence, however, why does not the Senator have confidence in the majority of the Members of the Committee on Finance? If the discussion is to degenerate into one of personalities, why cannot the Senator from Delware abide with safety in the majority of the members of the Committee on Finance, or all of the members of the committee? I kept personalities very carefully out of the discussion because I thought the Senator from Delaware was trying to do likewise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I believe I have kept personalities out of the discussion. I understood the Senator from Colorado as indicating that perhaps it might be dangerous to give such power to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, now, Mr. President, there is nothing to that effect at all in any of my remarks. If the Senator from Delaware believes I said anything like that, I ask him to produce it. I have taken scrupulous care to avoid any thing of that kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am willing to accept the explanation of the Senator from Colorado. However, I point out that the other investigating committees to which the Senator from Colorado has referred possesses the same power to obtain access to income tax returns that is possessed by the committee under discussion. I grant there have been examples in the Senate when committees have gone too far. I agree that we must always take care to protect the rights of every American citizen and to make sure that he is not crucified on the floor of the Senate. However, I do not think that the Senator from Colorado or any other Member of the Senate can point to a single instance when I discussed any case on the floor of the Senate which was before a grand jury or when a man had been indicted. I have scrupulously refused to comment on cases once I knew the Department of Justice has moved in.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a little while ago I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that at this very moment hundreds of courts throughout the land are trying to find out whether particular acts are violations of law, and hundreds of juries at this very moment are trying to determine factual situations.

Does the Senator from Delaware claim the virtue of perpetual infallibility or believe he will never commit a blunder in making a decision on a matter which deeply perplexes other men? I believe we should keep personalities out of the discussion. While he is talking about precedents, let me say that we have recently seen gross abuses of power by men, purporting to speak for committees, when they did not speak for committees at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree fully with what the Senator from Colorado has said, and I could even accept his view on this subject more freely and willingly if it were a forerunner of what might be the necessary restrictions of some subcommittees. The Senator from Colorado is not only the chairman of the Committee on Finance, but he is also chairman of the Republican conference, which authorizes the establishment of these subcommittees to which he has referred. If he is going to propose similar restrictions for other subcommittees perhaps all of us could agree with him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado is in the habit of letting neither his teeth nor his nose get too long. He is content to consider the issue before the Senate, which is exclusively with the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor this point any longer; but I desire to make very clear what I have in mind. For example—and the Senator from Colorado will correct me if I am in error—I went before the Committee on Finance a little more than 2 years ago, or perhaps nearly 3 years ago, regarding this corruption issue. I addressed a letter to every member of the Committee on Finance. I have a copy of the letter before me dated August 2, 1950. This letter calls attention to the fact that there were certain gross irregularities in the third collection district in New York. I asked the committee to take action. I should like to read the letter to the Senate. The copy of the letter is addressed to the Senator from Colorado, but identical letters were sent to every other member of the Committee on Finance. The letter, as I say, is dated August 2, 1950. It reads:

DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: During the recent weeks I have heard some rather alarming rumors in reference to the conditions prevailing in the Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue for the Third New York District.

I have called these rumors to the attention of Mr. George J. Schoeneman, Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, and have requested a copy of their most recent auditor's report of this district in order to determine whether or not there was any foundation to these rumors. I have just received a letter from Mr. Schoeneman to the effect that it is against the policy of the Bureau to comply with my request that I be allowed to examine a copy of the auditor's report of these records.

I want it thoroughly understood that I am making no charges of irregularity in this office since I do not have at this time any proof of these rumors; however, the nature and the source of the rumors are such that I do not feel that they can be overlooked. I am calling this to the attention of the members of the Senate Finance Committee with the request that your committee direct an inquiry to Mr. Schoeneman and examine for yourselves the report and records of this district.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

On the copy of the letter I sent to the then chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I added the following postscript:

P. S.—I will be only too glad to appear before your committee if you wish and to explain to you the nature of these rumors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What is the Senator's point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will get to it in a moment. I understand that the Committee on Finance did call before it—and if I am in error I stand corrected—representatives of the Treasury Department, and received assurance that there was nothing wrong in the city of New York and that perhaps the Senator from Delaware was unduly alarmed.

Five months later in 1951 I became a member of the Committee on Finance, and as one of the first actions on my part I asked that the committee obtain copies of the audited report to which I refer in my letter. I said I was not satisfied with the report which had been submitted to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to interrupt the Senator at this point. The Committee on Finance did a great deal better than anything the Senator from Delaware has suggested so far. It appointed a subcommittee to look into the matter, and other matters as well, and appointed the Senator from Delaware to be a member of the subcommittee. Therefore I ask again: What is the point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The committee appointed me a member of the subcommittee, Senator BYRD was the chairman of it, and I might say he did an excellent job. His assistance was invaluable.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Delaware was the most active member of the subcommittee. I do not think he will deny that he was the most active member of the subcommittee. Perhaps I have made a mistake, but I do not think I have made one, in paying full tribute to his being the most active member of the subcommittee.

This is getting to be a little frustrating. Perhaps the Senator from Delaware was not there at all. However, I want to keep the record straight. The Senator from Delaware never came before the Committee on Finance when I was present, and asked for anything that I did not make the motion to give it to him. The Senator from Delaware knows that statement to be correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator from Colorado could tell the Senate what the Committee on Finance did with the report I brought to the attention of the committee in August 1950.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not know the answer to that question. My memory is not that clear today. The committee did just as I suggested a moment ago, namely, it appointed a subcommittee, and appointed the Senator from Delaware chairman of it, and the committee never denied him a single power he asked for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Colorado is correct. However, I point out that between August 1950, and the date when I became a member of the committee nothing was done.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We were extremely happy to have him become a member of the committee. I will say again that he did a superb job, and I will testify to it again and again. However, that has nothing to do with the issue involved in this case. I will load the Senator down with medals, if that is what he wants me to do, but I will not put a martyr's crown on his head, because he has not been martyred.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not asking for medals. I wish the Senator from Colorado would instead give us the authority needed to do this job in a way that would command the confidence of the American people. All I am asking is that we not be bound to protect a man we think is a crook. I was always taught

that it was a crime to conceal a crime. I do not mean to imply that the present members of the Finance Committee would do this but we are establishing a precedent here.

As I was saying, in 1951 I became a member of the Finance Committee, and I requested a copy of these reports, as the Senator from Colorado will confirm. A subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Delaware was appointed by the committee; to read these reports and not one of us was bound in advance that we would have to withhold any evidence or anything else which developed. No conditions were spelled out and I heard no complaints.

We checked the records, and found them to be much worse than I had pictured them or that the committee or anyone else would imagine them to be. We found that notwithstanding that representatives of the Treasury Department came before the committee during the period between August and January and fully satisfied the committee that there was nothing wrong in the third district in New York, nevertheless the records of the Treasury Department showed they at that time knew about the corrupt condition in that office. Back in 1947—and all this material appears in the record, and can be confirmed—Mr. Roger Stuart, the editor of the New York World Telegram, wrote to the Secretary of the Treasury a letter in which he told him of the conditions existing in the New York office, and requested an investigation. The investigation was authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and Mr. James J. Saxon, an assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, Special Counsel to the General Counsel of the Treasury Department, was appointed to be in charge of the investigation.

In December 1949, Mr. Saxon wrote a letter to the Honorable John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, in which he stated that conditions in the New York office were even worse than had been pictured by the editor of the New York World Telegram, and stated that if something were not done immediately, that situation would blow up into a major scandal. That was on December 13, 1949, 8 months before I called the matter to the attention of the Finance Committee.

On February 27, 1950, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Schoeneman, wrote a personal memorandum to Secretary Snyder in which he reviewed the record of the two previous memoranda—the one in 1947 and the one in 1949—and then said he was sorry that he had to report that, instead of getting better, conditions in the New York office were becoming worse; and again he recommended that immediate action be taken. That was in February 1950, 6 months before I called the matter to the attention of the Finance Committee, and about 8 months before representatives of that office came before the Finance Committee and convinced the committee that there was nothing wrong.

It was not until August 17, 1951, that we were able to have the collector of that office removed. During that time I do not remember that the committee took too much interest. I discussed the problem with you and Senator GEORGE several times.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Was it done against the objection of the Senate Finance Committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; not against their objection.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The matter was not discussed with the Senate Finance Committee, was it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; it was.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did the Senator from Delaware discuss with the committee the fact that he was going to make a statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, yes; long before——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat my question: Did the Senator from Delaware discuss with the Senate Finance Committee the fact that he was going to make a statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. Has the Senator forgotten it? One conference was in the Senate district room.

Mr. MILLIKIN. A statement of confidential material which had been received by the entire committee or by the subcommittee at executive session or through its executive process?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a minute, Mr. President——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I ask the Senator from Delaware whether he made such a statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I have said I made the statement and as a result several men went to jail.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The question I have asked is a simple one, and can be answered either "Yes" or "No."

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have answered the question. I made the exposure of the New York, Boston, St. Louis, California offices and several other cases. Does the Senator object to any of them having been exposed?

Furthermore, Mr. President, I did tell the Senate Finance Committee; and I regret very much that in the few years I worked on this matter, I have yet to hear the Senator from Colorado even so much as raise his voice against one of these corrupt officers.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Now the Senator from Delaware is becoming personal—an attitude against which he has advised everyone else, a fault into which he said he would not fall.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I am not. But I think the Senator might likewise be a little more careful.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Colorado simply wishes to say that the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] were doing an adequate job, without the necessity of intervention on the part of anyone else.

However, all that is beyond the point. The point is in regard to the power claimed by the Senator from Delaware as a right as an individual to disclose, against the judgment of a majority of a a subcommittee or a majority of the full committee, confidential material which has been furnished the subcommittee or the full committee in executive session.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am merely pointing out how the new rule could work. I say I did disclose those cases, and I would do it again even if it had to be done over the objection of every member of the Senate Finance Committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What the Senator from Delaware is arguing—and I do not think he is doing it thoughtfully—is that the judgment of 14 other honest members of that committee is no good, and that his judgment is infallible—a very foolish position for the Senator from Delaware to take.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I am not making any such argument. I am merely pointing out that on the other side of the Capitol, the House Ways and Means Committee today is doing a good job under exactly the same rules that have been rejected by the Senate Finance Committee. The same was true of the King committee, last year; and the same is true of the subcommittee of which I was a member last year. In other words, we did not bind ourselves in advance that every one of us would keep our mouth shut under certain conditions if we found an actual violation of law. I will never do that and you have no precedent for asking it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Neither did the members of those groups bind themselves in advance not to burn down a house or not to rob a bank. What kind of an argument is the Senator from Delaware making?

Again I challenge the Senator from Delaware—because we can dispose of this matter very quickly if he will come to the point: Will the Senator from Delaware abide by the majority judgment of the whole Finance Committee or of a majority of the subcommittee of that committee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will never agree that I will permit the whole committee or the subcommittee to exercise a veto power upon me, so as to prevent me from disclosing a violation of law. Furthermore I am surprised that the Senator asks such a commitment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, I have accurately stated the issue, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And the statement of the Senator from Delaware about when he was right and others were wrong is not pertinent to the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Again I ask whether the Senator from Colorado or any Member of the Senate who has served on those investigation committees can point out in the history of the Senate an instance of a member of a subcommittee being bound in advance?

Mr. MILLIKIN. With the exception of the distinguished Senator from Delaware, it never popped into many heads that anything of that kind could be done. And when it has been done, it has been done irresponsibly, and has caused great embarrassment to the Congress and to the committees involved. It has been done, but not because of a rule or withholding a rule. A responsible committee member simply does not think of doing such a thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I see no need to delay this question further. The Senator from Colorado has clearly stated the point.

So far as I am concerned, I see no need to go through a long process of investigating a case and finding what may be regarded as gross irregularities on the part of any individual, and then as a committee member being put in a position of being bound in advance to keep his mouth shut, as has just been proposed. In that event a few months or a few years later, another committee might disclose the case, and might say, "Well, the Senator from Delaware knew all about it, but did not denounce it." In such an event there could be no clarification of your position.

Mr. President, I have never agreed to draw the line in that way in regard to any matter upon which I have been working, and I am never going to agree to have any committee draw the line for me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, since the Senator from Delaware is rather profuse in his use of the vertical "I," let me use one. I do not want to be on either a subcommittee or a committee of which an individual member receiving confidential information, may undertake to disclose and reveal the secrets of the committee or subcommittee meetings, without my knowledge. I do not want to have to read in the press for the first time things ascribed to a committee of which I am a member and on which I have equal responsibility.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the junior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. The junior Senator from Delaware has a short nose and dull teeth, but he would like to ask the learned and very much admired Senator from Colorado a question. Under the rules adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, is it possible for a minority report to be filed by a member of a subcommittee?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is possible for a minority report to be filed. I am assuming the Senator is talking about confidential matters, and what might be the position of the whole committee, as to confidential matters.

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It would, of course, be possible for a minority to file a report with the chairman, but not with the Senate. But an alternative is always open. If a Senator does not like the action of the whole committee, if he is convinced that a violation of law is being covered up, he may always come to the floor of the Senate and submit a resolution calling for a report from the committee on the matter which he describes. He can always do that. If there is enough steam behind the effort, he will probably get results.

Mr. FREAR. I do not think I fully understood the reply of the Senator from Colorado. Will he yield to permit me to ask a question for the purpose of clarification?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. In the rules adopted by the Senate Finance Committee, covering a subject such as the one which has been debated this afternoon, is it provided that a minority report may not be filed by the subcommittee on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. Am I correct that it would be necessary to obtain permission on the part of a majority of the Senate, in order that such minority report might be filed, in case the chairman and majority of the full committee did not desire a subcommittee report or a statement of minority views?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct, assuming it is not information which those who filed it dug up themselves, and also assuming that the nature of the subject is presumptively confidential, and has been obtained through committee processes or subcommittee processes.

Mr. FREAR. I failed to say it was assumed the information would come as the result of an executive session of the subcommittee. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, along the line of the point raised by my colleague, I may say, it is true, as the Senator from Colorado just pointed out to my colleague, that as a last resort, if such a controversy arose, the subcommittee, or any member thereof, could come to the Senate and submit a resolution calling for an immediate report. That is true. But is it not also true that, in submitting such resolution, and in defending it on the Senate floor, members of the committee would be morally bound, under the rules being laid down by the Finance Committee, not to tell the Senate, or the American people, the nature of the charge which the Senator is seeking to expose? You could come to the Senate as the Senator of Colorado states and say, "I know something I cannot tell," and then try to convince the Senate it would be interesting enough to override the committee report. You could not do it without disclosing the nature of the case and every Member of the Senate knows it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The charge could be generalized, without revealing anything that happened in executive session; and if the particular Senator had the requisite standing in the Senate, that kind of request might receive very sympathetic attention.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The American people need more than sympathy, they want action in cleaning up this corruption. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado one further question. Can he cite a precedent anywhere in the history of the Senate of a procedure being resorted to whereby, in order to file a minority report, a member of the committee must get permission from the United States Senate as a whole?

Mr. MILLIKIN. To file it in the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; or to speak on the subject in the Senate?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not so sure, so far as filing the report is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think you will find one. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Wait a moment. That is what the Senator mentioned first. I will answer the question, bite by bite, if necessary. I am not sure that a subcommittee has now a right to file reports in the Senate, without obtaining the permission of the Senate. What is the second barrel?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Certainly. The Senator is correct on the report. I am speaking about the rights of an individual Member of the Senate to speak. That is the controversy.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I answer the Senator again as I have answered him before. The field has literally been littered with stuff put out by irresponsible—let us not say irresponsible persons, let us say by persons of mistaken judgment, revealing things which should not have been revealed. Everybody is aware of such instances. I need not specify them. This discussion is sufficiently broad without undertaking to mention half a dozen recent instances. The Senator is fully aware of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor, when the Senator from Colorado has concluded.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I repeat that, so far as a Member of the Senate rising on the floor to repeat confidential information received in an executive session of a whole committee, or of a subcommittee, it is an unthinkable procedure, except by an irresponsible man; with the exception, I am sorry to note, that a responsible man like the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] wants such a right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to have the floor in my own right, if the Senator from Colorado has concluded.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator has it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). The Chair wishes to state that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Colorado was recognized with the understanding that immediately following his statement the Senate would proceed to a call of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a few brief remarks. I think it would be appropriate at this time, since this question has come up. It should be settled now while we are all here.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Delaware be willing to limit his remarks? The only difficulty is, I made certain promises. I supposed this discussion would be concluded long ago. Senators are waiting for a call of the Consent Calendar. Furthermore, we have a bill to take up regarding the reorganization plan. Would the Senator from Delaware limit his remarks?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be as brief as possible. I do not think I would require many minutes. However, if it is the Senator's wish, and it is agreeable with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I will wait and speak later.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—in the Senate within recent weeks the

practice has developed of limiting the time during which Senators may speak on the floor of the Senate. Even though the speaker, under the circumstances, might be willing to agree to it, it is bound to have an effect on the organization and presentation of his material. It is bound to have limiting effects. In my opinion, there is one thing we ought to keep inviolate on the floor of the Senate, namely, unlimited debate. I want to hear the Senator from Delaware without a feeling on my part that he is being limited by the clock. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

VISIT BY MEMBERS OF THE GERMAN BUNDESTAG

During the delivery of Mr. MILLIKIN's speech,

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am happy to say that accompanying me are four members of the German Bundestag, who are entitled to the privilege of the floor.

Last year it was my privilege to visit in Bonn. While I was there the members of the Bundestag were very hospitable to all members of the American delegation. They made our visit a memorable one in many ways. We were received most hospitably in the Bundestag and at all the receptions. The President of Germany literally took us into his arms.

So it is a great pleasure to present these gentlemen to the Senate. I will ask them to stand, please. They are: Hans Joachim von Merkatz, of the Germany Party; Karl Georg Pfleiderer, of the Free Democratic Party; Gerhard Schroeder, of the Christian Democratic Party; Franz Joseph Strauss, of the Christian Socialist Party.

They are in the United States in order to become better acquainted with us Americans. I suggest that we give them a hand. [Applause, Senators rising.]

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

ORDER TO CONSIDER CALENDAR AT POINT FOLLOWING LAST CALL

The bill (S. 242) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar begin at the end of the last previous call. The prior bills have been called three or four times. I ask unanimous consent that the call begin with Calendar Order No. 83, Senate Concurrent Resolution 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first measure following the previous call of the calendar.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the concurrent resolution will be pasesd over.

CAROL LYNN BARBARA HECHT

The bill (S. 55) for the relief of Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Russell E. Hecht, citizens of the United States.

BERNARD W. OLSON

The bill (S. 71) for the relief of Bernard W. Olson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard W. Olson, of Oakes, N. Dak., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor child who was fatally burned as a result of falling into an open pit of scalding water located on the United States naval air base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on January 22, 1949, and for burial and other expenses incurred as a result thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

NORMAN S. MacPHEE

The bill (S. 142) for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, apparently the author of the bill is not present.

Mr. President, I am advised by the Department that there are 225 other persons in a situation similar to that of one covered by the bill. I find no objection to this bill but the department recommends that it be generalized in its nature, inasmuch as there are so many others similarly situated. Since the author of the bill is not presently on the floor, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am not the author of the bill, but I am a member of the committee which considered the bill. I may say that during the 82d Congress, at the suggestion of the Navy Department, bills were introduced to authorize payments covering the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel. Those bills were not enacted. Had they been enacted, the result would have been to relieve not only Mr. MacPhee but also other individuals similarly situated.

The committee has recognized similar situations in the past, and sees no reason why the claimant herein, who acted in good faith and upon the basis of orders issued by competent authority in the Navy Department, should be required to wait for the enactment of general legislation in order that he may be relieved of his liability to the Government.

The committee therefore recommends favorable consideration of this bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah makes a fair statement. I find no objection to this bill. My objection was made in order that the problems of others similarly situated might be called to the attention of the committee. If the distinguished Senator from Utah will take upon himself the responsibility of calling to the attention of the committee the need for general action, then I shall withdraw any objection.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall certainly be glad to do that. I think the committee has considered two similar reports.

Mr. GORE. Then I withdraw my objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 142) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Norman S. MacPhee, of Underwood, N. Dak., is hereby relieved of all liability for the repayment to the United States of $284.35, representing the costs incurred by the Department of the Navy in providing transportation of household effects of the said Norman S. MacPhee from Richmond, Va., to Underwood, N. Dak., upon his separation from service in the Navy in 1946, the payment of such costs having been subsequently disallowed by the General Accounting Office on the ground that such payment was not authorized by law.

WALTRAUT MIES VAN DER ROHE

The bill (S. 306) for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Waltraut Mies van der Rohe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent

residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CORNELIUS A. NAVORI

The bill (S. 314) for the relief of Cornelius A. Navori was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cornelius A. Navori shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

DR. ALEXANDRE DEMETRIO MORUZI—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 389) for the relief of Dr. Alexandre Demetrio Moruzi was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have been requested by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to object to bills granting citizenship to exchange students. The case covered by the bill just called seems to be unusual, and it was my hope that the Senator from Arkansas would be present to hear the merits of the bill explained, but since he is not on the floor, I am not at liberty to withhold objection. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to apologize to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who has been called off the floor. I promised him that I would suggest the absence of a quorum before the calendar was taken up. It quite slipped my mind. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Fulbright	Lehman
Beall	Goldwater	Long
Bennett	Gore	Magnuson
Bricker	Green	Malone
Bridges	Griswold	Mansfield
Bush	Hayden	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Maybank
Byrd	Hennings	McCarran
Capehart	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Carlson	Hill	McClellan
Case	Hoey	Millikin
Clements	Holland	Morse
Cooper	Humphrey	Mundt
Cordon	Hunt	Murray
Daniel	Ives	Neely
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	Potter
Dworshak	Kefauver	Purtell
Eastland	Kennedy	Robertson
Ellender	Kilgore	Russell
Ferguson	Knowland	Saltonstall
Frear	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.	Taft	Welker
Sparkman	Thye	Wiley
Stennis	Tobey	Williams
Symington	Watkins	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR CONTINUATION OF CALL OF CALENDAR AFTER 2 O'CLOCK

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the hour of 2 o'clock has been reached, the call of the calendar may be continued to the end of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 486) for the relief of Che Kil Bok was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. At the request of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

RONALD LEE OENNING

The bill (S. 513) for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ronald Lee Oenning (formerly Michio Yoshida), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. Floyd L. Oenning and Mrs. Margaret L. Oenning, citizens of the United States.

DR. ALBERT HAAS

The bill (S. 616) for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I, as the author of the bill, would be very glad indeed to explain it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I would thank the Senator from New York if he would do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this is a bill to grant permanent residence in the United States to Dr. Albert Haas, a 40-year-old native of Hungary and citizen of France who last entered the United States as a visitor on May 19, 1950. His status was changed to that of an exchange visitor on June 4, 1951. Shortly after his arrival in the United States in 1950, he became an extern in tuberculosis rehabilitation at the New York University-Bellevue Medical Center in New York City, serving in that capacity until July 1, 1951, when he was appointed as resident physician in that hospital. His wife and 9-year-old son are permanent residents of the United States. He has been strongly recommended by men in whom I am sure we all have confidence. Documents were submitted to the committee showing the following citations received by him:

1. Medal of Resistance, signed by C. de Gaulle, September 1, 1945.

2. Citation of the Minister of National Defense with the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star, signed by Colonel Josset, March 27, 1947.

3. Citation of the President of the Provisionary Government of the French Republic with the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star, signed by General Bonneau, December 24, 1946.

4. Certificate of Service, signed by Field Marshal Montgomery, May 6, 1946.

5. Certificate and citation from United States Army Medical Service, signed by Maj. Donald H. Vollner, August 6, 1945.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The explanation made by the distinguished Senator from New York is quite satisfactory and sufficient. I withhold objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a member of the committee I wish to add that the wife and son of the beneficiary of the bill are permanent residents of the United States at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 616) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Albert Haas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 712) for the relief of William R. Jackson was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CHARLES ANTHONY DESOTELL

The bill (S. 846) for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Charles Anthony Desotell, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of T. Sgt. and Mrs. George G. Desotell, citizens of the United States.

JACQUELINE SUE LAWN (AKEMI INOUE)

The bill (S. 853) for the relief of Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue),

shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Jack Elsworth Lawn, citizens of the United States.

ROBERT HAROLD WALL

The bill (S. 954) for the relief of Robert Harold Wall was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Robert Harold Wall, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. and Mrs. J. V. Wall, citizens of the United States.

MR. AND MRS. LUCILLO GRASSI

The bill (S. 1039) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws relating to loss of nationality, Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi shall not be considered to have lost their United States citizenship by reason of voting in a foreign election or because of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the enactment of this act.

DR. PETER C. T. KAO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 69) for the relief of Dr. Peter C. T. Kao, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Peter C. T. Kao shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER LOUISE MARIE JOSEPHINE BELLOIR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER JEANNE MARIA HENNETH LANGLO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "fee", to strike out "and head tax", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE MAUNER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 811) for the relief of George Mauner, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Mauner may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF EXCHANGE STUDENTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is now on the floor. I should like to address to him a question with reference to three bills, as to two of which I happen to be the author, and as to one of which another Senator is the author, and to which objection was made today. The bills provide for the retention in the United States of persons who came to this country as students under the student exchange program. These students, having received an education in this country, now seek to remain here. Does the Senator from Arkansas look with favor upon their retention?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had not considered that aspect of the matter. I do not know whether any offer has been made to them.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not understand that any offer has been made.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I feel certain that the Senator from Nevada understands very well the reason for the objection to their retention. To permit foreign students to come into the United States under the auspices of this Government and then to remain in this country really defeats the very purpose of the program, because the objective is to acquaint them with our country and our way of life, and then to have them return to their own countries and, we would hope, present a favorable impression of this country.

I know that every time this question occurs, criticisms will arise. It is only because of my interest in the long-term permanence and effectiveness of the program that I object. I do not know these individuals personally. However, I should be glad to consider such a program. I should like to have the Board of Foreign Scholarships give an impression of its view as to this question.

Offhand, I would not want to assume the responsibility of consenting, because not only is actual money involved, but a great amount of trouble and effort goes into this program. If it ever becomes established that this program affords a way to get into the United States, then there will be many other persons making special efforts to come under the program. I think it would be very wise policy to discourage to the utmost the idea that if they can win scholarships, they can stay here, because such a plan would really defeat the whole purpose of the program.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator is correct in his view that such action would defeat, to a certain extent, the program. However, I do not believe there would be so many students who would want to stay. That is only my thought.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Unfortunately, I have seen a good many of them, and a number of them want to stay. In many ways, I do not blame them, because by their desire to remain they pay us a great compliment. However, I think it is necessary for us to be very careful and not permit them to stay here. To my mind, it would seriously hinder the program, and would be very bad practice.

There are other implications to be considered besides the money involved. Much of the money is also in foreign currencies, so it would be very difficult to evaluate the cost.

Mr. McCARRAN. I merely desired to have the views of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I might suggest to the Senator from Nevada that the question should be formally presented to the Board of Foreign Scholarships. I should also like to suggest that the Senator's committee consider the question, to see if a definite policy could not be developed by the Board of Foreign Scholarships under the guidance of the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does not the Senator recognize that there may be some cases in which equities have developed and should be considered, in view of which,

after students have entered the United States, they might be permitted to remain?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would not say that that is not possible. I could only judge that question in specific cases, where such a situation had actually developed. It might well be that something of that nature could happen.

By the way, my attention has just been called to a case which I had not previously heard about. It appears that the person originally came from Rumania.

Mr. WATKINS. It is calendar No. 90, Senate bill 389.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is a new case, to which I had not had my attention called previously, but the Senator from Nevada has mentioned it.

Mr. WATKINS. The person affected by calendar No. 90, Senate bill 389, is stateless at the present time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am not thoroughly acquainted with the case. It has just this minute been called to my attention, and I said I would be glad to look into it. I had not read the entire report. I understood the person came into this country from Venezuela. If he came from Venezuela, he did not enter the United States under the program with which I am thoroughly familiar.

There are some small programs involving specialists. There was one involved under the old Inter-American Committee. A doctor who was 50 years old was brought into the United States. It might be that that is a case in which an exception could be made. That person may be serving such a special purpose of benefit to this country that, all things balanced, he should stay here. However, I would not want to say definitely offhand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I read the report on this bill last night, I came to the conclusion that it had particular merit, in that the person affected came from behind the Iron Curtain and is supposedly stateless now. However, two questions come to mind. The first is, From what country did he come? The other question is, How is it that a man who is 50 years of age, and already protected, can come under the student-exchange program?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As I have said, I am not familiar with the case. It has just been called to my attention, and the point that strikes me is that the man could not have come into this country from behind the Iron Curtain under the program with which I am familiar, because we have no such agreement with Rumania. Under the student-exchange program, he could not have come from Venezuela.

Mr. GORE. The report shows that he came from France, but he does not now claim to be a citizen of France. The bill raises some questions, as well as meritorious circumstances.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator know under the authority of which law he came into the country?

Mr. GORE. I think it wise that the bill go over, and I had so requested.

Mr. WATKINS. I trust that the committee will get the information which has been requested by the Senator from Arkansas with respect to the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. I hope the committee will attempt to get the information the Senator wishes with respect to this person.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If it meets with the approval of the Committee on the Judiciary, I should like to have the information, and apparently that committee considers bills like this. I should like to suggest that they submit an inquiry to the Board of Foreign Scholarships as to what the Board thinks about this type of case.

Mr. WATKINS. I shall be glad to do that.

ESTATE OF MARY M. MENDENHALL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 851) for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$50,000 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the death of the said Mary M. Mendenhall from asphyxiation caused by the improper administration of an anesthetic during an operation performed on her" and insert "$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Mary M. Mendenhall while she was being delivered of a child", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall, deceased, wife of Capt. George W. Mendenhall, United States Air Force, the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Mary M. Mendenhall while she was being delivered of a child, on September 8, 1949, at the 49th General Hospital, Tokyo, Honshu, Japan: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED EXEMPTIONS UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The bill (S. 18) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], from whose committee the bill was reported.

According to the report, the bill would bring under the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act certain agencies which are now excluded from that act. I notice that the opinions given by the executive department are dated 1951. Does the distinguished Senator from Nevada believe it would be wise to secure an opinion from the Bureau of the Budget at the present time with respect to the application of the bill to certain agencies?

Mr. McCARRAN. As the Senator may recall, a similar bill was approved by the Senate in the 82d Congress. It seems to me that, regardless of what the Bureau of the Budget might say, the proposed legislation is meritorious. That is the position of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. COOPER. I think there is good ground for what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has said, but I thought it might be wise to obtain the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget. I therefore ask that the bill be passed over until the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 30) to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over, by request of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 39) to further implement the full-faith-and-credit clause of the Constitution was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, is that at the Senator's own request, or at the request of some other Senator?

Mr. GORE. It is at the request of the Senator from Tennessee. The question is rather complicated. The report itself consists of nine pages of fine print, and I simply did not finish my study of the bill last night. If the Senator does not object, I should like to have a little more time to study it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot object.

Mr. GORE. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FORFEITURE AND DISPOSAL OF PROPERTY SEIZED UNDER THE ESPIONAGE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 41) to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on page 2, line 9, there is a misspelling of the word "subsection." I move to correct the spelling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "subsetion" and insert "subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of title VI of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 233),

as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, sec. 401), is further amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever an attempt is made to export or ship from or take out of the United States any arms or munitions of war or other articles in violation of law, or whenever it is known or there shall be probable cause to believe that any arms or munitions of war or other articles are intended to be or are being or have been exported or removed from the United States in violation of law, the Secretary of the Treasury, or any person duly authorized for the purpose by the President, may seize and detain such arms or munitions of war or other articles and may seize and detain any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft containing the same or which has been or is being used in exporting or attempting to export such arms or munitions of war or other articles. All arms or munitions of war and other articles, vessels, vehicles, and aircraft seized pursuant to this subsection shall be forfeited.

"(b) All provisions of law relating to seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture and condemnation for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of the property forfeited or condemned or the proceeds from the sale thereof; the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures; and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures, and forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this section, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof. Awards of compensation to informers under this section may be paid only out of funds specifically appropriated therefor.

"(c) Arms and munitions of war forfeited under subsection (b) of this section shall be delivered to the Secretary of Defense for such use or disposition as he may deem in the public interest, or, in the event that the Secretary of Defense refuses to accept such arms and munitions of war, they shall be sold or otherwise disposed of as prescribed under existing law in the case of forfeitures for violation of the customs laws."

SEC. 2. Sections 2, 3, 5, and 7 of the act of June 15, 1917 (ch. 30, title VI, 40 Stat. 224–225; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 2[9], secs. 402, 403, 405, 407), and section 4 of such act, as amended by the act of March 1, 1929 (ch. 420, 45 Stat. 1423; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 22, sec. 404), are repealed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 252) to permit all civil actions against the United States for recovery of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected to be brought in the district courts with right of trial by jury was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CERTAIN TAX COURT DECISIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 984) making provision for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 5, after "January 1," to strike out "1954" and insert "1952"; and on page 2, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "1954" and insert "1952", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections 732 (c) and 732 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code, the decision of the United States Tax Court, entered after January 1, 1952, respecting the determination of any question arising under subparagraphs 711 (b) (1) (H), (I), (J), or (K), section 721, or section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code, shall be subject to review by the United States Court of Appeals in the same manner as other decisions of the Tax Court. In the case of any decision entered after January 1, 1952, and before the date of approval of this act, a petition for review therein may be filed at any time within 90 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROVISION FOR TRANSPORTATION ON CANADIAN VESSELS IN ALASKA

The bill (S. 719) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1954, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation: *Provided*, That such Canadian vessels may transport merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports and points herein enumerated.

APPROVAL OF CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

The bill (S. 1082) to approve a conveyance made by the city of Charleston, S. C., to the South Carolina State Ports Authority, of real property heretofore granted to said city of Charleston by the United States of America was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision in the act of Congress, approved May 27, 1936 (49 Stat. 1387), and in the deed made pursuant thereto by the United States of America to the city of Charleston, which prohibits the city of Charleston from transferring the title of the propertly conveyed thereunder shall not be deemed applicable to the conveyance of a portion of the said property, made without consideration, by the city of Charleston, to the South Carolina State Ports Authority, an agency of the State of South Carolina.

PROVISION FOR COMMISSION TO REGULATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION UTILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REFERENCE OF BILL

The bill (S. 922) to provide for a Commission to regulate the public transportation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill relates in major part to the District of Columbia, and I think it would be a good idea to have the bill referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for study, with instructions to report it back not later than a certain date, satisfactory to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce would not object to that procedure. However, there is this to be said: The bill deals entirely and exclusively with interstate transportation, and our committee is the proper committee to handle such proposed legislation. It does directly affect transportation in the District of Columbia. So the Committee on the District of Columbia could very properly consider it to see if there are any objections to it.

If the Senator from New Jersey will permit me to do so, I invite attention to a concurrent resolution on the calendar, Order No. 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia. It seems to me that that resolution deals with interstate transportation.

Mr. GORE. It is on the calendar for action today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado will not object to that resolution if it is amended so as not to deal with interstate transportation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will examine the resolution he will find that it relates entirely to the matter of study. It is not designed to accomplish the things which the Senator's bill is designed to accomplish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But does it deal with interstate transportation, or simply with transportation within the District of Columbia?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I understand, it deals with transportation within the District of Columbia.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The resolution is somewhat broad in its terms. It deals with all transportation within the District of Columbia, most of which extends in its operations beyond the boundaries of the District. There is no way that an adequate study can be made of the Capital Transit Co., for example, unless a study is made of the operations of that company both in Maryland and in Virginia. It seems to me, if the distinguished Senator will allow me to make the suggestion, that the two measures should be considered together.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I remind the Senator from Tennessee that I am not

a sponsor of either the bill or the concurrent resolution; nor am I a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. I am merely speaking as a member of the calendar committee on this side of the aisle.

Mr. GORE. It is my privilege to serve as a member of the District Committee. It is my opinion that the two measures should be considered together. Would the Senator from Colorado object to a reference of Calendar 114, Senate bill 922, to the Committee on the District of Columbia, provided there is objection to the consideration of Calendar 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, until the District Committee has studied it and has had opportunity for consultation with the committee of which the Senator from Colorado is chairman?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only point I raise—and I think it is important—is the distinction between intrastate and interstate transportation. Our committee is organized to handle interstate problems. On page 2, section 2, of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, Calendar 131, we find the following:

> It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of public transportation serving the District of Columbia—

And so forth. It seems to me that that would affect interstate transportation as well as intrastate transportation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is not the easy solution of these two problems to have both measures go over until the next call of the calendar, so that both committees may look into each one?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to make it clear that our committee has no objection whatever to having Calendar 114, Senate bill 922, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. We are glad to have the District Committee consider it, because it does affect the District of Columbia very directly.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The point made by the junior Senator from New Jersey is that the Committee on the District of Columbia can study the bill, whether it is before the committee or not, during the period between now and the next call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have no objection to handling it in any way the Senator wishes to handle it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In view of the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 114, Senate bill 922, be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for further study, with instructions to report back to the Senate within 2 weeks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to the request—I merely wish to state that the Committee on Rules and Administration considered Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 19, which was discussed on the floor in connection with the pending bill. Certainly it was not the intention of the Committee on Rules and Administration to invade the rights of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We merely wanted to obtain consideration for a concurrent resolution which would provide for a study of some of the transit problems of the city of Washington, and it is only natural that the interests should overlap to some extent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I understand. If I may be permitted to say a few more words, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has been trying to work out a solution to the problem of interstate transportation in the District of Columbia and neighboring Virginia and Maryland. We tried to work it out at one time on the basis of compacts between the State of Virginia and Maryland, but that effort was not successful, because the States were reluctant to enter into any kind of compact on that subject. Therefore the method which we find set forth in Senate bill 922 is the one we adopted almost through desperation. It seemed as though it would be the only way we could get any action. Action is very badly needed indeed. The transportation which serves the District of Columbia and the area adjoining it in Maryland and Virginia lacks a great deal of what it should be, and it does need supervision. The rates and the connections between the various private transportation systems fall far short of what they should be.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado feel that 2 weeks is too long?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that is all right.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Very well. Then I renew my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES ABROAD

The bill (H. R. 3658) to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free transportation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 3659) to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABOLITION OF COMMISSION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

The bill (S. 1041) to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the establishment of a Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard connnecting the present Lincoln Memorial in the city of Washington with the battlefield of Gettysburg in the State of Pennsylvania," approved May 20, 1935 (49 Stat. 285), is hereby repealed.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF LETHAL MUNITIONS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 903) to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America, or an instrumentality thereof, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments on page 2, line 6, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "of types normally used for hunting or sporting use" and insert "not in excess of caliber .50, shotgun ammunition, and small arms ammunition less than 20 millimeters of types normally used for hunting or sporting purposes"; in line 12, after the word "materials", to strike out "or devices containing explosive materials, designed" and insert "or combustible or toxic substances, or devices containing such materials or substances, designed"; in line 19, after the word "the", to strike out "movement is arranged" and insert "transportation is of lethal munitions procured (from private or governmental sources)"; in line 22, after the word "thereof", to strike out the colon and "*Provided, however*, That this act shall not apply to the transportation of articles" and insert "or when", and on page 3, line 1, after the word "by", to strike out "the Congress." and insert "the Congress: *Provided, however*, That this act shall not apply to the importation, or to the transportation (exclusive of exportation) in interstate commerce of, prototypes or test quantities of lethal munitions for test or development purposes, and not for resale by bona fide manufacturers and research and development institutions under existing safety laws and regulations."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Lethal Munitions Act."

SEC. 2. As used in this act, "lethal munitions" means all projectiles and propelling charges therefor or a caliber of at least 20 millimeters, land and naval mines, aircraft bombs, naval torpedoes, military rockets (whether free or guided), atomic weapons, hand and rifle grenades, when containing explosive, combustible, or toxic substances, or when designed to contain such substances, and all other articles, implements, or devices which (1) consist of or contain explosive, combustible, or toxic substances, (2) are used in warfare or training therefor, and (3) are designed or adapted to cause destruction of personnel, equipment, or facilities; except small arms ammunition not in excess of caliber .50, shotgun ammunition, and small arms ammunition less than 20 millimeters of types normally used for hunting or sporting purposes, ammunition of any type for the use of State or municipal police forces, pyrotechnic devices for signaling, display, or illumination, and explosive materials, or combustible or toxic substances, or devices containing such materials or sub-

stances, designed and intended for commercial use in agriculture, mining, or industry generally.

SEC. 3. The transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions is prohibited except when the transportation is of lethal munitions procured (from private or governmental sources) by, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof or when procured by the Department of Army, Navy, or Air Force for transfer on a grant or reimbursable basis pursuant to any foreign assistance program authorized by the Congress: *Provided, however,* That this act shall not apply to the importation, or to the transportation (exclusive of exportation) in interstate commerce of, prototypes or test quantities of lethal munitions for test or development purposes, and not for resale by bona fide manufacturers and research and development institutions under existing safety laws and regulations.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall in no way affect other requirements of Federal or State law or regulations issued pursuant thereto.

SEC. 5. Whoever violates, or causes to be violated, the prohibition of section 3 hereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall certainly not object to this bill, because it is a very worthwhile and fine piece of legislation. I would remind the Senate that in May 1950, as I recall the date, there was a terrible explosion at Perth Amboy, N. J., which took a number of lives and ruined property worth millions of dollars. Had this proposed legislation been on the statute books prior to that explosion I am certain, as I have been assured by experts, that that horrible tragedy would have been avoided.

I remember that during the last session of Congress the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. Ecton, introduced a similar bill. I believe the pending bill, with minor changes, is the same bill which was introduced by the then Senator from Montana. At the time I paid tribute to the Senator from Montana for bringing the measure to the floor of the Senate.

Today I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for bringing the pending bill to the Senate. I also wish to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is the chairman of the committee which has given the problem so much study.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 903) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when procured by, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof for itself or pursuant to an authorized foreign assistance program."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement on Senate bill 903.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

The purpose of this bill is to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when the movement is procured by, or on behalf of, the United States or one of its agencies or instrumentalities. This bill is substantially the same as S. 1429 which passed the Senate unanimously and was reported favorably by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in the 82d Congress. The committee knows of no objection to this bill, which has received the support of all the Government departments and agencies concerned, including the Departments of Defense, State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The bill is intended to do two things, principally: First, to protect citizens against the physical hazards involved in the transportation of the most dangerous type of war munitions, which would be accomplished by requiring that all such articles be manufactured and shipped under service specifications as to quality, packaging, and movement.

Second, this legislation should effectively forestall the development in this country of an illicit munitions industry organized to sell munitions to foreign countries or to any foreign agency or faction that will buy them, because the bill provides that products of munitions companies, whether foreign or domestic, doing business in the United States will be available only to United States of America or any instrumentality thereof or when procured by the Departments of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, for transfer on a grant or reimbursable basis pursuant to any foreign-assistance program authorized by the Congress. (There is no question about the sordid history surrounding the sale of munitions to foreign countries and so-called revolutionaries in the past. Companies which have engaged in this practice have been sources of friction between us and friendly foreign countries; they have been an unmitigated nuisance to our own military agencies; and they have been of no help to the United States as producers of the munitions of war.)

Your committee has taken into consideration all possible objections to a bill of this kind, and has so amended it that no necessary or worthwhile use of munitions or explosives would be prohibited. Such uses, which are protected in this bill, include ammunition for police or hunters, explosives for commercial and mining purposes, and materials for seismographing and oil-exploration purposes; as well as prototype munitions for test and developmental purposes.

STEVE EMERY SOBANSKI

The bill (S. 613) for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the bill, but I wish to call attention to the fact that on March 23 the Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported Senate bill 613. The House of Representatives passed a similar bill, which is H. R. 1192, and it has been referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of House bill 1192, for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski, and that it be immediately considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah, that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 1192, for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the present consideration of H. R. 1192?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1192) for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 613 is indefinitely postponed.

HISIMI YOSHIDA

The bill (H. R. 759) for the relief of Hisimi Yoshida was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDITH MARIE PAULSEN

The bill (H. R. 861) for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARINELLA TALLETI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 556) for the relief of Marinella Talleti which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 5, after the name "Marinella," to strike out "Talleti" and insert "Taletti," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Marinella Taletti, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Thomas A. Douglas, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Marinella Taletti."

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution go over. As soon as the call of the calendar has been completed, I shall move to make it the pending order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go over.

SCHEDULES OF ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAIL AND REPEAL OF OBSOLETE LAWS RELATING TO POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 3062) to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain

obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished author of the bill care to explain the purpose of it?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to amend existing postal regulations. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on March 2, 1953. It proposes to repeal certain postal laws which have become obsolete and to increase the efficiency of the Postal Service.

There are three sections in the bill.

Section 1 eliminates the present provision of law which requires postmasters to keep a detailed record of the arrivals and departures of star routes. It substitutes a provision under which the Postmaster General will require reports only when the arrivals or departures of star routes do not conform to schedules.

In connection with the first section, I may say that in every post office in the United States which has a star route the postmaster must make out a card showing the arrival and departure of the star route. Taken over the Nation, that represents a great number of cards which come rolling into the Post Office Department in Washington. The proposed legislation would not prevent any postmaster from reporting delays in arrivals or departures, or any negligence on the part of carriers.

I may say also that the bill was introduced at the request of the Post Office Department.

Section 2 of the bill eliminates an outdated definition of "clerk in charge." A bill which was enacted a year ago made some changes in legislation affecting postmasters. Therefore, the definition should be eliminated.

Section 3 of the bill repeals unnecessary language in the present law requiring the Postmaster General to make a report to Congress when such report is rendered unnecessary by the specific terms of later statutes.

Mr. GORE. Does the bill purport to take away any civil service rights from any postmasters who have been duly appointed according to law?

Mr. CARLSON. It does not affect the present status of postmasters under the civil service law.

Mr. GORE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3062) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS GRANTED TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The bill (H. R. 3073) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An explanation is requested.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to repeal a proviso in the Civil Service Retirement Act which prevents persons receiving survivorship benefits from Members of Congress unless such Members live 30 days beyond the effective date of their retirement.

This bill was introduced in the House of Representatives because of the recent death of a former Member of the House who, upon his retirement, had made an election to provide a survivorship annuity for his widow after his death. However, this Member of Congress died within 30 days after the effective date of his retirement; and, consequently, his widow is not entitled to an annuity.

The bill, which was passed by the House of Representatives on February 19, following unanimous approval by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, eliminates the restrictive provision outlined above; and under section 2 of the bill the amendment to the Retirement Act is made effective January 1, 1953.

We had an extensive hearing on the bill, and it was generally agreed that the situation referred to was an oversight when the original measure was passed.

As the provision does not affect civil-service employees, I do not subscribe to it as affecting Members of Congress. Certainly it will be unfortunate if it is not corrected at this time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Under the old law is it not true that the wife would have been entitled to the benefits referred to if her husband had lived for 31 days after retirement?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. But if the husband died on the 29th day or the 30th day after retirement, the wife would be precluded from receiving those benefits; is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. Then, Mr. President, it seems to me the law should be corrected.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, and that is our attempt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3073) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

The bill (S. 1410) to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948 was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An explanation is requested.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee is not on the floor at this time, I believe.

Let me say that the bill will extend for only 30 days the time in which the President may make to the Congress a report on a program for the disposal of the rubber plants which now are held by the RFC.

I do not know the exact number of those plants, but there are approximately 20 or 25 of them which still are held by the RFC.

The Chairman of the RFC reported to the President about a month ago, under a bill which was enacted at the last session of Congress, as to a program of disposal. The President's report was to have been made to the Congress on May 15. It was felt that it was impossible to obtain a report by that time, because of the new personnel and because of the problems involved in the matter. Therefore, an extension was requested.

This measure provides for an extension of only 30 days, within which time the President of the United States can report to the Congress his recommendations on the report of the RFC.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Ohio stated that under present laws the President must report by May 15. I believe the Senator will find the requirement to be April 15.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Tennessee is correct; the correct date is April 15. I was speaking only from recollection.

This measure will extend that date for 30 days, to May 15.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield further.

Mr. GORE. It is my understanding that the President requested that he have until July 15 in which to make the report.

As a Member of the House, I had some connection with legislation relating to this rubber program. From that experience I know the matter is very a complicated one, and a very valuable one.

According to the statement the Senator from Ohio has made, several plants are involved.

Why not give the President until July 15, the date of the administration request, rather than require him to submit the report by May 15?

Mr. BRICKER. For the simple reason that this proposed legislation has been before the Congress for the past 5 or 6 years. Ever since the end of the war an attempt has been made on the part of Congress to obtain a report on a proper procedure for the sale of these plants to private industry. I believe everyone desires that they be placed in the hands of private industry as soon as possible.

We finally got rid of the program providing for the pooling of patents; but now there is reluctance to proceed with the research programs in the case of individual companies, because they do not now receive the benefits which come from such research.

Several problems have to be solved. One of them relates to the heating of heavy-duty tires; another relates to the development of the cold-rubber process; and there are many other problems

about which the companies would be willing to do more if they had the benefit of the synthetic rubber plants.

The President did request a continuance; but I think that was done without knowledge of the past history and without appreciation of the fact that if the period in which the report is extended until July 15, another year will pass before Congress could possibly act on this matter, because during the last month of this session there will not be time for proposed legislation to be introduced, hearings to be held on it, reports to be made on it, and then for the bill to be passed by both Houses of Congress.

Being desirous of having the report made as soon as possible and of having proposed legislation introduced, the committee felt, as does the Senator from Ohio, that the provision of this bill should call for only a 30-day extension.

I have talked about the matter to the Secretary of the Treasury; and he says he is confident that every effort will be made to make the report within that time, and that a request for a 30-day extension should be sufficient. If not, a further request will be made of Congress, of course.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me that much of the statement the Senator from Ohio has made would strongly support the President's request for additional time in which to make a thorough report. It must be borne in mind that the administration is new in power.

If the bill is considered today, it will be my purpose to oppose the committee amendment and place the date at July 15, instead of May 15. I say that in order that the Senator from Ohio may be on notice, in the event he wishes to object to consideration of the bill at this time. Of course, he has a right to do so. But if the bill is considered, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I shall object to such an amendment to the bill, if it is offered, for the simple reason that such an amendment would prevent the enactment this year of a law providing any satisfactory program for the disposal of the synthetic rubber plants to private industry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 1410?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me say that I have no objection to the bill in its present form. Let the President submit to Congress his plan for the disposal of these plants, if he has such a plan.

However, I wish the RECORD to show that I believe there are some—and I think the number is large—who question the desirability of disposing of these wartime plants to private industry on the basis of any proposal that any of us has heard to date.

I would have no objection to having the plants go to private industry with adequate safeguards attached to the transfer. But as a former member of the Johnson subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, which went into the synthetic-rubber-plant problem and issued a unanimous report concerning it, I simply wish to raise today a signal of warning that we had better be on guard regarding the disposal of these plants to private industry, so as to see to it that when the plan comes before us, the public interest will be protected, and so that the plan finally enacted will not turn out to be another one of the handouts to private industries which seek to obtain, for little or nothing, valuable property belonging to all the people of the Nation.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to give assurance that there is no chance that anything of that sort will happen. Adequate safeguards have been placed around the report of the RFC, and no doubt will be contained in the report of the President; and, in any event, Congress has the last say on the matter.

The purpose is only to get this matter before Congress, so that if the proper safeguards are provided, Congress can provide for their inclusion in the public law which ultimately will be enacted.

This measure provides only as to the date when the report will be made to Congress; and thereafter, legislation will have to be enacted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the last part of my friend's statement, I am in complete agreement. This measure goes only to the making of the report to Congress, so that the report will be before Congress.

I simply say that Congress should keep its eyes open when the report is before us, for if the plan to be submitted bears any resemblance at all to the kind of plan we encountered before the Johnson subcommittee, let me say that then it will be found that the rubber companies will be seeking just as much as they can possibly get for nothing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment in line 6, after the word "thereof", to strike out "July 15, 1953" and insert "May 15, 1953", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. Appendix, sec. 1928), is amended by striking out "April 15, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 15, 1953."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I object to the amendment. From all the discussion which has occurred on the floor and from what knowledge I have of the subject, I feel strongly that in a field so complicated, in a field in which the public interest is so vitally concerned, if the President of the United States requests a reasonable extension of time in which to make to the Congress a report on which Congress can act, I believe we should grant such a reasonable extension.

An additional 30 days may not be sufficient. Undoubtedly the operations of these plants are vital. Undoubtedly many of the large rubber concerns of the country would like to hurry the enactment of legislation on this subject. I want to be sure that the President of the United States has sufficient time to enable him to protect the public interest. I want to be sure that, before the Congress acts, it shall have an ample, thorough report from the executive branch. Therefore, it would appear that the amendment of the committee is unwise, and I ask the Senate to vote down the amendment. We would then have an extension to July 15, which is the request of the administration that must make the report.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this particular amendment has met with the approval of the administration. The report has been in preparation for a long time, and I think 30 days more will afford sufficient time within which to finish it. Certainly, as my colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio, has said, unless we get it by May 15, nothing can be concluded this year. As I understand, the 30 days is sufficient for the administration, though 90 days was originally requested. Under the circumstances, I see no reason why the amendment of the committee should not be agreed to, in order that the consideration of this matter may be expedited.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I have been so advised by the Department, namely, that within 30 days they can complete their report.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is nothing in the report of the committee and nothing in the record that I can find to indicate that the President has modified his request. True, the junior Senator from Ohio has said he has talked with some official in the RFC, who agrees; but the RFC has not transmitted this request, as I understand.

Mr. BRICKER. I said I talked to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. Just what did the Secretary of the Treasury say?

Mr. BRICKER. The Secretary of the Treasury advised that they would be able to submit the report within 30 days, with the 30-day extension. That is exactly what I said a while ago.

Mr. GORE. When the Senator was speaking earlier, I understood him to say that the Secretary of the Treasury said they would do the best they could to submit the report by that time. Did the Senator say that?

Mr. BRICKER. They will have it within the 30 days, I was assured. I further said that, if they did not have it ready within the 30 days, another 30-day extension could be obtained, but I do not believe that will be necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio or any other Senator

who is in a position to do so answer the question I am about to ask. Assuming this bill is passed, providing for an extension to July 15, 1953, is there any reason why the President cannot, if he wishes, submit a report on the situation by May 15? Is it the purpose of this bill to require him to report by May 15?

Mr. BRICKER. The purpose of the amendment is to require a report by the 15th of May. It proposes a 30-day extension from April 15.

Mr. AIKEN. If the President were given an extension to July 15, there would be nothing to prevent his making the report by the 15th of May, would there?

Mr. BRICKER. Except that it might not be done.

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose of the bill, then, is to require the President to make a report by May 15. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. AIKEN. Is the President to be required to report by a day certain?

Mr. BRICKER. That is a responsibility of the Congress, I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely asked the question.

Mr. GORE. Under the law, the President is required to report by April 15. He requested an extension of 90 days. The committee has said, "No; we are going to give you 30 days. You must report by May 15."

Mr. AIKEN. I was merely wondering whether the President favored amending the bill to require him to do something 2 months earlier than he would otherwise be required to do it.

Mr. GORE. I believe I have an ally on the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. I am merely seeking information.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, the fact is that if the date is fixed at July 15, the report will be made on July 15; it will not be here any sooner. That is the way the executive department is operating today. It has plenty of things to do. If we ask them to do this by July 15, presumably that will be the reporting date. And I see no reason why it should not be done sooner. In fact, if we have to extend it beyond this session, I would be in favor of not extending it at all. Instead, let us get the report on April 15, which is the present date.

Mr. AIKEN. I should think the attitude of the new administration would be different in that respect.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I seem to have acquired the floor in some way. If I have the floor, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. As a matter of fact, the President is not going to be required to make the report. The Senator has a copy of the report on the bill in his hand. It is a department or agency which makes the report to the President and to the Congress. So the President would also be interested in having the report, I should think, at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, the law, as enacted last year, requires that the agency make a report to the Congress, and then the President is required to make a report to the Congress by the 15th day of April. By the amendment we would extend the time 30 days, until May 15.

This matter, which has been before the Congress for the past 6 years, was formerly in charge of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and then, 4 years ago, in some way it went to the Armed Services Committee. It is properly a matter for the Committee on Banking and Currency, because it deals with RFC and RFC property, and there are no longer any stockpiling requirements, so far as either synthetic or natural rubber is concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, if I may interrupt, the Senator from Ohio feels that making simply an extension of 30 days would be helpful to the President as well as to the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. BRICKER. There is no question but that it would be a help to the President. It would help him get the report before the Congress of the United States, and then the Congress could pass legislation which would be in the public interest.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I thank all my colleagues who have contributed this information.

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McCarthy
Beall	Hayden	McClellan
Bennett	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bush	Hill	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Humphrey	Payne
Carlson	Hunt	Potter
Case	Ives	Purtell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Sparkman
Duff	Knowland	Stennis
Dworshak	Kuchel	Symington
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Ellender	Long	Thye
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Frear	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Mansfield	Welker
Goldwater	Martin	Wiley
Gore	Maybank	Williams
Green	McCarran	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on line 6, to strike out "July 15, 1953", and insert "May 15, 1953."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1410) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. Appendix, sec. 1928), is amended by striking out "April 15, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "May 15, 1953."

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS — JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

Mr. MALONE obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is still considering the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest that the next bill on the calendar be called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GORE. Is Calendar No. 128, Senate Joint Resolution 13, now under consideration?

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

ELIZABETH A. REILLY

The resolution (S. Res. 94) to pay a gratuity to Elizabeth A. Reilly was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Elizabeth A. Reilly, widow of Sylvester Reilly, an employee under the office of the Achitect of the Capitol at the time of his death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WALTER QUARLES

The resolution (S. Res. 95) to pay a gratuity to Walter Quarles was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Walter Quarles, widower of Mattie Quarles, an employee under the office of the Architect of the Capitol at the time of her death, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PROPOSED STUDY OF TRANSPORTATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 2, line 22, after "January", to strike out "2" and insert "31"; on page 3, line 4, after the word "to", to strike out "January 3" and insert "February 1"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "40"; in line 14, after the word "em-

ploy", to strike out "and fix the compensation of", and in line 17, after the words "utilize the", to insert "reimbursable", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(b) A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of four members, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of public transportation serving the District of Columbia, including the fiscal, management, and operating policies of common carriers which transport passengers in the District of Columbia, the regulation of such carriers by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, and other matters related thereto.

(b) The joint committee shall, from time to time, report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report not later than January 31, 1954.

(c) The joint committee shall cease to exist, and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate, upon the submission of its final report.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress (prior to February 1, 1954), to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. The joint committee shall have power to employ such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 5. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, is Calendar 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, now under discussion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. GORE. Calendar 131, Senate Concurrent Resolution 19, was considered in connection with Calendar 114, Senate bill 922. At that time it was my understanding that we had agreed that Senate bill 922 would be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that Senate Concurrent Resolution 19 would be passed over. That is my understanding of the agreement which was reached.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from Tennessee is partly correct. There was some discussion along that line, but later I moved that Senate bill 922 be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, with instructions that the committee report back on a day certain. As I understand, that motion was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Then I was slightly in error in my understanding. But in keeping with what I understood to be an agreement with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], I ask that Senate Concurrent Resolution 19 go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] gave assurance that in dealing with the problem, the committee would keep in mind the difference between the intrastate and the interstate matters with which these measures deal. I was entirely satisfied with the Senator's assurance that the committee would keep those matters in mind in its consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 19.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator now satisfied that this concurrent resolution should be agreed to?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 123, House Joint Resolution 223.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

ORDER FOR INCLUSION OF CERTAIN BILLS IN NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the attention of the majority leader and also of the members of the committee in charge of calendar bills on this side of the aisle, with reference to Calendars Nos. 106, 107, 108, and 109, covering, respectively, Senate bill 18, Senate bill 30, Senate bill 39, and Senate bill 41. I think all of them went over today.

Mr. TAFT. Calendar No. 109, Senate bill 41, was passed; calenders Nos. 106, 107, and 108 went over.

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully request unanimous consent that they may be included in the next call of the calendar, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. TAFT. That is satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

INDIAN CHILD WELFARE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, for many years, those who are familiar with the problems of the American Indians have been anxious to see the social, economic, and political barriers between them and the rest of the citizens of the United States broken down. The opportunity and encouragement should be given to the thousands of Indians on the reservations to play an active, productive role in the social, economic, and political affairs of the country.

Pursuant to the country's obligation to provide educational facilities to the Navaho Indians, the Bushnell hospital in Brigham City, Utah, was converted into the Intermountain Indian School. This move was considered advisable not only because of the lack of water and other resources necessary for the establishment of schools on the Navaho Reservation, but also because it gave added opportunity for allowing young Navahos to learn the customs and practices of our people in a setting free from reservation influences. Education of this sort seemed to be the best way to acquaint the Indians with the white man's way of life.

A unique plan has been developed by the Intermountain Indian School which I believe deserves wider attention. This plan is illustrated by an article in the Provo Daily Herald explaining an exchange plan in which 25 Navaho boys and girls from the Intermountain Indian School will be guests in the homes of high-school students of Provo, Utah. The Indian children are brought into the students' homes as house guests. They live with the family and become part of a typical American household while they tour the points of interest around Provo, Utah.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Provo Daily Herald of March 4, 1953, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWENTY-FIVE NAVAHO STUDENTS BEGIN 3-DAY PROVO VISIT IN UNIQUE FELLOWSHIP EXCHANGE PLAN

Provo gave the city back to the Indians today, as 25 Navaho boys and girls, all high-school students from Intermountain Indian School at Brigham City, began a 3-day tour of points of interest. They will live as guests of Provo and BY High students in the latters' homes.

The visit will be returned next month, when Provo high-school boys and girls spend a few days as guests of the Indian school.

In addition to the keys of the city, the visiting Indians were each presented with a sponsor from Brigham Young High School and Provo High School.

Shortly after arrival Monday, the visiting Navahos were invited into the homes of their sponsors and spent the evening getting acquainted with Provo families.

This morning the Navaho boys and girls were scheduled to tour the city, including the Utah Valley Hospital, Provo Airport, the municipal power plant, residential areas, Utah State Hospital, and East Provo Stake House and they will be guests at the home of D. Spencer Grow, one of the members of the Provo Chamber of Commerce civic affairs committee.

INSPECT SHOPS, PLANT

This afternoon the Navaho braves were to inspect the Union Pacific railroad shops, and the Indian maidens, the Barbison plant.

The youngsters will also visit banks, business firms and the fish hatchery. This evening, the Navahoes, still accompanied by their Provo student sponsors, will be guests of Mark Berkimer at the Academy Theatre.

Wednesday morning, the students from Brigham City will tour Brigham Young University, with Dr. Harold Glen Clark as their guide. After luncheon at the China City cafe, the visitors will be guests of L. F. Black, general superintendent, on a tour of Geneva Steel plant.

Thursday, they will return by bus to Brigham City.

The civic affairs committee of the Provo Chamber of Commerce, which has sponsored the exchange of students is headed by J. Wylie Sessions, chairman, and comprises Loyd Whitlock, Ed Shriver, Rowan Stutz, Howard Knight, Mark Berkhimer and Dr. Clark.

STUDENTS LISTED

The Navaho students include:

Ernest Manygoats, 17; Peter Fran Nex, 17; Herbert Paul Denny, 17; Clyde Brown, Jr., 17; Chee Smith, 18; Bennie Kascoli, 18; Jimmy Alexius, 18; Ben Y. Segay, 20; Junior Sandoval, 20; Tulley Gray, Louise Hubbard, 20; James G. Lee, 19; Leo Tainajinnie, 19; and Ben H. Yezzie, 20.

Clarence Hill, Intermountain Indian School teacher; Mrs. Tamsey Cleary, home economics teacher, and Duane LeBeque, vocation school teacher, accompanied the youngsters.

The visiting of towns, homes, and business firms by the Navaho students is designed to acquaint them with life outside the reservation.

Because of the crowding on the reservation, it is expected that many, if not most of the boys and girls, who complete their education in Brigham City, will make their homes outside the reservation.

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly a few of the questions raised earlier this afternoon in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

In the discussion it was pointed out that this was perhaps the first subcommittee that had been appointed by the Senate Committee on Finance for investigation purposes, and probably that statement is correct. However, I wish to point out that it does not excuse the Committee on Finance from its responsibility to investigate the Treasury Department, and that it ought to keep an accurate check on what is going on in that Department, because, after all, that is the committee of the Senate which considers the nominations of most of the Government officials involved in the discussion.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall be glad to yield.

As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, there is no difference of opinion between us as to the powers which were extended to the subcommittee or the powers which the Committee on Finance offered to extend to the subcommittee. There was a difference of opinion—and I should like to refer to it as an honest difference of opinion—as to certain of the rules which were laid down, namely, the rule as to whether or not the Committee on Finance as a whole was to have veto power over the actions not only of members of the committee but also of members of the subcommittee itself.

Under the rules which were adopted by the Finance Committee, it would be theoretically possible for the subcommittee to go before the Finance Committee with a unanimous report involving what, perhaps, the subcommittee considered to be violations of law, such as acceptance of bribes or anything of that nature; and if the full committee in its wisdom decided that this information should not be disclosed, or if it decided that the subcommittee was in error, every member of the subcommittee would be automatically prevented from presenting a report to the United States Senate, and also, as was made very clear in the debate on this point, each member of the subcommittee and each member of the Finance Committee would be morally bound never to discuss the nature of the case, either on or off the floor of the United States Senate or before the American people.

It was for that reason that I objected. I did not question the good intentions of the present membership of the Finance Committee. However, I foresaw what might happen at some future time under such a precedent. It might be possible for the majority party in power to put a veto on the exposure of any corruption which might exist at some future time in the administration which happened to be in power. I think that would be a dangerous precedent to accept.

It was also pointed out that one reason for the rule was the nature of the information to which this particular committee would have access, namely, income-tax returns. I made it very clear, I think, in the Finance Committee, that I would not ask for authority to discuss income-tax returns. I was not asking for authority to come to the floor of the Senate and discuss the income-tax returns of any private citizen. I do not think I have ever violated that rule in the past, and I have no intention of doing so in the future.

I made it very clear that I was perfectly willing to respect the secrecy of the income-tax returns. I pointed out that the secrecy of income-tax returns is guaranteed to American citizens under section 55.

This afternoon and during recent weeks we have heard a great deal about preserving the sacredness of income-tax returns under section 55 of the Internal Revenue Code. Nevertheless, in the exposures during the past few months I have made disclosures where certain tax collectors were in conspiracy with insurance agents, furnishing information as to the private tax returns of troubled taxpayers, so that agents could sell them insurance, after which they split the commissions. I have yet to hear of the United States Department of Justice or the Treasury Department making any effort to invoke section 55 against those collectors or top officials of the Department. Yet you are trying to invoke the rule rather strongly with respect to a Member of the Senate, not only to restrict this type of disclosure but also extend it to protect them against disclosures of bribery or any other law violation.

I have discussed on the floor of the Senate information regarding compromise settlements with various taxpayers. However, I point out that any Member of the Senate, whether a member of the Finance Committee or not, or any member of the press, can go to the Treasury Department and ask for information as to how John Doe's tax was compromised, and that information is readily available under a ruling of the Treasury Department. It has been available for the past several months. It did not require a committee of the Congress to obtain the information which I discussed on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago, or that which I discussed in July or August, just before the adjournment of Congress last year. It could have been done by any Member of the Senate who was interested enough to find out how such cases had been settled.

I repeat that I have not revealed on the floor of the Senate a single case involving the tax returns of any individual. I will go further. I have not attempted to check the tax returns of any individuals. I did not come to the United States Senate to check the tax returns. I have checked and tried to follow through the manner in which they have been handled after they have been reported. At no point have I made an effort to check the accuracy of the reporting. In the first place, I am not qualified. I have to obtain the help of others to figure my own tax returns. I am not debating that point. However, I have followed through and checked to see if, at any point, there might be a conspiracy involving the manner in which certain taxpayers' cases were being handled. I believe that enough instances have been disclosed on the floor of the Senate and in the committees of the House to indicate to the American people that perhaps all was not quite as well in this particular department of the

Government as some of you have been led to think.

Another reason I do not think I could work on the committee under this rule is that it would lead us back to the debate as to whether the chicken or the egg came first. I say this with all due respect to those who feel that the rule should be invoked. I recognize that there are many arguments for it, even though I disagree with those who advocate it.

Would I be furnishing information to the subcommittee, or would the subcommittee be furnishing information to me? We would be in a perpetual debate in the future as to whether or not a Member had a right to reveal a certain subject. As an example, I call attention to one particular case which was discussed on the floor of the Senate last year. In connection with that case I was criticized privately by several members of the committee who felt that perhaps I was in error in bringing out the information on the floor of the Senate.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The Senator from Delaware, a man of widely acclaimed responsibility, is apparently being penalized for the acts of past, present, and future irresponsible Senators. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Delaware if this is not a rather ironic application of caution.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the Senator from Maine that I cannot understand the need for such an iron-clad rule, binding me and every other member of the committee in advance, while at the same time those who advocate the rule indicate that they think the situation was handled properly by our committee during the previous Congress.

Continuing, and pointing out a specific example of a possible difference of opinion which might develop, I call attention to one particular disclosure which I made last year, concerning conduct which was condemned throughout the country—I believe unanimously—by the American people.

Special rulings had been handed down allowing certain taxpayers who were large contributors to the Democratic Party to write off such contributions in their income-tax returns, under the guise of bad loans. I have in my hand—and I will show it to any Member of the Senate who wishes to look at it—one of the original rulings which was handed down. It is on Treasury Department stationery. I will not say where I obtained it, however. It was one of the rulings which established the fact that such rulings had been in existence.

With that knowledge as a background, I asked the Finance Committee to cooperate with me in obtaining copies of all such rulings and seeing how far the Treasury Department had gone in allowing the administration in power—or the administration out of power, for that matter—in financing their campaign indirectly out of the Federal Treasury. As a result, we found that there had been four such rulings in the history of the country. I released copies of all those.

To get back to the question which I propounded a few moments ago, did I give the information to the committee, or did the committee give it to me? There was some of both. I think the American people had a perfect right to know what was being done. I was not aware at the time of any objection on the part of the Finance Committee to the American people knowing what was going on. I do not think they will be found objecting today. Does the American people think that the Senate Finance Committee by a majority vote should have had the right to conceal this scandalous procedure?

Another example was a case involving certain tax settlements under section 102, relating to a tax settlement with Mr. Hannegan, former Democratic national chairman. On December 21, 1951, 6 months before the subject was called to the attention of the Senate, I directed a letter to John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and reported the case to him. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1951.

Mr. JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
United States Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUNLAP: I have just received a report as follows:

"Just before he resigned, Mr. Hannegan got an option to buy the St. Louis Cardinals for $3 million. The Cardinals had $2 million in cash. This had been accumulated to build a stadium and since it was for that purpose, the accumulation was exempt from section 102—whereas had it been paid out it would have been a dividend and subject to the tax rates of the income of the individual receiving it.

"Mr. Hannegan went to one of the St. Louis banks and told them he was sure he could get the $2 million out without paying any tax. They agreed if he could do this to loan him $3 million to buy the Cardinals. He then went to the Treasury Department where he secured a 'close-out' order exempting the 'take-out' of the $2 million cash from tax. With this order he got the loan, bought the Cardinals, and paid off $2 million of the loan. In less than a year he sold the Cardinals for $2 million, paid off the bank, paid long-term capital gains tax of $250,000 and ended up with $750,000 clear and he had put up nothing except the 'close-out' order."

Will you please check the records and advise me whether or not this report is accurate; and if so, furnish me with a copy of each Treasury Department ruling along with the dates, and any other details pertaining thereto.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The letter clearly indicates that the matter was reported not only to the Finance Committee, but to the Treasury Department, months before it was discussed on the floor of the Senate. Only after confirmation by the Treasury Department was anything said about it on the floor of the Senate. Did I give this case to the committee or did the committee give it to me?

Mr. President, I should like to refer to another case. I wish to make it clear that we are not debating the right to discuss the individual tax returns of John Doe. I will rise on the floor of the Senate at any time to protect the secrecy of the tax return of the individual citizen. I believe we must be very careful about that. However, here is a case which I believe should be further explored by Congress. The letter was dated March 11, 1952, and it was directed to Mr. Dunlap. It reads: "Dear Mr. Dunlap—"

I will delete the names in this particular case because the case has not been fully concluded, and I think it would be unfair to put the names in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator used a name. What was the name he used?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not use any name.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Who was the taxpayer to whom the Senator from Delaware referred?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not use the name of any taxpayer. I said the letter was addressed to Mr. Dunlap.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understood the Senator from Delaware to refer to the name of Steve Hannegan.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I have incorporated in the RECORD a statement regarding a certain tax settlement by the Treasury of the United States in relation to a deal which had been made with Mr. Hannegan and another individual in St. Louis.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The letter to which the Senator refers was received by the Senator after the death of Mr. Hannegan; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; that is correct. However I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that the surviving member was subsequently indicted and convicted, and that he is now serving his sentence. Therefore I do not think we are prejudicing any case when we put it in the RECORD under those circumstances. Otherwise the information would have been withheld.

I will say further that the man had not been indicted at the time the disclosure was made. It was not made at a time when it would prejudice the case.

The letter reads:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1952.

Mr. JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUNLAP: I have received a report that ——, a former employee of the Treasury Department in the Technical Service who resigned on June 30, 1948, was the recipient of an Oldsmobile club sedan from an attorney in ——.

According to my information, this car, engine No. ——, body No. ——, was purchased in —— on January 29, 1948, and transferred to Mr. ——; however, the transfer of the title was withheld until July 11, 1948—7 days after Mr. ——'s retirement.

Will you please check the accuracy of this information, and if correct, I would like to have a list of each tax case in the —— area upon which Mr. —— was in any way contacted, along with a list of each tax case which was handled by the lawyer in question.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, I should say that Commissioner Dunlap had made an agreement that he would check these cases and report them to the Committee on Finance upon its request. I have Mr. Dunlap's reply, which is dated March 24, 1952. I ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. In this letter, too, the names are deleted.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER
OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, March 24, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter dated March 11, 1952, concerning ——, a former employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, who you state was the recipient of an Oldsmobile club sedan from an attorney in ——. You request that a check be made of the accuracy of information concerning the transfer of the automobile in question, and if correct, that you be furnished a list of each tax case in the —— area upon which Mr. —— was in any way contacted, along with a list of each tax case which was handled by the lawyer in question (who is not named).

You are advised that the matters to which you refer will receive appropriate attention, but the investigative data requested by you will be furnished only to an authorized congressional committee upon its request.

Very truly yours,
JOHN B. DUNLAP, *Commissioner.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in this letter Mr. Dunlap agreed that he would assemble the information and have it available to the Committee on Finance.

On April 1, 1952, I directed a letter to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance, which I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1952.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I am enclosing a copy of a letter dated March 11, 1952, addressed to Mr. John B. Dunlap, requesting certain information regarding alleged charge against Mr. ——, a former employee of the Treasury Department.

I have been advised by the Commissioner that a reply can only be obtained with your consent, and I would appreciate your communicating with Mr. Dunlap requesting the information.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] if he would request from Mr. Dunlap an answer on this case. I ask what has section 55 which protects the secrecy of tax returns got to do with this type of a case? However, up to now that is the last I have heard of it, and it will be a year tomorrow. I hope the new committee being appointed will get these answers and then tell the American people.

Mr. President, there are other instances and cases which should be followed through.

I have one more case with which the Senator from Colorado is familiar, and he backed me on it when I went before the Committee on Finance. It was with reference to the possession by a certain collector of internal revenue of approximately $40,000 in currency. According to our information this currency was converted a few days before the deadline for the filing of the net-worth financial statements under the Reorganization Act.

I directed a letter to the collector and said that, of course, there was no law on the statute books providing that he may not have such currency in his possession; however, I felt that by virtue of the office which he held he had a responsibility to tell at least to the committee what the situation was, and to convince the members of the committee that he had accumulated the money in a legal manner.

I was unable to get any reply from him. Neither could I get any information so far as the Treasury Department was concerned. I directed a letter not only to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, but also called the case to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury. I felt the Secretary had a responsibility to check the case.

I also asked the Committee on Finance to call the individual involved before the committee. That was done. I think I am correct in saying that the committee was unanimous in rejecting what we considered an inadequate explanation on the part of the individual involved. However, we did ask him to assemble his records, which he said he could do, and that by so doing could convince us that he had a bona fide excuse.

As I say, he promised to report further. Again we have been waiting over a year without hearing any more about it. I think the case should be followed through and I have been trying to get the answer. Of course, the Committee on Finance was busy with writing tax legislation. On the other hand, I think it was just as important to get that information as it was to write a bill to increase the taxes. If the average taxpayer was caught with $40,000 in his lockbox he would explain very quickly or else.

I tried to make it clear last Friday that there were two sides to this question. I recognize the fact that it is possible for a congressional committee to go too far afield and to usurp the rights of American citizens. I believe that has been done. I would be the first to join the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator in restricting, if necessary, the rights of congressional committees and to protect the rights of the American people. I think we must be careful to do it. However, Mr. President, let us stop beating about the bush, and let us get down to the point of exactly what we are criticizing. If we are criticizing the Senator from Delaware, let us by all means go ahead and veto the power. If we are not criticizing him, but if we are indirectly criticizing what has gone on in the past or what may happen in the future with respect to another committee, let us either restrict other committees or wait until we have had trouble with this committee and correct the problem when it arises.

I say again, with all due respect to the Senator from Colorado, and without questioning his sincerity or the sincerity of any other member of the committee, that I could not in justification to myself serve on any committee if I had to agree in advance that I would agree to withhold any report which I as an individual member of the committee considered a violation of the law. I do not think the American people would have confidence in any investigation conducted with that agreement made in advance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator from Delaware has said, in effect, that because there might be some abuse of power elsewhere, the Senate Finance Committee should not abdicate its own authority. The Senator from Delaware is entirely correct. The Senate Committee on Finance has not abdicated its authority, and does not intend to do so. Because there have been irregularities and irresponsibilities and criminal conduct in matters affecting the revenues of the United States, the Senate Finance Committee set up the subcommittee on which the distinguished Senator from Delaware so ably served. We want him to lead the next one, and he was a very distinguished and efficient member of the last one.

I repeat that the distinguished Senator from Delaware never came before the committee and requested a power he did not receive. I repeat, if I may sound a personal note, that I believe I made the motion, every time, to give him the power he requested. I think it should be said, in justice to the Members on the other side of the aisle, that they voted unanimously with all the Republican members of the committee to give the Senator from Delaware that power.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Colorado will find that I have criticized the past operations of the committee. I was satisfied with the way it operated in the past.

However, I am wondering who is dissatisfied and is trying to lay down different rules for the future operation of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Delaware that, because he has been satisfied with the treatment he has received in the past, he should realize that the committee is now the same, with the exception of the new members, who also have indicated their approval of the objectives of the committee as it is now constituted. So I suggest that the Senator from Delaware has nothing to fear from the whole committee.

The Senator from Delaware has said he does not wish to look at tax returns. I do not cite the legal prohibition against publicizing tax returns as a prohibition against the Senator from Delaware. I cite the legal prohibition against the disclosure of tax returns in order to show

that when Congress has been considering the proper privacy of the citizen and how it should be protected, Congress has made it a law making it a criminal offense to disclose the contents of tax returns, except under very careful procedures which are spelled out in the law, and they do not coincide with the procedures the distinguished Senator from Delaware would have rule the operations of the Finance Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator from Colorado to infer that I have violated that law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, no, no, no. I was saying that the Senator from Delaware has said, "I want the power, under my own exclusive judgment, to reveal confidential matters when in my judgment I think a violation of law is involved."

In contradistinction to that, I am pointing out that when Congress was really paying attention to the rights of the citizen, Congress made it a criminal offense for employees and officers of the Government to disclose what is in a tax return—that is not making a criminal out of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], for I took pains to say that that provision does not apply to Members of Congress. I was citing it to show an example of Congressional solicitude for the right of privacy of a citizen.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, certainly there is no disagreement between the Senator from Colorado and myself, on preserving the secrecy of tax returns. Notwithstanding the fact that Members of Congress may, under the law, reveal on the floor of the House or the Senate John Doe's tax returns, nevertheless I made it very clear that even though we may have that right under the law, I believe we have a moral right not to violate the principle ourselves. Certainly I have tried not to disclose anything of a confidential nature in a citizen's tax returns.

I have said before the committee, in connection with this discussion, that I was not debating the question of that particular right.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that has nothing to do with the issue now before the Senate. I have cited an example, not of a Treasury rule, but of a congressional law in connection with which Congress showed solicitude for the right of privacy of the citizen. That was my sole point in citing it. The Senator from Delaware has admitted that the argument is valid, so far as it goes.

Then the Senator from Delaware tells us of his personal virtues, which I concede—in other words, that he himself never has revealed what is in an income-tax return, and that he never will. I am very glad to say that to be true, and I believe it will continue to be true. But it has nothing to do with the point now at issue.

The point now at issue is whether the Congress, when it acts to govern its own actions, should be solicitous in protecting the proper privacies of the citizen. I say Congress should, and I say the rule referred to by the Senator from Delaware is directly involved in that proposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there were other types of violations of law to which I had reference. For instance, there was a case where certain collectors of internal revenue were not paying any income taxes whatever. There have been cases in which bribes were accepted.

At this time I should like to read into the RECORD a statement of a former assistant United States attorney who testified before our committee as to conditions in a western Treasury office. I refer to the statement of Mr. Charles O'Gara. On August 31, 1951, he testified to the following:

I spent 5 years in the service. I finished law school in 1947 and took my present $4,800-a-year job as Assistant United States Attorney in 1949.

In my assignment with the United States attorney in San Francisco, I have done my utmost to fulfill my oath of office in upholding and enforcing all the laws of the United States.

In performing these duties I have seen the outlines of a shocking system of corruption in the handling of San Francisco internal revenues.

The magnitude and significance of this internal revenue corruption turns my stomach.

This corruption is far greater than you know. It is not the commonplace tax fix of the gangsters and the hoodlums. The appalling internal revenue corruption to which I refer apparently involves many persons occupying high places.

This corruption is so gigantic that in San Francisco in the space of a little more than 90 days it has resulted in (1) the firing of a newspaper reporter who attempted to expose this evil when Federal officials failed to act.

(2) It resulted in the extraordinary blocking of a Federal grand jury which initiated an investigation of the tax involvements of the metropolitan newspaper staff with the collector's office.

(3) The arbitrary firing of still another Federal grand jury who attempted to follow through a tax prosecution which has been deliberately sidetracked.

Because I could not stomach what had apparently been long existing, and I wanted a complete investigation, I was taken off the job I had commenced. The slightest efforts that I made to expose these evils have actually resulted in persistent pressure being brought to bear upon me.

Besides being prohibited from appearing officially before any grand jury, an extensive FBI investigation was commenced, not about my loyalty, but about my official conduct which ended with my complete clearance in a unanimous resolution of the grand jury, but not until after my superior had virtually proposed my indictment.

I am certain that a full FBI report on me may be obtained by you.

I have the official records, and those are subject to the approval of the Attorney General's office before they may be released. Those records contain a recital of the 15 instances of alleged corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Now, because the records have been turned over to the United States attorney's office in San Francisco, and because of the direction of the Attorney General, I do not feel free to reveal the contents of the 15 allegations set forth in the list.

That shocking indictment was made by an assistant United States attorney, Mr. Charles O'Gara, a Democrat.

Mr. President, I understand that 12 of the 15 proposed indictments, as recommended by that assistant United States attorney, and to which he referred, have subsequently been made by the grand jury in California.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at this time?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What has that to do with the issue now before us? The Senator has read a recital of certain evils; he has recited many evils. The subcommittee was set up to deal with them, and now it is proposed that the new subcommittee be set up to deal with them. That was the very purpose of the old subcommittee and is the very purpose of the proposed new subcommittee.

What does the Senator from Delaware propose to serve by reciting all these horror cases?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is this: In this situation, the assistant United States attorney was told that under the law he could not reveal the names of the persons involved in those cases; he had been stopped by his superiors and by the Office of the Attorney General, here in Washington.

He told our committee of those 15 cases, as nearly as he could do so. He said we could find out for ourselves about them.

Here we have a situation in which the political party in power could prevent a United States attorney from acting in those cases; but a Member of Congress could not be prevented from discussing them, once he found out about them. In the past, Members of Congress have not been prevented from doing so, and thus we have these indictments to show.

If we confer upon any congressional committee the power to do what the office of the Attorney General or the United States attorney in San Francisco has done, we shall have a very bad situation. Certainly a majority of the Finance Committee should not have had the power to join the Justice Department in covering up this case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest that the kind of situation referred to by the Senator from Delaware could be a very bad one. But I suggest that the situation would be far worse if any Member of the Senate on his own judgment, on his own discretion, in carrying out his own will or view, as against the view of his own subcommittee and the view of the entire committee, could, as I have said, disclose confidential information, which in many instances the Senator from Delaware knows is just as confidential and as inherently private as a man's income-tax returns.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I agree. I have agreed many times with all the dangers which have been pointed out by the Senator from Colorado, even though we have disagreed about the ultimate rules of the committee.

However, each time he makes the argument, I cannot help but think how we have been operating. Three other Senate committees have been voted funds, and the Senator from Colorado voted for funds for each of them, even though those committees did not and do not operate under the rules the Senator from Colorado now proposes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But when we set up a committee, we do not pass on its proposed rules in the future. The committee passes on its own rules; the Senate does not do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true; but the Senate passes on the question of whether a committee will be provided with funds with which to operate. In this instance, I was not even asking for an appropriation.

However, we have already authorized appropriations of funds for these other committees. I may be in error, but I believe those appropriations have been made almost unanimously. Therefore, having provided funds for the operations of the committees, we must approve of the rules under which the committees operate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that is a complete fallacy. The Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Rules and Administration comes here and asks us to appropriate a certain amount of money for a certain purpose. Whoever heard it suggested that either the Appropriations Committee or the Committee on Rules and Administration should sit down to study the rules under which every standing committee of the Senate operates? It never was suggested. It has occurred only to the agile, the very agile and intelligent brain of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To go back for one more specific example, to cite a case, where it was the United States Senate, and not any committee of the Senate, which set up the Kefauver crime committee, and I do not recall that we laid down any different rules for that committee. That action was taken by the United States Senate as a whole, and not by a committee; and the Finance Committee, as well as every other committee of the Senate, accepted responsibility in establishing the rules.

I point out to the Senator from Colorado again, I have great respect for his position, and I hope he respects mine. I am sorry that we differ. But again I see no need of continuing this debate indefinitely. I simply cannot see it the way he sees it, and, as I told him before, I cannot serve on any committee in which I am bound in advance, nor could I be a party to setting up a precedent under which it would be possible to bind in advance any member of the committee, or even the entire subcommittee itself, not to disclose every violation of the law which it discovers, and I say that, with all respect to the Senator from Colorado. I say that particularly in this instance, when it has never before been done by any committee.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I challenge the Senator to show one instance—one instance—where, under the rules of any committee of this Congress, one single man, on his own judgment, was authorized to disclose confidential information.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is not a question of authorizing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is the issue here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is not a question of that sort. The Senator from Colorado knows as well as I do that the end result is that the Finance Committee rejected the standard rules of procedure for committees, and for the first time placed a possible veto over any future disclosures. Personally, I would rather not know about a particular violation of law, if I were to be placed in an embarrassing position. It would be embarrassing to be sitting here in the United States Senate appropriating money to pay the salary of a Government official, perhaps, who we think was not fit, and be bound by any such rule as this, from disclosing what we considered to be the case against this individual.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In just a moment I will yield. I might say as I have said many times, I fully respect the responsibility of every member of the committee, and of every member of the subcommittee, to report first to the full committee. The full committee has a perfect right to differ, but if a member of that committee differs, and if he feels that Mr. X has violated the law and should be exposed, then the full committee at the same time could come on the floor of the Senate to say "we have reviewed the same evidence and we think he is wholly in error." The rights of all would be protected.

I do not question but that the Senator from Colorado is conscientiously trying to protect what he thinks is the authority of the committee. I respect that. At the same time, I hope he respects my position equally.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think I have paid as many compliments to the distinguished Senator today, and on other occasions, as my limited vocabulary will supply. I want to repeat, what the Senator is really proposing—perhaps the implications have not occurred to him—is a rule of man, rules accommodated to individuals rather than rules that govern all. I want to suggest to the Senator, not that he has anything in his mind or anything in his soul that goes to that implication, but this business of accommodating laws and accommodating rules and accommodating practices to an individual, an able and conscientious and patriotic Senator like the Senator from Delaware sets up a precedent which destroys later on. It is the key to a door that has opened every room for tyranny. And I repeat, this is not a rule for the Senator from Delaware, it is not a rule for any man. It is a sound rule which allows the judgment of a majority as to violation of law, to be taken, and, if necessary, to supersede the judgment of one person—first, the judgment of a subcommittee, next, the judgment of at least 5 out of 8 members of a working quorum of the whole committee, or a majority of the whole committee, if there are more than 8 members present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is the rule, and all the members of the subcommittee have the right to vote. The Senator from Delaware is unwilling to subordinate his judgment as to a violation of law, where confidential matters are involved, to any number of other individuals; and that has been demonstrated in this debate; and that, I respectfully suggest, is very, very wrong—not that the Senator intends to do a wrong thing. I, most respectfully, do not believe he has analyzed his implications correctly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will yield to the Senator from Illinois in a moment. I want to make one point clear. When we speak of the confidential nature of the material, that which the committee describes as confidential, is any case, no matter what type it might be, which is eveloped before the subcommittee; I repeat while the Senator from Colorado has every right to be alarmed at how far afield this may go, nevertheless, to put it on the other side, we can not escape the fact that what they are doing is, laying down a rule whereby in the days to come the political party in power can restrict the exposure of any case that might be developed in a subcommittee.

I promised to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not want the Senator to yield. I thought we might be able to take the reorganization plan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me come to the conclusion of this. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What we are doing is to lay down a rule which in the future will restrain some future Member of the Senate, some irresponsible blabber mouth, some headline seeker, from going out to ruin the reputations of private citizens on what he says is his claim that a violation of law is involved. That is the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am going to close with just this thought. Again, I want to pay my respects to the Senator from Colorado for his sincerity in this particular case. I am looking forward to the day when, not necessarily as chairman of the Finance Committee, but as chairman of the Republican Conference, he makes the same aggressive effort to lay dawn these same rules—for all the other committees of the United States Senate. Thus far that has not been done.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a letter addressed by me to the Chairman of the Committee on Finance outlining the scope of the investigation requested.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 18, 1953.

The Honorable EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
Chairman, Committee on Finance,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MILLIKIN: In accordance with your request I am outlining as nearly as possible the scope of the investigations which I think should be explored by a spe-

cial subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee.

In so doing I want it understood that I am not entering charges against any particular district office or individual in the Treasury Department; however, during the past few months certain allegations have been made which if correct should be exposed.

Among these allegations which should be further investigated are:

1. Bribes: Charges that certain employees (or recent employees) had accepted contributions or bribes from taxpayers whose cases they were handling.

2. Compromise settlements: Many instances have been discovered where compromise settlements have been made for small fractions on the basis of the inability of the taxpayer to pay. Such settlements have been made without obtaining from the taxpayer the required financial net-worth statement. Large racketeers are among those who have settled their tax obligations for small fractions without filing this net-worth statement.

3. Overassessments: Charges that certain Government agents have deliberately overstated the taxpayers' deficiencies solely for the purpose of using such overstated figures for bargaining in compromise settlements.

4. Influence: Charges that undue pressure has been exercised to influence decisions on certain tax cases.

5. Collectors: There is one case which has been reported to the full Finance Committee wherein a collector of internal revenue in one of the midwestern offices just a few days prior to the deadline for the filing of his financial statement under the new Reorganization Act converted approximately $40,000 of unexplained cash into Government bonds. While we fully recognized that there is no law against a man's having cash in his possession, nevertheless for a collector of internal revenue to show up with $40,000 of unexplained currency raises a question which should be explored further.

6. Abatements: The allegation has been made that in certain collectors' offices, particularly in the New York area, unusually large amounts of taxes have been abated during recent months without the proper effort being made toward collection. A sample check should be made of at least one area, and if the fears are justified the check should be continued until satisfaction can be established that such practices were not prevalent throughout the Department.

7. Racketeers: The Kefauver crime committee made the specific charge that prominent members of the underworld were being given preferential treatment by the Treasury Department. Last year in conjunction with Commissioner Dunlap a sample check was made of 10 of the Nation's top racketeers, and it was found that in 7 of the 10 cases proper attention had not been given toward auditing or collecting taxes from this group. As a result of that sample check a further study should be made to determine who was responsible for this undue leniency.

8. Improper relay: Allegations have been made that large tax cases have been pigeonholed until the statute of limitations for criminal prosecution has expired, while the civil case unduly delayed until collection possibilities negligible.

9. Audits: At irregular intervals the various district offices are audited by the Accounts and Collection Division (comparable to bank examiners); however, these reports are submitted to the Department here in Washington. In the past there have been many instances where damaging reports have been completely ignored. The subcommittee should request from the Department copies of these routine audit reports for those areas against which complaints are received, with particular attention being given to the Pennsylvania, California, and Illinois areas.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

AMERICAN PRUSSIANISM—STATEMENTS BY BRIG. GEN. ROBERT W. JOHNSON

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, Brig. Gen. Robert W. Johnson, Army of the United States, retired, former Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, and chairman of the board of Johnson & Johnson in my home State of New Jersey, can speak with telling authority on matters of military organization.

I hope the Senate and the people of the United States will listen when he unburdens important views, based upon rich experience.

I hold in my hand his introductory release, and a statement entitled "American Prussianism," which is an expression of concern over an only too real and living question which confronts all of us who are vitally concerned with the direction and attitudes of our Defense Establishment.

General Johnson's voice is one of several which have been raised on this theme in recent weeks. I commend it to the careful consideration of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, two statements by General Johnson, and a letter written by the general to Hon. Nelson Rockefeller, dated March 10, 1953. I hope, as I have indicated, that every Member of the Senate will study these documents carefully.

There being no objection, the statements and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY RELEASE

During the past 25 years I have been intermittently but consistently associated with military matters. My contact with the Pentagon has convinced me that clear and unequivocal civilian domination of our Military Establishment is essential to the security of the United States.

A group of experienced officers who must remain anonymous have visited me in Florida. The long-distance telephone has been burning with calls from Reserve and Regular officer friends of long association in the various military services. It is with deep concern, therefore, I learn that a bold, deliberate, and well-planned movement is under way to expand and entrench the power of the military with attendant loss of civilian authority within our Government. This is a matter of gravest importance, for it involves the preservation of our way of life and our survival as a nation.

A committee has been appointed to submit a program within 60 days. While several members of this committee are my personal friends I doubt that it is properly constituted. The members of the committee are: Chairman, Nelson Rockefeller; Arthur S. Fleming; Milton Eisenhower; Robert Lovett (forme. Secretary of Defense); Dr. Vannevar Bush; Gen. Omar Bradley; David Sarnoff.

This committee is not broadly representative of the services involved and is patently overbalanced with members already committed to the single staff centralized military power. Such a concept loses its wars and is destructive to the foundations of our republic. It is, therefore, necessary for me as an independent free citizen to oppose my friends on this committee and the other members whom I hold in respect.

The combat front for freedom is both at home and overseas. At times the home front fight is more vital and more difficult to understand than the issues in the theater of war. Patriotism and devotion to liberty are ingredients that we citizens must constantly guard. We owe this not only to ourselves and to the traditions of our great country but especially to the men who are suffering the pain of combat.

ROBERT W. JOHNSON,
Brigadier General,
Army of the United States, Retired.
MARCH 23, 1953.

AMERICAN PRUSSIANISM

Competent civilian control of the Military Establishment is essential to the security of the United States. Accepting this as a tradition established by George Washington, and defended throughout our history, we are confronted with certain administrative and executive issues. This grave problem is amplified at the present time by the size and complexity of our military organization. The need for clear and unequivocal civilian domination of our Defense Department is further highlighted through the efforts of certain military groups driving to establish a single-command authority. This refers to the continuing effort of the Army General Staff to gain control of our military forces and all aspects of our national security. Having failed, heretofore, to achieve its goal through legislative action, the Army General Staff now plans to accomplish its end under the guise of a reorganization of the Department of Defense. It intends to use the Rockefeller committee as its principal tool in implementing such a reorganization.

This idea is not of recent origin. The stage has been carefully set for this latest move. Initially, the Army General Staff was established as a "planning" agency. Not content with this status, the Army General Staff progressively gained an ever-tightening grasp of authority by repeated reorganizations of the War Department (Department of the Army). Each change resulted in more and more centralized power until, at the outbreak of World War II, the General Staff had gained complete control over the Army. With that achieved, the Army General Staff began as early as 1943 to seek control of our entire national security.

Civilian secretaries pass in parade while high-ranking military officers serve for a professional lifetime. This fact, combined with a natural but unsound reluctance on the part of civilians to hold and express their convictions in military matters, tends to minimize the influence of civilian leadership.

Many, if not most, Secretaries soon become captives of the military command. To assure our freedom we must choose men of great competence and experience in management specifically charged by the President and the Congress to establish and maintain civilian control.

CENTRALIZATION VERSUS DECENTRALIZATION

When Congress refused to accept the overall high-commanded concept of the Collins plan in 1946, the General Staff ostensibly accepted the so-called unification bill as a compromise. Not for a single moment, however, has the Army General Staff relinquished its objective. By direct and indirect means it has pushed unification of the Armed Forces far beyond the constructive unification envisaged by Congress when it passed the National Security Act of 1947.

Resonable centralization of control is, in the military as in business, a necessary and useful organizational device. Carried to an extreme, centralization leads to wrong policy

decisions, bad management, and eventual failure. Intelligent decentralization, accompanied by firm fixing of responsibility, by an overall policy and direction of authority, is the formula for proper organization of any major industrial or military endeavor.

But such a system does not lend itself to General Staff control. Consequently, we now find the National Security Act, which embodied the concept of intelligent decentralization, condemned and ridiculed. Significantly, such criticism has invariably originated with the Army General Staff or its spokesmen. The reason for this is obvious. In writing that law Congress deliberately, and with great wisdom, enacted strong obstacles to the imposition of the alien and dangerous Prussian concepts. Changing the law through so-called reorganization is the means by which the General Staff intends to remove those barriers.

The unification law was sound when it was passed. It is sound today. The faulty defense organization and administrtive deficiencies in the Pentagon are not the fault of the law.

I am deeply concerned by present efforts to establish a Prussian-type high command. My apprehensions stem from the historical fact that a totalitarian military system leads to certain military defeat. It is not only dangerous militarily, but it would inevitably destroy our constitutional civilian authority.

As a businessman I resent the General Staff drive toward Prussianism because in the recent war the performance of the Army General Staff demonstrated a stubborn determination to extend General Staff control over both labor and industry. Nothing since World War II indicates that this group has renounced that objective. American industry and labor must not permit themselves to be led down the same primrose path over which German industry and labor followed the Supreme German General Staff.

The sinews of American industrial power can be shackled as effectively by Prussianism as by Marxism. The danger is real and expanding. As we devote an ever greater percentage of our resources to the military establishment, we constantly increase the risk of a military economy dominated by a single-staff control. This risk must be avoided at all costs.

BATTLE OF VIGILANCE

Extreme vigilance is necessary. The advocates of a Prussian supreme staff will never label it as such. It can take many forms such as:

(a) Giving a so-called chairman of the joint chiefs power to resolve issues on which the military chiefs do not hold a view. This actually would make the chairman a single chief of staff after the model of Von Moltke.

(b) Isolating civilian control by establishing a new planning or advisory group or council called super chiefs or some other deceptive name; or by giving the Secretary of Defense a military staff, which Congress deliberately prohibited in order to prevent a supreme staff from developing under unification.

(c) Separating the Joint Chiefs of Staff members from their role as chiefs of military services. This would separate authority from responsibility which is now so firmly fixed under the present system. Any businessman knows the danger of giving authority without responsibility. It is the road to failure.

The present Rockefeller Committee is no source of reassurance to those who oppose Prussian concepts. Three members of the committee—Dr. Vannevar Bush, former Secretary of Defense Robert Lovett, and General Omar Bradley—have publicly endorsed essential features of a supreme general staff. The haste with which the committee is proceeding indicates that the General Staff is playing its cards boldly for it considers the hearings but a formality; and a report based on the Bush-Lovett-Bradley views is a certainty.

The General Staff power play must not be successful. The common interests of industry and labor—even the survival of our Nation itself—demand the resolute rejection of totalitarian militarism in the United States.

The Congress, with its mountain of duties, has a great responsibility in this area. Only constant vigilance and continuous specialized attention will restrain our military leadership from the actual control of our economy and society.

The threat is real. The danger is great.

MARCH 23, 1953.

MARCH 10, 1953.

The Honorable NELSON ROCKEFELLER,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

DEAR NELSON: News reached me way down at Caneel Bay of your selection as chairman of the latest Pentagon commission.

As one who has worked intermittently with the military over the past 25 years, I would urge that the question of unification be carefully reviewed and considered. Those who have spent a lifetime in modern management accept the fact that there is merit in centralization and equal or perhaps greater merit in decentralization. There is no fixed, inflexible rule for this.

One of the great difficulties with our military is its rigidity which has grown up over the past 100 years. Between service regulations, which are in fact law to the services, and civil-service regulations, which are law to the Civil Service, we have lashed ourselves down to incompetence.

May I warn you and your Commission to work toward simplicity in structure, giving the utmost consideration to elasticity. By all means, avoid the Prussian concept. The record here is clear. Such centralized military management does well at the start but loses its wars.

Please be careful.

The Army General Staff has for years conducted a crusade for centralized power. On your Commission you have Mr. Lovett, General Bradley, and Dr. Bush. These men come to you committed to the German system which captured civilian authority, lost two wars and ruined Germany. There may be others on your Commission of the same persuasion.

Modern management has created our world leadership through the greatest possible decentralization. We must avoid at all cost the tragedy of a dominant military influence. During the last war, and since, I have had personal experience in and out of the Pentagon with this dangerous type of militarism.

Many Secretaries, otherwise able and sincere, have become captives of their military associates.

This letter is not confidential. You can do anything you wish with it as it represents my convictions.

Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. JOHNSON.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) providing the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the resolution before the Senate, House Joint Resolution 223, has for its purpose the approval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, and, in effect, waives the normal 60-day waiting period prescribed by the Reorganization Act of 1949 by having the plan become effective within 10 days after its approval by the President. The plan has already been before the Congress for 18 days, and, if approved by the President immediately after adoption, the 10 days which would be required to lapse before the plan could become effective would cut the normal 60-day period to approximately half of that time.

Adoption of the resolution would permit the plan to become effective early in April. Otherwise, presuming the House of Representatives takes its usual 10-day Easter recess, during which period time would not run, the plan would not become effective until May 22.

The basis for this proposal is the fact that there has been little or no evidence of opposition to the reorganization plan itself. The committee unanimously agreed with the President that it should greatly improve the administration and emphasize the importance of vital health, education, and social-security functions now being carried on in the Federal Security Agency by giving them departmental status. The majority of the committee voted in favor of the proposal to have the plan become effective without the 60-day waiting period, or as early as practicable, and recommends that the Senate adopt House Joint Resolution 223.

Joint hearings were held by the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations on March 16, at which time full information was furnished relative to the various features of the plan by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and by the Federal Security Administrator. In addition, representatives of the American Medical Association and of the American Pharmaceutical Association appeared in support of the plan as submitted. The plan was also endorsed by former President Hoover, the American Public Welfare Association, the American Osteopathic Association, and the American Parents Committee.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations held further hearings on March 23, in order to permit those who had expressed opposition to the plan, or the proposed procedure for early implementation, an opportunity to present their views. Witnesses who appeared at the Senate hearings directed their testimony more at administrative policies of the Federal Security Agency which originated under the past two administrations, which the plan will help to correct, rather than in opposition to the reorganization plan. Most of those who testified agreed that these matters had no relation to the elevation of the Federal Security Agency to departmental status, although there was still some apprehension on the part of two or three witnesses who felt that this action might in some way tend to enhance programs which have heretofore failed to meet the approval of Congress, such as compulsory-health insurance and broader national welfare programs. It is the firm conviction of this committee that there are adequate safeguards in the plan to insure that the intent of the Congress, that medical and educational functions and those of the Children's Bureau and other programs will be carried on in line with legislative authorizations, and that statutes now governing the operations

of all components of the Federal Security Agency will be continued on the same basis under the new Department.

In considering reorganization plans or legislative proposals that have been submitted to the Congress in the past, proposing the elevation of the Federal Security Agency to departmental status, hearings developed considerable opposition, based on the premise that such action migh subjugate health and education functions under the administration of the larger social security or welfare functions of any new department. Plan No. 1 of 1953 insures that these functions will retain their present independence and that they will continue to be administered under existing statutory authority. The plan authorizes the Secretary to establish central administrative services, but also provides that no professional or substantive functions vested by law in any officer shall be removed from the jurisdiction of such officer.

To further emphasize this point, it might be well to quote direct from the section of the committee report which deals with the safeguarding provisions of the plan as applied to medical and educational functions, for the information of the Senate. I quote from page 11 of the report:

In order that proper emphasis might be placed on the importance of health functions to be administered by the new Secretary under the provisions of the plan, a section has been included to create a special assistant to the Secretary, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience. The President, in his message, stated that the purpose of this section was to insure that emphasis will be placed on the development of health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in the health and medical fields. It is the understanding of the committee that this section is intended to provide for the appointment of a special assistant to the Secretary who is a doctor of medicine and who is thoroughly familiar with the problems of medical practitioners as a result of firsthand experience. The committee is of the view that the functions which the special assistant to the Secretary will perform are advisory, and in no event would be broader than functions of the Department and the Secretary; that the advice and assistance which the special assistant may furnish the Secretary will be limited to the scope of the functions vested in the Department; that authority is not provided for the undertaking of comprehensive studies of all aspects of medical care for the American people or to make recommendations to the Secretary accordingly; and that a comprehensive study of the subject of medical care would undoubtedly require further legislation in any event.

The plan would also continue the present position of Commissioner of Education, with direct access to the Secretary. The President, in his message to the Congress, further advocated that the Department should create an advisory committee on education, made up of persons chosen by the Secretary from outside the Federal Government, which would have the function of advising the Secretary with respect to educational programs of the Department; that the creation of such an advisory body to the Secretary would help to insure the maintenance of responsibility for the public educational system in State and local governments, while preserving the national interest in education through appropriate Federal action.

The plan, in brief, creates a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with the head of such agency attaining the same rank as other department heads. It also creates an Under Secretary, two Assistant Secretaries, and an Assistant to the Secretary—with a rank of Assistant Secretary—in charge of health and medical affairs. It continues the Commissioner of Social Security, but removes him from civil-service status and makes the position subject to Presidential appointment. The plan retains the present functional status of the Commissioner of Education, the Surgeon General, the Children's Bureau, and other components of the Federal Security Agency. All functions of the Federal Security Administrator are transferred to the Secretary, and all agencies of the Federal Security Agency with their personnel, records, and appropriations are transferred to the new department.

The major feature of the plan is to improve the administrative and efficiency of Federal activities in the important fields of health, education, and social security by elevating the present Federal Security Agency to a departmental status, and by giving the Secretary added authority toward the establishment of central administrative services which are now duplicated in many respects by various agencies operating under the present structure of the FSA.

The plan creates only one new position—Special Assistant to the Secretary in charge of health activities. It changes the status of the Commissioner of Social Security from classified civil service to a Presidential appointment, and brings about increases in salaries of the Administrator, Assistant Administrator, and the present two assistant heads of the Federal Security Agency, who would be elevated to Assistant Secretaries. It retains the present salary status of the Commissioners of Education and Social Security and of the Surgeon General, as well as other officials such as the General Counsel, Chief of the Children's Bureau, and the Commissioner of Food and Drug Administration.

The President in his message to the Congress pointed out that he considered the functions in the field of health, education, and social security were of such vital importance that they should be properly recognized at a departmental level. After considering the plan and hearing witnesses who have testified regarding its provisions and import, I heartily recommend that the Congress permit the plan to become effective. Furthermore, since there seems to be general agreement that there is no serious opposition to the plan and that it will provide a means for better implementation of administrative policy, as evidenced by the fact that the Federal Security Administrator now attends Cabinet meetings of the President, the committee further recommends the adoption of House Joint Resolution 223 as an additional step toward expediting the recommendations of the President so that the program may be implemented at the earliest date possible.

Several Senators have asked questions regarding the status of the Children's Bureau in the proposed new department. Also, the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and other Senators have made inquiries concerning the administrator's consultants on social security.

I have received from Mrs. Hobby, the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, through the clerk of the committee, a letter concerning these matters, together with a list of the present consultants on social security in the Federal Security Agency, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter and list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, March 24, 1953.

Mr. WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Government Operations, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: In response to your two oral requests of yesterday to Mr. Miles, I hope the following facts will provide the answers which you need:

1. In respect to the concern expressed by various persons and groups about the fact that the Children's Bureau was not mentioned in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, the reason is that none of the constituent agencies of the Federal Security Agency was specifically mentioned in the plan. Such other important agencies as the Public Health Service, Office of Education, Food and Drug Administration, and Office of Vocational Rehabilitation were not mentioned by name in the plan. All of the component parts of the Federal Security Agency, including the Children's Bureau, will be transferred to the new department under the terms of section 5 of the reorganization plan. Nothing in the plan would in any way alter the status of the Children's Bureau. The plan would not change the relationship of the Children's Bureau to the proposed new department as compared to its present relationship to the Federal Security Agency.

2. We have recently begun to consult informally with various persons familiar with the field of old-age and survivors insurance for the purpose of developing recommendations to the President in respect to the extension of old-age and survivors insurance system so as to include groups of persons not now covered by the system. Some preliminary discussions have been held with persons in the insurance field. We are now in the process of adding individuals from organized labor and agriculture as consultants on this matter.

If I can be of further help, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Administrator.

CONSULTANTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY, FSA

Allen D. Marshall, General Electric Corp.

Reinhard Hohaus, vice president, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

M. Albert Linton, Providence Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Leonard Calhoun, former social security assistant and General Counsel, FSA (staff of Ways and Means Committee).

Spencer Evalyn Burns, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University.

Robert T. Burrows, New Hampshire pension consultant.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, it is my intention to support Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953—not that I am in full accord with it but because, as the board

of trustees stated in their report to the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, it is a step in the right direction.

The house of delegates did reject a motion to give "unqualified support to the plan." Dr. Bauer, president of the American Medical Association, pointed out that the AMA's support of plan No. 1 is a calculated risk, but he said,

"Gentlemen, this is going to be adopted regardless of what we do."

Generally speaking, in my thinking on plan No. 1, I find myself in complete accord with the position of the AMA, namely, to accept the plan with my fingers crossed. I shall attempt to analyze what may ultimately be the end result of this directive from the President. Specifically, my vote will be cast in favor of this plan for the following reasons:

For more than 30 years various suggestions and recommendations have been made to the Congress by Presidents of both political parties urging the grouping or integration of major Federal activities which are designed to promote social and economic security, provide better health guidance and health facilities, and improve our school system and educational standards throughout the Nation. These recommendations, down through the years, since the time of President Harding, have varied greatly in detail, but by and large are designed to accomplish the same purposes.

Of all the suggestions to the Congress down through the years, including the Hoover Committee report, on which the Hoover Committee itself could not agree, as well as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 and Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950, I find the plan now under consideration by this body, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, to my way of thinking, quite superior to all.

My second reason for supporting this plan is that the proposed department certainly should rank Cabinet status. There is no activity, no facet of our lives, individually or collectively, as important as the health of the Nation, the education of our people, and our security or welfare.

These most important aspects in the lives of every individual citizen of this country have long begged proper recognition by Government. I am pleased to see that their place of relative importance with other governmental functions and activities, some of which I deem not so important, is about to be achieved. The plan will improve the function and effectiveness of the organization and will, I believe, attract more highly qualified persons, with resultant better administration.

The plan should produce some economy in administration since it establishes central administrative services in the fields of procurement, budgeting, legal, library, personnel, accounting, and all functional activities in the Department. The plan provides for a new under secretary to assume this important responsibility. He should be, and I am sure will be, experienced and highly qualified to carry on these functions.

The facet of this plan which appeals most to me is the effort to bring the public-health services of our Nation into proper proportion, perspective, and relationship within the Department.

The physicians and dentists, as well as the educators, of this country have long resented the present plan, which places health and education in a secondary or subservient position to social security. The appointment of a Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health, including all aspects of medicine, dentistry, and hospitalization, meets a necessary requirement in connection with the proper evaluation and administration of the various health services. Likewise, the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Education will be helpful to the Department, and is a step in the right direction.

Giving to each division of the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare autonomy and freedom from overlapping of authority and direction as between departments will add immeasurably to the efficiency of the Department.

I especially invite the attention of Senators to section 5 of plan No. 1, which transfers intact the Public Health Service and the Office of Education into the new Department. For a great many years the health of the people of the Nation has steadily improved. When this Nation was founded our life expectancy was 35 years. Today it is practically double, or 70 years.

Never a year and hardly a month or a day goes by that there is not announced an advanced treatment of disease or a discovery in the field of medicine.

The Public Health Service, by virtue of organizing the States and the States' political subdivisions into agencies dedicated to the improvement of the health of the people, has been a tremendous factor in lowering the death rate, especially in the fields of communicable diseases, infant mortality, and sanitation.

Section 5, if I read it correctly, guarantees that there shall be no interference with this Department. There must be no injection of partisan politics in its selection of professional personnel.

Mr. President, I have very briefly enumerated the reasons why I favor the plan before us. There is one further aspect of this plan which I think will be helpful. At the present time, the problem of making adequate medical services available to all the American people is a serious one, and I am very hopeful that the Division of Health in this new Department will accept as one of its responsibilities a careful study of the recent report by the President's commission on the health needs of the Nation, and that they may bring strong influence to bear on those now in authority in our Government to take cognizance of the need for Federal aid to medical education.

At the present time it is most difficult to meet both the civilian and military requirements for medical personnel. Existing professional schools are filled to capacity, and in some cases are taking more students than they can adequately handle and properly educate, from the standpoint of teaching personnel and physical facilities. In recent years, as many as 20,000 young men desiring to study medicine and dentistry have been unable to do so because no school could admit them.

This is an area to which, to my way of thinking, the new member of the Cabinet and her Department created under this reorganization plan should give their first attention and intensive study. They should then constantly and consistently urge the interest and attention of the President and the Congress with respect to this problem.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming for a very enlightening and able speech.

The Senator will recall that about 2 weeks ago he and I met with the present Administrator, who we hope will be the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to discuss a problem in which the Senator and I are both interested. I know that the Senator's position has been the same as mine with respect to the field of education. I have always felt that we should have an independent commission on a Federal level. In other words, we should carry our school board system for education to the Federal level.

The proposed commission would not be a regulatory commission, but an advisory commission. It would carry up to the national level the principle, of which we as Americans have been proud, in the field of education on the local level.

In past sessions of Congress I have introduced bills which would have provided for an independent commission on education, a commission composed of 11 members, whose term of office would be spread over a period of 11 years. It would be nonpartisan, as I believe such an office should be.

I wish again to commend the Senator from Wyoming for his interest, particularly in this phase of the proposed legislation. I think that our visit with the President and the Secretary-to-be resulted in the formation of the Commission on Education enunciated by the President in his message to Congress.

I wish to recommend to the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that she use great care in selecting assistants to administer this program who will truly reflect our educational philosophy. Certainly this must be one area where the tinge of politics is excluded.

The National Council of School Administrators has been greatly concerned, and I believe that the members of the council are a litle fearful that by creating a Department there will be a tendency on the part of the Secretary to have the Federal Government further encroach upon the States and other local units of Government in the field of education.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would like to suggest to our new Secretary that she use careful judgment in selecting people for what I believe to be a very important committee. These people will advise her on educational problems, and will influence to a considerable degree the work of the new Department which she will head.

I am very pleased to say that I am looking forward with a great deal of confidence to the work of the new Secretary. I believe she is a very able and intelligent woman. I am sure she will perform the duties of her new position with credit to all the people of our country.

The Senator from Wyoming has been very kind to yield me the time in which to make my comments.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution, and I should like to say to him, with reference to giving the advisory board, or what one might call the Federal Board of Education, certain responsibility and authority, that it will go a very long way toward preventing Reorganization Plan No. 1 from setting up a bureaucracy of all bureaucracies.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me further?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. During his tenure in Government service the Senator from Wyoming has become acquainted with the fact that many advisory boards which have been created have never been used. I sincerely hope that this will be an advisory board which will be used to advise the Secretary on problems relating to educational subjects, and I am sure it will do a great deal to prevent what none of us wish to see happen, namely, an encroachment of the Federal Government upon the educational institutions of the States and local units of Government.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator from Michigan. In connection with this issue there is much to be said both pro and con.

In discussing the aspects of the legislation with which I am not in accord, let me say that I do not understand the great need for haste in pushing this plan through Congress. Neither, Mr. President, does this type or method of legislation appeal to me. In fact, it is not legislating in any sense of the word. It is simply giving our approval or denial to a Presidential directive.

The Reorganization Act of 1946, which we generously reenacted the other day by a voice vote, strips the Congress of its powers, rights, and prerogatives which the Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, thought rightfully belonged to Congress.

During the past few years we have heard much with reference to the Congress surrendering its prerogatives to the executive branch of Government. The acceptance by the Congress of the reorganization plan is the outstanding example of this surrender of power and authority on our part.

Such plans must be disapproved within 60 days or they automatically become the law of the land. No opportunity is given the Congress to amend a reorganization plan. It can only remain in the committee 10 days, which certainly is not ample time to study an exhaustive piece of legislation. Action by the Congress on this type of legislation is not subject to reconsideration.

To my way of thinking, in handling such important legislation in this manner, the Congress becomes merely a rubber stamp.

Mr. President, I opposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 in 1949. I opposed it strenuously for the reason that I thought, and apparently so did some 59 other Members of the Senate, that that plan was the first step toward socialized medicine.

The two succeeding plans, No. 27 in 1950 and this No. 1 in 1953, to my way of thinking, can have tremendous influence in bringing about socialized medicine in the United States, depending solely upon the type of administration and influence of the newly designated special assistant to the Secretary on health matters.

Under the administration of the lady designated to the Cabinet position, I have no fear of socialized medicine, but let me say to the Senate that Mrs. Hobby will not always be the Cabinet member serving as Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Times and events quickly change the thinking and position of the people of this Nation. Should we again enter a period of intense depression, as in the early thirties, or perhaps even find ourselves involved in a third world war, in either event there might come such a strong demand on the part of the American people for socialized medicine that should the administration give in to the demands, and should there be in these positions in the new Department those looking for greater opportunity for influence, which socialized medicine would give them, this Nation might easily find its great health services socialized.

Basically I think this reorganization plan is extremely weak in not providing for Federal boards comparable to the efficient, effective local boards. I refer to State boards of health, State boards of education, and State boards of public welfare.

This new Department needs, and needs badly (such advisory boards, meeting on certain designated dates, advising the various branches of the Department and bringing to them the thinking of the people from the grassroots of all parts of the United States with reference to these most important functions that affect the very lives of every individual in our land.

A Federal board of health would be far more effective, far more helpful, less prejudiced, and be able to give to the Secretary the advice and counsel which she, or he, as the case may be, not being a medical professional person, will sorely need. Such a board would be far more effective and unbiased than could an individual appointee who may be designated because of political activities or political influence.

Mr. President, if there is any one place in the Government of the United States where politics should play absolutely no part, it is in the administration of national health, education, and security.

This plan does provide for a Federal Board of Education and there is no sound reason why it should not provide for a Federal Board of Health and a Federal Board of Public Welfare.

I cannot understand why such an important feature would be left out of this plan.

Advisory boards that have been practically 100 percent successful in, I think, 100 percent of the States of the Union would certainly add much to the proper functioning of the Federal agency.

Surely those who have advised the President in the preparation of this plan should have given consideration to the proposition of what is right, not who is right.

I have certain doubts and fears, Mr. President, that there will be an immediate clash, under this plan, between the Special Assistant Adviser to the President on medical matters, and the Surgeon General.

I made previous reference to the Office of the Surgeon General, but let me reiterate that the professions and the rank and file of our people have great confidence in the Surgeon General's Office, and they will look with apprehension upon any political appointee who may be placed in a superior position in this agency.

I am referring, not to the present Surgeon General, but to the Office of Surgeon General.

Knowing as I have for over 20 years the splendid advice and leadership given to the State departments of health by the Office of Surgeon General, I hope this plan will not disrupt the effective, efficient functioning of that agency.

So Mr. President, even though I have some worries and grave apprehension about the acceptance by the Congress of this reorganization plan, I do feel that this plan, under proper administration, affords an opportunity to improve the vital health, education, and welfare functions now being administered by the Federal Security Agency.

This giving of additional departmental rank, this focusing of the attention of the whole Nation on the fact that these functions now are represented in the Cabinet, will all be helpful; and therefore, I am supporting the plan.

Mr. President, for years—I know not how long—other nations have had ministers of health and ministers of education; and, to my way of thinking, agencies of that kind are far more important than some of the Government agencies which at this time are represented in the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and have been represented there for a long period of years.

I realize, Mr. President, that public health services, like all other health resources, reflect the changing character of health needs. New problems require new techniques and methods of organization. It is unrealistic to tackle today's health problems with the type of services that do not improve or do not keep step with our changing times. I think this plan is a forward step.

I am hopeful this reorganization plan will keep in the forefront the objectives of this most important new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was delighted to hear my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, state his views on the pending plan. Some of us will vote for reorganization plans because of the money which may be saved in the operation of the agencies under the plans.

Can the Senator from Wyoming tell us whether any money can be saved the

taxpayers of the United States in connection with the management of this agency under the plan we are now considering?

Mr. HUNT. I think I can correctly say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that on that question we should take the information given us by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge. As I recall, he said that although there will be approximately $32,000 additional, he believes that by means of the appointment of the proposed Assistant Secretary or Under Secretary who will be in charge of the various functions having to do with administration, more money than the amounts of the additional salaries will be saved. His testimony was that the plan would not cost any more.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will money be saved under the plan?

Mr. HUNT. By more efficient administration.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator from Wyoming mean money will be saved by means of employing a smaller number of persons?

Mr. HUNT. No. I think money will be saved, let me say, by having a better general manager or a better office manager, if that term better expresses the point. That is the answer Mr. Dodge gave in the committee to the question the Senator from Louisiana has asked.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to call attention to the fact that under the plan now proposed, as I understand it—and let me say that I favor the plan, and I shall vote for it, just as I voted in favor of the plans submitted in 1949 and 1950—the Administrator under the present law, who now receives a salary of $17,500, will be given the title of Secretary, and will receive a salary of $22,500.

The Assistant Administrator under the present law receives a salary of $15,000. Under the pending plan that title will be changed to Under Secretary, and the salary will be increased from $15,000 to $17,500.

Under the present arrangement the Assistant Administrator for the Program receives a salary of $10,000. Under the plan now proposed, when it goes into effect, the title of that official will be changed to Assistant Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, and he will receive a salary of $15,000.

The position of Assistant Secretary for Defense Activities is now vacant, but carries a salary of $10,000. Under the plan now proposed, that position will be known as Assistant Secretary, and the salary will be $15,000.

The present position of Social Security Commissioner will be continued at a salary of $14,800.

Also, under the plan now before us, an additional job will be created, and will be known as Special Assistant Secretary for Medicine. The salary paid will be $15,000.

As the Senator from Wyoming has just pointed out, the additional cost to the taxpayers, as the result of the positions I have just mentioned, is shown by comparing the $67,300 now paid to the $99,800 which will be paid under the plan we are now considering, or an additional amount of $32,500, which will be paid in the way of salary increases to the job holders I have mentioned.

The Senator from Wyoming is familiar with that matter, is he not?

Mr. HUNT. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, let me add that the plan now before us is identical to the plans submitted to Congress in 1949 and in 1950, except for the fact that the pending plan would result in the creation of a new job, to be designated "Special Assistant Secretary for Medicine." That is in line with the actions of the Republican leadership in creating more jobs, as I have pointed out on the floor of the Senate on several occasions in the past.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, when President Truman sent us two reorganization plans designed to increase the efficiency and elevate the status of the Federal Security Agency, I voted for those plans. I thought them well conceived, sound, and in the public interest. The Congress disagreed.

Now President Eisenhower has sent us a reorganization plan very similar to the Truman plans. I intend to vote in favor of President Eisenhower's Reorganization Plan No. 1. I believe it is our function to legislate in terms of principles and to realize that when we act on reorganization plans we are creating institutions that will endure for decades, perhaps for centuries. It should not matter at all to us what particular individuals may occupy the seats of power at a particular moment. It is of the principles, not the individuals involved, that we should be thinking. Because I once voted in favor of certain principles regarding the reorganization of this agency, today I shall vote again in favor of the same principles.

I must point out, however, that in one respect the new reorganization plan differs from those we considered in past years. That is with respect to its creation of a new position within the proposed Department, the occupant of which is to be called Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs). Although I cannot see that it is particularly necessary, nevertheless I have no objection to the creation of such a position if the President and Mrs. Hobby believe it desirable; and I certainly do not mean to object to it. However, a reading of the hearings held by the joint committee raised in my mind two questions in connection with that particular position, and I believe they should be clarified before we vote on this measure.

The first question I had in mind was whether it was the intent of the administration that the occupant of this position serve in a purely advisory capacity, and not have any administrative authority whatsoever over constituent units of the Department. Mrs. Hobby had made it quite clear that that was what she had in mind. Nonetheless, the language of section 6 of the proposed plan is such as perhaps to raise doubts in the future. Therefore, I addressed to Mrs. Hobby a letter raising this question, and she was kind enough to answer immediately. I find her answer to that question completely acceptable. I now ask that my letter to Mrs. Hobby and her reply be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this time I should like to read, for the benefit of the Senate, and so that our legislative record on this measure will be completely clear, one paragraph of Mrs. Hobby's answer:

> In response to your first question, I think it should be made a clear matter of record that it is the intent of the reorganization plan and the Special Assistant to the Secretary, for Health and Medical Affairs, shall be an adviser to the Secretary and shall have no administrative functions. It is not the intent that section 6 of the plan shall be used to modify or supersede the clear purpose inherent in section 3 of the plan that the Special Assistant to the Secretary shall be an adviser and shall not have any administrative responsibilities.

In my letter to Mrs. Hobby, Mr. President, I also raised a second question which I thought had not been made clear in either the House or Senate reports on this plan. That second question has to do with the stipulated qualifications of the person who might be designated as Special Assistant. Section 3 of the reorganization plan says that the person appointed to this position shall be appointed "from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience." To me, that language seems to be perfectly clear. To me, it means that the President may, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint to this position a doctor of medicine who is a recognized leader in his field and who has wide nongovernmental experience. This, I believe, is made clear in both reports. However, I believe the language in section 3 also means that should the President so desire he could, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint to that position a layman, if the layman were a recognized leader in such fields as medical economics, hospital administration, medical administration, or similar fields. It seems to me that I perhaps did not ask my question with relation to this point clearly in my first letter to Mrs. Hobby, since her reply does not clearly indicate that she, too, understands the language of section 3 in the same sense as do I. Therefore, I have addressed another letter to Mrs. Hobby, and a similar letter to Mr. Dodge, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In both letters I have asked this very specific question:

> Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?

To me, it seemed as though the only answer to the question could be "Yes." I am happy to say that I have received an answer from Mr. Dodge, and that he agrees. Again, in order that the legislative history of this measure shall be absolutely clear, I shall now read Mr. Dodge's letter of March 30. It reads as follows:

> MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of March 27, in which you ask me to provide you, as soon as possible, an answer to the following question:
>
> "Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the

President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?"

It is my understanding that in submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, and with particular reference to section 3 of that plan, the President anticipated that he would appoint a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Nevertheless, in my opinion, section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 is so worded that a President could appoint a person who is not a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs) although it is not the intention of this administration to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JOS. M. DODGE.

Mr. President, with these specific clarifications of the language of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 understood by the Senate as being a part of its meaning, I intend to vote for the plan and I hope it will promptly pass.

I have previously submitted for the RECORD the correspondence first referred to in my statement. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my subsequent correspondence on the same subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

EXHIBIT A

MARCH 25, 1953.

The Honorable OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. HOBBY: Two questions have arisen in my mind in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 which I believe should be clarified before the Senate acts on that plan and which clarification should, I believe, be made part of the legislative record on this measure. Before posing those questions I should like to assure you that I am in favor of the proposed reorganization and intend to support its passage. I believe that you will share my interest in clarifying the two questions set forth below; both have to do with the proposed "Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs)."

My first question is in connection with section 6 of the reorganization plan, which states, "The Secretary may from time to time make such provisions as the Secretary deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of the functions of the Secretary by any other officer or by any agency or employee of the Department." (I understand from reading page 69 of the report on the joint hearings on the reorganization plan that you have stated that the Special Assistant to the Secretary would not have the authority of override the Surgeon General—that he would have "no line authority whatsoever.") In the light of your statement I believe that, despite the language of section 6, which I have quoted above, it should be understood that in approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 the Congress shall understand that under no circumstances will the Special Assistant to the Secretary exercise any of the administrative functions vested in the Secretary by law. In other words, despite the language of section 6, it shall be the understanding of the Congress that the Special Assistant to the Secretary is to serve solely in an advisory capacity to the Secretary or as the personal representative of the Secretary in connection with public appearances and similar matters.

In this same connection I am also concerned about some of the language which appears on the so-called job-description sheet found on pages 106 and 107 of the hearings and which I understand was circulated among members of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association prior to that association's formal approval of the reorganization plan. The language in question reads as follows:

"As directed by the Secretary the Special Assistant to the Secretary will see that related health and medical problems arising in any of the various constituents having health or medical-care programs are properly coordinated. * * * In short, the Special Assistant to the Secretary * * * will, as needed, coordinate related health and medical programs within the Department."

The phrase "will see that programs are properly coordinated" to me implies the exercise of administrative functions. If we are to clearly understand that the occupant of this position shall recommend to the Secretary whatever steps may, in his opinion, be needed to bring about proper coordination of the activities mentioned, I should certainly have no objections. If, however, we are to understand that this Special Assistant will be given the authority to direct the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, the head of the Children's Bureau, or the Food and Drug Administration to take whatever actions he believes are desirable, even though the heads of those divisions may disagree, then I believe that this intention should be set forth to the Congress very clearly and that we should stop referring to the occupant of the proposed position as one who will serve merely in an advisory capacity.

My second question refers to the phrase in section 3 which says that the "special assistant shall be selected from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field." In this connection I have read with interest the statement made by Mr. Fischelis, testifying on behalf of the American Pharmaceutical Association, which appears on page 111 of the report on the joint hearings. Mr. Fischelis stated, "We presume that the qualifications demanded of this special assistant will be such as to require him to be a doctor of medicine or an administrator in the field of health and medical affairs who has had very close contact with and experience in health and medical programs."

Mr. Fischelis' interpretation of the qualifications coincides with my own. I assume it is also yours, but I believe, particularly in view of the fact that the House report refers to the occupant of this position as a "physician" that this matter, too, should be clarified by you for the record. I would assume, of course, that the President in recommending a candidate for this position should be free to name a physician if he and/or the Secretary of the Department feels that a particular physician would be the best qualified adviser to meet the Secretary's need at any particular time. It is conceivable, however, that actual experience with the problems confronting the Department at certain times would indicate that the Secretary could be better served by a man trained and experienced in problems of medical administration or medical economics. Should this prove true at any time in the future—and, of course, we assume that this is permanent legislation we are discussing—we most certainly would not want to preclude the President's naming such a lay adviser by leaving in the legislative history in connection with the passage of this reorganization plan the intimation that the special assistant must be a physician.

Inasmuch as the Senate may be asked to act upon this reorganization plan at any moment, I would appreciate your comments on these questions just as soon as possible. I am sure that you have, of course, given the substance of my questions serious consideration before the plan was sent up.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

THE FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Your letter of March 25, raising two questions concerning the reorganization plan, has just reached me.

In response to your first question, I think it should be made a clear matter of record that it is the intent of the reorganization plan that the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs shall be an adviser to the Secretary and shall have no administrative functions. It is not the intent that section 6 of the plan shall be used to modify or supersede the clear purpose inherent in section 3 of the plan that the Special Assistant to the Secretary shall be an adviser and shall not have any administrative responsibilities.

The word "coordinate" which is used in the job-description sheet found on pages 106 and 107 of the hearings was not intended to mean that the Special Assistant to the Secretary would have any administrative authority. It is intended to mean that the Special Assistant to the Secretary will discuss health and medical programs with the various constituent agencies of the Department in order to assist them and the Secretary in making sure that there is no unnecessary overlapping or duplication between the health and medical programs of the constituent agencies and bureaus. If disagreement should arise between the Special Assistant to the Secretary and the head of any one of the constituent agencies or bureaus of the Department, the Special Assistant to the Secretary would have no authority to direct the constituent to take specific action. He would have authority only to recommend action to the Secretary.

In respect to the second question, although the plan does not specifically and explicitly say that the Special Assistant to the Secretary shall be a doctor of medicine, it has been my presumption and intention that a doctor of medicine shall be appointed to this position. I would like to call to your attention the discussion on page 59 of the joint hearings on the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, which, I believe, will clarify the administration's position on this matter. When Congressman JUDD asked Budget Director Dodge, "Do you think under that language anybody could ever be appointed to this special assistant position who is not a physician?" Mr. Dodge replied: "It might not be a practicing physician, but he might have had wide medical experience."

If I can provide you with any further information, I shall be glad to do so.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY.

EXHIBIT B

MARCH 27, 1953.

Hon. OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Administrator,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. HOBBY: May I express my appreciation of the promptness with which you replied to my questions in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. I find your answer to my first question quite clear, and I am sure the Senate will be very happy to have so explicit a statement set forth as part of the legislative history of the plan. It has certainly clarified the question in my mind and in a most acceptable manner.

Will you forgive me, however, if I attempt to restate my second question more clearly. I quite understand that it is your intention that a doctor of medicine shall be appointed as Special Assistant to the Secretary if the plan is adopted. I have no quarrel whatsoever with that, and as I read the plan, it unquestionably would authorize the President

to appoint a physician to the position. The question I raise, and the answer to which I believe should be a part of the legislative history of this Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, is simply this:

Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?

As I read the plan, my answer to the question would be "Yes." I should like to know whether your answer to that question would also be "Yes."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY

MARCH 27, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH M. DODGE,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DODGE: I am enclosing copies of self-explanatory correspondence between myself and Mrs. Hobby, in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I think you will agree with me that the acceptance of a reorganization plan creating a new department in our Government is so serious a matter that it should not be undertaken unless the Congress and the Administration are in complete agreement as to the meaning and intent of the language set forth in the proposed plan. Therefore, and in view of the fact that Mrs. Hobby, in her reply to my first letter, quotes part of your testimony at the Joint Hearings as possibly clarifying the Administration's position on one of the questions which I think should be answered before the Senate acts on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, I should like, in all sincerity, to address the following question to you:

Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?

As I read the plan, my answer to the question would be "Yes." I should like to know whether your answer to that question would also be "Yes."

Inasmuch as the Senate may be asked to act on this reorganization plan this afternoon, I should be most appreciative if I could have your answer just as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 30, 1953.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of March 27 in which you ask me to provide you, as soon as possible, an answer to the following question: "Does the language in section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 mean that the President could appoint a layman, a person who is not a doctor of medicine, as Special Assistant to the Secretary?"

It is my understanding that in submitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953, and with particular reference to section 3 of that plan, the President anticipated that he would appoint a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary.

Nevertheless, in my opinion, section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 is so worded that a President could appoint a person who is not a doctor of medicine to the post of Special Assistant to the Secretary (health and medical affairs) although it is not the intention of this administration to do so.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. DODGE, *Director.*

Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. KEFAUVER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I merely want to make a very brief statement. I voted against reporting favorably from the committee, House Joint Resolution 223, because I am opposed to the resolution, and not necessarily because I oppose the reorganization plan. I may say, Mr. President, I think the pending reorganization plan is a decided improvement in many respects over previous plans which have been submitted by the past administration. Both of those I opposed. I think I might support this plan, if it took its proper course under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949. I am against establishing the precedent that is now sought to be established by the procedures being followed, in order to put this plan into effect immediately.

We have a reorganization statute. I do not agree with all the provisions of that statute, some of which I have opposed, some of which are the result of compromise as the best that could be obtained at the time the statute was enacted in order to have any reorganization law at all. In this instance the procedure being followed is to pass a special joint resolution to put this plan into effect within a period of 10 days from the time of the enactment of the joint resolution, whereas the Reorganization Act of 1949 provides that a plan shall not become effective until 60 days after it is submitted, assuming that the Congress does not take affirmative action to reject the plan.

I have inquired, "What is the occasion for this joint resolution? Why not let the plan take its normal course as other plans have done, under the reorganization act?" The only answer I have received from any source is to the effect that it is desired to make this reorganization effective immediately, and that there are certain employees within the Federal Security Administration whose removal is desired. They are now under civil service. Through the joint resolution it would be possible to get rid of those employees a little sooner. I am not opposed to getting rid of employees whose services those in authority want to dispense with. Perhaps they are to be commended for taking that course. But if such a situation creates an emergency which justifies special treatment or a special resolution in order to evade the regular reorganization procedures, then the same condition, I dare say, applies in every department of Government today. Instead of attempting to pass a resolution simply to expedite the effective date of a reorganization plan, the better procedure and the sounder procedure would be to amend the existing law, which places the employees of all the departments in a position where those who have the final administrative authority cannot remove them, even if their services are unsatisfactory.

I think this is the wrong approach to that problem. If that problem exists in this agency of government, it certainly exists in many others, and the proper approach to it would be to amend the basic civil-service laws, instead of establishing the precedent of passing a special joint resolution, which would abrogate, in effect, the general provisions of law that now obtain with reference to reorganization plans. If this were to be the last instance of it, if there were to be no repetitions of such procedure, I would not raise my voice against it, although I disapprove of it. But I can well foresee that, instead of giving the Congress time to deliberate upon these plans and study them as they are submitted, and to make certain before they go into effect that the Congress has given them the study and the intelligent consideration they deserve, if we establish this precedent now, we can justify similar action, whenever a plan is submitted to the Congress, and a joint resolution can be passed to place it into effect immediately. Therefore, by this process we are destroying the efficacy of the act which authorizes the submission of reorganization plans.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I shall vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1, submitted by President Eisenhower, and which we are considering today, although I think there is a great deal of merit in the argument presented by the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], to the effect that the purpose of the basic legislation is to give both Houses of Congress 60 days within which to study and consider reorganization plans, and to hear from their constituents relative to the merits and demerits of proposals which may be sent to the Congress. I believe, however, that as to this particular reorganization plan, since it has been before the Congress on previous occasions and has been considered for quite a number of years, the public is fairly well familiar with the arguments in connection with it.

This matter was before the Senate on August 16, 1949, when almost an identical reorganization plan was submitted by President Truman, and at that time the Senate committee reported a resolution of disapproval which was presented to the Senate on that day.

I was very much impressed by the arguments of some of my colleagues to the effect that the proposed plan was in line with the recommendation of the Hoover Commission, that it would save a substantial amount of money, and that it would bring about a reorganization of several agencies under a Cabinet head, so that they would operate with greater efficiency. Therefore, on that occasion, on August 16, 1949, after listening closely to the arguments, I voted for the reorganization plan that was submitted. Thirty-two Members of the Senate voted for the reorganization plan and 60 voted against it, so that it was lost in that Congress.

Among those who voted for the plan which was submitted by former President Truman, some of whom spoke for it, whose arguments and positions impressed me substantially, were the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the present majority leader, former Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, who is now the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations, the then Senator from Arizona, Mr. McFar-

land, and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], as well as other Senators.

Because of the votes many of us cast in support of the reorganization plan in 1949, we were severely criticized by some members of the medical profession. I know that in my own State some physicians criticized my vote for the plan, which, it was contended, would promote the efficiency of governmental departments, would save a substantial amount of money to the Federal Government, and would bring about better service to the people whom these departments serve.

I remember that on that occasion, when the Senate was considering the proposal, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] stated that he had sent former President Hoover a telegram to inquire whether the reorganization plan at that time submitted was in line with the Hoover Commission recommendations, which the Members of Congress were so urgently pressed to adopt. On page 11527 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 9, is the reply from former President Hoover to the Senator from Louisiana. It is a rather long telegram, but in it the former President stated that the reorganization plan was generally in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

When almost the same plan was sent to the Congress this year, I desired to advise with the members of the medical association, and pharmacists and others in Tennessee who were interested, and particularly the officers of the Tennessee Medical Association, so I addressed a letter to the officers of the medical association and to V. O. Foster, the executive secretary. In my letter I stated that previously I had voted for the same program, but had been criticized by some of the physicians and directors of the Tennessee Medical Association; that I thought it was a good plan when submitted in 1949 and that personally I thought it was still a good reorganization plan, but that I did not wish to be fostering any measure which I thought might promote socialized medicine, or be inimical to the best interests of the medical profession, and that therefore I would very much appreciate their advice about the matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter I wrote to the officers of the medical association and to Mr. Foster be included in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dr. V. O. FOSTER,
Nashville, Tenn.

DEAR DR. FOSTER: President Eisenhower has sent to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1953. This plan would give Cabinet status to the Federal Security Agency and designate it as the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It would bring directly under the control of this Cabinet position all the agencies now loosely included in the Federal Security Agency including the Social Security System, Public Health Service, Food and Drug Administration, and Office of Education. The department, President Eisenhower stated, would be headed by Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby.

The plan automatically goes into effect in 60 working days unless it is rejected by a constitutional majority of either House of Congress. Hearings have now been started on this reorganization plan.

I want your advice on this matter. I have always had a high regard for the medical profession and for the tremendous advancement under our free-enterprise system. I do not want to support this plan if you believe it would tend to lead toward the socialization of our medical profession.

In the last Congress, President Truman, pursuant to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, sent to the Congress an almost identical proposal for the reorganization of the agencies under the FSA, and asked that the head of the new department be made a member of the Cabinet. When the proposal was being considered on the floor of the Senate, Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana received a telegram from former President Hoover, Chairman of the Reorganization Committee, stating that the proposal was in line with the Hoover recommendations. I sent a telegram to Mr. Hoover today and have his answer stating that the present proposal is also in accordance with his committee's recommendations. I am enclosing a copy of this. It was pointed out that by bringing the agencies together for operational purposes that a large amount of money would be saved.

I had previously expressed strong general support of the various Hoover recommendations and I voted to approve that reorganization. Many physicians criticized me for this vote, especially on the ground that Oscar Ewing might have been named the Cabinet member in the event the reorganization was approved. I stated that I doubted if President Truman would name him to this position and that I did not think a majority of the Members of the Senate would approve his appointment. I also stated that Congress could better direct the activities of the FSA and its head if he had to come before the Senate for confirmation.

There is no question but that some reorganization of these agencies is desirable. A great deal of money would be saved eventually and service would be more efficient. But before taking a position on the matter, in view of the criticisms that came to me when the same proposal was before the Congress last time, I would appreciate it if you would let me know your opinion and advice, and that of other physicians with whom you have an opportunity of discussing this proposal.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, that letter was sent on March 14. On March 19 I received a letter from Mr. V. O. Foster, the executive secretary of the Tennessee State Medical Association, in which he advised that the association, like the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, was favoring this reorganization plan. I should like to include in the RECORD at this point the letter from Mr. Foster to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE STATE
MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Nashville, Tenn., March 19, 1953.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: I appreciate your letter of March 14 in which you state that you would like to know the feeling of the medical profession in Tennessee with respect to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I feel certain you have received my telegram of March 13, 3:15 p. m., indicating the official position of this association. In the event you have not received the telegram, I am quoting the same below:

Dr. Overholt asked me to send you a list of local medical society presidents. Sending same by airmail today. Suggest that you weigh the telegram heavily for official position of the Tennessee State Medical Association. No objection however to your securing local physician's opinions.

The board of trustees of this association is the policy-making body between the physicians of the house of delegates. Pursuant to the action of the board, related in the above telegram, it must be stated that the Tennessee State Medical Association is in favor of Reorganization Plan No. 1. This association would greatly appreciate your support and interest in the plan.

On behalf of this association, I want to thank you for your effort to ascertain the official position of this association in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

V. O. FOSTER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I also ask that a telegram received from Dr. Calvert Cheney, who, as an officer of the board of trustees of the Tennessee Medical Association, attended the Washington meeting of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 15, 1593.*

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
The Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I appreciate your letter very much indeed. I asked Dr. Wilson to send you at once the recommendations as passed by the house of delegates yesterday. The physicians of Tennessee are all in favor of this. Delighted to know you will work for it.

Cordially,

CALVERT CHENEY.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in order to make certain that the present reorganization plan was in line with the recommendations of former President Hoover, as was the reorganization plan of 1949, I sent former President Hoover a telegram on March 13, 1953, reading as follows:

In considering President Eisenhower's Reorganization Plan No. 1, relative to Cabinet position for FSA, would appreciate your advising me whether this plan is in line with your proposal and if this is substantially the same proposal which you advised Senator ELLENDER was in line with the Hoover reorganization program when same matter was before 82d Congress.

With high esteem and good wishes.

President Hoover replied on March 13, as follows:

The President's plan is all right and at the request of your committee I am sending a full statement today.

With kind regards,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. President, I appreciate that some of the opposition to the reorganization plan in 1949 was based upon the idea that President Truman might nominate Mr. Oscar Ewing to head the new department, but I have always felt that in this country we must have a government of

law, and not of men, and that in the passage of laws, we must take into consideration that over a long period of time it is the provisions of law to which we must look. We must assume that we will have a Chief Executive who will nominate proper officers, and that we will have a United States Senate which will either approve or reject the nominations of the Executive according to whether the Senate feels the nominees are qualified to perform the duties to which they have been assigned.

I do not know whether or not former President Truman would have nominated Mr. Ewing to be a Cabinet head. I felt that if he had nominated him, Mr. Ewing probably could not have been confirmed by the Senate. The fact that there were 60 votes against the reorganization plan on August 16, 1949, probably is proof that my idea in that respect was correct.

In any event, I hope that over the years those appointed to occupy this important Cabinet post will be competent and will be able to fulfill the high hopes which are held for him or her in this Cabinet position. I feel certain that we all have great confidence in Mrs. Hobby, and that she will do her job well, because she has had great experience.

I think this can be, and will be, a Cabinet position which will be of assistance to the people of the Nation, and that, by the proposed reorganization, efficiency, economy, and better service will result.

I felt that I was right in my position in 1949. I am glad that Members of the Senate who voted against almost the same reorganization plan at that time have now changed their position and feel that this reorganization plan will be in the public interest.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say only a few words in behalf of Reorganization Plan No. 1, because it will achieve the ultimate result that I have been trying to obtain for a good many years. As I recall, the first bill on the subject (S. 2503) was introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and myself in the 79th Congress on August 1, 1946. No action was taken by the 79th Congress, but in the 80th Congress the Senator from Arkansas and I reintroduced our bill on January 10, 1947. Extensive hearings were held, and the bill was finally reported at that time by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The plan here proposed carries out substantially the same idea. It would create a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Fundamentally, there is no great similarity between health, education, and welfare at the local level. In any system that I know of, those functions are entirely separate. Schools are completely independent, and health departments and welfare departments are also independent.

Some persons in these fields have advocated a separate Federal department for each field. That has seemed to me to be impractical and unwise. What the plan would do would be to place in the proposed department the activities of the Federal Government in which the Federal Government really plays a secondary role. Under our constitutional system, the primary obligation with respect to health, education, and welfare rests with local communities and the States.

In a way, the proposed department would be a kind of State-aid department, in which would be grouped together the agencies with respect to which the role of the Federal Government is one of research and advice and, where necessary, of financial assistance. That is really the only consideration that binds together health, education, and welfare; otherwise, there might well be a separate department for each of the three.

It seems to me that those who are opposed to such a Department as is proposed—for instance, persons in the medical field—make a great mistake. If there were a separate, independent Federal Department of Health, it might indicate that the Federal Government was interfering and was attempting to play a primary role in that field. I think that we have succeeded in convincing doctors, who have usually opposed this program, that they will be better off under the arrangement now proposed.

Of course, those engaged in the field of health, in the field of education, and in the field of welfare, have always been somewhat afraid to be grouped together, for fear that one of the groups would dominate the entire department. Doctors did not want to be dominated by the welfare group; educators did not want to be under the rule of doctors; and those concerned with welfare did not desire to be supervised by either of the other two. The result has been a great deal of miscellaneous opposition, in my opinion, much of it mistaken.

The proposed plan has been taken up with the persons in the fields concerned, in an endeavor to satisfy them that there should be in the Cabinet one head in charge of the Department, instead of independent agencies continuing to function; that there should be someone in authority to whom they could present their cases. The three main sections in the proposed new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would have direct access to the Secretary, and the Secretary would be an impartial administrator, as among the three, and would represent their interests in working out the general policies of the Government.

Most of the disputes in the past have related to the relative strength of the different agencies within such a new Department. We have tried to make clear that each one of them will be almost autonomous, and will be directly under the Secretary, and that their special interests will be protected by the position they will receive in the new Department.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has made a statement opposing the procedure of a 10-day resolution. I think there are two reasons why, perhaps for the first time, such a procedure has been adopted. The principal reason is the necessity for speed. Until this matter is determined, the new Administrator of the Federal Security Administration, who will probably become the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, will be unable to proceed with an effective organization of her Department or of her Administration. A delay of another 30 or 40 days would be substantial in connection with the preparation of the budget and deciding upon the appointments that must be made in the new Department.

I do not think I would attempt a 10-day resolution, or recommend its adoption, if there were substantial opposition to the plan. In that case, I think probably it would be wise to follow the procedure provided by the Reorganization Act. But where there is no substantial opposition, there is no other way in which to put the plan into immediate effect, except by way of a 10-day resolution.

It seems to me that we must regard the situation as an emergency, not frequently to be followed, except if the conditions I have set forth should be repeated in the future.

I am very much pleased that we have finally reached our objective. We have sought for a long time to give to the three agencies affected representation in the Cabinet, the policy-making section of the Government, immediately under the President. These activities of the Federal Government are tremendously important to the welfare of the Nation, although the Federal Government does not undertake to assume primary direction in the three fields.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my intention to vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1 as submitted by President Eisenhower, and as reported by the committee. I merely wish to make note of what has already been discussed in some detail, namely, that the plan meets a long felt need for participation by the Federal Government in the services of health, education and welfare. I concur in the view expressed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the essential function of the proposed Department would be the carrying out of present programs, which are, in the main, State-aid programs, and represent mechanism for cooperation between the Federal Government, State governments, and local institutions and governments in the field of health, education, and welfare.

I point out, however, that in the creation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as provided in this plan, special consideration has been given to the medical needs and the health and medical services of the Federal Government. This special reference is related, of course, to the appointment of a Special Assistant to the Secretary in the field of medical and health services. It is my opinion that if there is any justification for this particular position, a justification likewise exists in the field of social security and in the field of education. I think it would be only fair to make known the fact that the special assistant was provided for primarily to remove the resistance of the American Medical Association and some other groups to the establishment of a much-needed Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I have noticed in the report of the committee on this proposal some language which I should like to explore for a moment.

I quote from page 11 of the committee report:

> In order that proper emphasis might be placed on the importance of health functions to be administered by the new Secretary under the provisions of the plan, a sec-

tion has been included to create a Special Assistant to the Secretary, to be appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, from among persons who are recognized leaders in the medical field with wide nongovernmental experience.

I appreciate the importance of having professionally trained people in any professional posts. It would be nothing short of a dereliction of public duty to appoint a person to a key position, such as that of Special Assistant to the Secretary, in the matter of health and medical services, unless that individual had the broadest professional experience. While I realize the importance of nongovernmental experience, I point out that the matter of operating the Government is not necessarily a job for alleged amateurs. It might be well for this individual to have a little governmental experience too, or at least to have some attitude of responsibility toward governmental service.

I make the note that while the plan calls for an individual in the medical field with nongovernmental experience, it is not to be considered a criterion of qualification that he has had no governmental experience. I assume that if we could find an individual with experience in both fields it would be highly desirable. That ought not to be too difficult, because many of the finest doctors in our land have served on governmental commissions, which I would surely call governmental experience. Many of them have been associated with State departments of health, and with city health departments, either in an advisory or administrative capacity.

I merely point out, as a member of the Government and one who has a certain enjoyment in the field of political life, that I do not think it is necessarily a badge of honor to be able to parade around and say that one has never had anything to do with the Government. I strongly protest, in the name of democracy and representative government. It would not hurt a bit if this individual knew of what the Department consisted, and if he had some intimate knowledge of the governmental responsibilities and duties in a Department as big a one as this one.

Let me continue with the description of this position:

> The President, in his message, stated that the purpose of this section was to insure that emphasis will be placed on the development of health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in the health and medical fields.

As I see it, the President had in mind a special assistant who would be of aid in the development of the health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in the health and medical fields. I consider that to be a proper description of the special assistant's functions. But later in the report we find the following language:

> It is the understanding of the committee that this section is intended to provide for the appointment of a special assistant to the Secretary who is a doctor of medicine and who is thoroughly familiar with the problems of medical practitioners as a result of firsthand experience. The committee is of the view that the functions which the special assistant to the Secretary will perform are advisory, and in no event would be broader than functions of the Department and the Secretary; that the advice and assistance which the special assistant may furnish the Secretary will be limited to the scope of the functions vested in the Department; that authority is not provided for the undertaking of comprehensive studies of all aspects of medical care for the American people or to make recommendations to the Secretary accordingly.

I submit that there is somewhat of a contradiction. If on the one hand we suggest that the responsibility of this special assistant is to advise the Secretary on the development of health and medical programs of the Department, and to permit the Secretary to develop programs for submission to the Congress relative to necessary legislation designed to improve Federal activities in this field—if that is the responsiiblity of the special assistant, the least he should be expected to do is to make a few studies.

I wish to make my position clear. I do not want a special assistant who will blindly recommend things to the Secretary, and I do not want a report to indicate that the special assistant ought not to do a little studying before he makes recommendations. I know that that is not what is going to happen, but I think the language of the report should be properly understood. So far as I see it, as a member of the committee—and I attended the joint committee hearings—as one who in the 81st Congress and in the 82d Congress was interested in similar plans, I do not interpret the special assistant's job to be one of merely making recommendations to the Secretary of the Department without having the opportunity to make broad studies in the field of medical care.

I know what this language is here for. It is here merely to indicate to anyone who might be apprehensive that this special assistant is not going to make recommendations about health insurance, or any recommendations which would be in any way in controversy with the established American medical profession.

However, I submit that if the special assistant is to be an adviser to the Secretary, he is to advise on all matters pertaining to health, and I see nothing within the reorganization plan—and I have looked it over very carefully—or within the job description, which was withheld from the committee until some of us pried it loose, which would indicate that the special assistant is under any obligation to restrain himself in the field of accruing knowledge. He has no administrative functions except to advise; but surely he has the obligation to conduct surveys, studies, hearings, or whatever else may be necessary to seek all necessary information for improving health and medical facilities.

I notice that the special assistant is to receive $15,000 a year. I make note of the fact that I do not call that economy, but I am not going to protest, because I am sure he will be worth $15,000 or more. I only submit that it stand out like a sore thumb that we have a special assistant in health, but that we have a little advisory committee on education, and a small advisory committee on social security.

I think the reason is obvious. The teachers were not mobilized, and the poor old-age pensioners who were trying to get along on small pensions did not mobilize. They had no conferences in Washington. They were not consulted. They were told exactly what was going to happen in connection with this plan as they were in connection with the plan of 1950.

This does not make the plan less desirable. It merely shows that those who perfected the plan, along the basic outlines of the plan of 1950, did two things.

First, they provided for a new Secretary. That new Secretary is well received and honored by Members of Congress and by the citizenry at large.

Second, in order to make sure that a political tempest would not be upon our heads, they made a special concession by providing for the appointment of a special assistant in the field of health. I commend the political sagacity of those who made that proposal. I do not think it necessarily means economy, but it is adroit politics.

I hope that as we go along in the development of these plans the politics will not cost too much, and that we may proceed with a full understanding of the importance of governmental reorganization.

One final word. It is my hope that this new department will take into consideration the recent study made by the President's Commission on the Nation's Health Needs. That Commission had a very fine group of people serving it, and had an excellent staff.

Dr. Paul Magnuson, who happens to come from the State of Minnesota, is a very eminent physician and outstanding leader in the field of medicine, and he has served with distinction as the head of the veterans' medical program. He was the Chairman of the President's Commission. Dr. Magnuson is an accredited, respected, and honored member of the medical profession. He is in good standing with the American Medical Association. I think that he and Dr. Hawley have done more than any other two men to revitalize veterans' medical care and at the same time save millions of dollars, while giving the veterans of our country the best care that any nation can possibly give to its veterans.

Dr. Magnuson's commission made a splendid report, and I would suggest that one of the first duties of the Special Assistant to the Secretary should be to read that report and to advise and consult with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with respect to certain aspects of the report.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] have submitted a bill which carries out a part of that report, I would suggest that it be given favorable consideration by the new department and the staff of that department. I refer, of course, to the proposal submitted by the Senator from New York

and the Senator from Vermont which provides for assistance to the States in the development of voluntary health insurance programs. I submit that the proposal is sound and that it merits immediate consideration by Congress. Certainly it merits favorable consideration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I am happy to support the reorganization plan, just as I was happy to support the plan in 1949. I submit that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] made a very pertinent comment when he pointed out that a government such as ours should be a government of law and not of men and that this plan is 3 years late. The plan of 1950 was almost identical with the plan before us today, except that it did not provide for a special assistant in the field of medical care. In other words, the 1950 plan was $15,000 a year less expensive than the one on which we are to vote today.

I also submit that this particular proposal will not necessarily save vast sums of money. I think it would be wrong to indicate any such thing to the American people. I do not believe there is very much in the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which will save the taxpayers substantial sums of money. It will provide coordinated services and it will provide cabinet status for the present Security Agency which, on the basis of its record, I believe it merits. I do not necessarily think, however, that we should tell the American people every time we adopt a reorganization plan that it will save hundreds of millions of dollars. We have adopted a number of reorganization plans, and as yet the budget has not been substantially reduced. I do feel that we have had great improvements in efficiency, and I believe that we will have greater efficiency under this program. However, Mr. President, every time we improve efficiency we do not necessarily save money for the taxpayers. What we do is to give better service, which may in the long run actually cost more money than previously.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as I see it, two major objections have been raised to this resolution. One objection is to the resolution itself. The other objection is to the plan itself. The objection to the resolution is that it is affirmative and accelerates the date when this plan goes into effect instead of having the normal 60-day period operate. The objection to the plan is the charge of socialized medicine. I will speak first on the socialized-medicine objection and then on the acceleration objection.

I do not consider this plan to be basically different from previous plans presented to and rejected by Congress on the matters that this plan covers. It involves the same principles, although the personalities have changed. While this change in personalities seems to have caused several who opposed previous similar plans to change their minds and to support this plan instead of opposing it, I say here and now about this plan what I said about Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 on August 16, 1949, on the Senate floor and in a minority report which I submitted on August 11, 1949, that the issue is not one of personalities but rather one of principle.

Although I differ with Dr. James L. Doenges, of Anderson, Ind., who appeared before my subcommittee in opposition to the plan—differ in that I am for this plan and he is against it—I certainly agree with what he has to say on this point of personalities versus principle. Dr. Doenges said:

> I cannot pass this point without mentioning the confusion which seems to be rampant in the minds of many. There seems to be a lack of discrimination between personality and principle. In fact, principle seems to be taking a subordinate position to personality in the thinking of many people. Such confusion is most regrettable in matters of personal importance, but it becomes tragic when matters of Government are concerned.
>
> There is such minor differences between the present Reorganization Plan and the two which were rejected previously that serious questions arise. Can it be the principle is abandoned? * * * Personality has no place in evaluation of principle.

As was the case with the plans of 1949 and 1950, the charge of "socialized medicine" has been made against this plan by the opponents to it. To this I say what I did back in August 1949 that "the issue is not socialized medicine as some would have us believe—were this true I would oppose the plan because I am opposed to socialized medicine."

Now I ask you, Mr. President, how can anyone take this charge of "socialized medicine" seriously when the American Medical Association, the American Pharmaceutical Association, former President Herbert Hoover, the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and President Dwight D. Eisenhower are all supporting this plan?

Does anyone really think that the American Medical Association would support a plan of socialized medicine?

Does anyone think that Herbert Hoover would advocate a plan of socialized medicine?

Does anyone honestly believe that either the senior Senator from Ohio or President Dwight D. Eisenhower would become a party to a scheme of socialized medicine through the coverup of a Presidential reorganization plan?

Of course not. You and I know that this talk of socialized medicine in reorganization plans is just as ridiculous in 1953 as it was in 1949 and 1950.

The second major objection that has been raised is that to the affirmative resolution approving the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 that consideration of the plan is being rushed through too fast and that the full 60-day period under the Reorganization Act should be permitted to run before this plan goes into effect so that full time can be given to consideration of the plan.

I must confess that this argument impresses me. Frankly, I am of the personal opinion that the normal 60-day period should be permitted to run its course before this plan becomes law and effective.

But in the interest of team cooperation with President Eisenhower, I am willing to submerge my own personal opinion on this matter to what I understand to be the wishes of President Eisenhower. Apparently he wants this plan to go into effect as soon as possible. Apparently he and his associates feel that time is of the essence in this matter. I am not going to stand in his way or try to hamstring him and his administration. Consequently, I am going along with this policy of acceleration on the plan, even if with considerable reluctance and misgiving.

I might not be willing to permit the desire of the President for accelerated action on this plan to override my own personal reaction on the acceleration were it not for the fact that, as Dr. Doenges stated, there is such minor difference between the present reorganization plan and the plans of 1949 and 1950 which were considered at great length by the Congress and its committees. There is nothing basically new offered in opposition to the principles of this plan that has not been offered before to the previous plans. Congress has studied the basic features of this proposal so much in the past that the great majority of the Members are sufficiently informed on the issue to be able to vote on it without the necessity of repetitious and drawn out hearings.

However, in this connection I am constrained to state that henceforth I shall probably oppose any proposals of accelerated action through affirmative resolutions on such reorganization plans as the President may send up in the future. I do not believe that the situation will be similar on future plans submitted by the President. I do not believe that they will have the striking similarity to past plans on related subjects as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 has to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1949 and Reorganization Plan No. 27 of 1950. They will not have the benefit of such a great backlog of hearings and debate as has Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953. They will require more time and study.

Mr. President, is a vote to be taken soon on the joint resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a minute or two, because I do not wish to delay the vote on the joint resolution.

After listening to the various substantive comments on this plan and earlier plans, I wish to say, first of all, that institutions can become the lengthened shadows of individuals. If I were seeking a reason why Congress was rather reluctant to do anything about the plan in earlier years, I might say that it was because of the gentleman who had impressed himself so thoroughly upon this instrumentality that he became something of a national issue. Mr. President, an Oscar in Hollywood is one thing, but an Oscar in Washington is quite another. Of course, I am referring to Oscar Ewing, whose name became a symbol, I believe, of compulsory medicine. One cannot very well examine his comments on his trips abroad and on the British system without coming to that conclusion.

There is no use searching for any ulterior reason or for something mysterious. The fact of the matter is that it was the man who headed the Agency who became a symbol of something the Ameri-

can people did not like. So in November of last year a referendum on this issue was held and I believe the way was cleared. So now there should be no objection to the plan.

I share the feeling of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], regarding the acceleration of the taking effect of the plan, namely, that the joint resolution itself calls for effectuation of the plan in 10 days, instead of in 60 days; and normally I would not go along with the plan if there were any real hostility to it.

Inasmuch as there is none, however, I wish to make only the further comment that next year's budget for this Agency will be rather close to $2 billion, I believe. In the wisdom of the Appropriations Committee, that budget may be curtailed somewhat. However, nothing much can be done in that field until the reorganization has been completed.

It has been said that the new Administrator could at this time select only her personal secretary, and that there are at least 100 policy positions in the establishment whose present occupants could not now be displaced in order to carry out a viewpoint which last year was vouchsafed to the country by the new administration. That is an additional argument, I believe, for approving the proposal that the plan take effect within a 10-day period.

So I am not disposed to let the matter run any longer, and thus I believe it might be well for us to vote now on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there is no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 223) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS AND FISCAL RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the state of the Union message, I expressed my deep concern for the well-being of all of our citizens and the attainment of equality of opportunity for all. I further stated that our social rights are a most important part of our heritage and must be guarded and defended with all of our strength. I firmly believe that the primary way of accomplishing this is to recommend the creation of a commission to study the means of achieving a sounder relationship between Federal, State and local governments.

The way has now been prepared for appropriate action. Shortly after stating my original intention, I called an exploratory meeting of interested officials, including Members of Congress and a group of governors representing the Council of State Governments, to confer with me on such a study. This conference produced general agreement on the importance of the problem and an offer of cooperation in the proposed study. Within a few days representatives of several leading organizations of local governmental officials will meet at the White House with several of my associates to give their considered and needed counsel.

The present division of activities between Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, is the product of more than a century and a half of piecemeal and often haphazard growth. This growth in recent decades has proceeded at a speed defying order and efficiency. One program after another has been launched to meet emergencies and expanding public needs. Time has rarely been taken for thoughtful attention to the effects of these actions on the basic structure of our Federal-State system of government.

Now there is need to review and assess, with prudence and foresight, the proper roles of the Federal, State and local governments. In many cases, especially within the past 20 years, the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary responsibilities of State and local governments. This has tended to blur the responsibilities of local government. It has led to duplication and waste. It is time to relieve the people of the need to pay taxes on taxes.

A major mark of this development has been the multiplication of Federal grants-in-aid for specific types of activities. There are now more than 30 such grant programs. In the aggregate, they involve Federal expenditures of well over $2 billion a year. They make up approximately one-fifth of State revenues.

While by far the greater part of these expenditures are in the fields of social security, health, and education, they also spread into many other areas. In some cases, the Federal Government apportions fixed amounts among the States; in others, it matches State expenditures; and in a few, it finances the entire State expenditure. The impact of all these grants on State governments has been profound. While they have greatly stimulated the development of certain State activities, they have complicated State finances and administration; and they have often made it difficult for States to provide the funds for other important services.

The maintenance of strong, well-ordered State and local governments is essential to our Federal system of government. Lines of authority must be clean and clear, the right areas of action for Federal and State government plainly defined. This is imperative for the efficient administration of governmental programs in the fields of health, education, social security, and other grant-in-aid areas.

The manner in which best to accomplish these objectives, and to eliminate friction, duplication, and waste from Federal-State relations, is therefore a major national problem. To reallocate certain of these activities between Federal and State Governments, including their local subdivisions, is in no sense to lessen our concern for the objectives of these programs. On the contrary, these programs can be made more effective instruments serving the security and welfare of our citizens.

To achieve these purposes, I recommend the enactment of legislation to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources to make a thorough study of grants-in-aid activities and the problems of finance and Federal-State relations which attend them. The Commission should study and investigate all the activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments, whether there is justification for Federal aid in all these fields, whether there is need for such aid in other fields. The whole question of Federal control of activities to which the Federal Government contributes must be thoroughly examined.

The matter of the adequacy of fiscal resources available to the various levels of Government to discharge their proper functions must be carefully explored.

The Commission should be of such size and composition as to permit appropriate representation of the various governmental levels and of outstanding members of the general public. It should be provided with an excellent staff, able to draw on the great amount of work which has already been done in this field.

In order that the Commission may complete its report in time for consideration by the next session of the Congress, I urge prompt action on this matter.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1953.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on page 2 of the Executive Calendar are 18 nominations of Army officers who are nominated to be promoted to major general, and to be given appointments for an indefinite term, in lieu of their present 5-year contracts. Eight of these officers are in the Ready Reserve, and their nominations should be acted upon

today. Ten of these officers are in the Retired Reserve, and no injury will be done if there is some delay in action on their nominations. The names of the officers in the Retired Reserve have been furnished the clerk. I ask that those nominations be passed over.

I now ask that the other nominations to be major generals, on page 2, and all the following nominations, to be brigadier generals, beginning on page 3, be acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations designated by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations: Julius Ochs Adler, to be major general; William Henry Draper, Jr., to be major general; Thomas Francis Farrell, to be major general; Ralph Maxwell Immell, to be major general; Harry Hubbard Johnson, to be major general; Edward White Smith, to be major general; Leif John Sverdrup, to be major general; and Robert Wilbar Wilson, to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, those nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the other major general nominations on page 2 of the Executive Calendar will be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the remaining Army nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with the nomination of Donald Bennett Adams, at the top of page 3 of the Executive Calendar, be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the Air Force nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there is at the desk a list which has been furnished to the clerk, of nominations of officers below the general officer rank. Those nominations have previously been sent to the desk, to remain there until today. The promotions are routine ones, and I ask for their present confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

THE AIR CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for promotion in the Air Corps, beginning with the nomination of Thomas Gabriel Hepner, to be chaplain, with the rank of major.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for permanent appointment in the Navy, beginning with the nomination of David A. Broad, to be lieutenant commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry other nominations for permanent appointment in the Navy, beginning with the nomination of Norma C. Furtos, to be commander.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the nominations which have been confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. On the Executive Calendar, the first nomination is that of Brig. Gen. Edward Higgins White. His name appears twice on page 1 of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The first name on the Executive Calendar is not included in the Reserve officer category and the category of those who are to be given indefinite terms under the law. In that category, the first nomination appearing on the first page of the calendar is that of Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted. That nomination is for a routine promotion to the rank of major general. Therefore, since there is no objection on the part of the committee, it was our desire that that nomination be confirmed at the present time.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well. I have no objection, Mr. President.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, during the adjournment period following today's session, bills and joint resolutions found to be duly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, April 1, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 30, 1953:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Clifford M. Raemer, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice William W. Hart, resigned.

Edward L. Scheufler, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri, vice Sam M. Wear, resigning.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Joseph Ira Kincaid, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone, vice John E. Hushing, resigned.

Omar L. Schnatmeier, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Otto Schoen.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in the grade indicated, under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Edward Hale Brooks, O6657, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

Lt. Gen. George Price Hays, O7149, commanding general, United States Forces, Austria (major general, U. S. Army).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 30, 1953:

IN THE ARMY

The officer named herein for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major general

Brig. Gen. George Hamden Olmsted, O195581.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of section 224, the Armed Forces Reserve Act (Public Law 476, 82d Cong.):

To be major generals

Julius Ochs Adler, O101888.
William Henry Draper, Jr., O148333.
Thomas Francis Farrell, O227201.
Ralph Maxwell Immell, O155458.
Harry Hubbard Johnson, O172820.
Edward White Smith, O129155.
Leif John Sverdrup, O129029.
Robert Wilbar Wilson, O233644.

To be brigadier generals

Donald Bennett Adams, O167951.
Wayne Russell Allen, O171232.
LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452.
Hugh Barclay, O402854.
Frank Frederick Bell, O173171.
Frank Brown Berry, O166083.
Carroll Owen Bickelhaupt, O165181.
Ralph Gates Boyd, O203104.
Clarence Lemar Burpee, O423085.
Robert West Chamberlin, O279810.

Edwin Norman Clark, O397337.
Robert Hunter Clarkson, O495357.
Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., O223635.
James Alexander Crothers, O189962.
Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr., O234688.
Carlton Spencer Dargusch, O246180.
Robert Charles Dean, O327502.
John Ross Delafield, O134416.
Brice Pursell Disque, O164274.
Georges Frederic Doriot, O423479.
Henry Russell Drowne, Jr., O136725.
John Bettes Dunlap, O301107.
Ken Reed Dyke, O510143.
Daniel Collier Elkin, O397970.
Edward Arthur Evans, O122172.
Charles Birdsall Ferris, O213192.
Charles Lyn Fox, O154765.
James Calvin Frank, O289883.
Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304.
Robert Joshua Gill, O501560.
Thomas Rodman Goethals, O219439.
Harold Leroy Goss, O201505.
Edward Samuel Greenbaum, O132915.
Robert Dinwiddie Groves, O129915.
Clement Bates Ellery Harts, O241711.
Ernest Henry Hawkwood, O218920.
John David Higgins, O152349.
Maurice Hirsch, O554761.
Gordon Cloyd Hollar, O245649.
Julius Cecil Holmes, O107360.
Whitfield Jack, O267915.
Ephraim Franklin Jeffe, O138243.
William Rodes Jesse, O190287.
Bernhard Alfred Johnson, O166223.
Edwin Whiting Jones, O105161.
Kenneth Barnard Keating, O901848.
Henry Kirksey Kellogg, O286132.
Francis Rusher Kerr, O232181.
John Reed Kilpatrick, O167001.
Rudolph Charles Kuldell, O900427.
Norman Miller Lack, O163445.
Andrew Frank McIntyre, O271317.
Ralph Hendricks McKee, O234931.
Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285.
Richard Leeson McNelly, O256304.
William Claire Menninger, O503932.
Hugh Meglone Milton II, O154541.
John Williams Morgan, O140899.
William Robert Clayton Morrison, O322448.
Harry Paul Newton, O123053.
Henry Carlton Newton, O104029.
John Joseph O'Brien, O430087.
George Hamden Olmsted, O199581.
Frederick Henry Osborn, O426878.
Ralph Albert Palladino, O232912.
Washington Platt, O139395.
Russell Archibald Ramsey, O215598.
Isidor Schwaner Ravdin, O399712.
Francis J. Reichmann, O219262.
Henry Joseph Reilly, O103718.
Benjamin Franklin Riter, O189468.
James Thomas Roberts, O220864.
Francis Willard Rollins, O165029.
Charles Eskridge Saltzman, O275984.
David Sarnoff, O208338.
Herbert Norman Schwarzkopf, O190484.
Harry Hodges Semmes, O900733.
Henry Aiden Shaw, O166022.
John Henry Sherburne, O156904.
Conrad Edwin Snow, O400511.
Oscar Nathaniel Solbert, O224371.
Albert Hummel Stackpole, O103158.
Carl Ferinand Steinhoff, O245045.
Arthur Elsworth Stoddard, O371507.
William Miles Stokes, Jr., O166391.
Frederick Smith Strong, Jr., O414433.
Carl Thomas Sutherland, O258676.
John Thomas Taylor, O114805.
Telford Taylor, O918566.
Samuel Morgan Thomas, O230963.
Lamar Tooze, O107927.
Kenneth Castle Townson, O163716.
Thomas Edison Troland, O115969.
Morris Carlton Troper, O902643.
Alfred Girard Tuckerman, O181648.
Elbert Parr Tuttle, O135785.
Herbert Harold Vreeland, Jr., O115042.
Frederick Marshall Warren, O266247.
Arthur Pope Watson, O181573.
Richard Seabury Whitcomb, O164276.
Lawrence Harley Whiting, O207522.
L. Kemper Williams, O125140.
William James Williamson, O911246.
Thomas Bayne Wilson, O900244.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the United States Air Force under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, AO271855.

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Victor Emile Bertrandias, AO267231.
Maj. Gen. Edward Peck Curtis, AO146277.
Maj. Gen. Cyrus Rowlett Smith, AO902787.

To be brigadier generals

Brig Gen. Walter Gelvin Bain, AO290604.
Brig. Gen. John Marza Bennett., Jr., AO403621.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Donald Campbell, AO900263.
Brig. Gen. Robert Emmet Condon, AO228877.
Brig. Gen. Merian Coldwell Cooper, AO163054.
Maj. Gen. Robert Lynn Copsey, AO104024.
Brig. Gen. Frederick Trubee Davison, AO245451.
Brig. Gen. Lawrence George Fritz, AO191234.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Johnson George, AO284578.
Maj. Gen. Wallace Harry Graham, AO34389.
Brig. Gen. Pierpont Morgan Hamilton, AO900788.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin, AO170727.
Brig. Gen. Harold Ross Harris, AO231186.
Brig. Gen. John Philip Henebry, AO406548.
Brig. Gen. Theron Baldwin Herndon, AO238180.
Brig. Gen. James Howell Howard, AO511937.
Brig. Gen. Ray Willis Ireland, AO909835.
Brig. Gen. Bruce Johnson, AO504391.
Brig. Gen. Douglas Keeney, AO114138.
Brig. Gen. Henry Christopher Kristofferson, AO252676.
Brig. Gen. Walter Barton Leach, AO907234.
Brig. Gen. Timothy James Manning, AO901542.
Brig. Gen. Charles Maylon, AO109296.
Brig. Gen. Chester Earl McCarty, AO235959.
Brig. Gen. Arthur Lee McCullough, AO257728.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Fenton McMannon, AO919209.
Brig. Gen. Richard Lewis Meiling, AO370824.
Brig. Gen. Henry Terry Morrison, AO168027.
Brig. Gen. Lacey Van Buren Murrow, AO230184.
Brig. Gen. Will Faust Nicholson, AO426283.
Brig. Gen. Charles Freeman Nielsen, AO924980.
Brig. Gen. Russell Isaac Oppenheim, AO300863.
Brig. Gen. Dick Royal Petty, AO263968.
Brig. Gen. William Leroy Plummer, AO114537.
Maj. Gen. Thomas Randall Rampy, AO927780.
Brig. Gen. Franklin Rose, AO166159.
Brig. Gen. Howard Archibald Rusk, AO166916.
Brig. Gen. Peter Constant Sandretto, AO908471.
Brig. Gen. Robert James Smith, AO903501.
Brig. Gen. Ray James Stecker, AO319899.
Brig. Gen. Luther Wallace Sweetser, Jr., AO270360.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Lafeton Whitney, AO102007.
Brig. Gen. Walter Wallace Wood, AO229786.
Brig. Gen. Albert McIver Woody, AO178850.
Brig. Gen. William Tandy Young, Jr., AO449164.

The officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officer in the United States Air Force for service as members of the Air National Guard of the United States under the provisions of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952:

Brig. Gen. Leonard Ewing Thomas, AO179089, to be major general, California Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

Col. Joseph Peter Gentile, AO384460, to be brigadier general, Massachusetts Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

Col. Rollin Bascom Moore, Jr., AO397579, to be brigadier general, California Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

Col. George Robert Stanley, AO289148, to be brigadier general, Connecticut Air National Guard, to date from September 12, 1952.

COMMANDING GENERAL, AIR UNIVERSITY

Lt. Gen Laurence Sherman Kuter 89A, to be United States Air Force commanding general, Air University, with rank of lieutenant general and date of rank April 11, 1951, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law:

To be majors

CHAPLAINS

Hepner, Thomas Gabriel, 18794A.
Brennan, George Joseph, 18795A.

To be captains

AIR FORCE

Shepard, Leland Casper, Jr., 21435A.
Aikens, Edwin Corry, 20035A.
Kuehl, Albert Robert, 21436A.
Gibson, Ralph Duane, 17284A.
Murray, Francis Peter, 21437A.
Dean, Louis Jefferson, 17285A.
Keeler, William Joseph, 21783A.
Jones, Arthur Meriwether, 17286A.
Anthony, William Harold, 22993A.
Weatherford, Ross Holmes, Jr., 17288A.
Buchta, Joseph, 20036A.
DeGrothy, Cornell, 21784A.
Messmer, Eugene John, 17289A.
Hunter, Cedric Vernon, 17290A.
Kult, Milton Louis, 17291A.
Carroll, Bill, Jr., 17292A.
× Wier, Charlie Younger, 21785A.
Gasiewicz, Sigmund Ignacy, 22994A.
Hurn, James Lee, 17294A.
Mutch, Alex Young, 17295A.
Bridgers, Sam, Jr., 17296A.
Jewell, Harold Roger, 17297A.
× Mackie, John Victor, 17298A.
Adair, Luther Ewell, Jr., 17299A.
Cathcart, Charles Earl, 17300A.
Joseph, Adolph Davis, Jr., 17301A.
Kelly, Charles Edward, 22995A.
Bryan, Donald William, 17302A.
MacKinnon, Robert Louis, 17303A.
Cunningham, Arthur Sylvester, Jr., 17304A.
Burcham, Lee Aubrey, 17305A.
O'Neil, Earl William, Jr., 17306A.
× Miller, Sumner Stark, 20037A.
Barr, Thomas James, 17307A.
Augustyn, Frank Joseph, 17308A.
Immig, Richard Graham, 17309A.
Crisp, Harold Newark, Jr., 17310A.
Grossmiller, William John, 17311A.
Shackelford, Dave Seale, Jr., 17312A.
Carroll, Thomas Lee, 17313A.
Lindeman, Jack Ray, 17314A.
Smith, Clyde Barton, 17315A.
Posvar, Wesley Wentz, 17316A.
Poytress, Earl Francis, 17317A.
Creveling, Louis Gregory, 17318A.
Temple, William Alan, 17319A.
Bryan, Robert Howell, 19582A.
Strain, Bailey Toland, 17320A.
Adams, George Talmadge, Jr. 17321A.

Stewart, Robert Benfred, 17322A.
McKinney, Joseph Tomlinson, 17323A.
Harper, Gilbert Stewart, Jr., 17324A.
Lengnick, Roger Horace, 17326A.
Wheat, Allen Albert, 17327A.
Yeoman, Wayne Allen, 17328A.
Cahill, Laurence James, Jr., 17329A.
Bellis, Benjamin Neil, 17330A.
Welch, Standford Alden, 17331A.
Studer, William Francis, 17332A.
Blasina, Thomas David, 17333A.
Naleid, Jerome Frederick, 17334A.
Bradburn, David Denison, 17335A.
Adams, Ranald Trevor, Jr., 17336A.
×Tallman, Kenneth Lee, 17337A.
Cole, Frank Ellsworth, 17338A.
Atkinson, Anderson Watkins, 17339A.
Christensen, Everett Eugene, 17340A.
Hafer, Frederick LeRoy, 17341A.
Allen, Lew, Jr., 17342A.
Colladay, Martin Grimes, 17344A.
Logan, Lewis Benjamin Castle, 17345A.
Lyman, Walter Alfred, 17346A.
Knight, Harry Russell, 17347A.
Wright, Robert Kenneth, 17348A.
Sherman, Milton, 17350A.
Hildebrandt, James Edwin, 17351A.
Buckley, Robert Clarence, 17352A.
Jernigan, Ernest Deloy, Jr., 17353A.
Williams, Henry Kirk, 3d, 17354A.
Evans, William John, 17355A.
Hauenstein, Charles Judd, 17358A.
Brothers, William Wesley, Jr., 17359A.
Lobdell, Harrison, Jr., 17360A.
Gorman, Robert Thomas, 17361A.
Chapman, Kenneth Richard, 17362A.
Brechwald, Edward Joseph, 17363A.
Williams, Harold, Jr., 17364A.
Hopkins, Herbert Ziegler, Jr., 17365A.
Fryberger, Philip Henry, 17366A.
Lester, Frank Gibson, 17367A.
×Heiberg, Harrison Howell Dodge, Jr., 17368A.
Lusk, Joe Fenton, 17369A.
Barricklow, John Alan, 17370A.
Deatrick, Eugene Peyton, Jr., 17371A.
×Baugh, Hale, 17372A.
Dresser, Richard Lloyd, 17373A.
Hackney, Donald Ingram, 17374A.
Upland, Robert Theodore, 17375A.
Berge, Truman Kent, Jr., 17376A.
Felices, Salvadore Enrique, 17377A.
Smith, Sam Hugh, 17378A.
Dunlap, Lloyd Leslie, Jr., 17380A.
Dosh, Robert Nathaniel, Jr., 17382A.
Burgess, Richard Benton, 17383A.
Clemenson, Robert Carey, 17385A.
Baisley, William Denton, 17386A.
Lundholm, Donald Alfred, 17388A.
Molchan, John Eugene, 17391A.
Galt, Richard Russell, 17392A.
×Poe, Bryce, 2d, 17393A.
Jenkins, William Henry, 17394A.
×Shawe, Hamilton Bruce, Jr., 17395A.
MacWilliams, Malcolm Means, 17396A.
Wayne, Robert Earl, 17397A.
Hamilton, Francis Frazee, 17400A.
Doolittle, John Prescott, 17402A.
Tribolet, Robert Webb, 17404A.
Hunt, Senour, 17405A.
Pitts, John Emmett, Jr., 17406A.
×Harton, William Martin, Jr., 17407A.
Wilson, Donald, Jr., 17408A.
Griffin, William Aiken, 17409A.
Jones, Gerald Marshall, 17410A.
Dorman, George Stanton, 17411A.
×Nemetz, Albert Michael, 17414A.
×Minor, John Max, 17415A.
Plank, David Heber, 17417A.
White, Richard Taylor, 17418A.
Umlauf, John Louis, 17419A.
Lowry, Robert Mason, Jr., 17420A.
Zeh, Theodore George, Jr., 17421A.
Stringer, Elbert Madison, 17423A.
McBride, Benjamin Ransom, 17424A.
Roddenberry, Harry H., Jr., 17425A.
Kimball, Jack Quentin, 17426A.
Paschall, James Ernest, 17427A.
Birdsall, Alan Homer, 17429A.
Richards, Marion Rich, 17430A.
Kellogg, Richard Allan, 17431A.
Hairston, Guy Edward, Jr., 17432A.
Hutto, Merl Galbreath, 17433A.
×Longarini, Edmond Charles, 17434A.
Clements, Philip Lee, Jr., 17435A.
Bodie, Jack Lowman, 17436A.
Denniston, Clyde Roscoe, Jr., 17437A.
Bowers, Grayson Hunter, Jr., 17438A.
Safford, Philip Riviere, 17439A.
Turner, Richard Hugh, 18060A.
Hilovsky, Steve Edward, 17441A.
Langstaff, Thomas Corbett, 17442A.
Withers, William Price, Jr., 17443A.
Carbine, James Thomas, Jr., 17445A.
Castle, Johnny Rudd, 17446A.
Green, Jesse Edward, 17447A.
×McPhee, Harry John, Jr., 17448A.
Grier, Samuel 3d, 17449A.
Lembeck, Edward Adams 2d, 17451A.
Burke, Robert Oscar, 17453A.
Reed, William Preston, 17454A.
Carnright, Richard Glenn, 17455A.
×Lacouture, Harold Francis, 19671A.
×Dobbs, Robert Lee, 17456A.
Korn, Alden Davis, 17457A.
Wilson, Robert Seedorf, 17458A.
Walsh, Robert Arthur, 17459A.
×Skladzien, Thaddeus Stephen, 17460A.
Weber, Marvin Octavius, Jr., 17461A.
Minnich, E. Scott, 17462A.
Whitfield, Raymond Palmer, Jr., 17465A.
Messmore, Donald Morgan, Jr., 17466A.
Gordon, Lawrence Norman, 17467A.
Gilbert, Raymond Harlan, Jr., 18092A.
Hughes, James Donald, 17468A.
Schmitt, John Jacob, Jr., 17470A.
Furuholmen, James Bjarne, 17471A.
Hudspeth, Roy Ritter, 17472A.
Cameron, Burton Gordon, 17473A.
×Wiedman, Charles Orion, 17474A.
×Moore, Arthur Raymond, Jr., 17475A.
×Yancey, William Burbridge, Jr., 17476A.
Miller, James Robert, 17477A.
Feibelman, Max Milton, 17478A.
Eichenberg, Robert John, 17479A.
×Berry, Waldron, 17480A.
Buckingham, Charles Edward, 17483A.
Newell, Richard Gordon, 17484A.
Horton, Clarence Frost, Jr., 17486A.
Ruggiero, Charles, Jr., 17487A.
×Clapp, William Lafayette, Jr., 17489A.
Fox, Harold Paul, Jr., 17490A.
Nelson, George Joseph, 17491A.
McMillan, Cornelius, Jr., 17492A.
Gordon, Mose William, Jr., 17493A.
Brosius, Charles William, 17494A.
×Rountree, Fred Brinson, 17495A.
Reed, Marvin Chapman, 17496A.
Memminger, Charles Gustavus, 17499A.
Melo, Eugene Emil, 17501A.
Bartholf, John Copeland, 17502A.
×Roney, William Rogers, 17503A.
Hopkins, Philip Bird, Jr., 17504A.
Harris, Edgar Starr, Jr., 17505A.
Martin, John Alexander, 17507A.
Norris, Paul Maxfield, 17510A.
×Walker, Robert Lawrence, 17511A.
Stees, Hubert Sheldon, Jr., 17513A.
Bowley, William Theodore, 19944A.
Parsons, Charles Henry, 2d, 17514A.
Chatfield, James David Lloyd, 17515A.
VanSickle, Earl Rosenquist, 17516A.
Jackson, John Wallace, 17517A.
Daye, Thomas Maldwyn, 17518A.
Flavin, Michael John, 17519A.
Schmidt, Julius Henry, Jr., 17521A.
Freshwater, Robert Earl, 17522A.
Zuppan, Lawrence Louis, Jr., 17523A.
Bajcura, Orestes Methodius, 17524A.
Norwood, Billie Jack, 17525A.
Murphy, Robert Denslow, 17526A.
Trexler, David Howerter, 17527A.
French, James Raymond, 17528A.
Potter, Campbell McLeod, 17529A.
Baxter, William Dee, 17530A.
Hicks, Arlie Hugh, Jr., 17531A.

MEDICAL

Clark, Ernest James, 20059A.
Wright, Walter Dick, 23063A.
Does, Charles Wordsworth, 22954A.
Crabtree, Sam Ferrell, 22987A.
George, John Wendell, 22555A.
Reynolds, George Edward, 22955A.
Gregory, R. D., Jr., 22956A.
Donnell, Alonzo McDonnell, Jr., 22957A.
McGrade, Hugh Patrick, 24123A.
Dewey, Walter Webber, 22958A.
Adams, Robert Harold, 22960A.
Schwarting, Bland Hugh, 22959A.
Frayser, Louis Augustus, 3d, 22961A.
Austin, George Nicolo, 22556A.
Talley, Thomas Peter, 22962A.
Spiro, Franklyn Cyrus, 22964A.
Staples, Pelham Porter, Jr., 23064A.
Kruse, Francis, Jr., 22558A.
Hensen, James Paul, 22966A.
Smith, Arthur Gene, 22560A.
Levine, Robert, 22559A.
Graf, John Edward, 22967A.
Simmons, Frederic Rudolph, Jr., 22561A.
Eastwood, Herbert Kendrick, Jr., 23065A.
Van Pelt, James Fred, Jr., 24124A.
Hough, Jerald Pat, 23169A.
Sanford, Clarence Edward, 23066A.

DENTAL

×Sunberg, Paul Vernon, Jr., 19846A.
Strong, William Lawrence, 19968A.

VETERINARY

Dalziel, George Teddy, 21605A.

CHAPLAINS

Alt, Eugene Runkle, 23202A.
Shelton, David Knight, 21863A.
Puseman, Edmund Alexander, 21864A.
Carlock, Freddie Willard, 23203A.
Terry, Roy Morton, 21429A.

To be first lieutenants

AIR FORCE

×Collier, James Carlton, Jr., 20050A.
×Refson, Jacob Spencer, 20049A.
Oles, Francis John, 20051A.
Woods, John Paul, 23802A.
Stevens, Patrick Roy, 21550A.
Courlas, John George, 23803A.
Strother, James Williams, 23804A.
Proffitt, James Vernon, Jr., 24403A.
Schuman, Richard Paul, 24402A.
Bock, Charles Cornelius, Jr., 24404A.
Yingling, John Wright, 20426A.
×Duncan, Kenneth James, 20427A.
Geil, William Clinton, 23805A.
Coward, Roderick William, 22842A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, 81st Congress. The officer whose name is preceded by the symbol (×) is subject to physical examination required by law:

To be first lieutenants

NURSE

Selleck, Ada Louise, 21403W.
×MacDonald, Goldia Nadine, 21754W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Francis S. Low to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Western Sea Frontier, and commander, Pacific Reserve Fleet.

Vice Adm. Matthias B. Gardner to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

Vice Adm. James Fife, Jr., to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as United States naval deputy commander in chief, Mediterranean.

Vice Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Rear Adm. Roscoe F. Good to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics).

The following-named line officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy, with the grades indicated:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

David A. Broad
Frederick D. Forger

LIEUTENANT

Roy D. Neufeldt

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Cecil G. Allison	Theodore E. Lide, Jr.
Richard S. Baird	Gale W. Nuernberger
George G. Dunn	William J. Shoemaker
John E. Fishburn III	Carlton B. Smith

ENSIGNS

Daniel S. Curran	Derrell B. Hauser
Gorman L. Fisher, Jr.	Murray A. Luftglass

The following-named ensign of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy for permanent appointment in the line:

Frederick J. Orrik, Jr.

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Norma C. Furtos

SUPPLY CORPS

Dorothy M. Quinn

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

John Abbott	Edgar K. Lofton
James J. Ash	Preston Luke
Kenneth W. Atkinson	Frederick C. Marshall
Keith R. Bare	John E. Marshall
Albert T. Barr	Daniel N. Mealy
Robert E. Bennett	Robert E. Morgan
Joseph Brecka, Jr.	Charles P. Moore
Warran R. Brown	Fred S. Newman
Richard B. Campbell	Robert D. Norman
Charles C. Carter	William R. O'Connell
Thomas M. Castner	Louis C. Page, Jr.
William E. Clark	James H. Pressley, Jr.
James C. Clarke	Harold A. Riedl
Robert J. Duffy	George G. Russell
James R. Edixon	William G. Sizemore
Kenneth E. Enney	Gordon H. Smith
Jack E. Everling	Donald E. Sparks
Harry N. Farnsworth	Robert G. Stammerjohn
Robert W. Fero, Jr.	
Arthur S. Fusco	Charles A. L. Swanson
William M. Golding	Benjamin W. Taylor
Jerome E. Hamill	Harold L. Terry
Martin H. Henry	Harry E. Thomas
Robert A. Holden	Richard G. Thomson
John C. Humphrey	William E. Tillerson
Roy T. Hynes	Ralph J. Touch
Robert N. Johnson	Marland W. Townsend
Francis N. Jones	Dennis A. Tuck
Isaac P. Jones	John H. Wachtel
Paul T. Karschnia	Edwin S. Wallace, Jr.
Jack E. Keller	Albert J. Weil
Edward J. Klapka	Henry T. White
Edward V. Laney, Jr.	George H. Willey
Robert L. Leydon	William O. Wirt

NURSE CORPS

Irene N. Dowe	Mary V. Redfern
Dorothy S. Mathewson	Clarissa M. Shaw
Rose M. Miller	

The following-named line ensigns of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Richard J. Biederman	Ward W. DeGroot III
Carl Courtright	Robert L. Jones
Walter E. Davis, Jr.	Warren G. Stevens

The following-named warrant officer of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF CARPENTER

Naaman Dingness

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS TO THE GRADES INDICATED

To be major general

William O. Brice

To be brigadier general

William J. Scheyer

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS TO THE GRADES INDICATED

To be major generals

Randolph McC. Pate	George F. Good, Jr.
Clayton C. Jerome	Merrill B. Twining
James A. Stuart	

To be brigadier generals

Frank D. Weir	Ion M. Bethel
Alexander W. Kreiser, Jr.	Nels H. Nelson
	David M. Shoup
Wilburt S. Brown	Francis B. Loomis, Jr.
John N. Hart	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 30, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Oswald C. J. Hoffman, director of public relations, the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, who for our redetmption didst take the road to the palace of Pilate, to the brow of Calvary, and to the tomb of death, Thou wast smitten with our hands; Thy head was crowned with our thorns; Thou wast accused, condemned, and led as an innocent lamb to the slaughter, bearing the cross we had prepared for Thee; Thou wast pierced with our nails and given our gall to drink; our spear did wound Thee.

We walk the way with Thee in this week of Thy passion, O Redeemer of the world. Do Thou, by these most sacred pains deliver us from all our sins, and by Thy holy cross bring us sinners to the place where he came who prayed from the other cross, "Lord, remember me."

O God the Father, who didst remember us in sending Thy Son to be our redeemer, remember our Nation in its efforts to establish national well-being. Be with us, O God, in our endeavor to arrive at international concord. Make Thy power and presence known among us. Give us faith and love to serve Thee, together with faith and love to serve each other and all our fellow men. In the shadow of Thy Son's cross, and for His sake, we ask this. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 26, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 25, 1953:

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to authorize the Clerk of the House of Representatives to furnish certain electrical or mechanical office equipment for the use of Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives.

On March 27, 1953:

H. R. 1362. An act for the relief of Rose Martin.

On March 28, 1953:

H. R. 3053. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until July 1, 1954.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 53–4.

RESIGNATION FROM STANDING COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 30, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit my resignation as a member of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY A. FINE,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 30, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Capitol.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby respectfully tender my resignation as a member of the Standing Committee on House Administration.

Sincerely,

J. L. PILCHER,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 194) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Government Operations: J. L. PILCHER, Georgia.

Committee on the Judiciary, SIDNEY A. FINE, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 25 I secured a special order for April 2 of 30 minutes. Through error, it is carried in the RECORD as April 22. I ask unanimous consent that the correction may be made and that I may have the special order on April 2, following the special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on March 31, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Thursday, April 2, following the special orders heretofore entered.

THE LANHAM ACT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which amends the Lanham Act to enable persons whose houses have been taken over for Federal housing projects to be given a right, or, rather, a priority, to repurchase their homes when the property is released by the Federal Housing Administration.

I am very sure, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the words "former owners" were omitted from the Lanham Act was a pure oversight. It would surely be grossly unfair to give priorities to present occupants, veterans and otherwise, and leave out the former owner who has been forced to vacate his property and to accept the price and other qualifications laid down by the Housing Administration.

Cases of this kind have been brought to my attention very forcibly in Shanks Village, in my district, where many former owners have been waiting anxiously for the day when they could return to their old homes that were taken over by the Government at the beginning of World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that this bill will receive speedy attention from the proper committee and that it may pass the House and be written into the law in the very near future.

STALIN'S TIMETABLE—ARE WE LIVING ON BORROWED TIME?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a short reprint sent me by the Diamond Bar Specialty Corp., of Lancaster, Ohio, on communism.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nicholas Nyaradi, the last non-Communist member of the Hungarian Government before it was taken over by the Russians, says:

I am always amazed to hear some prominent Americans say that the last thing Stalin has in mind is a shooting war.

Certainly those of us who have spent long years studying the tenets of communism and watching its steady march toward an undeviating goal, agree with Mr. Nyaradi. Had they read Lenin's book in which he said there would be a final clash between communism and capitalism, they would know that a shooting war is not out of the question.

And at the end of this last showdown—

Wrote Lenin—

the funeral dirge will be sung either over the tomb of communism or capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot emphasize too strongly my hope that the membership of this House will take the few moments required to read this powerful picture of Stalin's timetable which I am inserting herewith:

I SAW STALIN'S TIMETABLE

(By Nicholas Nyaradi, former Finance Minister of Hungary)

(Dr. Nyaradi was the last non-Communist member of the Hungarian Government before it was taken over by the Russians. Before going into voluntary exile he had spent 7 months in Moscow trying to effect a settlement of Russia's war claims against Hungary. This gave him an opportunity to study at first hand the plans and programs of the Soviet Union for world domination.)

I am always amazed to hear some prominent Americans say that the last thing Stalin has in mind is a shooting war. It is true that Russia would be happy if she could avoid a shooting war; if she could bleed the American economy white, infiltrate the country on the social level, and cause disorder within its borders. But a shooting war is not out of the question.

It is a pity that some leading American statesmen don't read books, because the statesmen of the West who were at Potsdam, Teheran, and Yalta, believing that Russia was a faithful and trustworthy ally, would have changed their opinion had they read Lenin's book, in which he said there would be a final clash between communism and capitalism.

To quote Lenin verbatim: "And, at the end of this last showdown, the funeral dirge will be sung either over the tomb of communism or capitalism."

I saw Stalin and his henchmen working to make this prediction come true. I saw that the basic principle of his policy was the destruction of America.

I saw Stalin's timetable—not because he showed it to me—but because I was in position to see his plans for coordinating economies, concentrating military powers, and preparing his people psychologically for a hate America campaign.

According to this timetable, we in America are already on borrowed time. Stalin's plans are actually overdue. I saw these plans and preparations, and I know that Russia was to have reached its maximum capacity, both in the military and economic fields, by the end of last year. In short, by the end of 1951, Stalin had achieved about the maximum economic and military strength which he can muster.

When we speak about steel capacity and say that Russia annually produces about 30 million metric tons of steel a year, please do not forget that 68 blast furnaces were sent to Russia during the war from this country in the form of lend-lease. I should like to warn you of underestimating Russian steel production. It is one-third of United States production, of course, but please do not forget that ever since 1945 about 90 percent of Russian steel production had been channeled into war industry. They didn't build skyscrapers, they didn't build pleasure boats, they didn't build automobiles, and they didn't build refrigerators. They built tanks and guns and shells and jet fighters. So we can say that in spite of their relatively low steel production, the Soviet Army had at its disposal until now more steel than either the American Army or any other army in the free world, or I could say, all the armies in the free world together.

How Stalin has achieved this is very simple: squeezing out the last drop of blood; squeezing out the work, the labor, and the sweat of the millions and millions of the Russian people. The result: a Soviet Army which is better equipped today than is the American Army. According to statistics which I have seen in the Soviet ministry of foreign trade, five-sixths of Soviet industrial production is going directly or indirectly for war purposes, and only one-sixth for consumers' goods.

You well know what the military preparations of the Soviet Union are. You well know that they have today an army which is almost 5 million men strong, the strongest army in the peacetime history of the world. But what you might not know is the plan for Soviet mobilization. Within 6 months of the start of war the Soviet Union would be able to send another 10 million men into the front lines, which would bring its total number to 15 million men. If you add to this the 5 million men of the Chinese Communist Army, and the 2 million men of the Soviet Eastern European satellites, you will see that in case of a war, you would have to reckon with a 22-million-man Communist Army on the American defense perimeter.

As far as the military is concerned, the Soviet Union is ready to fight; it has made its concentration of troops; it has made its concentration of economic power. The only deterrent in its economic concentration of power was the ban that the United States Government imposed on March 1, 1948, on the exportation of strategically important materials. This has wrecked Stalin's timetable to a considerable extent. But, of course, he was able to do something about it. He has been very busy keeping up a smuggling operation and also keeping up legal ties with the West. Your British allies, for instance, convinced you way back in 1949 that textile-mill equipment is of no strategic importance whatsoever; therefore, reluctantly you agreed that the British could ship the dismantled

equipment of a British textile mill to Communist Poland, in exchange for some hams, bacon, eggs, and other foodstuffs which the British were anxious to get from a nondollar area. The British got their ham and eggs, but Poland got a complete textile mill, which is today working 24 hours a day on uniform fabrics for the Red army, as a nonstrategic item to Russia.

At the same time, Communist Hungary was allowed to make a deal with the Marshall plan dollars allocated to Austria. Austria needed some foodstuffs. Communist Hungary readily sent them, taking them away from its own citizens who are going hungry. But this of course doesn't bother the Communists. They sent the foodstuffs to Austria. Do you know what they got in exchange for it? Marshall plan dollars for buying cotton in America. The cotton was bought in America by the Hungarian Communist Government, shipped to Hungary, worked through the Hungarian Soviet-owned textile mills, and the American cotton reappeared as Red army uniforms.

This is the way Stalin tries to circumvent the ban on the exportation of strategic materials. Today, the whole Soviet orbit is turned into a military camp, and no matter what material you ship into a military camp it becomes of military importance. In my belief, there is only one way to trade with Communist Russia—one safe and secure way—and that is not to trade at all.

There is finally a third angle in Stalin's timetable—the psychological angle—which is just as important as the military and economic angles. The reason for this is very simple. Communism is more than the armed power of a great country. Communism is more than an army. Communism is more than 20,000 jets or 50,000 tanks. Communism is an ideology. It is a philosophy. It is an evil religion. And, therefore, perhaps the most dangerous sector of Stalin's timetable is the psychological sector: the psychological sector which has a positive and a negative angle. The positive angle is the amazing fact that the Soviet people seemingly support this aggressive policy of Stalin. The negative angle—I'm sorry to say—is the even more amazing fact that the American people, or at least the great majority of them, are still reluctant to recognize the greatest danger in the history of their Nation.

We said in Hungary that when the Russian troops came to Europe—to Berlin, to Vienna, to Budapest, to Prague—Stalin made two great mistakes: he showed the Russians to Europe, and he also showed Europe to the Russians. But in the great majority Russians have no idea what is going on over here.

If we speak to them over our radio broadcasts about our ideals of life, our conceptions of human rights, it is exactly as if you would speak to a man who was born blind, about the difference between light blue and dark blue, because he hasn't the conception, he hasn't the imagination at all.

This is the psychological difficulty in the way of our broadcasts, but there is a technical difficulty, too. This technical difficulty is the lack of individually-controlled radio sets in Russia. The great majority of the Russian people—exactly 99 per cent of them—have in their rooms, in their houses, in their working places, in their factories or in their collective farms, nothing else but a loud speaker which is connected with a central set manned by some trusted Communist official. It is this Commissar who turns the knob of this central station, and all you can hear over the loud spekear is the official Soviet Government program of the Soviet radio. And this Political Commissar won't tune in the Voice of America, or the British Broadcasting Corporation programs. So that practically 99 per cent of the people don't hear it. The one per cent who do hear it are all trusted members of the Communist Party. They are the ones who do not want to hear what we are going to tell them.

There is of course one possibility, and the only possibility, to reach the Russian people. It has been tried out on a small scale, and involves sending free balloons to Russia. I have developed a program which I call the program of tangible propaganda. I'm going to point it out to you because this tangible propaganda of friendship balloons is about the only way I believe we can really reach the Russian people. If we were to drop matches, razor blades, cards of buttons, safety pins, cheap plastic toys, needles, spools of thread, shoelaces, lead pencils, lipsticks, cigarettes, scissors, and any of the thousands of inexpensive mass-produced dime-store gadgets of America over the cities of the Soviet, all of Russia would go mad. Shoes, yard goods, men's suitings, nylon stockings, cotton shirts, parachuted down upon Moscow would create the greatest sensation since the revolution, for these are things which the Russians can believe; tangibles which they can see, feel, smell, use, compare.

How they would react to this Russia hate America campaign if America presented them with gift boxes. How it would undermine the Russian feeling. How it would undermine the Russian preparation for war. How it would undermine Stalin's psychological weapons, according to which the United States has only one thing in mind, and that is to destroy the Soviet homeland. The Russians love their land, and the only way Stalin can dragoon them into the army is make them believe that America wants to attack them. They believe they act in self-defense.

Although western words are greeted with an immense amount of skepticism, the Russians do have a great curiosity about us. For less money than is spent on unheard broadcasts, or for 1 or 2 percent of the billions spent on defense preparations, the Russians could really be reached by an inexpensively produced shower of cheap gifts. Tangible propaganda: that is the cheapest and the shortest way to the Russian hearts and minds. That is what will defy indoctrination, because upon seeing such miraculous gadgets the Russians will begin to question all that they have been told about America. That is the only way to capture Russian thought.

Words alone, it seems, fail us.

There is then also another angle, which I have called the negative angle of psychological warfare, and I am amazed to see the attitude of so many Americans in this country. In spite of the gloomy picture I have shown you, you should not lose your hope. I was in an extremely high position and I was able to compare the economic and military strength of the Soviet Union with that of your country. I can tell you that you are definitely stronger if you take it as a full-time job. But on the other hand, I am not so sure about your strength and determination in the moral and spiritual sector. Americans take for granted all the wonderful privileges they have. I am amazed to see how you live without the slightest knowledge of the terrible danger which threatens you. I am amazed to see how you have this most dangerous attitude of "This can't happen to me." I am terribly sorry to tell you that Stalin has important allies in your country. I am not speaking only about those fools and criminals in the Communist Party, and their fellow travelers who want to undermine your country, but I am speaking about Stalin's allies in the person of those millions and millions of otherwise good, honest Americans whose ignorance and indifference paves the way for Stalin's domination of the world.

I am always amazed as to the reason for this. What is the reason that the great American people, with such amazing results in their history, seem to be confused, seem to be divided on those issues on which, after all, their whole national existence will depend? I think the only reason is that you in this country have enjoyed an unheard of prosperity. You haven't had war on your own territory for 90 years or so. I am always shocked somehow, and I always wonder how I can explain to you the Soviet danger when you don't know from personal experience what hunger, frustration, slavery, fear, and oppression are.

When I look at my American audiences who are well fed, well dressed, self-sufficient, I always feel that there is a great gap between us. There is a gap between us not because we speak different languages, but because our experiences are so different. I always think about the fact that I lived once in a city which was just as beautiful, just as happy, just as big and just as colorful as any of your great American cities.

Americans don't seem to know and to appreciate these privileges. And if you do not know these privileges how will you stand for them, how will you defend your institutions if it came to it? I am firmly convinced that organizing a Crusade for Freedom in order to bring the truth to the oppressed nations of Communist Russia and the Soviet orbit, to beat the Great Lie with the Great Truth, is not enough. You should extend the Crusade for Freedom in the way that I have told you here, but besides, what you need the most I believe is a Crusade for Freedom in America's own back yard to teach your people what it means to be an American and what it means to live in this country, which I am telling you is really God's own country.

The reason I tell you this is very simple. You are very happy that you have a home, that you have a job, that you have an income, and that you have a bank account. You haven't gone through what it means to come to the bank and find a poster on the door saying that the bank is nationalized and your account confiscated. You haven't gone to your farm and seen the Communist Party taking it over for the purpose of a collective farm. You haven't gone to your factory or to your shop only to have the Worker's Council throw you out, in the good case, or arrest you, in the bad case.

But I went through all this. I lost everything. I was a very wealthy man in my own country, and I have lost not only my job, not only my belongings, which were confiscated by the Communists, but what is worse, I have lost my citizenship because my country was enslaved, and I have lost every single relative and friend of mine who remained behind the Iron Curtain. My wife and I were able to flee. The rest were arrested. We don't know whether they have been killed, whether they are in Siberia, or what has happened to them. The reason I am telling you this is because it is a human characteristic that you cannot really appreciate things until you have lost them. I don't want you to lose these things. I want you to appreciate them beforehand.

THE VOTERS BETRAYED UP TO NOW

Mr. REED of New York Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article dealing with tax reduction.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, thousands of letters on tax reduction are pouring through the mail of which this letter is typical:

DEAR SIR: Your honest and courageous efforts to carry out the promises repeatedly made to the electorate by Members of the present administration to win our votes made me proud that you come from my home

State. My deepest sympathies to you, sir, that your fellow Republicans turned their backs to you and to the many voters they lured to their support with promises of spending and tax reductions of great magnitude.

I am an independent voter and up to now I feel I have been betrayed. I shall not lose hope as yet, but a radical change in administration actions—I want no more promises—will be needed soon to restore any measure of confidence for the present Republican leadership in me.

With best wishes and highest respect, I am Sincerely yours.

There is a steady flow of such letters from every community large and small voicing the sentiment expressed in the foregoing letter. What are businessmen saying? This is typical of the thousands of letters from businessmen throughout the country:

If we wait for politicians or even statesmen to balance the budget before tax reduction we will never get tax reduction. Your plan is better, "Here is so much money to spend, now live within that budget."

Good luck, and more power to you.

I call your attention to another letter from a source I would like to disclose were it not for what might happen to this prominent businessman if his views were to become known to those members of the leadership who are opposing H. R. 1:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *March 27, 1953.*

Congressman DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: I favor reduced taxes this year by—

1. Not renewing the excess-profits tax.
2. Giving individuals some relief in 1953 income.

Because—

1. Ambition and incentive of Americans must not be dulled.
2. High tax rates encourage waste and inefficiency in production.
3. The reduction of this waste and inefficiency through reduction of the deductions for taxes will recoup a substantial portion of the taxes resulting from the tax.
4. Many projects now Federal will be returned to the States where more efficient administration is possible.
5. Many projects now administered by the Government will be returned to the people who alone should administer them.

I favor tax cuts before budget balancing because—

1. The tax cuts will force a budget balance and the benefits set forth above.
2. It will be more difficult to balance the budget if taxes are not cut first.

Very truly yours.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the House the fact that in the city of Chicago tenants are being served eviction notices as of April 30, 1953. This is not the case in a few isolated instances. It is the general rule. The people of Chicago are concerned as to the source from which the real estate interests are getting their assurance that rent control will end as of April 30.

President Eisenhower is not blind to the danger in the existing situation. With the distinguished Speaker of this House and others in the Republican leadership he has declared for an extension of the controls till October 1953. This, at least, would serve as a temporary reprieve giving some time for the working out of a permanent solution. Yet time is galloping on, the real estate speculators have the April 30 gun to the heads of the tenants, eviction notices are going out, the people of Chicago are confused and terrified and the gamblers in human misery are preparing for the kill. Mr. Speaker, I feel strongly that the wholesale sending out of eviction notices at this time constitutes an unpardonable disrespect of the President of the United States and of the responsible leadership of the majority party in this House. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the only proper answer for us to make is to call off the Easter recess. Let it not be said that while we were enjoying a week of relaxation time had run out on our chance to act upon the recommendation of the President of the United States. I for one am willing to remain here, even holding if necessary night sessions, to work this thing out.

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a letter typical of the many that are coming to me in every mail. It is from a constituent of mine living at 1500 East 61st Street, Chicago, Ill., and is as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Here are a few facts as to the shape of things to come. Yesterday tenants in several large buildings in the Hyde Park area were given eviction notices. You know what this means. If all these tenants are forced to move thousands will be hunting for housing as of May 1, and rent uncontrolled will break the sound barrier.

The building in which I live was notified yesterday that all tenants were to vacate as of April 30. This building is not owned by a starving widow but by a bank. The agent is a large North Side realtor.

THELMA J. COHEN.

OUR OFFSHORE OIL RESOURCES

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the course of our national existence, Congress has been faced with many grave issues. When, living up to its responsibilities, this great legislative body resolved those issues in public interest, its decisions were of lasting benefit to our entire Nation. But when Congress, forgetting about the public good, legislated on the basis of other considerations, its enactments were short-lived, abortive, and detrimental to our national well-being and development.

Today, once again, we are faced with a very serious issue—the issue of our offshore oil resources. It behooves us, therefore, to stop for a moment and consider in which way we must proceed to best serve the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court—on three separate occasions—declared that the off-shore resources belong to the people of the United States. These resources are a part of our national wealth, and all the people of this country should derive some benefit from them. The legislation which we have before us would deprive our public of these riches. It would take this part of our national wealth and give it to a few. This is surely not in the public interest.

At the present time, our national debt approaches the figure of $270 billion. We are living in a critical period of history, which requires us to spend billions of dollars annually on our national defense. The people of this country must shoulder that burden, and they, too, are responsible for the national debt. Under such conditions, how can we possibly justify this tremendous give-away, proposed in the legislation before us? Surely we are not so rich that we can afford to make $60-billion gifts while our people are paying such high taxes. The income from our off-shore oil resources can—and ought to—be used for public good. We can use it to pay off a part of our national debt, to meet our defense expenditures, to improve our educational system, or for other worthy purposes. Whatever we do with this wealth, we should make certain that our entire country—not the few chosen ones—benefits from it.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to read an editorial which appeared in the March 11, 1953, edition of the Milwaukee Journal. This editorial is entitled "Tidelands: Principle or Money."

TIDELANDS: PRINCIPLE OR MONEY

There are those who contend that the fight over offshore lands sought by some States in tidelands legislation is based on the principle of States rights. Texas has been the most fervent flag waver for this principle.

There are others—and we're among them—who believe that the fight for offshore lands is, pure and simple, a fight for oil and income. Texas is best proof of this.

Leaving aside all of the constitutional and other arguments, let's look at Texas. When Texas came into the Union it was agreed that the State could continue to claim jurisdiction over lands 3 Spanish leagues seaward—or 10½ miles. Historically, except for the Gulf Coast of Florida, which also claimed 3 Spanish leagues, the national limits were set at 3 miles.

Texas started out shouting for its historic limits on the grounds of State rights. It gained many supporters.

But oil drilling hasn't found wealth inside the 3-mile limit, or the 10½-mile limit, off Texas. So Texas is forgetting its great basic principle of State rights. It is claiming rights now out to the end of the Continental Shelf—where oil has been found.

The States which backed Texas' original claims are embarrassed by this extension of the "great principle." Senator HOLLAND, Democrat, Florida, for instance, a strong supporter of tidelands for the States, has a bill to give States power to their historic boundaries. He is embarrassed at discovering that his comrades in arms no longer define "historic" by geographic history but by the latest oil strikes. His great State rights argument is knocked into a cocked hat by Texans whose boundaries seem made of elastic.

Senator DANIEL, Democrat, Texas, isn't satisfied with the Holland bill—although it's what he based his crusade on in the election campaign. Now, at the very least, he wants a 37½ percent royalty on everything found off Texas outside the historic boundaries.

This at least strips Texans of their armor of principle and shows up the fight for what it is—a fight for oil and the money therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the membership of this body will consider these comments, and vote against this legislation. There is no other course open to us, if we want to serve the public interest.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the whole subject of social security has been drained dry by investigations, studies, reports.

It reminds me of another subject—Hawaii—which has been explored so many times on the spot by committees whose capacity for thoroughness is amazing that the people of the islands must be worn out by investigationitis. It also leads to the suspicion that an old political trick is being used overtime to prevent any constructive action.

I suggest that those who oppose social security should say so in a forthright manner, instead of prolonging the agony under the false hope of further studies.

There is no scarcity of actuarial facts to work on.

But where are the improvements in social security that were promised?

Left hanging in the air, while want and solitude and death are supposed to solve this human problem.

In Denver, Colo., on August 9, 1952, Candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower said, and I quote:

I am particularly concerned about the present inadequacy of the social-security law and feel strongly that the law ought to be extended to presently uncovered persons.

But the Washington Post on March 1, 1953, reported that—

GOP House Ways and Means Committee Chairman REED has put social security under exhaustive study which he says makes action this year on social security unlikely.

"Exhaustive study" is an accurate description, because it will exhaust the old people in need before they can get help, and it will exhaust the patience of the American people who still believe that a promise should be backed up by performance.

I earnestly hope that this committee will promptly bring this serious issue to a head and recommend legislation that this session of the Congress will have a chance to vote upon—and by a rollcall—so that our older folks can have the opportunity of knowing who is for them and who is against them.

To evade the issue by delaying tactics, or by juggling with words, would be the shabbiest sort of treatment when directed against the helpless.

I find it hard to believe that such is the veiled purpose behind this re-review, but having observed the perpetuating habits of some study projects in the legislative field, I fear the worst.

I will not make a mockery of the aged by pleading for what is clear and plain. We have long since passed that stage, and we cannot go backward.

The need for more social security is obvious.

I leave it to the conscience of each Member to decide on the followthrough.

Shall it be faced now, or shall it be put off and put off like an obligation that is never fulfilled?

Many organizations have been working year in and year out to make the United States strong inside. They know, with instinctive wisdom, that while guns and tanks and ships and planes are necessary to protect us against aggressors, we must also protect our people against the physical and spiritual enemies of want and fear within our borders.

Among these dedicated groups, working with great hearts but slender resources, is the National Pension Federation, with headquarters in Washington, D. C.

Each Member of Congress has been informed concerning the pressing need for an improved social-security program.

This question was given high priority by the Republican administration and then it was sidetracked.

I join with many others in asking that a bill be reported favoring extension and increases, and that it be brought out into the open so that we can vote on it within the next 3 months.

That is our direct proposal.

What is your answer?

I trust it will not be: "We must study the problem, without end."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MISS MARY PICKFORD

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have the great pleasure of announcing the plans for a reception by Speaker MARTIN in honor of Miss Mary Pickford, who will launch a nationwide tour in behalf of the United States savings bonds program from the Capitol today.

A public ceremony will be held from 1:30 to 2 p. m. on the steps of the Capitol with the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Miss Pickford participating.

The United States Marine Band will play. Some of you may remember that Miss Pickford came to the Capitol in April 1918 to undertake a similar patriotic task for the Treasury Department. In a sense, it will be history repeating itself.

Miss Pickford will tour from coast to coast to inspire women to conduct a savings bonds signup campaign among the professional and self-employed people. I hope that all Members of the House will attend the ceremony and bid her Godspeed on her travels across America in behalf of a sound economy.

There will be full coverage by the radio and television networks, as well as newspapers and newsreels.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the state of the Union message, I expressed my deep concern for the well-being of all of our citizens and the attainment of equality of opportunity for all. I further stated that our social rights are a most important part of our heritage and must be guarded and defended with all of our strength. I firmly believe that the primary way of accomplishing this is to recommend the creation of a commission to study the means of achieving a sounder relationship between Federal, State, and local governments.

The way has now been prepared for appropriate action. Shortly after stating my original intention, I called an exploratory meeting of interested officials, including Members of Congress and a group of governors representing the Council of State Governments, to confer with me on such a study. This conference produced general agreement on the importance of the problem and an offer of cooperation in the proposed study. Within a few days representatives of several leading organizations of local governmental officials will meet at the White House with several of my associates to give their considered and needed counsel.

The present division of activities between Federal and State governments, including their local subdivisions, is the product of more than a century and a half of piecemeal and often haphazard growth. This growth in recent decades has proceeded at a speed defying order and efficiency. One program after another has been launched to meet emergencies and expanding public needs. Time has rarely been taken for thoughtful attention to the effects of these actions on the basic structure of our Federal-State system of government.

Now there is need to review and assess, with prudence and foresight, the proper roles of the Federal, State, and local governments. In many cases, especially within the past 20 years, the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary

responsibilities of State and local governments. This has tended to blur the responsibilities of local government. It has led to duplication and waste. It is time to relieve the people of the need to pay taxes on taxes.

A major mark of this development has been the multiplication of Federal grants-in-aid for specific types of activities. There are now more than 30 such grant programs. In the aggregate, they involve Federal expenditures of well over $2 billion a year. They make up approximately one-fifth of State revenues.

While by far the greater part of these expenditures are in the fields of social security, health, and education, they also spread into many other areas. In some cases, the Federal Government apportions fixed amounts among the States; in others it matches State expenditures; and in a few, it finances the entire State expenditure. The impact of all these grants on State governments has been profound. While they have greatly stimulated the development of certain State activities, they have complicated State finances and administration; and they have often made it difficult for States to provide the funds for other important services.

The maintenance of strong, well-ordered State and local governments is essential to our Federal system of government. Lines of authority must be clean and clear, the right areas of action for Federal and State government plainly defined. This is imperative for the efficient administration of governmental programs in the fields of health, education, social security, and other grant-in-aid areas.

The manner in which best to accomplish these objectives, and to eliminate friction, duplication, and waste from Federal-State relations, is therefore a major national problem. To reallocate certain of these activities between Federal and State governments, including their local subdivisions, is in no sense to lessen our concern for the objectives of these programs. On the contrary, these programs can be made more effective instruments serving the security and welfare of our citizens.

To achieve these purposes, I recommend the enactment of legislation to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources to make a thorough study of grants-in-aid activities and the problems of finance and Federal-State relations which attend them. The Commission should study and investigate all the activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments, whether there is justification for Federal aid in all these fields, whether there is need for such aid in other fields. The whole question of Federal control of activities to which the Federal Governments contributes must be thoroughly examined.

The matter of the adequacy of fiscal resources available to the various levels of government to discharge their proper functions must be carefully explored.

The Commission should be of such size and composition as to permit appropriate representation of the various governmental levels and of outstanding members of the general public. It should be provided with an excellent staff, able to draw on the great amount of work which has already been done in this field.

In order that the Commission may complete its report in time for consideration by the next session of the Congress, I urge prompt action on this matter.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1953.*

DEPARTMENT OF STATE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 115)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State on the operations of the Department of State under section 2 of Public Law 584, 79th Congress, as required by that law.

The enclosed report contains a summary of developments under the program during the 1952 calendar year. It also includes texts of executive agreements concluded with foreign governments pursuant to this legislation, as well as listings of names of both American and foreign recipients of grants, a detailed statement on expenditures, various statistical tables, and other information concerning the operations of this program during the 1952 calendar year.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 30, 1953.*

(Enclosure: Report from the Secretary of State concerning Public Law 584.)

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BAILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DODD asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Wednesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] released a statement to the press, a copy of which reads as follows:

The action of Congressman HOFFMAN in appointing a subcommittee to conduct a political investigation in Detroit is not within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. It is not in accord with the rules of the House. It is purely partisan. It is a disgraceful abuse of personal power, since the matter never was taken up with HOFFMAN'S full committee.

If any House committee has jurisdiction of this matter it is the Committee on House Administration. The Republican leadership of the House has full authority to stop HOFFMAN'S political smear show, and should do so. If it does not do so, however, if an investigation is to proceed, then the subcommittee should investigate the things that are really wrong with elections in Michigan, and elsewhere.

Every American has the right to have his vote counted and not offset by fraud or gross carelessness by election officials. There is clear evidence that this was not the case in Michigan in the 1952 election. There was certainly a shocking degree of reckless inefficiency in tabulating Michigan votes and there is a widely held and justifiable suspicion existing that former United States Senator Blair Moody was counted out in the late hours of tabulation on the day after election, when it became clear that the control of the Senate would depend on the result in Michigan.

This suspicion that Michigan voters had their will reversed by deliberate malfeasance on the part of election officials was strengthened by the strange refusal of the all-Republican State election commission to grant a request made by the Senate Committee on Privileges and Election for a retally of the votes in the Senate race. This request was not a political or even a Democratic request. It was a request by a unanimous Senate committee including the Republican member, to protect the sanctity of our fundamental democratic system.

The retally requested could easily have been held concurrently with the recount of the governor's race. Why did the all-Republican State commission refuse to cooperate with the Senate? Why, unless it feared that Republican foul play would be revealed, did it not act to have the recheck of Senate votes, so that the charges, if ill-founded, could be disproved?

Why do not Republican prosecutors enforce the law against Republican election officials in counties of Michigan where the latter are violating the law requiring an equal number of Republicans and Democrats on election boards? It is charged that the existence of all-Republican boards in many areas of the State make it possible for them to "count as they please." If these charges are untrue, would not the obvious course for the Republican State machine have been to cooperate with the Senate investigation? Instead, the Republican election commission callously refused to cooperate.

If HOFFMAN is sincere, and is given the green light to hold hearings in Michigan, he will investigate this situation—and let the chips fall where they may. He will also investigate the widespread practice of the big manufacturers of Detroit and Michigan of using economic pressure on their dealers and suppliers and employees to make political contributions to the Republican Party. The notorious plan for Republican money raising, for which a dozen Republicans were indicted and punished a couple of years ago, was renewed in 1952 in no less grossly unmoral form.

If HOFFMAN wants a real investigation into disgraceful political practices, he should not waste the committee's time or money on untrue charges of what did and did not happen in a relatively obscure party caucus in Michigan, but should call the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Wesley Roberts, to explain why he accepted an $11,000 fee for selling a building to his State for more than $100,000 which the State could have acquired for nothing.

For example, to show how far these unwarranted investigations could go, there is nothing to stop an investigation of the Republican National Convention of 1952 when prominent Republicans charged in the convention that not only votes, but delegations were stolen. As a Democrat, I would consider that any such proposed investigation would be not only unwarranted, but wrong.

It certainly would not be within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. However, if one investigation can be made, there is no limit to what can be made. The proposed investigation, which apparently Congressman HOFFMAN is making at the request of and to please Congressman OAKMAN, is wrong in every respect and it does not come within the jurisdiction of Congressman HOFFMAN'S committee. It is a personal and arbitrary act on his part. I hope the Republican leadership and the Republican members of the Committee on Government Operations will realize how wrong this is and not permit this unwarranted investigation to take place, that is if Congressman HOFFMAN does not realize himself the error of his ways.

The question of personal privilege arises out of the charges made by Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK that a proposed investigation to learn whether citizens had been deprived of civil political rights guaranteed by the Constitution, whether the Corrupt Practices Act was being violated, whether it should be amended; whether taxpayers' dollars were being used throughout the Labor Department's appointees to assist the CIO and the PAC in political activities in taking over political conventions in Southeastern Michigan; whether Federal legislation governing intergovernmental relationships between the United States and municipalities was adequate to protect the rights of the citizens of the States; whether a study of the "operations of governmental activities at all levels" was advisable in order to determine the economy and efficiency of such activities was "purely personal," a disgraceful abuse of personal power," a "political smear show," a waste of "the committee's time or money on untrue charges," "a personal and arbitrary act" by the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan; which charges reflect upon the integrity, in his representative capacity, of the Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has read the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and upon examination the Chair feels that the words "disgraceful abuse of personal power," and also where it is stated that "political smear show" justify the establishment of the point made by the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman for 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therewith certain newspaper articles and editorials; and in behalf of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. OAKMAN], I also ask that same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to answer those charges, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph.

The charge that the appointment of a subcommittee to hold the proposed investigation was "purely partisan" is without foundation in fact. The investigation was requested by another Member of Congress whose veracity I have no reason to question and who stated that the complaint grew out of charges made, not by Republicans, but by Democrats.

The charge that the appointment of a subcommittee to hold the proposed hearings was "a disgraceful abuse of personal power" is not true for the reason that there was no abuse of personal power.

The falsity of the charge is shown by the fact that by the rules and the customs of the House, the chairman of a standing committee has the authority to appoint special subcommittees.

Rule 3 of the Committee on Government Operations expressly states "that special subcommittees consisting of two or more members—at least one of whom shall be a member of the minority—may be appointed by the chairman." That procedure was followed in the instant case. That practice was followed in the 81st and 82d Congresses. Moreover, it has never been the practice of the House Committee on Government Operations, or the committee which it succeeded—during the more than 17 years that I have been on that committee—to question the authority of the chairman to determine the issues which should be investigated by a subcommittee.

There is no foundation in fact for the charge that the appointment of this subcommittee was a part of a political smear. On the contrary, one purpose was to learn, among other things, whether the taxpayers' dollars had been and were being spent by Federal employees to further the effort of the CIO-PAC to obtain control of a political organization, influence legislation, secure Federal jobs for its members and favorites, corrupt elections, deny the constitutional rights of citizens who desired to exercise freely their privilege to vote.

The further charge that the appointment of the committee to make the proposed investigation was "a personal and arbitrary act" is not factual for the reasons above stated—that it is the prerogative and has been the practice of the chairman of that standing committee to appoint special subcommittees to make investigations which he deems within the power of the committee and which are requested by individuals of good standing backed by statements of fact. The judgment of the chairman is, of course, in the first instance, subject to review by the committee, and the action of the committee is subject to review by the House itself.

In this case, the chairman has, ever since the 1st day of January 1937, had some personal knowledge of the unlawful violent acts of members of the CIO and of its political activities, and of some of the activities of Communists who instigated such unlawful activities.

Let it be stated here and now, and borne in mind throughout this discussion, that the patriotism, the loyalty, the integrity of the rank and file of the CIO membership of either the international or the local organizations are not questioned.

It is too much to expect that the left-wing radio commentators, columnists, editorial writers and news gatherers will not deliberately and maliciously ignore that statement. That has been their practice so long that they will continue to cling to the Communist line. It will undoubtedly continue to be their practice and all those who cross their path must accept their abuse and vilification.

But, first permit a reference to the authority of the committee as gathered from the House rules and from legislation.

This committee was first established in December of 1927. Its duty was to check the expenditures of the taxpayers' dollars by the executive departments.

In March of 1928, it was given authority to examine, among other things, the accounts of and the expenditures of the taxpayers' dollar by, the executive departments.

By the Reorganization Act of 1946, it was given the duty of examining the reports of the Comptroller General of the United States. And the Comptroller General of the United States was required to examine the expenditures of the executive departments including the Department of Labor.

The committee and its subcommittees have authority to study "the operation of Government activities at all levels" with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. That certainly includes the Labor Department and its employees.

It is strange, indeed, when employees of the Labor Department, acting with members of the CIO and the PAC and using the taxpayers' dollars, engage in political activities and use force to gain control of political organizations which affect the election of Congressmen and Senators, that the right of a subcommittee of this committee is challenged on jurisdictional grounds.

Oh, I, as well as many others, know of the political alliance between the CIO, the PAC and certain so-called liberals in both major political parties, but I do not know of any sound reason why members of either major political party should join in preventing an exposure of those activities when they are designed to affect Federal legislation.

The Reorganization Act itself confers jurisdiction upon this committee and its subcommittees to study intergovernmental relations between the United States and the States and municipalities.

It has been charged by reputable persons that State officials and employees and employees of a Federal executive department, and representatives of the CIO and PAC have, for several years, been acting together to secure appointments to Federal and State offices, to elect Federal and State officials who will further their activities to obtain control of political organizations, favorable legislation.

Just why should this committee, or a subcommittee, be denied the right to hold hearings, to determine whether additional legislation is advisable?

It is understandable from the press release of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the challenge to the jurisdiction of the committee by a former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], a vice president of the Democratic National Committee, why they should challenge the jurisdiction of the committee. If it is

permissible, may I suggest that they feared the result of any such investigation? Certainly when they both, as they do, vote for the expenditure of billions of dollars for wasteful spending abroad; when they let pass, without protest, the proposed expenditure of $300,000 to build a mansion in the city of New York for the use of the United States representative to the U. N., it is not the expenditure of a few hundred dollars in this investigation which they deplore.

Is it possible that they fear that the expenditures of the CIO, of the PAC, in behalf of the political candidates of their party might be put upon the record? If so, they should rest in peace for that was not the purpose which I had in mind. The thought that came to me was that an effort should be made to expose and to prevent political activities of employees of the Labor Department and the use of force to elect Federal officials—further the cause of candidates for the Senate or House.

Now, back to the political activities of the CIO and of some of the Communists within its ranks—and once more kindly remember that no charge of lack of patriotism, of integrity, or of any unworthy motive is made against the rank and file of any local of the CIO or of the international itself.

As long ago as 1925, John L. Lewis, after an investigation—and see Senate Document No. 14 of the 68th Congress—referring to the Communist International at Moscow, among other things, said:

> Imported revolution is knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers of America and of the American people. The seizure of this union is being attempted as the first step in the realization of a thoroughly organized program of the agencies and forces behind the Communist International at Moscow for the conquest of the American Continent.
>
> The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation.
>
> The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions, but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country, and with the single aim of eventually establishing a soviet dictatorship in the United States.

For good measure, and referring to Powers Hapgood, John Brophy, and Adolph Germer, all later active in the CIO, Senate Document No. 14 described the three as fakirs, repudiated leaders, traitors to the unions, opportunists, and purveyors of every falsehood, slander, and deception, and then added that the group had been "doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and to transform this splendid union into a Communist organization." Their successors in thought and act have continued to follow the Red procedure and methods.

It is my contention that today the similar activities of the Communist Party have been carried on ever since 1937 in the State of Michigan. That today Communists are attempting to take over by force a major political party, or at least the machinery of that party, so that they might elect to this House and to the other body individuals who do their bidding. Information is in my possession that employees of the Labor Department, have used their time working, while being paid by the Federal Government, to further the activities of the CIO and the PAC.

In June 1937,[1] from the well of this House I named some 30 leftwingers or Communists who dominated the CIO. Some of you will recall that over that period we were criticized, some of us by the leftwing columnists and those who spoke for the Communists, and that we had to endure the heckling of one Lee Pressman, who was general counsel for the CIO, and of Nathan Witt, who was counsel for the National Labor Relations Board; Witt appearing for the Board,

---

[1] Powers Hapgood was later field representative for the CIO.

John Brophy, then characterized as a traitor to the unions, the purveyor of every falsehood, slander, and deception, is now directed to supervise the administration of the CIO.

Adolph Germer, as stated, was roundly denounced by Lewis in 1930. For years he was a Socialist agitator. Today he is an organizer for the CIO, his work second only to that of Hapgood and Brophy.

Patrick Toohey, a leader in the movement which was "doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and to transform" it "into a Communist organization," and who is now in charge of Communist activity in Philadelphia, is the man who saved the day for the CIO in the RCA strike in Camden, N. J.

Sidney Hillman, one of the original seven who formed the CIO, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America—which made 1936 campaign contributions of $82,281.89, principally to Labor's Nonpartisan League and the American Labor Party, and including $4,350 to the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party—is one of those who in 1922 organized the Russian-American Industrial Corp. to raise a million dollars among the workers of America to bring about the "rehabilitation of Russia." He was active on the IWW defense committee and an honorary president of the Ultra Red National Religion and Labor Foundation.

David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union—which made campaign contributions in 1936 of $61,385.85 to the American Labor Party, Labor's Nonpartisan League, and the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party—was the man who undertook to raise $100,000 from the American radical unionists for the support of the Communist "red" front in Spain.

Clinton S. Golden was for several years business manager and field director of Brookwood Labor College at Katonah, N. Y., a school for labor students, prospective organizers, and strike leaders. He was a member of the board of counselors of Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark., where, according to a legislative inquiry in 1935, free love practices prevailed and communism and atheism were taught.

While Golden and Hillman were directors of the Garland fund, money was allocated from that fund to the Ferrier group, whose publication then stated:

> "We are anarchists because we see in the state an enemy of liberty and human progress; and we are Communists because we conceive communism as the most rational and just economic theory yet proposed. * * * As anarchists, we seek the abolition of the state."

This group then said:

> "The all-important thing is that industry be controlled at the point of production."

Which is what the CIO accomplished at Flint, Detroit, and other places.

Other CIO organizers, and ardent supporters who have been listed as Communists, can be named. Among them are:

Alfredo Abilio, a member of the Communist Party at South Chicago and a paid Steel Workers' Organizing Committee organized among Mexicans in that section.

John W. Anderson, a CIO organizer, who was the Communist candidate for Governor of Michigan in 1934.

Merlin D. Bishop, graduate and former member of the staff of the Brookwood Labor College, and who is on the payroll as educational director for the CIO.

Peter Chapa, who for years was a Communist organizer, is now a full-time organizer for the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee at Gary.

Ruth Chapa, wife of Peter Chapa, who is paid by the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, the SWOC, to do missionary work in the homes of Spanish steel workers.

Joe Cook, a member of the Communist Party, and who is part-time organizer for the SWOC in South Chicago.

Margaret Cowl, Communist writer and agitator, who is on the CIO payroll and was active in promoting the women's activities in the strike at Flint, Mich.

Dave Doran, Pittsburgh district organizer for the Young Communist League, who is on the SWOC payroll and who is a close associate of William Z. Foster, and confers frequently with Philip Murray, director of CIO's steel organization drive.

James W. Ford, colored, Communist candidate for Vice President in 1936. He attended a conference of Negro leaders, called by Philip Murray at Pittsburgh on February 6.

William K. Gebert, associate of William Z. Foster and member of the central committee of the Communist Party, is now a CIO organizer, and confers frequently with Philip Murray.

Paul Glaser, attorney for the section committee of the Communist Party, is a full-salaried member of the SWOC staff.

Doyle Glormer, reporter for the Communist People's Press, is on the payroll of the SWOC.

Jess Gonzales, Mexican, member of the Communist Party and a full-time salaried man on the SWOC in Pittsburgh.

Francis J. Gorman, president of the United Textile Workers, just recently became a member of the advisory board of communistic Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark.

Hansen, first name unknown, member of the Communist Party at Chicago Heights and a full-time organizer for the SWOC.

Charles Henry, member of the Communist Party and part-time organizer for the SWOC in South Chicago.

Mary Hillyer, leader in the leftwing League for Industrial Democracy, who has been assisting Comrade Margaret Cowl, who was active in promoting women's activities in the Flint, Mich., strike.

Clarence Irwin, district organizer for the Communist Party and on the SWOC payroll in Pittsburgh.

Genora Johnson, member of the Socialist Party and leader of the women's brigade at Flint.

Leo Krzycki, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, a member of the national executive committee of the Socialist Party, and a member of the advisory board of the CIO.

Louis Majors, member of the Communist Party, and on the payroll of the SWOC in Pittsburgh.

Homer S. Martin, former Baptist minister, who has been a leftwing orator for years, is president of the United Automobile Workers and Lewis' right-hand man in Michigan.

Leonides McDonald, Negro, Communist leader, on the payroll of the SWOC at Indiana Harbor.

Pressman for the CIO, when an employer was charged before the Board with an unfair labor practice. Could anything be more vicious than that conniving of two Reds to deprive employers of equal justice under law? Could anything be more destructive of civil rights, of justice, than to have the attorney for one of the litigants appear before a body where the counsel for that body, Nathan Witt, was his buddy, and admittedly by the sworn testimony of Pressman they both belonged to the same Communist cell here in Washington?

Mike Ostroski, member of the Communist Party, and on the payroll of the SWOC in Gary.

Blain Owen, alias Boris Israel, and whose real name is Isreal Brestein, and who formerly represented Amtorg, the Soviet trading agency on the Pacific, at present is working with William K. Gebert in the Pittsburgh district.

George A. Patterson, member of the Communist Party, and on the payroll of the SWOC in South Chicago.

Rose Pesotta, veteran anarchist leader, who was an intimate of Emma Goldman, is an active CIO organizer in the rubber and automobile industries.

George Powers, alias Morris Powers, former district organizer of the Communist Party in South Carolina, is now a district director of the SWOC of the CIO in Pittsburgh, at a large salary.

Lee Pressman, radical lawyer, CIO's general counsel.

Walter Reuther, Victor Reuther, Roy Reuther, long-time agitators for left-wing causes and now CIO organizers. Victor and Walter are graduates of the Communist Brookwood Labor College at Katonah, N. Y., a training school for black and white agitators.

Eleanor Rye, colored, an organizer for the National Negro Congress, a Communist organization, and on the private payroll of Van A. Bittner, Chicago regional director of the CIO.

John Schmies, former assistant to William Z. Foster and one time organizer of the Auto Workers' Union, a Communist organization, which was active until a few years ago. He is the Detroit representative of the fraternal-orders committee, organized by the CIO to line up fraternal organizations.

Tom Shane, member of the Communist Party and a fulltime CIO organizer on the steel workers' payroll in Pittsburgh.

Tucker P. Smith, president-director of Brookwood College, who writes for the auto workers' CIO organ and who assisted the CIO in founding a training school at Saugatuck, Mich., last summer, for the training of agitators for the sit-down strikes.

Jack Stachel, member of the central committee of the Communist Party, who is a director of CIO payroll organizers in Pennsylvania and who wrote the foreword to one of Foster's propaganda pamphlets distributed by CIO organizers.

Maurice Sugar, radical lawyer, who was the Communist candidate for the office of recorder's judge in the city of Detroit in 1936, and who is on the payroll of the CIO. (Twice convicted in Federal Court and once sentenced to a Federal prison.)

Mary Heaton Vorse, well-known Communist author, who has been directing the organization of CIO women's auxiliaries.

William Weinstone, secretary of the Michigan district of the Communist Party, who has been directing Communist activities in the Flint and Detroit strikes, and who is the author of the pamphlet, The Great Sit-Down Strike.

In addition to the long list of Communists and supporters, whose names I have recited as being moving spirits in the Committee for Industrial Organization, we have numbered, among those giving it active or tacit aid, the National Labor Relations Board; the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins; the Governor of the State of Michigan, Frank Murphy; the President of the United States.

William Z. Foster, America's Communist No. 1, national chairman of the Communist Party in America, outlined the plan and prescribed the methods of procedure for unionizing steel, the methods which have been followed in the CIO drive and strikes.

First. Foster recommended that supporting committees be formed among fraternal organizations. Within a month Philip Murray and three full-fledged Communists spoke at a fraternal orders' conference in Pittsburgh. Lewis sent his blessings, and a fraternal orders' committee was formed, with Bill K. Gebert, recently district organizer for the Communist Party in Chicago, as its national chairman. This organization took an active part in the Detroit strike.

Second. Foster suggested that support should be extended to the building up of the Workers' Alliance. As everyone knows, the Workers' Alliance, as now constituted, is a combination of three Red organizations, and not long ago, when a statewide meeting of that organization was held at Harrisburg, Pa., Clinton Golden, the CIO regional director, thanked the Alliance for the support it had given and pledged the support of the CIO to the Alliance.

Third. Foster suggested that prominent speakers of the National Negro Congress, organized by Communists, should be brought into the steel districts. In February Philip Murray met in conference with James W. Ford, ranking Negro Communist, candidate for Vice President on that ticket; John P. Davis, of the National Negro Congress; and Thyra Edwards, not long returned from Soviet Russia.

Fourth. "The women relatives of the steelworkers are a vital factor in the steel industry," said Foster, and directed that they "be organized into ladies' auxiliaries." The CIO immediately adopted the idea.

On the payroll of the CIO, into Flint went Margaret Cowl, leading Communist organizer and writer. There the women's auxiliaries, with their red armbands and red berets, under Mary Hillyer, leader in the League for Industrial Democracy, and Mary Heaton Vorse, Communist author, marched in the streets assisting the pickets and the sitdowners in the factories.

May 26, at Detroit, these women's auxiliaries marched on the Ford plants in Dearborn.

Fifth. The sitdown strikes no more than began when Foster issued further recommendations dealing with anticipated strike problems. These were distributed through Communist and CIO channels. One of these recommendations was this:

"Prominent liberals and others should be brought into the strike areas. A national citizens' committee, comprising such liberal strike sympathizers, including educators, writers, artists, etc., should be set up."

Within a few days from New York into Flint and Detroit went the American Civil Liberties Union, and a national citizens' committee to support the strikers was formed.

Sixth. Foster advised:

"Not only should all the strikers be mobilized for picketing, but their women and children as well."

We have been accustomed to picketing by women, but in Flint children were bedecked with the signs and slogans so characteristic of Red meetings.

Seventh. Foster recommended a legal department and said:

"Here the International Labor Defense can also play an important part."

Onto the stage and representing the strikers came Maurice Sugar, Detroit representative of the Communist International Labor Defense.

"ALIENS UNLAWFULLY IN THIS COUNTRY LEAD A SITDOWN STRIKE"

Eighth. Foster stated:

"Especially vigorous campaigns must be made against all attempts at deportation of foreign-born workers. This emphasizes the need to build up the ILD in the strike centers."

Three of the CIO organizers who assisted in taking possession of the Parke-Davis plant at Detroit—John Dolphin, Solomon Fine, and Anthony Probe—are aliens who are illegally in the United States. Anthony Probe is a candidate for vice president of the UAWA.

"CIO DEFIES COURT"

Ninth. Foster, the Red leader, advised:

"When injunctions are issued the strikers should follow the * * * policy of ignoring such court orders."

When Judge Gadola, at Flint, issued injunctions against the continued possession of General Motors plants by the CIO strikers, those injunctions were ignored, and Gov. Frank Murphy, executive officer of the State of Michigan, called in the National Guard and prevented the enforcement of those orders.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE GOVERNMENT

Of late CIO has been proceeding under the Wagner Act, asking for elections in those plants where it was sure it had a majority of the workers. Where it did not have a majority it refused to ask for an election, as, for example, at Flint, where its membership was but a fraction of the total number of workers.

The history of the Flint strike is well told in a pamphlet by William Weinstone, secretary of the Michigan district of the Communist Party. He lists the causes of the victory. Reference is made to but a few.

He gives first place to the sitdown tactics.

Second, he gives credit to workers in Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, Norwood, and Flint, who "operated as a single unit, as an army which responded to every critical situation and to every danger. Toledo and Norwood workers came to Flint in the first days of the strike and greatly strengthened the fighting lines."

COMMUNIST ACTIVE IN CIO BOASTS OF GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

He further says: "Of first-rate importance among the reasons for the victory must be considered the attitude of the Government. By the Government I mean in this case the attitude of the Governor of the State of Michigan and of President Roosevelt."

He states that the CIO "called upon and secured the aid of the La Follette Committee on Civil Rights."

Let us glance for a moment at the "attitude of the Government," to which Weinstone referred.

There has been a long-continued and thorough investigation of the activities of the mine operators in what is termed "bloody Harlan County." If but a fraction of the testimony taken in that investigation be true, the guilty should be brought to justice and measures adopted to prevent a recurrence of any such happenings. If there be truth in the testimony brought out by the Civil Liberties Committee, a reign of terror has existed for many years in Harlan County.

Under the Federal Constitution and a Federal statute, it was the duty of the National Government to protect the citizen. For more

My charge is, and the information which I have is to the effect, that some of those Communists had control of several local CIO unions in the State of Michigan. As a matter of fact, one of our colleagues who moved over to the other body exposed in hearings held in

Detroit the Communist infiltration into those unions—and some six of them were expelled by the unions themselves because it was publicly shown that they were Communists and adhered to the Communist Party line.

Yet, when I appoint a special subcommittee to look into the use of force, the use of baseball bats to throw the elected members of a political party out of the convention, a convention which elected delegates to the State convention, which went on into the election of Congressmen and Senators, and to disclose the activities of Federal employees who had repeatedly assisted the CIO, when I proposed to attempt that, the jurisdiction of the committee is challenged and, sad to relate, certain Republican Members seemed to agree.

So, what did I do? I said, all right; I was not going to wait to be censured by my Republican colleagues. I said, "All right, if any appreciable number of Republicans or of the committee do not want an investigation or will not countenance an investigation—I had been told by a Member of this House high in authority in the ranks of the party that any vouchers which I might issue would not be signed by the chairman of the House Administration Committee, but who, I am advised, never made such a statement; there was nothing for me to do but say, "All right, we will let it ride." That I did with the statement that apparently the issue and what might grow out of an investigation was too hot politically for either party to permit the investigation to continue.

That is the situation, and that is why I am here now. It makes no difference to me where the thread of corruption runs. I am ready to clean up the mess now, or later, whenever I am permitted.

One thing is sure: Constitutional government, a free government of the people, can never exist if this body is to close its eyes to the use of force to take over political conventions and political party machinery. Force is nothing new in the CIO organization; it is nothing new to Communists.

When a few days ago, acting as chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, I appointed a subcommittee to inquire into certain activities of the CIO and the PAC, did I know what I was doing? Did I know as much as the members of the committee, including the Republican members, of the record of the CIO and of the Communists who were associated with it, and—let me emphasize this—of the activities of Federal employees—individuals paid with the taxpayers' dollars while they were spending their time and their efforts in the furtherance of the CIO to obtain control of the State government in Michigan—did I?

I, personally, saw something of the sit-down strikes in Michigan. Those strikes began on the last day of December 1936. They continued to June 11, 1937. Many an individual afterward disclosed as a Communist not only participated in, but directed, those strikes. The CIO, with the assistance of the Governor of the State, took possession of more than one Michigan city.

They defied the law-enforcing officers; they disregarded court orders; they destroyed property; they beat and misused women and men who sought only to go peacefully to their jobs. Were they at that time, or later, assisted by the State and Federal Governments?

They certainly were. Has that effort ceased? When we learn that by force and violence they take over political parties, shall we assume Congress is powerless to learn the truth?

The Governor of the State of Michigan called out some 3,600 State troopers. Was it in an effort to preserve law and order? Oh, no. It was to prevent the local law-enforcing officers maintaining order, prevent the men and women who wanted to go to work, to reach their places of employment. The Governor of the State, was at that time, almost in daily communication with the then President of the United States as is shown by the record of the telephone calls.

The CIO, in its drive for members, did not hesitate to use the name of the then administration, a committee of the Congress. Its organizers were, on occasion accompanied by special Federal investigators from Washington and on the hood of an automobile was carried the statement "United States Senate Car—Civil Liberties Committee Invesigators."

But today when the CIO, the PAC, and Communists within their ranks are continuing their efforts to take over the Government in Michigan, determine who shall and who shall not be elected, I am told that the committee lacks jurisdiction. It might be helpful to some Members of Congress, who have, so far, been unable to see that Communists within the CIO were, as early as 1937, using that organization to destroy civil liberties, to take a glance at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1, 1937.

But, do I hear you ask: What has what happened in 1937 to do with the proposed invesigation? Just this.

Never, from 1937 on down to the present moment, has the CIO lessened its drive to obtain political control of Michigan or enlarge its influence in Federal Government.

And, never from that day to this, have some Federal employees ceased their efforts to increase the power and the influence of the CIO and, in more recent years, the PAC, the creature of the CIO. And always—a power in some CIO unions has worked with the Communists.

Time and again, as is shown by the records of the Clerk of this House, has the CIO made contributions of money to aid in the election of Members of Congress. And, in at least one instance, the Congressman forgot, even though the CIO did not, to report the contribution and its amount to the Clerk of the House.

Nor does the CIO always at the time acknowledge its political obligation to the recipient of its benefits. Just a few days ago, we noted that from money collected from the rank-and-file workers, it contributed a hundred thousand dollars toward the Truman memorial while the steel workers kicked in $150,000. A belated acknowledgment of favors shown by Mr. Truman.

It was my thought, in appointing this committee and contemplating the proposed hearings, that the Congress might learn whether the Communists who, for so long, have worked so successfully to promote the CIO, bring about strikes and violence, were now back of the CIO strikes in plants which are idle but which should be busy producing munitions of war for the men in Korea; whether they were encouraged in these strikes by Federal mediators, employees of the Wage and Hour Division, of the Conciliation Service of the Federal Government.

Previous hearings had shown State and Federal mediators and conciliators working with the CIO in labor disputes.

It was also my thought that we might learn whether charges made by apparently responsible individuals that some of those who, by force, took over conventions, which had an influence upon the elections of candidates for Federal offices, may have been rewarded by, for example, an appointment to a postmastership in Michigan and by appointment to the office of United States District Attorney.

Perhaps had hearings been held, we might have learned whether that charge was true or false, and whether, if true, those who used violence to take over political conventions and the management of political parties were to be rewarded with Federal jobs.

Something has been said of the violence, the lawlessness, the defiance of Government which Communist agitators in the CIO have employed to domi-

---

than 4 years this administration has had full power to remedy this condition, to prevent this injustice. Yet little was done until assistance to CIO's organizing efforts was needed.

Unfortunately no investigation of the activities of the CIO in that county has been undertaken. No investigation of the intimidation, of the brutality exercised by the organizers of the CIO has been made.

It is undisputed that in Flint the civil liberties of the citizens of that city were taken from them, but no committee attempted to learn who was responsible.

ARMED INVASION OF STATE

It is undisputed that hundreds of armed men invaded the State of Michigan and the cities of that State during the Flint and the Detroit strikes and, by show of force, intimidated and terrorized peaceful citizens seeking work. No investigation has been made; no steps have been taken to punish those guilty or to prevent a recurrence.

On the contrary, the Governor of the State of Michigan, who was in communication and talked with the Secretary of Labor and with the President, actively prevented protection being given to either property or person. No Communist, no Anarchist, no ultra Red could desire more effective cooperation.

In the motor industry Ford alone has refused to yield to the demands of the CIO. On the 26th of May organizers invaded his plant and were thrown out and beaten by workers.

Immediately a hue and cry went up to the National Labor Relations Board, to the Civil Liberties Committee, to the Governor of Michigan, and to the President for protection.

Protection from what? To protect these organizers in their invasion of private rights; to protect these organizers in their efforts to throw men out of their jobs, to force them to join the CIO, to force them to pay dues, to place the CIO in a position where if a man desires to work he must first sign on the dotted line and then pay such assessments as the officers of that organization might demand?

nate industry in Michigan from 1937 on down through the years.

Lest my words be not understood, permit me to show you copies of photographs from the court records in the eastern district of Michigan, sent me by United States District Judge Tuttle of that court, which were introduced in evidence in litigation, and which show the way in which Communists dominated the CIO, cowardly beat defenseless citizens. The six which I hold in my hand are but a part of the exhibit. Let me describe just one.

I quote:

STRIKE GANG CLUBS WORKER

On April 3, 1941, at the Ford River Rouge plant in Dearborn, Wayne County, Mich., as he attempted to enter gate 4 on Miller Road, to aid in making out the payroll for strikers, Melvin Bartling, timekeeper, was beaten until he was unconscious by four men shown in the picture. About 15 members of the Michigan State Police, who are not shown in the picture, stood within 50 feet of him, but gave no assistance—this despite the fact that section 17 of Act 176 of the Public Acts of the State of Michigan for the year 1939 makes it a criminal offense for anyone to interfere with any employee on his way to work.

The men who are shown beating Bartling are No. 1, the man with the club, Roy Snowden; No. 2, the man to the left of Bartling is Eugene Torrence; the man to the right rear, swinging his right and the man in front, are the Ferrara brothers, Nos. 3 and 4. None of these men was an employee of the Ford Motor Co. All were members of Briggs Local No. 212, UAW–CIO. Snowden and Torrence are members of the Communist Party.

The same methods of violence, the beatings which the Communists in the CIO used on many occasions in years gone by, we were reliably informed, were used to take over political conventions in that same general area and to, through the use of violence and the seizure of those political conventions, obtain political power, prestige, Federal jobs, and exert influence in the writing of Federal legislation.

Did the members of the Committee on Government Operations, who frowned upon the appointment of a special subcommitee realize that the force, the violence, the defiance of the law which existed in years gone by, was being used to obtain control of the party machinery of the Democratic Party in Michigan and through it, influence not only the writing, interpretation, and the administration of State law as it related to Federal legislation, but to influence the writing of Federal legislation? Is violence in connection with labor disputes to be subject to investigation by congressional committees but approved, or at least ignored in political activities which affect Federal legislation?

And do not forget that, over the years, Federal employees have been following a course of action which encouraged and gave strength to the CIO and the PAC.

Are we, in Congress, to sit idly by as we did when previous administrations built up the strength of Red Russia which is now being used against us and, by our silence, condone the activities of Communists and others who seek to take over and dominate the activities of a political party's organization?

Do I hear someone ask why all these facts were not laid before the committee when my judgment was challenged? In return, I ask, is the judgment of a chairman of a committee to be questioned and set aside unless he details the evidence which it is expected will be produced at a hearing? That has never been the custom.

Moreover, the committee has a rule, though already it is questionable whether its spirit, if not its letter, has been violated. That rule is to the effect that statements of proposed activities shall not be given out either by staff members or members of the committee until reports have been approved.

If that rule continues to be ignored or sidestepped by subcommittees, or members of subcommittees, then it will not hereafter be observed by the chairman of the committee.

Perhaps I was mistaken and the Congress and the people have no interest, no right to be interested, in whether those who violate State laws, who use force to obtain political control, are rewarded by appointment to Federal office.

The appointment of this special subcommittee and the holding of the proposed hearings were challenged on the ground that such action would invade the jurisdiction of other standing committees of the House. There is no question whatever that the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Government Operations overlaps the jurisdiction and is coincident with the jurisdiction of every standing committee of the House.

Not a single standing committee of the House, charged with legislation, but has an interest in, has a right to inquire into and should be concerned with, not only the necessity for legislation, but the effectiveness of the legislation which it sponsors.

Nevertheless, the Committee on Government Operations, from the date of its creation right down to the present moment, has, by the rules of the House and the statutes, been given the right to inquire into the effectiveness of all legislation, the efficiency and the economy or the lack of both, with which legislation is interpreted and administered. It has been given jurisdiction to inquire into the expenditures of the taxpayers' dollars by every single executive agency, no matter which committee writes the legislation.

To now hold that a subcommittee or the Committee on Government Operations has no jurisdiction to follow the taxpayers' dollar through the Department of Labor, when its employees join hands with the Communists in the CIO and the PAC in an effort to control the government of a State and increase the power of the CIO and the PAC in the Federal Government, is a policy with which I cannot go along, except as I am forced to do so.

Has all that violence—the acts of the CIO—anything to do with this issue which was up before the committee the other day? I say it has. This campaign of violence, of beatings, which was carried on then, has continued right on down to the holding of those conventions, and the same methods, the methods of the Communist Party, were used when the CIO–PAC fellows walked into the conventions in Wayne County and threw out the old-line regular Democratic members of the party. Yet, even though the CIO–PAC has over the years been aided, undoubtedly aided by the employees of the Labor Department—and I have a few affidavits over the years to that effect—the leadership on that side says the committee has no jurisdiction to investigate that, no not even to question the use of the tax dollar though they investigated expenditures all over the world.

They evidently have persuaded some of the Republicans who are not familiar with the past record of the Communists in Michigan, who are not familiar with the statement of Gus Scholle, State president of the CIO, that no Republicans should be elected, no matter how able, how competent, how loyal—they may not have been familiar with the record of the Reuther brothers, who studied in Russia, who learned something about communism there, and who appear in Washington off and on to tell committees of the Congress, just a week or two ago the Labor Committtee, what kind of legislation should be written. Of course the rank-and-file of the CIO does not know what has been going on, but the leaders do, and some of them are serving the Communist cause.

Now, as to the precedents bearing upon the action which was taken by the Chairman of this committee in appointing a subcommittee of this committee.

PRECEDENT JUSTIFIES THE APPOINTMENT OF A SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE

The challenge to the right to appoint a special subcommittee for the purpose heretofore outlined because standing legislative committees of the House have jurisdiction, is unsound.

As has been stated, there is no question but that legislative committees have jurisdiction to hold hearings on practically all of the situations which this committee has authority to investigate. But the Committee on Government Operations, ever since it was created in 1927, has had authority to inquire into the activities of every executive department, not only as to the expenditures of the funds of those departments, but as to the manner in which legislation was interpreted and enforced.

Permit the citation of a few precedents:

In the 80th Congress, without challenge, a special subcommittee was appointed to investigate the paroles granted to five of the Capone gangsters. Hearings were held in Washington and in Chicago. In the latter hearing the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. DAWSON], though not a member of the subcommittee, participated, examined witnesses, and exchanged charges with Captain Connolly and Captain Drury, formerly of the Chicago police force. Drury was later killed and the Chicago papers charged that his execution was the result of gangster activities.

The activities of those who assisted in the procuring of these paroles were, through the testimony of Paul Dillon, a one-time campaign manager of President Truman, traced directly to the White House.

The paroles were revoked, though later Federal judges, apparently accepting the

argument that a parole, once granted, was irrevocable, vitiated the order revoking the paroles.

Beyond doubt, the House Committee on the Judiciary had jurisdiction over the question of whether the granting of the paroles was justified, whether additional legislation was needed to prevent similar occurrences.

A special subcommittee was appointed during the 80th Congress to investigate violence and racketeering on the Dock Street market in Philadelphia. The issue was whether the civil rights of citizens, including veterans, had been denied them. Another issue was whether the Hobbs amendment to the antiracketeering law had been violated. The Attorney General insisted that it had not. But, as the result of the hearings, several of the gangsters—they were union officials—were convicted and sentenced to prison.

The issues involved in those hearings were clearly within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on the Judiciary. There was no complaint from that committee. There was no complaint from the Committee on Education and Labor.

While I was chairman of a subcommitte of the House Committee on Education and Labor, this subcommittee held hearings inquiring into the violence and the use of force in connection with labor disputes in Berrien County, Mich.; Cass County, Mich.; Clinton, Mich.; Michigan City, Ind.; in Galion, Ohio; in Dayton, Ohio.

In each and every one of those hearings, it appeared that Federal employees, paid with the taxpayers' dollars, had encouraged and given substantial aid to unlawful activities of the CIO.

In two instances in Michigan, State authorities and State police, acting in conjunction with Federal employees, gave aid and comfort to the violators of the law.

In Ohio, the Governor of the State called out the State troops because their assistance was needed to quell violence and rioting. Beyond doubt the Committee on the Judiciary had jurisdiction to investigate, hold hearings, and write legislation. There was no challenge to the action of that special subcommittee.

A special subcommittee held hearings in Chicago in connection with the unlawful activities of the CIO which then was carrying on a strike against the packing industry. Those strikes were being carried on in several cities. The railroads, as well as the highways were, in some instances, obstructed, railway cars were burned, many individuals were beaten, a great deal of property was destroyed and at least two men were killed.

In these strikes, as in others, the influence of the Communists was felt, their methods were followed.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Committee on the Judiciary had jurisdiction. There was no challenge of the authority of the special subcommittee.

In 1950 a subcommittee of 6 headed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] traveled to Europe, taking with them 4 other people at a cost of $6,820.21. Whatever may have been the purpose of the committee, no report was filed. The same year a subcommittee consisting of six Members headed by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Huber, traveled to Asia and the Far East at a cost of $2,864.75, but the purpose of that trip was never disclosed by a report. Yet today gentlemen who sponsored that trip object to hearings in Detroit which, apparently, it is feared might disclose political activities of a political organization aided and abetted by Communists and encouraged by Federal employees.

FEDERAL SUPPLY MANAGEMENT (OVERSEAS SURVEY)

In 1951, the Bonner subcommittee, charged with jurisdiction over intergovernmental relations—not foreign relations, not military expenditures—made a round-the-world trip, which took approximately 42 days, during which there were 29 days of hearings and a record of 1,465 pages of testimony was made.

It came up with a valuable report, recommendations of which if followed will save not millions, but billions, of dollars. Why then is reference made to that committee's activities? Because, and only because, the matters which it inquired into might properly be said to fall within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs, probably not within the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations. I made no objection then, nor now, because in my opinion the committee did a masterful job and it matters not at all to me whether a good job is done by Mr. A or Mr. B. It is cited here only because of the present attitude of some of the members of the House Committee on Government Operations toward the proposed investigation by a special subcommittee appointed for the purposes hereinbefore outlined.

MILITARY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION IN ALASKA

In September 1952, a special subcommittee on Military Housing Construction in Alaska was appointed. That committee, with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. HENDERSON LANHAM, present, held the hearings and filed a report.

Beyond question, the Armed Services Committee has jurisdiction in that matter.

ANOTHER CASE OF CONCURRENT JURISDICTION

In the 80th Congress, a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which undoubtedly had jurisdiction of the subject matter, made an investigation into the activities of Communists in connection with the GSI strike here in Washington, without objection from the Committee on Un-American Activities. Abram Flaxer, an official of the international, appeared at that hearing and refused to testify as to his connection with the Communist Party. Recently he was convicted of contempt of the committee because of his refusal to answer similar questions. At that time John Steelman, the President's assistant, was subpenaed to appear because the subcommittee desired to learn whether information which had been given the subcommittee that the President was backing the Communists in the GSI strike was true or false. The President refused to let Mr. Steelman appear. Not only did the Committee on Un-American Activities have jurisdiction over the subject matter, but certainly the Committee on the Judiciary had jurisdiction, but neither made any objection.

INVESTIGATION OF THE HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

In the 81st Congress, the gentleman from Illinois, who now challenges the appointment and the jurisdiction of the proposed subcommittee to hold hearings in Michigan, appointed a special subcommittee to investigate the Home Loan Bank Board. That committee consisted of three Republicans and two Democrats.

Later the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], acting as chairman and acting alone, except for the assistance of his general counsel, Mr. Hyman I. Fischbach and Fischback's assistant, Mr. Herbert Roback, held hearings. Apparently the principal purpose of the hearings was to force the Home Loan Bank Board and the Department of Justice to cease its opposition to the payment of a claim made by one Gregory for some $4,500,000 to $5,000,000 damages.

Hearings were held by the special subcommittee on 36 days, beginning on October 27, 1950, and ending on March 28, 1952. The record covers 2,118 pages. No report was ever adopted by the subcommittee, nor by the full committee. To date the Federal courts, twice the Supreme Court, have upheld the contentions of the Home Loan Bank Board and the Department of Justice.

The Committee on the Judiciary certainly the Committee on Banking and Currency, had jurisdiction over the issues here inquired into.

The right of the chairman of the full committee to appoint a special subcommittee was not challenged.

The right of the chairman of the subcommittee to make investigation and to hold hearings without the approval and attendance of the other member or members of the subcommittee was challenged. Nevertheless, on October 27, 1950, in the Federal Building in Los Angeles, the gentleman from California did hold hearings. I read from the record:

Present: Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives.

H. I. Fischbach, Esq., counsel for the special subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives.

On November 14, 1950, in the Post Office Building at Long Beach, Calif., hearings were held. Permit a quotation from the record:

Present Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives.

Hon. Clyde DOYLE, Congressman, Eighteenth Congressional District.

H. I. Fischbach, Esq., counsel for the special subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives.

When objection was made by me to the holding of hearings unless an opportunity was given to the minority to have a representative present, the objection was overruled. See committee hearings of October 19, 1951.

In view of the precedents established by the Committee on Government Operations, the present objection to the appointment of a special subcommittee to hold hearings to determine whether the

constitutional civil rights of citizens have been forcibly denied them by organizations which have over the years received the approval and support of Federal employees seems rather inconsistent.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] placed his interpretation upon what it was proposed to do in Michigan, let me give my opinion as to why a certain faction of the Democratic Party, sitting here in the House, objected to what might be disclosed if we went to Michigan.

My opinion is—and of course it is only an opinion, and a man is easily mistaken—that before these hearings were concluded the activities of the Communists would be hooked up to those of the CIO. And it would be shown that employees of the Federal Government had for years aided the CIO. Some of each group would have been disclosed as the instigators and conductors of a campaign of violence which took physical possession of the Democratic convention and ousted the so-called conservative Democrats in Michigan. It would have disclosed, in my judgment, that as a reward for their physical violence at least two of them received Federal appointments. Oh, the committee has no jurisdiction because Federal questions are not involved. If certain Republicans joined with them, either because they did not know the record or because, as was whispered around, we might get into some dirt of Republican organizations—as far as I am concerned, I will never cover up one single act of crookedness on the part of any Republican just because he is a Republican. Maybe I am wrong, but at least that is my opinion of what they were afraid of. They were afraid that that group, the CIO and the PAC, would have been shown to have been in a conspiracy which was furthered by the efforts of employees of the Labor Department on the Federal payroll. Do you see where we are getting? Now, if that is to be the criterion, and if the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations is to be charged with a lack of authority to make investigations similar to those which the committee throughout the years has heretofore made, or investigations similar to those which the committee throughout the years has made, then I think it is well that we have all of the proposed investigations by the subcommittees passed upon by the full committee; and the membership of the committee being 14 Democrats and 16 Republicans, if the opposition, voting as a unit, can persuade one Republican on the committee to go along with them, all investigations are at an end. That would certainly be a delightful situation for the Democratic Party and the members of that party, would it not? To their credit be it said that many Democratic committees and subcommittees over the last few years have exposed the rottenness and crookedness in their own party, assisted, of course, as they were by the Republican members of the committees. But now some do not want the Republicans to proceed with the work.

For myself, I can only say that in the November election, and prior thereto, I ran for office on the promise that I would do my utmost to reduce taxes and to balance the budget; to get us out of the Korean war, and to end the rottenness which permitted the creation of the mess here in Washington. That is why I am speaking today, not because I am critical of my fellow Republicans, but because I would like to have this House know that there is a move on foot to stifle all investigations. Day in and day out the commentators and columnists who served the left-wing new dealers and internationalists so well are deploring every move made by a Republican to clean house here in Washington.

You are all familiar with the fact that a member of the minority filed a resolution asking that we depose the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Oh, yes. Would anything please the leftwingers or the Communists any more than to have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] kicked off that committee? No. They got rid of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who was doing an outstanding job here in cleaning the Communists out of the administration. Oh, yes. Later on they got rid of two more good American citizens who were doing a job on the Communists. They got rid of John Rankin and they got rid of Mr. HÉBERT. Why? Because they were taking the lid off the dirty, rotten mess underneath. They got rid of them. They said—what was it? They must have lawyers on the Committee on Un-American Activities. The Democratic Party as a party just did not want them; they were too effective. They were nailing too many Reds who were in the administration. So now the issue before this House—this side at least—is: Are we going to fall for this propaganda?—these attacks on the chairmen of our committees?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

I did not say anything about the gentleman himself; I admire the gentleman from Mississippi very much.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point was that the Democratic leadership got John Rankin off the Committee on Un-American Activities. I was not talking about the election; if I was I did not mean to. They got John Rankin off the Committee on Un-American Activities, and they got HÉBERT off for the same reason, because both of them were just taking the cover right off the Communist activities in the administration. What I was getting at was that the Democratic Party got these people off the Committee on Un-American Activities and they got Joe Stearns off, too; he was on that same committee. The Democratic Party cleaned up on Un-American Activities. Those who did that job have never had the courage, they have never had the courage, I repeat, to come out in the open and endorse the Communist activities if they had any inclination to do so. They never had the courage to vote against appropriations for that committee—oh, no; there were only two votes against the last appropriation, nevertheless all the time they have crucified the opponents of communism on that committee; that is what they have done all during the record of the committee; and along the same line now they do not want any investigation of the dirty, rotten, communistic CIO-PAC mess in Michigan, because they fear it might defeat some of their candidates for Federal office in the next election. For the time being they have succeeded in gagging this subcommittee but there will come another day.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks, my own statement relative to the matter under discussion, together with various editorials and news articles from the three Detroit daily newspapers pertinent thereto; also, chapter VI of a book entitled "The CIO and the Democratic Party," pages 112 to 146, inclusive. This chapter is entitled "Michigan: PAC Enters a State Party." The author of the book is Fay Calkins, research assistant for the National CIO-PAC. This study is a project of the industrial-relations center of the University of Chicago and published by the University of Chicago Press.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am before you today to describe to you a menacing situation which has developed in our community. While the developments which I shall describe have taken place within the Michigan Democratic Party, I wish to make it clear at the outset that my comments are in no sense inspired by partisan motives. This is a situation which transcends all political considerations.

Many honorable and distinguished Democrats in the 17th district and elsewhere in Michigan have fallen victim to the conspiracy which has so far proven successful in seizing power and displacing honest and patriotic Democrats who stood in the way. My only interest is in maintaining the free representative institutions which, uncoerced by any hidden group, guarantee true representative government.

That I am not alone in this desire to preserve our free representative institutions, is indicated by the fact that complaints concerning the situation in Wayne County have reached me largely from Democrats.

The conspiracy I shall describe to you today has used terrorism and force in order to subvert the apparatus of the Democrat Party of Michigan. I respectfully submit that the success of this conspiracy is now preventing many of the voters of Michigan from properly exercising their franchise in Federal elections.

With your permission, I should like to begin by describing the events of the night of September 20, 1950, as they took

place at 5 of the 6 congressional district Democratic conventions in Wayne County. This is public knowledge and the reign of terror in those conventions on that night in Wayne County was reflected in all the newspapers the next day, as well as in cartoons depicting the brutality of the seizure of these congressional district conventions, and in editorials blazing with indignation.

Immediately following this disclosure in the public press there were evidences of an aroused citizenry, but the people were so concerned about Korea, spiraling prices, and their own immediate personal problems that before long the matter dropped out of public sight; although feeling that it was an unfortunate incident in the local political history, citizens of Wayne County failed to understand the true significance of this threat to their civil and political rights.

As a result of this seizure by force of the congressional district conventions in Wayne County, many of the real Democrats, as they have been known in America for generations, have ceased to be active within the party and have termed themselves "Democrats-in-exile."

Only a few county officials have been able to stand off the threat of this group and remain in office in spite of them. They have been able to do so because the captive congressional district organizations do not make decisions as to who shall run in the popular primary for county offices.

It is the State organization of the Democratic Party which was peculiarly vulnerable to this kind of conspiracy. This is so because it is the State convention which nominates the Democratic candidates for all elective State offices with the exception of the offices of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

The full significance of this seizure would not be apparent if there was not added the important fact that the captive congressional districts also choose the delegates to the State convention, which in turn elects the delegates to the Democratic National Convention, where the party chooses its nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States.

As a citizen residing in the 17th Congressional District of Michigan, and as a Representative of the people of that district in the 83d Congress, I have considered it my responsibility and duty to join in bringing to the attention of the Congress this use of force and terrorism in the seizure of the party machinery of the Democrat Party of Michigan.

The use of force was, I believe, limited to the halls wherein 5 of the 6 congressional district conventions of Wayne County were held. In order to understand the significance of this strategy it is necessary to know the importance of the congressional districts of Wayne County for anyone who wishes to control the Democratic organization of the State of Michigan.

Wayne County has a population in excess of two and a half million, which is 37 percent of the people in the State. But Wayne County has an even higher proportion of the State's Democrats. For example, 66 percent of the Democratic votes for Governor in 1948 were cast in Wayne County.

Wayne County is composed of six congressional districts, the 1st, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th, each of which holds a congressional district convention, separately, but on the same night. Any group which could seize control of the Democratic Party machinery in these Wayne County congressional districts would, therefore, be in a position to control the whole State Democratic Party. This was clearly the strategy of the conspirators who used force and terrorism to take over the congressional district conventions of Wayne County on the night of September 20, 1950.

By seizing the conventions on that night they were able to put into party office men of their own choosing. Once having seized the offices by force it has been possible for them to maintain power since that time.

The conspirators later apologized for their actions by complaining that there were fraudulent petitions among those submitted by the regular Democrats, and that it was impossible to get legal action to counteract these petitions. Is this a good excuse for resorting to violence and terrorism? In the United States, I submit, a dissatisfaction with some phase of the operation of the legal system confers no right on individuals, or groups, to take the law into their own hands.

This was clearly not a conspiracy by the respectable union officials of the A. F. of L. or even of the CIO. George S. Fitzgerald, then Democratic national committeeman, who walked out of the Fourteenth District convention, was also attorney for the A. F. of L. Teamsters Union. Mrs. Nellie Riley, State president, of the Eleanor Roosevelt League of Michigan, and a former delegate to the Democratic National Convention, is reported to have made this public statement:

> Socialists are in complete control of the Democratic Party machinery.

Similar descriptions of this brazen seizure of the Democratic Party appeared in the public press, attested to by reliable and responsible staff reporters of the three daily Detroit newspapers. This was the part of the conspiracy which the public saw; what they did not see was the long, careful preparation of the conspiracy, the underground struggle to destroy opposition in advance of this brazen thrust for power.

A recent study by Fay Calkins, described on the book jacket as a research assistant of the National CIO-PAC, is entitled "The CIO and the Democratic Party." This remarkable book describes in a singularly frank manner the strategy and tactics of the PAC and as it was written by a researcher of the PAC, who ought to know, I shall, with your permission, refer to it from time to time to supplement my own observations. I respectfully suggest that this book is worthy of the attention of the Congress. I would further request that chapter 6 of this book, pages 112 to 146, inclusive, be entered in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The part of the conspiracy which showed above the surface was only the quick lunge for power, the night of September 20, 1950, at the end of a long period of careful planning and underground struggle. The conspiracy began, according to Fay Calkins, of the PAC, one evening early in 1947 at a secret meeting of the State director of the CIO-PAC with several discontented members of the Democratic Party in the house of Martha and Hicks Griffiths at 12080 Montrose Avenue, in my congressional district in Detroit. Martha and Hicks Griffiths were law partners of Gov. G. Mennen Williams. It was at this secret meeting that the decision was made to seize the Democratic Party in Michigan.

The PAC study shows how this organization first had to convince or subdue CIO members who rejected the proposed methods. Having conquered its own membership, the small group of five men in Detroit—whom Calkins says controlled the PAC—could turn their attention to their plans to seize the party.

The whole core of the strategy has been one of stealth and concealment, except for the one burst of activity on the night of September 20, when the perfectly timed squads, armed with clubs and revolvers, according to Calkins, of the PAC, quickly and expertly took over the congressional district conventions of Detroit. Even today, although it is a matter of general knowledge among newspapermen and professional politicians, the public is largely unaware of what has happened to the Democratic Party of Michigan.

That is why I appear before the House today. It is a matter of public interest to Democrats and Republicans alike that this situation be explored to its fullest extent and the facts brought to public attention.

The book I have mentioned, The CIO and the Democratic Party, is a blueprint for political conquest of the United States by PAC, through the use of terrorism, fraud, and stealth. It might well be asked why the PAC would tolerate such an exposé of its sinister strategy, but I would draw your attention to Hitler's Mein Kampf and Karl Marx's Das Kapital. Hitler wrote out clearly his plan of strategy many years before he carried those plans out, yet no one would believe he really would disclose his actual methods. So it was with Karl Marx. Few have actually read his book, and some of those who have read the book keep hoping that it is not true.

An explanation of the public apathy in Michigan regarding the menacing control of the Michigan Democratic Party by the PAC, might be the complete success of this basic strategy of stealth. The PAC has done everything possible to hide the full extent of its power from everyone, including the CIO members. In the PAC study this absolute need to keep PAC plans hidden is emphasized again and again. In fact, they ascribe the victory of Senator TAFT in Ohio in 1950 to the fact that the PAC was detected by the voters.

This is what the book says, and I quote:

> Whereas, in Ohio, PAC was exposed to public opinion as a special interest group because of its separate precinct organization and marked literature, in Michigan PAC was hidden behind a broad party organization and a traditional party name. A Republican like TAFT could scarcely have crucified Williams. * * * Williams was a Democrat. His labor connections were not apparent to the average voter. Nor could

TAFT have capitalized on the idea that PAC had captured the Democratic Party. The average citizen did not concern himself with district and State party conventions, and the interest-group composition of these bodies was not widely known. *

The sinister fact, gentlemen, is that these conspirators are depending upon the apathy of the average American voter with regard to these local conventions, in order to seize and destroy our freedoms at that vital point. Once they have seized the local organizations by force, then they are in power. They make the rules. The party machinery remains intact; it looks just the same from the outside, but the hands on the levers are different, and they belong to evil men, who have only contempt for the very democratic processes which they have seized.

These men do not trust anyone. Their strategy of stealth is universal. As the PAC study indicates, it is a policy in Michigan to hide the identity of PAC workers from union members, as well as from the public. It was regular policy for PAC precinct workers working in the Williams campaign, for example, thus to hide their identity. The PAC writer describes this as "sophisticated politics."

As the PAC handbook of tactics points out:

The Michigan campaign committee * * * deliberately concealed its interest groups.

The PAC goes on to tell with amusement how the public was fooled because the PAC "candidate for governor was heir to the Mennen shaving-cream fortune." This, indeed, was a perfect disguise for a hard-bitten, ruthless gang of leftist conspirators. How would the average voter of Michigan understand that this affable, rich young Princeton graduate could be in secret collaboration with a gang like the PAC?

Faced by a hopeless situation, many honorable Democrats boycotted the State convention in 1950. George S. Fitzgerald, Democratic National Committeeman, refused to attend a State convention, the delegates to which had been picked, as he is reported to have expressed it, "with storm troopers guarding the doors and the chairman presiding with a baseball bat." With all minority opposition suppressed, the Detroit Times described the subsequent State convention as "the quietest in years."

In Michigan the PAC is controlled absolutely from the center. In their own book they describe the organization as "a centralized and disciplined structure," and then they add that "candidates were predetermined" and "approved like clockwork."

Once in power, there has been no pretense on the part of the PAC that they stand for anything but retaining their power at any cost. As they put it in their handbook:

PAC's compromises had to be pragmatic, in terms of the balance of power at the moment. It could seldom take an ideal position.

When it becomes necessary to doublecross a temporary ally, there is no hesitation and, in fact, the PAC calmly and without shame, describes how such activities are developed.

After the PAC took over hidden control, the idea of keeping the Democratic Party responsible to the public was immediately discarded. In their handbook the PAC analyst discards the idea of responsible parties as theoretical.

Not only are candidates now predetermined by a secret caucus, but the party platform in Michigan has become a simple reproduction of the PAC's program. All of us in the Detroit political arena are aware of this. The average voter is not aware, however, of this fact. The PAC handbook clearly states it as a fact and with your permission I will quote once again:

PAC's hand in this platform can be easily seen by comparing the platform with the State legislative program. This platform, like the candidates, was actually determined at informal caucuses * * * Ratification by the State convention was assured.

Could anything show more clearly than this admission that the PAC now has absolute control of the party which it seized by the use of force and terrorism in the Wayne County, district conventions of 1950?

As a public official of the city of Detroit for 12 years, I have seen some political situations develop which may not have been in the public interest, but I have seen nothing in all my political life to compare with the menace to our free institutions of this threat in Wayne County and Michigan. And Wayne County can be the test tube experiment leading to other conquests.

I respectfully suggest to the Congress that the conspiracy I have described relates to the free elections of Federal officials, and that this matter would be a proper subject for further investigation.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 21, 1950]

OLD GUARD ON LOSING END—DEMOCRAT CAUCUS WIDENS RIFT

(By Hub M. George)

Warring Wayne County Democrats caucused with police protection in 5 of the 6 congressional districts Wednesday night.

In the first round of the struggle, honors went to CIO and Americans for Democratic Action factions friendly to Governor Williams.

But deep-seated wounds of caucus encounters are likely to have far-reaching campaign ramifications.

It was apparent also that the steamroller techniques which flattened old-line party moves for more voice in Democratic affairs will result in appeals to the State convention September 30 in Grand Rapids.

In one instance, George S. Fitzgerald, national committeeman, withdrew from the 14th district caucus along with a sizable block of delegates. The walkout protested the rulings of Chairman Nicholas Rothe, a CIO stalwart.

Rothe was reelected chairman for 2 years, but he had a tight squeak.

The result was not accomplished until more than 75 delegates certified by the county clerk as elected had been excluded from Briggs UAW Local Hall, 10940 Mack.

Police guards barred the bitterly disappointed factionalists. Caucus sergeants, armed with delegate lists, refused admittance to scores whose credentials had been determined as irregular.

The rump withdrawal followed Rothe's refusal to permit shifting of 17 votes from Mrs. Gwen Swartz, who withdrew midway in the balloting, to John P. McElroy, who lost out at the finish 92 to 85.

Among those excluded were Charles S. Porritt, former State chairman, a delegate from a Grosse Pointe district and close ally of former Governor Murray D. Van Wagoner.

A close supporter of Governor Williams got caught in the nutcracker in the 15th district.

Hugh McGoldrick, director of hospitals under Williams, failed to convince sergeants at the 15th district gathering in the UAW hall, 15th and McGraw, that his credentials were authentic.

He appealed for a police escort into the hall. It was refused. Then he tried to force admittance by himself and was thrown out bodily.

He told police that CIO goon squads were the offenders.

County Chairman Ernest J. Lacey was reelected over State Senator James P. Hannan in the fifteenth.

It marked victory, even though the cost might be high, for the Williams cause.

Lacey was elevated to the county chairmanship when Hicks Griffiths, law partner of the governor, moved up to the State chairmanship.

More than 40 delegates were excluded from the 15th district caucus because someone unknown had determined that their petitions had been fraudulent.

What had been expected to be a stormy battle in the 13th district turned out to be a smooth affair.

Chairman James A. Burns, who had been a leader of the old-line faction fighting for party control, failed to show up.

That paved the way for former council president, George Edwards, to win the chairmanship over Patrick Sheehan, who had been nominated by incumbent Congressman George D. O'Brien.

The vote was 92 to 67.

Williams' supporters also won the embattled 17th district, where Griffiths was chairman before his appointment to the Probate Court bench.

Alfred Meyers, of the Griffiths-Williams camp, beat Emmet Donohue, 102 to 58.

Tom Downs, chairman of the Unemployment Compensation Commission, led the challengers in the 17th. As 20 or more supposed delegates were excluded, hoots greeted the name of Governor Williams.

In a melee at the door, William Munger, a young attorney who was excluded, claimed he had been slugged by a man he identified as a postmaster in a rural community.

Under the Hatch Act a postmaster has a questionable right to sit in the convention, Munger said he will swear to an assault warrant Thursday.

A pro-Williams slate was elected for other offices.

Stanley F. Rozycki was reelected first district chairman after another row over the exclusion of about 40 supposed delegates.

State Senator A. J. Wilkowski, who had an opposing slate, refused to continue in the convention after the main body sustained the exclusion.

Wilkowski and his supporters withdrew from further deliberation.

Only in the 16th District was there comparative harmony. There Court Commissioner William Krueger stepped aside from the chairmanship which he has held many years. John Plas, Jr., was named to succeed him by 99 to 87 votes over John Belose.

No attempt was made in this district to exclude any delegates. A lone deputy sheriff maintained order.

The controversy over party control was not injected.

[From the Detroit Times of September 21, 1950]

DELEGATES BOLT, BUT WILLIAMS HOLDS WAYNE—STORMY SESSION SPLITS DEMOCRATS

(By Frank Morris)

After a night of headbruising battling, the Democratic "eager beavers" led by Governor Williams and the CIO took complete command today of Wayne County's delegation to the Democratic State convention in Grand Rapids September 30.

Delegates to the sixth congressional district conventions last night wrestled like performers on television, pushing and pulling and shouting under the noses of astonished policemen.

USES HAT FOR GAVEL

The confusion reached a peak at the 14th district meeting where Chairman Nicholas Rothe used a sawed-off baseball bat as a gavel that threatened many skulls.

National Committeeman George Fitzgerald led his followers out of this convention, declaring:

"From now on, the song should be God Save America, not God Bless America.

"I won't be responsible for what happens to Governor Williams next November."

Delegates who thought they were properly elected were barred from the halls in all but the 16th district. In the 15th the anti-Williams cohorts were admitted for a short visit and then consigned to limbo, one by one.

CREDENTIALS QUESTIONED

One victim of the scuffles was Hugh McGoldrick, a loyal Williams supporter who is State director of hospital construction.

McGoldrick, one-time president of Young Democrats, was carried from the 15th district convention by CIO delegates who questioned his credentials and suspected the presence of a spy.

Those who got into the halls, and kept screaming such parliamentary phrases as "point of order, Mr. Chairman" were subdued quickly while waving Roberts' Rules of Order.

Shouts for police aid got the recalcitrants nowhere. Police were on hand at all six conventions, but the officers of the law bowed to majority rule.

The result was that close to 50 Democrats in the first district, who contended they had been elected as convention delegates, were excluded. Dozens were barred at other conventions without a voice.

The outcome leaves Governor Williams with a Wayne County delegation to the State convention completely under his command.

The maneuver also widens a breach in the party which has been widening for some time.

The battles culminated a struggle for power within the party in Wayne County.

On one side were Governor Williams and the ADA and the CIO. On the other were National Committeeman Fitzgerald and James Hoffa, head of the Teamsters' Union.

Fitzgerald walked out of the 14th district convention, charging that Rothe, who was reelected chairman, was operating a steam roller. A couple of dozen delegates walked out with the national committeeman.

BATTLE IN 13TH

John P. McElroy, personnel manager for the Wayne County road commission, scared the shamrocks out of Rothe by getting 85 votes for the chairmanship against Rothe's 92. McElroy would have won had Rothe allowed Mrs. Frand Schwartz to give her 17 votes to the loser. But Rothe ruled her out of order.

The biggest battle was to have been in the 13th, where former Senator James A. Burns has led the opposition to Williams and the ADA.

But Burns didn't show up and former Councilman George Edwards, charter member of the ADA, was elected chairman over Patrick Sheehan.

Stanley Rozycki, a battler for Governor Williams, was reelected chairman in the first district after State Senator Anthony J. Wilkowski led his followers out of the hall.

LACEY REELECTED

County Chairman Ernest J. Lacey won reelection as district chairman of the 15th after a noisy scrap with State Senator James Hannan, a member of National Committeeman Fitzgerald's law firm.

John Plas was elected chairman in the 16th, and Albert Meyers in the 17th.

[From the Detroit News of September 21, 1950]

FIGHTS, FRICTION, CRIES OF FRAUD ENLIVEN DISTRICT DEMOCRATS' CONVENTIONS

(By William R. Muller)

One of Governor Williams' own State aids was accused of fraud and ejected bodily during district convention balloting which splintered the Democratic Party in Wayne County today.

Hugh J. McGoldrick, State director of hospital construction and survey, was hustled from the hall of UAW-CIO Local 157.

He admitted before a screening committee of delegates that he swore to his own nominating petition as its circulator before it had been circulated.

The 15th District Democratic convention tried McGoldrick, found he was not entitled to a seat, and voted to accept the screening committee report that signatures on his petition were fraudulent.

FITZGERALD LEAVES

At a tumultuous 14th District convention over which Chairman Nicholas Rothe presided with a sawed-off baseball bat, National Committeeman George S. Fitzgerald walked out of the party.

In the First District, State Senator Anthony J. Wilkowski led his Democratic supporters out of Dodge Local CIO hall after the credentials of many were questioned and a large group of Negroes was barred.

Wilkowski had been a candidate for the district chairmanship. When he left, the remaining delegates reelected Stanley F. Rozycki, whom Wilkowski had defeated for the Second District Democratic nomination to the State senate.

After several people were slugged and police were called to the 17th Congressional District convention at Carpenter's Hall, 22521 Grand River Avenue, Alfred V. Meyers, a teacher, was elected district chairman.

EDWARDS VICTOR

Former council president, George Edwards, an original organizer of Americans for Democratic Action in Detroit, was named 13th District chairman over his opponent, Patrick Sheehan. Representative GEORGE D. O'BRIEN had asked Sheehan's election.

There was one peaceful Democratic convention. John Plas, a Democratic regular and a county-building employee, was elected chairman in the 16th to succeed William P. Krueger, now a Circuit Court commissioner.

Delegates barred from the 14th District Democratic convention tore off polka-dotted bowtie pins—political emblems of Governor Williams—and shouted "Me too for Kelly."

Harry F. Kelly is the Republican nominee for Governor November 7.

"After this the theme song of the Nation should be 'God Save America' instead of 'God Bless America'," said Democratic National Committeeman Fitzgerald.

CHARGES SOCIALISM

"I have just watched socialism take over the Democratic Party by communistic processes."

Rothe, refusing to appoint a temporary convention chairman in his place while he was being voted on for reelection, got 92 votes.

Mrs. Gwyn Schwartz got 17. Jack McElroy, Williams' appointee to the State board of aeronautics, got 85. The Schwartz backers rose and asked their votes be counted for McElroy just before the tally closed.

Rothe ignored them. Pandemonium resulted. Fitzgerald seized the microphone and pleaded for democratic procedure. He was shouted down. Bouncers forced McElroy into a chair.

"You haven't taken over the Democratic Party," Fitzgerald shouted at Rothe as he gathered Democratic regulars and left the hall.

"But you now are responsible for what will happen to Governor Williams in the 14th District in the November 7 election."

COALITION ON JOB

The CIO–ADA coalition set up screening committees in five districts to pass on credentials of delegates. Huge groups of opposition candidates were barred by bulky bouncers and accused of having been elected on fraudulent nominating petitions. Police stood guard with night sticks.

In many instances the bouncers disregarded election certifications of the county clerk's office.

In the 15th, McGoldrick, caught in the net set up by those he thought friendly, pleaded he was an aid and supporter of the Governor. He admitted he no longer lived at the address appearing on his petition. But he said he "kept an address next door."

James Hare, former Detroit head of ADA, charged the signatures on McGoldrick's petition were fraudulent. McGoldrick admitted he had signed the petition as circulator, but had done so before a single signature had been obtained.

Williams' own men cheered as McGoldrick was hustled away.

HANNAN FAILS

State Senator James P. Hannan failed to beat Ernest J. Lacey, running for reelection as 15th District chairman. Lacey scored 108 to 50. He will be up for reelection as county chairman also tonight.

The CIO–ADA coalition could claim 5 of the 6 congressional district chairmanships today. The opposition predicted openly the coalition had won party control at the cost of Williams' reelection.

The battle foreshadowed complete control also of the State nominating convention of the party in Grand Rapids September 30 by the coalition.

True to a secretly negotiated peace pact, the Teamsters Union (AFL) created no disturbances at the party's local delegate conventions.

Retiring Chairman James A. Burns took no part in the 13th convention in line with that agreement.

[From the Detroit News of September 22, 1950]

DEMOCRATS-FOR-KELLY CLUB FORMED AS FACTIONS FEUD

(By William R. Muller)

Democratic Governor Williams' reelection campaign today ran into its first open party rebellion.

National Committeeman George S. Fitzgerald rejected an invitation from Williams to come to Lansing today to discuss party strategy with Williams' cohorts.

The rejection came but a few hours after elective Wayne County officers stayed away from a Wayne Democratic Committee meeting which Williams addressed and which reelected Ernest J. Lacey as chairman.

Meeting in the Downtown Republican Club, the Wayne County Republican Committee was told by Chairman Fred W. Kaess that the first Democrats-for-Kelly Club is being formed in the 13th District.

Harry F. Kelly is the Republican nominee for Governor.

RESENTMENT FLARES

The rebellion was traced to flaring resentment by party regulars over CIO-ADA tactics in seizing control of Democratic organizations in five of Wayne's six congressional districts Wednesday night.

The CIO-Americans for Democratic Action coalition had established guards on the doors of district convention meeting places and screened delegates.

Governor Williams learned just before addressing the county committee Thursday night that Hugh J. McGoldrick, his director of hospital building and survey, ejected from a 15th District convention by Williams' supporters, had been taken to Mt. Carmel Mercy Hospital during the day with a heart attack. His condition was reported satisfactory.

LACEY UNOPPOSED

Lacey won the 15th District chairmanship again Wednesday night and went on to re-election to his county job Thursday night without opposition.

"I want to congratulate you roundly on what you have done here tonight," said Williams, referring to Lacey's reelection.

As he spoke, he could look over an audience decimated by the absence of Democratic regulars and most of the Democratic nominees for the State legislature.

Two officials of the 14th District Young Democratic Club had refused to allow party workers to pin Williams buttons in their lapels. Both identified themselves as World War II veterans but asked their names be withheld.

Pressed for an explanation of his refusal to join Williams' strategy meeting, Fitzgerald declined comment.

BITTER RESENTMENT

But Fitzgerald was known to be bitterly resentful over the CIO-ADA coup after a peace meeting in Washington where the Teamsters Union (A. F. of L.), the top command of the CIO and A. F. of L., and Fitzgerald had agreed to work for peaceful settlement of the fight for party control.

Democrats renominated Mrs. Stella Lecznar, county building worker, for her third term as committee vice chairman in the Barium Hotel meeting Thursday night. Miss Anna Pasztuska, former secretary of the First District, was nominated by the CIO.

Mrs. Lecznar measured the CIO forces with her eye and announced her retirement.

Stanley Frankowski, seeking reelection as county committee treasurer, also ran into CIO opposition. He withdrew after John N. Santieu, Dearborn undertaker, was nominated against him. Santieu then was chosen without opposition.

"Victory is possible for us, but it isn't coming on a silver platter," Williams told the Democrats. He warned them to get out the full party strength in the November 7 election.

Democrats rose and cheered him as he left.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 23, 1950]

DEMOCRACY'S NEW SYMBOL: BALL BAT

Governor Williams, Democratic nominee for reelection, was said to have won a resounding victory in Wayne County when his cohorts, the leftwingers of the Americans for Democratic Action and the CIO-PAC, captured control of the Democratic Party machinery in Wayne County congressional district conventions.

But whatever it means to the political fortunes of Governor Williams, it was no victory for democratic processes of orderly government.

In all but one district, the caucuses were marked by sluggings and the Communist techniques of beating down opposition by violence.

The ADA-PAC combination brought back to Michigan the sitdown strike methods which have been disavowed in labor disputes, and applied them to government.

The goon squads took over, and the gavel, that traditional symbol of orderly parliamentary procedure, was discarded for the sawed-off baseball bat.

In all but one district—the 16th—there was near-rioting as the strong arm squads took over.

Delegates representing the old-line Democratic elements were beaten and thrown bodily out of the halls by the shock troop goon squads.

In the 14th District the ADA-PAC chairman, Nicholas Rothe, presided with a baseball bat instead of a gavel.

His tactics of intimidation caused Democratic National Committeeman George Fitzgerald and his following to walk out.

"After this," Fitzgerald declared, "the theme song of the Nation should be 'God Save America' instead of 'God Bess America.'

"I have just watched socialism take over the Democratic Party by communistic processes," he added.

And another Democratic leader, high in CIO circles, echoed Fitzgerald's sentiments.

"You can see," he said, "what happens to democratic government when the Socialists move in."

So outraged were many of the delegates, it was reported, that they tore off their polka-dotted bow tie pins, the campaign emblems of Governor Williams. This was the insult direct to Soapy.

It was 15 years ago that Michigan was stricken by the wave of sitdown strikes, an imported device of the Communists to create violence and disruption.

The power behind the sitdown strikes was the gangs of goon squads, the professional thugs, armed with their clubs and ball bats.

It was the goon squads which, in utter defiance of law and public safety, closed streets in Detroit and forbade their use by citizens while the police stood by helplessly and watched.

It was the goon squads which invaded the capitol in Lansing and took over the government of that city, closing up business, and terrorizing the people.

Only when the goon storm troopers moved into East Lansing and tried to take over Michigan State College were their ranks broken. They came up against brawny American college kids who would not be intimidated like the politicians were. These youngsters threw the hoodlums into the river. That act so stiffened the backbone of the American people all over the country that the sitdown strike no longer could effectively be used.

But if the great mass of organized labor discarded this Communist technique, the left-wing political aspirants, the fellow travelers, the bleeding hearts, and the ADA-ers did not.

For them, the goon squad was a useful device, to be used any time or any place it would further their interests.

No means is unlawful to their ends, and they do not hesitate to use it, always bleating, meanwhile, about their constitutional privileges and the Bill of Rights.

Governor Williams and his ADA backers may have won a big victory by using strong-arm methods to take over control of the Democratic Party in Wayne County.

But they may find it difficult to convince the public, which is not prepared to surrender its rights to ball bat wielding goon squads, who would fit better into a picture of the Kremlin than of America.

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 28, 1950]

WAYNE DEMS EYE MORE TOP SPOTS

Wayne Democrats, alarmed by the threatened party bolt of old-line factions, are asking more key nominations to bolster their fighting front.

Both Governor Williams and Lt. Gov. John W. Connolly are from Wayne, but wounds remaining after last week's stormy conventions are disturbing.

Most serious defection was the announcement that National Committeeman George S. Fitzgerald would neither attend the Grand Rapids convention Saturday, nor participate in consultations.

"I cannot go to a convention whose delegates were chosen by storm trooper methods and the domination of sawed-off baseball bats," Fitzgerald said.

After a goodly number of elected delegates were excluded from the 14th District convention last week, the Fitzgerald forces withdrew from the Briggs local hall.

District Chairman Nicholas Rothe had provided himself with the bat to use as a gavel.

Primary gains had encouraged Democrats to expect a 200,000 Wayne plurality for Governor Williams, an offset for Republican strength outstate.

Now the word is that big blocs of 1st, 13th, 14th, 15th, and 17th District delegates will "sit out" at home during the Grand Rapids deliberations.

Some outstate regulars, including a Muskegon group and Menominee party men, also plan to hold aloof from the parley.

Richard T. Kelly, president of the Wyandotte city council, is the latest secretary of state aspirant. He is endorsed by 16th Congressional District officers.

Supporters claim his name would offset prestige of the name of Harry F. Kelly, former governor, and GOP nominee.

[From the Detroit Times of Sept. 28, 1950]

GOVERNOR FIGHTS PINCER MOVE—TWO REVOLTS FLOOR WILLIAMS

(By Frank Morris)

Governor Williams struggled to escape a political pincers today as he faced two rebellions within the Democratic Party.

The CIO, heretofore his guide and his strength, demanded that John W. Gibson, until recently Federal Assistant Secretary of Labor, must be nominated for Secretary of State.

This unexpected demand rocked Williams, for he is committed to support for that office Philip Hart, 38, his commissioner of securities and corporations.

LEADS BOYCOTT

While fighting this fire, Williams was burned by George S. Fitzgerald, Democratic national committeeman, who is leading a boycott of the party's State convention Saturday in Grand Rapids.

Williams' first move to combat the rebels was to woo the Wayne County elective officials, who never have been close to him or enthusiastic about his party leadership.

He met secretly with the so-called county building crowd last night in the office of Register of Deeds Bernard J. Youngblood, and the meeting ended with everyone shaking hands like lifelong friends embarking on a dangerous expedition.

GET CONVENTION VOICE

The county officials promised to work for Williams' reelection, abandoning their recent passive attitude, in return for a voice in the convention.

The move to force the nomination of Gibson had Williams floored.

Gibson, who came close to being appointed Secretary of Labor under President Truman, is Williams' close friend. They learned politics together under the late Supreme Court Justice Frank Murphy, their mutual idol.

There is no one Williams would rather have as a running mate in preference to Hart, but he made a commitment a year ago to make Hart the next Secretary of State if the Democratic Party wins the election.

BRIGGS' SON-IN-LAW

Hart, Detroit attorney, is a son-in-law of Walter O. Briggs, Detroit industrialist, and has been described as the "only Democrat in Bloomfield Hills."

Outside of about 890 delegates in the 16th Congressional District, the Wayne County delegates to the party's State convention Saturday are controlled by the CIO. In addition, the CIO is in command of delegates from such counties as Saginaw, Bay, Genesee, and Muskegon.

Gus Scholle, president of the Michigan CIO Council, has served notice on Williams that, despite their close cooperation, he will support Gibson over Hart.

This troublesome news was followed by Fitzgerald's announcement he will boycott the convention on grounds that the CIO used goons and baseball bats to control the Wayne County convention.

FLEW TO DETROIT

So Williams flew to Detroit to keep the pincers from closing too tightly and went wooing the county officials. Among those at the secret meeting were County Auditor Sumeracki, County Clerk Branigin, Sheriff Baird, County Treasurer Stoll, Prosecutor O'Brien, and their deputies.

Representative RABAUT, of the 14th District, also was present.

They told Williams they had been ignored in party affairs and pointed out they had no voice in the Democratic congressional district conventions here last week.

They told him they were almost certain to be reelected, while his reelection was questionable.

In the end, they agreed to help Williams out of his labyrinth, and Williams agreed to work closely with them in the future and open party campaign headquarters in various sections of the city to help them.

BOOTED BY ROTHE

Fitzgerald decided to boycott the convention because he was practically booted out of the 14th District convention last week by Nicholas Rothe, the district chairman and a CIO attorney.

Scholle had invited Fitzgerald to enter the inner councils on condition that Rothe receive the next Detroit judicial appointment from Williams and that Gibson be nominated for secretary of state.

Scholle had offered to give Fitzgerald, attorney for the Teamsters Union, a minority of the delegates to the State convention. He added that, if Rothe should be appointed to one of the courts, former Councilman George Edwards would become attorney for the CIO.

But at the last minute Scholle withdrew all peace terms, and the CIO took charge of all district conventions except that in the 16th.

[From the Detroit News of September 28, 1950]

WILLIAMS OUT TO HALT FEUD—VISITS COUNTY TRYING TO HEAL PARTY RIFT

(By William R. Muller)

Governor Williams is trying personally to smother Wayne County party feuds, with the Democratic State convention in Grand Rapids but 2 days away.

In an early effort to bring warring Wayne factions together before the convention, he went in person to the Wayne County Building late Wednesday.

He was escorted by Representative LOUIS C. RABAUT, fighting for reelection in the 14th Congressional District, where the Democratic feud is boiling. He met with Register of Deeds Bernard J. Youngblood and Dr. Samuel B. Milton, a county coroner.

Other Democratic county officials sent representatives to the meeting. Under Sheriff William C. Ryan attended for Sheriff Andrew C. Baird.

LOCAL FRONT PERILED

The theme of the meeting was the campaign threat poised over local county officials and Democratic Congressmen by the split in the party over control of convention delegates.

National Committeeman George S. Fitzgerald, appearing in court on the third floor of the county building, was apprised of Williams' conference but did not attend. Earlier Fitzgerald had announced he would shun the Grand Rapids convention because of treatment accorded Democratic regulars attempting to attend local congressional district caucuses as delegates.

Fitzgerald said the convention would be a CIO affair.

Williams conferred with Democratic nominees and their representatives for more than an hour and left without comment.

WOMAN LEADER SPLITS

Even as he was enroute home, a fresh party outbreak occurred. Mrs. Nellie Riley, State president of the Eleanor Roosevelt League of Michigan, announced she would attend a League meeting in Grand Rapids Friday but would not stay for the Democratic convention.

A veteran party worker, she is a former 13th Congressional District vice chairman and was a 1948 delegate to the Democratic National Convention.

She charged that party regulars were excluded from congressional district meetings where CIO-ADA delegates to the State convention were named.

"Socialists," she said, "were in complete control of the Democratic Party machinery. Mothers and housewives in Michigan cannot afford to let the State go socialistic."

DISPUTE OVER GAVEL

The county meeting quickly followed Fitzgerald's announcement that he would not go to the State convention. He said "the chairman presided with a baseball bat."

Nicholas Rothe, 14th District Democratic chairman, said the gavel he used at the meeting last week was not a baseball bat but "one of a pair of drumsticks bought for a kid's drum."

Fitzgerald stuck by his description. So did John McElroy, personnel director of the Wayne County Highway Commission, unsuccessful candidate for chairman against Rothe.

"It looked like a sawed-off bat to me," said McElroy, "but it might have been a kid's drumstick—for one of Paul Bunyan's kids."

[From the Detroit Free Press of September 29, 1950]

DEMOCRAT SPLIT NARROWS, BUT FRICTION REMAINS ON PARLEY EVE—SEPARATE CAMPS STILL OPERATING

(By Hub M. George)

Peace moves led by Governor Williams to quell a Wayne County Democratic uprising made uncertain progress on the eve of the Grand Rapids State convention.

Democratic segments regarded as vital to campaign success still planned to sit out this convention at home.

The friction grew out of turbulent congressional district caucuses last week in which hundreds of certified delegates were excluded.

Most important development was a decision by party strategists to set up headquarters for Williams and Representative LOUIS RABAUT in the 14th district separate from the district committee ruled by Chairman Nicholas J. Rothe.

It was Rothe's iron-fisted steamrollering of the 14th district caucus that caused National Committeeman George S. Fitzgerald and a bloc of nearly 90 old-line delegates to walk out.

The action followed the exclusion of another bloc of nearly 100 delegates by what Fitzgerald described as "goon-squad strong-arm methods."

The national committeeman has said he will have no part of a State convention growing from such roots.

"They've done everything but hang Thomas Jefferson in effigy," Fitzgerald said.

Registrar of Deeds Bernard J. Youngblood, in whose office Williams met with the "county building crowd," denied that county officers are at odds with the party's leadership.

He said the meeting was prompted by RABAUT's fear that existing frictions might complicate his own election chances.

"We discussed the necessity of extra effort in the 14th, in view of disputes there, and agreed that the Governor, RABAUT, and county officials would join efforts to get out the full Democratic vote," Youngblood explained.

"Williams for Governor" and "RABAUT for Congress" special teams will be set up and two or more headquarters will be opened.

"We are in no way attempting to circumvent or supersede the regular congressional organization."

In Lansing, Governor Williams concurred in Youngblood's explanation and said the separate teams are "merely supplementary." He said that he will continue to cooperate fully with Chairman Rothe's setup.

Other spokesmen explained, however, that no provision is being made for National Committeeman Fitzgerald in the "twin-pronged" machinery.

Fitzgerald, months ago, began organizing Williams Democratic Clubs when relations were strained between himself and former Democratic Chairman Hicks Griffiths.

It may be that Democrats will have four separate agencies operating in the 14th.

County Chairman Ernest J. Lacey, who also is 15th District chairman, corrected one error. Paul Shafer, an elected delegate excluded from the 15th District caucus, accepted a place on the Grand Rapids slate when he proved that he had filed an authentic and correct delegate petition.

With renomination of Attorney General Stephen J. Roth conceded and Banking Commissioner Maurice Eveland likely to get the treasurer nomination, only two places appear open.

Securities Commissioner Phil J. Hart and John W. Gibson, former Assistant Secretary of Labor, have been mentioned for secretary of State. However, Gibson may agree to accept the auditor general nomination.

[From the Detroit News of September 29, 1950]

PARTY SPLIT GROWS WIDER—DELEGATE ROW HARED AS DEMOCRATS MEET

(By William R. Muller)

This is the day Governor Williams hoped Democrats would stop fighting among themselves and start helping him pick a team to fight Republicans.

But feuds broke out anew as the 1,243 delegates to the Democratic State nominating convention—603 of them from Detroit—converged on Grand Rapids.

A telegram challenging the right of certain delegates from the 13th District to attend the convention—bearing the return address of UAW-CIO division—roused Democratic National Committeeman George S. Fitzgerald again.

There was talk of opposition to a second nomination for Attorney General Stephen J. Roth.

GIBSON MENTIONED

A report circulated in Detroit that John W. Gibson, former Assistant United States Secretary of Labor, viewed as a likely candidate for secretary of state, would leave the field to Philip A. Hart, corporations and securities commissioner.

The CIO–Americans for Democratic Action coalition within the party criticized Roth for failure to lend support to its fight to bar challenged delegates from district conventions.

As it was being voiced, Fitzgerald displayed a telegram from Mrs. Lillian Hatcher, secretary of the 13th District Democratic committee. It was sent to an elected delegate warning him he should appear for a hearing or submit a written denial before the district Democratic executive board concerning charges that he ran on an illegal nominating petition.

"A clear application of the communistic technic of controlling a public meeting by eliminating the opposition and replacing it with friendly tools," said Fitzgerald.

SHE GIVES ANSWER

Mrs. Hatcher's telegram gave a return address of 8701 Second Avenue. That is the Fair Practices and Antidiscrimination Department of the UAW. Mrs. Hatcher is a UAW representative.

"The telegram summoned those elected on fraudulent petitions to appear before our district credentials committee Wednesday night," explained Mrs. Hatcher.

"Three of those who appeared were cleared.

"We sent out 48 notices. Many did not answer. Some were dead. Some never lived in the city. Others did not live in the proper precincts."

The difficulties were piled on top of the 14th District Democratic insurrection which Williams attempted to quell with a statement Thursday. He said "special" efforts would be made to get out the vote there "in view of hostile attempts to magnify and exploit the party disputes in that district.

FITZGERALD STAYS AWAY

Fitzgerald and his followers were shunning the convention, which will be held Saturday. Party councils in Pantlind Hotel rooms will decide the ticket tonight.

The ticket most often discussed as a probability by Williams' supporters includes Roth, Hart, Mrs. Margaret Price, of Ann Arbor, for auditor general, and Maurice E. Eveland, State banking commissioner, for treasurer.

There was no indication here that the CIO-ADA coalition would insist on Gibson in place of Hart. Gibson is a former CIO organizer.

[From the book The CIO and the Democratic Party]

VI MICHIGAN: PAC ENTERS A STATE PARTY

Rockford was a fairly simple case. The PAC of a single industrial union council entered the structure of a county Democratic committee and obtained a voice in party decisions as part of a coalition. But could a similar internal relationship be established at the vastly more complex state level? How? What effect would it have on the party? Under what circumstances could it be accomplished?

The Michigan State PAC in 1950 was an important member of a coalition in control of the Michigan State Central Democratic Committee. This is a study of the relationship of these two groups and of how they functioned in 1948 and 1950 to elect their candidate, Mennen Williams, governor of a traditionally Republican State (see fig. 4).

PAC ENTERS THE MICHIGAN STATE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

In Michigan, as in Ohio, the Democratic Party is controlled by two bodies, a State Democratic convention, held in the fall of even years and the spring of odd years, and a Democratic State committee, composed of 4 members from each of Michigan's 17 congressional districts. The State committee handles party business between conventions. Since 1948 both the State convention and the State committee have been under the control of a liberal coalition composed of the Michigan Democratic Club, reform Democrats, certain minority groups, PAC, and part of the A. F. of L. In the 1950 convention this liberal coalition claimed over 750 of the 1,243 delegates, about 486 of whom were CIO members. The 68 members of the State committee in 1950 were all from the liberal coalition, and 20 of them were CIO members. The story of how this liberal coalition came to power in the State Democratic Party is so dramatic that it merits a chronological description.

The formation of the liberal coalition: Republican Michigan had no permanent Democratic organization at all until early in the Roosevelt era, when a State highway commissioner, Murray Van Wagoner, formed a tight little patronage machine which eventually elected him Governor. But, weakened by civil-service reform, this machine collapsed in 1942, and party control passed to a small clique of old-guard Democrats with a patronage outlook. Under old-guard leadership, party precinct activity declined in the 1940's; party slates were not filled; the party exchequer ran a deficit; and Democratic candidates got little campaign help. Critics claimed with disgust that the clique did not really want to elect a Democratic Governor because he might interfere with their control of Federal patronage. Neither the platform of the State party nor the activity of the party in the State legislature reflected the New Deal orientation of the National Democratic Party.

This State party developed some dissatisfied factions. One of these might be called the Reform Democrats, a few liberal party workers who strongly disapproved of the way the party conducted its functions and the associations it was developing. Another group referred to itself as the Michigan Democratic Club, an issue-oriented group of depression-bred New Dealers who found the State party quite out of tune with the national party platform.

Meanwhile, a State PAC was established in 1944 as a committee of the State CIO Industrial Union Council. It dabbled unsuccessfully in third-party politics with the Michigan Commonwealth Federation. In 1945 and 1946 it developed its own independent political organization, usually supplementing Democrats. After a severe electoral defeat in 1946, PAC was in the mood for suggestions.

The leaders of the reform Democrats and the Michigan Democratic Club provided the tip. One evening early in 1947 they invited the president of the State CIO council to join them at the home of Hicks Griffiths, an active Michigan Democrat. In the course of the conversation, they convinced him that the objectives of all three groups were reasonably compatible and that their combined resources could control the party. This meeting became the birthplace of a liberal coalition which determined to enter the State Democratic Party and seize control from the old-guard Democrats.

PAC leaders had to convert CIO members to this form of political action, however, before they could pursue it. This took more than a year of internal CIO maneuvering. PAC leaders dwelt on the futility of third parties and the accusation of prolabor Congressman DINGELL that PAC was "indulging in the luxury of nonpartisanship at a time when a clique of 50 was getting control of the Michigan party." They pointed out that labor was not large enough to spread its assets between two political parties and that nonpartisan labor usually found itself endorsing Democrats it had had no voice in selecting. They assured skeptics, "We are not accepting the Democratic Party in Michigan as it now is. Our purpose in going into it is to line up with its liberal element and remold the party into a progressive force" (Michigan CIO News, March 17, 1948).

On March 13, 1948, a State PAC conference in Lansing rewarded their efforts in the following declaration of policy:

"Progressives and liberals within the Democratic Party have often been outnumbered by conservative and reactionary elements. The PAC is unanimous in its opinion that the best way of supporting liberalism within the Democratic Party, to conform to national CIO policy, and to serve the best interests of Michigan labor, is to join the Democratic Party.

"It is our objective in adopting this policy to remold the Democratic Party into a real liberal and progressive political party, which can be subscribed to by members of the CIO and other liberals.

"We, therefore, advise CIO members to become active precinct, ward, county, and congressional district workers and attempt to become delegates to Democratic conventions" (ibid.).

Walter Reuther gave his approval, and every State CIO convention since has reaffirmed this stand.

Building the coalition: The first problem of the coalition was to build up its political resources. This involved bringing other compatible groups into the coalition. Part of the A. F. of L., the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, and important Polish and Negro political groups agreed to give partisan support. Some nonpartisan groups, like Americans for Democratic Action, the League of Women Voters, and a few liberal church groups, supported the new coalition, though they remained outside the party. The teamsters union and various Irish, Greek, and Italian political groups in Detroit lined up with the old guard Democrats against the liberal coalition.

Labor, reform, and Michigan Democratic groups had to strengthen themselves individually for partisan activity. The State PAC explained its objectives and trained its workers in specific techniques of partisan political action. It held innumerable conventions, PAC conferences, local union meetings, and classes. It started to raise funds. It sought to convince or control its own doubting Thomases, some of whom regarded partisan activity as dangerously radical, others who saw it as the megalomania of a few union bureaucrats, and still others who felt it to be a betrayal of the revolution.

Meanwhile, other members of the coalition strengthened their own interest groups. Reform Democrats in a few places conducted their own revolutions and took over several county party organizations. Hicks Griffiths of the Michigan Democratic Club spent months traveling through Michigan, starting Democratic groups. His wife laid the basis for an organization of Democratic women. Mennen Williams, in his 1948 campaign for governor, visited small rural communities, not to turn out a big Democratic vote from these Republican strongholds, but to strengthen and liberalize Democratic organizations.

A second problem was to keep the coalition together. One common bond was discontent with the old-guard party. Another bond was agreement on a liberal legislative program, including progressive taxation, civil rights, public housing, improved social security, and workmen's compensation. These points of agreement do not by any means indicate that the interest groups found themselves in complete harmony. Michigan Democratic Club leaders accused PAC leaders of being arrogant, politically naive, and all too ready to shirk routine precinct work. It was hard for Michigan Democratic Club workers to see PAC workers paid for political work which they had to give voluntarily. PAC, on the other hand, found that it had to provide a good share of the money and manpower and yet eclipse itself modestly behind the coalition. It had to make concessions for the sake of unity, even when it

was strong enough to enforce its demands. Each group suspected the other of secret deals. But such conflicts were kept under control at frequent caucuses. Coalition members presented a common front to the Old-Guard groups.

The final problem was to settle on a specific program of political action. The coalition decided to elect enough precinct captains at the bottom to control district and State party conventions. Old Guard Democrats were so lax in manning precincts and party conventions that this was a realistic possibility. But the plan required a tremendous amount of hard work, finding and training precinct candidates, raising funds, contacting interest groups, settling internal differences, campaigning, and poll watching.

Primaries and party conventions of 1948: Each interest group in the coalition found and trained its own precinct candidates. Wayne County PAC, for example asked all its union stewards and officers to run. PAC estimates that, of the 1,240 persons who filed for the 1,748 precincts in Wayne County in 1948, about 1,000 were from liberal interest groups. Seven hundred and twenty of them were elected.

The Old Guard was not expecting this challenge in the precincts. It failed to run sufficient precinct delegates to maintain control. At 5 of the 6 Wayne County district Democratic conventions which met shortly after the primaries, liberals easily captured control from the Old Guard. Coalition chairmen were elected for all the Wayne County districts except the 13th. Several other county parties also went liberal. State convention delegates were selected at these district and county conventions. Wayne County districts naturally selected liberal delegates, and this populous county happened to hold a majority vote at the State convention.

The 1948 State convention was about twice as large as in previous years. A PAC official estimated that the liberal coalition mustered two-thirds of its votes. One informed Democrat claimed that PAC had majorities in 4 of the 17 district convention delegations and was an important element in 2 others. PAC leaders admit that they had a good proportion of the total delegates, but probably less than half. Clearly, PAC formed the largest single group within the coalition.

The coalition captures the State committee: Since the State Democratic committee is not elected at fall conventions, a member of the Old Guard, John Franco, continued as State party chairman. War raged between liberal and old guard members on the committee.

Liberal members called a 1949 spring party convention for February 5, and old guard members ordered it for February 25. Sparks flew. Franco tried to remove Griffiths, who was the obvious liberal contender for the State chairmanship, from the State committee. He claimed he would be happy if the liberals held their illegal convention, saying, "Then we would be able to weed out the Socialist element of the Democratic Party." Liberals retorted that Franco's report of party contributions was $9,000 short and that he had paid a 45-percent commission to his brother's firm for raising funds.

The liberal coalition proceeded to hold its State convention on February 5, with 1,243 delegates, far more than the old guard could round up. Griffiths, leader of the Michigan Democratic Club, was easily elected State chairman. Sixty-eight liberals were elected to the State committee, of whom CIO claimed twenty. PAC showed its muscle at this convention. The New York Times of February 6, 1949, complained that Scholle, rather than the Governor, was real head of the convention. Scholle, director of the State CIO, responded: "Although CIO members constitute a substantial portion of the Democratic Party delegations, they do not operate as a unit." (Michigan CIO News, February 9, 1949.)

The Old Guard insisted that they would hold another convention up until 2 hours before it was supposed to convene on February 25. Then Franco capitulated lamely, saying he would have certified the February 5 convention, "if the opposition had given him a vote of gratitude."

The 1950 primaries: The liberal coalition thus found in 1948 that it could attain a position of leadership in the State convention and State committee by entering its members as precinct delegates. But could it hold this position in succeeding primaries when the old guard and other interest groups had become aware of this method of attack?

In February 1950, an attorney for the teamsters' union started an old-guard caucus known as the Truman Democratic Club of Michigan. Its object was to recapture control from the liberal coalition.

The coalition operated in 1950 much as it had in 1948, filing about 1,000 petitions for precinct captains in Wayne County, 821 of these petitions being from CIO members. But imagine the surprise of the liberals to discover that 3,598 persons had filed for precinct jobs in 1950 compared to the 1,240 who had filed in 1948. Such precinct competition was unheard of in Detroit. Obviously, the Old Guard had been busy rounding up precinct workers, and coalition control was in jeopardy.

The liberals examined Old Guard precinct petitions carefully and noticed some strange things. The signatures were very similar to those appearing on 1946 petitions, and the same handwriting appeared at regular intervals. The coalition concluded that the petitions must have been forged by a few men sitting around a table and copying old petitions. They therefore checked about 800 petitions by writing to the signatories. Some of their letters were returned marked deceased or moved. Other persons gave them affidavits that their names had been forged.

Early in August the liberal State chairman asked the Wayne County election board to disqualify these questionable petitions. But the board declared that it had no legal right to check the authenticity of signatures, nor the qualifications of candidates. Liberals then turned to the courts, which might have considered these as cases of personal injury to the persons whose names had been forged. Instead, a county court judge ruled that this was a political controversy which should be settled by the State party convention. This decision was small comfort to the coalition. By the time the State convention met, precinct captains running on forged petitions would have been elected at the primary, and the Old Guard would again be in control of the State convention.

"Blood on the pavements": Interest in the 1950 Wayne County primaries ran unusually high. The county reported 222,804 Democratic primary votes for Governor, as compared with 81,796 in 1946.

The liberals concluded that, since they could not prevent precinct captains from running on questionable petitions, they would prevent those who won from being seated at the district conventions, where party officers were to be elected. To this end the coalition equipped Wayne County district conventions with bouncers; a liberal bouncer from the 15th district told the author that he was equipped with 6 men, 20 clubs, and 2 pistols, but was not called upon to use them.

Evidently PAC did not have complete faith in its bouncers. Unknown to other members of the coalition, it made a deal with the Teamsters whereby the latter would receive CIO support for its chairmen in the 1st, 15th, and 16th districts and the CIO would receive Teamster support for its chairmen in the 13th, 14th, and 17th districts.

District conventions were held on the evening of September 19. The newspaper public was regaled next morning with stories of the 14th district chairman, a liberal, who "presided with a baseball bat." George Fitzgerald, of the Old Guard, walked out of one district convention, telling newspapermen that he had "just watched socialism take over the Democratic Party by Communist processes." A delegate to the 17th district convention whose petition was questioned was carried outside and proceeded to make a radio platter entitled "Blood on the Pavements." Actually, the challenged delegates were given the choice of defending their petitions before the district convention or of leaving. Most of them left. The coalition won all the six Wayne County district chairmanships except the 16th.

The 13th district convention illustrates what happened to the Teamster-PAC deal. Since this district had 256 precincts, 129 precinct captains were required for a majority. The primaries turned up 90 known liberal precinct captains, 75 of whom were CIO members, and at least 16 teamsters. The teamsters had agreed to support a PAC chairman in return for 4 seats on the 15-man district executive board. PAC therefore did not question petitions in this district, and the teamsters and old-guard Democrats were seated. The first vote was for district chairman, and the 16 teamsters violated their agreement by voting for the old guard rather than for the liberal candidates. PAC was incensed. Fortunately, the coalition had enough votes to elect a liberal chairman by a small margin. PAC immediately dropped its half of the teamster deal, and the coalition proceeded to elect all the district party officers and 100 delegates to the State party convention. PAC's first move after the election of officers was to throw out the 16 teamsters and 32 old-guard members on the basis of fraudulent petitions.

The 1950 State Democratic convention: Most of the old guard, defeated at the district conventions, decided to boycott the State party convention. George Fitzgerald announced that he refused to attend a convention, to delegates to which had been picked with "storm troopers guarding the doors and the chairman presiding with a baseball bat." (Detroit News, September 27, 1950.) Mrs. Nellie Riley, a former Democratic national convention delegate, warned her sex: "Socialists are in complete charge of the Democratic Party machinery. Mothers and housewives in Michigan cannot afford to let the State go socialistic." (Detroit News, September 28, 1950.)

Shortly thereafter, most of the old guard interest groups turned to the Republicans. They formed the Democrats for Kelly Club (Kelly was the Republican candidate for governor). The leader of this club said: "Leaders who have turned control of our party over to nonpartisans with Socialist backgrounds and others of their ilk, cannot expect true Democrats to be complacent. I know of hundreds of good Democrats who feel the Democratic label is being used to advance ideologies to which we cannot and will not, subscribe." (Detroit Free Press, October 11, 1950.) The State CIO president, Scholle, was evidently encountering completely different Democrats. He claimed: "The overwhelming majority of the regular Democrats have welcomed us into the party with open arms. They find no difficulty in working with union members on a wholesome and cooperative basis." (Michigan CIO News, March 3, 1949.)

With the exodus of the old guard, the Detroit Times called the 1950 State Democratic convention on September 28, 1950, "the quietest in years." Of the 1,243 convention delegates, the coalition had at least 950, about 486 of whom were CIO members. Twenty Old Guard members tried to caucus, and one delegate questioned the district conventions, but neither caused much disturbance.

The liberal coalition, with PAC as its strongest member, thus weathered its second election as a controlling bloc in the Michigan State Democratic Convention and Committee.

THE COALITION AND INTERNAL PARTY DECISIONS

Unlike the Ohio PAC, the Michigan PAC thus shared a position of direct internal control over the State Democratic convention and committee. From this position, what influence could it exert on the internal decisions of the party? How did the internal life of the party change when the liberal coalition came into power?

Selection of candidates: In Michigan, legislative and judicial officers are nominated at a direct primary, but a number of State and county executive officers are nominated at party conventions. From its internal position the coalition had noticeable influence on both primary and convention nominations.

At conventions, liberal candidates were predetermined at caucuses of coalition leaders and were approved like clockwork. The lively "horse trading" of Old Guard conventions disappeared. Old Guard elements deplored this limitation on their operations; so did some liberal precinct delegates, who wanted more direct voice in return for their precinct work. PAC leaders claimed they used their influence in the caucus as follows: If two liberals were contending for nominations, PAC did not take sides. But it supported liberals as against conservatives. Sometimes, in the interest of party unity, it did not oppose conservatives; but it always fought an antilabor contender.

The coalition also carried weight in preprimary maneuvers. Its chief contribution was an effort to fill the primary slates. In 1946 eight State senators and 16 State representative districts failed to run Democrats. In 1950, under the liberal coalition, Democrats ran in all but 1 senatorial and 3 representative districts. Even though they had little hope of electoral success, the coalition made an effort to run "sacrificial goats" in strongly Republican areas because of their value as a nucleus for Democratic organization.

Theoretically, interest groups operate separately in running primary candidates. Actually, the standards of indorsement for issue-oriented members of the coalition were so similar that these groups made an effort not to run against one another. Though primary cooperation was not so highly developed as in the party regular system in Chicago, PAC claimed that it would make no indorsement in a contest between liberals. At general elections PAC stated flatly that it would not indorse an antilabor Democrat or a Republican of any kind.

The result of this policy has been more liberal Democratic primary contenders, especially in Wayne County.

The State Democratic platform: One of the most striking changes in the function of the Michigan State Democratic Party under the liberal coalition is in the content, creation, and use of the State party platform.

Both the phraseology and the content of the 1948 and 1950 Michigan Democratic platforms indicated that the party, under the liberal-issue oriented-interest groups, aimed its appeal at a particular segment of Michigan voters. It did not attempt to please everyone, as the previous patronage-oriented party had done. The State Democratic Party platform stated: "For this record of indifference and hostility to labor's interests the Republican Party stands condemned. The Democratic Party believes that the prosperity of the whole State depends on the health, security, and dignity of the working man" (Michigan CIO News, October 5, 1950, p. 4.) Furthermore, the platform stood for specific legislative items which patronage interest groups had considered too controversal: a corporation profits tax, improved social security, a fair employment practices act, workers' education, and public housing. PAC's hand in this platform can be seen easily by comparing the platform with the State PAC legislative program. This platform, like the selection of candidates, was actually determined at informal caucuses of coalition leaders. Ratification by the State convention was assured.

Perhaps the most significant change regarding the State platform, however, was its use. Platforms of 1944 and 1946 State conventions played little part in the actual selection of candidates, campaign issues, and legislative battles. Liberal caucuses, on the other hand, did evaluate potential candidates on these issues. Williams used platform issues continuously in his campaign. These issues were stressed in his inaugural address in 1949 and in his first address to his Republican-dominated State legislature. In his first term he conducted sharp legislative battles on workmen's compensation, discrimination in the State militia, workers' education, old-age benefits, and public housing.

The Michigan party platform thus adopted a specific social orientation and became more binding, not because of any theoretical desire for "responsible" parties but because it had become a power medium for specific issue-oriented social groupings.

Electing party officers: The influence of PAC and the liberal coalition in electing precinct captains, district officers, and State conventions and committees has already been has already been described. The coalition elected enough precinct captains in Wayne County to control 4 of its 5 district conventions and a majority of the State convention.

Expanding party organization: Under the Old Guard, party organization in the State rural districts had been practically nonexistent. The Michigan Democratic Club set out to remedy this situation. Griffiths founded liberal Democratic groups; Williams visited them in the course of his campaign. These small county Democratic organizations were encouraged to run candidates, even with little hope of success, as a nucleus for party organization.

Even in urban areas the Old Guard had let basic Democratic organization slip. In 1946 no Democrat ran for over half the precincts in Wayne County, whereas 3,598 persons filed for these 1,748 places in 1950. Under the coalition, Democratic organization spread at the "grass-roots" level.

Internal party discipline: The liberal coalition ejected the incompatible Old Guard interest groups from the party by electoral means, supplemented in the 1950 district conventions by "bouncers." But what held the members of the coalition itself together? Many groups like PAC, A. F. of L., and Michigan Democrats were held by similar legislative interests. Patronage groups found that their objectives, while not exactly similar, could be obtained from the same candidates. All groups were united by a common desire to wrest control from the Old Guard.

What kept PAC from dominating this coalition? Certainly not timidity! PAC was limited by the fact that, while it had sufficient votes and money to dominate the coalition, it did not have sufficient resources to win a general election. In Michigan, as in Ohio, a liberal candidate had a far better chance of election when supported by a coalition with a traditional party name than he did with a strictly CIO label. The Michigan Democratic Club contributed liberal candidates and a statewide organization which performed as much precinct work as PAC members did. Reform Democrats provided party leaders of considerable political experience, like Niel Staebler, the 1950 State party chairman. These nonlabor members of the coalition proved more resourceful than PAC in contacting and reconciling compatible interest groups. They were even instrumental in reconciling compatible interest elements in the A. F. of L. Since PAC needed help to defeat the well-intrenched Republicans, it was forced to broaden the coalition by compromise rather than narrow it by domination.

Distributing patronage: PAC claimed it could get along without routine patronage jobs. It could pay PAC workers from union treasuries for time lost from work for political duties without the risk of losing them to the county court house, and few workers wanted to give up factory pay and seniority for the insecurity of political jobs, anyway. But PAC and other issue-oriented groups evinced considerable interest in policy-making jobs. PAC did not hesitate to bring pressure for sympathetic appointees to the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission, the State department of labor, and the public service commission. These, it felt, directly affected labor. When it became apparent that Governor Williams might appoint Vandenberg's successor to the Senate, all the coalition groups felt their interests were at stake and fought the matter out at liberal caucuses.

Michigan Democratic and reform groups, however, admitted that routine patronage was of great use to them in building party organization. The Wayne County Democratic chairman felt that until he had more money at his disposal he would have to use patronage as an incentive. Griffiths, of the Michigan Democratic Club, claimed he found patronage useful in bringing Polish, Negro, and Italian groups into line. Party-interest groups, like the ethnic groups just mentioned, found their chief party interest in patronage. Presumably more such patronage-oriented groups will enter the party if it becomes successful at county and city levels.

But patronage also had a way of creating trouble. District party chairmen asked that all patronage be channeled through them, for example. PAC, however, flatly rejected the idea of having its appointee for the Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission subject to the approval of a district party chairman. PAC won this controversy.

In summary, PAC did not cease to exist as a distinct interest group when it entered the Michigan party. It merely entered a new sphere of political action. It could still be seen jockeying for candidates, platform planks, offices, and patronage inside the coalition. But neither did PAC capture the Democratic Party. It had to share control with other interest groups inside the coalition in order to stay in power.

THE COALITION CAMPAIGNS FOR WILLIAMS

The influence of the coalition was clearly displayed in Williams' second campaign for governor. His election in 1948 was not surprising. Democrats had held the governor's chair in presidential years with few exceptions since the depression. But his reelection even by a narrow margin, in 1950 was unusual. Democratic governors had not been reelected since the Bull Moose days of 1912. How did the liberal coalition handle Williams' 1950 campaign? What part did PAC play?

Fund raising: Since both the State PAC and the State Democratic Party were campaigning for the entire State-wide Democratic slate in 1950, it is difficult to disentangle the expense of Williams' campaign from the others. Party and PAC sources indicate that total party and direct contributions to statewide Democratic candidates amounted to $328,519.68 and that CIO unions contributed about $211,550 or 64 percent of this (table 4). The coalition thus relied on PAC as its chief benefactor. Michigan Democratic, Reform, Polish, and Negro groups did not have large resources, and the party's orientation precluded support from wealthy business groups.

CIO gave all but $6,000 of its contribution directly to candidates rather than to the State committee. The unions also made most of their contribution in the form of election-day workers and supplies rather than money. This enabled PAC to control the use of its money directly and to direct it toward developing its own political workers and orienting its own members. CIO thus used its funds not only to elect Democratic

candidates but also to strengthen its position inside the liberal coalition.

Publicity and precinct work: The liberal coalition built precinct contacts in order to enter the Democratic Party. The same organization proved invaluable in campaigning.

The party conducted what it called a "grassroots" campaign. It could not depend on the commercial mass media for support, any more than it had in Ohio. The 53 daily papers in Michigan were all Republican. Only 25 of the 350 weekly papers were Democratic. The Auto Worker, a United Automobile Workers publication, was the largest of these. Radio stations also had Republican leanings.

TABLE 4.—*Source and disposition of Michigan Democratic Party and candidate campaign funds, 1950*

CONTRIBUTION TO THE STATE DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE [1]

Source:	
Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner	$12,168.67
Williams Campaign Committee	9,534.66
Teamsters union	9,223.53
UAW-CIO	5,000.00
USA-CIO	1,000.00
Staebler	1,000.00
Other	65,749.38
Total	103,676.24
Disposition:	
National Democratic Committee	35,317.67
Michigan Democratic Campaigns	62,969.68
Balance on account	5,388.89
Total	103,676.24

CONTRIBUTIONS DIRECTLY TO STATEWIDE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES [2]

Source:	
Michigan CIO unions	$200,000.00
National CIO-PAC	5,550.00
Nonunion sources	60,000.00
Total	265,550.00
Disposition: Statewide Democratic candidates	265,550.00
Total	265,550.00

[1] Report of Democratic State committee chairman to the Michigan secretary of state (Detroit Free Press, November 29, 1950).

[2] Niel Staebler, chairman, Democratic State committee, interview, December 20, 1950. Tilford Dudley, assistant director, National CIO-PAC, telephone conversation, January 9, 1951.

Democrats therefore relied on the doorstep contacts of their precinct workers, on neighborhood teas, local square dances, and ward rallies. These were good devices for a group which suffered in the press but had a personable and hard-working candidate. Such a campaign both used and strengthened precinct organization.

In urban areas PAC played an important part in Democratic precinct campaign work. It loaned staff members ("coordinators") to act as full-time campaign executives for Wayne County district Democratic Parties. PAC precinct workers were asked to contact all Democrats in their neighborhoods, not just CIO members.

Use of interest groups: Another interesting feature of the coalition's 1950 campaign for governor was its use of interest groups. The Michigan campaign committee, unlike the Ferguson committee, deliberately concealed its interest groups. It had no special campaign committees and no labor representatives on the general campaign committee. Precinct workers approached all voters alike with the same broad coalition program. PAC precinct workers identified themselves, even to CIO members, simply as Democrats. When reporters called PAC for campaign news, they were referred to party headquarters. This was a hard role for a virile young interest group like PAC, which was footing bills, contributing precinct workers, and anxious to justify itself to its membership. But it was sophisticated politics even in Detroit, where "captured by the CIO" was often, as in Ohio, a political scareword. Unable to locate the CIO, Republicans concentrated on the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA), whose small membership still retained an exposed external position. In an open letter to the voters of Michigan, Kelly, Republican candidate for governor, said:

"What else do we have? We have a strange thing called ADA—I call it a 'thing' because I don't believe there is any other way to describe it. There has never been anything like it in the history of this country. It seems to be a collection of people who don't want to belong to any honest American political party, and who usually end up in their political thinking pretty close to whatever the Communist and Socialist party lines may be. The ADA, you will find, is simply another strange splinter group whose leaders are hungry for power." (Detroit Free Press, November 3, 1950.)

But, though the Williams campaign concealed its interest groups, it had a definite social orientation. While Republicans denounced the liberal coalition as tools of the Kremlin, Democrats denounced Republicans as tools of the National Association of Manufacturers. Campaign publicity might have sounded like class warfare to Marx, but the fact was that the candidate for governor was heir to the Mennen shaving-cream fortune and the State Democratic committee chairman was president of an oil company.

Election-day work: Unfortunately, Michigan has not been blessed with complete integrity in the conduct of elections. For some years politicians have been aware that everything was not always in order at the polls. In February 1948, the Michigan Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections studied senatorial races in 12 counties and reported irregularities. The coalition recalled this when Williams lost by a narrow margin, and they demanded a recount. Michigan voters were incredulous at the errors discovered. Some tellers had forgotten to count straight Democratic ballots entirely. Others had inadvertently counted the yellow oleomargarine referendum vote for Kelly. A vote canvass, completed on November 27, gave Williams a 1,154-vote edge. The Republicans then demanded a second recount on December 4, but called it off when Williams' lead reached 4,119 and after 3,400 of the 4,355 precincts in the State had been recounted.

The recount was expensive for both sides, and PAC helped foot the bill of the coalition. The liberals thus performed a campaign function untried by the Old Guard Democrats. They helped police an election.

In summary, PAC actively campaigned under the Democratic label. Thus in Michigan, where organized labor actually played a significant role inside the State Democratic Party, the average voter was scarcely aware of it. In Ohio, where organized labor had very little influence inside the party, many voters feared that PAC had captured the Democratic organization.

ADVANTAGES AND LIMITATIONS OF AN INTERNAL PARTY RELATIONSHIP

From an internal position and with the aid of the liberal coalition, PAC was able to strengthen the party. Under the coalition the party took steps to fill its precincts, its slates, its conventions, and its campaign coffers. Thus strengthened, the party was able to reelect a Democratic governor in 1950 under rather difficult circumstances. If it had retained its external position, PAC would have had to supplement a party even weaker than the party in Ohio.

PAC was in a position, second, not only to strengthen the party but to liberalize it. So long as the Old Guard controlled the party, PAC usually had to select its candidates from a "lesser of two evils." As member of a controlling coalition, however, it was able to use its internal influence to see that liberals ran in the primaries and were selected at conventions. It was in a position not only to enter liberal planks in the party platform but to see that they were taken seriously. It could eject conservative interest groups from the party and use patronage to strengthen the coalition. Instead of selecting between two hostile parties, PAC could help make one party a better vehicle for its own ideas.

Third, as part of the Democratic Party, PAC received support from other interest groups, which might not have cooperated in third-party or independent activity. The Michigan Democratic Club provided leadership. The ethnic groups carried votes in urban areas. Without such resources, PAC might not have been able to attain a share of control in the party, and it certainly would not have been able to elect a governor.

Fourth, whereas, in Ohio, PAC was exposed to public opinion as a special interest group because of its separate precinct organization and marked literature, in Michigan, PAC was hidden behind a broad party organization and a traditional party name. A Republican like Taft could scarcely have crucified Williams as a "labor candidate." Williams was a Democrat. His labor connections were not apparent to the average voter. Nor could Taft have capitalized on the idea that PAC had captured the Democratic Party. The average citizen did not concern himself with district and State party conventions, and the interest-group composition of these bodies was not widely known.

But an internal position presented problems as well as advantages to PAC. In the first place, it required considerable political resources. In Ohio, PAC contributed heavily to one candidate in one campaign. In Michigan, PAC had to subsidize the party and a number of campaigns. Internal party activity was costly to PAC not only in money but in work. PAC had to locate and train hundreds of precinct workers, not just to supplement the party here and there but actually to carry party responsibility the year around. Successful internal activity also required a steady bloc of CIO votes. It is no easy matter to keep workers (or most average citizens) politically alert.

Second, PAC faced the necessity of compromise. Concessions to patronage, Reform, Michigan Democratic, or A. F. of L. groups brought PAC under censure from some CIO members, who claimed their political organization had betrayed them or had been captured by the party. On the other hand, an uncompromising position would have lost PAC allies whose support was essential to control the party or win a general election. PAC's compromises had to be pragmatic, in terms of the balance of power at the moment. It could seldom take an ideal position.

In the third place, PAC faced the problem of maintaining the loyalty of its workers and members. Would the average CIO member remember PAC if he were approached only by Democratic precinct captains? How would CIO members who were Republican react to Democratic partisanship? Would PAC workers follow PAC directives, once in party office, or would they be captured by other interests? In 1948 and 1950, PAC successfully maintained its internal identity by dint of PAC training conferences, training sessions, caucuses, and idealism. Many, though by no means all, CIO members who attended Democratic conventions voted with PAC.

Fourth, could PAC trust its allies? PAC itself was not above a deal with the teamsters, doublecrossing other members of the coalition. Other coalition groups faced similar temptations to leave PAC out of new controlling party coalitions.

And, finally, entering the Democratic Party did not automatically assure PAC of its ultimate objective—the election of sympathetic

legislators. Michigan was strongly Republican except in its large urban areas. With considerable effort the coalition was able to elect a governor in an off-year, but his legislature was overwhelmingly Republican and could easily override his veto. An internal party position simply meant that PAC faced the general election with the support, rather than the hostility, of other Democratic interest groups.

WHY DID PAC ENTER THE PARTY IN MICHIGAN?

Why did PAC in Michigan adopt an internal relationship to the Democratic Party at a time when the Ohio PAC was building an independent political organization, even down to the wards and precincts?

The election district: In Ohio, PAC would have had to capture a number of county parties in order to obtain control of the State convention or committee. In Michigan the liberal coalition had to capture just one—Wayne County. This county contains Detroit and 37 percent of the people in the State. But Wayne County has an even higher proportion of the State's Democrats. Sixty-six percent of the Democratic votes for Governor in the 1948 primary were cast in the five congressional districts of Wayne County. A coalition which controlled Wayne County was, therefore, in a position to control the State Democratic convention.

Fortunately for PAC, CIO membership was also highly concentrated in this strategic voting area. Four hundred thousand of CIO's 700,000 Michigan members voted in Wayne County. By political activity in one county where the CIO was strong, PAC could obtain a share of control in the Michigan State Democratic Party.

Election practices: In Wayne County, PAC could enter the Democratic Party by electing precinct captains rather than ward leaders—a much less formidable task. The votes of these precinct captains actually controlled district conventions and the selection of State convention delegates. Michigan precinct captains were up for election every 2 years.

The Michigan PAC could thus enter the party at the precinct level, whereas the Chicago PAC could not.

Voting behavior: The Democratic primary vote in Michigan in the mid-1940's was low. In 1947 the coalition could count on nominating a governor with 100,000 votes, a figure which seemed within the range of possibility for PAC with Michigan Democratic Club and Reform group support. The primary vote also indicated easy access to the party hierarchy through the precincts.

The Detroit Times (Sept. 17, 1950) described Michigan's general election voting behavior as follows: "Michigan has never been blessed with a strong opposition party. For three quarters of a century prior to 1932 it was a stand-pat Republican State. Since 1932 it has been a maverick; Democrats grabbing control in presidential years, and disorganized Republicans stumbling to recover in by-election years" (p. 30).

In 1932, 1936, and 1940, with Roosevelt heading the ticket, Michigan voters put Democrats in the governor's chair. The off-years, 1934, 1938, and 1942, has regularly produced Republican governors. But evidently the Democrats relied more on depression psychology than on basic party organization. With the coming of war prosperity, Democratic governors lost by 219,522 votes in 1944 and by 359,338 votes in 1946. This large difference between the Republican and Democratic vote in the mid-1940's indicated that PAC would have difficulty establishing a balance-of-power relationship. But the high Democratic vote during the depression indicated that Michigan might have a liberal vote untapped by the Old Guard Democratic Party. The liberal coalition counted on this vote in estimating that it might revive the Democratic Party. For this reason, Michigan's general election vote favored an internal, rather than an external, balance-of-power position.

Third-party activity has been a temptation to many Michigan CIO members. But third parties have never shown impressive returns on Michigan election sheets, with the exception of the Bull Moose party in 1912 and the La Follette Progressives in 1924. Father Coughlin's Social Justice Party reached a peak of 75,795 in 1936; Wallace got 46,515 in 1948; Socialists never rallied more than their maximum of 39,205 votes in 1932. A successful third party is difficult to build in Michigan. It faces the adamant opposition of the press and a Republican party which can turn out 934,000 votes for governor. PAC did not have sufficient votes to make a third party a practicable method of electing a governor in 1950.

The low primary vote, the difficulty of balancing power, potential New Deal sentiment, and the poor showing of third parties, all pointed to an internal method of political action in Michigan. A coalition could enter the weak Democratic party through the primaries and make it a vehicle which might appeal to the potential liberal vote, without being placed in the exposed position of a third party or a supplemental interest group.

Compatible interest groups: What interest groups were potentially compatible with PAC's program? What form of political action did they favor? With their combined resources, what forms of political action could liberal groups successfully underwrite? These factors had a bearing on the form of political action that PAC could adopt.

Some A. F. of L. unions, like the Teamsters, had already attempted internal Democratic Party activity but felt their objectives to be more compatible with the Old Guard than with the liberal coalition. The more liberal segment of the A. F. of L., however, at the instigation of the Michigan Democratic and reform groups, agreed to give partisan support to the liberal coalition. The A. F. of L. was not so active politically as the CIO was, but PAC could count on some A. F. of L. support for partisan activity.

The Americans for Democratic Action, especially in Wayne County, was a small but active interest group. Though they refused to adopt a partisan method of political action, they agreed to support Williams and contributed considerable political work in 1948. A number of ADA members, like Williams himself, who became converted to the partisan approach, left ADA and joined the Michigan Democratic Club.

The support of Michigan Democratic Club and reform Democrats was essential to the success of the liberal coalition. Their objectives were similar to, or at least not incompatible with, those of PAC. It is doubtful, however, whether PAC could have obtained their support for external or third-party political action. They were already committed to a partisan approach.

Especially in Detroit, the Democratic Party has obtained steadily increasing support from Negro, Polish, Italian, and low-income groupings. Polish and Italian and, to a lesser extent, Negro communities had well-organized political interest groups with patronage objectives in 1950. Like the Michigan Democratic Club, these groups adopted a partisan relationship to the Democratic Party. Hicks Griffiths approached these groups in 1948 and obtained the support of important Negro and Italian politicians for the liberal coalition. The political attachment of the Polish group wavered between Old Guard and liberal factions. It is doubtful whether these interest groups would have contributed their resources to anything but partisan activity.

Democratic Party structure: The Michigan party was controlled from the precinct level; hence its battlements could be scaled by electing precinct captains.

District and county party chairmen were not in a position of absolute control, as in Steubenville. They were supplemented by an executive board of 15 members, which had more authority than the rubber-stamp body in Jefferson County. Since power could be distributed among party officers, coalition government was possible. The relationship of PAC to Michigan Democratic Club and Reform Democrats was not that of lord and vassals; party control could be shared.

Party composition: Michigan old-guard Democrats had not built a formidable machine with broad interest-group contacts, like the party in Chicago. Their ranks were decimated by patronage factions and the disaffection of Michigan Democratic and reform groups.

As a result, party functions declined. Precincts and slates were not filled, factions were not disciplined, campaigning was weak. As in Rockford, the party was thus open to capture by a more active and disciplined coalition able to find and elect precinct captains and select and campaign for candidates.

PAC objectives: The Michigan PAC, like the four others studied here, accepted national CIO legislative objectives. In addition, the State CIO council approved specific State legislative objectives and made endorsements on the basis of these objectives.

Like Abner and Allen, however, Michigan PAC leaders were thinking of more than a few legislative concessions. They had a vision of parties and governmental bodies in which labor had an actual share of control. Existing parties, both under the control of nonlabor groups, looked to them like tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee.

The Michigan PAC nearly had a civil war over whether labor could obtain this share of political control by entering an old party or starting a new one. The third-party idea was by no means a monopoly of CIO's left wing. Even while deciding to enter the Democratic Party, the Michigan PAC left the third-party alternative open with the statement: "*Resolved*, That a thorough and objective study be made of the results of this [partisan] policy in both primary and general elections in Michigan, with the understanding that if this program has been unsuccessful that Michigan CIO then recommend to the National CIO convention which meets in November 1948, that action be taken to unite the AFL Railway Brotherhoods, and other progressive groups for the formation of a new political party based upon a progressive political program and independent of existing political parties." (Michigan CIO News, June 23, 1948, p. 2.)

PAC structure: In 1950 the State PAC had 150 to 200 members representing county industrial union councils, CIO international unions, and State CIO and international union staff. This committee met quarterly to elect officers, determine policy, endorse statewide candidates, and coordinate the political work of local unions and councils. Its members carried this policy back to their local groups.

As is common with such large committees, however, PAC policy was thought out by an executive board. The State PAC executive board consisted of about 15 members: 9 from the United Automobile Workers and 1 each from Steel, Chemical, Amalgamated Clothing, and Utility Workers Unions. All regional directors or international union presidents in the State were also included. This board met about once a month. Actually, however, its main work was performed by about five of its most active members, located in Detroit. This was the core of PAC leadership.

For its executive work, the State PAC had a staff consisting of a director, his assistants, 5 or 6 field workers, an education staff, a newspaper staff, and clerical help. Political action formed a major part of their work. Since the president of the State CIO council, its chief executive, the chairman of PAC, and the CIO regional director were one and the same man, August Scholle, he was in an unusually strong position to direct political-action policy. He personally favored internal rather than third-party activity.

While the State PAC accepted the legislative program and presidential endorsements of the national CIO, its relationship to the national body was not close. The State PAC did not consult with its national office as to the form of political action it should take, nor did it keep the national body informed of its activities. Thus Michigan felt freer to experiment with partisan activity than did Ohio, which adopted a supplemental party relationship more in common with national PAC practice.

Under the State PAC were the PAC's of county and city industrial union councils. They coordinated and promoted CIO political activity in their areas but had to stay in line with State and National PAC policy on pain of disciplinary action. The State PAC was the center of power in this hierarchy. It was thus able to develop sufficient consistency of action to enter the Democratic Party on a statewide basis.

Composition of PAC: The average CIO member in Michigan, as in other communities, felt his union was necessary but did not hesitate to gripe about its political and economic demands upon him. Immediate CIO legislative objectives sounded good to him, but did not arouse him to great excitement. Like his neighbors, he required considerable political education before he could be induced to undertake any form of political action.

Michigan's secondary leadership seemed to have somewhat more political experience and enthusiasm than Ohio's, owing perhaps to previous United Automobile Workers' excursions into the field of political action and internal UAW politics. Their very awareness of alternative political objectives and methods, however, made factionalism a problem.

The bitterest factions arose over the issue of leftwing or rightwing control. The rightwing won firm control of the State CIO Council in 1946. But the leftwing continued in control of the Wayne County Council until 1948, when the national CIO took disciplinary measures to bring it into line on the Wallace third-party issue. Since Reuther's victory over the Thomas-Addes faction of the UAW and the expulsion of leftwing unions from the CIO, the rightwing has been assured of control of the PAC in Michigan. But the conflict resulted in the rather centralized and disciplined rtructure just described.

The greatest 1950 factional differences centered around the question of third-party versus internal-party political action. This question was not permanently settled, and rumblings of discontent were not uncommon within PAC.

What were the political abilities and preferences of the PAC leaders in Michigan? August Scholle was State PAC director. He was militant, aggressive, and ruthless against opposition. His experience inside major political parties may have been more limited than that of some coalition group leaders, but he was well versed in the techniques of acquiring and holding power within the rough and tumble of the labor movement. He lacked Willard Allen's informal, genial, personal leadership, and he relied on authority, formal appearances, statements, and strategy to maintain control of his turbulent hierarchy. He held the reins tight. With his own restless membership in mind, he did not hesitate to make sharp demands of the party in return for PAC support. The coalition did not find him an easy teammate. He was personally convinced of the effectiveness of partisan activity and was largely responsible for building and maintaining it.

PAC thus had top and secondary leadership with sufficient experience and control to attempt partisan political action, and its membership was still in the stage of responding more readily to Democratic than to third-party appeals.

SUMMARY

In Michigan, PAC formed a liberal coalition with the Michigan Democratic Club, Reform Democrats, A. F. of L., and a few patronage interest groups. By entering precinct captains in the primaries, especially in Wayne County, the coalition was able to control a number of district Democratic conventions and send a majority of delegates to the Democratic State convention. From this position the liberal coalition was able to determine the composition of the Democratic State executive committee. PAC was the strongest single interest group in the coalition.

The coalition was able to bring marked changes into the life of the Michigan Democratic Party. It filled Democratic primary and convention slates. It entered liberal planks in the State Democratic platform and made the platform more binding. It governed the selection of party officers. It ejected the conservative Old Guard. It used its influence to appoint liberals to policy-determining patronage jobs and used routine patronage to strengthen its coalition. PAC's hand was observable in all these changes.

The coalition also had new ideas about campaigning and footed more than half the bill. Liberal Democratic campaigns relied on precinct work rather than on large-scale publicity. Special interest groups were well hidden behind a general Democratic campaign committee. For the first time the Democratic Party challenged a Statewide election and won a governor.

This internal position had obvious advantages for PAC. Instead of attempting to deal with a weak and hostile party, it helped create an active and friendly body. PAC's assets were supplemented by those of other compatible groups which might not have followed PAC into more independent activity. PAC was not left exposed before the newspapers. But an internal position also presented problems. It was costly in money, work, and votes, and it required compromises. PAC ran the risk of capture by other party groups or of being left out of new party coalitions. And, finally, a position on the Democratic ballot by no means insured a liberal candidate of actual election.

A third party was impractical as a means of electing Michigan's governor in 1950. Liberals were concentrated in a few urban areas, and their interest groups were already involved in a partisan approach. CIO members did not show themselves capable of a large independent vote, and their Republican opponents were strong. A supplementary or balance-of-power relationship also seemed unsatisfactory. The Republicans were strong, and both parties were hostile. PAC leaders wanted more than a "lesser of two evils." But the Democratic Party was weak in the precincts and the primary and was made vulnerable by Michigan election law. Liberal groups were willing to cooperate in a partisan move. PAC was strong enough and disciplined enough to think in Statewide terms. In 1948 and again in 1950 it was therefore able to share party control. A coalition, with PAC as an important member, found that it was able to capture the State Democratic Party.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, of course, the question of personal privilege was not anticipated by the Members, but under the circumstances I think I should have the right to express my views and I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, most of the utterings of the gentleman from Michigan were entirely irrelevant to the main matter he was supposed to discuss. As far as communism is concerned, years before anybody ever heard from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], a Member of this House by the name of McCORMACK was fighting them and fighting them practically alone. Nineteen years ago I was chairman of a special committee that investigated communism, and nazism and fascism, and my special committee also investigated bigotry.

Let me remind the gentleman that I am the author of the Foreign Agents Registration Act; and also to remind the gentleman that the first recommendation to this body ever made to make it a crime for anyone "to knowingly or wilfully advocate the overthrow of Government by force and violence," now a part of the Smith Act, was made by the McCormack special subcommittee; also giving the Army and Navy the power to control communistic activities that could go on prior to 1935 without anyone being able to stop Communist activities in camps and navy yards, was recommended by my subcommittee and put through under my leadership. I did not hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] in those years supporting me when I could not get a hearing on the bill before the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill making it a crime for anyone "to knowingly or wilfully advocate the overthrow of Government by force and violence" because it violated State rights. Can you imagine that? It is now the Smith law. I led the fight. I had to wait 4 years before that bill came before the House in order to get it passed.

So far as communism is concerned, why for many years I have been constantly fighting it and my record speaks for itself; but in those years I was practically alone. When I warned of the potential danger of communism, when I was being fought by powerful people in certain activities in this country outside of the Government and in powerful positions in Government, I had very few voices supporting me.

Now, let us get down to the facts. Here is a newspaper heading: "Sift Charge CIO Seized Democratic Rule."

Here is another headline: "State Democrats Face April Probe."

Suppose a Democratic House had said: "State Republicans Face April Probe," do you think that would be right? I do not care whether it is Republican or Democrat. You have the power now yourself. We did not abuse it when we were in control. Just put the shoe on the other foot.

Coming to the Committee on Government Operations, it has absolutely no jurisdiction over a matter of this kind. As the best evidence of the argument today in indirectly approaching it by investigating expenses on the part of some officials of the Federal Government, I have here copy of a letter dated March 25 sent by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], the ranking Democratic member of the committee. Here is what he said only a few days ago:

Among other things, this committee will endeavor to ascertain whether physical force was used to obtain control of several con-

gressional district political conventions which sent delegates to the State convention, which in turn had a voice in electing members of national political conventions.

Another purpose is to ascertain whether an amendment of the Corrupt Practices Act is either advisable or necessary, in order that regular lawful party procedure might be continued—whether such conventions which affect national elections might be controlled through the use of force.

The Corrupt Practices Act does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. If it comes under any committee it would be the Committee on House Administration and legislation relating to it could come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Now the gentleman says that the charge that it was purely partisan was "without foundation in fact." Well I have in my hand here the Detroit News of March 21. Right down here it says in part:

A witness at the Detroit hearings will probably be Representative CHARLES G. OAKMAN, Detroit Republican, now representing the 17th District. OAKMAN said he was anxious that the public know what went on at the 1950 Delegate Convention of the Democratic Party in Detroit—

And mark these words what this paper says. I do not know whether the gentleman said it or not, and if he says he did not, I will accept his word—mark these words—

and this was the first opportunity of a Republican administration to make an investigation.

Is that a justification? Now if that is correct, and I have a right to draw an inference that the newspaper men quoted it correctly, then, that the charge is partisan, is certainly justified.

Now we are entitled to say many things outside of this House that we cannot say on the floor of the House because of the rules of the House, and yet it might be the truth what we said outside of the House. With reference to my statement that it was "a disgraceful abuse of power," I did not say or intend that my dear friend from Michigan, or convey that he was "disgraceful." Why, if anyone said to me on the floor of the House or outside of this House that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was disgraceful, I would resent it and I would defend him, and I would defend the gentleman because I have a minimum high regard for him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Always.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I just call attention of the House, after words expressing some sort of appreciation of the gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman then said it was a minimum.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no, I said "minimum high regard" and very few have even that for my friend. I am still one of the few Members of the House that have a liking for him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for that compliment. There may be more than you think.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope there are, because I am a kind-hearted fellow. I want to think well and good of all of my fellow men, and I want all of my fellow men to think well of others, and to think there are more than a few that have a minimum high regard for my dear friend.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. Let me call attention to this, as strange as it may seem to you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Strange as it may seem? You are one of my strange things.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And difficult as it may be for you to give credence to it, I never made any statement to the press. I never saw those papers until you waved one of them over in the committee hearing. I have not read one of them—but will do so at my earliest convenience.

Mr. McCORMACK. The fact remains that somebody spoke to the press. I did not. That is a fact. Somebody did the speaking.

So, I guess we have had a good time. Probably it is best to let the matter rest. My friend is giving it a lot of fine advertising, more than I really deserve and really expected. My friend unconsciously and unintentionally has helped the Democratic Party in Michigan rather than hurt the Democratic Party. Now let me say to my friend, as chairman of the committee; I do not know much; I have only been here 25 years, but I know very little. I am trying to learn every day, but I know one thing, it is the easiest thing in the world to get along with those who serve in this House, whether Democratic or Republican, if you protect their rights. Might I suggest to my friend, as chairman, protect not only the rights of the Republican members of the Committee on Government Operations but also protect the rights of the minority members. And, let me say, when I was majority leader I always emphasized protecting the rights of the minority, and so has the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. He realizes that above all he must protect the rights of the minority, and fall over in doing so. And the chairman of the committee has the same responsibility, because the chairman of the committee is the leader of his party in committee, and he is supposed to do the same thing; to be very careful. We never had a meeting of the full committee that I was asked about the House Administration Committee and expenses for our committee. I served on a subcommittee of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is chairman. Our little subcommittee has not met. If the Republicans on the subcommittee have met, we Democrats have not been invited. At least invite us. Get your votes together but go through the formality of complying with the legislative rules and procedure and, might I say, with decency. The gentleman and I and the Democratic members of the committee will get along well if first he does not invade the rights of the chairman of his own subcommittee—he had better do a little about that; that is not a Democratic matter—and above all, if he will just show the elements of decent consideration, what a chairman should do for the members of a committee, both Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. OAKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned my name, and I would just like to make a remark for the RECORD, if he will yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired, although he can ask unanimous consent to proceed for another minute.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would be glad to, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. OAKMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts mentioned my name in conjunction with this.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, I quoted from a newspaper.

Mr. OAKMAN. Very good sir, I am happy to tell the gentleman and the other Members of this House that I am the Congressman who did go to Mr. HOFFMAN as the only Republican from Wayne County, but I assure the gentleman that it was not as a Republican that I went to Mr. HOFFMAN; it was as an American. I have had dozens and dozens of complaints, all from Democrats in my district in Wayne County, not from the Republicans. I show you a book called, "The CIO and the Democratic Party."

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman want me to get 5 minutes for him? I will ask for that if he wants to make a speech.

Mr. OAKMAN. It is the Democrats in my district and not the Republicans who are seeking the reformation.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is beautiful to see a Republican Congressman going to a Republican chairman to investigate a Democratic convention. I am glad to see that my friend is acting as an American and not as a Republican, but we have a right to our own views on that question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 193 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report

the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 4198, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands.

It is an open rule, providing for 4 hours of debate, after which it will be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. Under the rule, points of order are waived because it is probable that the question of appropriation in a legislative bill is involved. I refer you to page 6, beginning on line 9.

This legislation merely restores to the States the accepted law of the land prior to the Supreme Court's decision in the California case which, by a 4-to-3 decision, robbed the States of their sovereign rights.

The Judiciary Committees of both the House and the other body have had over the years many hearings on the subject. Always the committees have held in favor of the States. We must not forget that for over 160 years in our Nation's history that the States had unchallenged ownership.

The Supreme Court's decision applies to all the 48 States. Particularly does it apply to the 18 coastal States and the 8 States bordering on the Great Lakes. For instance, the great city of Chicago has filled in many square miles on the Michigan Lake front. As of this moment, the question of true titles to these lands may be in question.

While it is true that some are opposed to this bill, it is my understanding there is not any objection to the passing of this rule.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, just explained, this is an open rule providing for 4 hours of general debate, which together with the 1 hour provided on the rule makes 5 hours of general debate, after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, this question has been a controversial one now for the past decade and a half. For years and years, it was generally understood that the various States of the Union exercised the right of ownership and control over the sea bottoms according to their historic bounds. About 1935, some question was raised about that matter of ownership of these tidal lands by the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, although he had on a previous occasion, as I understand it, recognized the rights of the States to these tidewater subsoils. Subsequently the Supreme Court decided much to the surprise of many constitutional lawyers that the right to that soil belonged to the Federal Government and not to the States. This House on two occasions since that time passed a bill by overwhelming majority reasserting the right and title to these lands in the States. Naturally, coming from a State whose citizens pride themselves on the theory of States rights, I subscribe to the general theory enunciated here in the philosophy of this legislation of States' rights. Of course, no one could discuss this all-comprehensive legislation in such a limited time as we have here. In passing, I want to say that we want to give as much time as possible to the opposition to this bill on the rule, as I am sure it will be given in the general discussion of the bill.

But, generally speaking, there are more than three States involved in this matter; even though the public seems to have been given a contrary impression. Not only are California, Texas, and Florida involved, but all States with coastal borders are concerned with this legislation. In fact, all States are interested because of the far-reaching implications of the Supreme Court decision.

There are two questions involved. The question of the traditional or historic boundaries of the States, and the question of the Continental Shelf. I might mention before I leave that subject that with the exception, as I understand this legislation—and if I am in error, of course someone will correct me subsequently in the debate—but under this legislation only three States, California, Texas, and Florida—there may be others who claim—but, as I understand the testimony before the committee, it was the three States of California, Texas, and Florida which claimed more than 3 miles from the shore as their historical boundaries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I was just about to say how easy it would be to write a line in this bill to include all of the Lake States that have coast lines, but not on the ocean.

Mr. COLMER. I hope the gentleman will develop that under general debate. I think the gentleman will find that possibly that has already been done.

Now Texas comes in with its claim of more than 3 miles, because Texas came into the Union under a different status than the other States of the Union, which I do not have time to develop, but which will be developed during the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention particularly of the chairman of the committee and of the chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the committee generally to one phase of this matter that gives me considerable concern. That is the question of the comprehensive language used in the definition of what constitutes "natural resources." On page 3 we find that term. I shall not take the time to read it, but under the definition of "natural resources" the States would be given control and the right to the fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, et cetera. That raises a very serious question in my mind, as one who has been very much interested in that subject. Fish, shrimp and so forth are migratory. They are not fixed, in the sense that minerals are.

For instance, take the case of shrimp. Recently a large school of shrimp not heretofore discovered was found off the coast of Florida. Those shrimp moved gradually across the Gulf of Mexico, across the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas and now are somewhere off the coast of Mexico. Fishing fleets from Virginia to Mexico converged upon those shrimp without interference or limitation of State boundaries. This was as it should be. Otherwise the harvest would have been impossible. Migratory fish and shrimp do not recognize State boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact the practice engaged in by some States in the matter of regulating the taking of fish and other marine life is clearly unlawful and violative of the Privilege and Immunities clause of the United States Constitution. The United States Supreme Court in a fairly recent decision in the case of *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385) held that unreasonable and discriminatory regulations, licenses or fees could not be imposed or required by one State against the citizens of a different State in the taking of such marine life, to wit, shrimp. And I should like to call the attention of the learned committee members to the fact that this decision was made by the Supreme Court subsequent to the famous case in which the Court ruled in favor of the Federal Government and against the States in the so-called tidelands case. I might add that subsequent to the case just cited—the South Carolina case—the same United States Supreme Court made a similar decision in a case involving Texas and Louisiana, also involving the taking of shrimp.

At the proper time in the consideration of this legislation—and I wish I had more time to develop it—I am going to offer an amendment to try to clarify that situation and I hope I may have the sympathetic cooperation of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Mississippi very rightly points out a glaring defect of this bill, one of many; and I hope those defects will be made manifest as the debate progresses. I cannot see how shrimp, crabs, lobsters, and all manner and kin of fish can be deemed a resource or a part of the resources of a State. They are migratory, and that subsection (d) on page 3 is going to get the States involved in all manner and kinds of difficulties, all manner and kinds of claims and counterclaims, and what have you; so I think a suitable amendment would be very welcome in that regard.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I understood the gentleman to say that clams, quahaugs, and so forth, are migratory. They are attached to the land and planted there.

Mr. CELLER. I did not say "clams"; I meant some of the other marine animals or marine life that are mentioned

in the bill. However, I am opposed to this legislation in toto; I have been opposed to it from the very beginning.

This is an attempt to erase Supreme Court decisions, and I can assure you that whatever we do here with reference to this particular bill will be purely abortive. I can say that from my knowledge of the law; and a reading of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California case and in the Texas case, in the Louisiana case, leaves no doubt that this bill, if passed, will be declared illegal. The terms of the instant bill are no different in principle than the terms of the proposals passed upon by the Court. All we do will prove to be abortive, for the Supreme Court has stated in effect that the United States has no title whatsoever in these marginal lands and offshore lands seaward from low-water mark or in the minerals underneath. This bill purports to quitclaim to certain States these offshore lands and the minerals thereunder. I ask you how we can alienate that which we do not have, that which we do not own? Congress cannot quitclaim for the Government. The Government has naught to give a quitclaim. I say our action will be purely abortive. The Supreme Court will reaffirm the general principle that the Federal Government does not have title. Using legal verbiage the Court said in the Louisiana case, that as to these marginal lands off shore the Federal Government has "paramount rights"—that is, it has "imperium," that is, sovereignty. That is what is meant by "paramount rights" over the offshore lands. "Sovereignty" involves right, national defense, right of waging war, right to conduct foreign relations, make treaties, and so forth. The Federal Government cannot yield to the States any privileges or land or anything under the lands that interfere with that "sovereignty." Ceding any land seaward from the low-water mark would mean ceding some of the Government's sovereignty. This Congress cannot do.

Significantly the Court in the Louisiana case said:

> Although dominium (legal title) and imperium (sovereignty) are normally separable and separate, this is an instance where property interests are so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty.

Thus legal title merges into sovereignty and becomes part of it.

The Federal Government must have sovereign rights on the seacoast; it must have sovereign rights over the termini of the various coastal States for purposes of defense and for the conduct of international relations, and so forth. This bill decidedly nullifies those sovereign rights of the Nation.

When officials of the Government appeared before our committee they were in hopeless discord. There was no agreement. Signals got crossed. Arguments made by the administration's high officials were all tangled up. Three departments of the Government could not agree. The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, came before us and said we should "quitclaim" seaward to the traditional borders of the States; that is, the Federal Government should quitclaim these lands to the coastal States. But along came the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, a very astute and distinguished lawyer who knows the score, who knows the intricate legalities of the situation, and said, "Do not quitclaim." He undoubtedly had in mind the decisions of the Supreme Court which said that the Federal Government had no title, therefore, could not quitclaim what it did not have. Then Mr. Brownell—as I say, a very astute lawyer—realizing that there were some very improvident campaign pledges made by certain distinguished personages tried to reconcile differences, but he got into embarrassing difficulties. He said, "Do not quitclaim. Let the Federal Government allow the States to develop."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, finally the distinguished Attorney General said: "Draw a line between that which belongs to the States, and that which belongs to the Federal Government." He was rather naive in making that statement, because every member of the committee objected and said it would take until kingdom come to draw any sort of line of that kind. So that tack was discarded.

Then along came the State Department, and it said, in effect: "You were all wrong. Do not quitclaim. Do not allow development. Draw no line. If you attempt to give this territory and the rights thereunder to the States or allow development, you will involve us in all kinds of international entanglements." Whom are we to follow? The State Department, the Department of Justice, or the Interior Department? We cannot follow all three. They are in emphatic disaccord.

In particular, incidentally, the State Department, in its opposition, had in mind what happened recently when the Russians fired upon one of our planes that got nowhere near the 3-mile limit of Russian territory. Yet the Kremlin claimed the territory or sea over which the plane was flying. The Department had in mind what happened comparatively recently when our shrimp boats went down off the coast of Mexico and sailed allegedly within the 9-mile limit of Mexican territorial waters and got into trouble.

Just see what has occurred since we started this kind of legislation. Our minority report, which I hope you will read, indicates how various nations are now extending their boundaries away out to what is known as the Continental Shelf. The list includes Mexico, Panama, Chile, Peru, Argentina, and other Pan American countries. We started it all. Other nations taking their cue from the proposed legislation proceeded to extend their boundaries seaward clear to the Continental Shelf. One hardly blames them but see the complications that will arise from all these boundary extensions. Small wonder the State Department expresses alarm.

See what would ensue if France and England extended their boundaries in the English Channel as cavalierly as we would permit Texas and other coastal States to expand their limits by this legislation. We invite the States to extend their boundaries willy-nilly. I may be disputed on this, but I think I am right. There is an invitation, for example, to the States to go not only beyond 3 miles, the traditional 3 miles; but even to go beyond the marginal sea of 10½ miles, and clear out to the Continental Shelf—60 miles or 100 miles.

Section 4 in effect says that any claims of States as to seaward boundaries to any degree are not prejudiced by the legislation. This is the language used in part in section 4:

> Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line—
>
> The 3-mile limit.

These words will encourage States to extend their boundaries. Here is an engraved invitation to the coastal States to expand seaward—clear to the edge of the ocean shelf.

Up in Alaska the Continental Shelf extends 600 miles. If and when Alaska becomes a State it could extend its lines deep into the seas. What would Russia do? What is France going to do? What is England going to do? What are other countries going to do? They are all going to extend their territories way, way out, and they are going to get in each other's way and create incalculable turmoil and harm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in considerable disagreement with the comments of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. Later on in the course of debate I know that we are going to answer some of the points raised in the course of his remarks. At this time I would like to bring to the attention of the House a quotation of some paragraphs from a speech by the now President of the United States which was delivered in New Orleans on October 13, 1952, in which the position of President Eisenhower was made clear. That position has been reiterated in recent press conferences at the White House. I do so because the comment was made by the gentleman from New York that the present administration is confused as to what its position is on this issue. He said:

> The attack on the tidelands is only a part of the effort of the administration to amass more power and local responsibility.
>
> So, let me be clear in my position on the tidelands and all submerged lands and resources beneath inland and offshore waters which lie within historic State boundaries. As I have said before, my views are in line with my party's platform. I favor the recognition of clear legal title to these lands in each of the 48 States.
>
> This has been my position since 1948, long before I was persuaded to go into politics.
>
> State titles in these so-called tidelands areas stand clouded today.
>
> The Supreme Court has declared in very recent years that there are certain paramount Federal rights in these areas. But the court expressly recognized the right of Congress to deal with the matters of ownership and title.

Twice by substantial majorities, both Houses of Congress have voted to recognize the traditional concept of State ownership of these submerged areas. Twice these acts of Congress have been vetoed by the President.

I would approve such acts of Congress.

State ownership of the lands and resources beneath inland and offshore navigable waters is a long-recognized concept. It has not weakened America or impaired the orderly development of such resources. The States have administered the development of such resources in these areas from the beginning. And let me point out that this development has been carried on by State officials without scandal, fraud, or corruption.

The policy of the Washington power-mongers is a policy of grab. I wonder how far a consistent pursuit of this policy would take us. If they take the Louisiana, Texas, and California tidelands, then what about the Great Lakes? They have been held to be open sea. A good part of Chicago has been built on lands once submerged by Lake Michigan.

What of the inland lakes, rivers, and streams in Oklahoma, Iowa, Illinois, and Kansas?

What about the iron ore under the navigable waters of Minnesota and the coal under the waters of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and other States?

What of the fisheries in Florida; what of the kelp in Maine; what of the real estate built on soil reclaimed from the once-submerged areas in New York and Massachusetts?

The Washington power grabbers say, "Oh, we haven't tried to move in on any of those other States."

My answer is they didn't move in on you in Louisiana until the submerged lands became valuable.

So I repeat for the benefit of my opponents who have gone out of their way to misrepresent my views: I favor the recognition of these ancient property rights of the States in submerged lands.

Here are my reasons:

First, I deplore and I will always resist Federal encroachment upon rights and affairs of the States.

Second, I am gravely concerned over the threat to the States inherent in the growth of this power-hungry movement.

Third, the resources of these submerged areas, though still owned by the States, will be available for America's defense in time of national emergency.

Fourth, the orderly development of these resources under the States need not interfere with any valid Federal function.

Fifth, I believe the law twice passed by Congress which would recognize these State titles is in keeping with basic principles of honest dealing and fair play. These things are important—they are vital in Government as well as private dealings.

That was the statement of the President in his speech in New Orleans. Just a few weeks ago in a press conference he repeated his position in answer to a question which was put to him as to where he stood on this question. The question was:

Would you still say you favor restoring full ownership in the States within historic boundaries?

The President asked:

Within historic boundaries? Yes, sir.

The President said:

Which doesn't mean, of course, that the Federal Government doesn't perform certain functions in that region—security, smuggling—they do that. But up to the historic boundaries, that is State property as far as he was concerned.

This statement was contained in the New York Herald-Tribune of March 6.

I am convinced that the administration and the President of the United States are very much in favor of legislation to restore State ownership of the resources in the area within historical State boundaries.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. May I ask the gentleman from California if the excerpts from the speech of the President in Louisiana were made before the President stated that he had not read the Supreme Court decision?

Mr. HILLINGS. I do not know, but I know this, that the President has consistently felt, as he indicated in his remarks in New Orleans and as indicated in his press conference, that despite the Supreme Court decision this Congress can still act to properly determine the title to these lands in question.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I favor retention by the Federal Government of the rights to revenue from the development of natural resources on the public domain until such time as a complete resurvey of these rights—including a survey of public domain in inland States—can be made. I am against piecemeal quitclaiming of these revenue rights, particularly by a Federal Government that is heavily in debt to rich sovereign States which, to their credit, are not.

In taking this stand, I want to dissassociate myself from many of the tactics used by proponents of continued Federal ownership. These arguments include such canards as giving the lands to the oil lobbies, and so forth. I also feel that the attempt to tie up the so-called tidelands issue with Federal-aid-to-education legislation is misleading. It is sufficient, I feel, to point out to the people the financial plight of the Federal Government as it now stands. We should not have to buy their support for our stand by promising a new, and in this instance a popular, Federal spending program.

We are asked here to decide a matter of equity—and this question has two phases. Continued Federal ownership of the submerged lands without remedial legislation would, I am convinced, unduly penalize those persons who have in good faith spent time and money exploring and developing this great national resource under State lease. Without remedial legislation—should we defeat this measure—several johnny-come-lately Federal leaseholders would benefit at the expense of the legitimate developers and at the expense of the Nation as a whole. This I do not favor. This question of equity, however, can be settled by proper legislation, recognizing the legitimate rights of those who have operated under State leases. But we do not, we do not, have to protect their equity at the expense of the equity of all of the taxpayers in the Nation who now have, and until this measure is signed into law will continue to have, a right to their share of any revenue that accrues to the Nation from this vast oil resource.

Here, we have the second question of equity. We are asked by this bill to give up to the citizens of 3 States at the expense of the citizens of the remaining 45 States their equity in the revenue developed from this natural resource.

To the extent of 10 percent of this revenue—all of the States of the Union are involved. Under present policy of Federal ownership, 10 percent of royalty and rental revenue from oil development on the submerged lands would go into the General Treasury, where it is available for debt reduction, tax reduction, or for any program that the Congress in its wisdom decides upon.

Another 37½ percent of this revenue—if Federal ownership is retained—would be allocated to the inshore States, just as 37½ percent of the revenue from lands on public domain is now allocated to those States in which the domain lies. This I feel is a just allocation to the rich States of Louisiana, California, and Texas.

The remaining 52½ percent goes into the Bureau of Reclamation fund where it is used to help public-domain States develop their resources in the interest of the Nation. California, Texas, and Louisiana participate in these benefits—as does Utah, where 73 percent of the land area is under Federal dominion. This is the present method by which the citizens of the Nation share in wealth nationally owned and privately developed. I do not see why an exception should be made in the case of the residents of any three States. There should be no exceptions. If there is to be a shift in the distribution of revenues from Federal domain—all States and the citizens of all States should be treated equitably.

It appears to me indefensible for Congress to protect the equity of the good-faith developers of submerged oil lands by adopting a law that kicks the equity of the majority of the people of the Nation in these lands out the window.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss the merits of this bill. My views are briefly stated on the last page of the committee report. The reason I have asked for this time is that I sought to incorporate in my separate views on this legislation certain information which I had obtained concerning the international law aspects of this legislation.

I pointed out in my minority views in the report that there was no witness appearing before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House this year, at least, to discuss the international-law aspect of this legislation.

I wish to point out briefly that the definition of territorial waters which has been a matter of international law and the completely new field of international law dealing with the Continental Shelf seaward from the territorial waters are fields of great importance in international affairs and in international law.

Because of that gap in the information before the House Committee on the Judiciary—and I might say that no representative of the State Department was requested to appear before that committee, although the State Department did appear before the Senate committee considering similar legislation—I requested a colleague of mine, Professor William Bishop, professor of international law at the University of Michigan Law School, to brief me on the international-law aspects of this legislation. I wrote him on March 16, 1953, and received a reply from him on March 24, 1953, to which he attached a paper he gave before the Inter-American Bar Association at its sixth conference in Detroit, Mich., on May 19, 1949, entitled "The Exercise of Jurisdiction for Special Purposes in High Seas Areas on the Outer Limit of Territorial Waters."

It seems to me it is extremely important that the Members of the House should at least be aware of the problems with regard to the international-law aspects of this legislation before we vote on it. I assure you that the principles here involved are far reaching. My purpose today is to make this information available to the Members of the House early enough in the consideration of this legislation that they may, if they care to, familiarize themselves with the principles involved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate my letter to Professor Bishop, and his reply to me, together with a paper accompanying it at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

MARCH 16, 1953.

Prof. WILLIAM BISHOP,
University of Michigan Law School,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

DEAR BILL: As you know, the House Judiciary Committee now has before it legislation dealing with the transfer of submerged lands to the States. This is now before a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, but will shortly come before the Full Committee of which, as you probably know, I am a member.

When similar legislation was before the 82d Congress I voted against the transfer from the Federal Government to the States on the general grounds that Congress should not set itself up as a super supreme court to reverse judicial decisions which in its judgment were erroneous. Nor should it make donations of national wealth belonging to all the people of the United States to the citizens of just a few States.

I read the Supreme Court's decisions in the Texas-California and Louisiana cases, and it seemed clear to me that those cases held that rights, sovereignty, power, dominion, title, property or what have you, were in the Federal Government rather than in the States adjacent to the submerged lands. Although the reasoning did not appear too clear and the holdings were somewhat vague, I regarded these decisions as a final adjudication of property rights based upon consideration of principles of Constitutional and international law.

During the hearing in the current Congress, it struck me that we are dealing in a field which does not have a great deal of clearly established principles and precedents. Although the interest is concentrated on minerals under the submerged lands, there might be consideration concerning the waters above those lands and control of the air above the waters. I would be very much interested in knowing what landmarks have been established in international law that would shed some light on proper thinking with respect to submerged lands legislation. If you have ideas on the subject or can refer me to discussions which in your opinion contain sound reasoning, I think it would be helpful in my thinking in arriving at a sound conclusion, or in anything I may say concerning the present submerged-lands legislation.

I am enclosing excerpts containing the statements I made during the last Congress on this subject and would appreciate your criticism and comments.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE MEADER,
Member of Congress.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL,
Ann Arbor, March 24, 1953.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: This is in response to your good letter of March 16, 1953, asking for my views on the international law aspects of the pending legislation having to do with the transfer to the States of the submerged lands.

I am happy to say that I am in general accord with the position which you take in your letter, as well as with the statements which you made on the floor of the House on July 30, 1951, and May 15, 1952, and in your press release of March 4, 1953.

My own feeling is that in *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)) and *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)), the Supreme Court came to a conclusion with which I could not agree in view of its departure therein from the long line of Supreme Court cases beginning with *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212 (U. S. 1845)). I believe that the Supreme Court decision in *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)) was definitely erroneous, in view of the arrangements between the United States and the Republic of Texas pursuant to which the latter was to retain its public lands when it became a State in the Union. Indeed, I even took a small part on the Texas side of the latter litigation, concurring in the conclusions of the joint memorandum dated July 14, 1950, and filed with the Supreme Court in support of the petition for rehearing. [As you may be aware, that memorandum, and various articles about the special situation in *United States* v. *Texas*, are conveniently published in Third Baylor Law Review 115, 319 (winter issue, 1951).] But, although I do not feel that these cases were correctly decided, I share your doubts as to the Congress setting itself up as a body to reverse the Supreme Court, and as to the wisdom of turning over to certain States what the Supreme Court has found to be the property (or something approaching property) of the Nation.

Turning to your specific inquiries relating to the international law aspects of this question of submerged coastal lands, I would urge first that it does not appear to make any difference with respect to our international law rights or international law duties, whether as a purely domestic or intranational matter the ownership, control, paramount rights, or what have you, with respect to these submerged coastal lands belongs to the several State governments or to the Federal Government, or were even owned in fee simple by private individuals. Political control, sovereignty, territorial authority, or whatever term one may use to describe the powers of the United States over its territory when viewed from the international law standpoint, clearly does not require that the national government have ownership in the private-law sense of all of the property within that territory. From the international law standpoint, I suppose no one would doubt that the United States has just the same sovereignty or territorial authority over my own small house and lot in Ann Arbor, or over the State-owned campus of the university, as it does over the United States post-office downtown which is owned by the United States. Ownership by the United States Government is not a prerequisite to sovereignty or territorial authority, while indeed United States Government ownership of property in foreign countries (such as military cemeteries) does not carry with it sovereignty or territorial authority over such pieces of property. So far as I can see it, it makes no difference whether the property concerned is a house and lot, or the subsoil of the sea; ownership is one thing, and territorial sovereignty is another, and loss of one does not mean loss of the other.

Secondly, although from the standpoint of international law or international relations it would appear to make no difference whether the States or the Federal Government have property (or property-like) rights in the submerged coastal lands, yet it does seem to me very important that any action which Congress may see fit to take with respect to the domestic question of title to such lands should not be in terms inconsistent with the international position which the United States has taken, or wishes to take, as a nation in its relations with foreign countries. It is here that considerations of international law really do come into play in this matter, and I would suggest that it may be very difficult to have any action taken by Congress in this field which may not have undesirable repercussions upon our international controversies with other countries. As I see it, the proposed submerged-lands legislation may give rise to such international complications and with respect to the extent of territorial waters, and with respect to the nature and scope of rights which may lawfully be claimed by a nation regarding its continental shelf and the superjacent waters.

Unintended consequences may result from what the proposed legislation will do in drawing a boundary line (whether 3 marine miles, or 9 marine miles) between those lands transferred or returned to the States and lying inside such limit, and the lands remaining under Federal ownership or paramount control because they lie outside that limit. Here the trouble is that in any such legislation we must make a formal selection of some particular limit, which other countries will then be prone to consider an official statement by the United States of the limit of territorial waters. It may be possible to guard in part against undesirable consequences by appropriate disclaimer of any intention to deal with the limit of territorial waters. As I see it, if we make the limit 3 nautical miles along our entire coast, that would be no more than repeating our usual stand that the maximum breadth of territorial waters is 3 marine miles; and I suppose we have said that often enough so that no real additional embarrassment would result from saying it again, even if at some time within the next few years we might as a nation wish to change our minds and to advocate a broader belt of marginal seas in view of some of the inadequacies of the 3-mile limit. However, I understand that (except off California) the really important deposits of oil lie outside the 3-mile limit, and strong pressures are likely to give the States more than just the seabed and subsoil within 3 miles. Furthermore, in the case of Texas, pressures will be very strong indeed to draw the line at least as far from shore as 9 marine

miles (approximately 10½ statute miles), and this with considerable justification. I believe it can be shown that Texas as an independent republic, like Mexico before and since the independence of Texas, claimed as her own territorial waters 9 miles rather than 3; and I don't think that at the time of the annexation of Texas in 1845 customary international law on that point had developed to the point where it was internationally unlawful for a nation to claim 9 miles. [You will remember, for example, that the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo of 1848 between the United States and Mexico, ending the Mexican War, provided that the boundary between the United States and Mexico "shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, three leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande."] Now if we do in an act of Congress choose the 9-mile limit off Texas, I'm afraid that we will give great encouragement to various other nations that currently insist on claiming as their own territorial waters a belt of 5 or 6 or 9 or 12 nautical miles off their shores. Mexico, in particular, has frequently interfered with American shrimpers and other fishing vessels operating more than 3 but less than 9 nautical miles off the Mexican coast, and in dealing with such actions the United States has insisted that 3 nautical miles was the outer limit of Mexican territorial waters. According to the press, we are now trying to get the release of a number of shrimping vessels held by Mexican authorities at Campeche. It is well known that our shrimp fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico, and our California and Oregon tuna fishermen in the Pacific, find it highly desirable, if not essential, to engage in fishing operations not far outside the 3-mile limit off Mexico and countries to the south. I believe that any legislation enacted by Congress at the present time which might indicate United States approval of a 9-mile claim by Texas, and thus impliedly of that by Mexico as her predecessor-in-title, would jeopardize the chances of our Department of State in working out any satisfactory solution with Mexico regarding the status of our fishermen operating near the Mexican coasts. On this point I fully concur in the statement of Jack B. Tate, Deputy Legal Adviser of the Department of State, as reported in the press.

Please do not understand me to be saying that I believe that under contemporary international law the 3-mile limit is so well established as to be clearly binding against a nation, like Mexico or Norway, that has always claimed more than 3 miles. I don't think that the International Court of Justice would today hold that Mexico violates international law in maintaining its claim to 9 nautical miles and in enforcing it against vessels and nationals of the United States. Although the United States and Great Britain, and generally the nations with large seagoing tonnage which wishes to operate close to other nations' shores, have maintained that 3 miles was the international law limit, it seems to me significant that in the so-called liquor treaties concluded by the United States between 1924 and 1930 it was only Great Britain, Germany, Panama, the Netherlands, Cuba, and Japan whom we could get to agree on 3 miles as the proper limits of territorial waters; while in our treaties concluded with Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Italy, France, Belgium, Spain, Greece, Chile, and Poland, it was necessary to substitute the provision that the parties respectively retain their rights and claims, without prejudice by reason of this agreement, with respect to the extent of their territorial jurisdiction. During the League of Nations Conference for the Codification of International Law, convened at The Hague in 1930, it appeared that Canada, China, Denmark, Greece, India, Iran, Japan, the Netherlands, South Africa, United Kingdom, and the United States all advocated the 3-mile limit; while 3 miles plus an additional contiguous zone was supported by Belgium, Chile, Egypt, Estonia, France, Germany, and Poland. At the Conference Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden proposed 4 marine miles, Finland and Norway favoring an additional contiguous zone. Brazil, Colombia, Italy, Rumania, Spain, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia favored 6 nautical miles, as did Cuba, Latvia, and Turkey if a further contiguous zone was added. Portugal sought 12 miles. (On this, see I Hackworth, Digest of International Law, 628–630.) According to data gathered in 1951 by S. W. Boggs, a geographical expert of the Department of State, and published in his article, National Claims in Adjacent Seas, 61 Geographical Review 185 (1951), 3 nautical miles was regarded as the proper limit of territorial waters by Australia, Belgium, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Germany, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Korea, Liberia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Rumania, South Africa, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. He classifies as claiming 3 miles plus contiguous zones for special purposes, Argentina, Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, France, Laos, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Turkey, the United States, Venezuela, and Vietnam. He lists 4 miles as claimed by Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden (all within contiguous zones also), and perhaps as the Danish claim. Uruguay is given as claiming 5 miles; while Bulgaria, Haiti, and Saudi Arabia are classed as claiming 6, and 6 miles plus a further contiguous zone is listed for Egypt, Greece, Honduras, Iran, Italy, Lebanon, Spain, Syria, and Yugoslavia. According to Dr. Boggs, Mexico claims 9 miles, and Colombia, Guatemala, and the Soviet Union claim 12 miles. (The Soviet claims to 12 miles have been much in mind of late, while it can be seen from I Hackworth, Digest of International Law, 634–636, that such Russian claims antedate the 1917 revolution.) With this lineup of nations for and against the 3-mile limit, I think it very doubtful whether the United States could persuade the International Court of Justice today that the Mexican claim of 9 miles, or even the Soviet claim of 12 miles, clearly violates customary international law. But the point I am trying to make is that any action by the Congress which lends support to the 9-mile view through its treatment of submerged lands off Texas, would seem to put our negotiators in a much poorer position, giving encouragement and support to the Mexican contention that they can seize our shrimpers and tuna boats between 3 and 9 marine miles off Mexico, and perhaps even to the Soviet contention that our vessels and planes must not approach within 12 marine miles of Soviet shores without express permission. If Congress wants to take this risk, I would submit that it should only be after a full understanding of the complications involved.

The other sphere in which the proposed legislation might run into international law difficulties for the United States would be that of control over the Continental Shelf and waters above it, which lie clearly outside of what is claimed as territorial waters. Here we are dealing with a new and rapidly evolving concept in international law, which received its first official impetus from the two Truman proclamations of September 28, 1945, dealing respectively with the resources of the Continental Shelf and with coastal fisheries. On this subject you may find of interest the enclosed mimeographed copy of a talk which I gave to the Inter-American Bar Association at its Detroit meeting in 1949. Incidentally, I believe no confidence is violated when I say that as an Assistant to the legal adviser of the Department of State I played some part in connection with the 1945 proclamations, and that to the best of my recollection the main themes of my talk before the Inter-American Bar Association are in harmony with the thinking current in the Department of State at the time these proclamations were issued.

In that talk I was trying to point out the thinking behind, and the justifications for, the policy of the United States expressed in the proclamations; and I was also trying to show that the action taken by various Latin American countries (to some extent Mexico, but especially Peru, Chile, Costa Rica, and Argentina), in asserting that both the resources of the Continental Shelf, and all the water above, were part of their territory and completely subject to their control save for a right akin to that of innocent passage through admitted territorial waters, went way beyond anything the United States had done or advocated. So far as the seabed and subsoil are concerned, most of the Latin American Republics, the Persian Gulf countries, and a few others such as Pakistan and Philippines, have taken action asserting authority over oil and other resources of the Continental Shelf. I think there has been no serious protest by any foreign government so far as that is concerned, and I see no real violation of international law in such claims to the seabed and subsoil (whether asserted in terms of "sovereignty," "ownership," etc., as in some countries, or in the more cautious words of "appertaining to" and "subject to its control and jurisdiction" used in the United States Continental Shelf proclamation). On the other hand, once the claims begin to include the right to control fishing and the waters themselves which are above the Continental Shelf, and to assimilate those waters to ordinary territorial waters even though they may extend 200 miles from shore rather than 3 or 9 or 12, we get to the point where the freedom of the seas is seriously interfered with, and where justification in present day international law cannot be found, unless the assertion of control is narrowly limited (as in the United States coastal fisheries proclamation, which is limited to substantially developed fisheries and which brings the state of the fishing vessels in on a par with the coastal State in the regulating and controlling). You will recall that the United States and Great Britain are both reported to have protested strongly to the assertions of jurisdiction over seabed and superjacent waters by Chile, Peru, and Argentina. I am happy to see that the United Nations International Law Commission, in trying to draw up articles relating to the Continental Shelf and related topics, follows quite closely the position of the United States (you will find those articles appended to the mimeographed version of my talk).

Thus here, again, we have a difference of opinion between the United States and various Latin American countries regarding control over the Continental Shelf and superjacent waters. I would urge that any congressional action which might lay claim to the Continental Shelf beyond the three—or nine—mile limit, and refer to it as property of the Federal Government, should be carefully scrutinized to avoid inadvertant support to Latin American contentions which the United States regards as violating international law. At the present stage of technology and actual exploitation of oil, no one is too much concerned if under claims to the Continental Shelf by the coastal State a foreigner is prevented from drilling for oil or taking minerals without the permission of the coastal State. I see no harm likely to result from any actions or statements which might reiterate the coastal States' rights over resources of the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf, even if Congress were to use terms expressive of ownership or sovereignty rather than the more cautious language of the 1945 proclamation. On the other hand, Americans have long fished—and want to keep on fishing—not very far out on the high seas from the coasts of foreign countries—both Newfoundland and the Republics to the south—and if we do anything

to encourage the idea that the coastal State can control fishing on the Continental Shelf without the State of the fishing vessels having an equal say in the regulation and control of such fishing outside narrowly defined territorial waters, then I think we'll be acting directly contrary to our own United States interests. I am sure that you will perceive in the 1945 proclamation on coastal fisheries the attempt to safeguard fishing for salmon and halibut off Alaska and British Columbia—the latter, in particular, under a most successful conservation treaty with Canada—and at the same time avoid being cut out of our share in laying down any controls by the coastal nations over fishing by our vessels off Mexico and countries to the south, or off Newfoundland and the other northeastern fisheries. If Congress is going to adopt any legislation with respect to the submerged coastal lands, I hope that great care will be used to avoid hurting the United States position or aiding that of Mexico, Peru, Costa Rica, etc., in dealing with fisheries on the Continental Shelf but outside territorial waters. Indeed, in the present formative stage of international law with respect to the Continental Shelf and to fishing controls in contiguous zones of the high seas, I would submit that greater care may be necessary in this field than with respect to the line limiting territorial waters.

I fear that the foregoing may set forth my ideas at greater length than you will want, but I hope they may be of some use to you. Insofar as articles, etc., are concerned, I believe that most of my views are expressed in the enclosed talk before the Inter-American Bar Association. On the international law aspects of the Continental Shelf, the fullest published treatment seems to be in M. W. Mouton, The Continental Shelf (1952), a book in English by a Dutch naval officer which won the Grotius prize in 1952. Much briefer, but perhaps useful as a general introduction, I would recommend on the Continental Shelf an article by Richard Young, Legal Status of Submarine Areas Beneath the High Seas, 45th American Journal International Law, 225 (April 1951); and on coastal fisheries Charles Selak, Recent Developments in High Seas Fisheries Jurisdiction Under the Presidential Proclamation of 1945, 44 ibid., 670 (October 1950). There is a full bibliography in Mouton's book.

Hoping that this may be of some value to you, and with best personal wishes,

Sincerely yours,

BILL,

William W. Bishop, Jr.,
Professor of Law.

THE EXERCISE OF JURISDICTION FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES IN HIGH SEAS AREAS BEYOND THE OUTER LIMIT OF TERRITORIAL WATERS (E. G., CONSERVATION, ETC.)

(Paper prepared by William W. Bishop, Jr., professor of law, University of Michigan Law School, Inter-American Bar Association, sixth conference, Detroit, May 1949)

COMMITTEE X, THEME 2, TERRITORIAL WATERS AND OCEAN FISHERIES

I have been asked to discuss the exercise by a nation of jurisdiction for special purposes in contiguous zones of the high seas lying beyond the outer limits of territorial waters. I shall not attempt to touch upon one aspect of this problem which is of major interest to federations, like the United States, where great concern arises over the domestic constitutional issue whether the central Government, or those of the several States, should exercise such jurisdiction. Furthermore, my topic differs from that of the breadth of territorial waters. The exercise of jurisdiction in contiguous zones of the high seas becomes necessary in view of the inadequacy under modern conditions of any reasonable breadth of territorial waters; whatever we may regard as the breadth of marginal sea now accepted under international law, there are occasions and purposes for which jurisdiction must be exercised farther out from shore. This differs from an attempt to declare such areas territorial waters subject to the full sovereignty of the coastal state.

The efforts of the League of Nations toward codification of the law of territorial waters, culminating in the failure to achieve agreement at the Hague Codification Conference of 1930, points to the present unsettled condition of international law on this subject.[1] The replies of the various governments and their views at the conference showed agreement that a state has sovereignty over a belt of sea around its coast (subject to the rights of innocent passage and refuge in distress), but no agreement as to the breadth of this belt. No state disputed that territorial waters extend at least 3 nautical miles from shore, but many insisted upon 4 or 6 miles, while others requested 12, or in 1 or 2 cases 15 or 18 miles. Quite a number favored, in principle, a contiguous zone on the high seas, outside territorial waters, in which the coastal state might exercise jurisdiction for certain purposes. A majority of states taking part in the 1930 conference refused to recognize 3 miles as the outer limit of territorial waters prescribed by international law. Equally noteworthy, there was no disposition on the part of more than 2 or 3 to insist upon a breadth greater than 6 nautical miles as the limit of the territorial waters under the sovereignty of a state. No claim was made to more than 18 miles. Having in mind the work at The Hague, one may say that international law permits the exercise of full sovereignty over a belt of territorial waters extending from shore at least 3 nautical miles, but not more than 12 (more likely 6); and that many favor an adjacent zone or zones in which jurisdiction may be exercised for special purposes, although such zones would remain part of the high seas rather than becoming territorial waters.

This notion of a contiguous zone is nothing new. Almost as early as the attempts to fix upon the breadth of the marginal sea, we find jurisdiction asserted for defense purposes and for the prevention of smuggling, over areas outside those claimed as territory. The British Hovering Acts of 1736 and 1784, and the United States statute of 1790, declared jurisdiction for customs purposes as extending out four leagues.[2] Similar legislation may be found in many countries.[3] In the case of the other American Republics, it appears that jurisdiction for customs purposes is exercised beyond territorial waters, out to 12 miles by Argentina, Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, El Salvador, and Venezuela.[4] Such jurisdiction to prevent smuggling, over a reasonable extent of the high seas outside a state's territorial waters, appears to have become accepted in international practice. As Chief Justice Marshall stated in *Church* v. *Hubbart* (2 Cr. U. S. 187 234 (1804): "its (a nation's) power to secure itself from injury may certainly be exercised beyond the limits of its territory. * * * Any attempt to violate the laws made to protect this right, is an injury to itself which it may prevent, and it has a right to use the means necessary for its prevention. These means do not appear to be limited within any certain marked boundaries, which remain the same at all times and in all situations. If they are such as unnecessarily to vex and harass foreign lawful commerce, foreign nations will resist their exercise. If they are such as are reasonable and necessary to secure their laws from violation, they will be submitted to."

During the regime of prohibition in the United States, it became necessary to specify by treaty the distance from shore within which authorities might search and seize foreign vessels smuggling alcoholic liquor. Sixteen of these "Liquor treaties" were concluded between 1924 and 1930, under which it was agreed that the United States might exercise control for their purpose within one hour's sailing distance from shore.[5] These were not regarded as extending territorial waters but as recognizing the right to take action upon the high seas necessary for enforcement of the laws prohibiting importation of liquor. Likewise, in 1925 the 11 Baltic states concluded a convention to prevent smuggling liquors, under which 12 miles was accepted as a permissible limit for enforcement measures.[6]

In 1935 the United States Antismuggling Act (49 Stat. 517) provided that in case vessels of countries which had no liquor treaties with the United States were hovering off the coast, under Presidential action customs-enforcement areas might be established extending not more than 100 miles from the place where the vessel was hovering.[7] No indication has been found of objection by any other government to action taken by the United States under this 1935 statute, though jurisdiction may be exercised as far as 62 nautical miles from shore.

Security and defense form another sphere in which modern conditions necessitate control over high seas areas well beyond territorial waters. Although the original attempt to define the limit of territorial waters by cannon shot (deemed equal during the 18th century to 3 nautical miles) was intimately connected with the safety of neutral coastal states from the action of belligerent vessels, during the 19th century there was little disposition to increase the extent of territorial waters as weapons improved. Even during the war of 1914–18, to say nothing of World War II, the range of modern projectiles greatly exceeded the most extensive claims to territorial waters. Modern naval guns, rockets, aircraft, greatly complicate the problem of protection of the shore against damage consequent upon belligerent action at sea. It became generally recognized that for purposes of self-defense action might be taken on the high seas, but this vague general principle did not attain precision. During the war of 1914–18, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru supported the idea of a declaration by the American Republics that belligerents must refrain from hostile acts near the coasts of the Americas or interfering with the normal maritime routes between the American Republics; but no such action was taken.[8]

Upon the outbreak of World War II, the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics adopted the Declaration of Panama,[9] in which they declared that—

"As a measure of continental self-protection, the American Republics, so long as they maintain their neutrality, are as of inherent right entitled to have those waters adjacent to the American Continent, which they regard as of primary concern and direct utility in their relations, free from the commission of any hostile act by any non-American belligerent."

---

[1] League of Nations documents C. 74 M. 39, 1929. V; 1930. V. 7; 1930. V. 9; 1930. V. 16; reprinted in part in 24 A. J. I. L. supp. 25, 169, See also I Hackworth's Digest 691ff.; Reeves, 24 A. J. I. L. 486; Gidel, Droit international public de la mer (1934), vol. 3, passim.

[2] See W. E. Masterson, Jurisdiction in Marginal Seas (1929).

[3] Gidel, op. cit., 361ff.

[4] Gidel, op. cit. 120–122; S. A. Riesenfeld, Protection of Coastal Fisheries under International Law (1942) 231–246.

[5] See I Hackworth's Digest 674–679.

[6] 42 League of Nations Treaty Series 75.

[7] See I Hackworth's Digest 664–667; Jessup, 31 AJIL 101; hearings before House Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 5496, 74th Cong., 1st sess.

[8] Cf. 1914 Foreign Relations Supplement, 435 ff.

[9] One Department of State Bulletin 331; 34 AJIL, supplement 17.

Such waters were defined so as to extend several hundred miles from shore. Although on several occasions belligerent actions took place within this security zone, and although in response to protests from the American Republics, Great Britain, France, and Germany each declared that it did not recognize any basis in international law for this security zone,[10] the Declaration exemplifies a common agreement by our American Republics that they must and should assert their authority for this purpose over areas far in excess of what they would claim as territorial waters. Similarly, article IV of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, signed at Rio de Janeiro September 2, 1947, lays down boundaries of a region containing extensive areas of the high seas within which the parties to the treaty are obligated to assist in meeting armed attacks.

Despite disagreements as to details, we may perhaps say that fairly general recognition has been accorded the lawfulness of exercise of jurisdiction outside territorial waters for defense purposes and to prevent evasions of customs laws. Somewhat similar practices, though less extensive, have been recognized for quarantine and other sanitary measures. Of greater interest, however, is the assertion of jurisdiction for the conservation and utilization of products of the sea and seabed. Just as in the case of enforcement of customs laws or defense during maritime hostilities, it became evident that modern means of exploiting fisheries and mineral resources of the seabed necessitated the exercise of control farther from shore than it was necessary or desirable to have sovereignty for all purposes. The tremendously increased need for the food and mineral resources of the ocean resulting from World War II, the discovery of petroleum in shallow waters beyond the territorial sea and the development of equipment and methods for oil wells drilled in the bottom of the sea, the development of the factory ship and other technological advances in fishing which threaten extermination to certain fisheries, the extensive Japanese fishing activities carried on or proposed off the west coast of the Americas, and the proven success of such fisheries conservation regimes as that for Pacific halibut by the United States and Canada, or the Behring Sea fur seals since 1911, were factors which brought to the fore between 1925 and 1945 the problem of jurisdiction for the utilization and conservation of resources of the sea and seabed. It became necessary to consider how legitimate interests of the coastal state and of other states might best be protected, how such resources might be prudently utilized for today's needs and conserved for tomorrow, without violation of international law. Having in mind the consensus of states expressed at The Hague in 1930, it will be seen that any attempt to meet this problem by unilateral extension of territorial waters would meet great opposition if the extension were far enough to be effective. Furthermore, even if the extension of territorial waters might have gone far enough, and have been accepted by international law, such a step would have entailed numerous unwanted consequences, such as responsibility to other states for what happens in such waters to the injury of those states or their nationals. On the other hand, experience has shown the great delays and difficulties of getting international agreements among substantially all the countries of the world for a change in international law; the delay could not be risked. Though many urged extension of territorial waters as the only method, most of what was wanted could be obtained, without violation of international law and without the unwanted concomitants, through the assertion of jurisdiction for specified purposes over areas which remained high seas—just as had been done in the past for defense purposes and to prevent smuggling. Let us see how this might be, and was done.

In this development of jurisdiction over high seas areas for conservation and utilization of resources, so far a development confined to the Western Hemisphere, the United States took the lead. In President Truman's proclamations of September 28, 1945,[11] a clear distinction was made between jurisdiction over the resources of the seabed and subsoil, and over the fishery resources of the sea. The proclamation relating to the subsoil and seabed recited that "it is the view of the Government of the United States that the exercise of jurisdiction over the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf by the contiguous Nation is reasonable and just, since the effectiveness of measures to utilize or conserve these resources would be contingent upon cooperation and protection from the shore, since the Continental Shelf may be regarded as an extension of the land mass of the coastal Nation and thus naturally appurtenant to it, since these resources frequently form a seaward extension of a pool or deposit lying within the territory, and since self-protection compels the coastal Nation to keep close watch over activities off its shores which are of the nature necessary for utilization of these resources."

The operative portion read:

"Having in mind the urgency of conserving and prudently utilizing its natural resources, the Government of the United States regards the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control. In cases where the Continental Shelf extends to the shores of another state, or is shared with an adjacent state, the boundary shall be determined by the United States and the state concerned in accordance with equitable principles. The character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected."

An accompanying White House press release defined the Continental Shelf as "submerged land which is contiguous to the continent and which is covered by no more than 100 fathoms (600 feet) of water."[12]

This proclamation appears to result from the great need for additional mineral resources (especially petroleum), known to exist under the ocean on the Continental Shelf, where with modern technological progress their utilization is already practicable or will soon become so. Utilization and development, however, cannot proceed with assurance in the absence of some recognized jurisdiction. There is a natural reluctance to make the necessary investments, installing the expensive structures and machinery required for underwater mines or oil wells, until there is a reasonable assurance of title to the products and of governmental protection. Recognized jurisdiction is also required in the interest of conservation and prudent utilization.

No oil wells, mines, or similar installations are understood to be presently operated by foreign enterprises off the coasts of the United States or other countries, except under agreement with the coastal state. Herein the factual situation differs greatly from that of fisheries; for centuries, and in many parts of the world, vessels have fished off foreign shores. In the case of undersea mineral resources no actual operations off foreign coasts would be jeopardized by the assertion of such jurisdiction and control.

Furthermore, it has long been admitted that under international law a state may acquire by occupation and contiguity rights to land beneath the high seas, provided that freedom of navigation is not thereby impaired.[13] For many years, in some cases for centuries, claims have been asserted to the control and exclusive exploitation of such sedentary fisheries as oysters, pearls, chanks, or sponges, on the bed of the high seas off Ceylon, India, Bahrein, Ireland, Tunis, Australia, and elsewhere. These claims appear to have become established by acquiescence and to be acknowledged by other states. The rationale of the open sea being free and forever excluded from occupation is that it forms an international highway connecting distant lands and securing freedom of communications and commerce between states separated by the sea; there is no reason for extending this concept to the seabed or subsoil.

Where the Continental Shelf is shared with an adjacent state (e. g., in the Gulf of Mexico), or extends across the high seas to a foreign country (e. g., Russia across Behring Strait), the determination as to which resources fall to each is left for the future. As it appears that for some time to come installations will be comparatively near shore and that there will be little practical need for delimitation, this may be left to the future when a fair and wise solution can be worked out in the light of actual needs.

President Truman's coastal fisheries proclamation refers to the need for protection and for "improving the jurisdictional basis for conservation measures and international cooperation," calling attention to the "urgent need to protect coastal fishery resources from destructive exploitation, having due regard to conditions peculiar to each region and situation and to the special rights and equities of the coastal state and of any other state which may be established a legitimate interest therein." It continues:

"In view of the pressing need for conservation and protection of fishery resources, the Government of the United States regards it as proper to establish conservation zones in those areas of the high seas contiguous to the coasts of the United States wherein fishing activities have been or in the future may be developed and maintained on a substantial scale. Where such activities have been or shall hereafter be developed and maintained by its nationals alone, the United States regards it as proper to establish explicitly bounded conservation zones in which fishing activities shall be subject to the regulation and control of the United States. Where such activities have been or shall hereafter be legitimately developed and maintained jointly by nationals of the United States and nationals of other states, explicitly bounded conservation zones may be established under agreements between the United States and such other states; and all fishing activities in such zones shall be subject to regulation and control as provided in such agreements. The right of any state to establish conservation zones off its shores in accordance with the above principles is conceded, provided that corresponding recognition is given to any fishing interests of nationals of the United States which may exist in such areas. The character as high seas of the areas in which such conservation zones are established and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected."

This is no attempt to extend territorial waters, but an exercise of jurisdiction solely to regulate and control fishing in conservation zones which remain part of the high

[10] See VII Hackworth's Digest 702–709; 3 Hyde, International Law (rev. ed. 1945) 2348–2352.

[11] 59 U. S. Stat. L. 884, 885; 40 AJIL Supp. 45, 46. See comments by E. Allen, 21 Wash. Law Rev. 1; Bingham, 40 AJIL 173; Borchard, ibid. 53; Vallat, 23 Brit. Y. B. Int. Law 333.

[12] 13 Dept. of State Bulletin 484.

[13] I Oppenheim's International Law, secs. 287bb, 287c; Hurst 1923–23 British Yearbook of International Law 34.

seas. This proclamation is not in terms of the Continental Shelf nor limited by the depth of water. It is confined to areas in which, when jurisdiction may be exercised, fishing activities have been developed and maintained on a substantial scale; thus dealing with practical problems of real fisheries and excluding areas in which no conservation needs have arisen. It is based on the concept that the state or states concerned in each fishery should be the ones to regulate and control that fishery. If, in such an area, vessels of the coastal state have been the only ones to fish, the coastal state is the proper one to do the regulating. In areas where vessels of some other state have also fished, that state should join with the coastal state in determining how the fishery should be controlled. Thus, in the region off Alaska and Canada where the United States and Canada have built up the Pacific halibut fisheries, fishermen of each nation fishing in the high seas off the other's shores as well as off their own, the two states by joint agreement may establish and enforce conservation regulations, which must be followed by anybody fishing in such areas, even if he be from a third state. By the very terms of this proclamation, the United States indicated that it would gladly recognize the establishment of similar conservation zones by other countries, but only where similar protection is accorded interests of United States nationals who may have fished off the shores of such countries. Not propinquity alone, but propinquity plus established fishing activities, form the basis for the jurisdiction asserted by the United States or acknowledged by it in this proclamation.

It has become clear that new methods in fishing, utilizing the factory ship, newer types of vessels and technical devices, modern refrigeration facilities, and the like, contribute to intensified exploitation over wide areas, and have already seriously endangered certain fisheries. Experience with conservation controls has shown that careful regulation may permit an increasing yield from fisheries without endangering the maintenance of the stock. Equity and justice require that natural resources which have been built up by systematic conservation and self-denying restricted utilization, together with the industries based upon them, be protected from destructive exploitation by interests which have not contributed to their growth and development. It has likewise become apparent that fisheries differ markedly in the species, abundance, and other characteristics, from area to area, and that conservation measures must be diversified and adapted to conditions peculiar to each region. Regulatory arrangements for a particular fishing area or region can best be made among the states whose continued use of or relative proximity to the affected resources gives them both the interest and the intimate knowledge necessary for wise and effective control. Such conservation measures cannot achieve full success unless they are made applicable to all persons and vessels of whatsoever nationality engaged in fishing in the area.

The fisheries proclamation appears to be based upon the premise that reasonable and just bases for the exercise of jurisdiction over the fisheries of an area of the high seas off the coasts of a state may be found in the following factors: (a) proximity to that coast; (b) development and maintenance of well-established fishing activities on a substantial scale by a state's nationals; (e) the absence in that area of any well-established fishing activities on the part of nationals of states other than those seeking to exercise such authority; and (d) the existence of established conservation practices, or the need for such practices, in relation to fisheries of the area in question.

Upon consideration of the more important high seas fisheries of the Americas, it is evident that in each fishery only a limited number of countries, often only 1 or 2, have any real or considerable interest. In case the states having a real interest in each fishery, by reason of contiguity or substantial participation, agree upon and establish a regime of conservation and regulatory control for that fishery, it should have a good chance for success, and other states would seem to have no valid reason to object to the measures taken by the states primarily concerned. If and when the nationals of such other state shall have taken part on a substantial scale in such a fishery, then the time becomes ripe for their government to join in the control. One feature of this United States policy likely to win support, is its recognition of the rights of all states having any real concern in each concrete situation. Acquired rights and established activities are safeguarded. In the absence of oil wells or mines on the Continental Shelf off another state's shores, except under agreement with the coastal state, the question does not arise practically for mineral resources. In the case of fisheries, all interests built up by hard work over a period of years receive protection; in the establishment of conservation regimes those who have built up a fishing industry through their toil share with the coastal state. At the same time, merely theoretical privileges, to engage in a fishery at some future time, are not allowed to stand in the way of real conservation needs. Under the United States policy, Canada is accorded the right to join with the United States in the regulation of the halibut fisheries off Alaska in which Canadians have participated, while the United States maintains its right to share with Mexico and other good neighbors to the south in the regulation of the tuna fisheries in high-seas areas off their coasts in which United States vessels have played so important a part. But in cases like these the joint efforts of the United States and Canada for the protection of halibut, or of Mexico and the United States for the conservation and utilization of tuna, need not be obstructed by the inability of these parties actually concerned, to obtain universal acquiescence in the conservation regime by states like Norway or Switzerland, whose vessels have never attempted to fish in the areas affected. From the theoretical standpoint, a change in international law may require worldwide agreement of nations; from the practical standpoint, conservation needs cannot be made to await the approval of states having no real interest in the particular fishing activities to be regulated. It may be suggested that this attitude is in accord with Professor Brierly's suggestion that the future development of international law is likely to be facilitated more through the working out of fair and just solutions for particular situations, acceptable to the parties concerned, than through efforts to reach agreement on uniform general rules of worldwide application.[14]

No extension of territorial waters is envisaged in the United States proclamation, but rather the establishment of conservation zones in areas of the high seas which retain their legal character as such. The freedom of their use for navigation and other purposes aside from fishing remains unaffected. These measures looking solely to the conservation and economic utilization of marine resources are not to be regarded as in conflict with the general principles and underlying postulates of international law—however much one might question unilateral attempts to subject an extended area of the sea to sovereignty as territorial waters.

[14] Brierly, 7 Nordisk Tiddskrift for International Ret, Acta Juris Gentium 3 (1936).

The President of Mexico issued a declaration on October 29, 1945, referring to the mineral and fisheries resources of the Continental Shelf and waters off Mexico, and to the necessity of protecting them from immoderate and exhaustive exploitation; for these reasons, "The Government of the Republic recovers all the Continental Shelf or platform adjacent to its coastline and each and every natural resource, known or unknown, found therein, and is moving toward that vigilance, use and control in the zones of fisheries protection necessary to the conservation of such a source of well-being." The Continental Shelf was defined as the area less than 200 meters deep. It added that this "does not imply that the Government of Mexico intends to fail to recognize legitimate rights of third parties on a basis of reciprocity or that the Government of Mexico intends to affect legitimate rights of free navigation on the high seas since the only thing it seeks is the conservation of these resources for the national, the continental and world well-being."[15] Proposed amendments of pertinent articles of the Mexican Constitution are understood to be pending in Congress.

By a presidential decree of October 11, 1946, Argentina declared that "the Argentine epicontinental sea and Continental Shelf are subject to the sovereign power of the nation," although "for purposes of free navigation, the character of the waters * * * remains unaffected." This decree stated that the United States and Mexico had "issued declarations asserting the sovereignty of each of the two countries over the respective peripheral epicontinental seas and continental shelves," and that "implicitly accepted in modern international law" is the doctrine that "conditional recognition is accorded to the right of every nation to consider as national territory" the surrounding sea and Continental Shelf.[16]

Press reports indicate that on May 1, 1947, the Nicaraguan Congress extended national sovereignty over the Continental Shelf, out to 200 meters depth; and documents are not available.[17] *

A declaration by the President of Chile on June 23, 1947, asserted that the United States, Mexico, and Argentina had proclaimed categorically the sovereignty of those states over the Continental Shelf adjacent to their coasts, and over the adjacent sea throughout the extent necessary in order to preserve for those states the ownership of the natural resources therein." It added that, "the international consensus recognizes in each country the right to consider as its national territory all the extent of the epicontinental sea and the adjacent Continental Shelf." Consequently, the Chilean Government confirms and proclaims national sovereignty over all the Continental Shelf adjacent to the continental and island coasts of the national territory, whatsoever may be the depth, thus protecting all the natural resources that exist above the said Shelf, in it, and beneath it, known or which may be discovered. Furthermore, Chile "confirms and proclaims national sovereignty over all the waters adjacent to its coasts, whatever may be their depth, to the full extent necessary to reserve, protect, conserve, and make use of the resources and natural wealth of any sort which may exist above such seas, in them, or beneath them, placing under Government supervision especially the fishing and marine-hunting industries." The zones of protection are to extend to 200 nautical miles

[15] El Nacional (Mexico), October 30, 1945.

[16] Boletin Oficial de la Republica Argentina, December 5, 1946; English translation 41 AJIL supp. 11.

[17] New York Times, May 2, 1947.

* The Nicaraguan Constitution of 1948, art. 2, provides that Nicaraguan territory "includes * * * the Continental Shelves."

from the coast. Finally, the declaration states that it "does not disregard similar rights of other states on the basis of reciprocity nor the rights of free navigation on the high seas."[32]

On August 1, 1947, a Peruvian presidential decree, very similar in wording to the Chilean, declared "national sovereignty and jurisdiction" over the Continental or Insular Shelf, regardless of depth, and "over the sea adjacent to the coasts * * * to the full distance necessary to reserve, protect, conserve, and utilize the resources" thereof. A 200-nautical-mile limit was set, and the decree states that it "does not affect the right of free navigation of ships of all nations, according to international law."[33] A Costa Rican decree-law of July 27, 1948 follows a pattern very close to that of Chile.[34]

These actions of the six Latin American Republics all differ from that of the United States, in that they assert sovereignty over the Continental Shelf, and in their claims to the sea itself.[35] None expressly recognize the right of other states, whose nationals have fished in the areas concerned, to have any voice in the control of the fisheries affected. At least the Argentine, Chilean, Peruvian, and Costa Rican action seem to be assertions of sovereignty over wide areas of high seas as territorial waters, with merely an acknowledgment of the right of free navigation somewhat reminiscent of the right of innocent passage through ordinary territorial waters. Although apparently the more cautious Mexican declaration may not be clear as to what "legitimate rights of third parties" are to be recognized by Mexico "on a basis of reciprocity," this may be presumed to make provision for any other states whose vessels have engaged in legitimate fishing operations in the high-seas areas sought to be subjected to Mexican control. On the other hand, it would appear from their wording that the Chilean and Costa Rican provisos recognize merely the similar rights of other states to assert control over waters off their own shores, and that these two states (like Peru, whose decree has no such proviso) take no account of existing interests of other nations resulting from the building up and maintenance of a fishing industry on the high seas well off the coast. In the Argentine, Chilean, Peruvian and Costa Rican documents the references to the assertion by the United States of sovereignty over the epicontinental sea would suggest a misapprehension of the purport and effect of President Truman's proclamations. These documents also indicate greater confidence than appears justified, as to the acceptance in international law of claims of sovereignty over wide areas of the high seas.

How far do these several efforts to assert jurisdiction or even sovereignty over the Continental Shelf and wide areas of the high seas appear to be in conformity with international law? What reception may they expect? The United States proclamations, at least—perhaps also the Mexican—are restricted to the assertion of a jurisdiction resembling that already acknowledged as proper for customs and defense purposes. This method of achieving the desired result of conservation and controlled utilization of resources conforms much more closely to generally accepted international law and practice than would those actions which might be construed as unilateral attempts to assert full sovereignty over wide areas of the high seas—practically equivalent to an extension of territorial waters far beyond anything likely to be considered as in conformity with international law. (It can hardly be contended that the present failure to agree whether 3, 4, 6, or 12 miles is the limit of territorial waters means that a state may with impunity set 100 or 200 miles as its limit.) Actual controversies are far more likely to arise from the more recent decrees and declarations than from those of the United States. By acknowledging the equal right of any state whose nationals have fished on a substantial scale off the coast to join with the coastal state in regulating the fisheries, the United States policy is well designed to prevent controversies from arising, since the only states in any good position to argue that their real interests have been treated unfairly are precisely the ones who join in taking action. Finally, it may be predicted that the exercise of jurisdiction through measures clearly designed for conservation and optimum utilization of resources makes a far stronger appeal to the sense of right and justice upon which law is founded than would any use of this jurisdiction for purposes less clearly necessary for the common good of all states concerned.

In conclusion, may I suggest that these several efforts to deal with jurisdictional problems of the Continental Shelf and the conservation of high seas fisheries off the coast should be carefully examined to understand their legal bases and philosophy; and add that, on the basis of such examination, it would appear that the method followed in the United States Proclamations of 1945 combines success in achieving the desired degree and type of control, with freedom from the objectionable features of an assertion of full territorial sovereignty. A surgeon's knife may succeed in cutting out the tumor with less pain and damage to sound flesh than would a hatchet. I would, therefore, propose that this committee resolve—

"That careful consideration be given in the American Republics, especially in those which have not yet taken action to extend their jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf or offshore fisheries, to the legal theory and bases of the various methods by which the desired results may be obtained;

"That, insofar as possible, existing actions be construed, and new actions be framed, so as to afford the necessary protection and control, without violation of international law and without interference with the fair and reasonable expectations of other states;

"That, consequently, the legal method followed for this purpose be that of exercising jurisdiction for conservation purposes in areas which remain contiguous zones of the high seas, with full cooperation between the coastal state and other states concerned in those situations where one state's enterprises have been conducted on the high seas off the coasts of another state."

NOTE.—This resolution was adopted by the Sixth Conference. In Decree 449, December 17, 1946, regulating the shark fishery, the President of Panama laid down rules for foreign vessels, Art. 3 providing that "The national jurisdiction for the purposes of fishing in general in the territorial waters of the Republic extends to all the area included above the seabed of the Continental Shelf." In decree 96 of January 30, 1950, the President and Council of Ministers of Honduras declared that "the sovereignty of Honduras extends to the submarine platform of the national territory (continental and insular) and the waters which cover it, whatsoever may be the depth at which it is found and the distance which it comprises." No extent is specified for the Pacific, but 200 marine miles is laid down for the Atlantic.

With respect to action claiming control over the sea bed and subsoil, and primarily petroleum therein, by Saudi Arabia, Bahrein, Kuwait, the Trucial Sheikhdoms, Bahamas and Jamaica, see Richard Young, 43 American Journal of International Law 530 and 790 (1949).

In an article in 44 American Journal of International Law 670 (October 1950), C. Selak quotes American notes of July 2, 1948 to Chile, Peru, and Argentine, in which the United States said: "the United States Government notes that the principles underlying the Chilean Declaration differ in large measure from those of the United States Proclamations and appears to be at variance with the generally accepted principles of international law. In these respects, the United States Government notes in particular that (1) the Chilean Declaration confirms and proclaims the national sovereignty of Chile over the Continental Shelf and over the seas adjacent to the coast of Chile outside the generally accepted limits of territorial waters, and (2) the declaration fails, with respect to fishing, to accord appropriate and adequate recognition to the rights and interests of the United States in the high seas off the coast of Chile. In view of these considerations, the United States Government * * * reserves the rights and interests of the United States so far as concerns any effect of the declaration of June 25, 1947, or of any measures designed to carry that declaration into execution."

English texts of the Continental Shelf documents are in United States Naval War College, International Law Documents, 1948-49, p. 182. See further M. W. Mouton, The Continental Shelf (1952): Young, "Legal Status of Submarine Areas Beneath the High Seas," 45 American Journal of International Law 225 (1951); Lauterpacht, "Sovereignty Over Submarine Areas," 1950 Brit. Y. D. I. L. 376; Holland, "Juridical Status of the Continental Shelf," 30 Tex. L. Rev. 586 (1952). It appears that Continental Shelf claims have also been made by Brazil, Guatemala, Salvador, Pakistan, Philippines, Bahamas, Jamaica, British Honduras, and Iceland (fisheries only).

The 1951 report of the U. N. International Law Commission contains these draft articles (45 American Journal of International Law, Supp. 139):

"ARTICLE 1. As here used, the term 'Continental Shelf' refers to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas contiguous to the coast, but outside the area of territorial waters, where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil.

"ART. 2. The Continental Shelf is subject to the exercise by the coastal state of control and jurisdiction for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources.

"ART. 3. The exercise by a coastal state of control and jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf does not affect the legal status of the superjacent waters as high seas.

"ART. 6. (1) The exploration of the Continental Shelf and the exploitation of its natural resources must not result in substantial interference with navigation or fishing. Due notice must be given of any installations constructed, and due means of warning of the presence of such installations must be maintained.

"(2) Such installations shall not have the status of islands for the purposes of delimiting territorial waters, but to reasonable distances safety zones may be established around such installations, where the measures necessary for their protection may be taken."

"ART. 7. Two or more States to whose territories the same Continental Shelf is contiguous should establish boundaries in this area of the Continental Shelf by agreement. Failing agreement, the parties are under the obligation to have the boundaries fixed by arbitration."

Accompanying articles on "related subjects" provide:

"ARTICLE 1. States whose nationals are engaged in fishing in any area of the high seas may regulate and control fishing activities in such area for the purpose of preserving its resources from extermination. If the nationals of several states are thus engaged in

[32] El Mercurio (Santiago), June 29,1947.

[33] El Comercio (Lima), August 11, 1947; 7 Revista peruana de derecho international 301.

[34] La Gaceta (Costa Rica), July 29, 1948.

[35] See Richard Young, 41 AJIL 849.

an area, such measures shall be taken by those states in concert; if the nationals of only one state are thus engaged in a given area, that state may take such measures in the area. If any part of an area is situated within 100 miles of the territorial waters of a coastal state, that state is entitled to take part on an equal footing, in any system of regulation, even though its nationals do not carry on fishing in the area. In no circumstances, however, may an area be closed to nationals of other states wishing to engage in fishing activities.

"ART. 3. The regulation of sedentary fisheries may be undertaken by a state in areas of the high seas contiguous to its territorial waters, where such fisheries have long been maintained and conducted by nationals of that state, provided that nonnationals are permitted to participate in the fishing activities on an equal footing with nationals. Such regulation will, however, not affect the general status of the areas as high seas.

"ART. 4. On the high seas adjacent to its territorial waters, a coastal state may exercise the control necessary to prevent the infringement, within its territory, or territorial waters, of its customs, fiscal or sanitary regulations. Such control may not be exercised more than 12 miles from the coast."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by request I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the minority report on the legislation now being considered. No one can deny that the object of this bill, H. R. 4198, is to deed to a few States the vast natural resources, which are rightfully the property of all the people of the Nation. The reports are clear and concise in posting adequate warning of the consequences of giving statutory approval to a dangerous precedent which will serve as an opening wedge for the acquisition by a few States of other nationally owned and controlled resources, vital to the health, wealth, and preservation of our Nation, as a whole. I can see no reason whatever which can ever justify the surrender.

If the bill is passed giving the tidelands oil to the States, the loss to the American people will be staggering. Geologists, soil experts and petroleum explorers have assured us that the oil reserves have an estimated value of $40 billion.

The so-called tidelands question is one of the most controversial issues to come before the House in recent years. It does not really deal with the tidelands at all, but with "land" to the seaward of the low water mark, which is always covered by water. It is actually not land at all, but part of the ocean floor, and should more properly be referred to as "submerged" or "offshore" land.

The tidelands have been the subject of much confusion and misunderstanding not all of it unintentional. Before making their decision, the Members of the House should recognize fully the issues involved.

In 1947 and again in 1950, the Supreme Court declared that the Federal Government possessed "paramount interest in and full dominion and power over" the submerged lands. By these decisions, the Court found that the adjoining States do not and never did own the offshore lands, but that the rights to these lands belong to the people of all 48 States. There is no appeal from a decision of the Supreme Court; it is our final legal authority. The submerged lands unquestionably belong to all our people, not to just a few.

The pending bill cannot confirm the title of the States to the submerged coastal lands as it proposes to do, because the States never had any title. It simply makes an outright gift to a few States of submerged lands which are Federal property.

Propaganda about a Federal grab of State property is ridiculous. The Federal Government can hardly be accused of grabbing something it already had. The only grab involved is by those States which have claimed title to the Federal oil reserves and collected royalties on oil withdrawn from them.

There is no more justification for giving the offshore oil lands to those States bordering them than there would be to expect the States bordering the oceans to pay the entire cost of the Navy and the Coast Guard.

If this bill is passed, other special interests will make similar demands. If Congress gives away the submerged oil lands today, we may expect to be approached tomorrow by a swarm of profiteers, greedy for the national forests and the public lands. The end result might well be a raid on our natural resources far greater than the Teapot Dome scandal of the twenties. Nor is the thought a mere figment of the imagination. Already proponents of this bill have suggested that along with the submerged land other national resources belonging to the people shall be taken away.

Many advocates of tidelands legislation have based their stand on the principle of States rights, and claimed that it has nothing to do with the oil reserves involved. Undoubtedly there are sincere men among them. But the compelling force which has brought this bill before the House is not the principle of States rights, but the oil reserves which have an estimated value of $40 billion or more. This was clearly demonstrated when Attorney General Brownell recommended that the Federal Government retain title to the submerged lands, giving the States only the right to develop the oil reserves.

Passage of the tidelands bill would not end the dispute over submerged lands—it would merely begin a new chapter. When Congress overrules a Supreme Court decision by a legislative act, it is inviting a court battle. Plans have already been announced to challenge the constitutionality of the pending bill if it becomes law.

Furthermore, the legislation, if enacted, might well involve us in international disputes. Undersecretary of State Thruston B. Morton declared that provisions of granting territory to some States outside the 3-mile limit "would directly conflict with international law as the United States conceives it."

Mr. Speaker, the offshore oil lands are far too valuable to be given away recklessly to a special-interest group. The vast oil reserves they contain may be vital to our future defense needs.

I see nothing in the majority report that was not thoroughly considered and debated when this question came before the House in the 81st and 82d sessions of the Congress. The situation has not changed. The legislation was not then enacted into law. Why now? Let us guard our sacred trust and preserve all national resources for the benefit of all.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the enactment of this legislation and hope for its defeat.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very strongly opposed to the granting of this rule because I am strenuously opposed to the passage of the bill. In the first instance, I wish to take a second to make remarks pertaining to the statement made by Mr. Eisenhower before the November election, which was read by the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS]. Mr. Eisenhower's statement just adds confusion to this problem, because in the Government's brief before the United States Supreme Court, and in the Court's decisions and in their decree, it is made clear that there was no issue involved regarding inland waters, streams, navigable waters, bays, or rivers. So that the only question which was considered involved the submerged lands that extend seaward from the low-water mark and outside of inland waters.

I am opposed to this because—first, if passed, it would be a giveaway. I say that and I base my judgment on the Supreme Court decisions. They say very clearly that States do not own the submerged lands—to use the exact words—"The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein."—The Supreme Court findings was the same in the cases of Louisiana and Texas. They said secondly that the United States has paramount right and full dominion of the lands in the marginal belt. They also stated and I will try to develop this when I have more time, that the Federal Government has dominium and imperium which means jurisdiction and control as an incident to its external, national sovereignty. So the States have no interest or title or proprietary interest. Therefore, this bill would give to the States what the Supreme Court said the States do not own. Now the States would get, for nothing, without any consideration, that to which they have no right. Therefore, it is very clearly a giveaway.

It is distressing to me, when we talk about waste in Government, and when I understand that the President says he wants to prevent any waste, that this Congress should even consider giving away to several States, without any consideration, our national heritage which the Supreme Court says belongs to all 48 States; and which geologists estimate at a minimum to be worth $40 billion and up. Why we should give that national heritage away to several States and deprive the remaining of the 48 States of their proportionate share, I cannot understand.

If that is not waste in Government, it certainly is something beyond my comprehension.

The Federal Government since 1793, when the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, wrote to the British and the French Ministers, during the war between England and France, has held to the policy enunciated then that we recognize the 3-mile limit in international law, and no more and no less. The State Department is concerned at the present time that we, in Congress, endeavor to extend this 3-mile limit because of international complications. The fact is after the Executive order of 1945, when the President then stated that he wanted to take complete jurisdiction over the submerged lands out to the end of the Continental Shelf, several other countries immediately made claims to extend their boundaries. I certainly would not vote to deprive my constituents of their pro rata share of our national heritage, to which they are entitled under the decisions of the Supreme Court. Do not be confused by many of these statements about prior claims of various States, as to their historic boundaries and other boundaries, because those claims were brought to the attention of the Supreme Court on three different occasions, in the California case, the Texas case, and the Louisiana case. Every argument that has been suggested has already been presented to the Court on those three occasions, and the Court rendered its decision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas, member of the Rules Committee [Mr. LYLE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 4198, the subject of this resolution, will pass the House with a substantial majority. For that I am very pleased. It has had a long, weary, and rather discouraging journey over the past few years. It has been bounced from the White House to the courts and to the Congress, and even the most patient must be weary.

At this time I would like to express my very deep gratitude to those who have spent so much thought and so much time on this issue, who have no personal or State interest in it, such as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge GRAHAM; the chairman of the committee [Mr. REED]; and the present occupant of the chair, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]; the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I am one of those who like Mr. HOFFMAN very much.

It is not difficult for those of us from Texas, Louisiana, and California, and from other States on the coast, to look with favor upon this legislation. It has been difficult, in the face of the unprecedented barrage of misinformation and propaganda, for many of those outside of the coastal States to take the intelligent, legal, historic, and sound position that they have taken. And to all of those from inland States who have been helpful in resolving this issue I express gratitude.

I would be negligent if I were unmindful of the great contribution to this legislation made by the former distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], who, perhaps, as no other man in this body, has been the inspiration which has kept this legislation forcibly and rightfully before us.

Mr. Speaker, the passage of this legislation can but for the moment dispel the disquieting, discouraging philosophy which took heart and grew in the wake of the Supreme Court's phraseology and holding in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. Just for a moment.

Mr. FEIGHAN. There is no confusion in this decree by the Supreme Court.

Mr. LYLE. Will the gentleman permit me to finish my statement?

Mr. FEIGHAN. "The State of California has no title thereto or interest therein." That is absolutely clear and plain to me.

Mr. LYLE. A moment ago the gentleman from New York, the able gentleman who can think of many reasons to support what he likes or to oppose whatever he does not like—he is a very able advocate—spoke about the present Attorney General of the United States and his mixed-up conception of this legislation. I suggest that it is quite understandable that the Attorney General gets mixed up, because at times he gets on one brown shoe and one black shoe. So it would not be unusual for him to get disturbed about an issue like this. Nevertheless, he did get around to where he is in a better and sounder position than the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I have the highest regard for Mr. Brownell, who is a very able and distinguished lawyer.

Mr. LYLE. I, too, have a very high regard for him.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. With reference to the Attorney General's position on this issue, I think one of the difficulties that the present Attorney General had when he first appeared before the committee was that he was receiving some faulty advice from some of the aides in the Department of Justice that he inherited, aides who had consistently opposed State ownership in the past, but I think something is being done now to remedy that situation.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, here is one of the disturbing things about this matter. The Supreme Court's opinion was a majority opinion by a minority of the Court. The Court prefaced its finding by saying "the question of who owned the bed of the sea only became of great potential importance when oil was discovered there." The Court then denied State ownership with this confusing declaration:

> The Federal Government, rather than the State, has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil.

I do not know what that means and I think no one else does.

A little later they used strange, disturbing, and unusual language when they said "that property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and to unite in the national sovereignty. Today," they said, "the controversy is over oil. Tomorrow it may be over some other substance or mineral, or possibly the bed of the ocean itself." I suggest that it may be over your own State waters, or over your lakes, your own rivers.

I am displeased and concerned about the language used by the Court and the converts it has attracted. I do not propose to discuss the legal aspect of this controversy. It has been well and brilliantly placed before the Congress many times. Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Frankfurter, seldom thought to be reactionary, have most ably and in very few words presented what to me is unassailable legal logic in their dissenting opinions in the California case.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have read the opinion of the Supreme Court several times. I have had a little to do with the tidelands problem and with other interior-water problems where navigation rights were abandoned. In my opinion, the Supreme Court decision practically placed the problem in the lap of Congress. It almost uses that exact language, that Congress must decide what shall be done; and, since for a hundred years, by implication at least, these titles have been recognized as being in the States we are being asked to solve the problem now by giving back to the States property that was once theirs.

Mr. LYLE. That is correct.

All of the arguments of the opponents of this legislation are based upon the assumption that the Federal Government is the powerful entity and that the States but serve it in a minor role. Those who favor this legislation are firm in their belief that the Federal Government is but an agency to serve the States in its delegated capacity. The Federal Government was the creature of the States, born with restrictions. It was intended, I believe, to be the strength of the many, strength for the many, but never a strength to take over the many.

Those who oppose this legislation, consciously or unconsciously, remove the restrictions of this creature which we call the Federal Government and give it strength to rule its keepers. Under their philosophy the keeper becomes the kept. It is discouraging to me that we must fight ourselves to maintain that which we all fight for, that is the American way. This bill is in the American tradition, it is in keeping with the basic principles of the sovereignty of the States. Since the beginning of this Union, however, there have been those who disliked that system, who believed that all the power ought to be gobbled up by this hungry and thirsty creature, the Federal Government.

This House can do no better, in my opinion, than to firmly and strongly for-

tify the position of those who believe in the true, the basic American form of government. This bill ought to have the overwhelming, the encouraging support of all of the Members of this body. It ought to quiet not only the title to the lands involved, it should also quiet the philosophy that brought the dispute to life.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have just been giving some thought to the reference which appears in the minority report alleging that submerged lands and possibly other national areas may be given away. I think that ought to be clarified. I do not understand that anything is being given away by this bill; as I understand, the question is whether or not the States, the separate sovereign units, are to receive jurisdiction, control, right of ownership, whatever the various Members prefer to call it who have spoken here, or whether the Federal Government is to exercise the right of control over what is to happen over those lands. My point is simply this: We are no more giving away to some imaginary beneficiary any rights which belong either to the people of the several States or Federal Government than we were when the Federal Government on other occasions has made cession of national park lands or of other lands for other uses by the Federal Government to individual States; nor are we any more giving it away than when in any other resource is determined by court or Congress to belong to a State or to the Federal Government, as the case may be.

We are determining to assure the right to the Federal Government and the States, respectively, to exercise dominium, imperium, ownership, or control, as their interest may be legislatively established. We are devising here a means whereby the separate rights of the States and of the Federal Government may be determined, and in that connection I want to say finally—and then I will be glad to yield——

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. In just a moment I will yield.

I would like to point out, and I am sure it has been done before, that on the basis of the productivity of these submerged lands it is estimated by competent persons, 90 percent of the land's productivity is being retained in the Federal Government, 10 percent is being determined to belong by virtue of usage, treaty, and by actual ownership to the States, or to certain enumerated States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I want to state to the distinguished gentleman that we are not restoring what the States had originally. The States never had title to this territory and the Supreme Court used this language in the California case:

> The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein.

So we are not taking away anything that the States had. We are attempting by this bill to give to the States something which they never had before and are not entitled to.

Mr. SCOTT. The opinion of the Supreme Court is not necessarily the final answer for all time in this country, as the gentleman knows. If this Congress has the legislative power to do something to effect the respective rights of the Federal and State Governments it should not hesitate to exercise that power, and at the proper time, then the Supreme Court may be called upon to say what it thinks about our later exertion of the legislative authority.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Under the decision of the Supreme Court, when they held that the Federal Government has a paramount interest and control over these submerged lands as an incident to their external sovereignty, the problem was raised then, and it also hovers in the mind of the Attorney General that that is something that is an inalienable attribute of sovereignty, and therefore the Congress cannot give it away.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand the gentleman's point and I will say that there was a powerful and, in my opinion, valid dissent. I do not think the entire question has by any means been determined, and certainly, if this Congress shall act again then, of course, the question may not be finally determined unless and until the Supreme Court acts again also.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to get up and take this time, but it is difficult to get it when the Committee of the Whole House is working; so, coming from Massachusetts, I find I ought to say a little something.

The gentleman from New York has just stated that we never did own it and yet, in 1630, we got a charter from King James that gave us all of Massachusetts and three miles out to sea, and we had that three miles out to sea and have had it ever since, and no one has said aye, yes or no to us. If this decision of the Supreme Court stands then we will have to change at least about 200 laws on the books in Massachusetts, put there by the great and general court.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Well, did not that charter you got from King James also give you jurisdiction to the Pacific Ocean at the same time?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, it gave us as far west as they knew about. I do not think they knew anything about Ohio up to that particular time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know where the Supreme Court gets the idea that the Federal Government has paramount rights. We 13 colonies sat down and drew up a Constitution, and in that Constitution we specified exactly what powers and rights the Federal Government had, and that is all they did have, and what they did not was reserved to the States and people in those States. So, we have gone along since 1630 in Massachusetts knowing and believing that this land and property was ours. Well, the gentleman from Ohio gets up and says the Court says that the inland waters do not come under its jurisdiction; it is only down to low tide.

Mr. FEIGHAN. And that position agrees with the Supreme Court in the three cases: Louisiana, Texas and California.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Supreme Court has not decided what inland waters were. Low tide, if you live on the seashore, is about up to your front porch, so the Federal Government takes jurisdiction right from your front door and you cannot say aye, yes or no. Now, we have been taxing the people of Massachusetts for years for territory that the towns got from grants to plant shell fish, and so forth. We passed laws, and no State in the Union can come in and drag for flounders in a hundred mile square area, here, there and everywhere in Massachusetts waters. Well, under that decision, the first thing you know we have lost all of those things and the Federal Government takes them.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr .NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Is not the gentleman stating the fundamental principle that the States existed before the United States, and that all the authority the United States has came from the federation of the States?

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is exactly what I was trying to convey.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. That very point was considered by the Supreme Court of the United States in all three of its decisions and it came to the conclusion that the lands beneath the ocean do not belong to the States.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What does the gentleman say about 50 other decisions the United States Supreme Court has made on this matter?

Mr. YATES. Up to the time the Supreme Court considered the so-called tidelands cases there was not one case, not one case, that dealt with this question. The other cases dealt with the question of the inland waters. I challenge anybody to show me one case to the contrary.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Of course, the gentleman does not know what inland waters are.

Mr. YATES. The Supreme Court has decided that.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What does the Supreme Court say? They say that inland waters are low tide, which includes all of the land.

Mr. YATES. I suggest that the gentleman read the decisions of the Supreme Court to find out what they said.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not think the reading of the decisions of the Supreme Court we have had in the last couple of decades coincides with the opinions I have of the Constitution. You do not have to be a lawyer to sit down and read

what the Constitution says the Federal Government's power is in this country. The Government of the United States is in the hands of the people and not the Government.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The gentleman has just hit the crux of this situation. That power is in the people. As far as the colonial States were concerned, they got their grants from the Crown, and they were retained in the Crown. Under the Declaration of Independence the sovereignty that was in the Crown was transferred to the united Colonies. They had that sovereignty even before 1789, when they wrote the Constitution.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to have the gentleman read some of the writings of the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention and other statements in the early history of this country. There was one thing they did not want to do in the Constitutional Convention, and that was make a strong central government. They wanted to reserve all the powers to themselves, because they already had had one sovereign and they did not want another.

May I say to the gentleman that I hope no Members will vote on this bill because of the money they will get from the submerged lands. I would not care if they got a billion dollars down in Texas or California or Louisiana, but I am not going to sell out Massachusetts or an inch of the land that we own and have owned since 1630.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that three Members on this side of the aisle in minority views have made the following brief conclusion which seems very persuasive to me:

> Barring serious questions of constitutionality, Congress has the power to surrender all or part of the Federal rights to this property. We do not believe, however, that Congress should exercise that power. To do so amounts to a windfall to a few States at the expense of the others. It is a position to which we cannot conscientiously give support.

Mr. Speaker, neither can I conscientiously support this measure for the reasons stated.

I point out one other thing: This issue is not what it always has been. The cold war is hotter than ever and we are in a hot war in Korea. The Federal Government now clearly has these enormous reserves of oil by virtue of the decisions of the Supreme Court. They can be best utilized for the strategic security of the United States in the hands of the Federal Government. I think that security consideration so pertinent today dictates that this House ought now under present circumstances to turn down this bill and the proposal to turn these great national resources under the tidelands over, in effect, to a few great States.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I think we decided this issue at the last election. Now let us vote.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and ninetcen Members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4198, with Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 23 minutes to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Illinios [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinios. Mr. Chairman, I am certain that in the course of the debate other members will discuss fully and most capably the specific problems involved in this legislation as well as their legal aspects. Therefore it is my purpose to touch only upon its constitutional aspect.

Without question there is, in my judgment, a vital need for the enactment of the Graham bill, H. R. 4198, which I have the honor and privilege to report to this body. While some members of the Committee on the Judiciary do not agree with the majority of the committee, we are, I am sure, unanimous in our conclusion that the development of our submerged lands will be of tremendous assistance in solving the oil shortage that is facing our country at the present time.

No one questions the potentiality of the resources located in these areas, but since the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, exploration and development have come to almost a complete halt. No new wells are being brought in nor are they being sought.

This intolerable situation is further complicated by the fact—and this is admitted by everyone—that there is no statutory authority for any Federal agency or office whereby these areas may be administered, leases issued, and production set in motion.

Congress and only the Congress can establish such authority by legislation. It is our responsibility to take—here and now—the necessary steps to terminate this stalemate. The passage of this bill in my judgment is a proper and equitable solution of the present jurisdictional uncertainity and will be in the best interests of the States and the Federal Government.

It is my firm conviction that the Graham bill should be enacted out of a sense of justice and honesty. For over one hundred and fifty years it was the considered opinion of the best legal minds that these submerged lands now under consideration belonged to the States. That opinion was predicated upon unambiguous decisions of the Supreme Court.

Likewise, there were the confirmatory actions of the Federal Government itself that it did not think that it had title to the lands in question. History is replete with examples of the Federal Government acquiring parcels of land from the various States under conveyances of title from the States to the Federal Government. Why was this done if title was in the Federal Government?

Even as recent as 1933, the then Secretary of the Interior stated that the States were the owners of the lands beneath the marginal sea. When oil was discovered off the coast of California he refused applications for leases in those lands on the specific and sole ground that that those lands belonged to California who was the sole authority for leases.

Then in 1947 came the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case. The doctrine of paramount right enunciated in that decree has been described by many adjectives but I think that the phrase employed by the American Bar Association in its resolution on this subject has the best description from the standpoint of accuracy and connotation. That resolution referred to this doctrine as "the new concept."

It is not my intent to attempt at this time to analyze or to discuss in detail the rationale of that decision nor of those in the two subsequent cases. I cannot however refrain from mentioning, in all propriety, the lack of unanimity in those decisions and the divergent views therein expressed.

Since the Court has rendered its decision it is, under our system of government, the law of the land, regardless of whether we agree or disagree with its reasoning. But also under our form of government we, members of the legislative branch, have the right, the duty, and the responsibility to make the law, unhampered by the courts, the Executive, or the States, and restricted only by the Constitution itself.

As I read the decision of the California case I find in the majority opinion a direct invitation from the Court to the Congress to take action in this matter with due consideration for the rights of the State involved.

I am firmly convinced that a fundamental decision of policy must be made in this field and such a decision can be

made only in the halls of Congress, not in the judicial branch and not in the executive.

Such action is immediately vital in the interest of national defense; it is legally desirable to determine jurisdiction in our dual form of government and it is morally necessary in the interest of justice.

I believe this bill should be enacted at this time. Its provisions, in my judgment, contain the best possible solution to the problem. I am satisfied as to its constitutionality.

When the Supreme Court rendered the opinions in each of the three recent submerged lands cases it held that the States did not have title to these submerged lands in the marginal sea; but at the same time it carefully refrained from specifically stating that title was in the United States. This was emphasized when the Court struck from the proposed decree in the California case the words "of proprietorship." The Court did say in the California case that the Federal Government and not the State "has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water, including oil."

Such language leads to the question, "To whom does the land belong?" Clearly, not to the State; it is subject to the paramount rights of the Federal Government an incident of which is dominion over the land. While that concept may not be title as it is generally known in the law of real property, it seems to mean that the Federal Government has rights of possession, of enjoyment, and other similar rights that make up what we understand to be ownership. The source of such rights is the paramount rights of the Federal Government. They originate therein and flow from that sovereignty.

These lands therefore must belong to the Federal Government. They are possessed of it. Therefore they come within the scope of article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution which reads as follows:

> The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory and other property belonging to the United States.

Note carefully the words, "other property belonging to the United States." Surely, no one hesitates to say that these submerged lands are property and that they do belong to the United States.

If there is anyone who might so hesitate, permit me to read from that very same majority decision in the California case wherein Justice Black said:

> We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its power in such a way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permissions.

That language is definitely an unambiguous statement by the High Court that these lands are Government property and under the constitutional control of Congress.

That language is a direct invitation to Congress to enact a law such as the Graham bill—which will do justice to the States.

Justice Black in that same opinion had this to say about the constitutional power of Congress under article IV, section 3, clause 2:

> We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. (*United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29–30).) Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power.

Congress then and only Congress can act on these submerged lands in the marginal sea.

There is nothing in the bill now under consideration that does not conform to these pronouncements of the Supreme Court on the power of the Congress to make the disposition that even the Court itself asked for when it uttered the doctrine of paramount rights in these lands.

I recollect that during the hearings that were held on this legislation the question was raised as to whether or not the enactment of this bill would alienate the sovereignty of the United States and thus be unconstitutional.

I have no fears on that point. To dispose of these lands according to the provisions of this bill cannot in my judgment be construed as any possible alienation of the national sovereignty.

The power given to our Federal Government was delegated under the Constitution by the States and under the Bill of Rights all powers not specifically delegated to the Federal Government under its provisions are reserved to the States. I recognize that when the national sovereign functions in its constitutional capacity with regards to other nations as distinguished from the States which are members of the Union, there is another form of sovereignty which it possesses. I refer to its external sovereignty and distinguished from its limited sovereignty when dealing with the member States.

The external sovereignty of the Federal Government that is involved in the problem are its rights and responsibilities to exercise its power to protect the security from attack on its coastline—national defense—its power to conduct foreign affairs; its control of navigation.

Those rights and responsibilities are the sole source of the Federal Government's control over these marginal seas and the lands beneath them.

Are any of these rights and powers even compromised, let alone alienated, by this bill? You know they are not.

In the first instance, all powers disposed of in this bill are those that States have exercised in the territorial seas for years with the approval of the Supreme Court. Coastal States have long exercised their police power in these waters. Of course, no one questions the paramount right of the Federal Government to supersede the power of the State in such areas when it exercises its constitutional powers any more than when it so exercises them within the State boundaries inland. But only Congress can impose that paramount power, and so long as it does not do so and there is no conflict, the State is free to exercise its police power in those waters.

In the California opinion of Justice Black, the case of *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69, 75) was referred to in the following language:

> Through Mr. Chief Justice Hughes we said: "It is also clear that Florida has an interest in the proper maintenance of the sponge fishery and that the (State) statute so far as applied to conduct within the territorial waters of Florida, in the absence of conflicting Federal legislation, is within the police power of the State."

In *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385, 393 (1947)), Mr. Chief Justice Vinson, in the majority opinion, said:

> In the Court below, *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)) was relied upon for this proposition. Here appellants seem to concede, and correctly so, that such is neither the holding nor the implication of that case; for in deciding that the United States, where it asserted its claim, had paramount rights in the 3-mile belt, the Court pointedly quoted and supplied emphasis to a statement in *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69, 75 (1941)).

He then quoted the statement which I had quoted in the same case.

Here we have the Supreme Court stating that States may exercise their police power in territorial waters so long as there is no conflict with Federal powers extended therein by an act of the Congress.

If those who think that under the doctrine of paramount right there can be no exercise of any power by a State in these waters without a concomitant alienation or surrender of the national sovereignty, let them ponder on those decisions.

These legal principles were recognized by the very same bench at the very same time that principle of paramount right was enunciated. They have been affirmed by the same Court since.

If the State is permitted to take over these lands for the purpose of developing and extracting oil therein, and if the constitutional powers of the Federal Government are specifically reserved unto itself upon condition that nothing in the grant of powers to the State can in any way infringe upon those Federal powers, there can be no possible conflict, no surrender of the right to control navigation, the right of national defense and the right to conduct foreign affairs.

For years, in these very territorial waters in which State police powers have been exercised, those Federal rights of external sovereignty have and do exist concurrently. Moreover, in these same waters there is recognized those international rights of innocent passage and of refuge in distress.

Not a single sentence in this bill raises any conflict between these sovereign rights. Therefore, there can be no alienation of Federal sovereignty.

The supporters of the argument that this legislation is unconstitutional because it alienates Federal sovereignty should read its provision more closely. As I understand this bill, even such an eventuality is provided for and proper safeguards provided to protect its validity.

That is clearly indicated in the manner in which the powers and the nature of those powers are bestowed upon the

States. Under a very definite and elaborate separability clause such an unexpected, and in my judgment unwarranted, ruling that any one of the provisions should be held invalid, the remainder of them would be protected.

I repeat that while I am confident that the bill in its entirely is constitutional, I agree with the subcommittee that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

There are also some who express alarm and apprehension with regard to title III of this bill. That is the title which deals with the outer Continental Shelf beyond the boundaries of the States. I have heard it said that we are entering into an international field that has never been undertaken before.

Let me assuage the anxiety of such persons.

First, I believe that there must be some declaration in this measure to make effective the Presidential proclamation over this area. I fear that a failure to do that when we are dealing with the very same contiguous area within State boundaries might prejudice our position at some future date, should the United States become involved in a dispute with another nation over this area.

Moreover, many countries throughout the world have been and are continuing to proclaim their jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf. In most instances they go further than the very careful wording in this bill and in many cases they extend over a greater area.

This bill states that the seabed and suboil of the outer shelf appertains to the United States and is under her jurisdiction and control including the resources therein. Thus we do not claim the superjacent waters and we affirm the freedom of the waters above these lands. We seek this limited jurisdiction for the sole purpose of extracting the minerals.

Such a claim in the outer Continental Shelf is not novel. There have been instances of such action many years old. Lands beneath the high seas have been proclaimed to be under the exclusive control of a nation for exploitation of such things as oysters, pearls, sponges on the beds of those seas off such countries as India, Australia, Tunis, Ireland, and others.

Here in the United States, we, in the past, have extended our jurisdiction beyond our territorial waters for various specific purposes, such as customs enforcement which dates back to almost our birth as a nation; the prohibition enforcement extended seaward beyond our boundary and today, our defensive sea areas often go beyond territorial waters.

I have no qualms as to the effects of this bill in that regard, but I have a very decided fear that the failure to do so will eventually penalize our country at some future date.

But far more important to me—though I yield to no one in my concern for the national interest—is the restoration in the States of those lands which I am, and always will be, certain lawfully and rightfully belonged to them. In confirming that belief by the enactment of this bill we will have taken one of the most impressive steps ever taken by any Congress to enhance the prestige and integrity of our Federal Government in the minds of all our fellow citizens.

I make that statement in all sincerity and with all the fervor of my conviction in it. In enacting this bill we the Congress will not only terminate this wasteful, bitter controversy, we will not only properly and fairly dispose of natural resources and lands in accordance with principles of justice and equity, we will recognize the rights of the States and thereby restore their confidence in the integrity of our Federal Government but, most of all, we will be restoring the traditional philosophy of the American way of life in national affairs.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Government of the United States has a traditional policy of protesting claims made by other nations to areas of the marginal sea extending beyond 3 miles from the low water mark. The basic reason for not recognizing claims extending beyond 3 miles has been that the United States as a great naval, air, and maritime power must maintain freedom of the high seas and the air lanes which pass above it.

The Soviet Union today claims a strip of territorial sea extending 12 miles from its shores. Mexico claims a boundary extending 9 miles from its shore line. Ecuador claims exclusive fishing rights within 15 miles of its coast and Iran claims 6 miles into the strategic Persian Gulf. The dangers inherent in these extensive claims are most evident in the recent claim by Chile to complete national sovereignty over 200 miles of the adjacent sea.

Any extension of our boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit would undermine our traditional policy of maintaining the freedom of the high seas. Assistant Secretary of State, Thruston B. Morton, in a letter of March 4, 1953, to Chairman HUGH BUTLER, of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, stated:

> Likewise, if this Government were to abandon its position on the 3-mile limit, it would perforce abandon any ground for protest against claims of foreign states to greater breadths of territorial waters. Such a result would be unfortunate at a time when a substantial number of foreign states exhibit a clear propensity to break down the restraints imposed by the principle of freedom of the seas by seeking extensions of their sovereignty over considerable areas of their adjacent seas. A change of position regarding the 3-mile limit on the part of this Government is very likely, as past experience in related fields establishes, to be seized upon by other states as justification or excuse for broader and even extravagant claims over their adjacent seas. Hence a realistic appraisal of the situation would seem to indicate that this Government should adhere to the 3-mile limit until such time as it is determined that the interests of the Nation as a whole would be better served by a change or modification of policy.

A. UNITED STATES CANNOT PROTECT ANY STATE CLAIM BEYOND 3 MILES

As stated in the report of special master, in the case of United States against California, October term, 1952:

> The exterior limits of the marginal belt * * * involves a question of the territorial jurisdiction of the United States as against foreign nations, i. e., a question of external sovereignty.

It is inconceivable that a single State taking unilateral action through its legislature to extend its seaward boundaries beyond the traditional 3-mile limit could bind the Government of the United States in its dealings with foreign nations. The interests of any single State in matters of foreign relations must not take precedence over the interests of the Nation as a whole.

It is clear that the territorial waters boundary of a State and the Nation are indivisible. Mr. Jack Tate, testifying on behalf of the Department of State, stated before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on March 3, 1953, that—

> In international relations, the territorial claims of the States and of the Nation are indivisible. The claims of the States cannot exceed those of the Nation.

It cannot be argued that this legislation would only affect territorial water claims of a small portion of the United States entire coastline. If Congress takes legislative action to recognize extensions of territorial waters beyond the 3-mile limit off the coast of one State, it is more than certain that every coastal State will advance similar claims and petition the Congress to recognize these claims.

Specific provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 13 were attacked by the Department of State when it said:

> It is the view of the Department, therefore, that the proposed legislation should not support claims of the States to seaward boundaries in excess of those traditionally claimed by the Nation, i. e., 3 miles from the low-water mark on the coast. This is without reference to the question whether coastal States have, or should have, rights in the subsoil and seabed beyond the limits of territorial waters.

The use of any specific terminology such as "historic boundaries" or "boundaries at the time the State entered the Union" will only confuse and complicate the continuance of a uniform and sound policy of territorial water claims the United States supports with regard to foreign nations. In the first place, it is not at all clear what validity there is in so-called historical boundaries advocated by the States of Texas, Florida, and Louisiana. The determination of these claims would involve years of litigation. Secondly, it is perfectly obvious that many coastal States may advance historical claims on the basis of their colonial charters, early State statutes or constitutions. Where these claims would lead us no one can tell.

B. HISTORICAL UNITED STATES CLAIM HAS BEEN 3 MILES

In 1793, the then Secretary of State, Mr. Thomas Jefferson, wrote to the British Minister that—

> The character of our coast, remarkable in considerable parts of it for admitting no

vessels of size to pass near the shores, would entitle us, in reason, to as broad a margin of protected navigation as any nation whatever. Reserving, however, the ultimate extent of this for future deliberation, the President gives instructions to the officers acting under his authority to consider those heretofore given them as restrained for the present to the distance of one sea league or three geographical miles from the seashore. (Jefferson, Secretary of State, to Hammond, British Minister, Nov. 8, 1793.)

In 1875, Secretary of State Hamilton Fish wrote the British Minister in Washington that—

We have always understood and asserted that, pursuant to public law, no nation can rightfully claim jurisdiction at sea beyond a marine league from its coast.

Secretary of State Bayard wrote to Secretary of the Treasury Manning on May 28, 1886, stating:

We may therefore regard it as settled that, so far as concerns the eastern coast of North America, the position of this Department has uniformly been that the sovereignty of the shore does not, so far as territorial authority is concerned, extend beyond three miles from low-water mark.

In reply to a letter from Senator Connally, of Texas, Mr. James V. Webb, then Under Secretary of State, answered the Senator's questions on the extent of United States claims to territorial waters by quoting from the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Cunard S. S. Co.* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 100), to illustrate the Department's position:

It now is settled in the United States and recognized elsewhere that the territory subject to its jurisdiction includes the land areas under its dominion and control, the ports, harbors, bays and other enclosed arms of the sea along its coast and a marginal belt of the sea extending from the coast line outward a marine league or three geographic miles.

The most recent declaration of this firm and unwavering policy came in the letter to Senator BUTLER—opinion cited—when the Department of State replied:

Pursuant to its policy of freedom of the seas, this Government has always supported the concept that the sovereignty of coastal states in seas adjacent to their coasts (as well as the lands beneath such waters and the air space above them) was limited to a belt of waters 3 miles width, and has vigorously objected to claims of other states to broader limits.

The decision of the International Court of Justice in the Norwegian Fisheries case—United Kingdom against Norway, December 18, 1951—has not changed the position of United States. This case was decided on very special grounds, and was interpreted by Mr. Jack Tate, legal advisor of the Department of State, in his testimony as follows:

Mr. TATE. * * * The Norwegian Fisheries case has caused a great deal of discussion as to what it stands for. The northern coast of Norway that was involved in that case is a very cut-up coast. It is jagged, with little islands and rocks all over. It is what is known as the Skajaergaard.

The Court in the Norwegian Fisheries case sustained the claims of Norway. It did it, as I read the case on three grounds: (1) The nature of the coasts; (2) the historical claims of Norway, acquiesced in by other countries; and (3) the economic interests of the coastal states. On that basis it justified the claims of Norway.

I am not sure how far that case goes in its applicability to other situations that are not comparable with the Norwegian situation. I do not know of any part of the coast of the United States that is comparable to that section of the Norwegian coast known as the Skajaergaard. Possibly part of the southern coast of Alaska and the Aleutians might fit into that same sort of situation.

The historical situation is different as far as this country is concerned, and of course the economic situation varies. The Court did say in that case that the 10-mile rule was not firmly established as international law in such a way as to prevent its application to Norway under these circumstances. I cannot myself say that the 10-mile rule that has been adhered to by this country is required by international law. It certainly is not prohibited by international law.

C. FREEDOM OF HIGH SEAS HAS BEEN UNITED STATES POLICY

There is no question that the United States has traditionally been a firm advocate of freedom of the high seas. Any policy change which would place the United States in a position of limiting free access to wide expanses of the high sea would be most detrimental to our national interests. Not only would this action lead to the closing of water and air routes now open to our naval and air defense craft, it would seriously hamper our fishing industry and commercial-maritime activity.

In 1952 the Department of State called together an ad hoc Interdepartmental Committee on Foreign Waters to assess the benefits and detriments which might result from the extension of broad claims to the territorial sea off the coast of the United States. This committee was composed of representatives of the Departments of Defense, State, Justice, Interior and Commerce. It is more than evident from the letters and records of this committee that any extension of territorial waters would be most detrimental to United States interests. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of State, June 20, 1952, on this subject sets forth several areas which are now open to United States naval vessels which might be closed if the United States waivers from its traditional policy of a 3-mile limitation on territorial waters.

The effects which might accrue to the fishing industry are detailed in another section of this report.

Recent incidents involving the shooting down of American aircraft off the coasts of the Soviet Union or Soviet occupied territories, indicate the importance of maintaining the doctrine of freedom of the high seas and the airspace above them. The United States will be in no position to protest further such incidents, or press past protests if the policy of our Government should now be changed.

D. 1945 PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION CAREFULLY LIMITS UNITED STATES CLAIMS TO THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

The 1945 Presidential proclamation setting forth the policy of the United States with respect to the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf was carefully phrased so as to avoid any confusion that might arise concerning the intent of the Government of the United States to change its policy with regard to the freedom of the seas.

The United States considers the natural resources of the subsoil and the sea bed of the Continental Shelf contiguous to the coasts of the United States to be subject to its jurisdiction and control.

The character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation are in no way thus affected (ibid.).

Several other nations have followed the policy of the United States with regard to the Continental Shelf adjacent to their coasts, but in a number of instances have failed to limit their claims to the subsoil and sea bed, but rather extended jurisdiction over the seas to the edge of the Continental Shelf. A summary of these claims is included in the article National Claims in Adjacent Seas, by S. W. Boggs.

Any attempt to extend the boundaries of the United States or any of its constituent States to the edge of the Continental Shelf would result in the most serious problems involving the freedom of the seas. The careful wording of the 1945 Presidential proclamation has protected the interests of the United States to date, deviations from this would not be acceptable.

The State of Texas claimed that it had full and complete ownership over the waters of the Gulf of Mexico, includes all lands that are covered by said waters from the shoreline to the farthermost edge of the Continental Shelf. This action was taken by the legislature of the State of Texas in 1941 and 1947—act of May 16, 1941, May 23, 1947. The recognition of such an extravagant claim by the Congress would not only involve the United States in serious problems with other nations but would place the State of Texas in a position of dictating to the Federal Government matters which are clearly outside the Constitutional jurisdiction of the State of Texas. For as in the California opinion (332 U. S. at 35) the court stated:

Whatever any nation does in the open sea, which detracts from its common usefulness to nations, or which another nation may charge detracts from it, is a question for consideration among nations as such, and not their separate governmental units. What this Government does, or even what the States do, anywhere in the ocean, is a subject upon which the Nation may enter into and assume treaty or similar intentional obligations.

The Supreme Court in the decree in the Texas case (340 U. S. 900) settled this issue by stating:

The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Gulf of Mexico, lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of Texas, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf and bounded in the east and southwest, respectively, by the eastern boundary of the State of Texas and the boundary between the United States and Mexico. The State of Texas has no title thereto or property interest therein.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have been assigned the task of giving you a broad outline of the pending bill, H. R. 4198.

I want to discuss with you briefly and in a nontechnical way what the bill does, why it is before us, and the need for the legislation.

Perhaps I should begin with a definition of terms. You will hear a great deal during general debate today, first about the historic boundaries and second about the outer continental shelf of the States. Let me explain what these terms mean.

Each State was admitted into the Union by an act of Congress, and each State adopted a constitution which was approved by the Congress. The act of Congress and the first Constitution defined the boundaries of each State in the first instance. In some cases treaties were involved. Thus the Louisiana Territory was retroceded or reconveyed by Spain to France in 1803, and then France, in turn, transferred the Louisiana Territory to the United States. Thereafter, Louisiana was admitted into the Union as a State under an act of Congress of 1812, and the first Constitution of Louisiana, of 1812, was approved by the Congress. Both Spain and France exerted influence over and claimed, owned, and controlled a marginal belt as part of the Louisiana Territory, as shown by maps then used and still in existence.

Obviously, we must resort to all of such ancient documents in order to determine the true and actual historic boundaries of each State, and as a practical matter, that is exactly what this bill permits and accomplishes. I do not know of any better criteria for the establishment of the boundaries of the States than a historic approach.

And what about the outer Continental Shelf?

Measured in geological time, our continent once stretched out farther into the ocean than it does today. Stated differently, the outer edge of the continental mass has become covered with the waters of the ocean. The proof is that if you waded out into the ocean, so to speak, you would find that the depth increases gradually until you reached a depth of 100 fathoms or 600 feet. At that point you would encounter a very sudden, sharp and precipitous drop to the very bottom of the ocean. The drop occurs rather uniformly at a depth of 100 fathoms or 600 feet, and upon reaching that point you would realize that you had arrived at the end of the original continental mass or the edge of the Continental Shelf.

Keeping these definitions in mind, the bill H. R. 4198 does two things.

First, it restores to the States complete title to the submerged lands up to the limit of their historic boundaries.

Second, it proves that beyond that point and up to the end of the Continental Shelf the submerged lands appertain to the United States.

Vicious propaganda has led some people to believe that this bill applies only to California, Texas and Louisiana. That, of course, is completely false. The bill applies to all the coastal States and will benefit all of the States of the Union.

Thus, it has been estimated that nine-tenths of the areas covered by this bill will go to the United States, while only one-tenth will go to all of the coastal States. Specifically, the experts who testified before our committee have estimated that 26,000 square miles will go to all of the coastal States, while 237,000 square miles are located in the Continental Shelf beyond historic State boundaries and will go to the United States Government.

Stated in another way, if the minerals were deposited uniformly from the shores to the edge of the Continental Shelf, nine-tenths of the oil would go to the Federal Government and only one-tenth would go to the coastal States. As a matter of fact, however, the percentage in favor of the States is much smaller, for the simple reason that most of the mineral deposits are located in the Continental Shelf outside of and beyond the historic boundaries of the Coastal States.

Now why is this legislation before us today? Here is the reason.

You know that possession is nine points of the law. Prior to 1935, the States enjoyed open, peaceable and exclusive possesion of the submerged lands within their historic boundaries. Up until that time, all the lawyers, the courts, the laymen and everyone in general understood that the States had title to these submerged lands.

Even Mr. Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior, thought so. He not only thought so, he said so. He not only said so, he expressed his opinion in writing. Someone had applied for a Federal lease covering submerged lands off the coast of California. On December 22, 1933, Mr. Ickes turned him down in writing. In his letter, Mr. Ickes reviewed the court decisions and said that under the uniform jurisprudence the so-called tidelands belonged to California and not to the United States. Here is what he said:

> The foregoing is a statement of the settled law and therefore, no rights can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, or under any other public-land law.

Mr. Ickes was absolutely correct. He could have cited fifty-two Supreme Court decisions in support of his position. He could have quoted the considered opinions of Chief Justice Taney, Mr. Justice Field, Mr. Justice Holmes, Mr. Justice Brandeis, Chief Justice Taft, Chief Justice Hughes, and forty-six other eminent Justices of the Supreme Court.

Yes, Mr. Ickes could have pointed out that all the departments and agencies of the Federal Government had always recognized the title of the States. He even could have said that the Federal Government had actually leased and bought and paid for some of the tidelands from the States, and he could have concluded that in law, in good conscience, in moral and in equity the United States could not and should never question the title of the States.

But then what happened? Oil was discovered in the marginal seas. Visions of wealth and power can play tricks on minds and consciences of men. So Mr. Ickes and Harry Hopkins and others changed their minds. And we all know the sordid end of the story.

In the suits against California, Texas, and Louisiana the Supreme Court reversed all the mass of legal precedents and jurisprudence which had accumulated since the very foundation of our Republic. The Court, as presently constituted, held that the States do not have title to the submerged lands within their historic boundaries. But—and here is the catch—the Court did not hold that the Federal Government owns or has title to these areas. It only decided that the Federal Government has paramount power and dominion over the tidelands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. But what does "paramount power and dominion" mean? Nobody seems to know exactly. One thing is certain, and it is that legislation is necessary to straighten out the matter so far as mineral developments are concerned. The former Attorney General and the former Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and the present Attorney General and the present Solicitor of the Department of the Interior all agree on this. They agree and all of the members of the Judiciary Committee agree that no department or agency of the Federal Government has any authority under any existing law to develop the tidelands.

In the meantime, we need oil. We need it now. We need it at home and we need it for national defense and security.

Did you know that we are an importer of oil? We import crude oil and petroleum products every day of the year. We import crude oil and petroleum products from Mexico, Columbia, Venezuela, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere. My information is that we import on an average of 1 million barrels per month.

Therefore, it is imperative that we enact legislation to authorize the development of the submerged lands both as a matter of law and as a matter of economic necessity. The proposition is not whether legislation should be adopted, because everyone agrees that we should act. The only question is what sort of legislation should be enacted.

In the past, this body has acted twice on this subject, and I am confident that it will act again today in a fair and equitable manner. In the Committee of the Whole we will propose an amendment to restore language which appeared in the committee print, but which does not now appear in the bill, H. R. 4198. A discussion of this and other possible amendments will be made in due time during the course of the enactment of this most important legislation.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to have the gentleman answer this question. Let us assume that the Supreme Court of the United States had held that Louisiana had title to these lands: I want you to explain to this Committee, in case of a controversy how Louisiana could defend that title. In law, when you own title you can defend it. How could Louisiana defend it in the case I mention?

Mr. WILLIS. That is very easy. You said, "Should the Supreme Court so decide." That is exactly what we say they should have done, that is what had been the situation for 150 years. How could we defend our title if it is recognized? If you have title and possession, you can defend easily in any lawsuit known to the common law.

Mr. PERKINS. Let us take the shrimp boat case that occurred just a few days ago off the coast of Louisiana. Our State Department was able to get those parties released on the basis of the 3-mile limit. What could the State of Texas or Louisiana have done in an instance of that kind?

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman is obviously opposed to the bill, and he wants to confuse oil with shrimp. I do not think that is very enlightening to the debate here, nor does it add to the principle. However, I do not yield further for that line of questioning. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana on the splendid job he has done in connection with this legislation. The gentleman is an able lawyer, and I think he has as fine a grasp of the paramount constitutional issue involved here as any Member of this body. I know the gentleman's time is limited and I am probably interrupting the sequence of his discussion, but I wonder if the gentleman has time whether he will discuss for a moment the importance of the taxing power on the areas found on the Continental Shelf.

Mr. WILLIS. I should be delighted to if the gentleman would procure me 2 additional minutes; I would welcome the opportunity.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time is under the control of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIS. I am glad the gentleman has brought up that subject and I am quite sure it will be discussed later on, probably when the bill is read for amendment. The taxing power and the administration of our civil and criminal jurisdictions are both important for this reason: These areas—I am talking about the areas seaward and particularly beyond the historic boundaries but within the Continental Shelf—must be subjected to the jurisdiction of some authority, criminal and civil. You do not have any Federal jurisdiction over the administration of the common law offenses. True it is that we have limited criminal jurisdiction in the Federal courts but that is only when we pass a bill such as an income bill and attach thereto a penalty and then you can go into Federal court, but you cannot go to Federal courts to punish the crimes of murder, arson, or other common-law crimes; there is no jurisdiction. The "police power" referred to in this bill means the application of the civil and criminals laws of the States, and all the body of laws that pertain to persons and corporations.

In connection with the taxing power, the proposal to tax here in this bill is not a tax against the United States of America; it is a tax against the oil companies and lessees; against the production of oil or against the severing of that oil from the soil. There are no greater industries that use and abuse our highways more than the oil companies; they use our highways and they abuse our highways; and they use our bridges and tear up our bridges. The folks who will be hired and employed in these areas on the Continental Shelf will go to school in Louisiana, they will reside in Louisiana. If they are to be given the protection of our laws they should be taxed just the same as inland persons are taxed now. So it must be understood that this taxing power is not a tax against the Federal Government at all; it is the application of a uniform tax against severance of natural resources from the soil applying both inland and offshore, and under our Constitution the severance taxes are used for road building, for bridge repair and building, and for education.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS. Is it not a fact that in legislation heretofore passed, that power along with participation in the royalties has been included in the so-called Walters bill?

Mr. WILLIS. There is no question about that. The House resolved this issue twice before by substantial votes. It has never been questioned.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON] 5 minutes.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the submerged-lands bill has been before the Congress rather regularly over a period of about 15 years and has been hashed and rehashed over and over again. Thousands of pages of testimony have been taken and some 30 or 40 hearings by both Houses have been held, but to date no final decision has been made.

Members of this 83d Congress have dropped 40 bills into the hopper so far in an effort to determine a fundamental question of national policy involving the ownership of, and the production of, minerals from the offshore submerged lands of the United States.

The Supreme Court of the United States in litigation involving the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana, has heretofore held, on three occasions, that the Federal Government has a paramount interest in all of the so-called Continental Shelf. But that Court also recognized in its opinion the right of Congress to determine, as a matter of policy, rather than as a matter of law, whether or not continued Federal control is for our best interest. In view of our present world-wide crises, and the increasing need for petroleum in our own defense program, we, of the committee, many of our colleagues, and members of the Cabinet believe that our Nation's interests would best be served by restoring to the various States the coastal offshore lands to the historical boundaries of the respective States.

I have had a considerable amount of mail from my district opposing the present legislation on the grounds that, if passed, it would take funds away from the public schools. I should like to submit this to you in its proper light. All the submerged land revenues in the State of Texas have been devoted to public education for more than 30 years. All, or part, of such revenues are devoted to education in most of the other States where income is from other public lands. The latest available total of all revenues received by Texas, Louisiana, and California to date, from oil and gas leases, and royalties, is $77,292,000. This has meant a great deal to public education and other State functions in those States. But, if the revenue to those States was to be divided among the 48 States, it would mean only $1,610,000 per State. Even if that figure should become greater in the future, it is doubtful if any of the States would be willing to surrender to the Federal Government the title to its own submerged lands for one-forty-eighth part of the total revenues received from all the States through Federal ownership and management. At present, total Federal aid to schools is in the billions.

The Federal Government today owns 24 percent of all the land in the United States, and none of the revenues therefrom are being earmarked for education. Grants of this Federally owned land direct to the States would enable them to be self-sustaining, and to retain control of their educational systems.

We have much Government-owned land in my district, but you may be very sure that the advocates of Federal control, because of their intrest in the centralization of property and power in a national soverign rather than the support of public education, will not concede such a program. The Federal aid to education plan is merely an attempt to gain support of Federal control of submerged lands now being used by the States in support of their own systems of public education.

Incidentally, in our great State of Michigan, we have over 25 million acres of submerged lands and 1,500 miles of shoreline. Michigan is currently receiving royalties from leases covering oil, gas, sand and gravel. This legislation requires your careful and conscientious study.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 1, may I thank the gentlewoman for her attendance at our meetings. She has been faithful; she has never missed a meeting and she has contributed much of her time and effort. Mr. Chairman, I greatly appreciate it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] attempted to discuss the tax that had been placed by the State of Louisiana beyond the historical boundaries of the State. Will the gentleman state whether the power to tax is or is not an aspect of the sovereignty of either the State or the Federal Government and whether in his opinion it is constitutional for one of the Gulf States to impose such a tax?

Mr. CELLER. I believe the provisions for taxation that are found on page 12 and the provisions for police powers granted to each of the coastal States are, to say the least, impracticable, unthinkable, and unconstitutional. This is an attempt to allow one State to tax property beyond its boundaries. This would permit Louisiana and Texas to tax all companies that are operating on the Continental Shelf far beyond their boundaries. Now I cannot conceive how we would embrace such a proposal. If we could do that with reference to the coastal States, namely, that they can effectuate the imposition and collection of taxes on property not in their own States, then New York, for example, could tax corporations and properties in the State of Illinois and the State of Indiana. To my mind that is ridiculous. Frankly, it is just stuff and nonsense and I cannot conceive how we could swallow such a thing; yet it is in the bill.

I want to say to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] for whom I have affectionate regard—and I do not like to oppose him and offer contrary opinions—that the gist of this whole matter is in a very brief quotation which I will read from the Louisiana case as decided by the Supreme Court:

> If, as we held in California's case, the 3-mile belt is in the domain of the Nation rather than that of the separate States, it follows a fortiori that the ocean beyond that limit also is. The ocean seaward of the marginal belt is perhaps ever more directly related to the national defense, the conduct of foreign affairs, and world commerce than is the marginal sea. Certainly it is not less so. So far as the issues presented here are concerned, Louisiana's enlargement of her boundary emphasizes the strength of the claim of the United States to this part of the ocean and the resources of the soil under that area including oil.

To my mind, that is decisive of this whole proposition, namely, that all of this mineral wealth seaward from low-water mark is within the domain—that is the word used by the Supreme Court—of the United States Government. The Supreme Court is not going to eat up these words; the Supreme Court is going to follow that decision; it is not going to jump to a different conclusion.

In a sense, I might use an old Turkish proverb which is as follows: Who takes the donkey up to the roof must bring him down again. In other words, what we are doing here is just bringing the donkey up to the roof, and we must bring him right down here again. The Supreme Court will stand by those three decisions, paramount among which was the decision from which I just read.

Now, either we do have confidence in the State Department or we do not have confidence in the State Department. We either must have faith in Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State, or we do not have faith in Mr. Dulles, Secretary of State. Those who are in favor of this bill apparently have no faith whatsoever in the Secretary of State, who conducts our foreign affairs. He has sent representatives to those having jurisdiction over this legislation, indicating opposition to this bill, and the opposition is in the following.

The Deputy Legal Adviser to Secretary Dulles, Jack B. Tate, said:

> The Department is concerned with such provisions of proposed legislation as would recognize or permit the extension of the seaward boundaries of certain States—

He had in mind Florida and Texas—

> beyond the 3-mile limit.
>
> If the Nation should recognize the extension of the boundaries of any State beyond the 3-mile limit, its identification with the broad claim would force abandonment of its traditional position (that 3 seaward miles is the breadth of the territorial limit of any country.)

Then we have another important piece of evidence, as to what the State Department is thinking. This is the statement of Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State. He declared that such recognition proposed in quitclaim bills on oil-rich offshore lands, "may moreover precipitate developments in international practice to which this Government, in the national interest, is clearly opposed." Mr. Morton also said, "A number of foreign states are at present showing a clear propensity to extend their sovereignty over considerable areas of their seas." This restricts the freedom of the sea and the freedom of sea has been and is a cornerstone of the United States policy because it is a maritime and naval power.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I notice the gentleman's argument is directed toward the part of the bed of the ocean beyond the 3-mile limit, that is, at this point, but something else is bothering me, and that is about that part of the tidelands that is inside the 3-mile limit.

Mr. CELLER. I can ease the gentleman's mind on that score. The Supreme Court has stated in no uncertain language that the domain of the Federal Government extends from low-water mark seaward.

Mr. DONOVAN. Now, this is the question: If the Federal Government has paramount title to the lands under the sea within the 3-mile limit, what would happen to the sand and gravel business off the coast of the State of New York if the Federal Government suddenly decided that those sand people had no right to dig the sand out without paying money to the Federal Government?

Mr. CELLER. I never knew the gentleman's constituents had sand and gravel interests in and around New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman does know that they dig sand and gravel out of the tidelands around New York, does he not?

Mr. CELLER. Perhaps. I do not know.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is not the tidelands oil area specifically between the low- and high-water marks of the ocean? Is not the gentleman in error when he speaks of the tidelands out to the 3-mile limit?

Mr. CELLER. Yes. There is no attempt on the part of those who oppose this bill to say that they are taking anything from the States that are called tidelands. Beween low-water mark and high-water mark is proverbially called tidelands. This bill is called the tidelands bill. That is a misnomer. The bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the so-called tidelands. This bill has to do with the lands seaward from the low-water mark outside of tidelands. So that the sand and gravel interests can take all they want out of the shores anywhere between the low-water mark and the high-water mark, provided they own or lease or have rights in the adjoining uplands adjoining the tidelands.

Mr. YATES. Is it not an additional fact that the sand and gravel business is probably conducted on inland waters which belong to the State of New York?

Mr. CELLER. Quite so. There may be some activities elsewhere. I do not know.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I understood the question of the gentleman's colleague from New York to involve what the gentleman called the tidelands area, beyond the low-water mark. What is the gentleman's answer to his question?

Mr. CELLER. I presume the contractors in New York can get all the sand and gravel they want in the tidelands between the low-water mark and the high-water mark.

Mr. BOGGS. He referred to other lands. What is the gentleman's answer to that question?

Mr. CELLER. He may refer to other lands, but as to other lands the contractors taking out sand and gravel might have to get permission from the Government.

Mr. BOGGS. That is your answer?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Furthermore, it is well to know the value of this national heritage of oil which is being given to the various coastal States. The inland States, I think, would be interested in the value of these lands, and in the value of the minerals underneath these lands. The minority report contains some very interesting figures with regard to that, and you will find those figures on page 115 of the general report, the second

page of the minority report. The proven reserves total $1,230,000,000. The potential reserves out to the Continental Shelf of those three States, California, Texas and Louisiana, go up as high as $42,265,000,000. A rather tidy sum. Certainly we cannot hand that wealth to three States without greatest objection and remonstrance.

Here is an interesting table outlining these petroleum resources by barrels and dollars:

Estimated value of United States offshore oil resources

PROVEN RESERVES

	Quantity (barrels)	Value ($2.50 per barrel)
Inside 3-mile limit:		
California	156,345,000	390,862,500
Texas	15,000,000	37,500,000
Louisiana	107,000,000	267,500,000
Total	278,345,000	695,862,500
Continental Shelf, outside 3-mile limit:		
California	0	0
Texas	0	0
Louisiana	214,000,000	535,000,000
Total	214,000,000	535,000,000

POTENTIAL RESERVES

Inside 3-mile limit:		
California	[1] 1,100,000,000	2,750,000,000
Texas	[2] 400,000,000	1,000,000,000
Texas	[3] [1,200,000,000]	[3,000,000,000]
Louisiana	250,000,000	625,000,000
Total	[3] 1,750,000,000	4,375,000,000
Continental Shelf (total):		
California	2,156,000,000	5,390,862,500
Texas	9,000,000,000	22,500,000,000
Louisiana	4,000,000,000	10,000,000,000
Total	15,156,000,000	37,890,000,000

[1] Inside 3-league limit.
[2] Inside 3-mile limit.
[3] Totals exclude data in brackets.

NOTE.—Reserves from U. S. Geological Survey estimates. Value calculated at approximate current crude-oil prices.

This is only the beginning, may I say to the members of this committee. The raid will not stop with the quitclaiming of this offshore oil to the States. The arguments are going to run this way: If it is logical to turn over wealth under marginal seas, then it is just as logical to turn over wealth under Federally owned land to the inland States. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Senator HUNT, has a bill which is pending in the Senate to give the States the minerals under Federal lands. The Senator points out that the United States Government got $153 million in royalties from oil under Federal land in his State in 20 years. He wants those future royalties for the State of Wyoming. The western sheep and cattle growers are now casting a longing eye upon public forest and grazing land. Chairman Butler of the Senate Interior Committee threw out the first hint when during the course of hearings, he remarked, "I would like to say here that when the tidelands question is settled, there are plans for introduction of a bill which will make the same theory applicable to the public land now held by the Federal Government within the State." I can readily see that if California can get this oil, why should not the State of Washington get something and exploit the timberlands and the water and the minerals. There is the famous Rainier National Park. While it is not an oil bonanza like that under the marginal seas, that national park could be converted to hard, cold cash for that State.

If marginal seas belong to Texas why cannot the lakes of Jackson Hole—now protected as a monument—be tapped by Wyoming for hydroelectric power and other industrial purposes?

What about Mount Hood National Forest in Oregon? It just sits there, like a picture postcard to be stared at. Why not saw it down—log it off and make some money for Oregon and lumber groups out of it?

Let me read you significantly, part of an article from the New Leader:

The opening gun in the campaign to weaken the Forest Service was fired by Lawrence F. Lee, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, in a speech before the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association shortly after election.

Remember that is the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. Lee proposed that a study be made by Congress by departments, of the Federal real estate inventory, to the end that all property, which in the public interest is best adapted to private ownership, be offered for sale as soon as possible and thus be placed on the tax rolls and in productive use by private enterprise.

Mr. Lee entitled his speech "A Way Back To Land Freedom," but it was really a program for despoiling public property and turning over assets now owned by all the people to a privileged few. It is up to Americans to keep close watch on their property, whether it be multipurpose dams (which former GE president Charles E. Wilson wants the Government to sell to private enterprise), grazing lands, forest lands, or other valuable resources. The land grabbers have many stratagems and numerous complaisant Congressmen at their beck and call. We must keep a wary eye on them and mobilize all our political strength if we are to thwart their schemes.

Well, it has gotten so far that in the New York State Legislature recently, someone suggested selling West Point. Think of it. A legislator said it could be sold for $20 million to a boys' private prep school. Also I understand, but I am not sure about this, that the attorney general from Kentucky—I hope the Representative from the State of Kentucky will let me know whether this is so or not—that the attorney general of that State even began to size up his State's possible claim to the gold ingots buried in Fort Knox.

Apparently the raid is on. This is the season for plunder.

In South Dakota a wealthy promoter of carnivals and medicine shows negotiated at Pierre, the capital of the State, for exclusive rights to charge admission for viewing the carved heads of Lincoln, Washington, Jefferson, and Teddy Roosevelt at Mount Rushmore.

Well, Mr. Chairman, apparently they are going to put everything that Uncle Sam has of value on the auction block, and they are going to sell everything to the highest bidder. This is the season for easy pickings. I would not be surprised that somebody will come forward with a proposal that we auction off the Post Office Department to the highest bidder.

This offshore-mineral-deposits legislation has surely started some queer shenanigans.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] for the purpose of asking a question.

Will the gentleman state his question?

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman to refer to page 15 of H. R. 2948 as considered by the full committee last week, and I call the gentleman's attention particularly to the language on that page reading:

Provided, however, That within 90 days from the effective date hereof (i) the lessee shall pay to the State or its grantee issuing such lease all rents, royalties, and other sums payable between June 5, 1950, and the effective date hereof, under such lease and the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease, except such rents, royalties, and other sums as have been paid to the State, its grantee, the Secretary of the Interior or the Treasurer of the United States and not refunded to the lessee.

The above quotations are on page 15, beginning with the word "provided," that word being the last word on line 12, and the above quoted language beginning with that word "provided" continues through line 20 and includes the language on line 21, stopping with the semicolon after the word "lessee."

The above quoted language appears in the bill, H. R. 4198, now pending before us, on page 7 beginning with the word "provided," on line 13 and ending with the semicolon after the word "lessee" on line 22.

The gentleman will recall that in our committee meeting I called attention to the committee that the Coastal Petroleum Co., Inc., was the lessee under two leases from the board of trustees of the Florida Internal Improvement Fund, under which leases the Coastal Petroleum Co., Inc., was given the right to explore and extract oil from the tidelands along the Gulf Coast of Florida; that in view of the then pending tidelands cases, a provision was inserted in the leases allowing the Coastal Petroleum Co., Inc., an abatement in rentals to the extent that the areas under those leases might be adversely affected by the United States Supreme Court's decision in those cases; and on December 20, 1949, the trustees of the Florida Internal Improvement Fund passed a resolution abating the rentals on areas which had, in fact, been adversely affected by the decisions of the said Supreme Court in the tidelands cases; and that on March 7, 1950, the trustees of the Florida Internal Improvement Fund adopted a motion crediting rentals paid on such areas by the said Coastal Petroleum Co., Inc., before the passage of the resolution just described, to future rentals on other lands which had not been adversely affected by those decisions.

The gentleman will further recall that I asked our committee if the language I have quoted above would endanger any abatements made to lessees by the States? And that, was the above quoted

language in any way authorized to override any such abatements, for the reason that if it did so authorize that I wanted to offer an amendment to provide that "any rents, royalties, and other sums as have been abated by any State, or its grantee, or otherwise dealt with any existing agreements between any State, or its grantee and the lessee, was and is excepted." I ask the gentleman if he recalls that it was agreed by the committee that no such amendment was necessary, and that under the terms and provisions of the present bill that any and all abatements or rents and royalties heretofore made by any of the States to any lessee would be binding, and that such abatement proceedings would firmly stand as against any provisions in this bill, and that the provisions in this bill apply only to rents and royalties as might be due and which have not been abated or released from payment by the contracting State by and through its proper agents or authorities, and that this bill will be so construed?

I ask the gentleman if it was not the intention of the committee, by the language quoted above, to simply provide that any such payments provided in any contracts by the States and any lessee, which have not been modified or abated by the State heretofore, are the ones that the committee was legislating upon.

Mr. GRAHAM. The answer to the question is, "Yes."

Mr. FORRESTER. I appreciate that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of this bill. I have uniformly supported similar measures which have been before this body during my service here.

All of us agree that some kind of action on this subject is necessary. The only question is as to the kind of bill we should pass. The hands of the States are tied because of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases. The hands of the Federal Government are tied because of the absence of authority to develop, or lease for development, the resources in the lands confiscated on its behalf by the Supreme Court. The issue should be settled so that the lands in question might be developed without further confusion and strife.

In the beginning the Federal Government owned no land. Such land as it owns has been acquired primarily by purchase or by grants from the States.

At the conclusion of the Revolution, each of the Original Thirteen States became the absolute owner of all lands beneath the tidal and navigable waters within its boundaries, except such portions, if any, as had previously been granted out by the former sovereign. These lands were not surrendered to the Federal Government by the Constitution or otherwise. Had any doubt existed, and none did until recently, the 10th amendment should have set it at rest. The 10th amendment was thought to be the answer to the widespread fear, prevalent at the time of its adoption, that the Federal Government might attempt to exercise powers which had not been granted to it. Recent developments have shown that those fears were not groundless.

That the Federal Government is a government of delegated powers is too well established to require comment. And I submit as incapable of being successfully attacked the following proposition: That since the sovereign powers enjoyed by the Federal Government were derived from the States and expressly limited by the 10th amendment, its sovereign rights can rise no higher and can have no greater effect than those powers which were delegated to it.

Prior to 1937 no one questioned that the lands under consideration were owned by the States. The Original Thirteen States owned their submerged lands by virtue of the titles acquired at the end of the Revolution. That the States subsequently admitted into the Union were admitted on an equal footing has been held by the Supreme Court in cases too numerous to mention.

For more than 150 years prior to the California case, the States had been in possession of and had been using these lands in good faith. I am informed that, prior to the decision in that case, there were 53 other Supreme Court decisions and 244 decisions by State and Federal courts which held that the States owned all lands beneath the navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or seaward. On the strength of this authority, the States have in good faith encouraged and regulated the development of the natural resources found in the seas and lands lying thereunder within their boundaries. They have granted permission or leases for the construction of piers, docks, and other shore structures and for the filling in and reclamation of submerged lands. During all these decades in which the States exercised all the rights of sovereignty over these lands, no doubt was expressed as to the fact that the States owned these areas just as completely and just as surely as they did inland properties. It was only upon the discovery that valuable oil deposits were contained in these lands that the Federal Government showed any interest in claiming them.

That it was the settled law of the land that the lands now in controversy belonged to the States is further borne out by the fact that numerous grants of submerged lands outside of inland waters have been made by the States to the Federal Government. Would the Federal Government have gone through the steps necessary to accept a conveyance of land from a State if it had not believed that the land was owned by the State?

Since this controversy arose, much propaganda has been circulated to the effect that only a few States are affected. That is not true. The principle involved in the decisions which this bill will correct affects the sovereign interest of every State in the Union. I am told that, though various interpretations of the tidelands cases have been made, the vast majority of the lawyers of this country agree that these decisions cast a definite cloud upon title to vast areas of lands under the inland waters within the boundaries of all the States. And I have heard grave doubts expressed by my friends from the Middle West as to the title to lands under and lands reclaimed from the Great Lakes.

Though my own State of South Carolina has no commercial oil fields, it is vitally interested in the question involved. In South Carolina we have 461 square miles of submerged lands under inland waters and 561 square miles of submerged lands under the marginal seas. Structures erected into the ocean as well as the mineral deposits under the waters are affected by the decisions in the tidelands cases. In 1948, the Supreme Court ruled, in the case of Toomer against Witsell (334 U. S. 385), that the power of South Carolina to regulate fishing in the marginal-sea area within its boundaries could be exercised only in the absence of a conflicting Federal claim. The basis of this holding was the decision in the California case.

The fishing industry is already important in my State and offers promise of becoming a great industry. But the power of the State to regulate it is at present at the mercy of the Federal Government.

I might add, in discussing my State's interest in this subject, that the attorney general of South Carolina was one of the 45 attorneys general who filed briefs amicuse curiae in the California case to support California's defense and to oppose the assertions of power made by the Federal Government.

The issue before us today is not one of oil, though there are those who would have us believe that. The issue goes much further than oil. The Court's opinions are certainly not limited to oil. The problem before us is as broad as the Court's decisions and the intentions, present or future, of the Federal departments.

If the Federal Government can take oil lands in coastal States, it can do so in inland States. If it can take oil, it can take any other resource. There is no limit to the potential areas of exploitation which have been opened up for the Federal Government by the decisions in the tidelands cases. To say that this possibility is far-fetched is no answer. It is no more far-fetched than the claims made and upheld in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases. Nor is it sufficient to answer by saying that Federal officials have expressly denied the intention of exerting any further claims. If one Attorney General can justify the position of the Government in regard to the tidelands on the ground that the question had not previously been raised, may not another Attorney General make the same justification in filing a test case involving inland waters? The fact that the Federal Government has not as yet advanced such a claim is certainly no protection to the States. Under the holding in the California case, officers of one administration can no more legally waive the rights of the Federal Government to other lands or resources other than oil by disclaiming any interest therein than could their predecessors in

office legally waive the Federal Government's paramount rights over the oil by ruling that the submerged lands belonged to the States.

As I understand the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case, it was based on two grounds: First, the responsibility of the United States for the conduct of foreign affairs; and, second, its responsibility for national defense and the need of oil therefor. The Court assumed that the natural resources in these lands and waters might be vital to the national defense and that they might become involved in international negotiations conducted by the Federal Government with other nations.

I fail to see how national representation in foreign affairs implies national ownership. The Federal Government represents the whole Nation in international affairs, but that does not require that the Federal Government must own everything entering into such affairs.

Nor am I able to see how the Federal Government's responsibility to protect the shores can give it rights heretofore identified with the ownership of those shores. It does not follow that because the Federal Government is empowered to maintain a navy and to provide for the national defense it can appropriate to itself property owned either by States or individuals. If certain properties are essential for governmental use in the exercise of these powers, the Government may acquire them under its power of eminent domain. But this involves due process of law and the payment of just compensation as required by the fifth amendment. The mere existence of need, no matter how great, can never justify a circumvention of the fifth amendment.

Justice Frankfurter in his dissent in the California case said:

> The needs of defense and foreign affairs alone cannot transfer ownership of an ocean bed from a State to the Federal Government any more than they could transfer iron ore under uplands from State to Federal ownership. National responsibility is no greater in respect to the marginal sea than it is toward every other particle of American territory.

Justice Reed in his dissent in the same case said:

> This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the need or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these underseas lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation.

If the principle established in the tidelands cases is permitted to stand unchallenged, the Federal Government can, with the aid of an overzealous Supreme Court, invade and appropriate unto itself property almost without limitation as well as powers and rights historically and by the Constitution reserved to and exercised by the States.

In arriving at its decision in the California case, the Supreme Court evaded all its prior jurisprudence on the subject of tidal ownership by each State for its sovereign people and its often repeated decisions that the Original Thirteen States absolutely owned all their navigable waters and the soils under them for the common use of the sovereign people of each State, subject only to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the Federal Government, and that all States subsequently admitted to the Union succeeded to the same ownership and rights of sovereignty. No State has denied the power of the Federal Government over the navigable waters of the Nation that exists by virtue of its powers to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and to provide for the national defense. But the existence of these powers of the Federal Government is not inconsistent with State ownership of the lands below the navigable waters and should not be used as a basis for changing the original ownership of these lands from the States to the Federal Government.

The issue before us today has been clouded by the interjection of Federal aid to education as a rallying post around which to gather opposition to the bill. The desirability of such aid for schools is itself a controversial issue upon which so far as I know, the Congress has never affirmatively expressed itself. But even if we assume the nobility and the desirability of Federal aid to education, it has no place in the solution of this problem.

The issue before us is a fundamental one of States rights and of basic principles. The principle established by the tidelands decisions is far reaching and transcends all questions as to the value of oil or other properties involved.

Our duty in my opinion is clear. We must do what is right as the light of history has shown us what is right. We must counteract this step which has been taken toward nationalization of our resources and further centralization of power in our Federal Government. We must show the Nation that Congress still has sufficient power, as the Constitution intended, to remedy errors by the courts and the executive branch when the results are such as to circumvent, ignore, or run roughshod over the Constitution and when the results are such as to bring about substantial injustices such as were brought about by the tidelands decisions. We must affirm for all time the unwritten law under which we have operated for so many years. A proper regard for States rights and for property rights requires that this bill be passed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, for 15 or 16 years now we have heard much talk and argument about the so-called tidelands bill. "Tidelands," of course, is a misnomer, for as previously stated, it refers only to that strip of land between the low and high water marks. Why, except for the sake of brevity, the bill is called the tidelands bill, I do not know. There has been more propaganda, more untruths, and more misstatements made about this and other bills on the subject than I think have ever been made about any legislation pending before this Congress at least since I have been here, and this is the seventh year I have been here.

I heard a man on television a few days ago—he was a Member of the other body—say that there were some several trillions of dollars involved in these tidelands. That is a figment of somebody's imagination. Nobody knows how much oil is beneath the sea beyond the boundaries of the States; nobody could possibly know how much oil is under the Continental Shelf or the outer Continental Shelf. Geologists and others have said that they estimated, based upon the showings in the salt dome formations that have been explored, that there is somewhere between twenty and forty billion dollars worth of oil and gas in that territory. That is a pure guess, but I think all this talk is thrown out for one purpose, and that is to take your minds and the minds of the Members of the other body from the facts, to drive you away from the facts so that you will be laboring under the impression that you will never have to vote any more taxes if you will just get these tidelands regardless of how you get them.

There are several different groups who believe the money should be placed in the Treasury for the use and benefit of various purposes. I think this is a good bill; I think the facts will demonstrate to those of you who are open and fair-minded, the facts will demonstrate this bill to be a good bill. How anyone could make the statement that this is a giveaway, as far as the facts of many of the coastal States are concerned and many of the Great Lakes States, and be within the facts, I do not understand.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I will yield later.

Texas gained its independence in 1836 by force of arms. In 1836 immediately after gaining its independence it openly and notoriously proclaimed that it owned as a part of its public domain the area 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico beginning at the mouth of the Rio Grande, 3 leagues from shore and ending at the border of Louisiana. Nobody ever contested that claim while it was a republic and a free nation for 10 years.

When the Federal Government, the association of States, asked Texas to become a member, and Texas wanted to become a member, the Congress adopted a resolution the words of which are very plain. I inserted these words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some little time ago and will not take the time to read all of them now. But it provided that Texas should keep its public domain and would pay its debts of $10 million. Texas paid its debt of $10 million. This joint resolution adopted by the Congress, which was in effect a treaty, has been recognized since that time and was never questioned by any man until Secretary Ickes questioned the matter with respect to all the coastal States.

Many statements have been made, one by my former distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York, that he could not understand the provision in this bill permitting the States to tax in

the outer Continental Shelf. Let me read you section 189 of the Federal Leasing Act which applies to all of the Federal domain of all of the Western States, now known as the reclamation States. I will only read the section with respect to taxes:

Nothing in this section shall be construed or held to affect the rights of the States or other local authority to exercise any rights which they may have, including the right to levy and collect taxes on improvements, the output of mines and other rights or assets of any lessee of the United States.

What will this area become if this bill is passed and finally endorsed by the President? It will become the public domain of the United States. That is, that area outside of the historical boundaries of the States will become the public domain of the United States. What is this land that we find in the reclamation States of the West? It is the public domain of the United States.

Under section 189 of the Federal Leasing Act you even give local governments, any political subdivision, the right to tax. Some member in committee asked: Why should the contiguous States have the right to tax? As you know, the families of these men who are out on these large derricks built upon steel piling—many times 100 to 150 men work out there when they drill these wells—live on the shore, they live in the abutting or contiguous States. These families use the schools, roads, fire and police departments, and have all of the prerogatives as any other citizen. Is it not just as fair for the abutting States to be allowed to assess some kind of tax, and this bill limits it to a severance or production tax, which would be a tax entirely upon the lessee after he severs the oil? Is it not just as fair to permit those abutting States to collect a little tax in order to reimburse themselves for carrying on these services which are received by these people employed to explore this area? Is it not just as fair for these States to be able to do it as it is for the western reclamation States? I cannot see the difference. If there is any difference, I cannot see it.

There has been a lot of confusion about 3 leagues, 9 nautical miles, and 10½ miles. If you will refer to your proper dictionaries, you will see that a league is 3½ land miles, and the 9 nautical miles, which is referred to by nautical people, is also 10½ miles. So what appears to be confusing is only the use of different terms describing the same area.

As was stated by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], this bill deals with the inner Continental Shelf which is out to the historical boundaries of the several States, and contrary to what many of the opponents of this bill say when they try to lead you to believe that this is just a steal on the part of Texas, Louisiana, and California, they forget about all the other States as was stated this morning by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON]. Their claim, the claim of the State of Massachusetts, predates any claim Texas has. I think he is entirely right when he says he would not give up 1 inch of the territory of Massachusetts for any amount of money, and that is the way we feel in Texas. You are not giving us anything in this bill. We have owned this property since before 1836 and we obtained it by right of arms. We gained it when we gained our independence and asserted a claim to it. What did the Federal Government do 2 years after 1846 when Texas came into the Union except enter into an international treaty with Mexico. With regard to the boundary between this country at the border of Texas, after Texas became a State, in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, these words are used. This treaty was entered into in 1848 between the Federal Government and the Government of Mexico:

The boundary line between the two Republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande River, otherwise called Rio Grande del Norte, or opposite the mouth of its deepest branch, if it should have more than one branch emptying directly into the sea.

They recognized in 1948, 2 years after Texas became a State of the Union, that 3 leagues was also the starting point of the boundary between Mexico and the United States. That, of course, shows that the joint resolution adopted by Congress in bringing Texas into the Union also recognized the boundary at the same point.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I can understand the gentleman's claim concerning the State of Texas but I would like for you to tell this Committee from what source and when did the Thirteen Original Colonies obtain title to the marginal sea, the 3-mile limit from the low-water mark seaward?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The gentleman was here when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] gave his answer; was he not?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not touch on that point.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I ask the gentleman to consult the Members here from those States.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I want to know. They do not have any title at all.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Now, it is very important that this matter be settled once and for all. It is important not only to Texas, Louisiana, and California, but every State in the Union, every coastal State and every Great Lakes State, and it is important also that the inland States have this bill passed, not that they will get anything out of the coastal part of it, but that the inland waters and their lake beds and their river bottoms be settled for all time to come. It is important that this area, which is rich in oil and other minerals, many of which minerals we may not even know exist, be developed and developed at the earliest possible moment.

As was stated by Chairman REED, development in his area is now practically at a standstill. As a matter of fact, Texas was enjoined June 5, 1950, from accepting any further money. This bill ratifies and confirms the leases that have been made by the various States to this area within their boundaries, also ratifies those leases entered into on the outer continental shelf. These oil companies at their own peril will not continue to develop this area until they know who is supposed to own it and who they can get title from. You cannot blame them.

There are many costal States, not just Texas, California, and Louisiana. We talk about the police power. Some Members seem to be very afraid of the police power. The police power is only that power that flows from constituted society in an effort to protect itself by its civil and criminal laws. Do you think there is any danger in permitting an abutting State contiguous to this territory to enforce its criminal laws and protect the public interest in that area?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it not so that according to the very provisions of this bill the police and even the taxing power provision will prevail only as long as Congress does not invade the field, and that could be changed later?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is absolutely true.

Mr. WILLIS. The purpose is a continuity of the applicable local laws, the conservation laws, and so forth.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is absolutely true.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What is an abutting State? Suppose in this continental shelf beyond the political boundaries of the State you have a crew drilling for oil. As I understand the bill and the statement the gentleman has previously made, the contiguous State would be enabled to pass a severance tax applicable to that oil. Could not any State on the Gulf claim to be a contiguous State for the purpose of passing a severance tax, and who would determine that question?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The line would be drawn, provided the coastline was in a circle. A point 10½ or 3 miles from the coastline can always be established. There is no trouble about that. The courts will have to establish where the lines are.

Mr. YATES. But suppose this is a point 15, 20, or 25 miles out?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Extend the line straight on out to the end of the continental shelf.

Mr. YATES. Which State would have the power and which State would determine it?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The abutting State would have the power if the line were extended.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is it not true that the bill actually provides the line would be drawn by the Secretary of the Inte-

rior? That meets the objection just raised.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is right.

This bill, or a bill with language very similar, has been passed twice by this House by an overwhelming majority. The last time I believe the vote was 265 to 109. Before that I think this bill passed by a much larger majority. Both Houses of the Congress have always recognized the importance of this legislation to the country, internationally as well as nationally. It is important to protect its natural resources; and, by the way, let me get to that.

Many of the States, some States, at least, including Louisiana and Texas—I am not certain about California—have laws to prevent waste. They have conservation laws to prohibit any man even on his own private property from destroying this national resource, from abusing drainage, and from abusing letting off the pressure under the ground that brings the oil to the surface. It is absolutely essential that conservation laws cover this territory, otherwise a few drillers would dissipate that great natural resource which we need so badly, and which we can always use in this country in case of war or in peace.

Just imagine 10½ miles off the coast of Texas in the Gulf, where 1 man has a lease and can drill down, let us say, five or six thousand feet—I am not familiar exactly with the depth of these wells.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Suppose that one oil company had a lease out to the State line, 10½ miles, presuming that title 1 and title 2 pass, where the conservation laws apply and where the Railroad Commission of the State of Texas, who have very fairly but firmly enforced all conservation laws, provides that any operator can only draw 25 or 30 barrels a day off of each well. Suppose that the Federal Government should go out there and start a leasing program, and lease a thousand acres of that land, and a man right outside the State boundary would drill a well into the same salt dome, and he could stand there and draw 25,000 barrels a day if there was that much pressure, bringing the oil out; he could drain that pool in a very few months or weeks and destroy all the interest in the rest of the salt dome notwithstanding that he might be right on the edge of it, and the main part of it lie within the State boundaries. I asked Secretary McKay when he was before the committee if he thought, in view of the fact that the Federal Government has no conservation laws, that it was not absolutely imperative, and would it not be proper for the State conservation laws to apply in this area until the Congress has an opportunity to pass laws governing it, and he said, "Yes." I asked him also if he would have any objection to police powers and taxing powers on a purely temporary basis until the Federal Government preempted the field by legislation, and he said he would not. You will find that in the hearings on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is a long and complicated bill, and I have only been able to discuss very small parts of this entire matter as some of the other Members have done, but in view of the fact that it has been passed twice by the House by overwhelming majorities, and because the bill is not substantially changed except that it does cut out 37½ percent to be reserved by the States under the Walter bill, I feel the bill should pass.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The gentleman knows I am a layman and not a lawyer. But suppose I came to you as my family lawyer and told you that I had occupied a piece of property and had been in peaceful possession of it with no adverse claim made against me for 20, 30, or 50 years. Would you tell me I had good title to it?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I certainly would. That is if you had occupied it intentionally and openly and notoriously and had it fenced for 10 years, but you would not even have to have a fence if it were 25 years. All States have statutes of limitations in cases of that kind.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. This is not fenced, that is true. But then you would tell me that if someone else moved in on me, you would take the case into the courts and defend my title to the land?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I certainly would.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. And if you took it to the Supreme Court, I venture to say you would tell me that they would also sustain my title?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I certainly think they would.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. This question is not put as a smart-aleck question, but why then does the Supreme Court of the United States deny the State of Texas the same right and privilege that they would grant me as an individual citizen.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is what I would like to know. I believe the Supreme Court was wrong in the Tidelands case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the sentiments which I would like to leave with the Committee are those of a layman and one who is fully cognizant that on the Committee there are many able and experienced lawyers.

Texas held undisputed title to the so-called tidelands out to the traditional three-league boundary ever since Texas became a State, until the Federal Government stepped in with an adverse claim less than 10 years ago. By its claim the Government undertook to set aside a principle which I have always known as squatters' rights. These rights vary somewhat in different States, but in general if an individual has used and occupied a piece of property for some 10 years and if there have been no adverse claims in the meantime, he has a good title to such property. If the position of the Federal Government is finally sustained in this case, it would seem to me that it would render doubtful any title claimed under squatters' rights.

I have often noted in the course of the tidelands controversy in recent years that Texas is represented as trying to grab something that does not belong to it. The Texas position, of course, is that the grab came the other way. Texas had held peaceful possession for many years and continued to do so until the Federal Government asserted its claim.

Certainly the Texas position differs from that of any other State. The agreement with the Federal Government when Texas became a State is perfectly valid and has never been violated by the State. Under the present circumstances and without the passage of the legislation presently being considered, it is the Federal Government which has violated the contract. The opportunity is before your committee to direct that this contract be observed just as a lawyer would insist in any court in the land that a contract between individuals be carried out in accordance with its terms.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, on page 122 are some minority views of three members of the now majority, in which we differ with the committee report and point out that we are opposed to the provisions of the bill insofar as they grant to the States the area between the low-water mark and the outer edge of the so-called marginal belt or the historic State boundary. We believe this to be a windfall to a few States at the expense of all the States.

We do favor the provisions of the bill which confirm in the Federal Government the so-called outer Continental Shelf, except in one important respect, and it is to that I want to address myself briefly.

I am not under any misapprehension about the likely outcome of this debate in view of the forceful point made by my good friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. WILSON] that this bill has already been passed several times with margin to spare. If it is to pass, however, that is all the more reason for us to be sure that its provisions are sound.

It seems to me it is fraught with dangerous possibilities for the States to have the right to tax property which is held to belong to the United States as is provided on page 12 of this bill. I propose at the appropriate time to offer an amendment to provide expressly that this power shall not be vested in the States, and affirmatively that State taxation laws shall not apply in the areas of the outer Continental Shelf. With all due regard for the opinion of our able Secretary of the Interior as related here by the gentleman from Texas, I feel certain, as a lawyer and legislator, that we should not include this State power in this bill. It would be a precedent which this Congress should never adopt. Nor

is the objection to it cured, in my judgment, by a provision that it shall apply only until the Congress gets ready to do something different. Now is the time when we are legislating on this bill. Now is the time we should say or refuse to say that the abutting States shall have this taxing power.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that at this point in the RECORD I may be permitted to include the text of a proposed amendment which I shall offer when we are reading the bill, in order that the Members may be informed regarding the position which I have outlined.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. The text of this amendment is to strike out the paragraph on page 12 beginning with line 9 through line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, or such regulations as the Secretary may adopt, the laws of each coastal State which so provides shall be applicable to that portion of the outer Continental Shelf which would be within the area of the State if its boundaries were extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer Continental Shelf, and the Secretary shall determine and publish lines defining each such area of State jurisdiction: *Provided, however*, That State taxation laws shall not apply in such areas of the outer Continental Shelf. The Secretary shall reimburse the abutting States in the amount of the reasonable costs of the administration of such laws.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a rather interesting contradiction manifest here today. Mary Pickford out on the steps of the Capitol has just launched a program to raise some 3 or 4 billion dollars through bond sales, while we here in the House are in the act of giving away billions of dollars of public property. At least, if we stand by the decision of the Supreme Court it is entirely fair to say that we are giving this area to the States that are asking for it.

I would like to quote a statement which should be considered in contrast with the statement of President Eisenhower, which was read some time ago. This statement was made on June 16, 1952.

He was referring to an earlier statement he had made on the tidelands question. On June 16, Candidate Eisenhower said:

I did not know that there was a great struggle going on and I found out later that there was a Supreme Court decision on it, and I am one who obeys the Supreme Court.

One can obey the Supreme Court I assume and still support this legislation, but if one is going to obey the Supreme Court I think he should acknowledge that that decision of the Court to the effect that the States have no title in the submerged lands should stand, and we should then go on to decide whether or not we want to grant title, whether or not we want to give away, if you call it that, this land, this oil, and these minerals to the various States.

I see my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is here. Earlier today, I was somewhat surprised to hear him indirectly attack the Supreme Court urging that Congress should override the Supreme Court.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Supreme Court is one of our great American institutions. Many Members of this House who apparently are supporting this legislation thought the Supreme Court was a great institution when it overrode the President's order by which he attempted to take over the steel industry of this country. This is the same court that made that decision.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope I did.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I recognize the Supreme Court as one of the three coordinate branches of Government in this country, but I do not have to fall in love with those who compose its membership at a particular time or make certain decisions that have been handed down.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the gentleman will have to accept more than one decision, though.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not at this point; I will later.

If we hold that the legal title here is really vested in the Federal Government, then we must establish other grounds upon which to grant title to the States. It has been argued that we should do so in equity. The gentleman from Texas said he did not want charity, so I suppose we should not give it to them in charity.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I presume the gentleman from Minnesota also heard the gentleman from Texas, Mr. WILSON, make the statement that there had been a lot of propaganda about the other States, other than Texas, California, and Louisiana. I will ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this purported claim resulted from the interest of these three States alone?

Mr. McCARTHY. I think that is right.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman recognizes, I am sure, that even if the gentleman accepts the Supreme Court decision in these cases that Congress would still have to legislate; is not that a fact?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I accept that.

Mr. BOGGS. Does the gentleman deny the right of Congress to interpret or even to override a Supreme Court decision?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I do not think so; I have not denied that. But I do think it is dangerous to say that we should not pay attention to the Supreme Court decisions and that we should appeal to the Judiciary Committee or to the Committee on Insular Affairs for a reversal of the decisions.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman knows that Congress has legislated many times.

Mr. McCARTHY. I accept that to an extent, but the Supreme Court decision in this case was not based on statutory authority; throughout it was based on constitutional authority and upon the basis of traditional and historical arguments and treaties.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I cannot yield further. I have given more of my time now than I can spare.

If we can assume that the proponents of this bill accept the decisions of the Court to the effect that the coastal States do not have title and ownership of the lands beneath the marginal seas, the question to be debated and settled then is this, of whether for reasons of equity, or of charity, or for pragmatic reasons, such as the more rapid, or more orderly development of these resources, or in consideration of international relations and possible international conflicts, title to these lands should be granted to the States bordering on the seas, or whether title to these lands shall remain with the Federal Government.

The Supreme Court holds that the oil and other minerals in the submerged lands belong and have always belonged to the United States. The States thus appear to have no sound legal title. Can they claim title on the basis of the ordinary extra legal claims to ownership, or occupancy, control, and development, or adverse possession? The advocates of this transfer argue that a court of equity would settle the question promptly in favor of the person who had held possession of the land in good faith for over 100 years. They fail to prove this contention.

The case in equity is not much better than the case for legal claim. The States of the Union have not defended or assumed responsbility for this area.

First. They have not entered into international disputes or international agreements regarding it. They would not have been recognized by other nations if they had attempted such negotiations. Second. They have not even claimed title until recently. The commonly accepted definition of public lands both by the Republic of Texas and by the United States excluded the submerged lands of the marginal sea from the general term "public lands"—see brief for the United States in support of motion for judgment, United States against State of Texas, October term 1949, pages 22–34. The debates and correspondence relative to the question of the payment of public debt of Texas when admission to the Union was under consideration, show that all parties considered the vacant and unappropriated lands to be the equivalent of public lands. For example, when a special committee of the Texas constitutional convention appointed to inquire into the amount of appropriated and unappropriated domain in Texas and the value of such lands with a view to payment of the Texas debt reported it did not list in its report submerged lands of the marginal sea.

Debates in the Texas constitutional convention clearly showed also that the

"vacant and unappropriated lands" were lands for occupancy, or else waste lands and mountain ranges. There is no mention of submerged lands, or areas within the marginal seas. Until recent years the Commissioner of the Texas General Land Office did not include lands under the Gulf in accounting for the disposition of the public domain. The report of 1880, for example, showed the total domain of the State as 172,604,160 acres, comprising 151,811,390 acres already granted or reserved for specified purpose, 1,722,880 acres of bays and 19 million plus acres subject to location. The 1936 report estimated the total area at 170,936,080 acres, comprising 165,852,244 acres surveyed, granted or reserved, 1,500,000 acres unsurveyed in coastal areas, river beds, and vacancies, less loss due to conflicts estimated at 3,500,000 acres. Neither tabulation included lands below low water mark in the Gulf. In the 1941 report the Commissioner gave 170,926,000 acres as total area of the State, and the total area to the three league limit as 172,687,000 acres of which 3,250,000 were in submerged lands. This appears to be the first inclusion of the Gulf lands in any itemization of the State's public domain. This is a very recent expansion of the definition of "vacant and unappropriated lands."

Third. To what extent have the coastal States developed the submerged lands in the Continental Shelf. Unquestionably there has been some development of resources. The value of such development and the extent of operations has been very limited and insufficient as a basis for a claim in equity. It would be comparable to claiming a section of the national forests because one had picked blue berries in it without being molested, or hauled out a load or two of gravel. The fact that one had picked the blue berries would scarcely establish claim to the timber stand in the area, or to minerals beneath the ground. When California, then Louisiana and Texas, through their lessees went out into the marginal sea and appropriated for their own use and benefit mineral resources to which the Supreme Court has ruled they had no claim, they did not ask or obtain permission from Congress, or any other Federal agency. After the Senate in 1937 passed a resolution authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to assert and maintain the title of the United States to the oil in the submerged lands they did not stop, and even after the decision in the California case in 1947 Texas at least continued to make leases, and obtained the sum of approximately $8,300,000 in bonuses and began the collection of rentals for leased areas. Even after the 1950 decision Texas and Louisiana have continued to make collections.

If existing leases are ratified and confirmed as was contemplated under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 20 which was considered last year, and as is provided for in the Anderson bill, the claims in equity on the part of the State for their contribution to the development of the oil resources in the Continental Shelf will be more than adequately repaid. They are being allowed to keep the many millions they have obtained from natural resources which the Supreme Court has held belong to the Federal Government.

As a matter of fact the oil companies and engineers can probably make a better case on these grounds to ownership than can the State of Texas, and the coastal States. They risked funds, they provided the men and materials. If they had come from New Jersey could Texas have disputed their claims or halted their work and by what power? On the other hand, the Federal Government, since the United States was established, has claimed sovereignty over the seas adjacent to the United States, and since the Executive proclamation of September 1945, issued by President Truman, has claimed on behalf of the United States control over mineral resources of submerged lands under the sea off the shores of the United States to the edge of the Continental Shelf. The Federal Government has assumed responsibility for the defense of the coasts from the beginning of the Nation.

At the time of negotiations between Texas and the United States for annexation of Texas, that Republic was eager to obtain the protection of the United States forces in defending its territory from attack from the Indians and from the Republic of Mexico. The 3-league claim of Texas, prior to annexation was never recognized as having the same force as the 3-mile understanding accepted then, and since the 3-mile limit was determined by the fact that early cannon could fire no more than 3 miles. The Texas cannons apparently were three times more powerful.

Diplomatic correspondence resulting from the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo shows clearly the concern of other nations over the boundary provisions. A major contention of those supporting the special claim of Texas to a marginal seabelt extending 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico has been that this claim was recognized in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo between the United States and Mexico and ratified after the admission of Texas in 1845. Article V of the treaty contains this clause:

> The boundary line between the two Republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, 3 leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande, otherwise called Rio Bravo del Norte, or opposite the mouth of its deepest branch, if it should have more than one branch emptying directly into the sea (5 Miller Treaties 213).

This treaty established a line between the United States and Mexico at only one point on the coast. Maps of the time show no signs of a seaward boundary off the coast of the United States and Mexico. This was simply an extension of a boundary point at one point on the coast. Where the boundary line was located on the west coast it was drawn only to the coast and not extended 3 leagues into the sea. Article V says specifically with regard to the boundary "thence across the Rio Colorado, following the division between upper and lower California, to the Pacific Ocean."

The text of article V of the treaty and memorandums, and letters passed between the United States and Mexican officials charged with the actual plotting of the line indicate their concern only with the line extending from the mouth of the Rio Grande, not its extension across the Gulf, or its determination on the west coast. Moreover, for over 100 years the United States Department of State has consistently interpreted the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo as not establishing the international seaward boundary off the coasts of Mexico and Texas.

A letter to Senator Connally, on December 30, 1949, contains this statement:

> Accordingly, this United States Government claims and asserts the extent of territorial waters in the Gulf of Mexico and elsewhere along its coasts of three marine miles. It does not recognize any claim other than its own as binding on the relations of the United States with foreign nations. It does not, therefore, recognize the Texas claim of 3 leagues as binding for international purposes and does not recognize the Texas claim as binding upon Mexico or the nationals of Mexico.

Excerpts of earlier diplomatic correspondence bear out this explanation.

Mr. Buchanan to Mr. Crompton, August 19, 1848:

> In answer, I have to state that the stipulation in the treaty can only affect the rights of Mexico and the United States. If for their mutual convenience it has been deemed proper to enter into such an arrangement, third parties can have no just use of complaint. The Government of the United States never intended by this stipulation to question the rights which Great Britain, or any other power may possess under the law of nations.

On September 3, 1863, Secretary of State affirmed the same interpretation.

On January 22, 1875, Mr. Fish to Sir E. Thornton:

> We have always understood and asserted that pursuant to public law no nation can rightfully claim jurisdiction at sea beyond a marine league from its coast. * * * In respect to the provision in the Treaty with Mexico, it may be remarked that it was probably suggested by the passage in the act of Congress referred to "12-mile customs rule" and designed for the same purpose, that of preventing smuggling.

On June 3, 1936, Mr. De L. Boal to Senor General Hay, said this:

> That portion of article V of the treaty of 1848 which the Mexican Foreign Office quotes relates only to the boundary line at a given point and furnishes no authority for Mexico to claim generally that its territorial waters extend 9 miles from the coast. * * * Presumably it is true as indicated by a note sent by this Department to the British Minister of January 22, 1875, that the arrangement thus made between the United States and Mexico with respect to the Gulf of Mexico was designed to prevent smuggling in the particular area covered by the arrangement. * * * To say that because the United States agreed that in one area, so far as the United States was concerned, Mexican territorial waters extended 3 leagues from land, therefore Mexico was entitled to claim such an extent of territorial waters adjacent to her entire coastline is a deduction which the terms of article V of the treaty of 1848 do not warrant.

The convention of 1838 between the United States and the Republic of Texas establishing the northern boundary did not extend the boundary 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico.

In 1838 the United States and the newly forced Republic of Texas entered

into a convention to establish a boundary line betwen the two Republics. This convention is especially important in analyzing the true intent of article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo since its represents a boundary line with the independent Republic of Texas terminating at the mouth of a navigable river at the time the Republic of Texas claimed extent of territorial waters 3 leagues into the gulf.

The convention provided for the appointment of Commissioners to "proceed to run and mark that portion of the said boundary which extends from the mouth of the Sabine, where that river enters the Gulf of Mexico, to the Red River"—Eighth Statute, page 511. The Joint Commission was formed and actually began running the line from the mouth of the Sabine River, and not 3 leagues from the mouth into the gulf.

> On the 21st we proceeded to the entrance of the Sabine River into the Gulf of Mexico, and then, in virtue of our respective powers, and in conformity to the provisions of the convention between the two countries * * * we established the point of begining of the boundary between the United States and the Republic of Texas at a mound on the western bank of the junction of the river Sabine with the sea. (S. Doc. 199, 27th Cong., 2d sess., p. 59.)

Thus a boundary line was agreed to between the two republics beginning at the mouth of a river emptying into the Gulf of Mexico at a time when Texas claimed territorial water extending three leagues into the gulf. No mention was made of a line extending three leagues into the sea between the two republics, and the boundary commission took no notice of such a line.

This is certainly added evidence that the line at the mouth of the Rio Grande extending three leagues into the gulf established by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was drawn for other purposes than establishing the extent of territorial waters off the State of Texas and Mexico. The equity and justice pleas seems to have little substance.

Denying any valid claim in equity shall we then grant title to the coastal States in charity? We have in the past given small parcels of the public domain to States. In most cases they were of little value. It is estimated that there are at least 2.5 billion barrels of oil within the off-shore historic boundaries claimed by California, Louisiana, and Florida, alone. Surveys indicate a minimum of 15 million barrels of oil in the Continental Shelf surrounding the United States, plus natural gas valued at $10 billion. At $4.50 per barrel, the value of the petroleum claimed by the three States would come to approximately $11 billion. The value of oil estimated to exist in the Continental Shelf amounts at this price to approximately 67.5 billion. To grant title to such wealth would seem to go somewhat beyond the bounds of ordinary charity. Especially since the Nation as a whole owes a public debt of nearly $300 billion. Of course, not this whole amount would come into the national Treasury, but royalties of 8 to 10 billion would likely be received from oil developments alone.

The Supreme Court has held that the coastal States do not have any legal titled or claim to the lands beneath the marginal sea. Equity and justice clearly do not demand transfer of title to the States, but rather call for restitution to the Federal Government for encroachment and depletion of minerals which the Supreme Court has ruled are owned by the Federal Government. It is difficult to make a case for a charitable grant. In any case the proponents have insisted that they are not asking for charity.

Having lost their case on these three counts, the proponents might still argue that title should be given to them for practical reasons. Would Federal control impede or lessen the development of these resources? Impossible to prove. Development will be under lease to private oil companies in any case. States do not have a very good record of orderly development of depleting resources, or of sound conservation practices. Threat of legal action against coastal States has already been made by other States. Such litigation would prolong and further delay development.

International relations will not be simplified, but complicated. The proponents of this legislation in criticizing the Supreme Court have seized on the phrase "international domain" and contend that it means that beyond the low-water mark the rights of the international community rather than those of the United States prevail. Obviously, this was not the intent of the Court. What was clearly meant was that once the low-water mark is passed the Federal Government holds paramount rights, derived historically from international law and agreement. The Federal Government has never appealed to State claims seaward in settling international disputes in the waters adjacent to the United States.

It should be remembered that the United States proclamation of 1945, whereby we claim title to the edge of the marginal shelf has never been recognized by international agreement, although most other nations have now made similar claims. There is a special problem in the case of Alaska, for example, which has a continental shelf which is also the Continental Shelf of Siberia. Certainly if our Continental Shelf had been invaded or encroached upon before or after 1945 we would not have based our defense of it upon seaward claims of California if the event had occurred off the coast of California, or upon Texas claims, had it occurred in the Gulf.

States do not have a claim which is good in law, in justice, in equity, or in charity. They cannot make an argument for the greater practicality of State development. On the other hand the Federal Government does have a legal claim established in three Supreme Court decisions. In justice and equity the Federal Government has a sound case. It appears that more immediate and orderly development of the Continental Shelf is likely to occur under Federal jurisdiction and control, and that this development can take place without endangering national defense or international relations. For these varied and compelling reasons the quitclaim legislation should be rejected.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is this not a claim of squatter sovereignty?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know what kind of squatter sovereignty a State might exercise in the marginal sea, but I do not think that any good or provisional or conditional title to the lands beneath the marginal sea has been established by the States.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has stated that the State Department has said that the United States was not ready to defend any boundaries beyond 3 miles. Will the gentleman reconcile that with the provisions of article V of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which is the treaty which fixed the boundary between the United States and Mexico and which fixes that boundary starting at a point 3 leagues seaward from the mouth of the Rio Grande River?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes; I will be glad to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Buchanan, in an official note to England August 19, 1848, with regard to this question, stated:

> In answer, I have to state that the stipulation in the treaty can only affect the rights of Mexico and the United States. If for their mutual convenience it has been deemed proper to enter into such an arrangement, third parties can have no just use of complaint. The Government of the United States never intended by this stipulation to question the rights which Great Britain, or any other power, may possess under the law of nations.

Here is another statement in 1936 from the United States to Mexico:

> That portion of article V of the treaty of 1848 which the Mexican Foreign Office quotes relates only to the boundary line at a given point and furnishes no authority for Mexico to claim generally that its territorial waters extend 9 miles from the coast. * * * Presumably it is true as indicated by a note sent this Department to the British Minister of January 22, 1875, that the arrangement thus made between the United States and Mexico with respect to the Gulf of Mexico was designed to prevent smuggling in the particular area covered by the arrangement. * * * To say that because the United States agreed that in one area, so far as the United States was concerned, Mexican territorial waters extended 3 leagues from land, therefore Mexico was entitled to claim such an extent of territorial waters adjacent to her entire coastline, is a deduction which the terms of article V of the treaty of 1848 do not warrant.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, if it was in my power or my understanding of the Constitution and the laws of the country to do something for my brothers from Texas, I would be glad to do it. They started my State; they brought cattle up from the South, and after we were

run down at the heels a while and got in trouble, they started bringing oil machines up there, and they are up there now. If I could bring my mind in line with what they would like to have me do, I would do it. But, as I see the situation, you are asking the Government to give you something the Government does not own. They say Texas came into the Union on an equal footing with other States. Well, she now claims 10½ miles, 3 leagues. That was her boundary when she was a Republic. But, if she came in on an equal footing with the rest of the States, she came in on an equal footing and there was no State and there is no State today that came into this Union with a 3-mile limit. There is no decision of the Supreme Court of the United States today indicating that the Government of the United States owns any of the land from the low-water mark seaward.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Surely I will yield.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. We, in Texas, appreciate the gentleman's remarks about trying to do something for us.

Mr. BURDICK. I am sure you do.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The gentleman is a lawyer——

Mr. BURDICK. Yes, and a good one.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. And recognizes, of course, that a specific statement in a contract overrides a general statement; does he not?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the general law?

Mr. BURDICK. I will give you an example. Amos and Andy were fighting over a contract, and Amos said, "You are stuck now." Andy says "How so?" Amos said, "This contract sticks you, because in the big letters you are given something but in the little letters it takes it all away."

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The language pertaining to equal footing, which is the last paragraph in this treaty, reads: The general term "equal footing" is superseded, we say, by this specific language:

> Second, said State when admitted into the Union, after ceding to the United States all public edifices, fortifications, barracks, forts, and harbors, navy and navy yards, docks, magazines, arms, armaments, and all other property and means pertaining to the public defense belonging to said Republic of Texas shall retain all the public funds, debts, taxes, and dues of every kind which may belong to or be due and owing said Republic; and shall also retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits, to be applied to the payment of the debts and liabilities of said Republic of Texas; and the residue of said lands, after discharging said debts and liabilities of said Republic of Texas; and the residue of said lands, after discharging said debts and liabilities, to be disposed of as said State may direct.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, that is the longest question that was ever asked me.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Now, does the gentleman think that those specific words in a contract, which you would enter into or which this Congress would enter into with a new State coming into the Union, should override the general term of "equal footing"?

Mr. BURDICK. Well, I would say this, that the Government would have no power to grant one State an advantage over any other State that is already a member of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Does the gentleman understand that Texas was a republic?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. It was not a territory bought by the United States; it was an independent republic and made a contract by its Congress and its President with the President and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BURDICK. It came in as a State; that is, it gave up its rights as a republic and came in as a State.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the question of the unappropriated lands, I hardly think that in the year the joint resolution was passed the term "unappropriated lands" was meant to include the lands underneath the sea.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. It is public lands.

Mr. BURDICK. Let us get this established right here first, then we will argue from that point on. Is there any decision by the Supreme Court of the United States giving the Government title to any land beyond low-water mark?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Not the Federal Government.

Mr. BURDICK. Then it follows that the Government could not give away something it did not have.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. This is a quitclaim deed as opposed to a warranty. This bill does not give a warranty deed to anything. It says if the Government has any interest in these historic boundaries they quitclaimed them to the States. This is not a general warranty deed.

Mr. BURDICK. I think under the circumstances you would be willing to take any kind of a deed.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. I think "quitclaim" is used in a technical sense here. What we seek is to have the Federal Government quit claiming our land. It is ours. It was ours in the first place, so the bill says. They should quit claiming it if they do not have any title.

Mr. BURDICK. Has any decision of the Supreme Court ever come to your attention claiming that Massachusetts, Rhode Island, or any other State along the Atlantic seaboard owned any of the land beyond the low-water mark? Has any such decision come to light?

Mr. WILLIS. There is a decision involving the State of Illinois or one of the Great Lakes States recognizing title way out into the Great Lakes up to the boundary between the United States and Canada. The rule was, where did the Supreme Court get that jurisdiction? It quoted prior cases to sustain the proposition that there was no difference between the open sea and the fresh water in the lakes. So I say, yes, there are many, many decisions on that point.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. May I bring to the attention of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] and others that the case of the Illinois Central Railroad against the State of Illinois was strictly an inland water matter, and it did not pertain at all to submerged land seaward from the low-water mark.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, the reason there was no Supreme Court decision on that matter before that time was that until Mr. Ickes nobody ever questioned the States' title to the 3 miles or 10½ miles.

Mr. BURDICK. Nobody ever thought the States owned it, either.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. There are plenty of decisions that held the States did own it, some 52 of them.

Mr. BURDICK. I asked for one case showing that the Government owned the land beyond the low-water mark.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. There are 52 decisions.

Mr. BURDICK. Not one.

Mr. YATES. There is no decision that states that. The 52 decisions relate to the inland waters.

Mr. BURDICK. What I am afraid of is that you are going to get into international trouble giving away land you do not own. When you get out into the Continental Shelf where it extends out 200 miles—I believe that is what you wanted last year, the Continental Shelf—just the moment you start doing business on the Continental Shelf you are getting into international situations.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who has always voted for the tidelands bill. I do not know that my State has any vital, immediate interest in the subject so my vote has been based upon what I thought was the rightness of the situation. I agree that the States are entitled to their historic boundaries, extending out 3 miles, and I agree that the State of Texas by reason of the treaty under which it entered the Union is entitled to its 3 leagues. But, I am disturbed about another question which, unless it is answered to my satisfaction, I am afraid will prevent me and a few other Members who have no special interest in this matter, from voting for this bill on its final passage. That is the question of taxation by the States of federally owned property between the 3-mile limit and the end of the Continental Shelf. I cannot see any reason for that. I have great respect and admiration for my friend, the gentleman from Texas, FRANK WILSON, and I listened to his argument. I want to tell him I was not convinced. I do not believe we have any right to say to a State that they can tax the Government on federally owned property. I think that clause ought to come out of this bill, and some of us are going to be placed in a position of not being able to vote for the bill unless it does come out. That troubles me very, very much. I wish it were out of the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will get me some more time because there are 1 or 2 other things here that I want to discuss.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Did the gentleman hear me read section 189 of the Federal Leasing Act with regard to lands in the Western States, where the Government owns the land?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; I listened to the gentleman very carefully and very attentively because I have great respect for his opinion.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Does that not have any weight with the gentleman at all?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, I differ with him. I think it is different when the land is in the State itself. This is actually outside the State in the tidelands, and it is outside of the States' traditional boundaries. I do not think we should be permitting the States to tax that which belongs to the Federal Government.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Does not the gentleman think that this outer Continental Shelf will become part of the public domain of the United States, if this bill passes with title 3 in it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will answer that. I think it will become part of the public domain as far as our sovereignty will permit us to do so and to hold it, but I do not think that for that reason it becomes part of the public domain of any State that might be adjacent to it. That is where I differ with the gentleman. I differ with him on the ground that what is outside of the 3-mile limit is not in the State and never was in the State, and therefore, that is different from granting rights within the State itself. As my friend the gentleman from Texas knows, I regret very much to differ with him, but I do; and I do not believe I can go along with this bill with that provision in it.

Then there is another provision that I was going to ask the gentleman to explain as to just what it means. That is the provision in section 9 (g) on page 17. The language is as follows:

> (g) The provisions of sections 17, 17(b), 28, 30, 30 (a), 30 (b), 32, 36, and 39 of the Mineral Leasing Act to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the terms of this act, are made applicable to lands leased or subject to lease by the Secretary under title III of this act.

The report does not explain what that means. What does it do?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That only affects the mechanical part of it, the Federal Leasing Act, so as to permit the Department of the Interior or the Secretary to do certain things.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It does not give the States any jurisdiction outside of the 3-mile limit, or 3 leagues, as the case may be?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. None whatsoever. It delegates authority to the Secretary of Interior entirely.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There is one other question about this bill which I think we ought to take care of. Much to my regret, it looks like Hawaii will soon become a State of the Union. As you all know, it consists of a great many islands scattered all over the Pacific Ocean. I think there should be a provision in this bill that would exclude from its operation any State that may be hereafter admitted to the Union, because I do not know what we are getting into. There are about a thousand miles of stretches of ocean in the Pacific that would come under the provisions of this act, unless you exclude it. It seems to me if you are going to make Hawaii a State, we might leave that out of this bill and work on that a little later, because you will get yourselves involved in all sorts of things if you undertake to make this bill apply to the State of Hawaii.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I had not up to this time thought about the provisions of this bill applying to any future State. I would not have any objection to putting in such an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It says that any State that came in after the first 13 States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. What about the possibilitiy of Alaska coming into the Union? Would that not be the same?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think so. We do not know what problems will arise in the future. We should deal with the present and not with the future.

Mr. CELLER. We state that the continental survey off the coast of Alaska extends something like 600 miles.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is it not true that the bill provides that any future State would only be able to exert its sovereignty and ownership up to 3 miles? It is limited to that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That may be, but what is that 3 miles going to consist of when you begin to consider it around a series of coral reefs? I do not see the point of putting Hawaii in here. I think it would be the part of wisdom to leave it out.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Would the gentleman be willing to revert again to the question he raised on the right of the States to tax? I am highly in accord with his position. I am not going to support this bill if that provision remains in it. Of course I understand one swallow does not make a summer and so one vote will not determine what will become of this bill, but if that provision remains in this bill I shall not vote for the bill. I think the gentleman is on safe, wise, and solid ground. I think that is one of the serious defects of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the gentleman expresses the sentiment of a great many Members in this House who have no particular interest in this bill except to do what is right and fair to both the States and the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, we have come to the point in the debate where virtually all of the chief arguments on both sides of this important question have been profoundly advanced, and there is probably not much that I can add in the form of new matter, because of the extensive debate we have had so far. I think it might be helpful to the committee at this time if I should endeavor to summarize some of the arguments that have been advanced against the legislation by its opponents, and endeavor to summarize some of the answers to those arguments which have been made previously in the debate.

Of course, there has been the argument used over and over again by the opponents of the measure which says that the Supreme Court has already spoken on this question, and therefore there can be no further action, because final action has already been taken by the Supreme Court as far as the submerged lands in question are concerned.

It has been pointed out in the previous debate that if action should be taken by the House on this subject, it might well be ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, and that is advanced as a reason why the legislation should not be approved. Then it has been said that the Federal Government cannot give away something it does not own. Of course, the phrase "give away" has been constantly used in the debate.

The second argument that has been used quite extensively is that only three States of the Union are involved, and if we approve this legislation, we are going to be benefiting three States at the expense of the other States of the Union.

Then, too, it has been said that the present administration's position on this issue has been confused. One previous speaker in the course of the debate said that the administration was "all fouled up," insofar as its position on this issue was concerned. Then, too, it has been argued that if we disapprove this legislation and accept the questionable position of the Supreme Court on this whole issue that there is no need for any State to fear that its inland waters might not be jeopardized in the future. We are told that there is absolutely no concern there whatsoever so that is given as a reason why there is no particular need for serious consideration of the present legislation.

Then, too, the argument has been very strongly put to the committee that if we should approve this legislation we might seriously harm our national defense program, because if we allow the States and their lessees to deplete the natural resources in the submerged coastal areas that might hurt our national defense program, and that this legislation could possibly result in that effect.

Then, finally, an argument has been advanced perhaps not so much in the debate today as it has been in the press and the discussions outside these Halls in recent weeks, the argument that if we approve this legislation to restore State ownership in the submerged lands it

means that the States of the Union will then begin to claim ownership rights in the so-called public lands within those States.

Mr. Chairman, that is a rather brief and off-the-cuff summary of some of the points which have been raised by the opponents of the bill so far. Now, very briefly, I would like to try to answer some of those arguments by summarizing some of the answers which have already been advanced this afternoon.

Certainly as to the first argument, the fact that the Supreme Court has spoken means that there should be no action by the Congress, the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. REED], has given a most effective answer, a very scholarly discussion not only of this bill but of all the constitutional aspects of the submerged-lands legislation. I think it is worth repeating at this time that the Supreme Court of the United States in its decisions on this question urged legislation by the Congress to meet this particular problem.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on this particular subject?

Mr. HILLINGS. Not now; I will yield later. The Court said that Congress had the power to restore and confirm State ownership of the submerged lands. I want to quote specifically its decision in the California case. The Court said this:

> Article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in the Congress power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States. We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. (*United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16).) Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies may proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power.

Certainly that is an effective answer to the argument that Congress cannot act.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. Not at this point.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think the gentleman is getting an incorrect interpretation of what that law means.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. I decline to yield at this time. I will try to yield later.

It has been pointed out earlier by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] that for over a hundred years the decisions of the Court have consistently maintained that the States had the rights of ownership in the submerged lands adjoining the coast. It has been pointed out, too, that those decisions were recognized by the Federal Government, even by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, until the magic discovery of oil brought about a change in the attitude of the Federal Government. This change resulted in the desire of certain people in Washington to use Federal power to take away from the States the submerged lands they had, to put the rich resources in those lands under the Federal Government's control and ownership.

The argument has been made that the United States has no title to that land and therefore it cannot quitclaim it to the States. I would like to quote again from another Supreme Court decision, the case of *Cunard S. S. Co.* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 122), in which decision the Court said:

> It is now settled in the United States and recognized elsewhere that the territory subject to its jurisdiction includes the land areas under its dominion and control, the ports, harbors, bays, and other enclosed arms of the sea along its coast and a marginal belt of the sea extending from the coastline outward a marine league, or 3 geographic miles.

The Court in this case used the word "territory." It did not say that the United States Government actually owned the lands, but certainly it used the word "territory." If we refer back to article IV of the Constitution of the United States where the word "territory" is again used we will be given a clear understanding of what "territory" actually means because article IV of the Constitution says that the Congress shall have the power to dispose of or to make rules and regulations respecting territory or other property belonging to the United States. So, even if we concede, which I do not say we necessarily do, but even if we concede, the fact that the Supreme Court did not say the Federal Government had ownership in the submerged land, that would not prevent the Federal Government from quitclaiming or giving up title to the land. By its previous decision, the Supreme Court said that territory of the Federal Government includes all land under its jurisdiction and control.

Then there is the argument that only three States would benefit. It has been pointed out previously that actually there are many more than three States which make up the coastal area of the United States. It has been pointed out, too, that under this legislation nine-tenths of the submerged lands in question would go to the United States Government and one-tenth of the area in question would actually go to the various States. The Federal Government would have something like 237,000 miles, which would include the actual resources therein, and the States would only have something like 26,000 miles—that is, the individual States making up the coastal areas. Of course, when we think of the inland areas, when we think of the Great Lakes, the fisheries in Maine, in Florida, and all of the other areas of this country where we have inland waters certainly every single State of the Union is interested in and is directly concerned with this important legislation.

Then there is the basic question of the sovereignty of the States involved in this entire legislation; so, certainly, all 48 States are directly concerned.

There has also been the argument that the administration's position has been confused on this question. Earlier in the debate I pointed out the President's position. His position has been very strong; it has been repeated several times in the last few weeks at press conferences and elsewhere. I do not think that the administration is confused at all. It was an important plank in the President's campaign that the States would have returned to them title to all submerged lands and resources beneath inland and offshore waters which lie within historic State boundaries.

President Eisenhower in his own words made that very clear, and I would like to quote from a speech he made on the subject. These are President Eisenhower's words in New Orleans on October 13, 1952:

> The attack on the tidelands is only a part of the effort of the administration to amass more power and local responsibility.
>
> So, let me be clear in my position on the tidelands and all submerged lands and resources beneath inland and offshore waters which lie within historic State boundaries. As I have said before, my views are in line with my party's platform. I favor the recognition of clear legal title to these lands in each of the 48 States.
>
> This has been my position since 1948, long before I was persuaded to go into politics.

I do not think there is any question about the President's position. But regardless of the President's position, regardless of the political situation, there has probably been no piece of major legislation before the Congress for a long while which has been so bipartisan in nature. The attorneys general and the Governors of the overwhelming majority States of the Union, both Democratic and Republican, have backed this legislation consistently. The record is clear on the subject and the statements made in the hearings will bear that out. It is bipartisan legislation if ever we had bipartisan legislation.

Now, considerable has been said about the inland States if we allow the Federal Government to assert ownership and control over submerged coastal lands. That argument, of course, does not stand up. It has been used time and time again by people in the Federal Government just before they have gone ahead and attempted to assert ownership and control. For example, in the 1948 campaign Mr. Truman, as a candidate for President, and the Attorney General of that day, Tom Clark, told the people of Texas that they had nothing to fear despite the California decision if Mr. Truman and his administration were returned to office. Yet in December of 1948, a month after the election returns were in, the Federal Government began the cases against Louisiana and Texas despite the previous position it took in which it said: "You have nothing to fear in Texas and Louisiana."

Remember too that in the celebrated Fallbrook case the Federal Government used the paramount rights theory to assert rights of ownership in an inland stream in California. And the opponents of this bill say that there are no threats being made to our inland waters.

So, I do not think we can take that chance, because the previous record shows that the Federal Government has on other occasions gone ahead to assert claim of ownership against various States, despite what it said earlier. In February 1952 a Federal attack was made on the submerged lands off the coast of the State of Washington, and there is no indication that such a situation might not be repeated in the future.

Then there is the argument that State ownership of the submerged lands within the historical boundaries would harm the national defense program. That simply is not true. During the last war, World

War II, the States developed their natural resources, oil and other resources, and I never heard anyone criticize that operation by the States. I never heard anyone say that because the States developed those resources, our defense effort was harmed in any way. Certainly, the States have a right to develop them, and if they do, it means that we will eliminate much of the red tape that goes on when Federal bureaucracy takes control.

Then the final argument that has been advanced, if the legislation is approved, the States will then want to assert ownership and control over the public lands in the various States. I think there is a very definite distinction between submerged lands which are under consideration in this legislation and the so-called public lands. In the case of the submerged lands we are in this legislation restoring State ownership, ownership which had been in the States for over 100 years until the Supreme Court decision of 1947. This legislation would restore ownership which had heretofore been recognized. In the case of public lands it had never been recognized that there was any State ownership in those lands, and I am certain any claim any State might have of ownership to any public lands could not stand up on the basis of this legislation, and certainly this legislation would not give any precedent for such a claim.

Those are some of the answers to the questions raised, Mr. Chairman. This legislation means a great deal to my State of California and a great deal to all of the States. The revenue would mean more parks, harbors, playgrounds, schools, and improved beaches for all the people. It would benefit, of course, the people in all the States, but the important question, of course, is that this legislation will reaffirm and strengthen our republican form of government, the form of government that recognizes authority and sovereignty in the States themselves. I recall not long ago listening to an address by Dean Manion of Notre Dame University in which he pointed out why this country had prevented Federal dictatorship because of our system of sovereignty in the individual States. That is the great question before us. The rights of our States would be strengthened by the passage of this legislation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think, in the first instance, we should face the fact that the Supreme Court is the Court of last resort of our Government, and when they make their decision that is the law of the land. As President Eisenhower said, he will obey the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court very definitely and clearly in the California, the Texas and the Louisiana cases has settled this question. The exact wording in the California case, in the decree, is as follows:

> The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward 3 nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask the gentleman whether or not a similar decree was entered in the Texas and Louisiana cases?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes. The Supreme Court said that the United States has paramount rights and full dominion of the lands in the belt. Now, the Supreme Court having said that the Federal Government has paramount rights, dominion, and power over the submerged lands, and that the States have no title or interest therein, we are asked to appropriate to these various States off whose shores mineral deposits may be found in submerged lands that which the Supreme Court said does not belong to those States and does belong to the Federal Government.

You talk about a giveaway. If this bill passes it will give to those various States adjoining whose shores there are submerged lands running seaward from the lower-water mark, all right, title, and interest in these submerged lands, and we are to do that without getting any consideration therefor.

It seems very plain to me that since the Supreme Court says that the States have no title or interest in the submerged lands, and we turn these submerged lands over to the States without any consideration, it certainly is giving them away to the States.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Is not the creation of title in an area where there is no previous title, as the gentleman says the submerged lands area is, an exercise of the power of sovereignty? In other words, had not the British sovereign exercised his inchoate internal and external sovereignty by a positive act, there would never have been created private title within the British Empire nor within the colonies nor within the United States of America. Therefore, in this act by this Congress we are not giving away any title, we are not vesting any title, we are merely acting within the power of our sovereignty to establish a title where none existed before.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I disagree with that line of logic, if there is any in it. Because the land here involved is under the ocean, the high seas of the world, title and rights there depend on international law and not merely on the law of the adjacent sovereign country. Every nation as a sovereign has the right, which has been established in international law, to control submerged lands 3 miles from the low-water mark. That is the so-called 3-mile international belt. There has never been any question since 1793 that the United States has adhered to the recognition of that 3-mile belt.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the gentleman should point out that the only declaration of title here was by proclamation of 1945 by President Truman, who asserted the claim of the United States to the entire Continental Shelf.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the President's Continental Shelf proclamation of 1945 which related to the sea bed and subsoil under the high seas beyond the marginal belt, the President was careful not to assert title, but merely jurisdiction and control. This area is clearly outside of territorial waters and thus in a domain where international considerations prevail.

As to even the 3-mile belt, the paramount rights of the United States are predicated on its position as a member of the family of nations, as Justice Black said in the California case:

> The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title to the lands under the marginal sea. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner.

In other words, the United States has an interest there that is even more inclusive than mere legal title. In the Texas decision the Supreme Court defined dominium and imperium. Dominium they defined as ownership or proprietary rights and imperium they defined as governmental powers of regulation and control. In the Texas case, they said those two powers—imperium and dominium coalesced and here are the exact words:

> And so although diminium and imperium are normally separable and separate, this is an instance where property interests are so subordinated to the rights of sovereignty as to follow sovereignty.

We can be very definite and certain in the fact that the Supreme Court has stated the States do not own or have any title thereto or property interest in these submerged lands. Now Congress is asked by the terms of this bill to give away to the States these submerged lands which the Supreme Court, on three occasions, stated that the States had no title thereto or property interest therein.

We are asked to give them away in two ways, to give a quitclaim deed and if that does not work to delegate to the States authority to take these mineral deposits from the submerged lands.

It should be very patently clear that the Supreme Court decisions did not consider any inland waters, bays, lakes, or rivers. They considered only the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark. Let us not be confused about inland waters. The Supreme Court on 52 different occasions has confirmed in the States all rights and privileges and title to inland waters, rivers, and bays. The Supreme Court held that the Federal Government in owning these submerged lands of the marginal sea owned them as trustee for the whole 48 States. The theory of that was set out in the United States Supreme Court case of Illinois Central Railroad against Illinois. Only in that case it involved

inland waters. That was the situation where the State Legislature of Illinois had granted by legislation to the Illinois Central Railroad the whole Chicago lakefront. The Supreme Court held that the State of Illinois owned the bed of Lake Michigan in trust for the people of the State of Illinois and that the State of Illinois could not give it away or appropriate it to any private interest or corporation. By the same token, the Supreme Court has held that the Federal Government owns these submerged lands of the marginal sea as an attribute or incident of its national external sovereignty. If this is an inseparable incident of national sovereignty, then there is a grave doubt as to whether Congress can pass this bill.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

I note that the gentleman is calling attention to the Illinois Central Railroad case, which is reported in volume 146 of the United States Supreme Court Reports. In that case, the Court said that because the Great Lakes partook of the nature of the open seas, the same rule of ownership applied to them that had been followed by the Court with reference to the ownership of lands "under tidewaters on the borders of the seas."

Mr. FEIGHAN. That is absolutely correct because tidewater means the land over which the tide ebbs and flows.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. The gentleman is right.

Mr. FEIGHAN. So that is just another confirmation of the fact that the State owns tidelands and land underlying inland waters.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. That does not support the distinction that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, is making, I am afraid, because the gentleman is standing on the ground that we are taking in the former decisions in the Supreme Court of boundaries that had to do with inland bays and waters.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I said the Supreme Court decisions in the marginal sea cases had nothing to do with that. They were specifically excluded from the decision and from the decree.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I have not examined the files minutely. I am going by the language of the decision as laid down by the Supreme Court. In that decision the Court took the position that the Greak Lakes were no different, when it came to the matter of marginal lands and the 3-mile boundary line, than the tidelands that were affected by the tides on the seas.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In the Illinois Central case, the Court gave no consideration whatever to the marginal sea or to land underlying the open ocean. It related the ownership of land underlying the waters of the Great Lakes to the rule of ownership which applies to tidelands along the shore of the sea.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I am told there was a special master appointed to look into this matter, so we probably do not agree.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes. That is out in California. That is to determine the question of what is inland waters and what are waters seaward from the low-water mark.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. And that becomes a question of fact. But if the gentleman will bear with me 1 minute, I understood the gentleman to take the position this morning, in one of his questions, that regardless of what the Congress does there is no inherent power to disturb a decision of the Supreme Court, because the Court has said that the title is paramount. Regardless of what the Supreme Court does, the Congress cannot disturb any mandate of the Supreme Court?

Mr. FEIGHAN. No.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. That is not your position?

Mr. FEIGHAN. My position is that in view of the language of the Supreme Court, saying that the Federal Government has this dominion and power by virtue of its external sovereignty—it is quite possible that the United States Congress cannot, under article IV, give it away or appropriate it, by the same token that the State Legislature of Illinois could not give away the bed along Lake Michigan, because it held it in trust for the people of Illinois. By the same reasoning, these submerged lands seaward of the low-water mark are held in trust by the Federal Government for all the people.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I get the gentleman's point. It is somewhat conjectural. But the gentleman says the Congress could not disturb what the Supreme Court has ruled?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am raising that constitutional question.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. It is entirely possible, on reading those decisions, that we cannot act in this case under the strict interpretation of the Constitution, because of the use by the Supreme Court of the term, "Imperium and dominium."

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield again?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CELLER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Do I understand the gentleman to say in his question that the Congress of the United States cannot disturb a law or decree or edict that has been entered by the United States Supreme Court? In other words, they say, "we are paramount or supreme," and that fixes the basis upon which we can legislate?

Mr. YATES. Has the gentleman ever heard of the necessity of a constitutional amendment? The Court might hold this unconstitutional.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. One guess is as good as another.

Mr. FEIGHAN. May I just bring this to your attention: If the Supreme Court should decide—which they have not—that the ownership of the Federal Government in these submerged lands was merely a proprietary right, just as the Federal Government owns a chattel, then very definitely the Congress can, under article IV, dispose of it, appropriate it, or do what they wish. But I raise the constitutional question. If all we are dealing with is a mere fee-simple title, there is no question that the Congress can dispose of it without consideration. If, on the other hand, the United States holds its interest in the bed of the marginal seas, as an attribute of national sovereignty, it is subject to the argument that it is an inseparable attribute of national sovereignty. If this is so, I believe that the Supreme Court would hold that it is unconstitutional for Congress to give it away.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I think that the McGuire bill, which we passed in the last session to cure some of the shortcomings in previous legislation which the Supreme Court had pointed out was missing, is analogous to the situation here. I do not hold that the Supreme Court can by transposing words from their text create a situation where it takes from the Congress of the United States the power ever to legislate to cure or modify such a situation; I do not agree with that.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Under the tripartite system of government, the Supreme Court is that branch of the Government vested with the power to interpret our laws.

Preceding speakers stated that the Supreme Court looked to Congress for action. That is correct. What the Court was talking about was action by Congress to recognize the equities of those who have made investments in the development of the marginal seas in the past, under a mistaken assumption as to who owned the land. It was also contemplated that Congress would authorize the future development of the oil and gas deposits in these lands.

For the purposes of national security we need oil. Everyone will agree with that and under the Federal Leasing Act or under any other Federal statute there is no authority given by Congress to anyone to draw oil out of these submerged lands.

It is within the power of Congress to determine how those mineral deposits are to be withdrawn from the submerged lands.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the if the gentleman is not right in his concern as to the constitutionality of this issue here, for if I interpret the testimony of the Attorney General in the hearings before the Judiciary Committee he himself stated on page 220 of the hearings that instead of granting a blanket quitclaim title to the lands it would be better to grant all the rights that they need to develop the natural resources. He himself recognized the fact that a grave constitutional issue is involved here and, therefore, does not see the urgency of granting a blanket quitclaim title. I would like to point out further that one of the former Members whom we all loved here, the late Samuel Hobbs, a Representative from Alabama, who was a student of constitutional law and a scholar on this issue——

Mr. FEIGHAN. Exactly, but if the gentleman is going to read that I wish he would do it in his own time.

Mr. RODINO. All right.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I agree with the gentleman that the Attorney General's statement before the committee reflects a genuine apprehension as to the constitutionality of a proposal such as that contained in this bill.

With reference to the police power I think we should understand that these States do have police power, regulatory powers, out to the 3-mile limit, but in none of the Supreme Court decisions has that police power ever been interpreted as the State owning any portion of the submerged lands. In other words, a State can give a license to people to go out and fish but they do not have to own the submerged land over which that fishing is conducted.

I have introduced House Joint Resolution 126, which would provide that the Federal Government will manage and control the drilling of oil within the 3-mile limit. Thirty-seven and one-half percent of the royalties shall go to the State off whose shores these submerged lands lie, the remaining 62½ percent to be held in a special fund in the Treasury to be used during the present national emergency for such developments essential to the national defense as Congress may determine. After the national emergency is passed such money is to be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

I have prepared a section by section analysis of my resolution, House Joint Resolution 126, which I shall offer as a substitute to H. R. 1498. My analysis follows:

1. The whereas clauses are concerned primarily (1) with the increased need throughout the Nation for expanded school facilities of all types, (2) with the concept that public lands should be dedicated to creating an educated citizenry, (3) with the fact that leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf have already been issued by certain coastal States under claim of ownership, (4) with the holding of the Supreme Court that the United States has paramount rights in, and full dominion over the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, and (5) with the present need, in view of the national emergency, to continue without interruption the development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged land of the Continental Shelf.

2. The first section provides that all money received under the resolution except the 37½ percent paid the States as provided in section 8, shall be held in a special fund in the Treasury to be used during the present national emergency for such developments essential to the national defense and security as Congress may determine. After the national emergency is past, such money is to be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

3. The second section creates a National Advisory Council to be composed of persons experienced in the fields of education and public administration, and requires such Council to submit by February 1, 1955, a plan for the fair allocation of these grants-in-aid of education.

4. The third section provides that every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof which has issued any mineral leases covering submerged lands on the Continental Shelf must file with the Attorney General before December 31, 1953, a statement of all moneys or other things of value received since January 1, 1940, from or on account of such grant or lease. The Attorney General shall submit all such statements to Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

The purpose of this section is to furnish to Congress a background of information on the previous experience of the States with these leases.

5. Section 4 provides in effect that certain good-faith leases issued by the States to private operators are accorded Federal recognition provided they meet certain standards which are set forth in detail. Several of the conditions are that all royalties and other payments shall be made to the Secretary of the Interior, that all such leases require a minimum 12½-percent royalty, and that there must be a 5-year time limit on the lease.

Subsection (b) provides that the holder of a lease who meets the conditions may continue to maintain such lease and conduct operations under it in accordance with its provisions, and further provides that only after notice and hearing can such a leaseholder be deprived of this right.

Subsection (c) provides that the Secretary shall exercise all the control vested in the previous lessor by law or provision of lease.

Subsection (d) provides that permission granted to maintain a lease is not a waiver of any claim of the United States against the lessor or lessee which arose prior to the effective date of the resolution.

6. Section 5 provides that the Secretary of the Interior may after receiving the approval of the Attorney General disclaim all interests of the United States in tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters except those tidelands or submerged lands beneath inland waters which belong to or are held in trust by the United States.

The purpose of this section is to point up that the United States does not claim any interest in the true tidelands or the land under inland navigable waters.

7. Section 6 provides that if there is a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary of the Interior with the concurrence of the Attorney General has power to negotiate agreements with the State and other interested parties respecting operations under existing leases, (including payment of any moneys) and the issuance of new leases pending the settlement of the controversy. It also provides that payments made under any such agreement are made in compliance with the provisions of paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 4. It furthere provides that if the lands in controversy are determined to be submerged lands of the Continental Shelf (with paramount rights therefor in the United States), all of the provisions of section 4 must be complied with in order that leases on such land be valid.

8. Section 7 provides for the granting on the basis of competitive bidding of new mineral leases by the Secretary of the Interior on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf not already covered by valid leases. The States do not participate in the granting of these leases. Such a lease may cover an area of whatever size the Secretary may determine, shall be for 5 years and as long thereafter as oil and gas may be produced therefrom, shall require the payment of a royalty of at least 12½ percent and shall contain such other provisions as the Secretary may have prescribed. All moneys paid under such leases shall be disposed of as provided in the first section of the resolution.

Subsection (d) provides that the issuance of a lease for submerged land or the refusal to certify the United States does not claim any interest in submerged land shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement of the question of whether such land lies beneath navigable inland waters.

9. Section 8 provides that 37½ percent of all moneys received with respect to operations under leases of any type in submerged coastal lands shall be paid within 90 days after the end of each fiscal year by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State within whose seaward boundary such submerged lands lie. The seaward boundary is defined as a line 3 miles distant from the points at which the paramount rights of the Federal Government in the submerged lands begin. The moneys received pursuant to any agreement pending the settlement of a controversy over the status of submerged lands are excepted from the provisions of this section.

If the United States takes and receives in kind any royalty, the value of such royalty shall be deemed to be the prevailing market price of such royalty at the time and place of production, and 37½ percent of such value shall be paid to the State entitled thereto. This means that if the United States accepts oil instead of money, 37½ percent of the market value of such oil is to be paid to the State which is entitled to it.

10. Section 9 provides for the issuance by the Secretary of whatever regulations he deems advisable to carry out this resolution.

11. Section 10 provides for the withdrawal by the President of any of the unleased submerged lands in the interests of national security whenever he may deem it necessary. The United States is granted the right of first refusal to all oil and gas produced from such lands in time of war or when the President shall so prescribe. It further provides that all leases issued or authorized under the resolution shall contain provisions for suspension or termination of these leases in the event of war and for the payment of just compensation to the lessee in question.

12. Section 11 provides that any rights acquired under the laws of the United States in lands covered by this resolution shall not be affected by reason of the passage of this resolution, but shall be governed by the laws of the United States in effect at the time such rights have been acquired. The determination, however, of the applicability or effect of the laws under which such rights were acquired shall not be affected by anything contained in this resolution.

13. Section 12 is a definition section. It defines the term "submerged lands of the Continental Shelf" as lands under the sea, outside the low-water mark on the coast of the United States, outside the inland waters, and seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf.

The term "seaward boundary of a State" means a line 3 miles distant from the low-water mark of the tides.

The term "mineral lease" means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals.

The term "tidelands" means lands regularly covered and uncovered by the ebb and flow of the tides.

The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RADWAN].

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that the legislation now before us and in its present form is illegal, so that whatever we do here in the House of Representatives will be purely abortive. I am satisfied that the Supreme Court, whatever its makeup may be in the future, will decide that the legislation in its present form is unconstitutional. So I am going to let the Supreme Court be the final judge.

I am also opposed to legislation of this kind in any form. To me it just does not make sense, unless, of course, I lived in the State of Texas, the State of Louisiana, or the State of California. We have a national debt at the present time that is in the vicinity of $260 billion. I cannot understand the wisdom of giving away any assets that the Federal Gov-

ernment now has when we have a national debt of $260 billion. What banker in your community would be willing to lend money to a businessman who divested himself of assets without any consideration in return when the particular assets involved would approach the debt against his business? Such transfer of assets without consideration in return would be considered an "act of bankruptcy." I do not think that I was elected a Member of Congress, a Federal trustee, to give away something that belongs to all the people, especially after adjudication by the Supreme Court, which decided that these oil and mineral resources belong to all people of the 48 States.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RADWAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I look at this matter a little differently than the gentleman in two respects. I do not measure the value of the assets so much. I measure it in terms of what is right and wrong. I think the value of these assets have been terribly overrated. I made up my mind some time ago that the actual intrinsic value was terrifically inflated, that it was nothing like we hear over the radio and read in the press. But regardless of that, I make up my mind on the premise of whether it is right or wrong, then I do not worry. If the gentleman feels it is absolutely and palpably illegal for us to act, then the gentleman has nothing to worry about. If we are right I am going to do my duty and the gentleman is, too, I am sure, but the gentleman takes the position that the Supreme Court is going to knock this bill out. If so, why not let it go through and permit the Supreme Court to take care of the matter?

Mr. RADWAN. I stated at the opening of my remarks that the legislation now before us will be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court if we enact this bill into law. I also stated that I will oppose this give-away legislation in any form.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Does not the gentleman feels that the value of the assets has been terrifically overrated?

Mr. RADWAN. I do not. I do not think the public has been sufficiently awakened as to the tremendous value involved. We are not dealing with peanuts here; we are dealing with a great and valuable Federal asset.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We are dealing with unknown conditions, too. We have no way of knowing what there is underneath the sea.

Mr. RADWAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct that we are dealing with some unknown conditions in the present case and I am not going to take a chance on giving away anything that might approach the value of our national debt. I am not taking any chance on that with my vote.

I would also like to make clear at this time that what I have to say is directed only to a piece of legislation which is before us, as well as to similar legislation which may come before the Congress. I have no reference to any personalities which may be involved.

Let us see just how much of a give-away it is. The property now belongs to the Federal Government. I do not say so but the "law" has said so. What is the "law" in this case? It is the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by decisions of the Supreme Court.

Now comes an attempt to erase an adjudication of the Supreme Court. Both sides have had their day in Court. The losing side in the decision does not like it. It lost its case and now with might seeks to reverse right.

My party, the Republican Party, has always championed sound policies of conservation, especially so since the Republican administration of President Theodore Roosevelt. As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower, in his State of the Union message, cited the Teddy Roosevelt policies on conservation as a model to follow. Also, in his message, President Eisenhower acknowledged that it was President Theodore Roosevelt who had "awakened the Nation to the problem of conservation." As both an American and a Republican, I intend to stay awake. President Eisenhower goes on to say, "This calls for a strong Federal program in the field of resources development."

If ever in our history it has been important to exercise judicious wisdom with respect to our nationally owned natural resources, that time is now.

This refers with particular force to oil. Oil is one of the most strategic substances in the political economy of our times. Large quantities of oil are needed for the military and economic build-up of the free world. In the event of all-out war, oil could spell the difference between victory and defeat. Oil may be essential for our survival.

These considerations make the world distribution of known oil deposits a key factor in our national as well as our international planning. The most important of these deposits are in the United States and the Caribbean-Gulf of Mexico area, the Persian Gulf, and around the Black and Caspian Seas.

If the Middle East oil were cut off from our allies tomorrow, we could not now fill the gap without crippling our own economy. Therefore, it is imperative that we have emergency oil reserves quickly expandable into actual production.

There has been some attempt here to quote President Eisenhower on his position with respect to the tidelands since he has been inaugurated President. But I also know that at one of his press conferences, the President said he was opposed to the dropping of any revenue until there was other revenue to replace it. If this is the case, I am wondering what is to replace the millions of dollars the Federal Government is now receiving if this revenue goes to the coastal States. Estimates of what this oil and other submerged resources are worth range from $40 billion to $250 billion, almost the size of our national debt. Why then should we not use this money for the purpose of making some payment on our national debt? Such allocation of the royalties from these resources could well get us off to a good start in establishing a debt retirement program. Or, perhaps wisdom might dictate that this source of revenue should go into the Federal Treasury for general purposes of government. But it should not be given away for nothing.

I do not think that the great architects of our Constitution ever intended that the provision, vesting in Congress the right to dispose of property, gives us the right to "give away" without consideration in return.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak upon this issue. As a matter of fact, I have only returned from a week end down in Georgia. However, there are certain issues that are raised here on the floor today that impel me to make some observations.

First, I want to say to this Committee that in my personal opinion this is the best bill that has been brought out for action before this House. I am in accord with the general policy in this bill, and I expect to support this bill. I do want to compliment the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] on his timely observation. I think the gentleman is correct, and if he introduces that amendment I expect to support that amendment.

Here are some of the things I want to talk to you about. I just simply cannot go along with the argument here that the Supreme Court is inviolate. Now, my friends, if that is true, the thing that we should do, we just ought to resign and go on home. I do not agree that the Supreme Court is inviolate. As a matter of fact, I have disagreed with that Court many times, and I am going to be up here in the well and I am going to ask you to help me disagree with them. As a matter of fact, if it is disrespect to disagree with that Court I do not know of any one who disagrees more than that Court does with itself, because they hold one thing today and another thing tomorrow. I say that they have stricken down, by decision after decision, firmly entrenched principles in our jurisprudence, and they have not even grounded their change of sentiment by giving us any reasons therefor. I am in good company, too, with the position I take. Two committees of this House and two committees of the Senate, by the overwhelming votes by the Senate and the House on two occasions, have approved that the historical boundaries belong to the respective States. Now, in addition to that, the American Bar Association, a very respectable organization in my book, says that they have no right to take this property without just compensation. I seem to recall something in the Constitution of the United States that says that. In addition, as I understand, the Attorneys General Association and every attorney general has said that we are on solid grounds. Now, talking about overruling this Supreme Court: In the Texas case 4 said no to Texas and 3 said yes to Texas. Well, I am not willing for 1 man to say to Texas that you cannot come to Congress.

Now, another thing in this issue. When it was passed in the House and

Senate last year, just one man, Mr. Truman, said "No," but you know I am going to fall back on an old argument now that I have heard many times, getting down to brass tacks. I was just wondering about the gentleman from Ohio saying that we have got to stand on what the Supreme Court says. As I remember it, we had a War Between the States because they did not accept a Supreme Court decision.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Does not the gentleman agree with me that what the Supreme Court decides is the law of the land? They said that the States have no title or interest in the submerged lands and yet Congress is trying to give it away.

Mr. FORRESTER. I think they were talking about paramount rights and I do not like that because I do not know what it means; I do not know what paramount rights and inherent rights mean. I have never been able to find them in my law book.

Some of them have charged us with waste. No one can by my vote show that I was wasteful. But I will tell you this: The historical boundaries down there in Georgia belong to Georgia, and I am not going to settle for any 15 percent of the education, or anything else. I will never be satisfied with less than 100 percent. There is no oil down there, but if they are going to take the oil we do not have they are going to take the little fish and the little shrimp and the oysters and the clams and the crabs we do have.

Last year on the other floor when there was a representative of the Justice Department present I said to him, "I want to ask you a question as one lawyer to another. You will concede there is no such thing as proscribing against a State or a Government?" He said, "Yes, sir." I said, "All right. If that be true, is it not true as a matter of law that lands that have been filled in, where people have bought lots and subdivisions and built homes, and given mortgages of their own, and so forth, thinking they had title, would not that land belong to the Government under your contention?" All he would ever say was, "We never would contend for that."

I said to him, "I am not asking what you would contend for, because I don't know what your successor would contend for, but I am asking you just to answer that question as a matter of law." He did not answer it.

Talking about waste, our Government is the worst waster I ever heard of.

Another thing, I remember about Teapot Dome. I want to compliment our Republican brethren and the President of the United States. Maybe he does not want a repetition of something like that.

But I will tell you this: The historical limits belong to Georgia, and I do not want to give them away. You other States, if you do not want to give yours away, I can understand your viewpoint, and I am with you gentlemen every step of the way.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think it might be very pertinent to bring to the attention of my distinguished friend from Georgia that in the Supreme Court decision, which he seems not to understand, by his own admission——

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not think they do.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Those decisions did not have a single thing to do with any inland waters or the property or real estate of any State, Georgia or any other, that is, any property that lies inward from the low-water mark.

Mr. FORRESTER. The great trouble in Florida, in California, and so forth, is that they have filled in the sea and sold subdivisions, there are homes down there by the thousands, and people have titles and mortgages have been taken, operating on the idea that they have title. I say they are in jeopardy because there can be no proscription against the United States Government.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. We never heard of any claim by the Federal Government with regard to these historical boundaries until 1935 or 1936, did we?

Mr. FORRESTER. That is right.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. They could always lay claim to the inland waters, the beds of the rivers or lakes, or anything else, could they not?

Mr. FORRESTER. Absolutely. That is what we are trying to stop right now.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORRESTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. When we did first hear the claim the United States might make to these marginal seas, everybody took it very lightly. It has taken a decade and a half to build up an organized propaganda, with all kinds of misinformation, and abuse, too, to build up this case to where they could respectably go before the country and say that the Federal Government owns the land down there that the States have been owning and controlling and handling for 150 years.

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes. It is against every theory.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. When it first came up hardly a lawyer in the country would come forward and defend that claim, because there is no force and no logic and no support to it.

Mr. FORRESTER. There are not many lawyers now that will defend it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I understand we have 34 minutes left, and at the moment there are no requests for time on this side.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] such time as he cares to use.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, as a culmination of three decisions of the Supreme Court involving oil under submerged seaward lands bordering California, Texas, and Louisiana there is a concerted effort by those States, and by other States fearful of possible exclusion from a future opportunity to obtain control of natural resources, to obtain a quitclaim or transfer these oil resources. If this effort succeeds, it merely will be the opening wedge to a drive to accomplish the same type of transfer of all public lands, mineral resources, national forests, land-grant railroad rights-of-way, and other reserves of the Federal Government. These tremendous reserves and resources are found largely in 11 Western States where, it is admitted, they create serious problems of tax revenues and apportionment of responsibility between the Federal and respective State governments. Percentagewise, the Federal holdings of the total land areas in these 11 States are said to be as follows: Arizona, 73 percent; California, 46 percent; Colorado, 38 percent; Idaho, 64 percent; Montana, 35 percent; Nevada, 87 percent; New Mexico, 44 percent; Oregon, 53 percent; Utah, 72 percent; Washington, 35 percent; and Wyoming, 51 percent. As indicated earlier, the vast majority of the reserved lands exist in the Western States, whereas lands in the States admitted earlier are practically all privately owned and subject to taxation. It is this inequality, of course, which excites much of the criticism in the West.

The history of the public-land problem reveals that it was a focal point of dissension prior to the adoption of the Constitution in 1789. Six of the Original Thirteen Colonies had charters purporting to make the Pacific Ocean their western boundaries. New York claimed lands in what are now the States of Ohio and Kentucky by virtue of treaties with Indians comprising the Six Nations and their allies. Although there were thus 7 States claiming the western territory after the Declaration of Independence, 6 of these were by assertion of the right to succeed to the title of the English sovereign to vacant lands.

To alleviate dissatisfaction among the smaller States, New York tendered her western lands to the Continental Congress in 1790. That same year the Congress requested that other States do likewise and declared that these ceded lands should be settled and eventually formed into new States under such terms and regulations as Congress should provide. The relinquishment of these western lands did not require, of course, that vacant lands within the borders of the Thirteen States be released to the confederation government. Such lands, if extant, remained the property of these States to be sold or exploited without Federal control. In many instances the natural resources included in these lands were wastefully dissipated. In addition to Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina and Virginia, Texas, Kentucky, and Tennessee succeeded largely in obtaining possession of vacant lands within their borders. It is said that no public lands can longer be identified in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Missouri, and Ohio. Small areas may remain in Alabama, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Wisconsin in widely scattered and located tracts. Thus, the bulk of the Nation's remaining reserved natural re-

sources exist in the 11 Western States, noted earlier, and in the Territory of Alaska, and it is this bulk which is always involved in any effort to transfer public domain to any given State.

No one can deny that Congress has the constitutional power to divest itself of these natural resources by transferring them to the States, for the Constitution specifically says, in article IV, section 3, clause 2, that the Congress shall have power to dispose of the territory or other property belonging to the United States. This power was clearly recognized in the first tidelands case—*U. S.* v. *California* ((1947) 332 U. S. 19, 40)—wherein Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the majority, stated:

> We cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

Thus, even the decisions of the Supreme Court, holding that California, and later Louisiana and Texas, did not own the marginal belt along their coast, and deciding that the Federal Government rather than the States has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion of the resources underneath the water area, including oil, cannot preclude legislation by Congress under the above noted constitutional provision disposing of that property. Congress did it before in granting to the State of Wyoming a small tract of land containing oil—Public Law 887, 80th Congress; Sixty-second Statutes, page 1233—notwithstanding a prior decision of the Supreme Court fixing title to that land in the United States. See *U. S.* v. *Wyoming* ((1947) 331 U. S. 440).

Acknowledging this constitutional power of Congress to dispose of the property of the United States does not establish, necessarily, the merits of disposition. It has been said that the reserved oil deposits beneath the marginal seas constitute a huge public trust held by the Federal Government in the interest of all the people of the United States. They are enormously valuable, and there is no more impelling reason why they should be given to the bordering States than that other reserved natural resources should be given to the respective States in which they are located. It has been estimated that more than 2½ billion barrels of oil, in addition to the oil already recovered from the submerged lands under the marginal seas, may be discovered and given away by this legislation to the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas. Royalties from this oil could bring huge revenues into the Treasury and assist in reducing the national debt even under existing law. There may be other mineral resources of great value beneath these ocean beds which are said to cover an area of the Continental Shelf in the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific Ocean approximating 185,800,000 acres. See Senate Document 139, 82d Congress, page 3, and House Report No. 695, 82d Congress, page 11. Historically, it is interesting to note, the revenues from the sale of lands in the ceded Northwest Territory were used to liquidate the national debts incurred in the American Revolution.

No intelligent person will deny that oil resources are vital to national defense, for almost every vessel and machine of the Armed Forces is either propelled by its byproducts or uses oil in some form. The disposition of these resources would seriously involve powers conferred by the Constitution of the United States on Congress to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, and to regulate commerce. A serious depletion or extinction of these oil resources and other natural resources would be a national tragedy.

As stated earlier, the transfer of these lands will merely be the opening wedge of a drive to accomplish other transfers, and in this connection mention was made of rights-of-way given to land-grant railroads. Decisions of the courts have been uniform in holding that these grants to the railroads have not been in fee simple absolute, but rather have been in the nature of easements for public use with a right of reverter to the United States in the event that the railroad abandons the right-of-way or attempts to dispose of it for use other than that originally contemplated. See Forty-fourth American Jurisprudence, Railroads, section 97, citing *Rio Grande Western Ry. Co.* v. *Stringham* ((1915) 239 U. S. 44). These grants are subject to further legislative action on the part of the Congress—*City of Reno* v. *Southern Pacific Co. et al.* ((1920) 268 F. 751, 756). Already there is before Congress a proposal to grant parts of these rights-of-way to the railroads for disposition. Even if the rights-of-way were to be abandoned, insofar as railroad uses are concerned, their customary 200 feet of width conceivably could be of great importance for national-defense high-speed highways. This is, of course, merely one of the lesser items which must be considered. Of far greater importance are the national forests, the reserved power sites, the public grazing lands, and the mineral reserves. Capitulation to quitclaimism, whereby the United States would be persuaded to renounce blindly to States sovereignty over millions of acres of seaward lands, would lead to the ultimate destruction of all Federal conservation, public land, and public power policies and would result in the exploitation and waste of the remaining natural resources of the Nation. This would not be in the best interests of the Nation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] such time as he cares to use.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the passage of this bill, surrendering the security of the American Union to the oil barons, is forced by the administration as the price of a presidential election an angry Nation will swamp in a tidal wave of indignation the last vestige of the Republican Party. When the full purport has been felt Illinois, where the Republican Party was born, will be one of the pallbearers.

Once before Illinois accepted the challenge in the defiant cry that the State comes first and the Nation second. The people of Illinois, Mr. Speaker, have not changed in their unswerving and undivided loyalty to the Union since the days of Abraham Lincoln. Make no mistake on that score. Illinois never did, and it never will, sell out the American Union.

This bill gives to 3 or 4 States rights which conceivably can prove to be worth enough to pay off the entire national debt twice. The figure is by no means fantastic. Never has a threat so fatally paralyzing been raised against the Union.

If the arguments of the fine gentlemen of oil prevail, if the ambitions of sectionalism triumph over the devotion to the Union, if the publicized respectability of corporation lawyers serving rich clients succeeds in making a mockery of the Supreme Court of the United States, then, indeed, will the 83d Congress have written a chapter in infamy.

Does anyone think that the American people have become so craven and spineless that they will raise no outcry when someone is running away with the family treasures? Do not play the American people for suckers. Do not knock them down and strip them of their clothing and expect them to take it.

I would like to ask my Republican colleagues from Illinois what answer they will have for the people of our State when as a result of the passing of this bill every man and woman in Illinois, in addition to carrying their own heavy taxload, will be called upon to help out great big Texas. Now get this. The State of Texas not only fixes a minimum price for natural gas in the field, but also imposes a gathering tax upon such gas on the pretext of conserving the State's resources. Such regulation and taxation affects the price of gas supplied to domestic and industrial consumers at retail in the State of Illinois and other inland States. Interstate pipeline companies owning or controlling natural-gas fields are now divesting themselves of their natural-gas fields to get away from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. Please read the case of *Federal Power Commission* v. *Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Companies* (337 U. S. 498; 93 L. edition 1499).

In the bill that we have before us Texas is empowered to impose this gathering tax and extend it to the rich and unlimited fields to the Continental Shelf. That means that every man and woman in Illinois, as well as in the other States, will have to pay more for their gas, and all for the benefit of one State.

Similar manipulations to increase the cost of oil to consumers, including the United States Government, no doubt can be employed by the few States bordering upon offshore oil reserves with injury to all parts of the United States. How are my Republican colleagues going to explain it?

The counterscare that the lands on Lake Michigan and other inland bodies are in danger is knocked into a cocked hat by the facts. Please ask Henry E. Cutler, without whose legal opinion no banker in the Midwest will underwrite any municipal bond issue, what he thinks about such a silly contention. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the attorney general of Texas and the attorney general of California did try to work the scare on the city of Chicago and they got nowhere. Ask Joseph F. Grossman, special assistant corporation counsel of the city

of Chicago and one of the great authorities of the Nation on municipal and public-utilities law. Read the words of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Illinois Central case—146th United States Reports, page 387.

No, Mr. Chairman, the people of Illinois will not be scared by a bogey man into consenting to the sell out of the Union.

This bill is just that—a sell out of the American Union. It is the child of the same brain that plotted Teapot Dome. Moreover, it is a brazen sell out of the American people, north and south, east and west. It is taking us back to the days when speculators, timber and cattle barons, copper and steel kings, rode high and handsome in rugged and ruthless individualism. Then it was the public lands which we took from the people and in grants to railroads turned over to the gang of exploiters. What happened will be visited upon us again when this evil measure is enacted into law. The railroads ran the Government. They prevented for years the building of an inter-oceanic canal. They corrupted every level of government. Do the people of California want to go back to the political conditions of their State before Hiram Johnson at long last broke the strangle-hold of the railroads? Explain this bill to the common people of California, let them know that it is the cover-up of the same old hand reaching for their throats, and then try to sell them a bill of goods from the fashionable offices of corporation lawyers who have hired out to rich oil clients.

The States receiving title to tidelands oil will lease them for a pittance of royalties to the big oil companies. A small group of rugged and ruthless individuals will reap high profits. Petroleum deposits will be quickly exhausted, and the national security if war should come will go up in flames. What will the ordinary decent and honest men and women of California, Texas, and Louisiana receive? Just as much—not one whit more—than they have always been doled when exploiters held the gun. Oil can buy for hire corporation lawyers, but I do not think it can fool the common sense of the ordinary people of California, Louisiana, and Texas any more than it can make a nit-wit of the good people of Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are not buying this bill of goods. If the administration forces its passage, the American people will see to it that there is a new representation in the 84th Congress. The oil barons will discover that all that they got from the 83rd Congress was a law which the 84th Congress repealed.

It is said by those who are authorities on conservation and natural resources that the tidelands grab is merely the start of an expected raid on Federal lands. The Federal Government now owns 457,600,000 acres of land. Let the pattern be set of giving away the people's wealth and resources to States, which in turn give them away to rugged and ruthless individuals under the pretense of leases, and the jig is up. It will be the end of the great and glorious dream of the American people. What foreign nations could not do will have been accomplished from within.

Mr. Chairman, at this moment of crisis, when our destiny as an American union dedicated to the service of all the people is hanging in the balance, it is natural that I should be thinking of Theodore Roosevelt and of his great leadership in the fight of the American people to preserve our national resources for all the people against the designs of the exploiters. We stand at Armageddon.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, serious illness in my immediate family may compel me to leave Washington before a vote is taken on H. R. 4198, the so-called offshore lands bill.

I assure my colleagues that only the most compelling circumstances could prevent my casting personally a vote on this important legislation. The bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary is, in my opinion, clearly contrary to the best interests of our Nation. It gives away to the States our national resources, which should be retained, developed, and conserved for national purposes. The income derived should be devoted to education throughout the United States.

But the bill goes even beyond the position taken by the present administration. By quitclaiming lands beyond the 3-mile limit we would confer unprecedented and unconstitutional power upon a few States to tax production from federally owned lands out to the Continental Shelf. We would create a dangerous precedent, which might well be followed by proposals to transfer federally owned timberlands, grazing lands, and perhaps even national parks to the States for cession to private exploiters, or directly into private ownership.

I sincerely hope that the membership of the House will uphold and follow the good conservation traditions of our country by refusing to lend themselves to this dangerous, inequitable proposal to dissipate our national heritage.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, it is fantastic and incredible that Congress should consider for one moment legislating away the right and title to billions of dollars of oil reserves which all the people of our country own for the benefit of the citizens of a few States, and in particular to fatten the coffers of the oil trust. Are we to rob the youth of our Nation of the educational assistance assured them by the Federal Government since earliest colonial days? Are we going to jeopardize our national security by permitting private oil companies to gain control over our rich oil reserves, which are so vital to our defense?

I maintain that this legislative body, which represents the people of the entire Nation, has no such authority; it has no power to give away any part of our rich natural resources to any one segment of the country. Furthermore, in my opinion, the measure before us for consideration would be held unconstitutional if we commit the grievous error of passing it.

, The Supreme Court, in three separate decisions, has declared that the States never did own or have any title to submerged lands and established beyond all doubt that title to oil in submerged lands off our coasts belongs to all of the people, not to just a few States. Now Congress is being asked to override and reverse the Supreme Court in a question of land titles which rightfully came before the Court and was peculiarly within its judicial determination. Should we ignore these decisions, it will constitute a serious encroachment by the legislative branch of our Government upon the judicial branch, and I am opposed to such action on our part. I hold that this so-called tidelands issue has been decided under law; the question is not properly before us now.

The past history of our Nation, from its very beginning, supports the decisions of the Supreme Court. No State right to marginal waters, as is now requested, has ever been recognized. Instead, the Federal Government has consistently claimed these seas and submerged lands. Thomas Jefferson established the claim of Federal ownership in 1793 at the time of the Louisiana Purchase; he realized that Federal control of marginal waters was vitally necessary to the defenes of our new and fast-growing country. The national policy of using revenue from public lands for educational purposes was established in colonial days, but we find that as early as 1780 Congress had to beat off attempts by the States to lay claim to public lands when they sought to further their own selfish aims at the expense of others. Former President Truman vetoed legislation similar to that before us now, and upheld the right of the Federal Government to the lands in question.

The States now demanding that Congress make them a present of from $50 billion to $250 billion in offshore oil and natural gas resources are Texas, Louisiana, and California. They are claiming that we should restore their submerged lands to them. The word "restore" is deceiving as used by them—they have never had legal title to the property in the first place, so how can we return to them what they never owned?

Testimony given by Attorney General Brownell threw a serious doubt upon the constitutionality of this legislation. To circumvent such a test, he recommended legislation which would not quitclaim title to the submerged lands but would merely grant authority which the States in question would need in order that the rich oil reserves could be appropriated for their own benefit. Oil is the objective, and we know that the oilfields which have been developed under State control are beyond historic State boundaries. The issue is not tidelands—the coastal States fighting for offshore oil are claiming title to resources which lie

beyond the tidelands; beyond the historic national 3-mile limit—out to 200 miles from the shore. Their claim is ridiculous, for only the Federal Government has the power and the right to protect such lands, and the remaining States have the right and the law on their side to disprove such claim.

Federal funds, paid into the Treasury by the people of all States, have gone toward the acquisition of land, the development of our natural resources, the protection and preservation of every part of our Nation. It follows that any benefits and profits which are derived from federally owned resources should be distributed equally among all the people. The burdens are borne by all; let the good be meted out in equal proportion. Because by accident more natural resources happen to be located in one State than in another, does not mean that all the benefits can be hogged by the State where such resources are found.

The bill before us would give States complete control of submerged lands out to their historic boundaries; it would also give the States authority to levy a tax on oil pumped from submerged lands seaward of those boundaries. The coastal States will lease these lands to private oil companies and keep all the revenues. In effect, a few coastal States will become rich at the expense of the other 45 States. It is inconceivable that in addition, we should authorize those States to tax revenues the Federal Government would get from the Continental Shelf lands beyond the 3-mile and 10½-mile limits. These lands are absolutely vulnerable to enemy attack in time of war—they will, in fact, be a major target. Who will, of necessity, protect them? The Federal Government will be compelled to do so, and the ships and planes, weapons and men will be furnished by all of us—not by the few States reaping the profits of the oil fields.

Oil is vital to our defense; without it we cannot hope for victory in war, for our military forces must have oil. The Federal Government must keep control of our oil resources, an overall protective policy must be established and adhered to. Furthermore, to force the Federal Government to pay a tax on revenues collected from resources belonging to it is unthinkable.

It is a certainty that if we give the coastal States the oil they are demanding, then the Western States will be all set to ask for our public lands. If we pass this bill, it would set a dangerous precedent for surrendering to other private interests the remaining natural resources of our country—our public lands. Then we would lose our national forests, grazing lands, and rich mineral resources. Even as the oil interests seek to grab the submerged oil lands, so the lumber and cattle interests are ready to renew their attack to gain control of our public lands. Congress must act to protect the public interest in this instance as it has in the past.

In 1787 Congress adopted ordinances which set aside every 16th section of the public lands west of the Alleghenies to establish and maintain schools. The Federal Government recognized its duty to support schools so that every child could be assured of an education. Let us look at the educational picture of today. In every State—the poor and the rich—there is a crying need for financial assistance for education. It is impossible for the States to obtain the vast sums necessary to bring the schools throughout the Nation up to the desired minimum standards. We find millions of children in inadequate school buildings; teachers are poorly trained; classes are held in makeshift classrooms, hallways, basements, and even dangerous quarters. There are double and triple shifts of school schedules, classrooms are overcrowded, teachers are overworked and underpaid. The States simply have been unable to meet the educational demands of the rapidly increasing numbers of school children; financial needs for the local and State school systems have outdistanced any sources of State funds.

Only by incurring more debts or increasing taxes can this crisis be met by the States, and to add more taxes to the heavy tax load now being carried by our people would be disastrous. The alternative would be to use the oil-reserve revenues to rebuild our school systems. The wealth we are being asked to give away to a few rightfully belongs to our children; the principle of using such revenues for educational purposes is century old. It is not our privilege as Representatives to disregard that principle or to deprive our children of the educational assistance which has always been their birthright. Furthermore, the proper education of our youth governs their economic security and their usefulness as good citizens; it is vital to the preservation of our democracy and the future of our Nation.

Our duty is clear. The offshore oil lands belong to the American people—not to a few, but to all. Let the Federal Government collect the revenues and use them to rebuild and improve our school and college systems, or to apply them to our national debt and so reduce taxes. The strength of our Nation has grown on the basis of absolute equality among the States. Let us keep that balance. Let us remember that our national resources belong to all.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, during this week the House of Representatives will again pass on the momentous issue of who owns the so-called tidelands. Since about 1938, this has become one of the burning issues of the day. Few matters coming before this 83d Congress will have been discussed and debated as thoroughly as this tidelands issue. There have been volumes of testimony and debate on this great question since it was first raised back in the late thirties. It is an involved question, but the principle is indeed very definite and relatively simple. It involves a great principle of government which has been a subject of controversy since the establishment of the American Republic. That principle of government is commonly referred to as States' rights. Most people in America today give lip service to and express a belief in States' rights, but indeed many stray far afield of that great principle on many of the issues which directly affect that principle of government.

The question here is whether or not the various States of this great Union own the submerged lands within their historic boundary lines.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that the States do own these submerged lands and I am firmly of the opinion that any fair appraisal of the history of this question and all of the evidence at hand will lead to the same conclusion.

The historical background of this great issue goes back to the Revolutionary War. When our forefathers through long years of toil and struggle finally threw off the yoke of British tyranny, the Thirteen Original Colonies became free, independent and sovereign States. As such sovereign States, they became the successors to all of the proprietary rights of the Crown and parliament in, and all their dominion over, lands under tidewaters. The historic rule of the boundary line of any country extending 3 miles seaward from the low tide watermark established within the respective 13 independent and sovereign States title to the submerged lands now in question. No student of this subject will deny these facts. Then these Thirteen Original States free, independent, and sovereign as they were, decided to form a union. At that time all power and authority rested within the respective States and the people of those States. When the Union was formed, it became necessary for these various States to confer upon said union certain limited power and authority. This was done by a constitution in which that power and authority was spelled out. Some of the States fearing that down through the years, there might be some misinterpretation of this power and authority, refused to ratify that Constitution until there was written into it the first 10 amendments known as our Bill of Rights. My State of North Carolina was in this number. In an effort to assure that there would be no misunderstanding about the question of power for this new Federal Government, the 10th amendment was adopted which reads as follows:

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.

So these States joined the union and conferred certain limited power and authority upon it. There was neither a conveyance of property nor a relinquishment of any property. Then how did the Federal Government acquire this title?

Mr. Justice Frankfurter in his dissenting opinion in the California case said with reference to the Federal Government's contention in that case:

> Rights of ownership are here asserted—and rights of ownership are something else. Ownership implies acquisition in the various ways in which land is acquired—by conquest, by discovery and claim, by cession, by prescription, by purchase, by condemnation. When and how did the United States acquire this land?

Without a doubt, these lands remain within the ownership of the Thirteen Original States. The various other

States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction as the Original Thirteen States and likewise became the owners of the submerged lands within their boundaries.

This doctrine was recognized by the Federal Government as well as by the States from the beginning of our Federal Republic until a few years ago. This doctrine was undisputed for more than a hundred and fifty years. The United States Supreme Court has in numerous opinions recognized this doctrine for more than 100 years. Chief Justice Taney in 1842, said:

For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.

Mr. Justice Clifford in 1867, said:

Settled rule of law in this court is, that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders. When the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.

Mr. Justice Field in 1873, said:

All soils under the tidewaters within her limits passed to the State.

Mr. Justice Hughes said in 1935:

The soils under tidewaters within the original States were reserved to them respectively and the States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction in relation to such lands within their borders as the original States possessed.

So we see, Mr. Chairman, this doctrine has been recognized time after time by the Supreme Court, and was so recognized until 1947, when by a divided decision this legislative Supreme Court which we now have seized these lands by judicial fiat. Mr. Justice Black and Mr. Justice Douglas in setting forth this new paramount right or Federal theory treated with almost contempt our great doctrines of legal title and property ownership. They spoke of bare legal title and mere property ownership in such terms as to indicate that these were worn out doctrines and had no place in the new order of the day.

In view of these Supreme Court decisions the title to not only the so-called tidelands but also the lands beneath the bays, inlets, the Great Lakes, and every navigable stream in our fair land has become clouded. These decisions have left the situation so confused that it now becomes necessary for the real legislative body of America, the Congress of the United States, to declare once again where the title to these lands are vested. H. R. 4198 is in the form of a quitclaim deed to the various States for the submerged lands within their borders. We are recognizing that the Federal Government has no title to these lands, but in the event the judicial fiat of the present Supreme Court has created within the Federal Government any title, the same is hereby quitclaimed, confirmed, and established within the States of this Union. This bill confirms and establishes the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within the historic boundaries of the various States and provides for the use and control of the resources of the outer Continental Shelf and places the subsoil and natural resources of said outer Continental Shelf within the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the subject has been debated within this country as few subjects have been discussed, but never in my life have I seen as much false and misleading propaganda put forth on any issue. The propagandists, both inside and outside of the Government, have led many of our people to believe that we are giving away billions of dollars worth of the resources belonging to the Federal Government. They have injected what they believe to be a very popular issue into the fight in that they desire to becloud the issue by saying that all of these billions should be earmarked and used as grants in aid to education, including primary, secondary, and higher education. This is done in an effort to aline many of our educators behind their effort to assert and maintain Federal ownership and control over these lands. I sincerely hope that those educators who have been misled will use some of their fine training and experience to get at the facts in this matter.

Let us explode some of these arguments, and show them up for what they really are. First, Mr. Chairman, as we have pointed out before, all of the history and the evidence clearly indicate that the Federal Government does not own these lands. Second, there is a principle of government involved which must be decided on the basis of right and wrong and not upon the basis of the value of the lands in question. Third, these propagandists take the estimated value of all of the oil lying underneath water on the entire outer Continental Shelf as well as all lying beneath the navigable waters within the historic boundaries of the various States. We are told by the experts that a large part of the oil reserves lie on the outer Continental Shelf which is beyond the historic boundary lines of the States, and under the terms of this bill, Mr. Chairman, those oils would belong to the Federal Government. Those who would mislead never point out these facts to the people. Fourth, that the overall figure does not take into account that it will cost literally millions upon top of millions of dollars to discover this oil and to engage upon the hazardous task of taking it from these submerged lands. Fifth, they overlook telling the people that the burden of supporting the educational institutions and schools of our country has not as yet been assumed by the Federal Government. Sixth, they fail to point out to the people of this country that under their theory, the Federal Government can assert title to all the fish, oysters, sand, minerals, and all other things not only in the so-called tidelands area in question, but also in every navigable stream of our country.

Mr. Chairman, there are also those who would becloud and befuddle the issue by raising the great question of national defense. Those of us who support this measure are just as concerned over our national defense as those who might oppose it. Everyone recognizes the power conferred upon the Federal Government in our Constitution over navigation, commerce, national defense, and international affairs. This bill does not affect any of the Federal constitutional powers of regulation and control over these matters within the historic boundaries of the various States. Under this bill, the Federal Government would have the same right with reference to these matters on these lands in question as it has over all of the lands in all of the States of this great Union. This bill gives to the Federal Government the preferred right to purchase whenever necessary for national defense all or any portion of the natural resources produced from any of these submerged lands. It expressly exempts from the operation of this bill any areas where the United States has lawfully and expressly acquired a valid title under the laws of the State where the lands are located. Those who advocate the national defense theory fail to recognize that it would necessitate the establishment of another tremendous Federal bureau to develop these lands and to secure the oil. The States have heretofore administered the matter of obtaining oil from the lands within their boundaries in a manner which has not only proved successful but which has been free of fraud and corruption. The Federal Government will do well if it can develop in an orderly fashion the vast oil reserves on the outer Continental Shelf which is recognized as the province of the Federal Government in this bill. If these great oil reserves are properly developed, they can provide for the Federal Government vast stores of oil for national defense. While at the same time, under the terms of this bill, the Federal Government can at any time when needed for national defense come in and purchase the oil developed and produced under the direction of the States. The vast outer Continental Shelf containing approximately 235,892 square miles of territory will offer to the Federal Government a colossal challenge to develop and bring into production the huge oil reserves which are contained therein. If this area is properly developed and properly handled by the Federal Government, it will bring to the Federal Treasury untold millions of dollars in revenue and will provide vast oil reserves for national defense.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that the principle contained in this bill is sound and is right. We are not by this act giving to the various States of this Union vast lands and natural resources, but rather we are merely clearing the cloud from the title which has historically been vested in States. We are merely righting a wrong which was done when the Supreme Court clouded these titles. Let me say to those who doubt the wisdom of this step, to not only read the many decisions of the Supreme Court, but also review again the teachings of Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago when the so-called tidelands oil legislation was before the House, I spoke in opposition and voted against the bill. I have not changed my position in the interim and the present legislation contains almost identically the same provisions to take from the people of the United States the control and title to untold billions of our resources lying beyond the low-tide watermark in our coastal areas.

The Supreme Court of the United States has, on three different occasions, held that the various coastal States own the land underneath the ebb and flow of the tide, but that the National Government is the inherent owner of the lands beyond the low tidewater margins. The proponents of this legislation who have had charge of the newspaper and radio propaganda, emphasize the theory that the bill would give the various States rights to lands adjoining and underneath inland rivers and lakes and so forth. This contention is fallacious and in direct contradiction to the true facts. The proponents of this bill fail to emphasize that by placing the Nation's unlimited oil reserves located beyond the coastlines of the United States in the control of the various States, it would eventually cause the Federal Government to lose jurisdiction and ownership of the vast amounts of oil and gas which our Navy, Air Force, and Defense Department will, in the future, utilize for our national protection.

I have not heard it mentioned in the debate on this bill the fact that if this legislation is enacted into law, it will eventually bring about an increased cost in the price of oil and gas to the consumers in other areas throughout the Nation. Special consideration from this standpoint should be given to the effect of transfer to the States of title and jurisdiction to these submerged lands. As an example, the State of Texas not only fixes a minimum price for natural gas in the field, but also imposes a gathering tax upon such gas as a pretext of conserving the State's resources. Such regulation and taxation affects the price of gas supplied to domestic and industrial consumers which retail in the Calumet region of Indiana, the State of Indiana and all other surrounding States. Interstate pipeline companies owning or controlling natural gas fields are now divesting themselves of their natural gas fields to get away from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. This leaves the producing affiliates of the pipeline companies free to assess whatever price the traffic will bear for gas in the field. On account of this taxation-gathering tax, there is now pending before the Federal Power Commission an application for an increase in the price of natural gas to be delivered to the retail distributors in the Indiana-Chicago area. Similar manipulations to increase the cost of oil to consumers, including the United States Government, no doubt will be employed by the few States bordering on offshore oil reserves to the oil and gas consumers in all parts of the United States.

The propaganda which the oil lobbies have been using on the tideland oil legislation has been that the inland States would be deprived of title to submerged lands pertaining to rivers and lakes within or adjoining their borders. The real truth is, the enactment of the tideland oil legislation would free a few large oil producing States bordering on the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico from interference by the United States in the exploitation of the oil resources under those waters. Several legal experts of outstanding ability have given opinions which have not been questioned that the various States title to submerged lands within their States is not in jeopardy by the so-called tideland oil legislation which we are now considering.

Twenty-seven mayors of the larger cities in the United States have issued a joint statement that the civilian and defense needs of our country require prompt exploration and development of our offshore resources and that the Nation should have the use and power to conserve these resources. Legislation is now pending in Congress which I propose to support, will keep this offshore oil for all the people of the United States for the purposes of expanding our educational resources and give the school teachers of America a greater financial return for their services in educating our children. Today in America over 4 million school children have their education impaired by reason of untrained, underpaid teachers and inadequate school buildings because the State and local taxing units cannot meet the growing cost of education. I will support the so-called oil for education amendment to this legislation which provides that these offshore oil resources of the Nation will be developed in the interest of all the people and that the Federal revenues gained therefrom should be used to help meet the urgent need for these funds to aid our schools.

H. R. 4198 is bad legislation, and will eventually be a windfall to the oil monopolies if enacted into law. Legislation of this kind if enacted into law will create a precedent and invite further raids on our natural resources. It will lead to proposals for transferring our timber land, grazing lands, wildlife refuges, and perhaps our national forests to the States for eventual exploitation.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, today the House begins its biennial consideration of the bill which its proponents have designedly named the tidelands bill. This name could not be less appropriate, for the tidelands—the land lying between the high and low water marks on the shores of the ocean—is not even involved in the dispute. Everybody admits the fact that the strip of tideland belongs to the States in which it lies. But those who favor this bill propose to give a new meaning to the term "tidelands." They say these are the lands lying seaward from shore for a distance of 3 miles—in the case of Texas and west Florida, 3 leagues. Yes; and we are even asked to accept the proposition that the entire Continental Shelf, all of its 250 miles are part of the tidelands, because this bill says the States own such lands. It does this by giving them the taxing power. This bill says their title in such lands should be confirmed.

This is not a tidelands bill. This is a bill which could with much more justice be called the giveaway bill or the tri-States mutual assistance program or even the tri-States misappropriation bill. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided, not in one case, but in three cases, that the oil lying in the submerged lands beneath the ocean belongs to all the people of the United States. This bill seeks to misappropriate that wealth for the benefit of Texas, California, and Louisiana. Talk about pouring oil on troubled waters—this bill proposes to pour the oil and mineral wealth of 48 States into the tanks of only 3.

This controversy has been marked by deception and false issues. I should like to discuss one such issue today, an issue which has been falsely injected into this debate, that State ownership of inland waters has been placed in jeopardy by the three Supreme Court decisions. The bogyman has been created that the Federal Government is going to take all inland waters—the tidelands, the lands under the rivers, harbors, bays, inlets, and all other navigable waters. Nothing is further from the truth.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of what those who favor this bill say, inland navigable waters are not involved in this controversy. Lands beneath open ocean and inland waters constitute entirely separate and different problems. The proponents of general quitclaim legislation have deliberately confused the two issues in an effort to gain the support of the 45 States which stand to gain nothing and lose much if the rights of the Federal Government in the Continental Shelf are given away to California, Texas, and Louisiana.

The propaganda supporting quitclaim legislation benefiting three coastal States has been directed especially to the States bordering the Great Lakes, to my home State of Illinois and to States such as New York, Massachusetts, and Florida which have extensive harbor and beach developments on filled land. The numerous Supreme Court decisions and statements by Federal officials specifically declaring such areas "inland waters" have been ignored or misinterpreted.

The Supreme Court has held plainly and unequivocally in at least 23 decisions between 1842 and 1935 that the respective States own the beds of all navigable inland waters, such as lakes, rivers, and bays situated within their boundaries. There has never been a single exception to this general rule of constitutional law. The United States does not and never has challenged the ruling in these decisions.

They cover a wide geographical area, from New York on the east to California on the west, from Michigan on the north

to Alabama on the south. They involve such widely diverse types of submerged lands as the beds of Raritan Bay in New Jersey, the North River in New York City, Lake Ontario in New York State, Chesapeake Bay, the Ware River in Virginia, the Mobile River in Alabama, Lake Michigan in Illinois, St. Mary's River in Michigan, the Fox River in Wisconsin, Mud Lake in Minnesota, the Mississippi River in Minnesota, in Iowa and in Illinois, the Snake River in Idaho, the Grand, Green, and Colorado Rivers in Utah, Lake Union and Lake Washington in Washington, the Columbia River in Oregon, the Sacramento River in California, and San Francisco Bay. In addition, Long Island Sound and Puget Sound have been determined by the Court to be inland waters.

As recently as 1950, the Supreme Court expressly referred to its earlier decisions on this point and reaffirmed them. In the case of *U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), the Court held that the States are seized of "ownership of lands under inland navigable waters such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands down to the low-water mark."

Moreover, the sense in which the Court used the term "paramount rights" in the California case was a confirmation of earlier decisions that the States have title to lands beneath inland navigable waters. The Court stated that if, as it had held in many earlier cases, the States have paramount rights in the beds of navigable inland waters, the same reasoning leads to the conclusion that the United States has paramount rights in lands beneath the open sea by virtue of the international interest and responsibilities which the Constitution entrusted to it.

The Supreme Court has twice held explicitly that the Great Lakes are inland seas and that the States bordering on them own the portions of the beds of the Great Lakes that are situated within their respective boundaries.

In the case of *Illinois Central Railway* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892)), the Court held that the State of Illinois owned the bed of Lake Michigan in trust for the people of the State and that the State legislature could not make a valid conveyance of the bed of Lake Michigan to the railroad. The Court stated:

> These lakes possess all the general characteristics of open seas, except in the freshness of their waters, and in the absence of the ebb and flow of the tide.

In the case of *Massachusetts* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65 (1926)), where a lake with an international boundary line was involved, the Court ruled that the bed of Lake Ontario lying within the boundaries of New York State belongs to the State of New York to the international boundary line.

These two cases are applicable to other States bordering the Great Lakes and indicate that each of them has clear title to the bed of that portion of the Great Lakes within its boundary.

Those who favor this bill have undertaken a national scare campaign to quell all opposition. As an example of what I mean, let me call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 2, page 1916, and I read from the RECORD.

The junior Senator from Florida is speaking:

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a reply by the attorney general of Texas to the very able Senator from Illinois which I think would call forth some four-bit words on the part of the Senator from Illinois. I read from the letter:

Your radio broadcast charging that only Texas, Louisiana, and California would benefit from pending legislation confirming State ownership of submerged lands ignores and distorts the facts.

The truth is that the State bills confirm ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within the respective boundaries to each of the 48 States, including nearly 1,000,000 acres of Lake Michigan to your own State of Illinois.

If you doubt that the Federal Government can take your Lake Michigan lands and shoreline improvements in Chicago, please read the Supreme Court case of *Illinois Central R. R. Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), in which it was held that the Great Lakes are "open seas" and that your State holds title to the bed of Lake Michigan under the same rule of law that the coastal States hold title to "lands under the tidewaters on the borders of the sea."

If you lend your aid to destroying the title of the 21 coastal States you will be destroying the title of your own and neighboring Great Lakes States. The 8 Great Lakes States have more than twice as much land under the lakes as the combined 21 coastal States have within their marginal sea boundaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for calling my attention to a letter which I have not yet received. The Senator seems to have more information about my correspondence than I possess.

But let me say to my good friend from Florida and to my good friend from Louisiana that the issue is not on inland waters, land beneath rivers, or land beneath tidewaters. All that area belongs to the States, according to decisions of the Supreme Court, and it is not proposed to take it from the States.

This colloquy shows how desperate—yes, how irresponsible—was the action of the attorney general of Texas. The Senator from Florida had a copy of the letter to Senator DOUGLAS, even before he had received the original.

As another example of the type of scare warfare being conducted by proponents of this bill, let me tell you about what happened in 1950 with respect to the filtration plant which the city of Chicago is building in Lake Michigan as a part of its water system. The city was attempting to finance the construction of the plant and was negotiating with a group of bankers to finance it. The attornel general of Texas wrote to the bankers and posed doubts about title to the land in Lake Michigan. This was done for the purpose of inducing the city to join with the State of Texas to obtain title to the submerged land off the Gulf of Mexico bordering the State of Texas. The special assistant, Mr. Joseph F. Grossman, formerly corporation counsel of the city of Chicago and now a special assistant corporation counsel, wrote the following letter in reply to the attorney for the bankers:

MARCH 29, 1950.

Mr. HENRY E. CUTLER,
Chapman and Cutler, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your letter of February 14, 1950, relating to the so-called tidelands case decided by the United States Supreme Court, June 23, 1947 (*United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19–46; 91 L. ed. 1889)). Enclosed with your letter is copy of a statement by John D. McCall, of Dallas, Tex., to the water code committee on the subject of effect of adverse decision in tidelands case on inland water rights.

There is a general misapprehension of the nature of the case referred to. The term "Tidelands case" in my opinion is a misnomer. The case did not involve title to submerged lands under tidewaters. It involved a controversy between the United States and the State of California as to the ownership of the 3-mile belt of land under the ocean seaward of low water mark.

The realistic controversy did not involve so much the legal title to the submerged land as the right to exploit the ocean bottom for oil and other resources deemed essential to the security of the Nation. There is no inference in that opinion which denies to the States the ownership of lands covered by tidewaters, or by fresh waters in the Great Lakes, with the consequent right to use or dispose of any portion thereof, when that can be done without substantial impairment of the interest of the public in the lands and waters remaining, as that right was established in *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387, 435, 453).

On the contrary, the Supreme Court in its decision of June 23, 1947, distinguished that case from earlier cases holding that the States owned in trust for their people the navigable tide waters between high and low water mark and navigable inland waters. Our own research discloses that the title of the States to such waters and the underlying lands never was considered as absolute as the title to uplands intended for sale or other disposition. "It is a title held in trust for the people of the State that they may enjoy the navigation of the waters, carry on commerce over them, and have liberty of fishing therein freed from the obstruction or interference of private parties." (*Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois*, *supra*, p. 452.)

The Secretary of the Army, as successor to the Secretary of War, acting under authority conferred by Congress, may assent to the erection of structures, such as wharves, piers, breakwaters, bridges, and dams, in navigable waters wholly within the territorial limits of a State which may interfere to a limited extent with navigation, but not without assent of the State. (*Cummings* v. *Chicago* (188 U. S. 410).)

The statement of Mr. McCall, together with other propaganda to influence Congress in the enactment of legislation is not for the purpose of "depriving the States of title to underwater land," as you say in your letter, but the propaganda is designed to free the States bordering upon the oceans and the Gulf of Mexico from interference by the United States in the exploitation of the oil resources under those waters.

We have been importuned before the attorney general of California and others to join with them in the litigation involving the so-called Tidelands case and in sponsoring legislation in Congress to confirm title in the States to submerged lands, but we have always refrained from participating in these activities in the firm belief that the title to tidelands and submerged lands in the Great Lakes, as well as the right to reclaim such lands by authority of the States and Congress or the Secretary of War, is not in jeopardy by the Tidelands case.

As to the filtration plant in Lake Michigan, we secured power by State legislation to reclaim submerged land for water-purification plants by amendment to section 49–11 of the Revised Cities and Villages Act (Laws of Illinois 1949, p. 568) and by the terms of that amendment the absolute title in fee simple to the land so reclaimed will become vested in the city of Chicago. We do not anticipate any great difficulty in securing a permit from the Secretary of the Army for such reasonable obstruction to navigation, in the public

interest, affecting only the port of Chicago and, if necessary, the Congress can authorize the erection of a filtration plant in Lake Michigan. (*Wisconsin* v. *Illinois* (278 U. S. 367; 73 L. ed. 426, 432).) However authority or consent from the United States may be obtained, it will create no problem for prospective investors in revenue bonds which may be issued by the city of Chicago for the improvement of its waterworks system since the bonds will not be a lien upon the property but will be payable solely from revenues of the waterworks system.

We appreciate receipt of your communication for our consideration, but, as you will note from this, we have given this subject considerable study for a number of years.

Very truly yours,

J. P. GROSSMAN,
Special Assistant Corporation Counsel.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike criticizing a high official of one of our great States, but his no holds barred tactics leave no alternative. The title of the State to submerged land on the lake shore of Chicago was established in the Illinois Central Railroad case, which was considered and distinguished in the so-called Tidelands cases of California, Texas, and Louisiana. The title to the "Gold Coast" on the near north side of Chicago was confirmed in riparian owners in the case of *The People* v. *Kirk* (162 III, 138), and the title of the State of Illinois and dominion over lands covered by Lake Michigan along the north shore through Lincoln Park was confirmed in the case of *Revell* v. *The People* (177 III, 468).

In the Kirk case, the Illinois Supreme Court quoted the following language from the opinion of the United States Supreme Court in the Illinois Central case:

> We hold that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes applies which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea, and that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other and subject to the same trusts and limitations.

Mr. Chairman, the rule that applies to the State of Illinois is applicable to the ownership by other States of their inland waters. That is why the actions of those who are pushing this bill in conjuring up bogey men should be exposed for what they are—deliberate attempts to deceive the people of 45 States to give away all their right, and interest in the Federally owned oil.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is spawned and saturated in deception and delusion. Justice for all the people of this country demands its defeat.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, the United States Government now owns 24 percent of all the land in our mainland. This does not include the Indian reservations.

Besides owning all of this land, our Uncle Sam apparently is bent upon going into this landlord business on a whole-hog basis. Only one other government in the world is a larger landholder. That is Red Russia, which owns or controls all of the land in that Communist country where private ownership is forbidden.

Less than 25 years ago the United States Government owned 33 percent of all the land in 11 Western States. Today it owns 54 percent of it. This land pays no taxes for the support of our schools, colleges, universities, highways, and other public improvements of local and State governments.

Now, after acquiring ownership of one-quarter of this Nation's soil and a staggering number of dwelling units, the United States is trying to reach out to sea and lay claim to ownership of those areas off the shores of some of our States. The United States seeks to grab the oil and gas in these offshore areas. Who knows when this grab will be extended to fisheries, port and dock rights, beach facilities, and each and every other use related to our coastal waters?

Whither are we drifting?

Where is all of this to end?

It is a serious, a very critical situation. It constitutes a dire threat to our American system of government. What is to happen to private ownership and development under this new system? Where does it leave free enterprise which is the heart and soul of our American capitalistic system?

It is bad enough that Uncle Sam has gone into the land and housing business in a wholesale way. He at least presumably has a sound and marketable title to these possesions. In the case of the tidelands, he seeks to acquire additional possessions without any just claim to title.

I admit that the United States has paramount power and dominion over navigation, commerce, war activities, and so forth, but this does not bestow title to the soil and resources in navigable waters upon the United States nor does it destroy title, whether in States or in private owners.

Title of all States in the American Union to the soil and all resources in their navigable waters is supported by the Declaration of Independence, the Treaty of Independence with the British Crown, entered into in 1783, and several United States Supreme Court decisions.

I do not believe that anyone will dispute the proposition that if the United States does not have title to the submerged lands beneath navigable waters within the respective State boundaries, it is not entitled to them or whatever they may produce.

If we are to intelligently discuss the question of title to these submerged lands, we must look back to the original source of such title. This would, of course, stem back to the time when the original States became free and independent sovereign States under the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. Then, we find that the next link in the States' chain of title to these lands was developed by the provisional treaty which was entered into by and between the original States through the Congress of the Confederation and the British Crown on November 30, 1782, in which we find the following provision:

> Article 1. His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz, New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, to be free, sovereign, and independent States; that he treats with them as such; and for himself, his heirs and successors, relinquishes all claims to the Government, proprietary, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof; and that all disputes which might arise in future on the subject of the boundaries of the said United States may be prevented, it is hereby agreed and declared, that the following are and shall be their boundaries, viz:
>
> "Article 2. * * * East by a line to be drawn along * * * the rivers that fall into the Atlantic Ocean from those which fall into the river St. Lawrence; comprehending all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

This provisional treaty was ratified by the definitive treaty on April 11, 1783, between the original States through the Congress of the Confederation of the United States.

Therefore, by both the Declaration of Independence and the treaty with the British Crown which followed the Revolution, the Original Thirteen States were free and independent sovereign States, to whom the British Crown had relinquished not only all claims to the Government, but also all proprietary and territorial rights of the same.

For the next 6 years, or until the United States Constitution was written in the 1787 Convention and ratified, finally, in 1789, the original States functioned under Articles of Confederation, article IX of which provided that:

> No State shall be deprived of territory for the benefit of the United States.

In *Harcourt* v. *Gaillord* (12 Wheat. 523 (1827)), the United States Supreme Court held:

> There was no territory within the United States that was claimed in any other right than that of some one of the Confederate States; therefore, there could be no acquisition of territory made by the United States distinct from or independent of some one of the States.

When the Constitution was written by the 1787 Convention of Delegates from the original States, they were very careful to provide that the blood-bought right of government and their proprietary and territorial rights confirmed by the treaty with the British Crown in 1783, was made the supreme law of the land by a specific provision in the United States Constitution, which the people of the original States ratified finally in 1789.

Article VI, clause 2 of the United States Constitution, provides:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that on Saturday, August 25, 1787, on motion of Mr. Madison, made in the Convention, article VIII—later made article VI by the Committee on Style and Revision—was reconsidered and, after the words "all treaties made," were inserted the words "or which shall be made," with the explanatory statement:

This insertion was meant to obviate all doubt concerning the force of treaties pre-existing, by making the words "all treaties made" to refer to them, as the words concerned would refer to future treaties (69th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. No. 398, at p. 618).

So it is that the 1783 Treaty of the Revolution by which the British Crown relinquished to the original States all "proprietary and territorial rights," of the British Crown became, and is now, the supreme law of the land.

The same article VI of the Constitution requires all Members of Congress, and State legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, to support this Constitution, which makes said treaty the supreme law of the land.

The Supreme Court of the United States has, on more than one occasion, interpreted and confirmed the proprietary rights thus acquired by the original States in all of the submerged lands within their boundaries. This will be clearly seen by a reading of the decision by the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Martin* v. *Waddell* cited as 16 Peters (41 U. S. 367) and also *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391), both very old cases.

In the McCready case the Supreme Court had this to say:

The principle has long been settled in this Court, that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction, unless they have been granted away. In like manner, the States own the tidewaters themselves, and the fish in them, so far as they are capable of ownership while running. For this purpose the State represents its people, and the ownership is that of the people in their united sovereignty. Citing *Martin* v. *Waddell* (1842), supra. The title thus held is subject to the paramount right of navigation, the regulation of which in respect to foreign and interstate commerce has been granted to the United States. There has been, however, no such grant of power over the fisheries. These remain under the exclusive control of the State. * * * The right which the people of the State thus acquire comes not from their citizenship alone, but from their citizenship and property combined. It is, in fact, a property right, and not a mere privilege or immunity of citizenship.

THE TITLE OF NEW STATES

The title of new States admitted into the American Union since the adoption of the Constitution, to their submerged lands was recognized by our Supreme Court in 1845. In that year the Court in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212), had this to say:

"By the preceding course of reasoning we have arrived at these general conclusions: First, the shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States, respectively; secondly, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States."

In this and many other cases, the United States Supreme Court has held over a period of many years that the various American States have owned their tidelands.

You might wonder—and for that matter, so do I—why the successor to this same Court in 1947 and again in 1950 upset the settled and accepted law of the land in the now famous California, Texas, and Louisiana tidelands cases. Apparently without rhyme or reason was this radical departure made from the sound and well-reasoned doctrine laid down by the jurisprudence and settled law of the land.

It can only be explained by the unfortunate trend in recent years toward a paternalistic, a centralized government.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, this legislation should be defeated because it would give three States resources which belong to all the people.

One of the reasons why the giveaway legislation has not been more vigorously opposed in the past has been that most people have not appreciated the tremendous value of the oil and gas resources on the Continental Shelf. In fact, some supporters of the legislation have displayed an understandable interest in underestimating the great wealth that would be given away under their proposals—or in obscuring it behind a smokescreen of complicated legal disputation.

We are therefore presenting herewith some of the official figures prepared by the Department of the Interior.

Even these figures, however, are probably underestimates. The geologists who prepared them are traditionally conservative in their calculations. Their figures are minimum estimates. Further exploration and development will probably indicate that the offshore mineral resources of the Continental Shelf are still greater.

Also, the value of these resources is usually expressed in terms of current prices. The probability is that the price for both oil and gas will rise in the future—as it has in the past—and that the dollar value of these assets will therefore increase over the years.

First. Oil: The estimated potential reserves of our offshore oil resources in the Continental Shelf lying seaward of the coasts of California, Louisiana, and Texas is a little more than 15 billion barrels.

This figure can be compared with the 33.7 billion barrels of proved reserves for the upland area within the United States as a whole. It is 45 percent of the estimated proved reserves.

Both these estimates are set forth in the table entitled "Estimated Proved and Potential Petroleum Reserves," prepared by the Department of the Interior.

The table also shows the distribution of these reserves.

It can be seen that 9 billion barrels—three-fifths of the total for the Continental Shelf—are on the Continental Shelf off the shores of Texas. Louisiana comes next with 4 billion barrels, and California next with a little more than 2 billion barrels.

It can also be noted that in the case of California a slightly greater portion of the potential oil reserves in the Continental Shelf is found within than is found outside the 3-mile limit. In the case of Texas and Louisiana, the greater bulk is thought to be outside the 3-mile limit.

A special breakdown is provided for Texas, which claims an historical boundary of 3 leagues—9 nautical or 10½ statute miles—in the Gulf of Mexico. Only 400 million barrels—less than 5 percent of the Texas total of 9 billion barrels—is within the 3-mile limit. The 3-league limit includes a total of 1.2 billion barrels—thus tripling the amount found within the 3-mile limit. The largest proportion—7.8 billion barrels—is outside the "historical limit" of 3 leagues.

The table also indicates that only an extremely small portion of these reserves is as yet proved. The reason for this is that the campaign for "giveaway" legislation has again and again held up congressional action on legislation to expedite exploration and development under the auspices of the Federal Government.

It should also be kept in mind that there are probably vast oil reserves in the Continental Shelf off the coast of Alaska. The total area of the shelf off Alaska is estimated to contain 600,000 square miles, more than twice the 290,000 square miles in the Continental Shelf off the United States itself. An estimate of the United States Geological Survey, based upon the studies of L. G. Weeks for the American Association of Geologists, suggested that in the case of Alaska "the reserve estimate would be 23.6 billion barrels." This would bring the total estimate up from 15 billion barrels to 38.6 billion barrels.

The total dollar value of the oil reserves (excluding Alaska) can be shown as follows:

	Billion barrels
Landward 3-mile line	1.75
Seaward 3-mile line	13.25
Total	15.0
	Billion $ (rounded)
Landward 3-mile line	4.6
Seaward 3-mile line	34.6
Total	39.2

This tabulation is based on the conservative assumption of $2.65 per barrel. Thus, the total value of the potential oil reserves within the 3-mile limit comes to almost $5 billion. The total value outside the 3-mile limit comes to almost $35 billion.

An estimated 800 million barrels of potential reserves are to be found outside the 3-mile limit, but inside the so-called 3-league "historical boundary" of Texas. These reserves may be estimated as worth over $2 billion.

All in all, the total value of the 15 billion barrels of oil is worth just about $40 billion. This $40 billion figure is equivalent to the total Federal revenues from individuals and corporation taxes in fiscal 1951. It is greater than total budget expenditures for military services in fiscal 1952. It is almost one-fourth of the total current assets of American corporations, as reported by the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Even so, this $40 billion figure is an underestimate because it is based upon the current price of oil. No allowance is made for the normal increase in oil prices.

In a report entitled "Submerged Oil and Education" of February 20, 1953, the Public Affairs Institute makes the following estimate concerning the future price of oil:

A probable average price for the oil over the next 20 years is $4.50 a barrel. The price

of petroleum has been increasing at the rate of 7 percent annually. With the moderate estimate of 15 billion barrels the gross income would total $76,500,000,000.

In support of this estimate, it can be pointed out that over the 12-year period from 1940 to January 1953, the index of petroleum and petroleum products prices went from 50 to 117.4—an increase at the rate of 7 percent annually. If, under the pressure of increased demand, prices were to increase at the same rate anually, the price would be $4.50 within 8 years. On this assumption, the 15 billion barrels would be worth $76,500,000,000.

But these estimates do not include the 23,600,000,000 barrels of oil which are estimated to lie in the Continental Shelf off the coast of Alaska. As indicated earlier, when Alaskan reserves are included, the total estimate rises from 15 billion barrels to 38,600,000,000 barrels. At the current prices, the total offshore potential reserves would thus be worth not $40 billion, but over $102 billion.

This figure, of course, is based upon the current price. If it is assumed, however, that the price for oil over the next 20 years will average $4.50 a barrel, as estimated by the Public Affairs Institute, then the total value of the offshore oil resources, including Alaska, will amount to over $173 billion.

It should also be kept in mind that the estimates supplied by the Department of Interior are extremely conservative. Oil company experts who operate close to the scene have often come forth with what are probably much more realistic estimates. Thus a group of 18 Texas geologists and registered engineers have estimated potential oil reserves off the coast of Texas of 11 billion barrels, as contrasted with the 9 billion barrels estimated by the Department of the Interior—see Appendix for full report of Texas geologists and engineers.

Second. Gas; the estimated potential reserves of gas in the offshore lands as shown in the table entitled "Estimated Proved and Potential Petroleum Reserves," is 68,500,000,000,000 cubic feet. This is more than one-third of the proved reserves of 196,000,000,000,000 cubic feet within the land area of the United States.

The table also shows the distribution of these reserves. As with oil, the largest amount is off the coast of Texas and the smallest amount off the coast of California.

The dollar value of gas is extremely difficult to estimate. Prices vary from as low as 7 cents per 1,000 cubic feet to 25 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. Among the factors determining the price are the accessibility of the gas reserves and the extent to which the flow of gas from these reserves can be controlled.

For the purpose of simplicity, these gas reserves might be priced at an average of 15 cents per 1,000 cubic feet—the same price figure which is used in the report of the Texas geologists and engineers. This would bring the total value of the potential gas reserves in the Continental Shelf to a little more than $10 billion.

Third. Other minerals: There is no reason to believe that oil and gas are the only mineral resources in the offshore lands.

Geologists have already found sulfur in the offshore lands off the coast of Texas. The October 1952 report of the Texas geologists and engineers estimates 120 million long tons of sulfur at a price of $25 per long ton. The sulfur reserves alone would be worth more than $3 billion.

As the offshore resources are developed during the coming years, it is highly likely that other valuable minerals will also be discovered in sizable quantities.

Fourth. Potential revenues: As already indicated, the value of oil and gas resources in the offshore area can be estimated at $40 billion and $10 billion, respectively—or a total of $50 billion.

If royalties are estimated at 12½ percent, the potential revenues from these $50 billion worth of assets will be $6.25 billion.

This sum is practically equivalent to the total annual interest paid each year on the national debt.

A breakdown of these revenues is as follows:

	Estimated value	*Estimated royalties*
Landward 3-mile line...	$8,000,000,000	$1,000,000,000
Seaward 3-mile line...	42,000,000,000	5,250,000,000
Total..	50,000,000,000	6,250,000,000

These estimates, however, are extremely conservative. They do not take into account the value of either Alaskan reserves or sulfur reserves. They assume prices no higher than the present prices. Moreover, they do not take into account the estimates contained in the October 1952 report of the Texas geologists and engineers.

A summary of the Texas report appeared in the Houston Post of Sunday, October 26, 1952. According to this group of experts:

> The submerged lands off the shore of Texas are reported to hold gas, oil, and sulfur worth an estimated $80 billion.

The names of the experts who prepared this $80 billion estimate for Texas alone appear in the Appendix.

The inclusion of any of these additional considerations would add substantially to the $6.25 billion estimate of royalties. The inclusion of all these considerations would bring estimated royalties well above $20 billion.

Fifth. Revenues already accrued: Even though the development of offshore resources has thus far proceeded at a snail's pace, substantial revenues have already accrued since the Supreme Court upheld the rights of the Federal Government in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

For example, the offshore oil deposits along the California coast have produced revenues aggregating more than $47.3 million since the case against California was decided favorably to the United States in 1947.

The revenues derived from the Continental Shelf lands off Louisiana and Texas have aggregated approximately $15 million and half a million, respectively, since the cases against Louisiana and Texas were decided in 1950.

Thus, a grand total of approximately $62.8 million, derived from the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, is awaiting disposition at the present time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

LET'S RING THE SCHOOL BELLS AND NOT GIVE AWAY OFFSHORE RESOURCES

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, soon after Congress convened, I introduced House Joint Resolution 89 which provides that the royalties from certain oil and gas properties under the open sea located off the coast of California, and under the Gulf of Mexico, off the coasts of Texas and Louisiana, extending from the low-water mark seaward shall be expended for a better educational program in all the 48 States. One of our greatest national problems today is in the field of education.

At the outset, I wish to state that I am wholeheartedly against H. R. 4198, which purports to set forth as its purpose to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf.

No legislation could have been more skillfully drawn to deceive its true purpose. The sole effect of H. R. 4198 is to nullify the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases, and thereby attempt to give away to those States this valuable property that belongs to all the people in this country. The questions of tidelands oil is not involved, because it is conceded that the tidelands oil belongs to the States. The United States Supreme Court has continuously held to that theory, and no one disputes those rulings. That is, the lands along the seashore which are covered at high tide and exposed at low tide. The property involved here is from the low-water mark extending seaward.

We should not undertake to give away an asset, to a few States that border on the ocean, which belongs to the people of all the 48 States, notwithstanding all the window dressing and all the other superfluous statements in H. R. 4198.

I cannot think of any more appropriate way to spend the royalties from the offshore oil than for school purposes. In Kentucky today teachers' salaries range from $736 to $5,100. Our trained teachers are continuously leaving the profession. In addition to our underpaid teachers' problem and lack of facilities for our schools, it has been estimated that we need to spend more than $157 million alone for new construction in Kentucky. This must be done if we are to relieve overcrowded conditions and properly house the anticipated increased enrollments and replace obsolete buildings.

The seriousness of our educational problem was called to the attention of this Nation by Commissioner Earl J. McGrath of the United States Office of Education when he recently announced some of the results of a nationwide survey of

school building needs and the States' abilities to provide for them. The survey found among other things that there is a present need for an additional 708 million square feet of school building space for more than 9,250,000 pupils in public elementary and secondary schools. This is equivalent to more than 325,000 instruction rooms and related facilities, and the estimated cost is $10,700,000,000. Mind you, that would not, if provided, do more than relieve present overcrowding and replace obsolete facilities. That much space is needed only to replace the 170,000 classrooms that are obsolete and provide 155,000 new classrooms.

Even though through some miracle this vast number of classrooms should spring into existence, the space problem alone would be solved only for this year. That would make no provision for the future. The estimates of 1952–53 elementary and secondary school enrollment show a total of 27,533,054 pupils. Data developed in the survey indicate a public-school enrollment of more than 31 million in 1956 and a million more by 1958.

Where are these youngsters going to go to school? If every State and local school district exhausted its current legal resources through bond issues and whatever other means are currently available, the survey finds that only $5,800,000,000 could be raised. It is certain that this problem will become more and more critical year by year.

The survey I refer to definitely shows that financing practices will have to be improved and new and substantial resources for public-school construction will have to be tapped to make up the deficit of $4.9 billion to meet the minimum standards of safety for our present school systems. Additional funds will be needed to provide for the millions of new pupils we know we will have in the years ahead.

The physical needs for classrooms and buildings of course are only one aspect of the pressing problems our schools are facing and will face. I think we are all at least aware of the pressing needs for more teachers for our youngsters. These teachers are entitled to at least a living wage and the thousands of new teachers needed now and in the future mean even more funds must be found.

This is a national problem. Even those States with the most satisfactory facilities are in serious difficulties. Even there the building shortage is severe and will grow worse. All of our State and local school authorities are doing their utmost to cope with the problem. During the fiscal year 1952 the Office of Education, under the controlled materials plan of the Defense Production Act, issued permits and allocated materials supporting educational construction valued at $1,878,000,000 under a system of priority second only to defense needs. An estimated total of 49,500 elementary and secondary classrooms were completed during the year. However, this fell short by 6,500 classrooms of taking care of the actual increase of school enrollment—1,691,000 pupils—that took place within a year's time.

It is obvious that something else must be done if the children of our Nation are to have the advantages of even the basic education which Americans have traditionally considered their birthright.

Federal aid to education antedates the Constitution. I know that some Members of Congress do not want to admit it, but Federal aid to our schools has always been with us. Looking back over the records of this Congress, you will find that this body has continuously set aside public lands for this purpose as new States were admitted to the Union.

In more recent years, the Congress has enacted such beneficial legislation as the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act, and other vocational educational enactments which directly benefited our public schools.

Even if it were true, as some contend that the Founding Fathers intended education to be a State and local responsibility, there would still be the necessity for the Federal Government to contribute to the support of the public schools today. The Nation is no longer composed of self-contained and relatively independent communities as it was in the time of our forefathers. Quite the contrary.

Today our communities are so interdependent that the welfare of the whole Nation is affected by the educational attainment of the people in every locality. Furthermore, the birth rate in this country, in general, is highest in those areas where economic conditions are poorest and educational levels are lowest.

We all know that it is a part of our American system nowadays for hundreds of thousands of people to migrate annually from those areas to other localities. The migrants take with them the results of their relatively poor schooling. It is to the interest of all that the Federal Government step in and help solve our educational problem, for it is the only agency in a position to do so.

Here at hand today is a new possible source of funds for our schools. We are considering now whether the so-called tidelands, or more exactly the submerged lands offshore, should belong to the States or to the United States. We know that essential elements of our modern civilization are to be found there, oil and natural gas. Conservative estimates tell us that the Continental Shelf adjoining our Nation's shorelines contain 15 billion barrels of oil and 68 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Other estimates go much higher.

Royalties, rents, and bonuses to be derived from development and exploitation of these vast resources will constitute many billions of dollars. I am hopeful that these royalties will be devoted to the needs of the Nation's schools as a whole instead of giving them away to three States. If the entire income from this source could be thus directed, the bells of our schools would assuredly ring out loud and clear for many years to come.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that we will be able to do something for the schools by earmarking these royalties for educational purposes. Many of us have made pledges in the field of balancing the budget, eliminating waste, cutting taxes, making every contribution possible to ending the Korean conflict, fighting corruption, cutting nonessential Government spending, extending social security, replacing slums, combating inflation, promoting education, and promoting the welfare of agriculture.

I have commenced to wonder myself just how many of our pledges may be redeemed in the event we are successful in nullifying the Supreme Court decision and give away valuable property rights; which in all probability may easily defray our governmental operating expenses for 1 or more years, including all the money we are now spending to maintain our Army, Navy, and Air Force, the entire defense setup, and foreign aid.

The people of this country may rest assured that there will be no budget-balancing, in my opinion, if we continue to legislate against the national interest of all the people in this country. I am fearful that we are going to cripple our entire national-defense setup as long as we are confronted with world conditions as they exist today.

I cannot think of a more horrible thing from the standpoint of national defense than for us to set aside an order transferring a Nation's offshore oil deposits from the Interior to the Navy as a petroleum reserve.

As has been stated thousands of times, oil is the lifeblood of the Navy. I stated before a House committee hearing on this legislation that "the national defense of this country today from the standpoint of national interest would not permit any such gift to anyone."

I am still hopeful that this Committee will concern itself with the real issue, that we intend to keep the oil and decide how to use it best for the national interest. I have always felt that the royalties could be better used for school purposes, and to take effect at the moment the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf are withdrawn from their present status of a naval petroleum reserve.

It is to assure that the coming generations will benefit as a whole from the development of these resources that I approach the present problem of ownership, use, and incomc from submerged lands with a view to the maximum benefit to the schools.

The importance of oil to the United States cannot be overestimated. Without it a large proportion of American civilization would grind to a teeth-chattering halt. With access to an ample, nearby source the Nation can maintain its leadership in the world, it can make ready its defenses against any who may challenge its way of life. Through strength the Nation can bulwark the cause of democracy throughout the world. So much depends on this vital substance and yet we have discovered alarmingly that the United States is a net importer of oil. We are now dependent upon oil from distant lands to meet our daily needs and to fuel our defense effort.

Should world war III come, how long could we depend upon these sources from which tankers must travel thousands of miles through seas which would shortly become submarine infested? In an all out war effort modern day military needs

for oil and its products skyrocket, and we could find ourselves in a most critical situation. The net result would be that we would have to turn right around and buy back at most handsome prices something that we had already given away, if the proponents of H. R. 4198 are successful in their efforts; that is, if we had access to it at all.

There is only one answer to this question, and that is to hold on to our submerged lands and not give them away. H. R. 4198 should be defeated.

In the event this legislation is defeated, the Interior or Navy Department, I am sure, will go ahead and develop these resources. It has been estimated that under proper governmental supervision, daily production from offshore facilities within 5 years of intensive effort, could increase production to some 200,000 barrels of oil and 600 to 800 million cubic feet of gas daily. The National Petroleum Council anticipates that after that period of development, new discoveries resulting from intensive exploration will accelerate increased production at a greater rate.

The decision given in the California case clearly states that the Federal Government has paramount rights in and over the marginal belt, and incident thereto has full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area. This, of course, included oil and gas.

To me, that is clear enough. The question has been ruled upon specifically three times, as stated above, and the decision has been the same in each instance.

We should end this controversy by defeating this give-away legislation and earmarking the funds for educational purposes to take effect when this property is withdrawn from its present status as a national petroleum reserve.

All of the States admitted to the Union since the original 13 have been admitted with the provision that they were admitted on an equal footing with those first 13. At the time the Nation was established the then Thirteen Colonies were the property of the Crown. They had no existence as international entities. All of the properties, rights, and prerogatives of a nation so far as they were concerned were possessed by the Crown of England.

Historically, any right of sovereignty has been established in international law by national action. The Thirteen Original States did not exist as a nation and assert the sovereign rights and powers of nations on their own part. It seems clear to me that the sovereign power of the National Government arises inevitably from its duty and power to regulate commerce, conduct foreign affairs, and provide for the national defense.

A state or province has no standing in international law. No nation can claim more of the open sea than what other nations concede to it. The Constitution states that the Federal Government is to conduct foreign affairs, and since this question of ownership of the marginal seas is one of foreign relations, there can be no doubt that it is one for the Federal Government.

For States to lay claim to the marginal sea even beyond the generally recognized 3-mile limit is dangerous. It would force the United States to abandon its traditional position held ever since Thomas Jefferson first asserted it in 1793 when he was Secretary of State.

I read in the Washington Evening Star the other day where the United States was protesting the seizure of American shrimp fishermen 10 miles off its coast by Mexico, who claimed the violation of its territorial waters. The Navy has long advocated the 3-mile limit. This is important in that the Navy is charged with the defense of our territorial waters.

It seems that under proposed legislation the Congress is asked to give up the right of the Federal Government, and thus those of all of the people in the Nation, to the resources of the submerged lands. We are asked to deliver them to three States. Resources that are vital to the national defense and the welfare of all the people. I say this should not be, that we should not give away this valuable property.

To those who are concerned with the rights of enterprises which are already active in the offshore areas, I believe all will agree that under whatever final disposition their equitable rights will be protected.

In conclusion on this point it may be stated, and evidence will substantiate the contention, that sovereignty over and title to the subsoil of the seabed under the maritime belt—the 3-mile limit—are vested in the littoral state by international law. It may further be stated beyond possible contravention that the United States, not the original and subsequently admitted coastal States, is the sovereign in which this land is vested. It cannot be claimed that the States reserved the sovereignty and title to this land because the States were never vested with them.

In the case of Texas, admission on an equal footing with the other States, despite its previous existence as a nation, certainly implies that it gave up any such rights upon becoming a State. The most-often-cited cases in support of the claims of the States to this land are not precedents for the simple reason they were not decided with respect to land or parties on a comparable basis. Sovereignty and title to these lands are directly connected with international relations and therefore are vested exclusively in the United States. The outward, seaward boundary of the United States need not be the same as the borders of the States contiguous to the sea.

This does not mean, however, that the States give up the rights to police such waters in regard to fishing, the criminal codes, and the like, nor does it imply in any way any claim or right to the inland waters within the States.

Mr. Chairman, it is of the utmost importance that we defeat H. R. 4198 and enact a substitute which earmarks these royalties for educational purposes. We must aid our schools in order that the school bells will continue to ring out throughout the Nation. As the Liberty Bell heralded the beginning of our great Nation, let the rising volume of the school bells, made possible by the proceeds from these great oil and gas resources, be heard throughout the world. Their ringing will be a tocsin of the new era of freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on his splendid analysis of the legislation before us. It is true that the tidelands, inland waterways, and Great Lakes are not any subject of this controversy. As a camouflage, the interested States would like for us to believe that the inland waterways were endangered by the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases. But such is not the case. The Supreme Court clearly held that the tidelands and all inland waterways were the property of the respective States.

I have not been able to find out during the entire discussion today, from the proponents of this legislation, from what source the Thirteen Original Colonies obtained title to the marginal-sea area and I would like to know if the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] can give me the answer to that question.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. I would like to answer the question by reading a paragraph from the report of the California Senate interim committee on tidelands which I believe sheds some light on the question:

So firmly entrenched was this doctrine of ownership and control of the marginal seas by the time American colonization began that the colonial charters given by the King contained specific grants of wide belts of territorial waters. The colonists accepted this as a natural part of their local prerogatives. They utilized the submerged land in the same way they utilized the dry land of the North American Continent.

By the treaty of 1783 with Great Britain which ended the Revolutionary War, it was a provision of that treaty by which the Americans would have title and control of the lands under the marginal sea.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman well knows that the treaty with Great Britain was made by the Colonies united as a nation. Is that statement correct or not?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Constitution of the United States was not adopted until 1787.

Mr. PERKINS. Even before the Constitution was adopted, on July 4, 1776, when the Thirteen Colonies declared their independence from England, they did it as a united nation and not as 13 separate, individual colonies.

In answer to the gentleman from California, may I say that I have before me the United States Reports wherein the California case is reported. Page 31, volume 332, states:

It stresses that the Thirteen Original Colonies did not own the marginal belt; that the Federal Government did not seriously assert its increasingly greater rights in this area until after the formation of the Union; that it has not bestowed any of these rights upon the States, but has retained them as appurtenances of national sovereignty.

And further:

From all the wealth of material supplies, however, we cannot say that the Thirteen Original Colonies separately acquired ownership to the 3-mile belt or the soil under it.

And over on the next page:

At the time this country won its independence from England there was no settled international custom or understanding among nations that each nation owned a 3-mile water belt along its borders. Some countries, notably England, Spain, and Portugal, had, from time to time, made sweeping claims to a right of dominion over wide expanses of ocean. And controversies had arisen among nations about rights to fish in prescribed areas. But when this Nation was formed, the idea of a 3-mile belt over which a littoral nation could exercise rights of ownership was but a nebulous suggestion. Neither the English charters granted to this Nation's settlers, nor the treaty of peace with England, nor any other document to which we have been referred, showed a purpose to set apart a 3-mile ocean belt for colonial or State ownership.

Does it make sense, therefore, to undertake to make a quitclaim title by this Congress to property that the States never did own? That is the point I have in my mind.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Admitting for the purpose of argument what the gentleman has said, what would that have to do with the position of the States that came into the Union after that? Are you arguing that because the Thirteen Original States had no 3-mile belt, all other contracts made by the constitutional body, the Congress, constituting treaties, would have no effect?

Mr. PERKINS. I will say to the gentleman that I will treat your case separately; but if you know of any claim that the Thirteen Original Colonies had to the marginal sea extending 3 miles seaward from low water mark I wish you would explain it to this Committee. You do not contend that they had any such claim then?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The gentleman answers my question by asking me one. You answer my question first.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree that Texas does have some color of claim, but Texas was admitted to the Union by a resolution of this Congress and she was admitted under the equal footing clause of the Constitution of the United States. She surrendered her ports and harbors and the appurtenances pertaining thereto, and other properties essential for defense. Naturally this included any paramount rights and dominion over the marginal sea or Continental Shelf.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Such as post offices and other public buildings.

Mr. PERKINS. That is right.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. But they retained their public domain.

Mr. PERKINS. And anything incidental to the defense of Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. But they retained their public domain and public lands.

Mr. PERKINS. That is right, but the public lands and public domain did not include submerged land under the Gulf of Mexico out from the low-water mark extending seaward from the State of Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Only 3 leagues.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, that is where she surrendered the 3 leagues when Texas was admitted to the Union on an equal footing with the other States.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. I was trying to make an observation a while ago, that one of the former Members of this House, the late Samuel Hobbs, who was one of the finest constitutional authorities every to sit in this body and a scholar on this question of submerged lands, in his statement to the Committee on the Judiciary stated that there is no case or respectable authority that asserts fee simple title to the 3-mile limit or beyond outwardly.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PERKINS. Briefly.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. What claim does the Federal Government make as against the Thirteen Colonies? You are talking about what rights the States have. The States retained all rights that they did not give the Federal Government. Now what claim does the Federal Government make to that 3-mile belt?

Mr. PERKINS. The Federal Government has always had the responsibility of defending the Union and to regulate commerce, and, naturally, these things entail certain national responsibilities which make it necessary that our National Government have the paramount right and dominion over the marginal sea.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. This bill gives them those rights.

Mr. PERKINS. And the Federal Government, since the days of Jefferson, and before the days of Jefferson, has asserted and acquired national dominion and control over the marginal sea. And, because of the asserted right of the Federal Government over this area, it has always been the duty of the Federal Government to defend the area, and I have never heard that questioned. In fact, the duty is placed upon our Government by the Constitution to maintain our national defenses, which has always been accepted as the marginal sea. No State has ever questioned that duty and responsibility of our Government. Any claim that may obstruct our Government in being able to properly maintain our defenses over this area, certainly is junior and inferior to the paramount rights of the National Government, and would have to be struck down when the National Government asserts its superior right.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I insist that this bill protects the Federal Government's rights to control commerce and to use that territory up to the high-water mark for national defense or any other Federal purpose.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not think so. This bill undertakes to do something that would destroy in all probability the sovereign rights of the Federal Government if the courts were to uphold it. This bill authorizes the States to tax property far beyond the marginal sea limit, extending seaward, perhaps out some two or three hundred miles or farther, where oil or gas is extracted from the submerged lands beneath the ocean hundreds of miles out from the coast of Texas, for example. This just does not make sense, it is subsurd, and I do not believe the membership of the House will pass any bill with a provision like that in it. No one can tell what repercussions may result from a provision like this in the bill. We all know such a provision is unwarranted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think as they continue to extend these claims they may run into a paper line of demarcation, and maybe the Portuguese and the Spanish and all the rest of them have a right to this submerged and marginal land.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I would like to ask the gentleman with reference to national defense. The gentleman says in effect that the United States owns that 3-mile belt because it had to have it for national defense. As I conceive the obligation of the United States Government for national defense, it is to defend the country, whether it be the marginal sea or dry land; I think it has the same obligation. I am going to ask the gentleman if we do not have the same obligation on dry land that we have in these marginal seas, and is there anything in the law or the Constitution or anywhere else that would give the United States title to dry land which it is obligated to defend any more than the marginal sea?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly we have the right and duty to defend the dry lands, but the gentleman well knows that the States are not equipped to defend this Nation off the coast on the sea. If I used the word "title," perhaps I should modify that statement and use the words "paramount rights and dominion over," the words that the Supreme Court uses.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] made a statement that this would do no harm to the national defense. I challenge that statement. I think it would do great harm, much greater harm than if we were to convey the Teapot Dome properties out in Wyoming back to the State or undertake to give them away to someone else, because today we import oil, we no longer export oil. When the Government set this up as a naval petroleum reserve, and we undertake to remove this property from its reserve status, we are interfering with national defense, and we do not know about the necessities that will face us in the future.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. By way of clarification, as I recall my remarks, I said I felt it would not only not harm the United States if we allow the State to develop the natural resources within their historic boundaries but it might even benefit the national-defense program in view of the fine record of the States in World War II in the development of those areas.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. With reference to the national defense and national security, we need the oil; we will agree to that. However, if we give that oil away we will be damaging our national security and national defense to this extent: The Federal Government will have to be paying and paying and paying for that oil which belongs to it. In other words, it will cost the Government billions of dollars for that oil, which the Supreme Court says is theirs.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield, not only would the Federal Government have to pay billions of dollars for it but it would have to pay a severance tax on top of it.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The gentleman stated a moment ago he just could not understand how a State or local government could be permitted to tax by a a severance tax oil or minerals taken from the public domain. The gentleman is familiar with the Federal Leasing Act with respect to the public domain.

Mr. PERKINS. In a general way, I am familiar with the Federal Leasing Act, but I am familiar with the severance tax laws of several States also.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Would not this very domain we are talking about, the outer Continental Shelf, become the public domain of the United States if this bill is passed in its present form?

Mr. PERKINS. The Federal Government would have a paramount right to and dominion over any claim of the State of Texas. Naturally, this right would be a superior right to any claim of Texas to develop the mineral resources.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Would not this territory outside the boundaries of the States become the public domain of the Federal Government?

Mr. PERKINS. Their claim would be much superior to the claim of any State.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Would it not become the public domain? That is the question.

Mr. PERKINS. I am going to say this: It might become the subject of international controversy, but as between any claim of Texas and the Federal Government, the Federal Government's rights would be paramount, from the standpoint of developing the submerged lands for oil or for any other purpose pertaining to our national defenses.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If it is not the public domain, who owns the oil there? It has to be the public domain if the United States owns the oil.

Mr. PERKINS. The Federal Government has a paramount right to develop this oil, from a standpoint of national defense. Naturally, this right results from the conduct of foreign affairs, and to regulate commerce, and our duty to provide for the national defense.

Mr. YATES. If the gentleman will yield further, will the gentleman from Louisiana state whether the nation of Mexico owns the Continental Shelf out 9 miles out into the ocean, so that it can prevent our shrimpers from gathering shrimp there?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I will say this to the gentleman, that if we own the Continental Shelf, if the States own it out to the edge of the Continental Shelf, and the doctrines of the state of Mexico are similar to ours, then the individual states of the state of Mexico would own the land out to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true that as a result of our initiating this kind of legislation in an attempt to have bills of this character passed that the cue has been given to South American and other countries to extend their seaward limits clear out to their continental shelves, and if that is going to happen all over the world, one can readily perceive the perturbation and turbulence of mind of the State Department. We are a Maritime power and an able power, and therefore there will be and has been already because of this legislation, or attempted legislation, interference with what we traditionally call freedom of the seas.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from New York is exactly right. This bill undertakes at best to divest our Government of rights that the Department of State now will not assert.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think it would be advisable to bring to the attention of the membership, in view of the statements that have been made by some of the Members, that these various States have been claiming for years title or ownership to these submerged lands extending seaward from the low-water mark. That may or may not be true, that some people have made claims. However, the Supreme Court in the California case decided and said very definitely that for the first time this question as to who owns the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark has come to the Supreme Court and all the arguments were presented to them and they decided that the States never did own or have title to these submerged lands.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, at the present time I am not going to use all of my time. I want to extend and revise my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just one word with reference to this matter of national defense from a tidelands viewpoint. Just as a practical matter, we held some hearings some time back in reference to the value of these oil reserves, undiscovered and unexplored for that matter up to the present time. We also held some hearings as to the value of them from a national defense viewpoint. Frankly, after holding extensive hearings, I made up my mind that the oil reserves out in the ocean beyond the coastal lines of the United States would be of very little help to us in time of great national peril. In other words, they would be of little value as far as national defense in time of war. We had the experience in the last war of submarines coming right up to the coastline in the State of Louisiana. I was down there and saw a ship which had been sunk in the mouth of the Mississippi River by submarines.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at this point?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman for a question since he yielded to me for a question.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Louisiana well knows when you have title to anything, you are able to defend that title. That is from the common law on down. That is so under the Louisiana code and throughout all of the States of the Union as well. If we go ahead here and enact this legislation, and if the Supreme Court upheld the act, how could the State of Louisiana defend its own territory in the event of a controversy?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. You mean from the viewpoint of national defense?

Mr. PERKINS. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They would defend it just like you would defend Cincinnati or Chicago or any other place in the United States. We would defend it with everything we have. The obligation under the Constitution for the national defense rests primarily upon the Government of the United States; but the States, too, severally join in the national defense. When the gentleman refers to national defense, he knows we give the States hundreds of millions of dollars to aid in national defense.

The State militia which is the National Guard and the Air National Guard are set up under the authority of the States. The States have an obligation of national defense, as well as does the United States.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree that the States have an obligation for national defense, but your State of Louisiana, under that assumed state of facts, would not have any standing among the nations of this world.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Yes. The United States has the delegated authority, of course, to speak in international matters, for all of the States; but I was referring to the value of oil deposits out in the ocean, for national defense purposes. I say again that after these extensive hearings we had I do not see any force or logic to the argument that you can establish huge oil and gas reserves out in the waters in the open seas at an expense of multiple millions of dollars.

When war comes and a crisis is upon you, the submarines and airplanes do all the damage and destruction they can. How can you get any comfort out of your explosive material such as oil far out in the ocean in an exposed condition, beyond the ability of the National Government to safely defend such explosive deposits? If the gentleman has a ready answer to that question, I will pause to get his answer.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the answer the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] would give is that that is a very compelling argument for having the controlling ownership of these properties vested in the Federal Government.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is not an argument for Federal control. It is an argument that we ought to develop those deposits and use them in time of peace. But as far as relying upon those deposits in an exposed position, we all know we cannot do it in time of war, with any degree of safety. When we seek a location for an atomic plant or a nitrogen plant, we go to places that can be safely defended, because they are needed in time of great peril. When you develop oil deposits off the coast, out in an open, exposed sea, you cannot expect in time of peril to have those things safely defended. It cannot be done.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It seems to me that toward the latter stages of the last war we controlled the sea far beyond where these oil deposits might be, and nobody ever dared to attack us.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Well, just before Germany went under we did; but if the gentleman has had the experience that I have had and some of the other Members have had, he has flown up and down the Atlantic Coast and seen tanker after tanker burning, because it had been torpedoed or bombed and was going down. We lost hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of oil which was in tankers moving along the coast, and not in a stationary, exposed place as an oil field in the Continental Shelf. We almost lost the last war at one point on account of submarines sinking our shipping. The new Russian submarine is far more efficient and effective.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will admit all the gentleman says. That was in the early stages of the war, but after we had gone along we completely controlled the territory for more than a couple of hundred miles, and no attack was ever made upon our ships.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, on March 9 every Member of this House received a letter from Mr. Walter R. Johnson, special counsel for the National Association of Attorneys General. Mr. Johnson's letter enclosed a copy of a statement made by Harold R. Fatzer, attorney general of Kansas and president of the National Association of Attorneys General, in his appearance as a witness before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs considering measures relating to submerged lands.

In his letter Mr. Johnson said:

> I wish to call to your particular attention the memorandum set forth listing the officials of States and their political subdivisions (47 of the 48 States) favoring State ownership of submerged lands, in hearings held before the committees of Congress from 1938 to 1952. As indicated in the statement of Attorney General Fatzer, not one State official has ever appeared before the committees of Congress advocating Federal control of the lands involved.

I was somewhat surprised that some official of 47 of the 48 States should have favored State ownership of the submerged lands at various times. I turned to the memorandum prepared to take pride in the consistency of the State of Montana as the one State in the 48 that had held out against this attempt by Congress to nullify decisions of the United States Supreme Court and donate lands and mineral rights belonging to the Federal Government and held in trust for all the people of this Nation to the States.

When I located the part of the memorandum relating to Montana, I was amazed to see that Montana was included as one of the States allegedly favoring State ownership of submerged lands and that the official cited in support of that statement was Hon. R. V. Bottomly, former attorney general of Montana. The date given for Bottomly's support of State ownership of these submerged lands was 1945. Bottomly was the only State official or former State official named from Montana who had ever expressed himself in favor of State ownership of submerged lands and the implication was that by such expression Montana and her State officials and her representatives and her people were in favor of pending legislation to turn the submerged lands over to the States.

Now, R. V. Bottomly is one of Montana's most respected officials and best loved public servants. In addition to serving two 4-year terms as attorney general of Montana, for the past 4 years Bottomly has been associate justice of the Montana Supreme Court. During that entire time I, too, had the honor to serve on the Supreme Court of Montana and Judge Bottomly and I have had many talks about the question of the ownership of submerged lands and I know his feelings about this legislation. I know that he vehemently opposes State ownership of the submerged lands, that he firmly believes in the fundamental legality of the Supreme Court's decision in the three cases involving these submerged lands. More than any other person, lawyer or layman, Judge Bottomly in Montana is regarded as an authority on this question and he is everywhere in that area recognized as the leader of the great group of people that believes these oil-rich offshore lands should be used to help education all over the Nation. Senator MURRAY, who was a cosponsor of Senator HILL's bill to use part of the offshore oil royalties for educational purposes, and then Representative MANSFIELD, now junior Senator from Montana, who introduced a counterpart of the Hill amendment in the House of Representatives last session have both called upon Judge Bottomly for technical assistance and advice on this question.

I wrote to Judge Bottomly and asked him if, in 1945, he had advocated State ownership of these offshore lands. Judge Bottomly replied that in 1945, before the decision in the case of *U. S.* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19, 1947), he joined 45 other attorneys general on a brief in support of the then pending House Joint Resolution 225, 79th Congress. Judge Bottomly says, and I read from his letter:

> I signed this brief on the understanding that the subject matter referred to the tidelands, covered and uncovered by the tidewaters, and included all inland navigable waters as dealt with in the above cited cases.
>
> There has never been any question in my mind but that the States own the tidelands to low water mark and the beds of their navigable waters within their respective borders and all minerals therein; that question has been put to rest many times by our Supreme Court, and that is the only question in my understanding that was covered by the above mentioned brief which I signed, and that was the import that I received from reading the above report of the committee that then had the bill in charge.

Then Judge Bottomly, in his letter to me, continues:

> However, some time thereafter I learned that the true intent of the National Association of Attorneys General was to induce Congress to give to the three States and their assigns, not only the tidelands and the beds of all inland navigable waters but also to the coastal States, the lands and minerals therein on out beyond the tidelands.

After Judge Bottomly, then attorney general, learned of the intentions of the National Association of Attorneys General, he wrote to Walter R. Johnson, then attorney general of Nebraska and president of the association, in 1947. I am reading from Judge Bottomly's file copy of that two-page letter dated November 5, 1947:

> I took no part in regard to the rehearing on the matter (*U. S.* v. *California*) in the Supreme Court because I felt that the decision of the Supreme Court is for the best interests of the State of Montana and all of the other so-called reclamation States.

Judge Bottomly concludes:

> I therefore thought it was only right and proper that I notify you of my stand in this matter, and, as president of the National Association of Attorneys General, I request that my name not be used in any way, shape, or form in furthering the program which is now under way.

In reply to that letter, Attorney General Walter R. Johnson on December 19, 1947, sent Judge Bottomly a four-page letter starting with the following statement, and I am now reading from the original letter:

> Hon. R. V. BOTTOMLY,
> *Attorney General of Montana,*
> *State Capitol, Helena, Mont.*
>
> DEAR GENERAL BOTTOMLY: Yours is the first letter I have received from a State attorney general in opposition to congressional action recognizing State ownership of submerged lands.

General Johnson concludes:

> I hope you will reconsider your stand and fight with instead of against our sister States.

The Walter R. Johnson who signed this letter as attorney general of Nebraska, and president of the National Association of Attorneys General in 1947 is the same Walter R. Johnson who is the special counsel for the National Association of Attorneys General in 1953 and who signed the letter dated March 9

and addressed to every Member of the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress.

In his letter to me, Judge Bottomly says:

It is my contention that the above notice to the National Association of Attorneys General that my name could not be used in any way, shape, or form in furthering any legislation contrary to my views expressed to their president in my letter of November 5, 1947, and, as far as I know, this is the first time that such an attempt has been made.

I agree with that contention. I do not know how much research Mr. Fatzer made independently before he appeared before the Senate committee. I suspect that he relied on the counsel for the National Association of Attorneys General to do his research for him. But if Mr. Fatzer made his own search of the testimony and records to compile the statistics in the memorandum that accompanies his statement, his research was superficial because a more thorough job would have revealed that R. V. Bottomly had never actually advocated any legislation transferring title of lands lying to seaward of the low tidemark to the States. He would have found that, on the contrary, Judge Bottomly had, as early as 1947, in statements before congressional committees, advocated Federal ownership of these lands and opposed bills giving title to the States.

Therefore, Mr. Fatzer is mistaken when he says that 47 of 48 States are recorded in hearings as in favor of State ownership of submerged lands. He is also mistaken when he declares in the text of his statement:

At the onset I wish to present for the record a resolution adopted by the association at this 46th annual meeting held last December 10, in support of congressional action confirming and restoring State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States.

You have incorporated by reference the record of 14 previous hearings on the submerged lands issue which totals 5,506 pages. In those hearings you will find the names of officials of States and their political subdivisions from 47 of the 48 States, all of whom have favored the States in this controversy; not one, let me repeat again, not one, has advocated Federal control. There has been prepared for your use, and which I would like to have incorporated into the record a list of the said officials, arranged alphabetically by State, and after their names, the year or years in which they made their appearance before the committees of Congress by their personal testimony, statement, letter, telegram, or otherwise.

If Mr. Johnson assisted in the preparation of the testimony, he was in a position to know that the statement was not true and he should have, in candor, corrected it.

Since 1936 the State of Montana has had four attorney generals. They are Judge Bottomly who was attorney general for more than 8 years, Harry J. Freebourn who was attorney general for 4 years and is now an Associate Justice of the Montana Supreme Court, John W. Bonner, later Governor of Montana, and the present attorney general is Arnold Olsen, reelected at the last election for a second term. Everyone of these men, all able lawyers, two of them presently serving as justices of the Montana Supreme Court, are in accord with the correctness of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in the three cases ruling on the title to offshore lands. In their administrative positions as chief law officers for the State of Montana, they affirmatively declared that they believed that the decisions were correct. Judge Freebourn was attorney general before the offshore controversy arose but he has since declared that he believes these offshore lands and the minerals under them should be and remain the property of the Federal Government. John W. Bonner, both as attorney general and later as Governor of Montana, took the same position. So when Mr. Fatzer implies that State officials do not advocate Federal control of these lands he is misleading the Members of this Congress. In fact, the very records he cites contain statements of some of these men that contradict his declaration that "not one, let me repeat, again, not one has advocated Federal control."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Submerged Lands Act."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf, directed him to report they had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks in connection with the measure under consideration today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

STORM CLOUDS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a Member of Congress is a watchman for the people—particularly the people he has the honor to represent. If, from his position where the people have placed him, storm clouds should be discovered by him, it is his duty to warn the people of them.

STOP, LOOK, LISTEN, AND THINK

It is true that economic conditions in our country today are excellent. Not only are times good, but the outlook for the future appears real good. However, there are certain signs that can probably, I believe, be interpreted to mean, at least, caution, and some of them probably indicate that we should not only stop, look, and listen, but we should stop, look, listen, and think. We should think about what has happened before when the same signs appeared.

MONETARY A SUBTLE WEAPON

Any administration using monetary weapons to control our economy should keep in mind that the real effect of such a weapon is not always noticeable until great devastation has come to our country. It is a subtle weapon—one that cannot be evaluated or measured from day to day but is one that has powerful effects. This weapon can cause good times to be converted into bad times before attracting much notice or attention.

GREAT ANNUAL EVENT

One of the greatest annual events in our country is the increase in population. We must keep that in mind and provide for this increase—not necessarily thinking about the increase the year it actually happens but the year when these new arrivals become old enough to be workers. Every year, about three-quarters of a million new workers expect to secure employment. Our economy must be geared to take care of these new workers. If we just kept our economy dead still or on dead center, the increase in new workers would soon cause so much unemployment that our economy would suffer from a recession and then a depression. This problem becomes more serious with a policy of tight money and high interest rates.

In order to take care of these new workers, our gross national product must be increased 3 or 4 percent each year. This expansion is absolutely necessary in order to take care of the new workers and permit our country to expand and progress.

DEFINITE SIGNS

The signs that are disturbing me—if something is not done to change them—could be steps toward unemployment and recession. These signs are tight money, hard money, high interest rates, production and business loans hard to get, and particularly the disastrous decline in United States Government bonds. A few days ago—to be exact, March 25—I discussed here on this floor what I considered to be the disastrous consequences of the Federal Reserve Board's permitting United States Government bond prices to decline. At that time, long term 2½ percent Government's had declined to 94, but before the end of the week, they had declined another point—to 93.

In that speech, I called attention to the enormous decline in Government securities in Great Britain and endeavored to show a similarity between the actions taken over there the last 16 months and the actions that are now

being put into effect by the Federal Reserve Board and the United States Treasury here in the United States.

BRITISH BONDS DOWN TO 60

I did not bring out one point about Government securities in England that I think is worthy of much consideration by officials in the United States, and that is that the 2½ percent securities of the British Government have dropped from $100 to the low point of $60. Other British Government bonds are selling at par, it is true, but they bear 4 percent interest. I wonder if the officials of our Government are expecting our bonds to go down to 60 like they have in England. I wonder if the officials in our Government, including the Federal Reserve Board, of course, expect interest rates to increase almost 100 percent like they have in England. I wonder if our officials expect the policies that they are now putting into effect here which are similar to the policies put into effect in England 16 months ago can cause the stock market to decline as much as 30 percent, as it did in England.

LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Investors in our long-term Government securities, including life-insurance companies, had a right to expect that the Government bond market would be supported by the Open Markets Committee of the Federal Reserve System like it had supported it until March 1951. All during World War II, from December 7, 1941, our Government securities were never permitted to fall below par, or after the war until March 1951. There was speculation, it is true, on these bonds, but the speculation was above par—never below par.

ACTION CALLED FOR AFTER EASTER RECESS

I am convinced if the Federal Reserve Board does not take action soon to support the Government bond market and continues to follow the policy of tight money and high interest, which has in the past led to depressions, that Congress should make this problem its No. 1 problem to be dealt with after Easter and do something about it before it suddenly slips up on us and throws us into another great depression.

WHY DEPRESSIONS?

The Cooper Review—one of the best weekly newspapers in our State—published in the district I have the honor to represent, at Cooper, Tex., had an editorial in its March 27, 1953, issue entitled "Why Depressions?" It is as follows:

WHY DEPRESSIONS?

Dr. Clark Warburton, an economist who works for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in Washington, may have found the answer. If he's right, a number of people should be interested—i. e., just about every man, woman, and child on the globe.

The essence of a depression, Dr. Warburton says, is less spending for goods and services produced by business enterprise. When people spend less, one of two things, or both, must have happened. Either people kept money in their banks or pocketbooks that they might have spent without going too far in the hole, or they had less money to spend. In other words, depressions are caused by a shrinkage in money spending in the market.

Now, say, Dr. Warburton, the question is, does reduced spending precede or follow the shrinkage of the money supply. Modern economists have been saying that depressions begin with a decline in spending, a reduced rate in the use of money, rather than a smaller supply of money.

That's just the reverse of what economists thought 100 years ago. They said that the supply of money shrinks first, and then people begin to spend less. Dr. Warburton agrees. His studies show that by the middle of 1929, peak of the big boom, the Nation's money supply had already been contracting for a year. This was also true in 1937, in advance of the 1938 recession. In fact, shrinkage in the money supply preceded almost all of the 40 recessions and depressions since the American Revolution.

Now for the remedy. Dr. Warburton points out that the money supply in this country today is very largely controlled by the Federal Reserve Banking System. If the Federal Reserve banks operated so as to provide a rate of growth in the legal reserves of member banks for lending purposes corresponding to the rate of growth of money which is needed in the economy for business stability we need fear no major depression, Dr. Warburton thinks. It is not just a question of maintainng a constant supply of money. It is a question of increasing the money supply in proportion to the need.

The fact is depressions are manmade, or at least, permitted by man.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, by the middle of the 15th century the whole Balkan peninsula and most of southeastern Europe was overrun by the Ottoman Turks, who for more than 300 years ruled over all these areas. In Greece the Turkish regime was stern and unbending, but equally unbending and unyielding were the individualist and liberty-loving Greeks. For more than 300 years they endured the alien rule. They sacrificed much and suffered much. They were roughly manhandled and groups were even massacred. Often their children were sold as slaves. Yet during the course of these centuries the Greeks as a people did not lose their national identity, and they always cherished a dream of political independence. Finally, in proof of their undying loyalty to the sublime ideals of their forefathers, they unfurled the flag of revolt against their oppressors on March 25, 1821, and eventually attained their long-sought independence.

When Archbishop Germanos of Patras led his brave band of followers from the Lavra monastery against the Turkish garrison, he hoped to recreate Greece as a new independent political entity. Fortunately, the daring deeds of this fearless Archbishop were not in vain. From all over Greece the people rallied to his side. In the course of many years of arduous fighting, sometimes against heavy odds, and finally with effective outside aid, they succeeded in clearing Greece of its invaders, and then proclaimed their independence.

The fact that the Greeks were able to win their independence is not only a reason for joyful celebration today, but it is a fact of great significance to all oppressed and enslaved peoples everywhere. If the weak and almost helpless Greeks, after several centuries of subjugation under an alien regime, were able to keep up their national ideals and work ceaselessly for their attainment, then we should not be pessimistic about the peoples sealed off behind the Iron Curtain. For where there is reason to hope, there man's yearning for liberty and independence lives on. And so long as that yearning exists, man will be prepared to translate it into living reality.

Since that memorable day of the 25th of March 1821, the Greeks have made tremendous strides. Of course, since the attainment of their national independence the Greeks, like all nations, have had their share of misfortune, and more than once they have been victims of events over which they had no control. During World War I the Greeks sided with the Allied Powers. During World War II Nazis and Fascists overran the country, and for more than 3 years the Greeks lived in constant terror of these unwelcome invaders. At the end of that conflict the unfortunate civil war, which lasted more than 3 years, almost ruined the country. Finally, Greece was saved from communism, and also from bankruptcy, by British and, above all, by American aid. Our citizens were most happy to have been able to extend assistance to the unfortunate Greeks, and we are most proud of the excellent use which the Greeks have made of such aid. Today, Greece is back on the road to political and economic stability and we consider it a high honor that Greeks and Americans are Allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Today we all join Americans of Greek descent and celebrate Greek Independence Day. We pay homage not only to those glorious Greeks of ancient days, not only to the brave fighters for Greek independence, but also to the Greeks of today who so recently successfully repelled the Communist insurrectionists from Greek soil and who now stand ready to defend their freedom at the cost of their very lives.

Throughout the centuries they have always stood and fought for "Liberty under God and law."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BENDER in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. UTT in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MUMMA and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE and include an editorial from the Knoxville (Iowa) Express.

Mr. CRETELLA and include an editorial from the New Haven Register.

Mr. REED of New York in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MASON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include a short petition.

Mr. BEAMER and include a radio broadcast.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABERNETHY and include a speech by the Governor of Mississippi.

Mr. DIES on the subject "Who Was Right?"

Mr. MATTHEWS.

Mr. PRICE and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCMILLAN and include a resolution adopted by the State Legislature.

Mr. YORTY in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN of California in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and include a resolution.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include certain recommendations.

Mr. RAYBURN and to include a speech made at Dallas, Tex., on March 18 by the Hon. Allen G. Kirk, former Ambassador of the United States to the Soviet Union.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances, in one to include a splendid editorial in relation to the fine work being done by our colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] and in the other to include an article by Governor Stevenson which appeared in yesterday's New York Times magazine section.

Mr. SIKES and to include an address.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include an article on taxation.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington Star of March 15, 1953.

Mr. BUSBEY in reference to a new book entitled "A Century of Conflict, Communist Techniques of World Revolution, 1849–1850," and in the second instance to include a resolution by the anti-subversive committee of the Cook County organization, American Legion.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include an article entitled "Permit Communist Conspirators To be Teachers?" which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $798.

Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. JONAS of Illinois) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD and to include an article, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington) and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

Mr. MACK of Illinois in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa covering a résumé of returns to his questionnaire and including some quotations.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in the Appendix in two instances, in appreciation to the Coast Guard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CASE (at the request of Mr. HESELTON) on March 30 and 31, on account of illness in family.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS AND BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until six months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950; and

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 31, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

585. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

586. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting recommendations for the enactment of legislation amending section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

587. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on tort claims paid by the General Services Administration during the fiscal years 1951 and 1952, pursuant to title 28, section 2673, of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

588. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

589. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, relative to certain cases involving suspension of deportation, and requesting that they be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 26, 1953, the following bill was reported March 27, 1953:

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4198. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf; without amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII pursuant to the order of the House of March 25, 1953, the following resolution was reported March 27, 1953:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 193. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4198, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf; without amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the House Calendar.

[Submitted March 30, 1953]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1110. An act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; with amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1551. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1834. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3406. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4233. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1432. A bill to provide price support for the 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2154. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Leona Hungry; without amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2364. A bill to terminate restrictions against alienation on land owned by William Lynn Engles and Maureen Edna Engles; with amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4294. A bill to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 4295. A bill to provide for the repair, restoration, and preservation of the U. S. S. *Hartford*, flagship of Admiral Farragut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4296. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to years of service required for eligibility for retirement in the case of voluntary and involuntary separation from the service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4297. A bill to authorise the Attorney General to suspend deportation and admit for permanent residence under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act certain aliens who have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 4298. A bill to relinquish the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States over Federal lands within the State of Maryland, and to provide that the United States and the State of Maryland shall hereafter exercise concurrent jurisdiction over such lands; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 4299. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building to house the Wicker Park postal station in Chicago, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 4300. A bill to aid in promoting employment opportunities for members of minority groups; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 4301. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that gain or loss from the sale or exchange of certain property held for more than 2 years shall be treated as a long-term capital gain or loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 4302. A bill to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches, thereto, across the St. Marys River, from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada," approved December 16, 1940; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4303. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4304. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 and related laws so as to provide for an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, for a corresponding officer for each of the military departments, and for a Defense Research Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 4305. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for the lower San Joaquin River project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H. R. 4306. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals may deduct certain life-insurance premiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4307. A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 4308. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of a special canceling stamp or postmarking die bearing the words "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 4309. A bill to amend section 607 (b) of the Lanham Act so as to provide for preference for former owners in connection with the sale of certain dwellings under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4310. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to admissions taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4311. A bill to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the sale of Treasury stock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 4312. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct, as a business expense, the cost of providing care for children under 14 years of age, if such care is for the purpose of enabling the taxpayer to be gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 4313. A bill to clarify the status of mining claims in areas held under an oil and gas prospecting permit or lease and to encourage the exploration and development of fissionable source minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4314. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code Act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLELSON:

H. R. 4315. A bill to prohibit the imposition of concurrent sentences in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 4316. A bill to amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, to strengthen its provisions providing for the imposition of import quotas on agricultural commodities when imports of such commodities tend to interfere with price support or other programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, to transfer its administration to the United States Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4317. A bill relating to the temporary free importation of samples under bond for exportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 4318. A bill to clarify the status of mining claims in areas held under an oil-and-gas prospecting permit or lease and to encourage the exploration and development of fissionable-source minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 4319. A bill to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 4320. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide a flexible duty on the importation of lead and zinc so as to stabilize the domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4321. A bill to establish quota limitations on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 4322. A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. J. Res. 231. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution establishing the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown Celebration Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the annual meeting of the Interparliamentary Union for the year 1953, to be held in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. DEMPSEY: Memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico, me-

morializing the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction of a water storage reservoir to be known as the Nambe Dam and to be located on the Nambe River within the Pojoaque soil conservation district, New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Senate, 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico to the Congress of the United States of America, regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Agua Negra, the Cebolla, the Sapello, and the Manuelitas Creeks, in Mora and San Miguel Counties, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico to the President and Congress of the United States relating to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico, requesting the Congress of the United States to grant to the State of New Mexico for the benefit of the Museum of New Mexico 500,000 acres of public lands of the United States within the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the House, 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico, to the Congress of the United States of America, regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Agua Negra, the Cebolla, the Sapello, and the Manuelitas Creeks in Mora and San Miguel counties, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to remove the prohibition in section I of the compact between the United States and the State of New Mexico relating to the sale, barter, etc., of intoxicating liquor in New Mexico to Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the House, 21st Legislature, State of New Mexico, to the Congress of the United States and to the New Mexico congressional delegation relating to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to effect a change in the method of electing the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico to the Congress of the United States requesting the enactment of legislation to appropriate moneys for the construction of Los Esteros Dam on the Pecos River in Guadalupe County, N. Mex., for flood control, power, and reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the House, 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt pensions or moneys received from labor-union funds from taxation by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature, State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code providing for taxes upon the sale of toilet preparations and upon the sale of wallets, ladies' handbags, and similar handbags and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 397, introduced in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, constituting the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Interstate Commerce Commission to expedite hearings now pending and render a decision equalizing freight rates in the Southwest region, including New Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the 21st Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing Congress to refrain from passage of Senate bill 281, giving the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over the discontinuance of intrastate railroad services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado memorializing the Congress to enact legislation providing for distribution of revenue derived from the development of oil and gas deposits of the United States to the several States and the District of Columbia for purposes of education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado memorializing the Congress to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, that the President and the Congress give earnest consideration to the early construction of an Air Force Academy at a suitable location in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Arizona State Legislature, that the Congress leave in status quo section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, in the interests of equity and well-established need; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature requesting that the Congress leave in status quo section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, in the interests of equity and well-established need; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to the location of the new Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties and Executive agreements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to enact legislation providing for distribution of revenue derived from the development of oil and gas deposits of the United States to the several States and the District of Columbia for purposes of education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to cause a postage stamp to be issued in honor of Kit Carson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas, until debatable issues have been resolved as recommended by the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting passage of legislation and a supplemental appropriation to provide adequate facilities and operating funds so that veterans in need of treatment can obtain treatment in Veterans' Administration facilities in Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which would establish an American Foreign Legion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide a system which would permit persons absent from this country on election day to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for a system of absentee voting which would permit persons who are absent from their home States on any presidential election day to vote for their President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Manuelitas Creeks, in Mora and San Miguel Counties, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant to the State of New Mexico for the benefit of the museum of New Mexico 500,000 acres of public lands of the United States within the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting enactment of legislation to appropriate moneys for the construction of Los Esteros Dam on the Pecos River in Guadalupe County, N. Mex., for flood control, power, and reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting enactment of Senate bill 397, constituting the State of New Mexico as a separate customs collection district; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to refrain from passage of Senate bill 281, giving the Interstate Commerce Commission jurisdiction over the discontinuance of intrastate railroad services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass an act requiring imported trout sold in the United States be labeled as to origin and date of processing and imposing fine for failure to comply or for wrongful removal of said labels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support the agricultural conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging the amendment of the Federal income tax laws to provide that Alaskan taxpayers receive a $1,200 personal exemption and a $900 exemption for each dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting appropriate legislation be enacted authorizing the attachment of moneys owed by Federal agencies and instrumentalities to their employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 4323. A bill for the relief of the city of Harriman school district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4324. A bill for the relief of Joe Cameron Construction Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4325. A bill for the relief of Gerassimos Doryzas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Arthur Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4327. A bill for the relief of George P. Provencal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4328. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith D. Williamson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4329. A bill for the relief of Huntington, McLaren & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4330. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orlando Artuso and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Franco Gerbino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 4332. A bill for the relief of Willie C. Hung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Ivan Citrin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 4334. A bill for the relief of Juan Moreno, Josephine Moreno, and Arturo Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4335. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia, Gabriella Buia, and Daniela Buia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4336. A bill for the relief of Gustave Aldimars Freibergs (alias Gus Freiberg); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4337. A bill for the relief of Arturo A. Ignacio, Jr.; to the committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4338. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4339. A bill for the relief of Abbas Salahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4340. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Abarno and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 4341. A bill for the relief of Kurt Glaser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 4342. A bill for the relief of Carl R. Marten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (by request):

H. R. 4343. A bill for the allowance of certain claims, not heretofore paid, for indemnity for spoliations by the French prior to July 31, 1801, as reported by the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4344. A bill for the relief of Marina Fioralbi (Mikelle S. Korver); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 4345. A bill for the relief of Dr. Constantine E. Constantinidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4346. A bill for the relief of Constantin Phedon Manoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 4347. A bill for the relief of Pier Luigi Borghesi Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4348. A bill for the relief of Arvids Kulitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4349. A bill for the relief of Phil Wallace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 4350. A bill for the relief of Ralph Richard Vanderveld; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

118. By Mr. BENTLEY: Resolution adopted by the Erie County Medical Society of New York, and endorsed by the Shiawassee County Medical Society of Michigan, with reference to the "doctor draft" law (Public Law 779) and requesting that it be revised to provide that physicians reaching their 51st birthday be divided into two groups, and that it should be taken out of the hands of local selective service boards and placed in the hands of a special selective-service board one for each county or medical society district; to the Committee on Armed Services.

119. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Newport, R. I., urging the Department of the Army of the United States not to curtail activities at Fort Adams, in Newport, R. I., by removing the Narragansett Bay Marine Shop, 1112th Army Service Unit from Fort Adams; to the Committee on Armed Services.

120. Also, petition of the National Secretary of the National Sojourners, Washington, D. C., for the development of true patriotism and Americanism throughout the Nation and the opposing of any influence calculated to weaken the national security; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

121. Also, petition of the Mayors Committee on Off-Shore Oil, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the mayor's statement on off-shore oil signed by the mayors of 27 larger United States cities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

122. Also, petition of the city clerk, Boston, Mass., requesting the extension of Federal rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

123. Also, petition of the city clerk, Boston, Mass., requesting the adoption of the Joseph Lee stamp bill, S. 984; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

124. Also, petition of Lee Ora Brown, and others, of Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

125. Also, petition of William Ubbens, and others, of Daytona, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

126. Also, petition of L. J. Chandler, and others, of Daytona Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the enactment of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2247, proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 31, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all majesty and mercy by Thy grace we have entered upon Holy Week, commemorating days in the life of our Lord whose solemn and sacred significance our finite minds cannot comprehend.

Wilt Thou give us the interpreting light of Thy divine spirit as we seek to contemplate the meaning of His sufferings and death and resurrection.

We rejoice that when there was no eye to pity, no heart to comfort, and no arm to save, then in the fullness of time Thou didst send thine only begotten Son to be our Saviour.

Help us to understand more clearly that the kingdom of truth and righteousness for which we are hoping and praying and laboring can only be established through the power of sacrificial love.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 750. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 861. An act for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski;

H. R. 3062. An act to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress;

H. R. 3658. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 3659. An act to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; and

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 41. An act to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended;

S. 55. An act for the relief of Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht;

S. 69. An act for the relief of Dr. Peter C. T. Kao;

S. 71. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Olson;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo;

S. 306. An act for the relief of Waltraut Mies van Ger Rohe;

S. 314. An act for the relief of Cornelius A. Navori;

S. 516. An act for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning;

S. 556. An act for the relief of Marinella Taletti;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Dr. Albert Haas;

S. 719. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

S. 811. An act for the relief of George Mauner;

S. 846. An act for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell;

S. 851. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall;

S. 853. An act for the relief of Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue);

S. 903. An act to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when procured by or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof for itself or pursuant to an authorized foreign assistance program;

S. 954. An act for the relief of Robert Harold Wall;

S. 984. An act making provisions for judicial review of certain Tax Court decisions;

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi;

S. 1041. An act to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard;

S. 1082. An act to approve a conveyance made by the city of Charleston, S. C., to the South Carolina State Ports Authority, of real property heretofore granted to said city of Charleston by the United States of America;

S. 1410. An act to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948; and

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 53–5.

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 195, Rept. No. 225), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of S. 1110, an act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was most gratifying to read on the front page of yesterday's Evening Star that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] had proposed that Americans stop referring to our country as a democracy.

Last January 9 I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of my letter to Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, regarding the substitution of the word "democracy" instead of the true word "republic" with respect to our Government, and on February 2 I inserted additional material on this same subject.

I wish to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his statement. Yesterday the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] referred in his remarks to the House to the fact that he had always emphasized protecting the rights of the minority. Under a democracy, minorities have no rights. In a republic, such as ours, minorities are protected.

Therefore, I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] in urging all Members of Congress, regardless of party, to make certain in describing our form of government that they use the word "republic."

UNITED STATES IS URGED TO DROP WORD "DEMOCRACY" AS RED DISTORTION

Representative VAN ZANDT, Republican, of Pennsylvania, proposed today that Americans stop referring to their country as a democracy.

Communists, he said, have so twisted the word that it no longer means what it should.

He urged in a speech prepared for delivery in the House that Americans call the United States a republic.

"'Democracy' is the word the Communist regime has adopted to describe the present form of government in Russia," he said.

"The word 'democracy' is not in either the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party, always spoke of 'the Republic' or 'our republican form of government.'

"In all the state papers of the Presidents * * * from George Washington to Woodrow Wilson there was no reference to the United States as a democracy."

Representative VAN ZANDT said President Wilson was the first to apply the word "democracy" to the American Government when he spoke of World War I as being a crusade to make the world safe for democracy.

Thereafter, the Representative said, the word dropped from general use until President Franklin D. Roosevelt picked it up.

"We were a republic from 1789 until about 1933, when the New Deal decided we should be called a democracy," he said.

NEW ENGLAND NEEDS FLOOD DIKES AND UNEMPLOYMENT DIKES, BUT WASHINGTON SLEEPS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the spring floods are ravaging New England again, striking a second blow at the textile mills that line the banks of its rivers.

This is not news.

It is just a continuation of the compounded difficulties crowding some New England communities into a corner.

Calls for help have been sent to the Federal Government time and time again, but no assistance of any kind has been forthcoming. One administration has been repudiated because it ignored our very serious problem. Now the matter is being put squarely before President Eisenhower, who promised to give it every consideration when he was campaigning in Massachusetts last fall.

Mayor John J. Buckley, of Lawrence, Mass., is heading a small delegation that is meeting with the President on April 1, to expedite the award of textile contracts by the Government to this area where the labor surplus is more than 20 percent.

We hope that this administration will provide some assistance as it can and must do under the provisions of Manpower Policy No. 4 as amended. A sympathetic administration can also do more to encourage new industries to locate in labor-surplus areas, and to give us our share of any Government installations that may be in the planning stage.

We ask for temporary relief, via procurement contracts because our need is urgent. We must have this breather so that we ourselves will have time in which to make our own economic adjustments in the changing industrial picture, not a WPA, but opportunities to work and produce.

Is this unreasonable in view of our situation?

Look at the objective facts and figures, which are no secret, and I think that, far from ignoring our heavy load of unemployment, you will join with us to make the Federal Government see that something must be done.

This is no partisan issue.

It is simply an emergency call on Washington to wake up and go into action on a domestic problem that is serious.

President Eisenhower, what is your answer?

DESIGNING NEW STAR-SPANGLED BANNER

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently I read an article in a Washington newspaper that the Government has been deluged with proposed designs for a new Star-Spangled Banner. The reason back of this is, of course, the possibility of Hawaii becoming a full-fledged State.

This article goes on to state that there is no American flag designing body set up by law to make the final decision on a new design. Of course, it will be some time before the new design could be legal as stated in the article.

I have a solution to this problem from a Government standpoint. I am today introducing in the House a bill making the Quartermaster General of the Army responsible for resolving this problem. The reasons for this are: Historically the Quartermaster General has had the responsibility for designing and procuring flags, colors, standards, insignias, badges, medals, seals, decorations, guidons, emblems, ribbons, and similar items used or required by any department, agency, or office of the United States. Under the Quartermaster General of the Army, there is a heraldic branch and within its organization there are employees who are highly skilled in the creation of heraldic design.

The assignment of this responsibility to a single agency will also prevent the duplication of design and the confusion resulting therefrom, and will insure the distinctive character of the emblem, insignia, and other medals used by the various agencies. A centralized record of all identification symbols and awards used by the United States would be made available, and producer of such items would be able to deal with a single agency in all matters relating to the sale and manufacture of them.

The purpose of this bill, which I have today introduced is to provide for the design and procurement of heraldic items for the Federal Government by a single agency. At the present time, there is no fixed responsibility for these functions on a Governmentwide basis. Providing for their assignment to a single office will promote economy in that duplication of effort in the design, preparation of specifications, and research will be eliminated, and a single source of supply for the items will be created. The Office of the Quartermaster General was selected as the agency to carry out this program because it has had, for many years, responsibility for designing and procuring such items for the Department of the Army, and has been given the assignment of procuring and designing them for the Air Force and Navy, and in addition has designed flags and seals for the President and Vice President, members of the Cabinet, and other elements of the executive department. The Quartermaster General has employees who are highly skilled in the creation of heraldic designs.

I sincerely hope that the Congress will quickly act to approve this proposed legislation.

THE CHICAGO POST OFFICE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the Chicago Sun-Times of March 28, 1953, Acting Postmaster V. F. Werner is quoted as denying that there is any restroom checkout in the Chicago post office. He is further quoted as saying:

> We don't know what O'HARA is talking about.

I sincerely trust that Mr. Werner was not correctly understood by the reporter. I have a letter from Post Office Inspector James T. Nelson under date of March 11, 1953, stating definitely that the job ticket has been in use in the Chicago post office for approximately 9 months. I have too much respect for Mr. Werner to believe that he intended to raise an issue of veracity with the post office inspector for the Assistant Postmaster General. I am sure also that the Acting Postmaster of Chicago did not wish to be put in the position of showing disrespect for the Congress of the United States.

I hope that it is unnecessary for me to defend myself with my colleagues against the charge that I do not know what I am talking about. Nevertheless, to make the record perfectly clear, I am extending my remarks to include a letter from the president and secretary of the Chicago Post Office Clerks Union No. 1. The letter follows:

EDITOR, CHICAGO SUN-TIMES,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: In your Saturday edition two star final there appeared a news item headlined "Postal woes relieved," in which the postmaster of Chicago denied the complaint made by Congressman O'HARA in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD opposed to toilet recordings now being practiced on the eighth floor Chicago post office. The undersigned have submitted to Congressman O'HARA the following statement:

"In regard to the statement of Postmaster Vincent F. Werner appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times that Congressman BARRATT O'HARA doesn't know what he is talking about in regard to toilet recordings in the Chicago post office let it be understood that the Congressman knows what he is talking about and further that the postmaster has rebutted by evasion.

"From the outset it should be understood that positively, absolutely, and most assuredly a toilet checkout prevails on the eighth floor main post office. The recordings are made by supervisors or their assistants. There can be no denial.

"Congressman O'HARA is dependent upon his information concerning the post office from postal employees. He has received many letters from clerks condemning the practice of recording toilet departure and return on the eighth floor, Chicago post office. The public insult to the Congressman for championing human rights is a disgrace and regrettable.

"The denial of the problem, the failure to admit that an experiment is going on by a local postal official and yet acknowledged by a departmental official in Washington is amusing, and as contradictory as the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing."

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE J. WACHOWSKI, *President.*
WILLIAM FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, I may add that I am continuing the fight to end for all time in the Federal offices this abominable practice of forcing the Federal workers to check in and out of rest rooms. Despite all that is said, the practice is well on its way to being forced upon all Federal workers. Unless my colleagues in the Congress join me in protest it will not be long until the Chicago experiment has fixed the practice upon all the Federal offices.

I received a telephone call just before coming into the House that the practice has already been established in one of the Federal offices here in Washington. I have not had time to verify the complaint, and for that reason I am at this time withholding the name of the Federal department. I will not do a possible injustice by saying anything on this floor until I have completely verified my information. When I have verified any complaint that I receive as to the installation of this practice in any Federal office I certainly shall not stop short of making public from this well the verified information.

From Leon Dorf, 1879 Crotona Avenue, Bronx, N. Y., I have received the following letter:

> DEAR SIR: Being a retired postal clerk I was very much interested in your remarks concerning the practice of placing a check on the amount of time a postal employee in Chicago can spend in the rest rooms.
>
> This same system was put into effect in the general post office in New York City about 10 years ago, all employees being forced to inform their supervisors when leaving their posts of duty, and when returning to same. No employee was allowed to be in the restroom for more than a total of 20 minutes during the entire day.
>
> However this system lasted only a few weeks due to the tremendous protest of the employee's organizations.

SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within States boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4198, with Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to section 1, the Clerk will read.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. All moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be held in a special account in the Treasury during the present national emergency and until Congress shall otherwise provide, except as otherwise provided in section 8 of this act. The moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

"SEC. 2. The National Advisory Council on Grants-in-Aid of Education is hereby created to be composed of 12 persons with experience in the field of education and public administration, 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 4 by the President of the United States. It shall be the function of such Council to draw up and report to the President of the United States for submission to the Congress not later than February 1, 1955, a plan for the equitable allocation of the grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education provided for in the first section of this act.

"SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant, or leases or grants, covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1953, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant, since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

"SEC. 4. (a) The provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*, That—

"(1) such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this act, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

"(2) such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this act in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

"(3) within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents from which the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

"(4) except as otherwise provided in section 6 of this act, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this act, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this act shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as provided in the first section of this act;

"(5) the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this act;

"(6) such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ per centum in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold under such lease: *Provided, however*, That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this act in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however*, That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(10) the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

"(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

"(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this act.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

"SEC. 6. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 4 of this act, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the States, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however*, That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this act. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 4 of this act. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of subsection (a) of section 4, and thereupon the provisions of subsection (b) of section 4 shall govern such lease.

"SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary is authorized to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 4 of this act.

"(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

"(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as provided in the first section of this act.

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 5 of this act, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

"SEC. 8. (a) Thirty-seven and one-half percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties, and other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 6 of this act pending the

settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

"(c) If and whenever the United States shall take and receive in kind all or any part of the royalty under a lease maintained or issued under the provisions of this act and covering submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State, the value of such royalty so taken in kind shall, for the purpose of subsection (a) of this section, be deemed to be the prevailing market price thereof at the time and place of production, and there shall be paid to the State entitled thereto 37½ percent of the value of such royalty.

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this act.

"SEC. 10. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this act.

"(c) All leases issued under this act, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this act, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this act, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

"SEC. 11. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired. Nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

"SEC. 12. When used in this act, (a) the term 'submerged lands of the Continental Shelf' means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the sea and situated outside the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (b) the term 'seaward boundary of a State' shall mean a line 3 miles distant from the points at which the paramount rights of the Federal Government in the submerged lands begin; (c) the term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; (d) the term 'tidelands' means lands regularly covered and uncovered by the flow and ebb of the tides; and (e) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. FEIGHAN (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, inasmuch as this is merely the provision of my House Joint Resolution 126, which I am sure is familiar to all Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion in yesterday's general debate clearly showed that the Supreme Court in the offshore submerged land cases in California, Texas, and Louisiana decided that the States off whose shores mineral deposits may be found have no title thereto or property interest therein. Further, the court held that the United States has paramount rights and full dominion of the land in the marginal belt. The constitutional question was raised whether Congress can, under article 4, appropriate or give away these submerged lands.

If all we are dealing with is a mere fee simple title, there is no question that the Congress can dispose of it without consideration. If, on the other hand, the United States holds its interest in the bed of the marginal seas, as an attribute of national sovereignty, it is subject to the possible argument that it is an inseparable attribute of national sovereignty. If this is so, then a quitclaim might be unconstitutional. H. R. 4198 has two provisions. First, the quitclaim of these submerged lands to the States: and secondly, if the quitclaim is unconstitutional, a delegation of authority to the States to take the mineral deposits from these lands and to appropriate them for their own use. This authority is given to the States over that portion of the submerged lands that extend from the low water mark seaward to the so-called historic boundaries. There is a further provision that permits any State legislature to extend its boundaries to the extent of 3 miles. There is a further provision that if the State legislatures extend their boundaries further than 3 miles or their so-called historic boundaries, and if the Congress subsequently approves such extension by the States, that the States will have control over the submerged lands to the extent of their outward and seaward boundaries possibly to the end of the continental shelf. There is a further provision that beyond the historic boundaries the State will have police powers and the right to levy a severance tax on the mineral deposits taken from the submerged lands.

My amendment provides that the royalties from mineral leases covering the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf shall be used for grants-in-aid of education and national defense.

My amendment is applicable only to the areas outside of inland waters, that is, to submerged areas outside of inland waters and beyond the tideland strip.

The Supreme Court has ruled three times that the submerged coastal lands beyond the low-tide mark and extending seaward belong to the people of the United States as a whole.

Geologists estimate that the oil under these seas is worth more than $40 billion. By earmarking these offshore submerged land oil royalties for educational grants-in-aid to the States, Congress has the magnificent opportunity of securing our first line of defense—the education and training of our citizens, and to do it without any cost to the taxpayers.

Under the terms of this amendment, the individual State would get 37½ percent of the royalties that the Federal Government receives for the oil produced off the shores of that State within the 3-mile limit. In addition, such State would share equally with all other States on a pro rata basis in the remaining 62½ percent of the royalties obtained by the Federal Government. This appears to me to be very generous treatment to California, Louisiana, and Texas, as well as to any other State off whose shores mineral deposits may be produced. Beyond the 3-mile limit, the Federal Government would have complete jurisdiction and control of all operations and it would receive all royalties.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. FEIGHAN was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. FEIGHAN. To donate to coastal States this great public treasure which belongs to all the 48 States, this rich public heritage which the Supreme Court has three times decided belongs to all the people of the United States, in my opinion, would constitute an abdication of what I regard to be the responsibility of the Congress in regard to the matter.

I believe that Members of Congress should give thoughtful consideration to this matter before they vote to deprive their constituents and their State of their proportionate share of this national heritage.

My amendment also provides for proper conservation of these rich oil-bearing deposits in the interest of our national security.

We all realize that the Supreme Court has indicated that the Congress should take action with reference to these submerged lands in order to correct inequities that have arisen because of those who have accepted leases and have begun drilling operations under the mistaken assumption that their lessors owned the submerged lands. Moreover, Congress should authorize further development of the oil and gas deposits in these submerged lands.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The proposals the gentleman is offering here are identical, I believe, with the Hill proposal that was offered on the Senate side last year?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, fundamentally it is identical, with just a few minor variations.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. As I understand, the gentleman's substitute would not recognize the title of the States within historic boundaries in accordance with titles I and II of the Graham bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. My amendment would recognize complete dominion, as the Supreme Court stated, in the Federal Government from the low-water mark seaward to the end of the Continental Shelf. The answer, of course, is "No."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] for his wonderful presentation of the

argument involved here. I want to go on record supporting his amendment. I believe there is precedent for giving the adjacent States, as the gentleman proposes by his amendment, 37½ percent. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; 37½ percent of the royalties have been allocated to the States. An allocation in this amount follows the practice of the Federal Minerals Leasing Act which was enacted in 1920, under the terms of which the States that have public Federal lands in their States get 37½ percent of the deposits on such public lands. States adjacent to the open seas have police powers and responsibilities out to the 3-mile limit, which is recognized as the international boundary.

It is my hope that in the interest of preserving to this country what the Supreme Court has said belongs to it, you will support this amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed substitute has been before the House in one form or another two or three times before. The substitute amendment in essence would affirm the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases. That is the heart and the nub of this substitute. In other words, it would vest in the United States the paramount power and dominion, whatever those terms may mean to all of the submerged lands from shore out to the edge of the Continental Shelf. As a matter of fact, the proposal would constitute more than affirmance of the Supreme Court decisions because the Supreme Court in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases only was dealing with that area within State boundaries and was not specifically dealing with the area to the end of the Continental Shelf. I know in the Louisiana case, there was presented the act of Louisiana at one time enlarging the boundaries, but I still hold to what I say that there was not before the Supreme Court a general discussion of all of the area to the end of the Continental Shelf.

There is a provision in this bill which makes it slightly different from the ones we acted upon before. Last time this measure was before us, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] had a substitute for the bill then pending which would do the same thing as the Feighan proposal would do, namely, vest the jurisdiction in the Federal Government. That proposal was, of course, overwhelmingly defeated. Now there is a new provision in the Feighan proposal, added I suppose to make it a little more tasteful to some, and that is the Federal aid to education feature. I say to my friend, it does not embarrass me at all to rise in opposition to his substitute even with provision in it for this reason—he will have an opportunity later on to carry out the question of Federal aid to education because there was before the Judiciary Committee in the committee print, a provision impounding these revenues pending a calm and careful consideration as to what should be done in the matter. If the gentleman will support that proposal, why it would preserve his rights to contend for a fair share for education. And I myself would like to have dispassionate hearings on that feature of the proposal. But without more on the subject, I simply say to you that this is a repetition of the move of those who always have been against States rights, that is to say the rights of the States to these tidelands. We have had these proposals before. We have always defeated them. With us, it is not a question of dollars or of oil, but it is a question of principle. As the gentleman from Massachusetts said yesterday that he would not yield an inch of the territory of Massachusetts, I know that we in Louisiana, Texas, and California have the same attitude on the matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. With reference to the gentleman's latest remarks about those who are against States rights, you do not think for a moment that the Supreme Court in its decision was anti-States rights, do you?

Mr. WILLIS. Why, I know exactly what the Supreme Court said. It did not say that the United States had title. It did not say that the United States had ownership. It simply said that the United States has paramount rights. I will concede that the United States has paramount right and power over all facets of our life and property under the Constitution that it is possible to have. It has the power—the paramount power to call my son and yours to the Army, perhaps to be shot and killed. We do not deny that, and those paramount powers are preserved in this bill. The power of navigation, regulation of interstate commerce and all constitutional powers are adequately preserved in the Graham bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the proposal will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I concur in the remarks just advanced by the gentleman from Louisiana. I am completely opposed to this amendment. The amendment is virtually opposite of legislation that has come out of the committee; it is completely at the opposite ends of the position taken by the President of the United States in his stand favoring restoration of State ownership of the submerged lands out to the historical boundaries. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman has just stated that this bill is in accordance with the position of the President of the United States in permitting title to the States up to their historical boundaries.

Mr. HILLINGS. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. As a matter of fact, does not the bill go beyond that and give to the States not only what they conceive to be their historical boundaries, but also the right to claim the entire Continental Shelf if they want to? And I refer the gentleman's attention to page 9 of the bill, lines 7 to 19, inclusive.

Mr. HILLINGS. The gentleman is in error in his interpretation of the bill. It does not give the States authority to go beyond their historical boundaries and claim anything they desire. Technically, I suppose, anybody can claim anything. If I understand the gentleman's reference to the particular section correctly, all it provides is that the States at some later date may be able to extend their boundaries if the Congress of the United States should approve, but no State by action of its legislature or by any action of the State itself can go beyond the historical boundaries without approval by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of permitting me to read the section to which I referred?

Mr. HILLINGS. I do not yield any further; I believe I have answered the question.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Ohio directed to the gentleman from Indiana with regard to the Supreme Court decision being opposed to States' rights, I would say that it is not a shining light as a States rights document.

The amendment offered, as stated by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], is the same amendment or substitute that has been offered in this body and in the Senate repeatedly. It seeks to eradicate the principle for which we fight, and that is the historical State boundaries of the various coastal and Great Lakes States, and appropriate all of that large territory of 290,000 square miles to the Federal Government. It throws a sop out to the coasfal and Great Lakes States by providing that they shall receive 37½ percent of the revenues. We are not of course interested in 37½ percent of the revenue under this proposal; we are interested primarily in the principle of restoring to the States, not giving to the States, but restoring to the States their historical boundary that has been recognized for a century and a half by many Supreme Court decisions and by all textbook writers, by 47 out of 48 of the various State attorneys general and by various State officials and by all those who have written on the subject up until the question was raised by Secretary Ickes along about 1938.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Not at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides, and I am sure for the purpose of catching votes, that at least part of this money will be given to Federal aid to education. This money, of course, when it comes to the public under the present bill in title 3 would go into the general revenues of the Treasury. If Congress decides to appropriate money for education or for various reasons it can do so, but certainly no money and no fund dealt with in this bill should be denominated in the bill as Federal-aid-to-education money or for any other purpose. The general Treasury needs funds about as badly as does any other department of the Government or as does any State; so we think this proposed substitute should be voted

down because it is entirely a new approach to this situation and has been voted down repeatedly by this House and by the Senate.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, question as to ownership of submerged marginal lands has been discussed both in committee and on this floor to the fullest extent, both in this and previous sessions of the Congress. While I feel that every point of equity or law has been covered I must impart to you the feelings of the people whom I represent in Louisiana. For decades no question ever arose as to the Federal Government's claim to tidelands and submerged lands to the historic boundaries and it does not seem reasonable to me that the finding of valuable mineral deposits should suddenly change the policy of the United States Government. The Federal Government at one time refused to negotiate leases off the coast of California because the then Secretary of Interior stated that this is a matter for the State to handle. Previous legislation has been passed in the House of Representatives and the Senate granting ownership to the States, only to be vetoed, thereby reversing the action of the representatives of the people of all of our States. The Supreme Court did not declare the title to these lands were vested in the Federal Government, but merely mentioned that the Government had paramount rights in these areas.

I do want to commend my colleague, the Honorable EDWIN WILLIS, who is on the Judiciary Committee, for his untiring efforts in the matter of tidelands legislation. Certainly I know of no one who is better acquainted with the facts than he and his work has certainly been a reflection of his great ability and genuine interest in his representation of our people.

The House Judiciary Committee approved by a 14 to 7 vote a bill which gave States complete control to their historic boundaries. This august group, displaying a completely independent and judicious attitude, included in the bill provisions to tax oil pumped from submerged lands seaward to those boundaries and to also give the States police authority from the historic boundaries to the edge of the Continental Shelf. This committee also approved of language in the bill determining disposition of funds from the areas out from the historic boundaries, and while some language in this regard appears in the printed bill it apparently is not the full language which had appeared in the committee print.

It seems to me now that because of statements of policy some of the members of the committee are reluctant to support their previous position in these regards in the committee. I cannot quite understand this reversal and strongly urge that this House finally determine the case of ownership of these lands in an equitable manner which will not deprive our people of Louisiana of what is rightfully theirs.

As to taxation on production outside of the historic boundaries, I ask in fairness how else can the State of Louisiana receive recompense for the damage done to its highways by heavy equipment rolling through our State in the development of those areas? How else can Louisiana meet the cost of educating children of workers who are sent there? Those will be responsibilities of the State and I know of no other way to support the costs that will be involved. The very nature of our coastal areas require stupendous sums in the construction of highways and it is not at all infrequent that millions of dollars must be spent for construction and maintenance of bridges on very short stretches of highway because of the numerous streams which must be crossed to enter the coastal area, and in taxing the products of these areas the tax would not be levied against the Federal Government but against the individual companies who will be engaged in the development of oil products. Louisiana has done a marvelous job in the handling of leases for development of these areas. No scandal has ever been suggested in our methods of negotiating leases on a bid basis, with every applicant being allowed an equal chance. Many of the major oil companies, as well as some independent operators, have congratulated our State mineral board on the fairness with which they have conducted their business in these instances.

If the submerged lands beyond the historic boundaries of the States become public domain, then, certainly, the taxing power of the States in which this public domain is located should be the same as on other public domains. The Federal Leasing Act which applies to the domains in the Western States provides that States in which these domains are located will have the rights and privileges of levying and collecting taxes on improvements, the output of mines, or other rights or assets of any lessee of the United States.

As to the position that the United States Government must own these submerged lands for purposes of defense, I wonder if the ownership status of the Great Lakes would require a change in the event of an enemy attack through Canada from the north? Our coastal areas can just as well be defended regardless of whether these lands are under the title of the individual States or the Federal Government, which in my opinion is really an agent of the federation of States. I am alarmed at the apparent thinking from some sources that that situation has reversed, making the States agents of that all-powerful creation which is the Federal Government. We in Louisiana will always defend the sovereignty of our State.

As to the police power provided in the printed bill, how else could the people engaged in development beyond the historic boundaries be protected under common law? The police power referred to in this bill would only give the protections of the people of civil and criminal law through application of laws of the States in those areas. The Federal Government makes no provisions for such administration.

Throughout Louisiana during the past presidential election signs were erected indicating the solemn pledge of President Eisenhower to restore the title of submerged lands to our State. These signs were not written out in technical completeness but were printed in banner phrases which implied almost exactly what H. R. 4198 proposes. Our people have a right to expect its passage as agreed upon in the Judiciary Committee and certainly will be disappointed if current policy does not support what they understood to be a pledge.

It is my intention to continue to carry the fight for my people in not acquiring, but retaining, what is ours, and if there are sufficient votes in this House in opposition to our claim to what is rightfully ours I can only say that the responsibility will be theirs, not mine.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to clarify the discussion I had with the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS]. I refer his attention to the language as appears on page 9. I think in context we would have to start with the sentence beginning in line 2, which states:

> Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline, or to the international boundary of the United States in the Great Lakes, or any body of water traversed by such boundary.

Now, this is the language to which I refer:

> Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line.

What I think this does immediately is to give the right to a State, Louisiana, for example, which previously by act of its legislature extended its boundaries almost all the way out to the limits of the Continental Shelf, to continue to insist that the Federal Government does not own the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit. Further than that, in the event that other coastal States have taken similar action, and I do not know whether they have or not, there is thus a loophole which would permit such States to continue to assert that they have paramount rights to the Federal Government in the development of any mineral wealth that exists in the Continental Shelf.

I want to make the further point with reference to the statement the gentleman from California made yesterday; that under the terms of this bill nine-tenths of the land covered by this bill will go to the Federal Government and one-tenth will go to the States. I think that in substance is what the gentleman asserted yesterday. As I read the language on page 9, it does not settle as of this time any of the claims that the States have in and to the Continental Shelf. What this does is to state that the States have title to the submerged

lands for 3 miles seaward at least, and they may go even beyond if they want to assert such a claim. I do not see in this language the statement the gentleman referred to previously in which he said that such claim requires prior approval by the Congress. I do not see anything in the language which I have just read that requires congressional action.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. I regret that when the gentleman asked his question a minute ago I did not have the bill in front of me. I was referring to another section or another part of the section at the time. The sentence, beginning on line 2, page 9, that the gentleman refers to, states:

> Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline—

And so forth. There is a following sentence which refers to that previous sentence. It merely means that any coastal State which has not extended its boundaries 3 miles from the shore may do so. It does not allow any State to go beyond the 3 miles. It merely provides as I have stated. Virtually every State has already taken that action and it is recognized as the historical boundary line. Any State not having extended its boundary may do so. No State could so extend its boundary beyond the 3 miles.

Mr. YATES. Is it the intention of the committee that the language appearing between lines 7 and 19 on page 9 means only that which the gentleman from California has just stated, that none of the Gulf States may go beyond the 3-mile limit, and may not proceed to claim any portion of the Continental Shelf beyond their so-called historical boundaries?

Mr. HILLINGS. Insofar as that language is concerned, it means just as I have stated, that any State which has not claimed up to 3 miles now may do so.

Mr. YATES. It is the intention of the committee by the passage of this act with that language in it to foreclose any of the States of the Union from making claims beyond the 3-mile limit or their historical boundaries?

Mr. HILLINGS. It is not the intention of the committee to foreclose anybody from making a claim. Anyone can do that. This bill would not prejudice such a claim.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object to this request, it is hoped that we can conclude today the reading of this bill for amendment. If we can comply with the time limit of 5 minutes I am sure everybody will appreciate it.

Mr. YATES. I respect the majority leader's suggestion. The only purpose in asking for an additional 2 minutes is to clear up a most important part of this bill. As I understand the contention of those who favor this bill, and I am not one of them, it is that this is in the nature of a deed which fixes the property rights of the States and of the Government.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and of course I will not, I was wondering if we could not fix the time, because I, along with the other members of the Texas delegation, have an important luncheon engagement with a constituent of mine, a flier just returned from Korea, who shot down 13 MIG's. We want to have luncheon with him, and if we could fix the time for debate on this matter, it would be a very great accommodation to us.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, does the gentleman from Texas have in mind limiting time on the pending amendment?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close 5 minutes after the time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if what the gentleman from California has stated is correct, then I wonder whether he would say whether there is any objection to striking out the language appearing between line 7 and line 19, so that we may fix definitely the boundary lines at the 3-mile limit? What would the gentleman say with respect to that?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I think the gentleman should read the full paragraph and not take a few lines of the paragraph.

Mr. YATES. Let me say to the gentleman that I have read the full paragraph.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The first part of section 4 reads:

> The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline.

The other language in that section provides that any State that has furnished evidence of its historic boundary may bring in evidence to that effect.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I will say that the gentleman is eminently sound in his contention. This language, "Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted, either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise," and so forth, is an engraved invitation to any State to extend its boundary beyond 3 miles. It is very significant that the word "otherwise" is used. What is meant by "otherwise"? It says, "by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise." That is what we call a "sleeper." That might be some old fishing right; that might be some old resolution that was offered in the legislature. It may be anything. It is a catch-all phrase and it is very dangerous to have such a phrase or such language in legislation of this character.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

OIL FOR EDUCATION

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, in conformity with the many wires and letters I have received from constituents back home in the Third District of Minnesota, I have no other choice but to vote against the giveaway bill of a great potential and valuable natural resource that nature bestowed to all the American people and not the few who seek personal and selfish gain at the expense of the many.

In the Gulf of Mexico and in the Pacific Ocean are vast deposits of oil under the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf, which in some places in the Gulf extends out as far as 150 miles from shore. The geologists of the United States Department of the Interior and of private oil companies estimate that here are at least 15 billion barrels of oil. At the going price of $2.70 a barrel, which may well increase as the world's oil reserves are depleted, this adds up to over $40 billion.

Many proposals have been put forward for getting rid of these $50 billion. I shall not discuss them except to mention the most fantastic of them all, which for some strange reason is the one most in danger of acceptance. This is the suggestion that the Senators and Representatives from the 48 States disregard the decisions of our highest court and make an outright gift of the bulk of this oil and gas to 3 States, California, Texas, and Louisiana.

The wise and prudent man, when blessed with a sudden and surprising inheritance, thinks first of the security of his family. The American people must think first of the security of their families—which means the security of their country.

In national security our first line of defense is, of course, the military establishment itself. But the second and strongest line of defense is the education and training, the intellectual and scientific competence of our citizens.

I suggest that our present American capacity for organization and production, which is the essential basis of our national security, is largely the direct result of two mighty American inspirations about education. The first of these was the idea of public support for free schools with good educational standards, advocated and fought for by Thomas Jefferson and first implemented in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by Horace Mann. The second was the policy of dedicating revenues from our public lands to education.

Out of this farsighted and inspired use of a portion of the national domain has arisen a system of great educational institutions upon which the higher education of a great number of Americans depends. No one can estimate what it has meant to the development and progress of the United States. Along with the application of public funds for free education for all at the primary and secondary level, it has contributed vastly to that trained competence in industry, in agriculture, in social organization, upon which our national strength is based; a trained competence, not of a selected few, but of a whole nation.

The proposal embodied in the oil-for-education amendment is entirely in accordance with our continuing national tradition of devoting the proceeds of public lands to the support of education. The adoption of this proposal will be a historic act comparable to the ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and to the Morrill Act of 1862. In fact, the revenues from the oil-for-education idea will probably in the course of time far exceed the sum total of receipts from all previous Federal grants of public lands for educational purposes. Adoption of the proposal will be like dedicating an oil well to the support of each school and college in America.

A GOOD USE FOR OIL MONEY

The concern of the oil companies for States' rights has been sharply evident in the struggle between the Federal Government and some States for control of the tidelands oil fields. But one suspects that their concern is more practical than philosophic. It is evident that they believe their profits would be greater in deals with the States than with the Federal Government.

As Senator LISTER HILL pointed out in Harper's magazine some time ago, it would be unthinkable to deliver this fabulous fortune in oil to three States—California, Louisiana, and Texas. And he proposes a compromise which seems to have much merit: Why not use the oil money to improve the Nation's school system? Certainly no one—with the possible exception of those who stand to profit by other arrangements—would object to such a painless solution to the problem of both schools and tidelands oil.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, perhaps no issue to come before this House in recent times has been as widely misunderstood as this legislation dealing with the submerged lands or the so-called tidelands bill. Many have seen fit to beat the drums of prejudice and to charge that this bill is a gigantic giveaway. They have done much to spread the already widely held misconception that this is a sectional matter that affects only 3 or 4 States of the Union and have charged that the other States and the vast majority of the people would have everything to gain and nothing to lose by the taking of these lands by the Federal Government.

In the beginning, let me say that this issue is not a sectional one. It is an issue that involves the fundamental concept of State and private ownership of property, and as such, is a matter in which every man, woman, and child of these United States has a vital stake. It exemplifies the familiar spectacle of the Federal Government usurping more and more of the power of the States. It strikes at the very heart of the historic organization of our Government, and in considering this legislation, we must likewise determine whether the individuals and States that make up this Union have rights in property that are sacred and deserve protection or whether all of our ownership is subject to the whims of an all-powerful Federal Government that might devest us under the ill-conceived theory of paramount rights at any time.

On several occasions during the debate on this bill, the proponents of Federal ownership have asked, "Where is the title to the tidelands now?" or "How can any lawyer defend the title of the States now?" I should like very briefly, as a lawyer, to set forth precisely as I can the defense of Texas to her title and to show that the title to the so-called tidelands is now vested in the State of Texas. In order to do this, I must first ask that we consider this matter with complete disregard of the total prejudicial hogwash that has cluttered the radio, television, and newspapers concerning this issue and that we look at the facts as they exist historically.

In the first place, we must realize that the State of Texas entered the Union as an independent Republic as a result of negotiations with the United States and that during these negotiations the Republic of Texas acted as an independent nation and that the State of Texas was not created by the Federal Government out of territories that it already possessed and owned. After Texas became a Republic, the first Congress of that Republic fixed its limits by an act on December 19, 1836, which, among other things, established its boundaries as follows:

> Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues of land to the mouth of the Rio Grande.

About a year later, President Andrew Jackson said:

> The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence.

The first attempt of Texas to come into the Union was not successful. After some preliminary negotiation in 1844, a treaty was prepared and signed by the Republic of Texas and the United States, which provided for the annexation of Texas. In this treaty Texas was to cede to the Union its public land, and the United States was to assume the public debt of Texas. This treaty was sent to the Senate and was defeated by a vote of 36 to 16. If you read the records of that debate, you will see that one of the principal reasons for the defeat of this measure was that it was the consensus of the Senate that Texas public lands were worthless, and more than one Senator expressed the idea during that debate that Texas, if she were to come into the Union, should keep her lands and pay her own debts.

After the defeat of this proposal, there were a series of counter proposals and negotiations continued. Some of the proposals that were made during this period provided that Texas was to cede to the United States its minerals, mines, salt lakes, and springs. None of these proposals were adopted, and on one occasion one of these amendments to a proposal which would have required Texas to give up her mineral rights was defeated in this House. Subsequently, a revised resolution was adopted calling for the annexation of Texas. Thus, it is a historical fact that this very House, immediately prior to Texas's coming into the Union considered and determined that Texas should not cede to the Union her public lands or her minerals. This latter proposal, after being passed by the Congress of the United States, was submitted to and accepted by the Republic of Texas as the basis for its admission into the Union. The resolution passed by the House at that time contained two paragraphs. The first recited that Texas should be admitted into the Union as a State with a Republican form of government adopted by the people of Texas and approved by the Congress of the United States. The second paragraph specified the details of annexation.

The most important of these specific provisions was that Texas was to retain its public debt and was to retain title to all vacant unappropriated lands lying within the boundaries of the Republic of Texas.

Much has been said in the debate here about the fact that Texas came into the Union on equal footing with the other States, and my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. WILSON], who has done so much to bring this bill to the floor of the House, has ably answered these arguments, and you will all recall how he pointed out to you that it is a basic legal concept that specific provisions of any agreement or contract control the general provisions. There is no further need for me to discuss that here, but I would like to point out as a further fact that there was nothing in the first two paragraphs of the House resolution which I referred to a moment ago about equal footing with other States. This equal-footing question came into the resolution in the Senate when that body provided by an amendment to the House resolution that the President of the United States was to have the option at his own judgment and discretion to negotiate the annexation of Texas by treaty which would admit Texas into the Union on an equal footing with the other States instead of submitting to the Republic of Texas the proposals of the first and second paragraphs of the resolution as passed by the House. The then President of the United States, John Tyler, chose not to exercise the option given him in the paragraph added in the Senate, but instead, submitted the provisions of the first two paragraphs of the House resolution. This was approved unanimously by the Congress of the Republic of Texas. After the approval by Texas, the people of Texas, in a convention

called to prepare a State constitution to ratify the acceptance by the Texas Congress of the proposal leading to annexation, passed an ordinance of acceptance which stated:

We, the deputies of the people of Texas, do ordain and declare that we assent to and accept the proposals, conditions, and guaranties contained in the first and second sections of the resolution of the Congress of the United States.

On December 19, 1845, President James K. Polk signed a joint resolution of the Congress of the United States which referred to the offer by the United States and the acceptance of the provisions of Texas of the first and second paragraphs of the joint resolution which I have discussed.

So, we see that even though under the Senate amendment the President of the United States could have carried on negotiations to bring Texas into the Union on equal footing with the other States, he did not elect to do so, but rather followed the first two paragraphs of the resolution, and actually the proposal submitted to and ratified by Texas contained no mention of equal footing with other States. One of the specific proposals in the resolution and one that was acted on and relied on in good faith by the people of Texas was that Texas was to retain her public lands within her boundaries, and, as I have previously noted, the boundaries of Texas had been established as three leagues of land along the Gulf of Mexico from the Sabine River to the Rio Grande.

For over 100 years Texas had possession and exercised dominion and control over these lands, and its ownership had been recognized by the United States Government during that period of time. Yesterday several here asked about the recognition of our title, and in reply, I point out that over 50 decisions of the Supreme Court recognize the title of the States in submerged lands and that historically for over 100 years in dealings and transactions between the Federal Government and the State of Texas, the ownership by the State of these lands has been almost daily recognized.

A great deal has been said about the decision of the Supreme Court. Let me say here that as a citizen and as a lawyer, I have a great respect for the Supreme Court, but it is singular that in the so-called Texas tidelands case four members of the Supreme Court ignored the provisions of the annexation of Texas by which we retained our lands and minerals, and in justification of this ruling, these four Justices relied upon the alternate equal footing provision which was never submitted by the President of the United States to the Republic of Texas and was never considered, accepted, or agreed to by the Republic of Texas. It was contained in none of the proposals or negotiations by which Texas finally came into the Union. The equal-footing proposal was, in effect, rejected both by the United States and the Republic of Texas, but the Supreme Court implies that it is controlling. It is also singular that in the Texas tidelands case for the first time in history the Supreme Court refused to allow a State against whom a controversial lawsuit has been filed by the Federal Government to present evidence to support its position. The Supreme Court failed to look at and study the documents upon which Texas bases its title. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is our title based on historic evidence that has not and cannot be contradicted. The deed to the State of Texas is sealed with the blood of those who established our independence by their victory at San Jacinto, and the present citizens of the State of Texas hold a conveyance to these submerged lands from the people of the Texas Republic who established their boundaries at three leagues and entered into a solemn contract with the United States for their admission to the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FEIGHAN) there were—ayes 28, noes 82.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment .

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PERKINS: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "That (a) those mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to the terms of such lease or under the laws of such State) shall be continued in force and effect: *Provided*, That—

"(1) such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this act, or within such further period as may be determined by the Secretary;

"(2) such lease (i) was issued prior to December 21, 1948, and was in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it on June 5, 1950, or (ii) was issued with the approval of the Secretary and was in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it on the effective date of this act;

"(3) within 90 days from the effective date of this act, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction stating that the lease meets the requirements of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii), in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents from which the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

"(4) except as provided in section 3 of this act all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this act, which have not been paid, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this act shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as provided in section 5 of this act;

"(5) the holder of such lease agrees in writing, filed with the Secretary within 90 days from the effective date of this act, that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this act;

"(6) such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold under such lease. If the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary within 90 days from the effective date of this act, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this act in the absence of production or operations for drilling. If the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary within 90 days from the effective date of this act, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(10) the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) A mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall continue in force and effect in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal, or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease, unless minerals were not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950; then the lease shall remain in force and effect for a term from the effective date of this act equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease, of any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

"(c) The Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control with respect to any mineral lease which meets the requirements of subsection (a) of this section as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

"(d) Nothing in subsection (b) of this section shall be construed to be a waiver of any claim, if any, which the United States may have against any person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this act.

"SEC. 2. Upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, the Secretary, after obtaining the approval of the Attorney General of the United States is authorized to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the

State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

"SEC. 3. Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (c) of the first section of this act, in the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, after obtaining the approval of the Attorney General of the United Sates, to negotiate and enter into necessary agreements respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy. Payments made to the United States pursuant to any such agreement shall be considered to be made in compliance with paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of the first section of this act. If final settlement or adjudication of such controversy is in favor of the United States, then all the provisions of this act shall apply. The authorization contained in this section is not, and shall not be construed to be, a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this act.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary is authorized to issue to the highest qualified bidder, on the basis of competitive bidding, mineral leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of the first section of this act.

"(b) A mineral lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as he may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as minerals may be produced from the area in paying quantities or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

"(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as provided in section 5 of this act.

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary under this section, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands under section 2 of this act, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath the navigable inland waters.

"SEC. 5. All moneys received by the Secretary from leases issued pursuant to this act shall be held for use as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

"SEC. 6. The National Advisory Council on Grants-in-Aid of Education is hereby created to be composed of 12 persons with experience in the field of education and public administration, 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 4 by the President of the United States. No more than 2 from each group of 4 appointees shall be of the same political party. It shall be the function of such Council to draft and report to the President of the United States for submission to the Congress not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, a plan for an equitable allocation of the grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education provided in section 5 of this act.

"SEC. 7. It shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1953, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statement so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

"SEC. 8. The provisions of section 5 of this act shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any agreement pending the settlement or adjudication of any controversy referred to in section 3 of this act.

"SEC. 9. The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 10. (a) The President may, at any time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the minerals produced from the submerged lands covered by this act.

"(c) All leases issued under this act, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this act, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision vesting authority in the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any such lease during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this act, and for the payment of just compensation to the owner of any such lease.

"SEC. 11. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this act and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired. Nothing in this section is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this act or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

"SEC. 12. When used in this act, (a) the term 'submerged lands of the Continental Shelf' means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the sea and situated outside the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (b) the term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; (c) the term 'tidelands' means lands regularly covered and uncovered by the flow and the ebb of the tides; and (d) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. PERKINS (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. I object, Mr. Chairman. Under the previous statement made by the majority leader, we are seeking to limit this debate. Ample notice has been given. I object.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentlemen on the majority side have taken this attitude of denying sufficient time to get the issue clearly before this Committee.

I offer House Joint Resolution 89 as a substitute. This substitute protects the equities of all mineral leases issued by the States covering the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, and provides that other leases shall be issued by the Secretary of the Interior, and that the royalties from all such leases shall be used for grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education, and for other purposes.

This amendment differs from the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio in that it does not concede anything from the low mark, seaward to the States. It provides that all the revenue shall be expended for educational purposes.

I am sure that this committee is well aware of the unusually large growth in the school-age population, the inadequate supply of teachers, and the deteriorating condition of the school buildings throughout the country. These facts are the basis for the substitute bill.

The bill provides for an Advisory Council on Grants-in-Aid of Education to be composed of 12 persons with experience in the field of education and public administration, 4 to be appointed by the President of the Senate, 4 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and 4 by the President of the United States. No more than 2 from each group of 4 appointees shall be of the same political party. It shall be the function of such Council to draft and report to the President of the United States for submission to the Congress not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, a plan for an equitable allocation of the grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

All of the three decisions of the Supreme Court clearly held that neither the Thirteen Original Colonies, nor a State that came into the Union after our independence, can claim any proprietary rights beyond the low-water mark, and that the so-called marginal area of 3 miles did not belong to the States, that the States could exercise police powers and certain taxing powers, but could not exercise proprietary rights.

The development of oil and gas from this area certainly is a proprietary right which belongs to all the people in all the States.

This debate has been punctuated throughout with propaganda and confusion with the sole idea to get as many Members as possible from the remaining 45 States to go along with the interested States of Louisiana, California, and Texas. That is the only reason why the interested States, along with the help of the oil lobby, have managed to confuse this issue.

We all know that this whole controversy arose out of the disputes involving the States of Louisiana, California, and Texas. Who in here can truthfully deny that these three States are not the interested ones. The Supreme Court has clearly held that the inland waterways, lakes, rivers, and harbors are not involved here.

Mr. Chairman, if we really want to do something for education in this country, we now have the opportunity. I have before me a book entitled "The Uneducated," which recently came off the Columbia University Press, where President Eisenhower established a conservation of human resources, a research project, in 1950, within the Graduate School of Business of Columbia University. Philip Young, dean of the Graduate School of Business, was appointed administrative head of the project. Eli Ginzberg, professor of economics in the Graduate School of Business, was director of the project.

I would like to take time to read the first two paragraphs from chapter 1 entitled "Our Human Resources."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes to explain my point.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I must object.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the same type of substitute amendment as the gentleman from Ohio offered except that it is a little worse. The gentleman just made the statement that there was no Supreme Court decision holding that the Original States and the other States owned to their historic, seaward boundaries. I refer him to the case of Martin against Waddel, reported in Sixteenth Peters, page 367, which was decided in 1842 when the Court said:

> When the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and soils under them for their own common use.

I refer him to the case of *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (44 U. S. 212), where the Court said:

> First, the shore of navigable waters and the soils under them were not granted by the Constitution to the United States but were reserved to the States respectively. Second, the new States have the same right, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the Original States.

I also call the gentleman's attention to some 50 cases cited in the brief of the State of Texas in the case of the Federal Government against Texas. The brief is signed by Walter R. Johnson, attorney general of Nebraska; Clarence A. Barnes, attorney general of Massachusetts; Price Daniel, attorney general of Texas; Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general of Ohio; Fred LeBlanc, attorney general of Louisiana; and Edward F. Arn, attorney general of Kansas. This brief cites these 50 cases and textbooks and legal authorities to support the position of the States that they do own and have owned since the inception of this great Republic their seaward boundaries out to their historic limits. I think this substitute amendment should be voted down just as the other one was.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Those cases to which you refer are restricted to inland waters and do not consider submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to say to the gentleman, if I am not mistaken about reading the dissenting opinion of Justice Reed, that it was expressly admitted that the California case was the first time the marginal sea question had been before the Court. These are claims between a State and the United States and such actions as an original action must be filed in the Supreme Court. If I understand the analysis made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON], none of the cases that he cited was a controversy existing between a State and the Nation.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is immaterial.

Mr. PERKINS. All of the issues decided in the cases which he cited involved only inland waters.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I disagree with the gentleman. Many of these cases, in fact, all of them, touch this subject although they may not be between the Federal Government and any State.

The same problem came up in many lawsuits involving here one State and there another State. The question has been established for 150 years.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the record should be clarified again today as it was yesterday with regard to this matter of whether or not a decision by the Court has been made on specific issue that is paramount in this debate. Yesterday a statement by a former Member of the House, Sam Hobbs, who is recognized here as a constitutional authority was read into the RECORD; and he stated clearly that there has been no Supreme Court decision which would establish title either for the States or for the Federal Government in the land beneath the marginal sea. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], asked the proponents of this bill to cite one case, but not one could be cited.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. YATES. In the Supreme Court of the United States, United States against California, in the opinion of Mr. Justice Black the following statements occur:

> The United States sued in ejectment for certain lands situated in San Francisco Bay. The defendant held the lands under a grant from California. This Court decided that the State grant was valid because the land under the Bay had passed to the State upon its admission to the Union. *United States* v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391). There may be other reasons why the judgment in that case does not bar this litigation; but it is a sufficient reason that this case involves land under the open sea, and not land under the inland waters of San Francisco Bay.
>
> • • • Notwithstanding the fact that none of these cases either involved or decided the State-Federal conflict presented here, we are urged to say that the language used and repeated in those cases forecloses the Government from the right to have this Court decide that question now that it is squarely presented for the first time.

As a matter of fact, the report says in a majority opinion that this is the first case in which a case of this type ever came to the Supreme Court.

Mr. McCARTHY. I certainly agree with the remarks of the gentleman; and he might make the point that if we are going to—and apparently we are—to make this a transfer of title—if we can call it a transfer even though the Federal title is unclear—that we ought to do it with a clear statement of the reasons for which we are doing it. Let us not try to justify it by interposing a lot of references to legal decisions that have no bearing upon the case, or even to treaties which were never drawn and never signed, nor to other irrelevant historical argument, but simply say that we are going to transfer whatever title the Federal Government has in this area, title which has not been established by anything but a Presidential proclamation in 1945, and which has never been accepted by any court of law and say that we are giving the States whatever legal title we have.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I have always thought it was the custom that a Member offering an original amendment, would have an opportunity to explain the amendment even though 5 additional minutes may be necessary. Now, as I see it, the claim of California and Louisiana is completely fictitious and unfounded. No one on this floor has brought forth any source of title that could possibly give California, Louisiana, or any other State the right to claim the marginal sea.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS] yesterday admitted that when the Thirteen Original Colonies declared their independence, they did it as a united nation. When did any lapse of time intervene for the Thirteen Colonies to acquire ownership of the marginal sea? The so-called historic boundary claims arose since oil was discovered off the coasts of California and Louisiana.

In my judgment you would have made a greater and more persuasive argument if you had measured off one sword's length and said, "This is the extent of the historical boundaries of the claim of California and Louisiana."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see if we can reach an agreement as to further time for discussion of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we held hearings on this matter, Fourteen bills were submitted and the gentlemen presenting them were heard. If we are going to debate each of those 14 bills all over again on the floor, we will be here until next week.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to adjourn.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, it is entirely facetious to say that we should limit time because committee hearings were held. If that is the way we are going to conduct business, think of what would happen if on every bill 435 Members of Congress were to appear before every committee. There would not be time to hear them all, there would not be an opporunity to report out any legislation. This is the forum of the people, and here we shall speak.

I am against this bill because I do not want to see the basis for another Teapot Dome scandal being laid here today. I am against this bill because I resent a second Louisiana Purchase. I am against this bill because of the rough-shod methods that are being perpetrated upon us. You cannot sell the treasures of the United States of America for a mess of political pottage. If this is passed the Supreme Court will throw it out. Texas and Louisiana will not go Republican, and where will you be?

I would like to yield my time now to the gentleman from Kentucky to make any remarks he may desire to make at this time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to state that I am comparatively a new Member, but this is the first time I have experienced the steamroller in operation since I came to the Congress. I know that this has been a campaign issue, but there are greater rights involved in this legislation than merely trying to carry out a campaign pledge.

Mr. Chairman, commencing where I left off when my time expired, I wish to read from the first chapter of a book entitled "The Uneducated" that recently came off the press of Columbia University, entitled "Our Human Resources," page 3.

I would like to read the first and second paragraphs of that chapter:

> During World War II more than 5 million men liable for military service were rejected as unsuitable because of a physical, emotional, mental, or moral disability. Since about 18 million men were examined, this implies that approximately 1 out of every 3 young men was considered so handicapped that he could not serve his country in uniform during a major war. In the year following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea about 500,000 of the million and a half men examined were rejected. Once again, the number and proportion of handicapped men were very large.
>
> Hidden within these startling figures is the still more startling fact that during World War II 716,000 men were rejected on the grounds that they were mentally deficient.

In this book at a later chapter, page 234, we find certain recommendations. It is stated:

> What, then, are the options that face the country with respect to the elimination of illiteracy at the source—among those now of school age and those who will come of school age in the future? There are at least four alternatives. The first can be called a do-nothing program; it would hold that the Federal Government take no special action.
>
> Now, listen to No. 2:
>
> The second approach could be called a do-something-about-illiteracy program, and would include the use of Federal funds specifically for the eradication of illiteracy. The third could be characterized as a do-something-for-education program, and would include the use of Federal funds specifically for the eradication of illiteracy. The third could be characterized as a do-something-for-education program, and would direct additional effort and resources to raising the quality of education in general, without concentrating on the problem of illiteracy. A fourth approach would be still broader, a do-something-for-the-poor-States program, and would include Federal assistance not only for education but for the gamut of services that have to be supported by the taxpayer—health, roads, public assistance.

President Eisenhower was responsible for the publication of this book. You have the opportunity to do something about the uneducated instead of trying to quitclaim title to the marginal sea, especially since the States never owned any title to the marginal sea in the history of this country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. It is very apparent now that the gentleman from Kentucky has had all the time he wanted and certainly no one objects to that but I do want to say that I hope we will move along expeditiously from now on in the consideration of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is no attempt here to steamroller this bill. This bill, or one similar to it, has been before the Congress for the past 15 years. Six thousand pages of testimony have been taken in committee, 15 or 16 hearings have been held—long, hard hearings—where everybody had an opportunity to express his belief and his opinion. Certainly there are a number of amendments which are apparently to be offered. This amendment, as I understand it, is simply that the Federal Government shall expropriate all the territory from the high-water mark out to the end of the Continental Shelf and give it to the public schools of the United States. In other words, take Texas' money that is now dedicated to its public schools, and the money of a number of other States, take it away from those States' children and give it to everybody else.

There has been a lot of talk about how much money is involved. So far as Texas is concerned, there has been a little over $8 million deposited in the State Treasury as a result of leases out in this area. You can take that $8 million or $8,500,000—I think it is eight-million-four-hundred-thousand odd—and divide it into 48 States, and your State, Mr. FEIGHAN, would get $160,000. You certainly could not build any school buildings out of the money you would take away from Texas schoolchildren and build school buildings in your district or in your State. The other 2 States, I understand, have more. But, regardless of that, that would be Texas' contribution to your schoolchildren, so that is all there is to this amendment. I think it is worse than the other one we voted down, and I ask the Committee to vote down this amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I think that the gentleman from Texas is inconsistent in his argument. A few moments ago he made the assertion that the Treasury Department needs this money as well as the schools. If we were debating here today how we most wisely could spend the money from the standpoint of national interest, then the gentleman would certainly have made a point.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Well, I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech. I just yielded to him for a question.

Mr. PERKINS. That is a question.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. All right; I will answer the question. I do not think I have taken an inconsistent position on the matter. I do say that the Federal Treasury at this time needs money worse than anything else in this country, including the schools.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the assertion of the gentleman, and I ask the gentleman why he is not proposing that all the funds then go to some use for general Government expenses, if he opposes school legislation.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Nine-tenths of this money goes to the Federal Treasury under this bill, under title III.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have come to a number of conclusions after hearing the debate of yesterday and this morning.

First. That repealing three important, paramount Supreme Court decisions has turned out to be not quite so simple as the proponents of this bill seem to think it is. This debate indicates that this proposition sought by the proponents of this bill is fraught with insurmountable, incalculable difficulties.

Second. Trying to settle the controversy as the result of a hot political campaign and attempts here to bolster up those campaign pledges have simply made confusion worse confounded. Frankly, the bill before us is really a hedge of a campaign pledge.

Third. The last word will not be stated on this floor or on the floor of the other Chamber. The Supreme Court will not sanction the bill before us. Thus, legal qualms will avert the gigantic grab by the oil companies of the Nation's offshore oil. Lastly, the bill before us, to my mind, is nothing but a hodgepodge that is not going to satisfy anyone. It is not going to satisfy the boys back home in Louisiana; it is not going to satisfy the oil companies down in Texas; it is not going to satisfy those interested in California. I would suggest that Cali-

fornia and Texas might well rejoin the Democratic Party. They are getting small comfort from this administration.

With reference to what the gentleman from Illinois said concerning the definition of seaward boundaries, section 4, I want to say that as I read that section, which you will find on pages 8 and 9 of the bill, that section 4 is an illuminated invitation to any coastal State to, willy-nilly, extend its boundary to any distance seaward it sees fit.

Let me read you the language—and I brought this up a number of times before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. Page 9, line 2, reads:

> Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline, or to the International Boundary of the United States in the Great Lakes, or any body of water traversed by such boundary.

Then we have this strange language, a suspicious language:

> Any claim heretofore or hereafter—

Think of it, "hereafter"—

> asserted either by constitutional provision, statute or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line.

Beyond what line? Beyond 3 miles? Thus we in Congress say a coastal State "without prejudice" may "claim" beyond "that line," that is, beyond 3 miles. There is no limit beyond the "3 miles" to which the State may lay claim.

The Legislature of the State of Texas on May 25, 1947, enacted legislation containing the following provision:

> The gulfward boundary lines of all the counties of this State bordering on the coast line of the Gulf of Mexico are hereby fixed and declared to be the Continental Shelf of the Gulf of Mexico.

We approve by that language what the legislature did, because we specifically say there shall be approved any claim made "by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise."

Similarly with the State of California and similarly with the State of Louisiana.

You might have some outworn declaration, some map, some musty declaration dug up from God knows where, some old fishing right, some ancient document, that the legislatures of these States could bring forth to support the extension of boundaries indefinitely. They could say, "Why, our boundaries run 67 miles out," or they could say, "Our boundaries go clear to the Continental Shelf."

By passing this bill we buy a pig in a poke because we approve in advance all sorts of boundary claims without full knowledge thereof.

I am opposed to the bill in its entirety for that reason.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have hesitated to take any time on this bill, but some of the arguments made by the Federal proponents are so fallacious that it is hard to allow them to go unchallenged.

One gentleman came up here and referred to the Teapot Dome scandal. Anybody who has studied the history of that case knows it was a Federal scandal. It had nothing to do with any States making leases.

In much of the propaganda you see on this tidelands issue you find some reference to the oil trust or the oil companies, and it is made to appear by the proponents of Federal ownership that they are protecting the people of the United States against some of the oil companies.

Everyone knows that every bill proposed here, and in fact the bill proposed last year by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], provides that the leases issued by the States to the oil companies shall be validated. The bill the gentleman introduced last session provided that the Federal Government should proceed to lease the Federal properties for development to the oil companies pursuant to it and the Federal Leasing Act.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? He mentioned my name.

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, sometimes it is better to bend than to break. I am opposed to all these bills, but in view of what happened, that the House passed this bill once before, I wanted to get a compromise. I still maintain a good many of these bills were sponsored by and actually written by the oil companies, although I make no charges against any individual Member.

Mr. YORTY. I thank the gentleman. I will say that the oil companies supported his bill at the last session of Congress, and the gentleman is well aware of that. They supported that and did not support the State bill, because they did want to get out of this controversy, in which they find themselves right in the middle, between the Federal Government and the States. They do not know whether their leases are valid; they do not know whether they can legally continue to rely on them. Many of them have spent huge sums of money developing their properties. On the basis of the compromise the gentleman from New York proposed, they supported his bill, so he was on the same side with the oil companies. If he wants to drag the oil companies into this argument, I feel he is merely beclouding the real issues.

It is a false argument. It has nothing to do with the case. It is just to build up some kind of a scare in the minds of people who are supporting the States that they will be accused of being on the side of the oil companies.

Under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 the Federal Government has leased hundreds of thousands of acres of land to the oil companies. I suspect that some of the people who are opposing the States here today and trying to drag the oil companies in are actually in favor of the Federal Government going into the drilling field itself and socializing the oil business. I do not think they say that, but that is what I believe they have in the back of their minds. The Federal Government tried going into the oil business in Alaska and spent $50 million and did not produce any oil. Now they are abandoning that project.

So under all the bills it is provided that the leases negotiated in good faith will be validated. Whether the Federal Government or the States win this argument, the properties are going to be developed by private oil companies under Federal or State leases.

In the remaining minute I have, I want to say in answer to the argument that there are no cases on record setting a precedent for State ownership that Justice Black in writing the majority opinion in the California case admitted that the Supreme Court in the past cases had used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then felt that the States then owned all of the lands under their navigable waters, including the territorial waters. This is one other important point I would like to make. The California case was the first one decided and the Court was unable to cite any precedent for holding that the Federal Government owned this property. They decided the case without precedent on the basis of a rationale that is the most dangerous rationale ever employed in any Supreme Court decision. They said in the California case that the Federal Government had to defend this property, and that it might get us into foreign difficulties, and therefore the Federal Government had to have paramount rights and full dominion over it. Justice Reed said that that could apply to every farm and home, and Justice Frankfurter in his dissent criticized that rationale. It is this new rationale enunciated in the tideland cases that worries most of us. If the Federal Government must own and have a proprietary interest in everything that it is called upon to defend or in everything that is liable to get us involved in foreign affairs, then nobody owns anything in the United States of America except the United States Government. This doctrine could be extended to any length unless this Congress stops it, which I think it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have no reason to believe that anything I shall say will give pause to those who are intent upon passing this bill. I have always regarded this legislation as merely the price of a presidency. I see no reason why Republicans from the North and from the Middle West and from the East should vote to give away the treasures of this country to 4 States. I can see no reason for it unless that which is being done now is the price for breaking the solid South and bringing the party of Lincoln back into the White House. I think that this is a self-evident truth. There is no other possible explanation of why Republicans from the North, the East and the West are voting, almost solidly, to turn over this vast wealth to 4 Southern States. What other excuse could there be? Not only are they giving away properties worth sufficient probably twice over to pay the national debt, but they are leveling indirectly a tax upon their own constituents in the increased cost which will result of gas and oil sold at retail.

All of this is being done as the payment of the price for bringing the party of Lincoln back into the White House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Abraham Lincoln was the first Republican President of the United States and it was he who answered the challenge in the defiant cry that the State comes first and the Nation comes second. Abraham Lincoln founded and made great in those days the Republican Party by asserting the superiority of the Nation over the State. Now we have again the same challenge. I have listened patiently to the debates on this floor for 2 days. All of the arguments of the proponents of this bill can be stated in the one argument that the State comes first and the Nation comes second. That is exactly the argument that Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party had to meet in the early sixties.

Now that Abraham Lincoln all these years has been in his grave and the last of the boys in blue, who kept your party in power for decades after the Civil War, has gone to answer the last roll-call, you Republicans are surrendering all that Abraham Lincoln won and died for. Do you think the boys in blue, while you are doing this, are lying undisturbed in their graves?

When they were alive you courted them, you called them heroes and saviors of their country, and you took their votes. Do you think in view of what is now happening they can rest easily in their graves?

Now that they no longer have votes to give you, you are looking elsewhere for votes. So now you are saying, "Yes, the State comes first and the Nation comes second." What would Abraham Lincoln say to you if he were here? Abraham Lincoln, the founder of your party, betrayed.

And you are going to pass this bill which turns over from the people of the United States properties worth enough to pay twice over the national debt. I am not giving you a fantastic figure. If you do not know how much you are giving away, it is time that you learned. Nobody knows how limitless the wealth in the submerged lands will amount to. Scientists who have made startling progress in preparing for the development of submerged lands under all the seven seas tell us that within 10 or 20 years the wealth uncovered and made available for development will exceed beyond the reach of imagination all the resources heretofore known to man.

Well, my Republican friends, you are giving it away as the price of getting a 4-year occupancy of the White House. But you still say, perhaps, as a salve to conscience and to minimize the enormity of the price you are paying for the Presidency, that my figures of an estimated $500 billion are ridiculous. Let me tell you something. Thirty years ago the Texas gas people had some litigation in regard to prices in which the city of Chicago, then as now represented by Joseph F. Grossman, a municipal and public utilities lawyer of national stature, was interested. All of the financing of the oil companies was done over a 10-year amortization basis. All of the experts testified in that litigation that in 10 years those Texas oil wells would be dried up. That was 30 years ago, and many of those wells are richer today than they were then. Basing my conclusions upon that, plus the most recent reports of renowned scientists engaged in processing methods for developing submerged lands to the depths of the deepest seas, I am saying to you that the price you are paying for the Presidency in dollars and cents reaches to a figure of no less than $500 billion.

Next Memorial Day there will be flags again over the graves of the boys in blue. But if it were given to the occupants of those graves to speak, the flags would be at halfmast in mourning for the party that their votes had given power when the Republican Party stood up for the Union.

As I have listened to the arguments on legal phases my mind has kept going back to the years when the courts were confronted with another problem, essentially not unlike the present problem. Those were the days when we were fighting for legislation regulating the hours of employment and working conditions of workingwomen. The courts kept holding such legislation unconstitutional because under outworn precedents, descending from a different state of living and of thinking, labor was property. Then came a change, and thanks to Louis D. Brandeis—later Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court—then working as a lawyer for a cause and not a fee, the Court accepted the commonsense rule that "what men know as men they know as judges." The experiences of mankind in a new order of society at long last were accepted in a court of review as invalidating the outworn precedents furnished in the judicial decisions of bygone days.

The fact is that there is no decision of our Supreme Court on the question here involved, as applied to modern conditions and in direct bearing, that antedates the decision in the California case in 1947. Decisions that find their reasoning in the common law are based upon an entirely different order of things. We are not exclusively concerned with navigation and fisheries. Science and technology have opened up vast new fields of wealth. In the areas at the bottom of the seas we are finding the equivalent of what the discovery of the American continent meant to the Old World of centuries ago. The Supreme Court in 1947 sought to prepare for the future ahead by raising its sights from a concept of navigation and fisheries to one inclusive of the broader issues of national security and Federal control that had come with the vast expansion of the submerged domain opened for development.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that if my Republican colleagues persist in going ahead with their commitment the price of the presidency will add up to a lost future for an American Union that promised so much for all mankind.

Pass this bill, and the die is cast for 1954—when the people of an outraged Nation can speak.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when I was in law school I wrote a paper one time on tidelands, and I just want to mention here that the matter of tidelands and who owns the tidelands, that down to the lowest ebb of the tide is clearly shown to belong to the States, and the bottom of navigable streams, like the Columbia River and the San Joaquin River belong to the States; in fact, in my city of Stockton one of our biggest parks was formerly the bottom of the river. We bought that land from the State when the stream was filled up and made a park out of it, and we bought it from the State of California.

In reading numerous decisions when I wrote that paper it seemed to me that I could clearly see that our jurisdiction on the borders of the Pacific Ocean—I refer to California's jurisdiction—went out coterminus with the jurisdiction of the United States Government; and to show you that I am not entirely off base on that, I want to read what one of the Justices of the Supreme Court that decided this case said about the matter. Here is what Justice Reed said:

> While no square ruling of this Court has determined the ownership of those marginal lands, to me the tone of the decisions dealing with similar problems indicates that, without discussion, the State ownership has been assumed.

He cites the following cases in support of this statement. They are *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, supra; *Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (201 U. S. 1, 52), *The Abbey Dodge* (223 U. S. 166), *New Jersey* v. *Delaware* (291 U. S. 361; 225 U. S. 694).

In other words, some of the greatest lawyers and jurists in the law concerning tidelands and in international law came to the view that the slant of the thinking in those decisions clearly indicated that these States on the border, like California, Texas, Louisiana, and Florida, had rights that were coterminous with the rights of the United States or at least extended out to sea beyond the low tide line.

I want to make another point here. It is indicated that this bill will injure national defense. Nothing could be further from the truth. The same Justice mentioned above made that point. Remember this, there were only four judges who were in harmony with the majority opinion and three were in the minority; in other words, the majority opinion is also a minority opinon.

Then Justice Reed continues:

> This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the needs or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands, precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation.

This would not interfere in the slightest degree with the national defense, and anybody who thinks it out carefully and dispassionately will understand that. My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] made these same points. But it is just that simple to me, that here, after dozens of years, perhaps several decades, decisions of our courts have slanted in the direction where great lawyers and great jurists admit that they indicate conclusively that these marginal lands belong to the exterior States.

We are not coming here with our hat in our hand begging for anything; we

are just asking for what we think is lawfully ours. Our Governor was considered one of the finest witnesses who appeared before these various committees, and since 1938, when he was attorney general, until the present day he is of the same conviction that I am, based upon overwhelming study of the problem, that the only fair thing to do, the only legal thing to do is to nullify this decision by an act of Congress. Now, does Congress have the right to do it? In my opinion, Congress does have the right to do it. If the Federal Government has paramount jurisdiction, certainly the Congress of the United States can determine that that paramount jurisdiction that they have can be deeded over and shared with the States that are involved.

For these very simple reasons I think that we should pass this bill and divorce from it all of the politics the opposition is trying to throw into this problem. It is purely a legal problem, purely a legislative problem before us, and it ought to be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. FEIGHAN. It is a legal problem, and the Supreme Court has decided that legal problem.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Congress has the right to make regulations, including provision for its transfer to States, pertaining to said paramount right.

It seems peculiar to me that when leading members of the bar, the American Bar Association, and over a majority of the attorneys general of the various States have agreed that what we are proposing to do in this bill is the right thing to do, that we should have so much confusion and resistance to this bill. A reading of the decision convinces me, as I said yesterday, that that is what the Supreme Court had in mind, namely, that Congress would exercise its right to make a policy with reference to the underseas lands which the Congress thought fair and equitable.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the brief remarks that I shall make will have any effect upon the opponents of this measure or not, but I should like to call their attention to something which an examination of the RECORD of yesterday shows, apparently, has not been brought to their notice. Statements have been made that this is a comparatively new problem and that States were never recognized as having any boundaries beyond the low watermark. The Supreme Court, by convenience, has ignored, Mr. Chairman, the treaty by which our country came into existence. The words of that treaty are so important that, I think, all of the Members of the Congress should know them. I have had this matter photostated by the Library of Congress and I would like to read a part of the treaty to you. This is from the treaty now on record which has been approved and it sets up the United States, its Thirteen Original Colonies, and the boundaries thereof. You gentlemen who say you have never heard of States having any rights beyond the low watermark had better listen.

From that treaty I read the following:

ARTICLE 1. His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz, New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia to be free, sovereign, and independent States; that he treats with them as such; and for himself, his heirs, and successors, relinquishes all claims to the Government, proprietary, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof; and that all disputes which might arise in future on the subject of the boundaries of the said United States may be prevented, it is hereby agreed and declared that the following are and shall be their boundaries, viz:

ART. 2. From the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, viz, that angle which is formed by a line drawn due north from the source of St. Croix River to the Highlands; along the said Highlands which divide those rivers that empty themselves into the River St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean to the northwesternmost head of Connecticut River, thence down along the middle of the river to the 45th degree of north latitude; from thence by a line due west on said latitude; until it strikes the River Iroquois or Cataraquy; thence along the middle of said river into Lake Ontario, through the middle of said lake until it strikes the communication by water between that lake and Lake Erie; thence along the middle of said communication into Lake Erie, through the middle of said lake until it arrives at the water communication between that lake and Lake Huron; thence along the middle of said water communication into the Lake Huron; thence through the middle of the said lake to the water communication between that lake and Lake Superior; thence through Lake Superior northward of the isles Royal and Philipeau to the Long Lake; thence through the middle of said Long Lake, and the water communication between it and the Lake of the Woods, to the said Lake of the Woods; thence through the said lake to the most northwestern point thereof, and from thence on a due west course to the River Mississippi; thence by a line to be drawn along the middle of the said River Mississippi, until it shall intersect the northernmost part of the 31st degree of north latitude. South by a line to be drawn due east from the determination of the line last mentioned, in the latitude of 31° north of the Equator, to the middle of the River Apalachicola or Catauatche; thence along the middle thereof to its junction with the Flint River; thence straight to the head of St. Marys River; and thence down along the middle of St. Marys River to the Atlantic Ocean. East by a line to be drawn along the middle of the river St. Croix, from its mouth in the Bay of Fundy to its source, and from its source directly north to the aforesaid Highlands, which divide the rivers that fall into the Atlantic Ocean from those which fall into the River St. Lawrence; comprehending all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States, and lying between lines to be drawn due east from the points where the aforesaid boundaries between Nova Scotia is on the one part, and East Florida on the other, shall respectively touch the Bay of Fundy, and the Atlantic Ocean; excepting such islands as now are or heretofore have been within the limits of the said Province of Nova Scotia.

ART. 3. It is agreed that the people of the United States shall continue to enjoy unmolested the right to take fish of every kind on the Grand Bank, and on all the other banks of Newfoundland; also in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and at all other places in the sea, where the inhabitants of both countries used at any time heretofore to fish; and also that the inhabitants of the United States shall have liberty to take fish of every kind on such part of the coast of Newfoundland as British fishermen shall use (but not to dry or cure the same on that island), and also on the coasts, bays, and creeks of all other of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America; and that the American fishermen shall have liberty to dry and cure fish in any of the unsettled bays, harbors, and creeks of Nova Scotia, Magdalen Islands, and Labrador, so long as the same shall remain unsettled, but so soon as the same or either of them shall be settled, it shall not be lawful for the said fishermen to dry or cure fish at such settlement, without a previous agreement for that purpose with the inhabitants, proprietors, or possessors of the ground.

Article 2 sets up the boundaries. It is interesting to note that most of the opponents of this bill like that part of the international boundary or boundaries as described in the Constitution which says that they go down the center of the Great Lakes. This bill contains the same provision.

When it comes down finally to that part which borders on the Atlantic Ocean it is stated that it comes to the mouth of the St. Mary's River which was then the northern boundary of what was Florida at that time. Then it extends out into the ocean 20 leagues and from thence to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River, that all lands and islands 20 leagues to sea become the province and belong to the original States.

In order to indicate that this was the real intention and something that has not been brought up just recently, I asked whether there were any maps on record that would show that historically the States have maintained that their boundaries were something like originally set forth in their charters. The Library of Congress has sent to me a certificate that says there is on file in the Library of Congress and has been for many years the American Atlas, a printed publication published in 1796 and the attached negative is an accurate description. That accurate map of the United States of America, according to the treaty of peace of 1783, clearly shows that the 20-league line extends from Florida to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to talk on this measure, as many times talks are made to fill the hours and to cram the RECORD, but I do desire to try and refute some of the statements that I have heard on the floor today.

As a member of the State Legislature of California, I was on the committee that investigated some of the oil lands below the ocean waters. We had controversy after controversy trying to establish what was submerged oil deposits. At Huntington Beach the first discovery of slant drilling was found. The oil companies were drilling along the shore of Huntington Beach, and somebody with an idea learned to develop a crooked well, and it was only when one of the Standard Oil Co.'s wells was drilled through and cut off the oil supply. Finally a survey was made which revealed that the drillers behind the Standard Oil Co. were tapping the pool under the waters of the Pacific Ocean. We had a long controversy regarding that problem, and in California many elections were fought along that line. But, finally, we were able to establish

that that oil belonged to the State of California and we exacted royalties from those wells that were slant-drilled into that basin.

The first royalty we finally developed was a 32-percent royalty for all the oil taken out of that basin. The royalties, as we have collected them, have amounted to a large sum for the State of California.

These royalties each year were collected and distributed as follows: $150,000 was earmarked for education and facilities and advancement of veterans of our World Wars. Of the remaining balance 30 percent goes into the general fund of the State, and naturally finds it way into educational and other State purposes. The remaining 70 percent is used for the purchasing of beaches and park sites for recreational purposes and for their maintenance. These beaches and parks are facilities from which all citizens of the entire country derive a benefit.

We have used this money to purchase coastline properties and established many coastline beaches. Can you imagine traveling to the Pacific coast and traversing our highways and not being permitted to go down to the ocean shore? These moneys which we receive are used for this general purpose.

Permit me to give you some figures on royalties collected by California as compared with the Federal Government. Now we have heard the charge constantly that this is an oil company bill. I want the people who are making those charges to reverse themselves, because it is not factual; in fact, those who are opposing this bill are favoring the oil companies, if anybody is.

From 1921 through 1950, the yearly average collected by the State of California was 19.13-percent royalty. During the year 1950 California collected royalties at the rate of 24.99 percent from the oil companies who entered into agreements to produce from tideland deposits. By comparison, the Federal Government collects royalties from such sources as this on an average rate of 11 percent. The latest figures I have are for 1947, when the Government's rate of royalty collections was 11.38 percent. That same year the State of California collected royalties from tidelands production at the rate of 24.91 percent.

The State of California is receiving a proper proportion through the royalty on the production of these wells. The money being collected is used for almost the identical purposes in California as the opponents of this bill desire its distribution would lead you to believe on a national level. It has been said that this amount would be infinitesimal if distributed throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, do now close.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. Which section does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. GRAHAM. Section 1 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

DEFINITION

SEC. 2. When used in this act—

(a) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" means (1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which are covered by nontidal waters that were navigable under the laws of the United States at the time such State became a member of the Union, or acquired sovereignty over such lands and waters thereafter, up to the ordinary high-water mark as heretofore or hereafter modified by accretion, erosion, or reliction; (2) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coast line of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Great Lakes or Gulf of Mexico) beyond 3 geographical miles, and (3) all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as hereinabove defined; the term "boundaries" includes the historic seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof;

(b) The term "coast line" means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters, which include all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, historic bays, and sounds and all other bodies of water which join the open sea;

(c) The terms "grantees" and "lessees" include (without limiting the generality thereof) all political subdivisions municipalities, public and private corporations, and other persons holding grants or leases from a State, or from its predecessor sovereign if legally validated, to lands beneath navigable waters if such grants or leases were issued in accordance with the constitution, statutes, and decisions of the courts of the State in which such lands are situated, or of its predecessor sovereign: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as conferring upon said grantees or lessees any greater rights or interests other than are described herein and in their respective grants from the State, or its predecessor sovereign;

(d) The term "natural resources" includes, without limiting the generality thereof, oil, gas, and all other minerals, and fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but does not include water power or the use of water for the production of power, at any site where the United States now owns the water power;

(e) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" does not include the beds of streams in lands now or heretofore constituting a part of the public lands of the United States if such streams were not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States, and if the title to the beds of such streams was lawfully patented or conveyed by the United States or any State to any person;

(f) The term "State" means any State of the Union;

(g) The term "person" includes in addition to a natural person, an association, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private, public, or municipal corporation;

(h) The term "outer continental shelf" means all submerged lands (1) which lie outside and seaward of lands beneath navigable waters as defined hereinabove in section 2 (a), and (2) of which the subsoil and natural resources appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control;

(i) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(j) The term "lease" whenever used with reference to action by a State or its political subdivision or grantee shall be regarded as including any form of authorization for the use, development, or production from lands beneath navigable waters or lands of the outer continental shelf and the natural resources therein and thereunder, and the term "lessee" whenever used in such connection shall be regarded as including any person having the right to develop or produce natural resources and any person having the right to use or develop lands beneath navigable waters or lands of the outer continental shelf under any such form of authorization;

(k) The term "Mineral Leasing Act" means the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), and all acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to ask some questions of the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill. I should like to refer the attention of the gentleman to page 2 of the bill, line 1, where the word "nontidal" is used. Does this refer to fresh water or does it refer to the ocean waters which are nontidal in the sense of not covering the tidelands?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. YATES. The word is "nontidal," What does that mean, fresh water?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. There are no tides in fresh water that I know of.

Mr. YATES. The word is "nontidal." Therefore, would it mean fresh water?

Mr. GRAHAM. Beyond the tides.

Mr. YATES. Beyond the tides of the ocean, then. Now with respect to the language appearing in line 17, "historic seaward boundaries," will the gentleman state what is the historic seaward boundary of Louisiana, for example? I have read the report and I have not seen it defined and I have nowhere seen any explanation of what is the historic seaward boundary of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I have asked the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. Does the gentleman from Louisiana wish to answer it? I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIS. I tried to explain that yesterday during general debate. In order to explain the historic seaward boundary of any State admitted since the admission of the Thirteen Original States you have to go to the act of Congress admitting that State and the first constitution of that State. I said in certain cases you had treaties involved, such as in the case of Texas. So the historic boundaries of Texas and Louisiana both would be governed by the acts of Congress admitting those States and the first constitution of the States, and the

appropriate ancient documents spelling out the boundaries.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman state what is the historic boundary of Louisiana? Has a line been drawn defining the seaward boundary of Louisiana?

Mr. WILLIS. This bill does it.

Mr. YATES. At what point?

Mr. WILLIS. It defines the coastal line, and from then on the States have their boundaries in accordance with the condition of their admission, as in the case of the admission of Louisiana into the Union.

Mr. YATES. Will the gentleman state whether the seaward boundary of Louisiana under this bill is limited to a point 3 miles seaward from the low-water mark?

Mr. WILLIS. The bill does not mention Louisiana any more than Kentucky or the gentleman's State. The bill provides that the historic limits and historic boundaries of the States shall be in accordance with the conditions of their admission into the Union.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman has stated that. I am endeavoring to obtain an application of the language of the bill to a specific State—Louisiana. I am asking that it be applied to the gentleman's home State of Louisiana.

Mr. GRAHAM. If you fix the baseline, then you can determine it.

Mr. YATES. I have fixed the baseline. I have fixed it at a point at the low-water mark on the shore of Louisiana. Does this bill limit the seaward boundary of Louisiana at a line 3 miles seaward from the low-water mark of Louisiana?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is limited from the coastline of Louisiana.

Mr. YATES. Three miles?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is up to the State of Louisiana to establish anything beyond that.

Mr. YATES. In other words then, this bill does not fix the boundary of the State of Louisiana?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does fix it 3 miles out. If they claim farther than that, they must establish that.

Mr. YATES. They must establish it. In other words, they are given the right under the terms of this bill to still come in and establish it at still another point?

Mr. GRAHAM. They have always had that right.

Mr. YATES. Then I come back to my original question. What is the historic boundary of Louisiana because apparently this bill does not fix the historic seaward boundary of a State? If that be true, what is the historic seaward boundary of Louisiana?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not do that. We disagree thoroughly with the gentleman's position.

Mr. YATES. I imagine the gentleman does disagree with my position, but I will try to bear up under that blow. I still submit I am entitled to an answer, before we pass this legislation, to the question: What is the historic seaward boundary of Louisiana?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the argument we have just heard shows what really is behind this legislation. There is no limit as to the number of miles that a State may attempt to extend its boundary line. Now I would like to propound a question to the gentleman from Louisiana. Does this bill open the door for your State to extend its boundary line as far out in the Continental Shelf area as the State legislature may deem wise?

Mr. WILLIS. No, I answer that question categorically, "No."

Mr. PERKINS. What does that provision provide?

Mr. WILLIS. You have to go to the provision of the bill covering that, which I would like to read.

Mr. PERKINS. I am asking you if the provision does not expressly provide that a State such as Louisiana may extend its boundary lines in the future far out in the Continental Shelf.

Mr. WILLIS. That is covered by section 4 of the bill. That section has been aerated many times since yesterday. I will read it to you.

Mr. PERKINS. You do not have to read it. Just answer the question for the information of the committee.

Mr. WILLIS. Section 4, the first sentence provides that the seaward boundary of the Thirteen Original States are confirmed up to 3 miles.

Mr. PERKINS. What is the extension provision there?

Mr. WILLIS. That is the second sentence which says that if any State admitted subsequent to that time has not already done so, it may extend its boundaries up to 3 miles. Then the third sentence, that is the sentence that we heard about from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], says that if in the past the States have taken action so to extend (meaning 3 miles) that action is approved. Then the fourth sentence provides that nothing in the paragraph shall prejudice the rights of the States to——

Mr. PERKINS. To go beyond the 3-mile limit?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes, but under what conditions. That sentence has never been read. Here it is. Nothing in the section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographic miles if it was so provided by treaty ratified by the Senate of the United States or by an act of Congress or by the constitutional laws of a State prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union.

Now that is all there is to it and that is the information the gentleman has asked for.

Mr. PERKINS. The last provision just enables the States to extend their boundary lines far out into the Continental Shelf area.

Mr. WILLIS. This bill does no such thing.

Mr. PERKINS. In other words, this whole subject matter is not brought before the Congress again.

Mr. WILLIS. This bill does no such thing.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman failed to give proper emphasis in lines 10 and 12, which read as follows:

Without prejudice to its claim if any it has that its boundaries extend beyond that line—

"That line" meaning the 3-mile limit. So we say that when we pass this bill we do not in any way prejudice any claims that the State may make about territory even beyond the 3 miles.

Mr. PERKINS. I place the same interpretation on those lines as does the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I cannot yield.

Mr. WILLIS. I thought the gentleman wanted information.

Mr. PERKINS. I cannot yield because I want to discuss the values of some of the properties involved. I have some estimates before me made available by the United States Geological Survey concerning the known values and potential values of oil and gas rights. They are as follows:

Estimated value of United States offshore oil resources

PROVEN RESERVES

	Quantity (barrels)	Value ($2.50 per barrel)
Inside 3-mile limit:		
California	156,345,000	$390,862,500
Texas	15,000,000	37,500,000
Louisiana	107,000,000	267,500,000
	278,345,000	696,862,500
Continental Shelf outside 3-mile limit:		
California	0	0
Texas	0	0
Louisiana	214,000,000	535,000,000
	214,000,000	535,000,000

POTENTIAL RESERVES

Inside 3-mile limit:		
California	1,100,000,000	2,750,000,000
Texas	[1] 400,000,000	1,000,000,000
Do	[2] [1,200,000,000]	[3,000,000,000]
Louisiana	250,000,000	625,000,000
	[3] 1,750,000,000	4,375,000,000
Continental Shelf (total):		
California	2,156,000,000	5,390,862,500
Texas	9,000,000,000	22,500,000,000
Louisiana	4,000,000,000	10,000,000,000
	15,156,000,000	37,890,000,000

[1] Inside 3-mile limit.
[2] Inside 3-league limit.
[3] Totals exclude data in brackets.

NOTE.—Reserves from U. S. Geological Survey estimates. Value calculated at approximate current crude-oil prices.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Page 4, line 7, after the semicolon insert "Admitted prior to the effective date of this act."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this matter on yesterday. It is on page 4 of the bill under the heading "Definitions." and reads: "The term 'States' means any State of the Union." I proposed to add to it the following: "Admitted prior to the effective date of this act."

The purpose of this amendment is that it eliminates any future State that

may be admitted to the Union and confines the operation of this bill to the present 48 States. My reason for it is that it occurs to me that it would be rather unwise to undertake to fix the boundaries of the Hawaiian Islands in this bill with all the uncertainties that exist relative to the waters lying about those islands.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand the gentleman's position he raises the issue whether the boundary is 3 miles around each island, which has been the historic seaward limits or in view of the fact that in some places 1,000 miles intervene between some of the islands all the water enclosed between them would be treated as inland waters.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think the gentleman opens up the whole question. I do not propose to do anything except not to try and settle it in this bill. Nobody knows what the situation is or how much water should be taken in. Nobody knows what the historic boundaries would be of the Hawaiian Islands. It would seem to me to be the part of wisdom to eliminate it from this bill.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. As I understand, the gentleman's amendment would simply allow future Congresses to pass on this question when it arises.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is it. For instance, in the case of Canada I am told that the Continental Shelf runs out 1,000 miles, maybe more. You would have the same thing with the island territory you propose to take in. It does seem to me to be wise to limit this bill to existing States.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am thinking in terms of Supreme Court decisions that each State must be taken in on an equal footing, and that we cannot discriminate between those taken in before and those admitted after a certain time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yet this very bill as it is written now discriminates against them.

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not discriminate against them.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In the case of Texas, in the case of Florida, you give them different treatment in the matter of the seaward boundaries.

Mr. GRAHAM. Just to the historic limits.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have stated my position and offered this amendment. I am not insisting particularly on the amendment. I am merely trying to be helpful and point out what I think you are doing.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. How much thought has the gentleman given to the constitutionality of this as it will be interpreted by the Supreme Court?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understand the gentleman's question: The Constitution states that all States must come in on an equal basis. I do not question that, but I think when you bring in another and when you do not know all the facts regarding an area that may be admitted as another State, that the thing to do is let that issue be settled by the Congress when the area is admitted to statehood. As it is today we do not know what is the historic boundary of any Hawaiian island or what we may do regarding the waters between the various islands. I do not think we should attempt to deal with that question in this bill.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If it is incorporated in this bill it might involve the legislation, and any law that comes out of it, in a serious controversy over the constitutionality of the provision proposed by the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, I find nothing in the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to justify his amendment that the Territory of Hawaii be specifically omitted from the provisions of the legislation now pending before the House.

The proposal appears on the contrary to be based on a misstatement of facts with reference to the Territory of Hawaii. The latter does not—and I quote from the statement of the gentleman from Virginia appearing on page 2516 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday—"consists of a great many islands scattered all over the Pacific Ocean." The truth is that the Territory of Hawaii consists of a small group of very well defined islands.

I venture the assumption that there is no land area under the American flag today whose boundaries have been more clearly defined than are those of the islands that constitute the Hawaiian group. They are of such vital, strategic importance and became involved in the last war in such an important way that every aspect of their geography has been very carefully measured.

The main group of islands is eight in number. All of these are inhabited except one. The latter has been used for target purposes by the United States Navy and is maintained under their jurisdiction for that reason.

These islands consist historically of Hawaii proper. The land area and the waters around them have been clearly defined.

In addition to this group are some islets that have been covered under the jurisdiction of the Territory for obvious administrative reasons. Among these are the so-called Line Islands to the northwest of Hawaii that are, for the most part, coral reefs. They are uninhabited and uninhabitable. There is only one of these islands that is more than a mile square and it is only a mile and a half square.

I agree that being an insular area we have an unusually long coast line and that it presents problems that are different from those of the inland States. I do not, however, concede that they represent anything new or unusual or offer a single good reason why exception should be made in this or any other legislation relating to tidelands.

Moreover, the Hawaiian Islands are of volcanic origin and some of the atolls are covered within their jurisdiction are no more than coral reefs. It is a well established fact that there are no mineral resources whatsoever beneath the land area of the islands or within the tideland areas.

If there is any adjustment to be made in the jurisdiction of the island areas beyond the main group of Hawaiian Islands, it can and properly should be received for settlement by the joint committee of Congress that is provided for in the statehood bill to deal with the problem of the disposition of the lands in the Territory of Hawaii to which the United States now has title. To remove Hawaii from the legislation now before the House would only complicate the problems of the committee.

It should be said that their outlying islands are no asset to the proposed State of Hawaii. On the contrary, they are a liability. And it should be pointed out moreover that they were placed under the jurisdiction of Hawaii principally for reasons of convenience. This question has no place in the consideration of this legislation. There is no good reason for this amendment.

I want to point out further that the enacting clause of the Hawaiian statehood bill says that:

> The boundaries of the State of Hawaii shall consist of all the territory now included in the said Territory of Hawaii.

The statehood bill moreover recognizes that this issue of tidelands will arise in connection with the admission of Hawaii into the Union and contains in section 3, paragraph (f), this statement:

> The State of Hawaii shall stand on an equal footing with the other States with respect to lands beneath navigable waters or reclaimed therefrom, the beaches and shores of navigable waters, and the natural resources within such lands and waters.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Can the gentleman tell the House now what claim or what assertion of right the islands have made with regard to their seaward boundaries? Is there any set policy as to the claim they have made?

Mr. FARRINGTON. We take the position we should enjoy the same rights as is determined for the other States.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Does the gentleman mean the 3-mile boundary or the 10½-mile boundary?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I am perfectly willing to accept the decision of the Congress on that issue. May I say in that connection that our islands are of volcanic origin and some of the atolls are of coral; so the question, so far as we are concerned, does not involve any mineral resources as it is a well-established geological fact that we have no oil or any valuable minerals of any sort under the surface of the islands. We have fishing rights that come within the historical 3-mile limit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman questioned the accuracy of my statement about the islands being scattered. Would the gentleman state that Palmyra Island is a contiguous part of the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would be glad to clarify that.

Mr. SMITH of Virgina. And I understand there is an island called Johnson Island, which is some 700 miles away, while Palmyra Island is about 1,000 miles away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I regretfully object.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as the House has under debate H. R. 4198, the Submerged Lands Act, I find my mind turning back to an old phrase current at the time this Nation assumed its independence. That phrase is "not worth a continental," which referred to the fact that the bonds issued by the insurgent Continental Congress to wage its war of independence were worth something less than their face value. That being the case, they were not much in demand except by those who saw them as a good speculation. History indeed has a way of repeating itself, or is it just that human nature changes but little in different times in history? Time proved that the "continentals" were indeed worth something, as the new Republic assumed this obligation and paid these bonds at par. Thus, there existed for a long time another "Continental" which seemed to have but little value, and therefore had but little demand—the Continental Shelf lying off the shore of this Nation. Now the reaching fingers of oil development have given new worth, and therefore new demand, to the new Continental. This land has become an asset worth billions in potential, and the question of ownership assumes an importance greater than the ownership of the continentals of old. It follows that the debate, of national magnitude, befits the grandeur of the assets under cloud. It also follows, unfortunately, that the debate has served as much to muddy the waters as to enlighten. It has ever been thus, and nothing added suddenly here will, like a breath of air, sweep away all doubt. Yet this issue must come to a vote, not alone because it is important to "quiet" this matter so that dragging development may go on but also because it represents an important plank in the platform on which the present majority of Congress followed the President to victory last November. The promise was made and delivery is at hand. In times gone by legislation such as this was considered under the possibility of veto. That impairment is gone, and the bill and the issue stands before us on their own merits. True, it runs in the face of three major decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, but this appears to cause no concern, for the Congress can in its wisdom do many things. There is, however, no certainty that even the passage of this bill will end all controversy on this matter even on the domestic side, and even less certainty of its effect on the international side. It may well prove to be a Pandora's box, as State boundaries, that is, seaward boundaries of nonsovereign entities, creep out to sea, that other boundaries elsewhere may also creep out to our detriment. Such are the problems of living in a world and not in beautiful isolation.

One helpful thing about ownership before the law is that it must lie somewhere at all times. It cannot float around for an indeterminant time. Here we have a question of who owns what and it must turn then on historic ownership. About as far back as this Nation can go in terms of ownership is to the Sovereign of England, the mother country of this Nation. At some point, the King of England, in his glory, was held to hold title to this and that as a "divine" right. That right is not at question but it was none the less accepted. The King then gave grants of land in his possession in the New World, to various entities which in time became colonies. Later these colonies, in redress of grievance, declared themselves to be free and independent and no longer subject to the powers of the King. They took unto themselves the former powers of the King in a Declaration of the Congress of the United States. They also won a war and laid full claim to the declared independence and the former sovereign agreed to the peace terms, again not with the several States, but with the united spokesman, the States in Congress assembled. The next step in time was a jump from a confederated nation to a Federal Union for practical men found the confederation too weak. At this point the first, and still confused, matter of who owned what arose. At some point in this development, the separate sovereign States, however confederated, stood alone in their own eyes. At no point however, were they so viewed by other sovereign entities who did business with the confederated power. In this day, we find controversy arising out of this area of sovereignty. The claim of any State, with the possible exception of Texas, to lands lying off its shore, turns on whether or not the original 13 States retained title from the King or whether it passed to the Federal Union.

Many cases, often the same ones, are cited by those on each side of this submerged lands issue to show that either the States did or did not hold title to submerged lands offshore and below low tide mark. In this connection, I find it most important to notice that the bill before us vests title to the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to any resources beneath such waters. This matter, by all cases offered by either side, is unnecessary for there is unanimous agreement that the States do in fact and without question hold title to all lands lying beneath navigable waters within their borders. What is important then is the definition of these lands so contained in the bill. First it defines all navigable lands above high tide mark as State lands and this is unnecessary but it then turns to define what are actually tidelands, that is those lands upon which the tide rises and falls, and this too is unnecessary. However, without stopping in this definition it breathlessly pushes the State boundary out a minimum of 3 miles, or any other such figure as the State can squeeze in. Here is the crux of the issue as I see it in simple and noninvolved terms. If the States have always been owners of this minimum of 3 miles out, then this bill, except as it deals with truly outlying lands, is superfluous. If however, it is, as the Supreme Court has said, that the Federal Government has paramount power in the 3 mile zone, then the bill is indeed important for it changes what would otherwise be the law of the land. For myself, I can find no conclusive argument that any State can claim paramount rights to either the water's surface or to the land beneath it. Any claim it may establish, by this legislation, must yield at many points to the superior power of the Federal Government for navigation, the regulation of commerce and the provision of national defense. Neither can this legislation increase or decrease the real power of the Federal Government in the lands lying beyond the 3 mile belt for this is subject to international agreement which holds the high seas as the open highway of all nations.

All I can discover in this legislation is an attempt by the States involved, using an age-old principle that any State has full ownership of lands beneath navigable waters inside its lines, to assume an asset which belongs to the people at large as the real source of sovereignty. Failure of this bill would in no wise need deny them their full share of any revenue, of any improvements in harbors or reclaimed lands, but only insure that the Nation receives the returns of its national assets.

There has been no declaration that the Federal Government has any title to the lands lying offshore. There has been no claim by the Federal Government for lands lying inside confirmed State boundaries. There has been no plot to vastly increase any Federal power or reduce States to serfdom. Yet, in spite of this, there are those who see a great crusade on the part of the Federal Government, naturally at some highly indefinite time in the future, to take over something which is not its own. There are others who see a great crusade for socialism in any move the Federal Government makes, other than the erection of tariffs and the protection of property rights, or the assumption to old debts to be paid at par like the continentals. I am unimpressed by these allegations of great crusades for they, in the manner of most great crusades, are mostly mythical. I am also unimpressed by a bill which takes 27 pages merely to extend or, if you will, confirm State boundaries out into the sea and which kindly leaves to the people at large, what is left beyond. To me, this new continental in question, the Continental Shelf beginning at mean low tide, is just that; the

extension of the land mass of the Republic out into the sea. This is a part of the land mass of the Nation, a part of the sum total of resources of the Nation, and as the Supreme Court has held, these resources should accrue to the Nation at large.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 49, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FEIGHAN: Page 3, line 1, after the word "waters", strike out the comma and the words "which include" and insert in lieu thereof the word "in."

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment pertains to the definition of "coastline," which in the present bill seems to me to offer a new concept of what is the seaward limit of inland waters. In support of my amendment, I am going to read from a letter dated March 4 of this year, addressed to the Honorable HUGH BUTLER, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate, from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton, with reference to this particular amendment. He was referring to the Senate bill:

Inland waters are defined as including "all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, historic bays, and sounds, and all other bodies of water which join the open sea." This definition appears to be too broad. With respect to bays and estuaries, the United States has traditionally taken the position that the waters of estuaries and bays are inland waters only if their opening is no more than 10 miles wide, or, where such opening exceeds 10 miles, at the first point where it does not exceed 10 miles. With respect to a strait which is only a channel of communication to an inland body of water, the United States has taken the position that the rules governing bays should apply. So far as concerns a strait connecting 2 seas having the character of high seas, whether the coasts of the strait belong to a single State or to 2 or more States, the United States has always adhered to the well-established principle of international law that passage should be free in such a strait and hence has maintained that its waters, even though it be 6 miles wide or less, cannot be inland waters. With respect to both bays and straits, of course, the United States has excepted the cases where, by historical usage, such waters are shown to have been traditionally subjected to the exclusive authority of the coastal State.

The purpose of this Government in adopting such a definition of inland waters was to give effectiveness to its policy of freedom of the seas. The broader the definition of inland waters, the more the seaward limit of inland waters is brought forward from the coast. And since the seaward limit of inland waters is the base line whence the belt of territorial waters is measured, this by cumulative effect brings forward the outer limits of territorial waters. Of late, efforts have been made by some foreign states to broaden the definition of their inland waters and to gain control thereby of large areas of the seas adjacent to their coasts. This Government has opposed and continues to oppose such developments, but any indication on its part of a change of position, such as may be suggested by the broad definition of inland waters now present in the proposed legislation, may well encourage the growth of a dangerous trend. Hence, in the view of the Department, it would be advisable to amend the section as follows: "limit of inland waters"—

And so on; in other words, the amendment I have offered.

I think the State Department is perfectly correct in its assumption that we in Congress should not make a new definition of what are inland waters. Under this definition as it is set up, which states that the limits of inland waters include all these ports, bays, and sounds, it is quite possible that any area of the open sea extending from one point out in the ocean to another may be as far as 100, 200, or possibly 300 miles, and it may be as far as 30 or 60 miles deep. Then if you draw a straight line, as this bill does, across those two outermost projections into the sea, we have an absolutely new concept of what are inland waters.

For that reason, I hope this amendment will be accepted.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment. If this amendment is adopted, we would put in jeopardy every bay, harbor, port, or estuary on any coastal area in this country. We would invite litigation after litigation in the courts in trying to determine whether these bays and harbors, and so forth, were actually owned by the States.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Is it not a fact that this same amendment was proposed before the whole Committee on the Judiciary and we debated it and analyzed it and defeated it after careful study?

Mr. HILLINGS. The gentleman is correct. The same situation applied in the Judiciary Subcommittee, chairmanned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], on which I serve as a member.

It is also true that this definition of "coastline" has been in every previous piece of legislation on this subject which has passed the Congress, so it is not a new definition. It is a definition that the Congress has approved on numerous occasions.

It would be utter folly to remove this language and open up the possibility of taking away from every coastal State its bays, harbors, ports, and estuaries, which certainly could happen if this language were not in the bill to clarify the definition.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN STATE BOUNDARIES

SEC. 3. Rights of the States:

(a) It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that (1) title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and (2) the right and power to manage, administer, lease, control, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, severally recognized, confirmed, established, vested in and delegated to the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof.

(b) (1) The United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid, except as otherwise reserved herein, all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, moneys, improvements, and natural resources.

(2) The United States hereby releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States, if any it has, arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters.

(3) The Secretary or the Treasurer of the United States shall pay to the respective States or their grantees issuing leases covering such lands or natural resources all moneys paid thereunder to the Secretary or to the Treasurer of the United States and subject to the control of either of them or to the control of the United States on the effective date of this act, except that portion of such moneys which the Secretary is obligated to return to a lessee.

(c) The rights, powers, and titles hereby recognized, confirmed, established, vested in and delegated to the respective States and their grantees are subject to each lease executed by a State, or its grantee, which was in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, and such rights, powers, and titles are further subject to the rights herein now granted to any person holding any such lease to continue to maintain the lease, and to conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions, for the full term thereof, and any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease: *Provided, however*, That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on and before December 11, 1950, or if the primary term of such lease has expired since December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease: *Provided, however*, That within 90 days from the effective date hereof (i) the lessee shall pay to the State or its grantee issuing such lease all rentals, royalties, and other sums payable between June 5, 1950, and the effective date hereof, under such lease and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, except such rentals, royalties, and other sums as have been paid to the State, its grantee, the Secretary or the Treasurer of the United States and not refunded to the lessee; and (ii) the lessee shall file with the Secretary and with the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, instruments consenting to the payment by the Secretary or the Treasurer of the United States to the State or its grantee issuing the lease, of all rentals, royalties, and other payments under the control of the Secretary or the Treasurer of the United States which have been paid, under the lease, except such rentals, royalties, and other payments as have also been paid by the lessee to the State or its grantee.

(d) Nothing in this act shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control

by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns or may hereafter acquire the waterpower or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns the waterpower.

(c) Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 6, line 4, after the words "natural resources", insert the following: "subject to the condition that there shall be no unreasonable disparity between the treatment by a State or its grantees of its citizens and the treatment by such State or its grantees of the citizens of another State in the management, administration, leasing, controlling, developing, and use of the said national resources."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I addressed the House briefly on this subject, giving advance notice that I proposed to offer this amendment. In the brief time that I have, of course, I cannot go too much into the reasons and the need for this amendment. But the amendment is aimed at one thing and one thing alone. That is to reassert in this legislation what is already considered to be the law with reference to the use and taking of fish, shrimp, and other migratory marine life. Under section 2 of article 4 of the Constitution, there can be no disparagement in the way of treatment among citizens of one State against citizens of another State. We have had in this country, and particularly in my section, a great deal of confusion and chaos, particularly with reference to shrimp boats going from the waters of one State to the waters of another State. Sometimes attempts have been made to pass unreasonable laws requiring exorbitant licenses of the citizens of one State who may want to go into the waters of another State.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman is familiar with the Supreme Court decision involved in the Carolina situation with reference to shrimping. I understand his amendment goes no further than to simply spell out in this bill what the gentleman thinks the Supreme Court held in the matter of licenses and so on for shrimping and for the fishing industry as against one State vis-a-vis another State.

Mr. COLMER. I thank my friend for his contribution. Our States adjoin and he knows of the problem there. My amendment merely spells out what the Constitution provides and what the Supreme Court in the South Carolina case, to which my friend referred, announced to be the law. The purpose of this—if you ask why we should have this amendment written into this bill—is to dispel any idea that this tidelands law under the broad terms of this bill with reference to resources would give one State the right to discriminate against the citizens of another State. I hope my friends, the chairman of the committee and of the subcommittee, will see fit to accept this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Does the State of Louisiana allow citizens of Mississippi to fish in Louisiana waters and vice versa. What is the need of the amendment then, if that is so?

Mr. COLMER. I do not want to get into any argument here because there has been extreme controversy between the two States. Not only between those two States but between other States as well. For instance North Carolina and South Carolina and also between Texas and Louisiana and other States which I might mention. Two cases have gone to the Supreme Court. We want to spell out here that this does not grant any additional authority, or attempt to grant any additional authority. That is the purpose of this amendment. I cannot see why there should be any objection to it.

As I pointed out on yesterday, migratory fish recognize no artificial boundaries. They travel in the open waters, and as I illustrated in my talk yesterday, there was a gigantic school of shrimp miles square, which was discovered off the coast of Florida about a year and a half ago. That school of shrimp was converged upon by boats from Virginia on the east and Texas on the west. These fishermen from the different States followed the shrimp as they slowly migrated across the waters of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas and into the waters of Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, the words are entirely superfluous in view of the decision of the Supreme Court. In *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385, 393 (1947)), Mr. Justice Vinson, in the majority opinion, said:

> In the court below *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)) was relied upon for this proposition. Here appellants seem to concede, and correctly so, that such is neither the holding nor the implication of that case; for in deciding that the United States, where it asserted its claim, had paramount rights in the 3-mile belt, the court pointedly quoted and supplied emphasis to a statement in *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69, 75 (1941)).

Our position is that this matter is settled. This is a proposition which could not lead to discrimination on the part of one State against the others and thus open the door to endless litigation. We are opposed to it and ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I did not get the citation of the case the gentleman read. Was that the South Carolina case?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the South Carolina case, the shrimp-boat case.

Mr. COLMER. As I understand the gentleman—and I did not get everything he said——

Mr. GRAHAM. I said it was the shrimp-boat case.

Mr. COLMER. Of course the main thing I caught were the very unpleasant words that the gentleman rose in opposition, but I did not get the citation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I said when the shrimp boats come in in South Carolina.

Mr. COLMER. Now, if I understand the gentleman correctly, he takes the position that the provisions of my amendment are already in the law.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right; that is correct.

Mr. COLMER. And there is no necessity for this. Then I asked the gentlemen what objection there may be to a restatement of it here.

Mr. GRAHAM. Just the same as we would not restate the Constitution; that is the law.

Mr. COLMER. But the gentleman must realize that it would have a very powerful and deterrent effect upon these intrastate squabbles that have arisen in the past. I regret that the gentleman sees it necessary to oppose this amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. May I say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] that our position is that the Constitution, of course, is superior to any law of any State, and that has already been decided, and the Supreme Court held as I have indicated. We think it is redundancy, unnecessary, and could serve no good purpose.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it important that we give attention to this amendment, because it does, I think, draw a line which may save us some trouble in the future. Right now Minnesota is having trouble with South Dakota with regard to migratory birds. The South Dakotans refuse to let us hunt in South Dakota, and we do not know whether the Supreme Court will sustain us or not, but a provision such as this would have saved us the trouble that our duck hunters are experiencing.

Mr. GRAHAM. But that is a matter of intrastate and interstate concern and does not apply to foreign waters.

Mr. McCARTHY. These will be interstate waters once the boundaries have been redefined.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not altogether, no; there will be the broad ocean also.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 32, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 6, line 4, after the words "State resources", insert "subject to the condition

that there shall be no unreasonable disparity between the treatment by a State or its grantees of its citizens and the treatment by such State and its grantees of the citizens of another State in the management, administration, controlling, use, licensing, and taking of fish, shrimp, and other migratory marine animal life."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order because it is merely the same amendment offered at another place.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, we disagree with the learned gentleman from Pennsylvania. The first amendment offered went to the whole question of resources affected: oil, minerals, and other matters. This merely goes to fish, shrimp, and other migratory marine life. I hope that the distinguished chairman of the committee will accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that the amendment is different in wording; therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, of course, I realize what we are up against here today. I am not going to term it steamrollering as has been charged here today, but it is no different from any other proceedings that we have had here in the past. This is just another case of a legislative committee bringing out a bill and taking the position that the bill is sacred and there must not be any i's dotted or t's crossed.

This amendment is the same proposition that I argued here a moment ago, but, as I pointed out in response to the Chair and in response to the objection of the learned gentleman from Pennsylvania, it only affects marine life, while my first amendment covered all resources. That is the point we are concerned about, that is the point that we wish to have restated if it must be restated so that we can stop so far as possible these interstate squabbles. We like to live in peace with our neighbors, we do not want to be squabbling with them and all we are asking here is, according to my ordinarily genial friend from Pennsylvania's contention, for a restatement that that be the law.

I hope that some of that milk of human kindness that pervades him ordinarily when he sits on the aisle will assert itself in his position of authority here and in his desire for protecting the sacredness of the committee bill as it is brought out. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment; otherwise I realize fully that there is little hope of its adoption in view of what just happened on my first amendment.

But, Mr. Chairman, if this effort does prove to be futile as we have indicated we now suspect so far as the adoption of the amendment is concerned, it is nevertheless comforting to know that it has at least served the purpose of having made the record. And while the amendment may not prevail as part of the law, the debate will indicate conclusively that it is the opinion of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House and the chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House as well as the opinion of the House that the substance of the amendment is presently the law of the land. And furthermore that the refusal of the amendment is based entirely and exclusively upon the opinion of the Judiciary Committee and of the House that the provisions of the amendment are now the law and therefore that there is no necessity for a restatement of it in the bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his fine compliment.

Mr. Chairman, it has always been my understanding that anything of a migratory nature, like migratory birds and such, must be settled by treaty or compact. This whole matter can be settled as between the States of Mississippi and Louisiana or between the States south thereof by a compact.

The argument we advanced in the other case applies here. This is limited to fish, but is no different in our dealing with it than the other. We object to the amendment and we ask for its defeat.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman spoke of compacts. We entered into a compact down in these Southern States on the Gulf of Mexico here a couple of years ago and on the floor of this House I offered an amendment of similar import that would maintain the status quo, which was adopted and passed unanimously by the House. That is what we are asking you to do here now—to have a restatement of that and a protection of our rights and to stop this squabbling.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 25, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2948. This bill gives the States nothing whatever. It simply confirms title in the States to that which they have always owned—namely the lands within their historic boundaries. It goes a little further to deal with police powers in the Continental Shelf areas beyond but adjacent to the boundaries of the States. The bill also deals with existing leases and permits the States to exercise conservation rights in that area, and to facilitate the exploration and production of minerals within and beyond those historic boundaries in the Continental Shelf.

This legislation is long overdue. I introduced a bill on the subject at the beginning of this session and it was considered, along with a number of others, by the Judiciary Committee. My bill—as did the original Walter bill which the House passed 2 years ago—went a little further than H. R. 2948, as reported, goes. It provided that the coastal States would have 37½ percent of the revenue from the Continental Shelf areas. This was patterned after existing division of income from public lands, where the States now get 37½ percent of the revenues from such lands. But the committee, in its wisdom, has seen fit to leave that phase of the proposal out of this measure. It is indicated that subject will be dealt with in other legislation later on.

Mr. Chairman, there are many compelling reasons why this legislation should be enacted. Many of those reasons have already been thoroughly explored and debated. It should be kept in mind that the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases reversed the decision of that Court over a period of more than 100 years. The historic boundaries of the coastal States, which are here confirmed, were first recognized by the Supreme Court in the case of *Pollard* v. *Hagen* (3 How. 219) more than 100 years ago. That case has been approved and followed by the Supreme Court more than 50 times since then, and was only recently overruled by the decisions I just referred to. In addition, 49 opinions of the Attorney General of the United States have been to the same effect, as were 31 statements of the Solicitors and Secretaries of the Department of Interior. Mr. Ickes himself said in 1933, in his now historic reply to an application for a Federal lease by one Proctor:

> The foregoing (case of *Hardin* v. *Jordan*) is a statement of the settled law and therefore no rights can be granted to you either under the leasing act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any other public land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean either within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

In other words, even as late as 1933 the decisions of the Supreme Court with respect to the title of the States to soil beneath all navigable waters, seaward or inland, was recognized.

But, in the twinkling of an eye, the Supreme Court in the California case, followed by the Texas and Louisiana cases, threw overboard hundreds of years of law going far back into English history and carried forward by our own Supreme Court. A new and terrifying constitutional doctrine was announced. This marked a significant shift of constitutional relationship of the States and the Federal Government. We are now, by this legislation, attempting to correct that unfortunate judicial mistake and return to fundamental principles.

TIDELANDS GRAB WAS DANGEROUS

Mr. Chairman, this new theory of power in the Federal Government is fraught with much danger. It strikes at basic principles of States rights. It marks a usurpation of power in the Federal Government never dreamed of by the makers of the Constitution when all powers not expressly given to the central government were preserved to the States and to the people. It could easily be an opening step on the path of nationalization and socialization of our resources and the taking of property belonging to the States and to the people, without just compensation.

The actions of the Supreme Court have aroused the people and the American bar. Prof. James William Moore, of Yale, recently wrote an article in the Baylor Law Review in which he characterized the Court's action in the Texas case as "expropriation by judicial fiat."

In the May 1948 issue of Marquette Law Review appeared an article entitled "Title to Lands in Navigable Waters," which said:

> In view of the foregoing, the author submits that the United States Supreme Court is wrong in its decision in the California tidelands case. * * * The Court's holding in effect sanctions the confiscation by the Federal Government of the tidelands oil properties, title to which, historically and by settled rule of property law is vested in the States.

The precedent thus established by the Supreme Court in these recent decisions is fraught with grave implications. The rule is that he who owns the open seas adjacent to the shores owns the inland waters because they partake of the nature of the open seas. It follows, or may very well follow, that since the United States is determined to be the owner of the land under the open seas, adjacent to the coasts, it also owns the land under the inland waters. That includes lakes, streams, harbors, bays, estuaries, and the like.

There is no way of knowing where this dangerous doctrine could lead. The Supreme Court in its recent decisions has referred to the needs of national defense in extending the ownership of the Federal Government into the submerged lands, historically recognized as belonging to the States. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in his able dissenting opinion, said:

> The needs of defense and foreign affairs alone cannot transfer ownership of an ocean bed from a State to the Federal Government any more than they could transfer iron ore under uplands from State to Federal ownership. National responsibility is no greater in respect to the marginal sea than it is toward every other particle of American territory.

It has been very correctly said that it would, indeed, be an easy jump from the California and Texas holdings to nationalization or utilization of the Federal Government of all natural resources, regardless of where found.

SHADES OF LENIN

Mr. Chairman, I say this trend is a most dangerous thing. Is it any wonder that practically every attorney general and every governor in the Nation has become aroused and has urged this action by the Congress? The modern doctrine of paramount rights of the Federal Government, as enunciated by these Supreme Court decisions, is certainly not too far removed from the teachings of Lenin and Marx.

Mr. Nathan Bidwell, a distinguished Massachusetts lawyer, in an article which appeared in the Massachusetts Bar Bulletin in October 1950 called attention to this trend in these words:

> The doctrine laid down in these decisions finds its parallel in the writings of Marx, Lenin, and the platforms and principles of the National Socialist Party, in all of which it is provided that * * * property should be taken without compensation on the basis of need for all the people regardless of the law of the land.

In short, these modern decisions are consistent with and may very well lead to nationalization and to expanded Federal sovereignty at the expense of the States.

THE TEXAS CASE

Mr. Chairman, I wish now to address myself briefly to the Texas case. Ours is a little different from that of other States, because we came into the Union under different terms and conditions, and our historic boundaries extend 10½ miles seaward. This is not an idle claim. It is an historic fact growing out of a solemn agreement. In that respect, the very honor of the Federal Government is involved.

In discussing this phase of the subject, I should like to draw upon the findings and reasoning of Mr. Ben H. Carpenter, of Dallas, Tex., who made an exhaustive study of the history of the negotiations which led to the admission of Texas to statehood.

As Mr. Carpenter pointed out, it must be remembered that Texas was an independent nation prior to joining the United States. It negotiated its own affiliation with the United States acting in this capacity just as Canada or Mexico might theoretically do under similar circumstances today. The State of Texas was not created by the Federal Government out of territories that it already possessed and owned.

After winning its independence from Mexico on the battlefield of San Jacinto in 1836, Mr. Carpenter reminds, the First Congress of the Republic of Texas fixed its limits by a boundary act of December 19, 1836, as follows:

> Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande.

Thereafter, in 1837, President Andrew Jackson advised the Congress of the United States, as follows:

> The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence.

That condition obtained in 1844 when Texas was still an independent nation. It was recognized as such not only by the United States but also by the nations of Europe. The Republic of Texas at that time admittedly owned and held sovereignty over all the public lands within its boundaries. As has been pointed out those boundaries had been fixed. They extended 3 leagues seaward. Four years later that fact was recognized again by the United States, and wrote into the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo a description of the boundary between the United States and Mexico beginning at a point 3 leagues seaward from the mouth of the Rio Grande.

The negotiations for an annexation treaty began in 1844. The State Department drafted a treaty which, among other things, provided that all of the public lands of the Republic of Texas should become the public lands of the United States—just as some courts and politicians would make them today. That same treaty also required the Federal Government to assume the public debt of the Republic of Texas—just as was done for each of the original colonies, and has been done with respect to each of the other States that have been admitted.

That treaty, with those provisions, was submitted to the United States Senate for ratification, and was rejected, by a vote of 36 to 16. In Senate debate it was claimed that the public, unappropriated lands of Texas were worthless and it was said all the lands in Texas are not worth $10,000,000—the approximate amount of the debts at that time.

A year later a joint resolution was passed by the House and Senate which offered Texas annexation on terms set out in the resolution. There it was provided that the State of Texas should pay all of the debts of the Republic of Texas and that the State should retain title to all of the vacant and unappropriated lands within its boundaries.

There was then no argument, no confusion, with respect to the boundaries of the new State. Texas approved the annexation proposal. The boundaries had been recognized specifically by three Presidents—Jackson, Tyler, and Polk. The latter, on June 15, 1845, gave this assurance to the people of Texas:

> Of course, I would maintain the Texas title to the extent she claims it to be.

Thereafter no question arose until the strange Supreme Court decision of recent date, which had the effect of repudiating the agreement made by the United States in the annexation agreement. The three-league boundary was surveyed and agreed upon as the international boundary between the United States and Mexico in 1911. For a hundred years there was no question raised by any one about the binding effect of the agreement upon which the Republic of Texas yielded its sovereignty as a nation and became a State in the Union. Every act that occurred, every word that was spoken, recognized the binding effect of that agreement. For over 100 years Texas has had possession of these submerged lands—comprising an estimated 277,906,000 acres—and has administered them accordingly, and its ownership has been recognized by all parties, including the United States Government.

But 4 members of the Supreme Court, in a 4-to-3 decision, have completely ignored provisions of the annexation contract by which Texas retained these lands and minerals. In that decision the Supreme Court has undertaken to alter the acts and facts of history after they have already occurred.

Mr. Carpenter very properly pointed out that the Texas tidelands case marked the first time in the history of the United States that the Supreme Court has chosen to disregard the contractual obligations of the Federal Government in a written agreement between the United States and another nation made in good faith by both parties. In both its internal and external relations, the United States stood by its agreement for more than 100 years. The State of Texas stood by its agreement. It paid its public debt which it assumed as a condition to statehood. It has kept, maintained, and administered its submerged public lands, which it specifically retained, as a part of that bargain.

Mr. Chairman, if the Federal Government should be permitted to get by with its repudiation, and now 100 years later be permitted to gobble up the submerged public lands which it specifically recognized as belonging to Texas when it was admitted, then it should at least go farther and agree to pay the public debt of the Republic of Texas, plus accumulated interest. If it should do that, with 6-percent interest since 1845—the legal rate in Texas—payable annually as it accrued, the total amount would now be nearly $7 billion. I wonder how many of our friends who are now sanctioning the repudiation by the United States of its agreement with respect to now claiming the public lands, are now willing to introduce bills to reimburse Texas for its public debts?

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill should be passed, and I believe it will be by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize this issue as an invasion of States rights and favor the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, California for some time has been a focal point in the controversy over the issue of States rights in which the Federal Government has laid claim upon the tidelands which extend along the coast of California for 1,200 miles.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution provides that—

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

Under this provision, for more than a century in California and other States of the Nation, the rights of the States and their people to the ownership and full enjoyment of all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries were recognized by the Federal Government.

The boundary of the State of California, as provided in the State constitution, extends 3 miles into the Pacific Ocean and includes all islands along and adjacent to its coast. Sole ownership of this area by the State has always been recognized by the Federal Government and all of its departments and agencies until a little over a decade ago. As late as September 22, 1933, in answer to a letter addressed to him by an applicant for a leasing permit from the Federal Government, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes gave the following written reply to the applicant:

> Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

About 3 years later, however, Secretary of the Interior Ickes changed his mind and decided to seek to establish ownership and control in the United States over these lands. Efforts were made unsuccessfully to have the Congress declare these lands the property of the Federal Government.

When Congress failed to declare the tidelands the property of the Federal Government, proceedings were instituted in the Supreme Court, and a decision rendered which declined to hold that the United States was the owner of the tidelands, but stated that California was not the owner of these lands.

As a result of this decision, the title to the tidelands in California and in the other States has remained in controversy to the present with the subsequent confusion.

As an example, in California our great harbors are clouded by the Supreme Court decision. Our world-renowned public beaches and shoreline recreational developments are at a standstill until the State's ownership of tidelands is reaffirmed. One city alone, Long Beach, finds many of its important community projects paralyzed until the matter is cleared up.

Thousands of homes and pieces of land owned by thousands of persons are up in the air while the issue of whether or not the Federal Government is to be empowered to take at will, and without compensation, such lands as it needs or wants is still to be decided.

To illustrate what this means to real estate in California, the California tidelands in dispute include the land under San Francisco's ferry building and the land under San Diego's civic center and municipal airport. Half of Los Angeles Harbor and much of Long Beach Harbor are of uncertain status.

In the claims of the Federal Government for title to the tidelands, much has been made of the oil deposits under the tideland area in California, as well as in other States, and the need for Federal control for the preservation of natural resources. In the case of California, however, the facts show that oil deposits are actually found under only 15 miles of California's coastline, and half of the estimated oil supply in those pools has already been extracted.

The State of California is the guardian of all the rich natural resources so important to our natural resources within the boundaries of the State, and shares equal concern with the Federal Government for the development and protection of these resources.

The 1,200-mile coastline tidelands area of California is one of the State's greatest natural resources. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent by the State and its citizens on harbors, fisheries, pleasure resorts, and other uses essential to the orderly development of the State. The cities and counties of California have additional plans for the use of the tidelands. But if the tidelands question is not settled, these plans are retarded, and if title should be granted to the Federal Government, the people of California and the other States involved would be subordinated to the Federal Government in these matters.

I believe that equity calls for the confirmation of the title of these lands to the States as provided for in H. R. 4198.

Only the Congress can resolve the long-standing controversy between the States of the Union and the departments of the Federal Government over the ownership and control of submerged lands, and the longer this controversy is permitted to continue, the more vexatious and confused it becomes. In addition, much-needed improvements of these lands and the devolpment of strategic natural resources within them has been seriously retarded.

This bill would confirm and establish the rights and claims of the 48 States, asserted and exercised by them throughout our country's history, to the lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and the resources within such lands and waters, and would end the controversy which has been blocking development of the tidelands since 1938.

I sincerely urge favorable action on H. R. 4198 which would establish the legal title of the States to the tidelands areas, as defined in this legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. McCarthy: On page 8, strike out section 3 (b) (3) and insert the following in lieu thereof:
>
> "Sec. 3 (b) (3). The Secretary or the Treasurer of the United States shall retain all moneys received from the issuing of leases covering such lands or natural resources prior to the effective date of this act, except that portion of such moneys which the Secretary is obligated to return to a lessee."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to establish some kind of reciprocity. If you will examine the text of the bill on page 6, in paragraph 3, you will find this language:

> The Secretary or the Treasurer of the United States shall pay to the respective States or their grantees issuing leases covering such lands or natural resources all moneys paid thereunder to the Secretary or to the Treasurer of the United States—

And so forth. If you will turn to page 22, you will find these words in section 14:

> No State, or political subdivision, grantee or lessee shall be liable to or required to account to the United States in any way for entering upon, using, exploring for, developing, producing, or disposing of natural resources from lands of the outer Continental Shelf prior to June 5, 1950.

My argument is that if you are going to excuse the States from making these repayments, in the event that this decision should turn against the States, you should also extend the same privilege to the United States Government. I think the issue is clear enough. It is the responsibility of the members of the committee which brought in this bill to defend the distinctions that they have made, the contradictions which they have provided for here.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Do I understand the amendment to stop any payment back to the States or to allow it to the lessees?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right; except as obligated to lessees.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Now presently owning leases.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right; those who have the claims.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Of all the money that has been paid into the Treasury since these cases by the Supreme Court; is that true?

Mr. McCARTHY. Up to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I mean, how far back does that go? That is the main question.

Mr. McCARTHY. During such time as the Federal Government has made leases.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman realize that this proposed amendment would be diametrically opposite to the purport and intention and provision with repect to the States as of the date of the passage of the law as against immediately subsequent thereto?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not any more than the provision in the act that the States should not be required to make repayments. As a matter of fact, the court decisions argue for the adoption of my amendment rather than the position the gentleman is advocating. Three Supreme Court decisions support it. At the present time we are operating under the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Does the gentleman understand that his amendment is to title II, which is only the land under the sea within the State's historic boundaries?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is right. I have asked the committee to justify the discrimination that they have provided in the bill. Do not ask me to defend my amendment until you have explained your discriminatory provision.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. You mean where this bill restores that property to the States, you want the Federal Government to keep the money?

Mr. McCARTHY. You want the States to keep it in the event it goes to the Federal Government.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. If this bill is passed, this property will be restored to the States, and yet you want the Federal Government to keep the money.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct, to retain all it has collected up to this point, other than what is obligated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as stated by the gentleman from Minnesota, merely means this: Bear in mind that this is title II, the title that returns or restores this seaward boundary within the historical boundaries of the States to the States and means that he would not require the Federal Government to return this lease money paid by these lessees who have leases from the States to the States. That, of course, I think would be wrong. This property belongs to the States. We say it has always belonged to the States. We say they have been entitled to the lease money at all times, and are now and will be in the future. So it would certainly be a futile gesture and would be wrong morally and legally to say that they are not entitled to the lease money paid to them by lessees under leases that have already been executed and enforced. We think that the amendment should be voted down.

Mr. McCARTHY. In the resolution which was introduced here last year dealing with this problem, Senate Joint Resolution 20, that same provision was made, and that is all we are asking you to do here. I am surprised the gentleman said that they are asking for 100 percent. Now it appears they want 100 percent plus. I think you ought to be satisfied with the grant of the land beneath the marginal sea.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. We certainly would not have 100 percent plus if you took all the lease money away from us, even though you returned the property out to the historic boundary.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Would not this be a diametrically opposed provision to the whole spirit and intent of this bill?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. It certainly would.

Mr. HOSMER. Would it not complicate and create great legal difficulties with respect to the moneys that are now impounded awaiting settlement of this dispute?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. HOSMER. Practically insurmountable difficulties.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I think so.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to understand the situation. This money has been impounded, as I understand, subject to final determination as to who really is entitled to it?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is right.

Mr. HOSMER. So that it would not involve any effect on the budgetary situation, it would not involve going out raising the money by taxation or borrowing to make these payments. It simply would transfer to the States the money that has been impounded during the time of this trial?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is right. After the decision of the Supreme Court, they enjoined the States from accepting this money. The lessees started paying the money in to the Secretary of the Interior, impounding the money. Then when President Truman ordered that it be transferred to the Navy, that was all sent over to the Navy, so the Navy is holding those funds now which belong to the States and which should go back to the States, and which the gentleman wants to keep in the Federal Government.

Mr. HALLECK. If we stick to the provisions of the bill, then we are just being consistent with respect to the title to the land within the historic boundaries?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is true.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the gentleman from Indiana should examine the provisions on page 22 also, which provide that the money which the States have received shall go to the States even though the decision might go against them. This thing ought to work both ways.

Mr. HALLECK. I think we are here making the decision. I have thought all the time that this is a matter for the Congress of the United States to determine as a matter of legislative policy, and that we are here making the decision.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is it not true that the moneys referred to on page 22 of the bill have to do with the so-called outer Continental Shelf area beyond the historic boundaries, and the moneys referred to in the case of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota refer to the area within the historic boundaries?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is entirely right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCARTHY) there were—ayes 17, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. YATES. I object at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line. Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line, or to the International Boundary of the United States in the Great Lakes, or any body of water traversed by such boundary. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by any treaty ratified by the Senate of the United States or by an act of Congress or by the constitution or laws of a State prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 9, line 7, after the word "boundaries" strike out the remainder of line 7 and all lines thereafter through line 19.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to follow up my question of a few moments ago, "Where oh where is the seaward boundary of the State of Louisiana?" I think

I was able to demonstrate in my colloquy with the gentlemen who favor this bill, that we do not know where the seaward boundaries of the Gulf States are located.

Those who favor this bill have made the argument that its purpose is to establish definitely and once and for all the legal boundaries of the States, to confirm title within those boundaries to the States and to end the indecision which now prevents the exploitation of the submerged lands. To my mind the language which I sought to strike is contrary to that purpose and is in fact an invitation to continuation of the litigation between the coastal States and the Federal Government. The line 3 miles distant from the low water mark which is granted to the coastal States hereunder is only a temporary stop in the movement of some of the Gulf States to grasp the entire Continental Shelf. If 3 miles were to be the limitation for States other than Texas, why does not the bill say so specifically? The language is completely ambiguous and I do not believe anybody in this House knows all the claims which will be made by the States for additional interest in the wealth of the Continental Shelf beyond their 3-mile beginning.

Secondly, if the purpose of this legislation is to confirm title to the States in inland waters, that purpose is served by other sections of the bill. The language which I seek to strike has no relation to that purpose at all.

We all know that the Constitution contains the clause that all entering States shall be on an equal footing as they come into the Federal Union. This language gives special privilege to the coastal States. The New England States, the Atlantic Seaboard States, the Pacific States all have seaward boundaries 3 miles distant from the low point on the shore. The only States for whom this language is inserted are those on the Gulf of Mexico. Why should these be given special benefits? Certainly it is in the national interest that we have a uniform 3-mile boundary around the United States without deviation because of claims which the Supreme Court of the United States has already held invalid.

Thirdly, I think it is important that the language be stricken in the interests of our foreign policy. Is it not to our interest to maintain the necessity for a uniform 3-mile limit when we see the Soviet Union today claiming a strip in its territorial sea extending 12 miles from its shore? Mexico claims a boundary extending 9 miles from its shore line. Equador claims exclusive fishing rights within 15 miles of its coast. Iran claims 6 miles into the strategic Persian Gulf. What should our boundary be in the Gulf of Mexico? With the indecision written into this bill by the language covered by my amendment, nobody knows what the claims of the Gulf Coast States will be, and I suggest that our agents who have the task of objecting to expansion of foreign powers beyond their 3-mile limits may find this bill difficult to explain.

Let me read to you from a letter written by Assistant Secretary of State, a former Member of this House, Hon. Thruston B. Morton, of Kentucky, which letter was written to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the other body on March 4, 1953. He says:

A change of position regarding the 3-mile limit on the part of this Government is very likely, as past experience in related fields establishes, to be seized upon by other States as justification or excuse for broader or even extravagant claims over their adjacent seas. Hence, a realistic appraisal of the situation would seem to indicate that this Government should adhere to the 3-mile limit until such time as it is determined that the interest of the Nation as a whole would be better served by a change or modification of that policy.

As I see it, this letter states the intention of the President-to-be that he favors the 3-mile limit. I am inclined to think the viewpoint is sound for the reason that it is extremely difficult for the United States to protect the claim of any one of its States beyond the 3-mile limit, as it would have to do. Historically, since 1793, the United States has claimed only 3 miles and I do not believe that the admission of Louisiana and Texas into the Union warrants the conclusion that this altered our original claim. I believe, too, that it comes a little hard to reconcile our national policy of freedom of the high seas with the claims made by Gulf States of more than 100 miles into the ocean.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The gentleman's amendment would restrict the seaward boundary of all the States of the Union to 3 miles including the boundary of the State of Texas, which came into the Union under a treaty, would it not?

Mr. YATES. I know of no such treaty. Texas came in under a joint resolution, and my amendment would limit its boundary.

Is it not to our best interests to settle this question once and for all rather than inviting Texas to come in at a later time to say it has claims beyond 3 leagues. Let us settle the matter now instead of having Louisiana come in at a later time to sue the Federal Government for claims way beyond the 3-mile limit. I think it is better that as we legislate now, that we declare now that it is in the national interest for the seaward boundary of the United States, regardless of what State boundaries may be claimed, to be 3 miles from the shore line. We will then have a uniform boundary line all around our Nation. Beyond that line will lie the sphere of the Federal Government and international questions.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

As I understand, the gentleman's amendment strikes out on page 9 certain words beginning in line 7.

Mr. YATES. Beginning in line 7 with the words, "Any claim heretofore."

Mr. WILSON of Texas. The effect of this amendment would be that the seaward boundary of every State in the Union, coastal States, or Great Lakes States would be limited to 3 miles which would, in fact, put the rights under which Texas claims, and that is the treaty when it came into the Union, of three leagues, which is 10½ miles—this whole paragraph provides:

SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line. Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line or to the international boundary of the United States in the Great Lakes, or any body of water traversed by such boundary. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by any treaty ratified by the Senate of the United States or by an act of Congress or by the constitution or laws of a State prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

Certainly we do not want to pass a bill denying a treaty entered into by and between the United States and any State of the Union; and if we did do that it would go, of course, to the very nub of this bill in my opinion, and would deny to Texas at least, and other States, I am sure, their privileges guaranteed to them under the Constitution by right of contract and treaty and of the right to affix their historical boundaries as is provided in the bill.

I think the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Texas. The amendment would have Congress take away from certain States the rights which they now have. I want to read paragraph 3 on page 6 of the report which I think may help throw some light on the subject. It reads:

Title II authorizes and confirms the boundaries of coastal States to be 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline or the international boundary in the Great Lakes or any body of water traversed by such boundary. While it approves claims of States to so extend their boundaries to that line, it provides further that section 4 of the act is not to prejudice the existence of any State's historic seaward boundary into the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans, or the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes beyond these 3 miles if it was so provided by any treaty of the United States, or any act of Congress or the constitution or laws of a State prior to or when it entered the Union or has been or shall be approved by Congress.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Let me make a statement and then I will yield.

Some Members seem to be particularly alarmed by a proposition they think is going to defeat this bill, namely about our shoving our boundaries out there beyond the 3-mile limit. Seventeen nations of the world have already shoved theirs out past the 3-mile mark, so no precedent is being created by this bill—17 foreign nations have shoved their

coastlines, their boundaries, their seaward boundaries out as far as and even farther than we propose to shove ours out in this bill. So I cannot get excited about what some state department says he would expect to happen if we took this action. We are long overdue in this field.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. Is it not true that for the purpose of Federal customs enforcement we sometimes go 60 miles out to sea?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I was surprised to see opposition by the majority leader of the Republican Party to the amendment which I offered previously, an amendment which in very simple terms provided that the Federal Government should be permitted to keep revenue which it had obtained in good faith in that area in which its claims have been validated by the Supreme Court while he supported a proposition that the States should be permitted to retain revenue that they have derived from an area which they never have claimed, and which even in this bill they are not claiming.

So far as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is concerned, it is a good amendment. The fiction has been developed here that somehow the claims of Texas to 10½ miles are much stronger than the claims of other States to the 3-mile limit. I would like to call your attention to some pertinent facts: In 1838 the United States and the newly formed Republic of Texas entered into a convention to establish a boundary line between the two republics, and this convention provided for the appointment of commissioners to proceed to run and mark that portion of the said boundary which extends from the mouth of the Sabine where the river enters the Gulf of Mexico to the Red River. They actually began running the line from the mouth of the river and not 3 leagues from the mouth of the river.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. No; I would like to complete my statement. If I can get additional time, I will.

Reaction to the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo shows clearly that other nations were concerned over this 3-league proposition. Correspondence between the United States and other nations regarding this Texas claim is most enlightening. It fails to show that Texas has any strong historical claim 10½ miles seaward.

In 1848, Mr. Buchanan, of our Government, in answer to an inquiry from the British, said:

> In answer, I have to state that the stipulation in the treaty can only affect the rights of Mexico and the United States. If for their mutual convenience it has been deemed proper to enter into such an arrangement, third parties can have no just use of complaint. The Government of the United States never intended by this stipulation to question the rights which Great Britain, or any other power may possess under the law of nations.

In 1875, in another communication to the British it was stated:

> We have always understood and asserted that pursuant to public law no nation can rightfully claim jurisdiction at sea beyond a marine league from its coast. * * * In respect to the provision in the treaty with Mexico, it may be remarked that it was probably suggested by the passage in the act of Congress referred to the 12-mile-customs rule and designed for the same purpose that of preventing smuggling.

And more recently, in June 1936, in in an attempt to settle a dispute with Mexico, the United States Government said:

> That portion of article V of the treaty of 1848 which the Mexican Foreign Office quotes relates only to the boundary line at a given point and furnishes no authority for Mexico to claim generally that its territorial waters extend 9 miles from the coast. * * * Presumably it is true as indicated by a note sent by this Department to the British Minister of January 22, 1875, that the arrangement thus made between the United States and Mexico with respect to the Gulf of Mexico was designed to prevent smuggling in the particular area covered by the arrangement. * * * To say that because the United States agreed that in one area, so far as the United States was concerned, Mexican territorial waters extended 3 leagues from land, therefore Mexico was entitled to claim such an extent of territorial waters adjacent to her entire coastline is a deduction which the terms of article V of the treaty of 1848 do not warrant.

The historic Texas claim to 10½ miles seaward is of very modern verbiage. As I pointed out in general debate yesterday, the Texas land commissioner did not even enter the acreage under the marginal sea in his reports until 1941.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 17, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The balance of the bill follows:

SEC. 5. Exceptions from operation of section 3 of this act: There is excepted from the operation of section 3 of this act—

(a) all specifically described tracts or parcels of land and resources therein or improvements thereon title to which has been lawfully and expressly acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, provided such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the title to such lands and resources in accordance with the statutes or decisions of the courts of the State in which the lands are located;

(b) such lands beneath navigable waters held, or any interest in which is held by the United States for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians;

(c) all improvements which are occupied and used by the United States for any Federal purpose in the marginal sea outside inland waters and the use of the underlying subsoil or land therefor: *Provided*, That no State, municipality, political subdivision, or person shall be deprived of any right under existing law to claim and receive just compensation for such use.

SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, not including proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, development, and control of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, vested in and delegated to the respective States and others by section 3 of this act.

(b) In time of war or when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

TITLE III

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OUTSIDE STATE BOUNDARIES

SEC. 8. Jurisdiction over outer Continental Shelf: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the outer Continental Shelf, appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition as provided in this act. Federal laws now in effect or hereafter adopted shall apply to the entire area of the outer Continental Shelf. The Secretary is hereby empowered and authorized to administer the provisions of this title, and to adopt rules and regulations not inconsistent with Federal laws to apply to the area.

Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, or such regulations as the Secretary may adopt, the laws and police powers of each coastal State which so provides shall be applicable to that portion of the adjacent outer Continental Shelf which would be within the area of the State if its boundaries were extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer Continental Shelf, and the Secretary shall determine and publish lines defining each such area of State jurisdiction: *Provided*, That State taxation laws within such area shall be limited to severance or production taxes and may be levied only by those States which apply and administer their conservation laws and other State governmental functions in said area: *Provided further*, That the rate of such severance or production tax shall not be in excess of the rate of said tax within State boundaries.

This act shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the outer Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation and navigational servitude shall not be affected.

(b) Oil and gas deposits in the outer Continental Shelf shall be subject to control and disposal only in accordance with the provisions of this act and no rights in or

claims to such deposits, whether based upon applications filed or other action taken heretofore or hereafter, shall be recognized except in accordance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. Provisions for leasing outer Continental Shelf: (a) When in the Secretary's opinion there is a demand for the purchase of such leases, the Secretary may in his discretion offer for sale, on competitive sealed bidding, oil and gas leases on any area of the outer Continental Shelf. Subject to the other terms and provisions hereof, sales of leases shall be made to the responsible and qualified bidder bidding the highest cash bonus per leasing unit. Notice of sale of oil and gas leases shall be published at least 30 days before the date of sale in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, which publication shall contain (i) a description of the tracts into which the area to be leased has been subdivided by the Secretary for leasing purposes, such tracts being herein called "leasing units"; (ii) the minimum bonus per acre which will be accepted by the Secretary on each leasing unit; (iii) the amount of royalty as specified hereinafter in section 9 (d); (iv) the amount of rental per acre per annum on each leasing unit as specified hereinafter in section 9 (d); and (v) the time and place at which all bids shall be opened in public.

(b) The leasing units shall be in reasonably compact form of such area and dimensions as may be determined by the Secretary, but shall not be more than 640 acres if within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field and shall not be more than 2,560 acres if not within any known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field.

(c) Oil and gas leases sold under the provisions of this section shall be for the primary terms of 5 years and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities. Each lease shall contain provisions requiring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of the lease, and requiring the lessee to conduct his operations thereon in accordance with sound and efficient oilfield practices to prevent waste of oil or gas discovered under said lease or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him to the oil or gas sands or oil- and gas-bearing strata or the injury or destruction of the oil and gas deposits.

(d) Each lease shall provide that, on or after the discovery of oil or gas, the lessee shall pay a royalty of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the leasing unit and, in any event, not less than $1 per acre per annum in lieu of rental for each lease year commencing after discovery in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress. If after discovery of oil or gas the production thereof should cease from any cause, the lease shall not terminate if the lessee commences additional drilling or reworking operations within 90 days thereafter or, if it be within the primary term, commences or resumes the payment or tender of rentals or commences operations for drilling or reworking on or before the rental paying date next ensuing after the expiration of 90 days from date of cessation of production. All leases issued hereunder shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a rental of $1 per acre per annum for the second and every lease year thereafter during the primary term and in lieu of drilling operations on or production from the leasing unit in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress, all such rentals to be payable on or before the beginning of each lease year.

(e) If, at the expiration of the primary term of any lease, oil or gas is not being produced in paying quantities on a leasing unit, but drilling operations are commenced not less than 180 days prior to the end of the primary term and such drilling operations or other drilling operations have been and are being diligently prosecuted and the lessee has otherwise performed his obligations under the lease, the lease shall remain in force so long as drilling operations are prosecuted with reasonable diligence and in a good and workmanlike manner, and rental paid, and if they result in the production of oil or gas so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities.

(f) Should a lessee in a lease issued under the provisions of title III of this act fail to comply with any of the provisions of this act or of the lease, such lease may be canceled by the Secretary because of such failure; but before such a cancellation the Secretary shall give the lessee 20 days' notice by registered mail at his last known address of the claimed defaults. If the defaults are not cured by the end of said period the Secretary may proceed to cancel the lease. Any person complaining of such cancellation may have such action reviewed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. If a lease or any interest therein is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, in violation of any of the provisions of this act, the lease may be canceled, or the interest so owned or controlled may be forfeited by the Secretary as provided in this paragraph, or the person so owning or controlling the interest may be compelled to dispose of the interest in an appropriate court proceeding.

(g) The provisions of sections 17, 17 (b), 28, 30, 30 (a), 30 (b), 32, 36, and 39 of the Mineral Leasing Act to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the terms of this act, are made applicable to lands leased or subject to lease by the Secretary under title III of this act.

(h) In the interest of economy and of cooperation between Federal and State leasing agencies within their respective jurisdiction, the Secretary may, but only to the extent he deems feasible, make use of facilities available to him from the adjacent States and their leasing agencies. Each lease shall contain such other terms and provisions consistent with the provisions of this act as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary may delegate his authority under this act to officers or employees of the Department of the Interior and may authorize subdelegation to the extent that he may deem proper.

(i) The Secretary may deny any application for a lease, as to which it appears that the lease, if issued, or any interest therein, would be owned or controlled, directly or by stock ownership, stockholding, stock control, trusteeship, or otherwise, by any citizen of another country, the laws, customs, or regulations of which deny similar or like privileges to citizens or corporations of this country. Where such ownership or control arises after a lease is granted the Secretary may then cancel the lease because thereof. Any ownership or interest described in this section which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for 2 years and not longer after its acquisition. No lands leased under the provisions of this section shall be subleased, trusteed, possessed, or controlled by any device or in any manner whatsoever so that they form a part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust or form the subject in whole or in part of any contract, agreement, understanding, or conspiracy, to restrain trade or commerce in the production or sale of oil or gas or to control the price of oil or gas.

(j) Any lease obtained through the exercise of fraud or misrepresentation, or which is not performed in accordance with its terms or with this law, may by the Secretary be invalidated subject to the right of review as otherwise provided for herein.

SEC. 10. Exchange of existing State leases in outer Continental Shelf for Federal leases: (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue a lease to any person in exchange for a lease covering lands in the outer Continental Shelf which was issued by any State prior to December 21, 1948, and which would have been in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing such lease had the State issuing such lease had such paramount rights in and dominion over the outer Continental Shelf as it assumed it had when it issued the lease. Any lease issued pursuant to this section shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the unexpired term of the old lease, or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, the same: *Provided, however*, That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such old lease on and before December 11, 1950, or if the primary term of such lease has expired since December 11, 1950, then any such new lease shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of the old lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease, shall cover the same natural resources and the same portion of the Continental Shelf as the old lease, shall provide for payment to the United States of the same rentals, royalties, and other payments as are provided for in the old lease, and any taxes imposed by Congress, and shall include such other terms and provisions, consistent with the provisions of this act, as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Operations under such old lease may be conducted as therein provided until the issuance of an exchange lease hereunder or until it is determined that no such exchange lease shall be issued. No lease which has been determined by the Secretary to have been obtained by fraud or misrepresentation shall be accepted for exchange under this section. Any persons complaining of a refusal by the Secretary so to exchange a lease as herein provided may have such action reviewed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(b) No such exchange lease shall be issued unless, (i) an application therefor, accompanied by a copy of the lease from the State or its political subdivision or grantee offered in exchange, is filed with the Secretary within 6 months from the effective date of this act, or within such further period as provided in section 17 hereof, or as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary; (ii) the applicant states in his application that the lease applied for shall be subject to the same overriding royalty obligations as the lease issued by the State or its political subdivision or grantee in addition to any taxes imposed by Congress; (iii) the applicant pays to the United States all rentals, royalties, and other sums due to the lessor under the old lease which have or may become payable after June 5, 1950, and which have not been paid to the lessor or to the Secretary under the old lease; (iv) the applicant furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other reasonable requirements as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and (v) the applicant files with the Secretary a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction showing that the old lease was in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing it on the applicable date provided for in subsection (a) of this section; or in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavit, receipts, canceled checks, and other documents showing such facts.

(c) In the event any lease covers, as well as other lands, lands of the outer Continental Shelf, the provisions of this section shall apply to such lease insofar only as it covers lands of the outer Continental Shelf.

SEC. 11. Income from outer Continental Shelf: All rentals, royalties, and other sums

payable under any lease on the outer Continental Shelf for the period from June 5, 1950, to date, and thereafter shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 12. Actions involving outer Continental Shelf: Any court proceeding involving a lease or rights under a lease of a portion of the outer Continental Shelf may be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which any defendant may be found or for the district in which the leased property, or some part thereof, is located; or, if no part of the leased property is within any district, for the district nearest to the property involved.

SEC. 13. Refunds: When it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that any person has made a payment to the United States in connection with any lease under this act in excess of the amount he was lawfully required to pay, such excess shall be repaid to such person, his assignees, or his legal representative, if a request for repayment of such excess is filed with the Secretary within 2 years after the issuance of the lease or the making of the payment.

SEC. 14. Waiver of liability for past operations: (a) No State, or political subdivision, grantee or lessee shall be liable to or required to account to the United States in any way for entering upon, using, exploring for, developing, producing, or disposing of natural resources from lands of the outer Continental Shelf prior to June 5, 1950.

(b) If it shall be determined by appropriate court action that fraud has been practiced in the obtaining of any lease referred to herein or in the operations thereunder, the waivers provided in this section shall not be effective.

SEC. 15. Powers reserved to the United States: The United States reserves and retains—

(a) in time of war or when necessary for national defense, and when so prescribed by the Congress or the President, in addition to any and all other rights it may have under the law, the right (i) of first refusal to purchase all or any portion of the oil or gas that may be produced from the outer Continental Shelf; (ii) to terminate any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this act, in which event the United States shall become the owner of wells, fixtures, and improvements located on the area of such lease and shall be liable to the lessee for just compensation for such leaseholds, wells, fixtures, and improvements, to be determined as in the case of condemnation; (iii) to suspend operations under any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this act, in which event the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States; and payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease shall likewise be suspended during any period of suspension of operations, and the term of any suspended lease shall be extended by adding thereto any suspension period;

(b) the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, as areas restricted from the exploration and operation that part of the Continental Shelf needed for national defense; and so long as such designation remains in effect no exploration or operations may be conducted on any part of the surface of such area except with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense; and if operations or production under any lease theretofore issued on lands within any such restricted area shall be suspended, any payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operation and production, and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding thereto any such suspension period, and the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States; and

(c) the ownership of and the right to extract helium from all gas produced from the outer Continental Shelf, subject to any lease issued pursuant to or validated by this act under such general rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, but in the extraction of helium from such gas it shall be so extracted as to cause no substantial delay in the delivery of gas produced to the purchaser of such gas.

SEC. 16. Geological and geophysical explorations: The right of any person, subject to applicable provisions of law, and of any agency of the United States to conduct geological and geophysical explorations in the outer Continental Shelf, which do not interfere with or endanger actual operations under any lease issued pursuant to this act, is hereby recognized.

SEC. 17. Interpleader and interim arrangements: (a) Not withstanding the other provisions of this act, if any lessee under any lease of submerged lands granted by any State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, prior to the effective date of this act, shall file with the Secretary a certificate executed by such lessee under oath and stating that doubt exists (i) as to whether an area covered by such lease lies within the outer Continental Shelf, or (ii) as to whom the rentals, royalties, or other sums payable under such lease are lawfully payable, or (iii) as to the validity of the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantee issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease and that such claims have not been determined by a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction—

(1) the lessee may interplead the United States and, with their consent, the State or States concerned, in an action filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and, in the event of State consent to be interpleaded, deposit with the clerk of that court all rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease after filing of such certificate, and such deposit shall be full performance of the lessee's obligation under such lease to make such payments; or

(2) the lessee may continue to pay all rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease to the State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, as in the lease provided, until it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that such rentals, royalties, and other sums should be paid otherwise, and thereafter such rentals, royalties, and other sums shall be paid by said lessee in accordance with the determination of such final judgment. In the event it shall be determined by such final judgment that the United States is entitled to any moneys theretofore paid to any State or political subdivision, or grantee thereof, such State, its political subdivision, or grantee, as the case may be, shall promptly account to the United States therefor; and

(3) the lessee of any such lease may file application for an exchange lease under section 8 hereof at any time prior to the expiration of 6 months after it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantee issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease are invalid as against the United States and that the lands covered by such lease are within the outer Continental Shelf.

(b) If any area of the outer Continental Shelf or other lands covered by this act included in any lease issued by a State or its political subdivision or grantee is involved in litigation between the United States and such State, its political subdivision, or grantee, the lessee in such lease shall have the right to intervene in such action and deposit with the clerk of the court in which such case is pending any rentals, royalties, and other sums payable under the lease subsequent to the effective date of this act, and such deposit shall be full discharge and acquittance of the lessee for any payment so made.

SEC. 18. Executive Order No. 10426, dated January 16, 1953, entitled "Setting Aside Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf as a Naval Petroleum Reserve," is hereby revoked.

SEC. 19. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 20. Separability: If any provision of this act or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby; without limiting the generality of the foregoing, if subsections 3 (a) 1, 3 (a) 2, 3 (b) 1, 3 (b) 2, 3 (b) 3 or 3 (c) or any provision of any of those subsections is held invalid, such subsection or provision shall be held separable and the remaining subsections and provisions shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 12, line 9, strike out the paragraph extending to line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, or such regulations as the Secretary may adopt, the laws of each coastal State which so provides shall be applicable to that portion of the outer Continental Shelf which would be within the area of the State if its boundaries were extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer Continental Shelf, and the Secretary shall determine and publish lines defining each such area of State jurisdiction: *Provided, however,* That State taxation laws shall not apply in such areas of the outer Continental Shelf. The Secretary shall reimburse the abutting States in the amount of the reasonable costs of the administration of such laws."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike from the bill the provision permitting the States to impose severance and production taxes on the extraction of natural resources from the outer Continental Shelf. The subcommittee, which gave many weeks of consideration to this measure, proposed a bill without this provision and incorporating instead the language that I now offer. The full committee, however, due to the extremely persuasive abilities of my friends, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], reversed the subcommittee.

I must emphasize that we are dealing here with the outer Continental Shelf, an area over which no State has or claims to have any historic jurisdiction. My concern is for the taxpayers of the United States, for in truth it would be their money we would be generous with, if we leave the present wording in the bill.

The tax imposed by the adjacent States would fall, at least indirectly, on the United States, the landlord of this area, since the terms of any lease entered into would have to be fixed in order to permit the lessees a fair return and a proper incentive to develop the area. Therefore, in order to grant this tax

windfall to a few States, it would necessarily come from the pockets and pay envelopes of Federal taxpayers.

Our forefathers stoutly declared that taxation without representation is tyranny; we might add as a minor footnote that taxation without jurisdiction is larceny.

Even today, when production on the Continental Shelf is hardly started, the amounts involved are not inconsiderable. The Louisiana severance tax amounts to from 18 to 26 cents a barrel, depending on the specific gravity of the oil produced. Production from the area of the outer Continental Shelf, according to Department of Interior figures, is now more than 5,000 barrels a day off Louisiana. The take, in severance taxes on oil alone, without considering natural gas or condensate, is better than $1,000 a day—$350,000 a year. The State police could tour the present installations in yachts that would make Farouk green with envy, and, as more wells were developed, the take would increase.

The truth of the matter is that the Coast Guard and the Navy can take care of the policing of the area as they always have, and as they probably always will. The severance tax is not designed to reimburse anyone for any expense but to add more to the grant which is being given.

It is claimed that there is a vacuum in applicable domestic law which necessitates the application of State laws to the adjacent sea area. This vacuum in law is not real. It is presently filled by the well-established maritime jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

The Secretary of the Interior is given authority by the amendment I propose to use State laws and State enforcement where he believes such action advisable. Possibly he might find it advantageous to adopt a State's conservation laws for an adjacent area. He might further find it useful to call upon the State conservation officials to keep an eye on production to prevent waste. If so, there is no objection to his reimbursing the States for their out-of-pocket costs, provided they are properly accounted for and reasonable in amount. The proposed amendment so provides. That far I can go, but that is a far cry from the severance tax incorporated in the present bill. Authority to impose that tax should be stricken from the bill.

In view of statements on the floor yesterday by the gentleman from Texas to the effect that the Secretary of the Interior intimated that he saw no objection to giving States the right to tax in the outer Continental Shelf, I have asked the Secretary to furnish me a letter setting forth his position. I read his considered conclusion, which is: My view is that the State should have no taxing power whatsoever on the outer Continental Shelf. Outside their historic boundaries the States should be given nothing from the resources which now belong to the people as a whole beyond reimbursement for any services actually rendered.

On this specific question of the power to tax, I am authorized to say that this also represents the position of the administration on this issue.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I favor the gentleman's amendment. I would like to propound this question to the gentleman. If the language remains and the gentleman's amendment does not prevail, then would not we have this rather anomalous situation—some of these coastal States, notably Texas and Louisiana could actually tax property which is beyond their borders?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. By the same token, could not our State of New York then seek to tax property beyond the borders of New York State?

Mr. KEATING. Well, insofar as such property is covered by this bill, yes. Any outer Continental Shelf properties adjacent to New York could be taxed under this bill, and that is true of any State. Of course, this bill would only be a precedent for other action of a legislative character which, as the gentleman well knows, is not the equivalent of a judicial precedent.

Mr. CELLER. However, it would be a very important precedent and other States might follow suit.

Mr. KEATING. It would be an important precedent and a most unfortunate one. I have no doubt that is the reason for the very great concern over this provision and the extreme importance which is attached by those in the administration to a revision of this bill in line with the amendment which I am offering.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, the provision which your amendment strikes out was offered as a sort of compensation for the fact that no jurisdiction was given to the States over the so-called Continental Shelf, and, therefore, attempt is being made to do indirectly what cannot be done directly; namely, if they cannot get hold of the property, why, get the right to tax the property. Is not that what it really amounts to?

Mr. KEATING. Yes. This amendment is designed to correct that condition. As the gentleman remembers, the wording of the amendment was incorporated as a part of the bill as reported by this subcommittee which studied the problem so long and diligently. It was only in our full committee, when we considered it and had such eminent debaters in favor of the present wording, that the full committee did overrule the subcommittee.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I ask this question solely for information, because I am certain the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be debated at some length. Would the gentleman mind telling the committee whether or not the gentleman's proposal eliminates not only the taxing power of the States but also all police power on the part of the States?

Mr. KEATING. I refer the gentleman to the exact wording of the first sentence of the amendment, which is that the laws of each coastal State shall be applicable to the outer Continental Shelf areas, and the Secretary of the Interior shall determine and define——

Mr. BOGGS. Is the gentleman reading the committee amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I am reading now the proposed amendment which I have offered. If the gentleman will refer to the amendment and read it against the language in the bill, he will see that in the first sentence there is relatively little change. The words "police powers" are struck out.

Mr. BOGGS. That is what I want to question the gentleman about now. Why are the words struck out?

Mr. KEATING. Because insofar as any necessary powers are concerned, they are included within the "laws," which is retained in the amendment. The police-power provision was put in very obviously in order to include the taxing power. It says expressly that the police power shall include the right to tax. That is the reason for eliminating the words "police power," and substituting the word "laws."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes, so that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] may explain his amendment so that we will all understand it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I must object. I have objected to similar requests on the part of everybody else.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] explain just exactly how the police power of the States might be applied to these areas—Continental Shelf—under the terms of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KEATING. The police power as such would not be included except as it might be involved by the law which the Secretary of the Interior felt should be made applicable to this area.

Mr. BOGGS. I understand. Does the gentleman care to add anything to that?

Mr. KEATING. I may after I hear what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. BOGGS. I believe I understand the gentleman's amendment. It first strikes out any participation by the States in the taxing of these resources. In addition, it limits any application of State laws, State conservation regulations, or State police power, until and if the Secretary of the Interior specifically requests the application of such laws. I know there is going to be a great deal of discussion about this provision. I happen to represent, I believe, one of the few districts in the United States where there is actual development and production outside of the so-called bounds. Let me tell the committee just what is involved in that sort of situation. These particular operations are conducted off a community known as Grand Isle, a community which figures very prominently in the history of the State of Louisiana. For many, many years there was only a small town there made up principally of people engaged in tourist and fishing business, and others who made a livelihood plying the traditional occupations of the sea.

Then oil was discovered. Great docks were moved out into the water. In some instances, a good many miles offshore. Tremendous scientific knowledge was required to perform these operations, and where we had had small towns, all of a sudden there were hundreds of men with their families and their children who had come in from all of the surrounding country from Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and California, wherever men search for and discover oil. All of a sudden we had problems of schooling, of building roads, of building bridges, of providing public services out of the treasury of the State of Louisiana or the locality in which the operations were being conducted. So this is not an obscure, abstract problem. This is an actual, everyday concern of the people who live in those communities. I believe it not unfair, and I believe it entirely equitable and entirely justified by the precedents and the previous actions of this Congress that those people who are providing these services obtain some compensation. What has happened in the past? Is this something novel or new or different before this Chamber? Not by any means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] said, this amendment was the subject of discussion before the full committee. The committee print did not contain the taxing power. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and I offered an amendment providing for police power and the power of taxation. For the record, in order to show the history of it, I ask unanimous consent now, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment which we proposed before the committee be incorporated at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

On page 12, strike out lines 9 through line 4, page 13, both inclusive, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"Except to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable Federal laws now in effect or hereafter enacted, the laws and police power of each coastal State which so provides shall extend to that portion of the outer Continental Shelf which would be within the boundaries of such State if extended seaward to the outer margin of the outer Continental Shelf. The police power includes, but is not limited to, the power of taxation, conservation, and control of the manner of conducting geophysical explorations."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, for that amendment the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] offered a substitute. That was the subject of discussion. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] was passed with only two dissenting votes before the full committee. It is the Crumpacker substitute which is now in the bill before the Committee in the second paragraph in section 8.

I want to make one point perfectly clear, and it is this: Despite whatever might be said to the contrary, the taxation power provided for by this bill is most definitely not the taxation of property of the United States of America or any of the functions of the Government of the United States.

The taxing power presently in the bill is specifically limited to the placing of a production or severance tax and also limited to rates uniformly equal to those prevailing within the historic boundaries of the States. This provision we are talking about is found in title 3 of the bill, section 8, dealing with the outer Continental Shelf.

The bill provides that the subsoil of the outer Continental Shelf belongs to the United States or appertains to the United States. The bill states that leases granted by the Federal Government shall be for not less than $1 per acre and that the royalties received by the Federal Government shall be not less than 12½ percent. The leases are to be competitive, and from our experience in Louisiana and Texas you can bet your boots that in most cases the rentals will be more than $1 per acre and the royalties in most cases will be more than 12½ percent.

The rentals derived by the Federal Government under those leases are not subject to taxation. The royalties which the Federal Government will receive of 12½ percent and more are definitely not to be taxed by the specific provisions of this bill.

What is being taxed? What is being taxed is the portion of the oil going to oil companies when their share is severed from the ground and is in the possession of the oil companies. It is at that point that that oil is taxed. So it is a taxation not against the Federal Government nor against the interests of the Federal Government but a taxation on the oil in possession of third parties.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. Briefly.

Mr. BOGGS. I think it would be helpful if the gentleman would point out that this taxing provision and police power was included in the Walters bill which passed the House of Representatives in 1951.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Now, what are those taxes used for? I mean the tax imposed against the oil itself in possession of the lessees and not the property of the United States? Under our Constitution, and under the laws of taxation, I understand also, those funds are used for schools and for roads and for bridges and the like; those funds are used for the benefit of the oil companies, their employees, and others who benefit from governmental facilities.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment.

For the purpose of clarification, that portion which is sought to be stricken out on page 12, as has been explained, was added in the full committee. As the original bill came out of the subcommittee that language was not contained therein. However, the vote prevailed and it was inserted.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], restores the exact language which was in the original bill, and I wish to place in the RECORD at this time a careful analysis which I have made.

The proposed amendment would strike out all the language in the paragraph on page 12 beginning on line 9 down to and including line 24. That language already contained in the bill permits coastal States which so provide to exercise the police powers, including the power of taxation in the area set up by the Secretary of the Interior which would extend from their outer boundary to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf. In order to levy a production or severance tax, the State would be required to administer their conservation laws and other governmental functions in the area. Moreover, the rate of such tax would have to be the same as that within the State boundary.

What I have said to this point applies to the present state of the bill before the amendment was offered.

First. Under the proposed amendment the Secretary of the Interior is given the discretion to adopt the laws of the coastal States which so provide to cover the area of the outer Continental Shelf which would be within the State boundaries if they were extended to the outer edge.

Second. The Secretary would set up the lines defining the area.

Third. Any laws made applicable under those conditions could not be inconsistent with any Federal law or regulation.

Fourth. Moreover, State-taxation laws are specifically prohibited.

Fifth. Finally, the Secretary is authorized to reimburse the abutting States in the amount of the reasonable cost of the administration of such laws.

In effect this proposed amendment would make State police agencies the agencies of the Federal Government for certain purposes in the area beyond the State boundaries.

I refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], and ask if that is a correct analysis of that amendment.

Mr. KEATING. That is a very able analysis.

Mr. GRAHAM. I support the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time because I think this is a matter of sufficient importance to have it thoroughly debated on the floor, and I think that the actual knowledge of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] concerning the subject, would be of great value to the other Members in giving proper consideration to the issue. I, therefore, want to yield to him at this time for further discussion of the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS. I thank the gentleman very much. There are only two additional points that I should like to make in connection with this amendment.

It so happens that in the year 1943, I believe it was, I was general counsel for the Louisiana Department of Conservation, which at that time had jurisdiction over these areas in question, as well as the entire spacing and development matters in the State of Louisiana.

In that year the conservation act of the State of Louisiana—I believe it was

act 157 of the legislature of 1940—was questioned in the courts and finally came here to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of our spacing and conservation act, which act became a model for practically every other oil-producing State in this country involving spacing and unitization of the various fields in the production of oil. Any person who has any familiarity with the production of oil can imagine the pandora's box of confusion that will be opened if in one area you have one set of conservation statutes applying and in another area a different set applying.

Insofar as the producing sands and strata are concerned, they will not change because of a line. The same problems of spacing, of proper conservation, of adequate production are involved whether you are on the State side of the line or the so-called Federal side of the line.

It seems to me that the Congress would tremendously simplify the production of oil in these areas, and it is declared to be the intent of the Congress in passing this legislation to facilitate production, if the State conservation laws through the police power of the States are applied to these areas in question, not by request from the Secretary of the Interior, as the gentleman from New York would have it, but by operation of law.

If this were something novel, something being presented to this body for the first time, I might be able to understand a desire on the part of some people not to take this action. As a matter of fact, the bill presently before us does not grant to the States what has been granted twice before when we passed the Walter bill. We passed the Walter bill on April 30, 1948, by a vote of 257 to 29, and again on July 30, 1951, by a vote of 265 to 109.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding is that that bill passed in 1948 by the 80th Congress did not pertain to the Continental Shelf and did not deal with it.

Mr. BOGGS. Well, I could be wrong about that.

Mr. HALLECK. Counsel has checked the matter and informs me that is correct, and that is my recollection.

Mr. BOGGS. I will have to check that, but I am certain that the July 30, 1951, bill was the Walter bill and did deal with that subject. I am glad that the gentleman raises the question that he raises, because if the 1948 bill did not deal with the subject it meant that the Congress was saying, as the other body has said in the Holland bill, that as of now we are still not prepared to deal with this subject, therefore we do not touch it at all. It would seem to me that if this amendment is adopted, we would have to move to strike out all of title 3 in this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I speak here as one who has supported this legislation through the years. I was the majority leader in the Eightieth Congress when we brought a similar measure to passage here in the House, and I mention that fact specifically to indicate that all of this talk about some recent political operation or some effort to gain political favor just cannot be supported. It is true that the support for this legislation was evidenced in the campaign by the Republican candidate for President, but I think it should be borne in mind constantly that what he promised was to save to the States the areas within their historic, traditional boundaries. As I remember, that is what we undertook to do in the Republican 80th Congress. At that time we were saying to the States: We are going to recognize the rights that we always believed you had anyway, and grant to you the property within your historic boundaries.

I have looked at some of the debates back in the 80th Congress, and I find that the gentleman from Louisiana argued very vigorously for the historic boundary right of his State, and I find that the very eminent gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was there urging 10½ miles for Texas as against the 3 miles, but so far as I can discover, at that time there was no insistence about the Continental Shelf.

Generally speaking, there are two propositions involved here. One is, What about the traditional boundaries? Then there is some controversy, and there is controversy, about the Continental Shelf beyond that point. In the other body they have elected to proceed without what is here, title III, by dealing simply with the historic boundary proposition. Here our committee has seen fit to bring this bill in with a determination about the taxing power.

Again may I remind you I speak as a friend of this legislation, but I do not want to see its accomplishment and its final enactment jeopardized by a provision that is evoking as much controversy and difficulty as this particular taxing power. So I ask for the support of this amendment.

We all know that this is the beginning of the legislative process. I do not know what will be done with respect to these provisions of title III in the other body, but I trust something can and will be worked out that is satisfactory. However, I am quite convinced from what I have heard that a great many Members here on both sides of the aisle would feel most reluctant to vote for this bill if this language is not changed as indicated by this amendment. As I say, no irreparable damage will be done, if any is to be done. I think that those who are the strongest in their support of this legislation should not be too insistent against this amendment because, in the final analysis, we are here trying to work out the problem of the historic boundaries and the rights of the States in those historic boundaries. We are trying to definitely establish the rights of the States in those historic boundaries, and I do not believe that they should include such a provision as this, in the light of all the circumstances.

So, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the amendment will be adopted. If someone moves to strike out title III, the committee can act on that. Personally, I would like to see it remain; let the measure go to the other body, and I am quite certain that out of it all we can come up with a fair, equitable, and reasonable proposal.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman referred to the remarks that I made at the time of the debate in the 80th Congress. I simply wanted to point out to the gentleman that that proposed legislation contained no title III.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not believe it did. I think what we did in the Republican 80th Congress was to grant the demands of the States for the areas within their historic boundaries.

Mr. BOGGS. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say, in passing, that that was a proposal backed by the attorneys general, by most of the governors of the States, and hence it is as broad as the Nation itself.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I am opposed to it for reasons that I think are valid, certainly in my own mind, which I thought out rather carefully.

Mr. Chairman, this bill seeks to establish the boundaries of the States as being the historic boundaries; that is, those boundaries which were created by historic documents, by treaties, by laws, by State constitutions originally enacted, and approved by the Congress. To the limit of the historic boundaries, of course, all State laws are applicable and will apply. That includes taxation laws, as well as conservation laws, compensation laws, laws affecting schools, and things of that sort, but when you reach the edge of the historic boundary—I do not here seek, Mr. Chairman, to attempt to draw a map showing what are the exact historic boundaries in each State—you are going to have to apply the State and local laws.

To the limit of these historic boundaries you are going to have State and local laws. When you reach the edge of the political boundaries of each State, you have a political vacuum. You have no laws there applying except the general maritime laws of the United States and the international laws of the world. Other than that you have a political and a legal vacuum at the present time. The United States then will have to follow through. It will either have to make a financial arrangement with the States to apply the laws of the local subdivisions and the States to those areas, or it will have to go ahead subsequently, by subsequent legislation, to properly police and properly handle these areas itself, always bearing in mind that local laws and conditions prevail in that area, whether it be on the Atlantic seaboard, the Pacific seaboard, or down the Gulf or up in the Great Lakes. That is inevitable.

If you do not do it, what will happen is this: You will have a great industry,

perhaps, arising out in the Gulf of Mexico. You will have drilling there in areas where there is no drilling at the present time. You will have people working there. They should be covered by some type of workmen's compensation laws. We will have to pass those laws. They will have families. Will the families live in the oceans themselves or back in the States contiguous or bordering upon the seashore? If they live on land as they surely will, who is going to educate the families of those men working out there on the deep sea producing the oil and gas? It creates a problem. It will create many problems.

If that was a military reservation in your State or in my State; and we had a body of men there working, whether they were in uniform or were civilians, we would provide schools for them there. But our policy is now that we help the States themselves to provide the schools for those people and take care of them. In this particular instance, you are going to have a strip of territory that will not be in any State and will have no historic position in our Federal Government. As that industry develops, crimes are going to be committed. What body of law is going to police that area with reference to the crimes committed in that area? Will they be local State laws or will they be Federal laws? Will we use Federal courts or will we use local courts? All those will be problems and many more have come up and now harass the coastal States even at this hour.

If we take out of this bill the right of the State to police that area, the right of the State to levy production taxes upon the oil and gas produced in the area, then perhaps we had better reconsider title III and withdraw title III entirely from the bill and work it out carefully and give it thought and consideration, and know down what road we are proceeding before we attempt to legislate on that matter.

Mr. Chairman, other parts of this bill worry me very much. On the Gulf coast, we have a shoreline of some 3,000 miles. Most of this shoreline is along the coasts of Florida and Texas. Only a small part of Alabama and Mississippi forms the coastline of the Gulf. Out of this 3,000 miles, some 2,300 of them form a part of Florida and Texas. Louisiana has some 200 or 300 miles of coastline. Under the terms of this bill, along the entire Gulf coast on both sides of Louisiana are States which will have a tideland of 10½ miles. Louisiana will claim to the history boundaries; but Louisiana must fight in the courts of the Nation seeking to establish this boundary beyond the 3-mile limit, and yet Louisiana is the one State which more than any other has developed the Continental Shelf and the tidelands. It is the State which because of its history and background should receive consideration. This Congress should not seek to put our State of Louisiana in any less advantageous position than surrounding States. I do not ask for application of the 3-mile rule to Texas and Florida; but I do ask that the entire Gulf be given a more even and equal treatment.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

I said yesterday, calling the attention of the Committee to the Federal Leasing Act, that I am not alarmed about the right of any State to assess a small production or severance tax on the oil. Some Members seem to be. I cannot draw the line of demarcation myself as to this area which will arise on the passage of this bill if title III is left in the bill on final passage. The outer Continental Shelf will be part of the public domain of the United States. I do not think that can be contested successfully by anybody.

I think anybody who looks at the question fairly will see that these States will have the problem of schooling and roads and many other public expenses in order to house and in order to furnish all these services to the people who are to be used to explore this area.

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. IKARD. May I ask the gentleman if the amendment is adopted, would it not lead to great chaos? It would mean that it would be possible for one developer of oil to be drilling a well where there would be no tax because the Federal Government would not assess a property tax or a severance tax or a personal-property tax on that. Would it not lead to greater confusion and chaos if that oil was moved in on the coast line on tank farms where we would immediately be in the face of the Supreme Court decisions which say that we cannot tax things that move into interstate commerce, and further would it not lead to confusion and chaos by reason of the fact that the Secretary would have the right to determine the compensation due the States for services rendered, which would lead to a continual hassle between the States and the bureaus here in Washington to determine what the value of those services were?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I think the gentleman is eminently correct. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that this is the most important part of this bill. So far as we in Texas, and I am sure other Members in other States are concerned, the important part as stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is to return to the States and to restore to them the property they rightfully own. I can certainly see nothing wrong morally or legally in permitting a State, especially where the tax is restricted to the production or severance tax, which would apply only to the driller or the lessee operating in that area and who, but for the State tax which might be allowed, would probably pay no tax as opposed to the lessee within the State boundaries who would be subject to a State tax.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I believe the gentleman from Texas stated the situation correctly when he said the primary object of this legislation is to restore to the States what the Government evidently tries to take away from you under the authority of the Supreme Court decisions, and when you pull away from or defy this amendment, are you not furthering the purpose of this legislation? And are you not by supporting it injecting into this very important piece of legislation collateral matters which are incidental to what is going to happen after you have gotten the law adopted and in force?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I think not.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I think you are jeopardizing the whole situation.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I think not. I think a man can certainly support an amendment which he thinks is right, aside from the principal object of the bill, that is what I am doing in this instance. I think the State should have the right to charge a reasonable tax, a severance tax, and I think certainly a chaotic condition would result unless the coastal States and the Great Lakes States have the police power and the power to control it and put their criminal and civil laws in effect in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said about this bill. It seems to me we have discussed this matter fully this session. On two other occasions we discussed the bill fully. I am convinced that every argument made pro and con on this measure has been advanced during the general discussion on the bill, and whatever I say will to some extent be a repetition or reiteration.

The duly and elected representatives of the people of this Nation have on a number of occasions passed on the principles and provisions of this bill. The House on 2 of 3 occasions has evidenced its approval of this bill by an overwhelming majority. The Senate has also adopted this measure on two occasions. Although both the House and the Senate passed this legislation, there was an occupant of the White House that vetoed the measure when it reached him. It is my opinion that if the present occupant of the White House had been President when this legislation was passed by the Congress that it would today be the law of the land.

Not only have the Members of the Congress, as representatives of the people, heretofore passed this legislation but the voters of this Nation in 1952 overwhelmingly endorsed this legislation.

The tidelands oil question became one of the early issues of the presidential campaign in 1952. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, when he was commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, indicated from his Paris headquarters that if he were chosen as GOP candidate and elected President he would turn the offshore oil lands back to the States where it belonged.

Whereas Gov. Adlai Stevenson stood for Federal ownership of the submerged lands and so advised Governor Shivers, of the State of Texas. During

the campaign this issue was made prominent, and the position of the 2 candidates was well understood by the voters of this Nation when they went to the polls in November 1952. Therefore, I contend that the people of this Nation gave their approval and endorsement to the principles that the submerged lands and the natural resources therein within their respective historic boundaries belonged to the States and not to the Federal Government.

This tidelands oil question, or issue, I am quite sure influenced the democratic State of Florida, and the democratic States of Texas, as well as the States of Louisiana and California to give General Eisenhower such outstanding support and these are the States that are particularly interested in the tidelands issue.

Mr. Chairman, there are 2 or 3 principal reasons why I support this legislation. The first reason is that I conceive this to be a question of States rights, which has been discussed fully during this debate; and, second, that this legislation is just, it is equitable, and it is right that the States should have title to the submerged lands within the State's historic boundary. It will be noted that this bill relates to offshore lands beyond the 3-mile limit in only two cases, to wit: The west coast of Florida and the coast of Texas, both of which States have under their constitution boundaries extending 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico, otherwise known as offshore lands, and the bill is confined to those lands which extend out to the 3-mile limit.

The question as to the title to the tidelands within the 3-mile limit of the historic boundary State lines was never raised or disputed until about the year of 1937. The Federal Government, as well as the State governments, recognized the title as being in the coastal States. The Supreme Court, on a number of occasions, held the title to be in the various States. The man most responsible for raising this question and causing all of this disturbance was the then Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes. In 1933 the Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, took the position that the Federal Government could not issue prospecting permits or leases for submerged coastal lands and at that time he said:

> Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

In effect he said tidelands oil belonged to the States.

However, in 1937 there was discovered at Wilmington-Long Beach an oil field off California. And at that time Mr. Ickes reversed his position and a Federal move was begun to have the California deposit claimed as a naval oil reserve and in 1945 the Attorney General filed a test suit in an effort to establish Federal title to the offshore oil deposits and to prevent a California oil company from extracting offshore oil under a State law. In 1947 the Supreme Court ruled that the marginal sea off California belonged to the Federal Government or that the Federal Government had a paramount right thereto. Surely it is not right, just, or equitable for the Federal Government to come in after 150 years of recognized ownership in the States and claim ownership or paramount right to the submerged areas within the boundaries of the maritime States. Not only frequent judicial rulings but administrative rulings of the various Federal agencies covering some 150 years of time between formation of the Union and the date that the suit was filed by the Federal Government claiming title to the lands, the title thereto had been recognized as being in the States.

Certainly the principle of equitable estoppel should be invoked to prevent the Federal Government from encroaching upon the States' rights of ownership of such tidelands. A recognition on the part of the Federal Government as well as the State government for a period of 150 years should certainly establish title to the submerged marginal lands in the States.

Before concluding my remarks I desire to pay tribute to my colleague, Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, the senior Senator from Florida, for his untiring, energetic, and constructive work done in connection with this legislation. No one in this Congress has fought more gallantly, and with more determination and sincerity in securing the passage of this legislation than this able and distinguished Senator from Florida. He certainly has fought a noble and faithful fight as the introducer of the legislation in the upper House.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have here a resolution of the Massachusetts State Legislature in favor of this type of legislation which I want to read to the committee:

EXTRACTS FROM RESOLUTION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE OF MARCH 18, 1948

Whereas by the Declaration of Independence, in July 1776, Massachusetts and the several colonies asserted their character as free and independent States; and

Whereas the Treaty of Peace with Great Britain in 1783 acknowledged the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the several States "to be free, sovereign, and independent States" and relinquished "all claims to the Government, propriety, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof";

Whereas by the Constitution of the United States, the several States reserved to the States their sovereignty and ownership to those lands within their boundaries; and

Whereas since the founding of the Republic, the several States have been uniformly recognized as the owners of coastal lands and lands covered by the marginal sea within their respective boundaries; and

Whereas in its recent opinion in the case of *United States* v. *California* the Supreme Court of the United States declared, that the Federal Government had a paramount right to all of the resources, under California's marginal sea, without regard to or settling the question of ownership of the lands involved; and

Whereas the doctrine of the case of *United States* v. *California*, constitutes a direct threat to all ownership of minerals and other resources, public and private; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has stated publicly before a joint hearing by a committee of the Congress that he intends to file suit against other littoral States; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a littoral State and title to its shores and soils under the marginal sea is presently in danger of being taken from the Commonwealth; and

Whereas there are now pending before the Congress of the United States S. 1988,[1] and similar bills, the purpose of which is to confirm in the several States title to these lands and resources in and beneath the navigable waters within State boundaries; and

Whereas such bills have the active support of 46 Governors and 44 attorneys general, representatives of the several States; and

Resolved, That the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts approves the action of its Governor and its attorney general and their official representatives with regard to their support of S. 1988 in the joint hearings by the Senate and House Committees of the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts petitions the Congress to pass immediately S. 1988 or other suitable legislation to forever quiet the titles of the several States to submerged lands under the marginal sea and inland navigable waters within their respective boundaries and to all resources in and under said lands; and be it further

Resolved, That the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts petitions its Representatives and Senators in the Congress of the United States to vote for and actively participate in the enactment of S. 1988 or similar legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request to see if we can agree on a limitation of time for debate on the balance of the bill.

I understand there are two amendments to be offered to the bill, one by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the other by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 4:30.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if 20 minutes of the time can be devoted to a consideration of my amendment I will not object.

Mr. HALLECK. I will include that in my request and modify my request accordingly.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close at 4:30, 20 minutes of the time to be devoted to a discussion of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, and 10 minutes to the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how will the time be divided? I would like to get some time, I am not on the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state that a list of the names have been taken of those Members standing and the time will be divided according to the unanimous-consent request equally between Members speaking on the two amendments.

[1] Of 1948.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how will that time be divided among Members on either side?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understood the unanimous-consent request to state there would be 20 minutes, to be devoted to my amendment, and 10 minutes to the other amendment. I understood I would be allowed 5 minutes to present it out of the 20 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. If your amendment is to strike out title 3, someone on this side must have time to answer it.

Mr. WILLIS. That is what it is.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then we will answer.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the Committee of the Whole, is there any power lodged to take away from the Chair the inherent right of recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. The unanimous-consent request would be an invasion of that right by stating 20 minutes and 10 minutes. I am simply trying to protect the right of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The unanimous-consent request was to limit the time, the time to be in the hands of the Chair.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. How will the 20 minutes be divided between the Members and how will the 10 minutes be divided?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks we better proceed with only one amendment at a time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request for the present.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIS: On page 11, starting with line 21, strike out title III and all of the ensuing language thereafter down to and including line 14 on page 27; and on page 27, line 15, strike out section 18 and insert in lieu thereof section 8; and on page 27, line 19, strike out section 19 and insert section 9; and on page 27, line 22, strike out section 20 and insert section 10.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think we ought to have some indication of how many want to speak on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Louisiana will have 5 minutes, 5 minutes will be reserved for the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the balance of the time will be divided among those standing, namely, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana, Mr. CELLER of New York, Mr. FEIGHAN of Ohio, and Mr. WILSON of Texas.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike out title III of the bill or that portion thereof dealing with the outer Continental Shelf. Please do not get in your mind that the primary purpose of this amendment is the defeat of the tax amendment a while ago.

Here is what I envisage: All of the tidelands bills heretofore offered by friends of tidelands covering and affecting the outer Continental Shelf contemplated the application of the police power and State laws of the States adjoining thereto. All of the hearings were directed in that direction and no consideration was given to what would happen if that police power provision were stricken from the bill.

In the absence of the police power and the clear application of State laws, here is what is going to happen: In my judgment, you are going to have chaos with regard to the outer Continental Shelf because there will be no general body of laws clearly applying to the relationships between persons and corporations, and so forth, and governing property rights and so on. You must understand that the Federal courts have limited jurisdiction. The Federal courts have no jurisdiction over common-law crimes. The Federal courts have no general jurisdiction over civil laws. The Federal courts have limited jurisdiction, particularly when there is diversity of citizenship and where the amount in controversy is over $3,000. Generally, therefore, you cannot enforce contracts before the Federal courts because of the limited jurisdiction. The Federal courts have no power to administer State workmen's compensation laws.

Suppose a crime is committed on the Continental Shelf, say murder or arson, it would be doubtful whether the criminal could be prosecuted because the law of the place where the crime is committed applies. Now, if the police powers of the States are not made to apply then he cannot be tried before the State courts, and you cannot go before the Federal courts because they have no criminal jurisdiction. You could not try him later on or pass an act of Congress later on because you cannot have ex post facto laws. Suppose someone is hurt there while working? What are you going to do about workmen's compensation laws? If the laws of the State are not extended, you will not be able to give any relief. Suppose you have to have service of process over there. The local sheriffs in Texas or Louisiana cannot go over there and serve papers under laws as they presently are written, nor can you use the Federal marshal to serve State court papers. And, most important, you are not going to have the application of the general body of State conservation laws that my good friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], dwelt on a while ago. We have conservation laws that have been developed over a period of many, many years. Those laws have to do with the spacing of oil wells, utilization, waste, and all other conservation administrative procedures. For instance, when oil is found inland or in the historic limits of the State, then the local laws will apply; but if oil is found in the Continental Shelf, then you will not have any conservation laws made to apply, at least not specifically made to apply by this bill. Perhaps wells drilled within the historic limits will have a limitation of production of perhaps 300 barrels a day or 100 barrels a day, depending upon the State law, but as to the producing wells in the outer Continental Shelf you would have no laws clearly applicable. So chaos could well result in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in the time that I have I want to make the plea that we strike out title III of this particular act. I do that on the basis that I do not believe the whole proposition has been carefully and thoroughly thought out. As my colleagues have already said, they have sought to present to you the chaos that will naturally arise in cases of this sort where there is a great industry arising off a coastal State. That industry, as it expands, will find that it is not subject to State or local tax laws. It will find, if there is later on imposed a Federal tax law, that it is in competition with industry which produces oil and gas within a State that pays State, local, and Federal taxes. It will have the advantageous position of being immune to State and local laws as far as taxes are concerned. It will present so many problems that we have not thought out at the present time that I think we can well afford to strike out title III and give it more thought and more consideration, and then come back with a bill well thought out and well defined to present this entire problem before us.

So, Mr. Chairman, I make this plea that we do strike out title III, and then go ahead and enact a bill without title III and come back at a later date with a better program in reference to title III.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to review the legislative history of this particular section. As far as I can ascertain, the first bill was passed in 1946. That bill contained no section 3. The gentleman from Indiana corrected me a moment ago and pointed out that the bill in 1948 had no section 3. Apparently, the only section 3 was contained in the Walter bill which passed in 1951. That bill spelled out the taxing power and State participation. In the meantime, the other body was legislating and reported the Holland bill, which contained no section 3.

I am quite certain the reason that section has not been included is because of the very good and valid reasons advanced by my colleagues from Louisiana

[Mr. WILLIS and Mr. BROOKS]. I think it would be a mistake to legislate on this subject involving police power, local law, conservation statutes, taxing authority, and civil and criminal administration, without a thorough understanding of what we are doing and unless there were State participation

After all, all over the continental United States of America we have dual sovereignty. State sovereignty and Federal sovereignty are coextensive. I do not know of any situation anywhere within the United States of America where you have Federal sovereignty without State sovereignty. We are creating here today in section 3 a new concept of law, "Federaloceania," I guess you might call it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

The enactment of title 3 is highly desirable notwithstanding the fact that it is a part of a bill which gives away the mineral resources of the United States situated within the traditional State boundaries. The reason for this is the fact that there are presently located on the Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries along the coasts of Louisiana and Texas, numerous producing oil fields, and many additional areas which are likely to become important sources of oil production. It is in the interest of national defense and the general welfare of the country as a whole that these Continental Shelf areas be developed at the earliest possible time. Title 3 would permit not only a continuation of existing oil and gas production on the Continental Shelf beyond State boundaries, but also the immediate initiation of new production, all under the control and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. So, while I am opposed to that portion of the proposed legislation which would grant the marginal sea to adjacent coastal States, I heartily endorse the provisions which would authorize Federal control and management of mineral development on the Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries.

In the event that some legislation such as title 3 is not enacted at this time, existing development may, of course, be continued under the authority exercised by the President in his proclamation and Executive order of September 1945. But those actions relate merely to existing developments heretofore initiated. In order that new and additional development may take place on the shelf, the Congress should, at the earliest time, provide appropriate legislative authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] to close the debate on this amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS], a member of the subcommittee, will speak for the committee.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must oppose the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS]. His work on this legislation, which has long been before this body, has been extremely valuable to the Congress, and he has been among those in the forefront of the fight to restore this area within the historic State boundaries to the States.

I must oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] as the committee sponsoring the legislation opposes it, because I fear that if we leave this question of administration of the area beyond the historical boundaries into the Continental Shelf open we are going to create all kinds of problems, problems which will seriously affect the sovereignty of the United States in that area, problems which may very well hinder the development of the natural resources in that area.

In the course of the committee hearings on this question the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Brownell, and the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, appearing before our committee urged that this legislation be so-called one-package legislation, that it be legislation in which we not only restore ownership to the States within the historical boundaries but in which we also provide a means by which the area beyond the boundaries could be leased and administered by the Federal Government. Title 3 does that job. Incidentally, too, the basic provisions of title 3 contained in this bill providing for the leasing or administration of the area beyond the State boundaries are practically the same as were contained in the Walter bill which passed the House in the previous Congress. So for the reasons which I have mentioned, particularly because I am one of those who has long supported State ownership of submerged lands within their boundaries, I say that striking out title 3 from the bill jeopardizes the possibilities of deciding this important question once and for all. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana) there were—ayes 12, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I simply feel that the record should be made clear by calling attention to the fact that in view of the adoption by the committee of the amendment on page 12 changing the wording of section 8, it will be necessary in my judgment to amend the wording on page 19, line 22, after the word "royalties" by adding the words "together with a sum as additional royalty equal to any severance tax charged by an abutting State.

I do not propose to offer such an amendment at this time because the hour is late, and an effort is being made to complete the consideration of the measure this evening, but it is important that those who take the bill to conference with the other body bear in mind that in the provision relating to the exchange of existing State leases dealt with in section 10, in order to make that fair and in order to prevent a windfall to the holders of State leases, it will be necessary to make this change in conformity with the action taken already with regard to the elimination of power to the States to tax in the outer Continental Shelf. I simply make that statement for the record in order that there may be no misunderstanding about it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDMONDSON: On page 10, line 14, after the word "Indians", insert "As a further reservation to the grant of title in section 3, the United States hereby reserves a one-tenth mineral interest in the oil and gas resources found in all lands beneath navigable waters as defined in paragraph 2 of subsection A of section 2 of this act, said reservation of interest to be known as the American Indian education and rehabilitation royalty rights. This reservation is made in recognition of uncompensated, historic rights of the American Indian to the shore lands of the United States."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes after the time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, is there a Member of Congress, in this greatest assembly hall of the civilized world today, who can—in good conscience—call our debt to the American Indian paid in full?

Is there a man or woman, in this body, who can read the complete history of America's treatment of her Indians—the page after page of broken treaties and dishonor—with an easy conscience?

In this year of 1953, the time has long passed that we can call our Indian people—as have Members of this House in years gone by—simple savages and unhappy children of nature.

Today the American Indian supplies many leading citizens of our great Republic.

In my own State of Oklahoma, he provides a governor, several members of our supreme court, numerous members of our legislature, and many leaders of business and industry.

On the national scene, he has supplied an American Vice President, the greatest athlete of our century, our greatest ballerina, and many great artists.

There are Indian people today, living constructive and useful lives as productive citizens, in every State of the 48.

And, as our greatest paradox and America's greatest shame today, there are also thousands of American Indians living in our midst today, in relative poverty, hardship, ignorance, and want.

Official Government reports describe conditions of Indian housing in this country as generally poor and below standard, except in a few of the smaller reservation areas.

The same reports tell us of alarming rates of illiteracy, with one out of every six Indian school children between the ages of 6 and 18, out of school throughout the country. In some regions, the answer is poverty. In other regions, no school facilities.

Neglected by State and local welfare agencies, as an admitted obligation of our National Government, these forgotten red men are this century's greatest challenge to America's sense of decency, fair play, and justice.

The other day I appeared before a House appropriations subcommittee to ask for a $2 million appropriation for a minimum fund to carry on a badly needed and long-postponed program of vocational education among our American Indians.

I was told, in kindly but polite terms by the committee, that it was felt this modest request was exorbitant in its terms. The committee was sympathetic to the program, but the money was not available for it.

Yet we propose today, Mr. Chairman, to dispose of a buried coastal treasure worth several thousand times this modest amount, to dispose of American treasure to which our Indian people have a valid and provable claim which antedates the claim of any State or government on this continent.

If your measuring stick is history, I say the Indians have a claim to the tidelands, more time-honored than any State of the Union.

If your measuring stick is law, I say there are treaties with Indian tribes and nations which clearly identify all of these coastal lands as theirs, and not one of these treaties gives compensation for the tidelands.

If your measuring stick is equity, I say we have done more violence to the maxims of equity in our Indian policy than in any other field of government, and the hour is late for this Nation to invoke equity in defense of title.

Because their claim is just, because their need is great, and because public funds do not appear to be otherwise available, I have introduced this amendment, which reserves to the Nation a one-tenth mineral right, in oil and gas, beneath the tidelands, to be known as the American Indian education and rehabilitation royalty rights.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to you in all seriousness and good faith, to support this amendment and make it the foundation of a fair and effective, pay-as-you-go Indian policy by our Government.

By this amendment we give to the Indian people an opportunity and a future to become self-sufficient members of our commonwealth.

We give them nothing that was not once theirs in its entirety, and we impose no new burdens on our taxpayers in so doing.

I appeal to you to support this amendment and make the closing chapter of America's Indian policy a chronicle of equity and of honor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as one listened to the fervent and eloquent plea of the gentleman from Oklahoma no one could doubt the sincerity and honesty which he betrayed in speaking in behalf of his constituents, the Indians, many of whom are located in Oklahoma. But earlier in the day we decided that even the school children of the United States should not be participants in this fund; and we have further decided that this fund should go to the Federal Government in such way as it comes out of any tax on the outer Continental Shelf. As a consequence, if we were to begin now to attach this amendment or any other amendment we would destroy the whole force and effect of this work on which we have spent a tremendous amount of time. I personally have served for 7 years on this committee handling this matter. Great study has been put in the matter also by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] and many other Members. We have given of our time in an honest, genuine effort to decide between the Government of the United States and the respective States just what their rights shall be. It is my honest conviction that this should not be beclouded at this time by bringing in extraneous matters, no matter how honest and sincere and devoted the cause may be. We oppose this amendment and ask that it be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. EDMONDSON) there were—ayes 27, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, before the House today, is presented a proposal making possible consequences more dangerous to the welfare of the American people than anything that has been attempted during the generations of our Government's existence. The bounty of the Creator, which He has provided for the benefit of all His children is to be grabbed by a special privileged few; a very few indeed, to be used for their special advantage, instead of being enjoyed by the people as the heritage provided by God for His children. My friends, such brazen tactics, such high-handed efforts must not, and cannot, be ignored.

Having failed miserably to justify, upon the principles of ethics or sound political economy, or law, their effort to secure control of the natural resources, the special privilege seekers, in their frenzy, are now clinging to the threadbare claim that the Federal Government has not the right to determine policies as to land tenure. In short, they now try to make it appear that we have only a bare legal question to discuss.

I have not time now to quote from all the great authorities who may be cited but I shall quote briefly from Blackstone, the great commentator, who said:

It is an undeniable principle of law that all lands in England are held immediately by the King.

King meant the sovereign power of the nation. In our country the corresponding sovereign power is the Government of the United States.

The great Blackstone very well understood the principle underlying his statement. He understood well that under the feudal system the title to all of the earth within the confines of the realm was in the government itself, held in trust for the people of the nation. This, of course, did not prevent satisfactory terms of possession but did contemplate the principle that the revenue derived from the land, as such, belonged to the people as a whole, to be paid to their agency—the government. This is a just principle, which practically all peoples of civilized countries recognize. It is true that, as with the best of laws, those entrusted with power of administering government disregarded the wise purpose of the law and abused their power, but that did not change the real virtue of the principle.

One of the first tasks assigned to me as a lawyer just admitted to the bar was an examination of a complete abstract of title to property in suburban Cleveland. The first item in that abstract was in the following language:

England claimed the North American Continent by virtue of the voyages by John and Sebastian Cabot.

Under international law that gave England a valid claim. The common law of England then became the common law of the United States, including the principle of tenure prevailing in England. Wherever this principle of law was recognized it was a sovereign power, not a mere province or a satrapy, that had the authority to determine policies involving land tenure and its conditions. While the Government of England and other governments holding to the same principle did, of course, lease on appropriate terms parts of the domain under its jurisdiction, nevertheless, the final authority to determine the policies as to general use was always vested in and continued in the sovereign power—and so it is in our country.

Thomas Jefferson said:

It seems * * * to be a principle of universal law that the lands of a country belong to its sovereign as trustee for the Nation. (Batture case V III (1812).)

Williams on real property says:

The first thing the student has to do is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership. No man in law is absolute owner of his lands but only holds estate in them.

P. E. Dove, in his basic and scholarly work entitled "The Theory of Human Progression," says:

At page 307:

No truth can be more absolutely certain as an intuitive proposition of the reason, than that "an object is the property of its creator"; and we maintain that creation is the only means by which an individual right to property can be generated. Consequently as no individual and no generation is the creator of the substantive earth, it belongs equally to all the existing inhabitants. That is, no individual has a special claim to more than another.

At page 245:

The radical evil, the grand masterpiece of mischief, that requires to be corrected, is the alienation of the soil from the nation, and the taxation of the labor of the country.

The bill, H. R. 4198, now pending before us, if enacted, will make it possible for a handful of special privilege seekers, erroneously in their distress, talking about States rights, to secure for a mere trifle the benefits to be derived from the

resources provided by the Creator for the use of all the people.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled, not 1 but 3 times, that title to these submerged lands does not belong to those States. First in 1947, in the California case and twice in 1950 in the Texas and Louisiana cases, the Court held that the submerged lands and mineral resources under the marginal sea off the coast of the United States are lands and resources of the United States and that the various coastal States do not have and never did have any title to or property interest in such lands or resources.

In the California case—Three Hundred and Thirty-second United States Reports, page 19—the Supreme Court said:

> We decide * * * that California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast and that the Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil.

In the Louisiana case—Three Hundred and Thirty-ninth United States Reports, page 699—and in the Texas case—Three Hundred and Thirty-ninth United States Reports, page 707—the Court held that its decision in the California case is controlling in these cases.

The Supreme Court held that, because of its constitutional responsibility to defend the offshore submerged lands, and its obligation to conduct foreign relations with respect to them, the United States is possessed of full dominion and power over and paramount rights in such lands and their resources.

Underneath the submerged lands along the California, Louisiana, and Texas coasts are an estimated 15 billion barrels of oil. This oil is worth more than $40 billion. No single State or States should be allowed to usurp the title to this treasure which the Supreme Court has said belongs to all the people of our country.

In the 79th Congress and again in the 82d Congress bills were passed which would have given title to these submerged lands to the adjoining States. Both of these bills were vetoed by President Truman. In his first veto message in 1947, before the Supreme Court decision in the California case was rendered, the President stated in part:

> The ownership of the vast quantity of oil in such areas presents a vital problem to the Nation from the standpoint of national defense and conservation. If the Supreme Court decides that the United States has no title or interest in the lands, a quitclaim from the Congress is not necessary.

In the second veto message on Senate Joint Resolution 20, 82d Congress, the President stated that the question of ownership of the submerged lands had already been decided by the Supreme Court. The Court had stated on three different occasions that the coastal States did not have title to the submerged lands on the Continental Shelf.

In a speech prepared for delivery to the Americans for Democratic Action on May 17, 1952, President Truman referred to the quitclaim bill—Senate Joint Resolution 20, 82d Congress—as "robbery in broad daylight—and on a colossal scale."

Now before the House today we have a third attempt to pass a bill for a quitclaim and to reverse the three decisions of the United States Supreme Court.

This bill, H. R. 4198, proposes to yield to the State of California all submerged lands lying between the low-water mark and the 3-mile limit offshore. Other States are yielded all submerged lands lying within their so-called historical boundaries. In the case of Texas, it is a belt of land extending 10½ miles from the low-water mark. In the case of Louisiana, this belt may be anywhere between 3 to 27 miles offshore, depending upon legal interpretation. Furthermore, the bill proposes to give to the States policing and taxing power over the submerged lands beyond their historical boundaries.

The enactment of this legislation may create a dangerous precedent for surrendering to private interests, through State governments, title to all our natural resources.

From the American Government, representing all the American people, were derived the titles to all the privately owned lands and their natural resources within the territorial limits of the United States. Since the United States is the source of all ownership of land and its resources within its territorial limits, it is then by every principle of logic and justice the proper authority to regulate the use and terms for the use of land and its resources when necessary.

Since the submerged lands underneath the Continental Shelf and their natural resources belong to all the people of the United States, they should be used for the welfare and security of all our citizens and not just a few. The proceeds from the sale of this valuable oil and other resources contained in the submerged lands should be applied to relieve the tax burdens of all the people of the United States.

My friends, it is outrageous even to propose to give away our national heritage, belonging to some 158 million people, to a few people of 3 States with only 14 percent of our total population.

Members of the House of Representatives, the anger of the American people will rise to harass those who have been subservient to the minions of special privilege, who for years have been skulking in the shadows of the Capitol, frantically striving to secure for their masters the wealth-producing resources which they so eagerly covet.

Today we must say whether or not the birthright of the American people is to be surrendered to special-privilege seekers without even the trifling price named in the Bible as a mess of pottage. Shall we not rather as protectors of God's heritage to our children and children's children, bravely face special privilege in its worst form—oil and gas interests of mammoth proportions. Surely, we will not surrender weakly. No, on the contrary, let there resound over all the earth, to generations yet unborn, the message: "We have not failed you. Here, today, as trustees of the benefits provided for you by the Creator, we have boldly defied the enemy and have struggled faithfully for the sacred cause of justice."

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I again address myself to a subject on which I have spoken in this Chamber several times. My reference is to the subject concerning what is commonly called the tidelands bill. As is and has been the case so many times in the past few years, this piece of legislation has fallen victim to a popular name that is a misnomer. This has resulted in considerable confusion, not only on the floor of Congress but in the minds of many people in this country who are unfamiliar with the background of the problem and who must depend upon hearsay for their information. The bill should be called the State boundary bill. It occurs to me that, in view of the ambiguities and the resulting confusion, it is the duty of someone to simplify this matter so that the crux of the situation can be made apparent. I sincerely wish that I had the mind of Thomas Jefferson and the tongue of Daniel Webster as tools with which to carry out this purpose. However, since God did not see fit to endow me with such outstanding qualities, I beg you to bear with me in a presentation of this most important issue, which I shall do to the best of my limited ability. In the first instance, the Congress should not be concerned in the consideration of this legislation with the question of oil or no oil underlying the territory in controversy. The existence of oil or other minerals under a piece of land does not make it less the property of the rightful owner, nor does the absence of riches in land more firmly secure the title of the owner. The sole basic question involved in this legislation concerns a boundary dispute and nothing more. The many other incidental issues that have been injected into the debate have served only to confuse and becloud. They cannot and will not settle the primary issue. Each and every one of these incidental matters can be treated separate and apart, and it is my opinion that if they are being used for the purpose of blinding the Members of this Congress to the problem at hand they should be settled separate and apart. However, I do not challenge the sincerity of those who have raised these incidental and ancillary matters, and I firmly believe that all matters concerning this question should be settled in one piece of legislation. But I beg you to take first things first and to treat the basic problem before you move out into the different tangents and facets that can be subsequently created.

Actually, the problem should never have arisen, and would not have had it not been for the greed of a small handful of power-hungry politicians coupled with a far-reaching and unprecedented decision of the Supreme Court, a decision that in effect changes the United States from a country made up of the several States, each having its own gov-

ernment and constituting an integral part of the whole, and supplanting therefor a nationwide political philosophy that presupposes a centralized government and erases State boundaries. The submerged lands that have been placed in controversy are either a part of the State which is located adjacent to the sea, or they are not owned by anyone. Certainly, it could not be logically argued that the submerged lands in Texas are actually a part of Iowa, Colorado, Montana, or any other inland State. The opponents might argue that the submerged lands are a part of the public domain of the Federal Government. In answer to this, I ask these opponents, Where did the Federal Government get title and by what procedure? Has our Federal Government exercised the power of a sovereign nation, moved into these lands as unclaimed lands, and asserted the right of sovereignty over them as against all other nations?. Or have they acquired these lands by recognized legal procedures from the States of which they are a part? The answer to both questions is obviously "No." The opponents of the bill have argued in the debate that the title to these lands does not rest in the Federal Government. They then immediately make the conclusive assertion that the title to these lands does not rest in any of the States claiming them. If this is to be followed out to its logical conclusion, I ask these opponents to answer this question: "Where does the title rest?"

Is it the contention of the opponents that title to these lands hangs in midair, that it is an unclaimed portion of the earth, subject to the sovereign claims of the first nation asserting such a claim? Or do they claim that this land is a part of the open sea and subject to international law? They must choose if the problem is ever to be settled either as a domestic issue or an international issue. If they deny the ownership in the respective States adjacent to the ocean, they are opening the door to international complications and international problems, which they claim to be attempting to avoid. The entire matter goes back to one question. Since I am from Texas, I shall undertake to use Texas as an example. The question to be answered is simply this: When Texas was admitted to the United States, what was it that came into the United States? Are the opponents taking the position that only dry land came into the United States and that Texas lost a strip three leagues wide across her southern boundary when she accepted statehood? If so, to whom did these lands pass and by what medium were they transferred? The opponents say that title does not rest in the Federal Government and they also say that it does not rest in the States. Again I say, to whom did this title pass? No one will deny that when Texas obtained her independence from Mexico and became a sovereign nation, she had the power and exercised the power to fix her boundaries. Those boundaries on the southern side were fixed at three leagues in the Gulf of Mexico.

The Supreme Court does not say that title passed to the Federal Government. In fact, the Supreme Court's decision states that title is not vested in the Federal Government, but that the Federal Government has certain paramount rights which find their source in a coalition of the dominium and imperium. The Court admits that prior to Texas' entry into the Union she had both dominium — ownership or proprietary rights — and imperium — governmental powers of regulation and control. Texas admits that by her entry into the Union she did surrender imperium to the Federal Government, which is in effect the paramount power of the United States to control navigable waters for purposes of navigation in interstate and foreign commerce and for the defense of this Nation as a whole. However, dominium was not surrendered to the United States, and in order for the Supreme Court to reach the strange conclusion that it did reach in the Texas case, it had to beg the question concerning dominium and resort to what is termed the "equal footing" clause in the Constitution. The Supreme Court specifically admitted that the equal-footing clause had long been held to refer to political rights and to sovereignty, and then proceeded to extend the meaning of this clause to include proprietary rights. By its application as so extended, it then proceeded to strip Texas of a part of its property, to change its seaward boundary, and to lessen the area of Texas that actually came into the United States. To carry such an application of the equal-footing clause to its logical conclusion would be to reach the conclusion that there must be a complete resurvey of the United States made as to all States that came in on an equal footing so that those States would not only be on an equal footing, insofar as political rights and sovereignty were concerned, but that they must be composed of the same identical number of acres of land. The Supreme Court by this process of mixing dominium, imperium, and equal footing created a legal theory that does violence to all the basic principles of real-property law from the Code of Hammurabi to present-day decisions of our State and Federal courts.

Plainly and simply the treatment of the problem does not require complex theories and involved legal doctrines. It requires only the application of basic law of real property as it applies to boundaries. The other matters that have been injected into this debate are matters that would be proper subjects of legislation regardless of who owned the submerged lands. The primary question before this Congress is whether or not the Federal Government can summarily preempt the land of a State. If we in this country are ready to underwrite such a doctrine, God alone can save our Union. Either Texas is as large today as when it entered the Union, else the Federal Government has summarily preempted a strip of State land from the mouth of the Sabine to the Rio Grande 10½ miles wide.

It is the bounden duty of this Congress to unequivocally repudiate such a dangerous doctrine and to finally and definitely quiet the title of these submerged lands in their rightful owners, the States of which they are a part, and to forever end this controversy that was conceived in greed, born of political power, and nursed by prejudice.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against H. R. 4198, the bill to transfer submerged lands seaward of low tidewater mark from the United States to certain coastal States. I voted against similar legislation, H. R. 4484, in the 82d Congress, 2 years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I have no illusions. The bill will pass and become law. The vote in the House on similar legislation 2 years ago was 265 to 109. In the Senate the vote was 50 to 35. President Eisenhower will probably sign the bill. Nevertheless, I think this is bad legislation on principle and cannot give it my support.

My views are on the record as follows: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 7, page 9175; part 14, pages A5070–A5071; volume 98, part 4, pages 5249–5250; and March 30, 1953, pages 2490 through 2497. My views are also expressed in the printed hearings on the bill, and in House Report No. 215 on H. R. 4198, pages 122 and 123.

Mr. Chairman, there has been confusion in the public discussion of this legislation. For this reason, I set forth what the bill is and what it is not, as it appears to me.

First. The bill is a reversal of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In three cases between the United States and the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana the Supreme Court has, as I interpret its holdings, decided that the lands in question, and the oil therein, belong not to the individual States, but to the United States. Yet H. R. 4198 purports in its title "To confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf."

In title II, section 3 of the bill the United States confirms and vests title to the submerged lands in the States.

It is my position that the Congress does not under our Constitution possess the judicial power to determine controversies of this character.

The Constitution, article III, vests the judicial power of the United States "in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

The Supreme Court, article III, section 2, possesses original jurisdiction in all cases "in which a State shall be a party."

The Congress does not possess the power to reverse a judicial decision of the Supreme Court as such. However, the Congress does possess the power to alter

the law within the field of legislative authority granted it in the Constitution. Such change of the law must, however, operate in the future, since the Congress may not enact ex post facto laws—article I, section 9 of the Constitution. Furthermore, the Congress may not alter the Constitution. Changes in international law are commonly made through the treaty-making power, a much different procedure than the enactment of a statute.

The fact that the Supreme Court may be in error, or that we disagree with the Court does not alter the power of the Court or the power of the Congress. The power of a tribunal to decide controversies includes the power to decide them wrong. The finality of the authority of the Supreme Court in exercising the judicial power of the United States does not attach only in those cases where the Supreme Court is right.

I express no opinion on the correctness of the decision of the Supreme Court in the submerged-land litigation. As I view it, it is immaterial what decision I would have arrived at had I been a member of the Court. Frequently, I have been unable to agree with the findings and the logic of judicial decisions. Nevertheless, court decisions, even though erroneous, must be respected.

I do not believe the Congress has the power, under the Constitution to reverse a judicial decision of the Supreme Court. However, if the Congress does possess such power, I do not believe it should be exercised. The Congress is not equipped to consider litigation and hand down judicial decisions. Furthermore, under our doctrine of separation of powers—so important as a safeguard against tyranny—the prerogatives of a coordinate branch of the Government should be respected, perhaps most of all in situations where its action has been unpopular.

Second. The bill is a donation of Federal lands. I have never questioned the power of the Congress to transfer the public domain—article IV, section 3 of the Constitution. As a matter of policy, I do not believe it can be justified. National wealth belongs to all the American people. It should not be transferred to the States or any special group of citizens, at the expense of the rest. It is estimated that the oil alone in the submerged lands here involved is worth in excess of $40 billion. What else, in valuable minerals, lies beneath the sea in these lands, no one knows. Whether the mind of man can devise ways of exploiting these valuable deposits, if they exist, is likewise unknown.

Third. It is asserted that inland waters such as the Great Lakes are affected by the Supreme Court decisions in the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases. I am satisfied that this is not the situation; that no claim is made to the lands under the Great Lakes, and the title of the States to such lands is clearly settled by Supreme Court decisions. In *Illinois Central Railroad* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. Rept. 387, 435), the Supreme Court held that the lands covered by fresh water in the Great Lakes are of the same character as lands covered by the tidewaters, and that ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over such lands belong the the respective States within which they are found. In the California, Texas, and Louisiana decisions there was no controversy or question that the lands covered by the ebb and flow of the tide belonged to the States. The question arose only with respect to lands seaward of low-water mark.

Fourth. In my judgment, the question of States rights or State sovereignty is not involved in this dispute. I do not regard the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases, however erroneous they may be, as being an encroachment upon the sovereignty of the States. My vote against H. R. 4198 should not be construed as approval of any policy of Federal encroachment upon the rights of States or their sovereignty. I made this clear in a statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 4, pages 5249–5250. My position with respect to preservation of the rights and sovereignties of States is made clear in the following portion of that statement, which I quote:

> I wish to serve notice on my ambitious, empire-building bureaucrats that efforts on their part to employ the tidelands decisions of the Supreme Court as a means of breaking down the sovereignty of States for the aggrandisement of the Federal Government will be met with the most effective and relentless resistance of which I am capable.
>
> Although Members of the Congress are officials of the Federal Government, they should consistently and continuously seek to protect State and local governments from the usurpations of the huge and ambitious bureaucratic monster we have permitted to grow so rapidly in our Nation's Capital. I have sometimes been critical of the inactivity and apparent indifference of officials in State and local governments when demands have arisen for new and unusual public services. I have been extremely critical of those who continually turn to Washington for handouts when frequently the services they seek could be better performed and at a lower cost in their own localities. State and local governments and the people, in my opinion, have not been as jealous as they should have been of the power and authority of the local governments and have not resisted vigorously enough the appealing, sugar-coated blandishments of the Washington Santa Claus.
>
> The equilibrium between the Federal and the State sovereignties must be maintained. As I viewed it, that question was not presented in the bill before the Congress. When it is presented, my vote and my efforts will be directed toward the maintenance of the political system so wisely conceived by our Founding Fathers.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to all Members of the House who have assisted in the passage of tidelands legislation. As a member of the committee handling the legislation, I want to express my special appreciation to each and every member of the Texas delegation. Each of the other Members of the House from our State, 21 in number, has worked diligently in supporting me and the cause of Texas in the fight for our Texas tidelands. As the spokesman on the legislation for our delegation, I have done my best in behalf of our State. It was the feeling of our delegation that it would not be good strategy for all 22 Members from Texas to take the time of the House in prolonging the discussion and delaying the vote on this measure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before the House supports one of the fundamental concepts of our American Government. It emphasizes perhaps more than any other issue during the last 50 years the intent of the founders of this Republic to recognize, preserve, and maintain the individual sovereignties of the several States. It is to be regretted that the necessity for this legislation has presented itself; it is no less imperative that this bill be enacted into law, reaffirming title to the States to lands which have historically been theirs.

In my opinion, there is but one issue involved: The philosophy of States' rights as set out in the Constitution of the United States, and specifically defined in the several treaties and contractual agreements with the States at the time of their admission to the Union.

Except for the Louisiana, Texas, and California cases which make this legislation necessary, the Supreme Court has recognized in its precedents through the years, State ownership of the lands in question. This had been accepted by the courts, the Congress, and by the public until the recent decisions in which the Supreme Court did a complete about-face and confiscated these lands for Federal use.

The trend toward centralization of authority and increased Federal power seems to have gained such momentum that it has invaded the inner chambers of our highest court, prevailing upon it to disregard legal precedent in favor of Federal aggrandizement. It is not a happy situation the Congress must act to right obvious errors of the courts; nor is it the usual role of Congress to supplant the Court as defender of the Constitution. Here, thought, an aroused public is demanding protection for the constitutional prerogatives of the States, and Congress appears to be its only avenue of relief.

As a practical matter, the question is presented today whether Congress will sanction Federal confiscation of 85 million acres of land from its legal and rightful owners, the States.

Historically, the boundaries of each State bordering the sea or the Great Lakes extended 3 miles beyond the coast line, except for the few States wherein—by treaty agreement at the time of admittance to the Union—the boundaries should extend beyond that limit. It has already been pointed out in this debate that no less than 53 Supreme Court decisions have confirmed these historical boundaries.

Since the production of tidelands oil became a reality, the Supreme Court has reversed its previous decisions to hold that the Federal Government has paramount rights over the minerals in these areas, under authority of supreme defense powers. If these decisions are permitted to stand, it is inconceivable to what extent the Supreme Court might authorize the Federal Government to take over land and property under the pretext of having supreme defense powers. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that—should this bill be defeated and the decision in the tidelands cases remain in effect—the property rights of every State and every individual would be subordinated to that of the Federal Government.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution makes this legislation an obvious necessity. In the face of the fifty-odd previous court decisions establishing the historic boundaries of the States, and in the absence of any legislation or Constitutional amendments vesting title to such lands in the Federal Government, one is constrained to wonder what kind of judicial reasoning could have prompted the California, Texas, and Louisiana decisions. Obviously, they fly in the face of the 10th amendment and the guaranties of sovereignty to the States.

As others have shown here, the Federal Government has never been in possession of these lands within the 3-mile limit; nor can they now take possession and make use of those beyond the 3-mile limits in the absence of specific authorization by Congress. It is imperative that Congress act under the legislation now before us to clear once for all the title to all submerged lands in question, clouded by the Supreme Court's determination that the Federal Government has paramount rights—however that term might be defined.

In a letter dated December 22, 1933, the then Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Harold Ickes, wrote Mr. Olin S. Proctor, a Federal lease applicant in California, that "it was a matter of settled law" that "title to the oil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California." He said, further, that the land could "not be appropriated except by authority of California." Later, Mr. Ickes abandoned this position, and joined the leftwing fringe of the New Deal to initiate the resultant confiscation of these lands by the Federal Government.

It is not unexpected that opponents of the tidelands legislation should label it as a gift to the States; or, as some of the more vehement ones might say, a "steal" by the States. Actually, the States cannot steal what is already theirs, nor can the Federal Government give to the States that which already belongs to the States.

Contrary to arguments made by some opponents of this legislation, it will increase—rather than decrease—revenues from these lands. Under present Federal law, the Secretary may issue mineral leases for the nominal sum of 50 cents per acre, and the majority of the leases thus far issued on these submerged lands by the Federal Government have been made at a rate of 25 to 50 cents per acre. It is an established fact that the States have required substantially higher considerations for the leasing of their public lands—some leasing for as much as $20 an acre. This fact in itself should nullify some of the arguments, at least, advanced by opponents of the measure that it advances the interests of the so-called oil lobby.

The measure presently before us contains authority for leasing by the Federal Government of lands between the 3-mile historical boundary and the edge of the Continental Shelf. In the absence of this legislation, such authority does not now rest with the Federal Government. Submerged lands of the Continental Shelf total about 237,000 square miles, of which only 26,000 is within the 3-mile limit. This means that less than one-tenth of these lands are within the historic State boundaries confirmed by this legislation; certainly, this could not be considered a "steal" on the part of the States. Even under this legislation the Federal Government is given a lion's share of these submerged lands—more than 90 percent.

While oil might have been the spark that touched off the so-called "tidelands" controversy, it is actually a byproduct of the real issue, which is that of conflicting philosophies of Government. Its answer will hinge upon Congress' desire to uphold the dignity and meaning of the Constitution.

Nor is oil the only valuable resource to be found in these submerged lands. The ownership of natural gas, iron ore, marine animals, and plant life—fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp—and countless other resources is directly involved in this controversy. It is so far-reaching, so monumental in its importance, that Congress is duty bound to settle this question with finality, and with the least practicable delay.

This legislation follows the heretofore established separation of proprietorship from governmental powers, giving due respect to both, but making certain that the right to use, develop, and control natural resources of and beneath the submerged lands is vested in the respective States as recognized for more than 100 years prior to the tidelands decisions.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN AND TIDELANDS OIL

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my fellow colleagues, I have listened to learned discussions of the legal phases of the question as to who is the rightful owner of the mineral deposits beneath the surface of the tidelands. Is it Texas, Louisiana, and California on the one hand, or is it the Federal Government? Able men have spoken on both sides of this question and they honestly differ. I grant them that right. I admit I am finding it hard to decide between them.

But, Mr. Chairman, where there may be room for disagreement as to the rightful owners at this time, there can be no doubt who were the rightful owners not many years ago. Nor can there be any doubt as to how they became dispossessed. The American Indians were the rightful owners. We, our fathers, and our grandfathers, drove them from their inheritance. We forced them to abandon their fertile fields and settle upon the poorest land in every State in the Union. After destroying the bison which was their food and raiment, as was the aurochs of our ancestors in the forests of Europe for untold centuries, we abandoned them to the rigors of mountain and desert. We not only subjected them to semistarvation, we neglected their health and education. Shall we continue to carry on this system of neglect and abuse? Shall we send billions of dollars to South America, to the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and neglect at home the very people we dispossessed? Charity should begin at home.

But, Mr. Chairman, the American Indian is not asking for charity. Far from it. He is asking for his just dues. He is not asking that he be given back the land we so wrongfully took from him. He asks only that he be given a just and fair deal.

If the tidelands at this time belong either to the individual States or the Federal Government, they at one time belonged to the Indans. Here is a grand opportunity to pay back a part of the debt we owe to them without any inconvenience to ourselves.

Whatever we reap as a harvest from the tidelands is in the nature of a windfall. Where then is so much dispute about what to do with the spoils? What better can we do than to devote a meager 10 percent as a tithe to rehabilitate the remnant of a mighty race that roamed this continent for thousands of years yet never wasted any of its natural resources?

We drove them from the valleys of the New England States. We drove them from Pennsylvania and New York. We drove them out of the valleys of the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Missouri, and into the badlands of the Dakotas. We drove them out of the valleys on the west coast, the Columbia, the Sacramento, the San Joaquin. Yes, and we drove them out of the southlands, out of Florida, and Louisiana, and Texas.

Our dealing with the American Indian is a fact of history, and it is a fact of which we can well be ashamed. The least we can do is to give justice in the present and provide for the future.

The American Indian was a noble race. He was a vengeful enemy, but he never betrayed a friend. The experience of William Penn proves that statement.

The Indian is an intelligent race. The first Attorney General of the United States, Edmund Randolph, was of Indian descent. The late Charles Curtis, one of the most highly respected Members of this House, later a United States Senator, and finally Vice President of the United States, was of Indian descent. The mother of one of the most highly respected families that ever lived in Brown County, Kansas, the Margrave family, was an Indian maiden of the Sac and Fox tribe. A granddaughter

is at present living here in Washington, and doing Red Cross work in this area. The Powhatan basketball team, composed mostly of Indian boys from the nearby Kickapoo Reservation, has for years been the best high-school team in northeast Kansas. One of America's greatest and most-beloved humorists, the late Will Rogers, was an Oklahoma Indian. The greatest athlete of modern times was Jim Thorpe, an Oklahoma Indian.

My colleagues, let us do justice to a great race that, in our haste and our greed, we have made almost destitute. This Congress will do honor to itself and win the acclaim of the American people by passing this amendment.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, my support of California's position on this bill is based upon the plain equities of the case. There is no use arguing the law—the Supreme Court has said what the law is, and whether we like it or not the Supreme Court has the last guess on what the law is. But, that does not change the equities, and Congress has the right—and the responsibility—of recognizing these equities, as the Supreme Court in its decision clearly stated. We are following the suggestion of the Supreme Court in seeking the passage of this legislation.

Now what are the equities? Let me put it this way. How would you feel if you and your family for over a hundred years, more than four generations, had owned a piece of property, exercised every incident of ownership, recognized by everyone, including your neighbors, then someone tried to kick you off a part of that property by reason of a technical defect in the legal papers? You would not like it, and you would cry to high heaven for equity. Any court in the land would promply give you a decree in equity—even on a much shorter time. Now the Supreme Court in the California case did not give us a decree, but said that you cannot adverse the Federal Government, and that the ordinary rules applicable between individuals do not apply where the Federal Government is concerned. But that does not change the equities, they are the same, and the equity and fairness that would give an individual a title under similar circumstances have the same moral force against the Government as against an individual.

But let us go a step further. Let us assume that the neighbor who now questions your title had made a contract with you as to where the line was, and a fence on the line had been effected which was recognized and respected by both you and him over a long period of time. In 1850 Congress—on behalf of the Federal Government, our neighbor who now questions our title—recognized the constitutional boundaries of California upon its admission to the Union. They were specifically set forth as 3 miles into the Pacific Ocean. That was a contract with the Federal Government and the other States of the Union; it controlled the conditions under which we came into the Union. It has the same moral force and validity—and should have the same legal effect—as a written contract between you and your neighbor fixing the line between your property and his.

But that is not all. Let us assume that you and your neighbor honored and kept that contract for over a hundred years. That when he wanted a right-of-way or a little property on the boundary, he came and bought it from you, paying his hard cash and thus acknowledging your title. It must be remembered that in 14 separate instances the Federal Government has paid for land admittedly in the 3-mile belt. There have been 181 other instances of such purchases, but in some of them it is claimed that they involved inland waters, although we do not agree that is true. However that may be, there is no question that the record clearly shows that every agency of the Federal Government admitted and recognized California's title. Secretary Ickes wrote a letter plainly saying so in December of 1933. The Interior Department on 30 separate occasions has formally ruled that these areas belonged to the States. There are 49 Attorney General's opinions to the same effect. The Army and Navy Departments have always treated these lands as owned by the States, for over a hundred and fifty years.

But that is not all. Let us assume that your title to your property has been in litigation from time to time. And that in 52 separate Supreme Court decisions that court has said that you owned it and owned it all. That 244 Federal and State court decisions have said the same thing. Can there be any question about that? Justice Black who wrote the majority opinion in the California case said that the Supreme Court "has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

Now, suppose that based upon all that record—starting with the original contract with your neighbor who now questions your title—you had spent many thousands of dollars—in this instance millions of dollars in our State—improving your property; that you had filled in lands, built harbors, docks, and warehouses, and made leases on that property—all in reliance on that contract, the court decisions, and your long and unquestioned occupancy and use. Do you think that it would be equitable to turn all that over to your neighbor who has found a technical point, and now wants to grab your property together with all it's improvement—although he must admit that he agreed with you to begin with where the line is, and that he and everybody else including the Supreme Court accepted and recognized that line for over a hundred years?

It is a little strange to me that we Californians who are defending our State's historic title are charged in some places with being robbers. We are trying to prevent robbery—in broad daylight too—of the property we have had by contract, by court decision, by actual occupancy and improvement, recognized by everybody and never challenged by anybody, including the party now questioning our title, for over 4 generations and 100 years.

Let us not get mixed up on who are the victims and who are the robbers. I am sure this House will not. It has not in the past. And I hope that the action which the Congress takes on this bill brings to an end one of the most discreditable chapters on the part of the Federal Government in the long history of Federal-State relations.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, in dealing with the decisions of the United States Supreme Court, in the cases against California, Texas, and Louisiana, we are dealing with the law, as it is stated to be by the highest Court of the land, irrespective of whether or not we agree with the decision of that Court. I am sure that many of my colleagues concur that the decision, in our opinion as attorneys, defies the historic belief that title to the submerged lands within the historic boundaries of our Nation, was in the States.

But now, in this discussion and in the vote to come, we are not dealing with abstractions. We are dealing with a part of our present law and we must look to that law as it is. And we must look to it as law, stripped of propaganda and assertions of facts that may or may not be true.

We have heard from this well the assertion that, three times the Court has ruled that the oil belongs to the people of the United States, that this bill is a giveaway, that it is sponsored by the oil lobby, and so on, ad infinitum. These matters are assertions of fact and their truth or error is of no consequence, because the issue before this House is one of principle and law, not of fact.

And the law of the cases of the Supreme Court, with which we are dealing, is that neither the States nor the Federal Government has title to the lands within the historic boundaries. I repeat, the law of this land is that neither the Federal Government nor any of the States has any title to this territory. It is virgin territory.

The only ruling that the Court made in these cases was that the United States has a paramount right in that area, based on external sovereignty. Now, in dealing with this matter, the Court was dealing with a question of international law. It conceives the law of the nations to be in these areas that the nations, because of their external sovereignty, have certain paramount rights. That international law, as stated by our Supreme Court, and if the Court is correct, has the same applicability to Canada or to Russia, as it does to these United States, or to any other nation

of the world, whether this side of, or behind the Iron Curtain.

We are simply dealing with a legal concept, which is the common concept of sovereignty of all independent nations that exist in the world. That sovereignty, as defined by the law of the nations.

And we find that that law as stated by our Supreme Court, defines paramount rights as an incident to external sovereignty. That is an abstract legal status. That is a condition and that is the condition with which we are dealing.

We are not dealing primarily with the disposition of whatever natural resources be within those boundaries. That is only incidental. We are dealing with laws and principles of sovereignty and the exercise of the power that lies inherent within that sovereignty. We are dealing with how, as a matter of policy, should the United States of America exercise that power.

If we view this as a matter of law and principle, then our votes on the bill can be made without passion or prejudice, and without investigation of the truth or falsity of the various assertions of fact by both sides that have been made in connection with the submerged lands controversy.

It is simply a matter, today or tomorrow, when we vote upon this bill, of exercising an attribute, an inherent quality, a power of our sovereignty, that the United States Supreme Court has declared the law of nations gives us, that lies inchoate within our Government, awaiting exercise by this legislative branch of our Government.

Now, therefore, under this pure legal concept, which is the law of our land, the action by the House cannot be a vesting or giving away of title or assets, or national resources, or anything else that is a property right of the Federal Government.

It can be and is only an exercise of that power of sovereignty which is to establish title in virgin territories where no title before has been established by an exercise of the power of a sovereign.

Let me give an example: Had not the British sovereign exercised its inchoate, internal, and external sovereignty by a positive act, there would never have been created private title within the British Empire. Likewise, had not the British sovereign, in an exercise of its sovereignty, issued charters to the American colonies in the new virgin land of America where no title before existed, there would not have been any chain of titles within the United States of America, or its predecessor colonies.

In this legislation before the House, we are not therefore giving away any title. We are not vesting any title. We are merely acting within the power of our sovereignty to establish title where none existed before.

And it is of paramount importance that we do establish such titles by the passage of this legislation, for our economic life, the economic life which has developed this Nation into the greatest and richest nation in the world, is based on the concept of private property and private titles. Should we fail, refuse, or neglect to establish those titles in new areas of potential economic development, we hamper and circumscribe the progress of our Nation. Moreover, we make it impractical to develop under our system of economy, the natural resources and wealth of the Nation which is needed for our defense.

I hope that this concept, one of law and not one of prejudice or passion, will supply the basis upon which those of my colleagues who are coming to grips with this problem of the submerged lands for the first time, may find it within their logic to say that it shall once and for all by us be settled and resolved, so that the orderly processes of our national and economic life may proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf, pursuant to House Resolution 193, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CELLER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves to recommit the bill H. R. 4198 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings in connection with the measure now before us be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of all matters on the Speaker's desk, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter to appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SIEMINSKI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in connection with a special study mission which will depart for Europe on April 3 and return on April 20, I am authorized to request that the members of that committee be permitted official leave of absence for that period. The group, besides myself, comprises the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MORANO], the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON].

KOREA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, Korea claims the headlines today. It claims our thoughts every day. Sadness and anger necessarily prejudice our thinking and discussions of our involvement in Korea. Its tragedy lies heavy upon our hearts. We cannot fathom the brutal senselessness of a war locked in place by design. We are too provincial to accept without question the expenditures of billions of dollars for weapons we refuse to use, or to rationalize daily bloodshed for an enemy we refuse to defeat. Too many of us play our unhappy part in this war in an atmosphere of blindness, knowing neither where we are nor where we are going.

There is a vagueness and mystery, if not apathy, about this action which seems to make it a war without a beginning or ending—without even a name.

Now, it is proposed again to resume peace talks. About this I am most skeptical. Heretofore, the meetings between our emissaries and those of the Communists have borne fruit only for the enemy. The Communists were obviously insincere. Patently, they were interested only in stalling for breath. Under the flag of truce they prepared for war. Behind the mask of peace they spoke only of our surrender. Their past performances do not permit us the luxury of great hope for future negotiations. I am not at all satisfied that the Communist leaders have the character for honest discussions nor the honor to stand behind their agreements.

The aggressors are much too flushed with undeserved success to sensibly consider an honorable and lasting end to war. So long as the contest is fought under rules and restrictions favorable only to the enemy we cannot expect the respect of an unconscionable bully.

As the U. S. News & World Report so ably summed up the situation in a recent issue:

> Malenkov is in trouble at home and along the edges of the Soviet world. He needs time to consolidate, wants to lull the West. But goals are unchanged—to spread hatred of United States, confuse Europe, woo Asia, rule the world. It's still world war, Soviet style.

Even the most timid must wonder at the wisdom and future of an action limited to continuing bloodshed, limitations which logically can result in advantage only to the enemy—an enemy whose blood, by its enslavement, is much more expendable than ours.

We conduct this war in locked chains, limiting our troops to costly patrol actions, the value of which has yet to be explained, and to fire fights, instigated by the enemy, for selected hills whose possession may be desirable for military tactics, but whose cost in human resources is staggering. Of what value is a hill with a view of a forbidden land? Our present policies are in keeping only with a policy of no policy at all.

Our leadership is divided, and divided it is weakened. I have on my desk articles clipped from recent issues of Washington newspapers, some weeks old, some days old, some hours old. Each of these dwells upon Korea. I was attracted to these articles by their contradictory nature, their disturbing contradictions. Some quote General Van Fleet as saying our units in Korea are in bad shape and that we are short of ammunition. Some quote him as expressing confidence that our troops can meet any eventuality. Others quote General Taylor, the present field commander in Korea, as saying our ammunition supplies are ample. Others quote the President and the Pentagon as saying that our ammunition is so plentiful that recent shipments have been diverted to Europe. Among these articles are reported numerous statements of wide variance by Bradley, MacArthur, Van Fleet, Collins, and others regarding the conduct of the war in Korea. All of this must be as painfully confusing to mothers and wives of fighting men as it is to us. If retired generals may rebel with glory, then I am certain we may do so with understanding and with better grace, for as Congressmen our opportunity for constructive, useful, and helpful action is completely out of proportion to our responsibilities.

Words are often dangerous. Freedom of speech is a cherished heritage. At times it can be a hazardous practice. I am not at all sure but that the suggestion in the old ballad that "old soldiers fade away" was not a good one. Instead they seem to talk every day. The conflict of their opinions has resulted in confusion that certainly is not for the best interest of our country. What unhappy and bitter reactions thousands of American mothers and fathers of young men must experience when they read these statements. And what of the reactions of a Member of Congress who sincerely feels a great responsibility, not only for the broad, general policies of government, but a very personal anguish over individual misery, suffering and bloodshed occasioned by combat. The experience and general information gained by American generals is public property. Wisdom dictates that it be used in proper channels. Public discussions involving different views over supplies and tactical operations but further confuse us. Of this I am certain. And I am also certain that if retired and experienced generals shared as much information with the appropriate agencies and committees before retiring as after, we would better know where we are than where we were. Friday's press carried a story charging the present flareup of fighting in Korea to General Van Fleet's statements. I pray that such is not the case.

It is no reflection upon the generals' earned glory and public service to suggest to them the same public courage while in service as some of them demonstrate upon retirement. This body and other responsible agencies should not be relegated to post audits. Much better it would be, I think, if we could be informed in time rather than shocked too late. As the military might say, a critique at reveille might be more effective than one at taps. Few of us, if any, are able to evaluate conflicting estimates of military planners and commanders. Unfortunately, the enemy can and does evaluate all information, with profit. It seems to me that the national interest demands an end to public bickering regarding our military requirements, our weaknesses, our strength, and our soft spots. American people do not need to be frightened. They want to be and are entitled to be properly led and represented.

They look to you and me to bring such situations into focus. We must move to bring order and objectivity to the Korean war. A hundred and thirty thousand human casualties and billions of dollars expended in other unrecoverable resources should be enough to bring us to the reality that the future course must be different from the one now followed. We are where we started, except for our casualties, and our expenditures, and except for the tragic fact that the enemy is much more formidable, much better equipped, trained, and planned.

Those who advocate "wait and see" would, of course, be heroes if the Asian situation would suddenly right itself without further bloodshed. I am willing and anxious for them to be correct; I have no hope that they will be. I have no right to expect that they will be. We cannot dismiss our present dilemma with the statement that Communist aggression must be stopped. Such a statement is true. It is much too broad to translate into military orders. It brings into being only relative problems such as "ample" and "shortage" and only further darkens the atmosphere of blindness. Against what objective can Congress act? Against what criteria can Congress judge the number of men, the quantity of ammunition and material necessary and sufficient or ample to complete the needs of our troops in Korea? We must have a feasible goal. That which would permit a holding action, that which would supply a limited offensive, and that which would contemplate a decisive military victory is so different as to make it ridiculous for anyone to judge with intelligence and assurance. We need and must have a new recipe for mixing war and politics. The old one just does not come out right. A military objective which we are capable of meeting must precede a political victory. The leaders of our enemies are not the fools we would like them to be. Their cunning and ruthlessness are strengthened by the use of human resources without regard to human dignity. They do not tire of human bloodshed, nor reason in the interest of humanity. We can never satisfy their appetite for war until we give them more than they can take. Who, Mr. Speaker, is responsible for the course, the course of American troops being committed to combat in Korea or elsewhere? The United Nations, the President, or the Congress? I am not unmindful of the United Nations or the hopes and aspirations that brought it into being. Nor am I unmindful of the nobleness of its aspirations. I am conscious, however, of its inability at the present time to face fully and effectively meet the challenge of Communist aggression.

The United Nations cannot at this time be relied upon to steer the course of our actions in Korea. I have sympathy and understanding for the objectives of the United Nations. It is too early to place faith or hope upon their effectiveness. I am content in the belief that General Eisenhower, as our President, possesses the experience, character, and capacity to lead us successfully and to direct our future operations in this war. It is with no lack of confidence in the President that I suggest that this Congress, too, has a responsibility for overt action, a threefold action, may I suggest. We ought, by appropriate resolution, recognize the character of this conflict as war and spell out a positive request for military victory. Only the foolish can fail to realize that we should not continue to meet such aggression on the terms of the enemy. Brawn against brawn is a foolish course. The brains of a free people can defeat the brawn of a slave state, but we must use our brains. Sentiment and fears are unacceptable substitutes.

In his noted message to Congress in February, the President recognized this when he spoke regarding the release of

the naval blockade around Formosa. As he put it:

> There is no longer any logic or sense in a condition that requires the United States Navy to assume responsibility on behalf of Chinese Communists. This permitted—

Said the general—

> those Communists with greater impunity to kill our soldiers and those of our United Nations allies in Korea.

He concluded:

> We certainly have no obligation to protect a nation fighting us in Korea.

The President's thinking in that regard made good sense. Is it, however, less senseless for our leaders to fetter our own committed forces in Korea with limitations that preclude a decisive military victory. Our forces on the ground, on the sea, and in the air are chained to an arena of the enemy's choosing, beyond which area the enemy moves, trades, produces, trains, and transports with impunity—assured impunity. Who is afraid of a chained watchdog? Only those who choose to be bitten. Is it possible to conceive of a more satisfactory way for the enemy to engage us in combat?—to use troops of other nations, to fight on foreign soil, with the knowledge that so long as they stay beyond the arbitrary chalked-off arena no harm will come to them? Modern as this type of warfare may be, it is ridiculous, demoralizing, and senseless, more so than a continued blockade of Formosa. By our own rules our Air Force and our Navy and our ground forces are committed to a policy of protecting the Communists except when the Communists choose to be targets. Such limitations and restrictions cannot be longer tolerated.

I know, and all of you know, the arguments which are used to support such a position. I have heard them with patience for more than 2 years. I know the fears of world conflict and total war. I know all of the arguments and all of the fears, but I also know that we cannot arrange an agenda for war as we do for political discussions. War does not adapt itself to niceties nor to the desires of the peaceful. By its very nature it is a win-or-lose affair. Whatever reasons inspire the political and military considerations which have bound our troops and forces to unconscionable limitations have served only to strengthen the enemy and to give him time to make victory more expensive to us. This Congress should emancipate our own forces. We ought to unchain ourselves. We should free the full power of America, and of freemen everywhere to use their complete strength and in so doing let the enemy worry about the consequences, not our friends.

Members of this body are in no position to plan or execute military strategy. I make no such proposal here. Where to fight and how to fight, where and how our Air, Naval, and Ground Forces are deployed are decisions which the President and his military advisers must make. Ours, however, is the right to direct and order that such decisions be made with the objective of victory. The removal of all restrictions upon our Armed Forces would not direct the bombing of or the invasion of China or the blockade and sinking of supplies intended for the enemy. It would mean complete freedom for the President and military forces under his command to plan and take such action as will bring an ending to this endless conflict. It would mean that the enemy's immunity under our present policy setup would be canceled and that all enemy actions, wherever they may be, are in danger of attack and destruction. It would mean that the enemy's head and his heart, as well as his hands and the puppets he manipulates, would be vulnerable to attack and destruction. It would instill fear in the heart of the enemy and good heart in the spirit of our people. It would bring order and purposefulness to our actions and it would permit us to plan and act with intelligence. We could clear away the blind spots of stagnation and dissipate the foggy atmosphere of indecision. It would answer the why of service and sacrifice. It would permit us to walk forward with a bold step instead of stumbling as we are.

Such action, I feel confident, would assure the President of the people's confidence in his judgment, his experience, and his leadership. Surely the answer to those who fear a bigger conflict cannot be met or appeased by continuing an endless bloodshed under the restrained rules of fear. There is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that is worse than engaging in war; that is to lose one.

On my desk is a copy of Lincoln's Gettysburg address which was sent to me by the Purple Heart Association. From that unforgettable speech, you will recognize similar lines.

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it will never forget what we do here. It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought there have every right to expect.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WAMPLER and to include a resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Hayesville, Va.

Mr. HOPE in two instances and to include extraneous matter in one.

Mr. DOLLIVER and to include a speech he made on the occasion of naturalization proceedings held in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia on March 10 and the program.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include the seventh of a series of articles on "Know Your Government."

Mr. LANE in three instances.

Mr. PRICE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YATES and to include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of Monday, March 30.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech made by Ambassador Lodge at the United Nations on March 25.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include an editorial concerning James A. Farley.

Mr. FARRINGTON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an address he delivered in Chicago.

Mr. MEADER and to include an editorial.

Mr. ALLEN of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include an essay.

Mr. GREEN and to include a speech.

Mr. POAGE and to include a letter.

Mr. FEIGHAN to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas and to include two resolutions.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. ELLIOTT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances; to include in one the text of a statement on the rights and responsibilities of universities and their faculties, issued by the Association of American Universities; and in the other to include a statement made by Hon. James M. Mead.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter from Admiral Boone, director of the medical and surgical service of the Veterans' Administration, and certain resolutions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California, from April 2 to 16, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. PATTEN, for April 1 and 2, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 41. An act to further amend the act of June 15, 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 55. An act for the relief of Carol Lynn Barbara Hecht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 69. An act for the relief of Dr. Peter C. T. Kao, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 71. An act for the relief of Bernard W. Olson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 142. An act for the relief of Norman S. MacPhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 166. An act for the relief of Sister Louise Marie Josephine Belloir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 167. An act for the relief of Sister Jeanne Maria Henneth Langlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 306. An act for the relief of Waltraut Mies van der Rohe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 314. An act for the relief of Cornelius A. Navori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 516. An act for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 556. An act for the relief of Marinella Taletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 616. An act for the relief of Dr. Albert Enas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 719. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 811. An act for the relief of George Mauner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 846. An act for the relief of Charles Anthony Desotell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 851. An act for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 853. An act for the relief of Jacqueline Sue Lawn (Akemi Inoue); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 903. An act to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when procured by or on behalf of the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof for itself or pursuant to an authorized foreign-assistance program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 954. An act for the relief of Robert Harold Wall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 984. An act making provisions for judicial review of certain tax-court decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1039. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucillo Grassi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1041. An act to abolish the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial Gettysburg Boulevard; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1082. An act to approve a conveyance made by the city of Charleston, S. C., to the South Carolina State Ports Authority, of real property heretofore granted to said city of Charleston by the United States of America; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1410. An act to amend section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to make a study of public transportation serving the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 759. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 861. An act for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski;

H. R. 3062. An act to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress;

H. R. 3656. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 3659. An act to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; and

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LeCOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 759. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 861. An act for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski;

H. R. 3062. An act to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress;

H. R. 3656. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 3659. An act to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; and

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 1, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

590. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (c. 528, 56 Stat. 723), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

591. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

592. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report by the Bureau of Mines for the 6-month period July 1, 1952, through December 31, 1952, pursuant to sections 106 (a) and 212 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; Public Law 552, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

593. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

594. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of February 28, 1953, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

595. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the Fifth Annual Report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to section 12 of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948, Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

596. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3802 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide exemption for diplomatic officers and employees from payment of internal revenue taxes on imported articles"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 195. Resolution for consideration of S. 1110, an act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence; without amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1242. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2130. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3429. A bill to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3480. A bill to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title; without amendment (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. HARDEN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3367. A bill to amend section 1715 of title 18 of the United States Code to permit the transmission in the mails to certain officers and employees of State, Territorial, District, and local governments of pistols, revolvers, and other firearms capable of being concealed on the person, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4351. A bill to preserve the scenic beauty of the Niagara Falls and River, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement on that river for power purposes, and to further the interests of national security by authorizing the prompt development of such works of improvement for power purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 4352. A bill to permit deduction for income tax purposes of certain expenses incurred by working mothers in providing care for their children while they are at work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4353. A bill to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal farm credit system; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4354. A bill to authorize the modification of the existing project for the Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island in order to improve facilities for navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 4355. A bill to amend section 221 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to clarify certain requirements relating to the designation of persons upon whom process may be served; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4356. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4357. A bill to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4358. A bill to amend the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4359. A bill to provide for the performance of heraldic services for the United States by the Quartermaster General; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 4360. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4361. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1942, relating to the making of photographs and sketches of properties of the Military Establishment, to continue in effect the provisions thereof until 6 months after the present national emergency; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 4362. A bill to provide financial assistance to certain Sioux Indians employed in course of on-the-job training in a business and industrial establishment; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4363. A bill to authorize the President to establish daylight-saving time each year in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 4364. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries," relative to the composition of claims commissions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4365. A bill to prohibit the transmittal of communistic propaganda matter in the United States mails or in interstate commerce for circulation or use in public schools; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4366. A bill to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 4367. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the State of Nevada over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4368. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: Memorial of the Arizona State Legislature requesting that the National Park Service, the Indian Affairs Bureau, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Public Roads Bureau give most serious consideration to the development of these constructive projects in cooperation with the governments of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and Utah, for the benefit of the Indians and others residing in the area and the people of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to take any further lands of Hoke County for defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction of a water-storage reservoir to be known as the Nambe Dam and to be located on the Nambe River within the Pojoaque soil-conservation district, New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding the construction of a series of small dams at the head of the streams, on the Coyote, the Agua Negra, the Cebolla, the Sapello, and the Manuelitas Creeks, in Mora and San Miguel Counties, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States to effect a change in the method of electing the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal the provisions of title 16 of the United States Code providing for taxes upon the sale of toilet preparations and upon the sale of wallets, ladies' handbags, and similar handbags and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt pensions or moneys received from labor-union funds from taxation by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4369. A bill for the relief of Antonias Kalogrias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 4370. A bill for the relief of Judith Ann Zahoransky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 4371. A bill for the relief of June Ann Sakurai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARRIGG (by request):

H. R. 4372. A bill for the relief of Dominica Fontana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 4373. A bill for the relief of Elmer George Reitmeyer and Johanna Mary Reitmeyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 4374. A bill for the relief of Gilbert Frimmel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4375. A bill for the relief of Julia S. Criswell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4376. A bill for the relief of Attilio Gabriele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 4377. A bill for the relief of Natan and Anna Berenholz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 4378. A bill for the relief of Ng May Ngon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 4379. A bill for the relief of Nicolai Lazarescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 4380. A bill for the relief of James Beaman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4381. A bill for the relief of Fumiyo Maeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4382. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lottie Longo (formerly Lottie Guetler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4383. A bill for the relief of Chin-Ok-Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RILEY:

H. R. 4384. A bill for the relief of Christina Whitaker (Iwamura Keiko); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 4385. A bill for the relief of Jose Florencio Caamano Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 4386. A bill for the relief of Gioacchino Varsalona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 4387. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed," approved February 28, 1929; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 4388. A bill for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 4389. A bill for the relief of Miss Aimee M. Tsu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

127. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, reaffirming its vigorous support of the principle of the universal military training and service law and, in particular, the American Legion bill for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

128. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of William Kosma, financial secretary, U. E. Local 758, Mansfield, Ohio, and signed by employees of the highway department of Richland County and the Ohio Brass Co. asking for support of H. R. 117 and for a cut in taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

129. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul C. Clortz, and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

130. Also, petition of the president of the Board, Foreign Missions and Overseas Interchurch Service, New York, N. Y., relative to the immigration laws and to enact emergency legislation to operate until a revised immigration law is approved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. Also, petition of Isidro C. Tizon, and others, of Ormoc City, Philippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continuously giving moral and material support to the Philippines and to reconsider the recognition of deserving guerrilla outfits all over the Philippines; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, for this hallowed moment of devotion we would hush into stillness our busy thoughts. So relentlessly are we driven by the pressure of demanding days that our souls become jaded and drained. In these solemn and searching days of the passion help us to take time to search our own hearts. We would turn from the tragic, troubled world without to that inner kingdom where our own deepest desires and motives are regnant, knowing that there are the issues of life and that as a man thinketh in his own heart, so is he. We would dim all lesser lights that the light within may shine with a new radiance. In that light we would see ourselves as we really are, stained by selfishness, warped by prejudice, blinded by pride, duped by false lights that fail.

Grant unto us the grace of penitence that we may not grow insensible to our need of forgiveness from one another and from Thee. In the crises of our times join us, we pray, with those who across the wastes and wilderness of human need, preparing the way of the Lord, throw up a highway for our God. We ask it in the name of the Christ of this Holy Week. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 30, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) providing that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 2, 1953, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 13, 1953, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 30, 1953,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on March 31, 1953, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 759. An act for the relief of Hisami Ioshida;

H. R. 861. An act for the relief of Edith Marie Paulsen;

H. R. 1192. An act for the relief of Steve Emery Sobanski;

H. R. 3062. An act to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3073. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, with respect to the survivorship benefits granted to Members of Congress;

H. R. 3658. An act to extend for an additional 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad;

H. R. 3659. An act to extend until July 1, 1955, the period during which personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders shall be exempt from duty; and

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

TITLES TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 27, 1953,

Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted on March 31, 1953, the report (No. 133) on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Monday, April 13, 1953, because of official business.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from sessions of the Senate tomorrow, and also Monday and Tuesday of next week. My expected absence will be partially because of official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Ammunition Shortages of the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. DIRKSEN, and by unanimous consent, a special subcommittee investigating trading with the enemy was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

STANDBY CONTROLS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, there was published in the magazine America for March 14, 1953, an article entitled "Senator CAPEHART for Standby Controls," written by Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, S. J. This is a very complimentary and interesting article, which I feel should be incorporated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CAPEHART FOR STANDBY CONTROLS

(By Benjamin L. Masse)

On a number of occasions since the war, this writer has differed sharply with the economic views of Indiana's millionaire Senator, HOMER CAPEHART, the former phonograph and jukebox magnate. The most recent occasion was the so-called Capehart amendment to the Defense Production Act, which, by guaranteeing to manufacturers their his-

toric profit margins, threatened to make effective price control extremely difficult, if not impossible. Fortunately, in most cases supply caught up so quickly with demand that the mischievous possibilities of this profit escalator were never realized.

In view of this background, the reader will understand what a great and unexpected pleasure it is to be able now to take a stand on Senator CAPEHART'S side. Against the opposition of the Senate majority leader, Mr. TAFT, with no encouragement whatsoever from the White House, the Senator has started a fighting campaign for standby wage, price, rent, and credit controls. It seems to me that this action is so sound and so obviously in the public interest that former opponents of Mr. CAPEHART should forget the past, resist a human inclination to say "I told you so," and lend him whatever help they can.

In a moving address to the Senate on February 2, Senator CAPEHART explained what led him, a convinced and rabid defender of free enterprise, to advocate giving to the President complete standby controls over the economy. In June 1950, he recalled, prices in this country were relatively stable, as they are now. There were no shortages of consumer goods or raw materials worth bothering about. By that time consumers had largely satisfied the accumulated needs of wartime and were again spending in a normal, selective way—except, perhaps, for housing. Supply and demand were in happy balance.

Then came the sneak Communist attack on the Republic of Korea.

Remembering the shortages of World War II, consumers started an unholy scramble for sugar, shoes, shirts, television sets, sheets, and pillow cases, and all sorts of other items. Merchants snapped up all the goods they could lay their hands on. Manufacturers combed the markets for raw materials, especially for wool, copper, steel, and aluminum. Speculators and profiteers added to the general upward pressure on prices. So did the many reputable businessmen who hiked prices to make sure that when the freeze came, they would be on the safe side.

As a result of all this frenzied activity, the cost of living jumped 7 percent between June 1950 and January 1951, when former President Truman finally imposed price controls. According to Senator CAPEHART, that 6-month splurge cost the American people $18 billion. It added billions, too, to the cost of the rearmament program.

Nor was that the only cost of the Korean inflation. To quote the Senator from Indiana:

"More important than the money it cost is the human suffering which is unnecessarily created and the strain and stresses it puts on our economic system. It creates all sorts of dislocations, inequities, disequilibriums, friction and disruptions in our personal lives and in our productive system which takes years to rectify."

Senator CAPEHART is urging his standby controls bill because he wants no repetition of that debacle. Everybody hopes against hope that the Kremlin will not start other fires on the enormous periphery of the Soviet Empire—fires that will call for other and equally costly Korean police actions. Everyone hopes even more desperately that the cold war, the tensions in Berlin and Iran, the little hot wars in Indochina and Korea will not erupt into a third world war. But nobody knows for sure what the months and years ahead hold for the American people. Just as we are readying fire-fighting equipment to cope with possible new Soviet aggressions abroad, so the Senator would have us equip the Government to deal with another upsurge of inflation at home.

If Korea taught us anything at all about the economic aspects of modern warfare, it taught us that delay in formulating and imposing controls over wages, prices, rents, and credit is fatal. In June 1950 almost all the authorities in the land, and all the big economic groups, were opposed to immediate controls. Looking back now, we can see that it would have been much wiser to have frozen all wages and prices simultaneously with the decision to oppose Stalin's brutal attack on South Korea, as Bernard Baruch advocated at the time. The delay of 6 months proved disastrous.

Should there be another crisis, there will be a similar delay in dealing with it unless Congress approves standby controls now. No one familiar with the time-consuming ways of Washington will question Senator CAPEHART'S belief that between the time a President requests economic controls and Congress gives him a law, at least 3 months are sure to elapse, and that 7 or 8 months will slip by before the law is properly functioning. That is more than enough time for inflation to get out of hand.

To quiet congressional fears that President Eisenhower might use standby authority over the economy recklessly, Senator CAPEHART'S bill provides for a National Advisory Council, composed of representatives of consumers and of all our major economic groups, which the President would be obliged to consult before taking any action. If this Council were composed of eminent men, as Senator CAPEHART intends that it should be, it would provide a sufficient guaranty against hasty and ill-advised action. In any event, the bare theoretical possibility that the President might abuse the authority to control prices is scarcely an adequate reason for withholding it from him.

In explaining his bill to the Senators, Mr. CAPEHART noted that many among them would be surprised to see him in the role of advocate of controls. "He had not changed his beliefs," he said. He remained a convinced free-enterpriser, a man who believed that the less Government interfered with the economy, the better. But though his views had not changed, his experience and study of inflation since coming to the Senate had increased his knowledge of it. He was, paradoxically, advocating standby controls now, precisely because of his concern for the future of free enterprise. He was fearful that another inflationary binge would damage the economy irreparably. To preserve economic freedom he was willing in times of crisis to limit its exercise.

That is well said and scarcely needs any comment. I am confident that the hearings on the Capehart bill now in progress before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will support the strong case the Senator has made for it.

IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, much has been said in this Chamber and elsewhere regarding the importation of residual oil and its damaging effect on the production of coal.

During the last 3 months there has been imported into the United States a daily average of 477,000 barrels of residual oil. In 1952, 128 million barrels were landed on the eastern seaboard, the equivalent of over 30 million tons of coal. As a result 13 mines in central Pennsylvania have closed down, throwing 1,658 coal miners out of employment and seriously affecting workers in many related industries.

The State Chamber of Commerce of West Virginia reports that 63 mines have closed in that great coal-producing State since January 1, 1953.

In 1952 the projected production of coal was 535 million tons. The actual production was 465 million tons. The present rate of residual oil importation indicates that the 1953 production of coal will drop 25 percent below the 1952 figure.

Residual oil is principally used by utilities and industrial plants. It is not used for home heating.

Another matter which should have serious attention is the effect on Federal, State, and local taxes. It has been estimated that the loss in taxes will be more than $32 million. A further loss in taxes will result from the fact that many miners, railroad workers, and others in related industries are out of work by reason of the decreased production of coal.

I have had a table prepared which shows the effect of foreign residual oil importations on Federal, State, and local taxes for 1952, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Effect of foreign residual imports on Federal, State, and local taxes, 1952

[All dollar figures in thousands]

Item	Revenue or income lost	Taxes as a percent of income	Taxes lost
1. Bituminous coal [1] (tax of 33.21 cents per ton on 31 million tons)			$10, 295
2. Miners' wages	$77, 144	[2] 12.7	9, 797
3. Rail revenues	87, 030	[3] 11.9	10, 357
4. Transportation tax (4 cents per ton on 31 million tons)			1, 240
5. Rail wages	43, 863	[2] 12.7	5, 571
6. Total loss			37, 260
7. Amount realized from 1952 tariff at 5.25 cents per barrel of residual oil imported on 89,971,000 [4] barrels—credit			4, 723
8. Net loss			32, 537

NOTE.—1952 residual imports amounted to 128,510,000 barrels or approximately 31 million tons of bituminous coal based on 4.167 barrels equal one ton.

[1] Tax of 33.21 cents per ton broken down as follows:

Tax	Amount (cents per ton)
Federal income	20.18
Other taxes	12.97
Social security and unemployment compensation	.06
Total	33.21

Source: 29 companies representing 169 million tons, Moody's Industrials, 1952. 12 companies representing 50 million tons, Moody's Industrials, 1952. Survey of coal producing companies for 18 months ending 1953 representing more than 200 million tons.

[2] Based on 1952 ratio of income, property and other taxes, Federal, State, and local, to personal income (Department of Commerce).

[3] Based on 1952 ratio of all taxes, Federal, State, and local, to total operating revenues, class I roads (Association of American Railroads, or ICC M-100).

[4] Of the total imports of 128,510,000 barrels, the amount subject to import duties was arrived at as follows:

Total imports	128, 510, 000
Less duty free for Government use	5, 436, 000
Less vessel use, foreign bunker (duty free)	33, 103, 000
Amount subject to duty of $5¼ cents per barrel	89, 971, 000

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO EXEMPTION OF DIPLOMATIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM PAYMENT OF CERTAIN TAXES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3802 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide exemption for diplomatic officers and employees from payment of internal-revenue taxes on imported articles (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF BUREAU OF MINES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Bureau of Mines for the 6-month period, July 1 through December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SEMIANNUAL STOCKPILE REPORT

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential stockpile report (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission as of February 28, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 22

"Joint resolution relative to the location of the new Air Force Academy

"Whereas the Department of the Air Force is now considering the location of the new Air Force Academy, an establishment to be comparable in size, importance, and prestige to Annapolis and West Point, and Camp Beale is 1 of 7 sites, and the only site in California, still under consideration for this purpose; and

"Whereas Camp Beale meets all the specifications outlined by the Department of the Air Force and is superbly suited for the intended purpose by virtue of its year-round good flying weather, its favorable topography, its nearness to military laboratories at the University of California and Stanford University, to the Nation's aircraft production center, and to the city of Sacramento, a sizable community, long noted for its hospitality to servicemen and experienced in providing for large numbers of them; and

"Whereas it would be a great honor to the entire State of California to have such an institution, and men of the caliber of those who will attend it, within its boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as are necessary to assure the selection of Camp Beale as the site for the new Air Force Academy; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States of America to pass an act requiring imported trout sold in the United States be labeled as to origin and date of processing and imposing fine for failure to comply or for wrongful removal of said labels

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):*

"Whereas the State of Utah produces more than a million pounds of trout annually for human consumption; and

"Whereas the production of trout for commercial purposes is one of the main industries in Utah; and

"Whereas the trout produced in Utah is of superior quality; and

"Whereas Utah troutmen, licensed in the State of Utah in cooperation with troutmen from adjoining States, have gone to considerable expense in order to advertise their product; and

"Whereas foreign nations can and do export to the United States and the State of Utah, trout of an inferior quality at greatly reduced prices; and

"Whereas foreign trout are being sold as Utah trout or Rocky Mountain trout, to the prejudice of Utah trout producers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring),* That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to pass an act requiring that all imported trout sold in the United States be labeled as to its origin and the date of processing and that a fine be imposed for failure to comply with such requirement and upon any wholesale or retail handler wrongfully removing said label; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of state of the State of Utah be, and he is hereby authorized and directed, to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, requesting the United States Government not to take any further lands of Hoke County for defense purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. HOEY on March 30, 1953, p. 2410, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial relating to the Interstate Commerce Act

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"A movement is under way to induce the Congress to repeal section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

"Arizona and its sister States depend upon the transportation system to keep in movement the flow of goods between the States.

"The economy of the State of Arizona is to a very large extent dependent upon the reasonableness of its freight costs. The long-haul and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act has protected Arizona and its intermountain neighbors against rate discrimination since 1915. The continuance of this protection is of vital concern to Arizona.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress leave in status quo section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act, in the interests of equity and well-established need.

"Passed the house March 6, 1953.

"Passed the senate March 20, 1953."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial relating to the improvement of roads and recreational facilities in northern Arizona, and adjacent areas in Nevada and Utah, and requesting transfer of the grazing service office from St. George, Utah, to Fredonia, Ariz.

"*To the National Park Service, the Indian Affairs Bureau, and the Bureau of Land Management, of the Department of Interior; and the Public Roads Bureau of the Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"There is a pressing need for an all weather highway between Fredonia, Ariz., and Hurricane, Utah, in part across the Kaibab Indian Reservation and the Pipe Spring National Monument in Arizona. This road would provide a year-round route between Arizona and Utah, and materially help the economy of the area known as the Arizona Strip.

"The north rim of the Grand Canyon and the Lake Mead recreational area, both under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, are largely inaccessible to tourists and those seeking recreation because of the lack of access roads. The building of such roads connecting with State and Federal highways would be beneficial to people of the Arizona Strip and those of the entire Nation.

"A large part of the grazing areas now supervised by the grazing service office of the Bureau of Land Management at St. George, Utah, are located in Coconino and Mohave Counties, Ariz., in relatively close proximity to Fredonia, Ariz. Convenient office space is available in the Fredonia Community Building. The transfer of the office would simplify the payment of taxes and fees and eliminate much existing dissatisfaction with the handling of matters pertaining to grazing in this area.

"Roadbuilding and other improvements essential to the development of the Arizona Strip and the adjacent areas in Nevada and Utah could be arranged on a cooperative basis between the States concerned and the Federal Government.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"That the National Park Service, the Indian Affairs Bureau, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Public Roads Bureau give most serious consideration to the development of these constructive projects in cooperation with the governments of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and Utah, for the benefit of the Indians and others residing in the area and the people of the United States.

"Passed the house March 3, 1953.

"Passed the senate March 21, 1953."

CONSTRUCTION OF TUTTLE CREEK DAM ON BIG BLUE RIVER, KANS.—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present House Resolution No. 28, adopted by the House of Representatives of the Kansas Legislature on March 17, urging Congress to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle

Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas, and ask unanimous consent that it be appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works; and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"House Resolution 28

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas, until debatable issues have been resolved as recommended by the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas

"Whereas during recent years studies and research in flood-control methods have evolved new theories and practices for the effective and economical control of flood water; and

"Whereas the preliminary report of the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas, in conjunction with the Kansas Industrial Development Commission, states that more efficient methods of flood control do exist and questions the advisability of constructing said dam; and

"Whereas the Missouri Basin Survey Commission questions the justification of the said Tuttle Creek Reservoir; and

"Whereas the said reports state that the construction of said Tuttle Creek Dam will not control flood waters to a measure commensurate with the cost and damages occasioned by and resulting from such construction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and memorialize the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to halt the preliminary work now in progress for the construction of Tuttle Creek Dam on the Big Blue River in Kansas, until debatable issues have been resolved as recommended by the independent board of engineers appointed by the Governor of Kansas; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each Member of the Congress of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget of the United States."

I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the house, and was adopted by that body March 17, 1953.

CHARLES D. STOUGH,
Speaker of the House.
FRANK GARRETT,
Chief Clerk of the House.

EFFECT OF INCREASED CRUDE OIL IMPORTS ON TEXAS PETROLEUM INDUSTRY — SPEECH AND RESOLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the people of Texas, a State which produced more than a billion barrels of petroleum last year, view with growing concern the continuing increase in shipments of crude oil into the United States from other parts of the world. This concern has been given official expression recently by the Chairman of the Railroad Commission of Texas and by resolutions adopted by the Texas Legislature.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered Saturday, March 28, by Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, chairman of the Texas Railroad Commission, before the North Texas Gas & Oil Association in Wichita Falls, Tex., together with a resolution adopted by the Texas Senate on February 16, 1953, and a resolution adopted by the Texas House of Representatives on February 18, 1953.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and the address and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ERNEST O. THOMPSON, CHAIRMAN, TEXAS RAILROAD COMMISSION, BEFORE THE NORTH TEXAS OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION, WICHITA FALLS, TEX., MARCH 28, 1953

There is an immutable law called the law of supply and demand. It cannot be denied or thwarted. Certainly it applies to oil just as it does to cotton, beef, and butter.

Happily and wisely our legislature in Texas has long ago provided us with a market demand statute that forbids production of petroleum above transportation facilities or market demand to prevent waste.

With imports increasing so greatly it is becoming constantly clearer that domestic oil production cannot be maintained at current levels without causing serious oversupply.

Production above current market demand is waste.

Crude stocks are already at the peak estimates. They are much higher than the figures estimated as adequate by many estimators and purchasers.

On a day's-supply basis, United States stocks of crude and products are each higher now than a year ago, but below the comparable date in 1949. Using a 5-week average demand, gasoline stocks on February 28 were equal to 51.9 days of supply, which was the lowest of the 5 years except 1952. For crude stocks and products, the days'-supply situation on February 28, 1953, as compared with the corresponding date in the other 4 years, follows:

	Days of supply				
	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949
Crude	42.1	40.0	37.7	47.8	40.1
Gasoline	51.9	40.2	53.8	59.6	59.2
Kerosene	47.7	34.0	25.4	36.4	48.9
Distillate	34.0	27.6	27.6	36.5	38.2
Residual	33.1	26.6	26.7	31.3	43.3

Certainly stocks of all products are adequate. Yes, more than adequate.

The estimates of increase in demand of petroleum and products for 1953 run about 4 percent above the demand for 1952. But imports of crude and products increased an average of 12.8 percent in 1952 over those of 1951.

The 1952 imports averaged, crude 571,000 barrels per day, and products 380,000 barrels daily, for a total, crude and products, of 951,000 barrels daily.

But here is the thing that really hurts the domestic producer and driller and oilfield supplier and the oil-country economy.

In the fourth quarter of 1952 crude imports increased 45 percent over crude imports in the fourth quarter of 1951, and products increased 11 percent also. Thus it seems that there are going to be made imports to be reckoned with in filling our demand here at home. The more oil imports, the less domestic oil needed to fill demand.

We became a net importer of oil several years ago. We have lost our oil exports. Many refineries have been built in Europe since the war, and those refineries are, of course, taking the business, and they will keep it. We furnished the funds to build competition against ourselves. Now we, of course, cannot sell our oil products abroad, and we are having increasing trouble here in Texas.

Perhaps we can take some comfort in the knowledge that we shall have our own oil to defend our country and the free world should war come, which God forbid.

But I do hope that the penalty of our American generosity will not be that exploration and drilling here at home will be throttled and thereby weaken our own national security.

It is regretted that our domestic oil is being supplanted by imported petroleum. Your railroad commission has been vigilant in calling attention throughout recent years to this impending threat.

We know that we have no legal power over imports. We have repeatedly so stated. But as a free American with a sense of fair play, I have repeatedly invited attention to the increasing imports. How can wells in Texas with an average daily allowable of 20 barrels successfully compete with wells producing 5,000 barrels per day in the Middle East?

Your Texas Legislature, both senate and house of representatives, has unanimously passed resolutions asking the importing companies to report monthly to the Railroad Commission on their imports the past month and to give estimates on intended oil imports for the succeeding 5 months.

We promptly mailed copies of these resolutions to the heads of the importing companies and requested them to make the monthly imports report along with their nominations to purchase Texas crude oil.

I am happy to report that we have had responses from all of these companies stating they would comply gladly with our request; and they all did so comply at the hearing just held in Austin, except the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, who stated in their reply that "this information probably will come to you through the public press."

It should be remembered that within the last 3 years the peak petroleum consuming season has shifted from summer to wintertime due to the great increase in oil-heating use.

Also, you should keep in mind that regularly since then the second quarter of each year has been the lowest season of demand. This year proves to be no exception to this experience.

Comfort can be had, though, in the statistics that show the third and fourth quarters of the year show sizeable increases in crude demand. So it averages out over the long pull. Anyone taking a long-range view need not worry about these second-quarter dips in demand. Consider rather the entire year and average it out.

It should be noted, however, that the winter just now coming to a close was a very mild winter season, and therefore the heating-oil stocks laid up for a normal winter left the industry with a lot of heating oil on hand. This accentuated the oversupply accordingly.

As a matter of fact, Texas produced more than 1 billion barrels of oil last year. I congratulate the producers on this accomplishment.

Texas now has a daily reserve sustained producing ability in excess of 600,000 barrels above the present rate of production at the most efficient rates. This is our wartime security oilwise.

Whatever success we have had in bringing stability to your industry—and it has been considerable—has come about by carefully doing only those things that prevent physical waste in the production, transportation, and storage of crude oil.

We have stayed strictly within the expressed powers set out in our splendid statutes passed by the legislature. But can we preserve these statutes and expand conservation of oil and gas practices which prevent waste if the reward for our good judgment in Texas results in penalties that will

cripple or destroy our economy, thus forcing many of those who have pioneered for oil production in Texas and elsewhere to sacrifice their properties to the designing cunning or thoughtless leadership responsible for the impending chaos? An indication of this danger might be observed in the reluctance of other States to reduce their oil production and share the burden that is now being borne by Texas alone.

We never consider our price except as set out in the statute which says we shall consider the consumers of gasoline and lubricating oil. By this is meant that we must not make oil scarce in order to make it high to the consumer.

Certainly the ample stocks today, crude and products, reflect that we have allowed even more than ample oil production.

We, your public servants, are only carrying out the law by the standards set out for our guidance in those statutes.

We appreciate your wholehearted cooperation and thank you for your continued counsel and guidance.

Thank you.

"Senate Resolution 79

"Whereas the National Petroleum Council, which is made up of all segments of the industry, in 1949 stated 'A national oil policy for the United States,' and on the subject of imports this policy was stated as follows:

" 'The Nation's economic welfare and security require a policy on petroleum imports which will encourage exploration and development efforts in the domestic industry and which will make available a maximum supply of domestic oil to meet the needs of this Nation.

" 'The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent factors, provides the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.

" 'The implementation of an import policy, therefore, should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.

" 'Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oil fields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security'; and

"Whereas, in brief, this means inescapably that imports should supplement but never supplant our domestic crude production. To allow imported crude to supplant our home production would hamper our development in America and hinder our internal security.

"Recently our imports have increased, and this increase gives grave concern to the State of Texas.

"This increase in imports means a reduction in the production of Texas crude oil, and therefore affects the economy of our State adversely: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the State of Texas calls upon those leaders of the petroleum industry who are importing oil to use some business statesmanship and thereby protect the economy of our country and preserve our national security; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of Texas calls upon each importing company to publish monthly the amount of imports brought into this country by it during the previous month.

"BEN RAMSEY,
"President of the Senate."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on February 16, 1953.

LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

"H. S. R. 103

"Whereas the National Petroleum Council, which is made up of all segments of the industry, in 1949 stated 'A national oil policy for the United States,' and on the subject of imports this policy was stated as follows:

" 'The Nation's economic welfare and security require a policy on petroleum imports which will encourage exploration and development efforts in the domestic industry and which will make available a maximum supply of domestic oil to meet the needs of this Nation.

" 'The availability of petroleum from domestic fields produced under sound conservation practices, together with other pertinent factors, provide the means for determining if imports are necessary and the extent to which imports are desirable to supplement our oil supplies on a basis which will be sound in terms of the national economy and in terms of conservation.

" 'The implementation of an import policy, therefore, should be flexible so that adjustments may readily be made from time to time.

" 'Imports in excess of our economic needs, after taking into account domestic production in conformance with good conservation practices and within the limits of maximum efficient rates of production, will retard domestic exploration and development of new oil fields and the technological progress in all branches of the industry which is essential to the Nation's economic welfare and security'; and

"Whereas, in brief, this means inescapably that imports should supplement but never supplant our domestic crude production. To allow imported crude to supplant our home production would hamper our development in America and hinder our internal security.

"Recently our imports have increased, and this increase gives grave concern to the State of Texas.

"This increase in imports means a reduction in the production of Texas crude oil, and therefore affects the economy of our State adversely: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the State of Texas calls upon those leaders of the petroleum industry, who are importing oil, to use some business statesmanship and thereby protect the economy of our country and preserve our national security; and be it further

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Texas calls upon each importing company to publish monthly the amount of imports brought into this country by it during the previous month.

"REUBEN E. SENTERFITT,
"Speaker of the House."

I hereby certify that H. S. R. 103 was adopted by the house on February 18, 1953.

CLARENCE JONES,
Chief Clerk of the House.

THE DECLINE OF AGRICULTURAL PRICES—RESOLUTION OF THIEF LAKE FARMERS UNION, MIDDLE RIVER, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Thief Lake Farmers Union Local, of Middle River, Minn., relating to the decline in agricultural prices.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the farmers of Marshall County and the Nation as a whole have been affected adversely by falling prices; and

Whereas we believe that to discriminate against farmers and especially against family-size farmers, is to discriminate against the welfare of the entire Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we demand that the Congress of the United States take immediate action to correct the injustices that are being done to the Nation's farmers, and that we so notify our duly elected Senators and Congressmen, and to see that full parity is brought about at once.

THIEF LAKE FARMERS UNION LOCAL,
MIDDLE RIVER, MINN.
ERNEST BERG, *President.*
MRS. PAUL CWIKLA, *Secretary.*

FEDERAL CONTROL OF OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., on March 23, 1953, relating to Federal control of offshore oil and gas, be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 220

Resolved, That the Board of County Commissioners of St. Louis County, Minn., hereby places itself on record in favor of legislation placing offshore oil and gas rights under Federal control and providing that royalties derived therefrom be dedicated to educational and national defense purposes.

Resolved, further, That the county auditor is hereby authorized and directed to submit a certified copy of this resolution to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Minnesota.

RESOLUTIONS OF CO-OP SERVICES, INC., NEW YORK MILLS, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, four resolutions adopted by the members of the Co-op Services, Inc., at their 42d annual meeting held on March 20, 1953.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

CO-OP SERVICES, INC.,
New York Mills, Minn., March 25, 1953.
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of Co-op Services, Inc., representing 1,500 shareholders, passed the following resolution at our 42d annual meeting which was held in New York Mills, Minn., on March 20, 1953. We ask that you give this resolution your gravest consideration.

"Resolved, That the members and patrons of Co-op Services, Inc., of New York Mills, Minn., ask the Federal Government to buy butter in preference to oleomargarine, for Army personnel use and in other Federal school programs, etc.; and further that 90 score or better butter be purchased."

VERNER A. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

CO-OP SERVICES, INC.,
New York Mills, Minn., March 25, 1953.
Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of Co-op Services, Inc., representing 1,500 share-

holders, passed the following resolution at our 42d annual meeting which was held in New York Mills, Minn., on March 20, 1953. We ask that you give this resolution your gravest consideration.

"Whereas the farmers are now suffering in a terrific economic squeeze between falling farm prices and rising operating costs.

"And this not only endangers farm families, the jobs and living standards of workers, the property of small independent business, but our entire national economy;

"Therefore we again reiterate our demand for 100 percent parity price supports with regard to all major farm products, including perishables—as was promised by President Eisenhower in his September 23, 1952 speech at Kasson, Minn.

"Further we want our own PMA farmer elected committees to administer all farm programs."

VERNER A. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

To the Committee on Finance:

CO-OP SERVICES, INC.,
New York Mills, Minn., March 25, 1953.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of Co-op Services, Inc., representing 1,500 shareholders, passed the following resolution at our 42d annual meeting which was held in New York Mills, Minn., on March 20, 1953. We ask that you give this resolution your gravest consideration:

"Resolved, That we, the members and patrons of Co-op Services, Inc., of New York Mills, Minn., wish to again reiterate our stand against any further crippling tax levies against cooperatives which only result in added expense to the sole owners who are the people in the cooperatives' surrounding area."

VERNER ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Ordered to lie on the table:

CO-OP SERVICES, INC.,
New York Mills, Minn., March 25, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of Co-op Services, Inc., representing 1,500 shareholders, passed the following resolution at our 42d annual meeting which was held in New York Mills, Minn., on March 20, 1953. We ask that you give this resolution your gravest consideration:

"Whereas we are greatly concerned with the preservation of the irreplacable natural resources of our Nation which are all too often wasted to the benefit of a few and detrimental to the national welfare as a whole; and

"Whereas the offshore oil reserves off the United States coastline is one of our few remaining natural resources, we fear if national rights in this area are relinquished to a few States it may set the pattern for a shortsighted policy of disposition of the remaining Federal natural resources, such as timber, range land, water, and minerals: Therefore be it

"Resolved That this meeting favors control of the so-called offshore oil reserves by the Federal Government for the benefit of all of the people of these United States."

VERNER ANDERSON,
Secretary.

STATEMENT BY MAYORS COMMITTEE ON OFFSHORE OIL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a statement on offshore oil by the mayors of 27 large United States cities.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAYORS' STATEMENT ON OFFSHORE OIL, MARCH 1953

The United States Supreme Court has decided in three different cases that the oil in the land lying beyond low tide and under the sea around the United States belongs to all the people of the Nation.

The civilian and defense needs of our country require prompt exploration and development of this offshore resource, and at the same time national demands require intelligent use and conservation of this resource.

The education of more than 4 million children is being impaired by inadequate buildings, under-trained teachers, and part-time school attendance due largely to the inability of the State and local taxing units to meet the growing costs of education.

The Anderson bill, S. 107, keeps the offshore oil for all the people of the United States, and reaffirms State title to the tidelands, rivers, bays, the Great Lakes, and all other lakes, harbors, inlets, jetties, piers, docks and other harbor facilities, to all filled lands and to lands that might be filled in the future for public purposes.

The proposed oil-for-education amendment to the Anderson bill, S. 107, would provide that Federal revenues gained from the leasing of these offshore lands would be used for grants in aid to the 48 States for education.

The Congress should enact the Anderson bill, S. 107, with the oil-for-education amendment, and thereby provide that the offshore-oil resources of the Nation will be developed in the interest of all the people, and that the Federal revenues gained therefrom would be used to help meet the urgent need of the several States for aid to schools.

PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATION OF MEAT — PETITION OF NELSON COUNTY FARM BUREAU, PEKIN, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the petition of the Nelson County Farm Bureau, of Pekin, N. Dak., praying that action be taken immediately to bar all importation of meat as long as farmers are taking distress prices for beef.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NELSON COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Pekin, N. Dak., March 17, 1953.

GENTLEMEN: The Nelson County Farm Bureau requests that action be taken immediately to bar all importation of all meat as long as farmers are taking distress prices for beef.

All Nelson County farmers object to $20 Republican calves, nursing $400 Democratic cows.

It's not fair to the farmer, when farm prices go down, and everything he has to buy goes up.

Sincerely,

Mrs. CLARENCE RUUD,
Secretary.

DECLINE IN FARM PRICES—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF RICE LAKE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a resolution adopted by the common council of Rice Lake, Wis., with regard to the recent critical decline in farm prices, a matter which has aroused intense concern throughout the State of Wisconsin and other great agricultural areas.

I present the resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and thereafter be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas agricultural income has a definite bearing on the Nation's economy, and agricultural trends are closely watched as barometers; and

Whereas Barron County is basically an agricultural and dairy county, and Rice Lake is part of that county and naturally feels the effects of up and down trends in agricultural income sooner than do industrial sections of the land; and

Whereas farm prices have now dropped 12 percent under the 1952 level, while many things the farmer has to buy have continued to increase in price: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the mayor and common council, duly assembled this 24th day of March, 1953, do feel a concern over the trend in agricultural prices, and therefore respectfully petition Hon. Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra T. Benson to do everything practical to place all agricultural income on an equal basis with the things the farmer has to buy to maintain his farm operations, so that the family-size farm will survive, and remain prosperous; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of these United States, Hon. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Senators, and Hon. MERLIN HULL, Congressman.

FRANK A. HAVEL,
Mayor.

Attest:

G. M. BAILEY,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 4130. A bill to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 135).

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1419. A bill to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; without amendment (Rept. No. 136).

TITLES TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. JACKSON, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) submitted minority views on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which were ordered to be printed, as part 2 of Report No. 133.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1513. A bill for the relief of Erno Schischa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1514. A bill to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. TAFT when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1515. A bill granting the consent of Congress to certain Western States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the Western States and establishing the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUNT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1516. A bill for the relief of Akemi Terada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1517. A bill for the relief of Helen Knight Waters and Arnold Elzey Waters, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1518. A bill for the relief of Raymond George Hamway; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1519. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Datenko;

S. 1520. A bill for the relief of Andre Styka; and

S. 1521. A bill for the relief of Richard Robert Kabisch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1522. A bill to exempt from the Federal Power Act certain State and municipal water project works and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THYE:

S. 1523. A bill to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1524. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes;

S. 1525. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.;

S. 1526. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1527. A bill to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list of recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units;

S. 1528. A bill to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force;

S. 1529. A bill to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes; and

S. 1530. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. HUNT) (by request)

S. 1531. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1532. A bill for the relief of certain individuals who were denied receipt of retired pay under title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 from the effective date thereof although they were then qualified therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1533. A bill for the relief of Hilario Camino Moncado;

S. 1534. A bill for the relief of Michael Patrinos;

S. 1535. A bill for the relief of Hilda Tobe;

S. 1536. A bill for the relief of Elpis Eleftheria Morelelis; and

S. 1537. A bill for the relief of Diana Toy Moncado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CASE, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. THYE):

S. 1538. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to strengthen American agriculture and reduce the cost of price-support operations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MUNDT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1539. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1540. A bill to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1541. A bill to require the deferment of action with respect to the transfer of the operating headquarters of the Tennessee Valley Authority from Knoxville, Tenn., to any other place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEFAUVER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1542. A bill to provide for the health and protection of the citizens of the United States from harmful chemical additives in pesticides; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1543. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1544. A bill to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PAYNE (by request):

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution authorizing the District of Columbia to enter into Interstate Civil Defense Compacts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS AND FISCAL RESOURCES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to carry out in general the purpose of the President's message of Monday, to create a commission of 25 members to study State-Federal relationships. The essential purposes of the commission are set forth in the following language in the bill:

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate all of the present activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments. The Commission shall determine and report whether there is justification for Federal aid in the various fields in which Federal aid is extended; whether there are other fields in which Federal aid should be extended; whether Federal control with respect to these activities should be limited, and, if so, to what extent; whether Federal aid should be limited to cases of need; and all other matters incident to such Federal aid, including the ability of the Federal Government and the States to finance activities of this nature.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Does the study include aid to foreign nations?

Mr. TAFT. No; it has no relation to aid to foreign nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1514) to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources, introduced by Mr. TAFT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator

from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill requesting the Congress to grant its consent to the 11 Western States, Hawaii and Alaska, to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the West, and to establish a Western States Commission for Higher Education.

In introducing the bill, may I direct the attention of the Congress to the fact that last year some 20,000 young men in the United States could not enter a school of medicine or dentistry because of the lack of educational facilities.

Other thousands of young men who would like to study medicine or dentistry, understanding that they may never be able to enter a medical or dental school, do not embark upon a course of preparatory study for these professions.

In the Rocky Mountain area, 10 States, with over 10 million people, extending from Canada to Mexico, do not have a single institution of higher learning for the teaching of dentistry.

The bill is designed to make all of the higher educational facilities in the West available to the citizens from any of the 11 Western States, thereby increasing the possibility for higher education on the one hand—and greatly decreasing costs in many States on the other.

The bill provides a number of concrete benefits:

First. States now without training facilities in medicine, dentistry, and veterinarian medicine would be in a position to provide educational opportunities for their youth.

Second. Established schools would receive a welcome financial boost—in that nonresident students' home States will pay their full cost of training and the schools can add the staffs and equipment required to strengthen educational opportunities and facilities to all students.

Third. Qualified students from States without training facilities would be able to secure training in the field of their choice and, upon graduation, can help to strengthen the health-service picture in their home States.

Fourth. The West as a region would benefit by pooling its educational resources and planning the maximum utilization of these resources.

Most of the Western States, through their State legislatures, have created an Interstate Commission on Higher Education and have provided appropriations as follows:

Arizona: For interstate commission administration, $7,000 1 year; for local administration, $3,000 1 year; for student contracts, $56,000 1 year.

New Mexico: For interstate commission administration, $14,000 2 years; for student contracts, $100,000 2 years.

Oregon: For interstate commission administration, $14,000 2 years; for student contracts, $70,000 2 years.

Wyoming: For interstate commission administration, $10,000 2 years; for medical student contracts, $100,000 2 years.

In all probability other States have taken such action but I do not have the information available.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the committee to which the bill will be referred will take prompt action to the end that the proposed legislation may be accomplished at this session of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1515) granting the consent of Congress to certain Western States and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii to enter into a compact relating to higher education in the Western States and establishing the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, introduced by Mr. HUNT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL POWER ACT OF CERTAIN STATE AND MUNICIPAL WATER PROJECT WORKS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to exempt from the Federal Power Act certain State and municipal water project works, and for other purposes.

The Federal Power Act provides that any construction, except by a Federal agency, of a powerplant, a dam, or a diversion from a navigable stream shall not be undertaken until a license is obtained from the Federal Power Commission. The act requires reports and compliance with certain rules and regulations of the Commission. The act further provides that at the expiration of 50 years from the date of the license the works may be taken by the United States under certain conditions.

The bill would prevent the capture of a powerplant owned by a State, or a State or interstate agency, by the United States, and would exempt them from burdensome duties in administration and reporting. It would exempt them from license requirements generally.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1522) to exempt from the Federal Power Act certain State and municipal water project works, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to create a permanent independent small-business agency to be known as the Small Business Administration.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have become convinced that small business needs an agency in Washington to represent its interests in all the phases of Government activity. Our experience with the Small Defense Plants Administration has taught us how effective a small, efficiently organized agency can be in seeing that small business gets serious consideration in the formulation of Government policies.

My bill would create an agency similar in many respects to the Small Defense Plants Administration, but would broaden its scope to include other than strictly defense activities in order to preserve small-business institutions under our free-enterprise system.

I quote the statement of policy incorporated in the bill in outlining its purposes, as follows:

The essence of the American economic system of private enterprise is free competition. Only through full and free competition can free markets, free entry into business, and opportunities for the expression and growth of personal initiative and individual judgment be assured. The preservation and expansion of such competition is basic not only to the economic well-being but to the security of this Nation. Such security and well-being cannot be realized unless the actual and potential of small business is encouraged and developed. It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect insofar as is possible the interests of small-business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to ensure that a fair proportion of the total purchases and contracts for supplies and services for the Government be placed with small-business enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1523) to create a Small Business Administration and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ARMED SERVICES LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, eight bills relating to the armed services. One of the bills is introduced by myself, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Each bill is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the Department of Defense, which explains the purpose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letters in each case be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and the letters will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bills introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. HUNT), by request, were read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1524. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1524 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize

the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain supplies and services to foreign naval vessels on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to furnish foreign naval vessels at United States ports and naval bases the following categories of supplies and services under the conditions prescribed for each category: (1) routine port services such as pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities on a reimbursable basis but without an advance of funds either at a local or a departmental level, when comparable services are furnished on a like basis to United States naval vessels at ports and naval bases of the country concerned; (2) miscellaneous supplies such as fuel, provisions, spare parts, and general stores likewise on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds, but only after an agreement conferring reciprocal rights on the United States and covering reimbursement for the supplies has been negotiated with the country concerned; (3) supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations to foreign naval vessels, including the installation of equipment, only after funds covering the estimated cost thereof have been made available to the United States in advance. The bill also provides that payments for the first two categories of supplies and services may be credited to current appropriations so as to be available for the same purposes as the appropriations initially charged.

Under existing law, supplies and services of the sort enumerated in this proposed legislation must be paid for in advance where foreign naval vessels are the recipients. As a general rule, when United States naval vessels visit the ports or naval bases of foreign countries, no such demand for payment in advance is made. The need for the proposed legislation, therefore, is indicated by the fact that the present necessity of obtaining advances of funds from representatives of friendly foreign nations when their vessels visit the United States has been a constant source of embarrassment to United States naval commanders. This legislation would eliminate this source of embarrassment, and by so doing would further the friendly cooperation of naval forces of foreign governments with those of the United States. It should be noted that the proposed legislation would eliminate the requirement for obtaining payment in advance only where necessary to place the United States on a reciprocal basis with the country concerned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

S. 1525. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1525 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 certain parcels of land in exchange for other lands and interests therein at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The objective of this proposed legislation is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1 of Tarrant County, Tex., all right, title, and interest, except navigation easement rights and such other rights in, to, and over said lands as the Secretary of the Navy may deem appropriate, of the United States in and to three parcels of land at the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex. This transfer would be conditioned upon the conveyance to the United States by the water-control district of fee simple title to two described parcels of land located at the former air station, together with perpetual navigation easement rights, acceptable to the Secretary of the Navy, over other lands of the District lying within the flight clearance zone of the east-west runway of the air station. The Secretary of the Navy would be authorized to accept the conveyances to the United States by the water-control district.

Title to the lands comprising the former United States Marine Corps Air Station, Eagle Mountain Lake, Tex., was acquired in 1942 by the filing of a declaration of taking with pending condemnation proceedings. Among the numerous ownerships embraced within the area thus acquired was tract No. 16, which was owned by the Tarrant County Water Control and Improvement District No. 1. This tract is located on the eastern boundary of the station area and contains 453.5 acres, more or less.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

S. 1526. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1526 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "To amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation would amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947, as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy and provide for the rank of that officer upon retirement. The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Navy, a Chief of the Medical Service Corps from among officers of the active list of that corps of the permanent grade of lieutenant commander or above to serve for a term of not more than 4 years. While so serving the officer would have the rank of captain in the Navy and would receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for that rank.

The proposed legislation also provides that, in the discretion of the President, an officer who is retired while serving as Chief of the Medical Service Corps or who, having so served 2½ years or more, is subsequently retired while serving in a lower rank, may be retired with the rank held by him while serving as Chief of the Medical Service Corps and with retired pay based on the active-duty pay of that rank.

At the time that the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act was enacted authorizing a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Army with the rank of colonel, the Department of the Navy was of the opinion that there was no necessity for the creation by statute of a similar billet for the Navy. Experience over the period of more than 3 years since the statute was enacted has shown that such authority is now needed. There are in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy 810 officers, most of them coming from former enlisted status in the Hospital Corps and the others from civil life with degrees in pharmacy and optometry and doctorate degrees in physics, biology, biochemistry, and the related sciences. The problem of administration for such a diversified group of officers has shown a need for a chief of corps who should have the rank of captain and who could assume the responsibility for the proper handling of the administration and personnel problems incident to the efficient functioning of the corps. Although the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act provides that 2 percent of the corps may have the rank of captain, no officer of the corps has yet become eligible for promotion to that rank. Further, officers of the corps are constantly working with their counterparts in the Army, many of them holding the rank of colonel, and it is considered essential that at least one officer of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy be of corresponding rank in order to represent properly the corps and the Medical Department of the Navy in the many joint Army, Navy, and Air Force problems which arise.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposed legislation was presented for the consideration of the 82d Congress as part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1951. It passed the House of Representatives as H. R. 6319 on March 17, 1952.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

S. 1527. A bill to amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1527 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1953.

Honorable RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend section 40b of the National Defense Act, as amended (41 Stat. 759, 777), to remove the limitation upon the detail of officers on the active list for recruiting service and for duty with ROTC units."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 40b of the National Defense Act (10 U. S. C. 386, 536) authorizes the President to detail Regular Army personnel to ROTC units. It is also provided that in time of peace retired personnel shall not be detailed to ROTC units without their consent, and "no officer on the active list shall be detailed for recruiting service or for duty at a school or college * * * when officers on the retired list can be secured who are competent for such duty." It is the purpose of this proposed legislation to repeal the quoted provision, which prohibits officers on the active list from being detailed for recruiting service and for duty as ROTC instructors when competent officers on the retired list can be secured.

The ROTC program is one of the primary officer procurement programs for both the Regular and Reserve components of the Armed Forces. It is important, therefore, that the officers assigned to such units as instructors be fully qualified in current military weapons and techniques. To meet this requirement, it is necessary that they be procured primarily from officers in the active service.

While the provision which would be repealed by this legislation has been inoperative since the beginning of World War II and has thus caused no problem as yet, it will become operative on or before April 1, 1953, under the provisions of section 1 (b) (2) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 330, 333). This proposal is, therefore, submitted to the Congress in accordance with the direction of both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees that separate recommendations for permanent legislation be submitted on those provisions which should be permanently changed.

Such a provision appears to be inconsistent with the principle of flexibility in authority to assign military personnel, including Regular, Reserve, and retired personnel to any military duty, wherever and whenever needed, and for which best qualified. The need for unrestricted authority to assign personnel where needed is greater today than ever before. The latest congressional expression of this principle of flexibility in assignment of personnel may be found in section 237 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481, 492), which specifically provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of law, Reserve personnel serving on active duty may be assigned to any duty to which Regular personnel may be assigned. Such duty includes duty with ROTC units.

Aside from these considerations and from a practical standpoint, the time, personnel, and administration required during peacetime to screen the retired list for eligible officers and the correspondence required to obtain their consent is uneconomical in comparison to the number of officers who would be selected for such assignments.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Section 501 (a) of S. 325 and H. R. 1168, 82d Congress, which were bills to reorganize and strengthen the ROTC programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force would have repealed section 40b of the National Defense Act, in its entirety.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this legislation will cause no apparent increase in budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense as the personnel involved are paid from the appropriation "Military Personnel, Army," regardless of whether they are retired officers or officers in the active military service and utilization of retired personnel will not affect total spaces authorized for these functions.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense.

S. 1528. A bill to continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1528 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To continue in effect certain appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of the proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

During World War II the appointments of certain officers in the Army, which at the time included the Air Force, were for a limited period of time. The duration of these appointments was for 5 years or for the period of World War II and for 6 months thereafter. The appointments of many other officers were not limited in this manner. For example, appointments in the Regular Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, in addition to the appointments in the Naval Reserve and in the National Guard of the United States, were all made without any limitations as to the term of those appointments.

Under existing law, a large number of appointments as commissioned officers and as warrant officers which were continued in effect by section 1 (c) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act will terminate on April 2, 1953, and others will thereafter terminate on a day-by-day basis upon the expiration of the 5-year term specified in the appointment concerned. The proposed bill is necessary to prevent the creation of a gap in service for those persons who hold existing appointments and who are in a status of missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged. If these appointments are allowed to expire, the persons concerned will become civilians, and although the Missing Persons Act is effective to save the pay and allowances and other benefits encompassed within its provisions, it is not effective for benefits such as the accrual of cumulative years of service for purposes of pay and retirement. Further, if these appointments are allowed to expire, the services will have no specific statutory authority to hospitalize the personnel concerned, if such hospitalization is needed upon their return to the control of the United States. In this regard also, experience has shown that large numbers of these persons will be disabled after their period of internment as prisoners of war, and if their appointments have expired in the meantime there would be no authority to retire them for physical disability under title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 or any other law.

The proposed bill would protect the interests of the persons concerned by continuing their appointments in effect until such time as they could signify whether or not they desired an indefinite-term appointment. In the event they desire an indefinite-term appointment, they could be granted such an appointment, notwithstanding the fact that the period prescribed in section 224 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act had run before that person was returned to military control from his status as missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged.

The same problem is not presented in the case of enlisted personnel whose period of enlistment would otherwise expire during the period of time they are in a status of missing, missing in action, interned, captured, beleaguered, or besieged, as they may be retained in the service beyond the normal period for the convenience of the Government. (Act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 809), as amended (10 U. S. C. 652a)).

Senate Joint Resolution 57 and House Joint Resolution 226 are currently being considered by the Congress. These resolutions would continue, until July 1, 1953, most of the authorities (including the authority to continue the appointments covered by this proposal) heretofore continued by the Emergency Powers Continuation Act.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

S. 1529. A bill to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (c. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1529 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To amend the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the present law relating to posthumous appointments and promotions of military personnel (act of July 28, 1942; ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722; 10 U. S. C. 491c), so that the date of death of a person who had been previously carried in a missing-in-action status would be established as either the date of receipt of the evidence that such person was dead or the date of the death finding made under section 5 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, rather than the actual date of death.

Instances have occurred where a person, who was eligible for or under consideration for promotion, entered a missing-in-action status, with no information forthcoming so that a determination could be made as to whether he was dead or alive. Under the Missing Persons Act, such a person is presumed to be alive until determined to be otherwise, and, therefore, promotion action could be completed. At a later date it is sometimes discovered that the person actually died before the selection or recommendation for such appointment took place. Delay in ascertaining the death of persons missing in action frequently results from the failure of belligerents to make available current and adequate records of captures, deaths, or burials. Under the existing law relating to posthumous appointments and

promotions, the purported selection or appointment is void when it is later discovered or determined that death occurred prior to such persons' selection or appointment. In a case of this nature, the family or dependents of the deceased have first been notified that the person was missing in action; later they are notified of his promotion; and at a still later date, they are notified of his death and advised that the promotion was a nullity, and therefore, must be revoked because his date of death was actually prior to his promotion. This has caused needless grief and embarrassment to the next of kin, and has resulted in adverse publicity for the armed services.

BUDGET DATA

This legislative proposal would cause no apparent increase in budgetary requirements for the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

S. 1530. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy.

The letter to accompany Senate bill 1530 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 28, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of the proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to amend existing law relating to the appointment of nurses in the Regular Army, Regular Navy, and Regular Air Force, and women medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force by raising the age limits for original appointments and by authorizing such appointments in the grade of first lieutenant in the Army and Air Force and lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy.

Section 101 (c) of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (10 U. S. C. 166 (c)) prescribes an age limit of 28 years and authorizes appointment in the grade of second lieutenant only with respect to original appointments in the Army Nurse Corps of the Regular Army. Section 102 (c) of that act (10 U. S. C. 166a (c)) makes similar provision for appointments in the Women's Medical Specialist Corps of the Regular Army. The provisions of these sections are also applicable to comparable personnel in the Air Force. Section 204 of the act (34 U. S. C. 43c) provides for the appointment of nurses in the Regular Navy with the rank of ensign from persons who shall not have reached the age of 29 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed.

The effect of the amendments proposed by this legislation to sections 101 (c), 102 (c), and 204 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 would be (1) to prescribe an age limit of 27 years for appointments in the grade of second lieutenant or ensign, as appropriate, and (2) to authorize appointments of persons no more than 30 years of age in the grade of first lieutenant or lieutenant (junior grade), as appropriate. Such age limits, however, would be increased by a maximum of 5 years by the period of active commissioned Federal service performed after December 31, 1947.

The number of nurses and women medical specialists who are being appointed in the Regular components of the Army and Air Force under existing authority is insufficient to compensate for losses which are being incurred. It appears necessary, therefore, to relax somewhat the current age limitations on original appointments in order to make available to more people the opportunity to enter the Regular components of these services. And while the Secretary of the Navy has authority to utilize the act of April 18, 1946, as amended (34 U. S. C. 15), to appoint members of the Nurses Corps Reserve of the Navy and persons who served during World War II, who are under 40 years of age, in the Regular Navy with the highest grade held on active duty, that authority will expire on December 31, 1953. Therefore, section 3 of this proposal, which amends section 204 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, will make uniform the procurement opportunity for all three services in this field.

Raising the age limits for original commissioning will increase the number of Reserve officers eligible for selection as Regular officers. Thus, longer periods of active duty performed prior to Regular appointment will provide opportunity for a better evaluation of the capabilities and potentialities of the applicant. The average woman of 27 to 30 years of age has had an opportunity to investigate the various occupational possibilities available to her and can be expected to be more firm in her choice than a younger woman. Consequently, it is believed that, in addition to enlarging the field from which Regular nurses may be procured, a raising of the age limits for original commissioning and providing increased incentive through appointment in the grade of first lieutenant will create a more stable and larger supply of more highly qualified candidates for Regular appointment.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. HUNT) (by request):

S. 1531. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1531 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., April 1, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There are forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes," and a sectional analysis thereof.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to extend until July 1, 1955, the existing authority to induct male persons qualified in medicine, dentistry, and allied specialist categories into the Armed Forces. Current authority for such induction, which was granted by the act of September 9, 1950 (Public Law 779, 81st Cong.), expires on July 1, 1953.

Extension of the induction authority is considered to be the only means by which the replacement needs of the Armed Forces for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians can be met during fiscal years 1954 and 1955. Since the beginning of the Korean incident, and as a result of the consequent expansion in the size of the Armed Forces and of their participation in combat activities, the number of medical, dental, and veterinary personnel on active service has been increased substantially. The number of medical officers has increased from approximately 6,200 in June 1950, to approximately 13,700 today. In the same time the number of dental officers has increased from approximately 2,200 to 6,900, and the number of veterinary officers from approximately 318 to approximately 740. Of the additional personnel in the above categories now on active service, the preponderant majority are Reserve officers who were commissioned prior to induction and called to active service or were inducted and later commissioned. In either case, the maximum period of active service which such officers may be required to perform is 24 months. Therefore, since it must be assumed for planning purposes that there will be no material reduction in the size of the Armed Forces before the end of fiscal year 1955, there will be a continuing need for medical, dental, and veterinary officers to replace those officers similarly qualified who will complete their periods of active service before that time.

It is estimated that replacement needs for medical, dental, and veterinary officers during years 1954 and 1955 will be as follows:

	Fiscal year 1954	*Fiscal year 1955*
Medical officers	4,500	7,000
Dental officers	1,554	3,755
Veterinary officers	139	194

In addition, this proposal would (1) provide authority for the commissioning of otherwise qualified aliens subject to induction; (2) authorize medical personnel to be commissioned in grades commensurate with their professional qualifications regardless of whether they have had any prior service; (3) exempt from induction or recall to active duty under this proposal medical personnel who have served for 12 months or more since June 25, 1950; (4) authorize until July 1, 1955, medical reservists, who but for their status as reservists would be subject to induction, to be called to active duty; (5) provide for the discharge of certain medical specialists upon the completion of active duty; (6) clarify existing provisions as to service creditable for the purpose of induction and orders to active duty; and (7) authorize the National Advisory Committee to make recommendations for the deferment of persons engaged in residency training or serving on faculties of medical, dental, veterinary, or public-health schools.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT, AS AMENDED, SO AS TO PROVIDE FOR SPECIAL REGISTRATION, CLASSIFICATION, AND INDUCTION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND ALLIED SPECIALISTS CATEGORIES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Section 1 amends section 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, which is the present statutory authority governing the registration and induction of medical, dental, and allied specialist personnel, by adding the following paragraphs:

Paragraph (4) defines "active duty" and "active service," for the purposes of section 4 (1), to include active duty and active duty for training (as defined in subsections 101 (b) and (c) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952); active service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service, including the Reserve components thereof; service in the national health, safety, or interest and work of national importance performed by conscientious objectors; and equivalent service in the Armed Forces of World War II Allies of the United States performed prior to September 2, 1945.

Paragraph (5) further defines "active duty" and "active service" to include all periods of 1 day or more performed under competent orders, except periods spent as students in the Army specialized training program or the Navy V–12 program, or in similar programs, and periods spent in intern or residency training or in senior student programs or other postgraduate training prior to receipt of the appropriate professional degree.

Paragraph (6) provides that registrants under section 4 (1) who have served on active service since June 25, 1950, for a period of less than 12 months shall be liable for induction or reinduction under section 4 (1) unless they are members of a Reserve component. This paragraph is intended to avoid any interpretation that a person once inducted under section 4 (1) may not be reinducted under the same section even if he has spent only 1 day in service. It is also provided that persons who have served on active service since June 25, 1950, for a period of 12 months or more shall not be liable for induction or reinduction under section 4 (1). The 12-month period of active service which is used as a dividing line in this paragraph is also used in section 3 of this act in connection with discharges and with the liability for recall to active duty as a reservist.

Paragraph (7) provides that a special registrant under section 4 (1) will not be held to be ineligible for appointment as an officer on the sole ground that he is not a citizen of the United States or has not made a declaration of intent to become a citizen, unless he is forever barred from holding an office of trust under the United States by section 314 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. Certain aliens are required to register and are liable for induction under section 4 (1). Such an alien will be required to meet all other qualifications and conditions for appointment as an officer and will remain liable for induction if he fails to do so.

Section 2 amends section 4 (j) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to clarify and make more specific the functions and powers of the National Advisory Committee, with particular reference to making recommendations for the deferment of registrants engaged in residency training programs or serving on the faculties of medical, dental, and veterinary schools.

Section 3 amends the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 779, 81st Congress—

(a) to reenact those provisions which currently provide that if a person who served on active service as a physician, dentist, or in an allied specialist category, subsequent to September 16, 1940, was thereafter recalled to active duty as a physician or dentist in the Armed Forces (including the Public Health Service) he could be promoted to such grade or rank as was commensurate with his education, experience, and ability. The reenacted section is broadened so as to apply to any member of a Reserve component who has been or shall be called to active duty prior to July 1, 1955, as a physician, dentist, veterinarian, or in an allied specialist category in the Armed Forces (including the Public Health Service) whether or not he has previously performed active service. Such a person shall, under regulations prescribed by the President, be appointed, reappointed or promoted to such grade or rank as may be commensurate with his professional education, experience, or ability. This provision will insure that physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and allied specialist personnel will be given the rank to which they are entitled because of their professional qualifications without regard to whether they have previously served on active service or have previously been commissioned as Reserve officers. Thus uniform treatment of all such personnel will be possible.

(b) requires that persons who register under section 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, but are not then or thereafter registered under section 3 of the same act or otherwise obligated to serve on active service or in the Reserve components, and who subsequently accept a commission in a Reserve component and thereafter serve on active service for a period of 12 months or more, to be discharged upon completion of the period of active service or within 6 months after enactment of this section, whichever is later. The latter provision is for the benefit of persons who will have already completed their active service by the date of enactment of the section. The section applies to such persons because it is made retroactive to September 9, 1950, the date of enactment of Public Law 779. Persons discharged under the provisions of this section shall not thereafter be subject to induction under the provisions of section 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

(c) provides authority for calling to active duty persons who would be subject to registration or induction under section 4 (1), but who are exempted from such registration or from induction by section 4 (1) because they are members of Reserve components. Such persons are currently called to active duty under the authority of section 21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which expires on July 1, 1953. The maximum period of active duty which persons called under this section may be required to serve is 24 months. Persons who have performed a total of 12 months or more of active service since September 16, 1940, may be required to serve not more than 17 months and persons who have served on active service for 12 months or more since June 25, 1950, shall not be liable for recall under this provision for periods in excess of 30 days except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

(d) is a savings provision which makes it plain that this section does not affect or limit the authority to order members of the Reserve components to active duty which is contained in section 233 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act.

Section 4 amends section 7 of Public Law 779, to extend the effective date thereof and of the amendments made by this act from July 1, 1953, to July 1, 1955.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, by request, I also introduce for appropriate reference another bill. The bill would repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, requesting the legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1544) to repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The letter referred to is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington 25, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To repeal the authority to purchase discharge from the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 4 of the act of June 16, 1890 (10 U. S. C. 651) provides in part that in time of peace the President may, in his discretion and under such rules and upon such conditions as he shall prescribe, permit any enlisted man to purchase his discharge from the Army. The act of March 3, 1893, provides in part (34 U. S. C. 196) that in time of peace the President may, in his discretion and under such rules and upon such conditions as he shall prescribe permit any enlisted man to purchase his discharge from the Navy and the Marine Corps. Discharge by purchase has never been in effect in the Air Force, although section 4 of the act of June 16, 1890, would apply to the Air Force.

It is the purpose of this proposed legislation to repeal these provisions of law, since they are considered completely inconsistent with the present-day concept of universality of obligation and service upon which the Universal Military Training and Service Act is based. Authority exists, and has been utilized since the beginning of World War II, to discharge a person from the service when sufficient cause is shown. It is considered by the Department of Defense much more desirable and more in consonance with equity and fair play to continue to utilize such authority on a merit basis than to permit the relative worth of individuals to determine their continued liability for specified periods of service. For these reasons, it is not believed that any President would choose to exercise his discretion and authorize discharges under these archaic and obsolete provisions of law.

While these two laws are currently suspended by virtue of section 1 (b) (5) and 1 (b) (6) of the Emergency Powers Continuation Act (66 Stat. 330, 333), that suspension will terminate on or before April 1, 1953. And while section 8 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act provides, as did the Selective Service Acts of 1917 and 1940, that no person liable for training and service thereunder may purchase his discharge prior to the expiration of his period of training and service, this prohibition is limited to persons liable under section 4 of that act. Thus, after April 1, 1953, enlisted members of the armed services who are not subject to the Universal Military Training and Service Act would be eligible for consideration for discharge under this authority whereas persons inducted under or enlisting

pursuant to, the provisions of that act, would not.

In view of the foregoing, this proposal is submitted to the Congress in accordance with the request of both the House and Senate Judiciary Committees that separate recommendations for permanent legislation be submitted on those provisions contained in the Emergency Powers Continuation Act which should be permanently changed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO STRENGTHENING AGRICULTURE AND REDUCE COST OF PRICING SUPPORT OPERATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], my colleague the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 41 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(e) Whenever the Secretary shall make price support available to any commodity, the Secretary of the Treasury shall be notified and shall be advised the parity price of such commodity for the marketing season. Upon receipt of this notice, the Secretary of the Treasury shall impose and collect such duty or additional duty on all imports of such commodity as is necessary so that the duty-paid price in United States dollars is not less than the parity price."

The bill (S. 1538) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to strengthen American agriculture and reduce the cost of price-support operations, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate for 20 minutes on this subject, but I have sent to the Press Gallery a release which describes the bill, and I shall refrain from discussing it now. I hope other Senators will join in supporting the bill.

I now ask to have the release printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE BY SENATOR MUNDT

A new attempt to obtain parity prices for agriculture in the market place and lighten the load of farm-support programs to the taxpayers was launched in the United States Senate today when Senator KARL MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota) introduced a parity-protection amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 on behalf of himself and 12 other Senators.

The measure would call for flexible tariff duties that would be placed in effect immediately upon a price-support program being made available to any commodity, so that imported items of that commodity could not continue to force the price down to the American prducer and would permit importations of such commodities only at parity price levels or above, without paying the difference.

Senator MUNDT said the wide sponsorship of the measure in the Senate indicated the desire to eliminate conflicts which exist between the development of an expanded sound foreign-trade program and the policy of maintaining a sound agricultural economy in the United States:

Senator MUNDT added:

"Today this Nation stands committed to a policy of encouraging foreign trade and also to a policy of maintaining American agriculture at or near full parity levels. These cannot be successfully and practically achieved unless the policy on foreign trade takes into consideration the policy of maintaining agricultural prices at parity, and both policies must consider the cost to the taxpayer.

"American agriculture today faces, in many instances, competition from foreign producers which is based purely on that foreign nation's desire to obtain American dollars. No amount of efficiency here can compete with such a product when it is subsidized by its own government in order to undersell the American producer and take his market. The result is that, under law, the taxpayer must in turn subsidize the American producer while the products stack up in surplus and remain a threat to recovery of the market price for the American farmer.

"It is a known fact that for every $1 drop in farm income, there is a $7 drop in national income, for agriculture is the basic industry of this country. That is why this measure has been introduced as a parity protection measure, designed to protect the prices received by farmers at parity levels, which both political parties are pledged to try to achieve. It should receive wholehearted support, because it substitutes the theory of the first right to the American market for the American farmer, for the theory of letting cheaply produced and in many instances subsidized foreign products take our American markets for foreign producers and force the taxpayers to maintain parity for farmers with subsidies in this country.

"This Nation produces many crops which we produce in surplus, like cheese and butter, yet we permit imports from cheap-labor countries to force our producers onto the taxpayers' subsidy list. And where that alone would not solve the problem, it aggravates it and keeps the American producer from winning the battle to recover his own markets.

"We produce many crops in a deficiency supply. In the case of wool, we produce only one-third of the wool consumed in this country and yet the American producer is driven from the American market to the support program paid for by the American taxpayer, all because of subsidized foreign wool breaking the American market.

"There are many other crops in which we do not produce sufficiently to even supply our own market. We feel that foreign imports should come into this country to supply American demand and to compete with American producers, but such an exchange should be on a fair basis, on an American standard of living basis.

"That is why we have introduced this parity protection amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949. This act, designed to protect American agriculture at near parity levels, will be strengthened by this amendment, and the taxpayers of the United States will have a heavy burden lifted from them. For in this bill, when price supports are made available to any commodity, then the Government will say no foreign commodities can come in unless they come in at a fair American price. The American farmers with their efficiency can safely compete for the American market and more surely we can depend on a sound national economy."

Republican and Democratic Senators cosponsoring the bill with Senator MUNDT were: BARRETT, BENNETT, BUTLER of Nebraska, CASE, CORDON, DWORSHAK, HUNT, MCCARRAN, WATKINS, WELKER, YOUNG, JOHNSON of Colorado, and THYE.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from South Dakota that I wish to join as a cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to have the Senator from Minnesota do so, and that will change the number of sponsors from the mythical number 13 to the much more reasonable number of 14 Senators.

DEFERMENT OF TRANSFER OF OPERATING HEADQUARTERS OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FROM KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require the deferment of action with respect to the transfer of the operating headquarters of the Tennessee Valley Authority from Knoxville, Tenn., to any other place, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1541) to require the deferment of action with respect to the transfer of the operating headquarters of the Tennessee Valley Authority from Knoxville, Tenn., to any other place, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for a few minutes in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Tennessee may proceed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced requires that the Tennessee Valley Authority will not move its headquarters, situated in Knoxville, Tenn., to any other place before June 30, 1958.

The bill further provides that before making any such transfer the Board of Directors of the Authority will conduct a complete study of the purposes and effects of such a transfer and, not less than 6 months before any such proposed transfer, will transmit to Congress a full report of such a study.

Adopting the same principle which we have used in the reorganization plans, and in other congressional action, if Congress does not, by joint action of both Houses, disapprove such a proposed transfer prior to the expiration of 60 days of continuous session after the proposal has been received, then the consent of Congress will have been granted.

Under this bill the Authority could not move its office to any place not specified in the report submitted to Congress, and, of course, such office would be within the

geographical area within which the TVA operates.

Now, Mr. President, I would like to explain my reasons for introducing the bill. To do so will require that I review briefly some of the history behind the TVA Act.

When TVA was first established in 1933, the basic act provided that the corporation would be an inhabitant and resident of the northern judicial district of Alabama.

The reasoning behind this was that the only property then owned by the Government, and the only immediate operation of TVA, was Wilson Dam, at Muscle Shoals, Ala. The immediate purpose of TVA was to operate Wilson Dam and to maintain and operate the properties then owned by the United States in the vicinity of Muscle Shoals, where Wilson Dam is located.

However, the original act also directed TVA to improve navigation upon the Tennessee River; to control the destructive floodwaters in the Tennessee and Mississippi basins; and, of course, as by-products, to produce electrical power, further conservation, and to encourage a unified development program in the region.

Correctly, I think, the TVA chose Knoxville as its headquarters—Knoxville being the principal city situated within the mountainous area where the rushing waters of the Tennessee and its tributaries need first be controlled, if the ends of flood prevention and conservation are to be achieved; and secondly, can be most efficiently utilized for the production of electrical power through the construction of multipurpose dams.

TVA, therefore, for the past 20 years has operated in much the same manner as those many corporations which are formed under the laws of Delaware. For legal purposes—for annual meetings—it was a resident of the Northern Judicial District of Alabama. For operating purposes it was domiciled at Knoxville, Tenn.

That this was an efficient arrangement can be seen at a glance by looking at a map—or by reviewing power production and sales statistics.

In Tennessee there are now 14 major dams; 6 major steam plants; 865,000 customers; a net plant investment of $477,273,095. Power revenue, in the calendar year of 1952 was $72,000,000 in Tennessee.

In Alabama there are now only 3 major dams; 2 steam plants; 143,000 customers; a net plant investment of $157,725,455. Power revenue, in the calendar year of 1952 was only $15 million in Alabama.

Despite this, the TVA board of directors has announced recently that they plan to move headquarters from Knoxville to a building which will be built for them and leased by them at Muscle Shoals.

While I would question the wisdom of such a move, I have not attempted to bind the TVA into irrevocably establishing its headquarters in Knoxville in the bill which I have submitted.

Instead, I have attempted to draft what I consider to be a fair bill covering this situation. These are my reasons for doing so:

First. Such a move, effected suddenly, as proposed by the TVA Board, would uproot some 500 citizens of Knoxville, and their families. These people, many of them, own their own homes in Knoxville and have established roots in the community, since TVA first located there 20 years ago. Such a sudden move is a needless hardship.

Second. Knoxville and Knox County have recently completed a school-expansion program, brought on, in part at least, by the needs of serving these people of TVA and their families. Other facilities of Knoxville and Knox County are geared to their service. Such a sudden dislocation would correspondingly work a needless hardship on the community.

Third. TVA is now adequately housed at Knoxville, and this proposal, while technically a lease is in reality a purchase over a period of years of a building not yet constructed at Muscle Shoals—a step over which Congress should have the right of review.

Fourth. This bill does not disturb, in any way, the basic TVA Act. I am informed by the legislative counsel that it would be considered in the nature of overriding legislation, insofar as fixing the legal residence of TVA is concerned.

Fifth. By suddenly moving this number of families from Knoxville to Muscle Shoals—from a city which through 20 years has developed the housing, schooling, and other facilities necessary to serve them—the Board may be creating shortages in their proposed new home, which would cause not only hardships but the expenditure of additional funds to provide such facilities.

In conclusion, may I say that this is not a dispute between the States of Alabama and Tennessee insofar as I am concerned. Although a Senator from Tennessee, I would raise the same questions if the proposal were made to move this headquarters to any other city in Tennessee, suddenly and without advance preparation.

I consider the bill which I have sponsored a fair one. It leaves discretion as to the location in the hands of the TVA Board, with only a veto power in Congress, as is exercised in reorganizational plans. It delays any projected move a sufficient length of time for adjustments to be made. It provides that adequate notice must be given.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] introduced a bill with reference to the headquarters of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and made a statement explaining the bill, in which he gives some reasons for its introduction.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, a statement made by Mr. John Oliver, the general manager of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the House Committee on Appropriations, dealing with the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority headquarters.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS BY JOHN OLIVER, GENERAL MANAGER, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY, MARCH 27, 1953

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, before responding to the request of the chairman of this committee to discuss with you the details of TVA's plans for the removal of the offices of its board and a portion of its staff from Knoxville to Muscle Shoals, I should like, if I may, to correct certain misapprehensions that have regrettably arisen, at least in the local press.

This is not an abrupt or hastily considered change of residence of members of the Board or the general administrative offices. Fourteen years ago the Board of TVA, after an exhaustive study of all the factors concerned, concluded that it could serve the region best by moving its administrative offices to Muscle Shoals where its legal headquarters are located by act of Congress. Although the Board's decision to move has never been a secret, the actual date of moving has been postponed repeatedly because of national emergencies which prevented the use of materials necessary to carry out the plan. Those postponements have given the Board many opportunities to review its decision, and each year the evidence piles up that the decision of 14 years ago was a good one and has been too long delayed. Knoxville is not now a suitable location for the Board and central management of TVA.

At Muscle Shoals the Board of TVA will be nearer to the capitals of three of the four States where TVA's principal activities are concentrated. Muscle Shoals is in Alabama, but it is closer to Nashville, the capital of Tennessee, than is Knoxville. Muscle Shoals is nearer Montgomery, the capital of Alabama; it is nearer Jackson, the capital of Mississippi. As TVA witnesses testified before this committee earlier this month, TVA's relations with State and local governments are more and more important in the furtherance of the program going forward in the region. Likewise, Muscle Shoals is a central location on the navigation highway the Tennessee River has become. Similarly, although TVA's power headquarters will remain in Chattanooga, it is significant that Muscle Shoals is 125 miles nearer the center of the TVA power service area than Knoxville.

I should like to state as emphatically as I can that the Board has only one purpose in this move. It has not been guided by its own convenience or the convenience of its staff. Its single purpose is to place itself and its administrative staff where they can serve the region best.

We are aware that since the announcement of this move there have been many protests from the commercial and real-estate interests of Knoxville. This is entirely understandable and we do not complain that they have exercised their right to criticize and to protest. But the TVA Board has a job to do, and it is under a heavy obligation to do its job in the most effective way possible. Neither its personal convenience nor the pressures of local interests, nor even the preference of its employees, can be controlling when sound management dictates that a job can be done better for the region as a whole by working at one place rather than another. The responsibility of the TVA Board for such decisions cannot be delegated to local groups or the local press. I do not believe this committee would have it otherwise.

A BRIEF WORD ABOUT HISTORY

The considerations which led the Board in 1933 to locate administrative offices in Knoxville were precisely those which lead it now to move to Muscle Shoals. It went to Knoxville despite the fact that its legal

headquarters were Muscle Shoals and the general expectation was that members of the Board would reside there. But the most pressing job in 1933 was the construction of Norris Dam.

Fourteen years ago, within 3 years after the completion of Norris Dam, the Board of Directors concluded that the administrative advantages of remaining in Knoxville had largely disappeared, and that the time had therefore come for the move to Muscle Shoals. In 1940, funds were requested of the Bureau of the Budget for construction of office facilities at Muscle Shoals. The request came to the budget in the autumn of 1940, after the fall of France, when materials shortages were already developing as a result of the stepped-up-production program. So the allowance was postponed. World War II, of course, further delayed the move, and during the war years, when we were building dams on the tributaries, Knoxville was a reasonable location.

In the spring of 1946, in connection with the TVA appropriation bill for 1947, the Congress approved an item for carrying out initial planning for office facilities at Muscle Shoals. The record of the hearings includes a copy of the justification presented to committees of the House and Senate and testimony by the Chairman of the Board, then Mr. Lilienthal, reaffirming the Board's decision to move.

Again, in January 1947, Chairman Clapp indicated to the Senate Committee on Public Works that studies showed, and he believed, that the Board and major staff could function most effectively from Muscle Shoals.

In the spring of 1950, General Manager George F. Gant, to whom the Board had assigned further work on the plans, recommended that proposals be solicited from private builders who might be interested in providing space and leasing it to TVA. Proposals were obtained from four different sources, all considered financially responsible. The most advantageous proposal was one submitted by Mr. Wallace S. Pitts of Montgomery, Ala. After its general terms had been approved, but prior to formal acceptance by the Board, the outbreak of hostilities in Korea and the increased drain of military requirements on steel and other materials made it obvious that the project should not go forward for the time being. In order that the arrangement might be carried out with least delay, letters were exchanged with Mr. Pitts recording the understandings reached before the plan was deferred.

In the early spring of 1952, when it became apparent that the steel shortage was likely to be eased soon, the Board instructed the staff to resume negotiations, resulting in the agreement finally signed on March 10, 1953.

THE MOVE WILL PLACE THE BOARD, WITH ITS MANAGERIAL STAFF, CLOSER TO THE PLACES OF ITS WORK AND ITS FUTURE DEVELOPMENTAL PROBLEMS

In order that this move may be seen in its relation to the entire organization of TVA, I should like to describe briefly to the committee the activities which are now being carried on at the three major administrative centers—Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Muscle Shoals.

Muscle Shoals is headquarters for the Chemical Development and Chemical Operations Divisions, as well as the Alabama Power District, an area office of the Division of Reservoir Properties, the malaria control and occupational hygiene laboratories, a district forestry office, 1 of 2 TVA forest nurseries, and the central power warehouse and system service shop organization. The physical facilities include the Wilson hydro and steam plants, the central warehouse and service shop facilities for the entire power system (completed in 1952), the fertilizer plants (which are among the largest in the country), and the new chemical laboratory building completed in 1951. Colbert Steam Plant is under construction 12 miles from the Muscle Shoals reservation. As of February 28, 1953, there were 3,680 employees in the Muscle Shoals area, including 953 at Colbert.

At Chattanooga there is located the headquarters of the power organizations, the Division of Property and Supply, the maps and surveys organization, an area office of the Division of Reservoir Properties, and a district office of the Division of Forestry Relations, and the headquarters office of Health and Safety (which is the only group now in Chattanooga involved in the scheduled move). The total number of employees on February 28 was 2,210.

Physical facilities in the immediate Chattanooga area include Chickamauga and Hales Bar Dams. In the city itself, physical facilities are confined largely to electrical equipment involved in this nerve center of the power system.

At Knoxville, where 2,379 employees are located, there are several offices which are not involved in the move; these are the engineering divisions, the eastern power district headquarters, and an area office of the Division of Reservoir Properties. The principal staffs involved in program work which will be moved are the staffs engaged in agricultural relations work and in navigation.

To take the Division of Agricultural Relations first. It's work centers around the chemical research and production activities at Muscle Shoals. It is the staff responsible for determining how the research and production facilities at the Shoals can best be related to the problems of soil and land management.

It has long been clear that the Division of Agricultural Relations should be transferred to achieve better integration with the fertilizer operations at the Shoals, and it would have been transferred years ago if its activities had not also required frequent consultation with the Board. Action on this transfer therefore was postponed to permit it to coincide with the Board's move.

There is an analogous situation with respect to navigation. In Knoxville, this staff is based at the extreme upper limit of navigation. Muscle Shoals is much nearer the center of the channel and the activities with which the staff is concerned. The center of transportation use of the Tennessee River has been figured by the transportation experts at river mile 270, which is 377 river miles from Knoxville, 14 miles from Muscle Shoals.

It has also been clear that the Health and Safety Division, now divided between Chattanooga and Muscle Shoals, should be consolidated at the latter location, where its laboratories are. This move too has been postponed in order that it might coincide with the moving of the Board. I believe the committee will agree with me that the reasons for moving these three units out of Knoxville and Chattanooga to Muscle Shoals are compelling.

Now, may I discuss the move as it relates to the Board itself and the management service units—personnel, law, finance, regional studies and the headquarters of reservoir properties. These, too, need to be located closer to where the work goes on. The key factor responsible for the success of TVA's program operations to date is the fact that TVA's management service employees have kept close touch with the people actually doing the job in the field. The location at Muscle Shoals is better for this purpose than Knoxville. What the Board knows it must avoid, what every general manger has known must be avoided is the development in TVA of a headquarters or front office psychology which would insulate management from its job.

THE MOVE WILL INCREASE INTERNAL OPERATING EFFICIENCY

It will bring together under one roof staffs now scattered about in five different buildings in Knoxville and one in Chattanooga. Communication between staffs will be better, coordination of work made easier.

After the moves which have been described, the principal organizational units remaining in Knoxville will be the engineering divisions under direction of the chief engineer. The work of these divisions is of such a nature that it does not require day-to-day board review. I would not minimize the work of these divisions, which is extremely heavy and extremely important, nor would I minimize the importance to that work of Board guidance and supervision. It is a fact, however, that in design and construction work, questions requiring Board review arise with less frequency than in chemical engineering, agriculture, health, and safety, and other fields. To put it differently, it is less important to the work of the Knoxville engineering divisions that the Board be located at Knoxville than it is to the rest of TVA that the Board be at Muscle Shoals with the divisions already there or scheduled to move.

THE SHOALS AREA IS WELL LOCATED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF TVA'S WORK

It is a central point on the river, 259 river miles from the mouth, 371 from the head of navigation at Knoxville. As I have already mentioned, it is closer to Nashville, the capital of Tennessee, than Knoxville, whether one goes by highway, by rail, or by air. When one goes from Knoxville to Memphis on the Southern Railroad, he passes through Muscle Shoals. It is 34 air miles closer to the geographical center of the State of Tennessee than Knoxville and 125 air miles closer to the center of the TVA power service area. These figures mean less time spent in getting from headquarters to the jobs in the field; a saving in time means a saving in money and improved performance of the work.

One further misapprehension I should like to correct. I believe the size of the problems presented by this move has been exaggerated, at least in the Knoxville press. Less than a third of TVA's office employees in the Knoxville area are scheduled to move. The total number of persons now employed in the divisions affected is about 500. That includes messengers, file clerks, stenographers, secretaries, as well as the supervisory and technical staffs involved. They are not all heads of families. Not all of them will wish to move. While many of us will move and will leave Knoxville with very pleasant memories of the years our jobs have permitted us to live there, others will prefer to remain. We do not believe the impact on the community life of Knoxville will be as grave as some are now suggesting nor that the addition of a few hundred persons to the Tri-Cities area will prove too great a problem for these communities to handle.

PARTICULARS OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT

I believe this summarizes the reasons why the Board proposes to move to Muscle Shoals in the fall of 1954. The lease agreement entered into on March 10, 1953, provides that the building will be constructed by the lessor at his expense and that TVA will lease the building for 20 years. Rentals are based on a firm cost figure of $3,720,000. The building will have 120,000 square feet of net usable space, that is space exclusive of corridors, stairwells, washrooms, and so forth. The base rental for the first 10 years is $299,507 per year; $228,850 per year for the second 10 years, or an average of $264,178 per year. At the end of 20 years, the building becomes the property of the Government without further payment. In addition, the Government has the option at any time to buy the building at the base price less the amount of the cost amortized through rental payments on a 4 percent amortization basis.

The annual gross rental per square foot, including insurance, taxes, services, and amounts credited to the option price, is $3.68 for the 20-year period. This figure,

including as it does amounts credited to the option price, is consistent with prevailing rentals for space of similar quality in which the tenant acquires no such credits. Direct comparisons with Knoxville cannot be made since no comparable space exists there. We understand space of this character in Washington runs from $4 to $6 per square foot.

Without the option credits, but adding depreciation, the rental would be about $2.62 per square foot. This figure of $2.62 for modern, first-class, air-conditioned office space, designed for TVA's specific use to promote maximum efficiency in operation, may be compared directly with average rentals of $2.54 per square foot TVA pays in Knoxville for scattered and much less desirable space, most of which is not air-conditioned nor designed for TVA's efficient use.

I am sorry if I have taken too long to describe the details of a problem of office management. I hope I have made clear the considerations which prompted the Board's decision. Moving employees is an old story with TVA. The transfer 18 months from now will be an orderly process carried out, we are confident, with a minimum of disruption of current work. Last year over 700 of TVA's administrative, technical and supervisory employees were transferred from one official station in the Valley to another as requirements of the work changed. We are accustomed to moving about when moving about will help to get our jobs done better, more efficiently, and at less cost.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO RIGHT OF CERTAIN CITIZENS TO VOTE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to amend the Constitution in order to extend the suffrage to persons 18 years old and older. The amendment has been introduced in the Senate three times before this. It was first introduced in 1941 by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]; then in 1943 by the late Senator Vandenberg, and in the last session of Congress it was introduced as Senate Joint Resolution 127 by Senator Moody, of Michigan.

There are many good reasons for the passage of this amendment, and I have seen no opposing arguments which meet the tests of logic and civic concern. I believe this proposal will meet with nearly unanimous approval in the Congress, and that it has only been the pressures of other matters upon the time of the Congress which has prevented action upon it thus far.

I believe this proposal is amply justified as an attempt to broaden and extend the base of our democratic Government. Extending the suffrage to 18-year-olds will broaden the base of democracy not only by the number of young people which it immediately adds to our voting population; but also by encouraging the participation of these people at an age when they are enthusiastic and interested in government and politics. This will enable us to make real inroads on voter apathy in the United States.

I do not have to tell the Senate that there are many potential voters in our country who do not take an interest in elections, and do not exercise their right to vote. I think it is fair to say that many people are more interested in politics and political issues and are better informed on those matters when they are between the ages of 18 and 21 than they are later on when they have been longer out of school, have become more absorbed in the everyday business of earning a living, and have become subject to the political apathy which affects so many of our citizens.

There is no better civic training than the exercise of the vote. Without the vote, all other forms of civic training are lacking in meaning and effectiveness. It is essential that our young people take on political responsibility as soon as they are ready to do so, for the real value of education comes from its association with responsibility.

The young people of this generation are better prepared educationally for political responsibility at the age of 18 than were the Americans of previous generations. We do not have very complete figures on the education of our population prior to the 1940 census, but even comparisons with the year 1940 tend to highlight our progress toward the preparation of our youth for civic responsibility. In 1940, 14.1 percent of Americans completed high school; 4.6 percent completed college. In 1950, 20.2 percent of Americans completed high school; 6 percent completed college. Also, Mr. President, the intensity of living for young people today is something that surely prepares them for mature political responsibility.

Our young people would be more than mere passive voters—they could be a catalytic and informative force in American politics. They have the enthusiasm and the idealism of youth; they are fresh from our schools and colleges, with a lively interest in politics and social affairs. And they would take on their political responsibilities at a time when they will be more apt to place the national interest above those particular interests which they will later acquire.

The determination of voting qualifications has generally been a matter for the States to decide. But the amendment I am proposing would have to be ratified by three-fourths of the States, so that the States would certainly have a voice in its adoption. And by the way, Mr. President, there are States—and I recall specifically the State of Georgia—that permit voting at the age of 18.

As Members of the Senate well know—and I just mentioned this—one State has already extended the suffrage to those 18 and older. It is the State of Georgia. Last year, Ellis Arnall, a distinguished former Governor of Georgia, testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on the operation of the 18-year-old voting law in Georgia. His testimony was extremely favorable to this amendment.

Experience in our State—

He said—

has been very salutary and very fine. * * * It has met with widespread support and approval.

The reason most frequently advanced for extending the vote to 18-year-olds is that "If they are old enough to fight, they are old enough to vote." This was the statement of President Eisenhower on the subject last summer, when he announced his support of 18-year-old voting.

My amendment, Mr. President, in the form of a joint resolution, supports the statement made by President Eisenhower, and, of course, by many other distinguished Americans.

I think there are few people today who contest this point of view, least of all those who are familiar with the grave responsibilities which many men of 18 to 21 years of age take on in wartime and in our peacetime armed services.

The whole trend of this tense period in international affairs is to throw increasing responsibilities upon 18-year-olds, and to threaten interruption of their careers as well as jeopardy to life itself. Surely we have small right to place this onerous immediate future before our youth, and at the same time ask them to forego the rights and duties of full citizenship.

Youth ought to have a voice in determining its own future. What is more, youth has a definite contribution to make to the future of our whole country. I hope that the Congress will now act to grant the suffrage—the most essential right of citizenship—to the youth of America.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 64) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT — AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) providing for a consolidated general appropriation act, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration and ordered to be printed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RULES OF PROCEDURE IN CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS — ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] be added as cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) establishing rules of procedure in congressional investigations, and that the concurrent resolution be reprinted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL PLACED ON CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4198) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources and the resources of the outer Continental Shelf, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

INCLUSION OF AN ESCALATOR CLAUSE IN CONTRACTS TO PROVIDE ADJUSTMENTS FOR APPROVED PRICE AND WAGE INCREASES — CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, by authority of the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 413) to encourage the making of contracts with the United States by requiring the inclusion of an escalator clause to provide adjustments for approved price and wage increases, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I have taken the matter up with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and he has agreed that this course be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD L. SCHEUFLER, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 9, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Edward L. Scheufler, of Missouri, to be United States attorney for the western district of Missouri, vice Sam M. Wear, resigning. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF OMAR L. SCHNATMEIER, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 9, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Omar L. Schnatmeier, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Otto Schoen. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF CLIFFORD M. RAEMER, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, EASTERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 9, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Clifford M. Raemer, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois, vice William W. Hart, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH IRA KINCAID TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL, DISTRICT OF THE CANAL ZONE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 9, 1953, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Joseph Ira Kincaid, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone, vice John E. Hushing, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Statement prepared by him, entitled "Rochambeau, Freedom's Friend," concerning the movement under way in the State of Virginia to mark the route taken by Lieutenant General Rochambeau and his troops during the Revolutionary War.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "Toward a New Immigration Policy," written by him and published in the Journal of International Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

Letter received by him from the Reverend Ulric J. Proeller, S. A. C., of Hillsboro, N. Dak., dated March 27, 1953.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address on the subject Justice for Poland, delivered by Hon. Christian Herter, Governor of Massachusetts.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Tributes paid to Senator LEHMAN at a testimonial dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York, on March 20, 1953.

Messages from Representative MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, concerning the 14th anniversary of the independence of Slovakia.

Editorial written by Morris H. Rubin, and published in the Progressive, paying tribute to the late Robert Marion La Follette, Jr.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Statement by Mrs. Hannah M. Durham, editor of a Congressional Bulletin published by the Pennsylvania Council of Republican Women, following her visit to Russia in 1934.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "The Tragedy of the Times" published in the Boston Herald of March 27, 1953.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Article by Walter G. Moyle, of Washington, D. C., on the need for appellate review of Tax Court decisions in excess-profits cases under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code.

By Mr. BYRD:

Article entitled "The Sculpture of Liberty for the Yorktown Victory Monument," written by Oskar J. W. Hansen, sculptor.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Editorial entitled "The Treatymaking Power," published in the New York Herald-Tribune of February 21, 1953, discussing the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution with relation to the making of treaties.

By Mr. THYE:

Poll of farmers regarding present prices of agricultural commodities, conducted by the Minnesota Poll of Public Opinion, published in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, March 29, 1953.

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS S. MURPHY, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER OF THE HARTFORD (CONN.) TIMES

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes in tribute to Mr. Francis S. Murphy, editor and publisher of the Hartford Times, of Hartford, Conn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, our greatness as a Nation—as a Union of States—is measured, it is true, by the contribution in ability, in time, in effort, by all of us collectively, but guided by leaders of outstanding attributes whose interests are primarily the interests of their fellow men. Such a man is Mr. Francis S. Murphy, editor and publisher of the Hartford Times, of Hartford, Conn. The full page feature article in the Bridgeport Post of February 15, 1953, by my friend, Tere Pascone, presents the story of Frank Murphy so well and completely that I am taking the liberty of quoting from and using its contents liberally in paying my homage to Publisher Murphy.

Mr. Murphy has been called Mr. Connecticut, and a review of his contributions in many fields to the welfare of the people of Connecticut clearly indicates his right to the title. His life's story is the truly American story—America at its best. Mr. Murphy was born in New Haven, Conn., October 12, 1882, the son of Henry J. and Mary Ann Murphy. His grandparents had come from County Cork, Ireland. His father was a triphammerman by trade and Frank Murphy was the first-born of five children.

The family moved to Hartford when his father obtained employment with the Billings & Spencer Co. of that city—a company that many years later I had the pleasure of heading. A typical workingman's family, the Murphys did not have too easy a time making ends meet and Frank Murphy's elementary-school days were spent, first in the Arsenal School, and then St. Joseph's Parochial School.

As many other outstandingly successful men have done, Frank Murphy went to work in early youth as an errand boy working in hotels and with a construction crew. Fifty-five years ago at the age of 15, Frank Murphy, with patches on his pants, applied for, and got a job as an errand boy at the Hartford Times office at a $3-a-week wage. Even as a boy, one with an inquiring mind, he had observed in his dealings with his fellow men that people are willing to listen to the ideas of others if they have merit. He saw little chance at the time of completing high school, which he had attended for 1 year, and no chance of going to college, because of financial conditions; and so he aimed to retain his position as an errand boy with a determination to succeed.

By working harder than the average young man and dreaming up ideas, step by step he worked himself up to office manager, advertising manager, business manager, advertising director, general manager, and then the pinnacle—publisher and editor. He reached the top by hard work, by application, and by contributing worthwhile ideas. The suggestions he made for the newspaper's betterment were not always received enthusiastically, but gradually the publishers realized the value of his suggestions and accepted them. Everett C. Wilson, general manager and later publisher, realizing the value of Mr. Murphy's contributions, finally told him that he would not even have to come to Mr. Wilson for approval of his ideas; that he was authorized to incorporate them in the operations of the business, and he has been incorporating his ideas ever since. The results are evident.

When he first went to work for the Hartford Times, the circulation was 12,000, but in his 55 years with the paper its daily publication has risen in rank until it has become one of the outstanding newspapers in New England.

Mr. Murphy is a firm believer that the role of a newspaper, in addition to disseminating news, should be to render service in—and for—the community, and Mr. Murphy has made the Hartford Times almost a community center. The activities it sponsors reaches into every phase of daily living. It is a home-building institute, a home-service bureau, a travel bureau, operating all the year around, and it sponsors, in season, the Christmas carol sing, little-league baseball, soapbox derby, model air meet, swimming classes and swimming meets, home-building shows, aquacades, flower shows, bicycle safety league meetings, 50-mile bicycle classic, flycasting programs, amateur snapshot contests, photo shows, skating meets, ski classes, and canary shows. It operates the Times Farm for underprivileged children, has a speaker's bureau, provides visual-aid films to schools, and sponsors a radio program weekly to encourage small-fry talent titled "The Cops and the Kids."

An example of how Mr. Murphy gets an idea and puts it into action is brought out in the evolution of the Times' flycasting program. Several years ago, Fred Jordan, publisher of the Bangor News, invited him to go fishing for trout in Maine.

"I don't know a thing about fishing," was Mr. Murphy's reply. "Never had a chance to go as a boy."

"Don't worry about it. You'll catch on," was Mr. Jordan's reply.

And so Mr. Murphy went, but when he returned, he reasoned there must be many readers who would like to know something about fly casting—maybe people like himself who had never had time in their youth to engage in the sport. The result was the institution of flycasting classes under eight instructors, offered in season in Goodwin Park pond. Hundreds turned out, and the project rates as one of the most popular services the newspaper sponsors.

Here is a man, far-sighted, courageous, with faith in his State and his fellow men, and with the ability not only to conceive immediate and far-range, advantageous developments for his city and State, but with the courage to execute them. Mr. Murphy has the unique ability to get others to work with him and his zeal in the public interest inspires them. His untiring energy is a marvel to younger men. I shall not attempt to enumerate even a small portion of his far-sighted plans and his many accomplishments in the interest of his State and the people therein. A few, however, will indicate his right to the title of "Mr. Connecticut."

Before World War I his paper was predicting long before it became a commercialized production, that radio would sweep the country. Readers were encouraged and instructed how to build their own sets. A radio clinic twice a week was sponsored to assist those needing advice in making their sets. Hundreds of thousands of log charts giving instructions and dial settings were distributed as a public service. An expert radio man was hired as consultant at the clinic. Thus Frank Murphy not only anticipated radio's part in our lives, but he prepared his fellow citizens for it.

He is an air enthusiast and he campaigned vigorously to make Connecticut air conscious. When during the war he urged Government officials and legislators to plan ahead in obtaining control of Bradley Air Base, he was told he was "off his beam," and to give up the idea. But Mr. Murphy realized the growth of commercial flying would make Bradley Field an international airport with foreign lines discharging and taking passengers as they do at La-Guardia. He unfolded this dream which does not seem so farfetched today, and campaigned for it throughout the State, in one 6-month period delivering more than 200 talks in which he pointed out that with this expansion of the aviation industry, foreign lines would be forced to use the Hartford facilities. His persistency brought results. The first State aeronautics commission came into being in 1945, and Mr. Murphy was appointed its chairman, a post he still fills. Since that time, through Mr. Murphy's courageous advocacy, Bradley Field has become State-owned, and Mr. Murphy's dreams have been realized.

The Heublein Tower, atop Talcott Mountain, the highest point in Hartford, attracted Mr. Murphy as an ideal spot from which the broadcasting and receiving equipment of the Times-owned radio station could be improved; and so it came to pass that the Times tower came into being and was put to use in ways other than the primary purpose for which it was purchased. Famous people have been entertained on top of the mountain at social functions arranged by Mr. Murphy, among them Dwight D. Eisenhower, who, in 1950, came at the invitation of the publisher to participate in the ground-breaking ceremonies of the Murphy terminal. Others have been Admiral Nimitz, Admiral Hart, Admiral Murray, General Wainwright, General Hershey, Eddie Rickenbacker, Keith Funston, head of the New York Stock Exchange, Ronald Reagan, and Eric Johnston, head of the motion-picture industry in the country.

Many of his crusades have been launched "up on the mountain," and civic and women's clubs have been allowed the use of the tower facilities to conduct meetings.

In 1946 Mr. Murphy received the highest civilian tribute in the Nation when he was awarded the Medal for Merit by the then President of the United States, as one of only 286 persons ever to receive the award since the days of George Washington. This citation was in recognition of his services during the war. In March 1941 he was appointed Connecticut chairman of the New England aviation cadets committee, and he personally organized 20 local committees and used the Times office as a subrecruiting station. This effort produced more cadet recruits in Connecticut than any other State in the Union. He made newspaper space and facilities available for the recruitment of WAVES, SPARS, and the women's branch of the United States marines. Every major drive conducted during the war, found Frank Murphy actively participating. He developed the idea of a victory parade in 1942 to mobilize city civilian effort, and with the end of the war the Times office became a center for war veterans' problems until the city established a veterans' service center.

He also served on the judicial board, dealing with subversive enemy alien cases. Mr. Murphy's efforts were not restricted to the area covered by his paper. Three years ago, to help boost Danbury's hatting industries, he dreamed up the idea of a hatters' day parade, and the event proved not only a community success, but received wide publicity in the State and Nation. Pages could be written of Mr. Murphy's accomplishments known to the public. Additional pages could be written of Mr. Murphy's contributions in the public interest which have not been publicized.

When the Jewish Ledger was about to fold up because the then publisher could not swing it, Mr. Murphy stated:

You can't do that. Untold damage could be done by the elimination of a paper such as yours, which has always been run on fine lines.

He advised the publisher on steps to take, and agreed to serve on a board of trustees for the paper, and today the Jewish Ledger is still publishing the largest Jewish newspaper in the State.

Mr. Murphy has always been impatient with intolerance and bigotry. Twice he has been honored by groups for his outstanding service in the cause of interracial relations. He has a citation as Hartford's outstanding citizen, and his most recent award was a plaque presented to him last November by the Ararat Lodge B'nai B'rith of Hartford.

Trinity College of Hartford honored him with a degree of master of arts in 1947, and this modest man accepts the many honors and testimonials heaped upon him with wonderment because none of these has been sought by him.

Francis S. Murphy is retiring from newspaper work at the age of 70 years. But as his long-time friend and great admirer, I know that Frank Murphy will never retire from his active interest in the welfare of his fellow man. He has been an inspiration to thousands of others and will continue to be.

Francis S. Murphy has, unknown and unplanned by him, by his very acts and deeds erected a lasting monument to himself in the State of Connecticut. May his years in retirement be as many as were his years in active service of the Hartford Times.

AWARD TO HON. LINDSAY C. WARREN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, who has a magnificent record as Comptroller General, received a citizenship award from the North Carolina Citizens Association for 40 years of public service to his community, his State, and his Nation on March 18, 1953, at Raleigh, N. C.

The award contained the following language:

Member and leader in both houses of the North Carolina General Assembly.

Member of Congress for eight consecutive terms where he served as a skilled parliamentarian; able chairman of important committees; effective conciliator.

Comptroller General of the United States.

Ardent exponent of governmental economy and efficiency. Champion of the legislative branch of government; a defender of the constitutional right of Congress to control the purse against executive assaults; a firm enforcer of accountability in the use of public funds.

A North Carolinian who has brought honor to his State by distinguished service in positions of national trust.

A champion of freedom and a believer in rugged honesty.

A statesman of the highest order.

On that occasion the Comptroller General of the United States made a memorable speech which, in view of its importance, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed as a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate the invitation of the North Carolina Citizens' Association to be here and to talk to you tonight. Comprising as they do many of our greatest business, industrial, and financial leaders, your members have contributed mightily to the development of a State which is proud of its well-balanced industrial and agricultural economy. Coming back to Raleigh brings to mind my own service in both houses of the legislature. For 40 years I have closely followed the General Assemblies of North Carolina. I have said in Washington, and I say now, they have been the peer and sometimes the superior of any congress I have ever known. Fortunate indeed are we to attract some of our very best to come here every 2 years to give service to our State, and to keep it forever looking forward.

I rejoice with all of you over the continued improvement in the health of Governor Umstead, stricken so suddenly at the outset of his term. It is a tribute to him and the confidence he commands that the affairs of the State have moved so smoothly during this trying period. Few men achieve the distinction of serving in both houses of congress and in the governor's chair. The leadership that has been given to him finds him one of the best equipped men to ever hold this office. His broad knowledge of the State, its people, and its hopes and aspirations is a sure guaranty of 4 more years of progress and stability in the onward march of the State.

Some of things I shall say tonight have been said before, by others and by me. But being in an unique position to view government at its best, its worst, and its indifference, I cannot refrain from again calling attention to those things, and reiterating the hard course we must follow to keep our Government fiscally healthy and morally sound.

As I look around, I see many of my long-time friends. Besides being fellow North Carolinians, we have at least one other thing in common tonight. It has taken this good fellowship to remove the chill of the March 15 income tax deadline. Our own taxes may seem staggering enough to us as individuals. Add them all together and we will be paying an estimated $34 billion in individual income taxes and $24 billion in corporation taxes during the fiscal year which ends June 30. The figures for next year are only slightly different. These are only a part of the taxes it will take to make up the $69 billion revenue President Truman estimated for next year in his January budget message. Even with all the revenues there will still be a deficit of $10 billion if the Government spends the $79 billion the budget proposes. If North Carolina was operated like the Federal Government, we would be in a bankruptcy court in a week.

The problem of this tremendous budget is being attacked by both the legislative and executive branches. In the executive branch we have the viewpoint of many new men who have come in from the world of business. To a man they recognize the challenge to business thinking to do something about the budget. Already some are saying it is impossible to reduce expenditures next year significantly without cutting into essential defense and foreign-aid programs. While it is too early to see what the final result will be, I say it can be done. Much can be accomplished, even in defense and foreign spending, by such efforts as the House Appropriations Committee's "operation economy," which has enlisted some of the best men in business and Government.

For 25 years I have carried in my pocket the only known recipe for financial happiness. Here it is: "Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure nineteen nineteen six, result happiness. Annual income twenty pounds, annual expenditure twenty pounds ought and six, result misery."

This homely truism uttered by Mr. Micawber a century ago is just as inescapable today. Multiply it by a billion and it is still valid. In the final analysis, however, the achievement of economy in Government requires a patient, thorough, and continual examination of every activity and proposed activity and a careful balancing of the benefits against the costs.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and I are partners in the joint accounting improvement program. That program was started back in 1947 when James E. Webb was Director of the Budget. It had roots in earlier discussions when the late and great Governor O. Max Gardner was Under Secretary of the Treasury. In 1950 the Congress unanimously wrote it into a law which has been declared the most important legislation in its field since the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

The prime purpose of this program is to make the books of the Government speak the truth, including full disclosure of the cost of Government operations. That means full disclosure for the President, full disclosure for the Congress, and full disclosure, if you please, for the American taxpayer.

Now just what can we as citizens, taxpayers, legislators, and administrators do to control this gargantuan thing called government?

In the first place, there is no substitute for good administration. This begins at the top. It applies to the President, to members of his Cabinet, and to every Government agency head. It applies to governors and mayors. Much of the recent criticism of certain well-intended Government programs has been caused by the lax and careless way in which they have been administered. As put by Senator DOUGLAS in his recent book on Economy in National Government, to be a liberal one does not have to be a wastrel.

The General Accounting Office is continually bringing to the attention of Government agencies situations which need correction from the management standpoint. In most instances we have found them cooperative. In the case of the armed services, our biggest spenders, the door frequently used to be barred. Gordon Gray, who rendered an outstanding public service as Secretary of the Army, realized that the Army could benefit from an open-door policy. The cooperative approach adopted by him and continued by his successor, Frank Pace, Jr., has already saved millions of dollars. I am convinced that the new Secretary of the Army, Robert T. Stevens, so favorably known by many of you, will continue this beneficial policy.

Not only does good administration begin at the top, but it must be followed up to see that the administrator's policies are carried out by those at the working level. Practically all the executive agencies now have new heads. Unfortunately, in a few cases if the new administrators do not quickly make reforms, their agencies, like China, will absorb them.

It is a constant struggle even with the agency head on the alert to convince those in charge of operations that Government money doesn't grow on trees. A small incident, which I cite only because it reflects a pattern in some defense procurements, has to do with 12 yards of plush carpet bought for $160 for a general officer's airplane. The general later stated he neither asked for nor authorized the purchase and that a $20 rubber runner would have been better.

What if you learned that a trusted agent had sold a needed piece of your business property for $400,000, that you lost money on the sale, and that through a quick succession of resales a foreign corporation paid

over $1 million for the same property? That is exactly what happened in the case of the dredge *Las Cruces*, late lamented property of the Panama Canal. When we brought this situation to the attention of the Secretary of the Army, drastic action was taken to tighten up procedures and reprimand responsible Government people.

The Panama Canal is not alone in this type of transaction. Last week we reported to Congress an instance where the Public Housing Administration sold land and dwelling units to a local housing authority which practically immediately resold at a profit of $500,000.

Speaking of lushness, the $17 million American housing project built with "counterpart" funds at Bonn, Germany, takes the prize. We just reported to Congress that the 456 units averaged $21,000; furnishings, $5,000 per unit; and 5 official residences, $151,000 each.

I have frequently made the statement that any Government agency can reduce its personnel if it wants to and if its head has the courage to go through with it. That is a broad statement, and is not as easy to accomplish as it is to talk about. A friend of mine who heads another Government agency told me, "I know I have too many people, but I wouldn't go through what you have for anything in the book."

Reducing pains can be as bad as growing pains. Since April 1946 we in the General Accounting Office have voluntarily reduced the number of our employees from 14,904 to our present number of 6,250. For the most part, the reduction has been brought about by constant surveys resulting in improved working techniques, by the elimination of duplicating operations through the work done under the joint-accounting program, and by using the authority provided by the new legislation, permitting the elimination of cumbersome, overlapping, and outmoded procedures.

There are many obstacles to reducing the size of Government. You are familiar with the natural human attitude against change, especially where that is joined with the fear of loss of a job if procedures are revised or functions are abolished. Then the civil-service laws and regulations, although based on the merit concept, at times have the effect of absolutely prohibiting or retarding efficiency and economy. I don't mean to criticize the members of the Civil Service Commission. Nor am I speaking critically of the policy of the Congress in granting veterans' preference, although I do think at times we have gone too far at the expense of efficiency. With no authority in the agency head to retain employees wholly on the basis of merit, many of the best employees are lost when reductions in force are made.

One relatively painless method of reducing the size of swollen payrolls is by simply not filling vacancies. I am glad to see the principle of not filling vacancies, which we have followed religiously in the General Accounting Office, given effect in a recent directive of the new Budget Director, Joseph M. Dodge.

A good deal can be done by streamlining, simplifying, and modernizing the Government's methods of doing business. The Post Office Department's new postal money order system is one case in point. It is estimated to save 2,065 man-years and $6 million annually, as well as giving much better service to the public. Much can also be accomplished by reorganization of agency activities. The Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company has reduced the Company's Washington office from 129 to 7 employees, with an annual saving of $500,000, as a result of our recommendation. Another recommendation has been instrumental in reducing the long-range housing program in the Canal Zone from $80 million to $40 million, with an annual reduction of operating expenses of at least $1,500,000. That should be a good-news bulletin to the taxpayer.

I strongly favored the recommendation of former President Hoover that the President be granted reorganization authority in 1949. I also favored many, but not all, of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for reorganizations in the executive branch. I must sound a note of caution to our enthusiastic reorganizers that not all the Hoover Commission's recommendations were unanimous by any means. Some involved highly impractical and controversial policy areas which had been before the Congress for years. One aftermath of the Hoover Commission's operations was the fantastic claim of savings made by its proponents. Those claims are very effectively branded and blasted by Senator McCLELLAN'S report of last January from the Senate Committee on Government Operations. The report gives the Commission full credit for the remarkable job done. It then points out the fallacies and complete unreliability of the estimated savings of as much as $4 billion claimed for the proposed reforms.

We can save some money by streamlining procedures, consolidating similar functions, and like reorganization devices. Yet as long as a function is being performed, it will take people to do the work. This is where the real money goes. It is time to ask ourselves whether every function the Government is performing is absolutely necessary to the administration of the Government or the welfare of the people. You will not find any function without friends; so the job is not easy. In some cases the agency itself may be vital but encumbered with growth which could be cut off without seriously affecting the health of the agency itself.

The President has full authority not only to rearrange but to abolish functions by submitting reorganization plans to the Congress under the legislation just recently enacted. I do not think we need any machinery to study the situation in addition to what has already been set up in the executive branch. In government language, the words "study," "survey," "consider," and "take under advisement" often mean delay, procrastination, stalling, and inaction. The success or failure to install needed reforms may depend on how quickly they are initiated.

Not only our Federal Government functions, but our Federal-State relations, need reexamination in the light of present-day conditions. As of June 30, 1950, of a total governmental indebtedness of $281 billion, Federal, State, and local, the Federal share accounted for $257 billion and the State share for $5 billion. Our national debt stands today at more than $267 billion. The annual interest on the Federal Government's debt just about equals the entire amount of the indebtedness of the States, all of which, I am informed, have a balanced budget.

We ourselves are to blame for much of the national spending and the persistent calls that come up to Washington from cities, counties, States, chambers of commerce, and individuals with pet projects. Those calls don't slacken even during war or the grave foreign situation now facing all of us. Yet from the same sources come just as persistent cries for reduced taxes and less spending. The plain fact is that the States and their subdivisions have gone to Washington for things that it was their duty to furnish to their citizens. There is prevalent a strange theory that by going to Washington you get it for nothing. You don't. You pay, and will pay. We simply must reappraise these grants in the light of the present abilities of the States and the present Federal financial situation.

We are hearing a great deal about the Voice of America. Here is what a great American President had to say about the real voice of America. Woodrow Wilson when president of Princeton University, long before he thought of coming to Washington, used to tell the students: "Boys, be on your guard when you hear the voice of America coming from Washington. The real voice of America comes from the little farm, the little church, the little red schoolhouse, the little plant or factory, the places where men live and work and serve."

Another area which needs reexamination is the participation by the Government in business activities. I yield to no man in my belief in our free enterprise system and in the value of the profit motive. I have always felt that there were broad enough fields for government and for business. That government has invaded the field of business in many instances is true. However, it should not be forgotten that in quite a number of those instances it was done because business was unable to live up to its commitments and its obligations, financial and to the community. The reasons for the Government embarking on business enterprises varied from the marginal nature of the activity to the simplest human needs for rescue from starvation and misery. They ran the gamut from war to depression and back to war. The Government will never wholly withdraw from such activities. It now has $12 billion invested in Government corporations, not counting the billions invested in unincorporated Government activities. Those that are necessary ought to be able to stand the test of reappraisal.

Both the corporate form and the regular agency form of Government activity have been used for the payment of subsidies to particular areas in our economy. As just one illustration, the area administered formerly by the the Maritime Commission and now by the Federal Maritime Board has suffered and is still suffering, in my opinion, from overgenerous administrators who seem to feel that it is their job to promote and protect the subsidized industry at the expense of the Government's interest. All subsidies should be fully disclosed and dragged out in the open, so that the Congress and the public can make an objective analysis and a determination whether they are worth what they cost.

There is another area where I think our fiscal controls can be substantially improved. For the past 10 years I have been warning that Congress was abandoning its constitutional control of the purse by writing into law, at the request of administrators with a mission, the broadest kind of provisions granting them full authority over expenditures and setting them apart from any possible questioning or recoveries by the General Accounting Office as the audit agency of the Congress. Provisions of this type still in effect should be reviewed, and any new requests should be carefully screened. A strong believer in our three-branch system of checks and balances, I have always felt that the legislative branch, elected directly by the people, is closest to the people. We may lose something in ironclad efficiency in our democratic form of government, but who would exchange it for the most efficient dictatorship? In the words made famous by Lord Acton, "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Two recent cases within our experience show how even when the Congress spells out its will, administrators attempt to flaunt it and set their own judgment against the policy decision of the Congress. The first was the celebrated Fallbrook case. The Congress had clearly expresed its intent that the United States not go forward with a suit in California involving the respective rights of the Government and private users to the water of the Santa Margarita River. The Navy Department went ahead with the suit, notwithstanding the Secretary of the Navy was told that the expenditure of his funds in the suit would be in direct contravention of law and was not authorized. The former Secretary of the Navy condoned this violation of the law by saying he was attempting to protect the interests of the United States. It is fundamental in our Government that it is for the Congress to say how and on what conditions

the public moneys shall be spent, and the Congress in this case had left nothing to the discretion of the executive branch. The entire matter was brought to the attention of the Congress by our report of January 30.

In the second case, the Congress had provided that the Secretary of the Interior should not use his appropriations for constructing transmission lines in the southeastern power area until the private-power companies had executed or declined to execute systemwide transmission contracts and the Secretary had so informed the Congress. On January 7, we advised the Secretary of the Interior we would disallow any payments for the construction of a transmission line from Clark Hill to Greenwood, S. C., because his negotiations with the private-power companies did not constitute compliance with the mandate of the Congress. It cannot be emphasized too often that our Government is a government of laws, and not of men. That is one of the reasons that the Government cannot be operated exactly like a private business, as so many of my business friends are constantly advocating. That does not prevent us from using business methods in Government wherever practicable.

Since 1941 the General Accounting Office has collected $830 million which had been for the most part illegally or otherwise improperly paid out. Of even greater importance is the work the Office is doing to prevent the illegal or improvident use of funds by the improvement of accounting and auditing throughout the Government and by bringing instances of wasteful practices to attention for correction.

Sometimes the improper use of Government funds, property, or other resources stems from outright venality. In his recent best seller, How To Get Rich in Washington, Blair Bolles told a sorry story of privilege and influence in the transaction of public business. He turned the spotlight on such subjects of investigation as surplus-property sales, RFC loans, Maritime Commission subsidies, and internal-revenue scandals. Today the investigations are still going on under new management.

I want to say emphatically that I think the vast majority of Government people are not only competent, capable, and conscientious, but compare most favorably with those in private business whom it has been my lot to know. It would be foolish to contend that there has not been corruption in Government, but bear in mind, it takes two to make a bribe—the briber and the bribed. Most shady deals in Government are instigated from outside. Now that there are so many new men in Government, it is well to remind them that the same forces that sought favors from their predecessors will now be camping on their doorsteps.

The problem of ethics in government is as old as government. Among the ancient Israelites, the prophet Micah 2,500 years ago complained: "That they may do evil with both hands earnestly, the prince asketh, and the judge asketh for a reward; and the great man, he uttereth his mischievous desire: so they wrap it up."

In the England of Charles II, Samuel Pepys, the diarist, made a great reputation for efficiency in the management of the Navy Office. He cut out almost everybody's graft on Government contracts except his own.

Sir Walter Raleigh, whose name is so closely linked with North Carolina, observed that a man must first govern himself before he is fit to govern a family, and his family before he is fit to serve the government of a commonwealth.

Character and integrity were of the highest concern to those who set up our form of government. They made bribery 1 of 2 specific offenses (the other, treason) for which, after impeachment and conviction, any civil officer of the United States shall be removed from office. Jefferson wrote that: "Of the various executive abilities, no one excited more anxious interest than that of placing the interests of our fellow citizens in the hands of honest men, with understanding sufficient for their stations." In spite of this emphasis on the moral qualifications for public service, the Government very early began to suffer from those who were not above making a profit on its financial transactions and on its dealings with business. Harper's magazine during the 1860's edified its readers with a picture of Army contractors and speculators "at a banquet of abundance and delight." It exposed Army officers and Treasury agents who profited by shipping seized southern cotton and sugar to northern merchants.

The problem of morality in government is aggravated by war and defense spending. During World War II, shockingly low morality and callous indifference were displayed by some of those who dealt with the Government's money and property. Some were men wearing the uniform of their country and using it to feather their own nests. These, plus a few civilian exceptions to the many businessmen who came to Washington at a genuine sacrifice to help win the war, left a stench which nauseated honest men inside and outside of the Government. In the light of that experience, no one should have been surprised by the recent resurgence of dishonesty on the part of a few of those entrusted with the public business.

After all, these affairs are matters of conscience. The influence mongers and purveyors of private favors from the public store only reflect the moral climate of the public itself. That climate would be improved by a greater practice of old-fashioned common honesty and decency.

It is of paramount importance that the official actions of those in the Government service be subjected to constant examination and scrutiny. This sometimes thankless job is being performed for the public by congressional committees, by the press, and last, but I hope not least, by the General Accounting Office.

Our early leaders were much impressed with the idea that Government is a trust and the officers of the Government are trustees. We need to revitalize that idea, expressed by John C. Calhoun over 100 years ago in these words: "The very essence of a free government consists in considering offices as public trusts bestowed for the good of the country and not for the benefit of an individual or party." His statement has long since passed into the public domain, but even as eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, so it is the price of clean government.

HOSPITALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, recently I called to the attention of the Senate the failure of Congress to assume its financial responsibility toward the District of Columbia.

Today I should like to direct attention to an instance where Congress has fully shouldered its responsibility toward the District—only to have its forthright action delayed by an order of the Bureau of the Budget.

I refer to the hospital construction program for the city of Washington.

Senators will recall that several studies made by Congress in recent years showed the hospital facilities in Washington to be antiquated, unsafe, and pitifully inadequate. These conditions led Congress to enact legislation in 1946 providing for a comprehensive and modern hospital program for our Nation's Capital.

In its first step, Congress appropriated funds for the construction of a major hospital center to take the place of Garfield, Episcopal, and Emergency Hospitals. It then proceeded to authorize grants-in-aid on a 50-50 basis for the remaining hospitals in Washington to enable them to modernize and to expand their facilities.

Congress carefully studied these plans, and in each instance it weighed the wisdom of embarking upon the program. Congress did this not only as to the national legislative body, but also in its position as the sole legislative body for the District of Columbia, and as the chief architect of its municipal programs.

However, despite all the provisions made by the last four Congresses, and made with a view to the patent urgency for hospital improvement, I am advised that the entire program has come to a standstill.

By an order on February 3, 1953, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, suspended all construction in which the Federal Government had an interest. Let me say that I appreciate the spirit of that order. Its main purpose, as I understand it, was to enable Mr. Dodge to make an orderly and systematic review of all Federal construction projects. All of us can appreciate that.

Caught in this order, however, was the hospital program for the District of Columbia. Since that time, so far as the Congress or the public has been advised, no action has been taken to "unfreeze" these hospital appropriations or to give them the "go-ahead" sign here in the District. The result is that the program is being unduly delayed.

Frankly, I feel that if the Director of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, were familiar with the history of these hospital appropriations, he would not permit a delay in this critical construction and improvement program here in the District of Columbia.

All of us know that in the District of Columbia there are no large accumulations of business capital to provide funds for adequate hospitals. Without Federal funds, hospitals and nursing schools in the city of Washington struggle in old, expensive, and hazardous quarters. In no city of the Nation, or in no national capital of the world, are the bulk of the hospitals at such a low ebb. Medical groups and civic organizations unanimously agree that for lack of good and sufficient hospitals, our National Capitol cannot attract young women to train as nurses, or interns to prepare for a future in medicine.

Mr. President, let me conclude by saying that the hospitals of Washington have fulfilled their part of the program and are ready to proceed. The people of Washington—the taxpayers—are ready to carry out their part of the obligation. The hospital program, therefore, only awaits the order of the Bureau of the Budget to go ahead. In a short time after the order is issued, the program will be well under way.

I urge Mr. Dodge to withdraw the part of his order that results in the delay of the hospital construction and improvement program in the District of Colum-

bia. Humanitarian reasons alone are enough, in my judgment, to cause us to want the District of Columbia to have the finest and most modern hospitals in the world. We owe that to the people of Washington and to our Nation's Capital.

EASTER ADJOURNMENT BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair) laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 90, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourn on Thursday, April 2, 1953, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 13, 1953.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution. In effect it gives the consent of the Senate that the House may adjourn for a period of 10 days, which otherwise it could not do under the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, is the morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further routine matters to be presented, the morning business is closed.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 128, Senate Joint Resolution 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I stated——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HILL. The motion is not debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not during the morning hour.

Mr. HILL. I thought the Chair had announced that the morning hour was closed.

Mr. TAFT. The morning hour does not close until 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announced the morning business was closed.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Submerged Lands Act."

TITLE I

DEFINITION

SEC. 2. When used in this joint resolution—

(a) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" means—

(1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which are covered by nontidal waters that were navigable under the laws of the United States at the time such State became a member of the Union, or acquired sovereignty over such land and waters thereafter, up to the ordinary high water mark as heretofore or hereafter modified by accretion, erosion, and reliction;

(2) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coast line of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State become a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Gulf of Mexico) beyond 3 geographical miles, and

(3) all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands, which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as hereinabove defined;

(b) The term "boundaries" includes the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof;

(c) The term "coast line" means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters;

(d) The terms "grantees" and "lessees" include (without limiting the generality thereof) all political subdivisions, municipalities, public and private corporations, and other persons holding grants or leases from a State, or from its predecessor sovereign if legally validated, to lands beneath navigable waters if such grants or leases were issued in accordance with the constitution, statutes, and decisions of the courts of the State in which such lands are situated, or of its predecessor sovereign: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as conferring upon said grantees or lessees any greater rights or interests other than are described herein and in their respective grants from the State, or its predecessor sovereign;

(e) The term "natural resources" includes, without limiting the generality thereof, oil, gas, and all other minerals, and fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but does not include water power, or the use of water for the production of power;

(f) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" does not include the beds of streams in lands now or heretofore constituting a part of the public lands of the United States if such streams were not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States and if the title to the beds of such streams was lawfully patented or conveyed by the United States or any State to any person;

(g) The term "State" means any State of the Union;

(h) The term "person" includes, in addition to a natural person, an association, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private, public, or municipal corporation;

TITLE II

LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN STATE BOUNDARIES

SEC. 3. Rights of the States:

(a) It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that (1) title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and (2) the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof;

(b) (1) The United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid, except as otherwise reserved herein, all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, improvements, and natural resources; (2) the United States hereby releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States, if any it has, for money or damages arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters; and (3) the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Navy or the Treasurer of the United States shall pay to the respective States or their grantees issuing leases covering such lands or natural resources all moneys paid thereunder to the Secretary of the Interior or to the Secretary of the Navy or to the Treasurer of the United States and subject to the control of any of them or to the control of the United States on the effective date of this joint resolution, except that portion of such moneys which (1) is required to be returned to a lessee; or (2) is deductible as provided by stipulation or agreement between the United States and any of said States;

(c) The rights, powers, and titles hereby recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and their grantees are subject to each lease executed by a State, or its grantee, which was in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, and such rights, powers, and titles are further subject to the rights herein now granted to any person holding any such lease to continue to maintain the lease, and to conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions, for the full term thereof, and any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued such lease: *Provided, however,* That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on and before December 11, 1950, or if the primary term of such lease has expired since December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease: *Provided, however,* That within 90 days from the effective date hereof (1) the lessee shall pay to the State or its grantee issuing such lease all rents, royalties, and other sums payable between June 5, 1950, and the effective date hereof, under such lease and the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee

issued such lease, except such rents, royalties, and other sums as have been paid to the State, its grantee, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Navy or the Treasurer of the United States and not refunded to the lessee; and (ii) the lessee shall file with the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Navy and with the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease, instruments consenting to the payment by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Navy or the Treasurer of the United States to the State or its grantee issuing the lease, of all rents, royalties, and other payments under the control of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of the Navy or the Treasurer of the United States or the United States which have been paid, under the lease, except such rentals, royalties, and other payments as have also been paid by the lessee to the State or its grantee;

(d) Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any right of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power;

(e) Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States.

SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line. Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline, or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

SEC. 5. Exceptions from operation of section 3 of this joint resolution: There is excepted from the operation of section 3 of this joint resolution—

(a) all tracts or parcels of land together with all accretions thereto, resources therein, or improvements thereon, title to which has been lawfully and expressly acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the law of the State or of the United States, and all lands which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State; all lands expressly retained by or ceded to the United States when the State entered the Union; all lands acquired by the United States by eminent domain proceedings, purchase, cession, gift, or otherwise in a proprietary capacity; all lands filled in, built up, or otherwise reclaimed by the United States for its own use; and any rights the United States has in lands presently and actually occupied by the United States under claim of right;

(b) such lands beneath navigable waters held or any interest in which is held, by the United States for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians; and

(c) all structures and improvements constructed by the United States in the exercise of its navigational servitude.

SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights or management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

(b) In time of war or when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person in lands subject to this joint resolution and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this joint resolution is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact or in law applies to the lands subject to this joint resolution, or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights in such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything contained in this joint resolution.

SEC. 9. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed.

SEC. 10. Executive Order No. 10426, dated January 16, 1953, entitled "Setting Aside Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf as a Naval Petroleum Reserve", is hereby revoked insofar as it applies to any lands beneath navigable waters as defined in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 11. Separability: If any provision of this joint resolution, or any section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the joint resolution and of the application of any such provision, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or individual word to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby; without limiting the generality of the foregoing, if subsection 3 (a) 1, 3 (a) 2, 3 (b) 1, 3 (b) 2, 3 (b) 3, or 3 (c) or any provision of any of those subsections is held invalid, such subsection or provision shall be held separable and the remaining subsections and provisions shall not be affected thereby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment, being in the nature of a substitute for the text of the joint resolution, the amendment will be, for the purpose of amendment, considered as the original text and not as an amendment in the first degree. Any amendment thereto is open to amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Griswold	McClellan
Beall	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bricker	Hennings	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Payne
Byrd	Hunt	Potter
Capehart	Ives	Purtell
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kilgore	Stennis
Douglas	Knowland	Symington
Duff	Kuchel	Taft
Dworshak	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Tobey
Ferguson	Long	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Welker
Frear	Mansfield	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
Goldwater	Maybank	Young
Gore	McCarran	
Green	McCarthy	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Hon. HUGH BUTLER of Nebraska, for having given me the opportunity to sit as acting chairman of the committee during the hearings and subsequent proceedings with respect to the several bills and resolutions before the committee on the general subject of submerged lands.

I desire also to state, at this time, that the members of the committee, holding sharply different views on the subject matter, were all very cooperative in the hearings and in the later considerations in executive session, and I express my appreciation to them also.

Mr. President, the subject matter before the Senate this afternoon is not new to the Senate or to the House of Representatives. It has been before the Senate and the House numerous times. Action was taken by both bodies in the 79th Congress. Committees of the House and Senate considered submerged lands at length in the 80th Congress. In the 81st Congress, hearings were held by the committees and the matter was discussed at length on the floor.

SUBJECT THOROUGHLY DEBATED

In the 82d Congress it was again before both Houses, and a measure respecting submerged lands was passed by both Houses.

So it would seem, Mr. President, that certainly there are few subjects which have been considered more thoroughly and debated more generously than has the subject of which, as between the Federal Government and the States, should have title and control over the lands beneath the navigable waters within the State boundary lines of the several States.

In the current session of Congress, when hearings were requested on the bills, the Senator from Oregon had hoped that the hearings might well be limited to such new matter as might not already have been heard and considered in past years. However, Mr. President, early in the hearings it was made amply apparent that this hope was a vain one. It was clear that the hearings should not be so limited. It was most difficult if not impossible, to restrict witnesses in their testimony, so as to have a record made purely as a supplement to the record theretofore made.

As a result of, in effect, tossing into the discard the usual rule of procedure, we have before us today hearings comprising 1,282 pages of testimony and exhibits. In addition, a considerable amount of documentary data is on file with the committee. Despite the size of this volume of hearings, there is, in fact, very little that is new in the testimony or the exhibits.

PROBLEM GROWS OUT OF SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. President, the problem facing us in connection with this proposed legislation results from three decisions of the United States Supreme Court adjudicating the legal status of lands below the low-water mark outside the inland waters and within the statutory boundaries of the States of the United States having tidal waters along their shores, and from certain language appearing in those decisions which makes uncertain the law with respect to the ownership of lands beneath navigable waters, landward from the areas just mentioned, that is to say, lands beneath navigable waters, inland from those adjoining the open sea, such as in rivers, and in lakes.

I shall not long detain the Senate with any historical statement of the problem. I merely wish to say that from the beginning of this Nation the States known as littoral States, having boundaries on the seaward side of the Atlantic Ocean, and later the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Ocean, always considered and always believed that as States they owned the lands beneath all the navigable waters within their statutory boundaries. Through the years the States have acted upon that belief.

UNIFORM DECISIONS AS TO STATE OWNERSHIP

From time to time disputes arose among private owners, and on the part of private owners with States, as to whether the land beneath navigable waters within each State was, in fact, owned by the State. Until the California case in 1947, the decisions were uniform; and all were to the effect that the Original Thirteen States, when they created the United States, and the succeeding States, as they were admitted into the Union, became by virtue, first, of their sovereignty as among the Original Thirteen States, and later, as admitted States on an equal footing with the Thirteen Original States, possessed of title to all the land beneath the waters within their several boundaries. No dissenting voice was heard. At no time, Mr. President, was there raised any question as to that ownership.

Relying upon court decisions—and there were many—and upon administrative decisions—and there were even more of them—the States, from time to time, improved the lands beneath their navigable waters, and, time after time, granted by express conveyance title to portions of the lands beneath such navigable waters. Great ports were created, harbors were improved, and land was made where previously there had been only water. Untold millions of dollars, tens of millions of dollars—yes, hundreds of millions of dollars—were invested in areas of this character, and vast productive wealth added thereby to the basic assets of the United States.

This belief held by the States and their representatives, legislative, judicial, and executive, and likewise held, announced, and acted upon by all the executive officials of the United States Government, and enunciated by State and Federal courts alike, led every individual who had ever given any thought to the matter to the conclusion that there could be no question as to the legal status of the submerged lands within the boundaries of the States of the United States.

SUPREME COURT PREVIOUSLY HELD STATES OWNED THE LANDS

An outstanding case on this point, Mr. President, was the case of Pollard against Hagan's Lessee, decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1844, and found in 3d Howard at page 212. Experts in the law, on the bench, and at the bar, were generally—I may say universally—of opinion that that case was decisive of this question.

Another well-known case, Shively against Bowlby, came to the United States Supreme Court from my own State of Oregon, holding and enunciating the same views.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. For a question, the Senator from Oregon will be happy to yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oregon, of course, recognizes, does he not, that the Pollard against Hagan's Lessee case dealt strictly with the tidelands, a question which is not at all involved in the issue which now confronts us?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the philosophy expressed in the opinion of the Court in the Pollard case was precisely as the Senator from Oregon has suggested. The Pollard case went so far that Mr. Justice Black, in the first of the three submerged-lands decisions—namely, the decision in *U. S. v. California* (332 U. S. 19)—said in referring to the rule in the Pollard case, that the Court had "used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned the tidelands and soil under navigable waters or inland waters, but also own the soil under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Oregon read further what the Court said in that case or may I read it for him?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to have the Senator from Alabama read it.

Mr. HILL. The next sentence in the opinion of the Supreme Court, following the sentence which the Senator has just read, is as follows:

> All these cases were, however, merely paraphrases or offshoots of the Pollard inland water rule, and were not used as an enunciation of a new ocean rule, but as an explanation of the old inland water principle.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon stands on the statement that has just been made, and on the quotation that has just been read from the decision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. In one moment, please. The Senator from Oregon wants to make it abundantly clear this time that the Supreme Court, in the California decision, overruled the views expressed in the Pollard case and in the Shively against Bowlby case, and all the other cases; there can be no question about that. The Senator from Oregon is calling attention to a condition that exists, to beliefs that were held, and to action that was taken for over a hundred years, predicated upon the belief in the soundness of the views set forth in the Pollard case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are not the facts of the Pollard case those described by the Senator from Alabama, namely, that it referred to tidelands in Mobile Bay which, in the course of time, had become filled land, and therefore, in the Pollard case, is it not true that the Court was simply passing on the question of tidelands and filled land, and not the question of submerged lands seaward from the low watermark?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon suggests that the Senator from Illinois is making, or attempting to make, the old differentiation between dicta in an opinion and language in an opinion dealing directly with the issues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is precisely the point I am trying to make, and it is very germane.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon yields no further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has given his views on that point, and he believes that the Senator from Illinois will agree with him that that is the distinction he seeks to make.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator will yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in every case having to do with this subject, prior to the California case, the issues involved factual questions concerning (a) tidelands proper or the land between the high and low watermarks, washed daily by the tides, (b) land underneath rivers, (c) land underneath lakes, and (d) land underneath bays and harbors, all of which have been regarded as inland waterways? And is it not further true that, for the first time, in the California case the issue arose as to paramount rights in the submerged lands seaward from the low watermark?

Mr. CORDON. In answer to the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Oregon, first frankly admits that he has not read all of the hundred-odd cases in detail. He has relied somewhat on digests. Many of those he has read. The Senator from Oregon stated that the expressions of the Court, where those expressions indicated a belief of the Court with reference to the status of lands outside inland waters, were accepted and relied upon by the States and by the officers of the United States, until the 1947 decision; and it is wholly immaterial whether they were dicta or were not dicta.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will yield for a question; yes. He would like to proceed with his explanation, if he might, but he also desires to be as courteous as is possible.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure it is the desire of the Senator from Illinois to have the Senator from Oregon proceed with his explanation. I should like at this time to compliment the Senator from Oregon for the very fair way in which he conducted the hearing. No chairman could have been fairer.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But is not the Senator from Oregon expressing himself on an issue which is not before the Senate? As he has correctly described it, an obiter dictum is a remark not connected with the facts at issue and is, therefore, not binding upon future courts and future decisions.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon believes that is a fair statement of the weight which may be technically and legally placed on obiter dicta. The Senator from Oregon, Mr. President, is making the point that in the cases referred to the officers of States, the officers of the Federal Government, and the courts themselves did not so deem their opinions. The States relied upon the opinions as being decisions in matters in issue, and acted upon that reliance, and did so until they were met head on by the decision in the California case in 1947.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. In regard to the so-called legal hairsplitting, may I point out that even before the Pollard case, Chief Justice Taney, in 1842, made this statement with regard to the bed of Raritan Bay—a question which was at that time being adjudicated:

> For when the Revolution took place, the people in each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soil under them.

There was the Supreme Court, speaking through its Chief Justice, who was living at the time of the Revolution and at the time when the Nation was conceived, saying that the States became completely sovereign in their own right to the beds of all navigable waters.

It is such language as that which caused Mr. Justice Black, in 1946, to write in the majority opinion in the California decision that the courts had been saying for a hundred years that the property belonged to the States. It is true that the Court did not have before it the question of waters in the marginal sea, but the Court was making clear that the States own all parts of all navigable waters within their boundaries.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his contribution. It emphasizes the one point which the Senator from Oregon desires to make, and that is not whether any decision or a group of decisions had to do in essence at the moment with a problem which is inside or which is outside that indefinable line known as the line of inland waters, because the Supreme Court has foreclosed that matter. The Senator from Oregon is simply pointing out to the Senate at this time that the people of the United States relied upon the decisions; the courts of the Nation relied upon them; the officers of State and Federal Governments alike relied upon them. If the decisions were in error, so far as we are concerned at this moment, as a cold legal proposition, we must concede that the Court has met the question in the California case, in the Texas case, and in the Louisiana case, and said that even though the Court previously expressed a different philosophy, this is now the law. So now we are faced with that condition, as well as the precedent condition, and it is upon the basis of the equities arising from that condition that we are before the Senate at this time with this joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield so that I may ask a question on the matters of fact contained in the case to which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] referred?

Mr. CORDON. I take it that the case to which the Senator from Louisiana referred is the Waddell case, decided in 1842.

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that this case referred to submerged lands in Raritan Bay, in New Jersey, a bay which always has been regarded as inland water, and that it in no sense referred to submerged lands seaward from the shoreline, or the coastline, or to the submerged lands in the open sea?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Louisiana, I assume, will discuss the matter in his own good time. The Senator from Oregon feels that so far as he and his presentation are concerned, those questions are beside the point, under the record as it exists today. The Senator from Illinois well knows, I am sure, as every student of the subject knows, that the courts of the States, the officials of the States, the executive officers of the United States, and the courts, time after time used language such as that which I have indicated; that actions by the States are predicated upon those statements, and that the millions of dollars which have been expended and the titles which have been approved are predicated on the doctrine which the Supreme Court, in 1947, said was incorrect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not desire to interfere with the argument of the Senator from Oregon, but do I correctly understand that he is declaring that obiter dicta of the court, immaterial and irrelevant comments and facts which are not before the court in a particular case, are binding upon the Nation? I had always assumed that a court's opinions were controlling only insofar as they dealt with the specific facts and circumstances of the case before it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot yield further. I shall be more than happy to hear the Senator in his own right discuss the issues, but I do find it necessary to correct his assumption. The Senator from Oregon has not said, nor has he implied, that obiter dicta are binding upon anyone. The Senator from Oregon did specifically say that as a result of reliance upon Supreme Court decisions, reliance upon what the Court said, reliance upon the views of administrative officers in State and Federal governments alike, the States undertook to take the action they did; and the Senator from Oregon said that circumstance gives rise to equities. I think the Senator from Illinois understands equity. That is what the Senator from Oregon is talking about.

RELIANCE UPON STATE OWNERSHIP

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon had intended to go very little further with respect to his statement of history in the field of submerged lands prior to the California decision. In view of the statements which have been made—and there is nothing in my statement critical of them; the Senator from Oregon is always happy to yield, and believes that colloquies sometimes produce greater enlightenment than do monologues—I feel that it should be pointed out at this time that, however wrong the duly elected or appointed officials of the States may have been, however wrong the Secretaries of Interior, the Attorneys

General, and the particular members of courts writing opinions in the past, with respect to the legal status of submerged lands, the fact remains, and is abundantly shown in the testimony in the hearings, that the people of the United States, supported, as they thought, by court decisions, supported, as they knew, by words from the highest officers up to the department level of the United States, relied upon the basic concept that the lands beneath navigable waters were lands owned by the States, and those lands were bought, sold, and improved throughout more than a century of our history. Able lawyers, perhaps some of the ablest lawyers this country has ever known, examined the records of title to these lands, and the titles were approved. Title insurance companies have guarantied the titles, and men have spent millions of dollars upon such lands in reliance upon those legal opinions, which in turn relied upon the type of decisions I have discussed, and upon interpretations made by responsible officers dealing administratively with those very lands.

Mr. President, as a result of that situation, I submit that there are compelling equities in favor of the States concerned, in favor of the public subdivisions of those States, and in favor of the thousands of people who have spent their money in improving the lands, the investments in which, as before stated, total untold hundreds of millions of dollars.

Much of this investment is wholly without inland waters, as that term is defined. For a hundred miles along the west coast of Florida there are evidences of that sort of improvement, including sanitation works running for miles out into the open sea. Testimony in the hearings indicates that the same situation exists with respect to the city of Boston, Mass., and the city of New York. Lands beneath navigable waters outside inland waters have been sold and reclaimed, and all sorts of installations have been erected thereon.

I submit that when it is understood that that sort of condition has existed for more than a century, we have a right to believe that there are equities in favor of those who, in good faith, have gone ahead with this vast development, this addition to the economic wealth of the country.

EQUITY A MATTER FOR THE CONGRESS

I desire to suggest that the proper approach to the proposed legislation is to have in mind that in our system of Government there are three coequal and wholly separate departments. One department deals wholly with the interpretation and determination of laws. Another department, of which the United States Senate is a part, deals with the making of laws. When equities arise as between the United States and its citizens or member States, the equities as such are not determinable by any court. When a court decides a question with respect to the United States Government, it can only enunciate what it conceives to be and declares to be the law. When our courts determine matters between citizens, they may then go into the field of equity. The courts then are clothed with the chancellor's conscience. But that is not an attribute of a court when one of the parties before it is the United States of America.

So, when the Supreme Court had before it a case involving rights to submerged lands, while it recognized the equities and recognized also the vast expenditures, it could do nothing about them but could only enunciate what it took to be the law, and then do as it did, namely, suggest that, so far as equities were concerned, they could be handled by the Congress of the United States. Congress now, in Senate Joint Resolution No. 13, has an opportunity to deal with the equities. That is the position which the senior Senator from Oregon takes on the basic proposition involved in the proposed legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I particularly approve of and appreciate what he has just stated with reference to the highly important question of the equities which are here involved.

Would the Senator be willing to have me read into the RECORD at this time, to supplement his able presentation on this particular point, the words of the Supreme Court in the California case, almost at the end of the opinion, pointing out just what the Senator has indicated as to the belief of the Court that citizens, States, and other public units of government which might otherwise be prejudiced by the decision of the Supreme Court could look to the Congress of the United States to do equity as between them?

Mr. CORDON. I should be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator, and I shall read those words into the RECORD at this time:

> But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

I believe that is the portion of the decision referred to by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, in which the majority of the Supreme Court directly called to the attention of Congress, as well as of the public, the fact that Congress was clothed with authority to deal with the inequities which the Court had to disregard, and that the Court believed that Congress would deal justly with any such inequities.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Florida. The excerpt which he has just read is one of the portions of the opinion to which I was referring. I am in agreement with the statement made by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, the first attempt of Congress to take affirmative action in the field of the status of submerged lands antedated by about a year the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case.

The general belief which the Senator from Oregon has indicated as prevailing, and the actions taken in accordance therewith, were not questioned by anyone until the late 1930's. At that time resolutions were offered in the Congress seeking to declare Federal ownership in the area of the submerged lands along the coast. However, the Congress never adopted any of those resolutions. So far as the Senator from Oregon is aware, no thorough consideration was ever given them.

The next time the matter reached the attention of the Congress in any serious way was in connection with the course taken by the Government in bringing the action which resulted in the California case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in 1937 the United States Senate, upon motion of former Senator Nye, of North Dakota, unanimously passed a resolution declaring that the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark were the property of the Federal Government? While that resolution was not passed by the Congress, the records of the Senate indicate that it was unanimously passed by this body.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator's statement is correct. At that time the Senate unanimously passed such a resolution. The Senate passes most of its ill-advised legislation by unanimous consent, which is the most dangerous practice ever indulged in by any legislative body in this world. The Congress, however, has never passed any such resolution.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. With regard to the same resolution, is the Senator from Oregon familiar with the fact that that resolution was introduced in the closing days of that session of Congress, when Congress was anxious to adjourn? It slipped through on the call of the calendar, within 1 week of the time it was introduced. No hearings were conducted on it. I suggest to the Senator that those from the coastal States who would have opposed it probably were not aware of its import when the measure came from the Committee on Old Public Lands of the 75th Congress and slipped through without debate. The House did not pass it, and the next year the Senate refused to pass anything of the sort.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The fact that it was reported by the then Committee on Public Lands certainly indicated that those who were giving the subject the greatest amount of study approved it. I wonder if the Senator from Oregon wishes to take the position that every Member of the United State Senate is out of step except the advocates of the pending measure.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon takes no such position. It is idle to continue debate along this line. Considering the fact that there were no hearings on a matter of such importance, considering the fact that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has just finished considering the

same matter, and that 1,282 pages of testimony were required at this hearing alone to obtain a general view of the subject, considering the fact that since the subject really has had consideration of Congress more than 8,000 pages of testimony have been taken in 16 open hearings, one may be forgiven for suggesting that no consideration was given by the committee or the Senate to the substance or the legal effect of the Nye resolution.

PREVIOUS APPROVAL OF SAME TYPE OF LEGISLATION

Beginning in 1945 the Senate had the first forerunner of the present joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 13. It was in the nature of a provision to quiet, or an attempt to quiet, title to the submerged lands within the boundaries of the several States. That joint resolution passed both Houses of the 79th Congress. It is interesting to note that in 1946 it passed the House by a vote of 188 to 67, and by a vote of 44 to 34 in the Senate.

Thereafter, following the same general thought as to the best method of relief, after the Supreme Court decision in the California case indicated that more specific and positive action was urgently necessary, a bill similar in purpose and intent was passed by a vote in the House of 259 to 29 in the 80th Congress. The companion bill in the Senate at that time was reported by the committee in the closing days of the session, but no further action could be taken.

In the 81st Congress two separate hearings were held by the Senate Interior Committee, and hearings were held by the House Judiciary Committee also.

In the 82d Congress there was reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the Anderson-O'Mahoney bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20, which was in the nature of intermediate legislation. On the floor of the Senate, the Holland bill, for relinquishment to and establishment in the States of their historically held rights in the submerged lands, was substituted for the provisions as Senate Joint Resolution 20, as reported. In its quitclaim form the measure passed the Senate. The Walters bill, H. R. 4484, was passed in the House of Representatives. In conference the bill finally agreed upon and sent to the President was the Holland form of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

This year, because of the veto of the Holland bill in the 82d Congress, a bill, the same as that which passed last year was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and 39 other Members of the Senate, as Senate Joint Resolution 13. Other measures, approaching the subject from various viewpoints were also introduced.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION

Hearings were held, and we have before us 1,282 pages of the hearings and exhibits. In the course of the hearings the administration was represented by the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, who testified; the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, who testified; and by the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Anderson, who testified.

After the hearings were concluded, the committee took up the subject in executive sessions. There was before it the recommendations of these Cabinet officers in the present administration. Their recommendations were in favor of a bill such as the Holland bill of last year, or Senate Joint Resolution 13 of this year, conveying to the States the lands beneath all their navigable waters. The recommendations also included a suggestion for additional legislation to confirm the jurisdiction of and control by the United States of the resources in the seabed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf outside State boundaries, and extending to the edge of the Continental Shelf.

The committee had heard testimony on that subject in the hearings. In the course of consideration of the problem which arose when it sought to frame language that would accomplish the desired result with respect to the outer Continental Shelf, the committee concluded that the problem was too complex to be solved by way of legislation within any reasonable time. Of course, such proposed legislation is expected in both Houses, and Congress has a right to have such legislation reported.

Another reason which moved the committee in reaching the decision to split the problem into two parts, the first part dealing with lands within the boundaries of the States, and the second part dealing with the sea bed and subsoil of the Continental Shelf outside the State boundaries, was that there was a sharp difference of opinion among Members of this body with respect to the two types of legislation.

OPINION IN SENATE DIVIDED

It was found that some Senators who would like to vote in favor of Senate Joint Resolution 13 were hesitant about voting on a measure with respect to the Continental Shelf while having before them only the evidence that was at hand. Other Senators who were prepared to vote immediately with respect to implementing the Continental Shelf proposition perhaps would feel adverse to Senate Joint Resolution 13. So it was in the interest of giving every Member of the Senate an opportunity to vote his views on the two problems that they were separated, as well as, of course, because of the necessity, which clearly developed, for further study of the subject with relation to the Continental Shelf.

Again I desire to state that the matter involving implementation of the Presidential proclamation assuming jurisdiction and control of the resources in the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf will have the attention of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs concurrently with the debate on the pending joint resolution. The staff of the committee is even now engaged in going into the legal aspects of that proposed legislation. The executive departments are engaged in the same kind of study. I have every hope that there will be prepared and ready for consideration by the Senate a recommended measure on the subject matter of the outer Continental Shelf by the time the vote on Senate Joint Resolution 13 is taken.

I simply desire to assure all Senators that no "hidden ball" trick is involved in the pending proposal, which is based on sound judgment. The committee reached the conclusion that the problem had to be divided, and that both segments of it must have early solution.

Mr. President, as heretofore stated, Senate Joint Resolution 13, as it was introduced, is in exactly the same form it was in when it was approved by the Congress last year but vetoed by President Truman. The committee received evidence with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 13, and also with respect to Senate bill 294, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within original State boundaries, and to the natural resources within such lands and waters; to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; and to provide for jurisdiction, use, and control of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying outside of the original State boundaries. That bill was introduced by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and it included, in addition to the substance of the so-called Holland joint resolution, the third portion of the title, namely, that dealing with the Continental Shelf.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION BILL CONSIDERED

There was also considered, and testimony was heard on, Senate bill 107, a bill to provide for the development of the oil and gas reserves of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, to protect certain equities therein, to confirm the titles of the several States to lands underlying inland navigable waters within State boundaries, and for other purposes. Senate bill 107 was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and is substantially identical with Senate Joint Resolution 20 as reported and with the amendments adopted by the Senate prior to substitution of the Holland measure.

Evidence was also had with respect to an amendment to Senate bill 107—namely, the Hill amendment—which provides for the use of funds accruing from the development and use of the resources of the Continental Shelf, particularly specifying the use for educational purposes of certain of those funds.

There was also Senate Joint Resolution 18, to establish a commission to assist in making a proper and equitable settlement of the submerged lands problem. That joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The committee in executive session adopted Senate Joint Resolution 13 as the proposed legislation to be perfected and reported. The amendments which, in the opinion of the committee, were necessary to Senate Joint Resolution 13 numbered some 82. To a very great extent, those amendments are perfecting and clarifying, only; in nowise do they change the philosophy, the meaning, the purpose, or the mechanics of the so-called Holland joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will it disturb the Senator from Oregon to have me ask him, at this time, about some language of the joint resolution?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to reach that in a few minutes.

Mr. President, very few of the amendments go beyond phrases, words, or, occasionally, clauses. All the amendments are set forth in the report. Because of the fact that there were 82 amendments, it was deemed better to report a substitute for the joint resolution, rather than to report the joint resolution with all 82 of the minor and, to some extent, more or less major changes, indicated in the text.

AMENDMENTS SET FORTH AND EXPLAINED IN REPORT

When the report was prepared, the committee sought to give every possible assistance to the membership of the Senate in its study and ultimate understanding of just what the committee recommends in the report.

Therefore, in the report, as prepared, the joint resolution as reported is first set forth. It is also shown in the reported joint resolution itself, as a clean substitute for the joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's train of thought or the line of approach he is making to this matter, but I should like to ask whether Senate Joint Resolution 13, as amended, and as it appears now before the Senate, was approved by the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell; by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay; and by the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Anderson. Did they approve Senate Joint Resolution 13 as it came from the committee?

Mr. CORDON. So far as I know, it has never been the practice of committees to request a second opinion after technical and other amendments are made to proposed legislation. So my answer to the Senator is "No"; the joint resolution has never been submitted to those gentlemen as a complete, clean bill for their opinion in its last form.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am not referring to the technical changes; I am referring to the substance of the joint resolution.

Mr. CORDON. The substance was approved by each of the three in their testimony before the committee.

Mr. President, to continue my explanation of the report, let me say that, following the print of the joint resolution itself in its present, recommended form, there appears in the report, beginning on page 5, a statement of the purpose of the joint resolution. Following that general statement, and beginning on page 10, is a sectional analysis of the joint resolution as reported. This sectional analysis is a narrative explanation of the joint resolution, section by section and paragraph by paragraph.

EACH CHANGE SHOWN

Following that narrative general analysis, Mr. President, the committee has adopted a somewhat new approach for further purposes of explanation. Beginning on page 14 of the report and continuing to the bottom of page 17, there is set forth the language of the original Senate Joint Resolution 13, with the language recommended to be stricken, lined out, the language recommended to be inserted shown in italics, and with each amendment numbered and set in a black bracket, for easy reading and location in case anyone desires to pick out a single amendment or to identify the changes in language.

Following the amended joint resolution, as set forth, there is, seriatim, beginning on page 17, an explanation of each amendment. Each amendment keyed to the amendment number in the preceding amended joint resolution has its separate explanation. It was felt by the committee that such a procedure would be most helpful in the study of the joint resolution by any who have not heretofore been closely identified with its preparation or with its amendment.

Following the explanation, Mr. President, there is in the report a history of the proposed legislation, a statement with respect to support for the proposed legislation, and then voluminous appendices containing the opinions of the Court in the three cases of United States against California, United States against Texas, and United States against Louisiana, and other documentary information deemed to be of value to one studying the joint resolution and the problem presented by it.

Mr. President, that explains the report the committee has submitted to the Senate in order to aid it in understanding the problem which is under consideration. I may also say that, among the matters in the appendix of the report, is the text of the report of the Senate Judiciary Committee of the 80th Congress upon the then pending Senate bill 1988, known as the quitclaim bill, to which I referred a while ago in discussing the history of the proposed legislation.

That report, while it was prepared before the decisions in the Louisiana and Texas cases, is deemed by the committee to be of such pertinence to the present issues, because of its comprehensive presentation of the historical facts and judicial background of the submerged lands question, that it should be printed. Accordingly, it is printed in full. Those of my colleagues who are interested in a more comprehensive statement and a more comprehensive history of the problem and of the proposed legislation, are referred to that report, which, as I say, is set forth in the appendix to Report 133, to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. President, the Senator from Oregan feels that it perhaps would be better to leave a further technical explanation of the bill and its various sections, subsections, paragraphs, and so on, to a later time, after the Members of the Senate shall have had opportunity to study the report which has been submitted. That being the case, the Senator from Oregon will now limit himself to a few observations only, with reference to philosophy of the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CORDON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Alabama notes this language on page 16, line 7, of the joint resolution:

(d) Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

The Senator from Alabama also notes on page 18, line 20, section 6, subparagraph (a), some additional language on the same subject. The Senator from Alabama would like to ask whether there is any conflict at all between the language of page 16, subsection (d), and the language on page 18, section 6, subparagraph (a).

Mr. CORDON. So far as the Senator from Oregon can determine, there is no conflict whatever.

Mr. HILL. I take it that, so far as it concerns the right or power of the Federal Government to go into the State of the Senator from Oregon, to build a dam, let us say, on Snake River, the joint resolution would in no way interfere with that right, nor would it in any way delimit or curtail that right, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The language on page 16 to which the Senator referred, being subparagraph (d), is inserted for the purpose of clearly exempting from the effect of the pending joint resolution the powers of the Federal Government under the commerce clause of the Constitution of the United States. Comprehended within those powers under the commerce clause is the power to regulate navigation, and, as an incident to the regulation of navigation, there arises the right to obstruct the waters in order to regulate them, and to use the electrical power incidentally produced thereby. All that is completely outside of the effect of the pending measure.

Mr. HILL. As I read that language, I had in mind the same construction as that which the Senator from Oregon has expressed. I wanted to make sure that there was nothing in the language on page 18 which in any way impaired or delimited or represented a deviation from what was contained in the language on page 16, in subsection (d).

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will note, the language on page 16 is an express exception from all application of the bill.

Mr. HILL. That is true.

Mr. CORDON. The language, beginning on page 17, I believe it is——

Mr. HILL. Page 18, I think, line 20, subsection (a) of section 6, which begins on page 18.

Mr. CORDON. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon. That refers to powers retained by the United States, and they have been spelled out more meticulously in order that there can be no question as to the effect of the joint resolution with respect to the paramount rights and powers of the Federal Government. The Senator

from Oregon asserts there is no conflict between the two provisions.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Referring to the language in section 6, at the bottom of page 18, I note that it reads:

> SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

It seems to me that, in this particular section, which is supposed to contain a reservation of rights to the United States, it excepts and excludes from that reservation the "proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

Mr. CORDON. The philosophy of the section, indeed the expressed purpose of the section, is to clearly indicate the paramount right that rests in the Government in the fields of navigation, national defense, and international affairs. But it expressly differentiates those paramount rights and their absolute exercise, from subordinate rights which are not connected with them, but which may coexist with them, and which are transferred to and established in the States. That is the purpose of the section, and it would appear to be perfectly clear that that purpose would be accomplished by it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. Whenever the Federal Government builds a dam on a river, whether it be the Tennessee River in Alabama, or the Snake River in Oregon, it exercises its power in the field of navigation. Of course, in order to build the dam, it also must have the land on which the dam rests. It would, I take it, have a proprietary ownership of such land, and so it is the purpose and intent of this language that, whenever this paramount right is invoked, the other things that go with the land naturally go with the paramount right. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. They are incident to the necessities of the Government and its exercise of the power.

Mr. HILL. Naturally, the Government could not exercise its paramount right to build the dam without having the land upon which to build it, and without having a proprietary ownership, so to speak, of such land. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is not prepared to go into the question of proprietary ownership of the land upon which the dam is to be built, or of the adjacent land which might be flooded. It is a paramount servitude. It is overriding, and the right is in the United States by virtue of the commerce clause.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, may I ask a further question?

Mr. CORDON. Surely.

Mr. MURRAY. This language, it seems to me, while it reserves all "rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce," does not give the Federal Government the right to enter upon the rivers or to take possession of any portions of the rivers necessary for the construction of the multiple-purpose dams which have been provided for by various of pieces of legislation Congress has enacted in the past. It seems to me that that language would make it necessary for the Federal Government, at any time that it proposed to build a dam, to go to the States to obtain the privilege of doing so.

Mr. CORDON. To which language does the Senator refer?

Mr. MURRAY. I am referring to the language at the bottom of page 18, beginning in the last line: "but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources."

It seems to me that language takes away from the Federal Government the right to enter upon rivers and undertake to construct dams and other necessary works.

Mr. CORDON. I suggest to the Senator from Montana that his interpretation of the language would necessarily lead to the conclusion that the whole section is meaningless, in that the first part of the first section would except the rights, and the last part would destroy them. Certainly there is no need to consider what, if the Senator will pardon the use of the language, would be a fantastic construction. It is clear that every situation created by this section is the same as that under which this country has been living and functioning for 150 years. There is nothing new created at all.

Mr. MURRAY. But what is the purpose?

Mr. CORDON. The purpose clearly is to enunciate as emphatically as can be done that the paramount rights of the Federal Government in its constitutional field of controlling and regulating rivers, in national defense, and in international affairs cannot be interfered with by any situation created under the resolution. The resolution seeks to transfer, establish, and vest in the States interests which in themselves are proprietary in character but in no sense governmental. These interests are made subordinate to the paramount rights of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield in order that I may make an observation on this point?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will be happy to yield and will appreciate the observation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Montana owes his confusion to the fact that he stopped reading from the resolution with the words "natural resources". If he had continued reading the remainder of section 6 (a) he would have seen that the provision which he had read, "but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources," is limited by the rest of the sentence, which reads as follows: "which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution."

If the Senator from Montana will look at section 3 and particularly at subsection (d), on page 16, he will see that the powers which give him particular concern are not included in the grants to the States by section 3, but are particularly excluded in subsection (d).

It is that point which the Senator from Florida wishes to invite to his attention and which he hopes will give him assurance.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is appreciative of the explanation of the Senator from Florida. It is exactly in accord with the whole philosophy of the resolution as it was determined upon and reported by the committee.

Mr. President, one other matter, and I intend to close this discussion so far as my remarks are concerned. I shall be happy, at a later point, after the other Members of the Senate have had an opportunity further to consider the report and recommendations of the committee with respect to amendments, to go further into the technical aspects of the amendment. I think, however, that most of the explanations are clear as they appear in the committee report.

To those who may have some question in their minds as to the right of the Congress constitutionally to legislate in this field, I desire to say that there appears to the committee majority and to the Senator from Oregon not the slightest doubt that the Supreme Court expected action from the Congress; indeed, the Court adverted to that subject, as was shown earlier this afternoon. There can be no question, because, clearly, action was essential if there was to be wholesale taking by the Federal Government of private property without compensation. Certainly the Supreme Court's own language indicated that it expected Congress to function in the field where it seeks now to act.

In short, Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to create by law a status and a condition which existed, in fact, up to the time of the California decision. What had been done was done under a belief that the law was as the law will be if Senate Joint Resolution 13 is adopted. In the view of the majority of the committee and in the view of the

Senator from Oregon, the joint resolution does simple justice.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for one question?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I first wish to express my very deep appreciation to the Senator from Oregon, not only for his able handling of the joint resolution on the floor, but also for his exceedingly fair and thorough handling of it in the subcommittee and in the full committee, for which the Senator from Florida and many others are greatly beholden to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I am deeply appreciative of the statement of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the subject which I shall raise by this question relates to a matter which the Senator from Oregon has discussed with me since the report on the resolution was submitted and which is the only matter contained in any amendment which has given to the Senator from Florida any cause for concern or inquiry. While the matter in question is well understood between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Florida, the Senator from Florida felt it would be well in this opening day of the debate to have it made clear in the RECORD so that all Senators may have the question brought to their attention and may give it such consideration as they deem to be appropriate.

My question is addressed to amendment No. 61, which is the amendment having to do with section 5 of the joint resolution, and dealing with exceptions from the operation of section 3. I am not disturbed by most of the provisions of that amendment, but there are two which have given me some concern, one of which I think is completely taken care of by the statement filed by the distinguished Senator as an explanation of this particular amendment, No. 61. However, the two matters which have caused me concern are, first, the words: "all lands expressly retained by or ceded to the United States when the State entered the Union."

Secondly, the last provision, which reads: "and any rights the United States has in lands presently and actually occupied by the United States under claim of right."

I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I think the explanation given for this amendment is completely adequate to take care of the latter of the two provisions mentioned by me, the explanation in the printed report being as follows, if I may read it:

[61] The language that is substituted for that stricken in the original bill is generally similar in purpose, but spells out in greater detail the classes of land exempted from the operation of section 3 of the joint resolution. It is believed that, with this explanation, the language is otherwise self-explanatory. However, the committee wishes to emphasize that the exceptions spelled out in this amendment do not in anywise include any claim resting solely upon the doctrine of "paramount rights" enunciated by the Supreme Court with respect to the Federal Government's status in the areas beyond inland waters and mean low tide.

I am completely satisfied with the explanation with reference to the provision: "and any rights the United States has in lands presently and actually occupied by the United States under claim of right."

Am I correct in understanding that under that particular provision the mere fact that the Supreme Court might have held that the United States has paramount rights in submerged lands beyond mean low water, and within State boundaries, would not in any way give the United States the right to claim exceptions of such lands from the joint resolution, in view of the fact that such lands would not be "presently and actually occupied by the United States"? Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Florida is correct in his understanding. I should like to add that the last language quoted, namely, "any rights the United States has in lands presently and actually occupied by the United States under claim of right," came into the bill at the request of the Department of Justice. It was presented to the committee and explained by the Department of Justice as being for the purpose of reserving to the Federal Government the area of any installation, or part of an installation—and I use the term "installation" to distinguish a specific area, used for a specific purpose, from any vast area that might be claimed under the paramount right doctrine—actually occupied by the Government under a claim of right. There must be a right in the Government to it. The Government will have an opportunity, a day in court, to determine the correctness of its claim. There was no other purpose in the language.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. If he will permit me to ask another question, I should like to inquire if it was the purpose of this particular exception to leave the Federal Government exactly in the position it now occupies, with such rights as it may have, and with such obligations or responsibilities as it may have, with reference to any lands which it presently and actually occupies by reason of building and maintaining on such lands, installations and the like, under claim of right. There was no purpose to improve the rights of the United States, or to take from those rights in any particular, by this provision?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

I now wish to return to the earlier provision or exception, which relates to "All lands expressly retained by or ceded to the United States when the State entered the Union."

I am not disturbed by the phrase, "ceded to the United States," which I understand applies only in the case of Texas. I realize that the State of Texas is most ably represented here; and if there is any question about that provision, the two distinguished Senators from that State will know about it. However, I am concerned with the fact that there have been included in the enabling acts, by which some of the newer States have been created, general reservations of public lands. There are expressions which may go even further than that.

Therefore, I am exceedingly anxious that in the explanation of this amendment it may be made abundantly clear by the Senator from Oregon that mere paramount rights and the existence of such rights to offshore areas and to sea bottoms would not in anywise satisfy this condition of express retention by the United States when the State entered the Union, if that is the fact.

Mr. CORDON. The purpose of the language is to reserve to the United States those facilities and those areas which are used by the Government in its governmental capacity for one or more of its governmental purposes.

The provision specifically saves to the United States that type of facility concerning which there never has been, in the history of this country, a question as to the Federal Government's right of ownership.

The sole purpose of the legislation proposed is to recreate the situation in law as it existed in fact before the California, Louisiana, and Texas decisions and not to go beyond that point.

Mr. DANIEL and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CORDON. I yield first to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator from Oregon state if what he has just read with reference to lands expressly retained by the United States when the State entered the Union also applies with respect to the phrase "or ceded to the United States when the State entered the Union"?

Mr. CORDON. That is the understanding of the Senator from Oregon as to both phrases.

Mr. DANIEL. This exception, therefore, applies only to lands expressly retained or expressly ceded to the United States?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. And it is not intended to retain or except from this measure any lands which might have been interpreted, under the paramount rights theory, to have been retained or ceded as a matter of law?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Texas is correct, and expresses the view of the Senator from Oregon as he studied the joint resolution and presented it to the committee, and as the committee has reported it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oregon, as the distinguished acting chairman of the committee, of course recalls the testimony of the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell. He no doubt recalls that the Attorney General made certain recommendations to the committee.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. His second recommendation was that—

An actual line on a map dividing the two areas of submerged lands should be drawn by

Congress in the bill to eliminate much expensive and unnecessary litigation.

May I ask what the committee's reaction was to that recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States?

Mr. CORDON. The acting chairman of the committee for this legislation had a number of conferences with the Attorney General of the United States and other representatives of the Department of Justice. Careful study was made of the suggestion. It was the view of the Chairman of the committee, and the committee concurred, that it was impracticable to attempt to resolve this question by the use of any arbitrary line of delineation.

The philosophy of the joint resolution is limited to the areas of the States as they were when the States came into the Union, or as that area was thereafter approved by Congress, or to an area 3 miles from their coastline. If they desire now to extend it to that distance, or to the international boundary line if that line is within an inland-water area. Any arbitrary line clearly could not follow the sinuosities of such a line and become a legal determination of the boundary line of a State. The committee decided not to follow that suggestion.

Mr. HILL. Is it possible today to know what the historic boundaries of the various coastal States are?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon cannot say whether it is or is not. The Senator from Oregon says only that the committee and the Congress found a situation existing which had existed for some 150 years or so as to the older States, and for half a century or more as to the other States. As to where the lines are, the Senator from Oregon will say that in his opinion, in many instances either there will have to be agreement between the United States and the States in question, delimiting or fixing the boundary, or the boundary will have to be determined by litigation.

MEASURE WILL NOT CAUSE LITIGATION

This joint resolution does not create any necessity for litigation. Neither does it attempt to offer a substitute for that type of decision.

Mr. HILL. Some time, no doubt, such boundaries will have to be established. Is it not true that not only does the joint resolution seek to confirm title, or right, title, and interest, in the particular State to oil and gas, but also to any other resource which might be within what the joint resolution describes as the historic boundary of the particular State?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. If there should be sulfur, copper, uranium, or other valuable minerals in such areas, by this measure the United States would confirm any title, right, or interest, or right of use or disposition, to the particular State. No one can know today where such boundaries may be, and no one can know today what minerals may be in the submerged lands. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORDON. I doubt if there is anyone with wisdom enough to make such a determination.

Mr. HILL. Furthermore, we do not know how much we might be disposing of by this measure, how much we might be giving away, how far out the boundaries might reach, or how much in the way of valuable minerals such lands might have within them. Perhaps they contain some precious mineral or metal that we do not even know about today.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has a different view as to what is being given or not given; but aside from that, the Senator from Oregon is in agreement that no one knows what is under the ground.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon his understanding of section 2, subsection (a), paragraph 2, on pages 10 and 11, and of the latter part of section 4, on page 17 of the revised joint resolution. Let me state the question in this way:

If the Senator will look at the end of section 4, beginning in line 7, on page 17, he will note that the revised joint resolution reads:

> Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so as to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond three geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

I should like to ask specifically, what is the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Oregon as to what this provision does to the boundary of Texas? What does it mean in the case of Texas?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is not going to attempt to bound the State of Texas on the floor of the Senate. The boundary of the State of Texas is the boundary which was established for the State of Texas when she voluntarily pulled down her own flag and ran up the flag of the United States. That boundary has not changed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What was that, may I ask?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are we being asked to buy a pig in a poke?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is not being asked to buy a pig in a poke.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are we being asked to accept boundaries of Texas which the sponsor of the joint resolution says he cannot define?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President——

Mr. CORDON. Just a moment. Mr. President, I am surprised at the statement of the Senator from Illinois. Does the Senator from Illinois suggest for a minute that there is not a boundary to the State of Texas? Is that a pig in a poke?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it 3 miles, or 3 leagues, or is it beyond 3 leagues?

Mr. CORDON. Let the Senator from Illinois, if he will, charge the Senator from Oregon with ignorance. But let him not say that the State of Texas does not have a boundary. Let us be reasonable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The question is, What boundary is it?

Mr. CORDON. It is the boundary of Texas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But what is that boundary? Is it 3 miles? Is it 10½ miles? Is it out to the edge of the Continental Shelf, as Texans, in an exuberant moment, decided for themselves some years ago? Where is it? There are tens of billions of dollars involved in this very question. Is it not crucially important?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon would like to discuss this point first; then he will be very glad to yield.

BOUNDARY QUESTION LEFT WHERE IT IS

The States of the United States have legal boundaries. It is not a part of the power or the duty of Congress to make determination with reference to those boundaries, or where those boundaries should lie. It is a matter for the courts to determine, or for the United States, through Congress and the legislative organizations of the several States, to reach an agreement upon. The pending bill does not seek to invade either province. It leaves both exactly where it finds them. Whenever a question arises as to a boundary, it will be determined exactly as any other question in law is determined, and the boundary will be established.

The pending measure does not seek to prejudge that issue, or to determine it. It is not within the province of Congress to change the present boundaries of Texas without the consent of the State of Texas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me to answer the question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. It may be that the Senator from Illinois wishes to make certain that the State of Texas does not claim that its boundary at the time of its admission to the Union extended beyond 3 leagues. I may say that the boundary of the State of Texas at the time it entered the Union existed 3 leagues from shore, which is equal to 9 marine miles, or 10½ statute miles.

That boundary was fixed by the Republic of Texas in 1836. It was made known on the floor of the Senate before the United States recognized the independence of Texas, and was again explained to the Senate at the time Texas was admitted to the Union.

So 3 leagues from shore is the boundary Texas has always had since 1836. That was the boundary claimed by Texas at the time Texas entered the Union, and it is the boundary which Texas insists applies in the consideration of the question pending before the Senate today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon agree with the

interpretation of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is not going either to agree or disagree. The Senator from Oregon gives his opinion that the argument seems to him to be sound, but he is not passing upon that question because he does not have the power to pass upon it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that Texas was admitted to the Union, not by treaty, but by joint resolution, which, like all joint resolutions of admission, declared that Texas was admitted on "an equal footing"—and I quote those words—with all the original States? Since the Supreme Court has ruled that the original States did not have title to the submerged lands out 3 miles beyond the low-water mark, then Texas is not entitled even to these lands out 3 miles from its shoreline, let alone the 10½-mile boundary claim just referred to. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of that fact?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is aware that the Senator from Illinois is as completely scrambled in his thinking this afternoon as ever a man can be.

The question of the ownership of land out to the boundary line is one thing. Where the boundary line is, is quite another thing. The Supreme Court in its decisions, did not determine the boundary line at all. It determined who had the paramount interest or title in the land out to the boundary line.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Oregon believe that if the proposed language is adopted Texas will have paramount rights in the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark 10½ miles out?

Mr. CORDON. Texas will have title out to its legal, existing boundary line.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is its legal boundary line?

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator wants an answer to that question, he will have to get it from the Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the Senator's understanding about the paramount rights under this joint resolution of the State of Florida on the west coast of Florida, out into the Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon makes the same answer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is that answer?

Mr. CORDON. That question can be determined and should be determined in 1 of 2 ways, either by agreement through a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida and by Congress, or by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I had understood that when the Senator from Florida introduced his original bill last year he stated that he recognized the claim of Texas to 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico, and the claim of Florida to 3 leagues or 10½ statute miles, into the Gulf of Mexico on the west coast of Florida. Has the meaning with respect to that point been changed?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield so that I may make reply to the question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CORDON. In one moment I shall be glad to yield. The Senator from Oregon will yield the floor in a few minutes. First, however, he wishes to say that he is being asked his opinion about a matter which is wholly extraneous and not involved in the proposed legislation.

The resolution before the Senate does not deal with a determination of the boundary lines of the States. Those boundary lines do exist, but the Senator from Oregon will not usurp the prerogative, either of the Supreme Court of the United States to make a judicial determination, or of the legislative bodies of the States in question to make a legislative determination. He is not going to project himself into either field. He can well understand that the Representatives of those States will present their case and their reasons.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I should like to have my remarks apply not only to the question just raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], but also to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Alabam [Mr. HILL] with reference to a proposal at one time made by the Attorney General, but, as I understand, later withdrawn by him. That proposal of the Attorney General was to the effect that in the passage of legislation like that now pending the Congress should draw a little red line on the maps surrounding the various States, and indicate that the legislation applied up to that red line and not farther.

The committee decided, wisely, I believe—and as the Senator from Florida is not a member of the committee he may speak of wisdom existing within the committee, and the Senator from Florida also understands that the Attorney General joins in that opinion—that the drawing of a red line would not in any way avert trouble, but, to the contrary, probably would provoke more trouble, because no right existing in any State could possibly be diminished by the drawing of such a red line; that if there is a dispute as to where the boundary of a State runs, it will necessarily require legal determination and decision by the United States Supreme Court; and that the drawing of a line would just add an additional complicating factor.

With reference to the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] the answer is much the same. If it were proposed by the pending measure to extend the line beyond the 3 geographic miles, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would be justified in having concern. The real fact is that the joint resolution does not make any such proposal. It merely provides with complete clarity that no State which claims to have had a constitutional boundary going beyond 3 geographic miles at the time it was admitted to the Union, or claims to have a boundary that goes beyond that distance, and has been approved by the Congress since the time of its admission to the Union, will have those claimed rights affected in any way by this joint resolution. That is all the provision would bring about.

In further answer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, with reference to the State of Florida and its claims, I think it might be well, without trying to go in great detail into the claims of the State of Florida, to indicate substantially what the situation is.

Following the War Between the States, the State of Florida and other States which had been in the Confederacy were denied their right to occupy, through their Representatives or Senators, the seats which had belonged to them prior to that war in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. Congress very determinedly passed legislation to that effect. Incidentally, it had to be passed over the veto of the then President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was the so-called carpetbagger force bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois may use whatever term he wishes to use. It was legislation passed over the veto of President Johnson, under which it was provided that the former Confederate States did not have legal governments at the time, but had only de facto governments under which a general officer was assigned to be the commanding genius in each of those States until certain things were done. The things to be done included, among others, the drafting of a new constitution, which had to be reported to the Congress and had to be examined and approved by the Congress—and I use both words which were in the statute—before the State could again assume its representation in either the Senate or the House of Representatives. There were further provisions—for instance, a provision that the State would have to elect a legislature under the new constitution, would have to approve the XIV amendment, under action of that legislature, and would have to take various other acts, which I do not pretend to state in full in this brief explanation, before the State of Florida or any of the other States of the South could resume full partnership in the United States by resuming their seats in the Senate and House of Representatives.

The State of Florida did draw up a new constitution, and it was examined and approved by the Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me complete my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield, if I have authority to do so.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield the floor, and have the Senator from Florida proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon, but there are other Senators who wish to address questions to the Senator from Oregon.

The State of Florida adopted a new constitution which contained so many provisions that the debate here on the floor of Congress raged long and in detail about some of the provisions. But after long and extensive debate and

after the hearing of proposed amendments to strike Florida out of the act which would restore quite a number of Southern States to representation in Congress, Congress finally voted that the Florida Constitution was all right, and it was approved and accepted. Later, action was taken by the State of Florida to approve the 14th amendment; and thereafter the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Florida were seated.

One of the provisions of the new constitution placed the boundaries of the State of Florida on the Gulf of Mexico—that is, off the mainland of the State of Florida on its west coast—at the same distance as that which had prevailed since 1836, in the case of Texas, in the same shallow body of water, the Gulf of Mexico. It placed the limit at three leagues, or 9 sea miles or geographic miles or substantially 10½ English miles or land miles.

It is the contention of the State of Florida, and it will be our contention in any forum where the State of Florida has a right to be heard, that that action on the part of the Congress of the United States, and its approval of the Florida constitution with that provision included, effectually gave Florida her boundary out that far.

But in completing my answer to the distinguished Senator, let me say that nothing we could do here would, and nothing we shall attempt to do here will, under this measure, change those facts in the slightest degree, because all that is done under this measure, by means of the only provisions of it that apply to this question, is to preserve in status quo the exact rights, whatever they may be, of the State of Florida and, likewise, of the State of Texas or any other State to be heard upon this question.

The action taken by Congress in approving the so-called Holland joint resolution and this particular provision of it does not in itself operate to extend any boundaries for Florida, Texas, or any other State beyond the 3-geographic-mile limit. It simply preserves in status quo the rights of any States which may claim to bring themselves under this provision of the joint resolution. I know of none but two, including the State of Texas, as to its entire frontage on the Gulf of Mexico, and the State of Florida, as to more than one-third of its entire frontage, being all its mainland frontage on the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a question?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to have an opportunity to yield to each of my colleagues in turn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, to permit me to ask a question in regard to the joint resolution?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the following question: Does the joint resolution clearly define the status of navigable waters, such as lakes—and I have in mind the Great Lakes, including the Great Lakes which borders Minnesota—in relation to the oil and mineral rights under those bodies of water in the inland States, and in particular, in the State of Minnesota?

Mr. CORDON. It does.

Mr. THYE. The joint resolution does declare, does it, that oil and other minerals found under the lakes, whether they be inland lakes, or whether they be recognized as one of the Great Lakes, as well as any stream, are the property of the States?

Mr. CORDON. So long as it is a navigable body of water. The joint resolution specifically includes the Great Lakes. The joint resolution vests and establishes that right in the State of Minnesota and other States abutting the Great Lakes. There is a release by the United States of the lands and the resources therein, and the resources includes whatever of value that may be there.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Oregon for the opportunity to ask that question and to have it answered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Orgeon permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Florida, in view of the explanatory statement the Senator from Florida has made?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if the Senate will permit me to let my two colleagues join in mortal combat, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon to yield 20 minutes to me, so as to enable me to make a brief speeech while the Senator from Oregon gets some lunch, and then returns to the Chamber, to answer questions for the remainder of the session if need be.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may do both.

Mr. DOUGLAS. After the Senator from Oregon has had lunch and has refreshed himself, I hope he will return to the floor of the Senate, so as to permit some of us to ask him questions, because we have only begun to explore this subject.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield the floor?

Mr. CORDON. At this time I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understand that I have been recognized. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator from Oregon has yielded the floor, and that now the Senator from Mississippi will proceed, and that thereafter the Senator from Oregon will return to the floor to participate in the debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair fails to understand how the Senator from Oregon can go to lunch without yielding the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the question is not whether the Senator can go to lunch, but whether the Senator from Oregon can return to the floor, after going to lunch, with the understanding that he has retained his right to the floor. Greatly as I always value remarks by the Senator from Mississippi, I wish to say that I shall be compelled to withhold my consent to the request that he be permitted to proceed for 20 minutes at this time, because we have only begun to explore the question of boundaries. Although I am not a great expert on such matters, I shall be compelled to ask questions about the Texas boundaries, the Florida boundaries, the Louisiana boundaries, and various other boundaries, including the status of islands and the difference between shorelines and coastlines.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand from the distinguished Senator from Illinois that he can cite some precedent whereby a distinguished Member of this body is not permitted to go to lunch? I do not know under what rule or precedent the Senator from Illinois is proceeding, but I assume that the Senator from Oregon can yield the floor. Certainly the debate will continue for several days, and I am sure the Senator from Illinois will have opportunity to raise questions with the Senator from Oregon. But it is a most unusual procedure, that the distinguished Senator from Oregon should not be permitted to go to lunch; and I do not know under what rule or precedent the Senator from Illinois is proceeding.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. CORDON addressed the Chair.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, does the Senator from Mississippi have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the ruling of the Chair that the Senator from Mississippi has the floor. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say I have no desire to be unkind to the Senator from Oregon. I would like to have him enjoy a lunch—and a good lunch. Sometime I hope to buy a lunch for him. But the request of the Senator from Mississippi was that the Senator from Oregon temporarily yield the floor for 20 minutes, to resume it later. Of course, that would have given the Senator from Oregon a chance to go to lunch and then later to return. But then the Senator from Oregon slipped in a new idea—he took a new step—by saying that he not only would go to lunch, but that he yielded the floor, which implied that no Senator could ask him any questions. The Senator from Oregon is a brave man and a candid man, and while I hope very much that he enjoys his lunch, I also hope that, when the Senator from Mississippi has finished, the Senator from Oregon will return to permit us to ask him what is the real status of the boundary of Florida, whether it is 3 miles or 10½ miles from the coast, whether the boundary of Texas is 3 miles or 10½ miles offshore, and whether the boundary of Louisiana is 3 miles or 27 miles—or perhaps 31½

miles—and also what is the meaning of the term "coastline," whether it refers to the shoreline, or whether it is taken from islands off the coast—in which event it could cover a great deal of territory.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to extend every courtesy to the Senator from Illinois, of course, but I yielded to him only for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator from Oregon yielded for a 20-minute speech by the Senator from Mississippi, with the understanding that the Senator from Oregon would then resume the floor? Was that not the unanimous consent which was given?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was asked, and before the question could be put by the Chair, the Chair assumed that he heard the Senator from Oregon yield the floor unconditionally; and on that basis, the Chair recognized the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I desire to make only a short statement. The Senator from Oregon has no thought of retiring from the field. The Senator from Mississippi has been waiting to make some remarks on a subject which he deems to be of great importance, and certainly he should have the right to do so. The Senator from Oregon assures the Senator from Illinois that, so long as the Senator from Illinois is on germane and relevant ground, the Senator from Oregon will be glad to discuss with him the pending joint resolution or any part of it. He would prefer that there be a relevant discussion of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand, then, that the Senator from Oregon is saying that he will return to the floor upon the termination of the speech of the Senator from Mississippi, and that he will then discuss the questions which are raised at that time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not understand that to be a parliamentary inquiry. It is a question addressed to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will return to the floor—no one need worry about that—whether it be today or tomorrow.

RESEARCH AND EDUCATION—KEYS TO A PROSPEROUS AGRICULTURE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, during the past few months we have had much Senate debate from members of both parties about the problems confronting American agriculture. However, little has been said about expanding our research and educational programs, which I firmly believe hold the key to the long-time solution to many of our agricultural problems.

EXPANSION AUTHORIZED

In 1946, the Research and Marketing Act was passed. Title I of that act provides:

> It is the policy of Congress to promote the efficient production and utilization of the soil as essential to the health and welfare of our people and to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity.

The act further states that it is also the intent of the Congress to "assure agriculture a position in research equal to that of industry, which will aid in maintaining an equitable balance between agriculture and other sections of our economy." We have failed to put this expanded program into effect. This fact is forcefully pointed up in a recent statement by Mr. Byron T. Shaw, head of the Agricultural Research Administration. He said:

> Our current position in research is unfavorable. We have not been turning out new findings at a rate equal to the rate at which they are being used. We need to start the the research frontier moving upward at a more rapid rate, since the response of the average producer follows most research advances by a time delay of 10 to 15 years. The time to start moving the research frontier is now.

I think it is clear that the Federal Government has a vital function to perform in agricultural research and education. That function was placed clearly upon it before the days of the so-called Fair Deal or New Deal, before the days of Hoover or Wilson or McKinley. It is above party controversy. It springs from the old American emphasis upon higher efficiency and greater production. It belongs to the American tradition of producing a better article and many of them. Money spent for research is an investment that has shown its worth. Among today's far-flung activities of our Government we can find plenty of room for disagreement, but here, surely, is the one activity that we cannot afford to dispute about or neglect. Despite this knowledge we have been neglecting agricultural research and education. We must cut the expenses of the Federal Government, but it will be unwise economy for the Government to single out and neglect those activities that do not represent expenses at all, but investments in progress toward greater production and income in the future.

Mr. President, I desire to cite one specific illustration.

Considering the cotton crop of the United States as a whole, the tensile strength of cotton fiber has increased approximately 18 percent within the last 10 years. This is entirely as a result of a program of breeding and production research which has gone forward both in private and governmental laboratories and experiment stations within this 10-year period. This has resulted, of course, in an increased value of the cotton fiber to the grower. But far more important is the fact that there has been a distinct gain to all users of cotton fabrics throughout the Nation and really throughout the world on account of the greatly increased strength and durability and wearing life of the fabric.

Mr. President, I think that is an outstanding illustration. Cotton fiber has been used by civilized man since before the time of the Egyptian civilization. Under the impetus of research within the past 10 years the tensile strength of cotton fiber has been increased more than 18 percent, thus creating a benefit not only to the grower but to millions of American people and peoples throughout the world who use cotton goods in wearing apparel as a daily necessity.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has cited most interesting and challenging evidence. Does it not, in a most emphatic way, point up the tremendous possibilities in further research?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. It proves that we are just beginning to make a start.

Mr. President, in the 12 years since 1940 our Nation's economy has been through the greatest period of growth in all its history. Our total production, everything combined, has increased more than 50 percent. Our population has increased by 23 million people. Six million people have been drained off the farms, so that the number of nonfarm people to be fed and clothed has increased by 29 million, or well over one-fourth. The 23 million people left on the farms have had to increase the total farm production by one-third in order to meet our military and civilian needs. Over this period of universal expansion in our Nation's economy, with all of the strain that it put upon our agriculture, how much do you suppose our Federal Government expanded its investment in agricultural research? It has increased from about $29 million to $57 million. When we allow for the reduced purchasing power of the dollars invested, the real answer is that there was not any net expansion at all.

Over the decades preceding 1940 our agricultural research investment moved forward with the growth of the whole economy, until it reached the level of about $30 million in 1940. Since that time, we have had a tremendous expansion in just about everything else, but our Federal Government's investment in agricultural research has increased just enough to keep up with the increased cost of salaries and equipment, and no more. We have a 1953 population, a 1953 income, a 1953 tax load, a 1953 challenge to our productive resources, but a 1940 budget for agricultural research. This is not sound planning. No one pretends that it would be sound in any other field of research. We have had dynamic growth in other research. While the Federal dollars appropriated for agricultural research have increased only about 94 percent, or just enough to offset rising research costs, the total expenditures of all agencies, public and private, for all research work increased 300 percent. The total research program of the Nation, in industry, in government, and in universities and colleges,

now totals $3 billion a year, or about 1 percent of the national income.

The Federal Government, which has been so thrifty with research dollars in agriculture, has been far and away the leader of this total research expansion. Our total appropriations for research have multiplied sevenfold. They have grown so fast that the Government now pays for more than one-half of all the research done in this country. Much of the Government's research expansion has been on military projects, but by no means all of it. From 1940 to 1951, the Federal Government increased research appropriations more than threefold for the Department of Interior, or from $7.9 million to $28.5 million; more than fivefold for the Department of Commerce, or from $3.3 million to $17.4 million; more than twentyfold for the Federal Security Agency, or from $2.8 million to $59.9 million; and more than eightfold for other nonmilitary agencies. Agricultural research, which was singled out long ago as needful of special Government attention, has in reality been the object of special Government neglect. It now receives $57.5 million or about 3.6 percent of our Federal research budget.

If we know anything at all about agriculture, we know that there is no sound reason for holding the Government's agricultural research program down to the 1940 level while the rest of the country operates at the 1953 level. Never before has agriculture faced so many scientific problems, with opportunities for research pressing upon us so urgently and on so vast a scale. These are problems of chemistry, of genetics, of physiology, or mechanical engineering, of farm management, of marketing, and many others too numerous to name, stretching out across 5 million farms, 1 billion farm acres, and hundreds of important crop, livestock, and forestry enterprises. Those problems are so vast in number that simple illustrations fail to give the total picture. Recently, the House Committee on Agriculture released a report running to nearly 3,000 pages, giving a summary of research problems with which the Department of Agriculture is concerned, and of the needs for expanded work on these problems. Mechanization is still in its infancy on millions of farms and it offers problems only research can solve. By solving them we can multiply the productivity of farmworkers. Improvements in our knowledge of soil fertility have only begun to show what they could do for this Nation. The principle of hybrid vigor, which has been applied with such spectacular success to corn, is an almost unexplored agricultural frontier.

Mr. President, I see the distinguished Senator from Alabama sitting here. I am very familiar with the fine yield of the red hills of western Alabama and the increased production in the past few years, made possible by the important gains in connection with the raising of hybrid corn and new and improved methods of agriculture and new fertilizers.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the increased yield per acre of corn is almost fantastic because of new methods brought about by the very research to which the Senator is now so ably addressing himself?

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. The figures are almost unbelievable. The same land produces more abundantly with improved methods of cultivation and the use of improved fertilizers. The young people are so adept in adopting new methods that in my own State the fathers are learning from the sons.

Research holds out great promise with animals as well as plants. We are losing 10 percent of all our farm animals from diseases and parasites. Bang's disease is costing the cattle industry more than $100 million a year. Progress has been made toward detecting infected animals and immunizing the uninfected, but the entire problem of a cure is an unanswered challenge to research. The vast array of animal parasites, bringing wastage through lower feeding efficiency, death loss, and unusable animal products; this great neglected area of research is an especially promising one because of the new drug discoveries of recent years. Livestock losses from wheat pasture poisoning are a severe problem in the small grain areas. Moreover, this malady stands in the way of the good progress toward adapting cool-weather forage plants to that region. The basic cause of the malady remains undiscovered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows the marvelous transformation which has taken place in the elimination of such diseases as hookworm, pellagra, typhoid fever, diphtheria, and malaria. By research the cause was found and means discovered to prevent those diseases.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator from Mississippi is suggesting today in his very able speech is that through research we can find the cause of diseases in animals and crops, and when we find the cause, the next step is to provide the remedy which will prevent such diseases. Is not that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama has stated the problem, and the only method whereby the remedy will be found.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi undoubtedly recalls when many persons suffered from typhoid fever. If I may make a personal allusion, I remember the time when I had typhoid fever. Doctors tell us that if they want to study a case of typhoid fever they have to hunt all over the country, or even perhaps outside the country, to find a case of typhoid fever. Is not that true?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Notwithstanding a great amount of publicity, and the fact that developments have been taking place, the field of research and exploration in the animal world has relatively only been scratched.

Insects are costing the Nation $4 billion worth of crops and livestock every year. We have spent millions of dollars annually for years in an effort to check the spread of pink bollworm. Nevertheless, it continues to spread and bring havoc to the cotton crops of the Southwest, while our investments in research to find better ways of fighting this insect and reducing all the costs involved have been trivial by comparison. There is need for more research to find new and better uses for many farm products. I could go on endlessly with illustrations.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Mississippi may recall that many years ago, perhaps as far back as 20 or more years ago, we who live in the Cotton Belt spoke of the boll weevil as the billion-dollar bug. Of course, at that time a billion dollars meant a great deal more than a billion dollars means today. But the expression meant that the boll weevil had eaten up a billion dollars worth of property, into which had gone not only the nutrients of the soil, but also much of the sweat and toil of men, women, and children. Is not that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama is correct. At that time some areas were left more or less devastated, but through research and experiment so much has been learned that now the same lands are in a more productive condition.

Mr. President, we have great challenges to agricultural science. We have great promise of future progress. What we lack is a program of adequate size to meet the challenges and fulfill the promise. We lack it in a very considerable measure because the Federal Government has lagged in agricultural research and education.

The scientific progress made this year or in any year is the fruit of patient effort in the laboratories and research stations over many years and decades of the past. Gradually over recent years the men who know agricultural research have been recognizing the shocking facts. They know we are beginning to pay the real price of our lagging research program. We have been using up the knowledge that accrues to us from past research investments, without giving enough emphasis to the development of new knowledge for application in years to come. We have been drawing down our bank balance of fundamental knowledge about the science of agriculture. With all of our deficit spending in terms of dollars, we have also been running an even more serious deficit in terms of scientific knowledge. Our experiment stations have done a wonderful job in research work. I could cite numerous examples of the progress made in my own State of Mississippi through our experiment stations in the development of improved varieties of seed, fibers, insecticides, methods of establishing pastures and the almost revolutionary discovery of methods of applying anhydrous ammonia directly to the soil as a source of nitrogen. The worth of this work cannot be measured in dollars and cents. A big and costly problem today in agriculture is our surpluses. This is partly because funds have been inadequate for sufficient research in marketing, processing, and utilization of agricultural products, as well as their production. Serious inroads have been made in agricultural

markets by various synthetics. Millions of dollars were spent for research in developing these synthetic products. We have every reason to believe that with sufficient agricultural research the loss of a great many of these markets could have been avoided, or new markets found to take their place.

MUST BE VERSATILE

Our agricultural research program must be a versatile program, finding new uses and better means of utilization of farm products, while at the same time finding new and better ways of increasing production to meet the needs of an ever-expanding economy. Our population is now growing at the rate of 2½ million a year. No one knows exactly what the future rate will be, but the Census Bureau tells us that by 1975 there probably will be 190 million people in this country. Where are we going to get the agricultural production to feed and clothe this many people? Are we going to become a declining nation which cannot eat except by importing food? Down to about 1920 we met the needs of a growing population by bringing new land into cultivation. Since then, as tractors replaced horses and mules on the farms, many acres have been released from growing feed. The increases in yield per acre have given us a vast increase in farm production. Now, however, the best experts in the Nation tell us that our increased productive capacity, through increased yields and every other means, is not moving ahead fast enough to take care of the long-range increase in population.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me again at this time, or would he prefer to yield later?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. Is it not true that today many doctors and scientists believe that numerous diseases and ills which afflict humanity and which bring about not only physical suffering, but also great economic loss, and, of course, sometimes untimely death, are due to the fact that our bodies are not getting from the soil the nutrients and minerals they must have? In other words, the nutrients and minerals that make up our bodies, which feed, strengthen, and sustain our bodies, come from the soil.

A carrot might be red and look like a carrot, but still not contain the nutrients and minerals a carrot should contain, because, after all, a carrot can take out of the soil only that which is in the soil. Is it not correct that much research needs to be made in this field?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Alabama has summed up the elements of a situation that has become known only recently, and has not yet been probed to such an extent as to make us fully realize how greatly the nutrient and mineral ingredients of the soil affect the soundness of the human body, particularly the bodies of growing children.

Mr. President, the fact that we cannot even maintain our present standard of living and keep up with population growth constitutes a serious problem. Each year we are adding only about two-thirds as much farm productive capacity as we should be adding to take care of our rising population in years to come.

Our farm problems come from neglected education as much as it comes from neglected research. The Extension Service, operated through our great land grant colleges, is rooted just as firmly as research in the farm policies which were adopted with such wisdom by earlier Congresses. From 1940 to the present time, the Federal Government's appropriation for the Extension Service has not increased enough to offset rising prices. Its real support of Extension has actually declined. Have you ever thought of the size of the job that the county agent's office has to do? The county agent and the home demonstration agent holds the central responsibility for getting out to all the farms in his county, the practical know-how that comes from much of our research. The average farm county has an Extension staff of less than two persons, in addition to the home demonstration agent. Many do not have a home demonstration agent, which is a tragedy. That is the entire staff employed with Federal, State, and local funds combined. Now what is in the average county? It has 1,769 farms on which 8,000 people live and find their income. It has about 373,000 farm acres. It has an investment of $40 million in land, buildings, livestock, machinery and working capital. It pays out more than $4 million in farm expenses a year, and takes in more than $9 million in farm receipts. An inadequate Extension Service cannot do the job of supplying all these farms with the scientific information they need on all of their crop and livestock and forestry problems. In many States of the Union the demands on our county agent and home demonstration agent are more than twice the burden they can carry. The men and women and boys and girls to be directly served could be doubled or trebled in many States.

REASON FOR DECLINE

When Congress passed the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, there was clearly expressed the intention to almost triple its support of agricultural research within 5 years. What has happened? After a good start for the first 2 years, the steam ran out of the drive for adequate appropriations. Excuses began to take over. We heard the excuse that it would be impossible to expand the program because of shortages in scientific personnel, and yet we saw virtually all the other research programs of Government and of industry expanding at a headlong pace. It was only agriculture that failed to get increased research personnel. We heard the excuse that Government spending must somehow be curbed, and yet we saw Government spending go up and up. Agricultural research, which is truly an investment and not an expense, was one of the few things curbed. In real purchasing power, the Federal appropriations for agricultural research and education are lower today than in 1949.

It was my hope that the new budget request and the final appropriation for agricultural research would reflect the expressed attitude of the new Secretary of Agriculture, who has repeatedly stated that we must have an expanded program of research and education, and of the President. The President said at Omaha, Nebr., on September 18, 1952:

> To assure a productive future, we must strengthen our unique system of agricultural education, research, and extension. Agricultural research and education have been neglected by this administration. We are going to change that. We shall develop an agricultural research and extension program to meet present and future needs. We shall focus on both production and marketing to benefit producers and consumers alike. It can be done. It should have been done long ago. The present tired administration may be good at destroying our products or dyeing them blue, but it apparently isn't interested in research and extension. It will take a new administration to get this job done.

I am disappointed in the revised budget submitted by the present Secretary of Agriculture. Instead of recommending an increase in the funds for agricultural research over the original budget, he has recommended a substantial decrease.

I certainly hope, and I still believe, that that is only a temporary situation with the present administration and the present Secretary of Agriculture. But it is certainly a backward step, even if it be temporary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have just entered the Chamber. I heard the Senator from Mississippi say that he was disappointed that the Secretary of Agriculture had recommended a decreased appropriation for research. May I ask what the decrease is from?

Mr. STENNIS. The decrease to which I refer goes to the actual experiment station programs and the research proper. I do not mean the administration in the field, in carrying out the programs with reference to the pink bollworm, or something of that kind. I am talking about the intrinsic research, which explores and pioneers, tests better methods, better seeds, better fertilizers, and things of that kind.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator say that the Secretary of Agriculture recommended a decrease from the recommendation of the budget which we received in January?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator mean a decrease from last year's appropriations? What is the decrease from?

Mr. STENNIS. It is a decrease from the original recommendation of the budget in January.

Mr. AIKEN. How do the Secretary's recommendations compare with appropriations made for the present fiscal year?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not have those figures before me.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is where the comparison should be drawn. What does the Secretary recommend as compared with what has been done during the past few years?—not what Mr. Truman's budget called for, when Mr. Truman

knew perfectly well that he was not going to have anything to do with the program beyond the submission of the budget. That is why I think the comparison should be made on the basis which I have suggested.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Vermont will understand that I am making no attack on the present administration or the present Secretary of Agriculture. I made that plain.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand.

Mr. STENNIS. My point is that the program as a whole should be greatly expanded, and that the figures before us are even less than those recommended in the so-called Truman budget, which, as I recall, represented a small increase over last year.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true; but the Senator from Mississippi will recall that some of us have been critical during the past few years because the previous Secretary of Agriculture did not place the emphasis on research and development of markets which the Congress contemplated would be done when it passed the Research and Marketing Act, the Hope-Flannagan Act of 1946.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Vermont has not been present during all of my address. The whole burden of my presentation is that we should continue the Research and Marketing Act program as originally laid out, and we should expand and enlarge the program, because several years are required in order to get results under any new phase of a research program.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree wholeheartedly that we should develop the research and marketing program in the manner Congress contemplated when it enacted the legislation in 1946.

Mr. STENNIS. I think it would be well to place in the RECORD at this point the actual figures to which the Senator from Vermont referred a moment ago. I shall ask unanimous consent to supply those figures for printing in the RECORD at this point in the colloquy.

(The figures requested for insertion in the RECORD are as follows: 1953 budget, $57,100,000; fiscal year 1953 appropriation, $56,482,000. Original budget recommendation for fiscal 1954, $60,458,000; revised budget for fiscal 1954, $58,879,000.)

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Mississippi will permit one further observation, I was absent the last two days of last week. I read the report in the newspapers with respect to Secretary Benson's recommendations to the House Appropriations Committee. The report read as though he were apparently advocating curtailed activities in many lines, whereas, when I returned and read what he actually said, I found that he proposed to cut appropriations, but to make them up with sums available from other sources, so that the services would not be cut, as was indicated by the newspaper reports.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution. My contention is that we must get on the beam and provide funds for an extended and expanded program.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct. We should place the proper emphasis on market development and research, beginning now.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi for his program and policy with reference to market development and research. I think it is fundamental and basic. I know that his message is delivered in the spirit of helpfulness, and not in the spirit of criticism.

I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that when he inserts in the RECORD the figures with reference to last year's appropriations as compared with the so-called Truman budget and the figures for the revised budget before the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, submitted by Secretary Benson, he also be good enough to take the budget as presented by President Truman in January 1952 and compare the budget figure for research and marketing with what the Congress did by the time it finished with the program in the Appropriations Committees. I think that would be an interesting study. If my memory serves me correctly, a substantial cut was made in the House of Representatives. Some of the reduction was restored in the Senate, but I believe that when the bill came from conference there was a reduction.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I shall be glad to supply those figures. I doubt if it can be done this afternoon in time to go into the RECORD today. I wish to point out that the kind of research the Senator from Mississippi is discussing does not always appear on a certain page, and in a certain line.

To ferret out what types of research are provided for and how much is allowed may in certain instances involve opinion. There might be a variation between some of the figures I might give and the figures which someone else might have. But generally the figures which I have used are correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If I may be permitted an additional observation, it is not always the amount of the appropriation that counts. It is the manner in which the appropriation is expended after it is once made.

Mr. STENNIS. That is very true. Much depends upon where the emphasis is placed.

ADMINISTRATION CHALLENGE

The challenge is to this new administration, but these remarks should not be construed as criticism of this or any other administration. They are merely to sound the warning that unless we bring the matter of agricultural research and education into proper perspective and really do something about it, we can be certain of this one thing—a mighty citadel of personal liberty will be jeopardized, and in our hours of difficulty we no longer shall be able to pursue vigorously the ultimate goal for which we strive, an expanding economy and full and abundant living.

Presently we have legislative authority for research programs far beyond our present expenditures and up to $93 million. The announced purpose of the Authorization Act of 1946 was to gradually extend the program until it almost tripled the 1946 level. And progress was made in this direction for some 2 years, but the accelerated pace has not continued even though requested funds have never been denied by the Congress.

The Congress cannot reach this problem merely by appropriating more money. Administrative planning of new programs and the extension of present programs are necessary. We must have active leadership from the executive branch of the Government for this augmented program and a definite priority placed upon the expansion. The Congress will respond, I believe, with the necessary funds.

The new budget submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture reduces the funds requested for agricultural research by about $1½ million from the amount requested in the original budget for 1954. As soon as the funds can be judiciously used, I think this is one instance where we should actually exceed the original recommendation for fiscal 1954 of $60,458,000 instead of reducing it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very happy to listen to the Senator from Mississippi this afternoon. However, I should like to point out that in conversation with the Secretary of Agriculture the other day, I found that he is in communication with several private concerns in an attempt to have them expand their own research programs. Of course, many of them have almost unlimited funds with which to pursue such programs. That is one direction in which the Secretary's activities in the field of research have taken shape.

I understand that he is meeting with considerable success in persuading private concerns to expand their research. Some of the concerns during the last few years did not feel like going ahead with that work.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi is pleased to learn of developments along that line, provided that we will have the benefit of the fruits of such research, and that the research will be coordinated with Government research.

Mr. AIKEN. If it is coordinated with Government research, and if the research by private industry is sponsored by the Government, it is my understanding that the fruits of such research will be available to the public. If a concern conducts research strictly on its own, then under the law I suppose it can keep the fruits of its own research. As I understand the 1946 law, it authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with private industry. When there is cooperation between Government and private industry, then I understand the fruits of the research are public property.

Mr. STENNIS. That would have to be worked out by private agreement in advance, of course.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; it would have to be worked out, and worked out very carefully, too. We do not want any program in which the Government goes ahead and almost reaches a conclusion which would be of value to everyone, and then have the private corporation come in at the last minute and take it over. That has been done in the past. I believe it is something that we must guard against in the future.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

ENLARGED PROGRAM AN INVESTMENT

I strongly advocate returning to the schedule set up in the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 as rapidly as the personnel and other requirements can be assembled, and I certainly hope the Secretary of Agriculture and the President will reconsider this matter and come forward with an enlarged program that will more nearly meet the pressing needs in this important field of research and education. I am confident the Congress will actively support this enlarged program as a sound and necessary investment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I was very much impressed by what my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], had to say about research on the part of private companies. I may say that I had the pleasure of having lunch with the head of one of the great meat packers, Armour & Co., about a year ago, and I was impressed by what that company was doing along the line of research and how its research will prove beneficial not only to animal life but also to human life.

I am sure, though, as the Senator from Mississippi has expressed it, that what we should do is move forward, both with Government and private research, cooperate and coordinate the activities, and work together, with all the forces of research moving forward together.

I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Senator from Mississippi on his very fine and able and timely speech.

I may say that just before the present session convened, the members of the Alabama delegation in Congress met in the capital city of Montgomery with a number of leading farmers from all over the State of Alabama, and there discussed the very subject of providing more research. It was the unanimous opinion of those present at the meeting that we should move forward along the line so ably stated today by the Senator from Mississippi. I wish to say that the Senator from Mississippi has certainly spoken with fine statesmanship.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much, and I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wish to compliment the Senator from Mississippi on his speech in favor of research, and to assure him that I completely agree with him.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate that statement very much. Let me add to what the Senator from Vermont has stated with reference to private enterprise coordinating and cooperating with the Federal program by saying that I know of some instances of such cooperation, and before the Senator from Vermont came into the Chamber I gave the illustration of cotton. Within the past 10 years the tensile strength of cotton, or the pulling strength of the cotton fiber, has been increased by 18 percent. In part that came as a result of private research, coordinated with governmental research.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that is correct. As I see it, the problems of the cotton grower and the cotton trader are far from insurmountable. Last year when there was a 15,000,000-bale crop it looked like a lot of cotton. Our problem was not with respect to a 15,000,000-bale cotton crop, but was with reference to 500 million bales of cotton, representing the difference between what we had and what we needed.

I am convinced that by developing markets and new uses for cotton we will within a comparatively short time, if we bend our efforts to the task, find it to be relatively easy—I will not say too easy—to provide for the disposition of the surplus, as we call it now.

We have large surpluses, but I think we should consider our problem not as one of surplus. We do not have a billion and a half bushels of wheat to worry about. We must decide what we will do with 250,000,000 bushels of wheat. We do not have 150,000,000 pounds of butter to worry about. Instead, we have about a month's supply for which we must find a market.

When we start to think of our agricultural problems in terms merely of the difference between what we have and what we need, they become reduced in size.

I am glad the Senator from Mississippi is discussing the subject of research, with particular reference to cotton, because I believe that that is a field in which a world of good can be done. I know that in his own State a great deal is being done at the experiment station, which I have had the pleasure of visiting.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi feels this is a good time to thank especially the Senator from Vermont for his fine interest in all agricultural products, not merely those produced in his own area.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to have the opportunity of associating myself with the very fine remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and also with the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

While I was governor of my State, I served for 10 years as a trustee of Cornell University and the college of agriculture which is associated with that university. So, at that time, when I was in very close association with that great institution, I had a chance to observe the tremendous value of research to the agriculture of my State.

As a result of that research, New York is now the second most important dairy State in the Union. The help which has been given by the private research facilities to our agriculture, particularly to dairying and fruit growing, has been notable, and certainly has greatly increased the prosperity of our farmers and the supply of food that is raised in the State of New York.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from New York. Let me add that everyone in the entire Nation is indebted to that wonderful institution, Cornell University, and to the fine research and educational work it has done.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to express the same appreciation of Cornell University that the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from New York have expressed. I know it is not necessary for us to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Cornell University is a great land-grant institution, brought into being by the Morrill Act, the land-grant act passed by Congress many years ago.

Mr. STENNIS. The same act has done a great deal for the State of Alabama and for the State of Mississippi, through those splendid institutions, Alabama Polytechnic Institute and Mississippi State College.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Speaker announce the election on January 16, 1953, by the Committee on Ways and Means pursuant to section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of the following Members to serve as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Mr. JENKINS of Ohio and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania; said Members will serve with the following members of the Ways and Means Committee who have previously been duly elected to serve as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: Mr. REED of New York, Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, and Mr. DINGELL of Michigan.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy

Director of Central Intelligence, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence who shall be the head thereof, and with a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence who shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during his absence or disability. The Director and the Deputy Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status, or from among individuals in civilian life: *Provided, however,* That at no time shall the two positions of the Director and Deputy Director be occupied simultaneously by commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status.

"(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director, or Deputy Director, then—

"(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, or Deputy Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director, or Deputy Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit, or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director, or Deputy Director, of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, or Deputy Director, continue to hold rank and grade not lower than that in which serving at the time of his appointment and to receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be, including personal money allowance) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Central Intelligence Agency. He also shall be paid by the Central Intelligence Agency from such funds an annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the compensation established for such position exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"(3) The rank or grade of any such commissioned officer shall, during the period in which such commissioned officer occupies the office of Director of Central Intelligence, or Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, be in addition to the numbers and percentages otherwise authorized and appropriated for the armed service of which he is a member."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon the House passed Senate bill 1110 with amendments that are acceptable to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. There is some urgency to this legislation, for its enactment is necessary if the President is to appoint Lt. Gen. Charles P. Cabell to the position of Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, as he has indicated a desire to do. This important position is unoccupied at the present time.

The significant changes made by the House are as follows:

First. The authority for the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence is granted in the form of an amendment to the National Security Act instead of as a separate law.

Second. A prohibition was provided against having commissioned officers occupy simultaneously the positions of Director and Deputy Director of Central Intelligence. The Senate Committee on Armed Services considered such an amendment, but declined to adopt it, on the ground that in time of war it might be desirable to allow appointments to these positions of persons who were civilians in peacetime, but were in uniform because of the war.

Third. The Director of Central Intelligence, if a commissioned officer, is allowed to be carried as an extra number, an officer in addition to the number otherwise authorized for the armed service of which he is a member. The Central Intelligence Agency would be required to reimburse the military department concerned for pay and allowances received by a commissioned officer while serving as Director or Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1110. The three amendments voted by the House of Representatives were taken up this morning by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and were agreed to by it. The amendments are minor in character, and it is essential that the bill be enacted as quickly as possible.

Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the RECORD, let me inquire whether I correctly understand the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee to say that the amendments were taken up by the committee and were approved unanimously by it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to point out to the Members of the Senate that an incredible event has taken place on this, the first day of April 1953. This morning the Council of Economic Advisers to the President has passed out of existence.

Denied funds on which to operate, the agency of Government which was set up by the Congress in the Employment Act of 1946 to help protect our country against the ravages of depression and inflation has been forced to close its doors.

To millions of American people this event must sound like an April fool's joke. What reasonable explanation could there be for doing away with the Council of Economic Advisers at a time when so many difficult and important economic problems face America?

What justification could there be for suspending the Employment Act just at a time when new negotiations with the Communists may be renewed in Korea and when all Americans are hoping that it may become possible to end the Korean war?

What shall we tell our British and European allies who recently have been saying that their dread of an American depression is greater than their fear of another world war?

How can this action be squared with President Eisenhower's statement that he supports completely the principles of the Employment Act of 1946?

Yet, this is no joke. I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the Council's funds ran out on March 31. This means that Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the distinguished economist, who was just confirmed by the Senate as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, must resign his position, and can continue to serve the President only as an anonymous member of the President's personal staff.

How did the death of the Council of Economic Advisers come about?

Some newspapers have published reports that it resulted from the desire of members of the House Appropriations Committee to abolish the civil service tenure of members of the Council staff.

Other newspaper accounts have blamed the Council's demise upon a breakdown of communications between the White House and the Congress.

Whether or not there is any validity in these reports, it seems to me that President Eisenhower has been confused and misled by the politicians.

But the President should not take this lying down.

The President should not go along with the idea that the Council should be allowed to lie dead until the next fiscal year, in the hope that money would then be appropriated for its resurrection.

If the President really believes in the Employment Act of 1946—and I am sure he does—he should send to the Congress a special message, in which he should point out in vigorous language the need for the Council and should request a supplemental appropriation to provide the funds to bring the Council back into existence at once.

If the President takes action along these lines, I am sure he can rely upon the strong support of the Members of Congress in both parties who participated in the enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 and who today are dedicated to the all-important objective of avoiding both depression and inflation and maintaining the steady growth of the American economy.

Furthermore, I believe such action by President Eisenhower would win the sup-

port of Members of Congress who, just a few weeks ago, failed to realize the importance of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Just in the last 2 days the newspapers of the country have been carrying disturbing reports concerning the economic reverberations of the new Communist proposals in Korea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield at this point?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder whether the Senator from Montana is familiar with the fact that in 2 days' sales on the stock market, the investors in stocks and bonds suffered a loss in excess of $3 billion.

Mr. MURRAY. I intend to refer to that fact in my remarks. I appreciate the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Montana will permit me to do so, let me say that this morning in the Committee on Foreign Relations we were discussing some of these very matters, when General Gruenther appeared before us. We were discussing the great economic problems which now are coming to the fore, not only in the United States, but also in other parts of the free world.

I ask the Senator from Montana whether I am correct in understanding that the Council of Economic Advisers as an institution of Government is now dead.

Mr. MURRAY. It has ceased to exist, because it has no funds with which to carry on its functions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the supplemental appropriation bill did not provide funds for it; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct; the bill did not provide funds for the Council.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand, the Senate voted to provide for the Council.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And I understand that some provision for the Council was made in the House of Representatives. Were those provisions canceled in the conference?

Mr. MURRAY. They failed in the conference, as I understand.

A headline story in the Washington Post of March 31, for example, started as follows:

> A new Communist offer to exchange Korean war prisoners started a selling drive in the stock market today and forced prices back for the heaviest losses in more than 2 years.

On the same day the New York Times printed a report from Chicago that "the revival of peace rumors sent grain futures into a tailspin today."

The New York Times also carried this report:

> Foreign news affected the New York commodity exchanges yesterday as the reports of the peace moves in Korea led to lower prices when the markets closed.

Finally, the Wall Street Journal on March 30 carried a headline story indicating that President Eisenhower's staff is "beginning to brood a bit about the business outlook for the rest of 1953."

At a time like this I believe that all Members of Congress can agree with the splendid analysis of the problem that was presented on the floor of the Senate on March 18 by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS].

Let me quote the Senator's statement:

> In the months and years ahead, if we are able to reduce our military expenditures, we shall be facing a difficult situation in maintaining our economic prosperity. I think we may be certain that our new and our old friends in Russia confidently expect us to go into a tailspin if we stop our high expenditures for war.
>
> The [Employment] act * * * was directed toward an emergency which is now at the peak of its importance.
>
> Mr. President, it is my profound hope, therefore, that President Eisenhower will take immediate steps to impress upon the Republican leadership in both Houses of the Congress the necessity of a supplemental appropriation to bring the Council of Economic Advisers back to life so that it can assist our country in the perilous days that lie ahead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield again?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I think his remarks are extremely timely. It is simply incredible to me that the Council of Economic Advisers, which in a sense is a part of the chain of what might be called "observation posts upon our economy," should be permitted to lapse, particularly at a time when serious problems confront us, including trade problems of great consequence.

No doubt the Senate is fully aware that the strategy of the Soviet Union today is to divide us from our allies, and primarily to do so through economic tension, through trade wars, through all sorts of propaganda in the field of economic activity. Surely we need this general staff, so to speak, of economists to advise the President and the Congress and American private economic life as to some of the facts of today and some of the business of tomorrow. I know many persons in the business world who look to reports of the Council of Economic Advisers as being very fundamental to their business planning. That was one of the purposes of the Full Employment Act and the establishment of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We ought to let the President know, as the Senator has done, that we want this Council to continue, that we will support every effort he makes to continue the Council of Economic Advisers. Rather than to cut down on the Council of Economic Advisers, we ought to improve the general staff work at the economic level.

This is no time to be closing down institutions of such vital importance as this, particularly when there is plenty of evidence that we have ever-increasing economic problems in the American economy and throughout the world. There are all sorts of evidence leading to that conclusion. So I repeat that I, for one, wish through the means of debate on the Senate floor to let the President know that we would welcome any effort on his part to again remind the Congress of its responsibilities and of his responsibility to keep this important Council alive and active.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is exactly correct. At the time the Economic Council was originally established, it was hailed by businessmen and economists all over the country as a vitally important move. Walter Lippmann, the distinguished commentator on economic matters in his column, said it was the most important piece of legislation enacted by Congress in the past 50 years. I think it is recognized by businessmen in every section of the country, who are familiar with the work of the Economic Council, that it has been of great help in determining the economic trends; and it seems to me it would be a very serious mistake to allow it to lapse at this time, when we are facing such uncertainties in the world.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to resume my earlier remarks on the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. CORDON. The previous discussion concerned the boundary lines of the several States, insofar as those boundary lines are seaward of the shorelines of those States. I shall now discuss the joint resolution with reference to those seaward boundaries.

Title I contains definitions of terms used in the joint resolution, the definitions being limited to the use of the terms in the joint resolution, because the terms may be used differently from the way in which they are ordinarily employed. The definitions have been written into the proposed legislation, and the application of the terms to the provisions of the joint resolution is limited by the special definitions in it.

LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS DEFINED

The first definition is with respect to the term "lands beneath navigable waters."

The area of land and resources which is vested, confirmed, and assigned to the several States comprises lands beneath navigable waters, so the pertinency of the term and the necessity for a definition are apparent. The joint resolution defines the term as follows:

> (1) All lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which are covered by nontidal waters that were navigable under the laws of the United States at the time such State became a member of the Union, or acquired sovereignty over such lands and waters thereafter, up to the ordinary high-water mark as heretofore or hereafter modified by accretion, erosion, and reliction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon be willing to have an interruption?

Mr. CORDON. When I have finished my explanation, I shall be glad to yield.

The waters involved in the joint resolution, beneath which are lands affected by the joint resolution, are the waters of the seas from low-water mark to the boundaries of the several States.

Second, inland waters of the several States, which again are divided into inland waters which adjoin the waters of the open sea, and inland waters which are in navigable lakes or flowing navigable streams.

INLAND WATERS AND TIDAL AREAS SEPARATED

So the first definition has to do with lands covered by nontidal waters; that is, lakes and flowing streams, and such areas of inland waters as might be substantially in the dividing line between a flowing stream and waters that would be affected by the tides.

It will be noticed that that definition applies to lands "which are covered by nontidal waters." That is in the present tense. It then applies to nontidal waters of a State that were navigable at the time the State became a member of the United States, or when the State thereafter acquired sovereignty over such land and waters.

The two tenses are necessary because there is a vesting of title in lands that are now covered by nontidal waters, but which were navigable waters at the time the State became a member of the Union. The difference is set forth in order to take care of a movement from one side of a channel to another, or erosion on one side and build-up or reliction on the other side. That is the reason for the two tenses in the definition.

The provision as to application within a State which had acquired sovereignty over the lands after admission to the Union is to take care of instances such as those referred to, for instance, in the testimony, in connection with the State of Texas, where an area was, with the consent of Texas, added to the State of Texas, which became located on the United States side of the Rio Grande as a result of a change of course in that river. That is the type of change referred to in that particular portion of the definition.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois for a question on that subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his courtesy in returnnig to the floor, and I express the hope that he has had a very comfortable lunch and is now in good health.

Mr. CORDON. I am most appreciative of the concern of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that the decisions of the Supreme Court, in an unbroken chain, have held that title to submerged lands under navigable inland waters rests in the States?

Mr. CORDON. I have a general knowledge of those decisions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the understanding of the Senator from Oregon the same as my understanding that title rests in the States?

Mr. CORDON. I am fully in agreement with that position, but I call attention to the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, in discussing the California case and the two succeeding cases, raised a very deep concern in my mind, and in the minds of eminent lawyers, as well, and of other persons throughout the United States, as to whether the Supreme Court would go along with the precedents established as to inland water areas if the issue were to be presented again.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that in the brief submitted by the Government in the California case, the Government expressly disavowed any claim on the part of the Federal Government to title or paramount rights in submerged lands under any form of navigable inland waters, namely, lakes, rivers, bays, and harbors? There is an express disavowal to that effect in the brief and in the argument. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of that?

Mr. CORDON. I am aware of the fact that what is or is not in the brief of the United States Government has nothing to do with what the law is. There were also some decisions by courts of the United States on the major question, and there were determinations to the same effect by administrative officers, including the Cabinet officer in charge of public lands. Those decisions and determinations were wiped out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that the decisions of the Supreme Court in those three cases expressly point out that the Court was not going into the question of paramount rights in submerged lands under inland waters, but only into the question of paramount rights in submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark?

Mr. CORDON. I have read all three cases, and I now am uncertain in my own mind as to what the court would now hold. Many eminent lawyers—and I separate myself from that group—likewise are greatly concerned with reference to the philosophy upon which the decisions themselves turn. I am entirely satisfied that the action which is proposed by the joint resolution is essential if the cloud is to be removed.

The Senator from Illinois may not agree with my view, in which case he may vote against the joint resolution. But I am satisfied the committee has taken that position, so that ends the matter, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, the Senator from Oregon has studied the Anderson bills, Senate bill 107 and Senate bill 1252——

Mr. CORDON. Is this a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; this is a question. Is the Senator aware of the fact that those two bills would confirm by statute the right of the States to ownership of and paramount rights in the submerged lands underneath lakes, rivers, bays, and harbors, and in the actual tidelands? Is the Senator from Oregon aware of that fact?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is aware of that fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore——

Mr. CORDON. Just a minute. Does the Senator have another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will yield for a question. I ask the Senator from Illinois to make his questions to the point, and not indulge in argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore is it necessary that we pass Senate Joint Resolution 13 in order to confirm title in the States to the submerged lands of the inland waterways when this is done——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is still a question.

Mr. CORDON. Let us put the question mark there.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon answers the question in this manner: Is it not necessary that Senate Joint Resolution 13 be passed to do that, or that the Anderson bills be passed to do that, or that any bill which is now pending or under consideration be passed to do that? However, it is necessary that some legislation be passed to do it; and the legislation before us, Senate Joint Resolution 13, will accomplish that purpose and the additional purposes which it is intended to accomplish, in one package. It will undo in one package what the Supreme Court did in one package.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that the same confirmation would be given by the two Anderson bills, Senate bill 107 and Senate bill 1252?

Mr. CORDON. That question has been answered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not see how it was answered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on the very point with which the Senator from Illinois has just dealt, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, so that there may be continuity in the discussion?

Mr. CORDON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Florida for that purpose, and then I will yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. HOLLAND. On the very point so ably referred to by the Senator from Oregon, to the effect that the Supreme Court's decision and opinion in the California case in particular was like a red flag to attorneys general and other attorneys all over the United States, with reference to the jeopardy indicated to titles under inland waters, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not true that certain quotations from the able brief filed by the Federal attorneys in that case specifically bear out the fact, and give warning of the fact, that they are entirely out of sympathy with the rulings of the Federal courts referring to inland waters. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that those quotations show clearly that the Federal attorneys are out of sympathy with the rulings of the courts, and that it is the belief of those attorneys that the inland waters and the lands under them do not belong to the States.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield while I read into the RECORD at this point a quotation from page 11 of the brief

of the Federal attorneys in the California case on this specific point?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The quotation is as follows:

> We submit that ownership of submerged lands is not related to sovereignty at all, but that the decisions of this court dealing with the tidelands and lands under inland waters have proceeded upon a false premise.

The Senator is, of course, familiar with that question, is he not?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does that language indicate to the Senator that the Federal attorneys were recognizing that the rule relating to inland waters and their ownership by the States was sound, and that they approved such a rule?

Mr. CORDON. It indicates clearly to the contrary.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I should like also to read into the RECORD at this time various adjectives used at other points in the brief by the Federal attorneys in the California case, by which they referred to the rule of inland waters. Those adjectives are as follows:

At one place "erroneous"; at another place "unsound"; at another place again "unsound"; at still another place "erroneous"; at another place "wrong"; at another place "patently unsound"; at another place "fallacy"; at another place "a legal fiction."

I ask the distinguished Senator if those references to the inland-waters rule by the Federal attorneys indicate any respect by those attorneys for the existing rule, or any desire to uphold it.

Mr. CORDON. To the very contrary; that is a portion of the case for the cloud which now rests over title to the lands under inland waters.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order to clarify this point, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that on page 11 of the Government's brief, immediately succeeding the first reference made by the Senator from Florida, the language continues as follows:

> The Government does not ask that these cases be overruled—
>
> Namely, the cases on inland waters—
>
> Indeed, it suggests that in the interest of clarity and certainty they be reaffirmed herein.

The Government was asking that those rules be reaffirmed, not clouded, or set aside. The brief continued——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me finish.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. I still have the floor, and I intend to yield every courtesy to the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate that.

Mr. CORDON. But I will control the debate while I hold the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. I should like to hand this book to the Senator from Oregon and ask him if I have not read a portion of the sentence following the quotation read by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon does not question whether it is correct or not. The Senator from Oregon takes the position that it is immaterial whether it is correct or not.

The Senator from Oregon will continue his discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. If I may be permitted to make a very brief comment, I should like to allude to the questions which were asked earlier today by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], particularly with respect to section 5 subsection (a) of the joint resolution, the last clause of which appears on page 18, lines 10, 11, and 12. The language is: "and any rights the United States has in lands presently and actually occupied by the United States under claim of right."

The intent of section 5 is to spell out various exceptions from the assigning provisions of the joint resolution. The wording of the last phrase as presented to us by the chairman of the subcommittee reads, generally speaking, as follows: "lands presently occupied by the United States under claim of right."

This phrase is included in the exceptions which are made by the conveyance provisions of the bill.

A peculiar situation exists in the State which I have the honor in part to represent. One of the municipalities of California, namely, Long Beach, contends that a part of the area which in its judgment is clearly within the confines of the city is occupied without right by the Federal Government, through the Navy Department. If the language which was first suggested by the chairman of the subcommittee had been adopted possibly it would have given the United States more rights than it should have. For that reason the junior Senator from California suggested that the rights which the United States has in lands presently occupied under claim of right be maintained and accepted. Then, whether the city has a right in a given instance or the Federal Government has a right, is a matter for a court of law to determine.

I wished to make that comment because, as the language appears in the pending measure, it seems to be an indication on the part of the author of the bill and the committee which approved it of a desire to retain any rights which the Federal Government claims, but not an attempt to breathe into a claim of right any actual and perfected or vested right.

Mr. CORDON. I covered the point somewhat in answer to a question by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The purpose of the language is to retain in the Government such rights as the Government, under its claim of right in the lands, is actually occupying, thus putting the Government, after the enactment of the pending measure, in the position it would have occupied had none of these matters ever arisen, and if it had to stand on whatever law supported its claim.

In other words, if there is a claim of right, then to the extent that that claim of right might be substantiated, the Government retains it. If the claim of right could not stand, the question would be beside the point anyway.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the sake of clarifying the record?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I will yield for the purpose of answering a question. Does the Senator wish me to yield for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. What is the question?

Mr. HILL. The question is whether or not the Government brief filed in the case of the United States against California contained this statement——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon will answer by saying that he is not familiar with the brief. That saves the rest of the discussion.

Mr. HILL. May I read the language?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is not familiar with the brief.

Mr. President, the next point the Senator from Oregon desires to discuss is the remainder of the definition of the term "lands beneath navigable waters." The Senator called attention to the first paragraph of the definition, "all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which are covered by nontidal waters that were navigable," and so forth.

The second paragraph provides:

> (2) all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Gulf of Mexico) beyond three geographical miles, and——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a brief question on that point?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield presently. First, I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. President, attention is called to the fact that the term "coastline," as used in this paragraph, is defined further along in the section. Because the term is used for the first time in this subsection, I shall read the definition at this point:

> (c) The term "coastline" means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters;

So we have in mind the definition of the term "coastline" when we consider paragraph 2 of section 2 (a), which I have just read. In other words, with respect to areas not in the nontidal class, we have "all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line 3 geographical miles distant from the coastline of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into

the Gulf of Mexico) beyond 3 geographical miles."

LANDS WITHIN SEA BOUNDARIES INCLUDED

Mr. President, I think it is perfectly clear what is meant by that language. I call attention to the fact that an analysis of it appears on page 10 of the report, and an explanation of the change between the language of the pending joint resolution, as the committee has reported it, and the original Holland bill, appears at page 18 of the joint resolution in section 6. Section 6 takes care of the only change that was made in the measure.

Mr. President, referring to paragraph (2) on page 10 of the joint resolution as reported, it is perfectly clear that that paragraph includes in the definition of lands beneath navigable waters, those lands beneath the open sea from the tidewater out to a seaward line 3 geographical miles distant from the coastline of each State; and also, in cases where the boundary line of the State was different at the time when it entered the Union or was thereafter changed or may hereafter be changed and approved by Congress, and extends seaward into the Gulf of Mexico more than 3 geographical miles, it is perfectly clear that the land under that area comes within the land that is affected by, and the disposition of which is provided for in, Senate Joint Resolution 13.

That definition has no other purpose than to identify the lands in question as being under nontidal waters in the upper areas or being in tidal waters and—and I want this emphasized—outside inland waters.

Earlier this afternoon question was raised as to where the boundaries of these States may be in the sea. My answer then, which I reiterate now, is that the pending measure does not identify the location of those boundaries. It is not within the philosophy of the joint resolution that they be so identified. If they were so identified, that identification would have no legal effect. The joint resolution leaves that question where it found it.

QUESTION OF BOUNDARY LOCATION LEFT OPEN

It is the same question, left open here, that must be left open under any situation which can arise or which could have arisen after the pronouncement of the decision in the California case. When the Court in that case set the boundary of the area of paramount interest of the United States as adjoining inland waters, that question was raised. It will remain to be adjudicated if we pass no proposed legislation and if we simply stand on the legal effect of the three decisions in the California case, the Texas case, and the Louisiana case. That question will remain for determination if we pass the so-called Anderson bill. It will remain for determination under any conceivable arrangement by which the State retains its sole ownership and rights under inland waters.

The committee felt that this was a problem which it found unsettled, and a problem which it could not legally settle. Therefore, the committee treated it as it would have to be treated in any event, and left it there. That is my complete answer regarding all seaward boundaries of all States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has not the Senator from Oregon heard the statements of the very able senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who stated the claims of their respective States for boundaries, not 3 miles, but 10½ miles from their shorelines or coastlines out into the Gulf of Mexico?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall answer the question, but it is wholly beside the point whether my hearing was good enough to enable me to grasp that or not. It is beside the point, so far as I am concerned, for I am discussing the joint resolution. I suspect that if I listen carefully I shall hear every point of view under the shining sun expressed about this measure or about some feature of it or what it is or what it should be or what it should not be. What someone has said or has not said about the joint resolution, what someone has written or has not written about the joint resolution, what someone has proposed or has not proposed about it—every bit of that—is entirely beside the point.

The question is, What does the joint resolution provide, and what will be done under the joint resolution? I shall answer questions in that field, if I can; but I shall not answer other questions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then what is the meaning, so far as the States of Texas and Florida are concerned, of the following phrase, which begins in line 21 on page 10 of the resolution: "and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Gulf of Mexico) beyond 3 geographical miles."

Mr. CORDON. The language——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a minute, please.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg the Senator's pardon. I wished to complete my question.

Mr. CORDON. I thought the Senator from Illinois had asked three questions, but without using a question mark, and then had begun another question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I was going to complete the question.

Mr. CORDON. With respect to the several questions asked by the Senator from Illinois, or the questions involved in the words he used before the question mark appeared, let me say that the language of the joint resolution means just what it says. If the situation in Texas or if the situation in any other State falls within the provisions of that language, then the language applies to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a historical fact that the State of Texas consistently and under the very able generalship of the then attorney general of Texas, the present junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]——

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator from Illinois asked permission to ask a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg pardon; I have not done so. Will the Senator from Oregon yield, to permit me to ask a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield. I merely wish to have proper order preserved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I seek to learn the meaning of the language in the resolution, I want to ask the Senator from Oregon: Is it not an established fact that the State of Texas has claimed that its constitution historically gave it ownership of lands 3 leagues, or 10½ land miles, from the shoreline of Texas out into the Gulf of Mexico? Is not that a historical fact?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, again it seems that I cannot get across my original statement which is that I am discussing Senate Joint Resolution 13. As to whether what the Senator from Illinois has said is or is not a fact has nothing whatever to do with the joint resolution and its application. The State of Texas probably made the claim—I have heard it said that it did—but it is beside the point so far as this proposed legislation goes, in its legal effect or its application. I will answer questions on the subject matter of the joint resolution that are relevant to it and its meaning, and only such questions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does this joint resolution affirm, reject, or dodge the issue?

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Illinois desire me to yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the pending measure affirm, reject, or dodge the question as to whether the boundaries of Texas, at the time it entered the Union, extended 10½ miles from the shoreline or coastline?

Mr. CORDON. The resolution does just what the Senator from Oregon said it did; and it is idle to reiterate the statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, it must do one of these things. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that this resolution must either affirm, reject, or evade the issue? And I am now, in the form of a question, asking the Senator from Oregon, which one of these three possible things does this bill do?

Mr. CORDON. In other words, when has the Senator from Oregon quit beating his wife—or has he?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the resolution speaks for itself. It need not affirm where the line is, deny where the line is, affirm that claims have been made, or deny that they have been made. It applies to the boundaries, not to the claims.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield for a pertinent and relevant question, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does this language of the resolution mean as applied to the claim historically advanced by the State of Florida, that at the time of its constitution, in 1868, it claimed title to the waters three leagues, or 10½ miles, from the west coast of Florida, and as applied to the further claim of the State of Florida that the terms of its constitution and the boundaries of the State of Florida were affirmed by the Congress, when Florida was either (a) readmitted to the Union or (b) when its Senators and Representatives were again allowed to take their seats in Congress? What does this resolution do——

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator stated his question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought there was a question mark there.

Mr. CORDON. There was a second question mark being threatened. The Senator from Oregon would like to take the questions one at a time, if he could. The resolution does nothing to the claim. It neither validates it nor denies it. The resolution deals with the boundaries of the State of Florida as is perfectly apparent from reading it.

Now, Mr. President, if I may continue, subparagraph (a) on page 10 defines what the term "lands beneath navigable waters" means, and among other definitions is that found on page 11, subsection (3), which reads: "all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as hereinabove defined."

That would appear to be perfectly clear. It provides that the joint resolution shall apply to areas that are now above water, but which were under navigable waters at some time in the past.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator will yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Oregon that the particular provision which he has just read applies to filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands in navigable waters, whether such navigable waters be inland waters, Great Lakes waters, or off-shore waters within the boundaries of the States? Does it apply equally to all such lands in navigable waters within State boundaries?

Mr. CORDON. That is the view of the Senator from Oregon, and certainly it is the only view that can properly be entertained, if the language of the section be read in the order set forth and the section taken within its four corners. The paragraph itself provides for the applicability of the definition to "all filled in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as hereinabove defined." The definition of navigable waters is on the preceding page.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon be gracious enough to yield for a question on this point?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Pollard case, which was quoted earlier in the discussion today, referred to the very issue of filled in lands in the city of Mobile, on Mobile Bay, and that the ruling of the court was that those filled in lands, formerly tidelands, belonged to the State?

Mr. CORDON. That is an irrelevant question, Mr. President, so far as this matter is concerned, and so far as this explanation is concerned. However, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon suggests to the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Oregon is most happy to engage in a discussion of matters which are relevant to the explanation the Senator from Oregon is making; but the Senator from Oregon must say that if the Senator from Illinois is going as far afield again as he has just gone, bringing in a matter that is wholly irrelevant to the subject that was under discussion, then the Senator from Oregon, much as he regrets it, will have to refuse to yield at all. I regret to say so, but I am not going to stand here and let the Senator from Illinois make his case by hiding it under his questions. He understands that.

It is a marvelous piece of work he is doing, but the Senator from Oregon simply does not have time for it now.

Mr. President, we are now on page 11, subparagraph (b). I read:

(b) The term "boundaries" includes the seaward boundaries of a State or its bouncaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof.

Mr. President, I regret that we do not have a larger attendance on the floor. Perhaps Senators are lucky not to be here; I do not know; but I would have liked going over this matter with those who earnestly desire to know at least what was in the thinking of the committee when it considered the bill and reported it favorably.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. In one moment, please. In respect to subparagraph (b), which I have just read, we are here defining a term, "boundaries," which has been used earlier in the section; and when we give this definition, it must be understood that it is limited to the use of that word or term in this resolution.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I regret that I was not present at the time the Senator from Oregon touched upon the definition of the term "coastline." I should like to call his attention to page 18 of the committee report, which refers to the fact that certain words were stricken in connection with the term "inland waters." The words "which include all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, historic bays, and sounds, and all other bodies of water which join the open sea" were stricken at the request, I believe, of the Department of Justice, and also on objection by the State Department.

In striking those words the committee attempted to make clear in its explanation that it is not committed to any particular formula for the determination of inland waters, and it made clear that it does not believe that either the United States Government or a State government is bound by the so-called Boggs formula, which would provide, in effect, that if there can be drawn across a bay a line of exactly 10 miles, the waters would be regarded as inland waters, but in the case of a bay of the same relative shape if a line drawn across its mouth would be 10½ or 11 miles, it would not be regarded as inland waters. Such a formula was rejected by the committee, and the committee made it clear that it did not intend to accept a rule of 3 miles or 10 miles across a bay to determine whether it was a bay.

Mr. CORDON. The committee, as I recall, and I think I am correct, neither accepted nor rejected the Boggs formula or any other formula. It specifically pointed out in its explanation as follows:

The committee states categorically that the deletion of the quoted language in no way constitutes an indication that the so-called Boggs formula, the rule limiting bays to areas whose headlands are not more than 10 miles apart, or the artificial arcs-of-circles method is or should be the policy of the United States in delimiting inland waters or defining coastlines.

Then the explanation goes on to say:

The elimination of the language, in the committee's opinion, is consistent with the philosophy of the Holland bill to place the States in the position in which both they and the Federal Government thought they were for more than a century and a half, and not to create any situations with respect thereto.

That is a clear statement of the views of the committee, and I say to the Senate that as those views were expressed in committee, they are expressed in the report.

I have read the definition of "coastline" and have indicated its application in section 2 of title I.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon be gracious enough to yield for a question at this point?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I address a question to the eminent Senator from Oregon on the meaning of "coastline," insofar as it refers to islands offshore? Would the Senator permit me to give an illustration that will clarify my precise question?

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose we are considering a State which has a number of islands 10 or 15 miles off shore: Are we to measure the coastline from a line drawn from the outer point of the islands, or from the shore of the continent itself?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is not prepared to discuss the application of any rule defining shorelines in a situation where islands exist off the main mass of land. There could

be, conceivably, many situations, each needing an answer depending upon the depth and nature of the waters, the distance of the islands, and many other factors.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon agree with the Senator from Illinois that this is a most important question?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, there is no question about the general importance of the Senator's question, but it is not an important question to this resolution or to any other resolution or bill pending on this subject. It is an important question which exists irrespective of the resolution and would have existed irrespective of the California, Texas, and Louisiana decisions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be better for the bill to define coast lines more carefully and then to treat the question of islands quite specifically as a special case?

Mr. CORDON. In the view of the Senator from Oregon, it would not.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to point out, with respect to the question of the Senator from Illinois, that the United States Supreme Court, in the past 6 years, has had before it unanswered the question of what constitutes the coast line of the State of California. I think the basic philosophy of this resolution, as was so admirably suggested by the Senator from Oregon earlier, will establish as a fact that which the States of the Union thought was the fact from the beginning of this country until 1947, leaving unsolved, as it was unsolved in the past, what actually constitutes the boundary lines of the several States.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like, before the recess, to finish my discussion of the next page, if I may.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In regard to the language used in the resolution, however, it is clear to the Senator from Louisiana as it was clear to the committee that although there are questions which the resolution does not attempt to answer—and there are a considerable number of them—the proposed legislation does settle the fundamental question that the States have title to the lands they always thought they owned prior to the decisions.

Mr. CORDON. Of course, that is its major purpose. It has a second purpose, and that, of course, has to do with the outer Continental Shelf.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not probable that Hawaii will be admitted as the 49th State, and is it not a fact that in some instances the islands of Hawaii are approximately 1,000 miles separated from each other? What is the understanding of the Senator from Oregon with reference to the meaning of this joint resolution as applied to the boundaries and coast line of Hawaii as they will be drawn from island to island?

Mr. CORDON. That matter, Mr. President, does not appear to be of moment in this resolution, so far as I can now see. I recognize that when we reach the subject of statehood for Hawaii we may have some difficult problems in that field. However, those problems are not made by this bill, and they will not exist until such time as Hawaii becomes a State. Then what is done here now may be of assistance in determining what shall be done in connection with the act of admission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator from Illinois please ask questions which are relevant to the matter under discussion? I should like to proceed uninterruptedly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator from Illinois thinks is relevant, apparently is not so regarded by the Senator from Oregon. I assure the Senator that I am not asking these questions with any intention of being discourteous.

Mr. CORDON. I am sure of that. The Senator from Illinois is interested in an opposing view, and I am sure he would like to make his case on the time of the Senator from Oregon. Sometimes that makes a better case, but the Senator from Oregon does not want to help the Senator from Illinois to do it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. CORDON. Yes. But let us get back to the resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that for some years the question of the boundaries of California has been before a master of the United States Supreme Court?

Mr. CORDON. There is no question about that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the master has made a report, finding that the boundary should be measured from the continent of America, not from the islands off the California coast?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have not studied the master's report. I have looked into the record sufficiently to understand that almost everyone concerned with the matter has entered objections and taken exceptions to the report. At least, the special master's findings and recommendations are still subject to determination by the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, again we are off the subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. CORDON. Just a moment, please. I am being fairly generous to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Oregon will permit one observation, the case which has been pending 6 years, and which after much labor has brought forth a master's report, applies to only 15½ miles of the nearly 1,000 miles of the coast of California. That indicates something of the difficulty in connection with the fixing of a boundary delimiting inland waters, because the question in that case was only as to 15½ miles, and not as to the entire California coast.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I submit that whether it be difficult or simple to delimit inland waters, or difficult or simple to determine State boundaries, the fact is that the problems are with us. They are with us without regard to the proposed legislation, and they will be with us in any other legislation which may be suggested in the field. These problems are not created by the pending joint resolution; the joint resolution does not solve them and cannot solve them.

The boundaries of the States cannot be changed by Congress without the consent of the States. We cannot do anything legislatively in that field, and we have not sought to do so in this measure.

I think that answers all and every one of the discussions with reference to boundary lines of the States, including whether they are measured from low water, high water, inland water, or some island.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to proceed a little further, but I will see how much stamina I have. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand, then, that the Senator from Oregon is saying that paragraph (c) on page 11 does not make any determination whatsoever as to whether the coastline shall be measured from the continental land mass or from outlying islands?

Mr. CORDON. I believe that paragraph (c) is perfectly clear. It does not take into consideration the question of outside islands as islands. To the extent that they may affect the measuring of inland waters, they are comprehended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon desire to suspend until tomorrow?

Mr. CORDON. I should be very willing to suspend.

Mr. TAFT. I had not intended to propose that the Senate remain in session this week later than the usual 5 o'clock adjournment time.

Mr. CORDON. I would appreciate a little breathing spell.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] shall have the floor in order to continue his discussion of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMISSION TO STUDY FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Eisenhower administration, in office a scant 3 months, has followed through

on its first campaign pledge dealing with taxation policy, a policy which is probably closer to the American people than any other domestic issue we will deal with in this body.

The fulfillment of this, the first of four taxation planks in the Republican Party platform of 1952, is not by its nature a headline-getting medium. It may be that only keen students of Government—or those officials close enough to this vital situation to care—had the interest to read through the President's message to Congress proposing the establishment of a Commission To Study the Relationship of Federal, State, and Local Governments. But in fact the Eisenhower administration has redeemed its debt to a platform plank which, in my judgment, may well turn out to be the most important fiscal accomplishment of its years.

Mr. President, let me first read this particular portion of the Republican platform on tax policy which the party advocated and carried into the 1952 campaign:

> An immediate study directed toward reallocation of fields of taxation between the Federal, State, and municipal governments so as to allow greater fiscal freedom to the States and municipalities, thus minimizing double taxation and enabling the various divisions of Government to meet their obligations more efficiently.

The Republican platform used the word "immediate" in its reference to the suggested study—and President Eisenhower and his associates took the platform at its word.

The idea of a study of the proper relationships between our three levels of Government is not new with the Republican Party, nor was it new in Chicago last summer.

Several bills have been introduced in past Congresses with a view toward establishing a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, designed to study the prospects of getting the Federal Government out of a number of fields of Government which would be better left to the States to administer.

In the 81st Congress, a bill, S. 1146, to set up this study group was approved by the Senate.

However, on the following day, the bill was recalled from the House, and it may well have been that partisan considerations provoked that action. I have always suspected such to be the case.

I was a coauthor of that bill, as well as the author of similar legislation in the 81st and 83d Congresses.

I am grateful for the cosponsorship and maximum support of these efforts by many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle through the difficult years when the executive climate was not conducive to the bearing of the fruit of economy.

There is, however, a new climate in Washington these days.

Mr. President, please allow me to point out how President Eisenhower picked up the ball of leadership in this matter and started goalward with it.

Back in July at a press conference, he had this to say:

> I favor carrying out the Hoover Commission recommendations. I want to carry this recommendation further, and support a study to determine whether some Federal functions cannot be returned to the States. The closer to home we can keep the responsibility, cost, and authority for all Government projects, the better.

During the campaign, he touched upon this plank nailed into the Republican platform in this fashion:

At Houston, Tex., the home of the distinguished present occupant of the chair [Mr. DANIEL], on October 14, 1952, Candidate Eisenhower declared:

> Keep as much of the Government as close to the people as possible. That system of government has served us well, one in which States have had a vital part. The preservation of local order, elbowroom to produce and build, protection of our titles to land—

A subject which is very close to us at the moment—

> the sacredness of our homes from intrusion, our right to get the best schooling for our children—we are secured these basic freedoms in the first instance by our State, our county, and our hometown.

A few months later he was President Eisenhower, facing the Congress in his maiden state-of-the-Union address. He told the Congress:

> To bring clear purpose and orderly procedure into this whole field, I anticipate a thorough study by an appropriate commission of the proper relationship among Federal, State, and local programs in this whole field.

In requesting the Congress to authorize a Federal-State relationship commission, our President said in his message of March 30:

> The present division of activities between Federal and State governments, including their local subdivisions, is a product of more than a century and a half of piecemeal and often haphazard growth. This growth in recent decades has proceeded at a speed defying order and efficiency. One program after another has been launched to meet emergencies and expanding public needs • • •. In many cases, especially within the past 20 years, the Federal Government has entered fields which, under our Constitution, are the primary responsibilities of State and local governments.
>
> This has tended to blur the responsibilities of local government. It has led to duplication and waste. It is time to relieve the people of the need to pay taxes on taxes.

Thus spoke General Eisenhower, as candidate and as Chief Executive.

Leadership in this eminently important field of fiscal and functional relationships has been taken and tenaciously clung to by such outstanding organizations as the Council of State Governments and its Governors' Conference; by the American Municipal Association, the National County Officers Association, the National Municipal League, and many other organizations which have given our legislative proposals their earnest support through the difficult years.

The Governors Conference committee on intergovernmental relations, headed by the distinguished Governor of New Jersey, Alfred E. Driscoll, stated this view earlier this year:

> Our system of government can be maintained only if the sovereignty of the several States is preserved. The tax policies of the Federal Government have made it virtually impossible for the State and local governments to obtain the revenues which they require.
>
> The levying of taxes upon identical products by both State and Federal Governments results in a wasteful duplication of administrative expense.
>
> It is the belief of the Governors' Conference that more efficient service to the citizens could be rendered at lower cost if certain of the taxes now levied by the Federal Government were abandoned to the States in lieu of Federal grants-in-aid.

Mr. President, as long ago as May 9, 1949, Governor Driscoll came before the Joint Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the House and Senate Committees on Government Operations.

Testifying on behalf of several bills which would have established a study Commission, Governor Driscoll stated, with vision and candor:

> Year after year our Presidents in public messages have stressed the importance of retaining our Federal system, and pointed to the danger of concentrated political power based upon the power to tax and distribute tax money.
>
> The continued usurpation by the Federal Government of tax bases formerly belonging to the States and their political subdivisions has dried up sources of revenue upon which the latter relied, and thus increased the pressure upon the Federal Government for Federal assistance.
>
> We have thus, therefore, a vicious circle in which requests for assistance compel the Federal Government to maintain abnormally high taxes when the solution of the problem is to be found in the reduction of Federal spending and the restoration to the States and their political subdivisions the capacity to finance governmental services at the local level where the benefit is received.

Mr. President, suffice it to say that there are many responsible officials at all levels of government who have readily seen that our competitive fiscal and tax relationships, our overlapping functions, and our duplicating services represented a governmental bearcat which would sooner—not later—have to be seized by the tail.

The President's message and the legislation which will soon be offered in the Congress represent the "seized tail."

What would this Commission study; how would it approach this major problem of our times?

I submit, by way of suggestion only, that all Federal grants-in-aid programs be examined to determine the following:

First. Should the grant be continued?

Second. Can and should the service be provided and financed by the State itself and to what extent?

Third. How should the activity be administered?

To enable the States to assume more of the responsibility for performing the domestic functions of government and to raise necessary revenue to support these activities, the National Government might well withdraw from such tax areas as gasoline, admissions and amusements, local telephone service, and might reduce to some extent excise taxes on alcoholic beverages and on tobacco products.

It might reorganize and readjust Federal estate and gift taxes in order that the States might receive approximately 50 percent of the combined revenue derived therefrom.

More specifically, Mr. President, take the field of health, for example.

There are 10 separate and distinct programs in this field to which the Federal Government contributes through grants-in-aid to the States.

They are: General health assistance, venereal-disease control, mental health, heart-disease control, tuberculosis control, cancer control, water-pollution control, maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, and hospital construction.

Seven of these activities clearly have to do with health. With respect to three, there are other major aspects involved, such as welfare, education, and public works.

The total Federal grant to the States for these 10 activities in 1952 was $143 million.

These grant programs, certainly those that are strictly health, might be reappraised as a whole.

Should the Federal Government in Washington continue to make all these grants?

Should there be one consolidated grant for general public health rather than many individual and specific grants for parts of the health program?

These are questions which the Commission might carefuly explore.

Mr. President, there are many other areas of function, including agriculture, the old-age assistance program, and the construction of highways, which readily lend themselves to exploration.

These are random ideas hammered out on the tough anvil of governmental experience.

The field of inquiry is wide and the chances for improvement bright.

Those of us who have labored in the wilderness have a new champion in the executive department and we have a growing public awareness of the problem aiding us in our revived efforts.

A few days ago, on March 29, a clear-thinking editor of the New York Herald Tribune had this to say in an editorial:

> The problem of double and triple taxation is a fairly recent one, arising from the pressure for more revenue existing at all levels of government.
>
> Through much of our history, Washington obtained what it needed for national purposes from customs duties, excise taxes, and the sale of public lands; while property taxes and license fees sufficed for the States.
>
> Today, however, the tendency is for various governmental authorities to drink thirstily at the same sources of revenue.
>
> Gasoline and beer are taxed by all 48 States as well as by the Federal Government; death taxes and taxes on liquor fall almost as prevalently under the double burden.

Mr. President, the distinguished colleagues who joined me in the introduction of Senate bill 526 in the present Congress will need no urging when the administration bill is offered in the Senate.

I have reference to the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The Senate, I am certain, will recognize in the administration bill to be offered by the distinguished majority leader an opportunity for financial redemption from a hodge-podge of confusion which has been with us too long.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement about the program of the Senate for tomorrow and next week. The Senate will meet tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon and continue the discussion of the tidelands resolution after the morning business is concluded. Following the debate on the resolution it is proposed to have the Senate recess or adjourn until next Monday. At the session on Monday no important measures will be taken up, although nominations to which there is no objection may be considered. Senators desiring to make speeches may do so at that time.

It is proposed to have the Senate resume its work on Tuesday, and it is expected that from that time forward the Senate will meet every day of the week, except Saturday and Sunday, in order to consider proposed legislation which, from now on, will be coming to the Senate continuously as committees make their reports.

Probably the proposed tidelands legislation will be followed by consideration of the defense production and controls bill. I hope that bill may be followed by the measure providing statehood for Hawaii. By that time appropriation bills and other measures probably will be pressing on the Senate. So beginning next Tuesday, it is proposed to have the Senate meet every day through Friday in each week.

Mr. President, I desire to mention another matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

GOOD FRIDAY OBSERVANCE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post I noticed a statement by the Rev. Joseph E. Gedra, executive secretary of the Committee for Three Hours Observance of Good Friday, that the House customarily has adjourned in commemoration of Good Friday, but that this will be the first time in many years the Senate will have done so. I desire to correct that statement, because for the past 6 years the Senate has not met on Good Friday. Before that time, sometimes the Senate met on that day and sometimes it did not. In the 30 years preceding this year the Senate was in session on Good Friday 13 times, and not in session 17 times. So the Senate will be setting no precedent by recessing from Thursday of this week to Monday of next week.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL MODIFYING TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND CONSULAR RIGHTS WITH FINLAND—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive C, 83d Congress, 1st session, a protocol signed at Washington on December 4, 1952, modifying the treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights between the United States and Finland, signed at Washington on February 13, 1934. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and the protocol, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a protocol, signed at Washington on December 4, 1952, modifying the treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights between the United States and Finland, signed at Washington on February 13, 1934.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the protocol.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 1, 1953.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State. (2) Protocol, signed at Washington December 4, 1952, modifying the treaty of friendship, commerce, and consular rights with Finland.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Ray M. Gidney, of Ohio, to be Comptroller of the Currency, vice Preston Delano, resigned.

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

John Roger Lewis, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan; and

William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Ireland.

By Mr. CASE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Samuel Spencer, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board (reappointment);

Harmar D. Denny, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, vice Donald W. Nyrop, resigned; and

John C. Doerfer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.), in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received April 1, 1953:

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Lester L. Cecil, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Ohio, vice Robert R. Nevin, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

Gen. James Alward Van Fleet, O3847, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Idris W. Jones, associate minister, Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most merciful Father, we would begin the discussions and decisions of this day in the spirit of worship and thanksgiving.

We thank Thee for the Members of the House of Representatives. Their decisions affect the destiny of so many human lives. Keep them true, therefore, to the noblest insights Thou hast taught them through the many experiences of life.

Truly do we need Thy guidance and Thy help, our Father. May no unworthy motives move us this day. May we so plan, speak, and act that when we come to the close of the day, in the quiet of our rooms, each one of us may sense the word of the Lord: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

This is our prayer for today, in the spirit of Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] to recommit the bill H. R. 4198, the so-called tidelands bill.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CELLER moves to recommit H. R. 4198 to the Judiciary Committee of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 106, nays 283, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

YEAS—106

Addonizio	George	Moulder
Albert	Gordon	Multer
Andersen, H. Carl	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Aspinall	Gregory	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bailey	Gross	O'Hara, Ill.
Barrett	Hart	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hays, Ohio	O'Neill
Boland	Heselton	Perkins
Bolling	Holtzman	Pfost
Buchanan	Howell	Polk
Buckley	Hull	Powell
Burdick	Javits	Price
Canfield	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Case	Jones, Mo.	Prouty
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Radwan
Chatham	Keating	Reams
Chelf	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Chudoff	Kelley, Pa.	Roberts
Crosser	Kelly, N. Y.	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Rodino
Delaney	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Dodd	Klein	Rooney
Dollinger	Klucynski	Roosevelt
Donohue	Lane	Secrest
Eberharter	Lanham	Sieminski
Edmondson	Lesinski	Spence
Elliott	McCarthy	Staggers
Feighan	McCormack	Sullivan
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Sutton
Fine	Madden	Trimble
Fogarty	Marshall	Watts
Forand	Metcalf	Wier
Frazier	Miller, Kans.	Withrow
Friedel	Mills	Yates
Garmatz	Moss	

NAYS—283

Abbitt	Bolton, Oliver P.	Cooley
Abernethy	Bonin	Coon
Adair	Bonner	Cooper
Alexander	Bosch	Cotton
Allen, Calif.	Bow	Cretella
Allen, Ill.	Brambiett	Crumpacker
Andresen, August H.	Bray	Cunningham
	Brooks, La.	Curtis, Mass.
Andrews	Brooks, Tex.	Curtis, Mo.
Angell	Brown, Ga.	Curtis, Nebr.
Arends	Brownson	Dague
Auchincloss	Broyhill	Davis, Ga.
Ayres	Budge	Davis, Wis.
Baker	Burleson	Deane
Barden	Busbey	Derounian
Bates	Bush	Devereux
Battle	Byrnes, Wis.	D'Ewart
Beamer	Camp	Dies
Becker	Campbell	Dolliver
Belcher	Carlyle	Dondero
Bender	Carrigg	Donovan
Bennett, Fla.	Cederberg	Doyle, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Chenoweth	Dowdy
Bentley	Chiperfield	Doyle
Bentsen	Church	Durham
Berry	Clardy	Ellsworth
Betts	Clevenger	Engle
Bishop	Cole, Mo.	Fallon
Boggs	Cole, N. Y.	Fenton
Bolton, Frances P.	Colmer	Fino
		Fisher
Ford	Krueger	St. George
Forrester	Laird	Saylor
Fountain	Landrum	Schenck
Frelinghuysen	Lantaff	Scherer
Gamble	Latham	Scott
Gary	LeCompte	Scrivner
Gathings	Long	Scudder
Gavin	Lovre	Seely-Brown
Gentry	Lucas	Selden
Golden	Lyle	Shafer
Goodwin	McConnell	Sheehan
Graham	McDonough	Short
Grant	McGregor	Shuford
Gubser	McMillan	Sikes
Gwinn	McVey	Simpson, Ill.
Hagen, Calif.	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Pa.
Hagen, Minn.	Mahon	Small
Hale	Mailliard	Smith, Kans.
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Miss.
Hand	Mason	Smith, Va.
Harden	Matthews	Smith, Wis.
Hardy	Merrill	Springer
Harris	Miller, Md.	Stauffer
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Nebr.	Steed
Harrison, Va.	Miller, N. Y.	Stringfellow
Harrison, Wyo.	Morano	Taber
Harvey	Morrison	Talle
Hays, Ark.	Mumma	Teague
Hébert	Murray	Thomas
Herlong	Neal	Thompson, La.
Hess	Nelson	Thompson, Mich.
Hiestand	Nicholson	
Hill	Norrell	Thompson, Tex.
Hillelson	Oakman	Thornberry
Hillings	O'Hara, Minn.	Tollefson
Hinshaw	Osmers	Utt
Hoeven	Ostertag	Van Pelt
Hoffman, Ill.	Passman	Van Zandt
Hoffman, Mich.	Patman	Velde
Holmes	Patterson	Vorys
Holt	Pelly	Vursell
Hope	Philbin	Wainwright
Horan	Phillips	Walter
Hosmer	Pilcher	Wampler
Hruska	Pillion	Warburton
Hunter	Poage	Weichel
Hyde	Poff	Westland
Ikard	Poulson	Wharton
Jackson	Preston	Wheeler
James	Rains	Whitten
Jarman	Ray	Wickersham
Jenkins	Rayburn	Widnall
Jensen	Reed, Ill.	Wigglesworth
Johnson	Reed, N. Y.	Williams, Miss.
Jonas, Ill.	Rees, Kans.	Williams, N. Y.
Jonas, N. C.	Regan	Willis
Jones, N. C.	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wilson, Calif.
Kean	Riehlman	Wilson, Ind.
Kearns	Riley	Wilson, Tex.
Kersten, Wis.	Rivers	Wolcott
Kilburn	Robeson, Va.	Wolverton
Kilday	Rogers, Fla.	Yorty
King, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.	Young
King, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.	Younger
Knox	Sadlak	

NOT VOTING—42

Boykin	Evins	Mollohan
Brown, Ohio	Fulton	Morgan
Byrd	Haley	Norblad
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Patten
Cannon	Holifield	Rabaut
Carnahan	Judd	Reece, Tenn.
Condon	Kearney	Richards
Corbett	McCulloch	Shelley
Coudert	McIntire	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Mack, Ill.	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Magnuson	Vinson
Dempsey	Meader	Winstead
Dingell	Merrow	Withers
Dorn, S. C.	Miller, Calif.	Zablocki

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Withers for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Condon for, with Mr. Richards against.

Mr. Zablocki for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Cannon for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Byrd for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Dawson of Utah for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Haley against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Carnahan for, with Mr. Merrow against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Holifield against.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Shelley against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Corbett with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Meader with Mr. Dempsey
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Winstead.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 285, nays 108, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—285

Abbitt	Davis, Ga.	Jensen
Abernethy	Davis, Wis.	Johnson
Adair	Deane	Jonas, Ill.
Alexander	Derounian	Jonas, N. C.
Allen, Calif.	Devereux	Jones, N. C.
Allen, Ill.	D'Ewart	Kean
Andresen, August H.	Dies	Kearns
	Dolliver	Kersten, Wis.
Andrews	Dondero	Kilburn
Angell	Donohue	Kilday
Arends	Donovan	King, Calif.
Auchincloss	Dorn, N. Y.	King, Pa.
Ayres	Dowdy	Knox
Baker	Doyle	Krueger
Barden	Durham	Laird
Bates	Edmondson	Landrum
Battle	Ellsworth	Lantaff
Beamer	Engle	Latham
Becker	Fallon	LeCompte
Belcher	Fenton	Long
Bender	Fisher	Lovre
Bennett, Fla.	Ford	Lucas
Bennett, Mich.	Forrester	Lyle
Bentley	Fountain	McConnell
Bentsen	Frelinghuysen	McDonough
Berry	Gamble	McGregor
Betts	Gary	McMillan
Bishop	Gathings	Mack, Wash.
Boggs	Gavin	Mahon
Bolton, Frances P.	Gentry	Mailliard
	Golden	Martin, Iowa
Bolton, Oliver P.	Goodwin	Mason
	Graham	Matthews
Bonin	Grant	Merrill
Bonner	Gubser	Miller, Md.
Bosch	Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.
Bow	Hagen, Calif.	Miller, N. Y.
Boykin	Hagen, Minn.	Morano
Bramblett	Hale	Morrison
Bray	Halleck	Mumma
Brooks, La.	Hand	Murray
Brooks, Tex.	Harden	Neal
Brown, Ga.	Hardy	Nelson
Brownson	Harris	Nicholson
Broyhill	Harrison, Nebr.	Norrell
Burleson	Harrison, Va.	Oakman
Busbey	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Hara, Minn.
Bush	Harvey	Osmers
Byrnes Wis.	Hays, Ark.	Ostertag
Camp	Hébert	Passman
Campbell	Heriong	Patman
Carlyle	Hess	Patterson
Carrigg	Hiestand	Pelly
Cederberg	Hill	Philbin
Chenoweth	Hillelson	Phillips
Chiperfield	Hillings	Pilcher
Church	Hinshaw	Pillion
Clardy	Hoeven	Poage
Clevenger	Hoffman, Ill.	Poff
Cole, Mo.	Hoffman, Mich.	Poulson
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes	Preston
Colmer	Holt	Priest
Cooley	Hope	Rains
Coon	Horan	Ray
Cooper	Hosmer	Rayburn
Cotton	Hruska	Reed, Ill.
Cretella	Hunter	Reed, N. Y.
Crumpacker	Hyde	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Ikard	Regan
Curtis, Mass.	Jackson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Curtis, Mo.	James	Richlman
Curtis, Nebr.	Jarman	Riley
Dague	Jenkins	Rivers
Robeson, Va.	Smith, Va.	Wampler
Rogers, Fla.	Smith, Wis.	Warburton
Rogers, Mass.	Springer	Weichel
Rogers, Tex.	Stauffer	Westland
Sadlak	Steed	Wharton
St. George	Stringfellow	Wheeler
Saylor	Taber	Whitten
Schenck	Talle	Wickersham
Scherer	Teague	Widnall
Scott	Thomas	Wigglesworth
Scrivner	Thompson, La.	Williams, Miss.
Scudder	Thompson, Mich.	Williams, N. Y.
Seely-Brown		Willis
Selden	Thompson, Tex.	Wilson, Calif.
Shafer	Thornberry	Wilson, Ind.
Sheehan	Tollefson	Wilson, Tex.
Short	Utt	Winstead
Shuford	Van Pelt	Wolcott
Sikes	Van Zandt	Wolverton
Simpson, Ill.	Velde	Yorty
Simpson, Pa.	Vorys	Young
Small	Vursell	Younger
Smith, Kans.	Wainwright	
Smith, Miss.	Walter	

NAYS—108

Addonizio	Gordon	Moss
Albert	Granahan	Moulder
Andersen, H. Carl	Green	Multer
	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Gross	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barrett	Hays, Ohio	O'Hara, Ill.
Bielnik	Heselton	O'Konski
Boland	Holtzman	O'Neill
Bolling	Howell	Perkins
Buchanan	Hull	Pfost
Buckley	Javits	Polk
Burdick	Jones, Ala.	Powell
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Price
Case	Karsten, Mo.	Prouty
Celler	Keating	Radwan
Chatham	Kee	Reams
Chelf	Kelley, Pa.	Rhodes, Pa.
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Roberts
Crosser	Keogh	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson, Ill.	Kirwan	Rodino
Delaney	Klein	Rogers, Colo.
Dodd	Kluczynski	Rooney
Dollinger	Lane	Roosevelt
Eberharter	Lanham	Secrest
Elliott	Lesinski	Sieminski
Evins	McCarthy	Spence
Feighan	McCormack	Staggers
Fernandes	McVey	Sullivan
Fino	Machrowicz	Sutton
Fino	Madden	Trimble
Fogarty	Marshall	Watts
Forand	Meader	Wier
Frazier	Metcalf	Withrow
Friedel	Miller, Kans.	Yates
Garmatz	Mills	
George	Mollohan	

NOT VOTING—38

Brown, Ohio	Dorn, S. C.	Morgan
Budge	Fulton	Norblad
Byrd	Haley	Patten
Byrne, Pa.	Heller	Rabaut
Cannon	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Carnahan	Judd	Richards
Condon	Kearney	Shelley
Corbett	McCulloch	Sheppard
Coudert	McIntire	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Mack, Ill.	Vinson
Dawson, Utah	Magnuson	Withers
Dempsey	Merrow	Zablocki
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Withers against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Condon against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Zablocki against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Cannon against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Byrd against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Dawson of Utah against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Haley for, with Mr. Patten against.

Mr. McIntire for, with Mr. Magnuson against.

Mr. Merrow for, with Mr. Carnahan against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Mack of Illinois against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Fulton with Mr. Miller of California.
Mr. Corbett with Mr. Dempsey.
Mr. Norblad with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. LAIRD and Mr. DONOVAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EASTER RECESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 90) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 2, 1953, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 13, 1953.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROGRAM WEEK OF APRIL 13

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute in order to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] what we may expect in the week of April 13 on our return, if the gentleman knows that far in advance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I might say that I am glad to respond to the request of the gentleman from Texas, because many Members if they know today can arrange their affairs accordingly.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS APRIL 13 AND APRIL 14

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to call the Consent Calendar on Monday, April 13, and the Private Calendar on Tuesday, April 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Monday, April 13, is District day and if there are any bills ready out of that committee they will be called on that day, and the Consent Calendar will be called following the consideration of District of Columbia business.

Tuesday, April 14: The Private Calendar, and then on Tuesday and Wednesday we propose to call up House Resolution 3840, which extends the Farm Labor Act, and then a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency, House Resolution 4004, having to do with certain reports made by banks to the Comptroller of the Currency. We are very hopeful that the Interior Department appropriation bill can be filed on Tuesday. If we can get unanimous consent; that is, if

there were no objections, we could begin general debate on Wednesday; and, if not Wednesday, we would hope to take up the bill on Thursday.

Beyond that, so far as I know, there is no program for the week. Should something further develop, we would let the office of the Members know so that they might have the information.

NATURALIZATION OF PERSONS SERVING IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4233) to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this not the bill that is identical with the law as it existed during the war with the exception that it applies only to aliens who are legally and lawfully in the United States?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a correct statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, this also covers those who are in the service, aliens, who have permanent or temporary visas?

Mr. GRAHAM. Correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman advise the House whether or not this affects the wife of an alien who may become an American citizen?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not affect the wife.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Walter bill will permit the prompt naturalization of those aliens who have served honorably in our Armed Forces during the war in Korea. It is similar to a statute in effect during World War II. A minimum of 30 days' service is required and naturalization can be had in the field.

A like measure sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was passed by the House in the last Congress. I, too, was sponsor of a bill at that time, and I reintroduced the measure on the opening day of the 83d Congress.

On February 4, 1952, I made the following remarks in the House:

Mr. Speaker, I first saw the need of this legislation in August 1950, and I then introduced a bill to provide expeditious citizenship in the field for aliens fighting in our Armed Forces.

There had been called to my attention a case which most dramatically emphasized the importance of restoring to law that provision which had been law during World War II but had expired. It was the case of Roger Duquesne, a young Belgian, who had saved the life of an Air Force captain in my district. The latter had been shot down over Belgium, and this lad not only provided him with sanctuary but arranged for him to escape from Nazi forces seeking his capture and eventually to get back to American lines.

Roger had two great ambitions in life: One was to emigrate to the United States and see again his Air Force captain, and the other was to acquire American citizenship. He came to Paterson, N. J., and found that the captain, David Schwartz, was with the Armed Forces in Tokyo. The captain's mother-in-law, Mrs. William Nichols, of 308 Paxton Street, Paterson, became a mother to this lad. In a very short time he reported to the recruiting office in Paterson to sign up with our Armed Forces, and he was led to believe that his joining the Army automatically made him a citizen. It was not until he was in Korea that he discovered that this was not so. Mrs. Nichols was greatly concerned and reported the facts to me, and my introduction of the bill followed. Last year Roger Duquesne was reported missing in action in Pusan and nothing has been heard of him since.

Mrs. Nichols and Captain Schwartz are prayerful that he may be found to be a prisoner of war. Reports from Korea are anything but optimistic. However, I, too, am hoping that he will be found, and if he is, he will be thrilled to hear that the Congress has voted to make his citizenship possible. If it is discovered that he is definitely a casualty of this war, I want it to be recorded in the war history that Roger Duquesne fought for the land and the people he loved, and that in almost every letter he wrote to his Paterson home he stressed his ever-increasing desire to be known as a full-fledged American citizen.

All I can now add to this statement is this: Roger Duquesne has been awarded the Silver Star certificate which has been directed to his foster mother. He is still listed as missing in action.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, in passing this bill today, we are following the historic attitude of this body in showing consideration for aliens who respond patriotically to the needs of their adopted country, by serving in the Armed Forces of the United States when the Nation is in peril. I feel we should grant these concessions in order to facilitate their naturalization as citizens of the country they have served so patriotically and honorably.

As evidence of my concern in this connection, I introduced a bill in the 80th Congress to facilitate the naturalization of our brothers of foreign birth who served in the military or naval forces of our country in World War II. This bill became law in June 1948. Under this law certain requirements of the naturalization laws are waived, such as declaration of intention, period of residence within the country, and educational tests.

No one, I believe, will seriously challenge the contention that these same privileges should be extended to participants and veterans of the Korean conflict. The aliens, few in number, who choose to identify themselves with the ideals and principles for which this Nation struggles, are entitled to special consideration in their efforts to become United States citizens.

Proper safeguards are provided in the bill before us, in that affidavits of two credible citizens attesting to personal acquaintance with, and the good moral character of, the applicant and his attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States are required, together with convincing proof from military or naval forces of his honorable service. No dishonorably discharged soldier can qualify.

To those who, out of devotion to the country of their adoption, waived their exemption from military service, this bill provides a national policy of facilitating their conversion from the status of alien to that of citizen of the country for which they have evidenced such patriotic devotion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 310 (d) and 318 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, any person, not a citizen, who, after June 24, 1950, and not later than July 1, 1955, has actively served or actively serves, honorably, in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period or periods totaling not less than 30 days and who, having been lawfully admitted to the United States (within the purport of sec. 101 (a) (38) of the Immigration and Nationality Act), shall have been at the time of entering the Armed Forces within such area, may be naturalized on petition filed not later than December 31, 1955, upon compliance with all the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act, except that—

(a) he may be naturalized regardless of age;

(b) no period of residence or specified period of physical presence within the United States or any State shall be required: *Provided*, That there shall be included in the petition the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each such witness personally knows the petitioner to be a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States;

(c) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner;

(d) notwithstanding section 336 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the petitioner may be naturalized immediately if prior to the filing of the petition, the petitioner and the witness shall have appeared before and been examined by a representative of the Service; and

(e) no fee, except that which may be required by State law, shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certificate of naturalization, if issued.

Service in the Armed Forces of the United States may be proved by a duly authenticated copy of the record of the executive or military department having custody of the record of petitioner's service, showing that the petitioner is or was during the period hereinbefore described a member serving actively and honorably in such forces and, if separated from such service, that he was not separated under other than honorable conditions; or may be proved by affidavits, forming part of the petition, of at least two citizens of the United States, members of the Armed Forces of the United States, of the

noncommissioned or warrant officer grade or higher (who may also be the witnesses described in subsec. (b) of this section): *Provided, however,* That no period of service in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be made the basis of a petition for naturalization under this act if the applicant has previously been naturalized on the basis of the same period of service.

SEC. 2. Any person entitled to naturalization under section 1 of this act, who while serving is not within the jurisdiction of any naturalization court, may be naturalized in accordance with applicable provisions of that section without appearing before such court. The petition for naturalization of any such petitioner shall be made and sworn to before, and filed with a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service designated by the Attorney General, which representative is hereby authorized to receive such petition, to conduct hearings thereon, to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the admissibility of such petitioner for naturalization, to call witnesses, to administer oaths, including the oath of the petitioner and his witnesses to the petition and the oath prescribed by section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act and to grant naturalization and to issue certificates of naturalization: *Provided,* That the record of any proceedings hereunder shall be forwarded to and filed by the clerk of a naturalization court in the district designated by the petitioner and made a part of the record of such court.

SEC. 3. Any person otherwise qualified for naturalization pursuant to section 1 or 2 of this act who is or has been discharged under other than honorable conditions from the Armed Forces of the United States, or is discharged therefrom pursuant to an application for discharge made by him on the ground that he is an alien, or who is a conscientious objector who performs or performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, shall not be entitled to the benefits of such section 1 or 2 of this act: *Provided,* That citizenship granted pursuant to section 1 or 2 of this act may be revoked in accordance with section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act if at any time subsequent to naturalization the person is separated from the Armed Forces of the United States under other than honorable conditions, and such ground for revocation shall be in addition to any other provided by law: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of section 340 (f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, revocation on such ground shall be classified with revocatory action based on section 329 (c) of that act. The fact that the naturalized person was separated from the service under other than honorable conditions shall be proved by a duly authenticated certification from the executive or military department under which the person was serving at the time of separation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I vigorously oppose the so-called tidelands bill. What I want to say concerning the tidelands oil question can be put briefly.

If for no other reasons than our national security and our national welfare, the Federal Government must keep control of the tidelands properties.

The necessity and the wisdom of this has been recognized by the great majority of responsible, thinking citizens, and by the United States Supreme Court.

It is vitally important to realize that so far as oil is concerned, we rapidly are becoming a have-not nation.

Our continental supplies are dwindling. Consumption of oil is greatly outdistancing production. New oil fields are not being discovered fast enough to keep up with our enormous national demand. We have to import oil to meet our national needs.

Therefore, if our armed services are to be kept strong—if our Navy is going to have the oil it needs for its ships, the Air Force for its planes, the Army for its tanks and trucks and mobile weapons—we not only have to assure the proper, systematic development of the offshore oil lands but we also must recognize the time factor in this development.

For should these properties be turned over to private companies for their own use now, the necessary supplies may not be there when we need them in years to come. Today's defense needs do not have a time limit. They will exist as long as there is a threat to freedom and democracy, and we cannot throw away the security of future generations for the profits of a present few.

Equally, if we are to be strong enough to fight and win in the world of ideas and traditions and beliefs, then we have in these tidelands properties a vast benefit to all the Nation.

Our democracy depends on citizens who are active in government, who are informed, and who can understand events and issues. We have lived through the years when we could see that dictatorship in other countries took hold and grew as tyrants took over education, restricted it more and more, denied it to an ever-growing number of people.

Yet through this very tidelands bill, we can show the world that we oppose tyranny. We believe in people being active in running their government, in being informed, and having the understanding that makes them better participants in the responsibilities of democracy.

If the Navy, for example, is allowed to continue its assigned jurisdiction over the offshore properties, then it can supervise the orderly development of the tidelands, and the income that results can be used to strengthen education.

All over the country, local communities are running into increasing trouble meeting the expenses of educating a rapidly growing school population. Classrooms are overcrowded heavily. Buildings are old, outmoded, and have to be replaced—but there are no funds to build the new buildings, build the needed classrooms.

Teachers in locality after locality still are heavily underpaid. In many cases, they get less in wages than street cleaners; yes, and garbage collectors.

As a matter of fact, 25 States have let it be known they themselves are dissatisfied with their old, rundown, unsafe school buildings.

Mr. Speaker, millions and millions of dollars will be gained every year if the tidelands properties are developed along logical conservation lines. This money can and must be used for the education of children in all parts of the country, and to build safer, more adequately staffed schools for them.

The money can and must be used to attract and hold experienced teachers in these now underdeveloped school areas.

Our democracy will be only as strong tomorrow as its citizens who are growing up today.

And those citizens—today's children—all have the right to an education and to the same educational opportunities. The youngsters growing up in any one of the many States that will be benefited by these funds has as much right to a good public school education as the boy or girl who lives in a State that needs no such additional help at all.

The wealth of America's natural resources belongs to all the people. Not just the people of 1 State, or 2 or 3, but the people of all 48.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to make a national tragedy of tidelands. We have the ability to look ahead to our needs. We have the knowledge and the resources to plan to meet them now.

Oil for security and education means a lot more to the United States than oil for haphazard exploitation. We must not permit either a big deal or a big steal.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MARCH 31, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did, on January 16, 1953, elect the Honorable THOMAS A. JENKINS, of Ohio, and the Honorable RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, to be members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to serve with the following other House Members who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: DANIEL A. REED, of New York; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; and JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan.

Respectfully yours,

DANIEL A. REED,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee To Investigate the Justice Department may have permission to sit this afternoon after 3 o'clock during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CANCER EDUCATION DAY

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a joint resolution which I hope promptly will receive the approval of this House, and then of the Senate.

The resolution sets aside throughout the United States of America and its Territories, a day to be known as Cancer Education Day, which is to be designated as March 20 each year, and authorizes and requests the President of the United States to make appropriate proclamation to that effect.

I have had the opportunity by personal observation to realize how important it is, in seeking to combat by medical science the ravages made upon our people by the disease of cancer, to have the facts about cancer and its detection and its early treatment more widely known than they are. I do not pretend that this can be achieved merely by the issuing of a proclamation by the President of the United States; but such a proclamation, as provided for in my resolution, would arouse all of the people of this country to the serious challenge of cancer.

For leadership in a great program of education, the American Cancer Society, through the generous help of the American people by their donations and contributions, is particularly well qualified, mobilizing and unifying for this task, the human and scientific resources of the medical profession, of our colleges and universities and research centers, and bringing to it too the knowledge and the techniques by which can be passed on to every American the things they need to know to save themselves from pain and suffering and death. For of every 2 deaths from cancer, it has been authoritatively stated that 1 could have been averted or prevented, by proper treatment started early enough.

It is not the purpose of this resolution to take the place of Public Resolution 82, adopted by the 75th Congress and approved March 28, 1938. It is intended to help concentrate on one day, to be known throughout the country as Cancer Education Day, the attention which all of us properly and effectively can give to protecting health and saving lives by emphasizing the importance of education of the individual citizen about cancer.

GEN. J. LAWTON COLLINS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Members of the House will read with interest and approval a letter from one of America's ablest soldiers, Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, to another who also holds the great esteem, appreciation, and affection of his countrymen, Gen. James A. Van Fleet. It was read by General Collins during the impressive ceremonies marking the retirement of Florida's distinguished son and outstanding soldier.

MARCH 23, 1953.

Gen. JAMES A. VAN FLEET.

DEAR VAN: Although I know you are well aware of my high regard for you, I want to make a matter of record some small measure of my lasting appreciation for your many contributions to the advancement of the Army and the security of the Nation. For nearly 38 years you have devoted yourself to your profession with a fidelity and singleness of purpose in keeping with the highest traditions of the service. Now that you are about to retire, I join with your host of friends and comrades in arms in paying well-deserved tribute to you and to the distinguished record you have built.

The restricted space of a letter such as this is obviously far too small for me to attempt to list all of your accomplishments. I would be remiss, however, if I did not mention at least a few of the positions of responsibility which you have filled so capably. The history of World War II in Europe is replete with accounts of your personal gallantry and inspiring leadership.

On D-day I was proud to have your regiment lead the assault of the VII Corps on Utah Beach. I shall never forget our meeting on the outskirts of Ste. Mere-Eglise on D–1 and our subsequent ride through town to Matt Ridgway's CP near the Merderet River. Your driving energy and personal leadership were largely responsible for the linkup in Ste. Mere-Eglise with the 82d Airborne Division. You continued to demonstrate the same fine leadership throughout the Cherbourg campaign.

Subsequently, the 90th Division, under your command, played the major role in the capture of Metz, and led the Third Army in the counteroffensive in the Bulge. It was entirely fitting, therefore, that you should have commanded III Corps during the drive across Germany to the Austrian Alps. Nor did the end of hostilities in Europe put a stop to your distinguished achievements. In Greece, your forceful initiative and splendid grasp of tactical and strategic concepts played a decisive part in crushing the Communist forces there.

I can think of no finer climax to your long and honorable career than you furnished as commanding general of the great United States Eighth Army in Korea. Under your guidance, it became a splendid United Nations battle team with invincible spirit and a battlewise competence which has made it an inspiration to all in the fight against Communist aggression. In addition, through your vigorous training efforts, a new military potential has emerged in the Army of the Republic of Korea. This new army, largely through your efforts, is now taking its rightful place in the defenses of the free world.

Throughout your entire career, you have exemplified the highest form of courage, selfless patriotism, and tireless devotion to duty. When I congratulate you on the distinguished record you have built, I do so firm in the conviction that I speak for every member of the Army, as well as for all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Let me say, "Well done," and add the hope that your future will be bright with the fullness of happiness and good fortune you have so surely earned.

Faithfully yours,

JOE COLLINS.

BOSTON POST BROADCAST

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and honor recently of appearing on the NBC radio program conducted by the Boston Post under the able direction of John Kelso, its Washington correspondent, with my esteemed friend and colleague, Congressman WILLIAM BATES.

Because of considerable interest exhibited by many listeners in the matters discussed over the program, I feel it is appropriate briefly to review some of the problems discussed and specific questions answered.

There seems to be much interest in the recent testimony of General Van Fleet before the House and Senate Armed Services Committees. In response to specific questions, I responded that the matter would undoubtedly be carefully explored by a congressional committee. I also alluded to the fact that while the general had referred definitely to certain ammunition shortages, he had testified that there was sufficient ammunition for the type of war we were fighting in Korea—namely a war of more or less watchful waiting and stalemate. General Van Fleet further stated that if he had been given the green light at policy level in March 1951 that, in his opinion, we could have gained a decisive victory.

I stated that as I construed the matter there was absolutely no possible justification for shortage of ammunition, artillery, equipment, food and clothing, planes, tanks, or any other necessary weapons for Korea. The Congress has made ample provision for fully arming our forces and for fully equipping them and that it is entirely indefensible that we should have had shortages of any kind. I made it very clear that so far as the Congress is concerned we want and intend our boys who are making such bitter sacrifices for the Nation to have the best of everything they need to carry on this bloody battle.

I also made the point that this is the first American war that I know of in which we have not fought with the idea of gaining victory and that the time has long since passed to reevaluate our entire position in Korea and to insist that other member nations of the United Nations should make much more substantial and more equitable contributions to the actual fighting required by this desperate war to check Communist aggression and protect the free world.

I also commented on the recent A-bomb explosion in Yucca, Nev., which I deemed had a twofold importance: First, it marks another step in our development of the A-bomb, the secrets of which were stolen from our Government by the dastardly work of traitors. This made it possible for the Soviet, once in possession of the formulas, by following the ordinary paths of scientific discovery, to create fissionable material and ultimately the bomb itself.

I alluded to the fact that some people do not believe the Soviet has yet exploded a bomb but my personal belief is that the Soviet already has a small quantity of these devastating bombs.

The explosion at Yucca, as I said, illustrated the headway we are making in this field and I indicated my view that we were well in front of any other nation in perfecting this terrible weapon.

I indicated my view that we have more bombs and more powerful bombs than the Soviet has at this particular time and that we have the power to deliver them and that, in my opinion, that has been the greatest force in deterring aggression upon other parts of the free world or upon this Nation. If diplomatic policy had kept pace with scientific progress, we probably would not now be faced with the menacing prospect that confronts us.

I deem that the explosion at Yucca has again brought forcibly into the minds of the American people the urgency of civil defense. It would be most unwise to arouse or alarm the American people or get them into a state of hysteria at the prospect of attacks upon our cities, although that has been done and is still being done by some in an effort to justify appeasement and compromise with the great Red conspiracy.

But I honestly believe that at local, State and National levels we should intensify and extend our work in civil defense, particularly in the educational and instructive phases as well as in mobilization of resources and trained personnel.

In such a short broadcast, of course, it was not possible to cover many questions currently concerning our people. The progress of our defense against air attack evokes considerable public interest. Military experts largely agree that there is no such thing as complete defense to an air attack. Efficient units may be able to block and intercept enemy aircraft and shoot some of them down. They may be able to apprehend a number of them at a fairly good distance from the continental mainland, but it should be remembered that planes travel very fast these days, and they can cover great distances in a short space of time. Even when they are discovered on a radar screen or by ground observers there is not much time left for our defensive aircraft and antiaircraft power to get ready to meet the attack. The fact that a certain percentage of attacking planes are likely to get through makes civil defense all the more obvious.

Let me state that, in reverse, that would also be true of any American planes making retaliatory attacks—a certain percentage would undoubtedly get through. That is something we should keep in mind. From some quarters we hear a lot about the strength of the Soviet, its manpower, its large number of trained divisions, its multitude of tanks, its powerful air force. But we do not hear so much talk from these quarters about our own strength once we are girded for battle. I am not contending that we are fully prepared for every eventuality, or that we have achieved all necessary armed strength to meet possible world developments. But we have certain definite assets that should be recognized.

We have the atomic bomb and the striking power to carry it.

We have the greatest Navy in the world.

We have a radar screen to apprehend planes and ships and we are steadily extending its coverage.

We have guided missiles and all the latest developments in military science.

What is more—and this is extremely important—we have great industrial productive capacity—far beyond that of the Soviets.

There are weaknesses in our military setup to be sure, but we are moving to eliminate them. It should be noted that the Soviet also has some glaring weaknesses. It is lacking in many of the things we have—impressive industrial know-how, advanced scientific research and development even though it has harnessed some of the German skills and has made some distinctive contributions of its own.

But I doubt very much that the Soviet is ready or anxious to start a war at this time. It will wage war only when the military, the economic, and the psychological timetables are reached, and that will not be, in my opinion, until they have achieved overwhelming armed strength, and perhaps through further infiltration and consolidation considerably more political support. No matter how unfavorable the world situation appears, we should never abate our sincere and vigorous efforts for peace.

Another question I had intended to discuss if time permitted was the prospect of cutting military appropriations.

Practically everyone is agreed that economy and efficiency in the Federal Government are desirable aims necessary to keep American industry dynamic and progressive, necessary to maintain our high standards of living. It would be impossible to estimate accurately the baneful and dangerous effects of current heavy taxation. To a great extent we have become a tax-ridden people, not only in the Nation but in the States and localities as well. High taxes constitute a great threat to the American free way of life and we should frankly face that fact. Stifled initiative and low living standards caused by heavy taxation could be and will be, if continued long enough, destructive of the business and industrial vigor of the Nation and a severe blow to the national prosperity.

When we are dealing with military expenditures, however, it is very difficult to apply ordinary principles and standards of economy. One thing is paramount—we must have military defense, we must provide for the protection of the country, we must afford our gallant boys in Korea and in every other theater where they are unselfishly serving the Nation every most generous support.

The question is: Are the American people getting their $50 billion worth out of annual military expenditures. Is there waste and extravagance in the military that we can eliminate? Is the taxpayers' money being wasted on some activities? I would not presume to give a categorical answer to these questions, yet it is my opinion that there are unquestionably places in the various branches of our armed services where measures of economy and efficiency may well be effected. But hasty action of curtailment should be scrupulously avoided. Careful surveys and studies should be made to determine where and how these economies can be secured, before actual cutbacks are made.

It is true that, at present, there are huge unexpended balances to the credit of the armed services as well as huge uncommitted balances in some of these accounts. That does not mean, however, that these huge sums will not be spent, or will not be needed, because defense, vital and necessary as it is, is extremely costly and frequently various huge items must be provided over a period of years to meet certain heavy requirements. Naval air carriers may cost a hundred million dollars apiece in the light of current inflated prices before they are constructed and fully equipped, heavy bombers four, five or even six million dollars apiece and so on with practically everything we need by way of equipment and weapons. When one considers our critical needs in the air, one realizes the very heavy costs entailed to provide adequate numbers of these essential units of our great striking force, yet, that is only one illustration of huge, essential defense costs.

Whether unification of the Armed Forces has made for economy and efficiency is decidedly questionable. I am doubtful that unification has measured up to the hopes of its strong advocates. With deepest apprehension those of us particularly interested in the armed services have observed various echelons of administration in the Defense Department building up into what now undoubtedly is the mightiest and perhaps the most unwieldy, as well as the most expensive, bureaucracy that the world has ever known. The problem of unscrambling and disentangling this administrative labyrinth or at least molding it into a compact coordinated efficient overall unit certainly should receive early consideration from the Congress.

Let me refer again to the danger and injudiciousness of cutting vital activities of the armed services without the most careful, painstaking care, reflection and study. Sometime prior to Korea you will recall that the then head of the Department of Defense slashed several billion dollars from authorized expenditures without consulting the Congress. As it turned out, these cuts had to be promptly restored and even greater expenditures authorized to meet the urgent requirements of radically changing world conditions. That very recent experience should serve as a warning against indiscriminate curtailment. I want to see America fully and abundantly prepared to defend herself, prepared to meet commitments, prepared to command respect among all nations, prepared to face every contingency with courage and effectiveness.

While I believe that there are areas in which economies can be effected in the armed services, I am firmly of the opinion that before drastic retrenchment is made there should be careful studies and surveys to insure that, in seeking worthwhile economy, vital and crippling damage is not done to the overall efficiency of our fighting forces. For these reasons I would urge extreme care and caution in instituting and effectuating cutbacks in the armed services at this time.

It would be perhaps superfluous to emphasize to Members of Congress the gravity of our present situation in the world, the gravity of the period through which we are passing, the gravity of the problems facing us today. Regardless of the outcome of Korean peace negotiations, or the Korean war itself, these problems will remain with us for some time to come. If the Soviets are desirous of achieving the peace and will indicate their sincerity of purpose by tangible acts, rather than by mere declarations, then perhaps we can hope for the settlement of these great and pressing problems. Perhaps in that event our leadership can suggest not only a general conference to settle questions still remaining from World War II and other questions that have developed since that time, but also to propose and work for the principles of general and universal disarmament and control of atomic energy predicated upon mutual inspection. We must always remain receptive to any sincere, genuine plea or effort for peace. We must ever be willing to take the initiative where circumstances appear feasible to promote peace based on justice.

Although we are living perhaps in the most dangerous period of our national existence when we are beset not only by external but by internal problems, it is a time particularly for faith, for courage, for firm determination by a united American people—a time for us to recognize the need for building strength, not only strength of arms for our own defense, but strength in our great productive economy and that spiritual, moral strength and fortitude on the part of the American people which has played so great a part in shaping the freedom we enjoy and will be, must be, in this crisis, the redeeming force under God to maintain our heritage.

If we persevere in this strength of purpose, in this strength of the spirit, in this faith in the Almighty and in ourselves, we need not fear the Soviet Union, the worldwide Communist conspiracy, the subversive termites in our midst, or any other enemy, foreign or domestic, because our strength and our high purpose will keep and preserve America as a great free land, and we will hence be best fitted and best inspired to secure just and lasting world peace.

EQUALITY FOR ALL—NOT CONSIDERATION FOR A FEW

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to extend the excess-profits tax for 1 year. I, for one, am taking definite and affirmative action to help the many millions of people in this country who are being betrayed and ignored by the present administration. The Republicans rode into power on their promises of reduced taxes and a balanced budget. The people were fooled and deliberately deceived. Once again we are convinced that the Republican Party never had any intention of helping the poor, or the low-wage earners. Once again, we witness the Republicans, either by failure to act or by positive assistance, giving private industry and the big-money interests and the rich all the consideration and the breaks, while the lot of the little man becomes increasingly more difficult and despairing.

The Republican platform promised both to balance the budget and cut taxes. When the President delivered his state of the Union message, he stressed only a balanced budget—a change of heart had occurred that soon.

The bill to reduce personal income taxes is not permitted to come before us for action, as the President maintains that the budget must be cut before taxes are reduced. The Treasury Department has announced that it is flatly opposed to tax cuts of any kind until the administration has a clearer picture of the budget outlook. It flatly opposes any reduction of excise taxes. It has been charged that this failure by the administration to carry out its pledge as to taxes is unfair, dishonest and getting office under false pretenses.

We find that so far, the Committee on Ways and Means has considered only the individual income-tax reduction measure. It has been stated that this has been the first time in more than 20 years when public hearings were not held at some time or other when a major tax bill was considered; that the committee did not have at least the Treasury Department views on such a bill or that the budget estimates of the administration were not available. And now this tax measure to help all the people is stymied. We do not know when Congress will have the opportunity to act upon it, as the Republican leadership will not allow it to come before us.

No action is being taken to cut or eliminate excise taxes, which include admissions tax, taxes on appliances, necessities such as electric light bulbs, telephone facilities, and other commodities important to the well-being and comfort of the people.

Plenty is being done to help big business, for already they have the assurance that the excess-profits tax law will be allowed to expire on June 30, 1953. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has stated that the excess-profits tax must terminate as scheduled. This will mean a revenue loss of $2 billion per year. This assures still higher profits for those already capitalizing on the war crisis and the defense billions we are spending. Many millions of people who are going without necessities in order to meet high taxes will strongly object if no tax cut is allowed them while corporations are exempt from paying excess-profits taxes on their huge war and defense gains.

I am calling for an extension of the excess-profits tax. I refuse to give relief to big corporations and millionaires when no relief is in sight for the millions of taxpayers who were promised a tax cut.

It did not take the Republican Legislature of New York State long to get the drift of this situation. They put through a 15-percent rent increase recently because they knew that the landlords would be able to keep the profits. Up to now there was no real campaign in New York State to further increase rents, but with the Republicans in power in Washington, they knew they could count on reaping—and keeping—high profits.

A recent appraisal of the Eisenhower administration was that "the most positive thing about it may seem to be its negativism." That is putting it too kindly. This very negativism has served the purpose which, apparently, the Republicans had in mind all along, for it is the very lack of action which is helping the big-business man and allowing the poor one to be further bogged down by an unbearable taxload and increased living prices.

In these critical days we cannot afford the reversals, ineptness, and bungling, which we have suffered for the past 60 days. Constructive action as to tax reduction, expenditures, overall economic planning, and forthright commitments which can be counted on, are our just due. If this country is to survive, we cannot waste any more time or undermine the confidence of the American people. Instead of the indecision and confusion which have been the order of the day, we need courage, fairness to the people, and honesty on the part of the administration.

Tax relief is far off. At the same time, other burdens of our people have become much heavier. On March 17, 1953, the Office of Price Stabilization announced the end of all price controls. Price Chief Joseph Freehill estimates that the ending of controls will mean price increases of about $3 billion this year, $1 billion coming from consumers, $1 billion in defense costs, and $1 billion in higher business and industrial costs. On March 18, 1953, Dun & Bradstreet reported wholesale food prices in the previous week jumped 14 cents, the sharpest rise since the week after the Korean war started in 1950. Coffee prices which have been sky-high right along, are being raised 2 to 4 cents per pound. Bakers are demanding higher prices for bread. Price hikes have been announced on materials used to build homes, farm equipment, essential commodities. Clothing prices will go up. The steel industry is planning to raise many prices in the near future. Inflation is again on the upgrade; the people are faced with higher living costs on every hand.

With all this evidence before it, the administration is resisting more controls than it seeks. It does not even want a standby law to control prices and wages, but would accept a simple 90-day freeze bill if Congress believes it could not pass legislation quickly enough in event of an emergency. This indifference on the part of the administration to the present threat of inflation is unbelievable. It does prove, however, that the attitude is to let the ordinary citizen struggle along as best he can under a staggering load of taxes plus even greater living costs.

Will we never learn? When we found ourselves at war in 1941, prices and wages

soared sky high before the Government could control them. By the time action could be taken, much economic damage had been done and our people were the victims of the profiteers. When the Korea situation arose in 1950, the same thing happened and we witnessed frightening inflation and more undue hardship for the people. Twice in 10 years we have seen the terrible effects of failure to have a necessary controls law ready for use in a war emergency. And we are in a war emergency now. Bernard Baruch told the Senate that we should enact a complete economic-controls law now on a standby basis, for immediate use. He said that failure to do so at once would put a premium on selfishness and that "To wait is to die." Other economists bear him out. The international situation continues critical. The time consumed in preparing, enacting, and implementing legislation is of such duration that we cannot risk the chance the administration would have us take. A strong standby controls law is required.

The administration's attitude as to rent control is equally ruthless. They say that rent control should be extended until September 30, 1953, for those communities still under Federal rent control; that this would give them a chance to pass their own control laws. Only critical defense areas would have the protection of Federal rent control.

Limited controls now affect 14 million Americans in a dozen big cities and 1,400 communities. The housing shortage is still critical. This means that millions of tenants will be victimized by profiteering landlords if the administration's plan goes through. A 5-month extension of Federal rent control is no good—Federal rent control must be extended for at least 2 years. The States have not taken over the responsibility of protecting tenants; few State legislatures have overridden the objections of the real estate interests. They cannot be counted upon for help now. Should the administration plan go through, we know that at its expiration, rents will skyrocket again, and in this instance also, it would take too much time for Congress to act to save the people from gouging and profiteering landlords, and to keep roofs over their heads. According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, rents in decontrolled cities climbed from 17 to 35 percent in the past 2 years, while the boost for low-rent apartments ranged from 29 percent to over 50 percent. What more proof do we need that Federal rent control is necessary?

I have fought for the continuation of price and rent controls. Past history, present indications, and our critical times, prove their necessity. In the light of these serious problems, the stupid attitude of the administration must be overcome, and Congress must act to protect the people. We must be foresighted, not indifferent or careless in these vital matters.

The people are not being helped on the tax question; in addition, they are being injured by the lack of controls which are so necessary to our economy and our security. Their hardships are increasing daily. My aim will be to give them the assistance they must have, to lighten their tax burden, and to see that there is equality for all—not consideration for a few.

DR. M. G. BURNSIDE

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the leaders of the Republican Party made the solemn promise during the campaign that they would always seek the top talent available for the jobs in Washington.

Such a job, Mr. Speaker, was filled until recently by Dr. M. G. "Burnie" Burnside, in the National Security Agency. The work was of a top-secret nature, so much so that Dr. Burnside was under oath never to discuss it with anyone, not even his family. Then, quite suddenly, Dr. Burnside was dismissed.

Why? The Agency informed him in his separation notice his work had been satisfactory. He had been cleared after a thorough check by all the security agencies. The reason, it is now apparent, was politics. Republicans there were greatly disturbed that Dr. Burnside, a former West Virginia Congressman who served two terms, had gotten a job in the new administration. They were hungry for patronage and said so in many news items published in the West Virginia papers. For this reason they wanted Dr. Burnside out of his job, despite the fact he was working in crucial and secret defense work in the National Security Agency.

They got their way—unfortunately. Republican sources—a Republican Congressman, to be exact—announced that Dr. Burnside would be removed from his job many hours before the actual notice was given.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think politics should enter into a secret and technical agency such as the one here. It hurts the agency. It hurts the many thousands who are employed in such jobs. Does this mean all of them are liable to be axed if a few squads of angry Republicans happen to decide to jump on them?

This situation must be remedied, Mr. Chairman. Such a policy can only harm and weaken our Nation.

OFFSHORE OIL AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, now that the offshore oil problem has been settled in the House, a little reflection might be of some benefit to taxpayers throughout the country.

We have an enormous debt due largely to the war and defense problems. The interest on this debt is a burden to the taxpayers. The present administration had promised before the election that it would reduce the taxes and abolish waste in the Government. To the taxpayers the action today should be of paramount concern. The House has voted to give a great source of wealth to four States, taking it from the people of the country—the taxpayers.

As pointed out yesterday by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], the revenue from these oil properties would go a long way toward paying the national debt; and he might also have said it would make it possible to reduce taxes considerably. So we have an administration proposing on the one hand to relieve the taxpayers and at the same time giving away a great source of national revenue.

I hope that the taxpayers in my own State of Pennsylvania realize what was done today. I cannot think of anything recently that will so injure them and the people of this country as does this legislation. Here is a great source of wealth that over the years would be of immense benefit to all of our people, and yet it has fallen under the pressure of certain interests in four States. The taxpayers are again forgotten. The outlook is that we will continue to pay high taxes for many years to come, for the one clear opportunity this administration had to offer relief has been abandoned in the interest of a few.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Monday, April 13, to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN reserved all points of order on the bill.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 195 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of S. 1110, an act to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Armed Services now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the con-

clusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and I now yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the appointment of a Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The bill that will be under consideration after the adoption of this rule is a Senate bill, but the House amendments as reported make certain changes. There are three of them of particular importance.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Section 102 of the National Security Act establishes the Central Intelligence Agency and authorizes the appointment of a Director by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director may be a civilian or a commissioned officer.

There is no existing provision of law establishing a Deputy Director with statutory authority to act for the Director or to perform such functions as the Director may assign to him.

The administrative authority exists for a Deputy Director but there is no statutory basis for it. No certain functions of a Deputy Director are clearly existing in the present law. The proposed law would create the office of Deputy Director and would authorize the President to appoint such Deputy Director by and with the advice and consent of the Senate from among civilians or commissioned officers, similar to the basic law pertaining to the Director himself.

Although Deputy Directors have been appointed under the Executive Pay Act of 1949, there is no provision of law which would permit a commissioned officer or retired officer to be appointed to this position. As a matter of fact, there is a definite prohibition in the basic law which would prohibit any commissioned officer or retired officer from holding any other civilian office. The definitions of the functions of a Deputy Director are such that it would undoubtedly be held to be a civil office.

Up until the appointment of the present Director, Mr. Allen Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has always been a military officer; the Deputy Director has been a civilian since 1950.

The Central Intelligence Agency is most desirous of obtaining this legislation and has gone on record as in favor of the bill as amended by the House committee.

It is the intention of the President to appoint an Air Force lieutenant general to this position as soon as the law is enacted.

The pay of the Director and the Deputy Director is covered by the Executive Pay Act of 1949. The pay of the Deputy Director is fixed at $14,800. The pay of a lieutenant general is $14,900. This bill provides that the Central Intelligence Agency shall reimburse that branch of the military service which may supply a Deputy Director. The Central Intelligence Agency, however, is to make the actual payment. If the pay of the military person so serving shall be less than $14,800, the Central Intelligence Agency is required by this bill to make up the difference. So that if you had a major general serving here at $14,400, the Central Intelligence Agency would make up the $400 difference annually. Since the pay of a lieutenant general is greater than that of the Deputy Director, there is no necessity for additional reimbursement.

The House committee thought there were three points which ought to be covered, and that were not covered in the Senate bill, so that the House committee has provided that the Director and the Deputy Director, if either of them shall be a military person, shall have an additional number in grade if they are military personnel; second, that in both cases the Agency will reimburse the executive department; and, third, at no time can both the Director and Deputy Director be military personnel.

The reason for the additional number in grade is simply this: No service supplying a lieutenant general will benefit in that service from the designation of such person as a Deputy Director, for the simple reason that the bill goes on to provide that the appointee shall have no duty or responsibility to that service while acting as Deputy Director, and shall be free of any direction or control from that service. For that reason the service in this case will have lost during the time of tenure the service of one of its lieutenant generals. The number of lieutenant generals permitted to the Air Force is 19. At the present time, I understand, the Committee on Armed Services is considering the question of the number of high-staff officers, flag officers, and officers there should be in various ranks; and it is, therefore, thought best, as I understand it, pending this review that no service should be penalized by the loss of one of its officers to the Central Intelligence Agency. That is why the Air Force will be permitted to retain 19 lieutenant generals. If, however, this officer should return to the Air Force, the most junior lieutenant general on the list would drop back to major general. So that you are not increasing the number of general officers in the Air Force or in any other service, if someone should be appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I think that basically is pretty much what is done here, as we understand it.

I will be glad to yield to anyone who has any questions, if there are any questions at this time, before I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

If there are no questions, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has given a very authoritative and explicit explanation of the bill. It came to the Committee on Rules with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services, and it was voted out by the Committee on Rules unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1110, with Mr. COLE of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the bill S. 1110 is a relatively simple but extremely important bill. It is necessary because without enactment of this legislation it will be impossible to designate an officer of the armed services as a Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Up until the appointment of Mr. Allan Dulles, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has always been a military man. You will recall Admiral Hillenkoetter and Gen. Walter Bedell Smith as Directors. The deputies, up until the Executive Pay Act of 1949, were also commissioned officers of the Armed Forces. But when the Executive Pay Act of 1949 was passed, the lawyers contend that it created the statutory office of Deputy Director, at least to the extent that no officer of the Armed Forces could be appointed to that position because of other laws which preclude a commissioned officer of the Army and Air Force from being appointed to, or holding, a civilian office.

From 1950, and until recently, the position of Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency has been filled by a civilian.

However, it now appears highly desirable to permit the appointment of a commissioned officer as Deputy Director. It is felt that this Agency, working so closely with the Armed Forces, should have one military man in a high position in the Agency. The collection and dissemination of information dealing with our national security must of necessity involve the Armed Forces. Thus, this bill, as reported by the House Committee on Armed Services, amends the basic law with respect to the Central Intelligence Agency, establishes the statutory office of Deputy Director, and designates the duties, restrictions, privileges, and protection surrounding the office of Deputy Director.

Now there are three things in this bill that you all should know:

First, and in my opinion of paramount importance, the bill as reported by the Committee on Armed Services prevents commissioned officers from occupying the positions of Director and Deputy Director simultaneously. In other words, at no time in the future will it be possible for both the Director and Deputy Director to be commissioned officers. They both may be civilians, but they both may not be officers of the Armed Forces. We think this is sound and that it carries out the traditional concept of civilian control in all phases of our military structure. The bill as it passed the Senate did not contain this prohibition.

Now, the next thing this bill does is to permit the Director or the Deputy Director, if either is a commissioned officer, to be more or less an additional number in grade. That is, if the Director is a commissioned officer, the limit on the number of general officers in the Armed Forces, now contained in Public Law 7, may be exceeded by one so long as this officer occupies the position of Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. The same is true under the proposed legislation if the Deputy Director occupies the position as a commissioned officer.

Now, the Committee on Armed Services is quite aware of this problem of the numbers of high ranking officers on active duty. We are conducting very extensive hearings on this question, so you can be sure that it was given careful consideration. We came to the conclusion that it is not only desirable but also necessary to permit an officer, occupying the office of Director or Deputy Director, to be an additional number in grade.

It must be remembered that if an officer of the Armed Forces possesses the peculiar talent required for the type of work involved in the Central Intelligence Agency, that the President should feel free to designate such an officer to the position of Director or Deputy Director without having to penalize the service from which he takes this officer. It so happens that the President desires to appoint an Air Force lieutenant general to the position of Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. This officer is now occupying a very important position as Director of the Joint Staff under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As a lieutenant general he now counts as 1 of the 19 lieutenant generals which the Air Force is permitted to have on active duty. But when he becomes Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency it would hardly be fair to prohibit the Air Force from promoting a major general to fill the vacancy created by having a lieutenant general become Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. After all, this man, whoever he may be, now or in the future, is occupying a position of importance to the Nation as a whole and not to any single service.

Now the bill, as it passed the Senate, did not contain language which would have permitted the Director, if a commissioned officer, to be "in addition to the number and percentages otherwise authorized and appropriated for the armed service of which he is a member." Had the bill been allowed to pass in this manner, we would be in the inconsistent position of saying that if a commissioned officer were appointed as Director, he would be charged against the grade limitations for the service which supplied the Director, but not so if the commissioned officer were appointed Deputy Director. We removed that inconsistency by saying that either the Director or Deputy Director if a commissioned officer could be an additional number in grade. Bear in mind, however, that at no time can both the Director and Deputy Director be commissioned officers.

There is another part of this bill which should be carefully explained. Under existing law the Director, if a commissioned officer, is paid by the service of which he is a member. The Central Intelligence Agency does not reimburse the military department. But the bill, as it passed the Senate, provided that the Deputy Director, though paid by the service of which he is a member, would be reimbursed by the Central Intelligence Agency. Here again an inconsistency would have been created had we enacted into law the bill as it passed the Senate. So we removed that inconsistency by saying that in the event the Director or Deputy Director is a commissioned officer, the military department which supplies the Director or Deputy Director would be reimbursed by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Now, one final point: the salaries of the Director and Deputy Director. You will note that the bill, as amended by our committee, repeals the language dealing with the salary of the Director. This provision of the National Security Act is, of course, out of date. The salary was established in 1947 at $14,000 per year, but the Executive Pay Act of 1949 in section 2 establishes the salary of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency at $16,000 per year. That same act, in section 6 (a), established the salary of $14,800 per year for the office of Deputy Director. It was that act which brought about the necessity for this legislation because that created the statutory office of Deputy Director, at least in the minds of the lawyers.

Now, the law with respect to the Directors says that an officer of the Armed Forces occupying the position of Director shall receive the full pay and allowances of his grade and, in addition, shall receive the difference between the pay of the statutory office and his full pay and allowances. The legislation before the House today does the same thing for the Deputy Director. Here is what that means:

Let us take a major general.

Supposing a major general of the Army is appointed Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. His pay, if he is married and not occupying Government quarters, amounts to $14,483.44 per year. As Director he would be entitled to a total compensation of $16,000. This means that he would continue to draw $14,483.44 from the service of which he is a member, and, in addition, would receive $1,516.56 per year from the Central Intelligence Agency. Now, if he were a Deputy Director he would continue to draw $14,483.44 per year from the service of which he is a member, and since the salary of the Deputy Director is set at $14,800, he would also draw $316.56 per year from the Central Intelligence Agency.

Now, the lieutenant general who will occupy the position of Deputy Director, if this bill is enacted into law, will not draw any pay from the Central Intelligence Agency because his pay and allowances from the Air Force amount to $14,983.44 per year, which is $183.44 more than the salary established for the office of Deputy Director.

That is the bill in a nutshell. I might say that Mr. Dulles, for whom we all have the highest regard, is most anxious to have this legislation because the Central Intelligence Agency is functioning right now without a Deputy Director. While Mr. Dulles is admirably qualified for the important position he holds, he cannot do the job alone. He has been working 18 hours a day and we must give help immediately.

I want you to notice in particular that we have surrounded the office of Director and Deputy Director with many provisions designed to free a military officer, if he is the Director or Deputy Director, from supervision or control from the higher echelons, and from responsibility for, or direction of, lower echelons, in the Military Establishment. In other words, we protect the officer's rights and privileges but we are also careful to make sure that he is under no one's control except the President, the National Security Council, and the Director.

Let me say in closing that I would be less than frank if I did not state that in the past our military intelligence, in my opinion, has been the weakest link in our chain of national defense. There might be several good reasons for that. One is we are not an old nation steeped in political machinations and religious intrigues with their bitter rivalries and petty jealousies that have existed between countries of the Old World, nor have we as a people been so suspicious perhaps of the motives of other nations or people.

Another reason is that Congress has not devoted the study nor voted the funds for this Agency that it so richly deserves. It has been an orphan child and we need to exercise greater supervision, care, and support over its welfare.

To be perfectly frank, we are comparatively an infant country, and this is more or less a pioneer field for us. We must honestly confess that in the wars gone by other great powers, such as Russia, Germany, and Britain, possessed a superior intelligence to our own, but I am happy to report to the Members of this House, in which I think all members of our armed services will agree, that we have made tremendous strides and progress in two world wars and in the present conflict in Korea. Much advance has been made under Admiral Hillenkoetter, under Gen. Bedell Smith; certainly a great job was done by "Wild Bill" Donovan in World War II in OSS; and I might, without revealing any secrets, say that he is being consulted by the present able Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and I predict with

the passage of this legislation we will go a long way to strengthen our psychological warfare and strategy, but most important of all, to strengthen that department of defense in which we have been weakest in the past.

There is, Mr. Chairman, no more important and no more sensitive agency in Government today than the Central Intelligence Agency. The positions of Director and Deputy Director should be occupied by the best-qualified men in the United States. This legislation will permit the Central Intelligence Agency to have a Deputy Director in which the Director and the President have the highest confidence. I hope it will be passed unanimously by the House, as it was unanimously reported by the House Armed Services Committee after thorough consideration, and which was approved unanimously by your Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am happy to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. To me, one of the important provisions in the bill is to be found on page 4. I should like to read it for the purpose of getting it in the RECORD:

> He shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof.

I want to compliment the gentleman upon that provision in this bill, and I should like to say further that I hope it operates more effectively than did a similar provision in the Unification Act which supposedly protected Admiral Denfeld's right to come before the House Armed Services Committee of his own volition and testify. We all know what happened to Admiral Denfeld in that case. I hope this provision works more effectively in the protection of this Director and the Deputy Director.

Mr. SHORT. I am very much in sympathy with the views expressed by the gentleman from Iowa, and know that he has always fought to keep the military under civilian control. I appreciate the statement that he has just made.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I am happy to yield to my very able colleague from New York, who really is more responsible, I think, for the revised House version of this legislation than any other member of our committee. He is an outstanding lawyer, and we wrote the bill, I think, to carry out the intentions or the views that the gentleman from New York had in mind.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman is very generous, as usual, with his references and his remarks. But since he has indicated a part which I played in the proposal now before the House, I should like to make certain that there is no misinterpretation placed upon a certain portion of this bill. I direct your attention to the paragraph on page 5, beginning at line 5, with reference to the pay which an individual receives in serving as either a Director or Deputy Director, if that individual is a military man. The bill says that he is entitled to receive, reading from line 15, "the military pay and allowances—active or retired, as the case may be, including personal money allowances."

My question is whether the reference to personal money allowance is an allowance in addition to military pay and allowance which the individual would receive.

Mr. SHORT. Only the personal allowance for the particular rank or grade that he is occupying at the time.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the point. Is it a personal money allowance that goes to the individual because of the rank or grade he holds?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Rather than the billet he holds?

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. So that at no time is it intended by the committee or can it be construed in the future that an individual who may at the time, prior to his appointment, fill a billet which carries a personal money request because of the billet, automatically be entitled to that?

Mr. SHORT. He would not be entitled to that, and I am glad the gentleman from New York is getting that in the RECORD to make the intent perfectly clear. For example, we voted, as I recall, $5,000 expense allowance to a military officer, if appointed to the United Nations. If in the future, at some near or distant time, that member of the United Nations were called down to act as Director or Deputy Director of the Central Inteligence Agency, he would not be entitled to draw that $5,000.

Mr. COLE of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, as has already been said, this bill came out of the House Committee on Armed Services with no opposition. We are all in accord with one single purpose, to strengthen the Central Intelligence Agency. We wanted to do everything possible to give it the standing, authority, and efficiency which the people of the United States have a right to expect of this most important agency.

Because of the fact there is no fight on this bill or any portion of it at the present time normally I would not even raise my voice here and take the further time of this body in discussing the bill. It has been ably presented by my colleague, the chairman of our committee, who has developed a number of points. But I think it is so important to the safety of the United States that we have a good central intelligence that I want to emphasize one point, and this one point is the sole, actuating purpose of the membership of our committee in making these changes and reporting this measure to the House of Representatives.

The Central Intelligence is not an organization that can ballyhoo its exploits or its achievement; but when failures occur, somehow or other without great publicity we learn there has been a failure on the part of Central Intelligence to accumulate the proper information. In no phase of government is knowledge so important; in no phase of government is knowledge power to the extent it is with the Central Intelligence. By the proper handling of its affairs, by having the proper knowledge of what is going on in the world, this agency can help us win wars, of course; but I think even more than that, by proper handling of its affairs, proper efficiency, and proper activity, the Central Intelligence Agency can keep this Nation out of major wars and out of major differences and out of major disagreements with other nations, and keep us well along the road of peace which is the path our people are so anxious to pursue. So I was glad that it became my humble part to participate in helping to draft this measure.

There is one feature that I want to discuss very briefly. In this measure, S. 1110, as amended, we provide in section 102:

> That at no time shall the two positions of the Director and Deputy Director be occupied simultaneously by commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status.

I should like to have the record show that this stipulation does not preclude a reserve officer from being used in either one of these capacities and being classified as a civilian. We refer in this paragraph to an officer, whether on active or retired status, but we do not say that this includes the reserve officer. We have so many reserve officers and so many reserves in the Military Establishment, and we are building up the reserves to such a point, that it is well that the record show that a reserve officer may be called from a civilian activity and not be chargeable in the filling of this position "as an active or retired officer" in the Military Establishment.

I think in working this out we give elasticity to the filling of these positions, and it is proper that we do. We have had good men in charge of this agency in the past. In each instance to date we have had only military men in charge. Now we have a civilian in charge of the Agency.

This is a relatively new agency. I have heard a lot of condemnation of the failure of our intelligence to properly function. I do not think we should be too severe on this agency, and I have said so before. It is a relatively new agency. It was established, I think, in 1947. The Congress must give it the support which we should give an important agency if it is to function to the top degree. I think it is coming along fine. I was glad to hear our chairman extend words of praise for the progress the organization has made. We certainly want to help to produce greater efficiency in the Central Intelligence Agency in the future than we have had in the past.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I want to inquire about the number of civilians in the Agency compared to the military, if that is permissible, because complaints have come to me.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We cannot go into that for the reason that this is such a highly classified proposition that even when something happens, as

we saw yesterday in the paper, concerning the death of someone who was with the Central Intelligence Agency, you cannot safely go into it publicly and disclose what position the man might have had. If we do that, you would be giving information to an enemy who has his agents unfortunately all around us here, and who will use the information thus innocently given for the purpose of hurting our Government and our people.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know that to be true and I do not want to get into a field that should not be disclosed, but I must say that I have had a number of complaints from top civilians who have been let out of the Central Intelligence Agency so that someone in the officer class could replace them. I am wondering if that argues to the benefit of the CIA, or should we keep some of these top civilians in these places, and not turn them over entirely to the military.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It is difficult to get into an investigation, as the gentleman knows. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to advise the gentleman from Louisiana that there is evidence of action, which the gentleman from Nebraska was talking about, in the case of the national security agency, and it is my purpose in the 30-minute special order that I have following the conclusion of the regular business today, to lay some of those facts bare.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to say to the gentleman that I will listen with much interest to his remarks, as I always do. I give him credit for being a student and an exponent of our public education system of the United States, and I am going to listen to his remarks.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think when the story of the Inchon invasion is told in all of its aspects, the Central Intelligence Agency will come in for great credit. As everyone knows, it was a hazardous plan, brilliantly executed, and if Colonel Quinn is ever allowed to discuss the part that the Central Intelligence Agency played in planning that significant invasion, I think all our worries about its efficiency on that score will vanish.

One other observation, if I may. I hope that the staff colleges in the Armed Forces will make it plain to the future commanders of our corps and Army units that this organization can be of great help to them. In staff colleges, I think, just as we have become oriented with G–5 in military government, we should hammer home the vital role that the Central Intelligence Agency has in aiding of the front-line soldier as well as the folks back home. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I presume the committee, in its wisdom, has seen the merit of placing a civilian as top agency head, recognizing perhaps that if it was to be all military, there might be a tendency for this branch of the service to get into avenues which should be strictly civilian. I have not heard an explanation of why it has been designated that a civilian should head up the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This bill follows the practice of the preceding period in that respect. They always had authority to use a civilian. Heretofore, they have used military men. At the present time we have a civilian. I hope the time will come, and that it will not be too far distant, when the Central Intelligence Agency will be looked upon and respected as we respect the FBI for a good job well done. I will say this: When the Deputy Director, who I understand is now being held in mind, is put into this position—by the way, he is an able air officer—I think he will add much to the efficiency and high standard of this agency and will receive the gentleman's approval when he gets there.

Mr. SHORT. If I might interpolate at that point, I would like to say to our friend, the gentleman from Nebraska, that heretofore both the director and the deputy director have been military men.

Under the bill as passed and sent over to us from the Senate they both could still be military men; but under the House bill which is substituted for the Senate bill we make it possible for both the Director and Deputy Director to be civilians, but at no time can there be two military men in peace or in war; one must be a civilian, because we want to keep civilian control.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with that; I am heartily in favor of the bill, but I think many people in America have a dread that the military, as in some other countries, may unless we take some steps to curb the things that have been going on in the past, control the civilians to an extent which is not good for a republic such as our country.

Mr. SHORT. Knowing me as the gentleman from Nebraska does, he knows how I feel on that score.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 15 minutes to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am enthusiastically for this bill. The committee, in my opinion, has done a very constructive piece of work in the amendments to the bill as it passed the Senate, which I think strengthens the situation and strengthens the higher echelon of the CIA, and that means strengthening the entire organization. I had something to do with drafting the law establishing this agency, and I am very glad to see this bill amending it, because as I have said I think it is a strengthening influence.

I think we can all agree that the men who have headed the CIA in the past are outstanding men. Both have been referred to by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services. I think we can also all agree that the present head of the CIA, Mr. Dulles, is probably one of the ablest men of today. While I do not know him personally, I have met him a few times and he is a man who has impressed me very favorably. He impresses me as a man of vision, a man of great ability, a man of courage, and he impressed me especially as a man of commonsense, something that is of vital importance in connection with any position, but particularly a position of responsibility. I know that the President and Mr. Dulles, Chief of CIA, are very anxious that this bill pass before the Easter recess in order that they can get their organization established. In view of this, I want to congratulate the committee not only for the amendments but also on bringing the bill up for consideration before Easter, enabling the other body if in its wisdom it does so, to concur in the House amendments and send the bill to the President for his signature, and then for the President to send his nominations to the Senate.

There are a few observations I should like to make which relate to the general subject and on important matters which are current today in the minds of the people of the world.

Recently Mr. Stalin, the head of the Soviet Union died, and we see the fight for power which is going on in the Soviet Union. There is no doubt in my mind but what there is a fight going on in the Soviet Union between three individuals, and probably it will result in the supremacy of one of two, either Malenkov or Beria, a struggle for control.

After the death of Stalin we see various suggestions made, such as the release of 10 prisoners the British requested many months ago, the release of 4 or 5 Americans requested by our country by the Chinese Communist Government, then the offer for the exchange of wounded prisoners, and then the possible opening up of the exchange of other prisoners; then we read about the amnesty granted by Malenkov to certain persons in jail in the Soviet Union for things that would not be crimes in the United States or any other free country. The latter is probably a smokescreen for purges in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain.

I view all of these things with caution; I do not think our people should build up too great hopes as a result of these operations. It seems to me that so far as the exchange of wounded prisoners is concerned, that that can be arrived at very quickly; certainly the exchange of other prisoners which has been intimated should not take a long time. Expressing my own opinion, it seems to me there should not be any prolonged negotions in respect to these two subjects by our Government; either they are going to be done or they are not going to be done, and that should not take a long time. I will agree that it is right for our Government to explore any possibility. One of the main purposes of diplomacy, as I understand, is where differences exist between two or more countries to try to narrow down the area of differences as much as possible. So anything that will reduce the area of difference is a proper thing for our Government to look into and to explore and to enter into; and if there is a chance of the area being reduced, to make the necessary efforts. It does seem to me in these two fields, particularly in the field of ex-

change of wounded prisoners, that that can be done very quickly, and if the Soviet Union is making its offer in good faith, they will promptly and immediately enter into satisfactory arrangements in relation to that matter, and if they are sincere in relation to the broader subject of exchange of prisoners, with the long months of negotiations that have already taken place it should not take very long for that issue to be settled.

I agree with what has been released in relation to agreements with the French Government that the settlement of the South Korea situation is not the only thing that concerns us, that Indo-China and other countries, not only in the Far East, in the Middle East and the Near East, but throughout the world, are involved because this is a global situation.

If the leaders of the Soviet Union are sincere, they can arrive at a solution, and we can create a situation that is compatible where the countries of the free world and the countries of the Communist world can live at least in a compatible relationship with one another; but we cannot do so as long as the Communists adhere to the dialectic or doctrinaire aspects of communism.

I did not intend to make these remarks, but I think this is an appropriate time to make this statement and to caution my colleagues and the people of the country not to build up too great hope. Our Government should explore but we should be cautious and in a sense approach them with a feeling of skepticism. We should remember that the leadership of the Communist Party and the ideology known as international communism employs any means to obtain its end.

One of these is expediency. If it is expedient for them to enter into a relationship with other countries that seems to take the road of peace or to open up the hope of that road being traveled, they will do so. Then when they have consolidated themselves, or when the period of expediency has expired, they will veer off the road of peace and take another road. We have to realize that materialistic or atheistic communism has no accountability. The leaders follow the policy of might is right. There is only one thing they recognize and that is power.

I think we should proceed with caution, I think we should view these happenings with extreme reservations. When I see the leaders of the Soviet Union permit priests, ministers and rabbis enter the Soviet Union and its satellites and perform their duty as ambassadors of God to those who are members of their creed, then I will see some sign on the part of the Communist leaders of a primary nature, of a real departure from dialectic or doctrinary communism. That might lead to some real hope.

The thing we should do, as I see it, is to explore but not to weaken ourselves, not to let our hopes influence us to such an extent that we feel we can weaken America. This is the time to explore all opportunities, but to be skeptical and, above all, we should maintain our strength because the only thing that the Communists respect is what they fear. The only thing that the Communists fear is power greater than they possess.

So, in conclusion, I want to congratulate the committee for reporting out this bill, the passage of which, in my opinion, will strengthen the ability of the CIA to serve our country and thereby enable that valuable agency to make greater contributions to the strength and the preservation of America and to future peace.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I must take a few seconds to thank the minority whip, the former majority leader, for three things he stated.

First, I appreciate very much his kind references to the House Committee on the Armed Services that has acted expeditiously on this important piece of legislation. I admit without debate and confess with pride that we have a great committee. But without the sympathetic understanding of Members of the House and their admirable cooperation we could accomplish little.

Second, I share with him the high confidence in and great respect for Mr. Allan Dulles, whom I predict will do much to build up, strengthen, and improve this vital agency.

Third, I wish to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for the solemn warning that he has issued to this House and to the American people today. Let us hope for the best and prepare for the worst. Let us speak softly but carry a big stick; continue to trust God but keep our powder dry, because when it has been announced by great leaders of the Soviet Union that they will resort to trickery, artifice, and every other device of deception in order to achieve their aim or goal, believing that the end justifies any means, certainly we should move with the greatest caution and with a remarkable degree of skepticism. They do understand force, they respect strength, and they have only contempt for weakness; and, regardless of the outcome of these truce talks or proposed truce talks, let us remember for years to come that America must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. Let us not let down our guard, relax our efforts, but ever be alert and awake to the dangers, not only from without but from within our own country. I appreciate the remarks that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN].

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, it seems appropriate in discussing S. 1110, a bill authorizing the appointment of a deputy director of the Central Intelligance Agency, that I bring to the attention of the Armed Services Committee and the Congress a situation which in my opinion needs to be examined.

In the committee hearings on the bill under discussion, it was pointed out that the Armed Services Committee should hold an executive session and explore the progress that the Central Intelligence Agency has made since its creation under the National Security Act of 1947. Insofar as the Congress was father of this particular agency, it was pointed out to the committee that Congress should look into its operation to see whether or not it is doing the job for which it was intended. From some experiences which I will relate to you, I concur heartily in this stand.

As a member of the Select Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre in the 82d Congress, we held hearings wherein we questioned former members of G–2 Army Intelligence in an effort to locate the missing Van Vliet report on the Katyn Massacre. During this testimony we naturally sought to find out if there were any pro-Russian or Communist influences in the Intelligence Agency and to ascertain whether or not such influences could have been responsible for the disappearance of the Van Vliet report.

From the testimony, there is no question that during World War II there was in G–2 a very distinct pro-Russian influence. In fact, General Bissell, as a matter of policy, sought to have pro-Russian people in G–2 for the purpose of obtaining both sides to all questions. It was further brought out in the testimony that some of the people formerly in G–2 believed that these pro-Russians or Russian sympathizers entered the employ of the Central Intelligence Agency when that Agency was created in 1947. If that is the case, have these pro-Russians been weeded out from the CIA, or are they still there?

Last year, in Germany, our investigator for the Katyn Committee and one of the members of the committee sought to take depositions of witnesses with reference to the Katyn Forest massacre. They wanted to get a voice recording of their testimony. Unfortunately, the facilities were not available and the investigator appealed to the German authorities, specifically, to a gentleman who was the equivalent to the head of our FBI. However, the Germans did not have the facilities for so recording the testimony, whereupon our investigator suggested that they call upon our CIA branch in Germany, to ascertain whether they had the necessary equipment. To this the men connected with the German investigative agency objected in no uncertain terms and stated to our investigator that he should not bother with these CIA men because the CIA was infiltrated by Communists.

There have been, during the past several years, quite a number of incidents mentioned in the newspapers that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] mentioned yesterday, to the effect that former members of our intelligence corps have been apprehended in "leaking" or stealing secret documents. Whether these men were members of Army Intelligence or of the Central Intelligence Agency is not very clear as the newspaper reports are not very specific.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I did not mean to infer that there was anything wrong at all. I merely used that as an illustration of the fact that it was difficult to explore causes and reasons and backgrounds and employment with the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I realize that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I did not mean to indicate there was something wrong. I do not know.

Mr. SHEEHAN. I point out that in the newspaper reports there occasionally are stories that documents are stolen or misplaced. As you read the newspapers you have difficulty in know whether the persons involved are from the Central Intelligence Agency or Army Intelligence. It is rather obscure.

It would seem to me that a duty evolves upon the members of the Armed Services Committee to check and find out whether or not the Central Intelligence Agency has taken all possible precautions against subversion from within.

During the course of this check, the Armed Services Committee should take into account the adequacy of the CIA as it is presently operating. You do not have to take my word for it, but you can take the comment of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, who, in an address at Washington University, in St. Louis, June 6, 1950, according to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, said:

We are arming against one foe—Russia. Our Central Intelligence Agency should be sufficiently accurate and informative to tell us what we require. Let's not have guesses—let's get the facts. I have some reservations regarding this Agency.

Time does not permit me to give more facts and figures, but I feel, from the standpoint of our national interest, that the Congress, which set up the Central Intelligence Agency, should explore the progress that it has made to date.

In my estimation, one of the most important things for the Congress to find out is whether the Central Intelligence Agency is serving its purposes as chief intelligence department of the Government, or is serving merely as an arm of the executive branch to carry out its orders. If you gentlemen will refer to the testimony before the Katyn Committee of Gen. Clayton Bissell, who was head of G–2 Army Intelligence during 1945, you will find that he is one of the few men who were shown the actual Yalta Agreement. He stated to the committee that his interpretation of the Yalta Agreement was that it disposed of Poland completely and stated what the United States was going to do. General Bissell went on to say that—

Now, that is the policy of the United States enunciated by the President in wartime, the Commander in Chief, and that is an order to me.

I am shown it when it is secret to everybody but a very small handful, and I am supposed to have sense enough to know that, when the President signs something in wartime as the Commander in Chief, that is it.

Now, I am not asked for any views. I am not asked for my comments.

The purpose was to get Russia to fight and help us in the Japanese war instead of letting us exhaust ourselves and then having them turn on us.

Thereupon General Bissell was asked if the action he took was done in order to implement the foreign policy of the people above him and he stated:

I was doing this because it had on it the signature of the Commander in Chief. I wasn't doing it because he was the President and a politician. I was doing it because he was the Commander in Chief under our Constitution, and I am working for him under oath to do everything I can to further his policies.

If you gentlemen will remember, this same Agency during the next few months advised the President to do everything he could to bring Russia into the war because they estimated that Japan would fight on for another 18 months. As history has revealed, Japan had been negotiating with Russia 6 months prior to this time for peace and wanted to get out of the war, yet, our exalted Intelligence Agency was completely wrong and was giving the President poor advice.

It would seem to me that the suggestion to the committee is very well taken and some sort of an official review should be made of the Central Intelligence Agency to see that they are working efficiently and that they have sufficient security safeguards for keeping Communists and anti-Americans out of the Agency.

Time does not permit me to here point out the unorthodox intelligence policy of appointing men in the intelligence agencies who have very little experience. At some other time I hope to detail how the Army shifts men into intelligence work who have very little background in the intelligence field but are so placed more or less as a tour of duty. Certainly this is a practice which is unbusinesslike and unintelligent. Only people who have the background and experience to correctly evaluate information should be placed in intelligence work, and assignments in that field should not be merely on the basis of a tour of duty.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy that the gentleman is making the statement that he is making today. We have heard these criticisms and certain charges and no doubt some of them are true. As the chairman tried to make plain in his original statement, this is certainly not a perfect organization. It has been weak in the past. But let me assure my friend from Illinois that although the Committee on Armed Services is not holding public hearings on these matters, that does not mean we are not keeping in close contact with what is going on. We are being more fully informed now than we have been during any other time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the minority whip.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my purpose was not to inject myself into the question here except to call to the attention of my friends that the Committee on Government Operations, of course, is very jealous of its jurisdiction, and we have a chairman who is very jealous. I just want to have the chairman know that when I am on the floor I express myself in defense of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the committee amendment as an original bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 102. (a) There is hereby established under the National Security Council a Central Intelligence Agency with a Director of Central Intelligence who shall be the head thereof, and with a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence who shall act for, and exercise the powers of, the Director during his absence or disability. The Director and the Deputy Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status, or from among individuals in civilian life: *Provided, however,* That at no time shall the two positions of the Director and Deputy Director be occupied simultaneously by commissioned officers of the armed services, whether in an active or retired status.

"'(b) (1) If a commissioned officer of the armed services is appointed as Director, or Deputy Director, then—

"'(A) in the performance of his duties as Director, or Deputy Director, he shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were a civilian in no way connected with the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, or the armed services or any component thereof; and

"'(B) he shall not possess or exercise any supervision, control, powers, or functions (other than such as he possesses, or is authorized or directed to exercise, as Director or Deputy Director) with respect to the armed services or any component thereof, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, or any branch, bureau, unit, or division thereof, or with respect to any of the personnel (military or civilian) of any of the foregoing.

"'(2) Except as provided in paragraph (1), the appointment to the office of Director, or Deputy Director, of a commissioned officer of the armed services, and his acceptance of and service in such office, shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the armed services, or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade. Any such commissioned officer shall, while serving in the office of Director, or Deputy Director, continue to hold rank and grade not lower than that in which serving at the time of his appointment and to receive the military pay and allowances (active or retired, as the case may be, including personal money allowance) payable to a commissioned officer of his grade and length of service for which the appropriate department shall be reimbursed from any funds available to defray the expenses of the Central Intelligence Agency. He also shall be paid by the Central Intelligence Agency from such funds an annual compensation at a rate equal to the amount by which the compensation established for such position exceeds the amount of his annual military pay and allowances.

"'(3) The rank or grade of any such commissioned officer shall, during the period in which such commissioned officer occupies the office of Director of Central Intelligence, or Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, be in addition to the numbers and percentages otherwise authorized and appropriated for the armed service of which he is a member'."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to the committee amendment?

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1110) to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence Agency pursuant to House Resolution 195, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House from April 3, 1953, to April 13, 1953.

THE LATE DANIEL JEFF SLEP

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED REVISION OF McCARRAN IMMIGRATION ACT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been felt by many people since its enactment that the McCarran Immigration Act was unfair, unjust, and discriminatory to prospective immigrants from southern Europe and Middle East countries. Personally, I have long questioned the justice and equity of the national origins clause of our basic immigration laws because I have believed that under the operation of this clause and the laws and regulations by which it is enforced, that Italy, Greece, Armenia, Lebanon, Turkey, as well as Poland and Lithuania were not accorded proper quotas. The operation of these laws has been harsh in its effect on many splendid American citizens whose origin is in southern European and near eastern countries. These citizens are having considerable difficulty in assisting very close relatives to join them in the United States.

Overall world quotas, that is to say all quota numbers authorized by existing law, amount to about 155,000 persons. Of these about 126,000 are allocated to northern and western European countries, leaving only about 29,000 to be distributed to Italy, Greece, Poland, Lithuania, Syria, Armenia, Lebanon, Israel, and, in fact, the remaining countries of the world. Some of these nations are behind the Iron Curtain and their citizens at home cannot now use their quotas though escapees continue to swell the quota waiting lists and use some of these quota numbers.

I wish to emphasize that of the 126,000 quota numbers available for the most part to northern and western European countries, little more than half these numbers authorized by existing law have been used in recent years. Last year only about 66,000 quota numbers were used by this area. In fact, official State Department figures show that there were 59,881 unused quota numbers from these countries last year.

When the McCarran bill was pending in the House efforts, in which I joined, were made to permit these unused quota numbers to be allocated to southern European and remaining countries. However, this amendment was not carried.

Since the evidence discloses that very many splendid and patriotic American citizens of Italian, Greek, Polish, Jewish, Lithuanian, Armenian, Syrian, Lebanese, and other descents, anxious to be united with their loved ones overseas, are interested in securing appropriate changes in existing law that would liberalize current restrictions and permit some of their relatives to come to the United States and since I am convinced that their pleas and claims are just and in the interest of many loyal American citizens as well as the Nation itself, I am preparing an amendment to our immigration laws which would, if enacted, allow the unused quotas of all countries to be allocated on an equitable proportional basis to other countries with oversubscribed quota waiting lists.

While I realize that this measure would drastically revise the operation of the national origins clause, it is my conviction that it would work substantial justice to many thousands of worthy American citizens whose close relatives are now caught in the web of current discriminatory quotas and would have otherwise to wait for many years before getting an opportunity to join their loved ones in the United States, if indeed they could ever come to this country.

Let me make it clear that this measure does not in any way increase the present overall quota totals but merely equitably redistributes the unused quotas so that substantial justice can be done to a large number of fine American citizens and their relatives. Each year, thousands of quota numbers are lost through the lack of applicants in certain countries and it is this unused portion which my bill seeks to reallocate to other countries the following year when new quota numbers become available.

In my opinion, this legislation is not unfair to any of the other countries not now using their full quotas, because it contains a provision enabling such countries to regain their quotas, now irretrievably lost under the present law if not used during the quota year, whenever experience for 1 year shows that they are desirous of using them in full. Present prospects are that these countries will not use their quotas in the foreseeable future and this plan would thus deal more equitably with all nations.

Should the occasion ever arise, however, and this appears quite remote at present, those countries benefiting from the unused quota system I propose would repay, whenever necessary over a 5-year period, the countries from which additional quota numbers have been received.

As part of my remarks, I desire to include the following chart, showing the quota totals for all countries. Shown are the new quotas made available by the McCarran Act and the old totals established by law previous to the enactment of this act. Also illustrated are the numbers of quotas actually used and unused, as of the last fiscal year.

The material follows:

Immigration quota chart

	New quota	Old quota	Used [1]	Unused
NORTHERN AND WESTERN EUROPE				
Belgium	1,297	1,304	1,288	116
Denmark	1,175	1,181	All	None
France	3,069	3,086	All	None
Germany	25,814	25,957	All	None
Great Britain	65,361	65,721	21,873	43,848
Ireland (Free State)	17,756	17,853	4,035	13,818
Luxembourg	100	100	94	6
Netherlands	3,136	3,153	All	None
Norway	2,364	2,377	All	None
Sweden	3,295	3,314	1,431	1,883
Switzerland	1,698	1,707	1,497	210
Total	125,065	125,753	65,872	59,881
OTHER COUNTRIES				
Afghanistan	100	100	5	95
Albania	100	100	100	None
Andorra	100	100	None	100
Arabian Peninsula	100	100	91	9
Australia	100	100	100	None
Austria	1,405	1,413	1,413	None
Bhutan	100	100	None	100
Bulgaria	100	100	100	None
Burma [2]	100	None	None	None
Cambodia [2]	100	None	None	None
Cameroon (British)	100	100	None	100
Cameroon (French)	100	100	1	99
Ceylon [2]	100	None	None	None

[1] These figures do not represent actual new admissions into the United States. Many of these quota numbers were made available to persons already in this country whose immigration status was adjusted by the Congress through private or omnibus immigration bills.

[2] New countries brought under the quota system by the McCarran Act. Statistics on the quota use will not be available for some time.

Immigration quota chart—Continued

	New quota	Old quota	Used	Unused
OTHER COUNTRIES—Continued				
China (white)	100	100	100	None
Chinese	105	105	105	None
Czechoslovakia	2,850	2,874	2,874	None
Danzig	100	100	100	None
Egypt	100	100	100	None
Estonia	115	116	116	None
Ethiopia	100	100	4	96
Finland	566	569	569	None
Greece	308	310	310	None
Hungary	865	869	869	None
Iceland	100	100	95	5
India	100	100	100	None
Indonesia [1]	100	None	None	None
Iran	100	100	100	None
Iraq	100	100	100	None
Israel	100	100	100	None
Italy	5,645	5,677	5,677	None
Japan	185	100	92	8
Jordan	100	100	87	13
Korea [1]	100	None	None	None
Laos [1]	100	None	None	None
Latvia	235	236	236	None
Lebanon	100	100	100	None
Liberia	100	100	14	86
Libya [1]	100	None	None	None
Liechtenstein	100	100	3	97
Lithuania	384	386	386	None
Monaco	100	100	8	92
Morocco	100	100	78	22
Muscat	100	100	None	100
Nauru	100	100	None	100
Nepal	100	100	None	100
New Guinea	100	100	None	100
New Zealand	100	100	100	None
Palestine	100	100	100	None
Pacific Islands [1]	100	None	None	None
Pakistan [1]	100	None	None	None
Philippines	100	100	100	None
Poland	6,488	6,524	6,524	None
Portugal	438	440	440	None
Ruanda Urundi	100	100	None	100
Rumania	289	291	291	None
Samoa	100	100	1	99
San Marino	100	100	100	None
Saudi Arabia	100	100	1	99
Somaliland [1]	100	None	None	None
South West Africa	100	100	None	100
Spain	250	252	252	None
Syria	100	100	100	None
Tanganyika	100	100	None	100
Thailand	100	100	2	98
Togoland:				
British	100	100	None	100
French	100	100	None	100
Trieste	100	100	100	None
Turkey	225	226	226	None
U. S. S. R.	2,697	2,798	2,798	None
Union of South Africa	100	100	100	None
Vietnam [1]	100	None	None	None
Yap	100	100	3	97
Yemen [1]	100	None	None	None
Yugoslavia	933	938	938	None
Total	29,592	28,524	26,309	2,215

[1] New countries brought under the quota system by the McCarran Act. Statistics on the quota use will not be available for some time

NOTE.—Countries in the Western Hemisphere do not come under the quota system.

DR. MAURICE BURNSIDE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in the more than 150 years of our existence as a Nation, the world has been amazed at the great experiment of a free people in the development of the democratic idea of government. We have made great strides in the field of the arts and sciences. We have passed rapidly from the horse-and-buggy days to the iron age, the electrical age, and we are presently ushering in the atomic age.

It is strange indeed in face of these great accomplishments, that we have stood still in the field of political ethics. When a former Member of the Congress can be driven out of public life in order to satisfy the whims of a few designing politicians, we have turned back the clock of political thinking more than 100 years to the day when the late Senator Macy coined the phrase, "To the victors belong the spoils."

In this connection, I want to tell my colleagues the story of Dr. Maurice Burnside, who served my State of West Virginia with distinction in the 81st and 82d Congresses. Dr. Burnside, a native of South Carolina, after graduating from high school, enrolled at the Citadel in Charleston, where he was a member of the ROTC and studied military science. This was further implemented by training at Fortress Monroe and at Camp Eustis, Va. At Furman University, Greenville, S. C., he earned a bachelor of science degree with an added 2 years training in law.

Dr. Burnside holds a master's degree from the University of Texas, at Austin, where he majored in Latin American relations and international law. His greatest accomplishment was his ability to win his doctor's degree from Duke University at Durham, N. C. In the field of political science, he majored in public administration and international law.

Early November 1952, Dr. Burnside submitted Form 57 to Civil Service Commission. On December 11, 1952, he received a letter dated December 10, 1952, stating his application had been acceptable under the terms of the examining circular for the level of position comparable to his minimum salary requirements—GS-13. Civil-service number assigned: 445079, which rated the title "administrative officer."

Officials of National Security Agency were notified of Dr. Burnside's qualifications and he was asked to submit Form 57 to the Agency. Form 57 of Dr. Burnside was circulated by Personnel Division of National Security Agency among top officials.

Training Division Chief of National Security Agency called Dr. Burnside immediately to come for interview. A few days later personnel officers called him for interview. Personnel Division ordered preliminary investigation for position in top-secret agency. The preliminary investigation was satisfactory. Since there was immediate need for the position to be filled, they ordered prompt investigations for character, security, and training.

Dr. Burnside was called to report for physical examination at Pentagon. Favorable report resulted and he was called to duty at National Security Agency, February 6, 1953. He completed 5 weeks' training period and ordered to be sworn in under loyalty oath March 13, 1953.

During his training period Dr. Burnside was subjected to investigation by all security agencies and before taking his oath was subject to a lie-detector test.

As soon as word reached West Virginia that Dr. Burnside had been given a responsible position with the Government, Republican politicians immediately started protesting.

The first overt act came on March 7, when Harry Hoffman, political editor of the Charleston Gazette, called from Charleston, W. Va., at 5:30 p. m., to secure detailed information regarding Dr. Burnside's employment with Defense Department. Security regulations restrained Dr. Burnside at that time from divulging information.

The following day, March 8, the Charleston Gazette carried front-page story outlining Republican complaints on Dr. Burnside having Government job.

The following are excerpts from the Gazette article:

M. G. Burnside, only West Virginia Democratic Congressman defeated for reelection last November, has popped up in a mystery job with the United States Department of Defense under the new Republican administration in Washington.

Burnside, former political science professor at Marshall College in Huntington, confirmed to the Gazette yesterday that he has been working for little more than a month at a responsible position in the Defense Department but "it is against the law for me to tell you what it is."

He said it is in the critical division of the Department but assured that "it is not a political job" but one obtained "purely on merit on the basis of my training and experience".

It is known, however, that rumors of Burnside's success in landing on the Government payroll after his political defeat have stirred a tempest among West Virginia Republicans, particularly those in the Fourth District, where Burnside was rejected last November after serving two terms in Congress.

They also have led to the filing of a formal protest with Wesley Roberts, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Robert H. C. Kay, Charleston attorney and general counsel for the Republican State committee, said yesterday he had written Roberts objecting to the appointment of a repudiated Democrat by the Republican administration.

Republican National Committeeman Walter S. Hallanan wired Roberts that "it has been a profound shock to Republicans of West Virginia" to learn that Burnside has been appointed to a Defense Department position, adding, "How this happened is an enigma to me and it has certainly raised a furore in our State."

He asked Roberts to give him any information available as to how this could have happened.

Kay wrote Roberts that "to put it mildly, the Republicans in the (Fourth) District and the Democrats who voted to unseat former Congressman Burnside are up in arms over the situation. They cannot understand—and, as a matter of fact, neither can I—why this repudiated Congressman should be taken in by this administration and given a position of trust and confidence in the Defense Department."

The GOP attorney said the Burnside appointment hurts our political chances in West Virginia and declared that it cannot be laid to or shielded by, the civil-service law.

"It is an affirmative action of this administration and nothing else," wrote Kay, and "no benign interpretation or charitable consideration can blunt or dull the keen disappointment of the Republicans in the Fourth Congressional District."

He asked the national chairman for prompt and decisive action to remedy this situation.

The protest of National Committeeman Walter S. Hallanan and Attorney Robert Kay, of the Republican State Committee, was followed on March 11 by newspaper release from Congressman WILL E. NEAL, of the Fourth West Virginia District, that his office was investigating the appointment of Dr. Burnside to a position in the Defense Department. Congressman NEAL's statement which ap-

peared in the Huntington Herald-Dispatch on March 11, 1953, stated:

I have received approximately 50 protests concerning the appointment of Dr. Burnside.

The appointment amazes me. So far as I know it is the only appointment of a defeated Democratic Congressman to a position in this Republican Administration.

Dr. NEAL said his office is working through the office of National Committeeman Wesley Roberts and certain executive departments to find out who is responsible for Dr. Burnside's appointment.

Their frantic efforts to get the details of the position held by Dr. Burnside led them to engage in considerable harassment of Dr. Burnside's wife and 13-year-old daughter by repeated telephone calls from the office of Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of National Defense, Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens, and National Republican Committee Chairman Wesley Roberts.

They wanted to know the nature of Dr. Burnside's employment, his security telephone number in the Defense Department. This kept up for a period of at least 2 weeks and resulted in the announcement by National Committeeman Hallanan of a newspaper dispatch under date of March 25, in total disregard of security regulations, which included the nature of the National Security Administration work of coding and decoding secret messages. A newspaper release also carried details of Dr. Burnside's grade, his salary and the name of the head of his agency.

Dr. Burnside's appointment appears to have created confusion among the Republican leaders in West Virginia and led to considerable panning of the present National Republican administration. They seem to have lost sight of the fact that Dr. Burnside's appointment was strictly civil service and made on merit to a top civil-service security job. The record fails to disclose that the Eisenhower administration knew of Dr. Burnside's appointment until these partisan party protests were made. This is evidenced by the fact that Secretary of Defense Wilson did not even know of the appointment.

These Republican politicians got immediate action. Later in the day on March 25, they released a newspaper dispatch from Washington for publication in West Virginia newspapers announcing Dr. Burnside's dismissal. In this newspaper release, Congressman NEAL said he had been reliably informed that Dr. Burnside had been released after the Eisenhower administration had bowed to complaints of Republicans in the Fourth District and the State. The ruthlessness of these designing politicians led them to release the information concerning Dr. Burnside's dismissal before he had even been notified by the Defense Department that he was being discharged.

Dr. Burnside's formal notice of discharge was received on March 26 in the form of the following communication:

Dr. MAURICE G. BURNSIDE,
Alexandria, Va.

DEAR DR. BURNSIDE: This is to inform you that your appointment with the National Security Agency will be terminated in accordance with authority contained in civil service rule VI, section 6.1 (f), Federal Personnel Manual, chapter Z1, page 229, dated February 1, 1949. Your last day of duty will be March 27, 1953.

This termination is necessary because of an internal reorganization and has no bearing on your work performance, which has been satisfactory.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM O. ABEY,
Acting Chief, Civilian Personnel Branch.

Again, the ruthlessness of the action taken against Dr. Burnside is evidenced by the fact that the above notice contained the information that his services would terminate 1 day following the receipt of his notice of discharge.

I have in my hand here a copy of the National Security Agency Civilian Employee Handbook of 1952, and desire to quote from page 2, which states as follows:

Your appointment is permanent so long as you perform your job satisfactorily and remain loyal to the interests of the Agency and to the United States.

In this connection, your attention is called to the last paragraph of the formal notice of dismissal which says:

This termination is necessary because of an internal reorganization and has no bearing on your work performance which has been satisfactory.

Only last evening did Dr. Burnside decide to release a statement for the press. His statement follows:

I was removed from a purely technical Federal civil-service post without regard to due process or merit and solely to obey the whims and demands of Republican party leaders of West Virginia. The position is not involved in the making of any Government policy.

When I entered upon this employment, because of its secret and sensitive nature, I assumed obligations which preclude me from discussing my work. At the time I received my removal notice, I was again required to assume certain pledges regarding my silence.

I went into this work by invitation. My qualifications had nothing to do with my service in Congress or any activities in politics. I considered it an opportunity to serve my country in a most important and vital field.

What has happened to me of itself is not important. But it is a very shocking thing to realize that high Government officials have permitted petty Republican politicians of West Virginia to invade the work of one of the most secret and important, if not the most important, section of our defense program. This agency is doing a wonderful job. It is manned entirely by technical people, none of whom were selected for the remotest political reason. The very lives, not to mention the opportunity to succeed in their work, of many loyal governmental workers in this agency have been endangered by this political meddling into the agency. Work that had been kept secret for many years has now been made known to everyone, including our country's enemies.

I deeply regret that political reprisal against me individually has been invoked at such a price.

Now that Dr. Burnside has issued this forthright evidence of the manner in which he has been unjustly treated, may I remind you, my colleagues, that I offer this defense of the gentleman from West Virginia, in the hope that it will serve as a warning to the Congress and the people of the United States to be on guard against the strong possibility that this is the opening gun of a campaign on the part of other patronage-hungry and designing politicians to emasculate and in time destroy our civil-service system.

The leader of this first assault on our well established system of protection of our Government employees is today and has been for the past quarter century the Republican boss in West Virginia. May I remind my colleagues that West Virginia was once a strong Republican State, but since the advent of this man as party boss they have not elected a single Republican governor or other State officer. And they will not elect another Republican governor should he remain the party boss in West Virginia for another quarter century.

This gentleman was out of step with the present Republican national leadership at the Chicago convention in 1952. Imagine my surprise when I read in the press some days ago that he is being prominently mentioned as the new Republican national chairman. It is the considered view of the gentleman from West Virginia, now addressing you, that should this happen, I am sure, he would be no improvement over the outgoing chairman who was forced to resign as their party leader because of his 10-percenter activities in his native State.

Nor do I lay all the blame for this raid on the civil-service system at the door of the West Virginia political machine. I have here a news release of a special interview with the Secretary of Commerce, Sinclair Weeks, by a Washington Post staff writer, dated March 29, and I quote:

Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks implied yesterday that some civil-service workers were Trojan horses left behind to try and hamper, hoodwink, and wreck the new administration.

One is forced to wonder whether this Massachusetts millionaire has some personal political debts to pay or he is fronting for such political groups as the one from West Virginia.

Again, may I quote, "To the victors belong the spoils." The spoils collected as they have been in the case of Dr. Burnside may well be a boomerang to the victors. Such action cannot go unnoticed by the good, solid, thinking citizens of my State or other States of the Union who have an ingrained sense of fair play and common decency.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was terribly surprised and shocked when I heard of the circumstances surrounding the case of our former colleague from West Virginia, because of several reasons: First, he was hired because of his ability and there is no question that he was fired because he is a Democrat. There is no question about any political recommendations being involved in this. He was sent for, and, as he said in his statement issued last night, his invitation was based upon his qualifications. They were very carefully looked into, and he was appointed as a result.

It is most unfortunate that a matter such as this, in connection with this very

secret agency of our country, should become known to the enemy and to the world, and that means the enemy that is in existence. It can very easily detect the kind of work that is being done by this secret agency of government by reason of Mr. Hallanan and others in their frenzied desire to get the neck of a former Member of Congress who happens to be a Democrat and who, because of his qualifications, was employed in an agency of the Government under a Republican administration.

I cannot believe that President Eisenhower knew about this. I know that most of our colleagues in the House on the Republican side knew nothing about it. So any remarks I make are confined, and I know the remarks of my friend are confined, to those who are responsible. On the other hand, if a situation like this is permitted to continue they are carrying a responsibility of a broadening nature.

We hear a lot about bipartisan support. We Democrats are only too anxious to give bipartisan support, but you are not going to get it by saying no Democrats, no matter how well qualified, need apply.

At the end of President Truman's administration, out of 22 Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of the Defense Department, 15 were Republicans. In order to have bipartisan support, there has to be in the field of foreign affairs and national defense evidence of a desire for bipartisan support. Here we have a strictly nonpolitical position, and, in plain language, a man being fired because he is a Democrat. During the last 20 years, a number of our Republican colleagues, due to the misfortunes of their political campaigns and elections, have been defeated and failed of reelection. Some of them came to former Speaker RAYBURN and to me, and asked us to do what we could for them in relation to appointments calling for nomination by the President and confirmation by the other body and in other positions. We have consistently throughout the years done everything we possibly could to help them. I am not going to say any more except that I am sure in the mind of any decent person, whether Democrat or Republican, that with the facts in this case, whether their thoughts can be expressed publicly or not, there is severe condemnation of those persons responsible for firing a man simply because he is a Democrat; in this case a highly qualified man simply because he is a Democrat.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is a pleasure to yield to my colleague from the Fifth District of West Virginia, the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE].

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply distressed to learn of the unfortunate manner in which a former Member of this House was summarily dismissed from a top security job last week. I further regret the method in which such dismissal was announced. I refer to former Congressman M. G. Burnside, of West Virginia, who was doing highly technical work in the nonpolicymaking branch of the Security Agency of our Defense Department. I am advised that the first notice Dr. Burnside received of his dismissal was through a newspaper release published on the morning of March 26, 1953. A newspaper reporter from West Virginia called Mrs. Burnside at her home and told her of her husband's dismissal. The announcement had been made by a Republican Member of Congress and was released with the added statement that the action was made to satisfy West Virginia Republican Party leaders who were protesting Dr. Burnside's appointment, even though his appointment was made through regular civil-service channels.

Is this a proper manner in which to protect our civil-service employees?

Is this a proper way to protect our security agencies?

Are they to become the playthings of party politicians?

Are all security officers to be selected on the sole basis of party affiliation?

I had always thought that our defense secret agencies were free to select their personnel for the qualifications they possessed for their work.

Are we to have only Republican generals in the Pentagon department and draft only Republican boys?

I fail to see how the Republican Party, or the Secretary of Defense—who, I understand, ordered this action—can hold the confidence of the people of the United States with such political maneuvering.

Our civil service is a sacred thing to the men and women of America, our security agencies even more so. Can the men and women who work so hard and conscientiously in these often dangerous posts feel the safety they are entitled to when a thing like this is permitted to happen?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the Representative from the Second West Virginia District, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my protest to the handling of the case of former Congressman Burnside who had been employed by this Government of ours in a position which was a highly responsible one. I understand when he got the job there was no political pressure of any kind put on to get it. I know I did not ask anybody to give him the job, and I do not believe any other Member of the West Virginia delegation did. He was given a job because he was qualified for it. Back in our State there has been a great deal of publicity given to the fact that this administration can reach down into the civil-service ranks and take a man out of there and say, "We do not want you because you are a Democrat." Now that seems to be the policy of this new administration. If it is, and if that is going to be the policy, Lord help them when they begin to hire other men for other responsible jobs that they need to fill. I do not blame anyone or I would not blame any person for saying, "No, I do not want to take a job under you. I might be there 1 day, 2 days, or 3 days." The minority leader said just a moment ago that 15 of the Assistant Secretaries of the Department of Defense were Republicans at the close of the Truman administration. That was amazing to me. Did anybody ask to have them fired because of politics? They were evidently doing their job. I know, and you know, that former President Roosevelt tried to get the best men available, even in his Cabinet, to do the job, and to make it bipartisan. I have been reliably informed of a man who was released just a day or so ago, Dr. A. V. Astin, from the Bureau of Standards, who is a Republican. They thought he was a Democrat. They wanted that job or that position for somebody else. He was first appointed under a Republican administration and then he was elevated to the job as Director of the Bureau of Standards by the Democratic administration. They did not ask him whether he was a Democrat or Republican. He was qualified for the job. I am just wondering—we are waging a war and we do not know how it is going to spread and what the results may be. But do you think the mothers all over this land are going to ask if he is a Republican who is down here in Washington doing a job or doing these little jobs that need to be done, or whether he is a Democrat? They want to know whether a man is qualified, and whether he can do the job. Dr. Burnside was qualified—well qualified—I understand. It was a nonpolicy job covered by civil service, and yet they reached down because some professional politicians said we want to get him out of there. They did get him out of there. They did not ask about his qualifications, and whether he could do the job. I say it is highly regrettable that this has come up.

I wish to say only that I hope the administration will reconsider on this and say that if Dr. Burnside was qualified for the job that he shall be reappointed, and I also hope that the administration does not continue to pursue this policy. Like my colleague from the Third Congressional District of West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], I say that to the victors belong the spoils so far as they relate to the top policymaking positions, but when you invade civil service for political spoils, whether it be done by a Republican or Democratic administration, we are breaking down our system of government and certainly of bipartisan government and not making use of the best brains that we have in the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member who so wishes may have permission to extend his remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to believe that any responsible official in the present administration knew the facts in this Burnside matter as related by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Since the qualifications for the position held by Dr. Burnside are unknown to me I cannot comment on his capability to perform in that position. However, I have known Dr. Burnside rather inti-

mately during my period of service in the House. We served together on the Expenditures Committee and he was a valuable member of the subcommittee of which I was chairman.

Dr. Burnside was one of our most conscientious members. He is a very serious-minded and sincere individual, exhibiting always intense devotion to duty.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the other day I noticed a cartoon by the great cartoonist of the Washington Post, Mr. Herbert Block, better known as Herblock. It showed a man being collared and walked over to a plank, which stretched out into emptiness from a Government building. The caption went something like this: "Oh, Oh, It Looks Like They've Found Another Democrat."

Such a situation has been only too true to life, as many who have fallen from policymaking jobs well know. Yet, in the case of Dr. M. G. Burnside, we have a new kind of situation.

Dr. Burnside worked until recently with the National Security Agency in a highly secret job. As many of you know here, Dr. Burnside was here in the House for two terms as a Representative from West Virginia. He took the job offered him by the National Security Agency a short time after his defeat for Congress. He was asked to take it because his education, experience, and background qualified him to take it, and he had FBI clearance to work in top-secret matters.

The fact he was employed in the new administration alarmed the Republicans back in his State, who immediately started yelling for his scalp. Unfortunately, as it has now turned out, they got their way through pressure on Republican leaders and on the Defense Department.

In fact, oddly enough, a Republican Congressman announced that Dr. Burnside would be dismissed many hours before it actually happened.

Is this the proper way to run the Government, Mr. Speaker? Does this not put other such Federal employees in jeopardy of losing their jobs if some ax-grinding politicians get on their trail?

Mr. Speaker, such a situation should not be allowed to exist. It is up to those whom the people have given the responsibility of Government to do something about it.

"MR. CONNECTICUT," A TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS S. MURPHY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in Hartford, the capital city of Connecticut, there lives a man who is known throughout the length and breadth of my State as "Mr. Connecticut."

That title has been bestowed upon him by a host of fellow citizens who recognize in him the living embodiment of the virtues, the attributes and the achievements of our great State.

"Mr. Connecticut" is Francis S. Murphy, distinguished editor and publisher of the Hartford Times, who has announced his retirement a few weeks hence after many years as one of the outstanding personalities of American journalism.

The fact that this great editor and publisher has decided to retire from active newspaper work is a matter of deep regret not only to his coworkers of the press but as well to the people of the State of Connecticut.

He has labored long and fruitfully and the benefits which his work have brought to the city of Hartford and to the entire State will remain and bless countless generations which are to follow.

Fortunately for the community which is served by the Hartford Times, that great newspaper will bear the impact of his personality and his character even in his retirement.

For under his guidance and leadership it may be well said that the Hartford Times has taken its place as one of the truly illustrious newspapers of the United States. It is a paper with a conscience. That conscience is the soul of Francis Murphy.

Those of us who are faithful readers of the Hartford Times know that in its news coverage it at all times lives up to the highest standards of the profession of journalism, and we know too that its editorial opinion is cast in the mold of knowledge, decency, and truth.

There is no newspaper in the entire United States that has carried better the weighty responsibility of the press than has the Hartford Times under the leadership of Francis Murphy.

To have led and to have guided the Hartford Times to the very heights of journalistic eminence would be monument enough to the honor of this distinguished man.

But Francis Murphy has been more than a great newspaper publisher and editor. He has been a foremost civic leader, always striving to make the community in which he serves a better place in which to live.

He has been a man of broad vision who could see beyond the confines of the present and recognize the promise of tomorrow.

When radio was in its infancy and long before it had reached the fullness of its growth and influence, Francis Murphy, through the medium of the Hartford Times, was giving assistance and inspiration to the development of this communications miracle of the 20th century.

Before mass production of radio-receiving sets became a fact of modern American life the Hartford Times, because of Francis Murphy, was teaching its readers how to construct their own sets and how best to utilize them.

The development and expansion of the art of communications through the medium of radio signals in those areas served by the Hartford Times is a story of accomplishment worthy of a permanent page in the history of our era.

But the significance of his promotion of the development of radio lies in the fact that although primarily concerned with an institution devoted to the written word, he was not afraid to advance the new medium of the spoken word.

Thus, in these efforts, he identified himself with those who always push onward, unafraid of competition, and not dismayed by what is new.

He saw and recognized in aviation the world-changing potentialities of modern aeronautics. His interest in this new industry and the energy which he has given to the advancement of its cause brought to Connecticut one of the finest airfields on the Atlantic seaboard.

Bradley Field, which serves the Hartford-Springfield area, is the child of his fruitful and courageous brain. Today at Bradley Field there stands an edifice known as the Murphy terminal, constructed by the State of Connecticut and honored with his name by a grateful citizenry.

He was the first chairman of the State aeronautical commission and he still presides over that body with his characteristic fairness and efficiency.

During the war years he devoted himself tirelessly and unselfishly to the national war effort. The record of his efforts at that time include his chairmanship of the New England Aviation Cadet Committee. His help to the enlistment and recruitment services of the Armed Forces; his sponsorship of the Red Cross, of national relief organizations, and of innumerable patriotic enterprises, was directed toward a successful conclusion of World War II.

In the midst of all this seemingly overwhelming responsibility he found time to serve as a member of the enemy alien review board for the district of Connecticut and brought to that tribunal that same genius for justice tempered with decency which has marked his entire career.

A grateful Nation bestowed on him its highest civilian award when Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, the commanding general of the United States First Army, pinned on his breast, in the name of the President of the United States, the Medal of Merit.

In this remarkably active and extremely productive career, he has also found time to serve as a member of the New England Council, on countless public committees, and in practically every good public cause. To the credit of the public which he serves, let it be noted that his friends and neighbors, on occasions beyond number, honored him with public testimonials; and Trinity College, the flower of learning in Hartford, has placed on his shoulders the mantle of its degree of master of arts.

Francis Murphy springs from those simple, humble, and virtuous origins which have given so much greatness to American life. He stands in the company of those blessed with the companionship of great women. His devoted wife, he will be the first to tell you, has been at once his guiding inspiration and his sustaining strength. As he reaches the rewards of this retirement, he will enjoy the happiness of good parenthood in the loving atmosphere of his grandchildren.

I deem it a privilege and an honor to have been permitted to pay this tribute to Francis Murphy in the Halls of the Congress of the United States. For all of these things, and more, which he has done in his life, I join a vast multitude of American citizens in gratitude to him. He shall always occupy a special place in

the love and affection of Connecticut people.

As he steps across the threshold into the peace and contentment of well-earned retirement, we want him to know that his name has already been placed in the annals of those who are called the nobility of God.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate my colleague for the very fine and proper statement of tribute he has made to one of Connecticut's great citizens; and I am pleased to advise the gentleman from Connecticut that, as he probably already knows, Francis Murphy is going to retire into the Second Congressional District and become a constituent of mine very soon.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the Congress will recess for the Easter holidays and many Members will go back to their home districts. It is very desirable that certain information and certain figures be given these representatives regarding appropriations for the Veterans' Administration; past, present, and future appropriations.

I have rarely seen greater misinformation on any single subject. I have been a member of the American Legion myself for more than 27 years, and I have worked actively in my own post on the rehabilitation program of that organization. I am a member of the Disabled American Veterans, DAV, not an honorary nor an associate member, but an active member in my own right. I am a life member of the Regular Veterans' Association, which works actively on rehabilitation.

In previous budgets, under the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and now as chairman myself, I have worked for 7 years on that part of the Federal budget which has to do with appropriations for the veterans. I say with no hesitation that in all those 7 years I have never seen one dollar cut from a requested appropriation for hospitalization for the veterans who were deserving and entitled to such hospitalization; and yet today as the chairman of the subcommittee for the current session I find myself under personal attack; I find the facts completely misrepresented to the public, and I presume that every Member of Congress finds himself in the same position.

The best answer I can suggest to my friends of the Congress, Mr. Speaker, is that we simply place the facts before the American public, and particularly before the intelligent membership of the several veterans' organizations. I come to the floor now for that purpose.

This, Mr. Speaker, is in the nature of a preliminary statement. Over the Easter recess I hope to add to the statement and to document it further. If any Members find their questions unanswered in this statement I shall be glad to have them submit them to me, either now or at any later time. The facts I state today will I hope clear up a good deal of the argument and place the responsibility exactly where it should be placed.

The subcommittee on which I have had the honor to serve for 7 years—that is, this is the seventh year—has no controversy with anyone in or out of the Congress.

We have had before us this year, as we had in previous years, the representatives of any and all of the veterans' organizations who wished to testify. This year the American Legion, the VFW, the DAV, and the AMVETS all appeared and testified. All made helpful suggestions. I may say that the representatives of the AMVETS made a particularly understanding and helpful statement.

The distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], appeared before us and made a number of excellent suggestions. I observe that her resolution—House Resolution 34—giving the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs the authority to conduct an inspection of the Veterans' Administration with a broad view of determining the efficiency of the administration of this agency, has already passed the House and I hope that inspection, as it is designated, will be thorough and unemotional.

Here are some facts, Mr. Speaker, for the Members of the House to take home, as briefly as I can state them today. I shall not make these in an orderly fashion but simply make statements which at times may appear to have no connection, but in themselves will answer some of the statements and questions being raised regarding appropriations for the Veterans' Administration.

I desire to give this background. After World War I the maximum reached by the veteran population of the United States was about 4 million. We were, so to speak, a small and favored group in a nation which has done more for its veterans than any other nation, present or past, in the history of the world. The word "veteran" has always been a magic word, and no distinction has ever been made, in its application, between the veteran who has faced the enemy in combat and the veteran who has been in a training camp for a few weeks, perhaps in a college ROTC and has returned home with no disability whatever, and an improvement in health and outlook. This, with certain reservations which I shall attempt to indicate, is as it should be in a republic where the defense of the country is a privilege and a right and not an obligation imposed upon the male members of that nation by an autocracy.

The situation has changed. Today, there are over 20 million veterans, and we are adding to these rolls today at a present rate of about 900,000 veterans every year. The end is not in sight, although we can still hope.

When we built hospitals, and arranged benefits, for a maximum population of 4,000,000 veterans, it was not necessary for us to impose rigorous regulations on the conditions—for example, those under which men might be admitted into these hospitals. If there were vacant beds, and there usually were, these might be occupied by any veteran, whether he needed hospitalization for a service-connected injury or whether he had a service-connected injury and wanted hospitalization for some other condition, or whether he was simply a non-service-connected veteran and was there for some physical condition which any one of us might suffer as we grow older in life. The beds were there, the doctors were there and actually this broader field of practice kept doctors in the veterans' service.

In a generation we have had two more wars, including Korea; we have extended the benefits and we have thought up new ones for 20 million veterans, plus 20 million wives and 40 million children, which total approaches one-half the population of the United States, without including the parents or other relatives on either side.

It is no longer a casual problem. The veteran who, with his immediate family, represents half or more of the tax-paying population, is the most interested of any one of us. So, Mr. Speaker, we have today four possible solutions of the problem. Stating them very briefly:

First. We can continue the present liberal interpretation of benefits; we can supply hospitalization to veterans without service-connected disabilities. This will require 200,000 additional beds in less than one generation without any enlargement of the Korean war. This will take us into socialized medicine without our realizing it while we protest that we do not want it and defeat all direct proposals on this floor.

In order to figure the cost to the taxpayer, multiply 200,000 beds by approximately $20,000 per bed as the cost of building a hospital, and add a billion dollars to the administrative costs of the Veterans' Administration in addition to those we already have.

The World War I veteran, Mr. Speaker, buys one-third, with his present benefit dollar, that he would have bought with a dollar when he was discharged. The World War II veteran buys one-half of the things with his dollar that he could have bought when he enlisted. How much do we want the Korean veteran to get for his dollar?

The first suggestion, therefore, to continue the present program, is untenable.

Second. We can establish classes of veterans. We can say that the veteran who saw combat is in a higher category than the veteran who never left his home State, or that the paratrooper, for example, should be placed in a different category than an ordnance officer, one of which I was in World War I. We have never done this; I hope we will never have to do it.

The third possibility is to revise the classifications and limitations on the types of injury. We intend to do this now, but we do not apply, nor do we apply intelligently in the Veterans' Administration, the regulations already imposed or authorized by the Congress; at least, we do not do it very successfully, perhaps I should say that. A service-connected veteran wounded in the service

is entitled to anything he needs from a grateful Nation; a non-service-connected veteran has limitations imposed on his entitlement to service.

Fourth. Mr. Speaker, as a final possibility, we can economize and provide the best possible administration and administer the Veterans' Administration intelligently.

As far as my committee is concerned—I cannot speak for them; I have no idea how the subcommittee feels about this—but, from comments, I would say that the probable feeling of the majority of the Members of the Congress is a combination of the better interpretation of the limitations we already have and further economy and better administration on the financial side, and the regulatory side of the Veterans' Administration.

Now, to give you some idea, Mr. Speaker, of what this means, in the growth of veterans, I hold a chart in my hand which I doubt if you can see very easily, but the rising graph upon this chart indicates here, as opposed to the pillars which represent the beds available and authorized in the United States, the rising demands for hospital care upon the veterans hospitals by veterans who are not service connected. The Congress authorized 145,000 beds, and the then President of the United States, Mr. Truman, reduced that to 131,000 by Executive order, for reasons which involved both economy and the difficulty of locating and staffing hospitals. There have already been activated 121,000 beds, and we are in the process of building up the remaining 10,000 beds as they are needed. The greatest need runs with NP and TB cases. For the most part, a proper application of the regulations we already have would make the present G. M. and S. beds adequate not only for all veterans who are entitled to hospitalization but to many veterans who are in a field where we wish to give service without necessarily imposing upon them the strictest regulations.

I will explain that last statement briefly by giving you one example. When a veteran reaches, we will say, 60 or 65 years of age, if he is indigent, somebody must care for him, if he is sick. There is a question involving policy which is not for my subcommittee to decide but for the Congress to decide. In some cases it is probably cheaper to care for him in properly arranged veterans hospitals which have beds available than it is to build new State hospitals to care for the aged. However, as a general statement, such hospitalization should properly be given by the local agencies of government.

The next heading, if I were to break this into headings, is the way the Veterans' Administration requests for appropriations come to the Congress. That is the source of much of the misunderstanding which is translated into magazine articles, mimeographed attacks upon the Members of Congress in their own districts, and so forth. The Veterans' Administration request for 1953, having to do with hospitalization is only one part of an item in the budget of the VA under code headings 1000 to 9000, inclusive, and it covers administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary service. In other words, the veteran who writes and says the Congress has cut, or the Congress has refused, an appropriation for hospitals probably means—and probably does not understand—that some request for an appropriation for an entirely different subject appearing under this same code heading has been cut slightly. For example, the entire cut in the Veterans' Administration budget for the present fiscal year was only a net $31 million as applied against a request of $895 million, which is a cut of 4.37 percent, not to be applied against the hospital care, dentists, nurses, attendants, and similar service in the hospitals themselves.

I will read you, so you will understand, the following:

Item 1000 is general administration of the Veterans' Administration.

Item 2000 is the contact service.

Item 3000 covers the claims the Veterans' Administration is responsible for.

Item 4000 is the insurance activity of the Veterans' Administration.

Item 5000 has to do with vocational education and rehabilitation under the GI bill of rights.

Item 6000 is the loan guaranty for veterans who are building their homes.

Item 7000 is the readjustment allowance, which has to do with certain readjustments subsequent to World War II, and which is in the process, I would say, of liquidation, no requests having been made for it in the 1954 budget.

Then item 8400 comes as the subsidiary item which has to do with hospitalization, but it includes both the actual activation and operation of a bed, and the administration, and covers the whole area of hospitalization and domiciliary medical care.

Finally, item 9000 is the capital expansion program.

As I said, the Veterans' Administration asked in the budget for the current year—fiscal year 1953—for $895 million. I will include in the statement at this point the actual quotations from the conference report between the House and the Senate, which stated that no cuts were to be made in the service of doctors, nurses, dentists, and that type of service, to the hospitalized veteran. Conference Report No. 2443, July 2, 1952, to accompany H. R. 8072, in connection with the VA item, said on page 21:

> Conferees have approved the full amount of the budget estimate for research, including work in connection with prosthetic appliances, and have further agreed that there should be no reduction in the number of doctors, dentists, nurses, and dieticians.

The report was approved by both House and Senate. The cut, however, was not made by the Veterans' Administration in the way required by the Congress. The cut was a straight percentage cut through every one of these services and activities of the Veterans' Administration.

Even then, I suggest that the cut was not so severe that any reduction in hospital service to service-connected veterans or to veterans with a genuine entitlement need have taken place. It was small compared to the entire amount. In the supplementary bill, which has been the only appropriation bill before us this year, a further request was made for $5 million for this particular 8400 item, and all of that money was allowed with no reduction whatever.

There were two reductions made in the supplementary requests, for the Veterans' Administration funds in the second supplemental bill, 1953. The first was a reduction made before it reached the Congress. The original request had been for $18 million. That was reduced to $15 million before it reached the Congress.

On February 3 the Director of the Budget asked the individual agencies to freeze the personnel in their agencies so that there might be no expansion of the activities of government until the Bureau of the Budget, under the new administration, had had time to check into this matter of administrative, bureaucratic if you want, personnel.

Therefore, we did remove from the budget almost all of the additional personnel requested for services other than the hospitals. We did not remove any for that type of service. We removed, for example, an additional request for 428 employees in the contact service. The VA had been authorized to have 1,527 employees. They had never built this staff beyond 1,509, yet now the Veterans' Administration was asking for 428 additional.

I wish to interrupt myself to say that that is a controversial subject. It is an area in which economies can well be made. They must be made intelligently, and this Congress has never recommended otherwise. It has said only that where there are contact officers employed by the States, the counties, the cities, and employed by the VFW, the American Legion, the DAV, the AMVETS, and other organizations, the Federal Government should not duplicate those services, that we should only put contact officers into areas where this service could not otherwise be made available, and that we should furnish a sort of clearing house or supervisory service covering the work of all other contact officers.

The hearings, to accompany the appropriation for fiscal year 1954, will disclose testimony from American Legion representatives to the effect that the Pennsylvania department of that organization pays $170,000 from its own funds each year for such contact service. Other veterans' organizations have contact officers. The committee learns that the DAV has agreed with the attitude of the House Committee on Appropriations that this is an area where Federal expenditures may be cut.

That seems like a very small item to you, but in last year's budget it was over $7 million. My committee suggested its decrease to about $1½ million. The House thought otherwise and returned the entire amount. There was still money unspent when the supplemental bill came before us. This should be decided by the legislative committee, but it is a matter of record that the Committee on Appropriations feels here is a place for an exploration for economy.

There are other areas.

Mr. Speaker, my time is moving rather rapidly, and I am going to abbreviate some of these suggestions that I intended

to make. For example, I hold in my hand the issue of Colliers magazine for February 14. I have very high regard both for Colliers and for the Washington representative of Colliers, and I am very much surprised that a magazine of that standing in the United States should have accepted an article of this kind without checking the facts. There was one check made that I know of. The manager of the Washington office called me up and said an article had been submitted to the magazine for publication about the veterans' hospitals. He said that the writer of the article had referred to me personally in it, and had said that although I, as the then ranking minority member of the committee, had approved these so-called severe cuts in the budget for the Veterans' Administration, that at the same time I had insisted upon the building of a veterans' hospital in my own congressional district. He said, and I thanked him for saying it, that that seemed unlike me and he wanted to know what the facts were. I said there was no veterans' hospital in my district, that I had never insisted upon the building of any veterans' hospital which would in any way benefit my district directly or indirectly, and that what the writer referred to, and was obviously in complete ignorance about, was that last year the entire subcommittee approved the building of two NP hospitals, 1 in Cleveland and 1 in the city of Los Angeles, and only chose the latter city because the contract had already been let for the hospital and a loss would have been incurred if it had not been built. I was in favor of building both of them. I was in favor of building the NP hospital in San Francisco and rebuilding the one in Topeka, Kans., and doing something about the situation in Washington. The fields we have not entered fully are the joint fields of TB patients and NP patients, and we must have at the same time a thorough reexploration of the use of veterans' hospitals as now constructed, which will give us beds suitable for veterans who claim they are not being cared for, a statement which is not supported by the facts.

At the time of the passage of the supplementary bill, there were only 70 veterans who had service connections who were not being cared for in veterans' hospitals, and these veterans were not in hospitals by their own choice. A statement was made in the House in my hearing that a hospital in New Jersey had 68 veterans on the waiting list unable to get in, and that the veterans were service connected. Inquiry and an investigation, which I will not take time to read, disclosed that there were 68 such patients, but 52 of them were being taken care of adequately in other hospitals.

I would like to read you—but will not have the time—the official statement of the Veterans' Administration in reply to the article in Collier's magazine. I will quote one or two sentences, and I want you to understand that I take them out of context, not because they change the opinion on the whole, but because I cannot read the entire article now.

Regarding the writer of the Collier's article, I quote:

His opinions are at times open to question, and his conclusions are at places faulty largely because they are based upon inaccurate information.

At another place when the writer speaks of the high turnover of nurses, I now quote the Veterans' Administration comment:

The high turnover in nurses is because they are women rather than any deficiency in the program. Personal affairs accounted for resignations of 2,366, or 71.2 percent, of the nurses who left during the period discussed. They gave as the reasons for leaving: Illness, 128; family illness, 128; marital, 725; marriage 408; pregnancy 714; and personal, 236. Family changes of residence accounted for 345.

And so on. And continuing, the same applies to physicians and other professional staff. There is quite a discussion here of the internal arguments inside the VA, which I will omit, as they are pointless; they are past history now.

The fact that some hospitals are located in congressional districts is replied to pertinently by the Veterans' Administration. I quote:

It is a little difficult to see how hospitals are to be located at all without being in the district of some Congressman.

We have seen that article reprinted in various service magazines, and we have articles antagonistic to the Congress and the Members of the Congress, in the DAV semimonthly magazine, which I regret very much as a DAV member, because the same statement appearing in the recent issue of that magazine is the one the DAV representative, Mr. C. F. Hogan, made before our subcommittee.

We asked Mr. Hogan if having learned what he learned in the committee, if he would not like to change his statement, and show that the Congress was not responsible for the cuts he was discussing and also that these cuts were smaller than his statement showed. It was not changed, however, in the copy which appeared in the DAV bimonthly magazine.

Here are a few suggestions. The first suggestion is that there should be a little better cooperation from the various veterans' organizations. They do not come to the Hill for their facts. I do not know whether my distinguished chairman in the last Congress, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] or other members of the committee who are here have ever had a representative of the various veterans' organizations make any effort to check the facts given them from other sources, with the Appropriations Committee. I can say of my own knowledge this year that no attempt was made to check with us any of these statements which have appeared in various newspapers, magazines, and veterans' house organs.

The second suggestion is that there are excellent areas for economy right in the Veterans' Administration, beyond the figures that we are discussing here as presumed cuts in the budget. For example, when a veteran gets a loan on his house, a generous Nation gives him the amount of the first year's interest upon his loan. It is a gesture of generosity characteristic of the United States; no other nation would ever think of doing anything like that. But the veteran gets no immediate benefit from that; this money is applied by the lending institution upon the principal of the loan; it reduces the loan to that extent. The only veteran who would ever benefit from it would be the one who lived long enough or owned his house long enough to pay out the entire amount in full and he would, therefore, get a benefit some 20, 30, or 40 years in the future. He takes out of his pocket, at the time when he needs the money, and when we felt we were helping him, the amount of the interest he pays upon the loan for the first year. If he is going to have to do that, why should we make this generous gesture? You say it is a very small item; it is $64,000,000, Mr. Speaker, and this is money which could better be applied to the needs of the hospitalized veterans.

We send veterans to school; we pay their way and give them a supporting amount of money while they are there, and we require the school to send us a report every month on how the veteran is doing, is he still there, and what kind of marks is he getting. We pay the school $1.50 for each of these reports. No educational institution does it for its other students. My friend from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] would probably be glad to have $1.50 for every report to parents he made on every student in his school. If we cut down the number of reports to one on entering, at midyear, and at the end of the year—that is a reduction that could be made—this item alone would save $5 million. We are looking for economy. There are other items.

I want to call your attention to dental care. You probably have heard that many dentists received in March from the Veterans' Administration a mimeographed notice which looks like this. It is very simple. This is from Wisconsin. It says that—

The enclosed letter informs you that service connection has been granted for a dental condition and that you are eligible for treatment; however, we regret to inform you that as a result of reduced appropriations—

And so forth. Mr. Speaker, it is always reduced appropriations. Even though an agency is getting more money than it got the year before, it still blames reduced appropriations when word goes out to the country that there is something the agency cannot do, especially just before election. We have testimony showing the propaganda sent out by the VA during October 1952.

What are the facts in this case? When this letter was sent out to the dentist saying he had a patient he would like to take care of but there was no money for him, the Veterans' Administration on that same day had unspent in its outpatient fund $5,158,680, which was adequate to take care of this veteran and a great many others in the remaining 3 months of fiscal year 1953. A larger sum is requested for fiscal 1954.

I have two other items I think are important. The first has to do with non-service-connected hospitalization. There were as of a recent date, I think probably the end of 1952, 35.6 percent of the veterans in the hospitals who

were genuinely service connected and who were receiving treatment for such disabilities. You may not realize it, but there were 11½ percent service-connected veterans who were receiving treatment for something that was not service connected. There were 24.8 percent veterans who had permanent and total disabilities, receiving pensions and because of that could be treated for such service-connected or non-service-connected disabilities. There were 11.4 percent who had no service-connected disability, who were being treated for TB or psychosis or some NP condition. We had a few from the Armed Forces but we had about 17 percent who were in no way service connected at that time.

More important is the fact that in these non-service-connected cases, some of which have a remote connection with service, we have a regulation that a man can only receive treatment for such cases if he is indigent. This is important. He signs an affidavit, subjecting himself to a penalty, either fine or imprisonment.

The statement he makes is very clear. It has been transferred from the back page to the front page, right under his signature. That may help the matter. The Veterans' Administration contends that the final sentence in the act, which says that the affidavit of the veteran shall be taken as evidence of his indigency, does not permit the Veterans' Administration to look back of any single case. The Appropriations Committee does not feel that it cannot look back of cases. A GAO report to our subcommittee indicates, by going into 40 hospitals and taking in each hospital about 1,000 cases, or 40,000 cases in all, putting them in a file and going through this file very quickly, taking only this criterion and no other: This man looks as if he might have an income; he is a lawyer, he is a doctor, he is a professional man of some kind, he has a business in town, it would appear that this man had an income, that out of 500 such cases, the results showed 336 of those cases had incomes of from $4,000 to $50,000 a year. Twenty-five cases, possibly duplicating some of the income cases, owned property valued from $20,000 to $500,000. These are the "indigents" we are taking care of at the taxpayers' expense in veterans hospitals, who have signed affidavits that they had no means whatever to pay for hospitalization. Incidentally, our law should be amended at once to make it possible for a veteran to pay part of his hospital costs, if he cannot pay the entire amount. The VA hospitals should also be required to ask if the veteran patient carries hospital insurance. You would be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to learn that most of the hospitals do not ask this question, and make no effort to offset their costs with such insurance.

This is a very hasty statement. I want you to have these facts when you go home, when you discuss the problem with the veterans. It is not a question of whether we have appropriated enough. We have always appropriated without hesitation and without limitation for the veterans of the United States. The question is, How much is enough? That is the problem to be discussed in the Veterans' Administration, in the Congress, and at home, on the basis of what is best, not only for the veterans but what is best for the United States and for the people of the United States, more than half of whom are the veterans themselves when it comes to paying taxes. The committee on appropriations asks for economy wherever economy is possible. We ask for a redetermination of policy on several of these regulations, and we ask for a better interpretation and application of the regulations, and if we do that, the tax demand on the people will be reduced and the service to the veterans will be increased steadily, as it always has been.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire, my colleague on the subcommittee.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like, on behalf of some of us who have served through the years with the gentleman from California on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, to express the hope that this information he has given to us today will be widely disseminated and read. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] stands as a living refutation of any idea that the membership of the Committee on Appropriations does not give careful consideration or sympathetic consideration to the needs of the veterans. We have watched him. We know with what anxiety he has worked on this budget and tried to see to it not only that adequate appropriations were made but that they were made in the places where they would be spent for the best interests of the veterans.

I think I am expressing the sentiment of every Member who has been working with the gentleman through the months and years when we commend him not only for what he has done but for the very fair and orderly way he has presented it to the House this afternoon.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman. I just found the statement in the testimony of the Veterans of Foreign Wars that I wish to read. Colonel Ijams, formerly administrative officer in the Veterans' Administration, was talking about the duplications presently in existence since the change in policy set up separate offices in each area.

As an illustration—

Said he—

in Baltimore we have two hospitals and one regional office. There is no reason on earth why one finance man, one supply man, and one personnel man cannot adequately serve all three institutions. The same plan of operation, applied to the entire field, would enable you to save a vast amount of money now paid in unnecessary sums.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] then asked him whether in each of these three institutions these three men operated.

Mr. Ijams said:

That is what burns me up. We consolidated positions for years and have operated successfully, and then under the 1945 reorganization it was thrown out the window and we went into this duplication business.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield willingly to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I recall the gentleman's figures, the appropriations for the fiscal year 1953 were something more than $800 million.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Eight hundred and ninety-five million dollars was requested.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And the reduction on the part of the committee was approximately 4 percent.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It was 4.37 percent.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then the committee saw fit to bring the attention of the House to the need for further appropriations recently, and what is the amount of that particular appropriation?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I included that in my composite statement. It was $10 million; $5 million for the general operation of the Veterans' Administration and $5 million for hospitalization and domiciliary care.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think one of the things that brought this to our attention was the question of the $10 million amendment or an amendment submitted to the Committee of the Whole for a $10-million increase for hospitalization. Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, the great trouble with that, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, is that it was just a general figure offered on the floor by a Member for whom we have the highest regard, and it was offered not to apply to hospitals but to all of the Veterans' Administration; not specifically to the hospitals, and it was an unconsidered figure. There was no figure that could be arrived at to show how the Veterans' Administration should use $10 million. They had not asked for that much; they asked for only $5 million and we gave them that amount.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the $10 million had been approved, would it have been applied to hospitals?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It would not necessarily have been applied to hospitals, because it was not offered specifically for that. I tried to explain that in analyzing this general budget item.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand, the committee has under consideration at the present time the question of appropriations for the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. We expect to hear the Veterans' Administration on May 14 and report our final bill the following week.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks in connection with this discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. May I commend the gentleman from California on his straightforward and enlightening speech on this subject. No one in the House is more considerate of or more interested in the needs of the veterans of this country than he. As the gentleman from New Hampshire stated, the gentleman

from California has worked for and with the veterans for many years.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

There is an important point which I almost overlooked.

We think only of building VA hospitals. We already have, or propose to build, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health hospitals. Many of these have vacant beds. Some private hospitals have vacancies. The VA could and should contract for the use of beds in such hospitals for veterans. When the demands of war are ended, these hospitals will have additional beds and if we have overbuilt veterans' hospitals, these other hospitals will deteriorate. For example, in an inquiry regarding the new VA hospital in Philadelphia, it was disclosed not only that the Navy Hospital there had 300 or more vacant beds, and wanted veteran patients—as do other military or Public Health hospitals I could name—but the Navy Hospital is in danger of having a reduced rating given it by the American Medical Association, because it does not have enough patients, or a sufficient spread in the types of cases cared for.

LUMP-SUM LEAVE PAYMENTS TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, our Commitee on Post Office and Civil Service has just concluded hearings on a matter which has aroused wide public interest. This is the question of the large lump-sum leave payments recently made to Cabinet officers and other high officials of the Truman administration when they left the Government.

The hearings which our committee held were on legislation which will prevent such excessive lump-sum leave payments to high Government officials in the future. This legislation would not deprive career Government employees of annual and sick leave to which they are entitled.

For the information of the Members of the House, I am inserting in the RECORD my opening statement at the hearings with respect to these excessive lump-sum leave payments to high officials and also with respect to the annual and sick leave of career Federal employees.

The statement is as follows:

This public hearing is being held on H. R. 4039. This legislation will exclude from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, officials in the executive branch of the Government specified in Public Law 359, 81st Congress, the act which established the rates of pay of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent offices. This includes Presidential assistants and top level Presidential appointments.

This bill, when enacted into law, will prevent any such payments to department and agency heads in large sums as has been recently disclosed by the Comptroller General's report to the Appropriations Committee. This report pointed out that many retiring department and agency heads of the last administration received in excess of $5,000 in accumulated annual leave. In fact, one high official received over $12,000 in a lump sum for accumulated annual leave.

I have asked the Comptroller General to conduct such investigations as are necessary to determine whether or not there was misrepresentation in the certifications of officials calling for such large lump sum payments for accumulated annual leave.

My attention also has been directed to the fact that many postmasters have accumulated large amounts of annual leave. I have pointed out this problem to the Postmaster General and asked that he take affirmative action to reduce the amount of accrued annual leave of postmasters. This has been estimated to be about a $30 million liability against the Post Office Department at the present time.

To demonstrate to what extent the accumulation of annual leave can be carried, I have pointed to the former postmaster at New York City who resigned recently while his office was under investigation. He was paid more than $10,000 in a lump sum for accumulated leave when he left the service.

I think it is appropriate at this time, also, to clarify the situation regarding the leave privileges of career Federal employees as distinguished from the high officials covered by H. R. 4039.

It is a generally overlooked fact that the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has never considered the question of leave for Federal employees. The 1951 Annual and Sick Leave Act—which established the present graduated annual leave system—originated in conference as a Senate rider on postal rate legislation. Yet this is the law that governs the leave of most of our Federal employees.

The so-called Thomas leave rider requires that all annual leave earned by Federal employees during any calendar year after December 31, 1951, be used by June 30 of the next calendar year. This provision, which constituted a major change in the Government's leave policy, originated as a rider on an appropriation bill.

There have been a great many proposals as to what should be done regarding the leave of Federal employees and a wide variety of views have been expressed on the subject. Close examination and careful study of these proposals will be necessary before this committee can determine what action is to be taken with respect thereto. It would be most inadvisable, in my judgment, for the committee to act on any such proposal without full opportunity to consider all phases of this broad and important subject.

I plan to schedule hearings soon after the Easter recess to consider the whole problem of annual and sick leave for Federal employees.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO and to include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and to include an article.

Messrs. HILL and CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. FARRINGTON and to include an article.

Mr. MCGREGOR.

Mr. CLARDY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM and to include a short editorial.

Mr. RADWAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER in five instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include an excerpt from an article appearing in a magazine.

Mr. THORNBERRY and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. DURHAM and to include an article on the medical research program.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include an address delivered by a former Member of this House, Mr. Darden, at a Jackson Day dinner held in Richmond, Va.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FINE and to include an editorial.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. LESINSKI) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CELLER in four instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include a letter.

Mr. STRINGFELLOW.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAMBLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) and to include an article.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) and to include an article.

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN (at the request of Mr. RIEHLMAN) and to include an article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, previously today I got permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a speech by a former colleague, the Honorable Colgate Darden. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it exceeds the limit and will cost $250. Notwithstanding the excess I ask that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina and to include an article.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CONDON, for an indefinite period, on account of death in the family.

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. VORYS), for the period March 30 to April 20, on account of travel on official business for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MERROW (at the request of Mr. VORYS), for the period March 30 to April 20, on account of travel on official business for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN), for the period March 31 to April 20, on account of travel on official business for the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. ZABLOCKI, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD, for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

597. A letter from the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a revised draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

598. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to prohibit false advertising or misuse of names indicating the various exchange services of the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 4390. A bill to regulate the issuance of identification tags for motor vehicles and trailers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BECKER:

H. R. 4391. A bill to exempt from tax cigarettes sold to veterans' organizations for distribution, as gifts, to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 4392. A bill to provide that amounts erroneously paid to the United States as unemployment tax may be transferred to the State to which such amounts should have been paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit schoolteachers and other professional people to deduct, as business expenses, certain educational expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4394. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct, as a business expense, the cost of providing care for children under 16 years of age, if such care is for the purpose of enabling the taxpayer to be gainfully employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4395. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 4396. A bill to extend the excess-profits tax for 1 year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 4397. A bill providing for the construction of distribution systems on the Central Valley project, California, by irrigation districts and other public agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 4398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit certain actions for the recovery of overpayments of income taxes to be brought before the expiration of 6 months from the date of filing a claim for refund or credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4399. A bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, of expenses for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4400. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to provide that receivers and trustees in proceedings under chapter XI shall receive compensation on the same basis as those in proceedings under chapter X; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4401. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, so as to permit certain suits for the recovery of taxes to be brought in the district of the taxpayer's residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4402. A bill to permit actions against the United States for the recovery of internal-revenue taxes to be brought in United States district courts without regard to the amount in controversy and to permit any such action to be tried by the court with a jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 4403. A bill to exempt admissions to moving-picture theaters from the Federal tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. R. 4404. A bill to allow for construction of distribution systems by irrigation districts in the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 4405. A bill to exempt publications of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', and fraternal organizations or associations from the minimum rate of postage prescribed by law for each individually addressed copy of publications entered as second-class matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 4406. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Functions and Fiscal Resources; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 4407. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine-arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4408. A bill to amend section 11 of the act of April 1, 1942, relating to retirement of judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4409. A bill to amend section 9 (h) of the National Labor Relations Act to eliminate its provisions regarding affidavits, and to provide that the National Labor Relations Board shall not act upon a matter raised by a labor organization unless the organization's constitution bars membership to Communists and certain other individuals; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 4410. A bill to reduce certain rates of postage on parcels sent to or by members of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed outside the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 4411. A bill to authorize certain works of improvement on the Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and the head of Sand Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4412. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Colorado, and Wyoming, respectively, of mineral interests in certain lands in such States acquired by the United States under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4413. A bill to provide for the repair, restoration, and preservation of the U. S. S. *Hartford*, flagship of Admiral Farragut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4414. A bill to repeal section 10 of the act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936 (the so-called Walsh-Healy Act); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 4415. A bill to extend for 2 years the period of time within which former prisoners of war may file certain claims under the War Claims Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4416. A bill to amend section 4 (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, so as to provide shorter periods of service for certain doctors and dentists who are inducted thereunder after serving on active duty in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 4417. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment in the grade of first lieutenant of nurses and medical specialists in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and appointment with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) of nurses in the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4418. A bill to amend the act of July 28, 1942 (ch. 528, 56 Stat. 722), relating to posthumous appointments and commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4419. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Rayne, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 4420. A bill to extend the time for filing applications for lump-sum death payments under title II of the Social Security Act with respect to individuals who died on or after December 7, 1941, while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 4421. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as

on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON (by request):

H. R. 4422. A bill to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4423. A bill to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of contractors with the United States during World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim March 20 of each year as Cancer Education Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 91. Concurrent resolution providing that sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations be started with prayer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Res. 196. Resolution proposing study of the feasibility of establishment of on-the-job training program for career diplomats in the Department of State; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the removal of the Federal Government from the field of motor fuel taxation, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the recreational use of Government lands under the control of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 4424. A bill for the relief of Eleonore Friedrich McAnelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 4425. A bill for the relief of Angel Shirvanian Aykanian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4426. A bill for the relief of Andrea Paulette Quatrehomme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 4427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helena Piasecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4428. A bill for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 4429. A bill for the relief of Adolf Klein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4430. A bill for the relief of Frigyes Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4431. A bill for the relief of Maswood Bakt Choudry, Abdul Kadir Aftab Miah, and Abdul Whab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4432. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):

H. R. 4433. A bill for the relief of John Carlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4434. A bill for the relief of Nikolai, Gerda, and Annerose Korotkevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4435. A bill for the relief of Thomas Marfoe (also known as Tao-Wen Ma); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4436. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Giuseppe Collura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Louise Rank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4438. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maisie A. Long; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of John Abraham and Ann Abraham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Hilde Kretz Sforza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 4441. A bill for the relief of Stamatoula S. Roumanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Waltraud Mieske Pengelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

132. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of James W. Jewett, and 27 other members of the Pennsylvania Railroad Retired Men's Association No. 3, of Harrisburg, Pa., urging the Congress of the United States to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and abolish that part of the said act pertaining to the interlocking of the said act with social security and make them separate funds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

133. By Mr. ROBESON of Virginia: Petition of the W. C. T. U. and Virginia Church Temperance Council, Inc., in support of H. R. 1227, which penalizes interstate transmission by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, newsreels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor or advertising by radio, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

134. By Mr. WESTLAND: Petition of the National Pension Federation of Washington, D. C., requesting passage of H. R. 1041 and H. R. 4230, bills to amend the Social Security Act to provide a direct Federal pension of at least $100 per month to all American citizens 65 years of age and over who have been citizens 10 years or more, to be prorated according to the cost of living as on January 3, 1953; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world, in the holy pilgrimage of this sacred week we fain would join devout multitudes treading the way of sorrow. We lift our eyes to a green hill outside a city wall and to a lone cross against the sky, a cross so old and yet so new, hallowed by forgiveness for hate's most cruel blows; a cross sanctified by loving solicitude for all mournful mothers weeping at crosses where hang their sons.

Make us worthy of those who, day by day, are making the supreme sacrifice in the spirit of Calvary, that the flag of our dear country may become a symbol of peace on earth and of brotherhood among all men. May the cross of the Redeemer, about which men under all skies are now gathering, be for us as never before the sublime symbol that truth will conquer error, that light will dispel darkness and that, at last, life will prove stronger than death. Steady our hearts and steel our wills to pay the price for the coming kingdom, knowing there is no way to dawn except by dark, no way to light except by night, no way to Easter except by Calvary. We ask it in the name of that One who despised the shame and endured the cross. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 1, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4233) to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1110) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order agreed to yesterday, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has the floor. Does the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my impression was that this was the morning hour. The Senate adjourned, and the consent applied, as I understood, at the conclusion of the morning hour. In any event, I ask unanimous consent that the order be so modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yesterday I spoke to the majority leader about calendar No. 134, H. R. 4130. This is a matter of importance, because the contractor for the Air Force project cannot be paid unless this bill is passed, since the time in which payment could have been made expired on March 31. I wish to ask the majority leader at what time this measure could properly be brought before the Senate today. I should like to have it taken up as soon as possible.

Mr. TAFT. With the consent of the Senator from Oregon, I shall move to have the bill taken up as soon as the morning hour is concluded.

Mr. President, in response to a request by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I shall move to take up also the District of Columbia daylight saving bill, provided there will be no debate on it. If it leads to debate, the bill will have to go over until Monday. Otherwise, it is the intention to consider these two bills before the debate on the tidelands measure is resumed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe there will be no debate on the bill in which I am interested. I understand that the bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] desires to speak for about 25 minutes on a matter in which he is interested. So far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware for the purpose of allowing him to speak, with the understanding that I may have the floor at the conclusion of his remarks, or following any quorum call. I ask unanimous consent that that may be ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should also like to have the nominations on the Executive Calendar considered if the Senator from Oregon is agreeable.

Mr. CORDON. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Oregon is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Am I correct in my understanding that the Senator from Ohio refers only to new nominations, or reports, on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, only to new nominations and I understand there are quite a number of them.

JUDGE CHARLES VERNON TERRELL: GREAT TEXAS STATESMAN AND CHRISTIAN GENTLEMAN

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew my request for unanimous consent of the Senate that I may be permitted to proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a recent issue of Under Texas Skies, a periodical published in Austin, Tex., contains a tribute to one of our greatest Texans, Judge Charles Vernon Terrell. Judge Terrell, now 91 years of age, is president of the Texas Heritage Foundation. He is the oldest living member of the Sons of Confederate Veterans. During his long and honorable public career he has served as State senator, State treasurer, and from 1924 until his retirement in 1939 as a member of the Railroad Commission of Texas.

There is no more honored name in Texas than that of Terrell, and Judge C. V. Terrell throughout his life has adhered to the highest standards of personal and public conduct.

Mr. President, for many years my father served and worked with this distinguished Texan. There was no man for whom he had greater respect or deeper admiration. He knew Judge Terrell as a great Texan and a great man.

To bring before the Members of the Senate the inspiration of his career of public service, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article written by Maj. Horace H. Shelton and published in the periodical, Under Texas Skies.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE C. V. TERRELL

Judge Terrell's great work for education includes the following:

1. Helped pass the law in the State senate transferring 3 million acres of public domain from the general fund to the State public-school fund, from which land oil and gas has been discovered, making this the richest permanent school fund of any State in the Union.

2. Assisted in passing through the senate the law known as the uniform textbook law, which has been of untold value to our public schools, and which has saved the patrons of our schools thousands of dollars.

3. Introduced and passed the law creating the North Texas State Teachers College at Denton, Tex. This was the largest college of its kind in the United States. It is now called the North Texas State College.

4. Introduced and passed the bill, raising the free scholastic age from 14 to 19 years.

5. Made the location of, and helped pass the law creating, the South Texas State Teachers College at San Marcos, Tex., in 1899.

6. Assisted in passing the bill and locating the C. I. A., now the Texas State College for Women, at Denton, Tex.

7. As State treasurer of Texas, was the first to divide a full time job, giving to two students, half-time work to pay their expenses while attending the State university. The plan was spread to every State in this Union and to Washington, D. C., where perhaps millions of poor young men and women, who would have otherwise been deprived of an education, have received or are now getting a college education.

8. Introduced the first bill ever introduced in a Texas Legislature for State compulsory attendance in our public schools.

As State treasurer, under the law, loaned the State's money to Texas banks, bought United States bonds and cleared over $500,000 for the State and never lost 1 cent, and at the same time saved many banks from failing during the depression.

As railroad commissioner, helped to write the law creating the motor transportation division of the railroad commission, and helped organize and put into operation, the bus and truck laws, which have given to our State, one of the finest transportation systems of any State in the United States. We have a safe, secure, and responsible system for both freight and passengers. He wrote the opinion, denying a permit for 500 cotton trucks to run over highways in Texas, to and from every port in Texas, which, if granted would have endangered the lives of our traveling public. He also wrote the opinion, giving to Houston, Tex., equal water rates with Galveston and the other deep-water ports of Texas, which has helped to make Houston the largest city in the South.

Judge Terrell wrote more than 30 orders which the commission adopted, regulating busses. Among them was one requiring a bus driver to stop, look, and listen, before crossing a railroad or interurban track; one prohibiting drinking intoxicating liquor on the bus; one prohibiting an intoxicated person from entering a bus and one to prevent an operator from smoking while driving, or from conversing with a passenger while the bus is in motion. These safety orders have been carefully followed and have saved the lives of many people in our State.

As railroad commissioner, Judge Terrell helped write and signed the first order ever written, prorating oil and gas; and is really the father of proration and bottom-hole pressure as a formula for conservation of oil in the United States. This has saved many millions of barrels of oil from waste under open flow. At the same time, it raised the price of oil from 10 cents to around $3 a barrel. It has been the salvation of the entire oil industry, and has put millions of dollars into our public-school fund, the University of Texas and Texas A. & M. College. Our public-school fund and the university have each received over $100 million; and our A. & M. College has received $50 million. If our State had had no proration or conservation, at 10 cents a barrel, these great institutions would not have received very much revenue, and much of our oil would have been lost forever.

On October 28, 1936, the oil portrait of Judge C. V. Terrell was unveiled at the North Texas State College at Denton, Tex., and now hangs in the auditorium of that college.

The appreciation banquet given him at Fort Worth, Tex., in 1937, had the largest attendance of any banquet ever given anyone in Texas. More than 2,000 people attended.

He was a delegate to the National Democratic Convention held in St. Louis, Mo., in 1916, which nominated Judge Alton B. Parker for President. Judge Terrell was elected and served as presidential elector and voted for Cox and Roosevelt in 1920. He was the author of a history of Texas, Eighty-five Years of Texas, and at the ripe age of 91 years is writing another book, A History of the Railroad Commission of Texas. He was and is now the first president of the Heritage Foundation, Inc., a patriotic organization, nonprofitable and nonpolitical, dedicated to preserve the many great heritages left by our fathers.

At the unveiling of the portrait of Judge C. V. Terrell, at Denton, Tex., Hon. Fred Minor, presiding, said: "For half a century, Judge Terrell has rendered outstanding and unselfish service to the people of his State. He has made for himself an enviable record of public service and during all of that long period of time, no man has risen to question the honesty, the integrity, or the sincerity of purpose of that distinguished public servant; and this serves to make his a perfect record. We gladly join today to pay a just and well deserved tribute to the record and character of a great man."

Clarence Wharton, at the unveiling declared: "Vernon Terrell has given his life to the public service in Texas and there is no man living who can point to a dishonest act in his long career. It has been a life of sacrifice; for he has neglected his own affairs, even his own family for the public service. Twice in his career he could have easily been elected Governor of the State, but his modesty led him to seek humbler offices. And now, Vernon, we are growing old, our children are mature men and women. Side by side we go down into the twilight; we have seen great changes in our time; the men of our boyhood are scattered and gone. Patterson and Carswell, Piner and Emory Smith, and the sainted Tulley A. Fuller have long since passed away; new generations risen about us do not know the terrors of the bloody borders

on which we were born or the poverty of the reconstruction era in which we spent our boyhood, or the obstacles we and those of our day had to surmount. When the history of Texas shall have been finished and the story of its illustrious sons has reached its last chapter, no name will be more worthy, no career more unsullied than that of Charles Vernon Terrell."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL RESERVE

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth annual report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF GIRL SCOUTS OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (H. Doc. No. 119)

A letter from the president and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York, N. Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, the third annual report of that organization (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 30

"Whereas the Federal Government on June 21, 1932, entered the field of motor-fuel taxation by imposing a 1-cent-per-gallon Federal tax on gasoline, which tax has subsequently been revised as follows: June 1, 1933, increased to 1½ cents; January 1, 1934, reduced to 1 cent; July 1, 1940, increased to 1½ cents; and November 1, 1951, increased to 2 cents per gallon; and

"Whereas the 2 cents per gallon tax is now in force with no present prospect of its being removed; and

"Whereas the said 2 cents per gallon Federal gas tax yielded in the 48 States during the year 1951 a total of approximately $800,000,000; and

"Whereas virtually all highway construction came to a stop during the war years, 1941–45, during which time the highway transportation system suffered extreme damage due to unavoidable neglect and deterioration resulting from heavy traffic volumes; and

"Whereas the registration of motor vehicles shows an increase of 45 percent in motorcars and 80 percent in trucks during the last decade, which has further aggravated the damage incurred in the war years; and

"Whereas there now exists a backlog of sorely needed highway construction which is estimated to cost $50 billion, which cost exceeds the financial capacity of the States; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is diverting highway revenues to the general purposes of the Government, including the extensive construction of new highway facilities under the foreign-aid program, which policy is in direct conflict with that imposed on the States relative to the diversion of highway revenues; and

"Whereas in view of the fact that the present interstate system is composed of 37,800 miles of highways which are carrying 20 percent of the total traffic of the Nation and are of great importance to the social and economic welfare of the country and are vital to the Nation's defense; and

"Whereas the imposition of the Federal tax on gasoline is an unwarranted invasion of a tax field which should be left to the exclusive jurisdiction of the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein, a majority of the members elected to each house agreeing thereto):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, respectfully requested and petitioned to remove the Federal Government from the field of motor fuel taxation.

"SEC. 2. *Be it further resolved,* That the Congress be requested to channel the excise taxes on motor vehicles to increased aid to the States with the further request that the basis of allocations of Federal aid to the States be revised to provide 75 percent of the cost of improvements on the interstate system from Federal funds, in the same manner as Federal funds were allotted to the strategic network of highways during the war emergency.

"SEC. 3. That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States for the Senate of the United States; a copy to the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; a copy to each of the Senators and each of the Representatives in Congress from the State of Arkansas, and a copy spread upon the records of the general assembly.

"Approved March 20, 1953.

"FRANCIS CHERRY,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to authorize the recreational use of Government lands under the control of the Armed Forces

"Whereas the land area of the Territory of Hawaii is limited and thereby hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreational activities are restricted; and

"Whereas there are Government lands in Hawaii under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces which could be made available to hunting, fishing, and other outdoor recreational activities, without conflicting with the primary activities for which such lands are held: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to authorize the Armed Forces to permit hunting and fishing on and other outdoor recreational use by the residents of Hawaii of Government lands under the control of said Armed Forces, where such use will not directly conflict with the purposes for which such lands are held.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall, upon its approval, be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of Interior, Secretary of Defense, commanding general of the United States Army in the Pacific, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 25th day of March A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,
"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the 45th conference of the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, San Francisco, Calif., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing socialized medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CLAUDE R. WICKARD—RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA REA MANAGERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution dealing with the resignation of Claude R. Wickard, former REA Administrator and former Secretary of Agriculture. The resolution, adopted by the North Dakota REA Managers Association, of which Mr. Burnell C. Mabie is secretary, contains a word of praise for Mr. Wickard. Mr. Wickard did a remarkable job for North Dakota, and the folks out there appreciate it.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the North Dakota Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives Managers on this 18th day of March 1953 are in session at Bismarck, N. Dak.; and

Whereas the resignation of Mr. Claude R. Wickard, REA Administrator, has become known; and

Whereas it is the unanimous consensus of this association that REA has suffered a loss: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of this association extend to Mr. Wickard their sincere regret of his departure and their thanks and appreciation of his commendable efforts in furthering the rural electric program; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary forward a copy of this resolution to Mr. Claude R. Wickard.

BURNELL C. MABIE,
Secretary, North Dakota REA Managers Association.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS—LETTER AND RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS OF PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Peter K. Emmons, president of the board of foreign missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, of New York, N. Y., transmitting a resolution adopted by that board on February 17, 1953, relating to the amendment of the immigration laws so as to provide for the entrance for permanent residence of 300,000 refugees. I present the letter and resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OVERSEAS INTERCHURCH SERVICE,
New York, N. Y., March 30, 1953.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As president of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, I am transmitting herewith a copy of the resolution adopted by the board at its meeting in New York City on Tuesday, February 17.

This board is the official agency of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America for carrying on its work for Foreign Missions and Overseas Interchurch Service.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is a body of approximately 2,500,000 members. The board itself is composed of 50 members—laymen, women, and clergymen—who reside in all parts of the United States. The work carried on by the board is located in 34 different countries, including 12 countries in continental Europe. Our work is always conducted in the closest possible cooperation with the educational, commercial, and industrial, as well as religious leaders of the various countries. We have a particular interest in and large investment in work for social and economic welfare as well as in the training of national leadership in each of these countries. I mention these facts in order that you may know that we are in a position to understand the needs underlying our resolutions and the implication of the resolutions themselves in terms of both the nation of origin and our own Nation when we speak of the "uprooted people" of the world.

In transmitting these resolutions, I would urge you to give very careful consideration to this urgent problem.

Respectfully yours,

PETER K. EMMONS,
President of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

RESOLUTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OVERSEAS INTERCHURCH SERVICE, THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The board of foreign missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, aware of the millions of uprooted people in the world today who have no hope of returning to their homelands and who are unable to find livelihood where they are, urges the Government of the United States to—

1. Amend current immigration laws, especially portions of the McCarran-Walter Act, so that the present outdated quota system will be abolished, all discriminatory provisions based on race or nationality removed, and at least the former annual immigration limitation of one-sixth of 1 percent of our current population restored.

2. Enact such emergency legislation, during the period until a revised and adequate basic immigration law is approved, as will make possible the entrance for permanent residence in the United States of some 300,000 European refugees in the next 2 or 3 years.

PETER K. EMMONS,
President of the Board.
CHARLES T. LEBER,
General Secretary of the Board.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 2, 1953, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1110) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1545. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1546. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1547. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1548. A bill to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1549. A bill to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.; and to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1550. A bill to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. SALTONSTALL when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FLANDERS (by request):

S. 1551. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) to provide for the orderly and selective recall to active duty in the military services of members of the military reserves so as to afford the most effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. FLANDERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 1552. A bill to assure the development of petroleum resources necessary to the national security by providing a limitation on the quantity of crude petroleum and petroleum products that may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRISWOLD (by request):

S. 1553. A bill to postpone reduction of education and training allowances to on-farm trainees under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 for 12 months to allow for completion of the first crop year or animal cycle; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1554. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Katsikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1555. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See remarks of Mr. MILLIKIN when he introduced bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 1556. A bill for the relief of Achille Aquino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRICKER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1557. A bill to amend the act of June 13, 1902, to define the powers of the United States members of the International Joint Commission relating to the disposition of electric power developed at dams and hydroelectric plants located in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 1558. A bill for the relief of Sultana Coka Pavlovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1559. A bill to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1560. A bill for the relief of Valos Constantinos Lampos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 1561. A bill to permit the prospecting for and the development and utilization of mineral resources of national forest lands, or lands administered for national forest purposes or in connection with national forest programs, which are not subject to the operation of the general mining laws or the mineral leasing laws, or for the development of which no other statutory authority exists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1562. A bill to impose sliding scale stabilization duties on the importation of lead and zinc; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (by request):

S. 1563. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Guy Bulltail; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1564. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Sarah Rule; and

S. 1565. A bill for the relief of Filomena R. Ascuncion Bagaoisan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 1566. A bill to terminate the war rates of certain excise taxes, to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 1567. A bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1568. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,200 the limitation upon the amount of gross income which a dependent child of a taxpayer may receive without losing his status as a dependent for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. J Res. 65. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Army to restore the white crosses or other religious markers which until recently were above the graves of the honored war dead at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ARMED SERVICES LEGISLATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference six bills relating to the armed services.

Each bill is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the Department of Defense, which explains the purpose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letters in each case be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and the letters will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bills introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, by request, were read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1545. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1545 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is designed to authorize (1) the conveyance by the Secretary of the Army to the rector and vestry of Washington Parish (Christ Church), Washington, D. C., hereinafter referred to as the Vestry, owner of the Washington Parish Burial Ground (Congressional Cemetery), of all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain burial lots (392 in number), and a receiving vault at the cemetery in consideration of the payment of $100 by the Vestry and the release by the Vestry of any claim for reimbursement of moneys expended for upkeep and special care of Government-owned lots at the cemetery, and (2) the acquisition by the Secretary of the Army of certain burial lots at the cemetery now occupied by Government-owned burials, cenotaphs, or monuments (8 in number) by exchange for a like number of Government-owned lots at the cemetery. It is the intent of this proposed legislation to authorize divestment by the Government of all of its property rights at the cemetery for which there is no need and the acquisition by the Government of all those burial lots now in use by the Government at the cemetery without authority of the vestry. The numbers of burial lots set forth above are approximate and represent the most accurate accounting attainable on the basis of records presently existing or known to have been in existence. No statutory authority presently exists for the action contemplated.

The Washington Parish Burial Ground, popularly known as Congressional Cemetery, was originally established April 4, 1807, and has continued under the ownership and control of the rector and vestry of Washington Parish (Christ Church) since 1812. It was originally intended that this cemetery would be used in part as a burial ground for Members of Congress and other members of the United States Government, but no new burials have been made since 1902. At numerous times, prior to 1871, the Government acquired many burial lots and released others. Apparently meticulous records were not kept and preserved. Government burials were made in lots not acquired and private burials were made in lots sold by the Vestry but previously having been acquired by the Government. Several unsuccessful attempts have been made to clarify this scrambled ownership.

Current investigation reveals that the Government still retains, from the original acquisitions, about 400 burial lots for which there is no present or foreseeable need. Of these, about 188 have been inadvertently used for private burials by the Vestry. In addition, 8 burial lots are occupied by the Government for burials, cenotaphs, or monuments and 48 burial lots are occupied or obstructed by an unused receiving vault without authority of the vestry. It is proposed that this matter be rectified as follows: (1) convey the excess receiving vault and about 392 excess burial lots to the vestry, at a consideration of $100, and release of claim for reimbursement of moneys expended by the vestry for upkeep and special care of Government lots, and (2) exchange about 8 excess burial lots for a like number presently used without authority.

The consideration to be received by the United States for the conveyance of the excess receiving vault and burial lots is considered to be adequate and just. The claim of the vestry for reimbursement of moneys expended for upkeep and special care of Government-owned lots exceeds the present value of the property to be conveyed. This proposed transaction and the draft of authorizing legislation have the concurrence of the vestry.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

S. 1546. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1546 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and service lapel button.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The act of October 17, 1942 (Ch. 615, 56 Stat. 796; 36 U. S. C. 179–182), authorized the Secretary of War to approve a design for a service flag which may be displayed in a window of the place of residence of persons who are members of the immediate family of a person serving in the Armed Forces of the United States during the current war. It also authorized the approval of a design of a service lapel button to be worn by members of the immediate family of a person serving in the Armed Forces during the current war. The act provided that, upon the approval by the Secretary of War of the design for such service flag and lapel button, notice thereof together with proper description of such flag and button shall be published in the Federal Register. It provided for the issuance of licenses to manufacture and sell such flags and buttons and prohibited their manufacture and sale without a license. It authorized the Secretary of War to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

The proposed amendment would substitute "Secretary of Defense" for "Secretary of War" and in the place of "the current war" would substitute the words "any period of war or hostilities in which the Armed Forces of the United States may be engaged."

The apparent indifference of some groups of United States citizens to the struggle in which this country is engaged against Communist aggression in Korea and elsewhere has been noted with regret by many returning servicemen. Various measures have been proposed to help dispel this indifference, and to bring home to every community the importance of our national military effort. The armed services have all agreed that it would be highly desirable to restore the former practice of displaying service flags in the homes of service personnel, and thus give every neighborhood a better opportunity to honor the men and women who have left their homes to serve their country.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was presented for the consideration of the 82d Congress as part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1952, but it was not introduced in the 82d Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

S. 1547. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1547 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel.

This proposed legislation is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, and the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the presentation of this proposal to the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is twofold: (1) To validate payments, disallowed as the result of the Comptroller General's decision, B–66073, of June 13, 1947, for the transportation at Government expense of household effects of certain persons released from active duty; and (2) to authorize the payment of those claims of individuals for reimbursement for expenses incurred in shipping household effects upon release from active duty which were held by the Comptroller to be unauthorized.

Regulations issued by the Department of the Navy pursuant to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 authorized personnel, upon release from active duty, to ship household effects at Government expense between any points, provided the cost of such shipment did not exceed the construction cost to the Government, within prescribed weight allowances, had the shipment been made from the last duty station to the home of record

at the time of being called to active duty. In conformity with these regulations, the Department of the Navy made payments covering he cost of the transportation of household effects from home of record to places selected where the cost did not exceed the limitation established by those regulations. On June 13, 1947, however, the Comptroller General ruled that the shipment of household effects from homes of record to places selected by personnel released from active duty was unauthorized. A number of claims which were paid by the Department of the Navy prior to this decision were disallowed.

In addition to authorizing the payment of claims for reimbursement for expenses incurred in the shipment of household effects under the above circumstances, the proposed legislation would ratify and approve payments heretofore made for such costs of transportation. The proposal, however, would require the transportation of effects to have been authorized by the regulations prior to June 13, 1947, and the cost to be limited in each case to the constructive cost to the Government of transportation from the last duty station to home of record.

Although efforts are being made at the present time to effect collection in those cases where payment was made and subsequently disallowed, the interests of justice require that naval personnel should not be required to bear the cost of transportation of household effects made in accordance with duly prescribed regulations which prior to the Comptroller General's decision had been consistently interpreted by the Department of the Navy as authorizing Government reimbursement for such shipment. To require refund or reimbursements from personnel no longer in active naval service not only will produce injustices, but in many cases may inflict financial hardship. In addition, it is to be noted that current joint travel regulations issued pursuant to the Career Compensation Act of 1949 authorize the type of shipment involved herein, and, therefore, this legislation is retrospective only.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Legislation identical with this proposal, except for a technical change, was included in the Department of Defense legislative program for consideration by the 81st Congress, 2d session, approved by the Bureau of the Budget and introduced in the Congress (H. R. 6812 and S. 2860). H. R. 778, which was introduced in the 1st session of the 81st Congress is substantially similar to H. R. 6812 and S. 2860.

S. 2860 passed the Senate on April 19, 1950, with an amendment striking the word "effected" on page 2, line 1, of the bill and inserting the word "authorized" in lieu thereof. That amendment was recommended by the Department of Defense and it has been incorporated in the attached draft of bill.

S. 329 which was introduced in the 1st session of the 82d Congress is identical with S. 2860, 81st Congress, as passed by the Senate on April 19, 1950.

COST DATA

This legislation would legalize payments previously made in the amount of $50,400 and would result in an additional estimated cost of $42,600 to cover anticipated claims.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

S. 1548. A bill to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1548 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico.

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation is designed to provide for the transfer to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of approximately 1,540.78 acres of fee-owned land and 10.81 acres of roadway, electric transmission line, and water pipeline easements, no longer required for military use, in exchange for approximately 6,500 acres urgently required to expand the Salinas maneuver site, which is owned by the United States. This addition will increase the maneuver site to an area comprising approximately 13,000 acres.

The lands owned by the United States proposed for exchange comprise former harbor defense and training installations and consist of 12 separate parcels. Five of these were set aside from the public lands by the President for military use at the time Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States by Spain. Seven parcels were acquired thereafter at a cost of about $355,000. Four of the sites are within the city of San Juan and have now become very valuable business-district property, accounting for one-third of the current value of the 12 parcels. The present appraised value of the 12 parcels is $1,561,399.45.

The lands required by the United States for military utilization comprise about 6,500 acres of rural and agricultural lands adjacent to the Salinas maneuver site. The present value of this area, including the improvements thereon, has been appraised at $820,202. The insular government is now acquiring this area with funds appropriated for that purpose in anticipation of this proposed exchange.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

S. 1549. A bill to retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1549 is as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., January 5, 1953.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To retrocede to the State of Virginia concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within Fort Belvoir, Va."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

This proposed legislation will retrocede to the State of Virginia, upon acceptance thereof, concurrent jurisdiction over certain highways within the Fort Belvoir Military Reservation. The United States now has exclusive jurisdiction over this area. This measure will permit proper control of the highways jointly, by the Federal Government and the State, thereby obviating problems which might arise out of military policing of highways heavily traveled by the civilian public, and at the same time allowing appropriate military control of an area within a military reservation.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

Legislation identical to this proposal was included in the Department of Defense legislative program for 1952 and was introduced in the 82d Congress as H. R. 7661. No further action was taken by the Congress with respect to the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

S. 1550. A bill to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom.

The letter accompanying Senate bill 1550 is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation "To authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953, and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department of Defense recommends that it be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize the President to prescribe by regulation the occasions upon which persons who served in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war and who have been honorably discharged therefrom may wear the uniform of the armed force in which they so served.

Title 18, United States Code, section 702, provides a penalty for persons wearing the uniform of any of the Armed Forces of the United States without authority. Authority for persons not members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps to wear the uniform of any of these services is contained in the following statutes:

Section 2 of the act of June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1028; 34 U. S. C. 399d):

"All persons who have served honorably in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during war shall, when not in the military and/or naval service of the United States, be entitled to bear the official title and upon occasions of ceremony to wear the uniform of the highest grade held by them during their war service."

Section 125 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1393):

"It shall be unlawful for any person not an officer or enlisted man of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps to wear the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, or any distinctive part of such uniform or a uniform any part of which is similar to a distinctive part of the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps: *Provided*, That the foregoing provision shall not be construed so as to prevent officers or enlisted men of the National Guard from

wearing, in pursuance of law and regulations, the uniform lawfully prescribed to be worn by such officers or enlisted men of the National Guard; * * *; nor to prevent persons who in time of war have served honorably as officers of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, and whose most recent service was terminated by an honorable discharge, muster-out, or resignation, from wearing, upon occasions of ceremony, the uniform of the highest grade they have held by brevet or other commission in such Regular or Volunteer services; * * *; nor to prevent the members of military societies composed entirely of honorably discharged officers or enlisted men or both, of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, from wearing upon occasions of ceremony, the uniform duly prescribed by such societies to be worn by the members thereof."

Those statutes were made applicable to the Air Force by the National Security Act of 1947. Title 14, United States Code, section 484, provides that the provisions of law relating to the protection of the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps shall apply to the protection of the uniform of the Coast Guard in the same manner, to the same extent, and under the same conditions.

The phrase "occasions of ceremony" as used in the above-quoted statutes is not defined in either statute. The Office of the Attorney General has advised that, because the language of these statutes is so broad and indefinite, the enforcement of the criminal statute (18 U. S. C. 702) is most difficult, if not impossible. This proposed legislation is, therefore, considered necessary for the proper protection of the uniforms of the Armed Forces.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would involve no additional cost to the Government.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACTION AGENCY

The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT,
General Counsel.

EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) to provide for the orderly and selective recall to active duty in the military services of members of the military reserves so as to afford the most effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States, and for other purposes. In spite of the fact that I am introducing the bill by request, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

The bill (S. 1551) to amend the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 481) to provide for the orderly and selective recall to active duty in the military services of members of the military reserves so as to afford the most effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have today introduced by request a bill to establish a National Manpower Board in the offices of the President. The purpose of the bill is to provide for the selective recall to active military duty of members of the Reserve so as to afford the most effective utilization of manpower resources in the United States. The Board created by this bill shall effect a study of specialized personnel requirements, including those of the armed services, and recommend to the President criteria and procedures governing the call to active duty of reservists having specialized skills and experience.

The preliminary findings of the National Manpower Council indicate that we may shortly be faced with a shortage of scientific and professional manpower, both in military and civilian life. During the next few years practically all of our young men will incur a Reserve obligation to the military forces and I believe that the problems this bill seeks to reach are worthy of intensive study on the part of the Armed Services Committee. Congressman JOHNSON, of California, has introduced a similar bill in the House and it is my hope that both Armed Services Committees will shortly be able to give their attention to what appears to me to be a pressing problem.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to point out that the report of the Armed Services Committee on the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 stated that as the size of the Reserve gradually increases each year, it is highly questionable on the basis of the facts that the committee then had at hand, whether the selection for mobilization of these great numbers of men can and should be the exclusive property of the military. This was a problem of deep concern to the committee in 1952 and it is still a matter of deep concern to me. Although I am not committed to the terms of this bill, I believe that it should be introduced to provide the basis of investigation into this problem by the Armed Services Committee. It is also my hope that the executive branch will devote prompt consideration to this matter.

LIMITATION ON IMPORTATION OF CRUDE PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to assure the development of petroleum resources necessary to the national security by providing a limitation on the quantity of crude petroleum and petroleum products that may be imported into the United States. I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Kansas is recognized.

The bill (S. 1552) to assure the development of petroleum resources necessary to the national security by providing a limitation on the quantity of crude petroleum and petroleum products that may be imported into the United States, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the bill would restrict the foreign oil to the percentage level at which it entered the country from 1946 to 1951, and provides that the quantity imported could not exceed 10 percent of the domestic demand in the United States. It seems to me that 10 percent is a reasonable limitation.

Our domestic crude oil production during 1953 has already been forced downward by 200,000 barrels daily, with further curtailment anticipated.

This reduction in domestic production is of importance to our Nation from a security standpoint. When we are reliant on other countries for oil, we are dependent on others for security.

Steel, operated by man and powered by petroleum, constitutes our real defense. It is inconceivable to me that when we are capable of supplying our own needs, we should endanger the development of so vital a material of defense.

Oil imported from other countries during wartime would have to be protected from submarines with scarce manpower, tankers, and other equipment.

If we do not continue an expanded program of development of domestic petroleum resources necessary for national security, we could in time of war be faced with a civilian rationing that would be most damaging to our domestic economy.

I am not opposed to the importation of limited quantities of oil, but I think it is essential that we begin to seriously consider the ever rapidly increasing importation of this commodity.

The increase alone in imported oil from 1947 to 1953 was enough to have displaced the entire crude oil output of Arkansas, Colorado, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, New Mexico, and Utah. The economic health of these and the other 17 oil-producing States is closely tied to that of the oil industry.

Oil constitutes half of the value of all mineral production in this country. A depressed oil industry would have a serious effect on the general economy.

President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message stressed, and I quote, "legitimate safeguards for domestic industries."

I would also call your attention to the policy of the overall oil industry subscribed to by the importers, which was endorsed by the National Petroleum Council. This policy stated that "the paramount objective should be to maintain conditions best suited to a healthy domestic industry, which is essential to national security and welfare."

It would be highly desirable if this problem could be met by voluntary action on the part of the importing companies and I would strongly favor it. However, history shows there are times when it might be well to have some regulations to guide these agreements.

The bill does not limit imports by product. It allows flexibility according to demand, and would put imports on the same basis as the domestic industry.

The President could remove the quota restriction if total supplies became insufficient to meet consumption. This provision would protect the public from a shortage situation.

I would urge caution against indiscriminate application of the "trade, not aid" philosophy. There is nothing in our history that justifies aiding others by trading away our security.

At a later date I expect to discuss this bill in much greater detail.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended by adding a new subsection as follows:

"That notwithstanding the authority granted in the preceding subsection, or any foreign trade agreement entered into pursuant thereto, a quota for crude petroleum and petroleum products to be imported into the United States shall be provided limiting the total quantity imported from all countries, including oil for supplies for vessels at United States ports but excluding oil for manufacture and reexport, in any quarter of a year to an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the domestic petroleum demand in the United States, as reported by the United States Bureau of Mines for the same quarter of the previous year. The quota established under this subsection may be suspended by the President during any period in which he finds that there is an inadequacy of total petroleum supplies to meet current national consumption."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. If my time has not expired, I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas has introduced a bill which would seek to impose some limitation on the importation of residual oil. It is an importation which threatens the coal industry of our country.

On February 27 I introduced S. 1092, which, while differing slightly from the bill introduced by the Senator from Kansas, has the same objective. I see in the Chamber the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance. I should like to join with my colleague, the junior Senator from Kansas, in asking if, under the proper circumstances and at the appropriate time, we could possibly have these bills, which seek the same objective, taken up by the committee.

Mr. CARLSON. If it is in order, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee to make reply.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I think circumstances will develop under which the bills can be considered before the Committee on Finance, and that ample hearings will be held.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. If I have the time to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should merely like to ask, if we are in such desperate shape, is it not about time that we went full speed ahead with the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway?

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and myself, I introduce for proper reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River Storage Project.

The bill (S. 1555) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the project includes the initiation of the comprehensive development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, which includes the States of Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Arizona, by regulating the flow of that river, storing water for beneficial consumptive use, making it possible for the States of the upper basin to utilize the waters of that river which have been apportioned to them by compacts approved by the United States Government.

It is proposed, among other things, to provide for irrigation, control of floods, generation of hydroelectric power, conservation of wildlife, scenery, archeologic objects, recreational facilities; and, for carrying out the objectives of the bill, there are provisions for constructing, operating, and maintaining dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works.

The drainage basin of the Colorado River includes a total of 243,000 square miles. The upper basin of the Colorado River contains 110,000 square miles and the lower basin 133,000 square miles. The total length of the river is 1,350 miles, 650 of them in the upper basin and 700 in the lower basin.

The Senators who are sponsoring the bill reserve the right to support amendments as the facts may develop through hearings and otherwise.

Mr. WATKINS subsequently said: Mr. President, I appreciate the honor of joining with my colleagues in the Intermountain States of the great West in the introduction of a bill to authorize the construction of the upper Colorado storage project, together with participating projects.

It is a good omen for this area that all Senators, regardless of party membership, from the States of Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Wyoming, and Utah should unite in sponsoring this legislation so vital to the future welfare of all of them.

Even though this country is now engaged in a contest of uncertain duration with communism, it is still necessary to carry on a program of development of our natural resources. With an annual increase in population of approximately 2½ million people as a result of births within the United States and an annual immigration of over 300,000 people from other countries, the United States faces the absolute need for additional opportunities for farms, homes, and jobs to take care of this great increase. We cannot rest on our oars with a prospective increase of 30 million people in the next 10 years.

The last remaining frontiers where great developments can take place are in the far West. For many years Utah has been exporting many thousands of its young men and women educated and trained at heavy expense to the State. The same is true of many other States on the upper Colorado River. When Utah's part of this project is completed, it is estimated it alone will make it possible for the State to more than double its population. The other States will also greatly benefit.

This great project is one of the first of its kind to be brought before the Congress, in that it provides, in one measure, for the complete development of the upper Colorado. Heretofore there have been separate bills authorizing various projects on the streams. The States of New Mexico, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Arizona have joined in proposing, in one bill, the authorization of a single project for the full development of the stream, although there are many of what would be regarded in ordinary times as participating projects. This is a departure from the claims made in the past and from the procedures of the past, in that we ask that all these units be put under and designated as one project.

There are other departures which will be very interesting to Members of Congress. One of them is to the effect that interest shall be paid on all sums advanced for power and for the development of power, and that such interest shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States. We would not follow in this project the line heretofore followed of having interest increments, which would subsidize the other phases of the project. The money would be paid into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States. That is quite a departure from what was done with respect to projects built in the past.

ACHILLE AQUINO

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Achille Aquino.

Achille Aquino, of Ciro, Italy, is the young adult son of Mrs. Maria Francesca Aquino, of Mansfield, Ohio. His father, John Aquino, a naturalized American citizen, is now dead, having died shortly after Mrs. Aquino arrived from Italy a few years ago.

The bill would permit Achille Aquino to enter the United States for permanent legal residence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1556) for the relief of Achille Aquino, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TERMINATION OF WAR RATES OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would terminate so-called war rates of certain excise taxes.

During the past 20 years the people of the United States have been subjected to a plague of increasing taxes which have long ago passed the point of confiscation.

The Federal income tax itself takes approximately 20 percent of the average individual income; yet whatever amount is left is by no means immune to further dimunition through taxation, because everywhere the individual turns he is confronted with another "hidden tax."

On many articles in common use, not as luxuries, the taxes amount to almost as much as the price of the article itself. Of the price of a Ford automobile, for example, almost five or six hundred dollars represent hidden and direct taxes. Of course when Mr. Ford goes to England or to another European country and builds his plants there, he has a little better luck, because the taxes in those countries are not collected on the same basis on which they are collected in this country. But the people who must stay here are subjected to those taxes.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill today to terminate so-called excise-tax war rates, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1566) to terminate the war rates of certain excise taxes, to repeal certain excise taxes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective with respect to the period after June 30, 1953, the following sections and subchapters of the Internal Revenue Code are hereby repealed:

(1) section 1650 (war tax rates of certain miscellaneous taxes);

(2) section 1651 (retailers' excise tax on luggage, etc.);

(3) section 3406 (a) (10) (manufacturers' excise tax on electric light bulbs and tubes);

(4) subchapter B of chapter 30 (taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities); and

(5) subchapter C of chapter 30 (taxes on transportation of persons).

(b) The "rate reduction date" defined in section 1659 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be July 1, 1953.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2400 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on jewelry, etc.) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The tax imposed by this section shall not apply to articles sold at retail for less than $50."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to articles sold on or after July 1, 1953.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3406 (a) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code (manufacturers' excise tax on photographic apparatus) is hereby amended by striking out "20 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "10 per centum".

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply only to articles sold on or after July 1, 1953.

SEC. 4. Effective with respect to amounts paid after June 30, 1953, for the use of any safe-deposit box, chapter 12 of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on safe-deposit boxes) is hereby repealed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, during the past 20 years numerous taxes have been enacted and carried in our tax structure as "temporary taxes." They were renewed periodically by legislation extending the date of applicability until these taxes have for all practical purposes become permanent.

Whether or not these extensions are justified is of no consequence because we are not keeping faith with the American taxpayers when we sell them a temporary tax on an emergency basis and then extend and amend it until the temporary measure becomes a permanent policy.

In the last few years numerous temporary measures were rushed through to enactment under the guise of an emergency only to become a permanent burden.

Mr. President, I need go no farther than the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which was passed under the guise of an emergency measure supposedly to rescue this country from the economic depression. In reality it was, and still is, a sinister plan to divide the markets of this country with the rest of the world and to bring about the destruction of the American standard of living by reducing the financial status of the American public to that of a common world level. Every time that act has come up for extension an emergency has been created or magnified in order to gain such an extension.

The so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will soon be before Congress for another extension and the free traders are frantically working on an emergency to insure its passage. However, there will be vigorous opposition from some of us who can foresee its disastrous implications.

When section 1650 of the Revenue Act of 1943 was passed doubling the excise taxes on many articles and activities it contained a limiting clause calling for its termination 6 months after the ending of hostilities in World War II which would have been July 1, 1947, in consequence of the termination of hostilities in World War II at noon December 31, 1946.

However, before these war rates could be terminated by the passage of time the Congress intervened and by an amendment repealed the limiting proviso and thereby converted a temporary tax into a permanent one.

FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1567) to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Migratory Labor Committee Act of 1952."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress finds that—

(a) the employment of migratory agricultural workers presents grave problems of national scope. The services of the migratory workers are urgently needed, yet their employment does not provide a livelihood consonant with American standards. The national interest in protecting the health and welfare of American citizens demands that measures be taken to protect the health and welfare of migratory workers moving across State lines.

(b) Federal responsibility toward migratory agricultural workers is shared by several departments and agencies of the Government no one of which has overall responsibility. As a result no comprehensive national policy or program has been developed, nor have Federal and State and local programs been coordinated.

COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

SEC. 3. (a) (1) In order to bring about a more effective coordination of policy with respect to the employment of migratory agricultural labor, there is hereby established a Committee on Migratory Labor (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee"). The Committee shall consist of 9 members of whom 3 shall be appointed by the President from private life and 1 shall be appointed by the President from each of the following departments or agencies upon recommendation of the respective heads thereof: Department of Labor, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Federal Security Agency, and Housing and Home Finance Agency.

(2) Members of the Committee who are appointed from private life shall be appointed for terms of 3 years, except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed only for the unexpired portion of such term, and (B) of the members first appointed, 1 shall serve for a term of 1 year, 1 shall serve for a term of 2 years, and 1 shall serve for a term of 3 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. The President shall designate one member appointed from private life, who shall serve full time, as chairman.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee shall receive a salary of $16,000. The other two members of the Committee who are appointed from private life shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of the duties of the Committee. Officers or employees of the Government who are appointed to the Committee shall not receive additional compensation for their work as members of the Committee; but all members of the Committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as such members. The Committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems necessary for carrying on the work of the Committee. The Committee also may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(4) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall cooperate with the Committee in its work and furnish it such information and assistance as it may reasonably require in the performance of its duties.

(5) The Committee shall meet at least once during each calendar quarter and at such other times as may be designated by the Chairman.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Committee—

(1) to assist the affected departments and agencies in developing and coordinating policies relating to migratory labor, particularly with respect to more effective procedures for bringing employers and workers together;

(2) to study and recommend measures by which unnecessary migratory movements of agricultural workers may be reduced; and

(3) to consult and cooperate with such State and area committees on migratory labor as may be established and with other State and local units of government with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local efforts on the migratory problem.

The Committee, no less than once annually, shall submit to the President and to the Congress a report on its activities.

The statement by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY UPON INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO CREATE A FEDERAL COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR

The bill (S. 1567) is identical to S. 3300 which was unanimously reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the last session of Congress. Joining with me as cosponsors are Senators IVES, MURRAY, DOUGLAS, and KENNEDY.

A number of legislative proposals concerning migratory labor were placed before the committee during the last session—varied bills addressed to specific problems within the overall problem of migratory labor. After exhaustive hearings and considerable deliberation by the members of the committee, however, it was unanimously concluded that the best initial approach to this widely recognized problem would be creation of a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor, which would coordinate the activities of the various agencies of the Government now active in the field in one form or another.

While Members of this body on other occasions have had ample and frequent opportunity to become fully aware of the seriousness of the migratory labor problem in this country, I think that it is appropriate to briefly review the problem as it was presented to the committee.

I trust that in this presentation I will be able to convey to the Members of the Senate the great need for immediate action.

It involves the national interest, in a period when we must all be concerned with most effective use of our available manpower resources.

It involves the welfare and the hopes of more than a million persons who are employed as migratory farm laborers.

It involves the conscience of the American people, who cannot tolerate the continued plight of this huge group of second class citizens within our own country at a time when we are holding forth our democracy as an example of freedom before the rest of the world.

Few social problems of our time have more often irked the public conscience than the examples of the sordid conditions of misery and exploitation under which migratory workers often must exist.

Few problems have been given more searching investigation, or more exhaustive study and hearings before legislative bodies.

Yet, on few social problems has less progress been made in providing an organized means of coping with these conditions, or of reducing and eventually eliminating the basic causes of such conditions.

NECESSARY FIRST STEP

Conditions and circumstances surrounding the use of migratory workers in American agriculture are too complex to wipe out overnight the many social problems arising out of such seasonal employment on a bare subsistence level. But the challenge is before this Congress to take the necessary first step of providing for an organized, coordinated approach toward the most practical and humane solution to those problems.

Human justice, and the Nation's own interest, calls for that step to be taken without further delay.

Let me read you a very short quotation from the 1951 report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor:

"Migrants are the children of misfortune. They are the rejects of those sectors of agriculture and other industries undergoing change. We depend on misfortune to build up our force of migratory workers, and when the supply is low because there is not enough misfortune at home, we rely on misfortune abroad to replenish the supply."

That statement is an eloquent summation of the degradation, misery, and exploitation of over a million migratory farmworkers who earn their living by cultivating and harvesting our Nation's crops.

It should be quite unnecessary for me to spell out in detail the unhappy existence of our migratory farmworkers. The report of the President's Commission has told the story well. More recently, the seriousness of such migratory labor problems as insecurity, short work periods, low income, poor housing and health, inadequate schooling, and lack of social opportunities were capably set forth in a pamphlet issued within recent weeks by the National Planning Association, and prepared by Dr. Lowry Nelson, professor of rural sociology at the University of Minnesota.

The task of Congress is to examine this problem as to its effects on the welfare of our Nation, and to provide legislative remedies to the extent possible.

As Dr. Nelson and the NPA agriculture committee point out, a complete solution of these problems depends not alone on laws but on fundamental changes in the method and structure of agriculture.

Establishment of the committee called for in my bill would provide coordinated leadership in that direction, a vehicle to mobilize all the efforts of State and Federal Governments, civic groups, and farmers themselves toward helping to improve conditions of the migratory worker.

Certainly we cannot afford to dismiss or ignore the misfortunes of the migratory workers as individuals. We can afford even less to ignore the misfortunes when they adversely affect the Nation's well-being. Migratory farmworkers provide an indispensable source of manpower in producing the Nation's food supply. Yet this important segment of labor has been subjected to working and living conditions so far below normal American standards of decency that fewer and fewer American workers will perform such work, and labor from less fortunate lands has been imported to fill the gap. In the vicious migratory cycle, this imported labor has in turn further depressed the miserable economic status of those Americans still compelled by necessity to eke out an existence from this lowest rung on the ladder of employment opportunity.

My interest in the migratory problem is twofold: Human welfare and production manpower. I see no need for those interests to conflict.

I am concerned with the problems and welfare of all people in agriculture, whether they be farmowners or farmworkers. Migratory farmworkers and their families are a part of the population which depend in the main upon agriculture as a livelihood. Their welfare must be considered along with other efforts to strengthen our agricultural economy and improve all rural living conditions.

Migratory workers are still an important factor in agricultural production, particularly of certain crops in certain areas. While their employment is heavily concentrated on less than 5 percent of our farms, usually in specialty-crop areas, their importance to much of the commercial production on these farms, under present farming methods, must be recognized.

In my opinion, agricultural policy in this country must be guided by both production and human-welfare objectives, whether it be short-range or long-range policy. The two objectives cannot long remain separated in a society of free people, because each serves the other.

Promotion of the economic and social well-being of agricultural laborers, therefore, must be recognized as among the factors facilitating production.

ALL SHARE RESPONSIBILITY

Agriculture alone cannot be saddled with the responsibility for creating the conditions which exist among migratory workers in this country. Nor, in all fairness, can agriculture alone be depended upon nor is it able to fully alleviate such conditions.

The migratory problem is a product of our entire economy, including the economic hazards under which farmers themselves must operate. All of us share with farmers the responsibility for working toward solutions in keeping with American standards of decency and dignity of the individual.

Unfortunately, there has been widespread misunderstanding about migratory problems in this country that too often reflect entirely unfairly upon the great majority of America's farmers.

It's apparently another case of a few rotten apples creating a stench over the whole barrel.

Too much evidence has been uncovered in investigation after investigation for anyone to dispute the many examples of flagrant exploitation and abuse of migratory workers.

But too often it is not made clear in the public's mind that around 95 percent of the Nation's farmers use no migratory labor at all.

Even among the small minority using migratory workers, most of the instances of extreme social problems arising out of such

use have occurred on the even smaller percentage of large-scale industrialized type of farms, often operated by absentee owners. Such "factories in the fields" have little in common with the traditional American family farm; instead, they are often ruthless competitors. Such mass enterprises are usually not operated by farmers; they are operated by speculators with little concern for what happens to either the human or the natural resources they exploit.

The abuses frequently brought to light from these factories in the fields should not be permitted to reflect upon America's farmers, big or little, nor upon the good name of agriculture as a whole. Most progressive farmers have come to realize that it is to their own business interest, and improves their competitive position as employers, to provide good wages, housing, and working conditions.

The great bulk of farm labor in this country is performed by farmers themselves and members of their own families. Because of the great disparity between farm incomes and incomes of other segments of our economy, too many farmers themselves still have to work under conditions not far above the level of migratory farmworkers.

Because the bulk of farmwork on family farms is performed by the farmer and his family, any exploitation of cheap migratory labor is actually in direct competition with the historic pattern of family farming we have endeavored to maintain in this country, tending to pull down ever lower the standards of income and living for all of our farm families.

Farmers as a whole, therefore, have an important stake themselves in eliminating substandard working conditions now prevailing among the farmworkers who compete with family farmers, and thereby weaken the family farm bulwark of our democracy.

FAMILY FARM BEST HOPE

Most of our farm labor migration stems from the lack of better employment opportunities of a more stable and permanent nature. This makes it necessary for many families to turn to the short-term seasonal type of work offered in specialized farming operations for their livelihood.

Our long-term objective, therefore, should be the establishment of conditions in agriculture and the rest of our economy that make such migration unnecessary.

The family farm offers the best hope of stable all-year farm equipment. It usually uses but little hired labor, either migratory or local, and where it does use such labor it is usually more concerned with the individual needs of the laborers and their families.

Unless we can bring some order out of the chaos of current trends tending to perpetuate dependency upon migratory workers as a cheap labor source, we are actually undermining the family farm system in America.

A Louisiana strawberry grower testified last year before the Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations that 500 small farmers who had raised strawberries in his State had been forced out of business during the last several years by large operators using cheap imported labor. This is one of many examples that show some of our current policies are in direct contravention of the long-standing public policy of encouraging family-sized farms as the most stable and desirable unit of agricultural production.

THE MIGRANTS THEMSELVES

I have endeavored to show that our existing migratory-labor problems are extremely detrimental to agriculture itself. But what about the effect the perpetuation of present migratory labor conditions is having upon the migratory workers themselves?

Wasteful under-utilization of domestic migratory farm workers and the importation of foreign workers have created or aggravated several other problems of grave consequence.

Haphazard distribution of the labor supply keeps thousands of workers on the move in search of employment. When they do find it, it is most often of short duration and the worker and his family must move on.

LACK EDUCATION

This constant movement has made it impossible for migrant children to have any continuity of attendance at school. In addition, local school systems have found it virtually impossible to absorb the short-term enrollment of the children of migrant families who after a few days or weeks' employment again depart.

The gravity of this condition was brought into sharp focus by the testimony of Earl James McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education. Mr. McGrath told our subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management Relations:

"It is not surprising, therefore, that they (children of migrant families) constitute our biggest reservoir of illiterates. And strangely enough, Mr. Chairman, they have less education than their parents—which surprised me very greatly."

These children could grow up to be the rejects of the next generation. They will be excluded from many economic pursuits. They will be unfit for military service. They will have little understanding of American citizenship, because they have had no preparation for it. Yet they are more than one-half million in number.

HOUSING PROBLEMS

Poor distribution of the migratory farm-labor supply has also contributed to an already bad housing situation. Short-term employment has made even minimum-housing accommodations economically unfeasible. Decent housing cannot be supplied when it is used only during peak-employment periods. Nonoccupancy for many months out of the year makes the cost of adequate housing prohibitively expensive. As a result, housing is usually either nonexistent or incredibly bad. Sanitary facilities are all too often nonexistent. Such conditions threaten not only the health of the migrants, but often imperil the health of the whole community.

WASTE OF MANPOWER

A mass of evidence was presented to our subcommittee in the 82d Congress establishing gross and inexcusable waste of manpower, because of the chaotic method of labor procurement and distribution. The almost total lack of coordination of manpower utilization among seasonal workers in agriculture has resulted in two direct economic costs to employer and employee.

Substantial losses have been sustained by growers due to their inability to harvest crops or through wasteful and inefficient harvesting performed by dissatisfied or poorly trained and directed workers. The workers themselves suffer through frequent unemployment due to an oversupply of labor in one area, though at the same time other areas may be in urgent need of workers.

The full proportion of the poor utilization of manpower was indicated by the testimony of Robert L. Hudgens, who, as Associate Administrator of the Farm Security Administration, was principally responsible for the farm-labor programs in the early part of World War II. Mr. Hudgens testified:

"American agriculture, from a technical point of view, is the most efficient in the world, efficient in almost every aspect except in the management of its seasonal labor supply. The system that has persisted until now should be challenged for its sheer inefficiency.

"In 1942, under the pressure of wartime shortages, it was necessary to schedule the movement of agricultural workers, as I have described above (through the Farm Security Administration). It is estimated that the crops of California in that year were harvested with one-third to one-half of the seasonal labor that had previously been considered normal."

An intelligent, coordinated approach can help solve the complex migratory labor problem, and greatly minimize the social problems now surrounding the use of such labor—if we provide, within our framework of Government, some fixed responsibility for such a coordinated approach.

That's what our bill proposes to provide.

WE NEED COORDINATION

We are again in a period of heavy defense demands upon labor, which means we can't waste any of our manpower resources. Agriculture is having to produce more, with a shrinking labor supply. With falling farm prices, farmers can't compete with defense industry wage rates.

The Department of Agriculture, Department of Labor, Department of State, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Federal Security Agency, and Housing and Home Finance Agency each have responsibilities to a varying degree for different phases of activity in relation to these migratory labor problems.

None, however, has a fixed responsibility to approach the task in the light of the total job; and there is now no effective vehicle for making sure they are not actually working at cross-purposes, rather than in a coordinated pattern toward the same objectives.

We can't afford to put off much longer facing squarely up to this problem and doing something about it.

About 500,000 workers or one-half of our present migratory labor force is composed of American citizens. We import about 200,000 contract workers from Mexico and the British West Indies. The rest of the migratory work force comes mainly from the thousands upon thousands of illegal immigrants who cross the Mexican border each year to enter the stream of migratory farm workers.

Can we build a sound agricultural economy in our country if it must be dependent upon imported workers from another country?

These alien workers, both legal and illegal, pose a serious conflict in terms of our national immigration policy. The policy as expressed by Congress has declared that American living and working standards, particularly of wage earners, are not to be undetermined by foreign-labor competition. Though contract laborers have been specifically excluded by the immigration laws since 1919, the ninth provision of section 3 of the act has provided statutory authority for the recruitment and temporary admission of alien contract workers. This authority was exercised as an emergency measure during World War II.

The end of the war, however, did not bring its termination. On the contrary, the number of contract laborers imported from other countries in each of the last 2 years was more than double the number imported in the peak war year, 1945, when 92,000 were brought in.

Already a bill is before the Congress for extending authority for this imported alien labor another 3 years.

PERPETUATING SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Is that the best answer we can find for our agricultural labor problem? I don't think so. In fact, I'm convinced that this continued importation of foreign labor is serving only to perpetuate the problems we

are trying to solve, working directly against agriculture's own best interest.

Let me point out that last year these imported Mexican workers were used on only 31,200 American farms, far less than even 1 percent of our farms.

Is it in the public interest to subsidize, to the extent public funds are required for administration of the Mexican labor program, this small group of big-farm employers with cheap foreign labor that in turn forces down the earning and income standards of the great bulk of American family farmers, who must compete through use of their own labor and that of their own families?

Is it in the public interest to tolerate continued exploitation and abuse of the wetbacks, the annual influx of illegal entries across the Mexican border?

The gravity of this situation was fully stated during the last session of Congress when additional funds were sought for the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization to tighten the Mexican border patrol and to transport illegal aliens to central Mexico. These additional funds were denied, and the situation today is as bad as ever.

Considering the stringency with which our immigration law is being enforced in other respects, this laxity on the Mexican border is little short of incredible. Aside from the fact that undesirable and conceivably dangerous and subversive aliens can make their entry into this country in this way, these thousands of illegals on crossing the border immediately become fugitives from the law. The record of evidence is clear that too many big employers have taken advantage of this situation, and in offering them asylum on their farms, have exploited them at miserably low wage scales—wages far below the admittedly substandard farm-wage average.

The matters I have just referred to are, however, merely complicating factors to the basic problem.

Single-crop farming has long been characteristic of certain agricultural products. This specialization in growing food crops has been accelerated by increased mechanization on our farms and the ability of a farm operator to cultivate larger and larger tracts of land. With this specialization has come the need for large quantities of labor for short periods—particularly in the planting and harvesting seasons. These are the times when migratory workers are needed in large numbers.

Until and unless we achieve basic changes in some of our present farming operations—through encouragement, education, and public policies that favor the family-type farm over industrialized units—we are going to continue needing migratory workers in agriculture.

Our immediate problem, therefore, is to provide for the most efficient use of that labor and to improve the conditions under which it is used to the extent possible. A great deal can be done, particularly if we provide a coordinated approach and supervision to policies of recruitment and utilization.

At present, in their search for labor which is available at wages they can afford to pay, farmers have to recruit in any way they can, wherever they can. With no really effective machinery to perform this function, crew leaders and labor contractors have appeared who furnish farm operators with labor. Some of these contractors have performed this service with benefit to the farmer who needs labor and to the worker who needs employment. Others have performed poorly in both respects. Still others, regrettably, have mercilessly exploited their crews and left farmers with half-harvested crops.

Although these contractors operate over State lines, they have been unregulated or controlled by Government agencies. Transportation of workers is provided in shocking disregard of safety, sanitation, or comfort. Housing, if such it can be called, is arranged by the crew leader. Not infrequently this housing is supplemented by prostitution, gambling, and the illegal sale of liquor and dope.

From an economic standpoint, the haphazard methods of labor recruitment and utilization through the medium of the labor contractor have often resulted in a catastrophic waste of manpower and crops.

As the migratory labor system now operates in American agriculture, farmers can rarely be sure of an adequate supply of labor when it is critically needed. Workers can rarely be assured of employment, even after traveling great distances in search of work.

The aimless and often useless movement of thousands of workers with their families creates serious community and national problems.

All of us are familiar with this problem, for it certainly is not a new one. It was studied in 1936 by a subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator La Follette of Wisconsin. It was studied by a select committee of the House of Representatives under the chairmanship of Representative Tolan, of California. It was studied in the last session of Congress by the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations, under my chairmanship. Other studies have been made by various branches of the executive agencies—the President's Commission on Migratory Labor in 1951 being the most recent.

The findings and recommendations of all of these groups have a remarkable similarity. The only element which was really new in the study made last year was the further complication of the problem by alien contract labor and the illegal aliens or "wetbacks."

How can these findings and recommendations continue to be ignored?

It is generally conceded by farm management that the present migratory labor supply, and its availability when needed, leaves much to be desired. This situation will not improve unless effective action is taken.

It has become generally accepted as an established fact that if orderly means for recruitment and a system of scheduled movement of migratory workers were worked out, most of the labor supply could be recruited in this country.

But it will take organized leadership to get that done.

One of the first steps in that direction must be the establishment of a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor, as is proposed in our bill.

I have mentioned that at least six Federal agencies are presently engaged in activity bearing directly on migratory labor. The function of each of these agencies affects activities of the others. In addition, almost every State government has agencies operating in this field.

The function of the Federal Committee would be to act as a clearinghouse of information, and to promote coordination among all these agencies, none of which now has overall responsibility.

The need for remedying present conditions is continuing to increase, rather than diminish.

Failure to take necessary action will mean losses to farmers as well as to farm workers. These losses in turn will be felt by the Nation in terms of reduced agricultural production, and wasted economic resources.

It is my sincere hope that this legislation will be acted on by the Senate at the earliest opportunity.

There recently appeared an article by Thomas L. Stokes, "A Few Dollars for Migrant Children," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 13, 1953, which is as follows:

"A FEW DOLLARS FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

"(By Thomas L. Stokes)

"WASHINGTON.—Forty-one billion dollars is a heap of money. That is what Congress is asked to appropriate for national defense alone for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1. An item like $181,000 is almost infinitesimal by comparison. It sort of rattles around, like a mustard seed in a gourd.

"The national defense money is needed to protect our democracy from without. The $181,000 is to protect our democracy, too—from within. What it would be for, specifically, is for a survey in cooperation with the States to see what can be done about schooling for a million or more children of migratory workers. Every year with the seasons they move north with their families, following the crops, in four great rivers of humanity, along the east coast of Florida, up through the Mississippi Valley, farther west this side of the Rockies, and along the Pacific coast. They're never in any one place more than 4, 5 or 6 weeks, so that their education, such as they can get, is in bits and pieces, and many of them just give up, and so do their parents. They are not members of any community, and are usually not very welcome. They are, literally, waifs.

"Emergency not seen

"They constitute what Dr. Earl J. McGrath, Commissioner of Education in the Federal Security Agency, calls "our biggest reservoir of illiterates." And, he adds, "it is literally scandalous, the treatment that some of these children, the future citizens of the United States, are getting with regard to education."

"The $79 billion budget submitted by President Truman before he retired in January does not contain the $181,000 item. It was just omitted this time. Mr. Truman recommended it in his previous budget, but Congress turned it down. The House Appropriations Committee said:

"While the need to better the educational opportunities of this group of children is obvious, and has been for many years, the committee does not think there is an emergency need to set up a new program at this time."

"Urged by many groups

"So it was just swept, figuratively, under the national carpet. But it is a continuing emergency and slowly gets worse. Studies show that these children are receiving less education than did their parents, which provoked Senator HUMPHREY (Democrat), Minnesota, to say "that's progress in reverse," as he explored the problem with a Senate subcommittee.

"He exploded about how Congress appropriates handsomely to stamp out diseases among cattle, and for subsidies for ship lines, and for sugar growers, and so on, but does blessed little for education of the next generation.

"The problem is considered very much of an emergency by Commissioner McGrath, and dozens of organizations embracing education, churches, agriculture, labor, and the like whose representatives appeared at the last session of Congress to urge the $181,000 item in the budget.

"In the past few days, wires have come in from all over the country, including several from heads of State departments of education, to Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, appealing to her to try to squeeze a little money from the Eisenhower budget to make at least a start on this problem which is a blight on our democracy.

"It requires treatment on a national scale, with coordinate Federal-State support, be-

cause it involves many States, one after another, in any year.

"States' help is sought

"It is a complex problem, naturally, for it means special handling for the migratory children because of their necessarily short periods in one school after another in different States. And it may mean specially arranged courses so they can keep up, as well as teachers trained for this work.

"Just what the problem is overall, and how it might be met, is the object of the proposed study which the Commissioner of Education would institute in cooperation and agreement with States, private agencies, and private institutions across the country.

"Cause of delinquency

"As Dr. McGrath sees it, the job would entail, among other things, a census of migratory children, a history of their movements, a cooperative program with States for tests and records of the children which would go with them from one school to another, teaching materials that also could go with the child along with notation of the child's progress, specialized training for teachers by stimulating interest among colleges and universities, and publicity campaigns to arouse local communities to this problem.

"Thus, as Dr. McGrath put it 'in psychological terms, they will be accepted as members of the community, and not rejected, as they are at present.'

"He added that 'the psychological effect on the child of being rejected is very serious indeed, and it does lead to such things as crime and delinquency. That is the way they get their self-expression, if they are rejected in other life situations.'

"Here he put his finger on a very serious problem that goes inevitably beyond the child and becomes ours in society itself."

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4233) to provide for the naturalization of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after June 24, 1950, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF STANLEY N. BARNES TO BE ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, April 10, 1953, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be Assistant Attorney General, to fill an existing vacancy. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LESTER L. CECIL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, April 10, 1953, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Lester L. Cecil, of Ohio, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Ohio, vice Robert R. Nevin, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

Statement prepared by him on The National Guard of the United States.

Article entitled "Foreign Oil: How It Hurts America, How It Can Be Curbed," published in the March 1953 issue of Coal Age.

Article entitled "Primer on the Treaty to Date," written by Neil Stanford and published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 26, 1953.

Editorial regarding politics in the Philippine Islands, published in the Wall Street Journal of March 10, 1953.

Excerpts from published report of conservation of human resources project.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Freedom of Worship in all Corners of the World."

By Mr. TOBEY:

Address entitled "The Railroads and Education," delivered by Robert R. Young at the sixth annual railway progress dinner at Cleveland, Ohio, on March 26, 1953.

Article entitled "Another Witch Hunt in Massachusetts," dealing with the attitude of the Massachusetts Medical Society toward certain medical research projects.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "NEA Reports Growing Need of Teachers," published in the Washington Post of April 1, 1953.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Article entitled "No Standby Controls," written by Henry Hazlitt, and published in Newsweek for April 6, 1953.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Editorial entitled "Adopt Bricker Resolution," published in the Stars and Stripes for April 2, 1953.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Several editorials from recent issues of the Washington Post relating to the Bricker resolution dealing with limitation of the treaty-making power.

By Mr. DANIEL:

Radio broadcast by Eric Sevareid from Washington, D. C., on March 17, 1953, on the subject of "The Texas Chili Issue."

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Editorial entitled "An Unfinished Task," published in the New York Journal of Commerce of April 1, 1953.

THE AMERICAN TRAIL

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, in the 48 States, Alaska and Hawaii, millions of schoolchildren are hearing on their hometown radio stations an excellent series appropriately called The American Trail. The Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States provided these 13 dramatic true stories of American history as a public service to schoolchildren, their parents and teachers. Three hundred radio stations, among them station WTOP here in Washington, and in my own State of Maine, stations WGAN, Portland, WABI, Bangor, and WCOU, Lewiston, are giving the free time for the broadcasts.

This series vividly portrays the courage, the sacrifices, and the abiding faith of the men and women who blazed the American Trail. I should like to quote the conclusion of the final chapter entitled "The Brave Flag." These are President Eisenhower's own words to the young people of our land:

The job of being an American is an unfinished job. In terms of what we plan and hope for and can achieve, America will always be an unfinished job. Most of all, it is the job of America's youth. More than any others, the young people of our country have the right to ask, Where are we going? Because wherever we go, they will be there. Now it has been my good fortune to spend all my life with young people. I think I sense what's on their minds in these troubled days. They hope, of course, to build a stronger, better America as the cornerstone of a free world. A strong America—an America growing in spiritual and material strength—is a bulwark against war. But more than that, a strong and free America, actively cooperating with the free world, can give substance to the hope of lasting peace. Our crusade sees for tomorrow an America filled with opportunity that passes far beyond the little limits of today. America's role will be a decisive one. My message to you—my message to the youth of our country is that America is not through. America is unfinished business—the most important unfinished business in the whole world.

I also include in this commendation of the Ladies Auxiliary and their excellent program entitled "The American Trail," an editorial which appeared Wednesday, March 25, in the New York World-Telegram and Sun:

The Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars is making a splendid contribution to Americanism and to education with its American Trail historical programs for children, now being broadcast weekly.

These 13 thrilling narrations, recorded by professional actors, tell such dramatic stories as that of the Louisiana Purchase and the California gold rush in language the child can understand. They are so well done professionally that grownups are captivated too.

Like other thoughtful Americans, the ladies of the VFW were disturbed at the low level of many radio programs popular with children, and likewise concerned at the average American child's lack of interest in his country's history.

They did something about it, and did it well. The result is an inspiring series of broadcasts that should be available to every schoolchild.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the tidelands quitclaim is-

sue now pending before the Senate, I have received a great many messages from my State urging my continued effort for protection of the national heritage.

The State of Wisconsin has a great tradition of interest in the public domain—in the protection of the resources for all the people.

At this time I send to the desk the text of a telegram received from Mr. Charles M. Schultz, president, Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council, Congress of Industrial Organizations, endorsing my efforts on behalf of continued Federal title to the tidelands.

I submit this telegram as indicative of many messages which have come to me, and I know to a great many other Members of the Senate, often from groups which have differed with us on numerous other issues, but which stand united with us on the need for protecting the assets of 160 million Americans and of generations to come.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Schultz' telegram may be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *March 31, 1953.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

I wish to take this opportunity to congatulate you on your forthright stand on tidelands oil. Any person interested in the resources of America can only take this type of position. Your attitude is in keeping with the American principles. I urge you to continue your support of this important question.

CHARLES M. SCHULTZ,
President, Wisconsin State Industrial Council, CIO.

COMMISSION TO STUDY FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, yesterday I addressed the Senate on the subject of a proposed commission to study Federal-State relations. I concluded my remarks with the following statement:

The Senate, I am certain, will recognize in the administration bill to be offered by the distinguished majority leader an opportunity for financial redemption from a hodgepodge of confusion which has been with us too long.

At the time I was unaware that the administration bill to establish a commission to study the Federal-State problem had been introduced by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. TAFT] earlier in yesterday's session, while I was attending a meeting of the Armed Services Committee.

I commend the President of the United States and the distinguished majority leader for lending their able and courageous leadership to this worthy cause. I trust that the bill, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, will receive early consideration. Certainly it deals with a subject which entitles it to high priority treatment.

EFFECT ON PRICES OF THE ELIMINATION OF PRICE CONTROL

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, one of the most important questions concerning the American economy today is what has been happening to prices since the elimination of price controls which began on February 26 of this year.

A few days ago the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported a decrease in the Consumers' Price Index. Yet, because of the inevitable time lag in the collection of statistics, this report showed only those price movements which had taken place by February 15. It was the furthest thing in the world from an up-to-date story on what has been happening to prices.

On March 19, therefore, I requested the Director of Peace Stabilization, Mr. Joseph H. Freehill, to prepare a special report which would bring together the very latest data on price increases. I have just received this report from Mr. Freehill who states that—and I quote:

Currently consumer prices are advancing and the Consumers' Price Index for mid-March will undoubtedly rise, reflecting higher prices for coffee, eggs, sugar, services, gasoline, cigarettes, and rents.

Mr. Freehill has also submitted a table which shows that the annual cost to consumers of increased cigarette prices will be $200 million, that the annual cost of increased coffee prices will range from $65 to $100 million, and that the annual cost of increased gasoline prices will be about $158 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the communication from Mr. Freehill to which I have just referred, the tables which accompany Mr. Freehill's letter, and a copy of my original request for this information.

There being no objection, the letters and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1953.

The Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of March 19, inquiring about price movements since decontrol.

As you indicate, press reports leave the reader with a blurred picture of current price developments and trends. It is still too soon after decontrol to have any comprehensive and systematic survey of price movements from which to judge the significance of decontrol, particularly at the consumer level. Prices on the average are not skyrocketing as in July 1946, but significant increases have been recorded or announced for a number of important commodities entering the defense program or the cost of living. Prices for many other commodities, including textiles, lead, zinc, and many farm products, have remained weak and well below former ceilings or peaks. In acknowledging these weaknesses, we cannot overlook the fact that price trends since decontrol have turned modestly upward on balance.

Official figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that prices for basic raw materials in spot markets have risen since February 6, the date of the first decontrol order—a gain of 2.4 percent on the average. Any prolonged upturn or downturn for these materials has been followed historically by upturns or downturns at subsequent levels of distribution—manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers. The recent upturn has followed constant declines from February 1951 through January 1953.

Official figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics Weekly Wholesale Price Index show that producers' prices in primary markets advanced over 5 of the 6 weeks between February 3 and March 17. These prices averaged unchanged in the week ending March 10, making a net gain of about 1 percent. Such advances reversed the moderate but constant declines from April 1951 through January 1953. In mid-February of this year, prices for about 43 percent of the value of all commodities sold in primary markets were within 2 percent of record highs, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Commodities having prices at or near such record levels were concentrated in the following groups: Metals and metal products; machinery and motive products; fuel, power, and lighting materials; structural nonmetallic minerals; tobacco, and bottled beverages; and a large portion of the chemicals and furniture- and household-durables groups.

The Consumer Price Index for mid-February this year (to be issued in a few days by the Bureau of Labor Statistics) will probably decline more than it did in mid-January—mainly the result of the sharp drop in retail beef prices early in February. The time lag between collection and publication of price data for this index is a serious handicap, leading to the misimpression that price trends more than a month old are current. Currently, consumer prices are advancing and the Consumer Price Index for mid-March will undoubtedly rise, reflecting higher prices for coffee, eggs, sugar, services, gasoline, cigarettes, and rents.

I am enclosing two tabulations which may answer many of your questions:

1. A list of commodities for which price advances have been announced since decontrol, including date of decontrol, price at decontrol, most recent price, and cents or percent increase.

2. A list of certain decontrolled commodities with estimates of annual cost to users of the respective price increases following decontrol.

I trust the above information adequately satisfies your request. If I can be of any further assistance please call upon me.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. FREEHILL,
Director of Price Stabilization.

Cost to users of price advances of individual commodities recently decontrolled

Commodity	Estimated annual sales volume	Price rise (approximate percent)	Annual cost
	Millions		*Millions*
Cigarettes, retail	$4,000	5	$200
Coffee, retail stores	1,275	5 to 8	65-100
Rice, retail	120	15	18
Domestic copper	450	12 to 38	60-175
Copper scrap	400	40	160
Aluminum scrap	100	35	35
Steel scrap	1,500	2	30
Gasoline, west coast	(1)	(½ to 3 cents)	138
Fuel oil, west coast	(1)	(1 to 3 cents)	17
Soda ash	103	12 [2]	12
Sulfur	110	9 to 14 [2]	10-15
Copper sulfate	17	12 to 15 [2]	2-3

[1] Not available.
[2] Press announcements of planned increases.

Commodities for which price advances have been announced since decontrol, Feb. 6–Mar. 23

	Decontrolled	Decontrol	Most recent price	Increase	Remarks
Aluminum [1] ..... pound	Feb. 25	$0.205	$0.205	None	
Aluminum ingots ..... do	Feb. 12	.20	$0.22–.24	10 to 20 percent	
Aluminum scrap ..... do	do	$0.0925–.125	.15–.17	36 to 62 percent	
Alcohol, industrial ..... gallon	Mar. 12			$0.08	Effective Apr. 1.
Automotive parts	Mar. 5				Numerous suppliers are revising price lists upward.
Benzol, coke-oven ..... gallon	Mar. 12	.30	.36	20 percent	Used in many industrial chemicals. This rise by one leading producer.
Brass and bronze ingots ..... pound	Feb. 25			0.5 to 4.75 cents, 2-cent average.	Producers claim sharp increase in cost of raw material.
Bread ..... do					Too early to have price reports. Some leading bakers announced no change contemplated.
Cigarettes:					
Wholesale ..... thousands	Feb. 25			$0.38 to $0.43	
Retail ..... packages	do			$0.01	
Cocoa beans [2] ..... pounds	do	.292	.322	10 percent	
Coffee: [2]					
Green ..... do	Mar. 12	.555	.608	do	
Retail ..... do	do			0 to 8 percent	Too early to have full impact of higher wholesale prices.
Copper, domestic [1] ..... do	Feb. 25	.245	.275–.34	12 to 39 percent	
Copper scrap [2] ..... do	Feb. 12	.206	.265	29 percent	
Eggs, large grade A ..... dozen	do			2 to 8 cents	At a time when egg prices usually decline seasonally.
Flour [1] ..... hundredweight	Feb. 25	6.41–6.52	6.56–6.64	2 percent	
Fuel oil, west coast ..... gallons	Feb. 12			1 to 3.5 percent	
Gasoline, west coast ..... gallons	Feb. 12			0.5 to 3 cents	Half-cent increase rescinded in Northeast.
Incandescent bulbs and fluorescent fixtures	Mar. 12			5 percent	By General Electric, effective Apr. 1.
Iron ore ..... tons	Feb. 12			28 cents	By Cleveland-Cliffs Iron Co. This increase is equivalent to 35 to 40 cents per ton of finished steel.
Lanolin, anhydrous ..... pounds	Mar. 12	$0.42–$0.45	$0.82–$0.85	20 to 25 percent	
Lead scrap [2] ..... do	Feb. 12	.073	.075	3 percent	
Machine tools	Mar. 17				5 of 12 major suppliers expect to raise prices according to one survey (Wall Street Journal, Mar. 10).
Magnesium ..... pound	Feb. 12	.245	.27	10 percent	First increase since September 1950.
Molasses, blackstrap ..... gallon	Mar. 12	.09	.0975	8 percent	Basic material for making fermentation alcohol.
Nickel derivatives	Feb. 12			5 to 8 percent	
Petroleum, crude oil, midcontinent, 33–33.9 gravity [3] ..... barrel	do	2.51	2.51	None	
Parking-lot charges	Feb. 18				Increases reported in many large cities. No reliable measurement available.
Phosphorus, elemental ..... pounds	Mar. 12			2 cents	Monsanto Chemical Co. Effective May 1.
Rice, retail ..... do	Feb. 25			15 percent	Short crop.
Services, repair	Feb. 18			40 to 50 percent	Sears, Roebuck, Northeast States and perhaps nationally.
Soda ash ..... hundredweight	Mar. 12	1.20–1.30	1.35–1.45	12 percent	Effective May 1.
Sodium phosphates ..... do				2 to 10 percent	Monsanto Chemical Co. Effective May 1.
Steel-mill products	Mar. 17				Company executives state there will be no general increase at this time, although some "corrective" or selective adjustments must be made. Trade observers predict price advances by summer—after wage negotiations are completed. Record output of 10.2 million tons expected in March. No letup in demand, with continuing shortage of sheets strip, pipe, and alloy bars. Auto producers plan to buy high-priced conversion steel.
Steel scrap, No. 1 heavy melting, Chicago [1] ..... tons	Feb. 12	41.50	41.50	0 to 3 percent	Some scrap sold at $1 to $4 above former ceilings. Market not yet settled. Mild winter brought good supplies.
Sulfur, crude ..... hundredweight	Mar. 17	22–23.50	25.50–27.50	16 percent	Freeport Sulphur Co., second largest producer.

[1] Reported daily by Journal of Commerce.

[2] Reported daily by Bureau of Labor Statistics.

[3] Reported daily by New York Times.

MARCH 19, 1953.

Hon. JOSEPH FREEHILL,
Director of Price Stabilization, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FREEHILL: I am informed that at the direction of the President, the Office of Price Stabilization beginning on February 6, 1953, undertook an orderly termination of price controls. These series of actions were completed on March 17, 1953, when all price controls were ended.

I have seen various reports in the press that the decontrol program of OPS has not had any significant effect on the economy. However, I have also observed that a number of commodities of basic importance to the consumer have increased in price appreciably. For example, it has come to my attention that the price of coffee, cigarettes, gasolines, and a variety of services have experienced sharp increases since decontrol. In addition, I have been informed that a number of other commodities which are important in the defense program have likewise increased markedly.

In order to answer a number of inquiries which I have received, I would appreciate it if you could prepare a report for me as expeditiously as possible listing the following information:

1. A list of commodities which have increased in price since decontrol.

2. The dollars and cents amount of the increase in each case, and the percentage of increase.

3. The additional cost to the consumer of each commodity and service which has increased in price since decontrol.

I have also observed that the last Consumer Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics had shown a decline of 0.2 percent. This figure, of course, was based on the period from December 15 to January 15, and does not take into account price trends resulting from the OPS decontrol program. In addition, the next Consumer Price Index of the BLS will present the situation only until the middle of February. In view of this lag, I would appreciate your providing me with an estimate as to current price trends and, more specifically, any information you may have indicating your appraisal of price trends since the middle of February.

Would you be good enough to provide this information for me not later than by the middle of next week.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT III TO BE AMBASSADOR TO IRELAND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, out of order I desire to make some very brief remarks with regard to the nomination of William Howard Taft III, which is on the Executive Calendar, having been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations. I make the request because I must leave the Chamber very shortly, and I feel that my statement should go into the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in filling our diplomatic posts abroad, it is very difficult to match the requirements with the qualifications that are available in any one individual. With respect to Ireland, I think the President has made an admirable selection, and I am happy that he has named William H. Taft III to be our Ambassador to that country.

Members of the Senate know that Mr. Taft is the son of our very able and distinguished majority leader. It gives me considerable personal satisfaction, therefore, to urge the confirmation of his nomination. I want to say in that connection, however, that characteristically the senior Senator from Ohio did not lift a finger or say one single word on behalf of his son to any member of the committee so far as I know. He was not

present when the committee heard his distinguished son. While we would have been very glad to have had the father of this distinguished nominee present at the hearings, I assure you, Mr. President, that it was a pleasure to have the son sell his own bill of goods; and he did a grand job.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very short biographical sketch of the new Ambassador.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT III

Born: Bar Harbor, Maine, August 7, 1915.

Education: Attended city public schools in Cincinnati and Cincinnati Country Day School before attending the Taft School in Watertown, Conn., in 1930–33. Graduated from Yale in 1937, B. A. Princeton Graduate School, Ph. D., 1942 in English Literature.

Marital status: Married Barbara Bradfield; four children: Maria, 9; William H., IV, 7; Martha Bowers, 6; and Sean Thomas, 2½.

Experience: Instructor in English at University of Maryland, 1940–41. Instructor in English at Haverford College, 1941–42. Member of English faculty at Yale, 1942–45. While teaching, studied and worked in the graduate school in Old and Middle Irish. September 1948, went to Ireland as special assistant to the chief of the ECA mission there and acted at various times as information officer, industry officer, and on occasion as deputy chief of mission; left in August 1951.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, Mr. Taft's background and experience uniquely qualify him, I think, for the duties he will have to perform. In September of 1948, he went to Ireland as special assistant to the chief of the ECA mission. During the next 3 years he acted at various times as information officer, industry officer, and on occasion as deputy chief of mission.

Yesterday, Mr. President, Mr. Taft appeared before the committee and discussed with us the problems he would confront as Ambassador to Ireland and a number of ideas he has about the possible improvement of our relations with that country. He made a very favorable impression upon us. If every Ambassador going to his post in foreign lands were to approach his new assignment with the same high level of intelligence and enthusiasm that Mr. Taft displayed, I for one would be very pleased.

I am also impressed by the deep interest which he has shown in the country, the native language, the history and the people of Ireland. He has studied Gaelic intensively. I am confident that the interest he has already displayed in Ireland will endear him to the people of that country and will enable him to fill the role of Ambassador in an unusually effective manner.

Mr. President, I may say that a few evenings ago at dinner I sat with the wife of the new Ambassador to Ireland, and she made that very statement. She said the fact that for years the Ambassador-designate has been studying Gaelic, the language of Ireland, has endeared him very much to the Irish people.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very happy to rise in support of the statement just made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I was present yesterday when Mr. Taft appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations which was considering his nomination to be Ambassador to the great country of Ireland. I wish to add one thought.

A number of years ago while Mr. Taft and his wife were in Ireland in connection with the ECA operations there, it was my privilege to visit Ireland, at which time I had occasion to check up on what was being done there. What impressed me very much was the fact that the local people whom we met expressed great enthusiasm for the special interest which the young Mr. Taft was showing in the problems of the Irish people. Of course, with his knowledge of Gaelic, which he studied in college, and with his natural student approach to questions affecting Ireland, he has a remarkable understanding of the problems which lie ahead.

So I am more than happy to add my approval to this appointment. I think it is an outstanding one. In this instance a member of the younger generation will serve in a place where he will be of great value both to the United States and to the world, for Ireland is a very important country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no other routine matters to be submitted during the morning hour, morning business is closed.

REPEAL OF APPROPRIATION RESTRICTIONS ON ARO, INC.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4130, Calendar No. 134. Let me say that if the procedure I request is followed, and if debate develops on this subject, after a reasonable time I shall request that the Senate return to the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House bill 4130 will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Arnold Engineering Development Center is a Government-owned installation for research and development in the field of high-speed aircraft. It was authorized by the Arnold Engineering Development Center Act of 1949, and is located in Tennessee. The management of the center is provided by the firm of ARO, Inc., which has a management contract negotiated under section 2 (c) of the Armed Forces Procurement Act of 1947.

The House version of the Defense Appropriation Act of last year contained a proviso that no funds could be paid to ARO, Inc. after March 31, 1953—the day before yesterday.

The Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations made a full review of the ARO matter during May of last year, at the time when the subcommittee was considering the Defense Appropriation Act as passed by the House. A full panel of witnesses was called. The testimony was printed in the hearing of the Appropriations Committee beginning on page 473.

The Senate subcommittee recommended that the restrictive language against ARO should be removed from the House version of the bill. This recommendation was sustained by the Appropriations Committee and by the Senate.

However, the House conferees would not agree to the Senate action, with the result that the conferees reported a disagreement. In a yea-and-nay vote, the Senate adhered to its position, but the House continued to insist, with the result that the Senate finally receded.

The bill now pending before the Senate passed the House unanimously on March 25. It strikes out the language which was the subject of disagreement last year, with the effect that the House fully recedes from the position which it previously insisted upon, and agrees to the position taken by the Senate, namely, that the language arbitrarily terminating the ARO contract as on March 31, 1953, should be repealed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4130) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1419, Calendar No. 135.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1419) to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader whether it is his information that the bill was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], tells me that the bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Is not that correct?

Mr. CASE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota whether he is aware of any objection to

the bill on the part of any member of the committee.

Mr. CASE. One member of the committee raised some question about the wording of the bill, and said he would prefer to have some other wording. However, he raised no objection to the bill itself, and voted to have the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1419) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, after investigation, find that—

(1) the cities of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, or any 2 of the 3 cities enumerated herein, have advanced the standard time applicable to such city 1 hour during the summer months of any year; and

(2) as a result of consequent changes in train, bus, airplane, radio, and television schedules affecting the area and intercity transportation and communications, it is necessary for the promotion of the public welfare, convenience, and necessity of the residents of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time during such months,

the Board of Commissioners may establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during such year for a period commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. Any such time so established by the Commissioners under authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

Mr. CASE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of action on the bill to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia, the report by the Committee on the District of Columbia may be printed in the RECORD. The report is very brief, and I think it important that it be placed in the RECORD in connection with the language of the bill.

The bill approaches the question of daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia a little differently from the way in which it has been previously approached. Each year since 1947 Congress has enacted legislation to provide daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia. The bill just passed proposes to place the power to establish daylight-saving time in the Commissioners of the District, without the necessity for legislation by Congress from year to year.

The bill is permissive. It would not make daylight-saving time mandatory, but it would provide that if the Commissioners ascertained that daylight-saving time had been adopted in 3 principal cities in the eastern time zone, namely, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, or any 2 of those cities, so that the resultant changes in train, bus, airplane, radio, and television schedules affecting the area and intercity transportation and communications would be such that it would be necessary, for the promotion of the public welfare, convenience, and necessity of the residents of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time during such months, then the Commissioners might make a declaration establishing daylight-saving time.

Since this approach is somewhat different from that of previous legislation on the subject, it seems to me it is important to have the committee's report appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 136) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1419) to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, after full consideration, reports favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommends that the bill do pass.

The purpose of this bill is to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, provided the following conditions are met:

After investigation, if the Board of Commissioners of the District find that the cities of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, or any 2 of the 3 cities aforementioned, have advanced the standard time applicable to such city 1 hour during the summer months of any year, and as a result of consequent changes in train, bus, airplane, radio, and television schedules affecting the area and intercity transportation and communications, it is necessary for the promotion of the public welfare, convenience, and necessity of the residents of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time, then the Board of Commissioners may establish daylight-saving time in the District during such year for a period commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September.

Since 1947, legislation has been enacted each year to give daylight-saving time to the District of Columbia. Enactment of this bill would obviate the necessity for legislating from year to year on the subject. The provisions of this bill are not mandatory, but give the Board of Commissioners necessary permission.

The bill was favorably reported by a unanimous vote of the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider only the new reports among the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no committee reports, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar, beginning with the new reports.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Allison, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few minutes, to make brief remarks regarding the two nominations which the Senate has just confirmed.

First, I wish to address myself to the nomination of John M. Allison, of Nebraska, to be our Ambassador to Japan. It was my pleasure to work very closely with Mr. Allison during the time when he was special assistant to Mr. Dulles, in formulating and preparing for signing the Japanese Peace Treaty, and throughout the negotiations leading up to that treaty, and subsequently when he was in charge of the far-eastern desk at the State Department. I believe we have no more able representative, and I believe he will give us most excelent representation in Japan.

With reference to the next nomination, Mr. President, namely that of William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut, let me say this will be his first service in representing the United States in an ambassadorial capacity. He is a young man, whose name, of course, is recognized immediately by every Senator, for William Howard Taft III is the grandson of a very distinguished President of the United States, and is the son of our highly esteemed and most able majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. Taft appeared yesterday before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I wish to say that he made one of the most favorable impressions that any person has ever made in an appearance before that committee. He gave us a brief sketch of his ideas regarding what his duties as Ambassador should be. The understanding of Ireland that he displayed in the comments he made before our committee was outstanding, and certainly made a fine impression upon every member of the committee who had the pleasure of hearing him.

He has spent considerable time in Ireland; he was there, I believe, for approximately 2 or 3 years in connection with the ECA. He did a splendid job there, and endeared himself to the Irish people; and I believe he did a great deal of good for the United States while he was serving there.

I look forward to his administration as our Ambassador to Ireland with a great deal of pleasurable anticipation, and I believe we shall find that we are most ably represented there.

I wanted to take these few minutes to make this brief statement about the two distinguished new Ambassadors.

NOMINATION OF JOHN M. ALLISON

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, I regret that a few minutes ago, when the nomination of John M. Allison to be Ambassador to Japan, was under consideration, I was out of the Chamber answering a telephone call. I had been asked by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is presently detained elsewhere in the Capitol, to place in the RECORD a statement which he had prepared in connection with Mr. Allison's qualifications. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Senator from Wisconsin may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON THE NOMINATION OF MR. JOHN M. ALLISON TO BE UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO JAPAN

On behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, I am pleased to present to the Senate for its approval the nomination of Mr. John M. Allison to be United States Ambassador to Japan. Far from being a stranger to us, Mr. Allison is well known in Washington. This body confirmed him last year as Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Far Eastern Affairs, and before that he served as deputy to the present Secretary of State, who was at that time in charge of negotiations with respect to the Japanese Peace Treaty. In both these important and challenging posts, Mr. Allison served with distinction and ability, and the members of the Foreign Relations Committee grew to know him and respect him. On several occasions he met with the committee for the purpose of consulting on problems in the Far East. In addition, he was a frequent visitor to the subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs of our committee.

Mr. Allison is a career Foreign Service officer with a rich and varied background for the American ambassadorship to Japan. He has spent many years in both China and Japan, as well as a tour of duty at our Embassy in London. Having served under the Secretary of State on the matter of a peace settlement with Japan, with the personal rank of Minister, and having worked closely with Secretary Dulles as his deputy, Mr. Allison is well acquainted with the Secretary's views on our policy vis-à-vis Japan. For this reason, it is my feeling that he is peculiarly well qualified to represent the United States at Tokyo, and to carry out the instructions of the administration in its relations with Japan.

Inasmuch as he is a legal resident of Lincoln, Nebr., Mr. Allison was presented to the committee day before yesterday by Senator GRISWOLD. The able Senator from Nebraska not only knows Mr. Allison, but has had a long friendship with his family, and he spoke of him with warmth and admiration. Committee members were very favorably impressed with Mr. Allison's scholarly yet practical response to their inquiries about the current situation in Japan and what his hopes and intentions are with respect to his new duties. He has a thorough grasp of the difficult problems confronting us and the rest of the free world there, and it is my conviction that the country will have every right to be proud of his performance as United States Ambassador to Japan.

Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will act without delay in approving this nomination.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should also like to add my strong endorsement of the nomination of Mr. Allison. I know him very well. I was with him in the Far East, and was acquainted with him during the time he was head of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. I consider Mr. Allison to be a man who is eminently qualified for the important post to which he has been named.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ray M. Gidney to be Comptroller of the Currency, vice Preston Delano, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Roger Lewis to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before this nomination is confirmed, I think there ought to be a brief statement in the RECORD as to the qualifications of the nominee. I shall vote to confirm the nomination, but certain pertinent facts, for possible future reference, ought to be in the RECORD.

John Roger Lewis, nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, is a man 41 years old. From 1934 to 1947 he was employed by Lockheed Aircraft Corp. He worked the fields of production, material control, purchasing, and sales; also, during World War II, he supervised purchasing for Lockheed Overseas Corp., which operated bases for our Air Force in England. From 1945 to 1947 he was assistant general sales manager of Lockheed. From 1947 to 1950 he was sales manager and vice president of Canadian, Ltd., Montreal. From May 1950 to the present time he has been director of sales of the Curtiss-Wright Corp., and he is now a vice president of that organization.

The problem of stocks arose in connection with this nomination, as a similar problem arose in other cases of appointments to the Defense Establishment. The matter has now become somewhat regularized because of what I consider to be the very effective results of earlier debates on the floor of the Senate in connection with nominations to high defense posts. I speak of a regularization which, in my judgment, would not have taken place in the early days of this session of the Congress had there not been a few of us in the Senate who took the position that the public interest was vitally concerned with the financial holdings and past financial connections of persons appointed to high positions in the Defense Establishment. As one who participated in those early debates on that subject matter, I am proud of it; and I am proud, as we come to consider this nomination in the Senate of the United States, to note that it has been submitted to the regularizing process which I think should have been taken for granted at the very beginning of this session of the Congress.

So Mr. Lewis has agreed to sell his 1,500 shares of Curtiss-Wright Corp. and his 100 shares of Phillips Petroleum, which, of course, he should do—because of what? Because of the fourth criterion I have mentioned so frequently in debates on the confirmation of nominations, a criterion which must be met if we are to keep faith with proper practice and procedure in the Senate of the United States.

I pause to comment on the fourth criterion, Mr. President, because of a statement by an editor in my State. He is a distinguished editor, a close personal friend, and I have great respect for him, but when questions of public policy are involved friendship has nothing to do with the position which the junior Senator from Oregon takes on an issue.

It was back in 1945 that the junior Senator from Oregon made the research study he has used ever since in all the debates and fights on the confirmation of nominations. That research study went into every fight on the confirmation of a Cabinet nomination in the history of our country. Out of that research study I stated to the Senate in 1945 what has never been successfully contradicted since—and it cannot be, Mr. President—that over our history four major criteria have been followed by the Senate of the United States in giving advice and consent to nominations by the President of the United States; and one of the four has always been the criterion of self-interest the nominee might have in the job.

So when the distinguished editor of my State, to whom I have referred, the editor of the Oregon Statesman, Mr. Sprague, wrote the editorial I have in mind, he apparently relied on the wire services for his information—which is a pretty risky thing for an editor who is seeking the facts to do. Editors who are seeking the facts ought to do their own book work and get the facts out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and not assume that they are getting them correctly when they read a wire-service ticker. So he wrote his editorial on the fallacious premise that the Senator from Oregon was inconsistent when in 1945 he voted for the confirmation of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, and when in 1953 he voted against the confirmation of Charles Wilson to be Secretary of Defense.

Of course, if Sprague had done his paper work and his book work, and wanted to write on the subject at all, the editorial he would have had to write, had he wanted to square it with the facts, would have been an editorial showing complete consistency between the vote of the junior Senator from Oregon on the nomination of Henry Wallace in 1945, and his vote against the nomination of Charles Wilson in 1953. Why? Because, had Sprague taken the time to study the RECORD, he would have found that in 1945 the junior Senator from Oregon checked the Wallace appointment against four criteria, the first of which is character. No one in 1945, or in my judgment, since, has been able on

the facts successfully to reflect on the character of Henry Wallace. As I said in 1945, it was not the appointment I would have made, but I would not have made it on the basis of matters of policy, not character. As I said then, however, and as I have said many times since, we have no right to insist that a President appoint somebody whom we would appoint. We have only the duty in giving advice and consent, to find out whether the nominee meets the criteria the Senate has always applied. So, in 1945, Henry Wallace met the criterion of character.

Criterion No. 2 is loyalty to our system of government. No one questioned the loyalty of Mr. Wallace in 1945, regardless of what might be thought in this day of prejudice, and in fairness to Wallace let me say I would not question it now. I think he exercised exceedingly bad judgment in listening to some extremely poor advice in 1948, and in permitting himself to be the tool of certain interests in this country, the membership of which interests in some instances I did not think could meet a test of loyalty; but I have never questioned Wallace's loyalty, either then or since.

The third criterion, let me repeat for Mr. Sprague's benefit, is the criterion of competency to carry out the President's policies. No one in 1945 questioned Wallace's competency to carry out the President's policies, though many of us questioned the President's policies. That is why many of us took the position that we thought it too bad that someone else had not been appointed; but there was no question of the particular nominee's meeting the test of competency.

The fourth criterion I want to refer to in connection with the nomination now pending before the Senate and relate it also to the Wallace nomination and the Wilson nomination. The fourth one is the criterion of freedom from self-interest in the appointment. In the history of the United States Senate, when this body has found that the freedom-from-self-interest criterion has been violated, then a fight has occurred on the floor of the Senate over the nomination. I think in most such instances the nomination has been rejected. I may say that in 1945 no one raised the question as to Wallace having any self-interest in the job of Secretary of Commerce. So I checked him against the four criteria, and announced then that, irrespective of the politics involved, I was going to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

In 1953, with reference to Mr. Wilson, I believed that he was not qualified under the fourth criterion, and I am still of the same opinion. I pointed out that, in my judgment, anyone who as president of General Motors had helped negotiate, in round figures, $5 billion worth of contracts with the very Department he was called upon to administer did not meet the test of the criterion of freedom from self-interest in the job. I voted against his confirmation, and I am glad I did, because I am satisfied that I kept faith with the four criteria which have been applied throughout our history, just as I kept faith with them when I voted for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace.

That, Mr. President, leads me to conclude my remarks on this nomination by saying that we have now so regularized the procedure, as a result of the debates in this session of the Congress, that we are now given assurance by the committee that the nominee is going to sell his stock, the retention of which might make it impossible for him to meet the criterion of freedom from self-interest.

The committee tells us—and all I have to go on is the report of the committee, which I accept—that he owns no other stock that is pertinent to the position. The committee tells us that he will resign from Curtiss-Wright and will receive bonuses earned for 1951 and 1952. The record of the committee does not show the amounts of those bonuses.

That differs slightly from the Wilson case, in that in the Wilson case Mr. Wilson was to receive a cash settlement for past bonuses. In this instance there is an arrangement whereby the nominee will receive separation payment of 6 months' salary and annual payments of bonuses earned in 1950, 1951, and 1952. So, Mr. President, in view of the other safeguards which have been developed as a result of the debate in the Senate this year, in connection with understandings and arrangements which have been entered into between the committee and the Defense Department, this nomination is in proper form, and I am pleased to vote for its confirmation.

Mr. President, I know full well that, so far as my colleagues are concerned, it is boresome for the junior Senator from Oregon to reiterate from time to time his position on various issues, but in these trying times I do not know of any other Member of the Senate who is being subjected to the type of malicious misrepresentation by the press of America to the extent the junior Senator from Oregon is. So long as that condition exists, I want to say to my colleagues that I intend from the floor of the Senate to speak to the people of America as I have spoken on this issue today, and as I shall speak at some length later this afternoon when I give my weekly report on the committee work of the Independent Party. Tomorrow being Good Friday and the Senate not being in session, I would not think of foregoing my duty as a member of the Committee of the Whole to present to the people of America my weekly report on behalf of the Independent Party.

I desire to say to the several hundred persons who have written to me since my report last week that I deeply appreciate their expressions of confidence. It is rather gratifying, Mr. President, that I am receiving increasing evidence of the interest of the people throughout the country in the issues I raise on the floor of the Senate; and I would be less than honest if I did not say, also, that some of my colleagues in the Senate, returning from their bailiwicks, have been kind enough to come to me and say, "Wayne, I am surprised. We hear more about your work back home by way of your weekly reports to the people of the country than we realized could be possible while we were in Washington."

I think that interest is going to grow, Mr. President, because I shall continue from this desk, each week, to talk to the people of the country in terms of the facts and issues as I see them, which, in my judgment, will not be properly presented to the American people through other media.

I conclude, Mr. President, by saying that in my discussion this afternoon, one of the topics I shall discuss is the people's interest in a political "hands off" policy and program in the case of great departments of this Government which for years have demonstrated a nonpartisanship in protecting public health and safety and protecting the public interest—such, for example, as the Bureau of Standards, whose governmental scientific tests should be free of political pressure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of John Roger Lewis, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

CHAN GURNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not want this occasion to pass without my saying a word in favor of the public service of Chan Gurney. He and I came to the Senate in 1939. He was an outstanding Member of this body for 12 years. He has been for 3 years a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board and has done magnificent work there. I wish to commend the President for the renomination of Mr. Gurney, and I express the hope that his nomination will be unanimously and enthusiastically confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should not like this occasion to pass without also concurring on the RECORD, on behalf of all Members on this side of the aisle who had the pleasure of serving with former Senator Gurney, in the statement just made by the distinguished majority leader with reference to him. I personally should like to be associated with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President as one who sat beside former Senator Gurney for 4 years on the Armed Services Committee and worked under him as chairman, I should like to join in the sentiments expressed regarding him. I entirely agree with what the majority leader has said about former Senator Gurney, and I should like to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, may I use the vernacular and say, "Me, too."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board?

The nomination was confirmed.

HARMAR D. DENNY JR.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harmar D. Denny, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John C. Doerfer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel Spencer, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be permitted to speak at this time, but not beyond the hour of 2 o'clock, at which time consideration of the unfinished business is to be resumed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Delaware is recognized.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me for a brief matter?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter dated March 23, 1953, written by me, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to the President of the United States, and also the reply of the President, dated March 30, 1953, in relation to national security.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 23, 1953.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In common with other members of my committee and of the Senate, I am deeply preoccupied as to whether the increased defense program undertaken by the country since the onset of the Korean emergency has been reflected in actual improvements in our national security, and whether the resulting situation is within acceptable limits.

Recent statements and speeches made on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere indicate that there is concern, either that our defense program is inadequate, or that it has not been pushed vigorously enough, or that it is poorly oriented. I do not feel that the situation has deteriorated during the past few months to a degree which calls for some special apprehension not previously warranted, but I do most clearly recognize the need for vigorous and continuing evaluation and surveillance on the part of the Congress of all phases of our defense effort to the end that faulty procedures, loose thinking, and unrealistic planning are summarily eliminated.

As President and Commander in Chief you are equally preoccupied with these and other aspects of the Nation's program for national security, as is shown by the fact that in the relatively short time since you assumed your present duties you have moved promptly to deal not only with immediate problems but with the formulation of future plans as well.

I am certain that my colleagues feel, as I do, that the committee should not proceed on a unilateral basis with action which would tend, during this critical period of transition, to distract you and those associated with you from duties of vital importance and immediacy in these fields, and in effect thereby retard rather than accelerate the progress which you have already made.

I would respectfully urge, however, that you make available to my committee at an appropriate time the estimate which you have formulated concerning the state of our Nation's military security and the changes and adjustments which you feel should be made in present programs and procedures related thereto. With such information at our disposal, I feel that the Congress will be in the most advantageous position to proceed with the exercise of its own responsibilities toward this common objective—the security of our people and the protecting of our way of life.

Respectfully yours,

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 30, 1953.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am glad to have your letter of the 23d. I clearly appreciate the sense of serious responsibility which prompts you, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, to write to me.

It is accurate for me to say that the problems of the Nation's security have been my paramount concern during the first 2 months of this administration.

One of my early concerns was to devise means to improve and strengthen the operations of the National Security Council. Last week I approved recommendations which I believe will, when carried out, greatly strengthen the Council and enable it to act more effectively in matters contemplated by the National Security Act.

Since my inauguration, the Council has worked steadily and intensively. One to two meetings per week are the rule; this week, two meetings are scheduled, one running from 9:30 in the morning throughout the day. You will see from this schedule that we are devoting concentrated attention to security questions.

In addition to studying the status of the Nation's security program as reported at the end of 1952, the Council has been appraising the cost of the security programs, the impact of that cost on the Nation's economy, and the value obtained for the money expended, in terms of the current year and of subsequent years. The far-reaching ramifications of these considerations can be readily imagined. To bring a fresh point of view to the Council deliberations, we have asked seven civilian leaders from different parts of the country and engaged in varying enterprises to come to Washington and informally and individually counsel with us. This procedure is proving helpful, because the time of these men is not burdened with governmental administration.

Because so much is involved in this intensive work, I cannot venture now safely to predict a date on which we will arrive at firm determinations. Obviously, we must generally set our budget sights during the ensuing weeks for fiscal year 1954. In so doing, we must evaluate clearly just what calculated risks have heretofore been taken, whether or not the decisions which have been reached in respect to them have been soundly based, and whether or not fundamental changes of an organizational or other nature are necessary in order to increase the efficiency of our security effort. Of course, this requires a careful and accurate analysis of the adequacy and orientation of our present defense program in all its aspects. You are also aware of the study now in progress in the Defense Department on the organizational phases of the problem affecting that Department.

I think it is of the highest importance to the Nation that the legislative and executive branches work closely together in this effort. Therefore, I am encouraged by your statement that you do not desire to move unilaterally into this delicate field at this time, while this process of reexamination and reanalysis is still in progress. I hope your colleagues hold the same point of view. I know that you shared my feeling that the meeting at the White House with congressional leaders in the latter part of February, when we undertook to outline security matters then before us, was a useful step in the right direction.

I repeat that the determination of the Congress to see that the national security effort be soundly conceived and efficiently administered is shared by the executive branch. This determination in the executive branch will not abate. My own decisions on the subject, which will be made known to your committee as soon as possible, will be reached solely on the basis of what I believe to be the best interests of the Nation.

Thank you again for your thoughtful observations on this important matter.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS FOR COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE AND OTHER TREASURY OFFICIALS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on March 13, 1952, Congress adopted Reorganization Plan No. 1, the purpose of which was to give the collectors of internal revenue and certain other top Treasury officials civil-service security and thereby remove them from the influence of political patronage. This

plan was sold to the Congress and the country on the basis that this action would eliminate some of the mismanagement, incompetence, and favoritism which at that time were being exposed as existing in that agency.

The administration promised under this proposal open competitive examinations would be held and the appointees selected from the top three eligibles on the basis of their qualifications and not upon their political support.

Long before this plan had been submitted by the President I advocated that this procedure be followed by the Treasury Department, and I therefore became an early supporter of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

During the ensuing months nothing has happened that would change my opinion that all these collectors, or directors as they are now called, should be under civil service.

However, as one who supported this reorganization plan and as one who still believes in the principles under which it was adopted, I feel obliged to report that after a careful examination I have decided that as far as removing politics from the Bureau, or from the standpoint of greater efficiency was concerned, it was a dismal failure.

This failure is directly attributable to the arbitrary manner in which the administration officials responsible for putting the program into operation in many instances not only deliberately ignored the intent of Congress but also violated their expressed promise that these appointments would, following competitive examinations, be selected solely on the basis of their qualifications.

I fully recognize that under civil-service rules and regulations these positions could have been filled either on a competitive or on a noncompetitive basis; however, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Dunlap; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder; and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Ramspeck; were all quoted as having promised in their testimony before the congressional committees on behalf of this reorganization program that if the plan were adopted they would call for open competitive examinations and make their selections from the list of eligibles.

I quote the exact language of the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, under date of January 31, 1952, when testifying before the Committee on Government Operations:

> When the new jobs have been classified and the examination requirements set, open competitive examinations will be announced for the district commissioner jobs and any other key positions that are to be filled—I believe a total of about 90.

Also, the legislative background, as evidenced by the statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, clearly show that it was the understanding of the Senate that competitive examinations were going to be held. I quote a statement by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who led the fight on behalf of the administration for the adoption of this plan. The colloquy appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 2, page 2254.

> Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we should keep the record straight. I believe there is nothing in the reorganization plan which sets up a merit system. The Senator is correct when he says there is nothing within the plan which says "under competitive examination." However, I remind the Senator that in the Classified Civil Service Act there are provisions for competitive civil-service examinations, as well as noncompetitive.
>
> Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

I may say that this colloquy between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was as to the procedure which would be followed if this plan were adopted.

I resume the quotation:

> Mr. HUMPHREY. I remind the Senator that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, three top officers of the Government, have testified before a committee of the Congress, have placed their reputations before the people of this Nation, and have placed their whole professional standing before the entire American public on the basis that there would be competitive examinations for the positions we are discussing.

From this statement of the Senator from Minnesota, who was a member of the Senate committee before which these three administration representatives testified, it is very clear that there was a definite understanding as to the manner in which these positions were going to be filled.

I shall now proceed to document how these same three officials—the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Dunlap; and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Ramspeck—violated their promise.

There were 25 district commissioners of internal revenue authorized under the plan; 17 have been selected, and in every instance the men were selected for these Treasury posts without competitive examinations.

Of these 17, while 15 had obtained their original civil-service status through competitive examination, two, namely Stewart Berkshire and John B. Dunlap, had received their original status in 1942 and 1945, respectively, under the Ramspeck Act and Executive Order No. 8743.

Of the 64 Directors who have been selected under this reorganization proposal, competitive examinations were held in only 27 cases. All of the other 37 Directors were selected on a noncompetitive basis by an agreement between Secretary Snyder, Commissioner Dunlap, and Chairman Ramspeck—the same three gentlemen who, according to the Senator from Minnesota, had placed their reputations and their whole professional standing before the American people on the promise that there would be competitive examinations.

One of the arguments advanced in defense of the administration's using noncompetitive examinations instead of competitive, as promised, was that they were giving deserved recognition to employees who in the past had obtained their civil-service status through the merit system. However, I point out that that argument does not hold water, because, just as in the case of the two Commissioners, Mr. Berkshire and Mr. Dunlap, we find that of the 39 Directors who were selected on a noncompetitive basis, 18 of these, too, obtained their original status the easy way; that is, they were blanketed in under Executive order. They have never been confronted with the necessity of running the gauntlet of competitive examinations.

SELECTION BOARD

On April 9, 3 weeks after Congress adopted the Reorganization Plan No. 1, Commissioner Dunlap announced the procedure to be used. I quote from his press release of that date:

> A key feature of the procedure is the establishment of a Selection Board designed to insure that all promotions of career personnel to the positions are made strictly on a merit basis. The Board will be composed of an impartial group of leading career officials with broad experience in personnel selections. * * * All names submitted will be referred to the Selection Board, which, after careful evaluation of the qualifications of the persons under consideration, will prepare a list of proposed candidates for consideration by the Commissioner and the Secretary of the Treasury, ranked according to such order of consideration as the qualifications and record of each candidate justify.

Accordingly, on April 9, 1952, the following persons were designated as a Selection Board to make recommendations to the Commissioner: First, Mr. Justin F. Winkle, Assistant Commissioner; second, Mr. Edgar E. Hoppe, Director, Inspection Service; third, Mr. Frank Lohn, Chief, Intelligence Division; fourth, Mr. James H. Hard, Director of Personnel, Treasury Department; fifth, Mr. William T. Heffelfinger, assistant to the Fiscal Assistant Secretary.

As evidence that this Selection Board had been promised a free hand, I quote from a letter signed by John S. Graham, of the Treasury Department, in which he explained the powers of this group, as follows:

> Neither former Commissioner Dunlap nor the Secretary was an ex officio member of the Selection Board. In fact, they had nothing whatsoever to do with the Board's recommendations. Such recommendations were purposely designed to be the independent and impartial actions of this five-man group, based upon its collective judgment and evaluation of the qualifications and the suitability of each candidate which it considered.

To guarantee impartial decisions by the Board, the following policy was established:

> The Selection Board shall not consider any of its members for any position of district commissioner, assistant district commissioner, or director.

These high standards were publicly announced by the Treasury Department as a grandstand effort to convince the American people that a thorough housecleaning job was under way and that politics would have nothing to do with the newly reorganized Bureau.

On April 18, 10 days following the announcement of these high standards, the Treasury Department made the following announcement:

> In view of the tight time schedule applicable to establishing the Illinois and New York districts, it was necessary to appoint the district commissioners for those districts and to make recommendations for the fol-

lowing positions in Illinois and New York City without receiving applications with respect to such positions.

(a) Five directors of Internal Revenue—1 in Chicago, 1 in Springfield, and 3 in New York City area.

(b) Twelve assistant district commissioners—6 in Chicago and 6 in the New York City area (administrative; special investigations; audit; alcohol and tobacco tax; collections; and appellate).

Therefore applications for such positions should not be submitted.

This was the beginning of the complete surrender by the Selection Board of their responsibilities to the administration triumvirate—Secretary Snyder, Commissioner Dunlap, and Chairman Ramspeck. All those positions were filled without recognizing any of the rules or standards established at that time for filling such positions.

There were at least 11 other director's positions for which the Selection Board was not consulted or called upon to make recommendations.

The first was the selection of Mr. Stanley V. McKenney as the Director for Hawaii. In this instance the Board did not interview any candidates for that position. Mr. McKenney was selected as the Director for Hawaii by Mr. Stewart Berkshire, who himself was getting the job of district commissioner for that area without competitive examination.

STEWART BERKSHIRE

Mr. Berkshire, who had received his position upon the high recommendation of Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap, was the same gentleman whom the Kefauver crime subcommittee had criticized so severely. I quote the language of this Kefauver report:

In Des Moines, Iowa, Lew Farrell, an alleged Capone syndicate hoodlum with a considerable criminal record, who allegedly controlled the race wire in that city, and who helped get the notorious Cargotta brothers of Kansas City out of jail in 1947, distributes Blatz and Prima-Bismarck beers. Until recently he handled Canadian Ace beer. His inactive partners in the Canadian Ace distributing firm were the brother and sister of Alexander Greenberg, owner of Canadian Ace. In spite of Farrell's record and an adverse report on him by field supervisors of the Federal Alcohol Tax Unit in Des Moines and St. Paul, the ATU gave him a license in 1945 to distribute beer.

Mr. Dwight E. Avis, of the Alcohol Tax Unit, when testifying before the same committee on March 24, 1951, identified Mr. Berkshire as the official referred to above who reversed the field supervisor and granted Mr. Farrell his license. I quote Mr. Avis:

The matter was brought before the then Deputy Commissioner, Mr. Stewart Berkshire, on appeal, who, after hearing oral argument of counsel, rendered an order directing that the permit be issued and reversed the district supervisor.

The Kefauver committee had this to say about Mr. Berkshire's overruling the field supervisors and granting Mr. Farrell his liquor permit:

The committee fails to understand, for example, how the Alcohol Tax Unit could grant a wholesaler's permit to hoodlums such as Joe DiGiovanni and Lew Farrell.

Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap considered this background of Mr. Berkshire's so outstanding that they unhesitatingly appointed him for the position of Commissioner for the States of California, Nevada, and Hawaii. They even considered an examination unnecessary.

Nine other directors who were selected without any consideration being given to the opinions of the Selection Board were as follows: Colorado, George H. Allan; Delaware, Francis P. Graham; New Mexico, Steven P. Vidal; New York (Buffalo), George T. McGowan; New York (Syracuse), Frank J. Shaughnessy; North Carolina, Edward Gill; Pennsylvania (Scranton), Joseph J. Lawler; Vermont, Henry H. Riordan; Wyoming, Frank G. Clark.

LAURIE W. TOMLINSON, FLORIDA

The 11th director who was known to have been selected without consultation with the Selection Board was Mr. Laurie W. Tomlinson in Florida.

In this instance 2 persons acquired eligibility in the examination, 1 of whom was a veteran who not only had had previous tax experience with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but also had qualified for the job without even considering his 5-point veteran preference.

Again the Treasury Department, without asking the Selection Board for their recommendations, picked a man who either had not taken the competitive examination or else did take it and failed to qualify.

With respect to the 17 district Commissioners and the 64 Directors who were appointed, competitive examinations were held in only 27 collection districts, and the 11 cases pointed out above in which the Board was bypassed represented 11 of this 27.

GEORGE D. PATTERSON, ALABAMA

The charts of the 64 directors incorporated in the RECORD today indicate that George D. Patterson was selected from among three eligibles following a normal competitive examination; however, this report as first furnished by the Civil Service Commission is in error. This is how Mr. Patterson got his job.

Examination announcement for the Director of Internal Revenue at Birmingham, Ala., was issued on June 9, 1952. As a result of this examination a list of 3 eligibles was established, and the top 3 on the list were Robert A. Beeland, Jr., Fred H. Foy, and Grady M. Beasley, with gradings of 93, 87, and 80, respectively. Mr. Beeland, at the top of the list of eligibles, was a 10-point preference veteran, while Mr. Foy, the second on the list, had a 5-point veteran preference.

Mr. Patterson took this same examination and failed to pass. However, the administration in Washington was determined that Mr. Patterson should get the job, the results of the examination notwithstanding, and a special reexamination was given to Mr. Patterson. On the basis of "additional information furnished," he was assigned a rating of 85, just enough to place him above the third man, Mr. Beasley, and belatedly put him on the eligible list.

However, the administration still had another hurdle to cross because the two top men had veterans' preference, and when the name of Mr. Patterson, a nonveteran, was submitted to the Civil Service Commission, the Commission required reasons in writing from the Treasury Department for the passing over of the two veterans. The Civil Service Commission reviewed the reasons submitted and rejected them as insufficient.

The administration in its determination to give the job to Mr. Patterson, submitted an additional statement of reasons in writing to the Civil Service Commission for passing over these veterans. After careful consideration by the regional office of the Civil Service Commission of this second list of reasons, the Bureau of Internal Revenue was again notified that their reasons were not sufficient for passing over the two qualified veterans and the Civil Service Commission refused a second time to go along in the selection of a man whom they had once rated as ineligible.

Notwithstanding this background of rejections and recommendations by the Civil Service Commission, the Treasury Department on November 19, 1952, reported the appointment of Mr. Patterson as the director of the regional office in Alabama. I point out that in both these latter instances the veterans in question safely passed the examination without considering their 5- and 10-point preference.

Furthermore, a review of the background of Mr. Patterson shows that he had no experience in the tax field.

His primary qualification for this position was his background as an attorney, first with the OPA during the war years and later with the OPS, plus a determination on the part of Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap to give him a lifetime job.

WEST VIRGINIA, ROBB N. KEYSER

Here is another glaring example in which a man who failed to meet the qualifications and standards for the directorship in his first examination and therefore ruled ineligible for appointment, was, after the intervention of the two Senators from his State, reexamined and given a high grade. The record shows that Mr. Robb N. Keyser was selected on a noncompetitive basis for the directorship at West Virginia following this political intervention.

Mr. C. L. Edwards, the Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission, explained the procedure followed in the selection of Mr. Keyser for this important post. According to Mr. Edward's explanation, the Treasury Department chose to promote Mr. Robb N. Keyser without competitive examination and requested the Civil Service Commission's fourth regional office to approve his position as director. In accord with the standards for the position, the regional office held a personal investigation of his qualifications and interviewed Mr. Keyser. However, as a result of this investigation, the regional office disapproved the promotion of Mr. Keyser and reported him unqualified.

Following this negative report, both the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] called Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and suggested another examination for the nephew of the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr.

NEELY]. The junior Senator from West Virginia explained that Mr. Keyser had been assistant collector for several years and he felt sure he was fully qualified.

The Treasury Department joined the Senators in urging the Civil Service Commission to reconsider their previous actions.

The Civil Service Commission graciously reversed their previous adverse report and decided to accept Mr. Keyser, after this intervention.

TOLEDO, OHIO, GILBERT C. HOOKS

In this instance, competitive examinations were called for and again 3 applicants—Mr. P. William Gardner, Mr. Melbourne C. Emery, and Mr. John J. Quinlivan—qualified with marks of 90, 84, and 82, respectively.

A certificate of these 3 names, 2 of whom were veterans, was furnished to the Bureau; however, this list of 3 eligibles was returned to the Civil Service Commission without selection, and Mr. Winkle, one of the members of the Selection Board, notified the regional office in Cincinnati, Ohio, that Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap had decided to promote Mr. Gilbert C. Hooks, the assistant collector, to the position as Director.

Mr. Hooks obtained his civil-service status in 1942 by being blanketed in under the Ramspeck Act.

Whether Mr. Hooks took the examination in the first place and failed I do not know; however, following the personal intervention of Secretary Snyder and Mr. Dunlap, Mr. Hooks was given a special, personal interview examination, more diplomatically described as noncompetitive.

Following this unusual procedure Mr. Hooks was appointed. No explanation as yet has been furnished to show upon what authority Mr. Snyder and Mr. Dunlap bypassed the results of a regular civil-service examination and also ignored the Veterans' Preference Act in the selection of another administration pet.

WASHINGTON, WILLIAM ELLIOTT FRANK

I see no need of delaying the Senate further in examining these cases; I shall merely state that the same pattern again prevails in the State of Washington as in the other areas.

A competitive examination was called for, and 3 men qualified, 2 of whom were 10-point veteran preference; however, in its dying gasp, the New Deal administration was determined to leave behind a tax-collecting agency controlled by its own pet stooges. Again they completely ignored the results of the competitive civil-service examination, completely ignored the Veterans' Preference Act, and appointed their man, William Elliott Frank, who either had failed to pass the examination or had recognized a better way to get the job.

Now the question which arises is: Why did this five-man self-styled independent selection board so graciously vacate their responsibility and power to Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap? Remember, both of these men had stated that they would have nothing to do with the decisions of the selection board.

The answer to that question is best understood when we go back and see what happened to the early policy which had been established; namely, that the selection board was not to consider any of its own members for top positions under the new reorganization plan—either district commissioner, assistant district commissioner, or director.

We find that notwithstanding this rule, the first act of Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap was to appoint 3 of these 5 selection board members for top positions under the reorganization plan.

Mr. Frank W. Lohn, one of the members, was appointed as the district commissioner of the Denver district—a lifetime job with a substantial increase in salary.

Mr. Edgar E. Hoppe, another man on the Snyder-Dunlap team and a member of the selection board, was given the position as Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue with headquarters in Washington.

Mr. Justin P. Winkle, a third member, was appointed to the position of Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue for Operations with headquarters in Washington.

Thus we find that these men representing three-fifths of the selection board were given three top-level lifetime jobs. This completely nullified the rule which said that "the selection board was not to consider any of its own members for any of these positions."

The civil-service record shows that the appointments of these three men were authorized in letters addressed to the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and signed by John B. Dunlap, who at that time was serving as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and on each of these letters is found the following notation:

Secretary Snyder and I have agreed on the appointment of Mr. ——.

That is all it took—no application, no examination.

The fourth member of the selection board, Mr. James H. Hard, was promptly recommended for reclassification from GS–15 to GS–16. This recommendation, dated June 25, 1952, after his appointment to the selection board, was signed by Mr. William W. Parsons, administrative assistant to Secretary John Snyder, and, I might add, it carried a corresponding increase in salary.

The fifth member of the selection board, Mr. William T. Heffelfinger, apparently received only his normal in-grade raises which developed during the period.

However, from a review of the above it is noted that Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap promptly went out of their way to place a comfortable margin of the membership of this selection board under personal obligation to them, which no doubt explains the complete abdication of power and responsibility by these individuals. From that moment on Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap ran the show.

Of course Mr. Lohn and his colleagues, who likewise got good jobs, were appreciative enough to in turn recommend Commissioner Dunlap for a juicy plum with a lifetime appointment as director at Dallas, Tex., under the same reorganization program.

An interesting note regarding the background of one of the members of this selection board is that relating to Mr. Frank W. Lohn. It was this same Mr. Lohn who on February 19, 1951, prepared the famous whitewash report for James P. Finnegan, the collector in St. Louis.

I quote from that report as prepared by Mr. Lohn, who at that time was acting special agent in charge, with headquarters in Kansas City:

Whether Mr. Finnegan actually participated in the insurance commissions of Brodsky as a silent partner or if he received the funds from Brodsky as attorney's fees appears to make little difference. The method used in obtaining the commissions or attorney's fees seems to us to be at least highly unethical. It is probable that Mr. Finnegan saw no particular impropriety in permitting taxpayers to defer the liquidations of their tax obligations (which is entirely proper per se) and to furnish Brodsky with the names of such taxpayers in order that he could contact them for insurance, for which services Finnegan was to get a cut—whether as commissions or attorney's fees.

Mr. Finnegan's association with Brodsky, whether as attorney or as silent partner, has resulted in unfavorable speculation by outsiders, and he is, therefore, vulnerable to criticism. If the facts which have been developed in this investigation should become published, undoubtedly the public would interpret the entire matter in its worst light—a mild form of "shakedown."

During the investigation, Mr. Finnegan expressed the intention to resign as soon as he could induce the Secretary and President to accept his resignation. He stated, however, that he did not wish to submit his resignation until our investigation was completed. If he does resign, the resentment in insurance circles against the collector for being involved with Brodsky may subside and public criticism of the collector's office may be avoided.

In other words, Mr. President, in that particular report they did not question the guilt of Mr. Finnegan; they merely pointed out that if they could keep the public from finding out about it—which could be done if Mr. Finnegan could be permitted to resign in apparently a normal manner—criticism of the administration would be avoided.

Mr. Lohn signed the above statement on February 19, 1951, after reviewing the investigation reports of Mr. Finnegan. A few weeks later Mr. Lohn was the personal representative of the Treasury Department before a grand jury in St. Louis, which was investigating alleged irregularities on the part of Mr. Finnegan in the St. Louis office. During Mr. Lohn's testimony before that grand jury, he gave absolutely no indication of having any knowledge of irregularities as far as Mr. Finnegan was concerned.

It was only after I exposed the case on the floor of the Senate, on May 7, 1951, that the true facts regarding these charges were brought to light; and Mr. Finnegan was subsequently indicted and convicted.

Mr. Lohn was one of the key members of this selection board, and received the enthusiastic recommendations of Commissioner Dunlap and Secretary Snyder for a top position as Commissioner in the

Denver area, having jurisdiction over the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The administration did not forget their friends.

Before these appointments were made, I requested an interview with Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. However, I was advised that unless I wished to place specific charges of fraud or irregularities against the individuals, the Commission was not interested in what I had to say. Apparently the threat of an imminent jail sentence was the only thing they would consider as disqualifying one of their friends for an appointment.

Mr. Dunlap's public reaction last December regarding my request placed with Mr. Ramspeck for an interview, prior to some of these appointments, was a statement that my objections were based upon his refusal to furnish me confidential documents which were barred to a Member of Congress under the law.

That statement is not true. I have never requested Mr. Dunlap to furnish me, as an individual Member of the Congress, confidential tax returns or other confidential documents in violation of any law. I did submit to Mr. Dunlap, in his official capacity as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, certain allegations regarding the official conduct of some of the employees in his department, with the request that these allegations, which in certain instances were very serious, be checked; and I had asked for a report as to their findings.

Mr. Dunlap refused to render any report as to whether the allegations were true or as to what steps he was taking toward checking them; however, I did note that in some instances the employee mentioned in my correspondence suddenly left the Government service, by retirement for reasons of health.

There is nothing under the law which would have prohibited his reporting, nor is there anything under the law which would have relieved him of his responsibility to give recognition to a request from a Member of Congress for such information.

Without any further discussion, I think this record clearly demonstrates that Reorganization Plan No. 1 was not a medium for removing political influence from our tax-collecting agency.

I am making this report here today on the manner in which this reorganization plan has been put into effect, and I do so without making any suggestion as to what steps should be taken from this point.

I still firmly believe that we should never return to the old patronage system of appointing collectors of internal revenue; however, I am not satisfied to sit idly by and see some of these formerly discredited officials use the civil-service system as a haven of political refuge.

I do not question but that under the new reorganization plan, many of the appointees are men whose honesty and integrity would be above question, and who are thoroughly capable of filling the job; however, in each such instance that man could have qualified for the job under an open competitive examination, and the selection board should have made its selection in accordance with the rules.

I am asking that the appropriate committees of the Congress and the executive branch study this report and further examine the entire reorganization setup, with the thought of working out some plan whereby we can salvage those basic principles of the reorganization plan.

Whether new legislation will be needed or whether the administration can approach the problem through a new reorganization proposal is a question which I think should be decided by the administration and the committees involved.

The dangerous implications of a growing lack of confidence on the part of the American people in any agency of our Government are recognized by all, and it is imperative that appropriate steps be taken to reestablish the confidence which the American taxpayers once had in the honesty and integrity of this important Bureau.

Mr. President, in addition, I have assembled two other compilations. The first shows how the 17 district commissioners were selected and how they obtained their original civil-service status.

The second statement shows, in a similar manner, the manner in which the 64 directors were selected, and, in the cases where competitive examinations were not held, how the individual obtained his original status.

I am sending to the desk two copies of each of these statements, and I ask unanimous consent that each of them shall be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and also, that a copy of each be referred to the Committee on Government Operations and to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statements are as follows:

I. DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

1. Thomas E. Doyle, 226 High Street, Fairfield, Conn.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Headquarters city, Boston, Mass. Area: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont. Obtained civil-service status February 6, 1922, internal revenue inspector, $1,800 per annum, competitive examination.

2. Alfred W. Fleming, 740 Main Street, Buffalo, N. Y.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Upstate New York. Obtained civil-service status June 1, 1923, internal-revenue agent, $2,000 per annum, competitive examination.

3. Clarence R. Krigbaum, 155 Mitchell Street, West Orange, N. J.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompeitive examination. Area: New York City. Obtained civil-service status February 1, 1921, resident auditor, $1,800 per annum, competitive examination.

4. Edward C. Dougherty, 2109 Delancey Place, Philadelphia, Pa.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Pennsylvania, Delaware, and New Jersey. Obtained civil-service status July 5, 1929, assistant attorney, $3,000 per annum, competitive examination.

5. Wilber Andrews Gallahan, 3716 Warren Street NW., Washington, D. C.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia. Obtained civil-service status April 11, 1922, resident auditor, $1,800 per annum, competitive examination.

6. Ellison C. Palmer, 1723 Emory Road NE., Atlanta, Ga.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina. Obtained civil-service status November 25, 1910, substitute clerk, post-office service, competitive examination.

7. Raymond C. Cake, 2124 Arthur Avenue, Lakewood, Ohio: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Headquarters city, Cleveland, Ohio. Area: Ohio, Obtained civil-service status November 30, 1920, internal-revenue inspector, $2,000 per annum, competitive examination.

8. Raymond J. Roderick, 4809 Roanoke Parkway, Kansas City, Mo.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Headquarters city: Louisville, Ky. Area: Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee. Obtained civil-service status September 19, 1924, special agent, $2,400 per annum, competitive examination.

9. George E. Neal, 15720 Woodland Drive, Dearborn, Mich.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: State of Michigan. Obtained civil-service status January 22, 1913, deputy collector of internal revenue, $1,200 per annum, competitive examination.

10. Ernest C. Wright, 6853 South Cornell, Chicago, Ill.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Illinois and Wisconsin. Obtained civil-service status July 1, 1919, auditor, $1,600 per annum, competitive examination.

11. Theodore Feig, 5226 11th Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Minnesota, Nebraska, Iowa, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Obtained civil-service status January 19, 1925, junior auditor, $1,860 per annum, competitive examination.

12. Norman B. Eshleman, 7238 Northmoor, St. Louis, Mo.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Arkansas, Kansas, and Missouri. Obtained civil-service status June 16, 1922, assistant auditor, $1,400 per annum, competitive examination.

13. Morris A. Fremming, 7011 Shook Avenue, Dallas, Tex.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Obtained civil-service status July 1, 1935, internal revenue agent, $2,600 per annum, competitive examination.

14. Dallas Aubrey Sims, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Sixth Floor, Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash., formerly Office of Internal Revenue, agent in charge, 834 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington (including Alaska). Obtained civil-service status April 14, 1922, resident auditor, $1,600 per annum, competitive examination.

15. Stewart Berkshire, 249 South Manhattan Place, Los Angeles, Calif.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: California, Nevada and Hawaii. Obtained civil-service status February 11, 1942, deputy commissioner, $8,250 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

16. Frank W. Lohn, Albany Hotel, Denver, Colo., or room 417, New Customhouse, Denver, Colo.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Obtained civil-service status February 7, 1927, special agent, $2,400 per annum, competitive examination.

17. John B. Dunlap, 4432 McFarlin Boulevard, Dallas, Tex.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Area: Texas and Oklahoma. Obtained civil-service status December 8, 1945, administrative officer, $6,230 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

II. Directors of Internal Revenue

1. Augusta, Maine: Whitney L. Wheeler, 19 Cedar Street, Augusta, Maine. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) John R. Fortin, 84 Goudy Street, South Portland, Maine; 94 plus 5 points preference, 99. No tax experience.

(2) Whitney L. Wheeler, 19 Cedar Street, Augusta, Maine: 83 plus 5 points preference, 88. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) Roscoe N. Given, 4 Wyman Street, Augusta, Maine: 75 plus 5 points preference, 80. Has had tax experience in BIR.

2. Hartford, Conn.: James J. Graham, 129 Hazelmere Road, New Britain, Conn. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 3. Has had tax experience outside of BIR.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Thomas I. Shea, 17 Fuller Avenue, East Hartford, Conn.: 89 plus 10 points preference, 99. No tax experience.

(2) Thomas B. McDermott, 71 Brown Street, Bloomfield, Conn.: 87 plus 10 points preference, 97. No tax experience.

(3) James J. Graham, 129 Hazelmere Road, New Britain, Conn.: 95. Has had tax experience outside of BIR.

3. Burlington, Vt.: Henry H. Riordan, 80 South Willard Street, Burlington, Vt. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and was appointed noncompetitively. He also qualified in competitive examination as No. 3. Obtained civil-service status February 1, 1920, deputy collector, $1,800 per annum, competitive examination.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) James J. Carney, 10 Woodbine Street, South Burlington, Vt.: 98 plus 5 points preference, 103. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(2) Samuel E. Richardson, 80 St. Paul Street, Burlington, Vt.: 90. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) Henry H. Riordan, 80 South Willard Street, Burlington, Vt.: 89. Has had tax experience in BIR.

4. Boston, Mass.: Thomas E. Scanlon, 600 Huron Avenue, Cambridge, Mass. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 1, 1942, fiscal accountant, $3,200 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

5. Portsmouth, N. H.: John W. Gaynor, 244 Church Street, Burlington, Vt.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status April 1, 1921, chief field deputy, $2,200 per annum, competitive examination.

6. Rhode Island: John A. O'Connell, 111 Canonchet Avenue, Warwick, R. I. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status January 21, 1918, clerk, $1,000 per annum, competitive examination.

7. Albany, N. Y.: Riley J. Ratteree, 106 South Harrison Street, East Orange, N. J. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and has qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 19, 1916, clerk, $1,000 per annum, competitive examination.

8. Buffalo, N. Y.: George T. McGowan, 790 Auburn Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 1.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) George T. McGowan, 790 Auburn Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.: 82. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(2) John W. Dennin, 51 Westminster Road, Rochester, N. Y.: 77.5. Has had tax experience in State of New York Department of Taxation and Finance.

(3) Raymond H. Reichel, 1616 Colvin Boulevard, Kenmore, N. Y.: 76. Has had tax experience in BIR.

9. Syracuse, N. Y.: Frank J. Shaughnessy, 137 Highland Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 1.

Top three eligible in the competitive examination are:

(1) Frank Joseph Shauhnessy, 137 Highland Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.: 70 plus 10-point preference, 80. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(2) David Vincent Sheehan, Bishop Hill Road, Marcellus, N. Y.: 77.5. No tax experience.

(3) George Frederic Havell, Highbridge Road, Fayetteville, N. Y.: 70 plus 5-point preference, 75. No tax experience.

10. New York, N. Y. (upper Manhattan): Harold B. A'Hearn, 135 East 54th Street, New York, N. Y. Has had experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status July 2, 1917, stenographer-typist, $900 per annum, competitive examination.

11. New York, N. Y. (lower Manhattan): Denis J. McMahon, 11 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 1, 1942, junior administrative assistant, $2,600 per annum, Ramspeck Act, November 26, 1940, and Executive Order 8743.

12. New York, N. Y. (Brooklyn): Henry L. Hoffman, 121 Awixa Avenue, Bayshore, Long Island. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 16, 1942, senior administrative assistant, $3,400 per annum, Ramspeck Act, November 26, 1940, and Executive Order 8743.

13. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Raymond S. Kraft, 5737 Chew Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa. Appointed as acting director. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination for director of internal revenue at Newark, N. J., but detailed to Pittsburgh office instead. Obtained civil-service status November 29, 1920, internal revenue agent, $2,200 per annum, competitive examination.

The eligible in the competitive examination was (1) Alvin R. Guyler, University Club, Pittsburgh, Pa.: 89 plus 10 point preference, 99. No tax experience. Has declined position.

14. Philadelphia, Pa.: Leslie R. Miles, 242 Jericho Manor, Jenkintown, Pa. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status April 25, 1917, clerk, $1,000 per annum, competitive examination.

15. Scranton, Pa.: Joseph J. Lawler, 404 Church Street, Jessup, Pa. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 1.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Joseph J. Lawler, 404 Church Street, Jessup, Pa.: 92 plus 5 point preference, 97. No tax experience.

(2) Albert T. Glahn, 1735 Wyoming Avenue, Forty-Fort, Pa.: 89.50. Had some tax experience outside BIR.

(3) Joseph T. McDonald, 2016 Green Ridge Street, Dunmore, Pa.: 82. Has tax experience in BIR.

16. Wilmington, Del.: Francis P. Graham, 606 Jackson Avenue, Woodcrest, Wilmington, Del. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 1.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Francis P. Graham, 606 Jackson Avenue, Woodcrest, Wilmington, Del.: 78 plus 5 point preference, 83. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(2) Horace L. Brown, 32 West 40th Street, Wilmington, Del.: 81. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) Jesse S. Cooper, Main Street, P. O. Box 97, Camden, Del.: 74 plus 5 point preference, 79. Has had tax experience in BIR and outside BIR.

17. Camden, N. J.: Addington B. Campbell, East Main Street, Port Norris, N. J. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 16, 1942, head administrative officer, $4,800, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

18. Newark, N. J.: Bruce E. Lambert, 3569 South Stafford, Arlington, Va. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status April 16, 1942, zone deputy collector, $2,000 per annum, Ramspect Act of November 26, 1940 and Executive Order 8743.

19. Baltimore, Md.: Lewis Alfred Chamberlin, 3130 Guilford Avenue, Baltimore, Md. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status August 1, 1942, zone deputy collector, $2,400 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

20. Richmond, Va.: Hoke Murray, 811 West Lancaster Road, Richmond, Va. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status August 8, 1917, typist, $900 per annum, competitive examination.

21. Parkersburg, W. Va.: Robb Neeley Keyser, 2402 Oak Street, Parkersburg, W. Va. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status October 1, 1942, head administrative officer, $4,800 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

22. Atlanta, Ga.: William Wright Holland, 374 E. Paces Ferry Road NE., Atlanta, Ga. Has civil-service status and was appointed competitively. Has had no tax experience. Competitive examination was held.

Top three eligibles in competitive examination are:

(1) Brunswick A. Bagdon, 346 Woodward Way NW., Atlanta, Ga.: 92 plus 5 points preference, 97. No tax experience.

(2) Hammond B. Smith, 136 Ponce de Leon Court, Decatur, Ga.: 83 plus 5 points preference, 88. No tax experience.

(3) W. Wright Holland, 374 East Paces Ferry Road, NE., Atlanta, Ga.: 81 plus 5 points preference, 86. No tax experience.

23. Greensboro, N. C.: Edward Gill, King Cotton Hotel, Greensboro, N. C. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Henry Eugene Cox, Veterans' Administration, Nissen Building, Winston-Salem, N. C.: 74 plus 10-point preference, 84. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(2) Edward Gill, King Cotton Hotel, Greensboro, N. C.: 95 plus 5-point preference, 100. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) Gary Campbell, 4812 DeRussey Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.: 86 plus 5-point preference, 91. No tax experience.

24. Columbia, S. C.: Robert C. Pitts, 502 Capitol Place, Columbia, S. C. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Has had tax experience in BIR. Obtained civil-service status September 16, 1942, administrative officer, $4,000 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

25. Jacksonville, Fla.: Laurie W. Tomlinson, 3859 Concord Street, Jacksonville, Fla. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Has had tax experience in BIR. Competitive examination was held. Appointment was not made from register. Obtained civil-service status August 16, 1942, junior administrative officer, $3,700 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

Two eligibles were obtained from the examination:

(1) Walter A. Sahli, 5201 Northeast Fifth Avenue, Miami, Fla.: 93. No tax experience.

(2) Harley Howard: 87 plus 5-point preference, 92. Has had tax experience in BIR.

26. Cincinnati, Ohio: Russell A. Welch, 6618 Miami Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. No competitive examination was held. Obtained civil-service status July 1, 1920, assistant auditor, $1,600 per annum, competitive examination.

27. Cleveland, Ohio: Parker C. Williams, 2675 Scarborough Road, Cleveland, Ohio. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Patrick F. Murphy, 14432 Delaware Avenue, Lakewood, Ohio: 97 plus 5 points preference, 102. Has had no tax experience.

(2) Parker C. Williams, 2675 Scarborough Road, Cleveland, Ohio: 77 plus 5 points preference, 82. Has had no tax experience.

(3) Albert H. Anderson, Sagamore Hills, Macedonia, Ohio: 75. Has had no tax experience.

28. Columbus, Ohio: Nathaniel Looker, 6 Bells Mill Road, Philadelphia, Pa., (legal residence, Columbus, Ohio): Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Ralph H. Stone, 88 Nottingham Road, Columbus Ohio: 88 plus 5 points preference, 93. Has had no tax experience.

(2) Nathaniel Looker, 6 Bells Mill Road, Philadelphia, Pa.: 84 plus 5 points preference, 89. Has had no tax experience.

(3) Harry F. Busey, 2476 Powell Avenue, Columbus, Ohio: 84. Has had tax experience in BIR.

29. Toledo, Ohio: Gilbert C. Hooks, 628 Valley Drive, Maumee, Ohio. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 16, 1942, administration officer, $3,600 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) F. William Gardner, 3452 Kenwood Boulevard, Toledo, Ohio: 85 plus 5 points preference, 90. Has had no tax experience.

(2) Melbourne C. Emery, 3221 Lennox Drive, Dayton, Ohio: 79 plus 5 points preference, 84. Has had no tax experience.

(3) John J. Quinlivan, 725 Orchard Street, Toledo, Ohio: 82. Has had tax experience in BIR.

No selection from the competitive examination.

30. Indiannpolis, Ind.: Gary Campbell, 4812 DeRussey Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md. Has had no tax experience. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status August 8, 1922, clerk, $1,000 per annum, competitive examination.

31. Louisville, Ky.: William M. Gray, 2023 Eastern Parkway, Louisville, Ky. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status October 16, 1923, special agent, $2,250 per annum, competitive examination.

No competitive examination was held.

32. Nashville, Tenn.: James M. Rountree, Curtiswood Lane, Nashville, Tenn. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Has had no tax experience. Obtained civil-service status January 1, 1942, deputy to vice chairman, HOLC, $7,370 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

33. Detroit, Mich.: Albert M. Menninger, 8134 Langley, Chicago, Ill. (only available Detroit address is box 84, Detroit, Mich.). Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status August 7, 1923, internal-revenue inspector, $1,800 per annum, competitive examination.

34. Chicago, Ill.: Ernest J. Sauber, 302 Arbor Avenue, West Chicago, Ill. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 16, 1942, senior administrative assistant, $3,300 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

35. Springfield, Ill.: Ernest H. Vaughn, Oak Lane, Lake Springfield, Springfield, Ill. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination.

36. Milwaukee, Wisc.: George Reisimer, 3216 North 46th Street, Milwaukee, Wis. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Wilbur J. Schmidt, 1221 East Johnson Street, Madison, Wis.: 88 plus 5 point preference, 93. No tax experience.

(2) George Reisimer, 3216 North 46th Street, Milwaukee, Wisc.: 89. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) Carl F. Kottler, 5716 19th Avenue, Kenosha, Wis.: 83 plus 5 point preference, 88. No tax experience.

37. St. Paul, Minn.: Arthur R. Knox, 666 Chippewa Avenue, St. Paul, Minn. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 3.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Victor Christgau, Newport, Minn.: 92 plus 5 point preference, 97. No tax experience.

(2) G. Howard Spaeth, Ada, Minn.: 90.50 plus 5 point preference, 95.50. Has had tax experience outside BIR.

(3) Arthur R. Knox, 666 Chippewa Avenue, St. Paul, Minn.: 94. Has had tax experience in BIR.

38. Omaha, Nebr.: Delbert V. Gordon, 3212 Colby Street, Omaha, Nebr. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status February 27, 1922, internal-revenue inspector, $2,000 per annum, competitive examination.

39. Des Moines, Iowa: Frank M. Halpin, 5606 Urbandale Road, Des Moines, Iowa. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status January 29, 1920, deputy collector, $1,100 per annum, competitive examination.

40. Fargo, N. Dak.: James S. Lamb, 1111 Reeves Drive, Grand Forks, N. Dak. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Byron J. Rockwood, 702 Cottonwood Street, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: 87.50. No tax experience.

(2) James S. Lamb, 1111 Reeves Drive, Grand Forks, N. Dak.: 85.50. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) Jonathon C. Eaton, 302 Ninth Street, South Fargo, N. Dak.: 84. No tax experience.

41. Aberdeen, S. Dak.: William C. Welsh, 407 North First Street, Aberdeen, S. Dak. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) John B. Linn, 611 North Euclid Avenue, Pierre, S. Dak.: 88.50. Has had tax experience outside BIR.

(2) William C. Welsh, 407 North First Street, Aberdeen, S. Dak.: 81.50 plus 5-point preference, 86.50. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) George W. Chitty, 232 Iowa SE., Huron, S. Dak.: 82.50. No tax experience.

42. Little Rock, Ark.: Olin S. Godwin, 510 North Martin Street, Little Rock, Ark. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status October 1, 1920, clerk, $1,200 per annum, competitive examination.

43. Wichita, Kans.: Lynn Brodrick, Post Office Box 333, Wichita, Kans. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status November 10, 1911, substitute postal clerk, competitive examination.

44. Kansas City, Mo.: Edwin O. Bookwalter, 3017 Oloma, Wichita, Kans. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status July 1, 1935, internal-revenue agent, $2,600 per annum, competitive examination.

45. St. Louis, Mo.: Gustave F. Koehler, 4475 West Pine Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 3.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) John T. McKay, 9426 Ardmore Drive, St. Louis County, Mo.: 81.25 plus 10 point preference, 91.25. No tax experience.

(2) Gerard N. Byrne, 5857 Waterman Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.: 80 plus 10 point preference, 90. Has had tax experience outside BIR.

(3) Gustave F. Koehler, 4475 West Pine Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.: 86.25 plus 5 point preference, 91.25. No tax experience.

46. Birmingham, Ala.: George D. Patterson, Jr., 2432 Henrietta Road, Birmingham, Ala. Was appointed competitively.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Robert A. Beeland, Jr., Woodland Court, Greenville, Ala.: 83 plus 10 point preference, 93. No tax experience.

(2) Fred H. Foy, care of Essex House, Birmingham, Ala.: 82 plus 5 point preference, 87. No tax experience.

(3) George D. Patterson, Jr., 2432 Henrietta Road, Birmingham, Ala.: 85. Has only a slight amount of tax experience acquired during practice of law.

47. New Orleans, La.: George A. Lambert, 4618 Mandeville Street, New Orleans, La.: Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status May 16, 1927, Internal Revenue agent, $2,100 per annum, competitive examination.

48. Jackson, Miss.: James L. Enochs, Post Office Box 1601, Jackson, Miss. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 16, 1942, junior administrative officer, $3,600 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

49. Boise, Idaho: Calvin Everett Wright, Route 4, Liberty Road, Boise, Idaho. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in competitive examination are:

(1) Nick D. Collaer, 303 Daisy Street, Boise, Idaho: 82 plus 5 point preference, 87. No tax experience.

(2) Calvin E. Wright, Route 4, Liberty Road, Boise, Idaho: 80. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) H. Fred Garrett, 214 East Bannock Street, Boise, Idaho: 75. No tax experience.

50. Helena, Mont.: Thomas Miller Robinson, No. 4 North Benton Avenue, Helena, Mont. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 16, 1942, administrative officer, $4,200 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

51. Portland, Oreg.: Ralph C. Granquist, Office of Director of Internal Revenue, Portland, Oreg., formerly Internal Revenue Inspection Service, Chicago, Ill. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status July 2, 1923, internal-revenue agent, $2,000 per annum, competitive examination.

52. Tacoma, Wash.: William Elliott Frank, Office of Director of Internal Revenue, Tacoma, Wash., formerly Office of Special Agent in Charge, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Seattle, Wash. (Obtained civil-service status February 16, 1927, special agent, $2,400 per annum, competitive examination.) Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination (no selection from the competitive examination).

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Lester H. Hall, 11508 Third Avenue NE., Seattle, Wash.: 80 plus 10 points preference, 90. No tax experience.

(2) John C. Hazlett, 6026 29th Avenue NE., Seattle, Wash.: 72 plus 10 points preference, 82. No tax experience.

(3) Carl A. Pettibone, 301 McKenzie, Pullman, Wash.: 88. No tax experience.

(NOTE.—The Commission informed the Treasury Department that where a competitive examination had been held, and at least three eligibles were obtained, it would not approve a noncompetitive appointment unless the status person nominated for noncompetitive appointment would be rated among the top three eligibles when considered on a competitive basis. Mr. Frank was compared to the other eligibles on a competitive basis and found to be among the top three eligibles.)

53. Los Angeles, Calif: Robert A. Riddell, 3035 Berkeley Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status July 1, 1942, junior administrative officer, $3,700 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

54. San Francisco, Calif.: Glen T. Jamison, c/o LaSalle Hotel, 225 Hyde Street, San Francisco, Calif. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status September 1, 1942, junior administrative officer, $3,600 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

55. Reno, Nev.: Vaughn W. Evans, 1118 North 14th Street, Boise, Idaho. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status August 16, 1942, junior administrative assistant, $2,600 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

56. Honolulu, T. H.: Stanley V. McKenney, 835 Milmada Drive, La Canada, Calif. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status December 3, 1917, accountant, $1,800 per annum, competitive examination.

57. Phoenix, Ariz.: Wilson Barbour Wood, 514 North Fifth Street, Phoenix, Ariz. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 3.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Harold R. Holcomb, Post Office Box 351, Scottsdale, Ariz.: 81 plus 10 point preference, 91. No tax experience.

(2) William H. Smith, 5336 North Sixth Street, Phoenix, Ariz.: 91 plus 5 point preference, 96. No tax experience.

(3) Wilson B. Wood, 514 North Fifth Street, Phoenix, Ariz.: 90 plus 5 point preference, 95. No tax experience.

58. Denver, Colo.: George H. Allan, 614 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.: Qualified in competitive examination as No. 1. Has civil-service status but was selected through competitive examination.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) George H. Allan, 614 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.: 88 plus 10 point preference, 98. Has had tax experience in Bureau of Internal Revenue.

(2) Frank H. Stapleton, 2217 Jasmine Street, Denver, Colo.: 74 plus 10 point preference, 84. Has no tax experience.

(3) Bernard E. Teets, 1305 East Seventh Avenue, Denver, Colo.: 91 plus 5 point preference, 96. Has had no tax experience unless he handled some tax cases while in general law practice for 1½ years in 1935–36.

59. Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Steven P. Vidal, 1601 Las Lomas Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Qualified in competitive examination as No. 2.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Ralph S. Trigg, 406 Cloverway, Alexandria, Va. (legal resident of New Mexico): 98 plus 5 point preference, 103. No tax experience.

(2) Steven P. Vidal, 1601 Las Lomas Road, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: 87 plus 5 point preference, 92. Had tax experience in Bureau of Internal Revenue.

(3) Mayhew H. Davis, 1224 North Stanford, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: 85. No tax experience.

60. Salt Lake City, Utah: Charles Irvin Fox, 1660 Harvard Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status April 25, 1927, internal revenue agent, $2,100 per annum, competitive examination.

61. Cheyenne, Wyo.: Frank G. Clark, Frontier Hotel, Cheyenne, Wyo. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 3.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Archibald Ewoldsen, Route No. 1, Sheridan, Wyo.: 85. Has had tax experience in Wyoming State government.

(2) LeRoy Joyce, 218 West Third Avenue, Cheyenne, Wyo.: 82. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(3) Frank G. Clark, Frontier Hotel, Cheyenne, Wyo.: 76 plus 5-point preference, 81. Has had tax experience in BIR.

62. Austin, Tex.: Robert L. Phinney, 1907 Exposition Boulevard, Austin, Tex. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status June 30, 1948, postmaster, $7,400 per annum, competitive examination.

63. Dallas, Tex.: Ellis Campbell, Jr., 10034 Lake Gardens Drive, Dallas, Tex. Has had tax experience in BIR. Has civil-service status and qualified in noncompetitive examination. Obtained civil-service status August 16, 1942, zone deputy collector, $2,400 per annum, Ramspeck Act and Executive Order 8743.

64. Oklahoma City, Okla.: Earl R. Wiseman, 430 Northwest 27th Street, Oklahoma City, Okla. Qualified in competitive examination as No. 1.

Top three eligibles in the competitive examination are:

(1) Earl R. Wiseman, 430 Northwest 27th Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.: 80 plus 10-point preference, 90. Has had tax experience in BIR.

(2) James S. Hargett, 1506 Drury Lane, Oklahoma City, Okla.: 95. No tax experience.

(3) Joseph D. Dunn, Capitol Office Building, Oklahoma City, Okla.: 92.50. Has had tax experience outside BIR.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not rise to question any of the assertions the Senator from Delaware has made regarding the method of filling vacancies in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I simply rise to inquire how anything the Senator from Delaware has said regarding the method of filling vacancies in the Bureau of Internal Revenue distinguishes that method in any way from the one used during recent years in every other Government agency.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the same method is used in other Government agencies, it is time we did something about it. Unquestionably politics has played too important a part in the selection of too many officials.

As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I fully recognize that under the civil-service law and rules, the administration was perfectly within its rights in filling these jobs either through competitive examinations or through noncompetitive examinations. However, on that point I quoted the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and I should like to read that quotation again, because I think it is the heart of the entire problem.

When testifying before the Committee on Government Operations, Mr. Robert Ramspeck, then Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, testified on January 31, 1952, as follows:

> When the new jobs have been classified and the examination requirements set, open competitive examinations will be announced for the district commissioner jobs and any other key positions that are to be filled, I believe a total of about 90.

During the debate on the floor of the Senate, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], a member of the committee, was leading the administration fight in support of the reorganization plan. In the debate, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] pointed out that the plan contained nothing which made it mandatory that the Commission use competitive examinations, and he stated the fear that after the plan was adopted, the Commission might go back on its promises.

I should like to quote the reassurance given by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on this particular point, based upon testimony by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I am not questioning the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; he was stating the promises as he understood them.

I might add that I, too, had the same understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we should keep the record straight. I believe there is nothing

in the reorganization plan which sets up a merit system. The Senator is correct when he says there is nothing within the plan which says "under competitive examination." However, I remind the Senator that in the Classified Civil Service Act there are provisions for competitive civil-service examinations, as well as noncompetitive.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remind the Senator that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, three top officers of the Government, have testified before a committee of the Congress, have placed their reputations before the people of this Nation, and have placed their whole professional standing before the entire American public on the basis that there would be competitive examinations for the positions we are discussing.

While we all understood that both competitive and noncompetitive examinations were possible under the law, certainly the above statement was clear enough as to the procedure promised.

I do not think we could get a more positive statement on behalf of the man who was in charge of the bill at that time. And as I pointed out, of the approximately 90 positions filled, competitive examinations were held in only 27 cases out of that group. Of that 27, the officials bypassed, in many instances, the results of the competitive examinations. When there would be three men qualified for the jobs, they would go outside the register to pick another man, and in many instances give him the job over the objections of the Civil Service Commission. That was a direct violation of the established rules of the civil-service system as provided by law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question the accuracy of the statements of the Senator from Delaware, but I still do not see how the practice in regard to filling vacancies in the Bureau of Internal Revenue is distinguishable from that followed in practically all other agencies of Government, where political clearances are required for all appointments to positions carrying salaries amounting to $4,000, $5,000, and up. I think that what he has said in regard to the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the perversion of the civil-service laws also applies to most of the other agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not question that but that does not make it right, I do think, and I am sure the Senator from Vermont will agree with me, that when the representatives of the executive branch come before the Congress and testify that they will or will not do something, we have a right to expect them to carry out their promise. I should like to quote from a letter which I received from Mr. John S. Graham, of the Treasury Department, on this very subject, as to whether or not the Selection Board would have free reign in the operation:

> Neither former Commissioner Dunlap nor the Secretary was an ex officio member of the Selection Board. In fact, they had nothing whatsoever to do with the Board's recommendations. Such recommendations were purposely designed to be the independent and impartial actions of this five-man group, based upon their collective judgment and evaluation of the qualifications and the suitability of each candidate which it considered.

Also, I have quoted this afternoon from letters signed by representatives of the Selection Board, in which they cite many, many cases in which they never even knew the men were being considered until after they had been appointed. I have quoted also excerpts from letters to the Civil Service Commission, and which can be verified, in which the notation appears that Secretary Snyder and Commissioner Dunlap have agreed upon the appointment of Mr. X. Remember we were given the assurance that employees would be selected only on the basis of the competitive examinations, and also the assurance of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury that, in addition, neither Commissioner Dunlap nor the Secretary would have anything to do with the appointments.

Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield first to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Delaware will recall that in March 1952, when Reorganization Plan No. 1, involving the Bureau of Internal Revenue, was before this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], as chairman of the Government Operations Committee at that time, and other members of the committee, including myself, endeavored to forewarn the Members of this body that instead of taking politics out of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 would in reality blanket political manipulation within that Bureau. Control of the situation was then the responsibility of Congress. All the facts were laid before Senators during that debate, and while I appreciate the efforts now being made by the senior Senator from Delaware, I should like to ask him what Congress should do now to rectify the mistake that was made a year ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is going to make a comment on that in a moment. I said here that I felt the executive branch and the committee should study this subject. I still believe in the principle of keeping these men under Civil Service. However, I am not willing to sit idly by and see these men who were selected solely on the basis of their political affiliation continue to hold the positions they now occupy. Congress has every right to believe a member of the President's Cabinet, when he comes before the Congress and gives a promise that he will or will not do something. If we trust that member of the Cabinet, we should impeach him if he violates that promise.

Mr. DWORSHAK. May I ask how the Senator would propose doing that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We did it on November 4.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to associate myself with the question asked by the Senator from Vermont, when he inquired whether the procedure followed in filling of these particular positions by the Civil Service Commission is not comparable to the procedure which has been in effect for many years. While some of the local columnists in Washington tell us how sacrosanct and efficient the Civil Service Commission is, the fact remains that the Civil Service Commission, prior to January, for several years had frequently disregarded merit in the filling of these positions. So I ask, why, in this particular instance, were the Members of this body justified in assuming that any other procedure would be followed than that which had been giving precedence to political considerations in all the operations of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say that the difference is this: In this particular instance, the promise was asked for and was received, that the appointments would be made upon competitive examinations, that there would be an independent selection board set up to select these appointees to these jobs. That is not done under the Post Office Department or in any of the other agencies, and while I do not question that there have been many violations of the spirit of civil service, in the past—and I assume there will be a few, in the future—nevertheless, I say that is the responsibility and fault of those who are administering the service rather than of the act itself.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the Senator is now stating that, based on his investigation and his observations, politics rather than merit in the civil service has played an important part in the selection of many revenue collectors, or whatever the title may be now, under the reorganization plan?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have made the statement that I think the reorganization plan was carried out in direct opposition to the intent of Congress; and I do think that the political picture played a more prominent part in the selection of these men than did their qualifications—yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand the Senator from Delaware, he is saying that the Senate, in considering the concurrent resolution, took the word of Cabinet officials and of other Government officials and relied upon their statements, rather than writing into the law a provision that would not be the expression of a promise, but rather the expression of congressional opinion by means of a statute. We accepted their statements. I say "We"; but I did not, and I am sorry the Senator from Delaware did. He accepted the word of the officials rather than writing an express provision in the law. Is not that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. But I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that he, I am sure, recognizes that in

considering Reorganization Plan No. 1 last year it was impossible to write such a provision in the law, since a reorganization plan was not subject to amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Therefore, the reorganization plan was defective, and was known to us to be defective at the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree on that point, and I wish that it had been written into the law. I would have preferred that at the time. As the Senator from Arkansas very ably pointed out, we relied upon the sincerity of the men who gave their word. It was a little hard to conceive that three men, holding such positions, would carry their plans out in direct violation of what they had expressly promised to the Congress. I said at the time that while I was going to accept it on the basis of their promise, I was going to follow through to see that they carried out their promise; I am therefore today making this statement. I am making the specific charge that they did not live up to their promises to the Congress and to the American people.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator not recall that during the course of the debate on that resolution or plan, the Senator from Arkansas stated that instead of taking the Bureau of Internal Revenue out of politics, we were placing it in politics, behind an iron curtain; and has not that situation come to pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, I would not say so. We are not working behind an iron curtain today. Some of the administration officials might have intended it as such but if so they are in for a surprise.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The curtain is there, and politics is there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It so happens that Congress has control of the curtain. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that I am very much disappointed in the manner in which the plan has been carried out. However, had we rejected the reorganization plan and continued as we were then going, under the old administration, we would still have these men in office and we would have had to turn them out. Conditions at the time were so bad that many of us were willing to take most any chance to get them corrected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What does the Republican Party propose to do about it? Is it going to turn them out?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I speak only for myself. I made it very clear that I did not intend to sit idly by and see some of these discredited officials use the civil service system as a political refuge. That is why I have made such a thorough study of this subject. I think we will get it corrected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What effect will the Executive order which is being promulgated, if not already issued by the Chief Executive, have on those positions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not certain that I can answer that question, but I would say it would have no effect. If I understand correctly—the Executive order can be applicable only to those positions which were blanketed in under the civil-service system by Executive order, and in those cases in which employees obtained civil-service status as a result of a congressional act. I think it will take another act of Congress or another reorganization plan to change that situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then we can expect no remedy by Executive order of the President of the situation to which the Senator has so ably addressed himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think it can be so corrected; however, there is nothing to prevent another reorganization of the Bureau or to prevent Congress from passing another law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The only way it can be corrected is through legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The only way it can be corrected is either by legislation or reorganization of what is apparently a disorganized Bureau.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to congratulate the Senator from Delaware for the very able job he has done in investigating and uncovering the very unfortunate and improper acts which have occurred. I should like to ask the Senator if he is familiar with the statement made by one of the members of our committee, a Senator who I believe is one of the experts on the administration of our tax laws, to the effect that this ill-advised reorganization plan, and the way in which it was put into effect, probably cost this Nation approximately $500 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have heard various statements made as to estimates of the cost. I made the statement that instead of costing less money and operating with more efficiency, there is greater inefficiency and it has cost the taxpayers more money. We are loaded down with a worse situation than we were in when we started.

We are confronted with a condition which if not met affirmatively could cause considerable embarassment and loss of faith by the people in this agency.

Mr. LONG. Of course the statement was made in executive session, and I would not care to disclose the Senator's name, for I very highly respect him, but he made the statement that the employment of incompetent persons to administer certain features of the program, giving everyone a pay raise by changing his status, the general confusion which existed throughout the country as a result of the reorganization plan, and the way in which it was placed into effect, probably cost this Nation approximately $500 million in taxes due but not collected. Does the Senator believe that that is the case?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would not care to place an estimate on it. I heard the same statement which the Senator from Louisiana heard, and I respect the man who made it. There is no question in my mind but that the morale of the Treasury employees was never lower than it is today. It is rather discouraging to many of the employees of the agency who are trying to do a good job—and the majority of them are trying to do a good job—to see persons placed in high positions of authority who are, in fact, not capable of holding the job.

Mr. LONG. Of course the Senator from Delaware was acting in complete good faith in trying to improve the administration of the Bureau of Internal Revenue when he voted for the reorganization plan. However, I believe the manner in which the reorganization plan was put into effect, and the defective phases of the plan itself, pretty well disclose that we do not always get economy by having a reorganization plan. Sometimes we only waste the taxpayers' money. That is what happened in this instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. I think Congress has a responsibility to follow through. We can always correct such a situation. I think that is what we must do in this particular instance. I still believe there are good principles behind the reorganization plan. I still believe in many of its principles, and I think we can salvage the good and clean out the bad.

Mr. President, I promised to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a moment, because I must leave the floor——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I promised to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I desire to commend the Senator from Delaware for getting this information and presenting it to the Senate. As one of the Members of the Senate who were probably carried away by the debate, I voted against the plan. I did so on the basis that we were not improving the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue by blanketing certain officials into the service. The record shows they were blanketed in. At that time we were greatly concerned about the office of the collector of internal revenue and the collecting agencies all over the Nation. Today we find that persons have been placed in responsible permanent positions who were part and parcel of favoritism and political influence. It just does not speak well for the agency to have in it the men who were operating it at that time.

I notice that in the Senator's statement he referred to the Committee on Government Operations. As chairman of the Civil Service Committee, I shall be glad to go into the matter in any way I can, and if the Committee on Government Operations wants to take it up I shall be glad to accede to it.

The matter should be looked into. The Bureau of Internal Revenue should be a Bureau which is above reproach. I do not see how we can have it so when we blanket the wrong type of people into the service. I am a great believer in the civil service; I believe in the merit system. The administration had an excellent opportunity to carry forward a good type of program, but it selected political cronies and moved them all over the Nation and blanketed them into the system. It is unfortunate. The leaders are responsible for it, not the hard working, fine, patriotic employees. It is one of the problems of the present adminis-

tration, in dealing with persons in policymaking positions who were frozen into their positions. I can imagine the present collector of internal revenue, or anyone else in the new administration, asking cooperation and expecting to get sound, honest answers to the problems affecting the collection of internal revenue.

Mr. President, we and the Nation are indebted to the Senator from Delaware for his splendid statement today.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I happen to be one of the Members of this great body who voted for Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952. I did this because at the time I deemed it to be in the public interest.

Since casting that vote, which I now consider to be a bad vote, I have seen the operation of the Department in my city of Baltimore under that reorganization. I have seen worthy employees who had faithfully discharged their duties in the Bureau of Internal Revenue for 25 or 30 years suffer the experience of having placed over them men who should not be placed over them—men who had been brought in from Washington and placed in the "cushy" jobs which the Senator from Delaware has been discussing. I have seen the morale of that fine group of employees destroyed.

I have also seen in my city the actual moving of these fine long-time career employees from their places in the customs house and in other branch offices of the Treasury Department into unsuitable and crowded quarters, even to the extent that one of our local editors has characterized the quarters to which some of those fine men have been moved as a snake pit.

As can be seen, conditions in my State are deplorable, and I heartily commend the Senator from Delaware. I think all he has said is true and I shall join with him in an endeavor to bring about the reform which he seeks to bring about.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his contribution. I assure him, as another Senator who voted for the plan with the best of intentions, that I think all of us now recognize the problem with which we are now confronted. If we all get together, we can still straighten out this Department and restore this important agency to the point where it will once again command the respect of the American people. That can be done only by convincing the American people that we have cleaned up the corruption and thrown out all those officials who forgot that a public office was a public trust.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the unanimous-consent agreement has expired, and it now becomes the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

IMPORTATION OF COMPETITIVE FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a brief statement for the RECORD, so that I may then leave in order to attend a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Oregon was to be entitled to the floor when the Senate resumed consideration of the unfinished business. However, I have no objection to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] having opportunity to make his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I desire to make a statement in connection with Senate bill 1538, introduced yesterday by the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and a number of other Senators.

Mr. President, it was my privilege yesterday to join with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and a number of other Senators sponsoring a bill (S. 1538) designed to strengthen American agriculture and reduce the cost of price-support operations. The matter of importation of competitive foreign agricultural products, produced at wage standards and costs much below those of the American rancher, is causing great concern to the livestock people of my State and of all the States of the West. My mail is full of the concern being expressed by such people as Mr. Chandler Church, of Elko, president of the Nevada Wool Growers Association, and Mrs. Louise Marvel, of Battle Mountain, Nev. Mrs. Marvel perhaps expressed the feeling of all the ranchers as they face the downward trend in prices of wool and meats when she said, "If something could be done to stop importation until domestic supplies were exhausted, then perhaps we would all fare halfway well."

Mr. President, I think in this measure (S. 1538) we have an answer that is fair to the domestic producer of farm products, whose welfare we must consider if this Nation is to remain strong, and is to produce the food and fiber which forms the basis of our economy. And it is fair to those who need and want increased foreign trade, for it sets up the limits which will permit this trade without damage to the standard of living of our ranchers and their workers. With the passage of this bill, the Congress will have maintained its promise to agriculture to help maintain a parity price, and will at the same time be fair to the taxpayers in attempting to cut the cost of support programs.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1953, RELATING TO EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 120)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. This message is accompanied by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953. The message has already been read in the House. Therefore, the reading of the message in the Senate will be dispensed with, and it will be printed in the RECORD. The message, together with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today, p. 2716.)

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McClellan
Beall	Griswold	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Byrd	Holland	Payne
Capehart	Humphrey	Potter
Carlson	Hunt	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Kuchel	Symington
Duff	Langer	Taft
Dworshak	Lehman	Tobey
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	Mansfield	Wiley
Frear	McCarran	Williams
Fulbright	McCarthy	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senators

from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is recognized.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ANCHER NELSEN TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for an announcement?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to yield to the Senator from Vermont for the purpose of making an announcement in connection with official business, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may yield as indicated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I announce that at 10 o'clock next Tuesday morning the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold a hearing on the nomination of Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota, to be the new Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. Several Senators have asked me about Mr. Nelsen's appointment. I am unable to tell them anything other than that he is reputed to be a good man for the job, and there has been no objection to him. However, in view of the widespread interest in this position, I am announcing the hearing at this time. Any Members of the Senate who are interested will be welcome at the hearing, when Mr. Nelsen will appear.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the Joint Resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, when the Senate adjourned yesterday the Senator from Oregon was attempting to explain the terms of Senate Joint Resolution 13, and had reached paragraph (d) on page 11 of the joint resolution as reported. Before continuing the explanation, and in order that Members of the Senate may fully understand that the Senator from Oregon does not wish in any way to be discourteous or to favor one Senator over another, and that he is not unwilling in any sense to discuss fully the merits of the joint resolution, the Senator from Oregon desires expressly and explicitly to state that he is now engaged only in explaining the terms of the joint resolution, and not in discussing in any sense the merits or demerits of the joint resolution. He is limiting himself to what he thinks might conceivably be of aid to Members of the Senate in reaching conclusions as to what the joint resolution is intended to do. He would prefer not to be unduly interrupted. He will yield for questions within the framework of the purpose of his present statement, namely, a statement as to what the joint resolution means. He asks Senators who have questions to limit their questions to that field, and to make the questions as brief and as much to the point as possible.

The Senator from Oregon assures all Senators who may thereafter desire to engage in colloquy on the merits of the joint resolution that he will be most happy to join with them at a later time and make it a merry afternoon; but as of now, he desires merely to explain the joint resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have a question before I start. I yield for a question from my friend, the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me. I merely wished to ask if the Senator from Oregon intended to explain clearly what the joint resolution means, and what it would do.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon hopes to do so. It may well be that he will fail. He has failed before, but he will do his best to accomplish the purpose indicated.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, yesterday when the Senate adjourned I was discussing the definitions in title I of the joint resolution. The next definition appears on page 11, in line 17, and is a definition of the terms "grantees" and "lessees," as those terms are used in the joint resolution.

I deem it unnecessary to explain the definition. It seems to me to be perfectly clear, and to need no additional explanation.

DEFINITION OF "NATURAL RESOURCES"

The next paragraph is paragraph (c) on page 12. It reads as follows:

(c) The term "natural resources" includes, without limiting the generality thereof, oil, gas, and all other minerals, and fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but does not include waterpower, or the use of water for the production of power.

The Senator from Oregon calls particular attention to the language of exclusion in that definition. It does not include waterpower or the use of water for the production of power.

At this point in the joint resolution an amendment was inserted. The original language included this further language:

At any site where the United States now owns the waterpower.

That language was deleted by the committee in its recommended substitute amendment. My memory is that the committee was unanimous in that action. It is my recollection that the deletion met with the approval alike of those who believe in the philosophy of the Holland bill and those who believe in the approach of the Anderson bill.

DELETION OF ORIGINAL PROVISION EXPLAINED

The deletion of the language raised questions in the mind of the committee, and I invite attention to the statement of the committee which is found at page 19 of the report with reference to these words. I shall read that statement into the RECORD:

(20) The words "at any site where the United States now owns the waterpower" have been stricken here in the definition of "natural resources." The same language also is stricken from subsection (d) of section 3, page 16, at line 12, after the word "power." It is the committee's view that the provision is (1) surplusage; the right of the United States to generate and dispose of electrical energy as an incident to regulation of commerce is amply protected in preceding language; and (2) use of the word "owns" in connection with water power may be construed to import some right other than and in addition to the rights of the United States under its constitutional power to regulate commerce.

The remainder of the definition would appear to be clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question of fact?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has indicated that he will yield for questions with respect to the meaning and purpose of the terms used in the joint resolution, and he will be very happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois for any question in that field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon say whether the term "other minerals" includes sulfur?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, so far as the Senator from Oregon knows—and he is not a chemist, nor is he a geologist—sulfur is a mineral. He believes sulfur is a mineral.

The next definition is at page 12, line 12:

(f) The term "lands beneath navigable waters" does not include the beds of streams in lands now or heretofore constituting a part of the public lands of the United States if such streams were not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States and if the title to the beds of such streams was lawfully patented or conveyed by the United States or any State to any person.

That exclusion from the definition of lands beneath navigable waters" is placed in the joint resolution as a precautionary measure and as an explanatory provision. Its purpose is clearly to indicate that the pending joint resolution is not intended to affect in any way title to lands in the upland areas which have been lawfully patented and which may include still or flowing water that is nonnavigable. It has no other purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question of fact?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois would like to inquire about the meaning of the word "meandered." Is the word "meandered" used in the Homeric sense, "the river which wound about the battlements of Troy," or does it have a particular legal connotation?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is not at the moment discussing the battlements of Troy or the waters, nonnavigable or navigable, therein or round about. The Senator from Oregon enjoys a little persiflage with his friend from Illinois and, therefore, is happy to answer that one question.

The word "meandered" has a meaning and a definite definition, and any dictionary will supply it to my friend from Illinois, although I am perfectly certain that he needs no dictionary for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Does the word "meandered" as used here in connection with the "public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States" have any particular meaning under the laws or in connection with such surveys?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the laws of the States differ both as to their interpretation of the old common law of riparian rights, and as to their State statutes on the subject.

The word "meandered" as used in the joint resolution means the delineation of the banks of navigable waters. The United States, in following the sectional survey system, has habitually meandered those waters which were clearly and without any question navigable, and in extending its sectional survey system has stopped every line when it has reached the meander line around nonnavigable waters.

In some States we have decisions one way and in other States another way, not with respect to lands beneath meandered areas, but with respect to lands beneath waters where the lines have not been meandered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand the Senator from Oregon to say that the term "meandered" has the sense of to delineate, rather than to wind?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Illinois is correct in that respect. Of course, we again exclude the walls of Troy.

I read from page 12 of the joint resolution:

> (g) The term "State" means any State of the Union.

That paragraph is self-explanatory.

> (h) The term "person" includes, in addition to a natural person, an association, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private, public, or municipal corporation.

That concludes the definitions found in title I. Title II has the subtitle: "Lands Beneath Navigable Waters Within State Boundaries."

Section 3 in title II carries the first command in the joint resolution, although the definitions themselves partake of command in certain respects.

Section 3, in substance, Mr. President, determines and declares—

> That (1) title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and (2) the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use the said lands and natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Under this provision would the States have a right to require fishing and hunting licenses within the distance from the shore which might later be recognized as the boundary of the States; for instance, in the case of Florida for 10½ miles, if that is decided to be the legal distance the State of Florida extends on its west coast?

Mr. CORDON. A State has always had the right—and so far as I know, that right has never been disputed—of police power within its boundaries. In the case of the littoral States, that boundary is 3 miles at sea, or whatever other distance it may be.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the States do have authority to require fishing licenses within the 3-mile limit; is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. There is no question in my mind that they now have such authority and that they would have under Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. President, the next paragraph is an additional and precautionary approach to this overall problem. We must have in mind that we are dealing with two classes of lands under navigable waters: First, the land under so-called inland waters, including streams and lakes; second, the lands without the inland waters but in waters within the boundaries of the States, adjoining and being a part of the open sea.

INLAND WATERS PROTECTED

The decision of the Supreme Court in the three cases was limited in its legal effect to the latter class of lands, namely, those outside of inland waters and below the low-water mark on the coasts of the open sea. However, because of the danger the same philosophy enunciated in the decisions with respect to the marginal sea might later be applied to the inland waters—in other words, rivers and lakes—the joint resolution provides, in paragraph (a) and paragraph (b) (1), a separate approach. In paragraph (a) there is provision for recognition, confirmation, establishment, vesting in and assigning to the State the lands and the resources. In paragraph (b) (1) there is release and relinquishment by the United States to the "States and persons aforesaid," except as excepted in the joint resolution, of "all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, improvements, and natural resources"; and of "all claims of the United States, if any it has, for money or damages arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters."

Here we have release and relinquishment; and that release and relinquishment, in order to carry out the philosophy of the joint resolution to make the States whole and put them in the position in which they would have been in the absence of any of the three decisions. Under the quoted paragraph, the United States Government releases to the States any claims for money or damages which they might have by virtue of any acts taken pursuant to State law, but which might be found to be violative of whatever Federal rights arose as a result of the three so-called tidelands decisions, or any of them. That is the purpose of that particular release-and-relinquishment clause.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at this point for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I recall, the word "quitclaim" has previously been used in this section or in an analogous section. Will the Senator from Oregon advise us why that word does not appear at this point in the joint resolution?

Mr. CORDON. I am of the opinion that that word has not appeared in any legislation or proposed legislation on this subject since before the date of the California decision. Even then I believe the term used was "quiet title," rather than "quitclaim."

So far as I understand, however, the word "quitclaim" could have been added without in any way changing the meaning or purpose of the joint resolution. The words in the measure are used to spell out as precisely as possible its intent.

NO LIABILITY FOR PAST OPERATIONS

Mr. President, we now have reached page 14, line 4, of the joint resolution. Clause (3) in paragraph (b) (1) provides authority and direction to the agents of the United States to pay to the persons or to the States entitled thereto such moneys as have been paid to agents of the United States in connection with operations or continuation of operations under leases theretofore granted. Such operations in some instances have been continued under stipulation, and, in others, under operating orders or arrangements, the particularity of which the Senator from Oregon does not recall in detail at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at this point for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to inquire whether this portion of the joint resolution covers any moneys other than those paid for oil leases. If other moneys are covered, just which ones are covered?

Mr. CORDON. Any such moneys would be covered. I am of the view that no other moneys have been paid, although I would not make that statement

as a statement of fact. I myself know of no other moneys that have been paid.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator from Oregon give us a statement of the approximate amount of money thus paid? Can he tell us approximately how much it is?

Mr. CORDON. I have not come prepared with exact dollar figures, but I assure the Senator from Vermont that the figures are available. The amount is considerable.

Mr. AIKEN. The amount is a very considerable one, is it not?

Mr. CORDON. Oh, yes. I have just been advised by the committee counsel that the total is approximately $62 million. Part of that amount has been paid to the Federal Government, and a part has been paid to California, under the stipulations.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad the Senator from Oregon regards $62 million as a substantial amount. A moment ago, when he said the amount "is considerable," I was afraid he was going to refer to figures reaching the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. CORDON. When I said it was a considerable or substantial amount, I was speaking in my personal capacity. I could have said "a tremendous amount." However, when a Senator serves on the Appropriations Committee, sometimes he wonders whether an amount such as that involved here is any money at all.

Let me suggest to the Senator from Vermont that data on the subject to which he has adverted appear on page 570 of the hearings on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at this time for a question regarding paragraph (d)?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Oregon to say that these sums, amounting to approximately $62 million, which either are impounded under stipulation by the States or at present are held in escrow in the hands of the Federal Government, will revert to the States under this clause of the resolution?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. However, I must say that applies only to funds which have been paid with respect to operations inside the State boundaries. A portion has been paid from operations outside or seaward of the State boundaries. As to those funds, this joint resolution does not affect them in any way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question, together with a prefatory statement one sentence in length?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to renew the struggle we went through yesterday to find out what the State boundaries are. But until we know what the State boundaries under this resolution are considered to be, how can this provision be interpreted and applied, except as between the royalties received from inside 3-mile limit and those from outside the 3-mile limit? In other words, what will happen to the royalties from oil wells between the 3-mile limit and the 10½-mile limit in the case of Texas, and to the royalties from wells between the 3-mile limit and the 27-mile limit, in the case of Louisiana?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I see that my friend from Illinois will encroach just a little once in a while.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. CORDON. And I forgive him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I assure the Senator I am simply trying to find out the meaning of this joint resolution, and I am sure the Senator from Oregon wishes to cooperate in this matter. These sums revert to the States, except for the royalties from the wells in the reserved lands, which have not yet been finally decided to be within State boundaries. Now I am trying to find out what is going to happen to the royalties from wells outside the 3-mile limit.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the joint resolution makes no provision for disposition of funds received from wells outside State boundaries. The Senator from Oregon has indicated heretofore, and reiterates—although it is unnecessary—that this joint resolution does not locate the State boundaries. On page 570 of the hearings there appear certain tables which were presented by the United States Geological Survey and which indicate that someone in the Federal Government has some idea of where traditional State boundaries are. The Senator from Oregon does not confirm the accuracy of the tables. He simply states they are printed at that point in the hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed that the total revenue which might have to be repaid amounts to $35,284,000, of which $15 million would go to Louisiana, $500,000 to Texas, and nearly $20 million to California. But the amount payable to California appears to be for royalties paid under licenses granted within the traditional State boundary. I assume that is within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. CORDON. That is within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. AIKEN. I know I am asking an elementary question, but why has the Federal Government, in the case of California, been collecting money on licenses granted within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. CORDON. I may say to the Senator that the answer to that question involves the reason for this joint resolution. The Supreme Court has decided that the proprietary interest in those areas has coalesced with other and different interests which the Court calls paramount rights. Therefore, the proprietary rights which the States exercised have been declared to be in the United States in the form of paramount rights. The necessary legal result is that, even within that area beginning at the low-water mark along the coast and at the outward line of inland waters and on out to the Continental Shelf, everything, including the minerals in the subsoil and all other values there, is under that paramount jurisdiction and control of the Federal Government. Revenues, therefore, from operations in that marginal sea area, would inure to the United States under the theory of the decisions, although the leases provide such revenues should go to the State.

Mr. AIKEN. I suppose I become more elementary with every question; but did the Supreme Court decide that the resources within the 3-mile limit came under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, in the case of California, and, I assume, in the case of other States?

Mr. CORDON. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think the Senator from Vermont is the only person who had never before understood that.

Mr. CORDON. The sole purpose of Joint Resolution 13, as it was introduced, was to place in the States by law the values underlying navigable waters, including 3 miles seaward, or wherever the boundary line of the States may be. The purpose by law was to place in the States what the States have enjoyed in fact and what they thought they had, and did have, in fact, up to the time of the California decision.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the public has the impression that this resolution would give the States of Texas and Florida entire jurisdiction over the land beneath the sea for a distance of approximately 10 miles.

Mr. CORDON. That may be the case. I cannot say to the Senator that it is or is not. It depends on the validity of the claims made by the State of Texas and the State of Florida. I say they have made what appear to be good claims. But whatever they are, this resolution does not establish where they are, but it grants to the States affected the natural resources out to the State boundary.

Mr. AIKEN. This resolution does not attempt to fix the State boundary, does it?

Mr. CORDON. It does not.

Mr. AIKEN. If this resolution is passed, is there anything in it that would preclude the State of Texas, for instance, from claiming jurisdiction over the land and its resources, beneath the sea, for a distance of 70 or 80 miles?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon desires to add a little bit to his last answer. The Senator from Vermont asked whether this joint resolution fixes State boundaries. It does not fix any original State boundaries; it does not attempt to do so. It does provide that as to the 13 coastal States, their seaward boundaries shall be 3 geographic miles from their coast line. It does provide the consent of the United States that any State which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundary 3 miles from its coast line. That authority and provision with reference to the coastal States is in the joint resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the enactment of this joint resolution would still leave the way open for further controversy between the United States and the State of Texas as to the jurisdiction of the Continental Shelf. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. The resolution does not create any difficulty, nor does it do away with any difficulty as to the location of a State's sea boundary. It does confirm in the United States the jurisdiction and control of the natural resources in the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf outside of State

boundaries, as such boundaries are defined in the joint resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. But there is no way of telling, from this joint resolution, where such State boundaries may be.

Mr. CORDON. No, not as to either Florida or Texas, in regard to a three-league limit.

Mr. AIKEN. We are all concerned with this proposal because of the situation in regard to Mexico. If Texas claimed jurisdiction 10, 30, or 70 miles seaward into the Continental Shelf, would we be in a position to deny to the Mexican Government the right to do the same thing so far as its part of the Continental Shelf is concerned?

Mr. CORDON. With respect to the three leagues limit, there was in the treaty——

Mr. DANIEL. The treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

Mr. CORDON. Yes; the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. That treaty recognizes a boundary line extending three leagues from the mouth of the Rio Grande into the Gulf of Mexico, as the boundary line between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. AIKEN. The distinguished former attorney general of Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is a member of this body, and I am glad he is here. I should like to ask whether Texas is willing to accept that as its boundary?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield so that I may answer the question of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The answer to the question will have quite a bearing on the way I shall vote on the question.

Mr. DANIEL. That is the reason why I am anxious to answer the Senator's question. I desire to make it clear that under this resolution the State of Texas is not granted any property or released any property beyond its boundaries as they existed at the time the State entered the Union, which were fixed in the Gulf of Mexico at 3 leagues and later fixed in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo at 3 leagues. Nothing in this resolution would permit the State of Texas to claim ownership beyond 9 marine miles which equal 10½ statute miles.

Mr. AIKEN. Would there be anything in the resolution to prevent Texas from claiming the ownership of lands beyond that distance?

Mr. DANIEL. There is a Supreme Court decision which prevents the State of Texas from claiming ownership beyond 3 leagues. The resolution does assert in one of its final sections, section 9, that the jurisdiction and control of the United States——

Mr. AIKEN. I have the section before me, and it was a reading of that section which prompted my inquiry.

Mr. DANIEL. It asserts the jurisdiction and control of the United States beyond the historic boundaries, or the boundaries approved by the Congress of the United States. Beyond and seaward of the traditional 3-league boundary, the natural resources appertain to the United States and are subject to the control and jurisdiction of the United States.

There is nothing in any bill which has been introduced in this session of the Congress that would claim for the States the ownership or the control of any lands beyond their historic and traditional boundaries.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the passage of the resolution would, to all intents and purposes, so far as I am concerned, leave the boundaries of the State fixed at the 3-league limit from the shore.

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly, it would leave the boundary of the State of Texas, so far as the ownership of any lands is concerned, at 3 leagues. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Would any jurisdiction over the resources have to be conferred on the State of Texas by an act of Congress in case it was later decided to do so?

Mr. DANIEL. Would it have to be conferred by an act of Congress, beyond the 3-league boundaries?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Just one more question. The resolution does not in any way attempt to confer on the State any jurisdiction whatsoever outside of its natural boundaries, if that is the correct term——

Mr. DANIEL. Its historic boundaries.

Mr. AIKEN. Who would control the development outside the State's borders, then?

Mr. CORDON. First, let me give a little background in order that I may answer the Senator's question.

In 1945 the President issued a proclamation declaring that the natural resources of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf around the United States appertained to the United States, and that such natural resources were under the jurisdiction and control of the United States. When hearings were had on this resolution, the administration, through the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior, urged that the proposed legislation include a legislative confirmation of that proclamation. The administration spokesmen also implemented such a confirmation so that the Secretary of the Interior could administer and provide for development within the area.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well. Has this claim of the United States of jurisdiction over the land out to the Continental Shelf, outside the State boundaries, been disputed by foreign nations?

Mr. CORDON. So far as the Senator from Oregon knows, it has not. This joint resolution has in it a provision confirming in the United States that jurisdiction and control. I say to the Senator that the resolution does not go beyond that with respect to the outer Continental Shelf. When the committee got to the problem of writing a law to apply to that area, it ran into some rather tough legal snags.

The type of jurisdiction and control which starts with the land and goes down but does not go up is peculiar to this problem. It is something we had not previously encountered, and the committee felt that it should make haste a little slowly and be sure what it was doing before it offered legislation in that particular field and recommended its approval. So the committee has provided only for the ratification of the Presidential proclamation, leaving the rest of the Continental Shelf for a more careful study.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Mexican Government made any claims to resources in its part of the Continental Shelf?

Mr. CORDON. There are set forth in the hearings claims of various nations, including that of the Mexican Government. The claims vary from those which are limited by the Continental Shelf to those which go many, many miles into the open sea.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. With regard to the Texas question, I wish the very able Senator from Vermont would look at the map which appears at page 411 of the hearings. It was prepared by the United States Government and shows the boundary between Texas and Mexico as fixed in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. There is no doubt that the United States, in that treaty, recognized the Mexican boundary of 3 leagues and also the Texas boundary of 3 leagues.

It is ridiculous for the State Department to take the point of view that after entering into a treaty it can now say the treaty does not exist, and it can protest, and perhaps do even more, when the Mexicans arrest our shrimp fishermen who go within 10½ miles of Mexico. It is the most ridiculous thing in the world for any member of the State Department to talk about protesting when we, by treaty, recognized that the Mexican boundary extended 10½ miles into the sea.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I hope we shall not go too far afield so that I cannot maintain the rule which I laid down for myself and my colleagues.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since the Senator from Oregon was courteous enough to permit the Senator from Vermont to address questions to the Senator from Texas, I wonder if he will accord me that courtesy so that I may ask a question or two of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may do so, and I am happy to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understood the Senator from Texas to say that this resolution does not confer upon Texas any right to claim the ownership and control of submerged lands beyond 3 leagues or 9 sea miles or 10½ land miles; is that correct?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Texas believe that the resolution affirmatively gives to Texas the right to claim title and ownership out to 3 leagues or 10½ miles?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas very definitely believes that the resolution gives the State of Texas the ownership and title out to the boundaries of the State of Texas as they existed at the time the Republic of Texas came into the Union as a State, which boundaries were, of course, 3 leagues,

and were so recognized then and have thereafter been recognized by the United States Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon permit me to thank the Senator from Texas for clearing up a feature concerning the intended legal effect of the resolution which I labored all yesterday afternoon to try to clear up?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to accord that opportunity to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, since I am in charge of presenting the joint resolution, and therefore to some extent responsible for its explanation to the Senate, I may say again that I feel it incumbent upon myself to say that the joint resolution does not determine the location of original boundary lines.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I will yield for a question. I ask the Senator to limit his request to a question on the subject.

Mr. LONG. I wish the Senator from Oregon would permit me to clear up one issue which has been interjected into the discussion. I ask the indulgence of the Senator from Oregon so that I may make one statement with regard to the Louisiana boundary.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator make his remarks as brief as possible?

Mr. LONG. I will try to do so.

Mr. CORDON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. On page 280 of the hearings there appears a portion of the testimony of the attorney general of Louisiana, who makes clear that the act of the Legislature of Louisiana in extending its boundaries 27 miles has no effect insofar as this proposed legislation is concerned, and that Louisiana is limited to its original boundary unless the Federal Government should at a future time see fit to recognize the State boundary as extending beyond the boundary that existed when the State came into the Union. That statement is at page 280 of the hearings.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is interested in the matter, can find there the information he desires on the question. He can find also that responsible public officials of the State of Louisiana had great difficulty in trying to determine what actually is the seaward boundary of Louisiana, because the coastline has so many indentures and there are so many islands offshore.

With regard to leases on inland waters, the attorney general of the State many times has had to advise and warn persons who were filing for leases under State law that they were filing at their own risk. There was some thought about the State's issuing a lease subsequent to the Supreme Court opinion, when the State felt the waters were inland waters, and the Federal Government felt they were not inland waters.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that the Attorney General of the United States suggested at the hearings a very simple way to avoid the perplexing problem about historic boundaries? In the hearings, he said:

> An actual line on a map dividing the two areas of submerged lands should be drawn by Congress in the bill to eliminate much expensive and unnecessary litigation. If the statute merely refers in words to "historic boundaries" or in words describes a line beginning at the edge of the States' inland waters or tries to describe in words, bays or other characteristics of the coast, unnecessary litigation will almost surely result. Therefore, we make this suggestion of an actual line on a map drawn as part of the bill, which would eliminate also, we think certain international problems that might otherwise arise if Territorial-ownership claims are asserted in the State or Federal Government beyond their historic 3-mile limit.

The main point I desire to make is that the Attorney General believed that instead of trying to accomplish the purpose by words only, which, as the Senator knows, would raise as many questions as it would settle, he would have liked to have the joint resolution provide that a line be drawn on a map. He believed that that would eliminate a great amount of future controversy. Would that not be a very simple method?

I asked the Attorney General if that would be difficult for us to do. He said "No" that it would be very simple for Congress to make such provision. He said that many times he had seen Congress solve other problems a great deal more difficult than this one. So it seems to me that if a line is to be drawn we should follow the advice of the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law officer of the country. He specified in the hearings how the line should be drawn in order to avoid future litigation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not have the heart to suggest to my colleague from Montana that the point he raises is somewhat outside the area of discussion here. The Senator from Montana has done a marvelous job of cooperating in the handling of the hearings and in the preparation of the joint resolution. I am glad to extend to him any and every courtesy.

COMMITTEE DECIDED NOT TO DRAW LINE

I now answer the question involved by calling attention to the fact that the RECORD as of yesterday covered the subject matter; but in order that it be not necessary to turn back to the RECORD, the substance of the statement was that the idea advanced by the Attorney General, namely, of drawing an arbitrary line on a map, was given careful consideration. After further discussion of the matter with the Department of Justice, there was unanimity of belief that such a proposal was not a sound approach for the purposes of the joint resolution, and therefore it was discarded.

As to whether it would be better to draw such an arbitrary line, or to choose another method that might be evolved by someone else, I can only say that the line idea was considered and, with the agreement of the Department of Justice, was abandoned. The boundary lines of the States recommended by the committee majority are the lines as they were at the time the States entered the Union, or as they were thereafter extended with the approval of the Congress.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I desire to hear my good friend. Does he desire to ask a question?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the record show that the Attorney General agreed with the Senator from Oregon to abandon the proposal to draw lines?

Mr. CORDON. I am of the opinion that the record does not so show. I can only say to the Senator from Montana at the moment that discussions were had by me as chairman of the committee for the legislation in an endeavor to have the measure in proper form technically for presention to the committee. As of the moment, the Senator from Montana has no assurance except the assurance of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Oregon talks about an arbitrary line being drawn. The Attorney General did not recommend the drawing of an arbitrary line.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am afraid I shall have to ask for the regular order. I shall be happy to entertain questions from my colleague.

Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to apologize. I desire to thank the Senator from Oregon for his very kind attitude toward me today. He was always considerate during the hearings, and I tried to cooperate with him, as he has already admitted I did.

As the senior member of the minority on the committee, it seems to me, that I should be permitted to ask a question or two. Senators who are not on the committee at all have asked a number of questions. I cannot understand why I am to be precluded from asking some.

Mr. CORDON. I wish to assure my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Montana, that I desire to accord him every courtesy. I reiterate that he has been most cooperative. But he cannot now, while we are engaged simply in exploring what the joint resolution means, go back into yesterday's argument, bring it up to date, and let it continue as an uncontrolled dialog. The situation is bad enough under the circumstances of question and answer; but when it comes to contention, iteration and reiteration, denial and affirmation, and the like, we shall simply be lost. So far as I am concerned, while I have the floor, I cannot indulge in it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon permit a question as to the meaning of paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b) of title 2?

Mr. CORDON. I had completed my discussion of 3 (a) and 3 (b), but I shall be glad to entertain a question with reference to their meaning, and answer the question, if I can.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that the effect of paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b) is to release and transfer ownership in and control of submerged lands, and all the accrued royalties therefrom, within what may

hereafter be found to be boundaries of the coastal States?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the question really did not need such emphasis as the Senator from Illinois has given it. The Senator from Illinois fully understands that those provisions of the joint resolution are for the purpose of establishing, transferring, releasing, and quitclaiming to the States the lands, the natural resources, and the royalties that have accrued since the time of the particular decision affecting the particular area, to the States I am sure my friend fully understands all. If it is now more clear in the RECORD, the Senator from Oregon is pleased.

RECOGNITION OF STATE LEASES

We are now down to page 14, paragraph (c). Paragraph (c) is but the implementation of the recognition of the validity of existing leases in the areas in question. I shall not read the paragraph unless it is requested. In substance, it provides for confirmation of leases which were valid under State law, and provides for their continuation by the State under the terms of the leases themselves. This is somewhat technical, because of the fact that, as a result of the decisions, performance or the possibility of performance by the holders of the leases under their terms has been impossible in most instances.

In the case of an exploratory lease, exploration had to cease under injunction. In other cases there were other types of impediment. This language simply seeks to remove the effects of those difficulties and continue the leases in effect if they would be valid under the law of the State which issued them except for the conditions brought about by the decisions.

Paragraph (d) on page 16 is of such importance that I believe it should be read. It is as follows:

(d) Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power, or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation, or to provide for flood control, or the production of power.

I believe that paragraph is perfectly clear. I desire to say that the explanation I made sometime ago with respect to the elimination of the words "at sites where the United States owns the waterpower" applies here also.

CONTROL OF GROUND AND SURFACE WATERS UNAFFECTED

We are now down to paragraph (e) on page 16. This is another important provision. I particularly call it to the attention of my colleagues from the western arid-land or irrigation States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oregon is of course very familiar with the laws of the western States—much more so than some of us who come from nonwestern States. I wonder if the Senator would briefly summarize the reasons for subsection (e) on page 16, beginning in line 16.

Mr. CORDON. I was just about to read it and call attention to it.

Paragraph (e) on page 16 reads as follows:

(e) Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States.

That provision is inserted in order that there may be no question as to any intent to convey by this joint resolution any rights of the States in connection with consumptive use of water in the western land States. My colleagues who were Members of the Senate as far back as 1944 will recall that the Flood Control Act of 1944 contained language similar to this, its purpose being to establish the priority right in the arid States to the use of water for consumptive purposes.

That doctrine is written into the constitutions, into the laws, and into the judicial history of the western land States. The purpose here is expressly to exclude from the operation of the joint resolution any enlargement or abridgement of those rights—in other words, to leave them without any effect whatever from this legislation.

SEAWARD BOUNDARIES

We now come to section 4, beginning in line 24 on page 16. I shall read the section, and indicate its application to the remainder of the joint resolution:

SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is hereby approved and confirmed as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline.

That first sentence was inserted for the purpose of settling legislatively the seaward boundaries of the original 13 States, which were, of course, former colonies of the British Crown. They fought for and secured their independence, and were in themselves 13 sovereignties, which organized themselves into a confederation and then into a Union of States. The philosophy of the joint resolution is that, insofar as the legislature can establish them, the seaward boundaries of those States will be established by this resolution.

RIGHTS OF CITIZENS IN LANDS PROTECTED

The Senator from Oregon cannot say that as a result of the enactment of the pending measure the exterior boundary will always be as here established, since it may vary because of a change in coastline in 150 years. He does state categorically that this language confirms to the States affected everything to be transferred or released by the Federal Government under the terms of this measure. It leaves the United States in the position of having expressly conveyed and released to the original 13 States all the natural resources and lands beneath navigable waters out to the extent of the 3-mile line. The language thereby validates all the States have done in transferring to their citizens portions of the land in this area.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not a fact that this is the amendment which was requested by the able attorney general of the State of New York, Mr. Goldstein, as being in his opinion necessary to prevent subsequent ratification of the many deeds which have been given by the State of New York and by other original States to units of Government and also to private parties in the many years since our Nation was established?

Mr. CORDON. That was the request made by the attorney general of New York, and the reasoning is found in his letter, which is printed in the hearings of the committee, beginning at page 921.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon may say in passing that under the rules of law, with which the attorney general of New York, of course, was fully familiar, this language would operate to confirm, in the present holders, titles coming down from original grants by the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield so that I may make a brief statement on this point, relative to negotiations which I had with the senior Senator from New York, who is not in the Chamber, which may throw some light on this subject?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon will be happy to yield for that purpose if it advances the understanding of the joint resolution now pending before the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] brought to the Senator from Florida a communication from the attorney general of New York which, in substance, was to the effect that in the event the State of New York had to proceed under the provisions of the original bill and amend its constitution so as to reach out 3 geographic miles into the sea there would be at least the question raised whether the State would have to go back and confirm all of the many patents and conveyances which it had given since the foundation of the Union; and that he thought such a possibility would be completely obviated by the adoption of this additional provision in the joint resolution.

Subsequent thereto, at the request of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the attorney general of New York wrote to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and also to the Senator from Florida. Upon making a study of the subject it appeared to the Senators who were working on the joint resolution at the time that the point was well taken. It appeared to all of us that the suggestion does not depart in any way from the philosophy of the joint resolution under which all of the Thirteen Original States would have had authority, if they had not done so already—as many of them had—to extend their boundaries 3 geographic miles into the Atlantic, and that such provision would give them authority to do

so. The admission of that right, by the fixing of the line out that distance in this way in this joint resolution, at this time, would, in the opinion of the attorney general of New York, greatly lessen the labors of the various States, and erase any possibility of questions arising on titles which New York, and perhaps other Original States, have conveyed since the foundation of the Union.

Mr. CORDON. The statement of the Senator from Florida is in full accord with the history of this portion of the joint resolution as understood by the Senator from Oregon.

On page 17 of the joint resolution the next declaration under section 4 reads:

> Any State admitted subsequent to the formation of the Union which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coastline, or to the international boundaries of the United States in the Great Lakes or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries—

That provision would appear to be self-explanatory, except perhaps as to the last clause, namely—

> or any other body of water traversed by such boundaries.

That provision is included in the sentence because of a situation such as the one which exists in the State of Washington, where a portion of the international boundary between the United States and Canada follows the thread of the channel of the Straits of Juan de Fuca. It may be that the extension of the State's boundary there might go somewhat beyond 3 miles. In any event, its boundaries would be coterminal with the boundary of the United States along that international boundary line.

CLAIMS TO 3-MILE BOUNDARY CONFIRMED

The next provision is:

> Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line.

Mr. President, there is here spelled out the purpose of Congress to confirm the extension of boundaries or any action taken in an intent to extend the boundaries or any action taken in an intent to extend the boundaries in the past, so far as the 3-mile limit is concerned. There is also spelled out that that confirmation is without prejudice to any claim the State might have, if it has any, to a boundary beyond that. In other words, this joint resolution does not affect that area. It confirms the extension of a boundary, by whatever action taken that would show that intention, out to the 3-mile limit.

The next provision is:

> Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

Again, that is a spelling out of the fact that this joint resolution does not in any way question or attempt to prejudge the claim of a State, such as Texas or Florida, which claims rights beyond the 3-mile limit. That is a matter which is not sought to be resolved in this joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Would that language apply to a State, with reference to any claim which might have been made when the State was a colony, before it became a State?

Mr. CORDON. It would.

Mr. HILL. In other words, if it had made a claim as a colony, before it became a State, this language would apply to the claim it made when it was a colony. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. It would not apply to a claim so made; the language means that the existence of a boundary line provided by the constitution or laws of the State will not be prejudged. So a claim not reduced to a law or to a constitutional provision would not be included within this language.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I find that even as far back as 1691, Massachusetts, under its charter, claimed all islands and islets within 10 leagues. Would this language take care of that claim, namely, to all islands and islets within 10 leagues?

Mr. CORDON. Frankly, I do not know. I was not familiar with that situation. When I do not know, I am very frank to say so.

Mr. HILL. Yes; the Senator from Oregon is very frank.

Then is it not true that we get back to the proposition that we do not know where these boundary lines are? We do not know where they are or what they are, do we?

Mr. CORDON. There has never been any question about what they are. We know what they are, but not where they are.

Mr. HILL. Do we know what they are?

Mr. CORDON. Yes; they are the boundaries of the States.

Mr. HILL. In the case of Massachusetts its boundary includes the islands and islets withn 10 leagues. That would be approximately 30 miles out, which is quite a distance, would it not?

Mr. CORDON. I am not prepared to discuss that matter. When I come on the floor to discuss a bill, I hope to be prepared to discuss it in detail. However, I am not prepared to discuss that particular matter, which arises, as the Senator from Alabama has said, as I understand under a colonial charter.

Mr. HILL. Yes, under the colonial charter of Massachusetts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1611, Virginia passed a statute claiming jurisdiction over the seas for 300 leagues, which would be approximately 1,000 miles beyond the shore. Is the title of Virginia for 1,000 miles into the ocean confirmed by this joint resolution?

Mr. CORDON. So far as I am concerned, I make the same answer that I made to the Senator from Alabama: I will check into that matter, and will report my views on it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. CORDON. If it be another question of the same character, it will be reiteration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question that is not reiteration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon be interested in the claims of the State of New Hampshire or of the Colony of New Hampshire?

Mr. CORDON. I will investigate the claims of all the Original Colonies. The resolution confirms to the Original Colonies a boundary line 3 miles from their coast lines; and a careful study of the joint resolution may indicate that that is the limit of the benefits conferred upon them in fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon be interested in the fact that in 1635, New Hampshire claimed jurisdiction over the seas lying within 100 miles of the shore?

Mr. CORDON. I will not be interested in further reiteration. The question has been asked, and the principle has been established. I have very frankly indicated that I shall have to report on it later; and I do not desire any further discussion, and will not engage in any; and if I find that inadvertently I become engaged in any, I will not continue it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to insert at this point the statute of the State of Massachusetts which fixes Massachusetts' claim to the actual boundary. I wish to make this insertion for the information of those who read the RECORD, if I may do so.

Mr. CORDON. Very well.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is the latest assertion by Massachusetts statute—made some years ago—of her territorial limits:

> The territorial limits of this Commonwealth extend 1 marine league from its seashore at extreme low-water mark. If an inlet or arm of the sea does not exceed 2 marine leagues in width between its headlands, a straight line from one head land to the other is equivalent to the shoreline.

That is the assertion of territorial boundary now operative by Massachusetts law in that Commonwealth.

Mr. CORDON. That would appear to answer the question submitted by the Senator from Alabama, and I suspect there will be like answers to the similar questions. However, when I am not informed upon a subject of this character, I do not desire to speculate and to submit speculation as an adequate answer.

The next provision we are considering is section 5.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for further questions with regard to the last sentence of section 4?

Mr. CORDON. If the questions are germane, and not reiteration, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to have the Senator from Oregon interpret the meaning of the phrase—

Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles—

And so forth. If there is nothing in this section that questions such a boundary, and nothing that prejudices it, is it the understanding of the Senator that this phrase confirms it?

Mr. CORDON. It does not confirm; neither does it question or prejudice. That, I think, is perfectly clear. It ends the matter. We are now on section 5, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to be cantankerous——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. I have answered the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask another question regarding the last sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is requested. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. CORDON. I yield for the next question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon yields to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the interpretation of these alternatives:

Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Oregon that either one of these conditions—prior to, or at the time of entry into the Union—governs?

Mr. CORDON. Not governs; either one of them comes within the provisions of the sentence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So that if a State, at some time prior to entering the Union, had in its constitution a provision for 3 leagues, and, at the time it came in, had only 1 league, then the State could properly claim the 3-league boundary?

Mr. CORDON. That conclusion, of course, does not follow at all. This joint resolution does not prejudice the matter, nor does it repeal an ordinary law that would determine it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I asked if under the joint resolution "the State could properly claim it."

Mr. CORDON. The State may claim anything properly, but it would not necessarily follow that it was claiming it legally.

EXCEPTIONS OF CERTAIN FEDERAL AREAS

I read:

SEC. 5. Exceptions from operation of section 3 of this joint resolution: There is excepted from the operation of section 3 of this joint resolution—

(a) all tracts or parcels of land together with all accretions thereto, resources therein, or improvements thereon, title to which has been lawfully and expressly acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the law of the State or of the United States, and all lands which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State; all lands expressly retained by or ceded to the United States when the State entered the Union; all lands acquired by the United States by eminent domain proceedings, purchase, cession, gift, or otherwise in a proprietary capacity; all lands filled in, built up, or otherwise reclaimed by the United States for its own use; and any rights the United States has in lands presently and actually occupied by the United States under claim of right.

The provisions of this section were, I believe, discussed somewhat at length yesterday, so the Senator from Oregon will not again go over them unless there is some question with respect to any one of them specifically. The Senator from Oregon only wants to say with reference to the exceptions set forth in the section that they were to a great extent urged and recommended by the Department of Justice, and approved by it, as affording ample protection for properties of the United States which should not be affected by this joint resolution.

INDIAN RIGHTS PROTECTED

Subparagraph (b) on page 18, which is included in the exception, reads:

Such lands beneath navigable waters held, or any interest in which is held by the United States for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

The original language was amended by the committee upon recommendation of the Justice Department to broaden the type or classes of lands held for the benefit of Indians so as to include lands other than those held in a purely trust capacity by the United States.

Subparagraph (c), the last exception, reads:

All structures and improvements constructed by the United States in the exercise of its navigational servitude.

That exception is merely included through an abundance of caution, as it unquestionably is included in the exceptions under the provision excepting powers under the commerce clause.

POWERS RETAINED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I continue reading from the joint resolution:

SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its navigational servitude and rights in and powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the constitutional purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which shall be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership, or the rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in and assigned to the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

That paragraph, Mr. President, spells out an exception from this joint resolution and leaves unimpaired, as they would have to be left unimpaired, the paramount rights of the Government of the United States, under its Constitution, to control commerce and thereby to regulate navigation, provide for the common defense, and conduct international affairs. The provision differentiates and excepts from the paramount rights enumerated in its proprietary rights in the areas affected. It provides that these proprietary rights shall exist independently of, but be subordinate to the paramount rights possessed by the Federal Government, namely, those of regulation of commerce, provision for the common defense, and conduct of international affairs.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. Am I to infer, then, from the Senator's statement, that the United States would have no proprietary rights of ownership or rights of management, administration, leasing, use, and development of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, vested, and assigned to the respective States? In other words, the States are given, are they not, exclusive ownership, jurisdiction, and right to use and develop the resources within that area?

Mr. CORDON. Within their boundaries, such rights are confirmed to the States. But I am sure the Senator from Montana understands, there remains the overriding, the paramount right of the United States to do whatever is necessary for the control of commerce and of navigation, as a part of its constitutional right to regulate commerce. The same is true with respect to whatever the Federal Government may have to do to provide for the common defense, and whatever is necessary in connection with its conduct of foreign relations. Those rights are paramount to the proprietary rights of the States. The section merely seeks to recreate, and in the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, does recreate in law the condition which existed in fact since the beginning of the Nation up to the decision in the California case.

Those proprietary rights were enjoyed by and exercised by the States, and the belief was that they were owned by the States, up to the time of the California decision. The overriding and paramount rights of the United States existed through all those years. Their existence was never questioned. This joint resolution seeks to establish, by law, the same type of proprietary right in the States that they had possessed in fact, and leaves the paramount right of the Government unaffected, just as it has been in the past.

Mr. MURRAY. My advice, from legal experts, in the Department of the Interior, is to the effect that the proviso which appears at the bottom of page 18, namely "shall not be deemed to include" certain rights which will prevent the Federal Government from entering upon a river to undertake control of floods, the development of hydroelectric power, and reclamation within areas affected.

Mr. CORDON. I regret that any competent lawyer has ever expressed such a view in the light of the plain provisions of the resolution. The rights of the Federal Government referred to by the Senator from Montana have been expressly excepted from any effect by the resolution. I shall read in a moment a further exception. If such an opinion is held by others, then the Senator from Oregon can only say he disagrees with them 100 percent, and the majority of the committee disagreed with them when it reported the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it the Senator's opinion that if the resolution with this language is adopted it will not mean the United States Government would be excluded from the right to enter upon a river and undertake flood-control activities and the construction of power plants and reclamation programs?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Montana is correct. The rights in the field of flood control and the generation of electric power are incident to the right to control commerce. They are a portion of the powers of the Government to regulate navigation under its constitutional authority. They are incidents of it, and those rights are expressly reserved. So that it is unthinkable that any lawyer reading this section would say it had an overriding effect so far as priority rights of the Federal Government are concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand the exceptions set forth in section 5 also specifically apply to section 6, and those exceptions once made in the resolution apply to all provisions of the resolution.

Mr. CORDON. Of necessity, when we read the resolution in its four corners we must give effect to all.

On page 19, paragraph (b) provides that:

> In time of war or when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor.

In my opinion, that section is to some extent surplusage. Such rights exist, and there is nothing intended or expressed in the resolution to take them away, but they have been spelled out as a matter of precaution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the Senator's explanation of paragraphs (a) and (b), in section 6, "Powers Retained by the U. S.", is it the Senator's opinion, that the Executive order of former President Truman, placing these reserved lands and the resources thereof in what is known as a naval oil reserve, would come within the intent of this language?

Mr. CORDON. Whatever power exists for the purposes set forth is unaffected by anything contained in the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator is acknowledging the paramount rights of the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct—in the fields mentioned, commerce, common defense, and international relations. These are all paramount rights.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say a moment ago that insofar as navigable rivers are concerned, the development of flood-control facilities and hydroelectric facilities is incidental to the control of navigation?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, I should like to ask this question: If the development of hydroelectric facilities and flood-control facilities, which, of course, speaking in terms of engineering, has some relationship to the floor of the riverbed, or the land under the water, is incidental to the control of navigation, is it not true, therefore, that under the interpretation which the Senator from Oregon has made of section 6, it gives the United States paramount rights in the field of navigation and national defense, incidentally a part of the control of the seabed would go along with the control of the water itself?

Mr. CORDON. I do not quite follow the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Maybe I can make my question plainer.

If the Federal Government has control of navigation rights in a navigable river and, incidentally, has jurisdiction over the development of flood-control projects, which projects, of course, necessitate the use of land——

Mr. CORDON. What land?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The land on the bottom of the river. A project could not be constructed without coming in contact with the soil.

Mr. CORDON. Any flood-control project comprehends the rentention of water behind a dam, and flowage rights must be acquired as to any area back of the dam, the area on which the dam is located, and the area of the stream itself which is below the navigable water. The superior right of the Government, under the commerce clause of the Constitution, is the basis of its authority to build dams to hold back water and to use the power incidentally generated as a result of the complete operation. That same authority applies to navigable waters beyond low-water mark out to the boundaries of the State for the purposes mentioned—navigation, common defense, and international affairs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator state that the Federal Government has jurisdiction, for purposes of national defense, commerce, and navigation in the open sea—and that is what we are talking about——

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is answering questions as to areas within State boundaries, and if the Senator from Minnesota now desires to discuss matters outside State boundaries, he is presuming on my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator think the Federal Government has jurisdiction of the open sea?

Mr. CORDON. Where in the open sea?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of the water of the open sea.

Mr. CORDON. So far as the question goes to the open sea, beyond the boundary lines of the State, I am not entertaining such questions, for they are without the purview of the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator believe the Federal Government has paramount rights in the waters beyond the ebb and flow of the tides in what are commonly known as the open seas?

Mr. CORDON. Without question up to the boundary line of the State the Federal Government has a qualified right for the purposes of civil protection and patrol.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Within what is known as the 3-mile limit, does the Senator agree that the Federal Government has paramount rights in terms of national defense, navigation, and commerce?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It certainly does.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Just as the Federal Government has paramount rights in the navigable waters of a navigable river. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not correct that the Senator from Oregon has said that incident to Federal control of the navigable waters of rivers is the right of Federal control of navigation, national defense, and commerce?

Mr. CORDON. Not quite. Reclamation is on a different basis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well. Let us say hydroelectric generation, and flood control.

Mr. CORDON. Flood control and hydroelectric generation are incident to and a part of the paramount right of the Government under the commerce clause. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of his statement as to paramount rights in navigable rivers and incidental rights in terms of flood control and hydroelectric power, does the Senator say, therefore, that there are no rights incidental in the 3-mile limit, if I may put it that way, in the open sea?

Mr. CORDON. No, I do not say that. I say that the paramount rights of the Federal Government under the commerce clause pertain to the power and duty of the Federal Government to care for the national defense or international affairs. They are paramount in that area.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the waters. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore, is the Senator saying that the paramount rights carry with them also incidental powers in relationship to the land on the ocean bottom?

Mr. CORDON. There is no question whatsoever about the overriding servitude of the paramount powers for the purpose of their execution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In terms of control by the Federal Government over those areas.

Mr. CORDON. For those purposes, I agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. For purposes of national defense, for purposes of commerce, and for purposes of navigation.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, my question is this: If the oil reserves or gas reserves to be found in the seabed—on the floor of the sea—are vital to the national defense, and if Congress or the President finds such reserves to be vital to the national defense, would that be within the purview of the joint resolution which the Senator is discussing?

Mr. CORDON. It would not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would not?

Mr. CORDON. It would not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, how would one determine that the national defense would be served in any way by section 6?

Mr. CORDON. It would all depend on one's view as to what should be done to preserve the national defense. There are ships that float in the sea; there are sundry mines that are located under the sea; there are sundry structures of various types. All the things which exist along the coast of any nation for its protection would be deemed to be matters under the control of the Federal Government under its obligation to protect and defend the people of the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Oregon and I can both agree upon that analysis. Let me take the Senator from Oregon another step. Does he believe that natural resources, which might be of the utmost importance to the ability of the Nation to wage successful warfare in its defense, are also within the purview of the language of the Constitution which pertains to the common defense.

Mr. CORDON. As to the ownership of them, the Senator from Oregan does not. The natural resources of the United States are all available to the Government of the United States for the national defense. This country is committed to the philosophy of private ownership. It has been built upon it. The Constitution, which the Senator, among others, supports, provides that anything needed by the Federal Government for any of the purposes aforesaid may be acquired by the Government if it pays those who own it a reasonable price therefor, but it may take it with or without the owner's consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then, am I to understand that the Senator's proposition is that insofar as waters are concerned, together with the navigation, commerce, and defense factors in connection with the use of the waters, they are within the paramount right, control, and responsibility of the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, wherever an item of cost is involved and whenever a duty is to be performed for the common defense, that is the responsibility of the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator is attempting to say that it is the view of the Senator from Oregon that, in order to provide for national defense, it is necessary to pay for it, the Senator from Oregon agrees that it is necessary. For a long time there has been a budget for national defense.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as the waters, and any cost incident thereto in connection with the defense of the country are concerned, the responsibility is that of the Federal Government; but the area on which the water stands, namely, the seabed, which may yield some treasure, and which may be of use in providing for the common defense, is not within the purview of common defense?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Minnesota is making his argument through a line of questions, which the Senator from Oregon will answer. For the same reason that in the Senator's State of Minnesota the lands beneath the thousand navigable lakes belong to the State of Minnesota, and may or may not contain treasures in vast amounts, for the same reason that the lakes and rivers in all the 48 States likewise may contain vast treasures, and for the same reason that those treasures are deemed to be owned by the States within which they lie, it is the view of the Senator from Oregon that like ownership should in good conscience and equity extend to the maritime States to the extent of their boundary lines.

It happens that with reference to three of these States there are known to be some values in oil.

By some persons the word "principle" is spelled with the last syllable as "pal," but the Senator from Oregon does not indulge in that philosophy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the Senator from Oregon would like to have us believe that there is a similarity—in fact, an identity—between an inland lake within the geographical, terra firma, boundaries of a State, and the open sea. He would like to have us believe, am I to understand, that a lake, from which nice northern pike can be taken, is identical to the open sea in the Gulf of Mexico or the Pacific Ocean or the Atlantic Ocean?

Mr. CORDON. The analogy is so plain that the rest of the question is not worth answering.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not true that that was exactly the analogy which was made by the Supreme Court of the United States, when it held that the States owned the lands beneath the Great Lakes, an analogy that they are actually open seas, and that there is no reason for State ownership of submerged lands to apply along the borders of the sea, and not apply beneath the waters of the Great Lakes? Is not that correct?

Mr. CORDON. It is so clear that it does not need argument. It is not necessary to compare northern pike with striped sea bass in order to reach the conclusion.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to read into the RECORD one sentence from the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Illinois Central Railroad Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), which had to do with State ownership of the bed of Lake Michigan by the State of Illinois. The Court said:

> We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes applies, which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon feels that the matter has been fairly well covered, but he will yield for one more question, if the Senator from Minnesota desires to ask one more.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before the Senator from Oregon gives his official nod to the rejoinder of the Senator from Texas, I hope he listened very carefully to his remarks, because what the Senator from Texas has pointed out insofar as the Great Lakes were concerned is that they were as the tidelands. Is not that correct?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The decision does not say that.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I cannot yield for this sort of dialog, and I therefore ask for the regular order. I feel certain that the Senator from Minnesota realizes that he will have adequate time in which to expound his views at length, and I hope he will do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall do so.

Mr. CORDON. From time to time we may get into another discussion. In any event, the RECORD will carry fully the Senator's views.

WATER LAWS EXCEPTED

On page 19, section 7 reads as follows:

> SEC. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

There appears in the committee's report a brief explanation of each of those acts, and the Senator from Oregon will not burden this discussion with any further statement except to say that all the acts referred to provide for the consumptive use of water in the arid areas of the United States. Therefore the joint resolution expressly excepts those acts from modification in any way.

The act of June 17, 1902, is the basic reclamation law, and the act of December 22, 1944, is the Flood Control Act of 1944, which sets up the basic philosophy of the prior right for consumptive use of waters in the western land States.

"SAVINGS CLAUSE" ADDED

Section 8 of the joint resolution provides as follows:

> SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person in lands subject to this joint resolution and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this joint resolution is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation, or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact or in law applies to the lands subject to this joint resolution, or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights in such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything contained in this joint resolution.

I believe this language makes clear the purpose of the section. It is to protect rights, if any rights exist, which have attached to these lands by virtue of prior Federal law. It provides that any claimant to such rights shall have his day in

court, unaffected by anything in this legislation. It neither admits nor denies, enlarges or abridges, any such right.

PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION CONFIRMED AS TO OUTER SHELF

Section 9 of the joint resolution, on page 20, provides as follows:

SEC. 9. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed.

The Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior, speaking for the administration, requested that there be a constitutional confirmation of the rights in favor of the United States set out in the Presidential proclamation of 1945. The purpose of section 9 is to do just that.

The request also was for an additional title in Senate Joint Resolution 13 implementing this proclamation. When the committee had an opportunity carefully to consider the legal aspects of this question, it was apparent that we had a sizable problem in that one field. The legal situation created by the proclamation and its confirmation is new to American law, and the committee left legislation for implementation of the proclamation and its confirmation to be presented later, after a more thorough study of the legal and technical aspects of the problems presented by the outer Continental Shelf.

EXECUTIVE ORDER REVOKED IN PART

Section 10 simply revokes Executive Order No. 10426, dated January 16, 1953, entitled "Setting Aside Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf as a Naval Petroleum Reserve," insofar as the lands within State boundaries which are the subject matter of this joint resolution are concerned.

Section 11 is a separability clause spelled out in meticulous detail.

The remainder of the committee amendment is necessitated by the confirmatory provisions of section 9.

Mr. President, I hope that this explanation, if it does not aid toward an understanding of the joint resolution, will at least not cause greater confusion.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4130) to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the hour is late, and I understand from the distinguished majority leader that there are other Senators who wish to speak at less length than I would be required to speak in order to make the remarks that I had prepared to make at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, if it meets with the pleasure of the Senate I hope the Senate will grant unanimous consent that I may begin my principal speech on Tuesday, and that for that purpose I may be recognized then as having the floor. I understand the Senate will resume debate on this measure on Tuesday. If such consent is granted I shall confine myself at this time to a brief discussion of one of the tables which is incorporated in the hearing record. It was referred to in the colloquy this afternoon between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], and in the colloquy between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The Chair understands that the Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent to commence his first speech on the pending joint resolution on Tuesday next, and that he be recognized at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I believe it would be profitable to all concerned if we had a brief additional discussion of the table, which was discussed in some detail during the debate this afternoon. I refer to table II, printed at the top of page 570 of the hearings. In order to fully understand the table it is necessary to read the paragraph at the top of page 568.

I should like to advert to that table and to the said paragraph at this time for a brief discussion.

First, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that both the discussion in the paragraph at the top of page 568 and the table printed at the top of 570 are portions of the evidence presented by Mr. H. G. Barton, Chief, Oil and Gas Leasing Branch, Conservation Division, United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior. I understand that in no sense was this witness a partisan witness to any point of view in this controversy, but that, instead, he was seeking to give the committee the very latest information which was available in his office, he being the head of the office which is charged with the performance of duties in this field for the Federal Government.

With that explanation, Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the paragraph at the top of page 568 makes it clear—and I shall read that paragraph—that table II deals with the very point brought out by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], which is as to whether or not the rentals and royalties impounded should all be deliverable to the States, in the event of passage of the pending measure or whether portions of said funds shall be delivered to the States and portions of them to the Federal Government.

The paragraph at the top of page 568 reads:

Table II shows revenues, segregated by rentals and royalties, received and impounded by the United States pursuant to (1) the stipulation of August 21, 1950, by the Attorney General of the United States and the attorney general of California and (2) the notice of the Secretary of the Interior dated December 11, 1950, for Louisiana and Texas. Where the traditional State boundaries bisected a lease, rental payments were proportioned on an acreage basis. Royalties were proportioned on the basis of actual well locations. The data for this table were supplied by the Accounts Section, Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

Turning, then, to table II, it will be noted that table II covers, in the case of the revenue from the States of Louisiana and Texas, a period of approximately 25 months, from December 11, 1950, to January 16, 1953; whereas, in the case of California, the period of time covered is 24 months.

Those periods of time are set out in the note appearing under the table as note No. 1. I ask unanimous consent that table II be incorporated in my remarks as a part thereof.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Revenue*

State	Rentals		Royalties		Totals		Total revenue in State
	Landward of traditional State boundaries	Seaward of traditional State boundaries	Landward of traditional State boundaries	Seaward of traditional State boundaries	Landward of traditional State boundaries	Seaward of traditional State boundaries	
Louisiana	$1,310,471.58	$80,500,629.47	$2,566,447.71	$2,486,817.90	$3,876,919.29	$11,047,447.43	$14,924,366.72
Texas	285,388.00	143,350.00	62,700.70		348,088.70	143,350.00	491,438.70
California [2]			19,868,398.94		19,868,398.94		19,868,398.94
Total	1,595,859.58	8,703,979.47	22,497,547.25	2,486,817.90	24,093,406.83	11,190,797.43	35,284,204.36

[1] This table shows (1) for Louisiana and Texas, all moneys received and impounded by the United States from Dec. 11, 1950, to Jan. 16, 1953; and (2) for California, all moneys received pursuant to the stipulation of Aug. 21, 1950, from Oct. 1, 1950, through Sept. 30, 1952. Data supplied by Accounts Section, Office of the Secretary of the Interior.

[2] No breakdown between rentals and royalties available for California. However, the amount of rentals is only a very small percentage of total revenue.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators will observe from a reading of the table that the records kept as to all areas involved here are broken down, both with reference to the rentals and royalties which have been received, as between the areas within the States and the areas outside the States.

Before we go into this subject, it might be well to say that the situations in California on the one hand, and in Louisiana and Texas on the other hand, are different by reason of the nature of the operations. In the case of California, there was a stipulation entered into between the Department of Justice and the attorney general of California. In the case of Louisiana and Texas no such stipulation was entered into, but a publice notice was issued, in the nature of a proclamation or executive order of the Secretary of the Interior, which prescribed the terms and conditions upon which production could continue in the off-shore areas adjoining Louisiana and Texas.

By reference to the table itself it will appear that as to rentals, for instance, the rentals received in the offshore areas of Louisiana are broken down into two amounts, one of them being receipts from rentals landward of traditional State boundaries, which are shown by the table as $1,310,471.58, and the other being receipts from rentals seaward of traditional State boundaries, which are shown as $8,560,629.47.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What interpretation does the Senator from Florida give to the phrase "traditional State boundaries" in the case of Louisiana? The table shows in one column figures under the heading "landward of traditional State boundaries" and in a separate column figures under the heading "seaward of traditional State boundaries." Is it 3 miles, or 27 miles out into the Gulf? Is the measuring point or the dividing line used in this table the 3-mile limit, or is it the limit which was fixed by act of the Louisiana Legislature, which purports to take the boundary 27 miles out from the shore? I believe that act was passed by the Louisiana Legislature in 1938.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Florida was shown a map upon which this distribution was based. It was a map prepared either by the Secretary of the Interior or by the appropriate subdivision of his office. It showed a line drawn upon the map extending substantially 3 miles offshore.

Of course, with reference to the State of Louisiana, there are many complicated questions involved, and the Senator from Florida does not pretend that either the Federal Government or the State of Louisiana would be entirely pleased by the location of that line, but there had to be an administration of this particular subject matter while the production was going on, and so the line was drawn. The map was produced. The map shows the location of the various producing wells which enter into this computation in the case of Louisiana. Although I had nothing at all to do with the allocation of the amounts collected, I take it for granted that in this table the Secretary of the Interior endeavors to follow accurately the allocation made by that map.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, with the 3-mile limit as the dividing line?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; the 3-mile limit.

So, from an inspection of the table, it will appear again that, at least in the case of Louisiana, there are larger rent-producing leased areas outside the line drawn and followed, at least for this purpose, than there are inside the limits.

Similarly, with reference to royalties, in the next compilation it will appear that royalties received from the offshore lands of Louisiana are divided into two amounts, one of which is the amount received from production from operations landward from the line of which I have already spoken, which was $2,566,000-plus; and the other amount, royalties received from production from operations seaward or outside the line of which I have spoken, and that amount is $2,486,-000-plus.

In the next compilation will appear the totals for the State and for the Federal Government operations, or the totals that came from those operations in the Louisiana areas. When I say "the Louisiana areas," I mean the areas offshore Louisiana. It will appear that the total of rentals and royalties accumulating during that 25-month period from operations in areas landward of traditional State boundaries was $3,876,000-plus; and the similar total accumulating from operations in the areas seaward of traditional State boundaries was $11,047,000-plus.

So I think it is rather clear just what the operation has produced in those offshore areas in Louisiana, at least as reported by this Federal agency under this table. Of course, I am assuming that the compilation is correct, and I have already stated my understanding of the basis upon which the compilation was made.

In the last analysis, neither side might be completely satisfied with the location of this line; and there might be difficulties as to some of these producing wells, or there may be no difficulties at all. It may be that the line was so fixed in the beginning as to have met the interim positions of both the State authorities and the Federal authorities. I have no information on that point.

In the case of Texas, the amounts received are very much smaller. I shall not read them, except in their totals in the third column, where it is shown that for the 25 months in question the total amounts collected in Texas from operations in areas landward of traditional State boundaries was $384,000-plus; and in the case of areas seaward of traditional State boundaries, $143,000-plus.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield again for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the understanding of the Senator from Florida of the definition of traditional State boundaries in this table in the case of Texas? Does he understand it to be 3 miles or 10½ miles?

Mr. HOLLAND. In the case of Texas, the traditional boundaries are 3 leagues from the coast.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is 10½ miles, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. However, again I wish to say what I said on the floor yesterday and what I am sure is the case under this joint resolution, namely, that the joint resolution does not fix boundaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the Senator from Florida is discussing the meaning of boundaries in the table, not the joint resolution, for the moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, I am discussing the table, for the moment; and at another place in the report it is stated very clearly that this is the basis on which the compilation is made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The 10½-mile limit or the 3-league limit is treated, for purposes of this compilation, as the limit for Texas?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

I suppose there is no better time than this to try to clear up the difficulties in respect to the different terms of measurement of distance which have been used. Unfortunately, in all this discussion there have been references to two kinds of miles. One is the land mile or English mile or statutory mile—sometimes it is called one, and sometimes another—which is 5,280 feet, wherever we find it used. The other mile is the marine mile or geographic mile or sea mile or nautical mile and it is a variable distance, depending upon where on the earth's surface that mile is measured. For purposes of the record, I think it would be well to state here the definition of that mile. The geographic mile or nautical or sea mile is the length of a minute of latitude, or 1/21,600th of a great circle of the earth; or officially in Great Britain it is 6,080 feet, and in Great Britain it is called the admiralty mile. In the United States, it is an average distance of 6,080.20 feet. In other words, a great circle would go through both poles and around the earth, and of course the earth does not happen to be an exact sphere. Thus, an angle of 1 minute at the center of the earth would subtend a little different arc on the great circle at different points of latitude. For use in the United States and in evaluations of the distance covered by a marine mile in the latitudes of the United States, the distance is 6,080.20 feet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is roughly equivalent to 1.154 land miles; is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

That means that when we come to consider the term 1 league, or 3 miles, it is the equivalent of approximately 3.45-plus land miles, and is generally referred to as 3½ miles. Roughly, that is close enough to be correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. When we speak of 3 leagues, or 9 sea miles, it is roughly 10.35 land miles, and is generally referred to as 10½ miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the precise figure is 10.386 miles; but for purposes of debate, we can call it 10½ miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is a much better mathematician than I am, and I am perfectly willing to have the fractional amount which has been stated by the Senator from Illinois prevail.

The point which I think should be cleared up at some stage in this record—and I believe this is as good a point as any at which to do it—is that when some persons get red in the face in arguing about whether the correct figure is 9 miles or 10½ miles, they are talking about the same thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. In that case, they are talking of 9 sea miles or practically 10½ land miles. Similarly, when some persons argue about the difference between 3 miles and 3½ miles, the same situation obtains.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. While we are engaging in this discussion, I think it might be well for us to clear up another point in connection with the joint resolution, if the Senator will permit, and that is that there are three coastal States—one being California, another being Georgia, and the third State I do not now recall—which by constitutional or other measures have fixed the distance of their boundaries out into the sea, at 3 English miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe that is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The purpose of the joint resolution is as nearly as possible to equalize the situation in those three States with the situation applicable to the great majority of the coastal States, whose boundaries have been stated to extend into the sea a distance of 3 geographical miles.

So under the provisions of the joint resolution, in those cases some little change will be permitted to be made, namely, from 3 English or statutory miles to 3 geographic miles. The difference is very small, and the change is made in an approach toward uniformity.

I believe that is probably all that needs to be said about this highly technical situation. If the Senator from Illinois, who well knows the situation, cares to elaborate upon what I have said or to correct anything I have said, I invite such elaboration or correction, for I want us to make the record exactly correct at this time, as I believe it to be correct as previously stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for clearing up, for the sake of the record, these differences in units of measurement. I think it is very valuable to do so.

The question which I should now like to address to the Senator relates to the total amounts of money collected and impounded by the States and the Federal Government in rents and royalties from the submerged lands. My question is this: In addition to the two sums listed in table 2, are there further funds collected by California from the submerged-lands oil developments, and impounded by California, subject to the stipulation to which the Senator from Florida has previously referred?

It is my understanding that California has something over $27 million in royalties collected between 1947, when the decision of the Supreme Court was first handed down, and October 1, 1950, after which date the amount of the funds collected from these royalties and rentals was as listed in table 2, or about $35 million in addition.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is an additional amount existing. As to the precise size of it, the Senator from Florida does not have the information. There will be no argument at all about that amount, because it happens that in California the matter was covered by stipulation, in which both sides have had representation in carrying the work forward and in carrying the records forward, and it is also the case that there is no distribution or allocation required in the case of California, if this joint resolution be passed, because all of the operations there are within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the Senator is correct in that. I simply want to point out that the views of the minority of the committee, on page 9, shows that a grand total of approximately $62,800,000, derived from oil royalties and rentals from the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, is awaiting disposition, either to the Federal Government or to the three States at the present time. A little more than $27 million of this amount has been impounded by the State of California. A little more than $35 million is held in escrow by the United States. I take it that is the $35 million which is referred to in table 2, cited by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Table II relates to no funds except those that are held by the agency of the Federal Government, and that is clearly shown to refer only to those amounts stated. I believe I had reached the point in the table that relates to California, which is very simple to interpret, because there are no rentals. The whole amount of royalties shown is $19,868,398.94, and all of that is received from areas which are landward of the 3-mile line in California. So that I believe there could be a little argument about the details of that amount. Taken as a whole, table II would show that in the absence of some controversy arising in Louisiana and Texas, the total amount on hand shown by this table would be divided among the three States that are affected, as shown by the table, in the amount of $24,093,406.83 going to the three States, and an amount of $11,190,797.43 going to the Federal Government; and it seems to the Senator from Florida that this table should rather reassuringly show that the details of allocation will not be too difficult. However, the Senator from Florida reiterates that there is nothing at all in this matter which will preclude either the Federal Government or the affected States from raising a question as to the exact location of their lands.

Now, Mr. President, under the agreement heretofore reached, I yield the floor.

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I may say that it is our intention to adjourn today until Monday. On Monday there will be transacted only formal business such as the confirmation of nominations, the usual routine business, and such remarks as Senators may care to make.

On Monday I shall move a recess until Tuesday at 12 o'clock, at which time, under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] will be entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the agreement.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

COMMITTEE REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PARTY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the hour has arrived when the Independent Party wishes to proceed to do its weekly committee work on the floor of the Senate, as a member of the only committee it belongs to in the Senate, the Committee of the Whole. And I may say it is not the Independent Party that is in the hole, but I have a great many colleagues who are, and they are going to remain there so long as they continue to deny to more than 1,500,000 people in a sovereign State—my State, the great State of Oregon—equal representation in the Senate of the United States.

This is now the 12th week since January 13, when on the floor of the Senate there was established for the first time since 1871 a precedent which denies to the people of Oregon equal representation in this parliamentary body. I pressed that point on January 13, I have pressed it in a series of speeches since January 13, and I shall continue to press it until the wrong is righted, or until I am no longer in the Senate—which latter event, Mr. President, I do not think is going to be as soon as some people may think. I am going to fight on the floor of the Senate until action is taken to reverse the precedent which was established on January 13. I shall continue to refuse to believe that, once my colleagues in the Senate come to understand the historical significance of the principle for which I am fighting, they will not want to reverse themselves.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the distinguished constitutional lawyer, the respected majority leader of this body, Mr. TAFT, who is now in the chair, I repeat that I shall continue to refuse to believe that the Republican majority in the Senate and the Democratic minority, desire to stand on the very bad precedent which was established in 1871, at the beginning of another military administration in our history, and take the position that, because a Senator of the United States in an election campaign declined

to support a candidate in whom he had lost confidence, he thereby must be subjected to the treatment to which the junior Senator from Oregon was subjected on January 13 when, to use language the people of the country understand, he was kicked off the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Armed Services. That was done in spite of the fact that he held 8 years of seniority, and in the face of the fact that no precedent for such action exists except the unfortunate precedent of 1871; whereas, to the contrary, before and since 1871, time and time again, in the Senate of the United States, Liberals and Insurgents, Free-Soilers, and Progressives, and others who are frequently labeled as nonconformists, were not denied their committee posts. In some instances, they were denied a committee chairmanship, as they should have been. I would not have any quarrel with that, for I think the majority party has the right to protect its control by maintaining a regular party member in the chairmanship. In some instances, the nonregulars were put at the bottom of the committee table, so far as committee seniority was concerned, but they were not put off the committee.

Last Friday I presented to the Senate in my weekly report an analysis of the historical constitutional debates resulting in the so-called great compromise, which made possible the adoption of the Constitution of the United States; and without which the adoption of the Constitution would have been blocked. In the material presented last Friday, I pointed out that in the Constitutional Convention, the Founding Fathers insisted upon equal representation in the Senate of the United States for each of the States.

It is my argument, Mr. President, and I think it is constitutionally sound, that so long as the Senate denies to the people of the State of Oregon the identical treatment for their junior Senator that is granted to other Senators, then the Senate denies to the people of Oregon equal representation in the Senate of the United States. It is not possible to separate the procedures of the Senate of the United States from the substantive rights of the people of Oregon in the functioning of the Senate. The Senate cannot lay down one rule applicable to the junior Senator from Oregon and another rule applicable to 95 other Senators and meet the argument that the people of my State are not being denied equal representation in this body.

As I dwell upon this point week by week increasing number of persons in my State, including increasing numbers of political leaders, are beginning to see the point and are beginning to ask the Republican Party, which has a majority in the Oregon State Legislature, which has a Republican Governor, which has a Republican United States Senator, and which supported the Republican candidate for the Presidency in November 1952, "How come? Why discriminate against the State of Oregon and its sovereign rights?"

Because of political differences there has come to be personalized in the Senate of the United States this fight with the junior Senator from Oregon over committee assignments. I again say to the Senate and to the people of my State, that on January 13 I took the position, and I restate it today, that the Republican Party is entitled to a majority of one on those great and important committees of the Senate, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Armed Services.

As the record will show, the majority leader, now presiding over the Senate, took the position that the Republican Party was so entitled, and I agreed with him. He also made clear in his discussion on January 13 that he thought there was merit in the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon that those two committees should have added to them an additional Republican, so that the Senator from Oregon would be allowed to retain his position and thus guarantee to the majority party a majority vote on those two committees if they should ever vote on a partisan basis. He accepted it as a sound position for the majority in the Senate today.

But I made clear on January 13 that so far as my knowledge was concerned, from my long tenure on those committees, they do not cast partisan votes, be they Republicans or Democrats. It has been my experience, after years of service on those two committees, that their members vote on the basis of what they think are the merits of issues coming before the committees, free from partisanship.

I pointed out that the Johnson subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services had come forward with 43 unanimous reports, and I have never known a partisan consideration to be a factor in the deliberations of either the subcommittee or the full committee. We have always parked our partisanship outside the door, as we should. But, nevertheless, I quite agreed on January 13, as I still do, that the Republican majority is entitled to a majority of 1 member on those 2 committees, and I restate today what the RECORD shows, namely, that it was the Democratic side of the aisle, acting through the minority leader, that blocked my proposal on January 13 to add a Republican member to those two important committees so that the Republicans would have a majority on them.

It was demonstrated, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, that the mathematical situation, because of the close division in the Senate which resulted from the election of 1952, made it impossible for the Republicans to have a majority on each committee.

There was bound to be some committees in which the division would be equal. But the RECORD shows it was the position of the Republican majority that certainly the Republicans were entitled to a majority vote on the so-called major committees, and I quite agreed and still agree.

Mr. President, on Monday I shall offer a resolution to the Senate, as I announced last Friday I would do, which will read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, discharged from further consideration of Senate Resolution 32 temporarily increasing the membership of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I shall send it to the desk on Monday, and ask to have it go over under the rule. I shall do it, Mr. President, because by Monday more than 12 weeks will have elapsed since Senate Resolution 32 was sent to committee, and I believe it is quite reasonable for me to take the position that that is adequate time for the Committee on Rules and Administration to decide what it wants to do about the resolution, and that I have the right to have the committee report it to the Senate either favorably or unfavorably. Let Senators stand up in the Senate of the United States and be counted as to whether they want to give the State of Oregon equal representation in this body under the Constitution, or whether they want to continue the discriminatory practice and adhere to the very unfair precedent they adopted on January 13 of this year.

I have a feeling, Mr. President, that if each Member of the Senate will vote in accordance with what his conscience tells him is fair, he will reach the conclusion that the resolution offered by the Senator from Oregon is very reasonable, that the equities support his position, and that the people of the State of Oregon, under their equal representation rights, are entitled to have the kind of discrimination, which has been practiced against the junior Senator from Oregon since January 13, brought to an end. At least, I shall press the resolution and await the results of the action of the Senate.

THE CASE OF DR. ALLEN V. ASTIN

The next committee item I desire to take up this afternoon concerns the Bureau of Standards and newspaper stories which lead one to the conclusion that the head of the Bureau, Dr. Allen V. Astin, has been removed from office because of political pressure, and because of political interference in behalf of the Government with scientific analysis of an alleged battery additive which is supposed to rehabilitate or regenerate the strength of batteries.

I speak from the standpoint of presumption—and it is a rebuttable presumption—but, on the basis of newspaper stories, and on the basis of quotations attributed to Mr. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, to his Under Secretary, Mr. Sheaffer, and to Dr. Astin, the matter is of much greater concern than the mere personalities involved. Because the operation of the Bureau of Standards is of great concern to the welfare of this country and of its people, the American people are entitled to know whether or not there is any basis to justify what I consider to be a charge by the newspapers that Dr. Astin's removal as head of the Bureau of Standards was the result of political pressure.

The citizens of the United States as well as the Members of the Congress have the right to know, and constantly to be assured, that when the Bureau of Standards makes a scientific analysis in behalf of a Government agency, department, or official—and I underline

those words—the Government, as a matter of policy, will follow the scientific facts developed by the research. The people should be assured that we are not to enter an era in which political pressure and intimidation are to be brought to bear upon the Bureau of Standards, in order to force the Bureau to produce scientific findings that would justify placing the word "scientific" in quotation marks.

I do not know the facts in the instant case. As I say, I speak in terms of a presumption. But I know something about Dr. Astin's record. I know that he is a scientist who has enjoyed an unimpeachable reputation for scientific objectivity and for letting facts speak for themselves.

I do not like the implications of some of the quotations from Secretary Weeks and Under Secretary Sheaffer which appeared in the newspaper stories I read today. I was one who at the time of Sinclair Weeks' appointment said that I thought it was a good appointment. I still think so. I recognize that men make mistakes, and that each of us is entitled to his fair share of mistakes. Perfection should not be expected of persons in the public service any more than it is expected of men and women outside the public service. I highly approved of the nomination of Sinclair Weeks, and I said so at the time, because I felt the business interests of the country were entitled to have as head of the Department of Commerce a man with a businessman's point of view and a businessman's philosophy. The Department of Commerce is the department of Government which is supposed to watch over and guard, and advance the legitimate business interests of the country; and I underline the word "legitimate."

What disturbs me about this incident is the implication that Weeks and Sheaffer have the conception that they have a right to influence the research activities of the Bureau of Standards. Let me use another example to show how dangerous such a policy could be. Suppose the persons in charge of the Government department which administers the Pure Food and Drug Act should follow a course of action such as the newspapers indicate Weeks and Sheaffer have been following in this instance, a course of action that could cause the administrators of the Pure Food and Drug Act to doctor their findings based upon an investigation of a certain drug or a certain food. I think that illustrates the point quite well. Every man and woman in the United States can see how wrong that would be.

When the Bureau of Standards conducts scientific research to determine whether or not a certain additive to a battery will produce the results claimed for it by its inventors, and the Bureau comes forth with a negative finding, the Secretary of Commerce and the Under Secretary of Commerce ought to get their facts as to the scientific soundness of the research before they follow any such course of action as the newspapers indicate today they have followed in the Astin case.

I do not know whether or not the additive is good, but the presumption is in favor of Dr. Astin and his scientists in the Bureau of Standards, not with Weeks and Sheaffer, because they are not scientists and did not conduct the research.

Who is Sinclair Weeks to tell the American people, on the basis of any such investigation as the press indicates today was made by him, that the scientists in the Bureau of Standards did not conduct an objective scientific analysis of this particular additive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in full at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, an article that appeared in the Washington Post this morning in connection with this matter, and an excellent editorial entitled "The Astin Case," also published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. ASTIN TAKES ISSUE WITH WEEKS—FIRED UNITED STATES SCIENTIST DEFENDS REJECTION OF BATTERY ADDITIVE

Dr. Allen V. Astin yesterday defended his administration of the Bureau of Standards as "fair and adequate" and called for scientific tests on the disputed value of battery additives.

Astin was fired by Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks because, Weeks said, the Bureau "has not been sufficiently objective."

In a carefully and mildly worded statement, Astin declared that he never was able to see Weeks but had to deal with Assistant Secretary Craig R. Sheaffer, who told him Weeks wanted him to resign. The resignation now is at the White House and Weeks said yesterday it has been accepted.

Astin said he suggested that the dispute over the value of adding chemicals to auto batteries be turned over either to the Bureau's five-man visiting scientists committee or to a group from the National Academy of Sciences for an impartial check.

This suggestion was made about a month ago when "it was apparent to me that the Department of Commerce did not have confidence in the adequacy of the Bureau's work on battery additives." But the idea was not taken up.

Astin went on: "Since the thoroughness and fairness of the work of the National Bureau of Standards have been questioned, I still urge that it is very important to secure advice from such competent groups as those mentioned. I have no doubt that under qualified scientific scrutiny, the operations which I have been directing will be shown to have been fair and adequate."

Astin said the various tests run on the additive failed to modify earlier conclusions that they are worthless. It was pressure from an additive manufacturer, Jesse M. Ritchie, of Oakland, Calif., who makes AD-X2, which led to Astin's firing.

"As a great scientific laboratory, National Bureau of Standards is basically concerned with the soundness of its technical operations and it must adhere to the results of scientific findings regardless of what pressures are brought on the organization to change or modify conclusions based directly on those findings."

Astin said he had "striven to maintain and strengthen" the Bureau's reputation "of fairness, thoroughness, and accuracy in its scientific work."

He said he would be "pleased to testify before an appropriate committee" of Congress to answer questions about the battery additive experiments or any other matters. Chairman EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, Minnesota, of the Senate Small Business Committee which has been backing AD-X2 against the Bureau, has said he would be glad to hear Astin but had no plans to call him.

A number of congressional Democrats, however, began yesterday to call for further hearings. Two Senators on the Small Business Committee, JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, Alabama, and LESTER C. HUNT, Democrat, Wyoming, said they thought Astin should be heard.

In the House, Representative MELVIN PRICE (Democrat, Illinois) accused the Republican administration of introducing the spoils system in the Bureau which has always kept free of politics. And Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS (Democrat, West Virginia) said he was reliably informed Astin was fired because the GOP administration thought he was a Democrat. Astin is a registered Republican in Montgomery County, Md.

Astin would not say yesterday what he plans to do once his resignation is formally accepted but insisted that he would observe Government protocol while he is still on the job.

In discussing the battery additive controversy, Astin said that in the interest of scientific objectivity he ordered additional tests last June and again in December. He said the June tests were made using, in all essentials, test conditions prescribed by the manufacturer of an additive, apparently a reference to Ritchie. Astin commented:

"If any of these tests had developed results warranting modification of prior conclusions, I would have made such modifications immediately."

The Senate committee had a test made at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology which the committee said indicated the worth of AD-X2 and Ritchie has claimed many satisfied users.

THE ASTIN CASE

There is good reason for the alarm in scientific circles over Secretary Weeks' arbitrary demand for the resignation of Dr. Allen V. Astin, Director of the National Bureau of Standards. Doctor Astin was advanced to this position solely on the basis of merit after many years of distinguished service in the Bureau. He is in the best sense of the word a career scientist who has kept wholly aloof from politics and devoted his life to furthering the work of the Bureau. To remove him for any trivial reason would be a blow to the morale of hundreds of scientists in the Government service.

Far more serious than this is the ground advanced by Secretary Weeks to excuse the dismissal. Going before the Senate Small Business Committee, he supported the unproved complaint of a battery concern against the Bureau and concluded that the Bureau had not been sufficiently objective in its findings. How does he know? Before reaching such a conclusion Mr. Weeks ought to have made some objective findings of his own. Instead, he is reported to have refused even to see Dr. Astin, and he allowed the Bureau no opportunity to substantiate its report. Not only this; Mr. Weeks seems to lack understanding of the function of the NBS. He spoke of the disgruntled battery concern as having no luck getting the National Bureau of Standards to run tests of its product. The function of the Bureau is not to test products for manufacturers but to make tests at the request of other Government agencies.

Especially curious is Mr. Weeks' statement that he intends to get the best brains he can find to examine the functions and objectives of the Bureau and reevaluate them. Such examinations ought to come before and not after a Cabinet member starts shooting from the hip. If the Secretary sincerely feared that the Bureau had slipped in its examination of battery additives, his proper course would have been to ask for an outside scientific check on the Bureau's work. For this purpose he could have turned naturally to the National Academy of Sciences

or to the Visiting Committee created by law for the specific purpose of advising the Secretary on the efficiency of the Bureau's scientific work. But no such procedure was followed.

We think President Eisenhower would be well advised even now to follow the course that Mr. Weeks should have taken. It is not simply a question of Dr. Astin's future. He may insist on leaving the Bureau in any event. More important is the integrity of the Government's scientific work. If scientists are to be ousted on flimsy and unsubstantiated charges, a great blow will be dealt to scientific reporting. As the case stands, Dr. Astin's ouster is no more rational than would be the dismissal of J. Edgar Hoover on the unsubstantiated complaint of someone the FBI had investigated in the course of its duty.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been critical on occasion, as I shall be in the future, of newspapers which, in my judgment, publish editorials which are distorted and untrue. I have been critical of the Washington Post in the past, but I shall always try to keep faith with my conception of fairness and of fair play, by being just as high in my praise as I may be from time to time severe in criticism of a newspaper which does a courageous, enlightening editorial job on some subject, as the Washington Post did this morning in its editorial on the Astin case. The questions which have been raised by this editorial must be answered. I wonder what Weeks and Sheaffer will have to say about the arguments in the Post editorial. How are we going to find out?

I say, Mr. President, that if it be true that political pressure has been brought to bear on Dr. Astin, it is the task of the appropriate Senate committee to find out the facts about it. Perhaps steps have already been taken to that end. We move so fast in the Senate sometimes that a Senator on the floor cannot keep up with what is going on in Senate committees. I may read tonight that the appropriate Senate committee has already taken steps in this matter. If so, I congratulate that committee in advance. But if an appropriate Senate committee has not taken steps, I say that one should. Weeks and Sheaffer should be called before the appropriate Senate committee, and so should Dr. Astin, and the committee should obtain, under oath, all the facts about this incident. The American people are entitled to know whether it is true or false that Sheaffer, acting for Weeks—for it seems to be indicated that Dr. Astin was not able to see Weeks—forced the resignation of Dr. Astin as head of the Bureau of Standards for the alleged reason Sheaffer did not like the way Dr. Astin had handled the battery-additive investigation. When I say that, I think public information generally will agree with me. The facts should be ascertained because the implications of this incident and the possibilities of abuse to which it could lead are so serious that I think we ought to stop it at its very start.

THE AMMUNITION SITUATION IN KOREA

The next item I wish to take up is a brief comment on the ammunition situation in Korea and the testimony of General Van Fleet, as found on page 83 of the Senate hearings of March 5, 6, and 10, 1953, on the Korean ammunition problem.

I would have the people of my country listen to this testimony:

General VAN FLEET. Under the date of September 3, 1952, I was informed in a message from General Clark, and I quote:

"Steel strike has seriously reduced the amount of ammunition being received on new production. Present estimates are that approximately 37 percent of artillery ammunition production for 1952 has been lost. The above listed ammunition are the most critical types."

That is these heavier caliber there mentioned.

"All ammunition containing sizable quantities of steel are affected and expenditures should be reviewed accordingly."

Without taking the time to read it, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter of instructions, which is printed on page 84 of the Senate hearings. It is signed by General Van Fleet, and it deals with the question of ammunition shortage.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, EIGHTH UNITED STATES ARMY KOREA (EUSAK),
OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
APO 301, September 7, 1952.

Subject: Letter of instructions.
To: Commanding General, I US Corps, APO 358.
Commanding General IX US Corps, APO 264.
Commanding General IX US Corps, APO 909.
Commanding General, I ROK Corps.
Commanding General, II ROK Corps.

1. In a recent message the Department of the Army has advised that the last steel strike has seriously affected ammunition production and forecasts a loss of 37 percent in artillery ammunition production for 1952. The following is a pertinent extract from this message:

[Deleted.]

"While the above-listed ammo are the most critical types, all ammo containing sizable quantities of steel are affected, and expenditures should be reviewed accordingly."

2. The ASR for the period 101800 September to 201800 September 1952, and for subsequent periods, will reflect this condition. However, in the application of this allocation, I expect that the criterion for the expenditure of ammunition will not be based on the quantities allocated. Rather, every effort will be made by commanders at all echelons to insure that ammunition expenditures are consistent with operational requirements.

3. It must be borne in mind that special operations, such as raids, usually require above normal expenditure of ammunition. Consequently, in suballocating ammunition allowances, commanders should make careful provision for these special operations in any given 10-day period.

4. I intend to give this matter my personal attention and expect that you will exercise the necessary command supervision to insure the maximum return for all ammunition expended.

JAMES A. VAN FLEET,
General, United States Army,
Commanding.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the application of this testimony which I wish to make is to a little past history in the Senate, in connection with the steel strike. Before that strike was called, and when the controversy was raging in the Senate last year over its potential danger, the junior Senator from Oregon took the position that if the testimony of Bob Lovett, then Secretary of Defense, was factually sound—and I had every reason to believe it was, and every right to presume that it was until the contrary was shown—then it was a dangerous thing to allow the steel furnaces to grow cold, because I said on the floor of the Senate time and time again that the testimony before the committee on the part of the Defense Secretary was that it would require from 2 to 3 weeks to put the furnaces in operation again.

Mr. President, I refer Senator to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I speak from memory, but I speak accurately as to the meaning of the statements which I made in the debate many times on the floor of the Senate. I said over and over again in that debate, "Here is a singular physical fact applying to the steel industry which does not apply to very many other industries involved in labor disputes, namely, the fact that a stoppage of work in the steel industry, allowing the furnaces to grow cold, would mean that production could not get under way again for 2 or 3 weeks."

Go to the RECORD. In those speeches on the floor of the Senate I warned the American people that the Secretary of Defense, whose testimony I was going to accept until someone could successfully rebut it, had stated that if that industry were allowed to shut down we would pay for it in American blood.

But, with a presidential election coming up, the political pattern was to make a political football of the steel case, and to talk about applying the Taft-Hartley Act. Already more than 100 days of postponement of the strike had occurred, the delay having been arranged by agreement between the President of the United States and the steel union. The President had the right to make the agreement, because the Taft-Hartley Law, so far as its emergency dispute sections are concerned, is permissive, and not mandatory.

The then President of the United States knew that if he applied the Taft-Hartley law, and after 80 days the strike occurred—and the union gave every assurance that it would occur—the steel mills would grow cold, and production would be lost. We had the testimony of the Secretary of Defense that the situation was so serious that it would be translated into loss of American lives. The world situation with respect to Russia continued to grow more serious.

Mr. President, during that period of time I was at the Pentagon building one day in conference with Bob Lovett. He and I talked about the physical problem which confronted the Defense Department in connection with keeping steel production going.

What Bob Lovett told me in that conversation formed a part of the background which caused me to come to the floor of the Senate and argue, as I did, for the passage of emergency legislation which would keep the American flag flying over the steel mills, so that ammunition could be produced and the protection thereby afforded to our boys in Korea to which they were entitled.

In relating my conversation with Bob Lovett, what I shall say I would say on the witness stand, with my left hand on the Bible and my right raised. In that conversation with Bob Lovett, in discussing the kind of shortage which existed in military supplies at the time, he talked about the ammunition problem. He talked, too, about certain weapons, which I do not think it would be proper for me to mention here. But, Mr. President, at that conference with Bob Lovett he so convinced me of the emergent character of the situation that I returned to the floor of the Senate and in a series of speeches—and let the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD speak for itself—I pleaded with my colleagues to keep the flag flying over the steel mills and to work out a settlement of that dispute about wages and hours and conditions of employment in an equitable and fair fashion.

I said then exactly what I am willing to say today, because I do not read the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on the steel case to the contrary. Whenever the time comes when an emergency is so great that a President must act immediately to protect the lives of American boys on the firing line, where they may be called upon to die for us, or he must act to save the lives of the American people here at home, it is his clear duty to so act, to lay the problem before Congress as quickly as he can, and to seek confirmation and approval of his action, as he did in the steel case on April 9, after which the strike was called off.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAFT in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MORSE. The Congress of the United States pulled a strike in the steel case by not taking action and refusing to pass legislation which was needed in order to protect the lives of the boys in Korea.

I said then, and I repeat today, there were three strikes in the steel case: First there was the strike of Congress in refusing to pass legislation that ought to have been passed. Then there was the strike of the employers in the steel companies who asked first for an approximate $12 a ton increase in prices, when they were entitled to less than $3, and finally held out for and obtained approximately $5, which was about twice what they ought to have received. The steel industry, by pulling the strike, stole from the American people millions of dollars in price increases. The third strike, of course, was the strike of the workers themselves. Not one of the strikes could be justified in the public interest.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I believe that time has proved that those of us who felt it was useless for Congress merely to request the President of the United States to use the Taft-Hartley law were right in taking the position that we would just be playing politics by asking the President to invoke it. The President took the position that labor had held up its strike for more than the 80-day period already, and that in good conscience he should not use the Taft-Hartley law. It was clear that he would not use the Taft-Hartley law even if Congress asked him to use it.

I know I was one of those who were advised on a confidential basis that if we demanded that the President of the United States invoke the Taft-Hartley law, he was not going to use it anyway. I do believe it would have been in the national interest to have gone ahead and given the President some other authority to act, on the theory that the 80-day period had already expired. If the Morse amendment had been adopted or if the Monroney amendment had been adopted—and I believe the Maybank amendment would have accomplished the same purpose—the steel mills would not have been shut down.

The other day I looked at a trade publication, in connection with the equities involved in the situation. As I recall, the publication pointed out that the steel companies, particularly the major steel companies, lost only about 25 percent of their profits as the result of the strike—that is of their profits after taxes—because out of what was lost by the corporations in the strike more than 70 percent of the loss was absorbed by taxes which the corporations would have had to pay had the strike not occurred.

Mr. MORSE. And the boys in Korea lost 37 percent of the ammunition they should have had.

Mr. LONG. So far as the corporations were concerned, this Nation in effect cushioned three-quarters of the cost of the strike to the corporations by way of taxes it did not collect because the strike occurred. Even though the steel production was only 50 percent of what it would have been, the steel companies made around 75 percent as much profit as they would have made had the strike not occurred.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his very important contribution to the discussion. I thank him for his interruption, because his particular interruption makes it possible for me now to point out that the Senator from Louisiana was a member along with the junior Senator from Oregon, of the Committee on Armed Services last year at the time of the steel strike. I here and now make the Senator from Louisiana my witness, and I ask him this question:

Is it not true that he, too, was greatly concerned by the testimony which Bob Lovett gave to that committee concerning the serious consequences which might ensue from a shutdown of the steel mills, from the standpoint of supplying the weapons which were needed in order to fight the war in Korea?

Mr. LONG. I am not only familiar with that fact, but I recall that sometime later, after the shutdown actually had occurred, some of us, in reviewing the military problems, talked with the Secretary of Defense in the Pentagon. He expressed the greatest disappointment that, just at a time when the defense effort was beginning to move into high gear, the steel strike should be crippling the defense effort. Although, theoretically, the steel workers were producing essential steel for the defense effort, many parts, the need of which could not always be foreseen, were not being produced.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I am sure that if all the members of the Committee on Armed Services were present this afternoon, they would have to testify as the Senator from Louisiana has so accurately testified in answer to my question, namely, that we on the Armed Services Committee were greatly concerned about the consequences of the steel strike.

I remember on another occasion during the time of the steel controversy, when we were all taken to the Pentagon for a briefing by the Secretary of Defense and the top military officials, great concern was then expressed by our military leaders over the consequences of the stoppage of the production of the necessary sinews of war for the use in Korea.

Now we have the proof that the fear was justified.

I happen to know, in the first place, because Lovett told me so and, in the second place, because the President of the United States told me so, and in great detail, in discussions I had with him on several occasions—and by several occasions I mean more than two—at the time and subsequent thereto, when, with the facts he had before him, the decision was made to enter into the token seizure of the steel mills in order to keep production going.

I accept the Supreme Court decision, Mr. President, for what it is, but it does not say what a great many people seem to think it says. I accept the legal finding of the Supreme Court in the steel case, but I wish to say that obviously what happened in the case was that the Supreme Court never fully appreciated the singular fact that Bob Lovett was stressing to the President of the United States. I do not think there is a member of the Supreme Court, had he been convinced that the hour was the hour of crisis the President thought it was when he initiated the token seizure, who would have taken the position that the President of the United States in such an hour was impotent, and could not act immediately to protect the lives of American boys in Korea and the lives of millions of people in the United States. As a lawyer, I wish to say that in my judgment the Supreme Court decision does not say so, either.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that what actually happened at that time is an indictment of both the legislative branch and the executive branch of our Government. The whole theory of the 80-day injunction provision had been that if after the expiration of the 80 days, during which, theoretically, the President would have prevented a strike, the strike continued, Congress would pass a law giving the Executive power to take whatever steps it would be necessary to take in order to save the country.

Yet when we saw a situation of that type develop, we found that it wound up in a hopeless legislative tangle, with the Executive unwilling to take the action which Congress urged him to take, and

with the Congress declining to give the President authority to take the kind of action which he believed to be appropriate.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and I agree with him; I think both the executive and the legislative branches failed to take the kind of action needed to be taken in the case of the steel strike.

Mr. LONG. I do not think it is a sufficient answer to say that the President was hardheaded, stubborn, and unreasonable, unless we concede that the Congress was equally hardheaded, stubborn, and unreasonable.

Mr. MORSE. I agree.

Mr. President, in conclusion on this point I wish to say that the testimony of General Van Fleet bears out the testimony of Secretary Lovett; and the testimony of General Van Fleet bears out the President; and the testimony of General Van Fleet bears out the arguments I made time and time again on the floor of the Senate when I urged the taking of immediate action to keep the steel mills operating. An examination of the speeches I made will disclose that many times in that debate I said that from the standpoint of the defense of our country and from the standpoint of protecting our boys in Korea, we could not afford to run the risk of letting those steel mills grow cold.

The Senate is well aware of the way an unfriendly press distorted my position at the time, and took out of context statements I made on the floor of the Senate, never at any time accurately presenting my thesis. But, Mr. President, time, too, has a way of catching up on a prostituted press; and that has happened again, because now, months and months later, we are beginning to obtain the facts as to how serious the situation was; and there is the testimony of General Van Fleet. Let it speak for itself. We lost 37 percent of the kind of ammunition which he testified was sorely needed in Korea to protect American lives.

Mr. President, I have not changed my view as to the type of legislation that is needed, and I am now in the process of revising and redrafting my bill for the handling of emergency disputes. In the next few days I shall introduce the bill on the basis of the same premises for which I argued when I introduced the bill last year, and for which I argued in 1950, when I introduced a bill embodying the same principle in connection with the coal strike of 1950.

Tonight I say to the American people that future events will create other crises such as the ones we had in 1950 and in 1952, and we shall need to have on the statute books legislation which will empower the President of the United States to act quickly, and then to let the matter come before the Congress—as my bill provides—for confirmation or rejection by the Congress of the President's proposal, thus carrying out the true meaning of our system of checks and balances.

INCREASE IN TAX EXEMPTION FOR EARNINGS OF DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Mr. President, the next item I wish to take up is one which I believe will be of great interest to American parents. For a few minutes I wish to speak as a parent who believes—as I said when, some days ago, I spoke on the floor of the Senate on this general subject—that a part of a program for the building of a good character in children is to teach them thrift and the value of the dollar, and to create in them a desire to save and a desire to work, and to dispel the notion which I fear is too prevalent today in too many segments of the American population, namely, that they should try to get something for nothing and try to get along by working as little as possible, and should not face the reality of life that what is worthwhile is obtained by working for it, and that the silver-platter philosophy does not build character.

That is why I wish to make a few comments on a bill which I wish to introduce in regard to a tax-exemption problem. At the present time if a parent has a dependent child and the child earns 1 dollar in excess of $600, the parent loses the tax exemption for that child.

The other evening I had dinner at a friend's home, and there we were speaking of this matter. The father said, "I got into a bad situation last year, for my daughter earned just a little less than $600, and we took the exemption; but I forgot, and she did too, that over a period of time she had worked as an usher in one of the movie houses, and for that work she received a very small compensation. We forgot about it, and did not report it; but when it was added to her other earnings, the total was a very few dollars"—my recollection is that it was only $3 or $4—"over the $600 exemption, and so we lost the exemption."

However, Mr. President, that was not the most important point in connection with the discussion. The most important point was the psychological effect of that situation on the child.

I say that this feature of our income-tax law is doing serious psychological damage to a great number of American boys and girls. It is killing incentive. Not only that, but it is getting them to think in terms of evasion and cutting the corners. It is creating a feeling on their part that they should not give their all to a job, but that they should work a little while, and then should play the rest of the time.

Mr. President, I wish to be personal about this matter. One of my daughters earned approximately $462, as I recall, by clerking in Garfinckel's store. We talked about whether she should work there the entire summer. There were good reasons why she did not, but it was interesting to hear that she wanted to be sure to stop short of the $600 mark because she did not want her working to be a real financial liability to me. Mr. President, I say that is not a good attitude to develop among the young people of our country.

What are we trying to do in the tax law, on the basis of its present provisions? We are simply trying to make certain that the parent supports the dependent child. To help the parent in doing so, we allow him an exemption of $600 because of the financial problem he faces in supporting a dependent child. That is the purpose, but we should consider the effect of the tax law. I say its effect in this respect is bad.

So I have prepared a bill which provides for increasing from $600 to $1,200 the limitation upon the amount of gross income which a dependent child of a taxpayer may receive without causing the child to lose his status as a dependent, for income-tax purposes.

I wish to read the bill, for I desire to comment on certain of its provisions:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 25 (b) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to credits of individuals against net income) is amended to read as follows:

"(D) An exemption of $600 for each dependent (other than a dependent who is a son, daughter, stepson, or stepdaughter of the taxpayer) whose gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins is less than $600, and an exemption of $600 for each dependent who is a son, daughter, stepson, or stepdaughter of the taxpayer whose earned gross income for the calendar year in which the taxable year of the taxpayer begins is less than $1,200, except that the exemption shall not be allowed in respect of a dependent who has made a joint return with his spouse under section 51 for the taxable year beginning in such calendar year."

SEC. 2. The amendment to the Internal Revenue Code made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1952.

Now, let us take the case of college students. I know a little bit about their finances. I happen to have two children in college; and let me say, they would still be dependent if each of them should happen to earn $1,200 a year. If anyone does not think so, let him start paying the bills of a college student. Yet there are college students, Mr. President, who, by earning their board and room, are able to work their way through school with the assistance of their parents. There are, of course, exceptions, but, in the case of most of the students who are working their way through school, they are doing so in part, not entirely, because their parents supplement what the children are able to earn. The child who is able to earn somewhere in the neighborhood of $1,200, if he is taking an expensive college course, is still very dependent upon his parents.

So I think the kind of inducement or incentive that would be created by my bill is highly to be desired. In the interest of good parenthood, we ought to amend the tax laws to allow for such an exemption as I propose. It will be found to be fair and equitable, and Mr. President, if you will check with educators and with parent groups, I believe you will discover widespread support of the proposal I make this afternoon, when I introduce a bill that provides for an exemption up to $1,200 in the earnings of a child.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. In a moment. It would encourage many dependent children to get a job, to earn as much as they could during the summer, and to learn the value of work as a character builder. I hope my bill will receive early consideration by the appropriate committee, and favorable action by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed, out

of order, to introduce the bill and have it appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1568) to increase from $600 to $1,200 the limitation upon the amount of gross income which a dependent child of a taxpayer may receive without losing his status as a dependent for income tax purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The explanation of the bill would make the junior Senator from Louisiana anxious to support it, unless we would unwittingly create a tax-avoidance device by passing the bill. It occurs to the junior Senator from Louisiana that some parents in order to reduce their own income taxes, see fit to place stocks, bonds, and other securities, in the names of their children. So long as the income derived therefrom is less than $600, it is not taxable to the child. The result is that that $600 a year income, which ordinarily would have gone to the parent, and on which he would have to pay income taxes, is no longer taxable; and the parent still claims the child as an exemption. If the bill were limited to earned income, I believe it would accomplish the purpose the Senator has in mind.

Mr. MORSE. That is the intent of the bill, and I think its language bears out that intent. But if it does not, I shall, between now and the time the bill is printed, modify it, so that the intent will be perfectly clear.

PUBLIC POWER—THE PEOPLE'S YARDSTICK

Mr. President, I turn to the last item of business for the Independent Party this afternoon, in making its weekly committee report. I am sorry the hour is so late that it becomes necessary at this time to make this major speech, but I am going to make it for the RECORD, because it deals with a very vital subject matter, a matter which I think is of great concern to the people of the United States.

PUBLIC POWER: THE PEOPLE'S YARDSTICK

In this fourth of a series of talks on the preservation of our natural resources, I propose to describe how public power has operated as a yardstick.

We who believe in a real free-enterprise economy are greatly concerned over the miscarrige of utility regulation and the propaganda attack on the concept of a public yardstick against which we can measure the efficiency and pricing policies of the commercial electric utility companies.

In a society where most citizens do highly specialized jobs, take their cash reward and then go into the market to convert that cash into goods and services, everybody is concerned with prices.

Every wage earner and businessman is vitally concerned with the quality of goods and services offered for his purchase. And goods and services of decent quality and at reasonable prices must be readily available if they are to satisfy the enormous needs of our citizens and industry.

The strength of free enterprise and its usefulness in a democratic society are predicated upon the protection afforded by free competition. Competition provides the spur to full production and results in minimizing prices. Competition operates to improve the quality of goods and services as rival producers attempt to obtain purchasers. Competition results in new and better products as businessmen attempt to secure larger markets or hold positions already won.

Monopoly—whether private or governmental—has just the opposite effects. The purchaser is on take-it-or-leave-it basis. Restricted output, high prices, insufficient supply and dubious quality are the hallmarks of monopoly.

An indispensable condition of a free, competitive economy is free access to the market and free entry into the field of production and distribution.

The generation and distribution of electric power has never been characterized by that free and wholesome competition which is the guarantee of progress, abundance and low prices. In part, that has been due to the nature of the industry. In part, the pattern of State regulation has excluded competition.

STATE REGULATION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES

At the outset, private utilities were not subject to any regulation. With the passing of time, State commissions were established to regulate in this field. In the early agrarian days, some of these commissions were vigorous representatives of the public interest, as that term is commonly understood. Others were not so vigorous and regulations often became lax or superficial. Still others became the instruments of the very utilities they were supposed to regulate.

Some utility commissions were actually established by the utilities themselves to "simplify" regulation, i. e., to take regulatory powers from local governments and centralize them in the hands of a small State board. Arkansas is an example—Fortune magazine, October 1952, Selfish Arkansas Power.

Many commissions have been starved into weakness by insufficient funds.

Part and parcel of the local regulatory system is the granting of exclusive franchises. This carries with it the potentialities for abuse inherent in monopoly. Unless local regulation is effective in the public interest, regulation is little more than regularized monopoly.

Where conscientious regulation has been attempted by administrative bodies, the final outcome has been determined by the extent to which the courts decided to take an active role in reviewing determinations or in declining to interfere.

STATE LEGISLATIVE SOVEREIGNTY

In the famous case of *Munn* v. *Illinois* (94 U. S. 113), the Supreme Court of the United States considered a challenge to the regulation by the State of Illinois of the charges that a grain elevator should make. This case, which was decided in 1877, is one of the landmark decisions in the field of public utility regulation.

Seeking a precedent, the Supreme Court examined the English common law. The common-law cases recognized that when anyone voluntarily employed his capital in an industry that was "affected with a public interest," that industry was thereby subject to regulation in the public interest. The Supreme Court stated that this right to regulate was an inherent legislative right and once exercised was not subject to judicial review. The Supreme Court held further that if this legislative power were abused, the remedy was to be found in an appeal to the polls, and not to the courts.

In the Munn case, the principal claim of the companies was that the State action violated the 14th amendment of the Federal Constitution. They contended that the rate regulation deprived them of property without due process of law, without just compensation, and denied them equal protection of the laws.

However, the Supreme Court held differently. It decided that the right to regulate the price of services affected with a public interest was recognized as a legislative power in England; that the courts would act only in the absence of legislation; that English courts did not review or question the reasonableness of such a rate fixed by legislation. Thus, the doctrine of legislative supremacy was clearly upheld in cases wherein the public interest was involved.

THE SUPREME COURT OVERRULES ITSELF

The private utilities were not satisfied with this decision that subjected them to regulation in the public interest. By repeated appeals to the courts, they hammered away at the Munn case until they obtained the result they desired. Eventually, the Supreme Court created a new kind of law as regards the regulation of all public utilities. It overruled an impressive line of Supreme Court decisions which followed the Munn rule. The definitive case that caused this change was *Smyth* v. *Ames* (169 U. S. 466). It was decided in 1898, 21 years after the decision in Munn against Illinois. Soon, an entirely new kind of public utilities regulation became firmly established in court decisions, precedents, and law.

Under this new approach, the Supreme Court went into what had long been held to be legislative prerogatives—the whole question of the "reasonableness of rates to be charged" by private utilities—and concluded that "the company was entitled to a fair return upon the value of that which it employs for public convenience."

As we examine later cases we find few holdings that substantially extended the rule laid down in Smith against Ames. Judicial review has become widely grafted upon public-utility regulation.

Cases drag on for years and cost tremendous sums which are paid for by the consumers and taxpayers. Court decisions and statutes become hopelessly confused in verbiage. Effective, prompt regulation becomes impossible.

With the failure of regulation, the people sought other means to protect themselves from unreasonable rates. They found it in the public power yardstick.

ORIGIN OF PUBLIC POWER YARDSTICK

On the one hand, formal public regulation of private utilities was not achieving its stated goals. Monopoly utilities, on the other hand, either could not or would not develop hydroelectric power in the quantities and at prices which

would meet the needs of consumers and industry.

The almost limitless needs of our expanding Nation for inexpensive electric power required Federal action. The early great conservationists—Theodore Roosevelt, Pinchot, and Norris—pioneered the fight for publicly generated power, as I have described in earlier talks.

An important function of the public power program has been to act as a yardstick with which to measure the performance—in service, quantity, and price—of private utilities. This was a primary factor in overcoming the ineffectual attempts at administrative regulation. This was the factor which corrected in large measure the absence of competition in the electric-power field.

Not only have public installations generated vast amounts of cheap power, the public power program—coupled with the preference clause and the subsequent growth of municipal power systems, public utility districts, and rural cooperatives—has stimulated industry and private consumption opening up vast new markets for electric power. Private utilities have attempted—often reluctantly and belatedly—to provide larger amounts of power at lower rates in response to the challenge of the public power yardstick.

RESULTS OF THE PUBLIC POWER YARDSTICK

We have an authoritative report on this subject, prepared by outstanding engineers and power experts who have spent many years in this field. This is the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission that was issued a short time ago. This group had the leadership of a distinguished chairman, Morris L. Cooke, who was long associated with most of the significant technical power studies in America during the last generation.

I digress, Mr. President, from the manuscript only long enough to pay what I mean to be a very deserved tribute to Morris L. Cooke. I paid it to him not many weeks ago at a banquet where it was my privilege and honor to comment upon his great life work in the public interest.

I want to say, Mr. President, that here is a man of considerable wealth, as I understand, who is devoted to the public interest and who recognizes the fact that, after all, the welfare and the happiness of all our people are the greatest bulwarks for the preservation of the great American competitive system, which is based upon a private-property concept and also, of course, upon the democratic processes inherent in the freedom of self-governing men and women.

When Morris Cooke speaks on a matter such as I discuss this afternoon, we can be sure that a man devoted to the common welfare is speaking with the idea of protecting the public interest.

It is a notable report the Cooke Commission has brought forth on the general problem which I am now discussing.

One of the major findings of the President's Commission dealt with the public power yardstick. The report says:

> The Commission has found a considerable body of evidence that the marketing policy in question has already had decided effect on the level of electric rates in the regions in which it has been operative. Thus, at its field conferences, representatives of rural electric cooperatives showed that in areas in which an authorized Federal agency was actively marketing power from river basin developments, the cost of power purchased by cooperatives from private companies tended to be little more than half as high as the cost of similar power in less fortunate areas.

Equally significant, and that is very significant, Mr. President, is a comparison of what the people have to pay for power in different parts of the United States. Here are the conclusions of the Commission which show that where the public power yardstick was not present, as in the northeast, the cost of power for the same borrowers was roughly twice as high. In other words, when a public power yardstick operates side by side with the operations of private utilities in the same area, it has been shown that the cost of power is about half what it is when private utilities have a monopoly. The public-power yardstick constitutes a great check to protect the public interest and to offset the unfortunate results of Smythe against Ames.

Selfish forces are at work in America today, seeking either to weaken or to destroy the public-power yardstick. One of the main reasons why I announced early in this session of Congress that I would give a series of some 12 addresses on the question of natural resources was my great fear that if liberals in the Senate did not stand guard over the Nation's natural resources, those resources would be exploited both by way of the passage of undesirable legislation and the promulgation within the executive departments of administrative regulations and rulings which would not be in the public interest.

So it is necessary to bring this fight out into the open. We must constantly bombard American public opinion with facts about the dangers that confront us in the field of natural resources.

The Commission set forth a table of comparison of average rates paid to private companies by REA cooperatives in the Southeast and Northeast regions, and I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Charges by private power companies to rural cooperatives in Southeast and Northeast States*

[Cents per kilowatt-hour]

	Rates
SOUTHEAST STATES	
South Carolina	[1] 0.76
Georgia	[1] .70
Alabama	[1] .74
Mississippi	[1] .64
NORTHEAST STATES	
Maine	[2] 1.44
New Hampshire	[2] 1.41
Vermont	[2] 1.26
New York	[2] 1.38
Pennsylvania	[2] 1.12

[1] Mills.
[2] Cents and mills.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the same pattern exists elsewhere. Where purchasers in the Southwest have the benefit of the public power yardstick, the private power companies sell their power for substantially lower rates than in another area which does not have publicly generated power.

The Commission included another table, table 2, entitled "Charges by Private Power Companies to Rural Cooperatives in Southwest and West North Central States." I ask unanimous consent that this table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Charges by private power companies to rural cooperatives in Southwest and West North Central States*

[Cents per kilowatt-hour]

	Rates
SOUTHWESTERN STATES	
Louisiana	[1] 0.70
Arkansas	[1] .63
Oklahoma	[1] .66
Texas	[1] .63
New Mexico	[1] .74
WEST NORTH CENTRAL STATES	
Missouri	[2] 1.01
Kansas	[1] .93
Illinois	[1] .98
Iowa	[2] 1.10
Wisconsin	[2] 1.44
Minnesota	[2] 1.30

[1] Mills.
[2] Cents and mills.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, these cooperatives are operating in some of the least developed areas of this country. A difference of 35 or 50 percent in the wholesale rate is the difference between a project that will pay out and serve the rural areas, and one that may fail. Let us ask ourselves then how much savings in dollars do such differences in rates actually mean? Note this striking conclusion of the President's Commission:

> If the cooperatives in the Northern States could obtain their power at the average rate prevailing in the Southern States, they would save $7,275,000 a year based on present levels of consumption in the North and $13,575,000 based on average sales to members of rural electric cooperatives which have been in existence for 10 years. If this saving were passed on to farmers purchasing the energy, it would mean a reduction of $13.68 per year in their bills for the larger average service.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder if it follows that the use of the so-called public power yardstick necessarily could reduce the cost of electricity in the New England area. It occurs to me that the difference in fuel costs, and items of that sort, might account for the difference in the price of power. For example, if one is generating electricity by gas fuel—that is, natural gas—such fuel is much cheaper in the South and Southwest than it is in the North, where it must be piped.

Mr. MORSE. My reply is that if we would provide for the St. Lawrence waterway project and the development of the great public power resources that project would make possible, and stand firmly against undercover attempts which are being made to scuttle that program by letting private utilities get power at the bus bar, I think the same

result would be demonstrated in the northeast that has been demonstrated elsewhere whenever the public power yardstick has been established; particularly when the public power yardstick takes the form of the development of hydroelectric power.

That is one reason why I am a stanch supporter of the St. Lawrence waterway project, although I am very much concerned in this session of Congress when I see what I consider to be a very emasculated bill coming to the floor of the Senate. I do not think the bill that is being considered this year will adequately protect the rights of the people to the development of public power from the waters of the St. Lawrence. I for one am not in favor, by any subterfuge whatsoever, of turning over that power resource to the private utilities of New York and New England.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. What I had in mind was that if the cost of the production of power were greater by other means than by hydroelectric generation—for example, if the cost of the production of power were much greater in the New England States because of higher fuel costs than it is in the Southern States—then I would assume that to try to force rates down to the point where they are in the Southern States would simply run the private utility companies out of business. That view is based on the assumption that the cost could not be higher in the New England States.

Mr. MORSE. Let me make very clear, because I have a record of fighting to protect the legitimate rights of private utilities, that I am not in favor of the use by the Government of the public power yardstick as a device with which to destroy private business. I am simply saying that I think it is good, in the interest of the people, to have operating in the same area public power districts to provide power, because I believe the net effect is to establish a fair rate, a rate on which the private utility can make a fair profit.

One thing that amuses me in the argument made by a great many private utilities is that out of one corner of their mouths they say, "We are more efficient; we can do it more cheaply; we can do it better. Let us have a monopoly." Later in the same discussion they will be found engaging in a non sequitur, and saying, "Of course, it is necessary to take the Government out of the business, because if that is not done, the Government will run us out of business." The private utilities cannot argue both ways.

In my judgment, an efficiently conducted public operation and an efficiently conducted private operation will come out just about the same in regard to the profit that can be made, one for the people, and the other for the stockholders. But I think the operation of the public power yardstick is essential if private utilities are to be stopped from going beyond a reasonable profit and exploiting consumers of an area.

PUBLIC POWER RATES ON THE PACIFIC COAST

The public power yardstick has done an effective job in my region on the Pacific coast. Quoting the President's Commission, we learn:

On the Pacific coast, where there are active Federal programs and where important municipal power systems have provided public competition for many years, the rates charged by private companies to rural cooperatives are 0.61 cent in Washington, 0.80 cent in Oregon, and 0.77 cent in California.

WHAT PUBLIC POWER COMPETITION MEANS

Since the public power yardstick program is comparatively recent, it is refreshing to go back for approximately 10 years and see what has happened in the same States before and after the yardsticks were established, and then compare them with other States that did not have the power yardstick before, and do not have it now.

The following table shows this graphically and dramatically. In Texas and Oklahoma, the public yardstick was introduced. In other States, it was not.

TABLE 3.—*Cost of wholesale electric power to rural electric cooperatives*

[Cents per kilowatt-hour]

Year	Texas [1]	Oklahoma [2]	Colorado [3]	Combined: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland [4]
1941	1.03	1.16	1.32	1.25
1942	.86	.95	1.22	1.19
1943	.85	.87	1.19	1.22
1944	.88	.94	1.25	1.34
1945	.80	.88	1.24	1.25
1946	.69	.76	1.25	1.22
1947	.68	.73	1.23	1.22
1948	.66	.71	1.20	1.28
1949	.63	.66	1.19	1.35
1950	.56	.58	1.32	1.47

[1] Reduction due to Brazos River Transmission Electric Cooperative and Southwestern Power Administration.
[2] Reduction due to Southwestern Power Administration and Grand River Dam Authority.
[3] No competition.
[4] No competition. No electric cooperatives in New York during first 3 years.

Source: Rural Electrification Administration.

This is a dramatic statistical table, illustrating very graphically the argument I am seeking to make at this point in my speech. The table is so important in dollars and cents to Mr. Average American that I would like to quote the conclusion of the President's Commission:

The table shows that in Texas and Oklahoma, where competition was present, the charges to rural electric cooperatives have been practically halved in the 10-year period. In contrast, in Colorado and the northeastern group of States, where there has been no competition, the charges to such cooperatives have remained stationary or even increased. As a result, cooperatives in Colorado and the Northeastern States are paying more than twice as much for their power as are those in Oklahoma and Texas.

Texas and Oklahoma are in the general region where the Southwestern Power Administration of the Department of Interior markets hydroelectric power from the Federal multipurpose programs in the Arkansas, White, and Red Rivers.

EFFECT OF STATE AUTHORITY AND REA

We are using the term "public-power yardstick" in its largest sense. As such competition that arises from State power authorities or Rural Electrification Administration generating plants is equally important. Take, for example, the situation in Texas. According to the President's Commission:

In central Texas it was the advent of the Brazos River Conservation and Reclamation District, set up by the State, marketing power from the Morris Sheppard Dam through the Brazos River Transmission Cooperative, which brought rates tumbling from somewhat over 1.0 cent to about half that amount. In other words, the Texas Power & Light Co., as a result of competition, reduced wholesale rates to cooperatives by about 50 percent.

The same was true with the State power project in South Carolina. From the President's Commission report we read:

In South Carolina, where power costs averaged about 1.25 cents in 1941, it was the State-constituted South Carolina Public Service Authority, operating the Santee Cooper project financed by Federal loan and grant, which brought rates down to little over half that level. In Mississippi, REA-financed cooperative generating plants played an important part.

THREAT OF PUBLIC POWER COMPETITION

From past experience the private utilities have learned that the actual presence of a public power yardstick is not always necessary. The mere possibility of one has caused them to drastically lower rates. In the words of the President's Commission:

In a considerable number of States the suggestion that such plants might be constructed proved sufficient to bring about material reductions in private company rates to rural electric cooperatives.

RESULTS FOR 12 STATES

The President's Commission made a study of 12 States and ranked each in terms of its electric charges for all classes of consumption. This ranged from residential use of 100 kilowatts a month to industrial use of 200,000 kilowatts a month. Here again the real savings to the people are in the areas in which the public yardstick is operating:

According to this study, the 12 States having the lowest overall electric rates include the TVA and South Carolina Public Service Authority area States of Tennessee, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Kentucky; the Bonneville Administration area States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana; California, with its Central Valley program; Nebraska, in which all electricity is distributed by public or cooperative systems; and Utah.

On the same basis the 12 States having the highest composite rate structures include the northeastern States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware, and the States of Florida, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota.

Now what does this mean in actual dollars and cents to Mr. Average Householder, the small commercial customer and the medium-sized industrial user? Here are the President's Commission's findings:

For a household with electric refrigerator and range, the saving in electric bills from living in the low-rate group of States would average about $24 a year. For the medium-sized commercial power customers the saving would average about $312 per year. For the medium-sized industrial plant the savings would run to nearly $5,000 a year.

PRIVATE UTILITIES THRIVE ON PUBLIC COMPETITION

The question naturally arises: "Has this public power yardstick been developed at the expense of the private utilities?"

There is an effective answer to this question by merely looking at the record. It is a remarkable record and it shows conclusively that companies in the area of public-power projects are thriving financially. Here is the conclusion of the exhaustive study of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission:

Analysis of the financial record of a number of the power companies which have been shown to be charging rural-electric cooperatives lower rates, or which are the predominant companies in the low-rate States just enumerated, reveals that throughout the period since 1937 they have done consistently well. Their annual rates of return have in general been above what regulatory commissions have considered fair and have compared favorably with the average for the United States as a whole.

In order to remove all doubt, let us look at the actual rates of return of private utilities in the area of the TVA public-power yardstick, and in the area of the public-power yardsticks in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks two tables showing the rates of return in the respective areas.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 5.—*Rates of return on average net electric plants*

[Comparison of composite rates of return for all class A and B electric utilities in the United States with certain electric utilities operating in areas adjoining TVA service area]

[Percent]

Year	United States	Alabama Power Co.	Georgia Power Co.	Kentucky Utilities Co.	Louisville Gas & Electric Co.	Mississippi Power Co.	Mississippi Power & Light Co.	Carolina Power & Light Co.	Duke Power Co.	Kingsport Utilities Co.
1937	7.4	7.18	8.41	9.13	10.88	8.39	8.09	7.55	8.66	12.4
1938	7.2	6.76	7.97	9.42	11.32	7.20	8.74	7.32	7.68	8.2
1939	7.4	7.27	8.17	10.85	11.03	6.81	7.53	6.86	8.38	7.1
1940	7.4	6.42	7.81	11.80	10.56	8.04	7.38	9.11	7.94	7.0
1941	7.1	6.69	8.37	9.39	9.17	8.02	8.66	6.74	7.08	7.2
1942	6.6	9.90	7.65	8.47	8.41	9.27	8.13	5.41	6.77	9.3
1943	6.7	6.70	6.41	7.74	7.98	8.94	8.63	5.62	6.33	9.9
1944	7.0	6.43	6.68	7.86	7.85	8.05	12.07	5.59	5.80	7.2
1945	7.5	7.33	7.01	6.96	7.93	18.13	8.41	5.58	6.07	8.9
1946	7.3	7.99	7.86	8.15	8.68	11.53	10.04	7.48	8.08	8.3
1947	7.1	7.45	7.33	8.59	8.81	10.27	8.41	6.84	7.74	7.8
1948	6.8	6.92	6.83	8.10	9.53	8.32	8.05	6.86	7.19	5.6
1949	6.9	7.85	8.53	7.86	9.59	8.38	7.53	7.13	9.27	6.3
Average for period	7.11	7.30	7.62	8.79	9.36	9.55	8.64	6.78	7.51	8.9

Original cost less reserve for depreciation. In some instances estimates were used in allocating the overall depreciation reserve and annual provision to electric and other plant.

Source: Federal Power Commission.

TABLE 6.—*Rates of return on average net electric plants*

[Comparison of composite rates of return for all class A and B electric utilities in the United States with certain electric utilities operating in Pacific Northwest States]

[Percent]

Year	United States	California-Oregon Power Co.	Mountain States Power Co.	Portland General Electric Co.	Puget Sound Power & Light Co.	Pacific Power & Light Co.	Washington Water Power Co.	Idaho Power Co.	Montana Power Co.	Utah Power & Light Co.
1937	7.4	8.03	9.17	8.79	7.09	8.62	7.26	8.99	9.25	6.47
1938	7.2	7.86	9.70	7.81	6.84	8.53	7.55	9.15	8.17	5.68
1939	7.4	7.67	9.69	8.65	7.11	8.90	8.71	8.22	9.06	5.91
1940	7.4	7.55	7.01	8.08	6.20	8.27	8.10	7.83	9.67	6.75
1941	7.1	7.08	6.47	8.46	6.38	8.01	8.93	6.89	9.04	6.65
1942	6.6	7.97	6.24	8.75	6.47	8.87	6.20	6.71	8.21	6.31
1943	6.7	6.77	6.43	9.97	7.98	9.18	7.44	6.56	8.87	7.67
1944	7.0	6.41	6.83	9.92	7.58	8.07	7.37	6.61	9.04	5.32
1945	7.5	5.30	7.93	8.28	6.70	8.59	8.50	7.16	11.15	6.78
1946	7.3	6.19	7.72	10.55	7.35	9.62	8.09	6.32	9.39	7.33
1947	7.1	6.50	8.82	8.07	7.33	9.09	8.54	5.77	9.65	6.96
1948	6.8	6.77	7.94	7.32	6.66	8.33	7.13	6.18	8.90	6.83
1949	6.9	5.82	7.24	6.79	6.54	7.06	6.46	5.03	9.67	6.35
Average for period	7.11	6.91	7.78	8.57	6.94	8.40	7.48	7.03	8.70	6.54

Source: Federal Power Commission.

Mr. MORSE. These tables, which show ample rates of return, should be answer enough to those who oppose the public power yardstick. The fact of the matter is that the private utilities have prospered continuously in the areas in which public power is concentrated.

Public power has resulted in an expanding economy based upon abundance. It has stimulated private enterprise in the power and industrial fields. This kind of activity represents the best in America.

Under the shortsighted policy of high rates and low consumption, the private utilities would have condemned America to a small and limited future. Under the progressive low-rate policies of the public yardsticks, electricity is beginning to attain its maximum fruitfulness in all fields of human endeavor at a time when defense needs are making a heavy demand upon our potential manpower. Public power and the yardstick mean prices for electricity which the common people and business can afford.

TWENTY PERCENT SURCHARGE

It has been necessary to cover these essential historical facts, and reveal how rates have been cut in half or more, because they bear directly upon the 20-percent surcharge that the utilities have been levying upon electric consumers in Oregon and elsewhere recently.

The surcharge is allegedly designed to offset additional costs incurred in the generation of power in steam plants necessitated by shortages in supply. Of course, the shortages probably would not have occurred but for delays in the full development of public power occasioned by opponents of the program.

Before discussing this 20-percent surcharge, permit me to call attention to the situation relative to commission regulation in Oregon. Oregon has a public utility law that has the customary language about reasonable rates and charges found in most public utility laws. One sentence from it reads:

Every public utility is required to furnish adequate and safe service, equipment, and facilities, and the charges made by any public utility for any heat, light, water, or power * * * furnished * * * shall be reasonable and just, and every unjust or unreasonable charge for such service is prohibited and declared to be unlawful. (Oregon Compiled Laws Annotated, vol. 8, p. 405, art. 112-407.)

So we have the typical State commission law which prohibits unreasonable electric rates.

But we also have the usual State law which permits suspension of such safeguards. Let me read the following provision of Oregon public-utility law which permits the commissioner to suspend rates of a public utility:

The Commission may, pending such investigation and determination, order the suspension of the rate or schedule of rates. (Oregon Session Laws for 1949, ch. 81, pp. 91-92.)

The law which provides for protection against unreasonable rates also affords the means to suspend such protection. This makes the public utility law quite ineffective as far as protection to the people is concerned.

REASONABLE RATES

Let us examine the 20 percent surcharge that has recently been levied by the private utilities upon consumers of electricity in my State. Upon the basis of correspondence from my constituents, our citizens are pretty wrought up over this surcharge. They claim it is unjust, unreasonable and discriminatory. At this point, I cite typical objections to the 20 percent surcharge reproduced with my remarks at this point:

Three private power companies are now perpetrating a huge fraud upon the people of Oregon through imposition of the 20 percent surcharge on power bills. I enclose a statement of facts pertaining to the surcharge which I think the public at large should know. The public will never get any information on the true situation by reading the power-company-controlled Portland newspapers. Figures given in this statement have been checked with authoritative sources in the Bonneville Power Administration. I think the public should know that, contrary

to Portland General Electric Co. propaganda, the Federal Government is not responsible for the power shortage or the surcharge.

That is a typical quotation from the kind of complaints I have been receiving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted other material at this point in my remarks, without taking the time to read it. The first item is entitled "The Truth About the 20 Percent Surcharge."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE 20 PERCENT SURCHARGE

On February 4, 1953, customers of the Portland General Electric Co. paid for a full page ad in the Oregonian in which the company attempted to justify the 20 percent surcharge. In this ad the following statement was made:

"In contracting for the sale of power from Government dams, the former Federal administration deliberately took a 'calculated risk' that abnormally low water would not occur, but failed to provide for an equitable sharing of excess costs—by all users in the area—when it did occur."

There are several facts pertaining to the 20 percent surcharge now being levied on customers of several private electric power companies which should be brought to the attention of members of the legislature who are considering this problem and the public at large.

The Bonneville Power Administration sells two kinds of power to the private utilities. There is firm power delivery of which can be guaranteed 365 days a year, which BPA sells to the utilities at a rate of approximately 3.6 mills ($0.0036) per killowatt hour. Firm power is power delivery which can be guaranteed even during periods of low water. There is also interruptible power which BPA sells to the utilities at a rate of approximately 2.1 mills ($0.0021 per kilowatt hour). Interruptible power is power which may have to be cut off during periods of low water because the stream flow is not available to generate it.

The fact is that in 1942, and subsequently, this former Federal administration offered the private utilities firm power contracts and the utilities turned the offer down. The business managed private utilities gambled that BPA would have so much power that it would be a drug on the market; they could get all the BPA power they wanted at the low rate; they could sell it to the public at the same rate as firm power; they could make a lot more money. It was good business management.

The private utilities did not want firm power because they did not want BPA to make any stipulations concerning resale rates. They did not want BPA to have access to their accounting to insure that savings on low-cost power from Government plants were pased along to the consumer as provided in section 5 of the Bonneville Project Act. The private utilities cannot influence or dictate to the Federal Government regarding retail rates, as they do to the State public utilities commissioner.

The PUD's, REA's, and the aluminum plants in the area contracted to buy firm power and they were willing to pay the higher rate for it. They have been paying the high rate for years.

The private utilities gambled with the welfare of their customers and lost. Now that some of their interruptible power has been cut off, they are crying discrimination because the PUD's and REA's, under competent management, are able to deliver hydropower to their customers. Customers of the private utilities who lost the gamble, are now paying the cost of incompetent business management through the 20-percent surcharge.

Furthermore, the private utilities are now trying to get the national administration in Washington, D. C. to force BPA's firm power customers to share the high cost of steam generation, made necessary by the short-sighted business policies of the private utilities. There is no justice in it. The PUD's, etc., have been paying the higher rate for firm power for the last 10 years, while the private utilities have been selling the public the lower rate interruptible power. Instead of putting on the 20 percent surcharge, the private utilities should be made to pay any excess costs for steam generation out of the excess profits they made by selling low rate interruptible power during the last 10 or 12 years.

The Mountain States Power Co. also got in on the 20 percent surcharge. These power companies scream loud and long for free enterprise; yet they don't want it at all. Everyone knows that competition is the life of free enterprise. The power companies want absolute monopoly of the electric business. The Mountain States Power Co. put the 20 percent surcharge on all their customers, except those living in Springfield and Tillamook. Now it costs just as much to supply the residents of Springfield with steam-generated power as it does to supply their other customers. But in Springfield there is free enterprise; there is competition with the municipal power system. So the residents of Springfield are not required to share the 20-percent surcharge assessed on other Mountain States Power Co. customers. If the State public-utilities commissioner were performing his duty to protect the public interest, he would see to it that if the surcharge is justified against one group of customers, it will be levied on all customers alike; including those who live in Springfield and Tillamook.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the appeal made to the Oregon Public Utility Commission by a local Oregon grange, which states the problem clearly.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As a result of a proceeding before the public utilities commissioner the defendant was permitted to increase its rates by adding surcharges amounting variously to 10 percent or 20 percent on all billings to its customers on rates formerly lawfully established and has imposed such surcharges from December 1952 to the present. The effect of these surcharges in the aggregate has been to increase the gross revenues of the company by an estimated $400,000 by March 1, 1953, and the increase in its aggregate gross revenues will by May 1953 be approximately $550,000.

The reasons given by the defendant Mountain States Power Co. for imposing these surcharges upon its customers were that the critical water conditions in the 3 months of October, November, and December 1952 had increased the costs of its production of energy for sale to its customers to an amount in excess of such costs in a normal or median water year. The authority to institute the surcharges was granted by the commissioner without formal hearing upon representation of the company that its costs in excess of those in a median water year would amount to some $650,000.

The complainants would respectfully show to the commissioner that the defendant company grossly overestimated and overstated the excess of its power generation costs over those normally experienced in a year of median water conditions. Complainants would show that in the years 1949–50 to 1950–51 and 1951–52 the water conditions in the Pacific Northwest were substantially above normal or median water conditions, so that in each of these years the power generation costs of the defendant company were less than those of normal water conditions and consequently the company's net earnings were above those which it had a right to expect under a normal water cycle. Complainants would further show that the required earnings that the company requested and was authorized to charge as a surcharge upon its billings were computed on the basis of the recent favorable years instead of the costs they would have experienced in a median or normal year, this having the effect of inflating the increment beyond any charge adequate to maintain the company's normal earnings. And complainants aver that by this process the company is being permitted to exact charges from its customers which are excessive and exorbitant by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Complainants would also show to the commissioner that the adverse water conditions of 1952–53 prevailed only during the months of October, November, and December, 1952. Immediately thereafter water conditions changed, rainfall and runoff increased, stream flows went far above those of a normal or median water year and as a result defendant company was enabled in January and in February to cease its generation or purchase of high-cost supplies of energy. In a normal year the defendant would be subject to some cost for generation of steam electric energy during the months of January and February. As a result the company's present situation from the standpoint of its earnings is better than it reasonably has the right to expect in a median water year so that a portion of the excess earnings for January and February 1953, together with the entire surcharge of these months, should be recaptured under section 112–4, 104 of the Oregon Code to be placed in a reserve to be credited to the relief of its customers against whom the surcharges were imposed.

The complainants would further show unto the commissioner that the defendant, Mountain States Power Co., in contravention of the provisions 112–463 of the code of Oregon demands, collects, and receives from persons, firms, and corporations throughout Oregon, residing outside of Springfield, for a like and contemporaneous service under substantially similar conditions to those existing at Springfield either 10- or 20-percent surcharges on all billings, which practice causes an undue and unreasonable advantage and preference to persons and firms located at Springfield, and an undue, unreasonable, and unjust discrimination and prejudice against persons and firms served by the defendant company in other parts of the State.

The complainants would also respectfully show to the commissioner that the rates, tolls, charges, and schedules of the defendant Mountain Power States Co. are excessive and unreasonable as the result of the following facts or circumstances:

1. The valuation and rate base of the company is inflated over and above any prudent investment necessary and proper to enable the company to render adequate and efficient service to the public.

2. The operating expenses of the company in each of the recent years are and have been inflated by the inclusion therein of large amounts of moneys in the nature of political expenditures, unnecessary and improvident advertising items, excessive management salaries, excessive expenditures for entertainment, much of which is also expended for the political advantage of the company and its management and for general propaganda purposes in opposition to agencies of the region which attempt to render electric service at cost.

3. The depreciation fund of the company does not accord with Oregon Code 112–417 wherein it is required that proper and adequate rates of depreciation be ascertained and determined for the several classes of property of the utility, and therefore the company has collected an unreasonable

amount of depreciation which has reflected itself in excessive rates, tolls and charges to customers of the company.

Complainants would also show that the defendant Mountain States Power Co. in contravention of the provisions of 112-463; 112-407; 112-448; 112-465 and 112-472 of the Code of Oregon demands, collects and receives from persons, firms and corporations throughout its service area in Oregon residing outside of Springfield, for a like and contemporaneous service under substantially similar conditions to those existing at Springfield an appreciable higher charge or rate schedule in all classifications of about 20 percent on all billings, entirely aside from any present surcharge, which practice causes an undue and unreasonable advantage and preference to persons and firms located at Springfield, and an undue, unreasonable and unjust discrimination and prejudice against persons and firms served by the defendant company in other parts of the State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks an article from the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin for March 1953, entitled "Oregon People Oppose Surcharge."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON PEOPLE OPPOSE SURCHARGE

UNFAIR SURCHARGES BACKFIRE

In 1935 the State of Oregon had the lowest electric rates in the entire Nation. But in the past 17 years, despite the advent of two-mill power from the Bonneville Power Administration, the average electric rate in Oregon has failed to keep up with the national average. By 1952 Oregon had slipped to third place.

Not until the steam-surcharge issue came to the fore last month did the people of Oregon become fully aware of the problem.

Sensing danger when the first complaints against the 20-percent steam surcharge began coming in, the three major private utilities of Oregon immediately unleashed a broad propaganda attack upon the public agencies and upon the Federal Government.

A PGE vice president exhorted his Oregon City audience by urging that they should be aroused because they are paying for power which is used in Seattle and other municipalities. The PGE chairman of the board accused the Interior Department of deliberately engineering the power shortage and of using completely erroneous Federal power marketing practices.

THE PUBLIC REACTS

By mid-February Mr. Glen Allen began using his radio chain in the Willamette Valley by attacking the private company practices. Representative Monroe Sweetland filed a formal complaint against PGE before the Oregon Public Utilities Commissioner. Similar complaints were filed against the Mountain States Power Company.

Three bills popped up in the Oregon legislature aimed at preventing future surcharges.

Meanwhile about two-thirds of an estimated $5,000,000 in surcharges has already been collected.

As this issue goes to press the immediate furore on the surcharge has died but the stage is set for an inquiry by the people of Oregon into the reasons for their high electric rates. Why and how did Oregon slip from first place in the Nation to third?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without going into too much detail, I want to read one or two sentences from the exhibits which I have introduced this afternoon:

The Mountain States Power Co. put the 20-percent surcharge on all their customers, except those living in Springfield and Tillamook. Now, it costs just as much to supply the residents of Springfield with steam-generated power as it does to supply their other customers. But in Springfield there is free enterprise; there is competition with the municipal power system. So the residents of Springfield are not required to share the 20-percent surcharge assessed on other Mountain States Power Co. customers. If the State public utilities commissioner were performing his duty to protect the public interest, he would see to it that if the surcharge is justified against one group of customers, it will be levied on all customers alike; including those who live in Springfield and Tillamook.

Mr. President, this protest, however, should have included The Dalles. All consumers in The Dalles served by the Pacific Power & Light Co. are also exempt from payment of any surcharge because of the public utility district which operates a competing system in The Dalles.

So, the rate is 20 percent higher for the people where there is no public power distribution yardstick and 20 percent lower where there is a public power yardstick—in this case, a public utility district.

TRIBUTE TO W. GORDON ALLEN

I want to take this opportunity of paying tribute to W. Gordon Allen and his splendid broadcasting stations, KGAE, KSGA, and KGAL, that broadcast in the Salem, Lebanon, Redmond, and Bend areas. In line with the Federal radio law under which he operates, assuredly the public interest, convenience, and necessity are served when he broadcasts these vital power facts to the people.

CONCLUSION

The public power yardstick exists because it is performing an essential public service. Public power exists because it has produced and distributed more power and better service for less money than ever before in the history of our Nation. Like all other institutions, it will cease to exist when it no longer serves such an indispensable need that promotes the general public welfare. In the face of the breakdown of State and local regulation—of which the 20-percent surcharge is a serious example, in my judgment, of a violation of the best interests of the public—the public power yardstick is imperative to inject a measure of competition in the great monopoly field of electric power to keep our rates low, at the same time that ample power makes America strong and helps keep it free.

Mr. President, I have discussed the problem of the public power yardstick this afternoon because I am greatly concerned about the propaganda I read in the advertisements of the private utilities these days, which is aimed at weakening the public power projects in the estimation of public opinion.

Their advertising program is snide but clever. They found that surveys of public opinion show that the people are not opposed to TVA and are not opposed to multiple-purpose self-liquidating dams, but that they are opposed to what is called creeping socialism. So when appeals were made, by way of fear argument, to the emotions of the American people, they could get a favorable response to a charge or an accusation that the Government was seeking to lead the American people down the road of creeping socialism.

A reading of some of the confidential instructions to their members shows how clever they have been in this advertising program, in proceeding to advise and instruct their private utility membership that it would be smart to link the public power yardstick to the propaganda charge of creeping socialism.

Mr. President, I believe the people will see through it. They will see through it before it is too late. They will realize that the building of a great, multiple-purpose dam on the Snake River, for example, the Hells Canyon Dam, for which I have been fighting in the Senate for the past several years, is not creeping socialism, but, to the contrary, would result in a great strengthening of private enterprises in the Pacific Northwest, in that the cheap power made available by its construction would bring about the establishment of many new businesses and wealth-creating private enterprises which would never exist if we wasted the great power potential of the Snake River. We will waste it, Mr. President, if we let the Idaho Power & Light Co. build five low-head dams which will not begin to develop the great kilowatt potential of the Snake River, but the construction of which will remove for all time the possibility of building Hells Canyon Dam.

Yet the private utilities are spouting their false propaganda about "creeping socialism," and the attempt, which I discussed last week on the floor of the Senate, is being made by industrialists such as Charles Wilson, of General Electric Corp., to sell these people's projects and turn them over to private monopoly.

I was very much amused at the newspaper dispatches, at least, of Mr. Wilson's reply to my speech. He said that I was "off the beam" in making my suggestion that he was seeking to have these projects sold to the private utilities. Well, Mr. President, let Mr. Wilson's own proposal speak for itself. That would be the end result, and Mr. Wilson knows it. He also knows that today that is the propaganda line of the private utilities of the United States.

What really bothered Charley Wilson was that in the Senate of the United States there is someone who is willing to call Mr. Wilson's hand; that in the Senate of the United States there is someone who dares tell the American people that Charley Wilson is trying to sell them political soap, and that he is part and parcel of the snide propaganda advertising line of the private utilities that are seeking to shake down the American people by getting them to pay tribute to the private utilities, when our people should simply pay themselves by way of cheap electric-power rates, and should collect their own dividends on their own legacy and heritage in the great wealth of the streams of the Nation, so far as their potential generating power is concerned. That wealth belongs to the people of the United States, not to Charley Wilson and his ilk, as represented by General Electric Corp. and the other corporations which would like to obtain control of the people's projects, the preservation of which is necessary if the

public-power yardstick is to be maintained and retained. If the people lose it, then—as is clearly shown by the material which I have discussed here today—in all probability the people will pay much more, by way of electric rates, than they have to pay in the areas which are jointly served by private utilities and by public utilities working side by side in keeping with the true spirit of the American competitive system.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, and in accordance with the order previously entered, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday next.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 6, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 2, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, of Texas, to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, effective April 11, 1953.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Joseph E. Talbot, of Connecticut, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1953, vice John Price Gregg, deceased.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Kenton R. Cravens, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 2, 1953:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

William Howard Taft III, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Ray M. Gidney, of Ohio, to be Comptroller of the Currency.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

John Roger Lewis, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Glen E. Edgerton, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors, Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the remainder of the term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1955.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Chan Gurney, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1958, appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

Harmar D. Denny, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the remainder of the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1953.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

John C. Doerfer, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1947.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Samuel Spencer, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 2, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, inspire us during these days with the humble spirit and the contrite heart when we call to mind the redemptive ministry of our blessed Lord who gave His life upon the cross a willing and acceptable sacrifice for the sins of the world.

Grant that this Holy Week may be for all of us not only a time of commemoration but of renewed consecration and desire to have a larger part in lifting and leading mankind out of darkness and bondage into the glorious light and liberty of the Son of God.

Give us the calm and courageous assurance that those nobler instincts and capacities with which we have been created will some day be victorious and may the kingdoms of this earth become the kingdom of the Prince of Peace.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On March 31, 1953:

H. J. Res. 226. Joint resolution to extend until July 1, 1953, the time limitation upon the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions which but for such time limitation would be in effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950.

On April 1, 1953:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1953 shall take effect 10 days after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution; and

H. J. Res. 229. Joint resolution authorizing the Architect of the Capitol to permit certain temporary construction work on the Capitol Grounds in connection with the erection of a building on privately owned property adjacent thereto.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1110. An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes.

INTERIM AUTHORITY OF THE SPEAKER AND THE CLERK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 13, 1953, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INTERIM AUTHORITY TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until April 13, 1953, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1953—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 120)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953, prepared in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

The reorganization plan is designed to achieve two primary objectives. The first is to improve the organization of the Executive Office of the President. The second is to enable one Executive Office agency to exercise strong leadership in our national mobilization effort, including both current defense activities and readiness for any future national emergency.

The National Security Resources Board was established by the National Security Act of 1947 to advise the President concerning various aspects of future military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. The areas of responsibility assigned to the Board included the use of national and industrial resources for military and civilian needs; the sufficiency of productive facilities; the strategic relocation of industries; the mobilization and maximum utilization of manpower; and the maintenance and stabilization of the civilian economy.

The vigorous and efficient discharge of these vital functions is not well served by the simultaneous existence in the Executive Office of the President of the National Security Resources Board (charged with planning for the future) and the present Office of Defense Mobili-

zation (charged with programs of the present). The progress of the current mobilization effort has made plain how artificial is the present separation of these functions.

Both functions should now be combined into one defense mobilization agency. Accordingly, the reorganization plan would create in the Executive Office of the President a new agency, to be known as the Office of Defense Mobilization. It would transfer to the new office the functions of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and abolish that Board, including the offices of Chairman and Vice Chairman.

The reorganization plan also transfers to the new agency the statutory functions of the present Office of Defense Mobilization. These are of a minor nature, the major functions of the present Office of Defense Mobilization having been delegated to it by the President, principally under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. It is my intention to transfer the latter functions to the new agency by Executive order, and to abolish the Office of Defense Mobilization established by Executive Order No. 10193. There will thus result a new agency which combines the activities of the National Security Resources Board and both the statutory and delegated functions of the heretofore existing Office of Defense Mobilization.

The proposed plan would also reorganize various activities relating to the stockpiling of strategic and critical materials. Those activities are principally provided for in the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended. It has become increasingly apparent that the policy and program aspects of stockpiling are an integral part of mobilization planning. They should not be administered separately from plant expansion, conservation of materials, and materials procurement under the Defense Production Act of 1950, or from the duties placed in the National Security Resources Board by the National Security Act of 1947. Therefore, the reorganization plan would transfer to the Director of the new Office of Defense Mobilization responsibility for major stockpiling actions, including the determination of the nature and quantities of materials to be stockpiled. In the main, these functions are transferred from the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force (acting jointly through the agency of the Munitions Board) and the Secretary of the Interior. The duties of the Administrator of General Services regarding the purchase of strategic and critical materials and the management of stockpiles are not affected by the reorganization plan, except that he will receive his directions, under the plan, from the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization instead of from the Department of Defense.

This transfer of stockpiling functions will correct the present undesirable confusion of responsibilities. The functions of the heads of the military departments of the Department of Defense and the Secretary of the Interior under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended, are at present in considerable measure subject to other authority of delegates of the President springing from the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. The allocation and distribution of scarce materials among essential civilian and military activities and the continued maintenance of adequate stockpiles of strategic and critical materials are of major current importance. The reorganization plan will make possible more effective coordination and close control over the Government's whole stockpile program. It will speed decisions. It can result in significant economies.

The Department of Defense will, of course, continue to be responsible for presenting the needs of the military services. That Department and the Department of the Interior are specifically designated in the plan as additional agencies which shall appoint representatives to cooperate with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization in determining which materials are strategic and critical and how much of them is to be purchased. Final authority with regard to such determination will, however, be in the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Section 5 (a) of the reorganization plan withholds from transfer to the Director and abolishes the functions of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board with regard to being consulted by and furnishing advice to the President concerning the placing of orders of mandatory precedence for articles or materials for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States or for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, and with regard to determining that a plant, mine or other facility can be readily converted to the production or furnishing of such articles or materials. These abolished functions were vested in the National Security Resources Board by section 18 of the Selective Service Act of 1948—later renamed as the Universal Military Training and Service Act—and were transferred to the Chairman of that Board by Reorganization Plan No. 25 of 1950. The practical effect of this abolition is to obviate a statutory mandate that the President consult and advise with another officer of the executive branch of the Government.

Section 5 (b) of the reorganization plan abolishes the direction, authority, and control of the Secretary of Defense over functions transferred from the Department of Defense by the reorganization plan. The Secretary's functions in this regard are provided for in section 202 (b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (5 U. S. C. 171a (b)).

Section 5 (c) of the reorganization plan abolishes any functions which were vested in the Army and Navy Munitions Board or which are vested in the Munitions Board with respect to serving as the agent through which the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and the Interior jointly act in determining which materials are strategic and critical under the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended, and the quality and quantities of such materials to be stockpiled. These abolished functions are provided for in section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, as amended.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended. I have also found and hereby declare that by reason of these reorganizations it is necessary to include in the reorganization plan provisions for the appointment and compensation of a Director and a Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. The rates of compensation fixed for these officers are, respectively, those which I have found to prevail in respect of comparable officers of the executive branch of the Government.

The reorganization plan will permit better organization and management of the Federal programs relating to materials and requirements and will thus help to achieve the maximum degree of mobilization readiness at the least possible cost. It is not practicable, however, to itemize, in advance of actual experience, the reductions of expenditures to be brought about by the taking effect of the reorganizations included in Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953.

I urge that the Congress allow the proposed reorganization plan to become effective.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 2, 1953.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3 OF 1953

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled, April 2, 1953, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949, as amended)

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

SECTION 1. Establishment of Office: (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a new agency which shall be known as the Office of Defense Mobilization, hereinafter referred to as the Office.

(b) There shall be at the head of the Office a Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, hereinafter referred to as the Director, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall receive compensation at the rate of $22,500 per annum.

(c) There shall be in the Office a Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum, shall perform such functions as the Director shall designate, and shall act as Director during the absence or disability of the Director or in the event of a vacancy in the office of the Director.

SEC. 2. Transfer of functions: There are hereby transferred to the Director:

(a) All functions of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, including his functions as a member of the National Security Council, but excluding the functions abolished by section 5 (a) of this reorganization plan.

(b) All functions under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. 98 et seq.), vested in the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Interior or in any of them or in any combination of them, including the functions which were vested in the Army and Navy Munitions Board by the item No. (2) in section 6 (a) of the said act (60 Stat. 598), but excluding functions vested in the Secretary of the Interior by section 7 of said act.

(c) The functions vested in the Munitions Board by section 4 (b) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 714b (h)) and by section 204 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U. S. C. 485 (e)).

(d) All functions now vested by any statute in the Director of Defense Mobilization or in the Office of Defense Mobilization provided for in Executive Order No. 10193 (15 F. R. 9031).

SEC. 3. Performance of transferred functions: (a) The Director may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Office, of any function of the Director, exclusive of the function of being a member of the National Security Council.

(b) When authorized by the Director, any function transferred to him by the provisions of this reorganization plan (exclusive of the function of being a member of the National Security Council) may be performed by the head of any agency of the executive branch of the Government or, subject to the direction and control of any such agency head, by such officers, employees, and organizational units under the jurisdiction of such agency head as such agency head may designate.

(c) In addition to the representatives who by virtue of the last sentence of section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. 98a (a)), and section 2 of this reorganization plan are designated to cooperate with the Director, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the heads of such other agencies having functions regarding strategic or critical materials as the Director shall from time to time designate, shall each designate representatives who shall similarly cooperate with the Director.

SEC. 4. Records, property, personnel, and funds: There shall be transferred with the functions transferred by this reorganization plan from the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board and the Department of Defense, respectively, so much of the records, property, personnel, and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, and other funds, used, held, employed, available, or to be made available in connection with the said functions, as the Director shall determine to be required for the performance of the transferred functions by the Office, but all transfers from the Department of Defense under the foregoing provisions of this section shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 5. Abolition of functions: (a) The functions of the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board under section 18 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 U. S. C. App. 468), as affected by Reorganization Plan No. 25 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1280), with respect to being consulted by and furnishing advice to the President as required by that section, are hereby abolished.

(b) So much of the functions of the Secretary of Defense under section 202 (b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, as consists of direction, authority, and control over functions transferred by this reorganization plan is hereby abolished.

(c) Any functions which were vested in the Army and Navy Munitions Board or which are vested in the Munitions Board with respect to serving as agent through which the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Interior jointly act, under section 2 (a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended, are hereby abolished.

SEC. 6. Abolition of National Security Resources Board: The National Security Resources Board (established by the National Security Act of 1947, 61 Stat. 499), including the offices of Chairman and Vice Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, is hereby abolished, and the Director shall provide for winding up any outstanding affairs of the said Board or offices not otherwise provided for in this reorganization plan.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO LIMIT THE SPENDING POWER OF THE CONGRESS

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to limit the spending power of the Congress—except for military purposes—to 5 percent of the national income. The amendment would in addition place specific limitation on the authority of the Congress to obligate the credit of the United States, except upon a two-thirds vote of both Houses. An identical resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 61—has been introduced in the other body by Senator TAFT and Senator FERGUSON.

Such an amendment would constitute a frontal approach upon the problem of how to force economy, a balanced budget and sound fiscal planning. I am hoping that the Congress, after the Easter recess, will give close attention and prompt heed to this resolution and the proposed amendment.

RESIDENCE FOR THE UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, upon reading in various newspapers that the State Department plans to build or to buy a residence for our representative to the United Nations for some $300,000, I added a postscript to a letter which I have just written to our Ambassador, Mr. Lodge, asking about it. His reply has just been received and reads as follows:

UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS,
New York, N. Y., March 31, 1953.

The Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR FRANCES: Thank you for your letter of March 27, with its "P. S." The terrific thing that exploded all over the Hill is wholly erroneous. I would never approve of any arrangement which would not be advantageous to the American taxpayer. I issued a statement to that respect at once.

It came as a complete surprise to me, and I suppose is part of my education in the idiotic things that happen in a bureaucracy. I would appreciate anything you could do to spread the truth among your friends.

The one thing I am not trying to do is to increase the expenses of the Government. My whole effort is in the opposite direction.

Faithfully yours,

HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr.,
Ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, I trust this will clear the matter thoroughly and that we shall have greater confidence in the good sense and sanity of our Government.

FEDERAL TAXES VERSUS STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, State and local governments are the very backbone of our system of government.

Yet in recent years, the relentless growth of the Federal Government has all but smothered the States and their subdivisions. In 1915 the Federal Government took only 30 percent of the country's local taxes, leaving 70 percent to State and local governments. But now the Federal Government takes 77 percent of the total and the State and local governments are forced to get along on the remaining 23 percent.

President Eisenhower has asked us to do something about it. On Monday he recommended the creation of a special commission to study reallocation of taxes among Federal, State, and local governments. If we really believe in the importance of State and local governments as integral parts of the Federal system, we should move promptly as a Congress to establish this study commission.

NATIONAL MEMORIAL CEMETERY OF THE PACIFIC (HONOLULU)

Mr. FARRINGTON Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific came into being in 1948.

Punchbowl Crater was chosen as the site for this memorial. It is the remains of an extinct volcano which rises dramatically just back of the city of Honolulu. Pearl Harbor, where World War II began, can be clearly seen from the rim of this crater. The site is known among Hawaiians as Puowaina or the Hill of Sacrifice.

It was decided in the 80th Congress that this site was better suited than any other to serve as the final resting place for America's Pacific war dead. Remains of more than 14,000 American boys, who gave their lives to their country, have been interred in this cemetery since Congress first appropriated $1,-

172,000 to prepare the site for this purpose.

The original plans contemplated construction of an amphitheater and other features that would give this site the character of a memorial suitable to the great sacrifice made by those at rest in this cemetery. It has been frequently referred to as the "Arlington of the Pacific." But these plans were postponed because of the outbreak of the Korean war in June of 1950.

Since then interment of boys who have lost their lives in the Korean war is occurring almost daily.

And what has happened in the meantime?

The white crosses which have served traditionally to mark temporarily the graves of the war dead in American military cemeteries have been removed. This was done within a period of a few hours on September 24, 1951. It created a storm of protest from all parts of the country that is still being heard and will continue to be heard until appropriate steps are taken to correct this shameful and needless act.

The appearance of the cemetery, moreover, is growing progressively worse because of inadequate care. Many of the plants are dead and dying. In many places the grass is parched and dry. Thousands of dollars invested in the original landscaping is being lost by inadequate maintenance.

Those immediately responsible for this cemetery—this great war memorial—cannot possibly meet the problem until adequate funds are provided for maintenance.

There can be no excuse for the neglect that has marked the care of this cemetery; no blame except on Congress for its failure to provide the funds necessary for this purpose.

I am, therefore, requesting the Committee on Appropriations in the interest of sound economy, as well as in the name of the families of those American boys who are at rest in this cemetery, to provide at least the funds for proper maintenance until such time as Congress feels the additional expenditures necessary to complete this memorial can be made.

I am, in addition, introducing today a bill to authorize and direct the Department of the Army to restore the white crosses.

The continuation of the use of the white crosses as temporary markers would not establish any precedent. On the contrary, it would be in keeping with the traditional practice in military cemeteries where new interments are being continued. Certainly the use of these crosses in this cemetery is appropriate until such time as the entire area can be converted into the memorial that was originally contemplated.

TRIBUTE TO CLYDE A. TOLSON

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, no Government service anywhere in the world enjoys a higher standing than our country's Federal Bureau of Investigation. The reputation of our FBI has been built upon its record of absolute integrity of personnel, loyalty and devotion to America, and unequaled skill in the discharge of public responsibility.

One of the outstanding men in this branch of our Government is Clyde A. Tolson. Today marks a significant milestone in his career. Mr. Tolson is completing 25 years of outstanding public service as the Associate Director of the FBI. He is just starting on his next 25, and the people of our country owe him an unrepayable debt of gratitude. When you get men like J. Edgar Hoover and Clyde Tolson to work for our Government, you have achieved something permanent and good. These men have attracted splendid people to their department. They have made it a source of pride to all good Americans and a source of fear to every potential lawbreaker. I know that I speak for the people of our country in offering our sincere congratulations to Clyde Tolson for a job well done. From Maine to California, we thank him.

THE NECESSITY FOR TAX REDUCTION NOW

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, tax reduction is one of the first necessities of the Republican administration. It is vital at this time to restore the confidence of the average worker and businessman. In many respects we have reached and passed the law of diminishing returns in the field of taxation. Taxation has become confiscation. Many people are not using their full earning power because they believe they are not working for themselves but for the Government. This is a dangerous public psychology. It can put us on the road down which the British people are marching to mediocrity.

We must first restore public confidence by a definite tax cut of at least 10 percent to spark the best efforts of the American people to produce to full capacity. The worker is becoming discouraged, and the businessman is becoming discouraged, because of the heavy tax load. Tax reduction at this time might actually increase Government revenue by increasing earning power.

I predict that when the petition to bring the tax bill to the floor of the House immediately after the Easter recess is circulated among the Members that it will be signed immediately by the vast majority on both sides of the aisle and that the House will reduce taxes and start the ball rolling toward sanity in taxation.

I include within my remarks herein a letter written by Thomas P. Dallman, of Milwaukee, Wis., to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, at the time that he filed his income-tax return:

FEBRUARY 26, 1953.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Milwaukee, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: This tax is being remitted under protest. I feel no moral obligation to pay such a tax, only a legal obligation under threat of legal action. My reasons should be plain to any intelligent American. Billions of our tax dollars are being showered upon Great Britain to buy their friendship and promote state socialism while Canada, one of the members of the British Commonwealth, which is morally if not economically bound to bail out our British cousins, is cutting taxes by 11 percent. And while we are subsidizing England, among others, she is selling and delivering oil and other war materials to Red China which has been responsible for death and injury of tens of thousands of American sons, brothers, and husbands. When will this insane squandering of American lives and resources come to an end; when will the well run dry?

THOMAS P. DALLMAN,
Milwaukee, Wis.

INCOME TAX RELIEF

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how long our income taxpayers will endure the hostile attitude of those who are blocking tax relief under H. R. 1?

Practically 50 million sovereign citizens on the tax rolls were promised by candidates running for Congress last November that, if elected, they would reduce individual income taxes. I introduced H. R. 1 on the opening day of the 83d Congress to fulfill in good faith that promise.

"It is a great art to know how to sell wind"—Baltasar. Was the Republican promise a mere sale of wind?

MOTOR POOLS FOR GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government today is the largest fleet operator of motor vehicles in the world. Federal agencies own and operate approximately 100,000 automobiles and trucks. These vehicles travel nearly a billion miles each year.

I am convinced that this vast fleet of Government motor vehicles could be much more economically and efficiently operated if the use requirements were consolidated and if all of the vehicles in areas of high density were placed under centralized authority and control.

All the money we appropriate here is deemed necessary. But many of the taxpayers' dollars are spent needlessly and

wastefully. It behooves us to search out the holes in the dike and close them up wherever possible.

I offer a proposal in furtherance of this objective. I have just introduced a bill which I believe will go far toward eliminating waste in government transportation and in the use of furniture and office equipment.

This bill is similar to one which was introduced at the last session by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I have discussed the subject with the gentleman from Ohio and have his permission to introduce this legislation.

The bill I have introduced goes somewhat further than the Brown bill in that I have included a provision which authorizes the Administrator of General Services to adopt and prescribe standards of physical fitness and uniform minimum requirements for the operation of Government vehicles.

This provision was included in my bill to eliminate as nearly as possible incompetent and unsafe operation of motor vehicles. My hope is that by adopting such standards we may be able to reduce the annual vehicle accident rate and thereby produce substantial savings to the Government and reduce the hazards of the highways for all who use them.

To point up the need for this reform, I call attention to the fact that more than one-half million Federal employees have authority to operate motor vehicles on the highways of this country.

In many instances there is no requirement other than that they be on the Federal payroll to constitute their authority to operate motor vehicles in the conduct of Government business.

In other instances, the only requirement is the possession of a State or local operator's license. These are still obtainable in this country in some places for a nominal fee without examinations. Even in those States that require operator's examinations, the scope of the examination is highly varied and all too often involves no actual test of the prospective operator's ability to operate a motor vehicle safely.

I believe we should adopt minimum standards of physical fitness and qualifications that all who would operate Government vehicles should meet.

Another feature of this bill would put teeth into the statutes which deal with the misuse of Government cars for other than public business. While the bill does not intend that the Administrator of General Services shall be called upon to don leather puttees and a uniform and act as a traffic cop, adequate provision is made to punish those who are guilty of misusing Government vehicles. It is quite irritating to the general public to observe Government-owned vehicles being operated on the streets of any city on other than official business. I think firm steps should be taken to hold such misuse of Government vehicles to an absolute minimum.

There is another feature of this bill to which attention should be called. It would authorize the Administrator of General Services, when arranging to move an agency from one location to another, to move only such furniture, furnishings, and office equipment as cannot more efficiently and economically be made available at the new location. This provision would accept the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and many management studies which advise that it is much cheaper to "move the people rather than the furniture" in agency relocations.

But the principal feature of the bill is the authorization for the Administrator of General Services to establish and operate motor vehicle pools for the use of Federal agencies. The General Services Administration has already proved that this plan can be effective. GSA operates and maintains centralized control of its own motor vehicles in the Washington area, and the result has been greatly reduced operating costs. Since the plan has been in effect in GSA, the workload of that agency has materially increased although at the same time the number of vehicles used by the agency has been reduced from 312 to 277. Furthermore, the plan has resulted in reducing passenger car requirements of the GSA in Washington from 36 to 8.

There are other instances of Government operations where motor pools are operated on an intra-agency basis. I am informed by GSA that in each one of these instances such operation has demonstrated increased efficiency and improved economies which would seem to justify completely an extension of the system on an interagency basis.

There are many areas within the United States where there exists a high density of Federal vehicle population restricted to a comparatively small operating area. For example, the bulk of the Federal agencies in the District of Columbia are located within an area of approximately 30 square miles. Similar situations exist in other areas, such as, for example, the concentration of vehicles in the Chicago area. Within that area there are presently being operated some 500 Government owned passenger cars and a number of motor trucks. Similar conditions exist in Denver, San Francisco, New Orleans, Los Angeles, St. Louis, and in many other cities and locations. If the motor vehicles in these areas were properly consolidated into a centralized and well organized and properly managed motor pool, I believe big dollar and cent savings would result to the Government.

In addition to actual savings in money, such procedure would give assurance that the general public will not witness the irritating spectacle of the bureaucrats in various Government agencies vying with each other and all for a lead place in the traffic lanes in a Government car operated at the taxpayers' expense.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Wednesday, April 8, to file a report on H. R. 4004.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LAWRENCE TO LONG BEACH AIR RACES—WOMEN ON THE WING

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, "weaker sex"?

Throw that phrase away. It was just male propaganda all the time.

Many a brave man quails at the thought of standing on a stepladder to wash the outside windows—first floor.

As far as becoming a bird is concerned, he just is not up to it.

Aviation has come a long way since the hedge-hopping Wright brothers first flew through the air, but not with the greatest of ease, back there in 1903. Today we snap necks as we watch the jets streaking by.

The speed of planes now exceeds that of sound, but the women have done even better. They were grounded by jealous males until World War I started a revolution that is still going on. Once they were given the chance, they promptly proceeded to make up for the lost time, and have been amazing us ever since.

This year the little women are leading the sky parade that is celebrating the 50th anniversary of powered flight.

In tribute to the Wright brothers and to the swift progress that aviation has made in the past half century, more than 50 women pilots will take off from the Lawrence, Mass., airport on July 3 on a transcontinental air race to Long Beach, Calif.

Sponsored by the 99's, Inc., this is the first westward flight competition by the clever and courageous ladies who are pioneering in the great tradition of Amelia Earhart.

Lawrence is proud to be selected as the jump-off point for this thrilling test.

We too, are reaching for new horizons, with the enterprising spirit that wants to hasten tomorrow's progress for the service of today.

In step with the air age, we invite progressive industries to join with us and create new opportunities in Lawrence which is on the main line of modern transport.

The Massachusetts Legislature is planning to adopt a resolution that will express in behalf of our Commonwealth, the significance of aviation, our debt to those who made a dream become reality, and our admiration for the women who are taking a leading role in its development.

I ask the Congress of the United States to approve a similar resolution which I am happy to present.

In honor of the far-seeing Wright brothers, of the new freedom they created for us, and of the fine spirit of competitive sportsmanship in all fields which powers our progress, I believe we should give national prominence to this event.

Women's salute to aviation is symbolized by the Lawrence-to-Long Beach air race.

We return the salute by congressional recognition of the up-and-coming

women pilots who are the trail blazers for their sex.

Most women enjoy the reputation of being earth-bound angels, but the 99'ers are really winging through the heavens.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] who just preceded me, regarding the relationship between the Federal, State, and local governments. If the press correctly reports the conference called by President Eisenhower with the mayors of big cities and certain local governmental leaders, he evidently must be rather disappointed, because they told him that they wanted the paternalistic attitude of the Federal Government continued. What does that mean? It means that we will continue to have big government, and big government will get bigger. There is no other result, and the big city mayors and these local government leaders still want the Federal Government to help in various projects which costs millions of dollars. Those millions can only be obtained by high taxes and the tax dollar has a way of losing its value from the time it is collected from the taxpayer until it is returned to pay for some local service. If local government would use that dollar without its round trip to Washington, more value would be received.

Of course, we all realize we have to have Federal assistance for highways, for harbors, for airports, and for a lot of those things which affect national defense, but the local governments are going to get as much from the Federal Government as they can get, yet they want their taxes reduced and they want expenses reduced and all that sort of thing. The two just do not go together. So until the big-city mayors and the local government leaders decide and agree that they should assume their own responsibility and pay for it, we are going to have big government.

I was gratified to see that the distinguished majority leader [Mr. HALLECK] has introduced the bill H. R. 4406 in line with the President's recommendation that a very careful study be given to the matter of Federal-State-local government relationships. Until that is done; until our philosophies change and until greater dependence on ourselves is asserted, we will have big and bigger government in Washington.

I doubt if the attitude of the mayors of the big cities is encouraging to President Eisenhower.

It seems to me the basic fact to remember is that our freedom would be very limited if the United States were governed by only one national authority. In large measure, freedom is the product of local control over local affairs. The principle is established that the Federal Government assumes certain authority and control over that to which it contributes.

INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I think we have safely reached the point where we should have an investigating committee to investigate investigating committees. That is about all there is left uninvestigated. We are making ourselves look somewhat silly, and I question whether we are contributing anything salutary to the public interest by the multiplicity of investigations Congress is conducting. So, I say again, I think it is time for an investigating committee to investigate investigating committees, and I hope this may result in an end to unjustifiable investigating committees.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Easter recess marks the end of the preliminary period, the planting season, so to speak, for the 1st session of the 83d Congress. What we shall harvest remains to be seen.

It would be easy, but hardly fair, to say that the first Republican administration in 20 years has accomplished very little in these first few months of its tenure.

The first few weeks after we convened, and pending the inauguration and state of the Union message from the new President, were devoted to organization of the Congress. And it was not until February 9 that the outlines of a legislative program emerged from a conference of the majority leaders of the Congress with President Eisenhower.

It listed 11 major points on which action at this first session was proposed. On two of these, extension of the President's reorganization powers, and submerged lands, the House has acted favorably; the former being enacted into law and the latter now before the Senate.

Of course, the 11-point program was an informal schedule. It was never intended to be rigid or inflexible, excluding subjects other than those listed.

Nevertheless it is perhaps significant that the program of the majority leadership made no mention of taxes, of budget balancing, or of foreign aid.

The truth is that the Republican Party has come up against the hard facts of reality. It has made the painful discovery, after so many years of gaily flinging bricks from the sidelines, that it is a lot harder to carry the burdens of responsibility; that it is more difficult to administer the affairs of this great Nation than it is to vent destructive criticism at the administrators.

As a consequence it is not surprising that in these early months there has been considerable backing and filling on the part of the new team; of dissensions between at least some of the Republicans in Congress and the Republican administration; of uncertainty and lack of strong leadership.

From this situation the Democratic Party, I assure you, derives little joy. Having for so many years at this critical stage of world affairs carried the fearsome burden of responsibility, we can appreciate the problems faced by the Republicans today.

It has become quite evident by now that the new leadership of our Government finds its principal opposition on many vital issues comes, not from the Democratic Party, but from within its own Republican ranks. This is a matter with which only they themselves can deal.

As for the Democratic Party, we will support those policies and programs that best insure peace, prosperity, and the welfare of the people. We will oppose measures that jeopardize national security for the sake of political expediency. We will not barter the safety of the Nation for budget savings. We will not sacrifice defense needs for the mere sake of economy.

At this hour, when Stalin's successor in the Kremlin is seeking in numerous ways to convince the world that the Soviet's intentions are peaceful, I fervently hope that we shall stand firm in our resolution to build up our own strength. Too often in the past have we weakly harkened to the siren call to bring our boys home, only to pay a tragic cost later.

It is not too much to expect that President Eisenhower, in whom an overwhelming majority of our citizens reposed their confidence last November, will for the sake of the Nation soon resolve or overcome the differences within his own Republican Party.

His position requires also a strong and forthright leadership that points the way for Congress—

On a foreign-aid program that will assure the continued adherence of our allies abroad to the cause of the free nations.

On a revision of the Taft-Hartley law that will put labor-management relations on a sound basis, but on which he has made no recommendations whatever.

On fiscal policies that will resolve the question of lower taxes or a balanced budget, on which likewise there have been no official recommendations to the Congress from the administration.

Let us hope that when we return from this recess the Republican Party's new leadership of the Nation, both in the executive and in the Congress, will begin to lead.

MARKETING OF FARM CROPS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the United States today are in an extremely difficult situation. They have gone all-out in their effort to supply the food and the fibers which their Government told them would be required for our own use in the period of mobilization and for the use of our friends and allies abroad. Now they are finding the demand is not as large as they had been led to expect. Prices are tumbling on all the principal agricultural commodities. To cite a few: cotton prices have declined 18 percent in the last year; wheat, 6 percent; corn and oats, 13 percent; beef cattle, 28 percent; lambs, 24 percent; milk, 9 percent.

In most cases the reason for this drastic decline can be found in the reduction of our agricultural exports.

Cotton is an excellent example of what has happened. Cotton exports for the first half of this current season are only half what they were a year ago. The price has tumbled from over 40 cents a pound down to 33 cents. The price has fallen much faster than the cost of production and the price of the things the farmer buys. There are several reasons for this drop in exports. The price competition from the cotton in other countries has been much keener than it has in previous years because of a somewhat larger supply in the rest of the world. But there is no real surplus of cotton in the world. The biggest reduction in our exports has resulted from a reduction in stocks in the foreign mills. Stocks in foreign mills today are about a million bales below what they were a year ago. Most of the reduction has been in American cotton. The foreign mills suffered huge losses during the last 2 years as a result of a sharp upsurge and then a drastic decline in the world market prices for cotton and textiles. In fact, they lost a great part of their capital and today do not have the resources to carry large inventories. As a result of the experience they are also very cautious and are buying on a hand-to-mouth basis fearing to take further market risks. Unfortunately, the foreign spinners for the most part do not have ready access to dollar exchange and therefore cannot protect themselves against changes in the market price by hedging their cotton purchases on the New York or New Orleans cotton futures exchange. There are no other futures exchanges in the world today which they can use.

I have introduced a bill (H. R. 4147) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to aid the farmers in marketing their crops. This bill seeks to stimulate and facilitate United States exports by providing insurance to protect United States merchants against losses of their merchandise stored in foreign countries as a result of war, confiscation, seizure, and so forth. Insurance protection against these risks is not available at the present time after the merchandise is unloaded from the ship.

This bill was written primarily to encourage cotton exports but it is applicable to all United States exports. There are a number of agricultural commodities that stand to benefit, including fruits and vegetables, tobacco, and possibly wheat and wheat flour. Manufactured commodities could also be included.

This bill would encourage cotton exports in a number of ways. In the first place, it would help United States cotton meet its competition from other growths and from synthetic fibers by permitting exporters to sell on more favorable terms. At the present time most cotton is sold on terms that require payment before shipment. Since foreign-mill capital has been greatly reduced and since the volume of credit is limited and the interest rates are high—from 8 to 12 percent—it is extremely difficult for most foreign mills to finance cotton for a period of several months before they actually use it in the mill. By providing insurance protection for the cotton in foreign countries the United States exporter would then be in a position to sell on deferred payment terms. Foreign mills would very much like to buy on cash-on-arrival terms, for instance, and some may require additional financing. At the present time a few large international firms are selling foreign-growth cotton on deferred-payment terms. Synthetic fiber producers generally sell foreign mills on deferred-payment terms. With this insurance available the American banks have indicated they will be willing to finance sales by United States merchants generally on a deferred-payment basis such as cash on arrival. This will greatly facilitate the ability of the small shipper in the United States in meeting competition. The foreign spinners say such favorable terms would definitely induce them to buy American cotton. They further state that the payment terms offset the price disadvantage to a large extent.

Another advantage of this insurance is that it will permit commercial interests in the United States to assume the cost of rebuilding and maintaining the pipeline stocks for foreign consuming countries. It will cost at least one hundred and fifty to two hundred million dollars to rebuild the cotton pipeline to the level which the foreign mills feel is desirable from the standpoint of security and efficiency. If the foreign countries are required to make available the foreign exchange to rebuild these stocks this will represent a considerable drain on their treasuries. This is one way to transfer the burden of financing foreign governments from the MSA to the private industries. To the extent that it is done it will represent a saving to the United States Government.

Furthermore, because of the lower interest rates and because they can protect themselves by hedging these stocks on the futures exchanges, United States exporters can carry this cotton much cheaper than the foreigners can. This is another way to meet price competition.

It will also be a tremendous advantage in increasing United States cotton sales and also in increasing consumption of United States cotton if this cotton is available for the mills as they need it. Another advantage is that the mills can select the kind of cotton they want.

This measure would not put the Government in competition with private business since commercial insurance companies report they are not in a position to write such policies at the present time. Furthermore, it is contemplated under the proposed program that the Export-Import Bank would simply assume the abnormal or political risks which private companies would not be in a position to assume except at rates which would be prohibitive. In all other respects the program could be handled by commercial companies as agents as they now operate under the special maritime-insurance program.

Under normal conditions the program should not cost the Government anything as premiums charged should be sufficient to cover normal losses. The only cost to the Government would be in the event of very abnormal losses such as would occur in the event of all-out war, in which case the loss would be another cost of war. Even in such eventuality the total loss would doubtless be considerably less than the total amount at risk at any one time, which would be limited to $100 million. This program would not involve any Government expenditure unless and until losses as a result of war, and so forth, exceeded capital built up through premiums.

The coverage of the bill is limited to personal property used in commercial intercourse and located in any friendly nation outside the United States to the extent that such property is owned wholly or in part by citizens of the United States or to the extent that such property constitutes security for financial obligations owed to citizens of the United States in connection with commercial intercourse. The exported commodities to be eligible must originate in the United States.

This measure should definitely stimulate cotton exports and the consumption of United States cotton abroad. In so doing it will be a direct benefit to the cotton farmers. Of course, the entire industry would like to avoid acreage allotments and marketing quotas another year. The only hope is through increasing the off-take and the best possibility is in foreign markets. We cannot say for sure that by this means we will avoid quotas because we do not know what the crop and the total supply will be this year. At least, increasing exports and foreign consumption will hold to a minimum any reduction in acreage under any production-control program.

PUBLIC HOUSING—A BIPARTISAN APPROACH

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the matter of public housing will enter into my remarks today I wish to begin with a reference to the former distinguished Member of this House, the Honorable Albert M. Cole, with whom it was my pleasure to be associated on the membership of the Banking and Currency Committee in the 81st Congress.

The appointment of Mr. Cole as Administrator of Housing and Home Finance raised some concern as Mr. Cole had opposed in committee and on the floor of the House the National Housing Act of 1949.

It will be recalled that the debate on that occasion was one of the most heated of the 1st session of the 81st Congress. Feeling ran so high that at one point two of our beloved and most dignified colleagues, the late Honorable A. J. Sabath and the late Honorable Eugene Cox, engaged in a combat in the well of the House which made the first page headlines.

Under the circumstances, there was a high and unrestrained pitch to the debate on both sides. I think that the gentleman from Kansas in that atmosphere made statements that were to the extreme, and I presume that in my reply thereto my statements, from his viewpoint, were subject to the same criticism. In other words, it was an argument in the good old American way, with both sides pretty well heated up. I think that is the sort of thing which makes possible the functioning of our democracy.

GRADUATE OF CHICAGO UNIVERSITY

I think it is unfair to prejudge our former colleague in his direction of an administrative office by what he said in the passion of a spirited debate on the floor of this House. I confess I have an interest in Mr. Cole. He is a graduate of the University of Chicago, in the district which I represent. What he is and what he stands for and what, as an Administrator, he will accomplish, the University of Chicago, and that means the Second District of Illinois, is in some measure responsible for. Somehow, I feel that a graduate of that great school of learning on the Midway of Chicago cannot go wrong in a matter that concerns the welfare of all of our American people.

Mr. Cole has assured me that he is not in any sense opposed to public housing. He has already in the performance of his new duties declared for a continuance of the public housing building program for the year 1953 on a scale equal to that authorized for the year 1952. Meanwhile, as a friend of public housing, he is making a study of how best to proceed with a program the objective of which is to provide adequate shelter for all of our people within their financial means.

I have confidence in the good intentions of the new Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I, who differed with him in the debate in the 81st Congress, accept and welcome him as the sincere friend of public housing. There may arise occasions on which I will have differences of opinion with him as to procedures and policies, but I hope and believe that always he will recognize that our objective is the same—decent housing for all the people of America within their financial means and nowhere in any place the existence of slums in which to bring up the children of America.

It was reassuring to read in the Wall Street Journal of March 14, 1953, that there will be no major tampering with the present public housing program at this session of the Congress. The Wall Street Journal is as Republican as the Republican Party itself. It is about as far to the right as one can get. The article in the Wall Street Journal says:

As one housing expert on Capitol Hill put it: "The present plan was worked out after long hearings, a lot of debate, and a drawn-out fight; it won't be discarded lightly." Other key legislators agree with this prediction. Senate Majority Leader TAFT, for one, is reported ready to fight to keep the present program relatively intact.

ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR ALL

The fact is that there is not as much disagreement as to the necessity of public housing as most people are led to believe. What most of us are seeking is adequate housing for all of the American people. We all recognize that some people either through their own faults or through conditions over which they have no control have not adequate financial means. To leave these people in slums is to subject their children growing up in the atmosphere of the slums to an unfair disadvantage. Moreover it means the subjection of the children growing up in more favored communities to the unwarranted dangers from crime and disease spreading from the slums to other neighborhoods.

It is a big problem. It is a problem that necessarily entails large expenditures and temporary inconveniences, which are especially sensitive in and around communities where public-housing projects are being established.

In the working out of a problem in which all of our people have a common interest we must from time to time make evaluations. An argument made against the Housing Act of 1949 was that local governments would suffer because they would derive no real-estate-tax revenues from properties in the public-housing projects. It is true that public-housing projects do not pay real-estate taxes, and this would be unfair to the owners of other real-estate properties if there were not provision for the payment to local governments of service charges equivalent to the amount that otherwise would be paid in real-estate taxes. So it was written into the act that public-housing projects should pay to local governments in the way of such service charges an amount calculated to be sufficient to cover the cost of the services furnished. I think that as far as the Chicago public-housing projects are concerned, 10 percent of the shelter rentals are paid over to local governments.

DUTY OF THE CONGRESS

Now it is one thing for the Congress to adopt a formula and another thing for the formula to work realistically under the conditions obtaining in any particular community. Certainly we in the Congress want to know how the laws that we make are actually operating. If we do not have that information we cannot act with the wisdom that is properly expected of us by our constituents.

So when I received the 1952 figures from the Chicago Housing Authority I thought it my duty to report them to this body. In an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I made mention of the fact that the Chicago Housing Authority in the year 1952 had paid $312,669.86 to local governments in lieu of taxes. Also in my remarks I mentioned that some of the families dispossessed because of public improvements had found housing in the Authority's projects.

I do represent a Chicago district and I shall continue to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress factual information bearing upon the achievements of Chicago in every line. Recently, I remarked in the Congress on the report of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry that during the last 2 years $600 million had been expended in the Chicago metropolitan area in industrial-plant expansion. I made mention of this as I did of the item concerning the Chicago Housing Authority as factual information concerning our progress in Chicago which I thought my colleagues should know. I have never understood that it is reprehensible conduct for a Chicago Congressman to say a good word for Chicago.

LETTER OF COMPLAINT

To my surprise, I received a letter in complaint signed by five constituents purporting to speak for a group of young Republicans. I am sure they are earnest and well-meaning and I am glad they are participating in political activity. I think our country needs the active interest in politics of all our young people. In the performance of my duties here I make no distinction among my constituents along political lines. I owe the same serivce to Republicans as to Democrats and Independents. I am helped by their letters in the work that I am trying to do for our district and for our country. I wish my young Republican friends to know that it is in that spirit I make notice of their communication.

The objection which they make to my extended remarks seems based upon their dislike for public housing. In their letter they state:

We consider these projects and activities as counter to the basic tenets of our American system and as destructive of individual dignity and initiative.

As Senator TAFT was the presidential choice of the Republicans of Illinois I presume that my young Republican friends gave him their loyal support in the preconvention days and that after the convention they worked hard for General Eisenhower. I am sure they did not suspect either Senator TAFT or General Eisenhower as being enemies of the basic tenets of our American system or as destroyers of individual dignity and initiative.

General Eisenhower, speaking in Pittsburgh on October 27, 1952, said:

We must have better housing for those Americans who are now forced to live in slums and substandard dwellings.

Following his election and inauguration as President, General Eisenhower, through his new Administrator of Housing and Home Finance, declared for a continuance of the public-housing program.

POSITION OF SENATOR TAFT

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT was a major influence in support of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, under which the public-housing program is now proceeding. Speaking in the United States

Senate on April 21, 1949, Senator TAFT said:

I do not believe that anybody who has studied the question is opposed to public housing.

The five young Republicans who signed the letter to me can take no personal offense at that statement by Senator TAFT since their studies may have been more profound than Senator TAFT's and were made after April of 1949.

Senator TAFT continued:

I notice that the real-estate board of the city of New York has come out in favor of public housing, as I think all real-estate boards should. I think the real-estate people should realize that there is no competition involved in public housing.

Senator TAFT, in apparant disagreement with the five young Republicans who wrote me that public housing was counter to the basic tenets of our American system, further said:

The general theory of subsidizing low-income groups is not a new theory in Anglo-Saxon political life or Anglo-Saxon economic life. It is accepted in every State of the Union, and it does not involve any departure in principle from that which we have pursued during the 150 years of the life of the Republic.

Senator TAFT continued:

I think all of us acknowledge the duty of the community to take care of those who are unable to take care of themselves. We do have an interest, I think, in providing equal opportunity for all the children of families who are brought into being in the United States.

Senator TAFT continued:

I believe that a Federal policy of welfare service is justified to the point of assisting the States to see that that job is well and systematically done, and that the field is properly covered.

I will not take the time of the House to quote all of the remarks in the other body by Senator TAFT on April 21, 1949, but I think that I should bring to the attention especially of the five young Republicans who are in disagreement this final quotation from Senator TAFT's remarks:

I believe that we should adopt this 6-year program (National Housing Act, 1949) in spite of its cost of $300 million a year for the next 40 years.

WELFARE OF ALL OF US

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I should apologize to the House for taking so much of its time for the political education of my young Republican friends. I shall never believe that concern for the welfare of all of the American people is the exclusive attribute of any political party. I think that young Republicans should know of the fight that Senator TAFT made for public housing even when its administration was in Democratic hands. I think that young Republicans who rang doorbells for General Eisenhower should know more about his position on public housing before seeking to take political issue with a Democratic Congressman over something that transcends narrow partisan concern.

As a contribution to this study which, Mr. Speaker, I trust all of us are making to the problem of adequate housing for all of our people, I am extending my remarks to include a tabulation of the payments in lieu of taxes made by the Chicago Housing Authority projects for the year 1952 compared with property taxes before development. This tabulation shows that from the areas of 16 public housing projects there was derived by local governments in real-estate taxes a total of $138,668, and that in 1952 the housing projects in the said 16 areas paid to local governments in lieu of taxes a gross of $312,669.86. In other words the housing projects, in addition to their much larger contribution in diminishing the expense of local governments incident to disease and crime and fire, have actually paid into the coffers of local governments $174,001.86 more than the areas occupied by them in the last year before their redemption from the slums. The tabulation speaks for itself. It follows:

Property taxes before development compared with payments in lieu of taxes, Chicago Housing Authority projects

Project	Dwelling units	Last annual tax bill [1]	Payments in lieu of taxes [2]
Total	9,311	$138,668	$312,669.86
Jane Addams Houses	1,027	19,457	37,473.35
Altgeld Gardens	1,450	[3] 2,566	39,887.44
Bridgeport Homes	141	[3] 2,426	5,035.02
Robert H. Brooks Homes	834	18,780	30,440.25
Frances Cabrini Homes	584	12,667	19,284.89
Dearborn Homes	800	11,819	28,688.39
Harrison Courts	126	[4]	4,060.31
Julia C. Lathrop Homes	925	18,351	35,717.76
Lawndale Gardens	128	[3] 2,381	4,713.15
Leclaire Courts	316	[3] 1,328	11,503.59
Maplewood Courts	132	[3] 2,304	4,299.77
Ogden Courts	136	2,361	1,005.72
Racine Courts	121	[3] 384	3,784.17
Trumbull Park Homes	462	[3] 1,923	13,462.42
Ida B. Wells Homes	1,658	35,630	41,596.91
Wentworth Gardens	422	[3] 6,271	13,736.52

[1] Amount billed to private owners before development; of the total taxes billed, 22 percent remained unpaid.
[2] Amounts paid to local government in lieu of taxes for calendar year 1951 at rate of 10 percent of rents less cost of utilities.
[3] Built on vacant land.
[4] Built on tax-exempt school property.

RESIDUAL OIL

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the current series of atom-bomb tests is a commendable project in that it brings to the attention of the American people the destructive power of modern weapons, while providing the military with invaluable scientific data necessary for the conduct of our defense program. The splendid cooperation on the part of the television, radio, and newspaper industries has given each of us a new meaning of the horrors that another war would bring, and a new understanding of the importance of adequate preparedness in these days of uncertainty.

In the interest of the Nation it is equally essential that weaknesses in our defense structure be exposed to the general public. I therefore suggest that the spotlight be transferred from the sands of Nevada to the harbors of our east coast for a spectacle that is serving to nullify the best-laid plans of our military men and our scientists. Television and press cameramen will find at docks pictures of tankers that are unloading destruction in the form of foreign residual oil, for that oil is displacing domestic fuel and demoralizing the American coal and railroad industries. This foreign agent is weakening our defense efforts as effectively as if it were a Kremlin-directed maneuver, and unless countermeasures are swiftly adopted by the Congress there is going to be a new kind of ammunition shortage in the United States if another emergency develops.

Without coal there can be no atom bombs, nor airplanes, nor tanks. Coal provides almost half of our supply of toluene—the second "T" in TNT. It is the primary fuel for the generation of electricity in our war plants, our office buildings, schools, churches, and homes. It will eventually, when our synthetic-fuels program becomes a reality, be the principal source of gasoline and other products that now come from petroleum.

Without adequate coal supplies, no nation can defend herself from outside aggression. But by the strange policy of allowing unlimited quantities of residual oil to be imported into this country, we yield to the dismantling of the industry that must provide us with those vital supplies.

Foreign residual oil is closing mines and driving the labor force from coal communities. This is a destructive force that should receive national notoriety. When the American people realize the extent of the damage that it creates, the resultant repercussions will surely stimulate corrective action. I hope that such action will come before it is too late.

I subscribe to the quota-limitation provisions on residual oil in the bill introduced last Monday by Congressman SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, whose district is adjacent to the one I represent, and I trust that these provisions will be strongly supported by all Members regardless of political affiliation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today following the special orders heretofore entered.

WILLIAM OATIS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, this discussion today very appropriately should come on April 23, because that would mark the second anniversary of the arrest and imprisonment of William Oatis. So for that reason and before the Easter recess when we think of the risen Lord and the Resurrection, and the new life,

I would like to bring to the attention of the House the chronological situation involving William Oatis, and also the status of the case as I view it and as many of us view it today.

First of all, a brief chronological review of the case. It was on April 23, 1951, that William Oatis was missed from his office and his residence in Prague, Czechoslovakia, where he had been sent and assigned as an Associated Press correspondent. After 2 days the American Embassy in Prague was informed of his disappearance. The Embassy, orally and also by formal note to the Czech Ministry of Foreign Affairs, requested advice on his disappearance. Following that the Czech Ministry informed the American Ministry that Oatis was detained "for having carried out activities hostile to the Czechoslovak State involving the use of Czech employees in the AP office in securing and verifying secret reports, acquiring and disseminating illegal press material, and utilizing Czech employees for similar purposes." Now, those were the charges.

William Oatis was merely doing that which any good reporter would do, finding sources of information and using them. What he failed to do was to go to only one source of information, the Bureau of Information, or whatever title it may be, to get the same information which in turn is given out to their press, but William Oatis was a true newspaperman and he went to other people and, of course, they charged him.

Immediately afterward the American Embassy expressed astonishment at the arrest and sought to protect the rights of this American citizen. They requested permission for a consular officer to visit him and also asked whether an American lawyer would be permitted to represent him in Czechoslovakia, all of which was denied by the Czechoslovak Government.

On the following day, April 27, the American Embassy again requested the Foreign Office to use its good graces to transmit certain articles for Oatis' comfort; and, of course, that, too, was denied. Finally, on July 2 and 3, there was a trial which was termed by our own State Department as a "ludicrous travesty on justice." The United States defense counsel was denied and instead they provided a counsel who actually gave no defense of William Oatis in any respect.

The only record which we have of the trial there was that taken by two members of the United States Embassy in the rear of the room, some 40 feet distant from the witness. So we can appreciate how little and how inaccurate that record was. However, it was recorded in one of the State Department journals a month or two later.

On July 4, our own Independence Day, independence and freedom were taken away from Bill Oatis and he was sentenced to a Czechoslovak prison in Prague, Czechoslovakia for 10 years, and there he remains today.

I would like to recount, if I may briefly, some of the State Department actions that were taken under the past administration. These all have come to me, frankly, from press releases; I cannot say that they came to me from the State Department, because in the past it was very difficult to get very much, if any, information from that agency. But on April 25, the American Embassy in Prague requested the investigation of Oatis' disappearance, and on the following day, April 26, after report of his detention, the American Embassy, as I said previously, expressed astonishment, and was refused an attorney for Oatis.

On June 2 there was a press release, No. 467, which prohibited travel by American citizens in Czechoslovakia until further notice. That, by the way, was one of the first steps which was taken by the past State Department in determining to invoke some penalty on Czechoslovakia because they had arrested by a mock-trial process William Oatis.

Then there was another press release coming from the State Department in which they stated that it was a mock trial and a travesty on justice. The Czechoslovak Government rejected all of these requests that were presented to them by Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs. Nothing actually appeared in the newspapers and there are no requests coming from various sources. However, on August 16, reports came again that the United Nations group in the Assembly adopted a United States resolution by a vote of 13 to 3 at Geneva condemning the arbitrary jailing of news correspondents.

On August 3—I want to be frank and say that I wrote a letter to the executive assistant to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in reply to which was made these statements:

> The United States delegation at Geneva has brought the matter to the attention of the Economic and Social Council. In addition United States has brought trade pressures against Czechoslovakia.

Now I just mentioned briefly some of these actions on the part of the State Department. Later, in September 1951, I read that the occupation authorities, that is, the United States, British, and French Commissioners in Germany, banned all flights of Czechoslovak airplanes over Western Germany. That meant, of course, that it was necessary for them to use a rather circuitous and much longer course of flight than would be necessary otherwise.

It was also in September 1951 when President Truman had an interview with Czech Ambassador Prochazka. He was told at that time by the President that "United States relations with Czechoslovakia would not be improved" until Oatis' release and Secretary Acheson, as reported by a United Press correspondent, gave him a scathing lecture. It was interesting to note that the Ambassador did not remain in the United States very long and up to the present time none of us have been able to determine where he is today, whether he has returned to his country, whether he has disappeared or whether he has been liquidated.

On April 30, 1952, more than 1 year elapsed before Ambassador Briggs was permitted to visit Oatis and then only for 30 minutes in the police headquarters at Prague and in the presence of two Czech interpreters and the police officer. It was readily learned from them on that occasion that he was reported to be in good health, that he needed glasses and he wanted certain books, which were furnished him.

On March 15, 1952, there was a Czech radio broadcast, described as a "recording of the testimony of Oatis at a trial of accomplices in espionage." I might recount many instances.

Ambassador Briggs was in Washington. He came to my office and he said he had attempted to contact William Oatis, but I am fearful that he only used the usual slap-on-the-wrist policy which was the Acheson program of that time. Ambassador Briggs said that the United States Chargé d'Affaires in Prague was continuing negotiations.

That same month the United Press stated that the Czechs had sent Prochazka to Washington as Ambassador a year ago, but he was recalled a few months later and has never been replaced. In the meantime, George Wadsworth, the new Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, made a public statement saying, and this is recorded in the newspapers, that his "primary task in the new assignment would be to try to free Oatis." Likewise on October 7, 1952, the United States Chargé d'Affaires visited Oatis at Prague headquarters. This was the second time that any American had seen or talked with William Oatis. The only other information that we have in regard to Oatis came to us through underground movements, many of which may be reliable and others rather questionable.

I would like to mention briefly the things that were done by the Congress of the United States.

Immediately upon the arrest and imprisonment of Oatis, people from Marion, Ind., which is in the district I have the privilege to represent, phoned, telegraphed, and contacted me by letter and otherwise—some even came here in delegations—and said: "Do something for Bill Oatis, not because he is Bill Oatis but because he is an American being detained." So we introduced House Concurrent Resolution 140. Many other Members were interested and many other Members of their own accord introduced resolutions.

The first resolution introduced actually expressed only indignation and asked that the executive agency take some action. However, House Concurrent Resolution 140 went a bit further and suggested that we should break off all economic relations with Czechoslovakia until William Oatis was released. This came to the floor under a unanimous-consent agreement, and at this time I want to give excellent credit to the majority leadership of the 82d Congress because they were very, very helpful in the Oatis case. I am sure that the majority leadership in this Congress will have the same attitude. That concurrent resolution passed the House with only one dissenting vote and that one dissenting vote was dissenting because, as the Member said, he wanted a stronger resolution. Some people wanted to sever diplomatic relations with Czechoslovakia, but the sense of the House at that particular time was that this was the first step and later on, perhaps, it might be well to have another string to our bow.

Now, things happened. In September of 1951, implementing the Beamer resolution there was the Trades and Tariffs Committee, which met in Switzerland, and they in turn decided to amend the General Agreement on Trades and Tariffs, rolling back to the previous higher tariffs which had been in effect, thus making it more difficult to bring in Czech merchandise. This has been a very important factor in the severance of trade relations with Czechoslovakia. However, there was still merchandise sneaking in for some reason. We began to explore the reason for it and found that some of it possibly was coming in through the American foreign-trade zone.

In the last few days of the 82d Congress I introduced Resolution 8445, to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act, in order that it might be possible to reduce and to minimize Czechoslovakian imports. After all, Czechoslovakia needs American dollars and the only way she can get American dollars to continue her propaganda procedure is to sell merchandise to the American people.

There were many proposals. I would like to briefly tell a few of these. You will remember the story of Robert Vogeler, who, after 17 months of imprisonment, finally was released. He was a telephone executive and was arrested in Hungary on charges similar to those that were trumped up against Oatis. In retaliation for his arrest the United States ordered Hungarian consulates in this country closed. As a ransom for his release, Hungary was permitted to reopen her consulates and certain property in Western Germany was returned to the Hungarian Government.

I think all of us should pay tribute at this time to Lucille Vogeler, his wife, who was unrelenting in her efforts to secure the release of her husband.

Then there was another action that was taken. A ransom of $120,000 was paid for four American fliers who were forced down in Hungary in a United States Air Force plane.

On September 13, 1951, there was a runaway Czech train. A 4-car railroad train carrying 27 fleeing Czechs to freedom and 87 other "reluctant" passengers who wanted to return to Czechoslovakia. United States Army officers said return of train was out of their hands. State Department had no comment on reports train and passengers might be held for release of Oatis.

On March 5, 1952, Scripps-Howard staff writer reported that Czechoslovakia has offered to release Oatis in exchange for a $17 million steel mill, it was learned from a dependable source in State Department. Offer to free Oatis in exchange for steel mill discussed by diplomats now meeting in Paris.

Steel mill bought and paid for by Czechoslovakia in 1947 was never shipped, because of an export license ban imposed by Commerce Department after communistic coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948.

Steel mill actually consists of three mills—a hot strip mill to roll soft steel; a tandem cold mill to roll hard steel; sheet mill to make tinplate. Heavy equipment stored in Philadelphia, Pa.; motors at Troy, N. Y.; lighter machinery at New Castle, Pa.; and Youngstown, Ohio.

In March 1953 there was a proposal by Robert A. Vogeler to trade possible clemency for the Rosenbergs in exchange for Oatis' freedom.

This was reported rather fully in the newspapers, and in order that Mr. Vogeler may be properly interpreted, I would like at this point to insert a letter by Mr. Vogeler, and also a memorandum on the Oatis case:

BEDFORD HILLS, N. Y., *March 7, 1953.*

The Honorable JOHN V. BEAMER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: It was nice seeing you in Washington, even if it was only for a few minutes, but you know how they keep me on the go. I hope to be down in Washington again in the very near future and hope that we may have more time together.

Your letter of February 27 arrived during my absence on a short trip and I hope I am not too late in conveying the information you desire.

I know that with all of the recent developments, the new administration has had its hands full and probably has not been able to give much consideration to the Oatis case.

Soon it will be 2 years that poor Bill Oatis has been languishing in a Communist prison. It is easy to overlook the plight of this unfortunate American.

Bill Oatis' detention is a national disgrace. Our prestige as a great nation in the world requires that we take some definite action very soon.

Recently when the offer was made to exchange Sanders, my business associate who is being held by the Hungarian Communists, for Lee Meng, the Malayan spy, I expressed the sentiment that this should be done. I also took the opportunity to suggest that since the Communists have been so interested in the Rosenbergs, some satisfactory exchange might be made in Oatis' case. This does not mean that the Rosenbergs or Lee Meng should be allowed to go unpunished. However, if we can use these people who have committed serious crimes against decency and humanity to some good purpose, I believe it is highly desirable to do so.

In the instance above, for example, they can be used to purchase the freedom of two decent citizens who are the victims of injustice.

There is no question of precedent involved, we can always treat each case on its own merits. Future arrest of American citizens by Communist-dominated governments can be averted by imposing a travel ban in areas where our Government cannot protect them. That's a job for Congress.

My proposal concerning the Rosenbergs was made because I felt present developments indicate that the Rosenbergs will not be made to pay the death penalty for their enormous crime. Therefore if they are going to receive mercy, we should at least benefit.

We must not forget that we have a responsibility for some 5,000 other American citizens whom the Communists have detained over a period of years.

Stalin's death will resolve nothing. Let us not try to rationalize or procrastinate on the basis of such improbable hopes. We must face the situation realistically, the only language the Soviet leaders understand is force. I share with other millions of Americans a deep concern regarding our policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The time is long past for lengthy debates on the pros and cons of our every move. We can deal with eventualities if and when they arise. Among the things that have to be done in order to impress the Soviet Union is a quick termination of the war in Korea. No one who evaluates this situation realistically can doubt our success in Korea if the war is pursued with determination. We, who have successfully defeated the greatest military power that ever existed in the world, can certainly defeat the North Koreans and their allies.

Concerning fear of extending the war, this is a possibility which we must face. No positive action can ever be taken without risk. But we know the Soviet Union needs no excuse to engage in further aggression. Their decision will be predicated upon their appraisal of our determination. The threat of world war III has been a definite weapon of the Soviet Union in their campaign of fear which they are waging against us. This along with the other campaigns that are being waged against us are in this nature of further threats, designed to discourage active opposition to their ambitions. These psychological campaigns have been very successful against those countries which have already been conquered. We have evidence also of their success against our Western European allies.

When we are sitting behind barbed wire or in concentration camps, it will be too late to contemplate what we should have done, I have a great deal of confidence in the present administration and sincerely hope that their good intentions will not be modified by the influence of well-meaning but confused and discouraged potential allies.

We should not rely too much on the advice of our so-called allies. Their policies from 1918 until 1939 eventually plunged us into World War II. Since we have the responsibility of fighting these wars, it is time we tried our own diplomacy.

Churchill's comments about not engaging in the barter of human lives is inappropriate. Today we are not only bartering human lives, we are slaughtering human beings in great numbers because we loathed to take positive steps at a time when they would have been effective.

Recently the people of the United States went to the polls and expressed their desires. Are these millions to be disappointed again?

All this is very discouraging but I hope Congress will see fit to carry out the desires of the majority of good Americans. I can assure you that people are tired of the never-ending sacrifices they are called upon to make—the lives of their sons and the resources of this great country of ours.

Attached hereto is a short memorandum regarding the Oatis case which I hope you will find satisfactory. Looking forward to an early meeting with you, I remain,

Sincerely,

BOB,
Robert A. Vogeler.

MEMORANDUM RE: EFFORTS IN THE OATIS CASE

In June of 1951 the State Department requested that I not mention Bill Oatis in my talk to the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on June 7, 1951. Reason given: That the publicity might adversely affect Oatis' chances.

I promised to be silent for three months or until Oatis came to trial.

Oatis' trial took place on July 4 and from then on I tried my best to encourage interest in his case.

In December 1951, the Overseas Press Club in New York invited me to participate in a program which was to be supported by all the newspapers in the country, the purpose of which was to enlist the assistance of as many people as possible for Bill Oatis. I was informed a few days after the meeting that the State Department had requested that this project be abandoned, again giving the reason that it might jeopardize negotiations for Oatis' release.

In January 1952, I tried to contact Mrs. Oatis, the wife of Bill Oatis, in St. Paul, Minn. There I learned through a newspaper release which she made that the State De-

partment had requested she not discuss this matter in any form with me.

In May or June 1952, I visited William Oatis' father in Phoenix, Ariz. He informed me that so far as he knew, none of the efforts made by the State Department had been effective. As a matter of fact, he informed me that no representatives of the State Department had contacted him. His only source of information had been routine releases by the Department of State.

Just before the rally held last October in Marion, Ind., for Bill Oatis, Mrs. Vogeler contacted Mrs. Oatis by telephone to enlist her support of this project. Mrs. Oatis declined, giving as her reason that she had obtained instructions to that effect from the Department of State.

My repeated inquiries into the status of the Oatis case indicate none of the alleged negotiations had been successful. The State Department was allowed to visit with William Oatis on two occasions since his arrest. Both visits were conducted in the presence of members of the Czechoslovak Communist authorities and very little information was gleaned.

In the 23 months of Oatis' detention, all efforts by the United States Government have been unsuccessful since the fact remains that Oatis is still in prison.

It is significant that although both Houses of Congress suggested a complete boycott against Czechoslovakia, this boycott has never been properly enforced. Neither has the suggestion that we enlist the cooperation of our allies in carrying out the boycott been given serious consideration, even though the suggestion was made by Members of the Congress of the United States.

Our Government has not employed the many means at its command that might be successfully employed or used to obtain the release of Bill Oatis. The arrest and continued detention of Bill Oatis by the Czechoslovak Communist government is a hostile act against the United States and therefore it evolves upon our Government to take whatever steps may be necessary to rectify this injustice against an innocent citizen of our country.

ROBERT A. VOGELER.

Several other interesting things have come to pass. A young man who claims he was a Czechoslovakian, much desired and much wanted by the Russians, has offered his own life in exchange for Oatis.

I am merely bringing out this little experience because it shows there are people who are thinking about him. There have been many other occasions. I would like to tell you about how the people are feeling today.

In the United Nations recently a writ of habeus corpus proceeding was filed in behalf of Oatis by Luis Kutner, an attorney in Chicago. It was reported on the floor of this House by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] on May 8 of last year. Mr. Kutner reports that after conferences with several Members, many of these copies had been submitted, and it is merely adding another fagot to the fire.

I wish I could point out to you the petitions that were sent to our office and to the Congress by thousands of students of the University of Indiana in reference to William Oatis. This petition was signed on December 12, 1951, and was sponsored by the Indiana Daily Student, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind. Oatis Day in Marion was proclaimed by the mayor on October 3, 1952. Mr. and Mrs. Vogeler spoke. Incidentally, Mrs. Oatis was invited to attend that particular affair but was unable to come.

At this time I would like to insert a letter written by Frank J. Starzel, from the Associated Press:

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS,
New York, N. Y., January 26, 1953.

The Honorable JOHN V. BEAMER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BEAMER: Please let me acknowledge with appreciation your letter of January 22 to Mr. Cooper. He is away for the winter but I am forwarding your letter to him.

Meanwhile, I take this opportunity of expressing to you our thanks for your interest and activity on behalf of William Oatis. While all of his friends in the Associated Press deplore the fact that after nearly 2 years he is still in prison, we can find some solace in the knowledge that he has not been forgotten. The fight for Oatis' release is continuing unabated and I know that your efforts to keep the case active have been most fruitful.

I have been intimately acquainted with all the steps taken by our Government on Oatis' behalf. The lack of success thus far is not entirely discouraging. The State Department, at the level of our contacts, has been cooperative and responsive. I frankly do not know whether anything has been left undone because I have no experience in this area of delicate international negotiations and must necessarily depend on the judgment of those better versed than I in this field. Additionally, I have continued to be reluctant to consider criticizing the handling of the case because I have an idea that the Czechs would derive comfort from any evidence of a cleavage or division in our ranks.

I can only suggest at this stage that all of us continue what we have been doing, namely, not to overlook any opportunity for calling attention publicly to Oatis' situation. WMCA, a local radio station, is broadcasting a dramatization of the case tomorrow night. During the holiday season a large number of stations participated in a campaign to send Christmas greetings to Oatis. Newspapers are most generous in their editorial comment whenever there is any development in the case.

I feel confident that the new administration will readily understand the important principle involved and will work energetically to obtain his release.

With appreciation for your letter and for your efforts on behalf of our associate.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK J. STARZEL,
General Manager.

I would like to take up the few minutes that remain and tell you about H. R. 2072, which I will insert in the RECORD at this point:

H. R. 2072

A bill to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act

Be it enacted, etc., That the first two sentences of the first proviso of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 998), as amended, are amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That whenever the privilege shall be requested and there has been no manipulation or manufacture effecting a change in tariff classification, the collector of customs shall take under supervision any lot or part of a lot of foreign merchandise in a zone, cause it to be appraised, and the tariff classification to be determined. Merchandise so taken under supervision may be stored, manipulated, or manufactured under the supervision and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and whether mixed or manufactured with domestic merchandise or not may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, be exported or destroyed, or may be sent into customs territory upon the payment of duties based on such appraisement and classification at the rates in effect at the time the merchandise is sent into customs territory."

Czechoslovakia was one of our most favored nations at the time—April 1951—she arrested American newsman William Oatis on trumped-up spy charges. She is now on our trade blacklist.

It may be of interest to look at the record and review the changes in our trade policy toward the Communists during the past year. Also to note a little known law which permits the Communists to enjoy tariff benefits after we have withdrawn them.

At the beginning of 1951, the United States was applying its reduced import tariffs to all countries, whether or not these countries had negotiated agreements with us. The tariff favors were thus granted to both Communist and non-Communist countries alike; all nations were receiving most-favored-nation treatment.

In the spring of 1951, Congress decided to put a stop to the special tariff favors then being granted to the goods of Communist countries. The tariffs had been reduced under the trade agreements program. In authorizing continuation of the program by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, Congress directed the President to take action as soon as practicable to deny tariff favors to imports from Communist countries.

The Oatis case was not responsible for this action of Congress; the decision was first made at the Capitol before his imprisonment was known here. However, there is good reason to believe that Oatis was responsible, at least in large part, for the Executive decision to apply the rule to Czech goods.

It was in February 1951, that the House of Representatives voted to withdraw tariff favors then being extended to the Communists. The Senate voted a similar policy in May. The President signed the law in June, issuing a statement praising the tariff-reduction program, especially the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. He avowed that GATT would be continued.

Czechoslovakia was one of the original 23 countries that negotiated GATT, a fact that the President overlooked—or at least failed to mention—in his statement pledging continuance of that agreement; and on July 6, 1951, when the State Department announced the decisions to withdraw tariff favors from most of the Communist countries, there was again no reference to the policy regarding Czechoslovakia. Persons who inquired at the State Department regarding tariff policy toward Czechoslovakia were told that the matter was under consideration.

I suspect "under consideration" means that it was somewhere in the files, goodness only knows where.

But, in view of the monstrous imprisonment of Oatis, the American people did not take the delay complacently. There was a great public outcry for the withdrawal of tariff favors to Czechoslovakia and for the imposition of trade sanctions. Editorials and articles in the press demanded action—and promptly.

Radio commentators joined in. A nation was aroused. Resolutions were introduced in Congress and the action of the Congress was explained above.

The State Department now reported the matter under "active consideration." That probably means it had been found in the files.

At a meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, on September 27, 1951, the contracting parties of GATT authorized suspension of our obligations to Czechoslovakia. This meant that we could then, at any time, assess the higher tariff rates originally enacted by Congress rather than the reduced rates established under the trade-agreements program. Five days later, the State Department announced that the higher rates would be applied to all Czech goods that should be entered after November 1, thus granting 30 more days' delay in effecting the national policy which had been established 6 or 8 months before.

Having been critical year before last of the evident foot-dragging in the matter of withdrawing the tariff favors from the Czechs, I take pleasure in commending the one-two punch effectively delivered by the executive branch when action finally was taken. The day following news of definite action to withdraw, the Treasury Department announced it would exact the maximum penalty—up to the full value of the goods plus import duties—of importers of goods from Czechoslovakia who failed to produce certified consular invoices from a United States consulate in Czechoslovakia in due time—that is, within 6 months after entry of goods into the United States. The Treasury at the same time noted word from the State Department that certification of invoices in Czechoslovakia "is being indefinitely delayed."

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point order No. 30 of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Department of Commerce, prohibiting manipulation, manufacture, or any other process of treatment of any article of Czechoslovak origin in a foreign-trade zone. This came quite a long time after the request had been made by the Congress of the United States.

TITLE 15, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD ORDER NO. 30 PROHIBITING MANIPULATION, MANUFACTURE, OR ANY OTHER PROCESS OF TREATMENT OF ANY ARTICLE OF CZECHOSLOVAK ORIGIN IN A FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE

Pursant to authority contained in the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (48 Stat 998-1003; 19 U. S. C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board has adopted the following order which is promulgated for the information and guidance of all concerned:

"Whereas the Department of State considers that at this time it is detrimental to the public interest and contrary to the policy of the Government of the United States to permit the importation of merchandise of Czechoslovak origin normally requiring a certified consular invoice unless shipments of such goods are covered by certified consular invoices; and

"Whereas the Treasury Department has announced that the maximum liability under law might be assessed when shipments of Czechoslovak merchandise are not covered by the required documents within the legal time limit; and

"Whereas under the customs regulations of the United States, no certified or commercial invoice, or bond for the production of either, is required in connection with the entry into the United States of articles, whether privileged or nonprivileged, resulting from manipulation in a foreign-trade zone;

"Now, therefore, upon recommendation of the Department of State, the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, after full consideration, finds that it is detrimental to the public interest to permit manipulation of goods of Czechoslovak origin in a foreign-trade zone as an alternative for the requirement of consular invoices, and under the authority granted to it by section 15 (c) of the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 1002; 19 U. S. C. 810), hereby orders:

"No manipulation, manufacture, or any other process of treatment of any article of Czechoslovak origin shall be allowed in a foreign-trade zone on or after the effective date of this order.

"It is found that compliance with the notice, public rulemaking procedure, and delayed effective-date requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1003) is impractical, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest in connection with the issuance of this order, because the same emergency conditions which are a cause for this order necessitate that it become effective as quickly as possible. The effective date of this order is, therefore, the date of publication in the Federal Register.

"Signed at Washington, D. C., this 9th day of January, 1953."

[SEAL] FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD,
By CHAS L. SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce, Chairman and Executive Officer, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Attest:

THOS. E. LYONS,
Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

(NOTE.—This order (No. 30) was published in the Federal Register, Friday, January 16, 1953 (18 F. R., p. 375).)

Now, to pursue this matter further, it was attempted to get information from the foreign-trade zones. Finally in order to secure this information, which was not forthcoming by request, I wrote to all six of the foreign-trade zones in the United States and asked five questions, which I include at this point in my remarks:

1. Amount of Czechoslovakian imports now in free trade zones?
2. How much Czechoslovakian goods withdrawn from the free trade zones under privilege since November 1, 1951?
3. How much Czechoslovakian goods now in free trade zones with privilege status?
4. How much Czechoslovakian goods manipulated in free trade zones since October 3, 1951?
5. What are the principal Czechoslovakian imports for consumption in 1952?

From the information received, I would like to report that increased duties on Czech goods took effect on November 2, 1951. The following figures give the Czech imports to the United States and the United States exports to Czechoslovakia.

In 1950 the Czech imports to the United States amounted to over $26,000,000. In 1951 they had dropped to $22,404,000. In the first three quarters—and that is the last report we have for 1952—they had dropped to $1,214,000, which shows that the Beamer resolution was having some effect, and also that the cancellation of consular invoices was assisting. However, there still was $1,214,000 of Czech goods coming into the country.

Now let us see what happened to the United States exports to Czechoslovakia in the same time. In 1949 we shipped $21,000,000 worth of merchandise to that country. It dropped next year to $10,000,000. In 1951 it dropped to $1,000,000, and in the first three quarters of 1952 it dropped to $13,000. This indicates very clearly that Czech goods continue to enter the United States, and it is also evident that American goods do not go into Czechoslovakia in any amount that could be called material.

Although all imports of Czech goods are generally supposed to have been dutiable at the higher rates since November 2, 1951, it is still possible to clear some Czech imports through United States customs at the trade-agreement rates. Understanding of this rather astonishing situation requires at least a brief reference to techniques.

When goods are imported, they may be entered for immediate consumption, entered for warehouse, or entered into a United States foreign trade zone of which there are six in the United States. In the latter case import duties are paid, not when the entry is for warehousing or into the zone, but when imported goods are withdrawn from warehouse for consumption. In this manner they are subject to whatever duties are in effect at time of withdrawal, regardless of what the rates were at the time of importation. The foreign trade zone, though physically part of the United States, is considered to be outside our customs territory, so that goods are considered to be imported when they are released from the zone for consumption in this country, rather than at the time of their physical arrival here. They must pay duty at the time of release. But while in this zone they can get privileged status, which guarantees that they will get the existing favorable tariff rate, even though the tariff might be increased before the goods are released from the zone.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Has the gentleman made any recent check to determine what percentage of all Czechoslovakian exports that are coming into this country may have cleared through some other country affected by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. BEAMER. I will come to that in just a moment.

Thus the owner, knowing that the tariff is to be increased, can frustrate the increase by the privileged status arrangement.

It is clear, however, that this provision of law can operate to delay effectuation of the will of Congress that tariffs on imports of any particular goods should be increased. No doubt, cogent arguments in its favor were presented before Congress enacted it. The question is whether these arguments are adequate in the light of today's world.

It is for this reason that I have introduced H. R. 2072 to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act to plug this loophole and stop all Czech imports.

Now, I should like to answer the gentleman from West Virginia by stating that we have here all the reports that have come to us from the various trade zones. Five of them came direct from the various trade zones, and the reports from New York were brought here by the representative in the Department of Commerce, Mr. Lyons, just a few days ago.

Frankly, I may say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] it is rather difficult to determine whether this Czechoslovak merchandise which has come in from other countries is old merchandise that is still being held over or whether perhaps it is merchandise that has very little market value—but it is continuing to be a smaller amount all the time.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I asked the gentleman that question because if he will recall, a couple of years ago in the discussion of the amendment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act I have here some linen towels purchased in a department store at Miami, Fla., that had marked in the weave of the towel: "Manufactured in U. S. S. R." On tracing them down I found that they had come into the United States through Czechoslovakia under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; and I wondered to what extent some of these Czech goods may be unloaded onto this country by bootlegging them into an adjoining country that had the benefit of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If there is no objection on the part of those having special orders to follow the gentleman, the gentleman's time may be extended. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, now there are new bosses in Red Czechoslovakia.

Klement Gottwald died after his return from the funeral of Josef Stalin in Moscow and Antonin Zapotocky has succeeded to the presidency. Actually this is a dictatorship and the chances are that none of the voters had any choice in the selection of the successor to Gottwald. As shown above, Czechoslovakian imports to the United States have been reduced very materially and it is felt that these can be reduced further and perhaps even eliminated. If our ally, Great Britain, and some of the other nations to whom we have given billions of dollars, would assist us in the same economic sanctions, then the Communist-dominated countries soon would realize that the requests and demands of the United States must be met.

Now that there is a new president in Czechoslovakia, it is hoped that our Ambassador, George Wadsworth, can be instructed to adopt a firm policy and tell Mr. Zapotocky that if Oatis is released, normal trade relations can be resumed. This request dare not be made in the slap-on-the-wrist fashion as was the case under the Acheson administration. The policy of appeasement and containment has brought us nothing but more Communist successes. An alien religion and a subversive philosophy such as communism does not understand the meek, turn-the-other-cheek language. Mr. Lodge, our representative in the United Nations has made some display of the new and firmer attitude that should be displayed toward Czechoslovakia and all of those unfortunate nations behind the Iron Curtain.

It is hoped that this attitude, plus the attitude and spirit of cooperation displayed by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in our recent discussion will begin to be the new order of foreign policy in this country. The American public last fall asked, among other things, for a change in foreign policy and here is one excellent place to start. Why should we permit a fifth-rate power to insult us with Oatis and with hundreds and thousands of similar cases?

The Czechs shot down an American plane that was 15 miles in Western Germany from the Czech border. Will our demands for not only a reparation but also for an apology be met or will we as a nation with a proud past insist that these demands be met?

I want to conclude by suggesting that we have a duty to our children and our children's children. What kind of heritage are we passing on to the future generations in these United States? Let us make it a proud one, a forceful one, and a triumphant one.

For that reason I ask unanimous consent to include, to illustrate what people are saying, a letter from Mr. William Loeb, president and publisher of the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader, and also editorials from papers in Bill Oatis' home town.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

MANCHESTER UNION LEADER,
UNION LEADER CORP.,
Manchester, N. H., September 24, 1951.

Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEAMER: Looking over the letter of mine which you so kindly inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the editorial, brought to mind another incident, the inside story of which you might enjoy. It concerns the time the Kaiser sent the German fleet over to the coast of Venezuela to collect some debts owed by Venezuela to various German nationals. The American reaction to this violation of the Monroe Doctrine of that day was as follows:

Back at the turn of the century when my father was a young man, he served as chief private secretary to Theodore Roosevelt at the time he was President of the United States. One day the President sent him to call on German Ambassador "Speck" von Sternberg.

My father said, "President Roosevelt had asked me to call your attention, Mr. Ambassador, to the fact that the German fleet is in Venezuelan territorial waters, contrary to the Monroe Doctrine. The President further asked me to inform you that you request your government to remove the fleet within 24 hours' time."

Some 16 hours later my father returned to the German Embassy and told the Ambassador the White House had been informed that the German fleet was still in Venezuelan territorial waters and that no message had been received by the State Department or the White House as to the future movement of the fleet.

To which von Sternberg replied, "Surely you were not serious in bringing the message from the President. It would be worth my diplomatic career to convey such a message to the all highest. Yours is a fine country, Mr. Secretary, but, after all, I represent His Imperial Highness and the German Empire. Furthermore, your own father, Mr. Secretary, came from Germany. We are good friends, I gave your son, Billy, a large christening cup when he was born. Surely we can settle this matter."

To this my father replied, "I am sorry, Mr. Ambassador. It is true that my father came from Germany and we have many ties with the old country. But you must remember that our family left Germany for one reason—we preferred freedom.

"Besides, President Theodore Roosevelt is one who, once his mind is made up, is not swayed from acting in accordance with his firm principles.

"The President has instructed me to tell you further that, since we have had no reply at all in the 16 hours, we have no intention of waiting the remaining 8 hours.

"The Atlantic Fleet, under Admiral Dewey, is at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. President Roosevelt, early in the day, ordered Admiral Dewey to get steam up and strip his ships for action.

"If no word is forthcoming from your government inside of 4 hours, the President will order Admiral Dewey to set sail for Venezuela immediately to take whatever action is necessary."

With that, my father withdraw from the German Embassy.

In about 2½ hours, the American Minister to Venezuela reported that the German fleet had pulled up anchor and was moving out to sea.

I thought this story might be of interest to you, in contrast to what happens nowadays. This story is a bit of unpublished history.

Usual regards and best wishes.

Very sincerely,

WILLIAM LOEB, *President.*

[From the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle of February 6, 1953]

OATIS REMAINS IN PRISON

Truman, Acheson, and Eleanor Roosevelt have gone from the Federal Government, and William N. Oatis continues a prisoner in the hands of the Czechoslovaks.

It is the purpose of Congressman JOHN V. BEAMER, he says, to continue his efforts to secure the freedom of the former Marion newspaperman, who has spent a year and a half in a foreign prison on trumped-up charges of spying.

Oatis' release is demanded in a letter addressed by the national auxiliary of the American Legion to John Foster Dulles, the new Secretary of State, in President Eisenhower's Cabinet.

Friends of the prisoner charge that the Oatis case was not pressed by the former administration, out of fear of the consequences of antagonizing the Communists, who are responsible for his imprisonment.

Congressman BEAMER says he will ask for the State Department record of what has or has not been done in the Oatis case. Friends of the prisoner anxiously await development, and Oatis freedom restored.

[From the Marion (Ind.) Chronicle of December 17, 1952]

CARDS TO OATIS DRIVE STARTS

An intensive drive had been launched today by members of the Byron W. Thornburg Post 10, American Legion, to let the

imprisoned Bill Oatis know that his hundreds of friends in Marion have not forgotten him this Christmas.

Plans for the project were revealed Tuesday night at the regular post meeting and the slogan of the plan is, Send That Extra Christmas Card to Bill Oatis. The Legionnaires mapped a program which is designed to swamp the Czech prison where the former Marion newsman is being held.

The post commander, Charles Kilgour, urged residents to address Christmas cards to William Oatis, Pancrac Prison, Prague, Czechoslovakia, and suggested that cards be sent by airmail wherever possible.

Postage rates to Prague are 1½ cents per half ounce for unsealed envelopes and 5 cents for sealed communications and 15 cents for airmail delivery.

The drive to have Christmas cards mailed to Oatis will come to a climax Saturday when Legionnaires will be on duty at convenient locations in the downtown area to assist persons wishing to mail cards to Oatis. The Legion members will address and mail such cards.

Kilgour pointed out that although under international agreement the Communists do not have to deliver packages to prisoners, they deliver mail, and the Communist leaders might be impressed if Oatis were to receive hundreds of cards from well-wishers.

Clifford Prior was named chairman in charge of the campaign. Other members of the committee include, William Fowler, W. H. McGrew, Harry Jackson, Jr., Joseph Sexton, Noel Hill, and Almont Williams.

[From the Portland (Ind.) Graphic of February 5, 1953]

BEAMER BATS FOR OATIS

The most sensitive spot to the American press is the still-open sore of the William Oatis case. More than just a good, handy editorial whipping boy, the William Oatis case is a matter of the serious concern of freedom-loving Americans all over and, for obvious reasons, even more especially a concern to American journalists.

It's quite natural that the case should be kept alive by American newspapers, but it's really encouraging to see it receive official recognition by the few Government officials who consider the principle involved too important to permit its being shelved as an unpleasant experience in American diplomacy.

JOHN BEAMER, our district's Representative in Washington, is one of those officials who have worked toward Oatis' release. His recently proposed legislation which bears his signature is another step toward that end. BEAMER proposed a bill to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act to eliminate the loopholes in the existing law whereby Czechoslovakia has been able to continue importing its products at a tariff rate that existed before the last hike.

It was BEAMER who introduced the bill which passed the 82d Congress severing trade relations with Czechoslovakia until Oatis' release. His new bill is meant to plug a few gaps in the law.

It's really a poor substitute for some stronger and more effective action, but it's better than letting the case end with the issuance of a strong diplomatic rebuke; and until a better method of making that country suffer from the unjust imprisonment of an American citizen is devised, we strongly support the steps taken by the Indiana Representative from the fifth district.

[From the Kokomo (Ind.) Tribune of November 29, 1952]

DULLES AND THE OATIS CASE

Enormous problems will fall on the shoulders of John Foster Dulles when he takes over the post of Secretary of State in January. We wonder if he will have any time to devote to the problem of obtaining freedom for William Oatis, young Associated Press correspondent who has spent more than a year in a Czechoslovakian prison.

It may be that a fresh approach to the Oatis case can be made by the new State Department. Mr. Dulles, or his assistants, should work out a course of action capable of getting results. And after a reasonable period, the Department should give a report on the whole case to the American people. Under Secretary Acheson, the Department has revealed little about its efforts except to say it was doing all it could.

In the opinion of the Saturday Evening Post, no really effective efforts to obtain this American citizen's release have been made. Oatis was jailed after a phony trial because he tried to do a workmanlike job of covering Czechoslovak news.

After Oatis was sentenced, a partial embargo was put on American shipments to the Czechs, but Representative JOHN BEAMER, of Indiana, pointed out later that we still are shipping goods to them.

Assuming for the sake of argument that the Government has done its best for Oatis, the Post asks whether it has done anything to make sure that a phony arrest and trial do not happen to someone else. A Chicago lawyer, Luis Kutner, recently had the idea that the Reds could be forced to release Oatis by an order from the International Court of Justice. At least Mr. Kutner had an idea. Actually, about the only international agreement on arbitrary arrest and similar violations of human rights is contained in some very general wordage in article 55 of the United Nations Charter and in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

These, as the Post observes, are only statements of principle with no machinery for putting them into effect. Aside from the piety of the language, the U. N. has contributed little toward the protection of the rights of citizens abroad that was not available under the old international law.

As the Post says, the tragedy, as it affects Oatis, is that we have come to lean so heavily on these new but largely ineffective international agencies that we neglect the traditional pressures which are available. There are certainly several.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the opportunity of bringing this case before you again. I hope the Congress and the administration will continue their efforts to secure justice for Bill Oatis and his release, and that we give him the same consideration that we ourselves desire.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4130. An act to amend title V of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to permit the continued use of appropriations thereunder to make payments to ARO, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1419. An act to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

MAY 6 DESIGNATED AS MEMORIAL DAY FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 199) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, May 6, 1953, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on House Administration under the provision of clause 9 (n) (1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for 30 legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings, the Speaker shall call the House to order and then as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased he shall declare the House adjourned. The necessary expenses connected with such memorial services shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS' APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I think of the old story of the public speaker who was supposed to make three speeches, the one he intended to make, the one he actually did make, and the one he thought of on the way home. Yesterday I addressed the House for 45 minutes on the subject of Veterans' Appropriations. I realized that my time was about to expire and that I had not covered at least one point I wanted to make. In the intervening 24 hours another report has come to me, in preliminary form, from one of the investigators, and I wish to include that with my remarks.

The point I wanted to make particularly was that the subject I am discussing, the appropriations by the Congress for the Veterans' Administration, the growth of that agency, and the division of its money between functions, has produced a situation very little understood by the veterans themselves, who now constitute approximately one-half of our population. There has been criticism, and some inaccurate information given out, and I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that it is now necessary; that it is urgent and important that some reexploration be made of the expenditures of the country through the Congress for the veterans and all the functions united in the Veterans' Administration agency, and that this should be done by ourselves. I want it done in an orderly and sympathetic way by the veterans, by the Congress, by the veterans' organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, AMVETS, the DAV, the Regular Veterans Association, and others, rather than wait until the situation reaches a point where some sort of

reduction and change of administration is forced upon us.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, have a recollection of the Economy Act of 1933 and the tragedies and difficulties it produced. I think this is a matter of sufficient urgency to invite the attention of the Congress.

I have three more illustrations to put into the RECORD at this point. I spoke yesterday of the number of veterans who had gone to hospitals and had signed affidavits subjecting themselves to penalty, either fine or imprisonment, saying that they did not have sufficient money to pay for their hospitalization. Under no other circumstances could they have been admitted to the hospital. They were not service-connected veterans.

The Veterans' Administration itself takes the position that it may not look back of the affidavit, and I think there is a slight justification for that position although not a complete justification for it. The last sentence of the section of the act says that the affidavit of the veteran is to be taken as evidence of inability to pay.

I cited the fact that out of 40,000 cards, 500 had been picked out by a simple method: by saying this man is in a classification in ordinary life which implies income; he is a lawyer, doctor, businessman or professional man, and in all fairness it is right to believe he has an income.

Out of 500 such cards it was proven that 336 of these veterans had incomes ranging from $4,000 a year to $50,000 a year. In addition to that there were 25, possibly duplications, who had personal property valued at from $20,000 to $500,000.

I have today, in pencil form only, the check of 390 veterans discharged from a certain hospital—I have the name of the hospital, but I do not want to put it in the RECORD today—in the last quarter, October to December of 1951. This covers only 390 veterans, just cards taken at random. You reach in and pick out a card from the file; 234 of these had incomes under $1,000. That is the field we thought we were trying to do something for; 37 of them had incomes between $1,000 and $2,000 a year; 44 had incomes between $2,000 and $3,000; 43 between $3,000 and $4,000; 23 between $4,000 and $5,000; 4 between $5,000 and $6,000; 1 between $6,000 and $7,000; 1 between $7,000 and $8,000; 1 between $9,000 and $10,000, and 2 between $10,000 and $15,000.

These are veterans who made affidavits that they had no money with which to pay hospital expenditures.

I made the point yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I thought we should change our law so as to make it possible for a man to pay something against his hospitalization, if not all, and I am very much of the opinion that every hospital should be required to ask a prospective veteran patient if he carries insurance for hospitalization and to try to collect on that insurance. Some legislative action may be needed. We found in our check of 40 hospitals that few of them asked about insurance.

Of the two highest income cases on my list, above, one was a salesman, hospitalized for 22 days, who had a salary of $12,900 a year. The other was a resident physician and I think we should not count him, as a physician is entitled to hospitalization in his own hospital, either as a doctor or as a veteran. The desire of our committee is reasonable interpretation and enforcement.

Another section I did not mention yesterday among the functions of the Veterans' Administration, was the claims section. I give you an illustration why there is room here for exploration. I state that I think this is exceptional, but it is a case and it is one picked out at random.

Here is a man receiving compensation of $195 a month. Those of you who are familiar with the situation know that means almost complete disability. Investigation disclosed this man is earning in salary and wages, not invested income but earned income, more than $10,000 a year. I find it hard to believe he has permanent disability.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Most of those cases the gentleman recited of those hard to check were non-service-connected cases?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am referring only to, shall I say, one-third of the veterans in hospitals who do not have service connection. If the gentleman from West Virginia will recall, I said yesterday that there is an area in which there are service-connected veterans about which there is no question. That is about one-third of the total, 35.6 percent to be correct. There is a supplementary group of 11.4 percent in which the man is service connected but is not receiving treatment for a service-connected disability. There is another small percent who are in because of entitlement through disability pensions or some similar entitlement. We have about 17 percent who can show no service-connection, who are in no way service-connected.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman say that the case he cited in which the individual was receiving $195 a month in total disability benefits, and was making $10,000 a year was an exceptional case?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I said definitely it was an exception, but it is well for us occasionally to look into these things.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, who is making an outstanding record as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I think it was covered yesterday, and I have not heard all of the gentleman's remarks today, but will the gentleman please state for the RECORD the latest figures from the Veterans' Administration indicating the total number of service-connected cases that are applying for hospitalization and are not in hospitals. Are there not 70?

Mr. PHILLIPS. There were 70 who were service-connected. Did the gentleman say "service-connected"?

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The figure we had for about January 1 was 70. There were 70 service-connected applicants who were not in hospitals, and of that number almost all of them were not in hospitals of their own desire. They were going later or preferred to wait for some reason or other. Since that time another number has been supplied informally, but it is still in the same area; it is about 100.

However, I called attention yesterday, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that one list we had, showing 68 people who were waiting on a list to get into a certain hospital, were largely NP cases, neuropsychiatric cases, and those cases we know we have not supplied enough beds for. We are building two more hospitals this year of approximately 1,000 beds each. But even in the case of those 68, 52 of them were already in other hospitals and being taken care of by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BAILEY. I just wanted to ask the question that the gentleman just explained. I am having some difficulty in getting hospitalization for service-connected veterans, and we do need some more facilities in that particular area.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, we do. We have on our list three hospitals, two of which will be built this year; but it also should be understood if we take the minimum, 17 percent, which seems very small—but if you take 17 percent of 131,000 beds, you will see that you have there the equivalent of 13 hospitals in figures; that is, in statistics, not necessarily in fact. But the fact is we do not need to build additional general medical and surgical hospitals; what we need are NP and TB hospitals.

STUDY OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the President submitted an extremely important recommendation to the Congress with reference to the impact of legislation for grants-in-aid upon the various units of government. With the President's thesis that there should be a reevaluation of Federal laws providing assistance to the States I am in agreement, but I wish to make two points with reference to the proposal.

First, our thinking should be clear on the basic cause of the problem described by the President. Second, in setting up the commission to make such studies extreme caution should be exercised to make sure that the authority of the Congress is preserved and that we avoid the mistakes often made in the past of relegating these studies to executive agencies or to persons having no official responsibility to the electorate. I hope that consideration will be given to the idea of making this strictly a congressional study and that efforts be made to approach the problem without partisanship. Interest should be focused upon Federal aspects of the problem, leaving to the States and municipalities wide discretion in determining their own policies.

Vast economic and social changes of recent years have required Federal laws that have appeared to invade the rights of the States, and chiefly because the problems have been new, the allocation of Government authority has not been precise nor satisfactory. At the same time, demands for correcting the evils that this situation has produced should not cause the Congress to be defensive in attitude nor to assume that the problem will be solved by the Federal Government retreating from its responsibilities.

The best studies that have been made of various problems of government have been those directed by standing or select committees of the Congress, notably the joint committee which directed the legislative reorganization studies in 1946, leading to one of the most effective reforms in our history.

On the other hand, we have at times followed the pattern outlined in the President's message on Monday, only to find that the congressional role became secondary. An illustration is the report of the Hoover Commission which has brought some salutary results, but much more might have been accomplished had this been strictly a congressional committee.

We need not deprive ourselves of the valuable facilities that the executive department could place at our disposal or fail to take advantage of the information that many extra governmental agencies may make available. Consultation with such groups as the Council of State Governments and the various associations of municipal governments would be indispensable to the success of the studies to be undertaken in this instance.

The President refers particularly to the changes within the past 20 years, and this is, of course, an accurate reference, but I hope it will not appear argumentative to point out that the expansion of Federal authority first became pronounced even in an earlier period, beginning with the Wilson administration. Incidentally, it is one of the ironies of our political history that Woodrow Wilson, devoted Jeffersonian and faithful student of local government, became identified with an unprecedented projection of Federal authority, an influence directly attributable to the necessities of war. As we work toward the rule of law in our world, an ideal eloquently advanced by both Democratic and Republican Presidents, we will by that very process lessen the severity of the problem referred to by the President. But, Mr. Speaker, the tensions of war must be accepted by our generation, and the goal of peace is not yet within our grasp; hence we must confront the matter of adding to the Nation's strength through aid to the States.

One other influence contributing to the growth of the grants-in-aid funds is the geographical concentration of wealth that received such impetus in an earlier period. There have been mitigating influences in recent years, tending to reduce the importance of this factor in national policy, though as we all know, it, too, is a continuing problem. That it is less severe is shown by the income figures for my own State of Arkansas and those for the State of New York, for example. Twenty years ago the per capita income for New York was about five times that of Arkansas; today it is only a little more than twice as much. Still, the income factors have a direct bearing upon the relationships to be studied by the proposed Commission.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. To what extent is the Government responsible, we will say, for inequality of population or inequality of wealth?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The Federal Government is not obligated to equalize incomes of the States, of course, but Federal policies contribute to the disparities. The gentleman is familiar with the figures since he has studied the problem of educational facilities.

Mr. BAILEY. Where there is a Government responsibility.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes, exactly, but there would be few demands upon us, may I point out, for grants-in-aid, for education if there were uniform incomes throughout the United States. The States would have all the facilities they need.

Mr. BAILEY. That is true. May I implement what the gentleman was saying on this question of inequality by saying testimony before my subcommittee in the 82d Congress indicated that the State of New York—and we are speaking now of educational facilities—on eighty-five one-hundredths of 1 percent of its per capita wealth, that is, the wealth of its citizens, could supply $358 per capita for its school children's education. The other extreme was the State of South Carolina, where to raise $65.95 per capita it took 3 percent of the income of every citizen in South Carolina.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes. The best speech I ever heard made for specialized aid to schools was made by a taxpayer in a more favored State, Pennsylvania, who said that in terms of national security and national well-being Federal grants pay dividends.

I appreciate the indulgence of the House in permitting me to offer these first impressions of the President's excellent and significant message. My purpose in speaking today is primarily to urge consideration of the idea of a joint House and Senate committee rather than the noncongressional commission heretofore used for legislative studies.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOPE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE and to include a resolution.

Mrs. CHURCH in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include a letter from the Harley-Davidson Motor Co. on tariffs.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON relative to a bill for the appointment of qualified male persons as nurses in the United States Army Reserves.

Mr. FARRINGTON and to include an article on the design of the flag.

Mr. BRAY in two instances and in one to include an editorial appearing in the Cincinnati Inquirer.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include a prize-winning essay on the subject "The Living Constitution."

Mr. MASON on the subject of tax reduction and include an article on the same subject.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) and to include a report of a questionnaire he sent to his constituents.

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. WAMPLER and to include an editorial appearing in the Richmond News Leader paying tribute to his colleague, CHARLES R. JONAS, of North Carolina.

Mr. DIES.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH and to include a tabulation made by a committee some years ago in support of the United States maritime training program.

Mr. BLATNIK and to include an editorial.

Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR).

Mr. METCALF and include an article from the New Leader.

Mr. GWINN (at the request of Mrs. ST. GEORGE).

Mr. D'EWART (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

Mr. PHILLIPS in three separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1419. An act to permit the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1110. An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 90, the House adjourned until Monday, April 13, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

599. A letter from the national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the third annual report of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for the year ending December 31, 1952, pursuant to section 7 of the act of March 16, 1950, entitled "An act to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. 119); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

600. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

601. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

602. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain Government-owned burial lots and other property in the Washington Parish Burial Ground, Washington, D. C., and to exchange other burial lots"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

603. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of judgments and settlements entered during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, pursuant to section 10 of the Public Vessels Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1112); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

604. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to provide for the investigation by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of persons receiving Atomic Energy Commission fellowships"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

605. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide a temporary program of assistance in the construction of minimum school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

606. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress so as to make improvements in its provisions and extend its duration for a 2-year period, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 231. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 232. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2565. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries"; without amendment (Rept. No. 256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1919 (41 Stat. 16); with amendment (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3915. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 147. An act for the relief of Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko; without amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 516. A bill for the relief of Ronald Lee Oenning; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 682. An act for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya); without amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 954. An act for the relief of Robert Harold Wall; without amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 734. A bill for the relief of Mihai Handrabura; with amendment (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 813. A bill for the relief of Jane Loraine Hindman; with amendment (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Francesca Servello; without amendment (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 889. A bill for the relief of Scarlett Scroggin; with amendment (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Maria Buffoni and Emma Botta; with amendment (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1187. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna DiGiorgi; without amendment (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1200. A bill for the relief of Ronald J. Palmer and Ronda Kay Palmer; without amendment (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Schoenauer; without amendment (Rept. No. 244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Predrag Mitrovich; without amendment (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary: H. R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vagianos); with amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Goon (Goon Mei Chee); without amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2201. A bill for the relief of Constantinous Tzortzis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of Jaroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek; without amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3042. A bill for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco; with amendment (Rept. No. 250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3244. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Dutchess; without amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of Erna Meyer Grafton; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3678. A bill for the relief of George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky; without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lynn Neis; without amendment (Rept. No. 254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3758. A bill for the relief of Stavrula Perutsea; without amendment (Rept. No. 255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 4443. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 4444. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide, in the case of a fiscal year corporation which began business in 1949, that so much of a net operating loss as is allocable to 1950 may be carried over to the fourth and fifth succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4445. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 4446. A bill to extend foreign-trade-zone privileges to qualified public warehousemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 4447. A bill to provide for the appointment of qualified male persons as nurses in the United States Army Reserve and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 4448. A bill to reduce the interest charges on the national debt by refunding outstanding obligations through the issuance of tax-exempt bonds bearing a low rate of interest; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 4449. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 4450. A bill to amend section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that in those cases where, under existing law, the taxpayer may deduct only so much of his actual expenses for medical care as exceeds 5 percent of his adjusted gross income, he may henceforth deduct so much of such expenses as exceeds 2 percent of his adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4451. A bill to provide that where, for 15 years or more, the Veterans' Administration has rated an individual as totally disabled, and he is 65 or older, his disability shall be considered permanent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 4452. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4453. A bill to increase the penalty provisions of certain acts dealing with narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 4454. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by clarifying the definition of "employee", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 4455.—A bill to provide that members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians shall be given preference in employment in connection with the administration of the Red Lake Indian Forest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4456. A bill to assist the large cities of the United States in establishing and maintaining more adequate systems for the provision of efficient ambulance service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS of North Carolina:

H. R. 4457. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to authorize the administrator of General Services to establish and operate motor vehicle pools and systems and to provide office furniture and furnishings when agencies are moved to new locations, to direct the administrator to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 4458. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 4459. A bill to permit aliens registered on former quota waiting lists maintained prior to January 1, 1944, to be placed on the appropriate quota waiting lists maintained under authority of the Immigration and Nationality Act without loss of priority of their original registration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4460. A bill to provide for payments in lieu of taxes to be made to local taxing authorities with respect to Federal real property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4461. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRINGFELLOW:

H. R. 4462. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide a flexible duty on the importation of lead and zinc so as to stabilize the domestic production of such articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4463. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H. R. 4464. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide, in the case of a fiscal year corporation which began business in 1949, that so much of a net operating loss as is allocable to 1950 may be carried over to the fourth and fifth succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 4465. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taxation and borrowing powers of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 237. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Army to restore the white crosses or other religious markers which until recently were above the graves of the honored war dead at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Con. Res. 92. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the important role of women in the development of aviation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. Res. 197. Resolution investigating certain matters pertaining to the merchant marine and fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 198. Resolution providing funds for the studies and investigations to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 197; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 200. Resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior, and the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior, to submit a report to the House of Representatives concerning the peat resources of the United States and the possibilities for utilization of such resources for industrial, power, and fuel purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. Res. 201. Resolution authorizing the study entitled "Permit Communist Conspirators To Be Teachers?" and a related statement by members of the Association of American Universities to be printed as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 4466. A bill for the relief of Epifano Trupiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4467. A bill for the relief of Ciro Magliulo; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 4468. A bill for the relief of Giacomo Bartolo Vanadia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4469. A bill for the relief of Alton Bramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4470. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Robert D. McMillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 4471. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 4472. A bill for the relief of John Baltrusaitis (Baltrusaitieni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 4473. A bill for the relief of Mary Keane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4474. A bill for the relief of Frederick Joseph Buttaccio and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4475. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. McPhail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 4476. A bill for the relief of Patrick Joseph Devine (Joji Tabata); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 4477. A bill for the relief of Alfred P. Bauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4478. A bill for the relief of Simone Saracino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

135. By Mr. BEAMER: Petition of 107 members of the Methodist Church, Nazarene Church, Shirley "Friends" Church, and Gospel Tabernacle Church, of Shirley, Ind., in regard to H. R. 1227; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

136. Also, petition of Izaak Walton League of America, western representative, in re H. R. 4023; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

137. Also, petition of the Marion chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America, which chapter is unanimously in favor of the passage of H. R. 3056 which authorizes the issuance this year of a special 3-cent stamp commemorating the 300th anniversary of the publication of the Compleat Angler; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

138. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Minneapolis Sheet Metal Workers, Local No. 34, Minneapolis, Minn., urging careful consideration on the tidelands oil bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 6, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and of the living dead, from the beauty of the lilies in the sanctuaries of worship we come in the afterglow of Easter girding ourselves with its deathless message as we take up our daily tasks again, feeling through all this earthly dress bright shoots of everlastingness. In our own risen lives, seeking those things which are above, may we toil in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal, knowing in very truth that we have passed from death to life. And thus, in our personal lives and in our national and international relationships, may we face whatever the future holds, calm and confident in the assurance that—

"There lives a beauty that man cannot kill,
Yea; that shall kill all ugliness at last.
May we hold that faith and hold it fast."

We ask it in the name of the risen Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 2, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 4, 1953, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1110. An act to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the appointment of a Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, and for other purposes; and

S. 1229. An act to continue the effectiveness of the Missing Persons Act, as amended and extended, until February 1, 1954.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have given assurance to many Senators that no business except formal business would be conducted today. So, after the morning business has been concluded, it is the intention to have the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, and then to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

I may say that from now on it is expected that the Senate will, with some exceptions, meet every day of the week, Monday through Friday, and it is likely that that program will be followed until Congress finally adjourns.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GILLETTE was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week because of necessary absence from the city.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON YUGOSLAV EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, for the period September 16 through December 15, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and prevention of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of February 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROPOSED LOANS OF OBSOLETE SHIPS' BELLS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the St. Andrew's School, Middletown, Del., and the Sea Explorer Scouts Unit, No. 22, East Chicago, Ind., had requested loans of obsolete ships' bells; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LISTS OF JUDGMENTS AND SETTLEMENTS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments and settlements entered during the fiscal year July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952, under section 10 of the Public Vessels Act of March 3, 1925, and a list of judgments and settlements entered during the same period under section 12 of the Suits in Admiralty Act of March 9, 1920 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of the orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reason for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 874, 81ST CONGRESS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress so as to make improvements in its provisions and extend its duration for a 2-year period, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TEMPORARY PROGRAM OF ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOL FACILITIES IN CERTAIN AREAS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide a temporary program of assistance in the construction of minimum school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Memorial 4

"Memorial relating to the maintenance of Fort Huachuca

"To the President and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"It is reported that an order has been issued calling for the closing of Fort Huachuca, which is located in Arizona near the Mexican border.

"There are valid reasons why the proposed action should not be taken.

"Fort Huachuca is one of the oldest military installations in the West, dating back to the days of Indian warfare. Since its establishment it has been considered by military experts as an ideal place in which to train troops, because of its location, fine climate, and the nature of the terrain excellent for every type of military training.

"The urgent need for a military facility at the location occupied by Fort Huachuca becomes obvious when consideration is given to the importance of the protection thus afforded to the great copper mining operations and smelting facilities in the immediate area, both the United States and Mexico.

"In a time such as the present, when all possible economy in the handling of the Nation's finances is of utmost importance, it must be apparent that in the interest of economy Fort Huachuca should be continued as a training location. It is estimated that $100 million have been expended in making this installation one of the best in the Nation, and the question inevitably arises, Why should more millions be expended to enlarge and equip a training center elsewhere when one of the country's best facilities is now available at Fort Huachuca?

"Wherefore your memorialist, the senate of the State of Arizona, prays—

"1. That the President and the Congress take whatever action is necessary to continue in operation the excellent military installation at Fort Huachuca, Ariz.

"Adopted by the senate March 25, 1953.

"Filed in the office of the secretary of state March 25, 1953."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution Z

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to enact legislation supporting the prices of basic farm crops at 100 percent parity

"Whereas the maintenance of a strong and healthy agricultural economy is of the utmost importance to the citizens of this State and of the United States; and

"Whereas such an economy is impossible to maintain whenever basic farm crop prices

fall below 100 percent parity with the prices for other commodities and services; and

"Whereas to maintain the prices of basic farm crops at 100 percent parity it is necessary that the Federal Government undertake and continue a program of legislation providing for the making of commodity loans in such amounts as will assure the support of basic farm-crop prices at not less than 100 percent parity: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully petitioned to enact proper legislation to provide for commodity loans to maintain and support the prices of basic farm crops at not less than 100 percent parity; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the pending officers of each of the Houses of Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and to each of the members of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution X

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the appropriation under Public Law 731, so as to provide and secure a larger allotment of funds for FHA direct farm ownership loans in North Dakota

"Whereas all of the money allotted to North Dakota, out of funds appropriated by Congress under Public Law 731, to be used by the Farmers Home Administration in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, in making direct farm ownership loans in North Dakota was used up or committed by the end of October 1952; and

"Whereas it is estimated that there are several hundred young farmers, including a large number of former servicemen, who desire to purchase farms under the 40-year amortized plan of FHA direct farm-ownership loans, but cannot make such loans because the funds for this purpose allotted to North Dakota are insufficient; and

"Whereas these young farmers who desire these direct farm ownership loans are unable to obtain private credit and do not have the funds or possess the equity necessary to obtain so-called FHA insured loans; and

"Whereas many of these young farmers, unable to purchase farms of their own, are being forced to leave the State or to move to cities to seek employment there: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized, petitioned and urged to increase the appropriation under Public Law 731 for Farmers Home Administration direct farm-ownership loans and to take other necessary actions, so as to provide and secure an increased allotment of funds from such appropriation for direct farm-ownership loans in North Dakota; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation, and to the United States Secretary of Agriculture and to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations of the United States House of Representatives and to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations of the United States Senate.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution Y

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to return to the original landowners mineral rights acquired by Federal agencies

"Whereas this assembly is in favor of proposed Federal legislation providing for the return of mineral rights to original landowners whose lands have been acquired by Federal agencies through purchase, condemnation or foreclosure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That this assembly does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary for the return of mineral rights to original landowners whose lands have been acquired by Federal agencies through purchase, condemnation or foreclosure; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent by the secretary of state to the presiding officer in each House of Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, and to each Member of the North Dakota congressional delegation.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution Q

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation requiring lands from which parcels described by metes and bounds have been condemned or purchased for dam construction to be surveyed and platted to determine descriptions and acreage of remaining tract

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein):

"Whereas the United States Government has condemned or purchased numerous parcels of land in North Dakota for use in the construction of dams, which parcels are described by metes and bounds, without specifying the acreage taken, so that it is now impossible for a proper assessment to be made of such remaining tracts from which such parcels have been taken; and

"Whereas such remaining tracts must be resurveyed or accurately platted and the correct acreage determined; and

"Whereas it is deemed to be unfair to put the expense of such resurvey or platting upon the owners: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact necessary legislation to require the Corps of Engineers or other proper Government agency to resurvey or accurately plat to determine the metes and bounds of such remaining tracts and correctly determine the acreage thereof, and to record such plats in the office of the register of deeds of the county wherein such tract lies, without cost or expense to the person owning the lands from which such parcels have been taken; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, instructed to send copies of this resolution properly authenticated to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress of the United States and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate."

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution I

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and petitioning the Federal Congress to discontinue Federal taxation of motor-vehicle fuel and to reserve such source of highway revenue to the several States

"Whereas financing of State and local highway systems is becoming an increasingly severe problem in all States but remains a matter best handled on State and local levels; and

"Whereas State responsibility can be fully assumed only through full utilization of the limited fields of revenue available to the States; and

"Whereas highway-user revenue must continue to be the primary source from which costs of State and local highway systems are met and such revenue on the State level is devoted almost without exception to such systems; and

"Whereas the taxation of motor-vehicle fuels as a means of securing revenue for highway purposes is traditionally and appropriately reserved primarily to the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we do hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States that the present Federal taxation of motor-vehicle fuel be discontinued and that this important source of highway revenue be reserved exclusively to the several States; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated, be transmitted by the secretary of state to the presiding officer of each House of Congress, and to the Members of the North Dakota delegation in Congress.

"C. P. DAHL,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"WALTER BUBEL,
"Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

"House Concurrent Resolution T

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to pass legislation requiring investigations of Federal income-tax returns to be conducted within 2 years from the time such returns must be filed

"Whereas it has been the practice of the collector of internal revenue, now the director of internal revenue, and of the Treasury Department of the United States to investigate Federal income-tax returns several years after the same have been filed; and

"Whereas such delay is not necessary and is not efficient conduct of Government business; and

"Whereas the records of the taxpayer are more apt to be lost or destroyed during such delay and is unfair to the taxpayer: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That Congress is hereby petitioned to enact Federal legislation which would require investigations of Federal income-tax returns to be conducted within 2 years after the time such returns were required to be filed; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this concurrent resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota, to the director of internal revenue at Washington, D. C., and to the director of internal revenue for the State of North Dakota at Fargo, N. Dak.

"WALTER BUBEL,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"V. L. GILBREATH,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*
"C. P. DAHL,
"*President of the Senate.*
"EDWARD LENO,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 29

"*To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State; the Honorable Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior; and to the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully represents:

"Whereas a new and ominous threat to the fishery resources of Bristol Bay waters has appeared; and

"Whereas an Embassy dispatch from the United States Embassy in Tokyo, dated February 16, 1953, advises that the Japanese fishing fleet will, this year, enter Bristol Bay waters for the purpose of fishing for an expected catch of 1,100,000 king crab during a 5-month period, extending from the last of April through September; and

"Whereas the dispatch further advises that a 5,000-ton mother ship, the *Tekei Maru*, equipped with a two-line crab cannery capable of producing 300 cases per day, together with 12 catcher boats carrying with them approximately 4,000 miles of tangle net gear and 25 sets of trawl gear and crews of approximately 421 Japanese fishermen, will enter Bristol Bay fishing grounds by the end of April 1953 and over which the United States has no control; and

"Whereas this fishery is in an area now being fished by American fishermen under United States Government restrictions but which will now be exploited by other nations under terms of a treaty between the United States, Canada, and Japan as proposed in 1952, whereby the people of Japan agreed not to fish for salmon and halibut in the Pacific Ocean east of 175° west longitude and for herring south of the Aleutian Islands, but are allowed to fish for bottom fish, crab, and other shellfish in the Bering Sea and Gulf of Alaska; and

"Whereas in the absence of restrictions under existing provisions of the proposed treaty, the Japanese crab fishermen are allowed to use equipment, gear, and methods in these waters which are currently prohibited by the Japanese Government in Japanese waters; and

"Whereas during the 1952 fishing season the Japanese fishing fleet in the area west of the 175th meridian caught 2,102,707 salmon, of which 673,503 were red salmon, some of which were undoubtedly destined for the fisheries of the Bristol Bay; and

"Whereas the salmon fisheries of Alaska have become seriously depleted, and this Japanese operation threatens to exterminate the Bristol Bay crab fisheries with resultant irreparable damage to the economy and well-being of an American industry; and

"Whereas king crab fishing has been an established enterprise for a considerable number of years and has contributed to the national wealth; and

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 21st session assembled, respectfully prays, on behalf of the people of Alaska and of the United States, that immediate and positive action be taken by the Government of the United States to investigate and prevent the threatened destruction of the salmon and crab fisheries of western Alaska which contribute vitally to its economic well-being; that immediate steps be taken to implement the treaty by enactment of legislation providing for United States participation in research and management of this fishery before it becomes depleted by overexploitation, and to protect the rights of citizens of the United States who engage in fishing in this area.

"And your memorialist further prays that the Congress of the United States or its appropriate agency take immediate steps to define territorial waters and historic bays over which the United States may exercise jurisdiction in order to prevent entry in such waters by foreign fishing fleets.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

"Whereas the 82d Congress enacted Public Law 552, otherwise known as chapter 877, 2d session, S. 1310, and also designated as 66 Statute 692, purporting to be a bill for the prevention of major disasters in mines; and

"Whereas said Public Law 552 prohibits after January 16, 1953, the use of black powder in coal mines of States which authorize the use of such explosives, which prohibition will eliminate deep mining in Iowa and in States having like conditions; and

"Whereas Public Law 552 provides for preshift inspection in shaft mines even though those mines are operated by the method known as longwall mining; and

"Whereas it is impossible to examine the face of a longwall mine before the coal is removed from in front of the face; and

"Whereas Public Law 552 provides that State laws shall not be superseded by the Federal law where the State laws provide greater safety than the Federal law; and

"Whereas Public Law 552 provides that the board of review shall be the final finders of fact; and

"Whereas Public Law 552 is another example of the steady accretion of Federal power at the expense of the several States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the 55th General Assembly (the House concurring)*, That the 83d Congress give serious consideration to amending Public Law 552 of the 82d Congress so as to provide that black powder may be used in deep mines in any State in which there is no danger from methane gas, which State specifically authorizes such use; that said Public Law 552 be further amended so as to permit the examination of longwall mines at any time during every working day; that said law be amended to provide that any State law shall prevail which provides equal safety with the Federal enactment; that said Public Law 552 be further amended so as to provide that the effect of said law on any State law shall be a matter of law, and the court shall not be bound by any previous finding of fact; be it further

"*Resolved*, That attested copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the presiding officers of the Congress of the United States and to each member of the Iowa delegation in Congress, and that printed copies thereof, showing that said concurrent resolution was adopted by the Legislature of Iowa, be sent to each house of the legislatures of the States of the United States.

"LEO ELTHON,
"*Lieutenant Governor of Iowa.*
"CARROLL A. LANE,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*
"W. S. LYNES,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"A. C. GUSTAFSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN SOVIET UNION AND ITS SATELLITES—RESOLUTION OF TRI-CITY JEWISH CENTER, ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted at the Tri-City Jewish Center in Rock Island, Ill., condemning the outbreak of official anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and its satellites.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT THE RELIGIOUS SERVICES AT THE TRI-CITY JEWISH CENTER IN ROCK ISLAND, ILL., FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 1953

The latest anti-Jewish, anti-Zionist accusations of the Soviet Government, coming on the heels of similar charges in Eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary, have sounded a dire warning to all men and women who cherish liberty and justice.

The free world has not and will not be deceived by this treacherous attempt by the Soviet Government to mask its all-out war against human rights by hurling fantastic charges against its Jewish citizens and against the Zionist movement which has always been identified with the forces of freedom and justice.

This same warning was sounded 20 years ago but the democratic world then failed to realize that persecution of the Jews was merely the forerunner of contemplated enslavement of all peoples. While a confused world watched in horror, 6 million Jewish men, women, and children were slaughtered in an unparalleled blood bath which soon involved additional tens of millions who were lost among all nations and all peoples.

People of good will of all faiths have not forgotten and will never forget the barbaric tragedy that befell the Jewish people under Hitlerism. Complacency, the ally of all foes of freedom and democracy, must never again lull the free world into inaction and indifference.

It is an eloquent manifestation of the free world's awareness of the sovereignty of human rights that free men and women everywhere have responded to this latest challenge against humanity with instantaneous and deep indignation.

The Jewish community of the Tri-Cities which includes Rock Island and Moline, Ill., and Davenport, Iowa, calls upon its representatives in the Congress of the United States to speak out against this terrible threat to the 3 million Jews behind the Iron

Curtain countries. We ask that they be aware, as we must be, that this challenge is but the prelude to the suppression of the rights of free men everywhere. We respectfully request that the United States speak out in the United Nations Assembly, calling upon Soviet Russia to reconsider its dangerous decision and that it desist from persecuting its Jewish citizens. We also request that every aid be given the Jewish people who are in flight to freedom so that they might settle as free men in the State of Israel or wherever they may find a place of safe refuge.

The Jewish community of the Tri-Cities wishes to remind its Representatives in Congress that the State of Israel, created by the will of the United Nations, stands ready to receive all Jewish refugees from the world's places of persecution. The deceptive break in diplomatic relations between Russia and Israel must be recognized by the free nations of the world for what it really is, an attempt to win the support of the Arab states who are still at war with Israel. As Americans and as Jews we cherish world peace above all other interests. We, therefore, suggest that the United States carefully consider the effects of arming the Arab states and in particular Egypt, unless peace is restored as requested by the United Nations. Arming one side will lead only to war and the further spread of Soviet influence. We respectfully submit the suggestion that the United States refuse to send arms to any side refusing to agree to an immediate peace and full participation in building the security for a free world.

This resolution has been approved in the synagogue of the Tri-City Jewish Center in Rock Island, Ill., with devout prayers to the Almighty God of all the world in the fervent hope that our Nation along with all the countries of the United Nations will morally and honestly dedicate their every effort to preserve the fundamental principles of equal justice and democracy which are the only foundation for world peace.

Joseph Neff, Tri-City Jewish Center; Mrs. Herman Farber, Beth Israel Sisterhood; Samuel W. Gilman, B'nai B'rith Lodge, No. 1016; Mrs. Charles E. Hulman, Pioneer Women; Sam Moskowitz, Farband Labor Zionists; George Phillips, Center Men's Club; Gertrude S. Ness, Hadassah; Ida R. Blitz, B'nai B'rith Women; Jerome S. Zeffren, Tri-City Zionists; Bernard Diskin, Youth Guild.

BILLS INTROUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1569. A bill to amend the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, so as to provide for the investigation by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of persons receiving Atomic Energy Commission fellowships; and

S. 1570. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the establishment of the Fort Leavenworth, Kans., military post; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1571. A bill for the relief of Jake Bell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1572. A bill to recognize a Missouri River States Committee as an advisory group in preparing and executing a unified program for the conservation and development of soil and water resources in the Missouri River Basin based on the public-works program authorized by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944, to establish a States office to serve such a committee and the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. GEORGE:

Poem entitled "On the Death of Robert M. La Follette, Jr.," written by former Senator Scott W. Lucas.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "As Mr. Bunker Leaves Rome," published in the New York Times of April 4, 1953.

POSTWAR ECONOMY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have been concerned over what appears to be fear psychology among our citizens, based on peace in Korea—the fear being, of course, that once we conclude the Korean war and reduce Federal expenditures for the production of war material, a depression will ensue.

Personally, I cannot believe that our Nation, with its great productive capacity, must have its economy geared to a condition of continuing wars and Governing spending. It is contrary to the basic philosophy of our Nation. We are a peace-loving people, and it would be most discouraging to think that as a Nation we have reached the place where we cannot have peace and enjoy the fruits of prosperity for the betterment of humankind.

Let us begin to think of expenditures that fit into an economy which calls for spending for services and commodities, in keeping with our great heritage.

It is true, of course, that in a change from peace to war, or war to peace, there must be dislocations in agriculture, labor, and industry. Moving into a peacetime economy will require sound leadership, not only in Government, but in every phase of our national economy. I believe we have such leadership.

Mr. President, recently a very excellent editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal entitled "Peace and War," and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE AND WAR

When the Korean war broke out in late June 1950 the stock market went into a tailspin. It did it again last Monday.

On Friday, June 23, 1950, the Dow-Jones industrial averages stood at 224.35. Over the week end the North Korean Army marched south and President Truman intervened, first with the Air Forces and then with United States troops. On Monday the stock market averages dropped to 213.91. By the middle of the week they were 209.11. Three weeks later they were down to 197.63.

Friday, March 27, the Dow-Jones industrial averages closed at 287.33. Over the week end there was renewed hope that the Korean war might soon end. Monday the industrial averages dropped 4.26 to 283.07.

Some people noting this concurrence between peace news and the stock market—and forgetting what happened when war began—have already begun to talk of a "peace scare," as if war were bullish and peace were bearish.

In Washington some of the Federal economic forecasters speak of the "trouble-making possibilities" of a peace in Korea. It might reduce Government defense spending and, so they say, be hurtful to the economy, cause a downturn in business.

Whenever a nation shifts from war to peace, or to an armed truce, there is a period of unsettling uncertainty, just as there is when it shifts from peace to war. The stock market usually declines upon either event. This is not a reaction to peace or war. It is a barometer of the people's cautious reaction to prospects of great change.

Today this uncertainty of a great many people has undoubtedly been intensified by the absurd philosophy, long held in Washington and long preached by some self-anointed political economists, that prosperity is made by Government spending and that if peace stops the war spending the prosperity will collapse. That the idea is idiotic seems to be no deterrent to the argument.

It is quite likely, of course, that if the Korean war should be settled, and if other tensions should be eased, there will be some decline in our Government spending for war. Industries that make goods purely for war will have a little less business. But to conclude that this will be bad for a nation's economy is to indulge in the rawest kind of double think.

In the first place, those who fret over reduced Government spending ignore the fact that less Government spending makes possible a lesser tax burden. The Government will spend less money on goods useless for anything except destruction and the citizens will have more money to spend for economically useful goods or invest in new tools for making them. For those who like to be practical, we note that such soft spots as there are now in the economy are in consumer goods which the people, robbed by taxes and inflation, have not enough money to buy.

But more importantly, those who preach that a war economy is a prosperous economy are blind to the absurdity to which their own reasoning leads.

If it were true that a nation were made prosperous by putting a large part of its national product into arms, then we would have indeed discovered the millennium. We could get more and more prosperous by taking more and more men away from useful work and putting them into uniform; by taking more and more of our machines out of useful production and putting them into production of things to be blown up. The bigger the armies the less we would have to worry about unemployment; the bigger the war the less about surplus productive capacity.

As a matter of fact, if this idea made any sense at all we could do the whole thing much simpler. We could hire half the population to make balloons and the other half to explode them with pins and the resulting level of employment and economic activity would be stupendous.

The truth is that a war economy is the most destructive of all. It brings inflation, as the price indices and stock-market averages show, but this is the most bearish of all economic signs, for inflation in its worst form is the price mechanism's warning of spreading chaos and coming poverty. The war economy is destructive even if it blows nothing up, for it makes useless the work of vast quantities of men and machines.

Any promise of peace is a harbinger not only of hope but of a richer prosperity, for peace is the essential soil for all economic progress. It has been only the periods of peace that have made this Nation strong enough and prosperous enough to survive all its wars and, unlike so many other nations, emerge afterwards still not bankrupt.

It is possible that peace will come to Korea and it is also possible that there will be a decline in business. But any leveling off of business will not come because of the peace. It will come, if it does, because this country has been strong enough, as it has already shown, to take this war in its stride. People have found since June 1950, that no matter how energetically they bought and hoarded they could not strip bare for long the shelves of stores and factories.

War itself is a terrible thing but we find more terrible yet the fact that there are men walking about who talk of peace as if it were terrible.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, April 7, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

John Slezak, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Arthur S. Flemming, of Ohio, to be Director of Defense Mobilization.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and love, who coverest the earth with a tapestry of beauty, hallowed be Thy name. In the midst of the high concerns of public service, in this demanding and confusing day of global change, we are grateful for quiet cloisters of the spirit where in moments of reverential calm Thou dost restore our souls. In a violent world we seek Thy rest and the refuge of Thy sheltering wing; yet we desire not the rest of those whose hands are folded and whose swords are sheathed, but of those who fight the good fight with all their might.

Grant us, we pray Thee, the peace and poise of the Master Workman who steadfastly faced hate's worst and who, having overcome even death, goes on conquering and to conquer. In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORSE was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow.

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. DWORSHAK were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today on official business as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of last Thursday, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has the floor. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Ohio for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Green
Barrett	Cordon	Griswold
Beall	Daniel	Hayden
Bennett	Dirksen	Hendrickson
Bricker	Douglas	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Duff	Hill
Bush	Eastland	Holland
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Humphrey
Byrd	Flanders	Ives
Capehart	Frear	Jenner
Carlson	Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.
Case	George	Johnson, Tex.
Clements	Goldwater	Kerr
Kilgore	Millikin	Smith, Maine
Knowland	Morse	Smith, N. J.
Kuchel	Mundt	Sparkman
Langer	Murray	Stennis
Lehman	Neely	Symington
Malone	Pastore	Taft
Mansfield	Payne	Watkins
Martin	Potter	Welker
Maybank	Purtell	Wiley
McCarran	Robertson	Williams
McCarthy	Russell	Young
McClellan	Schoeppel	

Mr. TAFT. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Florida has the floor.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Members of the Senate be permitted, without the Senator from Florida losing the floor, to present unanimous consent requests and other routine matters that would be in order during the morning hour, if we had a morning hour, and that the remarks of no Senator may exceed 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON SOIL SURVEY AND LAND CLASSIFICATION, BOULDER CREEK SUPPLY CANAL, COLORADO-BIG THOMPSON PROJECT, COLORADO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that

an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands to be served by the Boulder Creek Supply Canal, Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON SALE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT-OWNED TIMBER

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report of investigation by the Office of Investigations, General Accounting Office, covering the sale of Government-owned timber by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON SURVEY AND REVIEW OF ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey and review of the Alaska Road Commission, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 21

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass a law granting to the State of Kansas all mineral interests and full mineral ownership in lands owned by the United States or any and all Federal agencies within the boundaries of Kansas

"Whereas there is pending in the United States Congress a bill commonly known as the Holland bill, which the sponsor contends, 'simply recognizes, confirms, establishes, and vests in the States the submerged lands and the natural resources therein'; and

"Whereas similar legislation has been passed by two former Congresses, which bills were vetoed: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Kansas, That we respectfully urge, request, and memorialize the Congress of the United States, that in the event they pass legislation granting to the border or coastal States, the mineral rights in and under and mineral deposits, including oil and gas, in the property commonly referred to as the 'tidelands,' whether it be the Holland bill or any other similar bill, that said Congress likewise pass a law granting unto the State of Kansas, all mineral rights owned by the United States, or any agency of the United States, and all mineral interests in and under land owned by the United States, and lying within the borders of the State of Kansas; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to: The President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, each member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate and to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"I hereby certify that the above resolution originated in the senate, and was adopted by that body March 27, 1953.

"FRED HALL,
"President of the Senate.
"SIDNEY MARGARET GARDINER,
"Secretary of the Senate."

The petition of Emily Soderman Pearson, of Minneapolis, Minn., relating to the settlement of the estate of Nels Pearson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation providing support prices for basic farm crops at 100 percent parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation to increase the appropriation under Public Law 731, so as to provide and secure a larger allotment of funds for FHA direct farm ownership loans in North Dakota; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation requiring investigations of Federal income-tax returns to be conducted within 2 years from the time such returns must be filed; and

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to discontinuance of Federal taxation of motor vehicle fuel and to reserve such source of highway revenue to the several States; to the Committee on Finance.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relating to the return to original landowners mineral rights acquired by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, favoring the enactment of legislation to require lands from which parcels described by metes and bounds have been condemned or purchased for dam construction to be surveyed and platted to determine descriptions and acreage of remaining tract; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See concurrent resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President, RECORD of proceedings of April 6, 1953.)

EXTENSION OF POWER TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO DISCONTINUE CERTAIN RAILROAD SERVICES—RESOLUTION OF IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, protesting against the enactment of the bill (S. 281) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce. There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, a nonpolitical arm of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, created by legislative act under authority of the Idaho Constitution and vested by said legislature with the duty to supervise and regulate all public utilities operating within the jurisdiction of said Commission as to scope of operation, rates, and condition of service, has taken note of recent activities of the independent agencies of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the independent agencies of the Federal Government, expressly the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Power Commission, have persistently sought, by projection of legislation, to extend the regulatory powers over public utilities into those areas that Congress has decreed should be left to local State control; and

Whereas the recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, as in the case of the *Federal Power Commission* v. *East Ohio Gas Company* (338 U. S. 464), which upholds the order of the Commission in assuming jurisdiction of a natural-gas company engaging strictly in the distribution and sale of natural gas only within the border of the State of Ohio. This with a recent ruling reading into the 13th section of the Interstate Commerce Act, the power to give weight to the nationwide passenger-train deficit in overruling the order of the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission and substituting its own schedule of intrastate rates represents a signboard that indicates the ever-increasing effort to overrun and to make meaningless every vested power of a State right to supervise, control and fix intrastate rates (docket No. 9, October term, Supreme Court, 1952—decision, December 22, 1952); and

Whereas the amendment to section 13 of the act, as proposed in Senate bill 281, would further invade and usurp the police power of the State and completely strip local authority, now vested in the various public service commissions of the respective States, of all jurisdiction and control over matters pertaining to the curtailment of railroad depot and station facilities, sidetracks, passenger- and freight-train services, and, by the adoption of this amendment, deprive the States of the last vestige of power and authority to regulate the railroads on purely intrastate operation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such corrective legislation as will accurately define the place where the regulatory agencies of the Federal Government cease to exercise their regulatory powers, and where the States, operating through the designated agency may control, regulate, and fix reasonable rates for commerce which, by the nature of their function, may be predominately an intrastate operation. That the 13th section of the Interstate Commerce Act be amended so as to make effective the policy herein designed, and that Congress may again restate its legislative intent: To leave to the States the enforcement of regulatory control of commerce whose prime functions are by their nature intrastate; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made a part of the minutes of this, a regular session of the Idaho Public Utilities Commission, and that the secretary of this commission is hereby directed to mail a copy of this resolution to Senators HERMAN WELKER and HENRY C. DWORSHAK and to Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST and Congressman HAMER BUDGE.

Done at Boise, Idaho, this 24th day of March 1953.

GEORGE R. JONES,
President.
H. C. ALLEN,
Commissioner.
H. N. BEAMER,
Commissioner.

Attest:

STEPHEN L. GUICE,
Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1573. A bill for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany; and

S. 1574. A bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (by request):

S. 1575. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Comdr. Wendell H. Froling; the estate of Mrs. Anna C. Froling, and the estate of Margaret A. Froling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1576. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Bouzos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1577. A bill to authorize the exchange of land in Eagle County, Colo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1578. A bill relating to the retirement of Government officers and employees whose sons or daughters shall have died while serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 1579. A bill for the relief of Mieko Kristine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1580. A bill for the relief of Dr. David Bethlahmy (Bethlachmy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1581. A bill to exempt lacrosse equipment from the tax on sporting goods; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 1582. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to establish and operate motor vehicle pools and systems, to regulate operators of Government-owned motor vehicles, and to direct the Administrator to report the unauthorized use of Government motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution making available certain unused immigration quota numbers for assignment by the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany. It is similar to the bill which I introduced 2 years ago, and authorizes the Government to pay for the German Embassy which was taken over by our Government during the war. It is in the amount of $300,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1573) for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JIRAIR MAZARTZIAN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian. I want everyone to know that he is a Pakistanian.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1574) for the relief of Jirair Mazartzian, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF DISCHARGE OF DR. ALLEN V. ASTIN AS DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution which proposes an official investigation on the part of the Senate, acting through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any other committee to which the resolution may be properly referred, of the dismissal of Dr. Astin as Director of the Federal Bureau of Standards.

I merely wish to repeat what I said last Thursday. I do not know what the facts are; but I believe that sufficient controversy about the situation has been disclosed by the press and enough conflict evidenced with respect to the representations made by various parties to cause the public to be interested in it. My only interest in the subject is to ascertain—and I think it is only fair to the President to do so—whether officials of the administration are adopting the spoils system in connection with an agency of the Government that I believe should always be kept above the spoils system.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 96), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Whereas it has been suggested to the press that Dr. Allen V. Astin has been removed as Director of the National Bureau of Standards because of political pressure and political considerations, and because of political interference in the Government with respect to scientific analysis of an alleged battery additive which is supposed to rehabilitate or regenerate the strength of batteries; and

Whereas it is imperative, if public confidence in the Government is to be maintained, that the National Bureau of Standards, which is engaged in scientific and objective analysis, be free of politics and political pressure and interference at all times; and

Whereas any substantial allegations tending to show political pressure and interference in this agency should be thoroughly and promptly investigated to determine whether political pressures have in fact influenced the removal of Dr. Astin, or whether the press has erroneously stated the case; and

Whereas if the press has misrepresented the case, the facts should be fully and clearly set forth in order that public confidence in the ability of the Government to perform scientific functions objectively may be restored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the removal of Dr. Allen V. Astin as Director of the National Bureau of Standards with a view to determining whether political pressures or political considerations influenced the removal of Dr. Astin and to what extent such removal impairs or strengthens the performance of essentially scientific and nonpolitical functions by the National Bureau of Standards. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

INCREASE IN MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES ON ARMED SERVICES AND LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE—PROPOSED DISCHARGE OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a request to make, based upon a discussion I had with the majority leader.

I served notice some days ago that I would submit a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from further consideration of Senate Resolution 32, temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare.

I am submitting my resolution today, but, as the majority leader will confirm, I explained to him that it is not my desire to interfere with his responsibilities of leadership on the floor in first disposing of the pending business. Therefore, I have suggested—and he certainly does not disagree—that the resolution lie on the table for a week, with the understanding that if the majority leader wishes to call it up in a shorter period of time he may do so.

I have a further understanding, because I shall be absent from the Senate on Wednesday, that the resolution will not be brought up on that day.

I now submit the resolution to which I have referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, and, without objection, will lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 32) temporarily increasing the membership of the Committees on Armed Services and Labor and Public Welfare.

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, TO BE DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably the nomination of Arthur S. Flemming, of Ohio, to be Director of Defense Mobilization. I ask unanimous consent that the biography of Mr. Flemming be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar; and, without objection, the biography will be printed in the RECORD.

The biography is as follows:

BIOGRAPHY OF ARTHUR S. FLEMMING

Mr. Flemming returned to Ohio Wesleyan on September 1, 1948, after 21 years of journalistic, educational, and governmental work in Washington, D. C., with the distinction of being the firm alumnus and the first layman to be elected president of this 108-year-old university.

He was named to the office June 3, 1948, and was inaugurated as Ohio Wesleyan's ninth president June 11, 1949, on the eve of

his 44th birthday. Ex-President Herbert C. Hoover delivered the main address at the inauguration exercises.

Appointed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1939 as the Republican member of the United States Civil Service Commission, Mr. Flemming was placed in charge of the Commission's activities in connection with World War II. Besides his work with the Commission, he served as a member of the War Manpower Commission and was chairman of its Labor-Management Policy Committee.

Mr. Flemming served as a member of the Hoover Commission to study the organization of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

On February 8, 1951, Charles E. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, appointed Mr. Flemming as assistant to the Director in charge of manpower problems and chairman of the Office of Defense Mobilization Manpower Policy Committee, Labor-Management Manpower Policy Committee, and the Committee on Specialized Personnel.

On January 24, 1953, the President appointed Mr. Flemming to be a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, and on February 19, 1953, a member of the Defense Department's Organization Committee.

He is a lay leader of the Ohio conference of the Methodist Church and was formerly lay leader and superintendent of the church school in Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C. He is past treasurer of the Committee on Religious Life in the Nation's Capital, an interfaith group, and served two terms as president of the Washington Federation of Churches.

In the field of journalism Mr. Flemming has been a newspaper writer, editor of Uncle Sam's Diary, a current-events publication, and a member of the editorial staff of the United States Daily (now U. S. News & World Report).

He was an instructor in government at American University, was named director of the school of public affairs there, and later became executive officer of the university. For 6 years he was an alumni trustee of Ohio Wesleyan, and he is presently a trustee of Temple University and of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association.

Born in Kingston, N. Y., in 1905, the son of Judge and Mrs. Harry H. Flemming, he received the bachelor of arts degree from Ohio Wesleyan in 1927, the master of arts degree from American University in 1928, and the bachelor of laws degree from the George Washington University in 1933.

Ohio Wesleyan, American University, Temple, Wesleyan, and Oberlin have conferred doctor of laws degrees upon him.

Mrs. Flemming, the former Bernice V. Moler, is a graduate of the University of Maryland. The Flemmings were married in 1934 and now have 5 children—Elizabeth Ann, 16; Susan Harriet, 13; Harry Sherwood, 12; and twins, Arthur Henry and Thomas Madison, 9.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Jackson Day banquet address delivered by Senator KERR at Springfield, Mo., on April 4, 1953.

By Mr. YOUNG:

Weekly news release distributed by him to all North Dakota newspapers under date of April 6, 1953, entitled "On Capitol Hill With Senator YOUNG—A Personal Report to the People of North Dakota."

By Mr. MURRAY:

Editorial entitled "Understanding the Commie Menace," published in the Machinist of March 19, 1953.

By Mr. LANGER:

Resolution adopted by the Evangelical Lutheran Church on the subject of social security for ministers, together with covering letter signed by O. H. Hove, general secretary, dated April 1, 1953.

Copy of letter sent to President Eisenhower by the Carter Carburetor Corp., together with an editorial entitled "Political Spending: The Cost of Handouts," published in the New York Journal-American of March 12, 1953, and the covering letter signed by Hugh H. C. Weed, president, Carter Carburetor Corp.

THE RATE OF INTEREST ON THE FEDERAL DEBT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions I have undertaken to point out the folly of increasing the rate of interest paid to bankers on the Federal debt.

It was therefore with considerable interest that I noted a letter on this subject by Prof. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard University, in the New York Times of Sunday, April 5.

Professor Harris points out that the national debt now costs $1 billion a year more in interest payments than at the end of the war although the size of the debt is roughly the same. He estimates that—

Should the administration continue with its present policies and bring rates back to the level of the twenties, the cost over 25 years may well be $100 billion.

In the light of the recent action of the Congress in killing the Council of Economic Advisers by failing to provide it with funds, I was particularly interested in the following observation made by Professor Harris:

The Congress is meticulous about appropriations of even $50,000 for the pay of economists whose task it is to study the $350-billion economy as a whole. Yet they allow, without any restrictions, full discretion to the managers of the debt even though one policy might cost from 1 to 4 billion dollars a year more than another.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the letter on national debt policy by Professor Harris from which I have just quoted.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor of the New York Times was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEBT POLICY—LONG-TERM IMPLICATIONS OF RISE IN INTEREST RATE EXAMINED

(The writer of the following letter is professor of Economics at Harvard University. He is the author, among other books, of the National Debt and the New Economics.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The new policy of debt management should be scrutinized by top administration, by Congress, and by citizens generally. This is the time to do it. Higher interest rates are crucial not only for management of the debt but the whole economy.

In 1946 the average rate on United States Government long-term bonds was 2.19 percent. Now the market is begining to anticipate a long-term issue of 3 or 3¼ percent, or roughly 1 percent above that of 1946. (The New York Times, on March 26, reported yield of 2.95 percent on one long-term issue.) Even by late 1952 Treasury bill rates had risen from .351 percent at the end of 1945 to 1.837 percent, and certificates of indebtedness from .875 to 1.890 percent.

Within 9 days of assumption of responsibility the present administration had offered an exchange of 1⅞-percent certificates of indebtedness for 2¼-percent certificates of indebtedness, and for some other issues. The market awaits still higher rates.

What is behind this new interest-rate policy?

PRICE OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES

First, there is the new administration's penchant for the free market. But in the management of the public debt there has been no free market. The price of Government securities depends upon the amount of money outstanding; and the latter in turn is largely determined by monetary authority. It has always been a manipulated market. In fact, many economists hold the theory that control of the interest rate is a price that has to be paid to assure freedom in other markets.

Second, the authorities seem to believe that it is sinful for the banks to hold large amounts of securities. Therefore, they hold, it is necessary to raise rates to a point where the public will be tempted to buy the securities and the banks to dislodge them. But I would remind the authorities that since 1914 purchases of securities by banks have accounted for about two-thirds of all rises in earning assets of banks and have been the most important monetary factor in financing a rise of money income of 8 to 10 times and of real income of 4 to 5 times.

Perhaps the monetary authority will tell us where, in the absence of bank purchases, the money is to come from which will be required over the next 25 years on the conservative assumption that real income would rise by 100 percent and prices by only 50 percent (less than 2 percent a year). For when the banks buy, additional deposits are created.

CONTROLS FOR CREDIT

Third, the new policy is supposed to deal with the problem of inflation. But surely since early 1951 the inflation has been a minimum (less than 3 percent a year in the cost of living, and a decline in wholesale prices) given the task of mobilizing resources for our military economy. Whatever the case for higher rates in earlier years, it is difficult to believe that, in the absence of the extension of war, higher rates are the appropriate policy in the next few years. If some classes of borrowers are abusing use of credit, there are alternative policies to higher rates which do not demoralize the Government bond market.

Defenders of the new policy will tell you that it was the Federal Reserve-Treasury concord of early 1951, with its repudiation of the debt-support policy, that stopped the rise of prices. To this I would reply, What about the reversal in the speculative rise of raw materials? The increase in taxes? What about the cumulative effects of record level of investments (and hence saturation of markets)? What about allocations of materials and price control? What about the excessive specuulation in the first 9 months of the Korean war? What about the difficulties of the soft-goods industries? All of these also can account for the flattening of the rise of prices.

The new administration should go slow in reversing the policies of the Roosevelt-Truman administration in this field. Managers of the public debt have learned since 1933 to tailor securities to the needs of different segments of the market, to give enough assurance to the market so that investors could safely hold long-term securities and hence be satisfied with lower rates. Compare the uncertainty today, with investors disposing and waiting until they are

sure they make the best possible bargain. Had rates in the last 20 years been those of the twenties, the cost of the national debt would have increased by more than $50 billion.

RISE IN COST

I hope that the new administration will be cautious. The national debt now cost $1 billion per year more than at the end of the war, though the size is roughly the same. Should the administration continue with its present policies and bring rates back to the level of the twenties, the cost over 25 years may well be $100 billion. I have not heard Senator BYRD say a word about economies in managing the debt.

It is also well to observe that a rise in the rate by 1 percent gives the banks an additional return of $600 million per year ultimately.

The Congress is meticulous about appropriations of even $50,000 for the pay of economists whose task it is to study the $350 billion economy as a whole. Yet they allow, without any restrictions, full discretion to the managers of the debt even though one policy might cost from 1 to 4 billion dollars a year more than another.

Again I urge a careful appraisal of the long-run implications of the new debt and interest rate policy. Not only the tax burden but also the state of our economy is involved.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *March 30, 1953.*

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FALL OF BATAAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the 11th anniversary of the fall of Bataan, on April 9, serves as a reminder that out of tragedy great rewards can come. There had already grown a close and deep friendship between Americans and Filipinos. But after Bataan, a friendship developed during 50 years of political association was forged anew in common suffering and sacrifice. Out of the sharing of disaster came an affectionate unity unsurpassed between any two other countries in the world. The glory of Bataan is a permanent part of Philippine-American relations.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we are all aware, the Eisenhower administration is confronted by a vast variety of policy questions relating to continuation of a tremendous variety of programs, domestic and foreign.

One of the programs in the international field which the administration is called upon to consider is our future policy with respect to the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

As of December 31 of this year, the present United Nations authorization for UNICEF expires, as does United States authorization for our own participation in this program.

So the question of our future United States policy in regard to this work has caused a delay in requesting and granting supplemental funds for UNICEF. As a result, today UNICEF is broke; it is down to its last unallocated $2,600.

From time to time I have drawn the attention of the Senate to the vital work which has been done by UNICEF through the years.

For a comparative pittance, this great organization has accomplished miracles of aid to tens of millions of youngsters and pregnant mothers in 70 countries.

At this time, I send to the desk a brief statement which I have prepared relative to the need for stopgap funds to continue UNICEF's work. I append an editorial on this theme which appeared in yesterday's New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that these items be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

GRANTING UNICEF SUPPLEMENTARY FUNDS

There is right now being considered by the State Department, by the Mutual Security Agency, and by the White House the question of future United States policy toward the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund.

Because of a tremendous number of factors involved in this complex question, I will not presume at the present time to attempt to offer any definitive conclusion as to the long-range decisions by our Government on this program.

I do state, unequivocally, however, that:

1. UNICEF has done a superlative job.

2. That it should be furnished at least the temporary wherewithal to continue doing that job, and should not be hamstrung in its current operations by the fact that certain long-range policy questions are still to be settled.

Great progress has been made in meeting certain administrative and jurisdictional problems, in integrating the work of UNICEF with the Food and Agriculture Organization and with the World Health Organization. Moreover, certain other problems which have confronted UNICEF have also been met with increasing success.

Now, the immediate problem confronting UNICEF is the need for stop-gap funds.

What is needed on the part of the administration and on the part of the Congress is a sense of genuine urgency which is intrinsically merited by this situation.

In other words, a starving child today cannot wait until January 1, 1954, until we settle high policy questions. The child will be dead by then. What then can allay the grief in the hearts of the child's parents?

A child suffering from yaws, tuberculosis, or malaria today cannot wait until the policy makers of this and other governments decide how the child's health shall ultimately be looked after. The child's little body will suffer permanent injury by then, even if the youngster can hold out at all.

The United States should not let that little child down.

Two days ago we celebrated Easter. Can we forget the words of the Master on the little ones?

Let me say now that it was a source of deep regret to me that at its recent meeting, when the executive board of the fund concluded approval of allocations for 52 new projects of aid to children of 30 countries, that for the first time in UNICEF's history the resources at the disposal of the executive board were solely contributions by countries other than our own.

Since its inception, the United States of America has played a leading role in advancing the great humanitarian work of UNICEF.

Unfortunately, however, the second supplemental appropriations bill for the 83d Congress failed to include a crucial sum of $9,814,333. Therefore, Dr. Martha Eliot, the United States delegate at the UNICEF executive board, was not in a position to make a statement concerning the prospects of further specific United States aid to UNICEF.

This was, in spite of the fact that the Congress has long since authorized a total of $16,481,000. But the Congress has failed to make available specific appropriations for this purpose.

I should like to point out, moreover, that every dollar made available by us or, for that matter, by other participant countries is matched and even exceeded by funds by the assisted countries.

Nations throughout the world have expressed to the United States their deep appreciation for our great previous efforts for UNICEF. I earnestly hope that our fine record of the past will not be marred by a further failure of the United States to take action now.

Surely, if there is any group in all this world well meriting our devoted efforts, it is the innocent youngsters.

They have paid for adult errors of omission and commision in war, and in time of so-called peace, in their suffering from malnutrition, from disease, and hunger. If we would, therefore, build for a peaceful, prosperous tomorrow, we must look after the needs of these little ones today.

During my service at the first session of the Seventh General Assembly of the United Nations in New York, from October to December 1952, it was my pleasure to serve in the work of the Negotiating Committee on Extra-Budgetary Funds. At that time I solicited contributions by other countries to UNICEF and other programs. The very least that I feel I can do, therefore, is to point out to my own country its continuing obligations and this temporary breakdown in the discharge of those obligations.

The Soviet Union, of course, has not contributed a single dime toward humanitarian work of this type; its failure to do so is marked exceedingly closely by the countries of the world.

On the other hand, in my own State of Wisconsin and in other States of the Union a great many civic-minded Americans are working at the grassroots on behalf of the U. N. International Children's Emergency Fund. I have been glad to assure these fine folks that I, for one, would continue my efforts on behalf of this noble work.

I and my staff have discussed the problem over a considerable period of time with Mrs. Oswald Lord, former chairman, the United States Citizens' Committee for UNICEF and now our able representative at the U. N. Human Rights Commission at Geneva. I have reviewed the problem with the United States Government officials involved and with Mr. Maurice Pate, executive director of the fund.

It is quite clear that the United States willingly spends billions for armaments, both in this country and in allied countries. Surely we can spend a few millions for milk for hungry little stomachs and vaccines for diseased little bodies.

Let me note this fact in particular:

Although 40 governments gave their contributions and pledges to UNICEF in the period since last October alone, most of the funds have now been allocated, and there is now left for allocation only the equivalent of $2,600.

Two thousand six hundred dollars—what advance planning can be accomplished with that?

Two thousand six hundred dollars—what new projects can be undertaken, what new hope can be given?

Let these grim questions be heeded and let constructive action be taken accordingly and promptly now, not next year. I have so urged the State Department, the MSA, and the White House; and I so urge my colleagues in the Congress.

[From the New York Times of April 6, 1953]

THE CHILDREN'S FUND

"I believe it would be a tragic mistake and an appalling setback of America's entire humanitarian record if Congress did not remedy the omission of funds for UNICEF. For a comparative pittance we and like-minded nations have achieved magnificent results for these youngsters and their mothers. * * *"

With these blunt words Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, sums up the tragic plight of one United Nations group with whose efforts—to save lives and restore sick and needy youngsters to health—this country has been alined since its inception. That group, UNICEF, or the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, is about to die for lack of contributions, and, indeed, for lack of leadership and wisdom in this country.

We have always been the mainstay of this fund, and by our leadership encouraged other governments to match our contributions, so that millions of youngsters and their nursing mothers suffering from malnutrition, malaria, tuberculosis, yaws, and tropical diseases, and suffering from war and disasters, might live; above all, might believe that the free and democratic world was in earnest about making this a safe and healthy world for all, not for the few. Yet today the incredible situation confronting UNICEF is this: It is broke. It has $2,600 left in its treasury. A pittance—$5,300,000—has been allocated to going programs in some 30 countries. It has been waiting for months for this Government to make good its pledge of $9,814,000, so that it can get on with advance planning and secure matching contributions from other nations.

"All that remains," Senator WILEY admonishes, "is to find a prompt form of legislation to include an adequate stop-gap appropriation" for UNICEF. The time for that action is now—as it would be now if our own children were the prime sufferers.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has the floor, I should like to state that from now on the Senate will meet every day, from Monday through Friday, and during this week I expect it to sit from 12 to 5:30 in the afternoon. The Senate is now actually down to business, and if we want to get away in the early summer it will be necessary to devote somewhat more attention to the business of the Senate than during the time up to now when there has been very little pressure for action by the Senate.

I hope very much that Senators will refrain from interrupting with irrelevant matters or even with unanimous-consent requests other Senators who are speaking on the question before the Senate, and that Senators who have such other matters to submit will wait until the end of the day or will avail themselves of the opportunity which will be given at the beginning of each session of the Senate. However, we shall take a recess from day to day, and there will be no regular morning hour during this period, until we have completed action on the pending joint resolution.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not expect to move that the consideration of the joint resolution be set aside for any purpose until a vote on the joint resolution has been obtained.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask a question regarding the procedure of the Senate in connection with the meeting of committees while the Senate is in session. I quite agree with the Senator from Ohio that we should proceed with daily and orderly debate on the submerged lands joint resolution until a final vote is had on it, which I trust will be at a very early date.

I have not reached a final decision as to my course, but I am having great difficulty in reconciling myself to the holding of committee meetings during sessions of the Senate, while there is before it a measure so vitally important as is this joint resolution. If it is of sufficient importance to warrant the holding of the debate which is being had on the joint resolution, I believe it is of such importance that Senators should remain in the Chamber and should listen to the debate which constitutes an essential part of the functioning of the Senate.

I wish to announce very courteously to the majority leader that I am inclining in the direction of insisting that the rules of the Senate be applied in regard to the holding of committee meetings, by not giving my consent to the holding of committee meetings while the Senate is in session during the course of the debate on the joint resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, Mr. President, it is very likely that the time will come when even I might refuse to give my consent to the holding of committee meetings during the afternoons. However, I do not think we have yet reached that point. On the other hand, as we draw nearer to July, it may be necessary to become much more restrictive in that respect, and to object to all such requests.

Of course, Mr. President, any Senator has a right to object to any unanimous-consent request for the meeting of a committee during a session of the Senate.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the outset of this discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 13, so that all Senators may have the benefit of my understanding, at least, of the procedure to be followed during the course of my tenure of the floor, I wish to announce that I shall expect to proceed as expeditiously as I can to conclude my prepared remarks, which, however, fall into 5 or 6 different classifications. I shall expect not to yield with reference to the particular discussion covered by any one classification until I reach the end of my remarks with reference to that classification, at which time I shall be glad to yield generously to all Senators who have an interest in the subject matter and who wish to ask questions regarding it. However, for the sake of continuity, I believe it best to complete the discussion of each segment of my remarks before I yield for questions regarding that segment.

Mr. President, the subject of Senate Joint Resolution 13 is property, property rights in the submerged lands beneath navigable waters. By way of a brief summary, the general purpose of this measure as reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is to recognize, confirm, establish, and vest in and assign to the respective States the title and ownership of the lands and resources beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries, as well as the right and power to manage, administer, lease, develop, and use these lands and resources in accordance with applicable State law. The transfer of property rights in the submerged lands and resources to the several States from the Federal Government is made subject to the exercise by the Federal Government of all its powers of regulation for the purpose of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, all of which powers shall continue to be paramount to, but shall not be deemed to include, proprietary rights of ownership and development. Of course, such lands as the United States itself has acquired in a proprietary capacity by eminent domain procedure, purchase, cession, gift, or otherwise shall remain the property of the Federal Government.

This joint resolution also revokes as to all areas within the boundaries of the States the misconceived and ill-advised action of former President Truman, in his attempt to make a naval petroleum reserve of all the submerged lands within the entire Continental Shelf. It is unfortunate that Mr. Truman added confusion to this complicated and controversial issue by such action when, as shown by the official departmental memoranda of the Department of Justice, he had been advised that he was not creating a naval reserve within the meaning of the statute on that subject. Attorney General Brownell, when questioned on this matter in the hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, on February 17, 1953, stated that the Executive order signed by Mr. Truman on January 16, 1953—and I now quote Mr. Brownell—"merely transferred the administrative power over these lands from one department to another, and did not set up a naval petroleum reserve within the meaning of the statute." Attorney General Brownell further stated in a letter dated February 13, 1953, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, that "it was also clear that the then Attorney General, Judge McGranery, approved the order, as finally drafted and issued, on the understanding that it did not intend to nor did it in fact or in law create a naval petroleum reserve within the meaning of the statute."

It will be noted that this joint resolution provides that nothing therein shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights

of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying outside the boundaries of the respective States, and it confirms the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Government over those natural resources. In other words, this measure clearly emphasizes that nine-tenths of the submerged lands off the coast of the United States is under the control and jurisdiction of the Federal Government and that the other one-tenth, which lies inside the boundaries of the States, and immediately adjoining the coasts of the States, should be owned and controlled by the respective States.

Mr. President, if Senators will give attention for a moment to the map which is placed in the rear of the Chamber, and which I believe reasonably and clearly outlines this situation, they will note that the map has a very narrow, dark line surrounding the entire Nation on the Atlantic frontage and on the Gulf of Mexico frontage and on the Pacific Ocean frontage of the continental United States. That narrow line represents the areas which are covered by the joint resolution, insofar as any grant of offshore lands to States is concerned. Senators will note that on the west coast of the mainland of the State of Florida that narrow belt is about three times as wide as it is all the way down the Atlantic coast, and they will also note that on the entire Texas frontage on the Gulf of Mexico the same situation obtains.

The reason for that is, as has been already stated in the debate on several occasions, that the State of Texas claims for its entire frontage on the Gulf of Mexico a 3-league belt, by reason of the fact that it, as an independent republic, had set its boundary at 3 leagues from its costline in 1836, long before it came into the Union; and, by reason of the further fact that it was admitted to the Union—or so it claims—with the understanding that it should retain the ownership, control, and jurisdiction over all the lands and water within its boundaries.

As to the State of Florida, the situation is a little more complicated. I went into that matter at some length in the colloquy the other day with my friend, the Senator from Illinois. I stand ready to go further into it, if he or any other Senator desires to do so. But the situation with reference to the mainland coast of Florida on the Gulf of Mexico is that, under the constitution of our State, adopted in 1868, and, as we feel, completely accepted and approved by the Congress of the United States, our boundary is fixed at 3 leagues in the Gulf of Mexico, insofar as the mainland west coast area of our State is concerned.

The same observation does not apply to the north or Gulf fringe of the Keys, which, as Senators will note, juts out southwesterly from the southern end of our State. In other words, briefly to state my understanding at least of the situation of Florida under the law which has been in effect since 1868, our State has a 3-mile boundary on the Atlantic and on the Florida Straits, and a 3-marine-mile boundary on the Gulf of Mexico, insofar as the Keys alone are concerned, but a 3-league boundary upon the Gulf of Mexico, insofar as the mainland of the west coast of the State of Florida is concerned.

Mr. President, I call attention to this map simply because, in my opinion, it shows clearly that what is involved here insofar as any grant of offshore submerged lands to the States is concerned, is nothing more than a narrow shoestring of land and water immediately adjoining, and, in some sense, strangling our coast on all our outside salt-water frontages, and immediately affecting the local development of all of the coastal communities, all the local coastal area of the States in the most vital way.

As to the areas in white on the map, which lie just outside the narrow belt to which I have referred, they represent the so-called outer Continental Shelf, or that portion of the Continental Shelf which lies beyond the State boundaries. The Continental Shelf may be roughly indicated as that part of the ocean bottom immediately appurtenant to our continent, which extends along the shoulder of the continent until it plunges into the ocean depths, generally at about a 100-fathom, or a 600-foot, depth.

Senators will note that the Continental Shelf in many places goes very much further out from our coastline than does the narrow coastal belt which is claimed by the States, and which, under the pending joint resolution, would be yielded to the States as fully and as effectively as a property may be yielded, by the Congress under the authority it possesses.

Senators will note, for instance, that as to my own State of Florida, on the Gulf frontage, the Continental Shelf extends to a distance of about 175 miles at the widest point. On the Atlantic frontage there is very deep water just off certain portions of the Florida Peninsula on the east, and in that area there is little, if any, Continental Shelf beyond the State boundaries. Generally speaking, there is a narrower belt of Continental Shelf adjoining our State in the Atlantic and in the Straits of Florida than in the Gulf of Mexico.

If Senators will look at the map even casually, I think they will note that on the Pacific coast it is the rule rather than the exception that very deep water comes very close offshore, so that there is very little Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile boundary—3 geographic miles, that is—which is the uniform boundary recognized in the case of the Pacific Coast States, California, Oregon, and Washington.

Mr. President, when I reach the end of this particular portion of my address, I shall be glad to yield on this or any other aspect of what I shall have said.

It is well to note that of the estimated oil deposits in the entire Continental Shelf as estimated by Ralph L. Miller, Chief, Fuels Branch, Geologic Division, United States Geological Survey, Department of the Interior—and he is our top nonpartisan professional Federal employee in this field—in his testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Tuesday, February 24, 1953, only 17 percent will go to the States under this resolution while the remaining 83 percent will be under the complete ownership and control of the Federal Government.

In other words, Mr. President, under the pending joint resolution, some nine-tenths of the area goes to the Federal Government, so far as area is concerned, and a little less than one-tenth to the States.

So far as estimated production of oil and gas is concerned, under the joint resolution, approximately five-sixths, or 83 percent, will be in the area which will remain completely in the control of the Federal Government, whereas approximately one-sixth, or 17 percent, will lie within State boundaries, and will come, when the joint resolution is passed, as we believe it should be passed, exclusively within the jurisdiction and control of the States.

I hope this point is very clear because there are some who have erroneously maintained throughout this controversy that the States advocate State ownership of all offshore resources of the entire Continental Shelf.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that both measures which have been passed on this subject, one in 1946, and one last year, simply provided, as does the pending measure, that as to offshore lands the States should own the property values in the submerged lands out to their State boundaries, and went no farther than that. I also call attention to the fact that that opinion seems to be accepted pretty generally in these days, and I am glad that there has been a great deal of public discussion of this subject matter. For instance, I have noted in three of the local newspapers in Washington approving editorials of this measure, one of which I shall not now refer to, though it is an excellent editorial, but two of which I shall briefly mention at this time.

The first is from the Washington News of last Friday, April 3, under the title "Offshore Flotsam." So pertinent is this editorial that I think I shall read it into the RECORD, rather than merely ask that it be printed. This is what the editorialist says:

OFFSHORE FLOTSAM

As we see it, the issue in the tidelands dispute before Congress is mainly a matter of the proper mechanics.

For many years the States had jurisdiction out to their traditional boundaries—3 miles for most States, 10½ miles in the Gulf for Texas and Florida. The bills before Congress confirm that.

Beyond these limits, the bills give authority to the Federal Government. Policing the waters over the Continental Shelf, as far out as 250 miles, obviously is a practical responsibility of the United States. Not even Texas has a navy.

By fixing firm areas of jurisdiction, Congress isn't giving anything away, authorizing a gigantic grab, or promoting plunder of the public domain, as some of the hysterical partisans in this dispute have alleged.

Neither have the tidelands bills anything to do with forests in Idaho, water rights in New Mexico, grazing rights in Montana, or coal under the ground in Pennsylvania.

Most of the debate has been so much driftwood. The bills before Congress are designed simply to end this nonsense and open the way for the explorers and developers to get at the resources under the sea.

Without seeking to prove anything stated in the editorial with reference to hysteria on the part of anybody, I must say that, as to the remainder of the editorial, it very clearly sets forth what is the obvious fact, that the measures now pending simply give the go-ahead signal for the development of any resources in this coastal area, giving to the States that which, without question, was enjoyed by them for 150 or 160 years, namely, the ownership of everything within State boundaries, and reserving to the Federal Government everything beyond that.

The other editorial appeared in the Washington Star of April 6. It is too long to read into the RECORD in full, but I shall read from it, and any Senator who wishes to read the remainder of it will have access to it at my desk.

The editorial is headed "The House on Offshore Wealth," and reads in part as follows:

The House has done a good day's work in voting, 285 to 108, to quitclaim to the States all submerged lands and resources lying within the historic seaward boundaries. Critics of the measure have attacked it as a give-away and a steal and robbery in broad daylight, but to call it that is to be guilty of gross misrepresentation. Actually, in terms of law, morals, equity, and the like, it is an excellent piece of legislation designed to effect a fair and honest settlement of the longstanding controversy over the Nation's offshore oil and gas deposits.

Under the House bill, this controversy—the misnamed tidelands issue—would be ended by clearly defining and delimiting what should belong to the coastal States and what to the country as a whole. Thus, the bill provides that the States are to have full title to the submerged riches within their historic seaward boundaries, and that the Federal Government, representing the entire Nation, is to be the owner and controller of all the resources in the Continental Shelf beyond those boundaries. The division on that score is not left in doubt in any respect.

I shall not read further from the editorial, Mr. President.

Completing my statement on this point, it seems to me that finally the fact has been understood by most persons—my mail so indicates—that this measure does not propose a grab on the part of the States of submerged resources beyond their seaward limits as States, but, instead, recognizes that the Federal Government does have whatever claim there is in that area and should be recognized as the proprietary owner thereof.

Mr. President, there is nothing which more needs to be understood at the beginning of this discussion than that very fact.

This joint resolution will confirm to the maritime States the rights which they had respectively enjoyed since the founding of our Nation, and up to the date of the decision in the California case, in their offshore lands and waters which lie within their constitutional boundaries.

I have already discussed that point with reference to the coastal States, and I go to another very important element of jurisdiction in this resolution. It will also confirm to all the States—and that means all 48 States—their full control and property rights in their lands and waters defined as inland waters, and will also confirm to the Great Lakes States—and this is the third grant of jurisdiction—the title and control of the lands and waters lying within their boundaries in the Great Lakes.

As I have already stated, this measure does not deal with the administration and development of that vast portion of the Continental Shelf which lies beyond the States' constitutional boundaries, and control of which is recognized by section 9 as being in the Federal Government. I fully realize that many questions concerning this outer belt must be settled by the Congress very soon in order to allow essential production of oil to get underway, but the consideration of these problems will raise entirely different and more difficult problems than those which will be solved by the passage of the joint resolution before us today.

The total value of oil and gas has been estimated by authorities in this field. The values are not to be compared at all in substance or in size with other values which I shall discuss later in my address, and which have to do with other things which are absolutely needed to be used in order to promote the development of the coastal communities and the coastal industries which depend so tremendously upon property rights and property values in this narrow coastal strip along our shores.

The questions presented by Senate Joint Resolution 13 have been fully considered by Congress several times, and I believe that this proposed legislation, which relates solely to property within the States' boundaries, can and should be speedily passed if left unencumbered by other problems. As to offshore lands confirmed to the States, this measure is confined to those lands which extend out to the 3-mile limit with two exceptions. The State boundary of the west coast of Florida and the boundary of the entire coast of Texas extend 3 leagues into the Gulf of Mexico under their constitutions, which were approved many years ago by the Congress. The seaward boundary of each original coastal State is approved and confirmed by this measure as a line 3 geographical miles distant from its coast line, and it gives to those States whose boundaries do not formally extend 3 miles distant the opportunity to so extend them. I emphasize the fact that this joint resolution does not extend the boundary of any State beyond the 3-mile limit. If under this resolution Florida and Texas receive property values out to the 3-league limit in the Gulf of Mexico, as I believe they should and will receive them, it will be because they can establish as a fact that Congress approved their 3-league outer boundaries as long ago as 1845 in the case of Texas and 1868 in the case of Florida.

Mr. President, in order clearly to illustrate the limited amount of offshore area affected by this resolution, I ask leave at this time to insert three tables.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The tables are as follows:

Approximate areas of submerged lands within State boundaries

(Expressed in acres)

State	Inland waters [1]	Great Lakes [2]	Marginal sea [2]
Alabama	339,840		101,760
Arizona	210,560		
Arkansas	241,280		
California	1,209,600		2,540,800
Colorado	179,200		
Connecticut	70,400		384,000
Delaware	50,560		53,760
Florida	2,750,720		4,697,600
Georgia	229,120		192,000
Idaho	479,360		
Illinois	289,920	976,640	
Indiana	55,040	145,920	
Iowa	188,160		
Kansas	104,320		
Kentucky	183,040		
Louisiana	2,141,440		2,668,160
Maine	1,202,000		759,680
Maryland	441,600		59,520
Massachusetts	224,000		568,640
Michigan	764,160	24,613,760	
Minnesota	2,597,760	1,415,680	
Mississippi	189,440		136,320
Missouri	258,560		
Montana	526,080		
Nebraska	373,760		
Nevada	472,320		
New Hampshire	179,200		8,960
New Jersey	200,960		249,600
New Mexico	99,200		
New York	1,054,080	2,321,280	243,840
North Carolina	2,284,800		577,920
North Dakota	391,040		
Ohio	64,000	2,212,480	
Oklahoma	470,040		
Oregon	403,840		568,320
Pennsylvania	184,320	470,400	
Rhode Island	99,840		76,800
South Carolina	295,040		359,040
South Dakota	327,040		
Tennessee	182,400		
Texas	2,364,800		2,466,560
Utah	1,644,800		
Vermont	211,840		
Virginia	586,240		215,040
Washington	777,600		300,800
West Virginia	58,240		
Wisconsin	920,960	6,439,680	
Wyoming	261,120		
Total	28,960,640	38,595,840	17,029,120

[1] Areas of the United States, 1940, 16th Census of the United States (Government Printing Office, 1942), p. 2, et seq. The figures are very approximate but are absolute minimums.

[2] World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1947, published by the New York World-Telegram (1947), p. 138; Serial No. 22, Department of Commerce, United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, November 1945. In figuring the marginal sea area, only original State boundaries have been used. These coincide with the 3-mile limit for all States except Texas, Louisiana, and Florida gulf coast. In the latter cases, the 3-league limit as established before or at the time of entry into the Union has been used.

Coastline of the United States, July 1948

Locality	Length in statute miles		
	General coastline	Tidal shoreline, general	Tidal shoreline, detailed
Maine	228	676	3,478
New Hampshire	13	14	131
Massachusetts	192	453	1,519
Rhode Island	40	156	384
Connecticut		96	618
New York	127	479	1,850
New Jersey	130	306	1,792
Pennsylvania		89	
Delaware	28	79	381
Maryland	31	452	3,190
Virginia	112	567	3,315
North Carolina	301	1,030	3,375
South Carolina	187	758	2,876
Georgia	100	603	2,344
Florida:			
Atlantic	309	618	3,035
Gulf	798	1,658	5,391
Total	1,197	2,276	8,426
Alabama	53	199	607
Mississippi	44	155	359
Louisiana	397	985	7,721

Coastline of the United States, July 1948— Continued

Locality	Length in statute miles		
	General coastline	Tidal shoreline, general	Tidal shoreline, detailed
Texas	367	1,100	3,359
California	840	1,190	3,427
Oregon	296	312	1,410
Washington	157	908	3,026
Atlantic coast	1,888	6,370	28,377
Gulf coast	1,659	4,097	17,437
Pacific coast	1,293	2,410	7,863
United States	4,840	12,877	53,677

The Coast and Geodetic Survey receives numerous requests for data on lengths of coastline and tidal shoreline of the United States and its Territories and possessions. As a result, graphic measurements have been made from time to time on maps of various scales and in units of various lengths. The three types of measurement selected for publication at this time are explained in the following paragraphs.

GENERAL COASTLINE

The figures under this heading are lengths of the general outline of the seacoast. The measurements were made with a unit measure of 30 minutes of latitude on charts as near the scale of 1:1,200,000 as possible. The shoreline of bays and sounds is included to a point where such waters narrow to the width of the unit measure, and the distance across at such point is included.

TIDAL SHORELINE, GENERAL

Measurements under the heading were made with a unit measure of three statute miles on charts of 1:200,000 and 1:400,000 scale when available. The shoreline of bays, sounds, and other bodies of water is included to a point where such waters narrow to a width of 3 statute miles, and the distance across at such point is included.

TIDAL SHORELINE, DETAILED

The figures under this heading were obtained in 1939–40 with a recording measure on the largest scale maps and charts then available. Shoreline of bays, sounds, and other bodies of water is included to the head of tidewater, or to a point where such waters narrow to a width of 100 feet.

Shoreline, general, Great Lakes, United States side only

By States:	
Minnesota	165
Wisconsin	645
Illinois	57
Indiana	42
Michigan	2,302
Ohio	198
New York	351
Pennsylvania	45
Total	3,805
By lakes:	
Ontario	255
Niagara River	27
Lake Erie	336
Lake St. Clair-St. Clair River and Detroit River	144
Lake Huron	678
Lake Michigan	1,309
Lake Superior	1,056
Total	3,805

These measurements are on the same basis as the center column of the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey coastline table, July 1948.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the first table sets out the approximate nuumber of acres of submerged land within State boundaries, divided into inland waters, Great Lakes, and the marginal sea.

The compilation has already been placed in the RECORD, but in order that we may have one terse statement covering the different groups of lands, let me say that in the marginal sea—namely, in the area just off the coast—there are involved a total of 17,029,000 acres of land.

In the area of the Great Lakes there is a much greater acreage involved, being a total of more than 38,595,000 acres.

In the area of the inland waters generally, including, of course, rivers, bays, ports, and harbors, and all the other areas of both salt and fresh water which lie within State boundaries and which are not included in either of the other classifications, there is a total of 28,960,000 acres.

It will thus appear in the very first instance, Mr. President, that though the coastal belt outside the States extending out into the Atlantic Ocean, the gulf, and the Pacific Ocean, has been most discussed and necessarily will be most discussed in the debate, when it comes to the areas affected, that belt contains only 17,000,000 acres, whereas 38,000,000 acres, or more than twice that amount are in the submerged lands of the Great Lakes which belong to the Great Lakes States, and there is a total of nearly 29,000,000 acres in the inland waters that are not a part of the coastal belt or of the Great Lakes.

The second of the tables which have been inserted simply shows the classification of the coastline around from the Pacific to the gulf and to the Atlantic, a total of 4,840 miles, practically 5,000 miles, on the outside perimeters of our 20 coastal States.

As to the shoreline of the Great Lakes, which is the third belt indicated in one of the tables inserted in the RECORD, it is shown that there are 3,805 miles of shoreline of the Great Lakes, which belong to or comprise the shoreline of the eight Great Lakes States. So it is rather clearly indicated that there is a very large and substantial mileage of frontage, as well as of submerged area, involved in the Great Lakes, as well as on the outside in the coastal belts.

It will be noted that the total marginal sea area involved amounts to approximately one one-hundred-and-fourteenth of the total area of the United States—total area of the United States is 3,022,387 square miles. The second and third tables, which were prepared by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, deal with the shoreline of the United States and the shoreline of the Great Lakes on the United States side.

We all know that the 82d Congress passed a measure last year which was similar to Senate Joint Resolution 13, but it was vetoed. That measure passed the Senate by a vote of 50 to 35; but, including those Senators who declared their position on the record but did not actually vote, the division of the Senate was 57 to 36. The measure was later agreed to by the Senate-House conferees and the conference report was adopted by both Houses. The House vote on the adoption of this report was 247 to 89, or nearly 3 to 1. I believe that the sentiment for the Senate measure is stronger in both Houses this year than it was last, and the public statements of President Eisenhower leave no doubt that he supports the principles embodied in the pending joint resolution.

Incidentally, in the House action of a few days ago, approving a House measure on this subject, the vote for the measure was a little heavier and the vote against it a little lighter than was the case with respect to similar votes in the last Congress upon the House measure which was passed at that time.

In 1946 the Congress recognized the States' claim to the tidelands by passing a joint resolution similar to Senate Joint Resolution 13, which was also vetoed by President Truman.

As a matter of fact, Congress has held some type of hearing on the question of title to submerged lands on 16 occasions in the last 15 years, and there have been 7,162 printed pages of evidentiary material presented for the consideration of the various committees.

The point I make now is that this matter has been so thoroughly considered on so many occasions by the Congress that it should be unnecessary to spend valuable time in extensive debate when so many issues of national importance require our attention.

As Senators know, there are 40 cosponsors of the proposed legislation, and we find our support coming from every section of the country and including many nationwide organizations whose dignity and patriotism cannot be questioned. In order to conserve time, I should like to insert as part of my remarks a partial list of these supporting organizations.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARTIAL LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED LEGISLATION RESTORING STATE OWNERSHIP OF SUBMERGED LANDS

The Council of State Governments; the Governors' Conference; National Association of Attorneys General; National Association of Public Land Officials; National Association of County Officials; National Conference of Mayors; American Association of Port Authorities; the American Bar Association; American Title Association; United States Chamber of Commerce; United States Junior Chamber of Commerce; National Water Conservation Conference; American Municipal Association (representing 10,150 municipalities); National Institute of Municipal Law Officers; National Association of Secretaries of State; National Reclamation Associations; State Bar Association of California; State Bar Association of Texas; State Bar Association of Louisiana; State Bar Association of Oklahoma; National Sand and Gravel Association; National Association of Real Estate Boards; National Ready Mix Concrete Association; Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities; Great Lakes Harbor Association; Western States Land Commissioners' Association (12 States); Western States Council (representing chambers of commerce in the 11 Western States); Western Meat Packers' Association; Illinois State Chamber of Commerce; Missouri State Chamber of Commerce; Idaho State Chamber of Commerce; Baltimore Chamber of Commerce; Florida State Chamber of Commerce; United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (Washington, D. C.); Southern States Industrial Council; Board of Public Works of West

Virginia; Public Lands Corporation of West Virginia; Interstate Oil Compact Commission; Department of Conservation of Michigan.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is interesting to note that representatives of State governments from 47 of the 48 States have testified before the various committees of Congress in favor of restoring the submerged lands within State boundaries to the respective States, and that not one witness representing a State government has testified at any time before a committee in opposition to the theory of Senate Joint Resolution 13. I should like at this time to insert as part of my remarks a list of officials of States and their political subdivisions recorded in the hearings held before the committees of Congress between 1938 and 1952 who have testified in favor of State ownership of submerged lands within their boundaries. The list also includes resolutions adopted by various States with respect to this problem. However, it does not include resolutions recently adopted by State legislatures, nor the names of those who testified this year before the Senate and House committees on this matter.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICIALS OF STATES AND THEIR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS RECORDED IN THE HEARINGS HELD BEFORE THE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS FROM 1938 TO 1952, AND FAVORING STATE OWNERSHIP OF SUBMERGED LANDS

ALABAMA

1939: State legislature, resolution.

1945: William N. McQueen, attorney general; Gessner T. McGorvey, special assistant attorney general.

1948: James E. Folsom, Governor; Kenneth J. Griffith, Governor's legal representative.

1949: James E. Folsom, Governor.

1951: State legislature, resolution.

ARIZONA

1949: Fred O. Wilson, attorney general.

1950: Fred O. Wilson, attorney general.

ARKANSAS

1945: Guy E. Williams, attorney general; Claude A. Rankin, State land commissioner.

1946: Guy E. Williams, attorney general.

1948: Guy E. Williams, attorney general.

CALIFORNIA

1938: Markell C. Baer, port attorney, port of Oakland.

1939: Culbert L. Olsen, Governor; Earl Warren, attorney general; George Trammell, city attorney, Long Beach; Harry R. Johnson, consultant, Long Beach Harbor Commission; Clyde M. Leach, assistant city attorney, city of Los Angeles, and Los Angeles Harbor Commission; Percy Hecendorff, district attorney, Santa Barbara County; Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners; California State Port Authority; board of supervisors, Santa Barbara County; Oakland Board of Port Commissioners.

1945: Robert W. Kenny, attorney general; W. W. Clary, special assistant attorney general; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; Carlyle F. Lynton, executive officer, State lands commission; Arthur Eldridge, harbor commissioner, Los Angeles.

1946: Arthur H. Breed, Jr., State senator; Carlyle F. Lynton, executive officer, State lands commission; Robert W. Kenny, attorney general; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; W. Reginald Jones, port attorney, port of Oakland; Fletcher Bowron, mayor, Los Angeles; board of supervisors, San Joaquin County; port district, Stockton.

1948: Earl Warren, Governor; State legislature, resolution; Arthur H. Breed, Jr., State senator; Oliver J. Carter, State senator; Fred N. Howser, attorney general; Long Beach Board of Harbor Commissioners; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; W. Reginald Jones, representing city of Oakland, board of port commissioners, and Pacific Coast Association of Port Authorities; Arthur W. Nordstrom, assistant city attorney, Los Angeles; Dion R. Holm, chief counsel, public utilities commission, city and county of San Francisco; J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer, State lands commission; State park commission, resolution; City Council of Long Beach; Harbor Commission, San Diego; Fletcher Bowron, mayor, Los Angeles; Los Angeles City Council, resolution; Clyde A. Dorsey, city manager, Monterey.

1949: State legislature, resolution; Hon. Earl Warren, Governor; Hon. Fred N. Howser, attorney general; E. W. Mattoon, assistant attorney general; J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer, State lands commission; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; Arthur W. Nordstrom, assistant city attorney, Los Angeles City and board of harbor commissioners.

1950: Hon. Earl Warren, Governor; Hon. Fred N. Howser, attorney general; Everett W. Mattoon, assistant attorney general; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach; Arthur W. Nordstrom, assistant city attorney, Los Angeles City and board of harbor commissioners; W. Reginald Jones, American Association of Port Authorities and port of Oakland; J. Stuart Watson, assistant executive officer, State lands commission.

1951: State legislature, resolution; Earl Warren, Governor; Goodwin J. Knight, Lieutenant Governor; Edmund G. Brown, attorney general; Everett W. Mattoon, assistant attorney general; Rufus W. Putnam, executive officer, State lands commission; Irving M. Smith, city attorney, Long Beach.

COLORADO

1945: H. Lawrence Hinkley, attorney general.

1946: H. Lawrence Hinkley, attorney general.

1948: Lee Knous, Governor; H. Lawrence Hinkley, attorney general.

CONNECTICUT

1945: Francis A. Pallotti, attorney general; Harry L. Brooks, assistant attorney general.

1946: Harry L. Brooks, assistant attorney general.

1948: William L. Hadden, attorney general; Nicholas F. Rago, assistant attorney general.

1949: William L. Hadden, attorney general.

DELAWARE

1945: Clair J. Killoran, attorney general.

1946: Clair J. Killoran, attorney general; Vincent J. Theisen, assistant attorney general.

1948: Albert W. James, attorney general.

1949: Elbert N. Carvel, Governor; Albert W. James, attorney general.

1950: Albert W. James, attorney general.

FLORIDA

1938: Lawrence A. Truett, assistant attorney general; Fred Elliott, engineer for trustees, Florida internal improvement fund.

1939: Lawrence A. Truett, assistant attorney general; Fred Elliott, engineer for trustees, Florida internal improvement fund.

1945: J. Tom Watson, attorney general.

1946: J. Tom Watson, attorney general; Sumter Leitner, assistant attorney general; E. B. Leatherman, clerk, and H. S. Sweering, deputy clerk, Dade County Commissioners.

1948: Millard F. Caldwell, Governor; Sumter Leitner, assistant attorney general; State legislature, resolution.

1949: Richard W. Ervin, attorney general; Ralph Odum, assistant attorney general; State legislature, resolution.

1950: Richard W. Ervin, attorney general.

GEORGIA

1945: T. Grady Head, attorney general.

1948: M. E. Thompson, Governor; Eugene Cook, attorney general.

IDAHO

1945: Frank Langley, attorney general.

1946: Frank Langley, attorney general.

ILLINOIS

1945: George F. Barrett, attorney general.

1946: Dwight H. Green, Governor.

1948: Dwight H. Green, Governor; E. Roy Wells, chief engineer, Illinois Postwar Planning Commission.

INDIANA

1945: James M. Emmert, attorney general.

1946: James M. Emmert, attorney general.

1948: Cleon H. Foust, attorney general.

IOWA

1945: John M. Rankin, attorney general.

1948: Robert D. Blue, Governor; Robert L. Larson, attorney general.

1949: Robert L. Larson, attorney general.

KANSAS

1945: A. E. Mitchell, attorney general.

1948: Frank Carlson, Governor; Edward F. Arn, attorney general.

1949: Harold R. Fatzer, attorney general.

1950: Harold R. Fatzer, attorney general.

KENTUCKY

1945: Eldon S. Dummit, attorney general.

1946: Eldon S. Dummit, attorney general.

1948: A. E. Funk, attorney general.

1949: A. E. Funk, attorney general.

1950: A. E. Funk, attorney general.

LOUISIANA

1938: Gaston L. Porterie, attorney general; Joseph A. Loret, assistant attorney general.

1939: David M. Ellison, attorney general; Joseph A. Loret, special assistant attorney general.

1945: Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general; John L. Madden, assistant attorney general; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office.

1946: J. H. Davis, Governor; Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general; B. A. Hardey, State mineral board; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish.

1948: State legislature, resolution; Kenneth C. Barranger, member of legislature; Henry C. Sevier, member of legislature; James H. Davis, Governor; Fred S. LeBlanc, attorney general; John L. Madden, special assistant attorney general; B. A. Hardey, State mineral board; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish.

1949: Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., attorney general; John L. Madden, assistant attorney general; L. H. Perez, special assistant to the attorney general; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; O. G. Collins, chairman, State mineral board; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish; de Lesseps S. Morrison, mayor, New Orleans.

1950: William J. Dodd, Lieutenant Governor; Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., attorney general; Lucille May Grace, register, State land office; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish; James W. Ellis, special attorney, State mineral board.

1951: Bolivar E. Kemp, Jr., Attorney General; L. H. Perez, district attorney, Plaquemines Parish.

MAINE

1945: Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.

1946: Horace Hildreth, Governor; Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.

1948: Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.

1949: Frederick Payne, Governor; Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General; State legislature, resolution.

1950: Frederick Payne, Governor; Ralph W. Farris, Attorney General.

MARYLAND

1945: William C. Walsh, Attorney General; Hall Hammond, deputy attorney general; Simon E. Sobeloff, city solicitor, Baltimore.

1946: William Curran, attorney general; George P. Drury, assistant attorney general; Simon E. Sobeloff, city solicitor, Baltimore.

1948: William Preston Lane, Jr., Governor; Hall Hammond, attorney general.

1949: Hall Hammond, attorney general and chairman, submerged lands committee, National Association of Attorneys General; State legislature, resolution.

1950: Hall Hammond, attorney general and chairman, submerged lands committee, National Association of Attorneys General.

1951: Hall Hammond, attorney general.

MASSACHUSETTS

1939: Daniel J. Doherty, assistant attorney general.

1945: Clarence A. Barnes, attorney general; Hirah Freed, assistant corporation counsel, Boston.

1946: Ernest W. Barnes, department of conservation; George Leary, special assistant, corporation counsel, Boston; Grant E. Morse, Randolph A. Frothingham, and Glenn G. Clark, selectmen of Salisbury.

1948: Nathaniel B. Bidwell, special assistant attorney general; George Leary, special assistant corporation counsel, Boston.

MICHIGAN

1945: John R. Dethmers, attorney general.

1946: Harry F. Kelly, Governor; John R. Dethmers, attorney general.

1948: State legislature, resolution; Kim Sigler, Governor; Maurice M. Moule, assistant attorney general; P. J. Hoffmaster, director, department of conservation.

1949: Stephen J. Roth, attorney general; Nicholas V. Olds, assistant attorney general.

1950: Nicholas V. Olds, assistant attorney general.

MINNESOTA

1945: J. A. A. Burnquist, attorney general.

1946: Ed. J. Thye, governor, city council St. Paul.

1948: Luther W. Youngdahl, governor; J. A. A. Burnquist, attorney general; John H. Burwell, special assistant to the attorney general.

1949: John H. Burwell, assistant attorney general.

MISSISSIPPI

1938: Greek Rice, attorney general.

1945: Greek Rice, attorney general.

1946: Greek Rice, attorney general.

1948: Greek Rice, attorney general, State legislature, resolution.

MONTANA

1945: R. V. Bottomly, attorney general.

NEBRASKA

1945: Walter R. Johnson, attorney general.

1948: Walter R. Johnson, attorney general and chairman, submerged lands committee, National Association of Attorneys General.

NEVADA

1945: Alan Bible, attorney general.

1946: Alan Bible, attorney general.

1948: Alan Bible, attorney general.

1950: Alan Bible, attorney general and president, National Association of Attorneys General.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1945: Harold K. Davison, attorney general.

1946: Ernest R. D'Amours, assistant attorney general.

1948: Ernest R. D'Amours, attorney general.

1949: Sherman Adams, governor.

NEW JERSEY

1938: Robert Leeward, assistant attorney general.

1939: State legislature, resolution; council, Borough of Stone Harbor, resolution.

1945: Walter D. Van Riper, attorney general.

1946: Walter D. Van Riper, attorney general.

1948: Russell E. Watson, counsel to the governor.

1949: Alfred E. Driscoll, governor; Theodore D. Parsons, attorney general; Robert Peacock, deputy attorney general.

1950: Theodore D. Parsons, attorney general.

NEW MEXICO

1945: Clyde C. McCulloh, attorney general.

1948: Thomas J. Mabry, Governor; Clyde C. McCulloh, attorney general; Hiram M. Dow, Interstate Oil Co. Commission.

NEW YORK

1938: John J. Bennett, Jr., attorney general; Warren H. Gilman, assistant attorney general; Albany Port District Commission, resolution; Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., associate counsel, Port of New York.

1939: John J. Bennett, Jr., attorney general; Warren H. Gilman, assistant attorney general; State Council of Parks, resolution.

1945: Nathaniel L. Goldstein, attorney general; Orrin Judd, solicitor general; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York and representing American Association of Port Authorities.

1946: Orrin Judd, solicitor general; State legislature, resolution; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York.

1948: Thomas E. Dewey, Governor; Nathaniel L. Goldstein, attorney general; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York; William O'Dwyer, mayor, New York City.

1949: Nathaniel L. Goldstein, attorney general; Leander I. Shelley, general counsel, Port of New York.

1951: State legislature, resolution.

NORTH CAROLINA

1945: Harry McMullan, attorney general; Hughes J. Rhodes, assistant attorney general.

1946: Hughes J. Rhodes, assistant attorney general.

1948: R. Gregg Cherry, Governor; Harry McMullan, attorney general.

1949: State legislature, resolution; W. Scott Kerr, Governor; Harry McMullan, attorney general.

NORTH DAKOTA

1945: Nels G. Johnson, attorney general.

1946: Nels G. Johnson, attorney general.

1948: Fred G. Aandahl, Governor; Nels G. Johnson, attorney general.

OHIO

1939: Port commission; City Council, Ashtabula.

1945: Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general.

1946: Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general.

1948: Thomas J. Herbert, Governor; Hugh S. Jenkins, attorney general.

OKLAHOMA

1945: Randall S. Cobb, attorney general.

1946: Robert S. Kerr, Governor; Mac Q. Williamson, attorney general; J. Walker Field, assistant attorney general.

1948: Mac Q. Williamson, attorney general; State Land Office Commission, resolution.

OREGON

1939: I. H. Van Winkle, attorney general.

1945: George Neuner, attorney general; John H. Burgard, chairman, commission of public docks, Portland.

1946: George D. LaRoche, general manager, commission of public docks, Portland; Lewis D. Griffith, clerk, State land board.

1948: George Neuner, attorney general.

1949: State legislature, resolution; Douglas McKay, governor; George Neuner, attorney general.

1950: George Neuner, attorney general.

PENNSYLVANIA

1945: James H. Duff, attorney general; Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general; Frank P. Truscott, city solicitor, Philadelphia.

1946: Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general.

1948: Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general.

1949: James H. Duff, governor; T. McKeen Chidsey, attorney general.

1950: Miss M. Vashti Burr, deputy attorney general.

RHODE ISLAND

1945: John H. Nolan, attorney general; John J. Cooney, assistant attorney general.

1946: John H. Nolan, attorney general.

1948: John O. Pastore, governor; John H. Nolan, attorney general.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1945: John M. Daniel, attorney general.

1946: T. C. Callison, assistant attorney general.

1948: J. Strom Thurmond, governor; John M. Daniel, attorney general.

1949: John M. Daniel, attorney general; T. C. Callison, assistant attorney general.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1945: George T. Mickelson, attorney general.

1946: George T. Mickelson, attorney general.

1948: George T. Mickelson, governor; Siguard Anderson, attorney general.

TENNESSEE

1945: Roy H. Beeler, attorney general.

1948: Jim N. McCord, governor; Roy H. Beeler, attorney general; William F. Barry, solicitor general.

1949: Jim N. McCord, governor; Roy H. Beeler, attorney general; William F. Barry, solicitor general.

1950: Roy H. Beeler, attorney general.

TEXAS

1938: James V. Allred, governor; William McGraw, attorney general.

1939: Gerald C. Mann, attorney general; R. W. Fairchild, assistant attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office; Homer C. DeWolfe, member, State board of education.

1945: Grover Sellers, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1946: Grover Sellers, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1948: Beauford H. Jester, Governor; Price Daniel, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1949: Allan Shivers, Governor; Price Daniel, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office.

1950: Price Daniel, attorney general; Bascom Giles, commissioner, State land office, and chairman, school land board.

1951: Allan Shivers, Governor; Price Daniel, attorney general.

UTAH

1939: Joseph Chez, attorney general.

1945: Grover A. Giles, attorney general.

1948: Herbert B. Maw, Governor.

VERMONT

1945: Alban J. Parker, attorney general.

1946: Mortimer R. Proctor, Governor.

1948: Clifton G. Parker, attorney general.

VIRGINIA

1939: State Port Authority, resolution.

1945: Abram P. Staples, attorney general; Herbert Wade, director, State port authority.

1946: Abram P. Staples, attorney general.

1948: William M. Tuck, Governor.

1950: State legislature resolution.

WASHINGTON

1945: J. J. Underwood, port of Seattle and port of Tacoma; Seattle Port Authority, resolution; G. W. Osgood, port of Tacoma manager; Otto A. Case, commissioner, State department of public lands.

1946: Harold A. Pebbles, chief assistant to the attorney general; Warren D. Lamport, general manager, port of Seattle; Donald Macleay, Tacoma Port Authority.

1948: Frank O. Sether, assistant commissioner of public lands.
1949: Arthur B. Langlie, Governor; Smith Troy, attorney general.
1950: Smith Troy, attorney general.

WEST VIRGINIA

1945: Ira J. Partlow, attorney general.
1946: James Kay Thomas, assistant attorney general.
1948: Clarence W. Meadors, Governor; Ira J. Partlow, attorney general.

WISCONSIN

1939: Common Council, city of Milwaukee, resolution.
1945: John E. Martin, attorney general; Harry C. Brockel, port manager, city of Milwaukee; C. W. Babcock, city attorney, Milwaukee.
1946: Walter S. Goodland, Governor; Harry C. Brockel, port manager, city of Milwaukee.
1948: Oscar Rennebohm, Governor; John E. Martin, attorney general; John Bohn, mayor, Milwaukee; Mrs. Walter J. Mattison, city attorney, Milwaukee; Harry C. Brockel, port director, city of Milwaukee; commissioners, city of Milwaukee.

WYOMING

1945: Louis J. O'Marr, attorney general.
1948: Lester C. Hunt, Governor.

WHY INLAND WATERS AND GREAT LAKES ARE INCLUDED

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before concluding my preliminary remarks, and yielding to questions at that time, I shall discuss briefly a question which has been raised by many disinterested people, who really desire to know the facts, as to why inland waters and the waters of the Great Lakes are included within the joint resolution.

In answer to the questions as to our reasons for including in our joint resolution the inland waters and the Great Lakes, I may say that the long recognized rule of law applicable to the inland waters and submerged lands of every State has been seriously undermined, and State and private titles have been badly clouded by the three Supreme Court decisions under which, to quote the majority opinion of Mr. Justice Black in the California case, the States have "a qualified ownership of lands under inland navigable waters." The Federal Government clearly indicated the possibility of future attacks on the inland waters in various comments in its brief in the California case.

I invite particular attention to the compilation of hostile remarks appearing in the brief filed by Federal counsel in the California case. On page 11 of their brief, the Federal attorneys said:

> We submit that ownership of submerged lands is not related to sovereignty at all, but that the decision of this Court dealing with the tidelands and lands under inland waters have proceeded upon a false premise.

The board of governors of the American Bar Association has sounded a clear warning on the same subject.

Again, on page 72 of the Government's brief in the California case, the rule with respect to tidelands and inland waters is attacked as being erroneous and unsound. At other places in the brief, the rule is called unsound, erroneous, wrong, patently unsound, fallacy, and a legal fiction—pages 143, 144, 148, 150, and 153.

The values involved in developments located on inland waters are immense. As just one illustration, the Commissioner of Public Works of New York City, Mr. Robert Moses, testified at the hearing this year, page 139, that the value of the 160 city piers and improvements standing on reclaimed lands is $350 million. He also said that there are approximately the same number of privately owned piers. Taking the Nation as a whole, there are undoubtedly several billion dollars worth of port facilities alone, located on inland waters or on built-up lands which were once inland waters, so that it is easy to understand why the attorneys general, municipal officers, port authorities, and other similar officials, are deeply concerned in this fight and are insistent that the Congress shall effectually release to the States and their grantees all property rights in the inland waters and their beds, saving only to the Federal Government those rights which will enable it to perform its constitutional functions.

I mentioned the grantees of State governments. In my humble judgment, so far as the developed lands in the inland waters are concerned, including, of course, inland salt waters, lands not in the coastal belt, and the developed lands belonging to private grantees, their value will greatly exceed the value of public developments because there are literally tens of thousands of such developments throughout the inland waters of our Nation.

In regard to the Great Lakes, it is enlightening to note what Mr. Perlman, former Solicitor General of the United States, had to say concerning the Great Lakes when testifying before the House Judiciary Committee in 1949 on H. R. 5991 and H. R. 5992. In answer to the question, "Are the Great Lakes construed to be inland waters?" Mr. Perlman stated:

> Attorney General Clark testified last year that personally he regards the Great Lakes as inland waters. Do you ask me what the Department of Justice thinks about it now? I think that the Great Lakes are probably inland waters—if I may speak for the Department of Justice on that subject. But I do not think that the decision of that question has any part in this bill, and the question ought not to be attempted to be resolved in this bill, and I want to tell you why. The Great Lakes can be regarded as inland waters. But there is one problem there that ought not to be too hastily settled by legislation. There is an international boundary line that runs through some of these lakes.

I interpolate to say, through all of the Great Lakes except Lake Michigan. I continue the quotation from Mr. Perlman:

> The only question that now disturbs us in the matter in which it is sought to settle this thing in a casual, offhand way is the question as to what would happen if something was discovered in the future, in the beds of those lakes, that became vital to the continued existence, either of our country or of the then Canadian Government. We do not know. We do not think that the question as to what should happen in an area in which an international boundary line is drawn should be resolved in this offhand manner. We think the Congress ought to study that question—

Going back for a moment, I wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Perlman himself, then serving as Solicitor General, stated as his reason for unwillingness to put in a quitclaim bill which covered inland waters, the waters and bottoms of the Great Lakes—

> the question as to what would happen if something were discovered in the future, in the beds of those lakes, that became vital to the continued existence, either of our country or of the then Canadian Government.

We do not need to have any more red flags hung out than that statement of a distinguished lawyer, then serving as Solicitor General, made to a committee of the Congress of the reasons why he was unwilling to have the beds of the Great Lakes quitclaimed, as were the beds of the inland waters in the measure being discussed, his reason being that he thought probably something of vital importance to our Nation or to Canada might be discovered in the future, and if so, he did not want to make effective any quitclaim deed away from the Federal Government preceding such discovery. The implication is so clear that it is unnecessary to draw it. He wanted the situation to remain such that the same rule asserted with reference to the California, Texas, and Louisiana submerged lands in the cases affecting those States might also be asserted in the matter of the discovery of any vital mineral or other resources in the beds of the Great Lakes.

Before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the 82d Congress, while testifying on S. 940, Mr. Perlman said:

> We were asked in the previous hearing why we did not include the Great Lakes, and I think I said then that the question had not been considered. There had not been any controversy developed over the Great Lakes and the shores of the Great Lakes, and, as long as there was no controversy, we did not want to be in the position of attempting to resolve that question in advance. It is true that an international boundary line does run through the most of the Great Lakes, and it might be that some time or other the interest of the United States against a foreign country might be involved, but as long as there was no controversy over the bed of those lakes, we did not see any purpose served by attempting to resolve it.

Again, in a different year, in a different appearance, before a different committee, Mr. Perlman made it very clear that he was holding out against quitclaiming the beds of the Great Lakes, because he thought certain things might possibly happen in the future which would make it desirable for the Federal Government to retain ownership or claim of right of ownership in the beds of the Great Lakes.

The language of Mr. Perlman points up the fact that there is doubt as to whether the Great Lakes constitute inland waters and even greater cause for apprehension on the part of States which contain portions of the beds of the Great Lakes than there is in the case of ordinary inland waters. I think that the need for the inclusion of the Great Lakes in this measure is so clearly established that further comment is unnecessary. Certainly the States bordering the Great Lakes are fully entitled to have their rights in the submerged lands under the Great Lakes specifically recognized by the Congress.

The testimony given at the hearing by Attorney General Frank G. Millard, of Michigan; Harry C. Brockel, secretary of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, and municipal port director of Milwaukee; and Herbert H. Neujoks, general counsel of the Great Lakes Harbors Association, showed clearly the great concern of the officials of the Great Lakes States, cities, and ports about this matter, and also established some of the multimillion dollar values which are involved in port and other public developments on filled areas that were formerly a part of the beds of the Great Lakes.

I shall not attempt to quote the various values given in the testimony of those three very fine witnesses, but I remember that one figure, which was given was $55,000,000, applied to the value of the developments on submerged lands in the city of Milwaukee alone. That figure referred to publicly owned developments.

The deep concern of the inland State officials over the tidelands decisions is best shown by the fact that the governors, attorneys general, and other officials from practically every State of the Union have expressed their opinion that the decisions have clouded the long-asserted titles of the inland States to lands and natural resources below navigable waters within their boundaries.

I now gladly yield for questions on the introductory part of my remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his courtesy. I think the suggestion which he made, that he be permitted to speak uninterruptedly with respect to each major section, and then yield for questions upon each section, was very proper.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what is the precise boundary claimed by the State of Florida on its west coast?

Mr. HOLLAND. The precise boundary claimed by the State of Florida on its west mainland coast is 3 leagues, which is the equivalent of 9 sea miles, or nearly 10½ land miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does Florida also claim a boundary beyond 3 miles on its east coast?

Mr. HOLLAND. It does not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I invite the attention of the Senator from Florida to article I of the Constitution of Florida of 1868, which which he is doubtless familiar. It lays out the boundaries in the following language:

> The boundaries of the State of Florida shall be as follows: Commencing at the mouth of the river Perdido * * * thence southeastwardly along the coast to the edge of the Gulf Stream; thence southwestwardly along the edge of the Gulf Stream.

How far off the east coast of Florida is the edge of the Gulf Stream?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that the courts of our own State have held that the edge of the Gulf Stream is not an invariable or fixed boundary, and therefore cannot be so used. The rule of law governing the boundary of Federal jurisdiction, extending for 3 miles, is applied to our boundary off that entire coast of our State.

Not only have the courts of our State so ruled, but the legislature of our State, in various measures which have come before it and acts which have been passed by it, has so ruled and held. As a matter of fact, the boundaries of the counties which have been formed on the east coast, which extend out to a boundary in the Atlantic Ocean, in substance read "out to the boundary of the United States," which is understood as being 3 marine miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am somewhat at a loss to understand this matter. If the constitution of 1868 is appealed to as the binding precedent for setting the boundary on the west coast of the mainland of Florida, I cannot see why the constitution of 1868 is rejected so far as the eastern boundary of Florida is concerned. The constitution of 1868 specifically states that the boundary extends out to the Gulf Stream and along the edge of the Gulf Stream, which is certainly beyond a distance of 3 miles.

Mr. HOLLAND. That might be difficult for the distinguished Senator from Illinois to understand; but the courts of our State, the legislature of our State and the citizens of our State have tried to apply to this question what they thought was the rule of law and the rule of reason. They themselves, without asking for any determination of the question by the Federal authorities, have ruled that they do not have jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile line on the east coast of Florida, which I think is commendable of our people, rather than something to be used as a basis for scolding on the part of the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not scolding the Senator from Florida at all. I am merely trying to find out the facts and to understand the provisions of this bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, as applied to those facts. Can the Senator from Florida give assurance that the State of Florida will not in the future seek recognition for eastern boundaries out to the Gulf Stream?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows perfectly well that his State cannot properly make any such claim, because such a boundary is not a fixable boundary. Today it is at one place, and tomorrow it is at another place, depending upon currents, wind, and so forth. The Senator from Florida knows perfectly well that even if his State were sufficiently unwise to make such a claim, the first court it reached would knock the claim down. So I think the State of Florida was commendably wise in having decided, as it did a long time ago, that its boundaries on the east coast went out only to the 3-mile limit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the understanding of the Senator from Illinois correct that Florida's case for a 3-league or 10½-mile limit on the west coast is based first on the constitution of 1868?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct in the statement of his first plank.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Plus, secondly, the act of Congress of the same year which permitted Florida and five other Southern States to have their Senators and Representatives readmitted to Congress?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is another point in the Senator's statement with which I agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Florida feel somewhat strange in pointing to the State constitution of 1868, when it was adopted by a constitutional convention set up under the first reconstruction act which barred from it those who had served in the Confederate Army, so that the convention was dominated by groups known as recently arrived carpetbaggers from the North and scalawags in the South? I am somewhat surprised at the Senator's pointing to the constitution of 1868 as a primary basis for the present boundary claims of Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that it is that constitution, as approved by Congress, which settles our rights in the matter. At least we think we can make a case of not having drafted the constitution from any unworthy or selfish motive, particularly when the Senator from Illinois makes such a strong case for the fact that the constitution was drafted by newly come citizens from Illinois and other good States throughout the United States who drew up the constitution for us.

Incidentally, Mr. President, that is the only good thing I can think of that happened to Southern States under the whole series of reconstruction acts of the time. I sincerely hope that the Senator from Illinois will not try to deprive that one southern State of the one good result that came out of that unfortunate experience of so many years ago, by questioning the State's right to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was merely somewhat surprised that the Senator from Florida should place such an air of sanctity and authority around the constitutional convention of Florida of 1868. But I pass from that point to another matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before the Senator from Illinois leaves that point, I should like to call his attention to the fact that Illinois figured rather prominently in the congressional debates on this question. As a matter of fact, it was an Illinois man who was not many months located in our State, who was the first presiding officer of the convention. He was chosen by a dozen or more of the first-arrived convention delegates to the constitutional convention. Unfortunately, he did not appeal to the majority of the members as a person who was proper material to head the convention. So later he was ousted, and another chairman was elected.

There was some feeling in Illinois about that action, because when the constitution reached the floor of Congress, Representatives from Illinois were very much disturbed about the mentioned action of the delegates at the constitutional convention, and moved that Florida be returned to territorial status.

Finally, a Representative in Congress, either from New York or from Massachusetts—Representatives from both

States were very friendly to us—rose and called a spade a spade. It will be remembered that Florida was not then represented in Congress and could not be heard on the subject. It was only after a considerable number of Representatives who tried to do right by Florida could be heard in Congress, notably Representatives from New York and Massachusetts, who were kindly disposed toward Florida, that the question was settled. As a matter of fact, those Representatives in Congress called attention to what was actually troubling some other Representatives. The trouble arose from the fact that the carpetbagger from Illinois who had been first elected to head the convention had been summarily fired as such, and the Members of the House did not think that the intemperate attitude of the Representatives from Illinois, based upon that occurrence, should prevail in Congress.

Eventually, the decision reached represented the attitude of Representatives from other States than those from the State of Illinois.

The Senator from Florida hopes that his distinguished friend from Illinois, with his usual generous approach to problems, will not consider it his duty to continue the vendetta of the Representatives from his good State against the State of Florida. Instead, the Senator from Florida hopes that the Senator from Illinois, in his accustomed generous approach to subjects before the Senate, will project his own consideration of the subject along the lines stated by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the carpetbagger from Illinois was a Republican, not a Democrat?

Mr. HOLLAND. On that point the Senator from Florida is unable to reply, because he did not look into the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He was a Republican.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is perfectly willing to concede, if the Senator from Illinois says so, that that is the case. I hope the present Senator from Illinois, a Democrat, has no intention of following or pursuing the hostile approach toward the State of Florida that was then the Republican approach.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; not at all. I believe that the reconstruction program carried through by the Republican Party under Ben Wade, Zach Chandler, and Charles Sumner was a great blot upon the United States, and set back the cause of unity very greatly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not leave out the name of Thaddeus Stevens.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would be willing to say that he was perhaps the most vindictive of them all.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Florida to say that Congress recognized the boundaries of Florida when, somewhat later, in 1868, it passed the act admitting Florida and five other States to representation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida will certainly strongly assert that fact. He has read the debates, and he knows that the very paragraph of the Constitution relating to the boundaries was not contested in the debates, which indicates rather strongly to the Senator from Florida that it was satisfactory.

The Senator from Florida noticed that all sorts of minor subjects did come up for debate; such as the salaries to be paid to constables and justices of the peace, the question as to which county officers were to be elected and which were to be appointed by the Governor, and of those to be appointed by the Governor, which were to be subjected to confirmation by the Senate and which were not to be subjected to confirmation by the Senate, and what the procedure was to be for amendment of the Constitution.

So many matters were debated that I believe it would be completely idle to say that the Constitution was not combed over with a fine-tooth comb. As a matter of fact, in the same debate, as the Senator from Illinois probably has discovered, if he has read the debate, Congress went so much into detail as to require that the State of Georgia, whose new constitution was then being considered, must go back and eliminate from its new constitution the so-called homestead exemption before its Representatives and Senators could be readmitted to their seats.

It is very clear, therefore, from the status of the debates in the Senate, and particularly in the House, as well as from newspaper files of the time, that in minute detail the Congress did go through all the provisions of the various new constitutions of the Southern States and subject them to a very complete sorting process before they were approved.

Mr. President, in closing this point, I may say that I hope the Senator from Illinois will not overlook the fact that Congress had imposed upon itself, by the passage of the act of 1867, under which the constitutions were redrafted, the condition that it must examine and approve the new constitutions before they could become operative. Other conditions, too, were placed in the act, which I do not believe need to be discussed at this time. Congress was so completely determined to prevail in its views of the respective State constitutions that it overrode the veto of President Andrew Johnson, after a very bitter and almost unparalleled debate as to the wisdom of the legislation, as the Senator from Illinois well knows.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the act of June 25, 1868, which granted representation in Congress to six Southern States, including Florida, made no mention whatsoever of boundaries, but merely stated that the constitutions were "republican"? The precise phrase was that these States had "framed constitutions of State government which are republican." Meaning that they had established a republican form of government; and in that connection I point out that the word "republican" is spelled with a small "r."

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, the Senator from Illinois is correct in this much of his statement: that the legislation passed in 1868 was short in its terms. But it was drafted, and so showed by its terms, to comply with the conditions set forth in the act of 1867, one of which was examination and approval of the State constitutions.

Furthermore, if the Senator from Illinois has read the debates which occurred on that point, he knows that, not once, but several times in the course of the debates, it was stated that the State constitutions were approved and accepted by the congressional committees and by many Members of Congress who participated in the debate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Illinois will consent to my yielding for a moment to the Senator from Texas, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, in connection with the same procedure of approving the constitution of the State of New Mexico when it was admitted to the Union, and without any mention of boundaries, the junior Senator from Texas would like to ask if the Supreme Court of the United States did not say that the admission of New Mexico into the Union by the Congress of the United States constituted an approval of the boundaries set up in the constitution of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Texas is completely correct. In the case of *New Mexico* v. *Texas* (276 U. S. 557) the Supreme Court said:

> New Mexico, when admitted as a State in 1912, explicitly declared in its constitution that its boundary ran along said 32d parallel to the Rio Grande. This was confirmed by the United States by admitting New Mexico as a State with the line thus described as its boundary.

I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois and also to the distinguished Senator from Texas, to whom I am indebted for bringing up this enlightening point at this time, that the debate showed quite clearly that the question of boundaries had not been discussed in the debate which occurred at the time when the State of New Mexico was admitted.

But the admission of the State with a boundary stated in its constitution and the approval of its constitution in general terms was held by the United States Supreme Court as being specific approval of the boundary stated in the constitution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is a fact that the act of Congress of June 25, 1868, did not refer to boundaries in any way, but merely referred to a republican form of government. Is that not correct

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct in that respect; but I believe he would be bound to admit, in fairness, that a perusal of the debate which occurred at that time shows that the discussion covered practically every other provision in the constitution except the boundary provision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a very significant point.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, it went into the details of articles which had nothing at all to do with the question of whether the State had set up a

republican form of government. For instance, it dealt with the section which fixed salaries. Of what possible relation to the question of whether a republican form of government was created was the consideration of the long list of salaries which was set forth, beginning with the salary of the Governor, and going down to the salary of justice of the peace and the salary of constable, as those matters were discussed in the active debate which occurred at that time on the floor of the House of Representatives?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the fact that the boundaries were neither mentioned in the act nor mentioned in the debate indicate that Congress did not consider the boundaries? Is there not strong ground to contend, therefore, that Congress did not then in legal effect approve those claimed boundaries? As a matter of fact, the issue at that time, as the Senator from Florida well knows, was whether Negroes were being given the franchise effectively and whether the whites who had been in the Confederate forces were disfranchised. In 1867, Congress, acting in a vindictive spirit, passed the Reconstruction Act, to bar and to disfranchise the former members of the Confederate forces. It was this that the Congress wished to assure itself about, as well as to see that no acts of involuntary servitude would be passed by the States, thus bringing slavery in by the back door. The second point was a very proper one.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator from Illinois is correct in his statement that those points he mentions were vital ones in connection with the procedure. However, the Senator from Illinois would be incorrect if he took the position that the entire constitution had not been submitted to the congressional committees and to both Houses of Congress and he knows that many provisions of the constitution which were not at all applicable to the question of whether the State as newly organized was under a republican form of government, were actually discussed during the course of the debate.

As I have already pointed out, in the same debate Congress went so far as to require as a condition precedent to readmission to representation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, in the case of the State of Georgia, that it strike from its constitution the provision relating to homestead exemption, and not include that provision in its new constitution. Of course, that question would have no possible relation to the fundamental question of whether the government of the State was republican.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that Florida was first admitted into the Union along with Iowa by the act of March 3, 1845?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that in the admission of both Florida and Iowa it was specifically stated that they were admitted on an equal footing with the original States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois is again correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since, according to the contention of the Senator from Florida, but not according to the contention of the Senator from Illinois, the original States could properly claim only a 3-mile boundary, how is it that Florida now can say that she has a 10½-mile boundary? Is it the position of the Senator from Florida that the equal-footing clause of 1845 is superseded by the proceedings of 1868?

Mr. HOLLAND. My contention is that the equal-footing clause has nothing whatever to do with the question of boundaries. As a matter of fact, various States have in their constitutions different kinds of provisions relative to boundaries. For instance, three of them have provisions, and I believe two of them have such provisions in their constitutions, fixing their boundaries at 3 English miles, rather than 3 sea miles; and, as the Senator from Illinois knows, the difference is about one-half a mile, as between the two classifications. There is no contention on the part of anyone that the equal-footing clause prevented any such action on the part of States, and there are many other essential questions of difference.

For instance, if the Senator from Illinois will consider his own State and the other Great Lakes States, he will find that by no means do the boundaries of his State and the boundaries of the other Great Lakes States extend equal distances into the Great Lakes. Instead, they extend to appropriate and convenient distances, to meet the boundaries of other States or to meet the international boundary with Canada.

So I do not believe the Senator from Illinois can properly be heard to say that the question of equal footing has any direct relationship whatever to any requirement that all the States must have identically the same boundaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the Texas case the Supreme Court said that since the Court had rejected the claim of California for ownership of and title to the submerged lands seaward to the 3-mile limit, certainly it could not approve ownership claims beyond 3 miles in the case of Texas, since Texas came in on an equal footing with the other States? Does not the same rule reasonably apply to Florida? Of course, the precise Florida case has never been before the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is incorrect in his reference to the Texas case. The question of equal footing had to do with the question of whether assets within the State boundaries should be the property of the State or the property of the Federal Government. The Supreme Court of the United States did not disturb in the slightest the boundaries of California, which extended only 3 English miles offshore; but the Supreme Court considered that case in reference to those boundaries, and made its finding on that basis. The Court did not disturb in the slightest the boundaries of Texas, which extended 3 leagues offshore. The Court went into the case of Louisiana, and there was some discussion of the 27-mile boundary of Louisiana, which had been fixed or had been attempted to be fixed by State statute. The Court did not even interfere with that.

The equal-footing reference upon which the Senator from Illinois is relying relates in no sense whatever to boundaries. To the contrary, different boundaries prevailed with reference to all three of the States which were involved in the three cases before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The equal-footing clause had to do with the question of whether the Federal Government or the State government owned the various property rights in the coastal belt from mean low water out to the State boundaries, wherever they were.

If the Senator from Illinois will carefully read the three decisions, he will find that the Supreme Court did not in the slightest degree either disturb the actual location or question the existence of State boundaries in any of those three cases, applicable to those three States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, it is true that the issue before the Court was, and the issue before the Senate is, the ownership of and title in the submerged lands out to the State boundaries, wherever they may be. I was interested in exploring the question of what the Court might do in applying this bill, Senate Joint Resolution 13, to the facts in the Florida situation and to its boundary claims in the light of the equal-footing clause.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say here that the Supreme Court had no trouble at all accommodating its philosophy to the three different cases, which I state again are the case of California, where the boundary by its constitution was 3 English miles off the coast; the case of Texas, whose boundary, determined long before its admission to the Union, and recognized at the time of its admission to the Union, was 3 leagues offshore; and the case of Louisiana, as to which there is a 3-marine-mile limitation, although the State had endeavored to extend its boundary 27 miles, or 24 additional miles, into the Gulf of Mexico. The Supreme Court had no difficulty at all fitting its philosophy into those 3 completely varying cases as to the question of where the boundaries were.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They were consistent in denying all three States claims, not in accepting them all, as the Senator from Florida has said.

Mr. HOLLAND. They were consistent as to the States of Texas and Louisiana, by not even questioning the jurisdiction of the two States. But, to the contrary, the Senator will find words which seem to approve the jurisdicton, for other purposes, of the two States of Texas and Louisiana. So that the Senator from Illinois has, for once, barked up the wrong tree. The question of equal rights——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Equal footing.

Mr. HOLLAND. Thank you. The question of equal footing relates not at all to the question of boundaries, but to the question of the type of rights granted to the various States, or permitted under Federal law to exist in the various States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota has been very much interested in the discussion, and is interested in the

map which the Senator from Florida has exhibited to the Senate. There is one matter on which I should like to have the Senator comment. The State of Louisiana, of course, was a part of the Louisiana Purchase, which embraced a great area running northward, as shown on the map, and of which my State of South Dakota was a part. What authority cut off the landward side of Louisiana to the north?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Federal Government, of course.

Mr. CASE. If the Federal Government has cut off the landward side of Louisiana to the north, can it not likewise cut off on the landward side of Louisiana seaward?

Mr. HOLLAND. It could have done so. At the time it admitted Louisiana to the Union it did not see fit to do so.

Mr. CASE. If it did not do so, do not the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and the straight area I point out on the map, which was a part of the Louisiana Purchase, have an inherent right to whatever mineral rights or whatever other rights may exist seaward on the coast side of Louisiana?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota would, I think, be able to make a good case for his State, along with other States of the Union, as to areas beyond State boundaries if they had been given away. As to areas within State boundaries, I think the Senator would have no more right to claim property rights there for his State than he would to claim property rights in the waters of the Mississippi River where they flow through Louisiana or property rights in the great swamps of Louisiana which were conveyed to Louisiana under the Swamp and Overflowed Land Act, or property rights in any of the other portions of Louisiana.

Mr. CASE. If the Federal Government can cut off Louisiana to the north, it is difficult for the Senator from South Dakota to understand why it cannot do so to the south.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from South Dakota has a point there of course. If the Federal Government had been willing to create a State that was not on equal footing with the other States, when it admitted Louisiana it could have specifically refused to grant it any offshore boundary, or any rights to property within that offshore boundary. But the Federal Government did not see fit to do that. The Federal Government granted to Louisiana, under its enabling act, an offshore boundary extending, as I recall, 3 marine miles into the gulf, along with the ownership of islands a considerably greater distance in the gulf. Those matters were within the jurisdiction of Congress, and the Congress acted, and the State of Louisiana was entitled to claim from that moment, all rights arising from that action, and does claim them, I am sure. The Congress of the United States would have no more right to recall a right granted to Louisiana or to any other of the new States at the time of their admission to the Union, or approved for them since that time, than a private person in a contractual relation with another private person would have a right to claim back something which he had given by way of rights to the other contracting party under the terms of the contract.

Mr. CASE. Then, is it not correct to say that Louisiana has a 27-mile claim to offshore lands, or seeks recognition of a 27-mile claim?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is correct to say that Louisiana has sought by action of its legislature to extend its boundary 24 miles further than the State boundary which was fixed by the act of Congress, and insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, the Senator from Florida questions the right of Louisiana to follow that course. There has never been any doubt about that being the position of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CASE. If that could be done——

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from South Dakota will defer for a moment, if he will look at the map of the State of Florida, he will see that the Continental Shelf outside State boundaries extends off the west coast of Florida to a point about 175 miles, at the farthest, from the mainland of the State, but Florida has not asserted any claim to areas outside its State boundaries. We think that to do so would be ex parte. We have never attempted to do that, for we think that the Federal Government has whatever right there is to such areas. That is a completely different question, however, from whether or not the Federal Government can negotiate in its own interest an arrangement with bordering States, whereby it can make use of the legal setup of such States rather than attempt to enact a great body of new laws which are now nonexistent. We have no Federal law other than admiralty law that prevails beyond State boundaries, and admiralty law, of course, does not cover the multitude of personal, private, and public relationships which have taken place and will continue to take place in the development of that outer area. The Senator from Florida has always felt that anything granted to the States by the Federal Government in that great outside area beyond State boundaries will have to be done by the Federal Government anew, and not as a result of something that has been done heretofore, and that it should not grant anything to the States except what it believes is proper compensation for any value it may get from the States. If it feels that it can receive no good value from the States, it should not give to the States anything within that outer area. That is just about as plain as the Senator from Florida can state his position, with which he believes he is in complete accord with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Florida is always able to state his position very plainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. I should merely like an opportunity to say, in connection with the so-called assertion by Louisiana of a boundary 27 miles from shore, that nothing in this joint resolution would give to Louisiana anything beyond its boundary as it existed at the time it entered the Union. The 27-mile claim was only asserted within recent times, and I believe that it is certainly clear, from the presentation made earlier today, that this measure covers nothing beyond the seaward boundary of Louisiana as it existed at the time Louisiana entered the Union.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], on the floor of the Senate this year, made a similar statement, which I would like to include in the RECORD at this time. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 2, 1953, at page 2696, I read:

> Mr. LONG. On page 280 of the hearings there appears a portion of the testimony of the attorney general of Louisiana, who makes clear that the act of the Legislature of Louisiana in extending its boundaries 27 miles has no effect insofar as this proposed legislation is concerned, and that Louisiana is limited to its original boundary unless the Federal Government should at a future time see fit to recognize the State boundary as extending beyond the boundary that existed when the State came into the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Let me say, to supplement what the Senator from Texas has said, that I am sure everyone knows that the position of Florida is somewhat different from that of Louisiana and Texas, but I must say, in complete fairness to the Senators from Louisiana and Texas, that not since I have been a Member of the Senate, and, I believe, at no other time, have they claimed in the Senate that their States have property rights extending beyond their legal boundaries. The measures which have been proposed recognize that fact and simply try to work out a participation in the fruits of development of the outer Continental Shelf based on what they consider the fair value of the use of their laws, police powers, facilities, and the like.

I have not agreed with them on some of the provisions which they have placed in their bills, but I know that not since I have been a Member of the Senate has any bill been proposed which would seek to take away from the Federal Government its proprietary interest in the Continental Shelf area. There has been very much loose talk on this question, especially by columnists and commentators, and I think it is well to restate the fact over and over again. Not since I have been a Member of the Senate, for over 6 years, has there been any measure submitted or, to my knowledge, suggested in the Senate which would lay claim on behalf of the States to any areas beyond the State boundaries.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The case cited in the hearings on the Submerged Lands Act—United States against Louisiana, decided June 5, 1950—contains references which would indicate that in that case that issue was at stake before the Supreme Court. There was a decision in the case against Louisiana, which asserted the Federal interest.

Mr. HOLLAND. The State of Louisiana has bowed to that decision insofar as areas beyond its State boundaries are concerned. In fairness, the Senator from Florida desires to state that in the various acts proposed by the Senators from Texas and Louisiana can

well take care of themselves. They have never claimed and do not now claim that the States own beyond their State boundaries, as fixed, in one case, by the Louisiana Enabling Act of Congress, and in the other case by action of the Texas Congress in 1836, later approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Florida what he understands the boundaries of the State of Louisiana to be?

Mr. HOLLAND. The sea boundaries of the State of Louisiana were stated in the enabling act as the Gulf of Mexico. They extend out 3 marine miles by operation of law and include specifically all islands lying within 3 leagues of the coast. Most of the debatable questions which eventually will have to be decided by some court and which relate to the precise location of State boundaries, relate to the State of Louisiana, particularly its southeasterly and easterly shorelines. Those questions do not apply to many other areas of the Nation. On the contrary, in most other places the boundary lines are clearly fixed, and there is no argument about them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida, in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with reference to the pending joint resolution, submitted a table which was largely, I think, identical with the table which he has submitted today. It is printed on page 35 of the hearings. In the footnote to that table the Senator explains the areas of the submerged lands within State boundaries. The last two sentences of the footnote read as follows:

> These coexist with the 3-mile limit for all States except Texas, Louisiana, and the Florida Gulf coast. In the latter cases the 3-league limit as established before or at the time of entry into the Union has been used.

Was that a misprint, or does the Senator actually say that in the case of Louisiana, as well as in the cases of Florida and Texas, the 3-league limit or the 10½-land-mile limit is the boundary line?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is unfortunate that all Senators did not have a chance to attend the hearings, because if they had, the Senator from Illinois would have learned that the inclusion of Louisiana in that particular way was stated to be incorrect, and the Senator from Florida, in his testimony, stated in great detail exactly what he has stated on the floor of the Senate today with reference to his understanding as to what constitutes the boundaries of Louisiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, 3 miles?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is 3 marine miles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not 3 leagues?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. That particular item is the only item in the table as to which the Senator from Florida discovered any discrepancy with the facts. I should like to make it quite clear that that discrepancy is not carried through in the statement of the areas included within Louisiana, according to my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the contention of Florida that Senate Joint Resolution 13, as applied to the facts in Florida's case, transfers title and ownership of submerged lands, and the right to administer them out 10½ miles on Florida's west coast?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct as to all the proprietary rights covered by the resolution, and always excepting those rights which are necessary for the Federal Government to enforce completely its jurisdiction as to control of navigation, commerce, international affairs, and the common defense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Florida that the resolution gives to Texas the claimed rights, as mentioned by the Senator from Florida, to the 10½-mile limit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not think the Senator uses the correct words. This resolution does not give anything to anyone; it simply recognizes the Texas limits, provided Texas can, as I believe it can, show that its limits were 3 leagues out before it was admitted into the Union, and that fact was made known to Congress and Congress approved it. The State of Texas is entitled to claim that right under the law.

To be a little more specific, I have always said, and I now repeat, that the joint resolution extends no State boundaries beyond the 3-geographical-miles limit. It simply leaves the 2 States in the status which they now occupy; and as to the only 2 States which the Senator from Florida knows will have any right beyond 3 miles, the States of Florida and Texas, the cases for Florida and Texas will have to be brought within the provisions of this resolution, based, in the one case, that of Texas, on action taken prior to 1845, on the part of the Republic of Texas, and action taken in 1845 by Congress in admitting Texas into the Union, along with its boundaries; and in the case of Florida, on action taken in 1868, to which the Senator from Illinois has already adverted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I find myself in a difficult position. Apparently, in the hardening up of the Louisiana Purchase, land of North Dakota was cut off from South Dakota. Within the past few years there has been discovered a great body of oil in North Dakota. The oil has been cut off from us to the north, and now, apparently cut off to the south, or it would be if the desires of all the States along the coast were granted. The only way by which the people of South Dakota can ever have any interest in the oil in areas which were a part of the Louisiana Purchase, as South Dakota was, is to establish, somehow, our rights somewhere along the line.

In view of what the Senator has said about Louisiana and its 3-mile belt and its claim to a 24-mile belt beyond the 3 miles, does not the Senator believe that this would be an appropriate time to make a declaration in order to settle ownership of the land on the Continental Shelf, at least beyond the 3-mile limit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that that would be done by the pending joint resolution. Perhaps the Senator has overlooked that fact. Such a provision is contained in section 9, page 20, of the joint resolution, which I shall read into the RECORD at this time:

> SEC. 9. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to affect in anywise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters, as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed.

If the Senator from South Dakota had been present earlier in the discussion, he would have learned that, according to the estimates of the best-trained persons we have been able to obtain to make such estimates, one-sixth of the oil and gas to be found in all offshore areas—that is, out to the Continental Shelf—lies within State boundaries, while five-sixths of it lies without State boundaries. Considering the fact that as to California all of the known oil is within State boundaries, it is quite apparent that much more than five-sixths of the total in the Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico lies outside the boundaries of the States.

Mr. CASE. By virtue of my reading on the subject, I was aware of that general theory or estimate with respect to the place where oil exists. However, earlier in the discussion this afternoon the Senator from Florida was referring to the Louisiana situation, and I understood him to indicate that he thought that at some time there should be a definition of the area of the 3-mile belt. Is the Senator from Florida saying that that would be taken care of by the joint resolution, so that Louisiana could assert ownership to anything beyond the 3-mile limit?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am saying that the joint resolution, if passed, would completely confirm in the Federal Government all jurisdiction and control of every sort outside the State boundaries of not only Louisiana but also every other coastal State.

Mr. CASE. In making his statement, what does the Senator from Florida have in mind with respect to islands?

Mr. HOLLAND. With respect to islands, only those islands which were granted to the States by the Federal Government at the time the States came into the Union, or since, if there be any such instances, could possibly be claimed by the States.

Mr. CASE. Would the 3 miles extend from each island?

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, the former Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, wrote a long letter to the committees of both the Senate and the House which were hearing this matter, setting forth the understanding which the State Department had on the subject. Secretary Acheson stated that each island had its own 3-mile belt around it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not possible, under the language of Senate Joint Resolution 13 with respect to submerged lands extending out 3 miles from the "coast line," that the coastline may be interpreted as being the outer shores of

islands far off the shores of the mainland, as California has been claiming under a State statute and, I believe, before the master in chancery of the Supreme Court, in which event boundaries and ownership could go out a long distance from the continental land mass?

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding is that California has no provable case beyond 3 miles from its mainland; and that as to the islands, its provable case would be 3 miles around each of the islands. I so stated in the hearings on this matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a consummation devoutly to be desired, but I am not at all satisfied that that is what the Senator's joint resolution would accomplish, because the coastline is not fully and clearly defined.

Mr. HOLLAND. On that point, all I can say is that, in the first instance, the joint resolution was drafted by representatives of the attorneys general of 44 of the States; was perfected in hearings in both the Senate and the House, with changes made throughout the draft; and was then closely scrutinized many times by the Department of Justice. I know of no opinion on the part of the Department of Justice that holds to the contrary. From the statements of representatives of the Department of Justice, and from private conferences with them, it is our belief that they understand the joint resolution exactly as we understand it. If the Senator from Illinois has an understanding that is different or contradictory, I should appreciate his placing it in the RECORD, so that we may see the basis for such belief.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the California case, California claimed that the line was 3 miles from the outer chain of islands?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall that aspect of the matter. Certainly in the Supreme Court decision there is no such statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no; I agree it is not in the Supreme Court decision, but in the record of the hearings before the master of the Supreme Court, Mr. William H. Davis.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the only document I have seen on that matter is the report of recommendations by the master and the objections made by both sides. Neither side was satisfied. I understand the point in argument before the master was not the question mentioned by the Senator from Illinois, but, instead, the question, What is the outer boundary of inland waters, particularly of San Pedro Bay?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Most certainly that was one question. But I believe also there was a question as to whether the 3 miles should be measured from the continental land mass or from a line connecting the outer shoreline of the chain of islands lying off the coast of southern California.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the joint resolution, no such contention could be maintained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator certain of that?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is what I believe, and that is what every legal authority I have consulted on the subject believes. Incidentally, the only reason why there was some thought to the contrary was some wording in the original joint resolution, which has been omitted, which would have made the outer boundary of inland waters farther out than that which is now provided by the joint resolution. The joint resolution simply continues the outer boundary of inland waters pursuant to the decisions of the Supreme Court already made. In the case of California I think the record should also show that very deep waters exist off the shore of the mainland of California, so, in my opinion, it would certainly be completely illogical to make a claim that the State boundaries embraced those deep waters and channels. I do not believe any such claim could possibly be substantiated under existing law, much less under the joint resolution, if it should be passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from California. I am glad he is here to discuss the question.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that in 1949, as the Senator probably knows, the State of California enacted a statute which purported to extend its boundaries seaward 3 miles from the farthermost islands off its coastline.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the point to which I referred.

Mr. KUCHEL. Yes. Certainly the State of California was acting either constitutionally or unconstitutionally. In either event the language of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Florida would not affect the boundaries of the State of California, aside from its provisions by which the State of California, like all the other States of the Union, would be given title to the "historic boundaries" in the specific case. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from California is, of course, correct. However, the recital in the joint resolution which, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, would absolutely preclude the State of California from successfully asserting any claim to a boundary extending beyond the islands is the last sentence in section 4, which is the saving clause which simply preserves the situation in California and every other State, under the conditions stated in that sentence, which I read into the RECORD:

> Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond 3 geographical miles if it was so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

The Senator from Florida, without seeking in any sense to limit the State of California or any other coastal State—and he could not do so if he wished to—but simply observing what he believes to be the facts and law in the matter, has merely stated that he does not think that reservation would breathe life into a statutory extension or attempted extension of the boundaries of California or any other State after the time of its admission to the Union, unless Congress should approve such extension.

Mr. KUCHEL. At the time the State was admitted to the Union originally.

Mr. HOLLAND. Or since.

Mr. KUCHEL. Or since; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. If Congress did approve the action of California, Louisiana, or Texas, or the action of one of the New England States which might seek to extend its boundaries—and I believe Delaware made such an effort, but the legislation was passed by only one house—that, of course, would be the right of Congress, subject to the law of nations as to how far it could exercise such rights.

The point the Senator from Florida is making is that he has not heard of any contention on behalf of California that at the time it became a part of the Union its constitution or its laws prescribed its boundaries in any different place than 3 English miles off the shore of the mainland. The Senator from California knows that there has been nothing done since that time by way of congressional action to extend those boundaries; and there is nothing in this joint resolution which would affect the right of California or any other State to claim what it thinks it is entitled to claim. But there is certainly nothing in the joint resolution which would confirm, or even tend to confirm, a claim based upon a statutory extension of boundaries made since the State was admitted to the Union, such attempted statutory extension not being approved by Congress.

Mr. KUCHEL. Or to deny the State that right if, indeed, by its 1949 statute it did no more than what was originally intended at the time the State came into the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, that would be a question for the courts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator from California to feel that this joint resolution would not foreclose California from claiming the shoreline as being the line connecting the outer shoreline of the islands, rather than the shoreline of the continental mass? Does the Senator from California feel that, under this bill, California would not be foreclosed from making such a claim?

Mr. KUCHEL. I should say that, with respect to the State of California, the joint resolution merely places the boundaries as they existed when the State came into the Union, or as they may subsequently have been established in accordance with the language of a statute enacted by the Congress at a later date. In any event, we have a question unanswered in 6 years before the Supreme Court in connection with a master's report; and so far the Supreme Court has not found where the outer limits of the inland waters are with respect to our shore line. In my judgment, whether or not the 1949 statute is valid or invalid is not touched upon in any fashion by this joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from California believe that the measurement of the seaward boundaries of California at the time it came into the Union started from the continental land mass or from the outer edge of the chain of islands?

Mr. KUCHEL. I have no comment to make upon that question. The fact is

that my State has enacted a statute on this point. Whether or not that statute is valid is something for the courts to decide, and quite apart, however, from the pending joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator from California believes that there is an ambiguity in the joint resolution?

Mr. KUCHEL. Not at all. The question of a definition of boundaries by metes and bounds is something which is not, and in my judgment should not be made, a part of the joint resolution before us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator is suggesting that it may later be decided that the boundary is measured from the continental land mass, or it may later be decided that the boundary is measured from the outer edge of the chain of islands lying off the continental land mass.

Mr. KUCHEL. I think it would be within the purview of a court of competent jurisdiction to determine, in any instance, what actually are the boundaries of a littoral State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not that open up the prospect, under this bill, (a) of endless litigation; (b) of endless delay; and (c) of the possibility of tremendous extension of State boundaries and State ownership into the open ocean?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida can understand the impatience of the distinguished Senator from Illinois with the law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. After all, the law is not so certain a science as, for example, mathematics or other sciences with which the Senator from Illinois is familiar. The Senator from Florida knows full well that if the United States Supreme Court should change its mind as to what constituted the outer limits of inland waters, and should change it to a sufficient degree, it could open up, not only under this joint resolution, but of its own initiative, questions which would reach out much farther than anything we have been talking about here.

The Senator from Florida believes that the laws, as announced over and over and over again by the Supreme Court, as to the delimitation of inland waters, are sufficiently fixed, definite, and certain so that it would require a complete, cataclysmic change of the Supreme Court's philosophy in that field to afford any hope for an extension of the boundaries of the good State of California so that they would go out beyond the islands as to all areas contained within an outer line. There is no way for us to foreclose the Supreme Court from changing its mind. It might change its mind with reference to inland waters and their delimitation. But failing such change, the Senator from Florida cannot see how, under this joint resolution, there could possibly be any serious question affecting California or any other State.

What we are talking about is the boundaries as of the time the various States came into the Union. If such boundaries have been approved by Congress on an extended basis since that time, that fact, too, is germane in connection with the joint resolution. But unless the boundary can be brought into one or the other of those categories, the State is bound by the limitation of 3 geographic miles, which applies, without constitutional action and without statutory action, as the outer limit of the claimed boundary of jurisdiction of the Nation, and of the States situated on the coast.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Florida favor an amendment to the joint resolution which would eliminate the possibility of future boundary extensions of States into the marginal sea and further transfers of ownership or control to the States beyond the limits which the Senator has designated as the present limits of the coastal States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida hopes that no amendments whatever will be made to the joint resolution. As the Senator from Florida understands, the President of the United States is committed to the support of the joint resolution. Those acting for the President have checked the very minor changes made up to this time. The Senator from Florida does not want any substantial changes of any sort made in this measure. However, he does invite the attention of his friend to the fact that even if Congress should take such action now, there would be nothing in that action to prevent future Congresses from adopting a different point of view. So there would be little to be gained by the inclusion of such a provision in the joint resolution.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is merely suggesting that we might place in the legislation that which the Senator from Florida says is its intent.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Illinois wishes to prepare an amendment the Senator from Florida, of course, will be glad to study it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would he support it?

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Florida insists there is, in his opinion, no substance whatever to the claim that the State of California can under present conditions and under the pending measure successfully surmount that part of the California facts and law which fixes its boundaries 3 miles offshore.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Florida permit the Senator from Illinois to turn his questioning to the field of so-called inland waters?

Mr. HOLLAND. Gladly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the Supreme Court in an unbroken series of decisions has stated that ownership of and title to submerged lands under navigable inland waters belong to the States?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Supreme Court decided that the States have qualified ownership in the bottoms or beds under their inland waters. However, I doubt whether the Supreme Court has stated that point any more often than members of the Supreme Court had stated in cases prior to the bringing of the California case that the same situation obtained as to all lands under waters lying within State boundaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that in every case, up until the California case, the lands involved were (a) true tidelands, or lands daily washed by the tide, (b) submerged lands under bays and ports, (c) submerged lands under rivers, and (d) submerged lands under inland lakes, and that in every case the Court held the ownership in and title to such lands rested in the States?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; but the Court sometimes used a good deal more general language than that. Furthermore, the Senator from Illinois is not correct in saying that the cases are limited to the subjects which he mentions. The Florida case of Skiriotes versus Florida has to do with the enforcement of police laws of the State of Florida in the open sea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That did not involve ownership of submerged lands; it involved questions of control over fishing rights.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. However, the whole general subject matter of where control lay, whether in the State or in the Federal Government, was a part of that case. There have been other cases not yet cited. For instance, the Senator from Florida is looking at a quotation from the United States Supreme Court case of *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S., 240), in which a very responsible and highly regarded Justice of the Supreme Court, writing a decision by the Supreme Court, which was, I believe, unanimous, used these words:

> The extent of the territorial jurisdiction of Massachusetts over the sea adjacent to its coast is that of an independent nation, and, except so far as any right of control over this territory has been granted to the United States, this control remains in the State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is that case?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is the case of Manchester against Massachusetts. It is a fishing case. It had to do with the waters of Buzzards Bay. Again, the waters of Buzzards Bay are within a bay which I believe would be held and should be held to be inland water.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has it not always been so regarded?

Mr. HOLLAND. It has; but the point I am making is that the Supreme Court time after time has used general language, which it regarded as having no particular effect when it later decided the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases.

Incidentally, let me call this further fact to the attention of my distinguished friend from Illinois. Those who adopt his view in this matter are very reluctant to give any force and effect at all to obiter dicta, or statements made by the court in decisions which were not necessary to a determination of the facts in the case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Such statements are irrelevant and not germane.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yet they are asking us to give attention to obiter dicta in connection with the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, in their finding, for

instance, that the Thirteen Original States never had jurisdiction out to sea beyond 3 miles, and in the references of the Court to other States of the Union which were not before the Court at the time.

So we shall ask and hope that the distinguished Senator will be consistent, and when he claims the benefit of obiter dicta, he will be gracious enough to admit that obiter dicta have the same effect when pronounced by 48 judges of the Supreme Court over a long series of years, each of whom said, in effect, that it was his understanding that the States owned the lands under their waters out to their boundaries, including both tidal waters and inland waters.

Therefore the question of obiter dicta must be allowed play in both directions in a discussion of this subject.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly willing to let it apply in both directions. The Senator from Illinois, as the Senator from Florida well knows, is not a lawyer, and cannot contend with him in legal ability. But the Senator from Illinois understands that the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case was to the effect, first, that the Original Thirteen States could not have ownership in and title to any of the lands situated seaward from the low-water mark, because it was generally asserted first by the Federal Government in 1793, under Thomas Jefferson, that the Federal Government had ownership of and title to such lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me interrupt at this point to say that none of the Thirteen Original States was before the Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. None of the Thirteen Original States was a party, nor was the bottom land of those States before the Court. So, the decision of the Court, and the effort to deprive the Thirteen Original States of their opportunity to be heard by the Court, is on a par with what recently happened when the former President of the United States sought to declare a naval oil reserve not merely over the lands and waters of California, Texas, and Louisiana, which States had had their day in Court, but also over the waters of Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and other States, both on the Pacific and the Atlantic, ignoring the fact that they never had had their day in Court, but showing complete willingness to reach out and grab the land for the United States Government, in such a way as to deprive sovereign States of a right to be heard by their Court, our Court, the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Florida permit the Senator from Illinois to observe that he proves too much? He said that the Supreme Court indulged in obiter dictum in the California case, because it cited the fact that the Original Thirteen States did not possess ownership of or title to submerged lands. But this was precisely the opposite argument to that which was advanced by the State of California as the basis of her claim. California argued that the Original Thirteen States did have ownership in and title to the submerged lands; and that, since it came into the Union on an equal footing with the Original Thirteen States, it was entitled to the submerged lands off its shores also.

In elaborating its ruling denying the validity of this California argument, the Supreme Court conceded the application and validity of the equal-footing clause in the statute admitting California to the Union.

So, if the Senator from Florida says that the decision of the Supreme Court as to the Thirteen Original States and as to the equal-footing clause is obiter dictum and therefore falls, then the claims of Texas, Florida, California, and Louisiana, all of which came in after the Thirteen Original States were admitted, fall also. I do not believe that in any of the cases the Supreme Court was indulging in obiter dictum. Those sections of the decisions which we are discussing seem to me relevant and necessary to the Court's rulings.

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be very exciting if it should be the fact. However, as a matter of fact, not one of the Thirteen Original States had had its day in Court, as Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi have not had their day in Court, and as the two States on the Pacific seaboard north of California have not had.

The only place now existent in all the Nation where this question can be reasonably settled, so as to obviate the absolute necessity of litigation affecting each of these States, and also the necessity of litigation affecting countless local communities and private individuals, is the Congress of the United States; and here is where we are trying to settle the question, in order to obviate hundreds or thousands of cases which may otherwise have to be filed, and to obviate long delays such as have already occurred in the California case for example, in which approximately 6 years have elapsed since the Supreme Court committed the question to a special master to determine where the boundary of 15½ miles of inland waters was on the shore of California. They are still struggling over those 15½ miles, out of a thousand miles of coastline of the good State of California; and they have not yet reached Oregon or Washington, and they have not yet reached the other coastal States.

Nevertheless, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senators who join with him, apparently do not want to see this question settled, ignoring the fact that Congress is the only place where it can be settled, and ignoring the further fact that Mr. Justice Black in writing the majority decision in the California case, almost closed his opinion with a statement—I think it is the next to the last paragraph—to the effect that he and the Court do not believe that the Congress of the United States will be unjust to States, local communities, and literally thousands of private owners.

I do not see how he could have made any more clear the suggestion that in Congress was the place for the question to be settled. We are trying to settle it. We hope that we may have the cooperation to that end of the distinguished Senator from Illinois and of his friends.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that it is the desire of the Senator from Illinois and the other Senators who hold similar opinions on the pending resolution to treat both the coastal States and the private lessees with complete equity. In the so-called Anderson bill, S. 107, which we are sponsoring, we are proposing to turn over to the coastal States 37½ percent of all royalties obtained from resources inside the 3-mile limit, and to continue unchecked the rights of the existing lessees from the States.

So the idea that the Federal Government and those of us who are supporting the claims of the Federal Government are trying to gouge the coastal States or their lessees is not well taken.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator from Illinois should have said, because he has more of a case than he has indicated, that he and his associates are willing in their bill to quiet the title to some billions of dollars' worth of submerged lands off the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will point that out.

Mr. HOLLAND. At this time I wish to comment on it, because I believe it is a completely inconsistent and discriminatory provision.

It happens that the State of Florida has almost throughout its length beaches which are susceptible of development. It has hundreds of miles of beautiful beaches, where cities, hotels, apartments, boating facilities, and other developments can be erected. Unfortunately, the State of Louisiana does not have that kind of coastline, but it has along its coast great assets of a different kind.

The Senator from Illinois and his associates have been suggesting to the Senator from Florida and to other Senators whose States are in a similar situation, "If you go along with us, we will quiet the title of your own State and your own public units and your own thousands of private owners to these properties if you will help us take away from Louisiana and Texas what they happen to have along a coastline that is completely different from yours."

Mr. President, I do not think that is equity. I believe it is discrimination. I believe that all the values, whatever there are, within the coastal belt lying off the shores of the several States—and in different places the values vary—have to be considered at one time. So far as I know, there is no oil in the submerged lands lying off the State of Florida. Many millions of dollars have been spent in an effort to discover oil there, but no oil has yet been discovered. However, I wish to have equity done to Texas, Louisiana, and California.

Furthermore, if oil were to be discovered off the coast of Florida, I do not wish to have settled in Washington, far removed from the scene of production, the question of whether oil-development operations should be had just off of the front steps of a hotel in Miami or of a hotel in Jacksonville or of a hotel in Palm Beach. I want there to be local control regarding the question of how that development shall occur, and I believe that is the only sound kind of control.

It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Illinois and his friends

have been trying as hard as they could to make this matter exclusively one of oil, for they have been willing to give away everything else, provided only that they can hold on to some oil and gas assets which are found in portions of only 3 States out of the approximately 20 or 22 States which are affected, not including the Great Lakes States. It seems to me that is not equity; and I hope my distinguished friend from Illinois will reexamine the situation and will determine whether in his judgment it is equity to give to one State all it can claim, simply because its frontage happens to be of the type I have mentioned, but to deny to a sister State, which has a different type of frontage, the enjoyment of the properties which are found off its shores.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTER in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Florida at the beginning of his remarks this afternoon pointed out that the comparative acreage which would be under State control, as against Federal control, under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 13, would be, I believe, five-sixths, as compared to one-sixth.

Mr. HOLLAND. No.

Mr. PASTORE. Or perhaps it was nine-tenths, as compared to one-tenth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Nine-tenths as compared to one-tenth in the case of the area; five-sixths as compared to one-sixth, in the case of the estimated production of oil and gas, as determined by the best estimates available.

Mr. PASTORE. That leads me to a question which I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida. Has there been any reliable estimate, or any estimate that is reliable in the judgment of the senior Senator from Florida, as to what the comparative resources would be in terms of the value of the oil, as against the five-sixths and the one-sixth?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would know of no basis for fixing that value, except the barrel basis, which would be the same in both places.

However, in the deeper water in the offshore belt it is quite possible that the cost of production would be greater than it would be in the more narrow belt along the States. Except for that difference, I see no difference between a barrel of oil produced 10 feet beyond a State boundary and a barrel of oil produced 10 feet within a State boundary.

Mr. PASTORE. Neither do I see any difference at all.

The reason for my question is that there have been many estimates as to the worth of these oil resources. I have heard the figure $40 billion mentioned. Does the Senator from Florida believe that estimate to be correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe that estimates of that size, and even greater estimates—and some of the estimates have amounted to as much as $300 billion—are simply figments of someone's imagination, because the best qualified experts in this field have arrived at much smaller estimates. I am glad the Senator from Rhode Island has asked the question.

The amount of proved reserves now existing offshore California, Texas, and Louisiana is 259 million barrels only. The Senator from Rhode Island will find the figures on that point in table V in the hearings. The amount of the estimated proved reserves appears on page 577, in table V. There the Senator from Rhode Island will find that, according to the testimony of the geological experts of the Department of the Interior, it is stated that the complete estimated proved reserves within State boundaries are as follows:

Eighty-four million barrels, in the case of Louisiana.

Fifteen million barrels of oil, in the case of Texas, together with 75,000,000 thousand cubic feet of gas.

In the case of California, 160 million barrels of oil—or a total of 259 million barrels of oil.

That is approximately a 32 days' supply of oil for this Nation. That is all the oil that is known to exist within State boundaries, as stated by the geological experts.

The royalties to accrue over a period of 25 or 30 years constitute only a small amount. My recollection is that all-told it would be approximately $50 million to the Federal Government and approximately $30 million to the State governments. However, as to that the Senator from Rhode Island can make his own computations.

With reference to the estimated reserves which are seaward of traditional State boundaries, the Senator from Rhode Island will see the figures stated in the lower portion of the same table.

Mr. President, I think it would be well at this point for me to ask unanimous consent that table V, as it appears on page 577 of the hearings, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE V.—*Estimated proved reserves*

FIELDS WITHIN THE AREA CLAIMED BY UNITED STATES BUT LANDWARD OF TRADITIONAL STATE BOUNDARIES

State and product	Number of proved fields	Estimated proved reserves
Louisiana: Oil or oil and gas	5	84,000,000 barrels.
Texas:		
Oil	2	15,000,000 barrels.[1]
Gas	1	75,000,000 thousand cubic feet.[1]
California: Oil	5	160,000,000 barrels.

FIELDS SEAWARD OF TRADITIONAL STATE BOUNDARIES

Louisiana:		
Oil or oil and gas	17	335,000,000 barrels.
Gas[2]	[2]14	2,100,000,000 thousand cubic feet.
Texas	None	None.
California	None	None.

[1] Estimates based on incomplete data.
[2] Includes 2 gas and 12 oil and gas fields.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Rhode Island will notice from the table that the only estimated proved reserves outside the traditional boundaries of the States are in Louisiana, where they are stated to be 335 million barrels. Of course, under the philosophy of the pending measure, that is wholly the property of the Federal Government, and is so confirmed by the pending joint resolution.

With reference to the areas in general, and the estimates of the amount of oil to be found, as given by these experts in the field of geology, the Senator will find those figures on another page of the printed report, page 584. If he will turn to that page, he will find that the total estimated amount, nonproved and proved—the table includes both—in the case of Texas, within its State boundaries, is 1.2 billion barrels, and for the entire Continental Shelf off the Texas coast including the 1.2 it is 9 billion barrels. In the case of Louisiana, he will find that 0.25 billion barrels is estimated as the total amount, both proved and unproved, within State boundaries off the Louisiana coast; whereas, for the entire Continental Shelf off the Louisiana coast the estimate is 4 billion barrels. In the case of California, the similar amounts are 1.1 billion barrels within the 3 sea miles, or 3½ land miles, of the coast, and for the entire Continental Shelf off the California coast, 2 billion barrels, including the 1.1 billion barrels; or a total overall of 15 billion barrels estimated, both proved and unproved, of which 13 billion barrels are outside State boundaries, and 2-billion-plus barrels are estimated to be within State boundaries.

So the Senator will see that, even using the maximum figures estimated by the geologists of the Department, we are talking about something over 2 billion barrels within all the State boundaries, to be produced over the next 25, 30 or some say even 50 years. Consequently, the amounts of money to be figured by way of royalties are indeed small as compared to the astronomic figures I have heard mentioned over the radio and have read in some of the newspaper columns. There is no just basis at all for such astronomic figures.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 13, make any claim whatever to a percentage of the oil that is beyond the so-called statutory boundary?

Mr. HOLLAND. None whatever. To the contrary, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13), in section 9—which I hope the Senator will read—makes it very clear that not only will all the natural resources in the outer shelf appertain to the United States, but that the jurisdiction and control of everything in the outer shelf is confirmed in the United States.

The unfair, untrue propaganda about this measure has gone to such an extent as to make people shudder, when what they are really anxious to get at is the facts. The very idea that some columnists and some commentators, too, have stooped to the practice of reporting, where all can hear it, such extravagant claims as that there are involved 200 billions of barrels of oil, or 300 billions of barrels, and that the share for one State for a certain year, if it were split among the States, would be $9 million. I heard such a statement over the air

not long ago, as to one of our smaller States.

Such statements are so completely variant from the facts as to be disturbing; but, under our system of free speech, such is the latitude given to permit the propagandizing of people who only want to know the facts. I may say that they are gradually getting the facts, because conservative papers and some of the conservative broadcasters have finally come to the point of telling the facts just as they were told in the two editorials which the Senator from Florida placed in the RECORD earlier, the one from the Washington News, the other from the Washington Star. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his questions.

Now, Mr. President, I come to the legal case, and I shall yield for questioning at the termination of my discussion of that phase. Because of the recent rulings of the Supreme Court, it is necessary to consider briefly the legal questions involved in this controversy. I shall not deal with them at length, for many reasons. In the first place, they have been hashed and rehashed in the hearings and in the debates. In the next place, there are two Members of the Senate, namely, the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Louisiana, who are so much better qualified than is the Senator from Florida to speak about all the legal details that he yields to them, and particularly, because the Senator from Florida feels that what the Senate wants in this RECORD and what the people are hungry for are the facts in this case. So it is to the facts to which the Senator from Florida will largely confine himself after this brief discussion of the legal case.

THE LEGAL CASE

In the face of exceptionally strong evidence of historic ownership and use of the submerged coastal lands by the respective States, the Supreme Court in its latest decisions has seen fit to declare that the Federal Government holds paramount rights in these lands.

This holding contravenes the earlier beliefs of the Supreme Court as frequently stated by them.

State ownership of the offshore lands in question had always been recognized by the Federal courts in their decisions up until the recent decision in the California case. As a matter of fact, even in the California case, in the majority opinion, Mr. Justice Black frankly concedes that the United States Supreme Court had in previous decisions—

> Many times * * * used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that State not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

Those are the words of Mr. Justice Black, who wrote the majority decision against the States, in the California case, and even he recognized that he had to change the law to reach that decision, because of the fact that so many Justices before that time, in statements which he held to be obiter dicta—and I think they were—had so frequently and clearly held that there was no question as to their belief that the States did own the soils beneath their navigable waters, whether inland or outside. Certainly the record bears out this statement of Mr. Justice Black, and I should like at this time to insert as a part of my remarks a list of the Supreme Court Justices who, in their written opinions, held and expressed, through the many years of the life of this Nation, just such a belief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list of Justices was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF JUSTICES

Chief Justice Harlan Fiske Stone, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, Associate Justice Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice Benjamin M. Cardozo, Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice Willis Van Devanter, Associate Justice George Sutherland, Associate Justice Pierce Butler, Associate Justice James C. McReynolds, Chief Justice William Howard Taft, Associate Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice Edward Terry Sanford, Chief Justice Edward Douglas White, Associate Justice Joseph McKenna, Associate Justice William R. Day, Associate Justice Mahlon Pitney, Associate Justice John H. Clarke, Associate Justice John Marshall Harlan, Associate Justice Horace H. Lurton, Associate Justice Joseph R. Lamar, Chief Justice Melville W. Fuller, Associate Justice David J. Brewer, Associate Justice Rufus W. Peckham, Associate Justice William H. Moody, Associate Justice Henry B. Brown, Associate Justice George Shiras, Associate Justice Stephen J. Field, Associate Justice Horace Gray, Associate Justice Howell E. Jackson, Associate Justice Joseph P. Bradley, Associate Justice Samuel Blatchford, Associate Justice Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Associate Justice Samuel F. Miller, Chief Justice Morrison R. Waite, Associate Justice Nathan Clifford, Associate Justice Noah H. Swayne, Associate Justice David Davis, Associate Justice William Strong, Associate Justice Ward Hunt, Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, Associate Justice James M. Wayne, Associate Justice Samuel Nelson, Associate Justice Robert C. Grier, Chief Justice Roger B. Taney, Associate Justice Joseph Story, Associate Justice John McLean, Associate Justice John McKinley, Associate Justice Peter V. Daniel.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will not take up the time of the Senate to read this entire list, but I do call to your attention the fact that the names of such jurists as Charles Evans Hughes, William Howard Taft, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and Louis D. Brandeis, appear on this list of 48 Justices.

After reading many opinions of the Supreme Court regarding this subject, I agree with the statement found on page 7 of the report which the Senate Judiciary Committee filed on the submerged lands question in the second session of the 80th Congress. After quoting the excerpts from the opinion of Mr. Justice Black cited above, the Senate committee said:

> Thus the Court by its decision not only established a law differently from what eminent jurists, lawyers, and public officials for more than a century had believed it to be, but also differently from what the Supreme Court had believed it to be.

This decision has resulted in chaos and complete instability, and as a matter of sound public policy must be corrected. This is the only place where it can be properly corrected. As you know, in the decision in the California case the Court was divided 6 to 2, and in the Texas case the division and by the even closer margin of 4 to 3, and obviously a change in the personnel of the Court could very easily cause a reversal of this decision. This fact alone causes confusion and instability.

Mr. President, when people who are asked to invest, or who wish to invest, millions of dollars for a certain development in this area, are aware that the Supreme Court itself is just as evenly divided as it is possible to divide it, they know perfectly well that the law may be changed overnight with the accession of a new judge, and so they hesitate to invest, and as a result, development is stayed.

The second situation of instability is the refusal of the Supreme Court to rule on the question of title, which refusal has immeasurably increased the difficulty. The certain result will be long and complicated litigation.

Mr. President, I desire to say, to the credit of the Department of Justice, that it realized this, and asked in its prayer that the title be determined. When the first decision came down in the California case, it failed to determine the title, but simply announced in whom paramount right lay, and held that the States did not have title. The Department of Justice again realized how much confusion the decision was causing, and it went back to the Supreme Court and asked the Court to rewrite its opinion and decision so as to determine and decide the question of title. The Court failed to do so. I say that fact constitutes another element of grave instability which shakes the chance for any titles to be permanently established in the area which is affected, and it also kills the chance of any development moving forward.

Further complicating future litigation, the court will be faced with many differences in the various State constitutions. That is another matter causing instability.

A good illustration of this arises under the Washington State Constitution. In this case, the State of Washington in its constitution, ratified before it became a State, specifically asserted its ownership to the beds and shores of all navigable waters within its boundary which was fixed at 1 marine league in the Pacific Ocean.

The Court is never going to reach the ultimate problem until it gets to the State of Washington, because the constitution of that State specifically recites in one of its articles that the State has complete sovereignty over the area lying within its border, which is fixed at 3 miles offshore.

The Constitution of the State of Florida, adopted February 25, 1868, ratified by the people of Florida May 4 to 6, 1868, and approved by Congress June 25, 1868, fixing the State boundaries on the West coast in the Gulf of Mexico at 3 leagues from the land, presents still another variation. The constitutions of the Original Thirteen States present still further and varied problems in this regard. It is easy to see that these varying situations in the several States will necessarily cause much confusion and multiplicity of litigation.

I pause long enough to say, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the con-

stitutions and the laws in various States are different, that if the Government had taken a proper attitude it would have required that each coastal State be given the right to have its own situation litigated before it began to reach out and grab submerged lands in States which have not had their day in court, as it did in the recent past.

Still further instability in the present completely unsettled condition appears when we note that although the California case was decided by the Supreme Court in 1947, now, almost 6 years later the Court has not yet determined what is the coast line of the proven oil-bearing 15½ miles of their nearly 1,000-mile-long coast so that it can be ascertained where the paramount rights of the Federal Government begin. I predict that if Congress does not act by passing our bill or a similar measure such inaction will bring endless years of litigation, completely defeating for generations any stability of title and all hope of adequate development in our marginal belt.

Mr. President, in our State we can feel this situation. We know that development in this disputed area stopped when the decisions were announced. We do not want that condition longer to continue. We do not think it is in the interest of the United States as a whole that such a situation should continue in our State or in any other State, because when wealth is created in Florida it serves the whole Nation, and when industries are created in any of the other States the wealth is distributed to the entire Nation.

Mr. President, the time allowed is too brief to permit a summary of the great mass of testimony presented in hearings before congressional committees which substantiates the sound legal and historic position of the States. I think that the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Reed in the California case clearly states the fundamental legal question in the following words:

> The original States were sovereignties in their own right, possessed of so much of the land underneath the adjacent seas as was generally recognized to be under their jurisdiction. The scope of their jurisdiction and the boundaries of their lands were coterminous. * * * California, as is customary, was admitted into the Union "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever" * * *. As was the rule, title to lands under navigable waters vested in California as it had done in all other States * * *. The authorities cited in the Court's opinion lead me to the conclusion that the original States owned the lands under the seas to the 3-mile limit.

I think it is fair to say that the expert testimony presented by the States in early hearings before congressional committees, substantiates over and over again the soundness of the legal position of the States as approved by Mr. Justice Reed.

To think of carrying the new doctrine of paramount rights to its logical conclusion is most disturbing. It threatens the very fundamentals of property rights and ownership. This fact has been clearly expressed by two of the most outstanding legal groups in this country. The American Bar Association, after careful investigation and consideration, expressed the following conclusion:

> The new concept that the Federal Government has the paramount right to take property without compensation because it may need that property in discharging its duty to defend the country and conduct its foreign relations can have no logical end except that the Federal Government may take over all property, public and private, and under this theory the Federal Government could nationalize all of the natural resources of the country without paying the owners therefor, wholly in disregard of the fifth amendment.

With this very same thought in mind, the National Association of Attorneys General expressed their deep concern in the following comment:

> The principles of the tidelands decisions, if not erased from the law of the land by act of Congress, could lead to nationalization of private lands as well as State lands without compensation.

Many other responsible organizations, too numerous to list at this time, have expressed this same view. They have sounded the warning, and I firmly believe that the 83d Congress, heeding this warning, will approve and pass our resolution, as necessary legislation, and that the President will approve it.

Mr. President, that concludes my dealing with the legal features, and I shall go on to the next subject, if there is no question.

Mr. President, it is no new thing for the Congress to supplant and overturn by legislation an opinion of the Supreme Court which it regards as unsound. An interesting and significant parallel to the submerged land cases is found in the case of *United States* v. *Wyoming* (331 U. S. 440 (1947)). The United States filed suit against the State of Wyoming and the Ohio Oil Co., its lessee, claiming ownership of certain Wyoming lands as part of the Federal public domain. Wyoming claimed the lands as State school lands, and acting on the belief that it was the owner, it had, in good faith, leased the lands for oil production to the Ohio Oil Co. Wyoming believed and claimed that, upon its admission to the Union, section 36 of each township vested in the State as school lands.

The United States claimed that under the act admitting Wyoming to the Union school lands would not become vested in the State until the date of the approval of the official survey of such lands, and if prior to such approval, the Federal Government had made some other disposition of the lands, the State could select substitute lands. In this case, the land which had been leased to an oil company had been placed in a petroleum reserve by Presidential order issued prior to the date of the approval of the official survey.

Follow this closely, Mr. President.

The Supreme Court, in the Wyoming case, unanimously upheld the United States contentions and the judgment was that the lands leased to the oil company never did vest in the State of Wyoming but belonged to the United States.

The case is parallel to the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases in that, in all four situations, the States had, in good faith, leased lands within their boundaries for oil development, acting on the belief that they owned such lands. Indeed the equities of the three coastal States based on prior court decisions and on the long recognition of State ownership by the United States, are much stronger in their submerged land cases than they were in behalf of the State of Wyoming in the Wyoming case.

Nevertheless, on July 2, 1948, Congress unanimously passed an act directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent vesting title to the disputed lands in the State of Wyoming, and the patent was issued.

Every Member of Congress felt that it was the right thing to do. The State of Wyoming had proceeded in good faith; the oil company which had made the lease had proceeded in good faith; very large investments had been made in good faith. Under the act, there was turned back to the State more than a million dollars which had been impounded by the court.

The State of Wyoming was not content with one effort to correct the matter. It came to Congress session after session, Congress after Congress, until its rights were recognized, and they were recognized by a complete upsetting of a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in favor of the United States. Wyoming's rights were recognized because it was the considered opinion of Congress, and of all of its Members, that when a State had operated under a great undertaking with the Federal Government, and had believed it had a right to act as it had with respect to the particular 160 acres of land involved, and had done so, and the matter had stood for years without question, it was in the interest of morality and equity that the situation which had existed up until the time of the contract should be upheld legally and recognized.

Mr. President, I yield again for any questions which Senators may desire to ask.

I come now to what I believe is the strongest feature of the States' case, namely, that it is based on equitable and moral grounds of the highest value, but which the Supreme Court of the United States was not able to consider, and which it ruled out of consideration when, for instance, it refused to allow our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who at the time was attorney general of his great State, to prove his case, and refused to let him take testimony in support of practices between the Federal Government and the State since 1845.

The Supreme Court simply said—and perhaps it was correct in so saying—"We cannot consider these equitable defenses in this kind of case."

But, Mr. President, Congress is the place where equitable defenses can be considered.

EQUITABLE AND MORAL CASE

One important aspect of the strong case of the States—as well as of numerous private persons whose titles depend upon grants from the States—flows from the long and continuous course of dealing between the Federal Government and the States relative to these submerged lands, and the equally long course of dealing between States and citizens based upon the disclaimer of interest by the Federal Government and its agents.

I am well aware of the fact that in the majority opinion of the Supreme Court in the California case Mr. Justice Black ruled that the ordinary rules of acquiescence laches, estoppel, adverse possession, and prescription could not operate against the sovereign Federal Government. He said, "and even assuming that Government agencies have been negligent in failing to recognize or assert the claims of the Government at an earlier date, the great interests of the Government in this ocean area are not to be forfeited as a result. The Government, which holds its interest here as elsewhere in trust for all the people, is not to be deprived of those interests by the ordinary court rules designed particularly for private disputes over individually owned pieces of property."

However, I do not believe that either Congress or the general public, which has a great stake in the matter, would ever allow their views to be controlled by such a narrow legal principle, without considering as important the facts which existed in 150 years of dealing between the Federal Government and the sovereign States and, flowing out of that background, between the States and thousands of individual citizens. It seems to me that this long course of dealing creates a strong equitable and moral case, on behalf of the States and their grantees, which merits discussion.

Aside from the long series of Court pronouncements, already mentioned, and which preceded the California case, the executive branch of the Federal Government had recognized State ownership of the tidelands for many years prior to the present controversy.

We have already heard quotations from the judicial branch of the Government, but now I shall refer to the executive branch. Particularly is the attitude of the executive branch exemplified in its frequent acquisition from the States of locations for jetties and other submerged lands. The State of California, in a list which is incomplete, cited in its Brief 195 instances in which various coastal States—or their municipalities—had granted submerged lands to the United States at the request of some agency or department of the Federal Government. The Justice Department claimed that many of the granted lands were within the inland waters but even the Justice Department conceded that 14 of the grants were clearly in the marginal belt and that many others were doubtful.

I am now speaking about concessions made in open court during the hearing of these cases. The Federal Government recognized the fact that at least 14 of the cases represented instances in which the Federal Government had bought from States or local municipalities or private owners lands which were outside inland waters and were in the coastal belt.

Moreover, it is significant that the United States, in acquiring submerged lands by grants from States, never made any distinction between ownership in the inland waters and in the marginal belt. Apparently no one acting for the United States ever knew or believed that any such distinction existed. All submerged lands within the States' boundaries were recognized as belonging to the State, whether the land was within a bay or harbor, or merely within the 3-mile belt. This was demonstrated by the uniform treatment on the part of the United States of all grants to acquire submerged lands from the States.

It would take too long to list all of the State grants of this type, but we have several acquisitions in Florida which are directly in point. For the sake of brevity, I would like to call attention to two of these cases. In 1938 Florida granted to the United States about 450 acres of land extending some 2¾ miles out under the Atlantic Ocean from the mouth of the St. Johns River. With the border 3 miles out, the 450 acres went to within a quarter of a mile of the border. A deed was requested from the State of Florida by the War Department on behalf of the United States to a parcel of land beginning at what is called Xalvia Island, lying just off the mouth of the St. Johns River, as the location of a jetty.

I hope Senators will follow this explanation, because it shows so clearly the course of dealing between the Federal Government and the State of Florida that no one ever could question what both parties believed about the matter.

This grant is of peculiar interest because the State of Florida reserved in the grant a three-quarters undivided interest in all phosphate and minerals in or under the granted lands and an undivided one-half interest in all petroleum under the granted lands.

In other words, those were the conditions in the deed which the Federal Government negotiated with, secured, and accepted from the State of Florida in the acquisition of a location for the construction of jetties at the mouth of the St. Johns River.

It seems clear that this reservation by the State in granting its submerged offshore lands and the acceptance by the United States of the grant subject to this reservation constituted a contract in which Florida's title to these lands and minerals was recognized. As an illustration of this type of dealing, I ask that a copy of the deed in this matter be inserted in my statement.

There being no objection, the deed was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT FUND, STATE OF FLORIDA

DEED NO. 18,471

Know all men by these presents, that the undersigned, the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida, under and by virtue of the authority of section 1061 of the Revised General Statutes of Florida, and according to the provisions and procedure provided for in section 1062 of the Revised General Statutes of Florida, and for and in consideration of the sum of $1 and other good and valuable consideration to them in hand paid by United States of America whose permanent address is Washington, D. C.

——— County, Fla., receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, have granted, bargained, sold, and conveyed to the said United States of America and its assigns, forever the following-described lands, to wit:

A certain tract or area lying and being in the southeastern part of Little Fort George or Xalvia Island in township 1 south, range 29 east, Tallahassee Meridian, portion of said tract or area being a part of Little Fort George or Xalvia Island.

Said tract or area being further described as—

Beginning at a point 2,439 feet easterly from the west line of section 20, measured perpendicular to said section line, from a point in said section line 2,396.6 feet southerly from the northwest corner of section 20. Said "point of beginning" being 850 feet easterly from a United States Engineer Department survey mark called station VII, measured along the axis of the North Jetty, whose bearing is S. 72°55'20" east;

Thence northerly 500 feet measured perpendicular to the axis of the North Jetty to a point;

Thence easterly parallel with and 500 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty, a distance 6,450 feet, more or less, to a point;

Thence easterly, parallel with and 500 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty whose bearing is S. 80°18'20" E., a distance of 6,450 feet, more or less, to a point 500 feet northerly from the axis of the North Jetty, in a line drawn at right angles to said axis, at the east end of the North Jetty;

Thence, southerly along said line 1,500 feet to a point 1,000 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty;

Thence, parallel with and 1,000 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty a distance of 6,600 feet, more or less, to a point;

Thence, parallel with and 1,000 feet distant from the axis of the North Jetty a distance of 6,600 feet, more or less, to a point 1,000 feet southerly from the point of beginning measured perpendicular to the axis of the North Jetty;

Thence, northerly 1,000 feet to the point of beginning.

Continuing 449.5 acres, more or less, and lying and being in the county of Duval, State of Florida.

To have and to hold the said above-mentioned and described lands and premises, and all the title and interest of the trustees therein as granted by section 1061 of the Revised General Statutes of Florida, unto the said United States of America and its assigns, forever.

Saving and reserving unto the trustees of the internal improvement fund of Florida, and their successors, an undivided three-fourths interest in and title in and to an undivided three-fourths interest in all the phosphate, minerals, and metals that are or may be, on, or under the said above described lands, and an undivided one-half interest in and title in and to an undivided one-half interest in all the petroleum that is or may be in or under the said above-described land, with the privilege to mine and develop the same.

In witness whereof, the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida have hereunto subscribed their names and affixed their seals, and have caused the seal of the Department of Agriculture of the State of Florida to be hereunto affixed, at the capitol, in the city of Tallahassee, on the 28th day of December, A. D. 1938.

FRED P. CONE,
Governor.
J. M. LEE,
Comptroller.
W. V. KNOTT,
[SEAL] *Treasurer.*
GEORGE COUPER GIBBS,
Attorney General.
NATHAN MAYO,
Commissioner of Agriculture.

Sent to district engineer, United States Engineer Office, War Department, Post Office Box 4970, Jacksonville, Fla., December 30, 1938.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, that is a copy of the deed, as it was accepted and recorded. I wish to read the reservation clause merely to show that the Federal Government, far from claiming

the oil and other minerals in the offshore lands, not only admitted that they were in State ownership, but actually permitted the State to save, reserve, and except them in the formal deed. I read the reservation:

Saving and reserving unto the trustees of the internal-improvement fund of Florida, and their successors, an undivided three-fourths interest in and title in and to an undivided three-fourths interest in all the phosphate, minerals, and metals that are or may be in, on, or under the said above described lands, and an undivided one-half interest in and title in and to an undivided one-half interest in all the petroleum that is or may be in or under the said above described land, with the privilege to mine and develop the same.

So much for that particular transaction. A question arose in the committee hearings as to whether or not that deed had been approved by counsel for the Federal Government. Request was made by the committee for a search of the files. I find that the Department of Justice assigned this matter to be investigated by the land attorney who was an assistant in the office of the United States attorney for the southern district of Florida. The title was examined by him, and he made a written report upon the title to Hon. H. T. Bock, chief administrative assistant, United States engineer office, Jacksonville, Fla., approving it, including the reservation. This report contained a showing of the soundness of the title which was being procured.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the approving opinion be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA,
Jacksonville, January 14, 1939.

Hon. H. T. Bock,
Chief Administrative Assistant,
United States Engineer Office,
Jacksonville, Fla.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of January 4, 1939, enclosing deed No. 18471, which instrument is a deed from the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida to the United States of America.

This deed is in proper form and the execution of same is in proper form.

This office has not proofread or checked the description.

It will be noted that this deed contains a saving and reserving clause, that is, the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of Florida have conveyed to the United States of America the fee simple title to the lands described in said deed, saving and reserving to the State of Florida an undivided three-fourths interest in and title in and to all the phosphate minerals and metals that are in or may be in, on, or under said lands. This saving and reserving clause also saves and reserves in the trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of Florida an undivided one-half interest in all the petroleum that is or may be in or under the said land.

With this last reservation, this deed conveys to the United States of America fee simple title.

Deed No. 18,471 is returned herewith.

Yours very truly,
HERBERT S. PHILLIPS,
United States Attorney.
By DAMON G. YERKES,
Assistant United States Attorney.

Mr. HOLLAND. I cite one more Florida case. In 1939, at the request of the War Department, the State of Florida granted a permit to the United States to deposit material obtained from dredging the entrance channel to Crystal River in the Gulf of Mexico. This particular case relates to the Gulf of Mexico. The case which I previously cited related to the Atlantic. The areas covered by this permit extended about 2 miles into the Gulf of Mexico. This document was made subject to the condition that the permit and the authorization granted to the War Department should not affect or impair the title to the bottoms used for the spoil areas, and stated that in the event, through the deposits of excavated material, the areas or any of them were raised to an elevation of 5 feet or above, as referred to mean low water, the previous authority conveyed by the permit should revert to the State of Florida on the condition that authority be granted for using other areas for like purposes. In other words, any substantial islands created by the deposit of the spoil should go back to the State of Florida. In order that the Senate may examine the document in its entirety, I ask leave at this point to insert a copy of the permit as part of my statement.

There being no objection, the permit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERMIT FOR DEPOSITING DREDGED MATERIAL ALONG NORTH SIDE OF ENTRANCE CHANNEL TO CRYSTAL RIVER, FLORIDA—TRUSTEES OF THE INTERNAL IMPROVEMENT FUND OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA TO WAR DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas pursuant to application dated March 18, 1939, from the district engineer officer, United States War Department, Jacksonville, Fla., for permit to deposit dredged material upon certain areas along the north side of the entrance channel to Crystal River, Florida; and

Whereas the trustees of the internal improvement fund are the owners of the bottoms comprising said spoil areas: Now, therefore—

This permit issued by the trustees of the internal improvement fund hereby authorizes the War Department of the United States, its agents, engineers, and/or contractors, to deposit on those certain areas indicated as spoil areas on map attached hereto, identified by the caption "Crystal River, Fla. (6-Ft. Project), Survey January 1939," and by this instrument made a part hereof, material excavated in the construction and maintenance of the entrance channel to Crystal River, Florida.

Subject to the condition that this permit and the authorization to the War Department of the United States herein described shall not affect or impair the title to the bottoms used for said spoil areas, and in the event through the deposit of excavated material thereon said areas or any of them shall be raised to an elevation of 5 feet or above, as referred to mean low water, the privileges hereby conveyed shall revert to the trustees of the internal improvement fund, conditioned, that the trustees grant authority for using other areas selected by the War Department for like purposes.

This permit shall become effective upon the execution of the same by the trustees of the internal improvement fund and its acceptance by a proper officer of the War Department of the United States.

In witness whereof the trustees of the internal improvement fund have executed this permit in duplicate this 2d day of May A. D. 1939, and the said War Department has accepted the said permit for the purposes herein described.

FRED P. CONE,
Governor;
J. M. LEE,
Comptroller;
W. V. KNOTT,
State Treasurer;
GEORGE COOPER GIBBS,
Attorney General;
NATHAN MAYO,
Commissioner of Agriculture;
As and composing the Trustees of the Internal Improvement Fund of the State of Florida.

Accepted by—
LEWIS H. WATKINS,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, District Engineer Officer, Jacksonville, Fla.

Mr. HOLLAND. It will be noted that the permit was accepted, for the United States Government by the District Engineer, who appended his signature.

Another outstanding example of Federal recognition of the fact that the respective States own the tidelands off their shores is the transaction between the Federal Government and the State of Mississippi concerning an island off the shores of Mississippi in the Gulf of Mexico. In 1858 Mississippi granted to the United States title and jurisdiction to Ship Island in the Gulf of Mexico, and contiguous submerged lands around that island out a distance of 1,760 yards, or 1 mile, below low water mark, for construction of forts and other structures.

As long ago as 1858, the Federal Government requested from the sovereign State of Mississippi a grant of title and jurisdiction to an island in the Gulf of Mexico, and to contiguous submerged lands. Such grant was given. The grant included title and jurisdiction to submerged lands for a distance of 1 mile out into the Gulf of Mexico. The Federal Government not only accepted the grant, but used it to its advantage.

As late as 1940, 82 years later, the State Legislature of Mississippi passed an act confirming and clarifying the 1858 grant, so as to clear up title to the Federal Government.

Cases of similar transactions to those I have just mentioned, which are clearly in the marginal belt, can be found in Texas, California, Washington, South Carolina, Delaware, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and possibly other States, but I will not further consume the time of the Senate on this point. I think the point is abundantly clear.

That the Federal Government recognized State ownership is clearly illustrated in many past rulings of the Interior and Justice Departments. In some thirty opinions from 1900 to 1937, the Department of Interior ruled that ownership of the soil in the 3-mile belt was in the respective States.

Since former Secretary of the Interior Ickes raised the first legal challenge in this matter, I think the next part of my remarks will be particularly interesting to Senators.

A letter written on December 22, 1933, by Mr. Ickes as Secretary of the Interior to an applicant for an oil lease on submerged lands off the California coast, shows clearly his administrative ruling and the declared policy of the Interior

Department on this subject before the "great change" took place. I shall quote from Mr. Ickes' letter, as it will be found in one of the hearing records. Mr. Ickes said in part:

> That title to the shore and underwater in front of lands so granted inures to the State in which they are situated. * * * Such title to the shore and the lands under water is regarded as incident to the sovereignty to the State. * * * The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no right can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437) or under any public land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean whether within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State.

In answer to a question concerning this letter from Senator LONG in the Senate committee hearings of 1951, Mr. Ickes said that this policy, as stated above, was the policy he "inherited" and was the policy when he wrote the letter. Obviously it had long been the standing policy of that agency and had been "inherited" by many Federal officials before Mr. Ickes' time. Many similar rulings were made by the Justice Department, the War Department, and other Federal agencies.

Certainly these positions taken by the Federal Government should be enough to convince any reasonable person that it repeatedly disclaimed ownership of the submerged areas within the boundaries of the maritime States.

I feel that the States had every right to rely in good faith on these repeated and frequent judicial rulings, administrative rulings of various executive agencies, and courses of dealing between the States and the several Federal agencies, covering the 150 years of time between the formation of the Union and the date when Secretary Ickes, according to his own testimony, was persuaded by the lawyers for the claimants who had filed applications for oil leases on the offshore lands to change his earlier ruling and ask the Court to rule that the offshore lands were Federal property. I feel that not only the States but also the many cities and other units of government and the thousands of private citizens who relied upon this sustained course of Federal conduct and spent countless millions of dollars in developing the waterfronts in every one of the 20 maritime States have a right to look to Congress to protect them against the clouding of their titles and the upsetting of their property values by the devastating effect of the opinions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

Perhaps the Court itself was justified in so limiting the effect of the equitable principles of prescription, adverse possession, estoppel, laches, and acquiescence that the States and private business and individuals could not now be protected against the claims of the Federal Government, by pleading these equitable defenses and sustaining them by evidence. But in my opinion this Congress has every right, and indeed a positive duty, to look into the equities of the moral considerations that are involved and, in passing our joint resolution, to protect the States, the local units of government, and private citizens against the destruction of their rights and property values which will ensue if the decisions of the Supreme Court are fully carried out. The Supreme Court refused to hear these equitable defenses based on actual dealings of a century and a half, and upon good-faith investment of billions of dollars. This Congress is now the only place where the long-standing rights of the States, the local units of government, and many thousands of citizens can be fully heard, and then recognized and protected for all time to come.

I now yield for questions, if there are any.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Florida if the actions and transactions of the executive to which he has referred were brought to the attention of the Supreme Court in the California case?

Mr. HOLLAND. Some of them were. A small portion of them were—enough, I think, to be illustrative. But the Supreme Court held—and I quoted that finding just before the Senator from Illinois returned to the Chamber—that in a suit against the United States Government it could not give effect to defenses of that kind. It listed certain of such defenses, including prescription, adverse possession, estoppel, laches, and acquiescence. The Court held that private individuals, States, and local units of government could not be protected under such defenses.

While the Senator was out of the Chamber I said also that even upon making effort to advance those defenses, and to sustain them by offering evidence, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], then attorney general of the State of Texas, was denied by the United States Supreme Court the right to take any such course. I have just stated, I may say to the Senator from Illinois, that perhaps the Court is necessarily bound by a rule of such complete fixity; but I do not think that the public is bound by any such rule, and I do not think Congress is bound by any such rule. I should be surprised indeed if Congress would shut its eyes to manifest equities of the type I have been discussing.

In fact, the distinguished Senator from Illinois earlier in the day stated that he does not want to shut his eyes to at least some of those equities, because he states he is a supporter of the so-called Anderson bill, by which some of those equities would be recognized and by which titles would be quitclaimed as to lands which have been already filled and which have already been developed, and as to piers which have already been built, and as to groins and other types of structures which have already been erected. So to that degree the Senator from Illinois has shown his desire to do equity, for which I commend him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did not the Supreme Court hold that these actions of the Federal Government, or previous failures to act on its part, did not bar the Federal Government from asserting its paramount rights in submerged lands?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; the court did so hold. Then the Supreme Court, almost at the conclusion of its decision, after discussing the fact that it had not overlooked the argument that great values had been created, said:

> But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

Mr. President, if the Supreme Court had been trying to draft a lithographed invitation to Congress to correct the situation and to give protection to those whose properties were adversely affected, and to remove the inequities, it could not have done a better job than in writing the sentence which I have just quoted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the Anderson bill preserves all the legitimate equities of the States, of the localities, and of the private lessees?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator from Illinois has asked me that question. The Anderson bill does quitclaim any Federal right to all those who have invested up to now and have developments and improvements of the kind I have mentioned.

However, so far as doing justice is concerned to communities which are not static, because they need to move forward, and must be able to give title to land, for instance, for the location of piers which may cost millions of dollars to construct, and for which bond issues must first be floated before they can be built, the Anderson bill leaves the States, local units of government, and private owners of properties which abut on the coastal waters, without anything except the right to come with tin cup in hand to a Federal bureau in Washington, in an effort to obtain the right to build, for example, a sewage system, or to build a pier, or to construct a bulkhead, or a groin, or to pump some sand from offshore, or to do any of the other things which are completely necessary to be done for the enjoyment and development of property rights in the very important area which we call the coastal belt of the various coastal States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of my friend the Senator from Florida, to section 11 of the Anderson bill, which is S. 107, appearing at page 14 of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am familiar with subsections (a) and (b) of section 11 of the Anderson bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Section 11 (a) reads:

> SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

Therefore, everything which in the past has been filled in is given to the States and other local claimants by subsection (a). Then I read subsection (b).

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The Anderson bill lives in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Wait a minute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me say what I think should be said at this point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I say advisedly that the Anderson bill does confirm to the States and local communities and to private owners their developments, which are worth several billion dollars, which have been constructed prior to the time of the passage of the bill.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Florida is speaking about the Anderson bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am referring to the Anderson bill, in reply to the question of the Senator from Illinois. I am referring to S. 107, the Anderson bill.

But, after excepting such completed construction in seeking a grant or permit for any of those activities, many of which are detail, but necessary detail in building any future structure of the kind, the owner is left no recourse except to come to Washington or to go to an agent of the Government outside of Washington in order to get a permit before any such construction can be undertaken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask permission of the Senator from Florida to read subsection (b) of section 11, which deals with the future, and reads as follows:

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois has a point. Subsection (b) corrects the situation in part. It says, under the peculiar philosophy of those who think that public rights should be placed above private rights, that States, political subdivisions, and public agencies may go ahead in building, on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, parks, bathing beaches, and the like, and that the right to do so shall not be denied.

However, there are two things it does not do. First, it does not put private industry on a parity with public units of government. It does not say anything about private industry, except that in another section it has the right to come to the Capital City and deal with Washington, if it can. The second thing it does not do is that it does not completely correct the title situation with reference to the future, as it does with reference to things in the past.

So, Mr. President, what is sought to be done is to inhibit public communities in the future to a degree, though not to the same degree, that private industry and private property is to be harmed if S. 107 should be passed.

Mr. President, if S. 107 should be passed, I hope the Senator will read the statement in the RECORD by the distinguished public coordinator of the city of New York, Mr. Robert Moses, who stated in effect, though I shall not attempt to quote his exact words, that insofar as S. 107 is concerned it is simply an invitation to people generally to come to Washington and entertain the Army or other agencies in Washington if they expect to get any recognition.

Mr. Robert Moses told about the tremendous developments on Long Island and on Staten Island. I believe Long Island is approximately 100 miles long, and my understanding is that very little of its present ocean shoreline was originally in existence, but that most of it has been filled in by developments of the greatest value, worth many millions of dollars, as, for instance, Coney Island, the Idlewild Airport, the Floyd Bennett Airfield, and all the public parks and beaches on the south shore of Long Island. All of them have been built on filled-in land, and much of the other development on Long Island has been on filled-in land. Before our committee Mr. Moses indicated he was outraged by what he thought was a deliberate and so far successful effort to cloud the titles to highly expensive and highly valuable frontages on Long Island, which is the principal sea and recreational outlet for the teeming millions of people who live in New York City and on Long Island itself. He also mentioned Staten Island, the parks there, the other public improvements, and the private improvements on that island. Both those islands face the open sea.

Mr. President, I hope that some of the Senators who are opposing this measure will search their consciences and, in the sanctity of their rooms, or wherever they go to pray, will examine a picture of Long Island and a picture of Staten Island in the light of the testimony of that distinguished public servant, Mr. Moses, who says that the actual values there amount to hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars, and then will decide whether they want that kind of development to continue freely and without interruption, or whether they want, instead, to impose an obstacle, a handicap and a hurdle to the making of further developments of that sort. If Senators search their souls as I have suggested I do not believe they will return from their sanctum sanctorum with any other answer than that we must not disturb the initiative of the American people, who already have developed to such great degree lands of the type I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I believe that completes my answer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, except that I may say I remember that those who testified upon this particular point exemplified better than anything I could possibly say on the floor of the Senate the difference between the thinking of those who want the present stymied status to be continued, except as it would be modified by Senate bill 107, and those of us who still want to see American private enterprise move forward and accomplish worthwhile things in the building of our great country.

I remember that the distinguished former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, when he was questioned by me specifically about these two subsections, namely, subsection (a) and subsection (b) of section 11 of Senate bill 107, the so-called Anderson bill, said in so many words that he thought they were good, and that he thought it would not impose any handicap upon private owners or public agencies who wanted to do something that is not permitted by those provisions, to require them to come to the Federal Government in Washington; that it would amount to nothing more than a change in landlord—the word "landlord" was actually used by him—which he said need not cause anyone any concern; that it would be just as well to have located in the city of Washington a landlord who would pass on the matter of whether a sewer could be constructed to serve a small home in one of those areas, as it would be to permit such a matter to be handled by and decided by the local agencies in Miami Beach or by the local agencies in any other of the many coastal cities of our Nation. Mr. President, the latter is the American way of doing things, and the way by which our country has grown great.

It is sound and right to have the Federal Government serve as the arbiter in the case of all these rights, tiny in themselves, but which in the aggregate constitute such a tremendous set of values, and which in their totality will determine whether our coastal cities can continue to move forward and progress, or whether they must enter the doldrums, must stop moving, and must not even have any title to such areas—for under the Supreme Court decisions or under the partially remedial proposed laws there is nothing whereby the coastal cities can really obtain a title on the basis of which they can move forward with any really important undertaking.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator from Florida exaggerating this point? I ask that question because, so far as the inland waters are concerned, the States, the municipalities, and local government units would have a right to fill in land and to convey such rights as they deem proper to convey.

Mr. HOLLAND. Why is it not just as well to grant the same right on the lands lying outside?

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, is that not true in the case of inland waters?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; it is true as to them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The inland waters cover a very broad extent, as the tables previously inserted in the RECORD of this debate by the Senator from Florida reveal. For instance, to mention only a few pertinent examples, they cover New York Harbor, Long Island Sound, Puget Sound, and, I believe, the waters between the coast of Florida and the outward chain of islands, and so forth.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois will permit me to say at this point that he is adopting the form of pleading which we know in the

law as de minimis. He says that because we did not work complete catastrophe on all coastal units everywhere, therefore we should not pay much attention to the fact that we would work complete catastrophe upon the units of government and the properties which border the open sea.

I recognize, as I have said, that Senate bill 107, the so-called Anderson bill, would quitclaim title to lands beneath the inland waters just as effectively as would our joint resolution. However, I say to the Senator from Illinois that I find it very hard indeed to justify a philosophy by which the good city of Tampa, Fla., which happens to be located on inland waters, would be told, "Yes, you can proceed with your developments and progress with the building of docks, and so forth," but by which the good city of Miami Beach, Fla., would be told, "No, you cannot do that, at least as to your ocean frontage, because we have not seen fit, in the grace of Congress, to give you the right to do that sort of thing."

Mr. President, I think this is a good time to relate an actual occurrence at Miami Beach during the war. This matter has no particular pertinency to the present situation except to show what ridiculous things can be done by persons who do not know the local situation. At Miami Beach there is no depth of soil; there are just a few inches of sand over rock. As a result, it is not possible to dispose of the sewage from Miami Beach except by treating it and then moving it out to sea. The sewage-disposal plant of the city of Miami Beach reaches out to sea 2 or more miles, into the edge of the Gulf Stream, and disposes of the treated sewage at that point. That sewage-disposal plant cost many millions of dollars to build. During the war the Navy was convoying tankers in the Gulf Stream. The alert commander of one of the Navy destroyers or destroyer escorts saw bubbles rising at a point in the ocean where a submarine could have lain in wait. He decided that a German submarine was lying there. So he had his vessel dash to that point, and had the crew drop several depth charges there. Then he left, thinking that he had probably destroyed the enemy submarine, and that all now was safe for democracy. However, as a matter of fact, he had bombed the sewage outlet of the city of Miami Beach. That fact is clearly set forth in a letter written to me by the city engineer of Miami Beach.

Mr. President, are we going to impose intolerable handicaps upon necessary construction of the sort to which I have just referred.

In the case of Los Angeles, for instance, the record shows that the city is about to complete an enormous outlet. I believe, a 12-foot steel and concrete pipe—that is what it amounts to—which reaches more than 1 mile into the open Pacific Ocean, by means of which sewage from the city of Los Angeles will be discharged. That will be the second pipe of the sort, but the second one is much larger than the first. The city of Los Angeles has invested in its sewage disposal construction $43,800,000 of its funds. Are we going to admit that that type of development cannot move ahead except with all the restrictions, handicaps, and hurdles the Senator from Illinois and his friends would place in the way of such communities, by requiring them to go through various Federal Government procedures before they could make such developments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the Senator from Florida aware that by both subsection (a) and subsection (b) of section 11 of Senate bill 107, the so-called Anderson bill, works of construction on the part of municipalities, States, or local subdivisions resulting in filled-in land or buildings or structures in the submerged lands can be carried out or made, and title in the local unit is recognized and confirmed by the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from Illinois put his finger upon the confirmation of title? I should like to have him do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now read subsection (a) of section 11 of Senate bill 107:

SEC. 11. (a) Any right granted prior to the enactment of this act by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, or any such right to the surface of filled-in, made, or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this act.

I now read subsection (b) of section 11 of the same bill:

(b) The right, title, and interest of any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder to the surface of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands as a result of authorized action taken by any such State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, or public agency holding thereunder for recreation or other public purpose is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States.

I stress the fact that the former subsection uses the words "any right granted is hereby recognized and confirmed" and the latter subsection uses the words "right, title, and interest."

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Illinois understand that to mean areas not now owned and not now claimed by the cities and the public units of government?

Mr. DOUGLAS. "Submerged lands on the Continental Shelf which in the future become filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands."

Mr. HOLLAND. All I can say is that the people in the coastal cities are not at all sure that it applies except to titles which they now have, and that it is joined with subsection (a) of section 11. They are not at all sure that that permits them to choose new sites, which will have to be chosen. They are not at all sure that adequate machinery at all is provided by which title can be granted in such cases. At the very most, all the Senator could claim for subsection (b), even if it is as good as he thinks it is, is that public units are recognized as having rights superior to private property owners. But there is no machinery included by which private property owners can proceed, except and unless they go to the Washington functionaries to get permission.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was not on the floor when the Senator from Florida referred to the situation in New York State. I want to mention that particularly, because it certainly is not my desire in any way to misquote the Senator or to misrepresent him in anything he may say.

Mr. HOLLAND. I remember the Senator from New York submitted subsection (b) of section 11, which I was happy to have him do, when the debate was raging last year. But I called his attention during the debate at that time—and the RECORD will so show—to the fact that he was showing a much more tender regard for, and a much more tender recognition of, public developments than he was for private developments, and that his amendment, taken by itself, left no place in the development picture for private investors or private property owners. The Senator will recall that I mentioned that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, I think the Senator said that. Of course, I am in favor of having private development, too, as well as public development. What I am trying to make clear to my colleagues in the Senate is that, when Robert Moses, power commissioner of New York—and he has been a very fine power commissioner—came here and made representations at the hearings that the rights or the titles of the city of New York and State of New York were jeopardized, unless this quitclaim measure were enacted, he was setting up what in my opinion was entirely a straw man. Likewise when the mayor of the city of New York, Mr. Impellitteri, wrote in support of a quitclaim for the State, he was setting up a straw man, and was in my opinion entirely ignorant of the facts.

There has never been any question on the part of any State official, during the many years I was Lieutenant Governor and Governor, as to the title and control of the piers and docks of the Harbor of New York, of our inland lakes, or of the built-in lands on Coney Island, Staten Island, Oriental Beach, and Manhattan Beach, as well as the various other recreational centers which have been developed. I may say to the Senator from Florida that last year when I submitted this proposed amendment to his joint resolution, an amendment which would have amply protected the public interest in the State of New York, it was drafted in association with and with the full consent of the corporation counsel of the city of New York. He was entirely satisfied with it. As a matter of fact, he inspired the submission of the amendment.

For years it has been proposed by Members of Congress that such an amendment be included in any bill on this subject. It never was adopted, and, as has been testified to before the committee in my presence, I believe that one of the reasons it was not adopted was because the proponents of the quitclaim legislation did not want to lose what they felt was an argument. In my opinion it was no argument at all. There is no threat made to docks or piers in the in-

land waters, or on the sound, or on the seacoast, provided they are on filled-in land. Under the provisions of the Anderson measure, I believe it is clear that the rights, not only of New York State, but of all the States, are amply protected both with regard to land that has already been filled in and the land that may be filled in in the future.

It seems to me that the only interference there could possibly be on the part of the Federal Government would be when the interests of navigation were involved; and of course, then the Federal Government would be in a position to exercise its rights, and we would want it to do so. It is impossible to build a long dock from the Jersey coast, the Jersey shore, or the New York shore, which would impede navigation, without receiving authority from the Federal Government; and I do not think the Senator would urge to the contrary. Except in such circumstances as that, it does not seem to me that the Federal Government could, or ever would, interfere with the control and ownership of these lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. Of course, he is correct in one thing he said, namely that the Government's engineers have the say under present law, as they would under any law that has been suggested, with reference to whether any proposed improvement would be harmful to navigation. Nobody questions that.

Mr. LEHMAN. That goes back many, many decades.

Mr. HOLLAND. But in the other features of his statement the Senator from New York is almost alone in taking the position which he has taken, so far as the distinguished dignitaries of his own State are concerned. The present Governor of the State of New York has repeatedly asserted himself in behalf of the State's legislation. The attorney general of the State of New York, Mr. Goldstein, has not only come to Washington to testify, but has aided in perfecting the measure by suggesting an excellent amendment. The former attorney general, who served as such under the distinguished occupancy of the governor's chair by the Senator from New York, has also supported it. The mayor of New York City, Mayor Impellitteri, supports it. The public commissioner, or the commissioner of parks—I believe he is called the public coordinator—Mr. Moses, whom the Senator from New York recognizes as a distinguished figure in the field of public improvements, also supports the State's position; and so far as the Senator from Florida knows, he does not know anyone other than the junior Senator from New York who takes a different position. The senior Senator from New York has taken exactly the opposite position.

The Senator from Florida would be glad to feel, if he could, that the junior Senator from New York was on sound ground; but he does not entertain that view. When he looks at a map and sees that the larger part of the great developments on the south side of Long Island are on built land, and that there is need for further extension of that land in order to bring about further developments—and Mr. Moses said there are plans now under way to build many millions of dollars' worth of additional parks and bathing beaches in that same area—it seems to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from New York is not on sound ground, even with reference to public improvements. Particularly do I feel that the Senator is on completely quaking sands when he declines to propose, in the protection of private investors and the owners of private property, legislation which would give them even the same modicum of rights which he offered to give to the public units of government under his amendment of last year.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the Senator from New York to say a moment ago that he wished private industry could have those rights. But I am not aware that he has submitted to the Anderson bill any amendment to give private industry those rights; and there is no measure as yet known to the Senator from Florida by which private industry can get those rights, except by the support of the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida will recall that I offered last year an amendment to protect private rights. So far as the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Florida is concerned, that the present Governor of the State of New York favors turning over these great assets to the States, that is correct. It was one of the issues when I ran against the present Governor of the State of New York, and the people of the State supported me. I ran against the park commissioner, Mr. Moses, and I again won by a very large plurality.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did not the Senator from New York defeat Mr. Moses by the largest majority ever received by a candidate for Governor of the State of New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think that is true, up to that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the senior Senator from New York prevailed over his opposition by something like 1,150,000 votes last fall. My recollection is that the prevailing party in New York, which has stood with the States of Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California, carried the State, as I recall, 850,000 votes. If my recollection is incorrect, I hope the Senator will correct me. It was a very large vote. It seems to me that the Senator from New York must feel rather keenly that he stands in a rather isolated position, considering that not only his present Governor, with attainments almost equaling his own, but both the Attorneys General whom I have mentioned, the mayor of New York, the public parks commissioner, and the senior Senator from New York, all differ with the opinion of the junior Senator from New York. The junior Senator from New York simply counters by saying that that is a ridiculous position for them to take.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, no.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the Senator to use those words.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I did, I do not recall using them. But I may point out to the Senator from Florida that when he says the junior Senator from New York stands alone on this proposition, I deny it. It is perfectly true that the present Governor of New York, the present mayor of New York City, who is of my own party, and the present commissioner of parks of New York, do not tase the same position I take, but it is my sincere and heartfelt belief that the vast majority of the people of the State of New York stand shoulder to shoulder with me in this fight which I am joining with my associates in conducting.

I believe they realize, if the Senator from Florida will yield further, that this gift of billions of dollars of assets to 3 States at the expense of 45 States is contrary to the spirit in which this country became a federation.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from New York is one of those referred to by the Senator from Florida a little while ago who, for some unknown reason, proceed to put their sights up into the billions of dollars when they talk about the funds which the Federal Government would be relinquishing to the States under this resolution. The actual fact, as shown by the highest estimates made by the public servants whose duty it is to know and understand this field, is that the total of all the royalties which could move to the 3 affected States from all oil and gas estimated to be within their State boundaries, in the event it could all be produced, would be well under $1 billion, and would be stretched out over the next 25 or 30 or even 50 years. Those facts are so clearly shown by the record that there is no debating them whatsoever.

So the Senator from New York, in talking about a grant of billions of dollars, could have been referring only to one thing, because there is only one place where there are billions of dollars in value, namely, in developments along the shore. The Senator's own State certainly has many hundreds of millions of dollars invested in filled land along Long Island Sound and Staten Island. I would not be able to make a good guess on that exact amount, as would the Senator from New York; but it is a fact that the values involved in the development along the coastlines of our 20 coastal States upon lands which have been filled run into many billions of dollars.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the case of New York, the value of the lands in question is paid for out of New York capital, for the benefit, as a matter of fact, of persons from all over the Nation. We are proud and happy to welcome people from the other 47 States. I can say that so far as I am concerned—I can speak only

as the junior Senator from New York—New York State is perfectly willing to share the mineral wealth which may come from the sea outside the low tide with the 47 other States of the Union. New York State does not want anything that gives us an advantage. We today pay infinitely more than our share of taxes on a per-capita basis, and we are glad to do it because we believe that what is good for one part of the Nation is good for every part of the Nation. Therefore, we are glad to do it. But we certainly do not want to see this great wealth—and I do not agree with the figures given by the distinguished Senator from Florida—used for the purposes of only 3 States when we know the Nation needs great amounts of money to build up and maintain its schools and to pay decent salaries to its teachers. We want Mississippi, Oklahoma, and Georgia to get exactly the same relative advantage from funds derived from offshore resources as New York State receives. There is nothing selfish about the attitude of those of us in New York State who want to use this money for education, for defense, or to pay off the national debt. We are willing to share the wealth, if there is any off our shores, with all the other States of the Union.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since it is apparent that the distinguished junior Senator from New York has not examined the record, I refer him at this time to table V on page 577 of the hearings and to table I on page 584 of the hearings, which give the latest information obtainable from the most expert sources in Government as to the amounts involved.

So far as the State of New York is concerned, I am quite persuaded that the distinguished Senator from New York has no selfish motive at all. Yet I would remind him that there is no State in the Union which, in a dollars-and-cents way, will profit so greatly from the passage of this resolution as will the State of New York, because the coastal developments there greatly exceed those to be found in any other State of the Union, far surpassing anything that could even be hoped for or dreamt of as possible royalties to be received by Louisiana, Texas, or California out of the comparatively small amounts of oil and gas which may be found within the offshore boundaries of those three States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the minimum figures which the Senator from Florida quotes refer to proved reserves?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct as to that table——

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if we turn to potential reserves, are not the sound estimates very much higher?

Mr. HOLLAND. The potential reserves are contained in the other table, namely, table 1 on page 584, to which I referred. They show that, including both proved and potential, the reserves within those boundaries are 2 billion barrels plus. Outside those boundaries, there are 13 billion barrels to which the States make no claim, and in those lands the resolution confirms the title of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall make an argument on that point when I obtain the floor.

Is it not true that the minimum estimate of 15 billion barrels of oil on the Continental Shelf, which at present prices, as a matter of fact, would amount to about $40 billion, is nothing to be sneezed at?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois insists upon including in those figures the great bulk of five-sixths of the oil that would not be confirmed to the Federal Government. The States would not have any interest in it whatsoever under the joint resolution. Instead, the interest would go to the Federal Government. There are only three coastal States where any oil has been found and they would get something like 2 billion barrels, if all of it could be produced.

Incidentally, if the Senator will look at the last sentence on page 585 of the report of the hearings, which I now show to him, he will read the following:

> The estimate includes, of course, much oil that is not now economically recoverable by processes of exploration and production that are now known to be practicable. Only a small part of the Shelf lies beneath water of such shallow depth as thus far to invite exploration and development by the use of existing techniques.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the definition of "Continental Shelf" is that it is submerged land not more than 100 fathoms, or 600 feet, beneath the surface of the water.

Mr. HOLLAND. Exactly; but the point I am making to the distinguished Senator, which is a valid point, is that these very estimates on their face show that much of the oil and gas that is said to be present is not recoverable under any presently known methods, and it is not known whether they will ever be recoverable.

I listened to the testimony as it was presented to the committee, and it was very apparent, at least to me, that the extra costs of production of oil and gas in the offshore waters would be such that the same degree of exhaustion of proved deposits of oil and gas could not be accomplished as economically as it could be accomplished on the upland.

Incidentally—and with one more point I desire to close on this subject—these estimates are the most fictional sort of estimates which could be worked out, except as to proved reserves, which are inconsequential, merely enough to supply our Nation for about 32 days. The rest of the estimates were made on the basis of a guess on production inland, back from the shoreline, in an area of land comparable with the area of submerged land which lies in the shelf.

The experts who made the estimates have said that the deposits may be found to be greater than the estimates, or they may be found to be less than the estimates. But the fact is that they are guessing, and are basing their guess upon the upland production, while they tell us in the next breath that as much cannot be produced under water as can be produced upland, because the cost of operation is such as not to permit of production in the case of deposits which, on the uplands, would be marginal or nearly so.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Florida said that within their historical offshore boundaries, according to the highest estimates, the States would receive only a little more than 2 billion barrels of oil. Actually, the States would receive only the royalties on a little over 2 billion barrels.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the Senator's correction. The royalties on 2 billion barrels, even if every bit of it was produced, would be well under a billion dollars. Incidentally, the very people who are opposing the joint resolution propose to divide that amount by allotting 37½ percent to the States and the balance to the Federal Government. Under that arrangement, the Federal Government would actually receive something like a half billion dollars over the next 25, 30, or 50 years if all estimates within State boundaries were actually produced. That is all anyone can see in the matter up to this time. Yet I still hear effusive statements about billions and billions of dollars worth of oil being cast away, when there just does not happen to be any factual basis for such statements. As a matter of fact, there is no oil in the States represented by many Senators and Representatives who are supporting the resolution, and there is no chance, under present geological disclosures, of their being any oil in their States; but they are tremendously interested in again releasing the palsied hand of private enterprise, which has been stayed by the three Court decisions, under which there is no title anywhere and no assurance anywhere as to what the law is going to be in the future. Private development has been held up pitifully during the years since 1947, when the first decison was handed down.

The question is, does Congress, which is the only place where there is sufficiently far-reaching jurisdiction to bundle this whole set of problems up into one basket and solve them fairly, as between the Federal Government and the States and the people, intend to do that, or is Congress going to continue to drag its feet and decline to do what it is quite evident the people want it to do? What is desired has been indicated by the Gallup Poll, by the great majority of newspapers, by the great majority in Congress every time the question comes to a vote; and I do not know how many times it has come to a vote between 1946 and the present. Two bills have been passed by both Houses. At other times bills on the subject have passed the House. A great majority of the Members of both Houses listen to what the people back home say to them.

There is an American way to handle the question. There is a democratic way to solve the problem and that is to turn private energy loose and enable it to go again into the building of developments of immense value, such as exist on the south shore of Long Island, where there is one value after another, of multi-million dollar proportions, in

great flying fields and great beach resorts and parks.

Mr. Moses placed in the record pictures of Coney Island, showing the same kind of groins built into the Atlantic there in order to protect the shores, as have been built from the beaches into the open Atlantic along the coast of Florida.

That tremendous set of values presents a challenge, as to whether we are to stop or to move forward. It seems to me that it is unthinkable that we should prolong this stalemate and require the good people who desire to go ahead with building new values to stay their hands until they can ascertain what Congress is going to do and what the law will be.

I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely had in mind some questions about the estimates of potential oil reserves. The distinguished Senator from Florida earlier this afternoon referred to astronomical estimates, and stated that enough unfair, untrue propaganda had been issued about the joint resolution to make one shudder and that outlandish claims had been advanced.

I took to the radio last night and made some statements about the quantity of oil which might be contained beneath the submerged lands on the Continental Shelf of the United States, so I believe I have some statements to defend.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Illinois made no statement of his own which the Senator from Florida has asked him to defend, because I have made no reference to any such statement made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if he is aware of the article written by a very eminent oil geologist, Mr. L. G. Weeks, entitled "Concerning Estimates of Potential Oil Reserves" in the Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, volume 34, No. 10, pages 1947 to 1953, issued, I believe, in the year 1950.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have seen the article.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that that very distinguished oil geologist estimated that the potential oil reserves in the Continental Shelf off the coast of the United States amount to 40 billion barrels, which at $2.70 a barrel would amount to $108,000,000,000, with the value of gas and sulfur to be added to that amount?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall the amount stated in the Bulletin. What I was referring to, if the Senator will allow me to refer to it again, was, for instance, the testimony of John J. Gunther, legislative representative of the Americans for Democratic Action, who played a considerable part in the hearings, together with the CIO and other ultraliberal groups. Mr. Gunther said:

> These offshore lands are rich in oil. Estimates run from forty or fifty to two hundred billion dollars.

The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] then asked Mr. Gunther:

> Where did you get those estimates? That is the highest maximum I have heard yet.

Mr. Gunther said he got them from a newspaper article; and that was that.

One of the members of the committee projected a 300-billion-barrel guess. Various others whom the Senator from Florida has heard over the radio, and whose effusions he has seen in various columns, have claimed amounts up to 400 billion barrels. That is the largest estimate the Senator from Florida has yet seen. But the Senator from Florida prefers to think that the Senate will believe that the expert testimony of Government geologists, uncertain as it is and uncertain as it is stated by them to be, is the best we could have right now, particularly when it happens to agree very closely with the estimates of the best oil predicters. The figures from the geologists are the ones in the record which the Senator might like to escape, but which are there, and which show repeatedly that about 2 billion barrels is all that can be expected to be produced at the most in the areas within the State boundaries.

Let me say to the Senator that the veto message of former President Truman used pretty much the same figures. He stated in his message that the proved reserves amounted to 278 million barrels, as I recall, and that there was a possibility of finding something over 2 billion barrels, including the 278 million.

So there is not very much difference between the figures. The thing which has distorted the figures so badly has been the inability of many people who, I think, were trying to make an honest appraisal, to realize that there is not now and never has been any bill introduced to claim for the States the areas outside the State boundaries. They have either been unwilling to see that, or they have not had the facts brought to their attention. They prefer to take the largest possible estimate applying to the whole Continental Shelf, and reduce it to terms of State boundaries, as though it came from within State boundaries, where there is only about one-sixth of what is in the Continental Shelf. Then they prefer to use that figure as though there were not to be a distribution between the State and Federal Government, even though you advocates of Federal ownership concede that the States should have 37½ percent.

They come up with a figure which is wholly unrealistic, completely extravagant, and highly exaggerated. They set up a straw man which they like to demolish for their own edification. The Senator from Florida has hope that at long last the public is beginning to understand what the facts are. Editorials in responsible newspapers are showing what the facts are.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Senator from Illinois takes the floor he intends to introduce a table which will make allowance for the factors to which the Senator from Florida has referred.

In addition to the estimate of 40 billion barrels by Dr. Weeks, who is a very able oil geologist, is the Senator from Florida aware of an article which appeared in the Houston Post for October 26, 1952, signed by 18 eminent Texas oil geologists?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not seen that particular article. I shall be glad to have the Senator place it in the RECORD in his own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a matter of fact——

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida will continue with his next point, unless the Senator from Illinois has a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that there is an estimate by these Texas geologists of $80 billion worth of oil off the coast of Texas alone?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida would be astounded if any responsible person should place his signature under any such statement, but he has not seen the statement. He has just said so. So he could not discuss it further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of an estimate by Dr. W. E. Pratt, published in the Bulletin of the American Association of Oil Geologists, of 100 billion barrels for the Continental Shelf, which, at current prices, would represent a value of $270 billion?

Mr. HOLLAND. I read that article; and it seemed to me that the larger part of that oil was claimed to be off the coast of Alaska.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I submit to the Senator from Florida for his inspection the Houston Post of October 26, 1952. The headline is: "Rich Tideland Potential Cited—Engineers Say Ultimate Worth Is Over $80 Billion."

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to have the Senator place that article in the RECORD in his own time. I shall be glad to read it. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has received a great deal of cumulative evidence from sources which are unimpeachable, and of the highest character, including the highest officials in our own Government. Even those who try to give away to the Federal Government the assets of the States, and even those who tried to seize those assets under the so-called surplus grab last year, come to just about the same figure—about 2 billion barrels within State boundaries, and about 13 billion barrels outside State boundaries. The Senator from Florida would be surprised to see any figure from reputable sources which varied greatly from that estimate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida cited as an added reason why these oil lands should be turned over to Florida, Texas, and Louisiana the great improvements in recreation facilities, airports, and parkways which were built at great cost. I wonder whether the Senator knows that the beautiful developments which we have in New York State—such as Jones Beach, Idlewild Airfield, LaGuardia Airfield, and all our magnificient parkways on Long Island—were paid for out of public funds provided by the taxpayers of the State of New York. They did it cheerfully, and they would be happy to have the Senator from Florida and our other friends from all over the country come to New York and share those facilities.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has already made that point, and it is a good

point. I do not care to have it reiterated in my time.

All I can say is that the very gentleman who had most to do with making those improvements came to Washington fighting for the right to go ahead with similar developments, and telling us about bond issues which had already been sold in order that they might move ahead with other developments. They told us that they were stymied and held up, and that no one could safely proceed. They implored Congress, including the distinguished Senator from New York, to pass this measure so that they could go ahead in further service to the people of the great city which is the metropolis of our country.

WHAT IS THE SOUND PERMANENT PUBLIC POLICY?

The next subdivision is built around the title "What Is the Sound Permanent Public Policy?"

Congress has the clear right and power in determining and carrying out what it regards as sound public policy, to quitclaim or convey to the States the submerged lands within their original boundaries. Article IV, section 3, clause 2, of the Constitution vests in Congress "Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States." Mr. Justice Black specifically refers to this power of Congress in his majority opinion in the California case. He closes the very paragraph in which he takes note of the great value of the improvements made in the coastal belts by public and private agencies with the sentence:

> But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

Former Solicitor General Perlman stated several times in his testimony before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 82d Congress, that Congress had the undoubted power to dispose of the coastal belt. One of his statements is as follows:

> Now, if Congress can provide that the Secretary of the Interior can make leases, certainly it can authorize the States to make leases, and the power of Congress to dispose of the minerals or dispose of the revenues of the minerals is absolute. (Hearings before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 82d Cong., 1st sess., on Senate Joint Resolution 20, at p. 366.)

Congress followed its judgment as to what constitutes sound public policy in another matter when it conveyed, under the Swamp and Overflowed Lands Act in 1850, the immense areas of valuable Federal swamplands to the 15 States in which these public lands lay. Congress believed that this course would result in quicker development and sounder administration of these swamp areas, which were much larger in area and value than the submerged lands covered by our bill, and by and large the States have handled the problem successfully, to the great good of the whole Nation. That great area now comprises some of the greatest tax values and some of the greatest production values to be found in our Nation. By way of specific comparison, the total area of public Federal lands, whose title lay without question in the Federal Government, which was conveyed by Congress as swamp and overflowed lands to 15 States, was 64 million acres, whereas the offshore areas to be quitclaimed under our bill to the 20 coastal States total only 17 million acres.

I repeat that statement, Mr. President. In 1850 our great Nation which was then certainly much poorer than it is today, gave to only 15 States a grant of 64 million acres, as contrasted with the 17 million acres proposed to be granted in the submerged lands offshore to our 20 coastal States.

I have read the debate in that case, and I was impressed with the fact that the men who passed that bill were largely from the original States and the early-admitted States, none of which had any Federal public lands within their limits.

There was considerable argument on the bill. However, the final outcome of it was that the Thirteen Original States and the great States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Vermont, and Maine, the early established States in the Nation, and others which had been established before 1850, through their representatives—and the result in the Senate was by unanimous vote—granted to 15 States 64 million acres of land, comprising most of the swamps and most of the overflowed lands in that area of our Nation which had been surveyed up to that time.

In the case of my own State, such great values have been produced as those in the reclaimed lands around Lake Okeechobee which constitute the winter market basket of the Nation. In the States of Iowa and Michigan, as well as in other great agricultural States, tremendous agricultural values have been produced by reason of that grant. Likewise many industrial and residential values have been created, as well as many mining values and many oil-producing values. There is no telling what value, under modern measurement, should be placed on that grant.

But a new, ambitious nation, full of initiative, and seeking to develop and promote self-government and local government, could find it in its heart to grant 64 million acres of land to 15 of the newer States, who needed that shot in the arm in order to get started.

Speaking for my own State, Mr. President, I wish to say that we are extremely grateful, not only to the Nation, but particularly to the Senators from the older States for the action taken at that time. I see before me Senators from several of those States, who are worthy successors to worthy predecessors who looked at the national interests and said it is not sound government for these great areas to remain in Federal control; it is not sound policy for these areas to remain unreclaimed; it is not sound from any standpoint to put any handicap upon the play of private initiative in those areas. So they made it possible for reclamation and drainage to go ahead on a great scale and to make possible the development of tremendous values in the 15 States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Illinois interfere with the regular progress of the Senator from Florida if he were to ask a question at this point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. I should like to complete my presentation of this section of my remarks. Then I shall be happy to yield.

Congress has also followed what it regarded as sound public policy in the granting of many millions of acres to States and Territories for schools, railroads, canals, and other improvements. In order to clearly illustrate this point, I ask leave at this time to insert excerpts taken from an official publication, table 105, page 128, of the 1951 Report of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, listing the acreage of Federal lands granted to the States as of June 30, 1951, for some of the various purposes which Congress has held to be in furtherance of sound public policy.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the real question here is, What is the sound public policy in this matter? Those who want to be legalistic will find no comfort in looking at the course of action of our Nation up to this time. Our Nation has freely granted from its great land reserves immense values, not because the Nation did not own them, but because it thought the country should be built up, that riches should be created from the developments which would follow, and that the public interest would be promoted by making such huge grants.

The total of all such public lands granted to the States by Congress is 245 million acres.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the table to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Acreage granted to States and Territories,[1] as of June 30, 1951

State	For common schools	For other schools	For railroads	For swamp reclamation
Alabama	911, 627	383, 785	2, 747, 479	441, 184
Alaska	[2] 21, 009, 209	[2] 438, 250		
Arizona	8, 093, 156	849, 197		
Arkansas	933, 778	196, 080	2, 593, 721	7, 696, 575
California	5, 534, 293	196, 080		2, 192, 678
Colorado	3, 685, 618	138, 040		
Connecticut		180, 000		
Delaware		90, 000		
Florida	975, 307	182, 160	2, 218, 705	20, 324, 980
Georgia		270, 000		
Idaho	2, 963, 698	386, 606		
Illinois	996, 320	526, 080	2, 595, 133	1, 460, 164
Indiana	608, 578	436, 080		1, 259, 231

[1] For additional information concerning these grants, see the Report of the Director, 1947, Statistical Appendix pp. 118-135; 1948, p. 80; 1949, p. 80; 1950, p. 88.

[2] Except for 102,500 acres granted to the Territory for university purposes, the lands in Alaska are reserved pending statehood.

Acreage granted to States and Territories, as of June 30, 1951—Continued

State	For common schools	For other schools	For railroads	For swamp reclamation
Iowa	1,000,679	286,080	4,706,945	1,196,392
Kansas	2,907,520	151,269	4,176,329	
Kentucky		330,000		
Louisiana	807,271	256,292	373,057	9,491,865
Maine		210,000		
Maryland		210,000		
Massachusetts		360,000		
Michigan	1,021,867	286,080	3,134,058	5,680,310
Minnesota	2,874,951	212,160	[3] 8,047,469	4,706,503
Mississippi	824,213	348,240	1,075,345	3,347,853
Missouri	1,221,813	376,080	1,837,968	3,432,481
Montana	5,198,258	388,721	[4]	
Nebraska	2,730,951	136,080		
Nevada	2,061,967	136,080		
New Hampshire		150,000		
New Jersey		210,000		
New Mexico	8,711,324	1,346,546		
New York		990,000		
North Carolina		270,000		
North Dakota	2,495,396	336,080	[4]	
Ohio	724,266	699,120		26,372
Oklahoma	1,375,000	1,050,000		
Oregon	3,399,360	136,165		286,108
Pennsylvania		780,000		
Rhode Island		120,000		
South Carolina		780,000		
South Dakota	2,733,084	366,080		
Tennessee		300,000		
Texas		180,000		
Utah	5,844,196	556,141		
Vermont		150,000		
Virginia		300,000		
Washington	2,376,391	336,080	[4]	
West Virginia		150,000		
Wisconsin	982,329	332,160	3,652,322	3,300,786
Wyoming	3,470,009	136,080		
Total	[2] 96,532,429	[4] 17,033,972	37,128,531	64,893,482

[2] Includes not more than 65,000 acres of lands in Montana, North Dakota, and Washington which were selected by a grantee of the State of Minnesota.
[3] See footnote 3.
[4] (See footnote 2.) Includes acreage of grants for "educational and charitable" purposes, as follows: Idaho, 150,000; North Dakota, 170,000; South Dakota, 170,000; and Washington, 200,000. Includes 660,000 acres granted to Oklahoma for "charitable, penal, and public building" purposes, and 200,000 acres granted to Wyoming for "charitable, penal, education" and other institutions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call special attention to the fact that the grants of public lands of unquestioned Federal ownership to 29 States and Alaska for public school purposes alone total in excess of 98,000,000 acres. That does not include the grants for higher institutions of learning.

The point I have been trying to make to those who refuse to look beyond the decisions of the majority of the Supreme Court is that this question is not a purely legalistic one—that the major consideration is and should be one of sound permanent public policy. This Congress has been thoroughly within its rights in conveying to the States full fee simple title to vast areas of the public domain whose Federal ownership was established and unquestioned, when Congress has determined that sound public policy quickened national development and more democratic government would result from such conveyances. For the same reasons, Congress would have the clear right to make such a conveyance here, even if the Supreme Court had heard the entire case of the States and the people, which it did not, and even if the Supreme Court had decided unanimously in favor of Federal ownership, which it did not, and even if there were not present the many elements of instability and uncertainty now apparent, and which of themselves cry out for positive and stabilizing action by Congress to replace the present frustrating situation.

In determining what kind of bill Congress should pass as its expression of sound permanent public policy to clear up the primary question before us, that of the ownership, control, and development of the submerged coastal belt within the boundaries of the States, we must consider the many values that are involved in this narrow coastal belt and how they may best be used, developed, and conserved. It is clear that the oil involved is of substantial value in at least 3 States, but the oil will be produced and used within a comparatively short period, possibly 25 or 30 years, and its value is only temporary, whereas the greater values in the coastal belt will continue throughout the life of our Nation and will be of greater importance with each passing year. Senate Joint Resolution 13 will assure to all 20 of the coastal States their continued control, within their boundaries, of the taking of fish, oysters, shrimp, sponges, kelp, and other forms of marine life, the use of sand, shell, and gravel, the erection of piers, bulkheads, and groins, the filling of new lands, and the control thereon of valuable recreational, commercial, and private improvements, and the disposal of sewage and industrial waste. The control by the States of the production of oil from their coastal belts will also be restored, which is important in a few places for a few years, but insignificant when compared with the permanent values which determine the development and prosperity of our coastal communities.

It might be helpful to consider some of these permanent values, private and public. There are only a few Members of the Senate in the Chamber, and perhaps they could view this one little picture of the highly developed coastal frontage on a part of the Atlantic coast of my State, which I believe illustrates better than many words the various types of values which go into an enormous development of this kind.

I present for inspection a photograph showing a portion of the ocean frontage of the city of Miami Beach, which is largely land built up from the little strip of sand and mangroves which constituted the original Miami Beach.

Mr. President, I do not go to Miami Beach because it is different from other similar areas in the country—there are many others which are comparable—but because I happen to know its history and because I happen to have from my wall a picture which illustrates the many millions of dollars of invesment in this part of Florida better than any words could portray it. The photograph shows 12 or 15 of the beach-front hotels.

I ask Senators not to become too nostalgic when they look at the picture of this beach. It will be difficult for Senators who have been there not to grow very nostalgic when they examine the picture, but I ask them to withhold their desire to return to that beach, and not to return to it until after the vote on the pending joint resolution has been taken. After the vote is taken, they will certainly have my approval to go there.

As I count the structures which were built in that very limited area to protect that built land and the improvements thereon from the devastating force of the ocean's waves, I note great lengths of expensive bulkheads, besides at least 19 different groins, which are structures which extend perpendicularly into the Atlantic Ocean. Each of the groins extends several hundred feet from the built-up shoreline into the body of the Atlantic Ocean. Each of the groins and the various bulkheads consists of a steel-and-concrete structure built down into the very mother rock itself. An excavation must be made, and part of the underlying rock must be removed, in order to weld, as we might say, this protective structure into the rock which at that point underlies the little film of sand at the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean. Many of the hotels themselves stand in whole or in part on this built land; and their cabanas, swimming pools, and beaches are on built land. All of the sand with which the fills were made was pumped either from the ocean bed or from the bottom of the bay which lies between Miami Beach and the mainland. The expensive municipal pier which appears in the picture is constructed on and over the bed of the Atlantic Ocean. The sewage line from the city of Miami Beach, which I cannot place in the picture, but which is in existence and is a highly expensive structure, extends along the ocean bed for some distance seaward. The jetties appear in the distance, built upon ocean bottom along the ship channel. As shown in this one picture alone, the man-made values on the original offshore ocean bed alone amount to many, many millions of dollars; and at the very place shown in this picture, many private and public titles of great value are hurtfully affected by the present situation, which flows out of these decisions of the Supreme Court.

Certainly an additional threat to the millions of dollars invested in those coastal regions is apparent as a result

of the testimony of Mr. Mastin G. White, former Solicitor of the Department of Interior, before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the recent hearings on submerged lands proposed legislation. In answer to a question concerning the legality of the Federal Government's filling in of the submerged lands beyond the low-water mark in front of privately owned, State-owned, or municipally owned land for the use of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or some other public purpose, Mr. White said that he did not have any doubt whatever about the authority of the Federal Government itself in the present situation to use the lands for a public purpose, regardless of whether they lie in front of a shore holding belonging to the Federal Government or a shore holding belonging to the State or to the State's grantees.

Mr. President in the record of the hearings, Senators can read for themselves what Mr. White said. He said there is no doubt in the world that under the present situation resulting from these three Supreme Court decisions, an airstrip could be built immediately adjoining the shore of Miami Beach, where the multi-million-dollar hotels now stand, and he said a similar development could be made at Atlantic City or at Coney Island or at Rockaway Beach, or at many other places along the shores of New York State.

Mr. President, the question is, not what will be done, but what can be done and what sort of threat is presented by proceeding under a laissez faire policy and by permitting to remain undisturbed the immense power which is given to Federal administrators or at least is implied under the decisions in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases, and by not doing our duty to remedy the present highly unstabilized, unsatisfactory, disturbing, and distressing situation under which the developments of ocean-front properties has virtually ceased.

In other words, Mr. President, the Federal Government now claims the right to build an airstrip or any other structure desired for a public purpose closer to these hotels than the end of the groins we see in the picture. Mr. White further stated that the sand and gravel on the bed of the sea below the line of mean low tide, and outside the inland waters, would be subject to the Federal Property Act in the same way and to the same extent as oil and gas, regardless of how destructive to the values of the upland property the taking of the sand or the seabed there would be.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the use of the sand and gravel is completely necessary. Sand and gravel cannot be brought from 100 miles inland to make these fills. It is necessary to pump sand and gravel there by dredging from sand bars which lie offshore or from sand bars which lie in the bay. Yet, under present circumstances, if the Federal Government needs that sand or gravel or shell, it can pump out all of it, and then can leave a naked frontage of completely impoverished ocean shore—in other words, a beach with no attraction whatsoever, a beach made of nothing but bare rock extending into the Atlantic Ocean.

In order not to place too much importance on the values already created, and to give adequate consideration to the additional vast values which should be created in the future in our State and in every other coastal State of this growing Nation, I wish to invite attention to a specific problem in Florida concerning the development of the string of islands which, beginning just below Miami, extend nearly 200 miles into the open sea, roughly from the southeast corner of Florida, southwestward and westward to Key West and on to Loggerhead Key.

Senators will see those islands portrayed on the map as the little finger of State holdings—as we now believe them to be—extending from the southeast corner of Florida in a generally westward direction, for a distance of approximately 200 miles. That whole string of islands constitutes all of the land area that is left of Monroe County, whose mainland area was given to the Federal Government to become a part of the Everglades National Park.

Mr. President, I hear some Senators say that a few States are trying to grab something from the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the fact. The State of Florida has already granted much to the Federal Government, more than 1 million acres of land, for the development of the Everglades National Park. We have done so because we believe that is a purpose for which that land can serve to the best advantage, and we have granted that land to the Federal Government, and we are proud to have our part in that development. So it cannot be said with correctness that our State and the other States have not adopted a fair and proper approach to these problems.

The future development of this long string of islands is gravely endangered by the present situation, and will be vitally helped by the legislation which we propose. These islands, or keys, of which there are hundreds, are generally quite narrow. They lie between the Atlantic Ocean and the gulf, or between the Florida Straits and the gulf. In general, they must be extended into the vast, shallow areas of water which surround them, if they are to be commercially developed. Generally they have long fingers of rock, with open, shallow spaces between them. In order to develop them and make them of sufficient size to be profitable, bulkheads have to be built, to connect the ends of those rocky fingers. Then sand or gravel has to be pumped within the bulkheads, and then groins have to be built, in order to preserve the newly made areas; and then sewage plants and pipes and piers have to be built. In fact, no one could possibly begin a development of that kind without having advance assurance that he would have access to the manifold values in the Gulf of Mexico, on the one hand, or in the Atlantic Ocean, on the other.

On many, the land is already being sold on a front-foot basis because it is extremely desirable for the location of winter homes. No one can start making a development there, at the very large expense which is involved, without having the following questions answered: "How are we going to make a fill? Where will we get our sand?" The islands themselves are practically all coral rock with only thin layers of sand overlying.

Other questions which must be answered are: "How can we enlarge the land area of our investment to the point where we can build a group of beautiful homes or hotels and facilities and utilities to serve them?"

"Where are we going to get the authority to build the bulkheads or groins which are necessary to protect our investment, or the authority to build a pier? Where shall we get the authority to lay out sewage lines which have to be built along the sea bottom in the form of permanent concrete and steel structures?"

How ridiculous it would be to take such problems away from the local or county health officers and engineers who by State law are empowered to determine where it is safe to dump sewage or industrial waste, so that it will not come drifting back to the shores of the very persons who are to live there. How ridiculous it would be to handicap the genius of our American people for the development of new properties and the creation of new values by transferring the handling of such local problems as these to far-away Washington and its agents.

To get the true meaning of the immensity of these problems of coastal properties to the 20 maritime States as a whole, we must multiply hundreds of times the values we see depicted on the Miami Beach picture and extend them to the hundreds of other residential and recreational coastal areas on our Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts. We must likewise extend the total picture to include the many port and commercial developments which appear along the thousands of miles of our coastline. I wish that time permitted my making specific reference to the excellent book of plats which has been prepared by the American Association of Port Authorities, which shows the immense values on built-up lands in only a comparatively few of our ports, selected for illustrative purposes, which are adversely affected under the present situation and the much greater values which would be affected if the present ruling of the Supreme Court should be extended to the bays, harbors, great rivers, and the Great Lakes. It is not overstating the situation to say that already billions of dollars of developments are directly affected and that many additional billions are indirectly affected in that they are to be found on the bays, harbors, or other parts of the so-called inland waters or on the shores of the Great Lakes.

To mention only a few of the recreational and vacationland areas which show immense values of developed properties that would be released by the passage of our bill from the present clouds that hang over them, I cite the Massachusetts Bay area, the areas along the ocean shores of Long Island and Staten Island, and along the coast of New

Jersey, at Atlantic City and similar highly developed areas.

Mr. Robert Moses, the distinguished commissioner of public works, city of New York, testified before the committee that on Staten Island and Long Island the values run into many hundreds of millions of dollars.

To complete the picture, we would have to consider the whole coastline of the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to the Florida straits along with the entire coastline of the Gulf of Mexico and the entire coastline of the three Pacific States. The total general coastline alone is nearly 5,000 miles, not counting the thousands of miles on bays and harbors, many of which are of doubtful classification, and the thousands of miles on the Great Lakes. The immensity of this issue is so self-evident and the adverse impact of the present status upon the 20 coastal States and hundreds of coastal communities and tens of thousands of coastal private developments is so clear that I cannot believe the Congress will longer delay clearing up the matter by the prompt passage of our joint resolution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Florida is again mentioning the development of shore-front property in New York State, and I am very eager to have the information, because I cannot exactly follow him. As I look back, and as I think about New York State, which is the State in the Union I know best, of course, I cannot think of any instances where private development of the shore front would be interfered with through failure to pass this quitclaim measure. It has been developed for many, many generations. There is nothing to stop the development, and I am simply confused by the statement of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, all I can say is that the present status is one of complete stoppage of developments, because the United States Supreme Court has held in so many words that the States do not own the offshore area, and that the Federal Government has paramount rights to it. The Supreme Court has said that it is only an incident of this general paramount-right situation that applies to the oil and gas, that all property values are affected. There is no way to read the decisions without realizing that that is the case.

Surely the distinguished Senator does not think that all the dignitaries of his own State and of his own city, whose names have been mentioned already, and similar dignitaries of other States throughout the Union, are disturbed needlessly about this question, or that the continued development of additional parks on Long Island and Staten Island is to be held up for reasons that are unsound, when it is desired to proceed with them. The fact of the matter is, I think, that the Senator has never come face to face, he has never come completely to grips with the decisions and realized that they have stayed the hand of prospective developers, public and private, in such a way that only an act of Congress can release them and enable them to go ahead again. I believe, had the Senator understood that, he would have listened with attentive ear to the prayer of the developers throughout the Nation, both public and private, who are supporting the passage of this measure, because they have realized, whether others have or not, that the hand of progress has been stayed, and that coastal communities have now no place to which to turn for their necessary developments, because they cannot go ahead safely under the present condition. Surely the Senator realizes that that is the case, or he would not have submitted his amendment last year to take care of future public developments.

When the Senator from Florida called the attention of the Senator from New York to the fact that it did not cover private developments, the Senator said he was willing for them to be covered; but he did not submit any further amendment, and he has not done so yet.

The only way we can provide the tools with which to do this job for private industry, which greatly transcends in importance the public units, is to pass Senate Joint Resolution 13, which is the only measure I know of now before us which deals adequately with this problem. I hope the Senator, revising his own views, particularly when he realizes that only one-sixth of the estimated amount of offshore oil and gas is within the State boundaries and that five-sixths is without State boundaries, which proportion is recognized and confirmed in the Federal Government by this joint resolution, will be found supporting us, instead of imposing on us the necessity of overcoming his very able and very effective and very stubborn opposition. I glory in the fact that the Senator stubbornly asserts his own views; but I again call his attention to the fact that all the dignitaries of his State of first rank, other than himself, are on the other side of the fence. Is he going to take the position that "everybody is out of step except my son John"?

Mr. LEHMAN. No. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I repeat that I believe the majority of the people of my State are in step with me. It is perfectly true that some of the officials are opposed to the position I have taken, but I think they are opposed largely through a misapprehension, because they fear, until the matter has been explained to them, that there might be some uncertainty with regard to the ownership and control of inland waters and of improvements on inland waters.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the Senator on that point—he was not here when I dealt with it earlier—it is crystal clear from reading the brief of the Federal attorneys, themselves, in the California case, not by one reference but by repeated references, that they do not favor the inland water rule. They do not believe the States have any right to claim ownership of lands under the inland waters, and they have said so in their brief time after time. We have more reason to be apprehensive now with reference to the inland waters than the coastal States had reason to be apprehensive of their offshore waters before the time the California decision was handed down. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I assure the Senator from Florida that I am eager to hear his clarification of certain statements he has made. In very moving terms he referred to the development of parks, great recreational facilities, and wonderful airfields. I hope the Senator will not consider the reference immodest when I make the statement which I am going to make, to the effect that I think during my own public career I had as much as anyone else to do with the development of recreational facilities in the State of New York, the parks, the forest reserves, the airfields, the parkways, and other things.

I wish to make it clear that in no instance were difficulties raised by Federal authorities or by the local authorities to the development of these great and wonderful facilities by a great governor, my predecessor, Mr. Alfred E. Smith, by Franklin D. Roosevelt, and by myself.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York pause just at that point? Of course, he is 100 percent correct in that statement. I have already put into the RECORD evidence showing that we were proceeding in just that way in our dealings with the Federal Government, in my own State of Florida, up to the time of these decisions; but, once the decisions were rendered, the wheels of progress were turned back, the hand of the developer was stayed—and it is stayed now. The Senator's own public lands and park commissioner of the city of New York, appearing before the committee, said that they had ambitious and expensive plants and programs laid out and money provided with which to go ahead with them; but they could not do it because of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases.

I certainly honor the Senator from New York for the magnificent administration of public affairs of the State of New York which characterized his service as governor, but I am telling him that he is thinking in terms of what used to be, and not in terms of the present time. What we are trying to do is to strike the shackles which have been imposed by the three decisions and put a practical tool into the hands of private industry and public units so that they can go ahead with the fine type of expensive and useful developments in the construction of which the Senator has heretofore had such a large part. He is entitled to be proud for having had that part. But we want subsequent public officials in New York, Florida, and all the other States to have the same possibilities. We would regret extremely to see those possibilities restrained by a continuation of the present situation under which that type of development is stymied. The Senator from New York does not have to rely upon what I tell him. He can read the testimony offered by his own public officials. I tell the Senator from New York and the world

that there are areas ready to be improved and developed, and we are asking that Congress do the necessary thing to permit them to be improved and developed.

I hope the Senator from New York will give a willing and attentive ear to the prayer of the public servants of his State who are trying to emulate the example of illustrious service which the Senator so wonderfully exemplified during the years he was Governor of the great State of New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Let me make one brief observation. I still have not heard of a single concrete instance in which there has been any difficulty in development, either by public or private interests, of shore-front property down to low tide.

Mr. Moses testified and talked about Oriental Beach and Manhattan Beach——

Mr. HOLLAND. He also talked of certain parks, some of which I had never heard of, as needing original or additional development.

Mr. LEHMAN. There can be no question that the Anderson bill recognizes title in lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. I commend to the Senator a reading of pages 139, 140, 141, and 142 of the printed hearings, being the testimony of Mr. Moses relating to New York City parks, the Manhattan Beach story, and Long Island. Then there is a list of other extensive areas of land, under water, granted to the city of New York. I think the Senator will find in that portion of the testimony exactly what I have been telling him. I was present and heard the testimony, and I have in my files letters from the distinguished park commissioner stating in so many words that improvements were being held up. I am sure the Senator must have seen these letters, because two of them were printed in the New York Times. I placed them in the RECORD last year. Certainly the commissioner of parks has sounded the alarm; so has the present Governor, two attorneys general, and the mayor of the city of New York. I hope the distinguished Senator will be attentive to those alarms.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have never known any question raised with regard to the control, ownership, or development of any properties on inland waterways, including streams or lakes, or on the shore front of Long Island or Staten Island. I say that in spite of the statement of Mr. Moses.

Mr. HOLLAND. My attention has been invited by my administrative assistant to a fact which I should have mentioned earlier, namely, that the Legislature of the State of New York has, by the adoption of resolutions on this subject, invited the attention of the public servants who serve that great State to the fact that they desire the passage of this resolution restoring the rights to the States which they enjoyed so long. New York has enjoyed them for the longest possible time. Commissioner Moses referred to public port developments on Manhattan Island, in Brooklyn, and on the East River, totaling $350,000,000 in value, every one of which is built on submerged land. They are on inland waters which are affected by the same philosophy and subjected to the same hazard which I have already repeatedly pointed out and which the Senator from New York knows must be present, or why would the attorneys general and governors of other States be furthering the passage of this resolution?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know. I just cannot understand it. It is incomprehensible to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am trying to help the Senator to see this question in its proper perspective. The Governor of New York would not have come to Washington and testified for a case in which he did not believe. I think the Senator from New York must realize that the Governor of Kansas, the Governor of Nebraska, and the Governors of other States far removed from the seacoast must have tremendous apprehension in their minds and hearts, or they would not come here and testify and jointly maintain a permanent office here through the years. The Council of State Governors would not have taken that position through the years; the American Bar Association, through its legislative committee, would not have taken the position which it has taken through the years if it did not have that apprehension. I hope the Senator will open his eyes and see.

Mr. LEHMAN. I frequently disagree with the American Bar Association on many questions, and this is not the first time I have fought alone when I thought something was right and in the interests of my State and my country. That is what I am doing now. I believe the officials of my State, with whom I have frequently disagreed, are mistaken. I believe the people of the State of New York and the people of the other 47 States understand the issues and do not want these great resources belonging to all the people of the Nation turned over to 3 States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before leaving that point, I invite the attention of the Senator from New York to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 4, page 5308, in which the letter from Mr. Moses is printed. I read only one sentence from that letter:

> In my letter I made the point that unless the title of the coastal States to the submerged lands along their shores is confirmed by congressional action, endless confusion would result as to ownership, and further waterfront development by the States and municipalities would be paralyzed.

He, of course, maintained that position at greater length last year and again this year. I thought the distinguished Senator from New York was present when Mr. Moses maintained that position in the hearing before the Senate committee this year. Perhaps I was mistaken.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator advise me how much longer he expects to speak?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have a page and a half remaining, I will say to the distinguished majority leader, and I can complete my statement in 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. If possible, I should like to have the Senator from Florida conclude his statement this afternoon. We will continue until half-past five or six o'clock in order to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I can conclude within 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. President, I now come to the next point in my statement, which deals with the political implications of the question. I have often been asked what the political implications are in this controversial issue, and I think the answer to the question is both important and revealing. I think it should be stated on the floor, because I have heard it misstated so frequently that I believe there ought to be one entirely accurate, authoritative statement contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, based on actual recitals of the platforms and other facts which I shall mention.

It is interesting to note that in spite of frequent reports to the contrary, the Democratic Party platform has never contained a plank on the submerged lands issue. I wish to make that statement particularly emphatic, because for a long time I have received letters stating an understanding of the writers that the Democratic Party had come out on the other side of the question. The Democratic Party has done no such thing. So far as votes in the House are concerned, the Democratic Party has shown a majority in favor of passage of measures on this subject supported by the States.

Last year in the Senate the vote was exactly even—24 to 24—but in the House of Representatives there was a sizable majority of the Democratic Party in favor of the joint resolution.

There has never been a plank on this subject in the Democratic platform. Mr. Ickes tried to obtain such a plank from the platform committee in 1948 at Philadelphia, but his proposal was voted down overwhelmingly. The Republican Party platform in 1948 and in 1952 included a plank to confirm to the States the very values covered in Senate Joint Resolution 13. As a matter of fact, those who oppose this bill will have to look to the platform of the Progressive Party—Mr. Wallace's party—in 1948 to find any comforting political philosophy or party support for their position. To my knowledge, the Progressive Party is the only party which has gone on record against the philosophy of our joint resolution.

In closing, it is interesting to note that many of those who oppose this proposed legislation are the very ones who have been active proponents of an ever larger Federal Government and who seem to think that an all-powerful Federal Government is a panacea for all the ills of the people of this country. Those of us who support the proposed legislation are strongly opposed to the nationalization of resources—and that is what they are attempting to do to us—in the 5,000-mile shoestring of coastal waters which

throttles the shores of our coastal States The resources in this narrow belt are vital to the States and to local growth and prosperity, and we feel that the ownership and control of these resources should remain in the States and be subjected to State and local control where it will be very close to the people who are so greatly affected.

We are now talking about fundamental philosophy. We are talking about local self-government. We are talking about the opportunity of a citizen to see the very officials who serve him in the regulation of lands which may represent the total investment of his lifetime savings. We think it is sound government to keep such regulation, control, and ownership just as close to home as is possible.

We strongly feel that our position is sound and just, and that it will receive, as it has already received, the approval of the vast majority of our people who, we believe, as indicated by the result of the recent Gallup poll, agree with us that the important rights enjoyed by the States for 150 years should be restored and safeguarded, and that such action would be in the interest of soundly economic and democratic government. These rights and the immense values already developed and to be developed in the coastal belt, plus the similar values in the inland waters and in the Great Lakes, involve problems which are so clearly local in nature that we shall continue with all of our strength to fight to prevent their transfer to a Federal Government which is already too big, too wasteful, and too far from the people.

Mr. President, there is not a Senator within the sound of my voice who does not know that much of the body of ills which afflict us on the domestic front flows directly from the fact that the Federal Government is too big, and that there is no finite mind which can grasp all its implications or all its details, even though it is the responsibility of Senators and Representatives to make laws for the government of our huge, swollen Federal system, as well as of our people, and it is our duty to provide appropriations whereby those immense pieces of uncoordinated machinery can attempt to function.

It is our hope that the joint resolution will speedily pass the Senate and be enacted into law.

Mr. DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The hour is late, and there is still to be read a message from the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] may have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished senior Senator from Florida on the excellent presentation he has made this afternoon.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 38)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my state of the Union message I recommended that the Congress take the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act under immediate study and extend it by appropriate legislation.

I now recommend that the present act be renewed for the period of 1 year.

I propose this action as an interim measure. As such, it will allow for the temporary continuation of our present trade program pending completion of a thorough and comprehensive reexamination of the economic foreign policy of the United States.

I believe that such a reexamination is imperative in order to develop more effective solutions to the international economic problems today confronting the United States and its partners in the community of free nations. It is my intention that the executive branch shall consult with the Congress in developing recommendations based upon the studies that will be made.

Our trade policy is only one part, although a vital part, of a larger problem. This problem embraces the need to develop, through cooperative action among the free nations, a strong and self-supporting economic system capable of providing both the military strength to deter aggression and the rising productivity that can improve living standards.

No feature of American policy is more important in this respect than the course which we set in our economic relations with other nations. The long-term economic stability of the whole free world and the overriding question of world peace will be heavily influenced by the wisdom of our decisions. As for the United States itself, its security is fully as dependent upon the economic health and stability of the other free nations as upon their adequate military strength.

The problem is far from simple. It is a complex of many features of our foreign and domestic programs. Our domestic economic policies cast their shadows upon nations far beyond our borders. Conversely, our foreign economic policy has a direct impact upon our domestic economy. We must make a careful study of these intricate relationships in order that we may chart a sound course for the Nation.

The building of a productive and strong economic system within the free world—one in which each country may better sustain itself through its own efforts—will require action by other governments, as well as by the United States, over a wide range of economic activities. These must include adoption of sound internal policies, creation of conditions fostering international investment, assistance to underdeveloped areas, progress toward freedom of international payments and convertibility of currencies, and trade arrangements aimed at the widest possible multilateral trade.

In working toward these goals, our own trade policy as well as that of other countries should contribute to the highest possible level of trade on a basis that is profitable and equitable for all. The world must achieve an expanding trade, balanced at high levels, which will permit each nation to make its full contribution to the progress of the free world's economy and to share fully the benefits of this progress.

The solution of the free world's economic problems is a cooperative task. It is not one which the United States, however strong its leadership and however firm its dedication to these objectives, can effectively attack alone. But two truths are clear: the United States' share in this undertaking is so large as to be crucially important to its success—and its success is crucially important to the United States. This last truth applies with particular force to many of our domestic industries and especially to agriculture with its great and expanding output.

I am confident that the governments of other countries are prepared to do their part in working with us toward these common goals, and we shall from time to time be consulting with them. The extension for 1 year of the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act will provide us the time necessary to study and define a foreign economic policy which will be comprehensive, constructive, and consistent with the needs both of the American economy and of American foreign policy.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 7, 1953.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POTTER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 8, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of April 6), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Felix Edgar Wormser, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Guy O. Hollyday, of Maryland, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter of 1952.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER			
			1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A"—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" an answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenitures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E."—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. J. Carson Adver on, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese. (a) Amendment to Contract Settlement Act. (b) H. R. 6693. (d) For.
E. (10) $391.18; (11) $391.18.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.
D. (6) $4,094.29.
E. (2) $3,750; (6) $5.06; (7) $336.23; (8) $3· (9) $4,094.29; (10) $18,286.78; (11) $22,363.07.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached sheet containing answers to items 1, 2, and 3.)[1]

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $50.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $4,374.99; (7) $1,001.66; (9) $5,376.65; (10) $16,132.72; (11) $21,509.37.

A. American Citizens Committee for Economic Aid Abroad, 124 East 70th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bills pending in Congress or which may hereafter be introduced appropriating funds for economic assistance and technical aid to foreign countries.
E. (10) $3,209.70; (11) $3,209.70.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $797.
E. (5) $343.91; (6) $40.77; (9) $384.68; (10) $5,045.95; (11) $5,430.63.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.
D. (6) $1,593.56.
E. (2) $1,472.45; (5) $64.20; (6) $6.96; (7) $49.93; (9) $1,593.56; (10) $9,628.41; (11) $11,221.97; (15) See attached statement item 7, pages 3–5.[1]

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,576.
E. (2) $6,576; (9) $6,576; (10) $22,107.25; (11) $28,683.25; (15) $3,000, Francis J. Garvey, salary as counsel to council on legislation; $1,603, B. J. Conway, salary as assistant secretary to council on legislation; $1,152, O. O. Norberg, salary as executive assistant to Mr. Garvey; $822, Helen Hofener, salary as secretary to Mr. Garvey.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, General office: 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. Washington office: 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See schedule "2".)[1]
D. (6) $21,310.
E. (2) $15,057; (4) $3,467; (5) $1,629; (6) $609; (7) $185; (9) $20,947; (10) $63,988; (11) $84,935.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $7,189.34; (2) $14,663.58; (4) $4,161.85; (5) $950.80; (9) $26,965.57; (10) $78,571.63; (11) $105,537.20; (15).[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (10) $3,425; (11) $3,425.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $124,139.01.
E. (See rider).[1]

A. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the conduct of the business of marine insurance. Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
E. (2) $2,000; (8) $208.11; (9) $2,208.11; (11) $2,208.11; (15) $2,208.11, December 30, 1952, Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.; counsel fee for services, together with their disbursements.

A. The American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) See statement attached (p. 4).[1]
D. (6) $320.74.
E. (2) $11,531.25; (4) $1,322.33; (5) $2,628.94; (6) $272.82; (7) $1,310.38; (9) $17,065.72; (10) $89,169.37; (11) $106,235.09.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life insurance business. (a) Life insurance company income tax (U. S. C. A., title 26, sec. 201); Social Security Act; individual retirement legislation.
D. (6) $5,601.34.
E. (2) $4,261.12; (5) $513.95; (6) $149.07; (7) $677.20; (9) $5,601.34; (10) $13,020.88; (11) $18,622.22.

A. American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the business of hull insurance. Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
E. (2) $1,500; (8) $208.11; (9) $1,708.11; (11) $1,708.11; (15) $1,708.11, November 25, 1952, Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.; counsel fee for services, together with their disbursements.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine.
E. (2) $25,854.81; (5) $7,275.60; (6) $1,164.40; (7) $738.82; (8) $5,733.64; (9) $40,767.27; (10) $229,406.99; (11) $270,174.26; (15).[1]

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Defense Production Act, Federal meat inspection appropriation, forest range improvement fund, foot-and-mouth disease, capital gains, transportation legislation.
D. (6) $15,468.47.
E. (2) $5,100; (9) $5,100; (10) $19,645.06; (11) $24,745.06.

A. The American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Leo G. Miller, 420 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Nebr.
C. (2) S. 106, bill to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia; H. R. 4528, bill to prohibit interstate commerce of fireworks; S. 2325, bill to create bureau to promote safety in industry; S. 2714, bill to provide assistance to State agencies to promote safety in industry; S. 2738, bill to equalize treatment accorded commissioned officers of the Corps of Army Medical Service; H. R. 7320, bill to grant free outpatient medical care to children of deceased veterans; H. R. 6319, bill to amend Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act to authorize.
E. (10) $9,222.12; (11) $9,222.12.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $453.90.
E. (2) $375; (5) $69; (6) $9.90; (9) $453.90; (10) $2,138.97; (11) $2,592.87.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices, and properties.
D. (6) $295.
E. (2) $250; (6) $25; (7) $20; (9) $295; (10) $590; (11) $885.

A. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction; support of legislation providing national school health services; appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers; bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers; appropriations for the Children's Bureau; appropriations for the national school-lunch program; emergency maternal and infant care, S.2337.
D. (6) $7,664.10.
E. (2) $1,030.80; (4) $78.70; (5) $138.50; (6) $48.12; (7) $113; (8) $446.49; (9) $1,855.61; (10) $6,329.92; (11) $8,185.53.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $1,180 (see attached explanatory statement).[1]
E. (2) $5,625; (5) $3,200; (6) $142; (6a) $1,635; (9) $10,602; (10) $32,478; (11) $43,080; (15) $2,625, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. E. Kane, API, Washington, D. C., salary; $635.80, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. E. Kane, API, Washington, D. C., expenses; $484.10, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. E. Kane, D. of C. PI, Washington, D. C., expenses; $3,000, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. L. Dwyer, API, Washington, D. C., salary; $515.23, October 1 to December 31, 1952, J. L. Dwyer, API, Washington, D. C., expenses; $142, October 1 to December 31, 1952, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices, and properties.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3.)[1]
D. (6) $60,634.14.
E. (2) $8,750; (5) $785.83; (6) $607.69; (7) $309.60; (9) $10,453.12; (10) $31,649.52; (11) $42,102.64 (see pp. 6 and 7).[1]

A. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See Legislative policies, p. 224 of Proceedings, attached).
D. (6) $943.20.
E. (2) $250; (4) $192.39; (5) $241.15; (6) $25.60; (7) $194.22; (8) $39.84; (9) $943.20; (10) $4,512.72; (11) $5,455.92.

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Continuing in general.
D. (6) $14,089.
E. (2) $9,142.52; (4) $1,275.55; (5) $1,824.34; (6) $185.48; (7) $2,988.94; (8) $915.83; (9) $16,332.66; (10) $39,332.71; (11) $55,665.37; (15) $874.14, Chas. F. Noyes Co., rent and electricity; $157.72, Graham Stationery Co., stationery and supplies; $179.32, New York Telephone Co., telephone service; $18.04, Great Bear Spring Co., water service; etc.[1]

A. America's Wage Earner's Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,380.
E. (2) $3,537.50; (6) $42; (8) $0.90; (9) $3,580.40; (10) $12,554.48; (11) $16,134.88; (15) 90 cents, District Unemployment Compensation Board, quarterly tax; $31.30, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., telephone bill; $10.70, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., telephone bill, etc.[1]

A. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads. For: S. 1657, airmail subsidy separation; H. R. 4483, to amend section 307 (d) of ICC Act; S. 719, clarifying Robinson-Patman Act; S. 2349, S. 2351, S. 2355, S. 2357, S. 2358, S. 2359, S. 2361, S. 2362, S. 2365, S. 2518, S. 2519, all amending the ICC Act. Opposed: H. R. 2 and H. J. Res. 27, St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend railroad unemployment insurance; H. R. 1998 and S. 2356, making mandatory certain communication systems.
E. (1) $4,374.99; (7) $519.33; (8) $4,894.32; (9) $18,037.29; (10) $22,931.61.

A. Richard H. Anthony, the American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (7) $56.91; (9) $56.91; (10) $193.05; (11) $249.96.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $1,782.77; (11) $1,782.77.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. ARO, Inc., Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) The following rider to the Air Forces appropriation for research and development, Defense Appropriations Bill, H. R. 7391: "*Provided*, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Inc., for the operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center."
E. (6) $41.50; (9) $41.50; (10) $439.81; (11) $481.31.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle 4, Wash.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $180.30; (9) $1,080.30; (10) $3,157.17; (11) $4,237.47.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Ave., Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 920 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. None. (See Rider D–14 for list of full member roads, A. A. R.)[1]
C. (2) (See Rider C–2);[1] (3) (See Rider C–3).[1]
D. (6) $53,066.96.
E. (2) $31,135.10; (3) $10,500; (4) $136.44; (5) $3,225.05; (6) $351.54; (7) $3,203.52; (8) $4,515.31; (9) $53,066.96; (10) $182,910.78; (11) $235,977.74; (15) (See Rider E–15).[1]

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The registrant is an unincorporated association. For a statement as to the nature of its business, reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.[1]

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. (See attached list of member companies.)[1]
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.
D. (6) $1,661.78.
E. (See Exhibit A attached hereto);[1] (2) $1,302.85; (4) $39.87; (5) $94.53; (6) $30.69; (7) $72.99 (8) $120.85 (9) $1,661.78; (10) $5,056.71; (11) $6,718.49.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) This association is interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the Western Railroads.

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See appended statement, page 3.)[1]
C. (2) (See appended statement, page 4.)[1]
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (6) $3.63; (7) $137.86; (9) $141.49; (10) $176.66; (11) $318.15; (15) $31.17, November 17, Pennsylvania Railroad, travel; $31.17, December 10, Pennsylvania Railroad, travel; $25.52, December 11, Pennsylvania Railroad, travel.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order, 3025–3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any laws relating to immigration, free public schools, communism, other legislation considered of benefit to Americans.
D. (7) $249.99.
E. (5) $65; (6) $3; (7) $8.14; (8) $1.25; (9) $81.39; (10) $322.68; (11) $404.07.

A. Frazer A. Bailey, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Baker.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman St., Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (legislative office). My only receipts consist of my salary which is $11,700 per annum.
E. All expenses incurred by me are paid by the National Farmers Union and the specific items appear in the report submitted by the National Farmers Union covering this quarter.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. H. M. Baldridge, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.

A. J. H. Ballew, Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $8,724.08.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor—especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,860.45.
E. (6) $202.04; (7) $202.46, (8) $191.19; (9) $595.69; (10) $2,110.78; (11) $2,706.47.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, page 5.)[1]
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (6) $18.47; (7) $590.56; (8) $64.18; (9) $673.21; (10) $1,118.14; (11) $1,791.35;

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

$27.80, October 29, 1952, Hotel Delmonico, New York City, hotel bill; $12.50, November 18, 1952, Biltmore Hotel, New York City, restaurant; $16.00, December 8, 1952, Fan & Bills, Washington, D. C., restaurant; $27.14, December 18, 1952, Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City, Mo., hotel bill; $20.10, December 19, 1952, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Ill., hotel bill.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Jr., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,124.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicine industry.
E. (7) $150; (9) $150; (10) $300; (11) $450.

A. J. A. Beirne, president, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Library services bills and legislation affecting libraries and librarians.
E. (2) $1,451.25; (4) $20.77; (5) $5; (9) $1,477.02; (10) $4,712.10; (11) $6,189.12.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3.) [1]
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (10) $9.50; (11) $9.50.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) See attached.) [1]
D. (6) $303.75.
E. (7) $3.68; (9) $3.68; (10) $146.77; (11) $150.45.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 932 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The firm represents companies engaged in the business of marine insurance and as members of the American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks, reparations, subrogation. Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (5) $75.60; (6) $21.33; (9) $96.93; (10) $319.29; (11) $416.22.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,500; (11) $2,000.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
E. (10) $283.68; (11) $283.68.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $2,193.30.
E. (2) $1,999.98; (7) $117.72; (8) $75.60; (9) $2,193.30; (10) $8,396.41; (11) $10,589.71.

A. Chester F. Bletch, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (a) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks. War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951. S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, and S. 1848 and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against the legislation.
(b) H. R. 7844 and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.
E. (2) $700; (8) $65.43; (15).[1]

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and those institutions.
D. (6) $625.
E. (10) $133.14; (11) $133.14.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C. (When in Washington, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.)
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (See previous quarterly reports.)
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $540.82; (6) $123.07; (7) $780.89; (9) $1,444.78; (10) $5,154.56; (11) $6,599.34.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $125.
E. (10) $21.86; (11) $21.86.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the grain and feed trade.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security; (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. D. H. Brackett, Post Office Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc.; (3) The Brewery Worker.
E. (10) $167.50; (11) $167.50.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the Association are interested.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Dawes E. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Such legislative interest is primarily for analysis and reporting—(a) Revenue Act of 1951; (b) H. R. 4473, and the Senate version; (d) for modification of automotive excise tax provisions.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (2) $8,025; (5) $375; (8) $45.90; (9) $8,445.90; (10) $22,239.55; (11) $30,685.45; (15).[1]

A. Paul W. Brown, Department 731, Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
E. (10) $1,222.37; (11) $1,222.37.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., attorney and director of television, NARTB, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C., a national trade association.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

D and E.[1]

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.

E. (10) $1,588.03; (11) $1,588.03.

A. John M. Brumm, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in all legislation regarding national health insurance. (The numbers of the specific bills are unknown since the 82d Congress has been terminated.) (3) (See attachment B.)[1]

D. (6) $2,374.98.

E. (14) $660.77.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects. Specific legislation interested in during the calendar year 1952 included appropriations for the civil functions of the Army, H. R. 7628.

D. (6) $1,350.

E. (6) $23.35; (8) $32.57; (9) $55.92; (10) $151.16; (11) $206.08.

A. Henry H. Buchman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.; 351 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y. (consultant service for benefit of independents in rubber-tire industry), National Federation of Independent Business, 351 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (national trade association representing interests of independent business).

C. (2) Interested in rubber tires bill, basing-point legislation, antitrust law legislation, F. T. C. quantity limit discount case—all legislation affecting independent small business. Opposing spare-tire monopoly.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, page 5).[1]

D. (6) $1,875.

E. (7) $369.98; (8) $40.05; (9) $410.03; (10) $1,165.68; (11) $1,575.71.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, post-office box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $8,097.50.

E. (2) $3,036.61; (5) 316.90; (6) $36.34; (7) $190.64; (8) $273.60; (9) $3,854.09; (10) $11,139.54; (11) $14,993.63.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Orrin A. Burrows, assistant to international president, International Brotherhood of Electric Workers, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave for Federal employees, and in support of unemployment insurance and severance pay, and other liberal benefits for the workers.

D. (6) $3,683.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable and educational institutions, and organizations.

D. (6) $2,475.

E. (10) $124.05; (11) $124.05.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) For the quarter covered by this report, the undersigned worked with Schenley in seeking reduction in the rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits, and in seeking extension of the bonding period for distilled spirits—both as part of full-time work on general public relations for which Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., is retained by Schenley. (a) Revenue Act of 1952. (b) Internal Revenue Code.

E. (2) $550; (4) $490; (6) 90; (7) $735; (8) $1,050; (9) $2,915; (10) $2,772; (11) $5,687; (15) $167.67, November 16, United Air Lines, New York City; $85.49, November 20, Saxony Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla; $490, October 1 to December 31, Mailing Specialists, Inc., 41-14 29th Street, Long Island City, N. Y.; stationery used in distributing statements regarding Revenue Act of 1952, and extension of Federal bonding period; $12.50, November 19, National Association of Beverage Control Administrators, Cleveland, Ohio; $13.14, November 19, Amanda McMahon, mimeograph specialist, Miami Beach, Fla.; $20, November 18, Beach Letter Co., Miami Beach, Fla.

A. John W. Caffey, 830 Southeastern Building, Greensboro, N. C.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting wine.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

D. (6) $760.20.

E. (10) $88.47; (11) $88.47.

A. James A. Campbell, Room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, Room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government Employees and District of Columbia government employees.

D. (6) $2,307.66.

E. (7) $230.76; (9) $230.76; (11) $230.76.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants. H. R. 1062 would establish a Tax Settlement Board—for; H. R. 4371, H. R. 4373, H. R. 8390, H. R. 8391 would permit postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund—for; H. R. 7269 would provide for retirement pay for Tax Court judges—for; H. R. 7746 would provide for voluntary social-security coverage for self-employed certified public accountants—for; H. R. 7893 would provide for improved enforcement and administration of revenue laws—for, with reservations.

D. (6) $76.25.

E. (7) $87.51; (9) $87.51; (10) $75; (11) $162.51.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C.; 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural-gas industry.

D. (6) $3,197.95.

E. (1) $1.67; (2) $20; (4) $103.28; (5) $14; (6) $28; (7) $31; (9) $197.95; (10) $910; (11) $1,107.95.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (5) $634.86; (6) $62.50; (7) $382.21; (8) $187.50; (9) $1,267.07; (10) $3,230.04; (11) $4,497.11; (12) $1,267.07; (14) $1,114.76.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) Enactment of S. 1308, H. R. 63—30-year, half-pay retirement legislation.

E. (6) $11.34; (7) $33.57; (9) $44.91; (10) $220.42; (11) $265.33.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The foundation has a "general legislative interest" in statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers. Its only "specific legislative interest" at present is the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and any amendments thereto or extensions thereof which may affect the interests of milk dealers.

E. (10) $15.30; (11) $15.30.

A. Larry Cates, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Air Line Pilots Association, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Aviation legislation—Railway Labor Act.

D. (6) $1,302.90.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

C. (2) S. 75, Bridge Canyon Act; and H. R. 1500 and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act (known more frequently as central Arizona project bill), or as it may be renumbered. (3) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River, What the Central Arizona Project Means To You, Truth, Settling Up Time, Facts You Should Know Respecting the Central Arizona Project, National Tax Benefits From the Central Arizona Project.

D. (6) $4,535.65.

E.[1] (2) $5,921.13; (4) $191.91; (5) $915.74; (6) $232.75; (7) $3,436.12; (8) $138.99; (9) $10,826.64; (10) $30,002.60; (11) $40,829.24.

A. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislative interests consist of advocating, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 456 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. William E. Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the 81st Congress as H. R. 2756, "To implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes"; and bills in the 82d Congress such as S. 1693, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes"; and H. R. 1755, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

D. (6) $20.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See attachment A, p. 3.)[1]

C. (2) (See attachment B, p. 4.) (3) (See attachment C, pp. 5 and 6.)

D. (6) $749,603.95.

E. (9) $8,515.34; (10) $84,781.95; (11) $93,297.29.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y. (See schedule E attached).[1]

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.

D. (6) $2,527.98.

E.[1] (1) $648; (2) $1,827.50; (4) $1,615.23; (5) $148.89; (6) $23.16; (7) $190.62; (8) $7.85; (9) $4,461.25; (10) $10,528.54; (11) $14,989.79; (15).[1]

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Robert M. Clark, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 50 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $4,400.

A. David R. Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting industry in general.

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Genocide, the President's civil-rights program, House Resolution 561 (82d Cong.), Public Law 414.

D. (6) $125.

A. Marvin J. Coles, Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Promotion of Tramp Shipping under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

E. (6) $62.69; (8) $837.98; (9) $900.67; (10) $1,119.26; (11) $2,019.93.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Bldg., Denver, Colo.

C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code. Specific bills in which it is presently interested will be similar to those known in the last session of Congress as H. R. 240 known as the Mason bill, S. 892 proposed by Senator WILLIAMS, and H. R. 1179 proposed by Congressman DAVIS.

D. (6) $370.

E. (2) $375; (4) $1.50; (5) $19.25; (8) $569.20; (9) $964.95; (10) $1,191.56; (11) $2,156.51.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) (See page 3 attached).[1]

E. (1) $8,667; (2) $10,699.26; (4) $1,967.76; (5) $2,044.05; (6) $1,462.56; (7) $4,537.58; (9) $29,378.21; (10) $82,159.94; (11) $111,538.15; (15) $97.60, 10-2, 11-6, 12-4, Allen's Press Clipping Bureau, 124 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, clipping service; $100, 12-4, T. G. Armstrong, 548 Spreckles Bldg., San Diego, Calif., public relations services; $30, 12-4, N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., newspaper directory; $138.48, 10-2, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, hotel room and expenses, etc.[1]

A. C. Pred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.

B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co. as assistant general claim agent with headquarters at Lewisville, Ark.

E. (10) $1,372.85; (11) $1,372.85.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the 81st Congress as H. R. 2756, "To implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes;" and bills in the 82d Congress such as S. 1693, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes;" and H. R. 1755, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."

D. (6) $100.

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $455.

E. (3) $650; (8) $204.95; (9) $854.95; (10) $592.17; (11) $1,447.12; (15) $250, 10/25/52, Kilgore Committee, Daniel Boone Hotel, Charleston, W. Va., for Senator KILGORE'S campaign fund; $100, 10/25/52, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Somerset, Ky., for his campaign fund; $100, 10/25/52, District of Columbia Montanans for Mansfield Committee, 3207 Highland Place NW., Washington, D. C., for MIKE MANSFIELD'S campaign fund; $100, 10/25/52, Benjamin A. Javits, treasurer, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, for JACOB K. JAVITS' campaign fund; $100, 10/29/52, District of Columbia Montanans for Mansfield Committee, for MIKE MANSFIELD'S campaign fund; $192.59, 11/19/52, Hooven Letters, Inc., 352 Fourth Ave., New York City, for lettershop work; $12.36, 12/9/52, Hooven Letters, Inc., for lettershop work.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (See attachment A.)[1]

C. (2) Legislative interests: Cannot state bills, since none yet introduced into 83d Congress. In last Congress we were interested in the following: H. R. 27 and H. R. 54; S. 337, S. 445, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, H. R. 14, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3) (See attachment B.)[1]

D. (6) $11,604.

E. (2) $6,939.52; (4) $598.01; (5) $1,844.02; (6) $410.04; (7) $579.61; (8) $500; (9) $10,871.20; (10) $34,380.86; (11) $45,252.06.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies was organized and functions to protect the legitimate interests of petroleum

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

pipelines, including, when necessary, legislative interests. At this time the only pending legislation affecting petroleum pipelines in which the committee is interested is S. 1889, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and H. R. 5632, a bill to require interstate oil pipelines to procure certificates of public convenience and necessity before construction of new or extension of existing lines. The committee is opposed to certain provisions contained in bill S. 1889 and to bill H. R. 5632. There has been no action on either of these bills during the period covered by this report.

D. (6) $237.

E. (2) $9,128.90; (4) $55; (5) $890.55; (6) $90.73; (7) $800.76; (8) $2,067.12; (9) $12,923.06; (10) $39,998.74; (11) $52,921.80; (15) (see attached p. 3).[1]

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests: (a) mutual security; (b) military manpower.

D. (6) $1,003.89.

E. (2) $1,478.63; (5) $1,632.23; (6) $212.77; (7) $2,814.81; (9) $6,138.44; (10) $12,776.61; (11) $18,915.05; (15) $738, October 8, November 4, December 2, the Sheraton, Inc., 1 Court Street, Boston, Mass. office rent; $22.50, October 17, November 4, December 4, Answering, Inc., 422 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., telephone answering service; $49.44, October 17, November 4, December 3, Fox-Jones Co., 1419 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $22.50, October 17, Typewriter Sales & Service Co., 811 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C., rental of office equipment, etc.[1]

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades. A bill to this effect has been introduced in the House as H. R. 5346.

D. (6) $1,200.

E. (4) $234.83; (5) $135.70; (7) $962.48; (8) $150; (9) $1,483.01; (10) $13,760.72; (11) $15,243.73.

A. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News.

D. (6) $1,422,908.24.

E. (1) $15; (2) $3,833.32; (4) $130; (7) $213.04; (8) $176.49; (9) $4,367.85; (10) $15,068.68; (11) $19,436.53.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Counsel for Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc. No change from previous report.

D.[1]

A. John C. Cone, Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) May be interested in supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways System.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $8,179.37.

E. (2) $2,165; (3) $3,500; (4) $525; (5) $635; (6) $900; (8) $454.37; (9) $8,179.37; (10) $28,399.52; (11) $36,578.89; (15) $1,115, October 1 to December 31, 1952, Marguerite Nadonley, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., clerical salary; $1,040, October 1 to December 31, 1952, Patricia Shilby, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., clerical salary; $3,500, November 5, 1952, CIO Housing Committee, 734 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution; $18.96, October 9, 1952, Congressional Quarterly, 723 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C., subscription, etc.[1]

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (10) $143.62; (11) $143.62.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

D and E. (See attached.)[1]

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Lime Association, 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and particularly those affecting the lime industry.

D and E. (See attached.)[1]

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $300.

E. (2) $194; (5) $9; (6) $14; (9) $217; (10) $651; (11) $868.

A. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (2) $500; (5) $125; (6) $50; (7) $210; (9) $840; (10) $2,520; (11) $3,360.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.

D. (6) $3,741.

E. (5) $351.27; (6) $28.02; (7) $180.30; (9) $559.59; (10) $1,266.92; (11) $1,826.51.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $150.

E. (10) $1,260; (11) $1,260.

A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company in addition to my administrative duties at the company's Capitol offices.

E. (7) $73.50; (9) $73.50; (10) $161.50; (11) $238.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) $400.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East 42d Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation which may help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland. House Resolution 82.

D. (6) $790.67.

E. (7) $40.67; (9) $40.67; (10) $294.82; (11) $335.49; (15) $9.45, December 17, Hotel Commodore, New York; $16.50, December 17, Eastern Airlines; $8.72, December 17, Pennsylvania Railroad; $6, December 17, miscellaneous expenses.

A. Nathan E. Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $4,586.66.

E. (7) $920; (9) $920; (10) $1,830; (11) $2,750.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. M. P. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) On behalf of the association, I have a general interest in any legislation affecting the chemical industry.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.

E. (2) $425; (9) $425; (10) $1,297.88; (11) $1,704.88.

A. Leo J. Crowley, Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Arnold Adler, 1011 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Amendment of Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to grantors dying after January 1, 1951.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.
C. (2) A bill to amend section 8 of the act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (Public Law 378, 81st Cong.) to permit persons under a disability to take advantage of same.
E. (10) $17.58; (11) $17.58.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) A bill to amend section 811 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit its application in certain disability cases.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) A bill for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

A. John C. Cuneo, post-office box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 2678–2679 (new 1953 members not assigned); Townsend plan bills in Congress.
D. (6) $2,698.82.
E. (1) [1]; (5) $593.73; (6) $113.92; (7) $170.45; (8) $114.34; (9) $2,007.21; $4,731.77; (11) $6,738.98.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (6) $19.56; (7) $127.15; (9) $146.71; (10) $261.98; (11) $408.69; (12) $6.38; (14) $143.39.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. William L. Daley, 911 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Newspaper Publishers' Association—National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 3760, to revise and codify laws relating to patents; H. R. 2682, Government stamped envelopes; H. R. 505, to separate subsidy from airmail pay; H. R. 2516, to deny benefits of NLRB to certain labor organizations; S. 1137, to separate subsidy from airmail pay; S. 719, to allow price differentials made in good faith; H. R. 2188, to prohibit interstate transportation of liquor advertising; H. R. 1514, to let FTC regulate liquor advertising; S. 672, to increase minimum age of District of Columbia newspaper boys; House Resolution 116, to authorize House Commerce Committee to investigate newsprint; S. 106, to regulate practice of optometry; H. R. 1768, to require cost and indemnity in political advertising; H. R. 116, seeks repeal of Gearhart amendment; H. R. 525, definition of "employee."
D. (6) $825.
E. (5) $66.25; (6) $31.78; (7) $100; (9) $198.03; (10) $480.02; (11) $678.05; (15) $31.78, October, November, December 1952, C. & P. Telephone Co., telephone service; $32.10, October, November, December 1952, United States Post Office, postage; $100, November, B. & O. Railroad Co., transportation.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn.; and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Bill listed deals with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail. Study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (6) $1.69; (9) $1.69; (11) $1.69.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Bill listed deals with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail. Study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, legislative affairs department, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislative interests—as an employee of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce such matters affecting business and commerce in Ohio as are referred to me from time to time by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce; e. g., proposals in the fields of taxation, general appropriations, old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, industrial development and other management problems.
E. (7) $77.55; (9) $77.55; (10) $222.36; (11) $299.91.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interest: Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba. Specific legislative interest: The Sugar Act of 1948 (P. L. 388, 80th Cong.) and 1951 amendments thereto (P. L. 140, 82d Cong.).

A. William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Activities limited to advising association in connection with postal rate matters.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (6) $4.07; (7) $27.71; (9) $31.78; (10) $82.12; (11) $113.90.

A. B. B. Derrick, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mr. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.
A. A. W. Dickinson, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,375.
E. (7) $3.75; (9) $3.75; (10) $31.45; (11) $35.20.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3408 and legislation affecting the motion picture industry.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (10) $3,900; (11) $5,200.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before the Senate Finance Committee; Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee; two Post Office and Civil Service Committees; two Armed Services Committees; House Veterans Affairs Committee.
E. (2) $5,066.60; (7) $63.25; (9) $5,129.85; (10) $15,834.28; (11) $20,964.13.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,500; (9) $2,500; (10) $7,652.46; (11) $10,152.46.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employee Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,458.93.
E. (10) $368; (11) $368.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Legislation terminated. (This closes my employment.)
D. (6) $1,248.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilcox Oil Co., et al.
C. (2) Legislation terminated. (This closes my representation in this matter.)
D. (6) $1,500.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Bldg., Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44 is subject to the direction of the International President and the General Executive Council of the I. A. of M. and subject to the will of the membership of District No. 44 as per its by-laws.
C. (2) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. Not more that 5 percent of its time and resources was spent on this during the fourth quarter of 1952. For further

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

particulars see page 3 under c-2 hereto attached.

D. (6) $12,672.43.

E. (2) $4,803.06; (4) $180; (5) $525; (6) $223.80; (7) $1,030.33; (8) $1,396.09; (9) $8,158.28; (10) $28,472.35; (11) $36,630.63; (15) $175, October 1, 1952, I. A. of M., Machinists Bldg., City, rent; $500, October 1, 1952, N. P. Weathersby, Room 303, Machinists Bldg., City, salary and expenses; $42.29, October 1, 1952, Nettie Barkersmith (same), clerical services; $62.99, October 1, 1952, Mabel Almalel (same), secretary services, etc.[1]

A. Doctors for Freedom, 511 Medical Arts Bldg., Houston, Tex.

C. (2) General legislative interests in the medical field. (3) "A Christian's Political Responsibility," "The America We Lost," "Worth Repeating," "Eisenhower Slaps Socialized Medicine Again."

D. (6) $131.26.

E. (4) $51.96; (8) $17.92; (9) $69.78; (10) $1,796.48; (11) $1,865.96; (15) $43.12, October 1, 1952, Houston, Tex., postmaster, stamps; $8.74, November 3, 1952, Moore Paper Co., Houston, Tex., manila envelopes; $10, November 3, 1952, Brazos Floral Co., Houston, Tex., floral arrangement; $7.92, December 5, 1952, Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, N. Y., 2 copies of "Understanding Our Free Economy."

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York City.

C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.

D. (6) $885.

A. Doherty, Rumble, Butler & Mitchell, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) $2,750.

E. (6) $60.92; (7) $264.28; (8) $31.25; (9) $356.45; (11) $356.45; (15) $29.27, October 24, 1952, N. & W. Railway, railroad and pullman fare; $27.88, October 25, 1952, Chicago B. & O. Railway, railroad and pullman fare; $10.09, October 25, 1952, Blackstone Hotel, Chicago, Ill., meals and lodging; $13, October 20, 1952, secretary of state, State capitol, St. Paul, corporation filing fee, etc.[1]

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act.

D. (6) $9.50.

A. James L. Donnelly, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.

E. (10) $697.51; (11) $697.51.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.

D. (6) $900.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. No specific interests during fourth quarter of the year.

D. (6) $99.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.

B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.

D. (6) $1,339.25.

E. (10) $155.80; (11) $155.80.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber-manufacturing industry. Impractical to state names of specific bills and statutes because of broad basis of interests.

D. (6) $1,900.

E. (7) $93.67; (9) $93.67; (10) $479.29; (11) $572.96.

A. Mrs. F. P. Douglas, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $550.02.

E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (10) $22; (11) $24.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Payette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.

C. (2) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies is interested in any legislation which, if enacted, would divorce pipelines that are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act from their existing owning companies. It is also interested in any proposed legislation which would require any extensive revision of the Interstate Commerce Act, S. 1889 and H. R. 5632, for example.

D. and E.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. M. J. Dowd, Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

E. (10) $1,311.17; (11) $1,311.17.

A. Adin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

D. (6) $1,625.

E. (10) $69.90; (11) $69.90.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.

B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action.

D. (6) $1,650.

E. (4) $225; (5) $225; (6) $225; (7) $225; (8) $225; (9) $225; (10) $675; (11) $900.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Transportation legislation.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (2) $175; (5) $847.15; (6) $158.41; (7) $180.76; (9) $1,361.32; (10) $2,610.87; (11) $3,972.19.

A. Reed Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

E. (10) $63.52; (11) $63.52.

A. William M. Dunn, assistant to the president, Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mills Road NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Communications Workers of America-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Matthew Dushane, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Seafarers International Union of North America, 450 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Bills of interest to unions affiliated with the international union.

D. (6) $568.75.

E. (5) $41.25; (6) $12; (7) $170; (8) $35; (9) $258.25; (10) $1,318.30; (11) $1,576.55.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Petroleum legislation, S. 1498, S. 2348 through S. 2366, S. 2743, S. 2744, Senate Resolution 50, and various petroleum

bills before House Interstate Commerce Committee, current tax bills, House Joint Resolution 42 and House Joint Resolution 206.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $515.23.

A. George S. Eaton, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Tool & Die Manufacturers Association, 907 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small businesses.

A. John W. Edelman, 910 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy and general welfare—oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. Support health insurance, aid to medical education, rent control, housing point 4, District home rule, FLSA, Mutual Security. Oppose certain amendments to UMT bill, S. 349, Taft-Hartley law, Dirksen, Fulbright, Robertson, and Bricker amendments to DPA, cut in school-lunch appropriations.
D. (6) $2,055.80.
E. (7) $430.80; (9) $430.80; (10) $1,272.93; (11) $1,703.73;

A. Herman Edelsberg, Director, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.
C. Registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans; more specifically, the program of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, and opposes discrimination in immigration legislation.
D. (6) Approximately $140.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $45; (11) $60.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, 13th and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interest on all bills relating to education and training of World War II veterans and Korean veterans and all other legislation affecting proprietary schools.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (6) $47.56; (7) $99.50; (8) $73.36; (9) $220.42; (10) $521.40; (11) $1,041.82.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, Suite 708, Ferguson Building, Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Affiant is interested in general legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers—no specific legislation.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John E. Else, 302 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retail lumber dealers, including housing, controls, etc.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $378; (9) $378; (10) $908.95; (11) $1,286.95.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting public-power projects generally.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (10) $313.60; (11) $313.60.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. Department of Water and Power of the city of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conference and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public-power projects.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Public Law 470, 82d Congress, Interior Department Appropriations Act, 1953, and legislation affecting social security coverage for municipal employees.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (10) $410.45; (11) $410.45.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the District's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (10) $158.35; (11) $158.35.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project, and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions, and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
D. (6) $10,990.13.
E. (4) $70.18; (6) $27.16; (7) $888.29; (8) $27.05; (9) $1,012.63; (10) $858.08; (11) $1,870.71.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. Sun-Pacific, Inc., 520 Ash Street, San Diego, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to client on legislation affecting Sun-Pacific's interests, i. e., tuna tariff legislation (H. R. 5693) and related Federal Tariff Commission hearings.
E. (10) $229.86; (11) $229.86.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project and legislation affecting Federal reclamation and public power policies and projects generally.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (10) $16.80; (11) $16.80.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Public Law No. 504, 82d Congress, Army Civil Functions Appropriations, 1953, and legislation affecting flood control projects generally.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (See attached sheet.)[1]
B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans educational assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, 78th Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.
D. (6) $3,359.85.
E. (10) $959.85; (11) $959.85.

A. Emergency Committee of Small- and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D. (6) $510.
E. (2) $1,375; (4) $26.09; (6) $26.25; (8) $2.50; (9) $1,429.84; (10) $3,487.11; (11) $4,916.95; (15) Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses, 4th quarter, $1,004.84; J. K. Lasser & Co., 1440 Broadway, New York, N. Y., accounting fees, $425.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.
D. (6) $6,775.
E. (6) $226.15; (8) $226.15; (9) $1,172.12; (10) $1,398.27; (13) $226.15.

A. Leon J. Engel, 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Excise taxes.

A. Walter M. Evans, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.
C. (2) All Federal legislation relating to equality of taxation, governmental economy, and tax reduction.
D. (6) $450.
E. (6) $15.27; (7) $31.08; (8) $50; (9) $93.35; (10) $2,341.88; (11) $2,437.23.

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Millers' National Federation, 209 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (10) $92.87; (11) $92.87.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers.
D. (See attached statement.)[1]
E. (15) $32.86, October 1, Angus McDonald, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense; $103.84, October 1, Dorchester House, Washington, D. C., rent; $48.15, October 1, Gist & Chairs, Inc., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $23.40, October 1, A. C. Electric Co., Washington, D. C., electrical work, etc.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles J. Farrington, National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All small-business legislation, tax revision, funds for public roads, highway safety legislation.
D. (6) $7,355.78.
E. (7) $1,715.65; (9) $1,715.65; (10) $4,953.36; (11) $6,669.01.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. Abner H. Ferguson, 1130 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.
D. (6) $900.
E. (6) $0; (9) $0; (10) $27.70; (11) $36.70.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) No legislation pending during this quarter.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Irving Ferman, Century Building, 412 Fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Supported: (H. R. 28, S. 127, S. 1733); (H. R. 1320, S. 1734); (H. R. 29); (S. 1732); (S. 656); (S. 49, S. 50).

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.[1]

A. H. L. Filer, the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.

A. James Finucane, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Foreign economic assistance programs, military appropriations, universal military training, and other manpower legislation, peace treaties, disarmament, immigration, and educational exchange.
E. (7) $84.39; (9) $84.39; (11) $84.39.

A. Mrs. Edith Fisher, 3601 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 600 South Michigan Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the National Congress are concerned with measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in fields of education; social and economic well-being, child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection, and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. The National Congress may support or oppose specific statutes and bills which relate to the area of its general legislative interests.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D. (6) $675.

A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) General legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies.
D. (6) $18,000.
E. (4) $223.43; (6) $904.50; (7) $2,067.65; (8) $499.45; (9) $3,695.03; (10) $11,291.45; (11) $14,986.48.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Particularly interested in legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See attached).[1]
D. (6) $1,166.66.
E. (7) $31.09; (9) $31.09; (10) $120.52; (11) $151.61.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement. Items in Agricultural Department budget affecting research and control work on black stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (2) $254.70; (5) $93.02; (6) $41.60; (7) $100; (9) $489.32; (10) $3,980.33; (11) $4,469.65.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects. Specific legislation interested in during the calendar year 1952 included Appropriations for Civil Functions of the Army, H. R. 7268.
E. (2) $1,350; (8) $55.92; (9) $1,405.92; (10) $4,201.16; (11) $5,607.08; (15) $450, October 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, consulting engineer, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., for professional services; $22.81, October 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, reimbursement for expense incurred; $450, October 30, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, for professional services; $17.05, November 30, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, reimbursement for expense incurred; $450, December 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, for professional services; $16.06 December 31, 1952, Henry H. Buckman, reimbursement for expense incurred.

A. Aaron L. Ford, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill to provide compensation from blocked or vested funds to Nicholas B. Perry for losses suffered as a result of seizure of his property by the Government of Rumania or Hungary, or either of them. H. R. 5557, 82d Congress, 1st session and S. 2338, 82d Congress, 1st session.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (11) $4.25.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 3994 and S. 1767, to amend the definition of "agriculture" as contained in section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; H. R. 2752, to encourage the prevention of water pollution; S. 1149, Reorganization Act of Department of Agriculture; H. R. 5474, to provide for accelerated amortization of stream-control expenditures; H. R. 565, Tackett bill, direct 10 percent of national forest receipts to recreation and wildlife development; H. R. 3527, McKellar bill, direct 25 percent of national forest receipts to recreation and wildlife development.
E. (10) $366.42; (11) $366.42.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See rider C-2).[1]
D. (6) $9,290.40.
E. (7) $816.37; (9) $816.37; (10) $641.81; (11) $1,458.18; (15) (See rider E-15).[1]

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 18th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation pertaining to war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which the DAV is interested are before the Senate Finance Committee, Senate Labor and Welfare Committee, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, two Post Office and Civil Service Committees, two Armed Services Committees.
D. (6) $2,260.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. Protection of the Robinson-Patman Act. (3) N. A. R. D. Journal.
D. (6) $2,800.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $105; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,575.

A. Dr. John H. Frederick, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.
B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, mineral, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

A. H. Maurice Fridlund, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, 1609 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3715 and H. R. 3797 to amend Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950. For these bills or equivalent. H. R. 3715, enacted July 21, 1952; H. R. 3797, not reported out.

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) No particular bills; but any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.
D. (6) $4,299.98.
E. (7) $1,515.09; (9) $1,515.09; (10) $3,319.81; (11) $4,834.90.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $625.

A. Fyffe & Clarke, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the manufacturing industry.
E. (10) $50; (11) $50.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.[1]
C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and proposed amendments; Interstate Commerce Act and proposed amendments; and Federal Employer's Liability Act and proposed amendments. Generally favor legislation favorable to railroads and oppose unfavorable legislation.
D. (6) $500.
E. (10) $523.94; (11) $523.94.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, including H. Res. 520.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (10) $349.50; (11) $449.50; (15) $20, 10/5/52, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., dinner, two persons; $35, 10/9/52, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., dinner, three persons; $45, 10/20/52, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., dinner, five persons.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.
C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, 81st Congress, H. R. 4702 and H. R. 5802, 82d Congress. (3) Memorandum in support of H. R. 6074, 81st Congress, dated March 1, 1950.
E. (6) $6.25; (7) $59; (9) $45.25; (10) $190.35; (11) $235.60.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See attached).[1]
D. (6) $1,062.48.
E. (7) $38.83; (9) $38.83; (10) $112.33; (11) $151.16.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $2,362.50.
E. (10) $181.96; (11) $181.96.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Explanation and analysis of Federal bills, rendering of advice concerning their relationship to ADA policy.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.
E. (10) $252.59; (11) $252.59.

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $51,644.37; (11) $51,644.37.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer & C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerks.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. William Glasier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's & Warehousemen's Union, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. William Glasier, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $175.
E. (7) $49.57; (9) $49.57; (10) $179.70; (11) $229.27.

A. Hugh V. Gittinger, Jr., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Suite 603, Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees Council, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.
D. (6) $4,693.99.
E. (2) $3,209.91; (4) $179.01; (5) $558.41; (6) $114.56; (8) $315.63; (9) $4,377.54; (10) $13,181.75; (11) $17,559.29; (15) $2.277, October, November, and December, Thomas G. Walters, 900 F. Street NW., Washington 4, D. C., received for services, fees, per diem, etc., operations director, GECAF of L; $938, October, November, and December, Gladys M. Monroe, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., secretary, GECAF of L.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318/418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
E. (2) $4,085.33; (5) $559.37; (6) $104.72; (7) $820.81; (8) $32.02; (9) $5,602.25; (10) $16,584.26; (11) $22,186.51; (15) $2,500.03, October 20, November 20, and December 20, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,585.30, October 15, October 30, November 15, November 30, December 15, and December 24, Glenn C. Russell (employee), 310 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; $337.50, October 6, November 6, and December 5, Labor, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., rent; $60, October 6 and November 25, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., postage, etc.[1]

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ernest W. Greene, Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Streets NW., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (10) $74.81; (11) $74.81.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof; tax legislation; S. 2742, Inland Waterways Corp., user charges; S. 2745, water carriers, preferential rates; S. 2752, contract carriers, rate regulations; S. 2753, water and motor carriers, operating rates; S. 2754, ICC rate regulation; H. R. 6750, Social Security Act Amendments of 1952; S. 2591, grain discount-futures contracts; H. R. 8210, DPA 1952 amendments; H. R. 6292, exempt tax coconut oil from Philippines; Public Law 420; Public Law 451.
D. (6) $6,875.06.
E. (10) $4; (11) $4.

A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
E. (10) $85; (11) $85.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Political organization.
C. (2) All legislation covered by convention-adopted program of organization. (3) Column in monthly organization paper, ADA World.
D. (6) $1,575.
E. (7) $277.69; (9) $277.69; (10) $979.42; (11) $1,257.11.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation covered by convention-adopted program of organization.
D. (6) $1,645.
E. (7) $299.44; (9) $299.44; (10) $1,234.82; (11) $1,534.26.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Hugh P. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $949.98.
E. (7) $26.50; (9) $26.50; (10) $123.25; (11) $149.75.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (10) $770.98; (11) $770.98.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of Postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,395.80.
E. (7) $122.35; (9) $122.35; (10) $1,014.88; (11) $1,137.23.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 Eye Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,125.
E. (10) $1,918.98; (11) $1,918.98

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; also 33 South Clark Street, Chicago.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (6) $600.
E. (2) $97.50; (4) $690.04; (5) $124.41; (6) $91.21; (7) $116.65; (9) $1,119.80; (10) $2,633.02; (11) $3,752.82.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.,
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miss Elsie D. Harper, National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert E. Harper, National Business Publications, Inc., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street, NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters. No specific bills in this quarter.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence.
E. (10) $300.43; (11) $300.43.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control, and other ranching expenditures, and livestock accounting methods.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412-14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested for the B. F. Goodrich Co. in legislation authorizing the sale to private industry of facilities for the production of manmade rubber in the United States, also on behalf of my client in the repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure which would relieve burdens upon business and industry, and generally in all legislative proposals in Congress relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (7) $5.50; (9) $5.50; (10) $153.40; (11) $158.90.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (3) Article for NRDGA's Stores magazine, NRDGA Washington News Letter.
E. (7) $43; (8) $1.25; (9) $44.25; (10) $518.12; (11) $562.37.

A. Thomas P. Healy, CWA-CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Works of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $1,952.70.
E. (1) $15; (2) $1,833.34; (7) $95.27; (8) $9.09; (9) $1,952.70; (10) $5,414.82; (11) $7,367.52.

A. Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.
E. (10) $851.49; (11) $851.49.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. K. W. Heberton, Room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.
E. (7) $68.45; (9) $68.45; (10) $248.10; (11) $316.55.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents' Committee, 132 3d Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction. Support of legislation providing national school health services. Appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers. Bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers. Appropriations for the Children's Bureau. Appropriations for the national school lunch program. Emergency maternal and infant care, S. 2337.

A. Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.
D. (6) $500.
E. (10) $200; (11) $200.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.
D. (6) $2,327.49.
E. (7) $178.71; (9) $500.43; (10) $769.14.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects directly or indirectly the interests of local property agents: Taxes; S. 2887, bonding; S. 2148, H. R. 6493, disaster insurance; national health bills, S. 337, etc.; S. 2714 and S. 2325, industrial safety; Federal hospitalization, S. 3001, etc.; social security; war damage, S. 1848; marine and aviation war risks; motor laws and regulations.
D. (6) $42.49.
E. (7) $42.49; (9) $42.49; (10) $431.88; (11) $474.37.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry, such as: H. R. 187, 1278, 1514, 1749, 2187, 2188, 2982, 5505, 5563, 5889, 6241; House Resolution 278; S. 22, 1046, 2444. Any proposed legislation affecting the wool industry.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,365.53.
E. (6) $3.85; (7) $111.68; (9) $115.53; (10) $364.60; (11) $480.13.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 528 Barr Building, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John L. Hoen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $3,666.66.
E. (7) $5,850; (9) $5,850; (10) $11,100; (11) $16,950.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective and existing legislation which may affect the life insurance business. (a) Life insurance company income tax (U. S. C. A., title 26, sec. 201); Social Security Act; individual retirement legislation.
D. (6) $2,583.33.
E. (7) $677.20; (9) $677.20; (10) $1,778.82; (11) $2,456.02; (15) $2,583.33, October 1 to December 31, Robert L. Hogg, salary; $1,027.78, October 1 to December 31, Robert A. Crichton, salary; $346.68, October 1 to December 31, Mary Louise Long, salary; $303.33, October 1 to December 31, Davilee Bryant, salary; $416.66, October 1 to December 31, Randall H. Hagner & Co., Inc., rent, etc.[1]

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (10) $26; (11) $26.

A. Home Rule Headquarters, 4800 U Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Kefauver bill (S. 1976), home rule for the District of Columbia.
E. (2) $416.02; (4) $111.41; (5) $105; (6) $89.83; (8) $235.39; (9) $957.65; (10) $2,852.44; (11) $3,810.09.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Victor Hood, 4209 Queensbury Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 12th and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation; the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto; against H. R. 5234.
E. (10) $1,270.59; (11) $1,270.89.

A. Jesse V. Horton, post-office box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, 100 Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $2,300.
E. (7) $100.10; (8) $342.69; (9) $442.79.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. Legislation of an economic significance to family life.
D. (6) $50.
E. (4) $36; (9) $36; (10) $121.23; (11) $157.23.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. All legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.

A. Harold K. Howe, suite C, 2480 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.99.
E. (2) $1,079; (7) $430.50; (9) $1,509.50; (10) $4,180.60; (11) $5,690.10.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.
D. (6) $3,959.

A. Hudson, Creyke, Lipscomb & Gray, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $13.82; (7) $521.85; (9) $535.67; (10) $129.36; (11) $665.03.

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project: (Opposed). Due to the death of Mr Carroll B. Huntress on November 29, 1952, this will, of course, be his final report.
E. (7) $48; (9) $48; (10) $3,988.90; (11) $4,036.90; (15) $48, November 3, traveling expense, New York to Albany and Boston, October 28, 29, and 30.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally and specifically.
D. (6) $3,052.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (6) $26.25; (8) $189.75; (9) $216; (10) $753; (11) $968.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattsville, Wyo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $750; (9) $750; (10) $2,650; (11) $3,400.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $29,863.50.
E. (2) $5,750; (5) $300; (9) $6,050; (10) $18,150; (11) $24,200.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
E. (2) $680; (4) $11.75; (5) $117.40; (6) $16.63; (7) $689.42; (8) $828.80; (9) $2,344; (10) $3,922.54; (11) $6,266.54.

A. The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., second floor, Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation—examples, the Mason bill, H. R. 5064 in the 81st Congress, and the 1951 revenue bill.
E. (3) $42.50; (8) $30.75; (9) $73.25; (10) $1,726.14; (11) $1,801.39.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalson, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125.
E. (7) $55.65; (9) $55.65; (11) $55.65.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $2,150.
E. (1) $1,250; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $2,150; (10) $5,450; (11) $7,600.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) General interest is in Federal and State legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (2) $3,750; (9) $3,750; (10) $11,250; (11) $15,000.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (10) $7.92; (11) $7.92.

A. Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., 463 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa.
C. Such bills as H. R. 240; H. R. 1177; S. 892, and H. R. 4473 previously introduced. We definitely favor equal taxing of net profit dollars, regardless of where these originate from an income tax viewpoint.
D. (6) $465.
E.[1]

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $6,785.
E. (2) $2,750; (6) $3; (7) $11.35; (8) $13; (9) $2,777.35; (11) -$2,777.35; (15) $2,750, December 31, 1952, Doherty, Rumble, Butler & Mitchell, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn., services; $27.35, December 31, 1952, same as above, expenses.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.
B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) Tidelands legislation—supporting State ownership.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (2) $591.60; (5) $697.88; (6) $79.13; (7) $298.90; (9) $1,667.51; (10) $4,344; (11) $6,011.51.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $325.
E. (7) $49.93; (9) $49.93; (10) $512.83; (11) $562.76.

A. Seward H. Jacobi.
B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting business and industry.
D. (7) $2,750.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal Legislation affecting savings and loan business.
D. (6) $300.
E. (5) $125; (8) $125; (9) $375; (10) $500; (11) $500.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn. Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn. United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J. Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky. Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co. Cooley Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co. of Mayfield, Ky.
C. (2) We are interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown by title 26; section 114, Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $503.96.
E. (10) $649.77; (11) $649.77.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945—Millwood Dam. Legislation affecting lumber industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (2) $1,250; (9) $1,250; (10) $5,532.77; (11) $6,782.77.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,916.
E. (10) $122.82; (11) $122.82.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (6) $3,720.50.
E. (7) $769.65; (9) $769.65; (10) $2,811.31; (11) $3,580.96.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries. S. 940, and similar bills.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (7) $552.63; (9) $552.63; (10) $2,422.66; (11) $2,975.29.

A. Lillian Cohen for Willard Johnson, General Secretary, United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide Convention, 56 Brook Manor, Pleasantville, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interest will continue until Senate ratification of Genocide Convention.
E. (10) $438.13; (11) $438.13.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $643.21; (9) $643.21; (10) $2,609.21; (11) $3,252.42.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3).[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $304.10; (9) $304.10; (10) $895.14; (11) $1,199.24.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, 12th and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation; the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto, against H. R. 5234.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. The Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Tax equality and other legislation affecting independent business.
D. (6) $50.
E. (5) $150; (9) $150; (10) $1,061.11; (11) $1,211.11.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. City and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriations, civil defense, ship construction, payments in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban development, taxation and Government controls, and veterans' educational benefits.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $825; (6) $344.16; (7) $972.76; (8) $71.10; (9) $2,213.02; (10) $5,198.39; (11) $7,411.41.

A. (Miss) Elizabeth A. Kendall, 5415 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation related directly or indirectly to the development of the Antarctic Continent, such as that regarding geopolitical decisions, inventions, transportation, communications, equipment, long-range planning, exploitation of natural resources, etc., in the interests of all United States taxpayers and world peace and prosperity. H. J. Res. 291 declaring right of sovereignty of United States over certain areas of the Antarctic Continent. (For.)
E. (6) $15; (8) $2; (9) $17; (11) $17.

A. Earle R. Kennedy, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $305.60; (9) 305.60; (10) $1,885.25; (11) $2,190.85.

A. Mr. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (8) $25; (9) $225; (10) $975; (11) 1,200.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, The American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 N. Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) (See statement attached.)[1]
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (7) $564.17; (9) $564.17; (10) $414.88; (11) $979.05.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,730.
E. (2) $2,703; (9) $2,730; (10) $8,010; (11) $10,740.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $132; (9) $132; (10) $371; (11) $503.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, which appear in section 4 of Public Law 594, 82d Congress, 2 session, approved July 21, 1952.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Willford I. King, Room 300, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Favor all constitutional legislation according with sound economic principles.
D. (6) $3,075.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $165.
E. (7) $26.26; (9) $26.26; (10) $260.60; (11) $286.86.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
C. (2) Legislative matters in which the American Farm Bureau Federation is interested, primarily those matters affecting directly American agriculture.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Private bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of $725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy. Bill for relief of Palmer-Bee Co.; S. 116 and H. R. 3739.
E. (6) $2; (7) $20; (9) $22; (10) $63; (11) $85.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative developments of interest to association members.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (10) $63.50.

A. John Kolanda, Room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Employees' Department, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,700.

A. Alfred U. Krebs, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,492.
E. (10) $6,412.13; (11) $6,412.13.

A. Lake Carriers Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $900.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 Amendments; vesicular exanthema in hogs.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $2,674.49; (7) $50.20; (9) $2,724.69; (10) $5,525; (11) $8,249.69.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 Amendments; vesicular exanthema in hogs.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (4) $287.57; (5) $2,674.49; (6) $487.58; (7) $787.91; (9) $4,237.55; (10) $6,214.71; (11) $10,452.26.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., and United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa., an affiliate of Congress of Industrial Organizations.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $3,208.31.
E. (7) $2,351; (9) $2,351; (10) $4,872; (11) $7,223.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,749.98.
E. (7) $8.40; (9) $8.40; (10) $28.85; (11) $37.25.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y
C. (2) Relating to mining, smelting, and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically this includes, but is not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, 82d Congress., 2d session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper such as Public Law 38, 82d Congress, 1st session, May 22, 1951.

A. Clarence F. Lea, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation having anything to do with transportation.

A. League of Women Voters of the U. S., 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (3) Congressional Strings on the Public Purse, Put Publications To Work, the National Voter.
D. (6) $1,149.70.
E. (2) $550.02; (4) $846.49; (6) $10.10; (9) $1,406.61; (10) $5,499.27; (11) $6,905.88.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General—Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. Sugar Act of 1948 and Public Law 140, 82d Congress, amending the Sugar Act of 1948. Trade Agreements Act. Tariff Acts.
D. (6) $1,741.46.
E. (4) $92.54; (6) $47.47; (8) $201.45; (9) $341.46; (10) $3,618.07; (11) $3,959.53; (15).[1]

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Public education.
E. (2) $400.63; (4) $28.70; (5) $60.35; (6) $37.25; (7) $49.57; (9) $576.50; (10) $9,344.78; (11) $9,921.28.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I., National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
C. (2) Measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection, and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Mining, smelting, and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically this includes but is not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, 82d Congress, 2d session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO, custom duties, including copper, such as Public Law 38, 82d Congress, 1st session, May 22, 1951.
D. (6) (See p. 3.)[1]

A. Arnold Levy, Freedman & Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anthracite Operators Wage Agreement Committee, 237 Old River Road, Wilkes Barre, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting anthracite industry.
D. (6) $4,613.30.
E. (6) $19.19; (7) $73.36; (8) $20.75; (9) $113.30; (10) $50; (11) $163.30.

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning fair bidding procedures. Principal legislative interest is in S. 2907.
D. (6) $5,083.13.
E. (2) $4,400; (4) $600; (7) $83.13; (9) $5,083.13; (10) $11,626.82; (11) $16,909.95; (15) $1,365.95, October 1, 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; $1,374.16, November 1, 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; $2,343.02, December 1, 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses.

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: mutual-assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation, including universal military training and service, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees, and displaced persons, educational exchange, and immigration legislation.
D. (6) $1,329.12.
E. (7) $104.13; (9) $104.13; (10) $347.63; (11) $451.74.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John W. Lindsey, counsel, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $16.30; (7) $1,096.28; (8) $159; (9) $1,271.58 (10) $1,632.40; (11) $2,903.98; (15) $14.10, November 8, 1952, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon; $18.90, December 9, 1952, Occidental Restaurant, Washington, D. C., dinner; $19.40, December 23, 1952, Fan & Bill's, Washington, D. C., luncheon.

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West 6th Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Major Steam Railroads of California (see schedule attached).[1]
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $1,159.32; (11) $1,184.32; (15) $25, December 29, 1952, California State Society, dinner.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, box 1107, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to the pipeline industry. The committee is interested in S. 1889 and H. R. 5632. Both provide for amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. We are opposed to some provisions of S. 1889. We are opposed to the enactment of any part of H. R. 5632.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Mr. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks. War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951. S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against this legislation. H. R. 7844 and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $700.
E. (6) $12.44; (7) $175.01; (8) $5.18; (9) $192.63; (10) $334; (11) $526.63; (15) $12.44, October 1 through December 31, 1952, Michigan Bell Telephone Co., Detroit, Mich., long-distance telephone (legislative and other business); $175.01, November 29 to November 30, 1952, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Pennsylvania Railroad, New York Central Railroad, Belleview-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, restaurants, taxis, etc., attendance at meetings in Washington and Philadelphia.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,500; (11) $2,000.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (8) $5; (10) $5; (11) $5.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $11.51; (8) $5; (10) $16.51; (11) $16.51.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $51.21; (7) $10; (8) $5; (10) $66.21; (11) $66.21.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (8) $5; (10) $5; (11) $5.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Townsend Plan for National Insurance, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Townsend plan as per H. R. 2679.
D. (6) $35.50.
E. (7) $45.50; (9) $45.50; (10) $185; (11) $230.50.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Washington Office, Ford Motor Co., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
E. (10) $959.94; (11) $959.94.

A. A. L. Lynn, Island Creek Coal Co., Pond Creek Pocohontas Co., Huntington, W. Va.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, Government controls, Government expenditures, etc., including so-called Federal mine safety bill.
D. (6) $5,500.

A. John C. Lynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See attached).[1]
D. (6) $2,156.22.
E. (7) $20.45; (9) $20.45; (10) $243.41; (11) $263.86.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. A. E. Lyon, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $700.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.
C. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton.

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen in particular, and railroad employees in general.
D. (6) $2,500.03.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of Federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $412.50.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 W. 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $349.11; (9) $349.11; (10) 709.61; (11) $1,058.72.

A. John A. McCart, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government Employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
D. (6) $1,403.85.
E. (7) $4.90; (9) $4.90; (10) $34.20; (11) $39.10.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills ponding before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $225.63.

A. Warren C. McClure, Mississippi Valley Association, Box 207, Camden, Ark.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $900.
E. (10) $100; (11) $100.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers Educational & Cooperative Union of America, 1556 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. A. J. McFarland, field secretary, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement.
C. (2) House Joint Resolution 156; Senate Joint Resolution 29. (3) The Christian Patriot.
D. (6) $810.
E. (7) $120; (9) $120; (10) $740; (11) $860.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, United States of America, Lobbying Purposes, 3012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation touching on the taxpayers' welfare, national security, world peace.
D. (6) $180.
E. (2) $180; (9) $180; (10) $540; (11) $720.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, O. R. T. Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Railway Express Agency, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $1,439.10; (11) $1,439.10.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Candy Wholesalers Assn., Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in amendments, if any, to the Robinson-Patman Act.
E. (7) $26.97; (9) $26.97; (11) $26.97.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 106, H. R. 4528, H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, H. R. 6720, S. 2738, S. 2714, on behalf of the American Optometric Association, Inc., % Dr. Leo G. Miller, 420 Sharp Building, Lincoln, Nebr.; on behalf of Vera Sarah Keenan, Franton Court, Greens Farms, Conn., bill to permit residence in the United States, S. 1126; on behalf of John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., bill to compensate John J. Braund for use of patents by United States Government, H. R. 4507.
D. (6) $200.
E. (6) $1.61; (7) $3.67; (8) $4.80; (9) $10.08; (10) $132.51; (11) $442.59.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees in behalf of former owners of land sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.

A. Lachlan Macleay, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (10) $1,697.95; (11) $1,697.95.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $62.86; (11) $62.86.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above trade association.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $0; (7) $131.53; (9) $140.53; (10) $126.02; (11) $566.55.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $9; (7) $131.53; (9) $140.53; (10) $426.02; (11) $566.55.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (1) $15,000; (9) $15,000; (10) $47,750; (11) $62,750.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.
D. (6) $3,302.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $1; (11) $1.

A. Robert F. Martin, 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., 3032 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific relationship to air transportation costs. H. R. 508 (air mail subsidy separation bill). In favor of enactment.
D. (6) $498.
E. (4) $36.50; (6) $14.76; (9) $51.26; (10) $674.62; (11) $725.88.

A. Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Inc., 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Will Maslow, 15 East 84th Street, New York City.
B. American Jewish Congress, Inc., 15 East 84th Street, New York City.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $112.50.
E. (10) $30; (11) $30.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,632.
E. (6) $14.70; (8) $141.30; (9) $156; (10) $565; (11) $721.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $2,749.98.
E. (7) $150.48; (9) $150.48; (10) $304.16; (11) $454.64.

A. E. A. Meeks, National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (7) $2,724.92; (8) $2,724.92.
E. (10) $161.48; (11) $161.48.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See attached statement, p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (3) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (10) $10,346.78; (11) $11,846.78; (15) (See explanation No. 3, pp. 4, 5, and 6.)[1]

A. Dale Miller, Room 372, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills. (3) Monthly article in Dallas magazine.
D. (6) $2,200.
E. (2) $275; (5) $121.67; (6) $12.81; (7) $527.29; (8) $51.85; (9) $988.62; (10) $2,931.87; (11) $3,920.49.

A. Dale Miller, Room 372, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (5) $26.29; (6) $34.33; (7) $348.47; (8) $22.36; (9) $431.45; (10) $1,247.21; (11) $1,678.66.

A. Dale Miller, Room 372, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $825; (6) $76.51; (7) $188.39; (8) $99; (9) $1,188.90; (10) $3,888.58; (11) $5,077.48.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street Northwest, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (10) $717.87; (11) $717.87.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 605–607 Plaza Building, Post Office Box 1329, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulations of business and taxation such as Mason bill, H. R. 240, Davis bill, H. R. 1177, and Senator Williams bill, S. 892.
D. (6) $465.
E. (4) $4.61; (8) $15.13; (9) $19.74; (10) $3,581.81; (11) $3,601.55.

A. Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Association is interested in legislation relating to taxation of independent business, labor legislation, and encroachment of Government into private industry.
D. (7) $160.
E. (4) $366.62; (5) $9.03; (7) $88.51; (8) $7.50; (9) $471.66; (10) $1,655; (11) $2,126.66.

A. P. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (10) $1,924.08; (11) $1,924.08.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. The Morris Plan Corporation of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (a) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation. (d) Against.

A. Giles Morrow, Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute (same as above).
C. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $25.78; (6) $3.63; (7) $40.55; (9) $69.96; (10) $184; (11) $253.96.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation of interest to the aircraft-manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $5.06; (7) $418.98; (8) $3; (9) $427.04; (10) $86.60; (11) $513.64.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.
D. (6) $300.
E. (6) $50; (7) $25; (9) $75; (10) $120; (11) $195.

A. Walter J. Munro; Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D. (6) $300.
E. (9) $300; (10) $900; (11) $1,200.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. Francis J. Myers, 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit, Inc.
C. (1) Regulation W, Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.
D. (6) $937.50.
E. (7) $40.53; (9) $40.53; (10) $502.90; (11) $543.43.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 3904, S. 1767, H. R. 2572, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (11) $246.42.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (11) $1,534.77.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security, and tax-privileged corporations in business. (3) Washington Report.
E. (2) $3,113.80; (4) $4.40; (5) $624.23; (6) $152.37; (7) $48.50; (8) $233.75; (9) $4,177.05; (10) $15,036.35; (11) $19,213.40.

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (2) $6,043.43; (4) $23.46; (5) $473.80; (6) $178.58; (7) $1,227.63; (8) $1,188.17; (9) 9,135.07; (10) $21,006.03; (11) $30,221.10.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418–19 Homer Building, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all kinds, particularly bills relative to GI education for Korean veterans. (3) Business School News and Business School Executive.
D. (6) $14,516.79.
E. (2) $7,297.62; (4) $1,177.56; (5) $2,141.77; (6) $92.06; (7) $2,406.84; (8) $77.71; (9) $13,193.56; (10) $28,061.87; (11) $41,255.43.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–65 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) 13,787.50.
E. (11) $161.79.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1] (3) (See appended statement, p. 6; also see detailed listing of expenditures, E–15 (pp. 12–16)).[1]
D. (6) $29,378.39.
E. (1) $28,972.16; (2) $71,743.31; (3) $350; (4) $10,631.86; (5) $4,655.58; (6) $980.49; (7) $8,138.67; (8) $3,102.58; (9) $128,574.65; (10) $349,367.09; (11) $477,941.74; (15) $26.64, November 3, November 26, December 18, 1952, Addressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbitt Road, Cleveland, Ohio. Addressograph plates; multigraph machine supplies and maintenance. $350, October 31, 1952. Aid Chinese Refugee Intellectuals, Inc., care of J. P. Grace, Jr., president, W. R. Grace & Co., 7 Hanover Square, New York, N. Y. Charitable contribution, $1,612.65, October 24, November 26, December 31, 1952, American Airlines, Inc., 910 South Boston Avenue, Tulsa, Okla. Transportation, etc.[1]

A. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The association has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers. (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $29.04.
E. (4) $29.04; (9) $29.04; (10) $287.01; (11) $316.05; (15) $29.04, October 31, 1952, November 28, 1952, December 31, 1952, Kaufmann Press, Inc., 25 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Estimated cost of printing and distributing two items in Dealer News during fourth quarter of 1952 which might be said to relate to "legislative interests." This figure is based on an estimate of that part of the total cost of publication attributable to the two items.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents; War Damage Corporation legislation; social-security legislation; insurance legislation; tax equality legislation; wage, salary, and manpower control legislation.
D. (6) $2,802.63.
E. (2) $3,986.20; (5) $436.25; (6) $314.21; (7) $42.49; (8) $135.25; (9) $4,918.40; (10) $13,169.92; (11) $18,088.32; (15) $2,983.20, October 10, 24; November 7, 21; December 5, 19, 31, Maurice G. Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va., salary; $1,005, October 10, 24; November 7, 21; December 5, 19, 31, Margaret E. Yeager, 4115 Nicholas Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; $360, October 1, November 1, December 1, Washington Loan & Trust Co., Washington, D. C., office rent, etc.[1]

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation that may relate to margarine.
D. (6) $28.
E. (2) $25; (7) $3; (9) $28; (10) $187.80; (11) $215.80; (15) $200, January 15, 16, 17, April 28, June 11, 13, 17, 18, 20, December 31, Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary on account of legislative activities.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing. There were no specific legislative interests during this quarter.
E. (10) $164.50; (11) $164.50.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service.
D. (6) $4,142.76.
E. (2) $2,300; (4) $3,865.70; (5) $300; (6) $10; (7) $100.10; (9) $6,575.80; (10) $14,777.20; (11) $21,352.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards—Its Public Relations Department and Its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.—1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (a) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $22,766.10.
E. (1) $1,045.02; (2) $21,598.01; (4) $2,028.34; (5) $2,970.37; (6) $1,398; (7) $8,439.01; (8) $145.21; (9) $37,613.96; (10) $90,279.69; (11) $127,893.65; (16) $190; October 1 to December 31, 1952; Lucille Bettinger, 1882 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C., $950.01; $315, Mary T. Burton, 2122 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C., $630; $530.01, Margaret Crosby, 4305 Van Ness Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1,325.01; $412.50, Ruth Clements, 3447-A Stafford Street, Arlington, Va., $825; etc.[1]

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) "The Annuitant."
E. (10) $600; (11) $600.

A. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, John A. Cranage, National Secretary-Treasurer, 4742 North Carlisle Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States Storekeeper-Gauger.
D. (6) $565.20.
E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,500; (11) $2,000.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,350.22.
E. (2) $333.99; (4) $18.50; (5) $78; (6) $12; (9) $442.49; (10) $1,327.47; (11) $1,769.96.

A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 15th Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food canning industry.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $321,595.94.
E. (2) $3,827.49; (4) $107.63; (6) $68.69; (7) $178.71; (8) $46.71; (9) $4,229.23; (10) $16,294.22; (11) $20,523.45; (15) $2,327.49, October 31, November 30, December 31, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., salary; $1,500, October 31, November 30, December 31, Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C., legal services; $12.75, October 3, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., 25 copies of Congressional Quarterly, etc.[1]

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.
D. (See attachment A.)[1]
E. (See attachment B.)[1]

A. National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt. Senate Joint Resolution 155.
D. (6) $15.
E. (4) $32.28; (9) $32.28; (10) $1,352.79; (11) $1,385.07; (15) $32.28, October 27, 1952, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. Reimbursement for months of July, August, September, October, postage and mailroom.

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.
E. (4) $536.39; (5) $113.82; (6) $12.05; (9) $662.26; (10) $557.07; (11) $1,219.33; (15) $12.05, November 20, Jones, Day, Cockley & Reavis, 1135 Tower Building, Washington 5, D. C., reimbursement for phone calls. $93.73, December 15, William Feather Co., Cleveland, Ohio, stationery. $136.83, December 19, National Planning Association, Washington, D. C., reimbursement for stamps. $20.09, December 22, William Feather Co., Cleveland, Ohio, stationery. $393.95, December 31, Raus Bros., Cleveland, Ohio, printing.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
E. (10) $561.76; (11) $561.76.

A. National Cotton Council of America, postoffice box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $5,046.46.
E. (2) $3,075.90; (4) $394.91; (5) $199.80; (6) $57.53; (7) $1,318.32; (9) $5,046.46; (10) $23,676.48; (11) $28,722.94; (15) Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., 1952, salary and expense, $8,250.21; Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., 1952, salary and expense, $251.02; William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn., 1952, salary and expense, $604.52; J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., 1952, salary and expense, $3,242.80, etc.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the postal service.
D. (6) $1,023.96.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (1) $900; (5) $73.29; (7) $50.67; (9) $1,023.96; (10) $4,881.53; (11) $5,905.49; $900, October 7, November 6, November 24, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., for public-relations counsel; $57.74, October 7, November 24, December 31, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., to reimburse for messenger and supplies; $50.67, October 7, December 29, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals and lodging.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such: Mutual-assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation, including universal military training and service, economic assistance (point 4), disarmanent, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange and immigration legislation. (3) Peace action.
D. (6) $8,555.44.
E. (2) $5,541.94; (3) $35; (4) $862.98; (5) $1,187.64; (6) $77.07; (7) $282.17; (8) $1,105.01; (9) $9,391.81; (10) $26,528.70; (11) $37,920.51.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Our legislative interests are in favor of any legislation that tends to support private enterprise, maintain American independence, and in opposition to any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $18,060.13.
E. (2) $6,222.69; (4) $4,487.82; (5) $4,489.07; (6) $489.14; (7) $995.60; (8) $1,130.51; (9) $18,814.83; (10) $67,649.83; (11) $106,464.68; (15) $201.03, Brooklyn Eagle Press, Inc., 24 Johnson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., Council letter No. 294, copy enclosed last report.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The National Electrical Contractors Association has an interest in the enactment of S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes. (3) Qualified Contractor.
D and E. (See Ref. A.)[1]

A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Members are: Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Shipowners Association of the Pacific Coast, 110 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.; American Merchant Marine Institute, 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $23,310.30; (11) $23,310.30.

A. The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attached.)[1]
D. (6) $80,907.50.
E. (2) $900; (5) $225.84; (6) $75.75; (8) $23.67; (9) $1,225.26; (10) $3,979.95; (11) $5,205.21.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $125,934.65.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $6,587.36; (4) $7,339.28; (5) $330; (6) 66.30; (8) $5,826.53; (9) $20,199.47; (10) $77,669.69; (11) $97,869.16; (15) $1,222.39, October 9, Sound Studios, Inc., legislative expenses; $147.92, October 17, Railway Express Agency, express charges on transcript; $340.80, October 17, Radio Station, WCFM, talent and program time for September 1952; $97.49, October 31, Railway Express Agency, express charges on transcript, etc.[1]

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In support of the Robinson-Patman Act, the law prohibiting unfair price discriminations. Opposed to S. 719, a bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor. (3) An Old Enemy Haunts the Food Industry.
D. (6) $1,179.70.
E. (2) $500; (4) $448.71; (5) $30; (6) $15; (7) $185.99; (9) $1,179.70; (10) $2,093.31; (11) $3,273.01; (15) $500, Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. Estimated portion of regular salary as president of the association which may be considered as compensation for legislative activities; $13.96, October 1952, railroad fare to New York, Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington, D. C.; $101.43, November, Trans. World Airlines, Kansas City, Mo., for fare to Springfield, Ill., via American Airlines.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) At the opening of the 83d Congress no bills have yet been introduced in which the National Housing Conference has basic interests. As the session develops it is probable that measures relating to private and public low-rent housing, slum clearance, and redevelopment will be submitted and the conference will be interested in expressing an opinion on them.
D. (6) $11,316.47.
E. (2) $6,150.22; (3) $30; (4) $1,528.25; (5) $1,590.81; (6) $711.72 (7) $1,207.90; (8) $2,501.26; (9) $13,720.16; (10) $48,197.54; (11) $61,917.70; (15) $345.37, October 30, November 16, November 21, Fox-Jones, 1419 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $11.33, October 30, Capital Couriers, Press Building, Washington, D. C., delivery and messenger service; $24, November 6, December 22, Royal Typewriter Co., 1105 D Street SW., Washington, D. C., rental of typewriters; $602.82, November 18, December 11, Rufus H. Darby, 24th and Douglas Streets NE., Washington, D. C., stationery, etc.[1]

A. The National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $350.
E. (1) $467.85; (2) $2,252.01; (4) $273.49; (5) $562.96; (6) $215.59; (7) $481.31; (8) $89.89; (9) $4,343.10; (10) $11,103.61; (11) $15,446.71; (15) $185.50, October 1, the Bowen Building, Washington, D. C., October office rent; $118.65, October 3, WPIK Potomac Broadcasting Co., Alexandria, Va., three radio broadcasts; $2.04, October 6, Charles G. Stott & Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $74.86, October 6, C. & P. Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone bill, etc.[1]

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $485.25.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News, National Defense Development Letter.

D. (6) $9,693.40.

E. (1) $5,534.15; (2) $3,677.14; (4) $858.27; (5) $200.01; (6) $28.84; (7) $1,608.76; (8) $2,831.83; (9) $14,939; (10) $37,541.46; (11) $52,480.46.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) Dairy Director, News for Dairy Co-ops, Legislative Letter.

D. (6) $43,440.86.

E. (1) $39,130.02; (2) $25,761.49; (3) $13,337.13; (5) $2,429.62; (6) $816.86; (7) $10,098.01; (8) $1,029.39; (9) $92,602.52; (10) $127,234.74; (11) $219,837.26; (15) October 3, 1952, District Unemployment Compensation Board, District of Columbia, District of Columbia unemployment, $8.50; October 3, 1952, Margaret K. Taylor, Woodner Apartments, District of Columbia, travel, $80; October 15, 1952, Val C. Sherman, 411 Highland Avenue, Kenwood, Md., salary, $317.17, miscellaneous, $1.50, etc.[1]

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (See p. 3.)[1]

E. (2) $3,375; (4) $2,038.83; (5) $517.60; (7) $176; (8) $2.50; (9) $6,109.93; (10) $19,595.54; (11) $25,705.47; (15) $3,000 (fee), October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, John C. Hazen, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $44.25 (expense), October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, John C. Hazen, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $375 (fee), October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, Erskine Stewart, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $1.25 (expense), October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, Erskine Stewart, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., legislative representative; $517.60, October 31, November 30, December 30, 1952, Washington office, Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C., overhead.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation that affects retail trades.

E. (2) $500; (5) $400; (6) $50; (9) $950; (10) $4,650; (11) $5,600; (15) $500, Leo J. Heer, National Retail Furniture Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., allocation of salary for period covered by this report (paid in semimonthly installments).

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $515.

E. (2) $1,135.66; (5) $7.19; (6) $14.20; (7) $23.25; (8) $468.91; (9) $1,649.21; (10) $13,287.06; (11) $14,936.27; (15) October 17, the Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., 725 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone bill, October 1, 1952; $466.56, October 17, Director of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding and FICA taxes, third quarter, 1952; $23.25, October 17, Gulf Oil Corp., 1515 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa., charges, September 1952; $75, November 5, Hamilton National Bank, Washington, D. C., payroll deduction bond; $85.16, October 6, 22, LaD. McG. Kriner, 4301 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; $975.50, October 8, 22, November 5, 19; December 3, William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project: H. J. Res. 337; S. J. Res. 27 (opposed).

D. (6) $10,500.

E. (1) $500; (2) $4,791.04; (4) $448.44; (5) $1,085.17; (6) $370.82; (7) $848.58; (8) $171.92; (9) $8,215.97; (10) $53,676.10; (11) $61,892.07; (15) $51.44, October 1, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., bill of September 13; $21.75, October 1, Loran & Herlihy, mimeographing, September; $10, October 2, Dorothy H. Baker, stamps (New York); $82.25, October 3, Whitehall Club (New York), luncheon meetings, etc.[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Opposition to legislation adverse to savings and loan associations.

D. (6) $784.83.

E. (2) $1,000; (9) $1,000; (10) $7,946.20; (11) $8,946.20; (15) $1,000, Oscar R. Kreutz, salary.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (2) $4,372.92; (5) $1,291.21; (6) $187.47; (7) $99.25; (9) $5,950.85; (10) $17,889.53; (11) $23,840.38; (15) $22.50, October 10, November 10, December 10, accurate answering, Washington, D. C., Washington office expense; $179.70, October 10, November 10, December 10, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone; $55.08, October 10, November 10, December 10, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., Washington office expense; $219.65, October 10, November 10, December 10, K. Blyth Emmons, Washington, D. C., Washington office expense, etc.[1]

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, including: Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bacon Act, UMT, Selective Service, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills, income-retirement legislation. (3) Legislative Bulletin.

D. (6) $16,806.44.

E. (2) $1,183; (4) $252.42; (9) $1,435.42; (10) $4,795.20; (11) $6,230.62; (15) $148.89, October 9, December 19, United States Post Office, postage for Legislative Bulletin; $103.53; October 9, December 24, Colortone Press, Washington, D. C., printing Legislative Bulletin.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation such as H. R. 240.

D. (6) $26,731.24.

E. (1) $3,678.22; (2) $6,947.34; (4) $6,442.69; (5) $1,134.19; (6) $2,300.71; (7) $4,491.93; (9) $24,995.08; (10) $38,750.31; (11) $63,745.39; (15).[1]

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Post Office Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

B. National Tax Relief Coalition, box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

C. (2) Favor tax limitation.

D. (6) $570.

E. (2) $375; (5) $250; (7) $2,735; (9) $3,360; (10) $2,910; (11) $3,360.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

B. The National Woman's Christian Temperance Union with headquarters at 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $474.75.

E. (2) $1,250; (3) $10; (5) $438.53; (8) $1.25; (9) $1,699.78; (10) $5,409.11; (11) $7,108.89; (15) $725, October 29, November 28, December 30, Elizabeth A. Smart; $525, October 29, November 28, December 30, Alice H. Haffey; $285, October 16, November 24, January 5, for December rent at 138 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

D. (6) $37,401.80.

E. (2) $2,500; (7) $992.50; (8) $825; (9) $4,317.50; (10) $14,932.36; (11) $19,249.86; (15) $2,500, October 1 through December 31, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah, salary; $825, October 1 through December 31, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo., services; $643.21, October 1 through December 31, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah, expenses; $349.29, October 1 through December 31, W. H. Steiwer, Fossil, Wyo., expenses.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C., employed by National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.[1]

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) Legislative interests: all legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

D. (6) $155.80.

E. (2) $1; (8) $1,093.20; (9) $1,094.20; (10) $396.98; (11) $1,491.18; (15) $1,078.20, November 4, 1952, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C., for aid in solicitation of funds and furnishing information; $15, December 23, 1952, William P. Helm, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., 1953 subscription to Reports from Washington.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage banking industry.

D. (6) $6,232.31.

E. (2) $210.51; (4) $21.07; (5) $1,574.13; (6) $416; (7) $385.64; (9) $2,607.35; (10) $7,644.69; (11) $10,252.04.

A. Mr. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (2) $381.59; (6) $6.23; (7) $384.23; (8) $384.23; (9) $1,056.67; (10) $5,121.41; (11) $6,178.08; (15) $17.50, October 13, 1952, Beatrice Fitzhugh, 2723 P Street NW., Washington, D. C., cleaning apartment week ending October 11; $49.47, October 18, 1952, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif., hotel bill, October 5–9; $11.05, October 18, 1952, Harvey's Restaurant, 1107 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., restaurant charges for the month of September; $14.01, October 18, 1952, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., restaurant charges for the month of September, etc.[1]

A. Donald F. Nemitz, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.

B. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.

C. (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of IRC.

D. (6) $434.53.

E. (7) $59.53; (9) $59.53; (10) $141.28; (11) $200.81.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

E. (10) $457.12; (11) $457.12; (see attached).[1]

A. W. R. Noble, Suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSoto Building, St. Louis, Mo. and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Inc.

C. (2) Keeping associations informed as to pending legislation and interpretations of legislation. Special attention given to all labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing, Hardware Retailer.

D. (6) $3,375.

E. (6) $108.91; (7) $664.52; (8) $184.23; (9) $957.66; (10) $2,664.32; (11) $3,621.98.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]

D. (6) $4,374.94.

E. (6) $10.64; (7) $427.65; (8) $76.30; (9) $514.59; (10) $864.61; (11) $1,379.20; (15) $14.60, September 15, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon, $13.20, September 26, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon, $13.40, October 7, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon, $24.50, October 20, 1952, Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C. luncheon, etc.[1]

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. D.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, minerals, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan. Taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.

E. (10) $20; (11) $20.

A. A. E. Notarianni, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) A bill for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 1062, would establish a Tax Settlement Board—for; H. R. 4371, H. R. 4373, H. R. 8390, H. R. 8391, would permit postponement of income tax with respect to a portion of earned net income paid to a restricted retirement fund—for; H. R. 7269, would provide for retirement pay for Tax Court judges—for; H. R. 7746, would provide for voluntary social security coverage for self-employed CPA's—for; H. R. 7893, would provide for improved enforcement and administration of revenue laws—for; with reservations (legislation affecting certified public accountants).

D. (6) $916.67.

E. (6) $50; (7) $193.17; (9) $243.17; (10) $927.56; (11) $1,170.73.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Public Law 590 (H. R. 7800).

D. (6) $9,816.50.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry. H. R. 5505 (H. R. 1535) customs simplification, amendment to section 2 (c); H. R. 5474, stream pollution (accelerated amortization); H. R. 2594, Defense Production Act; H. R. 7391 Defense Appropriations Act (clarification of Berry amendment).

E. (10) $381.48; (11) $381.48.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company. H. R. 5693, 82d Congress, an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930; opposed.

E. (10) $755.75; (11) $755.75.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio (see p. 3).[1]

C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.

E. (10) $600.37; (11) $600.37.

A. Fred N. Oliver, Oliver & Donally, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East 42d Street, New York.

C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks or railroad security owners have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Clarence H. Olsor., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) (See attached statement.)[1]

D. (6) $1,929.24.

E. (7) $122.64; (9) $122.64; (10) $415.76; (11) $538.40; (15) $121.64, October 4–8, Pennsylvania Railroad, Union Station, Washington, D. C., carfare to Indianapolis, Ind., and return and for meals and lodging incidental to the trip (to attend meetings of national executive committee by authority of the national adjutant). $1, October 15, taxi to and from Apex Building to attend immigration hearings.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.

D. (6) $1,875.

E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160; (10) $480; (11) $640.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.

D. (6) $200.

E. (2) $900; (9) $900; (10) $2,700; (11) $3,600.

A. James G. Patton.

B. Farmers Education & Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. International Minerals & Chemical Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) To amend section 34 of Trading With the Enemy Act to protect the interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. Legislation affecting the real-estate industry because of its complex character does not lend itself to any ready classification on the basis of support or opposition.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $2.80; (7) $531.33; (8) $32.50; (9) $566.63; (10) $787.45; (11) $1,354.08; (15) $23.92, October 30, 1952, Statler Hotel, luncheon conference; $15, December 15, 1952, Board of Trade, congressional dinner; $18, December 15, 1952, Board of Trade, midwinter dinner; $25, December 1, 1952, Board of Trade dues.

A. Hugh Peterson, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation referring to the cane sugar refining industry.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, post-office box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States, Agana, Guam, M. I.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of Guam. To make applicable laws to Guam which should be made applicable and to oppose those that should not be made applicable. A bill making certain laws applicable to Guam and declaring some laws inapplicable. Certain bills amending National Guard and Housing Acts making same applicable to Guam. For H. R. 6808. Also for National Guard Act applicable to Guam.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $8.46; (8) $2.17; (9) $10.73; (10) $890.41; (11) $901.14; (12) $3,125; (14) $625.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (See preliminary report.)[1]

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).
D. (6) $2,175.
E. (10) $135.45; (11) $135.45.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) (See explanatory statement.)[1]
D and E.[1]

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,062.38.
E. (7) $3.20; (9) $3.20; (10) $12; (11) $15.20.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York City.
C. (2) No lobbying activities during this quarter.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting the proprietary medicines industry. (3) Legislative bulletins.
D. (See attached sheet.)[1]
E. (See attached sheet.)[1] (4) $136.80; (7) $150.; (9) $286.80; (10) $710.40; (11) $997.20; (15) $150 4th quarter, A. K. Berta (misc.), 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (1) $3,500; (5) $35.24; (8) $3,535.24; (9) $11,185.35; (10) $14,720.59; (15) $3,535.24, October 8, 1952, Milo J. Warner, Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio, professional services.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (8) $0.28; (9) $0.28; (10) $42.51; (11) $42.79.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $234.13; (11) $234.13.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession. H. R. 4914, military construction bill, in support of this bill section 504. Defense housing bill S. 349, general support but criticising certain aspects. H. R. 1901 Nevius Tract protesting against this. S. 898, reorganization of the National Park and Planning against this as presently proposed. S. 2645 and S. 2584, Defense Production Act continuation, in support. S. 2137 and H. R. 6596, lease purchase of public buildings, in support. S. 2487 to extend judicial review of administrative decisions, in support. H. R. 4371 (Keogh), H. R. 4373 (Reed) individual retirement, in support. H. R. 1171 (Davis), tax adjustment, in support. H. R. 7502, in support. Statement filed on civil-defense appropriation bill.
D. (6) $200.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.
E. (10) $267.40; (11) $267.40.

A. William A. Quinlan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. (See item B attached.)[1]
C. (see item C (2) and (3) attached.)[1]
D. (7) $80.50.
E. (6) $1; (7) $96.50; (9) $97.50; (11) $97.50; (15) $62.50; (16) $25.52, October 15, Pennsylvania Railroad, Washington, D. C., tickets for New York trip; $30, December 31, University Club, Washington, D. C., luncheon meeting.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West 57th Street, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Public health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people.
D. (6) $6,875.02.
E. (2) $844.96; (5) $423.62; (6) $154.60; (7) $1,884.17; (9) $3,307.37; (10) $11,779.82; (11) $15,087.19.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, page 5.)[1]
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (7) $47.20; (9) $47.20; (10) $87.60; (11) $134.80.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission, and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Defense Production Act; excise taxes; excess-profits taxes.
E. (2) $2,037.50; (8) $51.02; (9) $2,988.52; (10) $8,791.64; (11) $11,780.16.

A. Leon Raesly, Suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of 30-year retirement regardless of age at half-pay based on the 5 years of highest earnings—S. 1308, H. R. 63. (3) Pension Conference Bulletin.
D. (6) $286.25.
E. (4) $38; (5) $182.10; (6) $11.34; (7) $33.57; (8) $10.03; (9) $275.04; (10) $702.23; (11) $977.27.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.
E. (10) $50; (11) $50.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver.
D. (6) $4,249.98.
E. (7) $753.08; (9) $753.08; (10) $2,889.76; (11) $3,642.84.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof. In support of S. 2752, a bill to require the establishment of actual rates by contract carriers.
D. (6) $465.23.
E. (2) $412.50; (4) $27.73; (5) $25; (9) $465.23; (10) $12,349.18; (11) $12,814.41; (15) $2773, October 13, October 27, November 10, November 24, December 8, December 22, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C., biweekly newsletter; $25, December 31, pro rata amount of rent, fourth quarter.

A. 1. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) (a) The Reserve Officer.

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognisant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $21,749.18.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,510.
E. (2) $3,558.38; (4) $1,121.56; (5) $374.78; (6) $30.08; (7) $1,262.76; (8) $734.66; (9) $7,102.22; (10) $17,096.93; (11) $24,199.15; (15) $195.09, October 1, December 10, Shepherd Printing Co., 110 High Street, Portsmouth, Va., printing envelopes, letterheads, Christmas cards, etc.; $45.69, October 1, November 6, December 1, Commercial Office Furniture Co., 915 E Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $1,458.93, October 3, October 17, October 31, November 14, November 26, December 12, December 24, Walter L. Disbrow, 800 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C., salary, etc.[1]

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $425.
E. (10) $21.55; (11) $21.55.

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
E. (10) $0; (11) $0.

A. William M. Rice, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Engaged to advocate, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 14th Street, Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $68.84; (9) $68.84; (10) $442.01; (11) $510.85.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation which may relate to margarine.
D. (6) $25.
E. (7) $3; (9) $3; (10) $12.80; (11) $15.80.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,632.
E. (6) $16.95; (8) $175.05; (9) $192; (10) $660; (11) $852.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Suite 3, Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects, and appropriations for construction of projects.
E. (2) $346.11; (4) $23.10; (5) $155; (6) $19.56; (7) $25; (8) $11.12; (9) $579.89; (10) $1,810.43; (11) $2,390.32; (15).[1]

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of American farmers to grow and market sugar beets.
D. (6) $390.
E. (2) $74; (4) $20.36; (5) $68.43; (6) $16.61; (7) $483.95; (9) $663.35; (10) $1,404.71; (11) $2,068.06; (15).[1]

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, including: Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bason Act, UMT, Selective Service, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills, income retirement legislation. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry (see attached sheets for specific bill numbers).[1]
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In support of the Robinson-Patman Act, the law prohibiting unfair price discriminations. Opposed to S. 719, a bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor.
D. (6) $500.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interest in the enactment of S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries.
D and E. (See Ref. A.)[1]

A. John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $632.70; (11) $632.70.

A. Edward A. Rumely, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $990.
E. (7) $103.22; (9) $103.22; (10) $2,206.99; (11) $2,310.21.

A. Francis N. Russell, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (6) $13; (7) $7; (9) $20; (10) $621.55; (11) $641.55.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (10) $104.29; (11) $104.29.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $400.41; (9) $400.41; (10) $906.25; (11) $1,306.66; (15) dinner, Carroll Arms Hotel, (5), November 19, 1952, $15.75.

A. William Henry Ryan, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Lobbying, that is, supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,490.94.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $45; (11) $60; (14) $15.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Sterling St. John, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In support of act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 998, 1001), as amended, to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $20.
E. (7) $274.58; (9) $274.58; (10) $750.53; (11) $1,025.11; (15) $149.58, November 15, General Oglethorpe Hotel, Savannah, Ga., lunch, November 10, for special committee, AAPA; $125, November 10 to 15, out-of-pocket expenses for travel, food, and lodging in connection with meeting of AAPA in Savannah.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates.
D. (6) $950.
E. (2) $26.09; (6) $26.25; (9) $52.34; (10) $237.06; (11) $289.40; (15) $26.09, Superior Office Services, 524 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., stenographic work, during quarter; $26.25, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., long-distance calls, during quarter.

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social legislation.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (5) $102; (6) $36; (7) $48; (9) $186; (10) $438; (11) $624.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, which were enacted as section 4 of Public Law 594, 82d Congress, 2d session, approved July 21, 1952.
E. (2) $1,000; (9) $1,000; (10) $9,000; (11) $10,000.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health. Specific legislative interests include support of H. R. 910 (a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for nursing education); and support of H. R. 911 and S. 661 (a bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force). (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $2,900.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 N. Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 N. Jefferson Street., Roanoke, Va.
E. (10) $30.75; (11) $30.75.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Studies of Joint Committee on Railroad Retirement.
D. (6) $4,312.50.
E. (6) $8.19; (7) $1.75; (9) $9.94; (10) $38.43; (11) $48.37.

A. John W. Scott, 317 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Mildred Scott, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) "National Services for Disabled Persons Amendments of 1951" (introduced March 22, 1951, by Senator Douglas, and others) (opposed); to establish the Federal agency for handicapped—An act to increase defense manpower, and help preserve our Nation, by establishing the Federal Agency for Handicapped (for); tax exemptions for handicapped and for those who support handicapped who cannot care for themselves (for); National Leprosy Act (for).

A. Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., whose address is 927 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to taxation, government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $40; (9) $40; (10) $123.35; (11) $163.35.

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Defense Production Act; excise taxes; excess profits taxes.

A. Mr. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.
E. (10) $37.10; (11) $37.10.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.
D. (6) $5,649.99.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 8th Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For bills (1) to return tidelands to the States, (2) to provide for compensation to residents who are deprived of rights to damages by the Rome Convention, (3) to amend Surplus Airport Act to relax restrictions on grantees.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $2.55; (7) $175.49; (8) $22.50; (9) $200.54; (10) $380.52; (11) $581.06.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (10) $600.37; (11) $600.37.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation regarding silver.
D. (6) $1,195.
E. (2) $6,409.48; (5) $856.89; (6) $467.30; (7) $753.08; (8) $610.35; (9) $9,097.10; (10) $28,887.10; (11) $37,984.20.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, point 4, etc.; favor plans for universal disarmament; favor full cooperation with U. N. in economic and social welfare, UNICEF; favor modification of the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Nationality Act; oppose UMT, UMS, and military-aid program; oppose rearming Germany and Japan; other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (7) $58.80; (9) $58.80; (10) $133.30; (11) $192.10.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project, and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water-resources policies.
E. (2) $6,977.50; (8) $1,012.63; (9) $7,990.13; (10) $14,279.83; (11) $22,269.96; (15) $2,290, October 13, 1952, Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; $637.35, October 13, 1952, Northcutt Ely, reimbursement of expenses; $2,272.50, November 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, retainer and per diem; $11.95, November 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, reimbursement of expenses; $2,415, December 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, retainer and per diem; $363.33, December 10, 1952, Northcutt Ely, reimbursement of expenses.

A. Stephen G. Slipher, Room 512, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (See attached sheet).[1]
D. (5) $1,150.
E. (7) $12; (9) $12; (10) $46.75; (11) $58.95.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 138 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, narcotics, international relations, women and children: H. R. 1749, sale of alcohol to members of land and naval forces, etc. (for); H. R. 2187, reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials to security of United States (for); H. R. 2188, advertisement of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce (for); H. R. 2340, violations of narcotics laws (for); H. R. 264, use and sale of intoxicating beverages to Indians (against); H. R. 1206, District of Columbia sales-tax exemptions of foods in hotels, cafes, bars, etc. (against); H. R. 1736, excise tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc. (against); H. R. 3072, abolish functions of Indian Bureau, repeal act of June 18, 1934 (against); H. R. 2982, increase postal rates (against); S. 1046, increase postal rates (against); S. 1, universal service and training bill (against); S. 278, investigate radio and television programs (for).
D. (6) $612.
E. (5) $114.70; (6) $26.82; (9) $141.52; ($10) $1,259.60; (11) $1,401.12.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Forestry; regional development; resource conservation; labor relations.

A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests including the improvement of Government efficiency, elimination of waste and economy in Government. Specific interests include appropriations bills, bills to enact recommendations of the Hoover Commission, other reorganization proposals and substantive legislation involving Government expenditures.
D. (6) $2,708.36.
E. (6) $9.47; (7) $426.27; (9) $435.74; (10) $1,656.23; (11) 2,091.97.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co.
D. (6) $2,085.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $16,249.97.
E. (6) $100; (7) $857.27; (8) $348.60; (9) $1,305.87; (10) $3,154.08; (11) $4,459.95; (15) $14.79, October 3, 1952, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., lodging; $34.90, October 6, 1952, Hotel Fort Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, lodging; $35.36, October 9, 1952, Hotel Morrison, Chicago, Ill., lodging; $47.50, November 6, 1952, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone, etc.[1]

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $6,750.
E. (6) $41.52; (7) $1,285.14; (8) $7.50; (9) $1,334.16; (10) $2,769.07; (11) $4,103.23; (15) $12.33, November 11, 1952, Saxony Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., luncheon conference; $70, November 10, 1952, Red Coach Inn, Miami Beach, Fla., dinner conference; $54, November 11, 1952, Hurricane Inn, Miami, Fla., dinner conference; $10.50, December 6, 1952, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon conference.

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, Room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $750.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $29,484.33.
E. (2) $15,986.92; (4) $3,766.79; (5) $1,323.12; (6) $136.81; (7) $485.89; (8) $605.88; (9) $22,305.41; (10) $61,578.15; (11) $83,883.56.

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H. R. 2423, H. R. 6228, H. R. 2422, S. 510, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2345, H. R. 1313, S. 1125, Public Law 234, Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, and all legislation pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act, and to secure additional benefits for the rank and file employees covered by the Railroad Retirement Act. (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $1,400; (6) $38.20; (7) $143.19; (9) $5,115.89; (10) $8,237.55; (11) $11,353.44.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. Numerous House and Senate bills dealing with the subject of bonding of Federal employees and bills reactivating War Damage Corporation.
D. (6) $150.
E. (10) $15.25; (11) $15.25.

A. Charles I. Stengle, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,403.80.
E. (7) $11.20; (9) $11.20; (10) $99.90; (11) $111.10.

A. Mrs. Nell P. Stephens, L. P. N., Post Office Box 6261, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (a) To license all nurses alike—national and all United States Territories and District of Columbia.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street., Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $3,911.90.
E. (7) $459.83; (8) $152.07; (9) $611.90; (10) $687.11; (11) $1,299.01.

A. Erskine Stewart, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $39.55; (11) $40.80.

A. Wilson E. Still, 163 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $352.94; (9) $352.94; (10) $711.27; (11) $1,064.21.

A Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,965.17.
E. (7) $495.25; (8) $44.92; (9) $540.17; (10) $132.96; (11) $673.13.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American Merchant Marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $19.84; (9) $19.84; (10) $54.57; (11) $74.41.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) National Services for Disabled Persons Amendments of 1951 (introduced March 22, 1951, by Senator DOUGLAS and others)—opposed; to establish the Federal agency for handicapped—an act to increase defense manpower, and help preserve our Nation, by establishing the Federal Agency for Handicapped—for; tax exemptions for handicapped and for those who support handicapped who cannot care for themselves—for; National Leprosy Act—for.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,025.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1084 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Assn., 1084 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits.
D. (6) $1,340.46.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3).[1]
D. (6) $625.
E. (10) $18.50; (11) $18.50.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal Valley Authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence basin. For legislation to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several States.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $44; (5) $20.92; (6) $10.26; (7) $912.25; (8) $680.26; (9) $1,667.69; (10) $2,920.80; (11) $4,637.49; (15) $44, October 3, 8, 10, 17, 31, November 7, 14, 22, 28, December 5, 12, 16, 23, Billy White, Austin, Tex., janitor service; $65.68, October 24, November 24, December 29, Austin Club, Austin, Tex., dues, locker rental, entertainment; $10, November 1, Texas Friends of Conservation, Inc., Houston, Tex., membership dues; $11.04, December 1, Eldon Powell, florist, flowers for Judge Clifford H. Stone's funeral, etc.[1]

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before the Senate Finance Committee; Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee; House Veterans Affairs Committee; 2 Post Office and Civil Service Committees; 2 Armed Services Committees.
D. (6) $2,906.60.

A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.
B. Louis Cary, successor trustee of Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bond holders of Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank, of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For H. R. 6313.
E. (10) $59; (11) $59; (12) $59.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 310 Commerce Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, IRC.
D. (6) $640.50.
E. (2) $521.25; (4) $99.81; (5) $160; (6) $11.30; (7) $96.75; (8) $22.84; (9) $913.95; (10) $2,594.39; (11) $3,508.34.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C. (formerly 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.)
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C. (formerly 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.).

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $2,362.50.
E. (10) $16.45; (11) $16.45.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Mutual Security Agency; Department of Agriculture.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $338.09; (8) $42.39; (9) $380.48; (11) $380.48.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.
D. (6) $2,462.37.
E. (5) $484.71; (6) $41.64; (9) $526.35; (10) $1,789.90; (11) $2,316.25.

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attached statement.)[1]

A. John U. Terrell, 424 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) S. 75 and H. R. 1500.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th (Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station), Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. For legislation to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several States.
D. (6) $6,713.
E. (1) $661.66; (2) $1,894.54; (4) $942.07; (5) $625.88; (6) $289.20; (7) $1,619.62; (8) $2,640.17; (9) $8,673.14; (10) $15,663.89; (11) $24,337.03; (15) $10.50, November 15, J. R. Railey, Austin, Tex., 6 months' subscription to Dallas Morning News; $11.90, November 15, Curry Office Supply, Austin, Tex., mimeograph supplies; $142.85, November 15, L. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Smith & Corona Typewriters, Inc., typewriter, etc.[1]

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev. (one-third each): The Union Pacific Railroad Co., the Western Pacific Railroad Co., Southern Pacific Co.

C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads. The St. Lawrence Waterway; H. R. 7838, Comer bill.

D. (6) $675.

E. (10) $423.64; (11) $423.64.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.

D. (6) $6,166.66.

E. (7) $30.50; (9) $30.50; (10) $439.75; (11) $470.25.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (10) $33.75; (11) $33.75.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street, Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interest. (For specific legislative interests, see p. 3, attached.)[1]

E. (10) $98.75; (11) $98.75.

A. Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, 322 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,750.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market milk.

D. (6) $2,178.72.

E. (10) $123.68; (11) $123.68.

A. John H. Todd, 1008 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.

E. (10) $15.58; (11) $15.58.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.

B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.

C. (2) My only interest has been in the size of the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.

D. (6) $600.

E. (6) $1.46; (9) $1.46; (10) $1,000; (11) $1,001.46.

A. Matt Triggs, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Provisions of agricultural legislation, repeal of resale price maintenance; immigration regulations, farm labor; selective-service regulations, Mexican farm labor importation; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; transportation legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing.

D. (6) $1,687.50.

E. (10) $144.38; (11) $144.38.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry. Specifically, in the 82d Congress: H. R. 1755 and S. 1693; S. 2325 and S. 2714.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. Unemployed Service Association, 623 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) No specific bill but various proposals for unemployed people.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 50 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) $1,000.03; (7) $200.35; (9) $1,200.38; (10) $3,507.93; (11) $4,708.31.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw cane sugar specifically.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See appended statement A).[1]

D. (6) $82,441.36.

E. (1) $1,196.69; (4) $1,377.58; (9) $2,574.27; (10) $15,216.08; (11) $17,790.35; (15) (see appended statement D).[1]

A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Virginia Associated Businessmen, 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va.

C. (2) All Federal legislation relating to equality of taxation, governmental economy, and tax reduction.

D. (6) $1,198.68.

E.[1]

A. Vitrified China Association, Inc., 517 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Mutual security; military manpower.

A. H. Jerry Voorhis.

B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the health, welfare, and safety of the American people.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. James A. Waggener, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. John E. Walker, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Engaged to advocate, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2).

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).[1]

D. (6) $6,999.94.

E. (7) $654.03; (8) $84.65; (9) $738.68; (10) $1,642.62; (11) $2,381.30.

A. Thomas G. Walters, Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.

D. (6) $2,277.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.

B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.

C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

D. (6) $3,500.

E. (6) $35.24; (9) $35.24; (10) $1,185.35; (11) $1,220.59.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, 616-623 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Kefauver bill (S. 1976), Home Rule for the District of Columbia.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

E. (10) $500; (11) $500.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio- and television-broadcasting industry.

A. J. R. Watson, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, I. C. R. R. Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.
E. (10) $146.71; (11) $146.71.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and, incidentally, organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $75; (11) $100; (14) $25.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (See preliminary report.)[1]

A. William E. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,050.50.
E. (3) $61.60; (5) $18.65; (6) $38.53; (7) $161.88; (8) $351.56; (9) $652.42; (10) $2,100.39; (11) $2,752.81; (12) $10; (15) $20, October 13, December 12, LaD. McG. Kriner, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., petty cash fund; $42.53, October 17, November 18, the Mayflower, Washington, D. C., charges, September 10, 1952; $32, October 17, November 21, the National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues and tax, fourth quarter; employees' Christmas fund, and tickets for country store night, etc.[1]

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.)[1]
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Charles F. West, Jr., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $500.

A. Edward K. Wheeler, Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.
C. (2) Measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $19.88; (11) $21.13.

A. George Y. Wheeler II, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (10) $83.50; (11) $83.50.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building., Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carrier Act.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (8) $1.25; (9) $1.25; (10) $25.70; (11) $26.95.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.,
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) $3,125.02.
E. (2) $31.25; (4) $11.40; (5) $15.98; (6) $3.99; (7) $7.12; (9) $69.74; (10) $197.53; (11) $267.27.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.
D. (6) $1,702.89.
E. (2) $1,200; (5) $278.55; (6) $8.88; (7) $165.51; (8) $50; (9) $1,702.89; (10) $2,199.83; (11) $3,902.72.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 161 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. C. J. S. Williamson, 421 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General major legislation and specific bills or regulations of interest to California economy.
E. (2) $6,680; (7) $1,881.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $3,750.

E. (7) $974.78; (9) $974.78; (10) $1,195.51; (11) $2,170.29.

A. Frank J. Wilson, 1246 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees. (3) The Annuitant.
E. (10) $100; (11) $100.

A. Everett T. Winter, Mississippi Valley Association, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislative matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American Merchant Marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (10) $1,469.43; (11) $1,469.43.

A. Harley Z. Wooden.
B. The International Council for Exceptional Children serving as a department of the National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the education and well-being of the exceptional child, both the handicapped and the gifted. (3) Monthly section in the journal, Exceptional Children.

A. Walter P. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.[1]
D. (6) $4,894.32.
E. (6) $56.01; (7) $411.51; (9) $467.52; (10) $4,937.78; (11) $5,405.30; (15) $14, October 21, Hotel Adolphus, Dallas, Tex., hotel expense; $14.40, October 25, University of Texas, Austin, Tex., football tickets; $37.50, November 6, Shamrock Hotel, Houston, Tex., hotel expense, etc.[1]

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See attached.)[1]
D. (6) $2,109.38.
E. (7) $6.95; (9) $8.95; (10) $98.09; (11) $107.04.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Mr. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (10) $406.78; (11) $406.78.

A. J. Banks Young, 1632 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $60.
E. (7) $159.91; (9) $159.91; (10) $272.89; (11) $432.80.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations, and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. Carlisle Bargeron, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to St. Lawrence waterway and power project. (Opposed). (4) $1,500 per month and reimbursement for traveling and out of pocket expenses.

A. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Clive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Legislative interests consist of advocating, before appropriate members and Committees of the Congress and Administrative Agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2). (4) $200 per diem.

A. Col. H. A. Cole, 2011½ Jackson Street, Dallas Tex.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Repeal of section 1700 (a) as amended by section 1650 IRC (20-percent tax on theater admissions). (3) "Your Plan for Tax Repeal." (4) Traveling and miscellaneous expenses estimated $500 per month.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) "The Retired Officer." (4) Anticipated expenses: None. Monthly salary $400.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Repeal of section 1700 (a) as amended by section 1650 IRC (20-percent tax on theater admissions). (3) "Your Plan for Tax Repeal." (4) Salary and expenses approximately $500 a week; estimated time spent on this drive 10 percent per month (allocation $200 a month).

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn. and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Revere Copper and Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting copper.

A. Wallace G. Dempsey, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are limited to advising and assisting the Ambassador of Denmark in securing a legislative lump sum final settlement of unsatisfied claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States Government in 1941. No bills for such a settlement have yet been introduced.

A. Doherty, Rumble, Butler & Mitchell, E-1006 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) See legislative policies, page 106 of agenda, attached to employer's return for third quarter, 1952. (4) Expenses covering travel and entertainment, estimated $50 monthly. Annual salary $9,000 covering all duties—unknown portion of time to be devoted to legislation.

A. Kenneth W. Ingwalson, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislative matters concerning agriculture. (4) Annual salary: $9,000.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

A. Charles W. Jones, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized. (4) (See attached statement.) [1]

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Zionist Council, 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

C. (2) American assistance to Israel. (4) Monthly compensation of $1,120. Expenses for travel, publications, etc., estimated at $600 per month.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are limited to advising and assisting the Ambassador of Denmark in securing a legislative lump sum final settlement of unsatisfied claims arising from the requisitioning of 40 Danish vessels by the United States Government in 1941. No bills for such a settlement have yet been introduced.

A. McClure & Updike, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.

C. (2) Amendments of Internal Revenue Code.

A. Pat McGee, 1441 Welton Street, Denver, Colo.

B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Repeal of section 1700 (a) as amended by section 1650 Internal Revenue Code (20 percent tax on theater admissions). (3) Your Plan for Tax Repeal. (4) Traveling and miscellaneous expenses estimated $500 per month.

A. Leslie T. Mahurin, 5001 Battery Lane, Bethesda, Md.

B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The general legislative interests are the same as those of the organization which are in large part but not exclusively exemplified by the bills which are indexed in the Digest of Public General Bills issued by the library under the captions, "Public Officers and Employees," "Retirement," and "Taxation, Exemptions to Annuitants." (4) $110 per month.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States and Hawaii. (4) Actual out-of-pocket expenses $200 per month retainer.

A. Howard E. Munro, Room 607, A. F. of L. Building, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.

C. (2) All legislation affecting A. F. of L. union members employed on the Canal Zone. (4) $600 per month salary plus $20 per day expenses.

A. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.

A. Peter R. Nehemkis, Jr., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Home Laundry Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Repeal of manufacturer's excise tax on electric and gas dryers and mechanical ironers. (3) Petition for submission to the Congress (in the forms of brochure) setting forth arguments why excise tax should be repealed. (4) Total anticipated expenses (including monthly compensation), $17,091.95. Monthly compensation, $750.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States.

C. (2) Legislation affecting Guam. For omnibus bill making certain legislation applicable to Guam. Against legislation that would adversely affect Guam and for legislation that would be of assistance to Guam. For an act making National Guard Act applicable to Guam. (4) $2,500 every 3 months for fees and $625 every three months in lieu of expenses plus actual traveling expenses. It is expected that this and $600 for traveling will cover all expenses. This covers legal work other than legislative but difficult to separate.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General legislative interests of American Trucking Associations, Inc., include all bills, resolutions, and investigations affecting the trucking industry. (3) Special Legislative Bulletins, Transport Topics,

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Truck Beat. (4) Anticipated expenses: Nominal, taxi fares, etc.; annual compensation: $14,000 per annum.

A. Murray Preston, 901 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of certain legislation to be introduced on construction and operation of a St. Lawrence seaway. (4) $75 a day in Washington; $100 a day, plus expenses while traveling and away from Washington. (None specifically anticipated at this time.)

A. William M. Rice, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Engaged to advocate, before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2). (4) Anticipated expenses consist of telephone, travel, food, lodging and entertainment and are not expected to exceed an aggregate of $500; daily rate of compensation for services will be $200.

A. Randolph S. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.

C. (2) Mutual Security Agency; Department of Agriculture. (4) Salary $10,000 per annum. Actual expenses, principally for travel and expenses incident to travel.

A. Seeve Toney, 600 57th Avenue, Capitol Heights, Md.

C. (2) 25 percent tax cut; $2,400 exemption for married couples; $800 exemptions for dependents. Eliminate inheritance taxes. Make deductible all medical, dental, and hospital expenses.

A. John E. Walker, 631 Tower Building, 14th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Central Public Utility Corp., 1017 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (2) Engaged to advocate before appropriate Members and committees of the Congress and administrative agencies, amendment of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the inclusion, in subsection 458 (d) (2), of the principle now set forth in subsection 441 (g) (2). (4) Anticipated expenses consist of telephone, travel, food, lodging, and entertainment and are not expected to exceed an aggregate of $500; daily rate of compensation for services will be $200.

A. Oliver Francis White, 418 Third Street, Stambaugh, Mich.

C. (2) Against any legislation legalizing developed, "Thought and Nerve Impulse Transmitters," which are also Telecremators and Teleportage devices. Lobby for an open committee investigation of the organization working the above-mentioned devices. (4) Printing and postage, $75 per quarter.

A. John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rifle Association, 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) General interest in firearms legislation.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 8, 1953

(Legislative day of Monday, April 6, 1953)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, with minds burdened for the Nation and for the world we turn to Thee, in this baffling hour, praying that in this fear-haunted earth the flame of our faith may not grow dim. Unworthy though we are, Thou hast made us keepers of the holy torch of freedom the fathers kindled with their lives. We would share that sacred fire until tyranny everywhere having been consumed, all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.

Steel our wills and steady our hands with power and wisdom, that with eager joy we may dedicate the Nation's strength to throw open the gates of a new life for Thy children everywhere. We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 7, 1953, is dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent that, without the Senator from Texas losing the privilege of the floor, Members may be permitted to introduce bills, submit resolutions, and present other routine matters which would be in order if there were a morning hour, their remarks, however, in any case, not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. MARTIN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Shortage of Ammunition of the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MARTIN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to continue hearings for the remainder of the week during sessions of the Senate.

ANNUAL-LEAVE LAWS FOR CIVIL-SERVICE EMPLOYEES—PETITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a petition signed by 47 employees of the Veterans' Administration at Fort Snelling, Minn., relating to the annual-leave laws for civil-service employees.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION FROM VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, FORT SNELLING, MINN.

We, the Federal civil-service employees of the State of Minnesota, do hereby petition Congress to amend existing annual-leave laws for the following reasons:

1. Government agencies are affected by changes in economic conditions and political parties. While new agencies are born, others die. This creates a degree of instability and insecurity. Government employees lack unemployment compensation. A sudden, unexpected reduction in force creates in numerous instances undue hardship. Immediate employment is sought without regard to choice of position. Former Government employees, realizing the value of unemployment compensation, soon become alienated by shortsighted Federal employment practices. A fixed leave accumulation would remedy this "no leave" situation.

2. Annual leave accumulated during a given year must be consumed by the first day of the succeeding fiscal year. This ruling constitutes a hardship, especially so in the case of new employees, because of the fiscal June-July severance. Vacation must either be taken before the end of June or annual leave must be rebuilt during the months of July, August, and September. In a cold climate such as Minnesota's, this is far from an ideal situation. It defeats the purpose of a revitalizing 2-week vacation. A calendar year severance would remedy this poor vacation condition.

CONCLUSION

It is requested therefore that 480 hours annual leave be established as a reasonable maximum leave accumulation within a given calendar year and that any annual leave in excess of said 480 hours shall be subject to forfeiture at the end of any given calendar year.

We, the undersigned, therefore resolve that the above amendments be given due consideration for enactment into law.

(Signatures omitted.)

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—STATEMENT AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in connection with the so-called submerged lands joint resolution Senators are debating a measure applicable to the waters of the ocean. At this time let me say that I have prepared a statement regarding the St. Lawrence Waterway and power project. I look forward to hearing the same Senators state their positions about that project, which will be before the Senate a little later.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement which I have prepared on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and the need for urgent action on the so-called

Wiley bill (S. 589) providing for the creation of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, and so forth, together with three resolutions adopted by the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of Wisconsin Rapids, La Crosse, and Neillsville, in the State of Wisconsin. I request that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the statement and resolutions will be printed in the RECORD, and the resolutions will be appropriately referred.

The statement by Senator WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Yesterday afternoon, it was my pleasure to discuss with the Chief Executive of our country the vital issue of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Next Tuesday, April 14, the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the St. Lawrence Seaway is opening 3 days of public hearings on this issue.

The purpose of these hearings is to come to an answer, basically on a single question: Do we or do we not as a nation want to join with Canada in construction of the seaway canals?

If we do not, the Canadian Government is ready, willing, and eager to go ahead with the project. Just yesterday, the ranking minister of the Canadian Cabinet, the Right Honorable C. D. Howe, Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking before a Town Hall forum in New York City, reemphasized the urgency with which Canada seeks to go ahead on its own behalf in this project.

This latest statement by this distinguished official, completely demolishes the arguments of those seaway opponents on this side of the border who have so ridiculously contended that there is or was the slightest doubt as to the intentions of Canada.

On the contrary, the Canadians are unequivocally committed to the construction, as soon as the power license has been granted to New York State and Ontario.

In that connection, I earnestly trust that in line with President Eisenhower's firm position, which he reiterated to me personally yesterday, that the Federal Power Commission will quit stalling and will approve the New York State-Ontario application for the construction of the hydroelectric project. This approval is crucially necessary to serve the expanding electric needs of that great industrial area of New York, New England, and the bordering areas of Canada.

New York State and its power authority have been completely prepared down through the years to proceed with the power construction, in conjunction with the Province of Ontario. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey has with vision and judgment, long established a firm legislative and executive foundation for the necessary action.

I trust therefore, that there will be no further delay in the FPC approval of the power project. Approval, of course, is only the first step toward the construction of the navigation phase.

The BPW resolutions represent but a few of the great many of which I have received, and they cover but one vital segment of Wisconsin society. Our women's groups have joined with all other segments of America's dairyland to devotedly support this important dual purpose, dual nation effort. I congratulate them and assure them of my own continued efforts toward this great objective.

Not all the selfish lobbying by the railroads, the coal interests, the fearful Atlantic or gulf ports or all the other backward-looking would-be saboteurs of the seaway can deter us in this noble fight.

The resolutions presented by Mr. WILEY were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB,
Wisconsin Rapids, Wis., March 17, 1953.

Whereas Canada is ready to build the St. Lawrence seaway without United States participation after many years of waiting for cooperation on this project; and

Whereas there is a great need to improve and develop Great Lakes transportation for national defense and the welfare of industry and agriculture in the Midwest; and

Whereas as business and professional women, we feel charged with the responsibility of promoting and encouraging action in the best interests of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Business and Professional Women's Club of Wisconsin Rapids approve of speedy legislation for the immediate construction of the St. Lawrence seaway by joint American-Canadian action; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relation Committee, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, and to Wisconsin Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY; and to Representatives CLEMENT ZABLOCKI and CHARLES KERSTEN.

LA CROSSE BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB,
La Crosse, Wis., March 17, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This club at its March meeting, passed the following resolution:

"Be it resolved by the La Crosse Business and Professional Women's Club, That this organization commend our Senators and Representative for their stand on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project and urge their continued support until the project becomes a reality."

And, it is further the writer's hope and trust that the Republicans may be able to do a thorough, conscientious, and wise housecleaning in our Government.

Very truly,

DORA D. MARSHALL,
Legislative Chairman.

"Whereas there is before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of the 83d Congress, a bill relative to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and

"Whereas the building of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project serves our national interest by furthering our Nation's economy and by improving our national defense: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Neillsville Business and Professional Women's Club approve wholeheartedly and urge speedy legislation for its immediate construction; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to our Senators, Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, who is also the Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, and Hon. JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, and to our Representative of the Ninth District of Wisconsin, the Honorable MERLIN HULL."

Passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the executive board of the Business and Professional Women's Club, of Neillsville, Wis., this 9th day of March 1953.

VIRGINIA GABSEN,
President.

PAT N. VAN GORDEN,
Secretary.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

S. 1583. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to treat as an involuntary conversion the sale or exchange of property by a taxpayer in order to remove a legal inhibition on his discharging governmental duties; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1584. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE (by request):

S. 1585. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 1586. A bill for the relief of Maria Pia Baccarelli; and

S. 1587. A bill for the relief of Elias A. Papastergiou (Louis A. Pappas); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1588. A bill to grant price support on certain wool of the 1951 clip; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1589. A bill to authorize the expansion of post-office facilities at Williston, N. Dak.; and

S. 1590. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post-office building in Mandan, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1591. A bill to provide for a review by the Court of Military Appeals in certain cases in which relief pursuant to section 12 of the act of May 5, 1950 (64 Stat. 147) was denied by The Judge Advocate General of any of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1592. A bill for the relief of Harriet T. Johnston; and

S. 1593 (by request). A bill for the relief of Michele Bevivino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1594. A bill for the relief of Berenice Catherine Montgomery; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1595. A bill for the relief of Stamatoula S. Roumanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (by request):

S. 1596. A bill to amend Public Law 815, 81st Congress, to provide a temporary program of assistance in the construction of minimum school facilities in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; and

S. 1597. A bill to amend Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress so as to make improvements in its provisions and extend its duration for a 2-year period, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS RELATING TO THE SALE OR EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate refer-

ence a bill to amend section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to treat as an involuntary conversion the sale or exchange of certain property.

The bill (S. 1583) to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to treat as an involuntary conversion the sale or exchange of property by a taxpayer in order to remove a legal inhibition on his discharging governmental duties, introduced by Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, announcements in the public press within the past few days concerning the disposal of certain securities by the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, recall to mind the discussions, difficulties, and controversy surrounding the confirmation of this highly qualified and outstanding business leader as Secretary of Defense. On January 19, 1953, in an effort to facilitate his confirmation, I proposed that an exception to the tax law be immediately enacted to apply to all or any businessmen, industrialists or others who might be confronted with a comparable situation upon entering the Government service.

This exception would permit such persons to dispose of controversial stocks and avoid the tax on capital gains, providing the principal and profits therefrom are immediately used to purchase noncontroversial securities. In which case, the newly purchased securities would take the same cost basis of the old securities so that at subsequent sale of the new securities any resulting profits would be taxed on the basis of the original cost of the old stocks. Thus, the profit tax is not eliminated but only postponed or deferred until such time as a voluntary sale is made.

The bill has ensued from my earlier suggestion and an intensive study of the subject, and is basically intended to furnish an added stimulus in attracting persons of great competence and qualifications to the field of government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Maryland that 2 minutes have expired.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. May I have a half minute or a quarter of a minute in order to conclude my statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland asks for an additional half minute. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object. It is necessary to hold to the 2 minutes if we are to accomplish the work that is before us.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of my statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement of Mr. BUTLER of Maryland was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMAINDER OF STATEMENT OF MR. BUTLER OF MARYLAND

The legislation proposes that in instances where a private citizen must dispose of securities to qualify for a governmental position, the transaction would be treated as an involuntary conversion, and that taxes on profits would be deferred in much the same way that certain real-estate operations with respect to the sale of private dwellings are now treated.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT TO IMPROVE LEPROSY SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to make at least a beginning at correcting some of the evils which we have for generations been perpetrating in connection with those unfortunate enough to suffer from Hansen's disease. To anyone who knows the facts concerning these poor people it comes as a distinct shock to realize that now, in the middle of the 20th century, millions of Americans are still uninformed as to the nature of this disease and that we have on the statute books of the several States, and in fact, among the statutes of the United States itself, laws based upon medieval conceptions, laws which work great and unnecessary hardships on people to whom we should be extending every possible aid.

I do hope that the Congress at this session will show sufficient interest to study this bill. If it does, I am quite sure the result will be favorable action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the close of these remarks a letter on this subject sent me by Mr. Iglesias, an active leader among the patients in our Public Health Service hospital at Carville, La. I believe that anyone reading this letter carefully will note the difficulties under which these sufferers from Hansen's disease are forced to labor in order to bring their problems to the attention of Congress and of the people. I believe, too, they will notice the great-hearted resourcefulness with which they manage to cope with these problems and the cheerful spirit they somehow manage to maintain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1584) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letter presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

JOLLY SOCIAL CLUB FOR BLIND,
UNITED STATES MARINE HOSPITAL,
Carville, La., February 5, 1953.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: I know from the past that you were the one that had brought the national leprosy bill in your Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in 1952, and we were so happy because we believed that something at last would be done. It ended the same way as it did in the other 4 years preceding 1952. But we are not disheartened as I feel as do the patients here that so long as we have a champion such as you in the end we will win. I urge you in behalf of the 50 patients in the Jolly Social Club (all either totally blind or crippled) to introduce the national leprosy bill at this session. Following are some of the reasons why this bill should be passed through the Senate and House as swiftly as possible to right many of the wrongs done us in the name of society.

1. When the head of the house is diagnosed as having Hansen's disease he or she is O. K.'d and segregated immediately and sent to this hospital from a few miles to over twenty-three hundred miles, no thought is given to the plight of the remaining members of the patients who would be in need of financial help.

2. Once an individual's health breaks down with Hansen's disease the body cannot withstand hard physical labor. Upon being discharged after being confined in this hospital for 5, 10, or 15 or as high as 25 years, all the Government does is to take the dischargee to the railroad in New Orleans and there the responsibility ends. No thought is given to the fate of the patient—he or she—nor of the patient's family. Many dischargees have returned to this hospital after a year or so with their loved ones because their health broke down through hard physical labor and then to face the terrible prolonged stay here to regain a semblance of former health. This has happened so many times in the past.

3. There are many of us here now that are discharged at the present time and who are reluctant to return to our homes because many of the patients would be an added burden to an already strained income. Quite a few, as in this club that I head, are blind or crippled either from the disease or from the drugs used in the treatment.

4. The Federal Government spends on each patient between $10 and $12 a day here. Would it not be an economy of around $200 to the Government if each patient (citizen) upon receiving a discharge get a scaled pension according to handicap or a pension to all so that everyone can go home thus making room for newly discovered victims.

There are many more reasons for the urgent passage of the national leprosy bill that I can give you if there is need and I will give you if you so desire but for the present I end it by saying this: One of the principal reasons for our isolation is for the protection of the public. After years of isolation and segregation with broken homes and businesses—yes even loss of families and friends—the Government through the Congress should give us a pension in token of our enforced stay here which had taken our liberty although guaranteed under the Constitution.

Senator MURRAY, I am president of the Patients' Federation as well as the president of the Jolly Social Club and I implore you with all the humility that I have to do this for a very small minority of people that have been made more to feel like criminals rather than just poor people that are sick.

You can use this letter in any way that you see fit in trying for a passage of the bill.

If I can be of future service in this matter, please let me know.

With best wishes to you and God bless you, I am,

BUDDY IGLESIAS,
President.

AMENDMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT, 1925

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the request of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia recommending the enactment of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1585) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, introduced by Mr. CASE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The letter is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1953.

The Honorable FRANCIS CASE,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CASE: The Commissioners have the honor to submit herewith a draft of a bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended.

The proposed legislation amends the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925 (43 Stat. 1121), as amended (title 40, secs. 301–303, 601–603, 605, 609, 610, 614, and 615; and title 11, secs. 601, 616, 617, 621, 623, and 1407, D. C. Code, 1951 ed.), so as to accomplish the following:

1. Permit the Director of Vehicles and Traffic of the District of Columbia to accept evidence of a person's ability to operate a motor vehicle (e. g., an operator's permit issued by a State) in lieu of requiring a road test.

2. Make the learner's permit valid for a straight 60-day period, instead of the present 30-day period and a 30-day extension.

3. Permit motor-vehicle operators under 18 years of age to drive any passenger-type motor vehicle (but not for compensation), rather than only a vehicle owned by himself, his parent or guardian, or a driving school.

4. Provide for the extension of operator's permits of persons in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine who are on active duty outside the District of Columbia.

5. Clarify the provisions of the Traffic Act relating to motor vehicle registration reciprocity and the licensing of operators.

6. Exempt Members of Congress, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, and administrative employees of Members of Congress, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, who are legal residents of the State or Territory from which the Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they are employed has been elected, from the requirements of registration of their motor vehicles and the licensing of operators thereof in the District.

7. Provide for the mandatory revocation of the operator's permit or privilege to drive in the District of any person convicted in the District of certain stated offenses.

Under section 7 (a) (1) of the Traffic Act, the Director of Vehicles and Traffic of the District of Columbia, who has been designated by the Commissioners to act as their agent, requires an applicant for a motor vehicle operator's permit to give a practical demonstration of his ability to operate a motor vehicle. Frequently, however, an applicant possesses an operator's permit or driver's license issued by another jurisdiction where a driving or road test equivalent to that of the District is required as a condition precedent to the issuance of such permit or license. The proposed amendment of section 7 (a) (1) would authorize the Director to honor an operator's permit issued by another jurisdiction, in lieu of requiring the applicant for a District operator's permit to take a road test.

The bill also amends section 7 (a) (2) of the Traffic Act to provide for the issuance of a learner's permit for a period of 60 days (in lieu of the present period of 30 days, with authority to extend such permit for an additional 30 days). The Director has found by experience that the majority of such permits are renewed for an additional 30 days. A straight 60-day period would reduce the inconvenience to the learner of having to have his permit extended, and also would reduce the administrative burden on the Department of Vehicles and Traffic. The amendment also provides that a learner may drive any passenger vehicle (rather than a professional driving-school vehicle or one owned by himself, his parent, or guardian), provided such vehicle is used solely for purposes of pleasure and is not operated for compensation. This will permit a young driver to use the motor vehicle of a friend for purposes of instruction and taking the required road test, and will reduce his expenses in connection with securing an operator's permit, since should he, his parent, or guardian not possess a motor vehicle, he would not be put to the expense and inconvenience of hiring a professional motor vehicle instructor and his vehicle to teach him the operation of a motor vehicle and to take the required road test. Instead, he would be able to use a vehicle owned by a friend, and receive his instruction from such friend.

Existing law does not authorize the Director to extend the validity of the operator's permit of a member of the Armed Forces while the holder of such permit remains on active duty out of the District of Columbia. The bill adds a new paragraph to subsection (a) of section 7 to authorize the Director to extend for a period not in excess of 6 years the validity of the operator's permit of a person in the Armed Forces or the merchant marine, when such person is on active duty outside the District of Columbia.

Section 4 of the bill deletes the requirement in subsection (b) of section 7 that an operator's permit contain a space "wherein the police court judges or their subordinates are required to note convictions of violations of sections 9, 10, and 11 of the act to provide for the regulation of motor vehicle traffic, etc., in the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1925." Inasmuch as such a notation no longer is made, but in lieu thereof an examination is made of the operator's traffic violation record, this provision of existing law is obsolete.

Section 5 of the bill also deletes an obsolete requirement of existing law, and redesignates the remaining subsections of section 7.

Section 6 of the bill expands subsection (a) of section 8 of the Traffic Act to clarify the reciprocity provisions of such act. At the present time, the District of Columbia and approximately half of the States have automatic reciprocity laws. Under these automatic reciprocity laws, with each jurisdiction agreeing to do exactly what the other jurisdiction would do under reverse circumstances, no definite course of action may be determined. Section 8 (a) as amended by the bill, will extend to nonresident motor vehicle operators the same privileges that the nonresident operator's home jurisdiction extends to District residents, but the amendment provides that when the reciprocity provision of the other jurisdiction is the same as the District's or where the privilege extended to a legal resident of the District is for the remaining portion of the current District registration year, then residents of such jurisdiction coming into the District of Columbia shall, at the expiration of the current registration year of such jurisdiction, comply with District licensing and registration requirements.

It would be possible, however, without further provision in the bill, for inequities to arise. For example, the provision discussed in the previous paragraph, necessary as it is to clarify the present situation, nevertheless might result in one person's registration being valid for only 1 day, while another person's registration might be valid for as much as a year, depending on that portion of the registration year remaining at the time such person became a resident of the District. Accordingly, the proposed bill also provides, in a case involving a stand-off between the District and another jurisdiction (as the result of which the registration of a motor vehicle is to be deemed valid for the remainder of a current registration year), that the Commissioners or their designated agent shall have authority to enter into a reciprocal agreement or arrangement further limiting or extending the time during which such registration shall be deemed valid. This authority, it is believed, will permit the Commissioners to take action to prevent the inequitable treatment of motor vehicle owners who might otherwise become the victims of circumstance.

Section 6 of the bill also adds a provision exempting Members of Congress, Delegates and Resident Commissioners, and the administrative employees of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners who are legal residents of the State, Territory, or possession from which the Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they are employed has been elected or appointed, from the requirements of registration of their motor vehicles and the licensing of operators thereof in the District. Under section 8 (a) of existing law, the Director, as the agent of the Commissioners, is required to make certain findings as to the privileges extended to legal residents of the District by other jurisdictions in the matter of exempting them from compliance with any provision of law or regulation requiring the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators thereof, and then from time to time to cause such findings to be promulgated. Frequently, these findings have disclosed that under a strict interpretation of this section, not even Members of Congress are exempt from the requirements of registration of their motor vehicles and the licensing of operators in the District. To clarify this point with respect to Members of Congress and certain of their employees, the bill amends section 8 (a) so as to except them from the registration and licensing requirements of the act.

Section 7 of the bill strikes the third sentence of section 10 (b), since this provision is included in a new subsection added to the act by section 8 of the proposed bill.

Section 8 of the bill adds new subsections (d) and (e) to section 10 of the act. Subsection (d) would require the mandatory revocation of the operator's permit or the privilege to drive a motor vehicle in the District of any person who is convicted in the District in five categories of cases: (1) Operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor or narcotic drug; (2) any homicide committed by means of a motor vehicle; (3) leaving the scene of an accident in which the motor vehicle driven by him was involved and in which there is personal injury, without giving assistance or making known his identity and address and the identity and address of the owner of the vehicle; (4) reckless driving involving personal injury; and (5) any felony in the commission of which a motor vehicle is used.

Subsection (e) would require the clerk of the court in which a person has been convicted of any offense set forth in subsection (d), to certify such conviction to the Commissioners or their designated agent for the action required by subsection (d).

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia believe that the proposed amendments of the Traffic Act are necessary and desirable, and will facilitate the administration of the act. Accordingly they strongly recommend the early enactment of the proposed bill.

The proposed draft of bill was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and returned to the Commissioners with the advice that there is no objection on the part of that office to the presentation of the bill to Congress.

Yours very sincerely,

F. JOSEPH DONOHUE,
President, Board of Commissioners,
District of Columbia.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LONG:

Address delivered by Senator ELLENDER before the 28th annual convention, Red River Valley Association, at Shreveport, La., April 7, 1953.

By Mr. BUTLER of Maryland:

Statement prepared by him relative to the St. Lawrence seaway.

Editorial entitled "Not Elections, but Defense, Tops the Slate," written by John W. Owens, and published in the Baltimore Sun of April 8, 1953.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Interview entitled "What and Why of the Files," given by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and published in Newsweek magazine of April 6, 1953.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled "Langer Proposal Backed," published in the New York Times of April 7, 1953, relating to disposition of Arab refugees.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Editorial entitled "Chester Bowles: Friend of India," published in the Times of India of Sunday, March 15, 1953, and editorial pertaining to Hon. Chester Bowles, published in the Evening News of New Delhi, India, of March 15, 1953.

By Mr. STENNIS:

Statement entitled "Conformable Cotton Gauze Bandage," written by Dr. Leonard Smith, of the National Cotton Council of America.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "This Teacher Makes Sense," written by Bruce Barton, and published by King Features Syndicate, Inc.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Appeal for assistance of refugees by Lord Mayor Reuter, of West Berlin, published in the New York Times of March 17, 1953.

Editorial entitled "Square Deal for the Farmers," published in the Northland Times of Bemidji, Minn.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION — COMMENTS BY SECRETARY DULLES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent that he may address the Senate for 2 minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. I read with great regret the remarks by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles before the Senate Judiciary Committee, stating that the new administration will not press for ratification of the Genocide Convention.

The enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain will have no reason to take heart from this development in administration policy—this retreat in the face of an entrenched opposition, an ill-considered retreat carried out even before an effort was made to secure ratification, at this session of Congress, of this most vital and desirable international convention.

If we are thinking of the merits of the Genocide Convention rather than the domestic politics of that proposal, there can be no substantial argument against it. Surely the announcement that the administration will not press for its ratification will give us little credit abroad and will deepen the cynicism with which American professions of faith are sometimes received abroad.

The entire campaign against the Genocide Convention has been one based on distortions and misrepresentations. Here is a convention whose purpose is, according to its own text, to outlaw actions "committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group."

Surely there is nothing in these purposes which are not wholly consistent with the spirit of the laws of the United States and of the several States. Moreover, this convention is not self-executing. It requires the passage of additional legislation by the Congress to bring it into practical effect.

Millions of our own citizens have indicated their support of this international agreement. It represents an international declaration of outlawry of the practices referred to. It would make them international crimes, but subject to actual enforcement by implementing legislation in each of the signatory countries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of the statement printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. LEHMAN's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yet, despite its merits, we have withheld our approval of this convention. And now the new administration indicates that it will not press for its approval.

This attitude on the part of the new administration, as expressed by Secretary Dulles, is especially disheartening since it marks an about-face on the part of Mr. Dulles himself, who in the past has favored this convention. It represents a victory for isolationist forces against the enlightened opinion of such legal experts as Dean Wesley Sturges, of Yale; Prof. Manley Hudson, of Harvard; Mr. Harrison Tweed, and the late Judge Robert Patterson—men of different political parties, but united in their advocacy of this epoch-making convention.

I had hoped the new administration would take a fresh toehold on the Genocide Convention and push it through. Such a move would have had widespread support in the Senate, if given bold leadership.

But the administration, in order to buy off the proponents of the Bricker resolution, and unwilling to oppose the Bricker resolution on its demerits—has agreed to pay this ransom.

I regret this as much as anything that has happened since January 20.

ABANDONMENT OF COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, an Associated Press dispatch in yesterday's morning papers indicates that the stock market has once again sharply declined as a result of the current peace rumors. In fact yesterday's decline, according to the Associated Press, is the "biggest break since the week the Korean war started."

This news underscores the folly of abandoning the Council of Economic Advisers at a time when it could prove most useful to the Government of the United States and to the American people.

As they read the daily newspaper reports of peace jitters, I sincerely hope that the officials of the administration will consider more seriously the proposal which I made on the floor of the Senate on April 1 of this year, namely, that the President send a special message to Congress pointing out the tremendous importance of the Council of Economic Advisers at a time like the present and asking for a special supplemental appropriation to bring this important agency back into existence.

In this connection, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a communication to the President which was released yesterday by Mr. Walter Reuther, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations:

It is fantastic and inhuman—

Stated Mr. Reuther—

that in Wall Street and elsewhere men should be afraid that "peace will break out" and depression will follow. As rational human beings, we need to take counsel together, think, talk, and act responsibly and quickly to replace fear with practical plans and confidence that such plans can and will be carried into effect.

Mr. Reuther closes his letter by urging President Eisenhower and the Congress:

To continue and implement the Employment Act of 1946, now more needed than at any time since its enactment.

I should also like to call the attention of the Senate to a very excellent column by Marquis Childs, entitled "Administration at Sea Economically," which appeared in the Washington Post on April 3.

Mr. Childs points out that the Employment Act of 1946 has been undermined in more ways than one. In addition to the abolition of the Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Childs alleges that "the work of the Joint Senate-House Committee on the Economic Report has been brought virtually to a stop."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the communication from Mr. Walter Reuther to President Eisenhower and the column by Marquis Childs.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 6, 1953.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Recent reactions in the Congress and in Wall Street to apparent change in Communist policy in Korea, Germany, and elsewhere give added urgency to the need for adequate and timely planning for the transition of our American economy from peak defense production to sustained civilian production at levels that will continue to provide full employment in the critical months and years ahead.

For months past, economists have been predicting a return of large-scale unemployment because of the inability of the American people to buy back a fair share of the vast and steadily increasing amounts of goods and services the American economy can produce. Fortune magazine has stated that such unemployment may reach 5 million by 1955 and might even go to 8 or 9 million.

Conservative forecasts for 1955 predict a gap between production and buying power of $63 billion to $65 billion. Continuance of the past trend of increasing production, which is essential to our expanding economy, will boost our potential output by $50 billion and raise the value of our annual national production to $395 billion in 1955. But, against this potential increase in production, cuts in purchasing power amounting to from $13 billion to $15 billion are in sight unless early and effective action is taken to meet the problem.

Present authoritative estimates of reduction in purchasing power fall in the following categories:

Defense spending, off by $9 billion; nondefense spending, up $1 billion; net drop in Government buying, $8 billion a year.

Industrial expansion stimulated by fast tax writeoffs will be over in 1954. Investment in new plant and equipment in 1955 is expected to be about 20 percent below 1952. Under present plans, total 1955 investment by corporations, businessmen, and farmers is likely to be about $5.5 billion below the 1952 level.

Everyone hopes the Kremlin's proposals turn out to be sincere and are backed up by tangible action that will bring peace to the world, but to relax our defense efforts prematurely, as proposed last week by Representative TABER in his reckless recommendation of an immediate $12.5 billion budget cut, would be flirting with disaster.

If and when the world situation permits drastic cuts in the Federal budget, the imbalance between potential productive power and purchasing power will be further exaggerated unless tax reductions are made that will strengthen the purchasing power of low and middle income groups.

This gap between production and consumption is the most compelling challenge that our free economy faces. It is the most basic unsolved problem that your administration and the Congress must meet. Upon whether or not we meet this challenge successfully, without a sharp downturn into recession or depression, may largely depend the final outcome of the continuing global contest between freedom and totalitarianism.

With our ability to produce increasing by $50 billion and with effective demand for defense goods and industrial equipment scheduled to shrink $13 to $15 billion, we must either produce and distribute $63 to $65 billion more for other purposes by 1955, or plants will slow down and workers will be unemployed.

We must maintain full production. We must maintain full employment.

Depression is wholly unnecessary. It can be avoided, but not by leaving the outcome to chance. There are enough unmet needs within the United States and among the free peoples of the world to provide full production and full employment at steadily rising standards of living for at least the next quarter of a century.

It is fantastic and inhuman that in Wall Street and elsewhere men should be afraid that "peace will break out" and depression will follow. As rational human beings, we need to take counsel together, think, talk, and act responsibly and quickly to replace fear with practical plans and confidence that such plans can and will be carried into effect.

At moments in history such as this, bold plans, quick decisions and actions turn dangers into opportunities and open the way to great advances. This is not a time to relax, to be either overconfident or panicky with fear of so-called overproduction. It is a time to dedicate our efforts to production and cooperation among all free peoples for peace.

The people of America and our friends throughout the free world need at this moment the practical reassurance that we as a nation are dedicated to the maintenance of full employment in peacetime.

We urge you to call a broadly representative conference at the earliest possible date to draft a worksheet for full production and full employment.

And we urge you and the Congress to continue and implement the Employment Act of 1946, now more needed than at any time since its enactment.

Transmitted herewith is resolution No. 32, adopted March 27, by 3,000 delegates representing 1,350,000 UAW-CIO members at our 14th constitutional convention.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER P. REUTHER,
President.

RESOLUTION No. 32—FULL EMPLOYMENT

(Adopted unanimously by the 14th constitutional convention of the UAW-CIO, March 27, 1953, Atlantic City, N. J., and ordered to be sent to President Eisenhower and to the Members of the Congress of the United States)

Whereas defense production is approaching and soon will pass its scheduled peak. This once again will face us with the basic unsolved problem of our time—now to have full production and full employment in a free society in time of peace.

At a full-employment level of production in the year 1955, national output will be $50 billion greater than it was in 1952. This reflects the steady increase in the capacity of the Nation to produce, based upon past experience.

But full employment at that higher level will neither be achieved nor maintained unless the buying power of the Nation—its capacity to consume—is increased by at least $50 billion in 1955.

The 1930 depression showed us that prosperity and full employment must be built from the bottom up; it must be based upon the buying power of the Nation. Business prospers and hires workers when we have enough purchasing power to buy back the products that workers and farmers produce. The American people themselves are the real job givers in our economy.

We learned that lesson during the depression, but, except under the stimulation of war buying, we have not yet put it to work. Indications are that around the end of 1953 the Government's military expenditures will begin to taper off. We shall then face the necessity of proving that we can maintain full employment through increased buying power and expenditures for civilian purposes.

Consumer spending, Government expenditures, and business investment make up the bulk of the Nation's buying power. By 1955, it is estimated that military expenditures of Government and investment by business will be smaller than they are now by some $13 to $15 billion.

Therefore, to assure full employment in 1955 at a level of output $50 billion higher than 1952, consumer spending will have to be increased by some $65 billion, unless Government expenditures for civilian purposes have been increased.

Higher wages can make the most substantial contribution toward the required addition to consumer buying power. Wage rates not only should keep pace with increasing productivity per man hour, but should move up faster in order to make up for their past failure to keep pace.

The guaranteed annual wage can exert a powerful influence in this direction, both by increasing total wage payments and by giving management a bigger stake in seeing to it that the Nation's economy is held at full-employment levels.

Amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act to allow collective bargaining to operate more freely and to benefit more workers will increase workers' buying power.

So will an increase of the Federal minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 per hour.

Government support of farm prices to maintain prosperity on farms can provide another important guaranty of adequate buying power.

Profits in many industries are very generous. Present profit levels permit orderly price reductions which will help to maintain sales and bolster employment and buying power.

As military expenditures of the Government fall, the resulting tax reductions should go to the great body of low-income taxpayers who will spend what they save in taxes, instead of going to corporations and upper-income taxpayers who cannot spend now all the income they receive.

Increase of present miserably inadequate social-security benefits and unemployment-compensation payments will bolster weak spots in consumer buying power and help to maintain full employment.

If such measures fail to add up to the increase in buying power that is necessary to maintain full employment, the Government must be prepared to step up its expenditures for civilian programs to offset the reduction in military outlay.

Such Government expenditures can be used to rehouse millions of city families now living in substandard dwellings; to begin building the $18 billion worth of new schools that we shall need by 1958; to build $2 billion worth of new hospitals a year to make up for the present serious inadequacy of facilities; to step up our inadequate highway building and repair programs from the present $3 billion a year to $7 or $8 billion; to join with Canada in constructing the St. Lawrence seaway from tidewater to the head of the lakes; to undertake new river valley developments which will bring to other areas of the country the benefits demonstrated by TVA; to increase investments in the development of basic resources in the underdeveloped countries of the world.

There is no lack of opportunity for maintaining full production and full employment in our economy year after year, in peacetime as well as in war. We need all that we can produce to raise the living standards of all our people, to provide adequate facilities in education, health, housing, and transporta-

tion, and to help the underdeveloped areas of the free world to help themselves toward a better way of life.

The problem of maintaining full employment in our country is not that we don't know what needs to be done, but that we may not do it. The results of the 1952 election give rise to serious danger that the necessary steps will not be taken to prevent layoffs in 1954, or sooner, as Government military expenditures decline.

Business has been encouraged by its victory in the election to resist all the measures listed above for increasing the buying power of the people. The new administration in Washington has filled its top offices, where policies are made, with bankers and businessmen.

The traditional viewpoint of banking and big business is now shaping policies both inside and outside of Government. This viewpoint holds that prosperity is built not from the bottom up, but from the top down. Instead of expanding the buying power of the people, it relies on creating a favorable climate for business management by holding out opportunity for greater profits. It would concentrate prosperity at the top and hope that some of it will trickle down to the people at the bottom.

Initial moves of the new administration give cause for alarm. In the Employment Act of 1946, Congress directed the Government to make plans and to coordinate all its programs so as to maintain maximum employment throughout the Nation. It created a council of economic advisers to keep watch on developments and advise the President on action needed to hold employment up. The President, in turn, is directed by that act to render an annual economic report to a special joint committee of Congress, which is to advise both Houses on measures required to maintain full employment.

Since the new administration took office, the staff of the council of economic advisers has been dismissed. Its funds have been cut because Congress has been unable to find out what the President wants to do about it. As economic adviser, a person has been appointed who in the past has demonstrated no confidence in the forward planning function which the Employment Act calls for. Forward-planning units in the Treasury and the Department of Commerce have been closed out.

Instead of making plans in advance so that unemployment shall not gain headway, the new policy appears to be to rely upon manipulation of the money market and interest rates, and to give tax cuts to those at the top who need them least. This is the same policy as that which was followed by Andrew Mellon, who, as Secretary of the Treasury under Coolidge and Hoover, was the economic boss of the Government at that time and became, in effect, the architect of the great depression of 1930.

It is not likely that the present administration will intentionally permit a full-scale depression like 1930 to strike the country again. Twenty years of exile from office have convinced even Republicans that our Government has the responsibility to prevent such a disaster. But the danger is that this administration will not make plans in advance, that it will not act soon enough, and that, by the time it does act, 5,000,000 or more will be out of jobs, and the task of reversing the trend and putting people back to work will be long and difficult.

Meanwhile, great and unnecessary hardship will be done to millions of workers and to the Nation as a whole. Timing is vital. A delay of days can mean layoffs of hundreds of thousands in an atmosphere of uncertainty and fear: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 14th constitutional convention of the UAW-CIO call upon President Eisenhower and Congress to retain and put to work the Employment Act of 1946, needed now more than at any time since it was passed.

That we ask President Eisenhower to call upon all States, municipalities, and counties to begin now to blueprint public works projects in their jurisdictions for which Federal grants would be appropriate if national conditions make such projects necessary for maintaining full employment.

That we recommend to President Eisenhower that at an early date he call together in Washington a national planning conference representative of all groups and interests for the purpose of appraising the Government's plans and policies for maintaining full employment and to make recommendations with respect thereto.

[From the Washington Post of April 3, 1953]

ADMINISTRATION AT SEA ECONOMICALLY

(By Marquis Childs)

At the mere suggestion that peace might break out the stock market has been suffering nervous palpitations. The chain of economic consequences following an end of the Korean war and a sharp reduction in spending for arms can alter the present condition of full employment and high purchasing power with a roller-coaster suddenness.

It is just at this point that an odd kind of stalemate has developed on Capitol Hill. Congress first, despite the wishes of President Eisenhower, abolished the President's Council of Economic Advisers with the staff of experts attached to that office. Now the work of the Joint Senate-House Committee on the Economic Report has been brought virtually to a stop.

The chairman of this committee is Representative JESSE P. WOLCOTT (Republican, Michigan). One of the ultraconservatives of the House, WOLCOTT owes his chairmanship to the majority leader of the Senate, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio.

Under the Democrats, former Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, was the head of the study group. With the Republicans in control, the chairmanship was expected to go to Senator RALPH FLANDERS, of Vermont. A businessman and one of the leaders in forming the Committee for Economic Development, FLANDERS was exceptionally qualified for the post. While he is opposed to Government planning of the economy, he feels strongly that the economic consequences of what the Government does, or fails to do, should be thoroughly analyzed and reported. As a director of CED, FLANDERS testified for the Employment Act of 1946 under which the joint committee was created.

But TAFT argued that the chairmanship should be rotated as between Senate and House. The House should have a turn according to TAFT, and WOLCOTT got the job.

Despite repeated prodding from FLANDERS, little or nothing has been initiated. WOLCOTT appears to be very, very busy. In fact, he is so busy that he has failed to answer several letters from FLANDERS asking why no steps have been taken to put the committee and its experts to work on the problems looking just ahead. Nor does the imperturbable Congressman from Michigan find time to respond to the Senators' telephone inquiries.

The strong suspicion, of course, is that he simply doesn't believe the committee has any business looking into the economy and where it is heading. This is all the more surprising since in the past leading Republicans, including TAFT himself, have taken an active part in the work, the most important phase of which has been a lengthy critique of the report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Although it was sponsored by Senator JAMES MURRAY, of Montana, a New Dealer, with the backing of President Truman, TAFT supported the bill. That was after the language had been toned down and the title changed from a "Full Employment Act" to merely "Employment Act." Its objective, however, remained the same—to try to insure full employment in the face of the expected postwar depression.

Edwin G. Nourse, a conservative economist, and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman, shows in his just published Economics in the Public Service how important the studies of the joint committee have been. Nourse resigned in a dispute with Leon Keyserling, a Council member and later Chairman.

The Senate-House committee is stymied and the Council has been allowed to pass out of the picture. But President Eisenhower does have one economic counselor left in Arthur F. Burns. Although there is lawfully no office in which he can function, an appropriation of $50,000 has been passed for him and his assistants, and this apparently puts him in business. That, at any rate, is the interpretation of Senator FLANDERS and others deeply concerned with getting informed guidance for the future. Without such guidance Congress cannot intelligently prepare steps to help meet a recession.

The stalemate over the Joint Economic Committee is similar to the prolonged feud over the chairmanship of the Joint Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee. There Majority Leader TAFT had not been able to prevail. Representative W. STERLING COLE (Republican, New York) insisted the House should have its turn at the top job. But Senator BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, the ranking Republican from the upper chamber, would not yield. While this deadlock has now been settled, it held up the atomic energy program in Congress.

Atomic energy rates, of course, far higher than economic reporting. Yet in terms of preparedness for the peace with prosperity promised by the Republicans, this is not a matter to be brushed aside.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 13, confirming and restoring State ownership of submerged lands within their historic boundaries, the junior Senator from Texas desires to discuss seven points. Some of these points have already been touched upon in the arguments which have been made on the floor of the Senate, and I shall try to avoid unnecessary repetition. These points may be summarized as follows:

First. All the 48 States—not merely 3 coastal States, and not merely 21 coastal States, but all 48 States—have lands beneath navigable waters within their historic boundaries, title to which would be confirmed or restored by this legislation.

Second. All of the 48 States have held and possessed their submerged lands, both inland and seaward, under the same rule of law, recognized for more than 100 years by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Third. It would be rank discrimination against the coastal States to exclude their marginal sea lands from this rule of State ownership while continuing its application to the far greater bodies

of lands beneath inland waters and the Great Lakes.

Fourth. The rule of State ownership of lands under inland waters and the Great Lakes grew from the common law rule of State ownership of the lands under the marginal sea.

Fifth. The coastal States have been in complete good faith in their possession and ownership of the sea bed within their historic boundaries for more than 100 years.

Sixth. Under such circumstances, restoration of these lands to the States will not be a gift but an act of equity and justice.

Seventh. Texas has a special claim under its annexation agreement with the United States which should be confirmed by this legislation.

ALL STATES CONCERNED

All of the 48 States have lands beneath navigable waters within their historic boundaries, title to which would be confirmed or restored by this legislation.

Senators who would like to know the exact acreage within their respective States may turn to page 76 of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 13, Senate Committee Report No. 133, which is on the desks. In the table on page 76 will be found the approximate areas of submerged lands beneath the waters of each of the States. The map which was used yesterday by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] shows the lands beneath the navigable waters within each of the 48 States. It will be noted that the inland waters are shown in black. The rivers, lakes, and bays are also shown. Senators will note the small marginal belt along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts within the boundaries of the Atlantic Coast States and the Pacific Coast States, extending out 3 miles from shore. On the gulf coast it will be noted that the boundaries of Florida and Texas are 3 leagues from shore, while the boundaries of the other Gulf Coast States extend out 3 miles from shore.

I ask particular attention to the Great Lakes States, in which we find by far the greater acreage involved in this legislation. On page 76, in the table showing the approximate areas of submerged lands within State boundaries, it will be noted that the Great Lakes States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin that there is a total of 38,595,840 acres of lands beneath the Great Lakes.

These lakes have been held to be open seas, high seas. State ownership of the land underlying them has been held to rest under the same rule of law by which the coastal States own the lands and tidewaters within the marginal belts inside the 3-mile or 3-league boundaries.

States with inland waters have 28,960,640 acres covered by the joint resolution. That information is shown on page 76.

If Senators will compare column 3 with the previous columns to which I have referred, it will be seen that the 21 coastal States put together have only 17,029,120 acres of marginal sea lands within their boundaries, and covered by the pending joint resolution.

There we have the comparison. The Great Lakes States have more than 38 million acres of land under what have been held to be open seas. States with inland waters have 28,960,640 acres covered by the joint resolution. The 21 coastal States have only 17,029,120 acres of marginal sea lands within their boundaries and covered by the joint resolution.

All 48 States have valuable resources beneath their navigable waters. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing not only the approximate area beneath navigable waters within State boundaries, but present uses and revenues of such lands. I have obtained this information from a brief prepared by the National Association of Attorneys General.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approximate areas and present uses of submerged lands within State boundaries

[Expressed in acres]

State	Inland waters [1]	Great Lakes [2]	Marginal sea [2]	Present uses and revenues include
Alabama	339,840		101,760	Sand, gravel, shell, oysters, oil and gas leases.
Arizona	210,560			Sand and gravel.
Arkansas	241,280			84,641 acres under oil and gas lease; sand and gravel.
California	1,209,600		2,540,800	Oil, gas, sand, gravel, kelp, and shell.
Colorado	179,200			Sand, gravel, and gold.
Connecticut	70,400		384,000	50,000 acres of marginal sea under lease; shellfish, sand, gravel, oysters, clams, mussels.
Delaware	80,560		53,760	Oyster bed leases, sand, gravel.
Florida	2,750,720		4,097,600	903,000 acres of Gulf of Mexico under lease. 2,748,000 acres of land under inland waters and under lease; oil, gas, sand, gravel, sponges, oysters.
Georgia	229,120		192,000	Sand and shell, approximately 1,000 acres of land in marginal sea leased.
Idaho	479,360			Sand and gravel. 1,302.96 acres under lease for gold and gravel.
Illinois	289,920	976,640		Sand, gravel, coal, and clay.
Indiana	55,040	145,920		Sand, gravel, coal, oil, mussel shells, peat, and marl. The revenues during 1948–49 included: sand and gravel, $50,563.68; oil, $101,413.51; coal, $4,453.56.
Iowa	188,160			Sand and gravel, coal, stone, ice, shell.
Kansas	104,320			Sand, gravel, oil, and gas. 6,944.96 acres of submerged lands under mineral leases.
Kentucky	183,040			Fish, mussel, shells, coal, gas, oil, sand and gravel.
Louisiana	2,141,440		2,068,160	Sand, gravel, oysters, and other marine products. 2,191,179 acres under lease in coastal waters.
Maine	1,392,000		759,680	Kelp, clams, lobsters, mussels, fish. Total income of $14,000,000.
Maryland	441,600		59,520	Oil and gas leases on entire marginal sea. Receive $20,557 annual rentals.
Massachusetts	224,000		368,640	Clams, lobsters, mussels, sand, rock.
Michigan	764,160	24,613,760		Leases cover oil and gas, sand and gravel.
Minnesota	2,397,760	1,415,680		Sand, gravel, clay.
Mississippi	189,440		136,320	Sand, gravel, oyster shell.
Missouri	253,560			Sand and gravel.
Montana	526,080			Do.
Nebraska	373,760			Do.
Nevada	472,320			Do.
New Hampshire	179,200		8,960	Kelp leases, sand and shell.
New Jersey	200,960		249,600	$55,000,000 improvements below high watermark, including Atlantic City piers.
New Mexico	99,200			Sand and gravel.
New York	1,054,080	2,321,280	243,840	Recreation beaches, surf; removal of sand and earth. Millions of improvements on filled-in lands.
North Carolina	2,284,800		577,920	Oysters, shellfish, clams, sand, seaweed, shrimp.
North Dakota	391,040			Sodium sulfate, good prospects for oil, sand and gravel. Revenues dedicated to school fund.
Ohio	64,000	2,212,480		Sand and gravel.
Oklahoma	470,040			Mineral leases, sand and gravel.
Oregon	403,840		568,320	Sand and gravel, oil, gas, kelp.
Pennsylvania	184,320	470,400		Oil sands, clays, and coals.
Rhode Island	99,840		76,800	Sand, gravel, oysters.
South Carolina	295,040		359,040	Sand and gravel. All lands leased for oil and gas explorations.
South Dakota	327,040			Sand and gravel. Possibility of oil under submerged lands.
Tennessee	182,400			Sand and gravel.
Texas	2,364,800		2,466,560	Sand, gravel, oysters, shell, shrimp, sulfur, oil and gas.
Utah	1,644,800			Mineral leases for salt; sodium sulfate, oil and gas.
Vermont	211,840			Sand, gravel, and quarries.
Virginia	580,240		215,040	Sand, gravel, oysters.
Washington	777,600		360,960	Placer gold, gold, copper, lead, silver, zinc, coal, limestone, marl, peat and salines, sand and gravel, and rentals on 130 oil and gas leases; 1 producing oil well in the tidelands area.
West Virginia	58,240			Sand and gravel, and prospecting for coal, oil, and gas.
Wisconsin	920,960	6,439,680		Sand, gravel, and marl.
Wyoming	261,120			Sand and gravel.
Total	28,960,640	38,595,840	17,029,120	

[1] Areas of the United States, 1940, 16th census of the United States (Government Printing Office, 1942) p. 2, et seq. The figures are very approximate but are absolute minimums.

[2] World Almanac and Book of Facts for 1947, published by the New York World-Telegram (1947), p. 138; serial No. 22, Department of Commerce, U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey, November 1915. In figuring marginal sea area, only original State boundaries have been used. These coincide with the 3-mile limit for all States except Texas, Louisiana, and Florida Gulf Coast. In the latter cases, the 3-league limit as established before or at the time of entry into the Union has been used.

Mr. DANIEL. For instance, Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reports from the governors of several States as to the valuable resources their States have beneath the navigable waters of the States. I have in my hand a report from Gov. William G. Stratton, of Illinois, in answer to questions submitted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Question No. 9 was:

What prospect is there for minerals in your State which may be found under submerged lands in the future?

Governor Stratton replied:

Coal, oil, and gas, in some localities. Also gravel, sand, some lead and fluorspar.

I have here also a report from the Governor of the State of Michigan. In answer to question No. 9, as to what natural resources there are under the Great Lakes and other waters of that State, or that may be anticipated, the Governor replies:

According to our State geologist, the bottoms of the Great Lakes potentially contain huge deposits of iron ore, copper, oil, gas, salt, brines and many other minerals which are known to exist under Michigan's dry land.

I have also in my hand the report of the Governor of Minnesota. Question No. 5 submitted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the governor of that State was:

What minerals are now being developed from your submerged lands?

The reply from the Governor of Minnesota states:

Iron ore, sand, and gravel. Rules and regulations are now being drafted covering the prospecting for and the mining of copper and nickel.

Question No. 6 submitted by the committee was:

What prospect is there for minerals in your State which may be found under submerged lands in the future?

The Governor of Minnesota replies:

Low grade copper and nickel have recently been discovered in a part of northeastern Minnesota that contains a large water area. There are prospects for finding cobalt, gold, and other precious minerals. Titanium and large deposits of iron ore and marl that have not been developed are also known to exist.

The Governor of Minnesota adds this note:

To date about $2 million has been collected by the State in royalties covering iron ore removed from submerged lands.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that the amount recovered by Minnesota from royalties on iron ore under the Great Lakes, which have been held to be open seas within the State boundaries, is more than the State of Texas has recovered, up to date, from royalties on oil taken from its marginal sea lands.

I cite that instance to show that while all the States do not have oil beneath their submerged lands, every State has some deposits beneath its soil, and the records of the committee show that today 10 times more oil is being produced from the inland waters of the United States than from the marginal lands of the coastal States.

I point that out because there are some Senators who have introduced bills which would quitclaim to the States a far greater area of inland water and Great Lakes lands but would deny to the coastal States a like right of property, to which they are entitled under the same rule of law.

SAME RULE OF LAW

Second. All the 48 States have held and possessed their submerged lands, both inland and seaward, under the same rule of law, recognized for over 100 years by the Supreme Court.

This common rule of law applicable to all States and to all lands under navigable waters, both inland and seaward, was stated more than 50 times by the Supreme Court, to be as follows: "That the States own all lands beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries." Prior to the California decision in 1947, no distinction had been made between lands beneath inland waters and lands beneath seaward waters so long as they were within State boundaries.

That was the test: Is the land within States boundaries, and is it under navigable waters? If so, the courts have always held that it belongs to the States.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The distinguished Senator from Texas is a former eminent attorney general of the State of Texas, and he has attended national meetings of State attorneys general. Can the Senator tell us what has been the attitude of the attorneys general of the States on the issue before the Senate now, in connection with which he says that under the common law, and according to over 50 Federal court decisions for over 100 years, the States have been conceded to be the owners of the submerged lands at least out to the 3-mile limit, which is the question covered by the pending joint resolution?

Mr. DANIEL. I shall be glad to. The National Association of Attorneys General has for many years, I believe since 1945, taken the position that the Congress should write clearly for the future the law as it was understood by all our courts to be in the past. The Association of Attorneys General has always taken the position that the States owned the lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. At page 77 of the committee report the Senator will find a brief which the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has included as appendix G. It was written by the National Association of Attorneys General.

I should like to point out that the attorneys general from 44 States joined in this report, and, as was shown yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], only 1 State in the Nation has failed to send a State official before the Congress during the past 6 years of this fight asking for State ownership and the passage of the type of legislation now under consideration. Forty-seven States are supporting the proposed legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator who now has the floor, who was a most able attorney general of the State of Texas. If the Government would have a right to the tidelands oil, as it is called, would they not also have a right to the oysterbeds and the shrimpbeds which are found on thousands of acres of land off the coast of my State?

Mr. DANIEL. Absolutely.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I recall, the attorneys general almost unanimously supported a concurrent resolution introduced in the House and the Senate to support the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was a supporter of such a proposal before knowing the Senator from Texas, who in years gone by joined the attorney general of my own State in the points the Senator has brought out. I forget the exact amount of land, but it was shown that there were in the neighborhood of two or three hundred thousands of acres of shrimpbeds, oysterbeds, crabbeds, and the like, which the State owns. The proposed legislation would affect not only oil, but oysters, shrimp, crabs, and other products of the sea.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from South Carolina has brought out a good point. As former Solicitor General Perlman testified, and as other former Federal officials testified before our committee, they claim for the Federal Government not only oil, but every other natural resource, including oysters and fish up to low tide along the 21 coastal States. They told our committee this year that the claim was the same as to the fish and the oysters as it is regarding the oil.

Mr. MAYBANK. And those lands have been under lease for over 100 years in South Carolina.

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, in the case of the oyster beds.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also true that either last year or the year before President Truman said that if we let the Federal Government take the oil he would agree that the States could keep their fishery resources? If the Government did not claim title to all submerged resources, why was it necessary for him to say that?

Mr. DANIEL. I have not seen the statement to which the Senator has referred. The only statements made by President Truman I have seen were statements made in 1945, when he said the Federal Government had jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf. On the same day, he said the Federal Government had the same jurisdiction over the fish below low tide along the coasts of the 21 coastal States. Only recently before President Truman left the White House he stated that when he claimed

jurisdiction over the oil in the Continental Shelf, he claimed jurisdiction over the fish also.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that one of the few places where poor people can fish is between high water and low water, because so many of the wealthy have bought the property beyond that point. The same is true of many of the members of some organizations that are opposing the Senator from Texas on the submerged lands question.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas a question, for all during the debate I have not heard any reference to the point I have in mind; neither have I seen any reference to it in any of the reports. My question is this: Under the decisions of the Supreme Court, who owns the docks and the piers that extend over the tidelands, in the case of practically every port city in the United States? Will the Senator from Texas comment on that situation?

Mr. DANIEL. I shall be glad to do so. The question asked by the Senator from Wyoming is, Who owns the piers and docks which are built beyond the low-tide mark, along the coast? Under the three decisions of the Supreme Court thus far on this point, the Federal Government has paramount rights and power over the docks and piers and every other piece of property which has been built beyond the low-tide mark, off the coasts of our country. As I shall show in a few moments, we believe there is danger that officials of the Federal Government at some time in the future, if they ever wish to do so, will assert the same kind of claim in the case of our inland ports and rivers and harbors and the Great Lakes, for, as I shall show, the lands beneath the inland waters and the Great Lakes have been held under the same rule of law that applies to the lands beneath the coastal waters. I shall show that that rule was actually born in reference to submerged lands along the seacoast, and that it was extended to the lands beneath the rivers and bays as "arms of the sea." If the officials of the Federal Government of the last administration remain successful in destroying the rule of State ownership of lands beneath the marginal sea, they will be destroying the rule as it applies to the very area which gave validity to the ownership of the lands beneath the bays and the Great Lakes.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask another question about the interpretation the Senator from Texas has placed on the question of the ownership of docks and piers. From the Supreme Court's decisions, can the Senator from Texas arrive at any other conclusion except that of the confiscation of property?

Mr. DANIEL. Quite a few persons have arrived at that conclusion. Actually, I would express it, I think more accurately, in the following way: The Supreme Court of the United States has held that the paramount governmental powers which the Federal Government has over every farm, home, mine, and factory in the United States, as well as over the submerged lands, give the Federal Government the right to take property without paying compensation. It is closely akin to the "inherent powers" doctrine which was announced by President Truman toward the end of his administration. I say it is a dangerous doctrine. I do not believe the present Supreme Court ever intended that its doctrine should be extended to cover private property. But at some time there may be in office those who will contend that the United States should have the same system of nationalization that exists today in many other countries in the world. I do not like to see the Congress of the United States leave written into the law of our country a rule under which there can be further nationalization of property in our Nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The point has been made many times that in the 52 previous decisions of the United States Supreme Court in which the Court said this property belonged to the States, those cases involved bays, rivers, and inland waters, and the Court was laying down a rule of law to the effect that all the land beneath navigable waters belonged to the States. If that point be sound, it can be argued from it that the very foundations and the very legal concepts under which every citizen owns his property need not be applied to his property, although it is the foundation of his title to his property and is the basis upon which everyone's title to property was recognized historically.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the Senator from Louisiana is correct.

At this time I should like to read into the RECORD a statement by Dean Roscoe Pound, formerly dean of Harvard University Law School, on the very point the Senator from Louisiana has raised:

> If sovereignty with responsibility for defense and international relations did necessarily and inseparably involve dominium—that is, ownership of land—all private ownership of land would have to be given up.

It is a rule which we do not wish to see extended, and I say it is important that the Congress of the United States today abrogate the rule, insofar as the Congress may do so. Certainly the Congress may separate the proprietary rights and the property rights in these submerged lands from the paramount governmental powers of the Federal Government, so long as the Congress recognizes that the paramount powers of the Federal Government are supreme and superior. It is true that any property rights in lands beneath navigable waters are subject to and must not interfere with the powers of the Federal Government in navigation, national defense, commerce, and international affairs, all of which powers the National Government has over the waters. There is no reason why by means of this joint resolution the Congress cannot properly separate proprietary rights in the soil from those paramount governmental powers of the national sovereign, in the way we have always in the past thought they existed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to complete the discussion of this particular point before I yield further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

THE POLLARD CASE

The rule I have just discussed was first stated by the Supreme Court in the early case of *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229 (1845)) in the following words:

> First. The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively.
>
> Second. The new Sates have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States.

Mr. President, the whole theory behind the State ownership of submerged lands is based upon the 10th amendment to the Constitution, which provides that—

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.

These lands were not transferred to the Federal Government by the original States, and therefore the Supreme Court has said that they were retained by the States, and that the new States have the same rights of ownership therein.

The Pollard case, from which I have just read, and its general rule common to lands under both inland and seaward waters was cited with approval by 52 Supreme Court decisions and 244 State and Federal court decisions prior to the decision in the California tidelands case. Excerpts from some of these opinions are included in appendix G of the report of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 13, page 77.

The majority opinion in the California case concedes that the Supreme Court in the past has indicated its belief that this Pollard rule of State ownership applies equally to all lands under navigable waters within State boundaries, whether inland or seaward.

Mr. President, those who are trying to accuse the States of taking something they have never owned, those who accuse the coastal States of proceeding in bad faith, should read the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case. That decision was by Mr. Justice Black, and it should be read carefully, because he himself says the States have been acting in good faith.

Mr. Justice Black said for the majority in the California case:

> As previously stated this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also

owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

Mr. President, if this rule of State ownership of land was enough to make all the previous courts believe that the States owned their submerged lands, whether inland or not, so long as they were within the State boundaries, it certainly was enough to justify the belief of the 21 coastal States that they owned these lands, and that these lands were theirs; and that belief existed for approximately 150 years after the Union was formed. No Federal Government official ever made a claim to these lands until 1937.

On the contrary, as was pointed out yesterday on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], time after time officials of the Federal Government wrote opinions in which they said the States owned not only the lands beneath the inland waters and the lands beneath the Great Lakes, but also the lands beneath the marginal sea within the 3-mile or the 3-league belt of the coastal States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy, and I wish to affirm what every Member of the Senate knows, that the Senator from Texas has probably had the greatest legal experience with this issue of any Member of this body, and perhaps of any citizen of the United States, because he very ably represented his State in the proceedings before the Supreme Court. In a sense, therefore, I feel as though I were a third-rate prizefighter being sent in at the last minute to contest against the champ.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his flattering remarks. I stand ready now for the Senator's blows. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to be contending that for the Federal Government to retain the paramount rights in the submerged lands is equivalent to the Federal Government's putting into effect a program of national socialism?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas said that if the theory of paramount rights of the Federal Government were carried to its logical conclusion, it would result in national socialism, because the Federal Government has paramount rights in national defense and international affairs, over your home, over the streets of this city, over the streets and roads of the States, over farms, ranches, and everything else. The Federal Government can take any property it wants for national defense or for use in connection with international affairs. It can exercise its paramount right to take any property, but heretofore it has always been held that the Federal Government must pay just compensation. In the tidelands opinions, the same kind of reasoning was used, namely, that the Federal Government has paramount rights over this property; but nothing was said about paying any compensation to the States. If that rule were extended to private property, we would end up with nationalization of property. I believe that, if Dean Roscoe Pound made such a statement, it certainly is not an exaggeration for the Senator from Texas to concur in it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Texas is contending that ownership of and title to the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark to the degree that they are covered in Senate Joint Resolution 13, should be vested in the States?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then is not the Senator from Texas advocating State socialism?

Mr. DANIEL. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What difference does it make which level of government owns and operates the property, so far as the rather emotion-arousing word "socialism" is concerned? Is it not government ownership in either case?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas is not saying that Federal ownership of the lands beyond low tide would create State socialism or nationalization of property. What the Senator from Texas said was that, if the reasoning of the Senator from Illinois as to the Texas and Louisiana tidelands cases is carried forward to private property, then it would create national socialism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But to defend us against any such danger to private property, we have the protection of the Constitution, which provides that no property can be taken without due process of law, and without just compensation.

Mr. DANIEL. Does not that protection apply to the States as well as to private persons?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. But now we come to the question as to whether the States ever had ownership of or title to the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I should like to say that the courts of our land have held that the constitutional provision that the Federal Government shall not take property without just compensation applies equally to States and political subdivisions, as well as to individual citizens.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let that be true. Now, I should like to raise a question regarding the Pollard case, which the Senator used as his principal precedent. Is it not a fact that the Pollard case involved lands which were originally washed by the tides of the Mobile River, and, partially, of Mobile Bay, and which, over the passage of years, later became filled. That being true, did not the Pollard case involve lands washed by tides and inland waters? Am I not correct in stating that this case in no way concerned lands seaward from the low-water mark, which is the area of land covered by the pending joint resolution now under dispute?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Illinois is correct as to the particular lands involved in the Pollard case. But if the Senator from Illinois will read the Pollard decision——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which I have.

Mr. DANIEL. He will find that the court was trying to arrive at a general rule of law, and then to see whether the property under the Mobile River came within that general rule of law; and, in arriving at the general rule of law, the Supreme Court of the United States determined the boundaries of Alabama—at least, it recited those boundaries—and it said, under the boundaries Alabama extended its jurisdiction into the sea.

"Into the sea." It went on to say that the particular lands under navigable waters involved in the Pollard case came within the rule that the States did not grant any of their lands beneath navigable waters to the United States, but retained them. So in the Pollard case there was a statement of a general rule of law applied to particular submerged lands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator for another question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not this general statement made by the court what is called obiter dictum, so far as the facts of the case were concerned, namely, a statement that was non-germane and irrelevant to the question of submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark? Obiter dicta, while interesting, have never been held to be controlling on future courts or future decisions?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois that the rule stated in the Pollard case was obiter dictum. I want to make my position perfectly clear. There was no land beyond low tide on the sea involved in the Pollard case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. Nor was there in many of these other cases. But the rule of law stated was like a rule of law that contracts without consideration are not valid within a certain State. Merely because for 100 years we have had court decisions involving written contracts, and every time a case involving a written contract arises the court lays down the rule, "Contracts in this State are not enforceable unless there is a consideration," that would be no reason for saying that these decisions are dicta when applied to an oral contract. The Supreme Court in the Pollard case stated the general rule of law, exactly the same as if the Congress had written a general rule of law, that the States own all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. It is not obiter dictum when the court has to state a general rule of law in order to arrive at a particular decision, which rule of law might be broader than is necessary to cover the particular property involved. Let me give a quotation from Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, on that point if I may. Justice Holmes said:

> Jurisprudence, as I look at it, is simply law in its most generalized part. Every effort to reduce a case to a rule is an effort of jurisprudence, although the name, as used in English, is confined to the broadcast rules and most fundamental conceptions. One mark of a great layer is that he sees the application of the broadcast rules.

Mr. Justice Holmes then went on to state that—

> There is the story of a Vermont justice of the peace, before whom a suit was brought by one farmer against another, for damages for breaking a churn. The justice of the peace took time to consider, and then said he had looked through the statutes and could find nothing about churns, and gave judgment for the defendant.

That is the reasoning the Senator from Illinois would have us apply to this subject.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield in a moment. The Senator would have us apply that theory in this case. Because many times the general rule was stated broader than necessary to apply to the particular property involved, he would call it dictum and say it should not be given any weight.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. To show the kind of dictum the Senator from Illinois has in mind, I may say that about 1842, in the case of Martin against Waddell, someone held a lease from the State of New Jersey for an oyster bed in Raritan Bay. A suit arose between the lessee of the State and claimants under a Federal lease. The Supreme Court held that the State owned that property, and the State could give a good lease, because, it said, the State of New Jersey, when it won its independence, had acquired all the rights the King of England had had, and the States owned all the lands beneath their navigable waters.

Mr. DANIEL. Within their boundaries.

Mr. LONG. Had that lease applied to the Senator from Illinois, he would have been in the position of saying, "We have here a case involving a mere declaration of principle"——

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. LONG. "And since that is the case, the Government should go ahead and take the land, because the rule would not apply."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not at all. May I be permitted to reply briefly to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the Waddell case, to which the Senator from Louisiana refers, covered submerged lands in Raritan Bay, and that Raritan Bay had always been regarded as an inland navigable water, and therefore there was no new rule introduced? All these cases involved either (a) tidelands proper or (b) submerged lands under navigable inland waters. The Senator could try to stretch these cases to eternity, but he could not make the facts of the cases extend to submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark.

Mr. DANIEL. And, Mr. President, neither can the distinguished Senator from Illinois find anything in the 52 Supreme Court cases which limits the rule of law to inland waters or to rivers or to the Great Lakes. I shall point out to the Senator from Illinois that this rule began with tidewaters of the open sea. As applied to the State of Illinois, the boundaries of that State extend 40 miles into Lake Michigan. The title of the State of Illinois to the lands which are beneath the lake was held not to rest on the fact that they were beneath inland waters. Those lands have the same characteristics as lands under the open sea. Another court referred to these waters as the "high seas." In the past the rule was held to apply to all navigable waters within the coastal boundaries of the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to go further into that point, and then I shall yield.

UNWARRANTED DISCRIMINATION

Third. It would be rank discrimination against the coastal States to exclude their marginal-sea lands from this rule of State ownership while continuing its application to the far greater bodies of lands beneath inland waters and the Great Lakes.

Yet that is exactly what the supporters of S. 107 and S. 1017, the Anderson bills, would do. They propose to quitclaim and quiet the titles of the Great Lakes States to 38 million acres of submerged lands, and also 28 million acres of lands under inland waters, while taking away from the 21 coastal States their smaller area of 17 million acres within their seaward boundaries.

Thus, we shall see the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] defending with all his might the ownership by Illinois of 976,000 acres beneath Lake Michigan while he rejects the same claim of ownership for the coastal States.

We shall see the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] fighting with one hand for Minnesota's 1,415,680 acres under the Great Lakes which extend 32 miles from the shore, while with the other he flays the coastal States which have held their submerged lands under the same rule of law.

The cry is that all these coastal lands within seaward boundaries should be put in a common pot for all the people to enjoy. They lie offshore from 3 miles to 3 leagues distance. I ask why not include the submerged lands of their own States in the common pot? They are just as valuable and cover a greater area.

As I said earlier, Mr. President, the record shows that there is 10 times as much oil being produced from land underlying the inland waters as from the marginal belt of the coastal States. The Great Lakes States do not stop at 3 miles or even 3 leagues from shore. As I pointed out, some of them run from 20 to 75 miles from shore. Illinois runs its seaward boundary 40 miles from the shores of Lake Michigan. Minnesota's boundary extends 36 miles from shore.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Not only would possible oil deposits under the Great Lakes be involved, but other mineral deposits would also be involved. Is not that correct?

Mr. DANIEL. That is true.

Mr. THYE. It applies to deposits of minerals, such as iron ore, under the margins of the Great Lakes, as well as under inland lakes in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. The State of Minnesota recognized that fact, many years ago, when it authorized the attorney general of the State to participate with other States in a suit in the United States Supreme Court involving the protection of the rights of such States.

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. We have telegrams and letters from the Governor and the attorney general of Minnesota, from port authorities, and many others in support of the proposed legislation. Earlier, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, I read the report of the Governor of Minnesota on that point.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois. I still have not completed the point as to the rule of law dealing with the marginal sea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was going to ask the Senator from Texas some questions about the inland waterways, but if he would rather have me withhold them at this time, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DANIEL. If I may, then, I should like to proceed to cover the point to which I have referred, and I think the Senator from Illinois will understand why I say that it is not a matter of obiter dictum, because the rule of law actually developed from Crown ownership of the lands beneath the tidewaters of the marginal sea and was later broadened to cover other lands under other navigable waters.

There is no English or American decision indicating that the sovereign-right theory of State ownership is only an inland-water rule. On the contrary, all court decisions on the point indicate and say that the rule of State ownership applies to all lands which are, first, beneath navigable waters, and, second, within State boundaries.

The whole rule of ownership of land under navigable waters as a sovereign right grew from the common law's recognition of ownership by the king of soils under the tidewaters of the adjoining marginal seas. The rule was extended to bays and rivers as "arms of the sea," and since then all of such submerged lands have come within the same rule of ownership as a sovereign right so long as they are, first, navigable, and, second, within the jurisdiction or boundaries of the sovereign concerned.

As early as 1610, in *The Case of Royal Fishery of River Banne* (80 Eng. Rep. 540), the highest court of England related the history of and stated the rule to be as follows:

> The reason for which the King hath an interest in such navigable river, so high as the sea flows and ebbs in it, is, because such river participates of the nature of the sea, and is said to be a branch of the sea so far as it flows; * * * And that the King hath the same prerogative and interest in the branches of the sea and navigable rivers, so high as the sea flows and ebbs in them, which he hath in alto mari, is manifest by several authorities and records.

This derivation of the one rule applicable to lands under all navigable wa-

ters was recognized in many United States Supreme Court cases, including the following:

In *Weber* v. *Board of Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57, 66 (1873)):

> The title to the shore of the sea, and of the arms of the sea, and in the soils under tidewaters, is, in England in the King, and in this country in the State.

For exhaustive discussion of the rule and how it was extended from the sea to cover all navigable waters, see *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1), wherein it is said:

> In England, from the time of Lord Hale, it has been treated as settled that the title in the soil of the sea, or of the arms of the sea, below ordinary high water mark, is in the King.

Then, what about the situation in this country? I resume my quotation from the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States:

> And upon the American Revolution, all the rights of the Crown and of Parliament vested in the several States, subject to the rights surrendered to the National Government by the Constitution of the United States.

It is made clear in the opinion that these surrendered rights are paramount but regulatory and do not involve any proprietary rights.

The history of this ownership as a sovereign right under all navigable waters within State boundaries is summed up in the able text of Gould on Waters—Chicago, third edition, 1900—as follows:

> The rule of the modern common law, whereby the king has a private interest, apart from the ownership of the adjoining lands, in those tide waters which are within the territory of England, appears to be connected historically with the above claim of sovereignty over the sea, and to be derived therefrom (p. 7).

I am reading from page 7 of a book by one of our most eminent authorities on waters and lands beneath the waters of this country.

> Those rivers and parts of rivers in which the tide ebbs and flows are known as "navigable" rivers, and by the common law they are vested prima facie in the Crown. Hence, as was said in an early case, "all navigable rivers in England appertain to the King." They are arms of the sea—

Not inland waters, but arms of the sea—

> and the King has them because they partake of its nature. This ownership is for the public benefit, and in this country each State, as sovereign, has succeeded to the rights which the King formerly possessed in such rivers and in the soil beneath (p. 100).

The unity of this rule of property and State-Federal relations, as applied to both inland and coastal waters within States boundaries, properly accounts for the great concern of all the States, both inland and coastal, in its preservation.

Here we have a navigable water rule: State ownership of all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries originated with sovereign ownership of the land beneath the marginal sea. If the very foundation of the rule is destroyed, naturally the extension of the rule as it applies to the inland waters and to lands under the Great Lakes is destroyed. That is why inland State officials are worried. They do not want this rule destroyed at its very foundation. They can see that if the theory of the recent Supreme Court decisions can be made to apply to the foundation of the rule, it may also be extended to lands under rivers, lakes, and other inland waters.

The unity of this rule also accounts for the fact that all previous members of the Supreme Court have written the rule broad enough to cover all navigable waters, whether inland or not. There is no dispute that the tidewater area within the marginal sea is navigable both in law and in fact, and that all such areas covered by this legislation are within the lawful boundaries of the respective States.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] pointed out yesterday that the joint resolution is limited to lands beneath navigable waters and within original or historic State boundaries, boundaries as they existed at the time the States entered the Union, or as they were thereafter approved by the Congress of the United States, as in the case of Florida.

In the above-mentioned Pollard decision—*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229), Mr. Justice McKinley expressly said that "the territorial boundaries of Alabama have extended all her sovereign powers into the sea"—page 230—and stated the broad question of the case as being "whether Alabama is entitled to the shores of the navigable waters, and the soil under them, within her limits"—page 225.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] speaks of the Pollard decision as a rule applying to inland waters. If that be so, why did the Supreme Court of the United States state the rule in a broader way, and why did the Supreme Court say that Alabama's boundaries extended out into the sea? They were looking to see if the property involved was within the boundaries of Alabama, not if it was under inland waters, so they stated that the boundaries of Alabama extended into the Gulf of Mexico.

Holding that Alabama's sovereign municipal power was the same on the sea as on the shore within her boundaries, the Court said:

> First, the shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively. Second, the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the original States (3 How. at 230).

Note the emphasis and the controlling points for State ownership of all lands beneath all navigable waters within State boundaries in the following excerpts from other learned Justices:

Chief Justice Taney, in 1842, in the first case establishing the rule, said:

> For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.[1]

Does the decision say "lands beneath inland navigable waters"? No. It says "navigable waters and the soils under them."

Mr. Justice Clifford in 1867 said:

> Settled rule of law in this Court is, that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders. When the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign, and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them.[2]

Did the Court limit that to inland waters? No. It included all waters within the boundaries of the State.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not desire to interfere in any way with the argument the Senator from Texas is now making, but I should like to ask a question with respect to his argument and the law he is quoting. The Senator from Texas is speaking with reference to waters. Has he given any thought to the carrying out of the same idea with respect to public lands in the Western States, such as lands under the control of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, whether such lands be in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, or elsewhere in the West?

Mr. DANIEL. I have not given any extended thought to that particular subject, except as I have observed that the Federal Government in the management of its minerals has not received anywhere near the amount the States have received from State management of mineral lands. That is as much as I have gone into the matter thus far.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason I have asked the question of the junior Senator from Texas is that in my State practically 63 percent of the entire area of 122,000 square miles is either Federally owned or State owned, and not 1 cent of taxes is derived from that land.

I believe there may be some justification for the argument being made by the Senator from Texas with reference to tidelands, especially in Texas, but if the submerged lands which are off the shore lands within certain States are to be given to those States, why, by the same token, should not lands within any other State be given to the particular State?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas would not like to get into any argument or discussion of the comparison, except to say that there is a difference: the State of New Mexico may be entitled to receive more of the public lands. Already the Federal Government owns 24 percent of all the land within continental United States. If the policy of the tidelands decisions is continued, the Government will take over more and more land within the United States. But there is not an exact comparison between federally owned lands which have always been claimed by the Federal Government and never claimed by the States, and lands within the marginal belt of Texas which have always been claimed by the State and never by

[1] *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367, 410 (1842)).

[2] *Mumford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423, 436 (1867)).

the Federal Government until 1948. So there is that difference, although I concede that there might be other considerations which would be analoguos.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator contends that continuously certain States have claimed the tidelands, but the law up to the moment is to the effect that such lands belong to the Federal Government. Otherwise, we would not be debating the joint resolution. Is not that correct? Up to the moment the courts have held that such lands belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. DANIEL. I yielded for a question. The Senator's question is whether the courts have held that such lands belong to the Federal Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. That is not what the courts have held. The courts have held that the Federal Government has paramount rights and powers over such lands. The Supreme Court refused to hold that the Federal Government had ownership of them. It clearly held that the Congress has the right to determine the question of future ownership of the property.

Mr. President, I should like to continue my argument.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I am just about to conclude my discussion of certain decisions. I should like to complete the quotations from the decisions which emphasize the points I have tried to make. The Supreme Court of the United States, in all its decisions, was not at all concerned with the question of whether the submerged lands under consideration were within inland waters. It was applying a rule which is broader than that applicable to all navigable waters within State boundaries. When the Supreme Court states that broad rule in deciding the ownership of lands beneath inland waters, it is not dictum as to lands which are beneath the navigable waters of the marginal sea within State boundaries.

Mr. Justice Field in 1873, for a unanimous Court that included Chief Justice Chase, said that—

All soils under the tidewaters within her limits passed to the States.[3]

He was referring to California.

Mr. Justice Bradley in 1876 said:

In our view of the subject the correct principles were laid down in *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367), *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 312), and *Goodtitle* v. *Kibbe* (9 How. 471). These cases related to tidewaters, it is true; that they enunciated principles which are equally applicable to all navigable waters * * * it (the bed and shore of such waters) properly belongs to the State by their inherent sovereignty.[4]

Chief Justice Waite in 1876 said that—

Each State owns the beds of all *tidewaters* within its jurisdiction.[5]

Did the Court say "tidewaters under bays" or "tidewaters and lands under rivers" or "inland waters"? No. The Court said:

Each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction.

Mr. Justice Gray in 1894 said:

The new States admitted into the Union since the adoption of the Constitution have the same rights as the original States in the tidewaters, and in the lands under them, within their respective jurisdictions.[6]

Not "within their inland waters," but "within their respective jurisdictions."

Chief Justice White said in 1912:

Each State owns the beds of *all tidewaters* within its jurisdiction.[7]

Chief Justice Taft in 1926 said that—

All the proprietary rights of the Crown and Parliament in, and all their dominion over, lands under tidewater vested in the several States.[8]

Chief Justice Hughes said in 1935:

The soils under tidewaters within the original States were reserved to them respectively, and the States since admitted to the Union have the same sovereignty and jurisdiction in relation to such lands within their borders as the original States possessed.[9]

So we see that in these cases, and in all the other cases to which I refer, the Court, in determining who owns lands beneath navigable waters, has simply applied two tests, namely, first, "Is the land beneath navigable waters?" and, second, "Is it within State boundaries?" The Court has never applied the test of "whether the waters happen to be inland waters."

The rule is so broad because it actually grew up from the marginal sea and was extended to inland waters as arms of the sea. That is why the rule is stated so broadly; and because it is stated so broadly and applies to all the inland waters, as well as marginal sea waters, officials of the States do not want to see the rule destroyed as to any States, especially as to the States and the area in which the rule itself originated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from Texas to say that the question of who has ownership of and title to submerged lands started first out at sea, in the marginal or territorial sea, however broad that might be, and then proceeded inland to bays and ports, and then rivers, and finally to inland lakes, and that all the other rules are derivatives of the law of the sea?

Mr. DANIEL. That is exactly what the text writers and the decisions of our own Court, as well as the English decision from which I quoted, have said as to the origin of the rule.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is he further stating that the first case on the right of a nation to submerged lands under the open sea was the case decided in England in 1611, from which case the Senator quoted earlier in his remarks?

Mr. DANIEL. The 1610 case was the first case explaining the origin of the rule in the common law. It was the case of the River Banne.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Texas will, of course, permit the Senator from Illinois to point out that the case referred to was a British case, and that England, or Great Britain, is what is known as a unitary government; that is to say, there is a national government which has external jurisdiction, but there are no state subdivisions within Great Britain. Great Britain has internal jurisdiction as well. In the United States, however, we have a Federal Government, or a so-called National Government, having jurisdiction over foreign affairs, with the State governments being given large powers over domestic affairs. Is not that true?

Mr. DANIEL. That is true; and that is exactly why, in England, the King had both the governmental powers and the ownership.

But when the Colonies, and then the original States of this Nation, won their freedom, they did not give proprietary rights to the Federal Government unless they expressly described the property and granted it for certain purposes. Certain paramount governmental powers of the King were delegated to the National Government in our country, but, according to all our court decisions, the proprietary rights in soils under navigable waters were left by the Constitution in the States, and not delegated or transferred to the National Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Texas that in England it may well be true that the same political authority which had jurisdiction over submerged lands seaward from the low watermark should also have jurisdiction over submerged lands in bays, ports, rivers, lakes, or inland waters. There was no other government to have it. But in this country we have a federal system, and we have the problem of delimiting where the authority of the Federal Government stops and where the authority of the State government begins. We have to decide what are the essential incidents of national sovereignty and what are the powers of the States. The Senator from Texas would extend the State powers and ownership all the way from the lakes, the rivers, and the harbors out to the sea.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I would do for the State of Texas, out to our historic boundaries 3 leagues from shore, exactly what the Senator from Illinois would do for his State of Illinois. I would claim and ask the Congress to leave us with the ownership we have had and the uses we have had for all these many years in regard to the lands beneath those waters exactly as the Senator from Illinois would ask the Congress to leave the State of Illinois with 976,000 acres which have been held by his State under the same rule of law.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTIN in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield only on the point I have covered, because I am coming to another point. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

---

[3] *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57, 66 (1873)).

[4] *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324, 338 (1876)).

[5] *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391, 394 (1876)).

[6] *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 57 (1894)).

[7] *Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166, 174 (1912)).

[8] *Appleby* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 364, 381 (1926)).

[9] *Borax Consolidated* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 15 (1935)).

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Texas this question: If what the opponents of the pending measure hold to be true, that the Federal Government has rights to the submerged lands, what would be the effect on the 210,000 acres of submerged lands in a comparatively dry inland State such as Arizona?

Mr. DANIEL. Federal officials in the past have claimed that they would not ever seek title to the rivers and waters of the Senator's State. They started saying that when they felt it was necessary to prevent the passage of legislation like the measure which is now before the Senate. But I would say to the Senator from Arizona that the principles which have been applied to the marginal sea in the three tidelands cases could be applied some day in the future to his State if Federal officials ever wanted to apply them. At least they to some extent clouded the title of the Senator's State and the State of Alabama and all the other States represented on this floor to their rivers.

The very same Federal officials who first came before the Congress in support of the Nye resolution said to the committees of Congress, "The Federal Government has the right to all the natural resources, the oyster beds, and other things, in the inland waters." I wish Senators would not forget that. In recent years Federal officials have receded from those claims and said they would be willing to cede such rights to the States. They need to do that in order to divide and conquer the coastal States. But it was said by them in 1937: "The Federal Government has the same right under the rivers and the inland waters as under the marginal sea lands."

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In view of the recent Fallbrook case, in which the Federal Government tried to do just what the Senator has been stating, we in Arizona are disturbed by the possibilities arising from that case, because our Colorado River is a navigable stream for from 135 to 150 miles. Recurring to the question I put to the Senator before, the fact that the Colorado River is a navigable stream leads me to ask him whether, if the Federal Government claimed the rights to the lands off the shores of the Senator's State which have been historically the property of that State, it could claim the same rights to lands under the Colorado River or any other navigable water in my State.

Mr. DANIEL. I should think so. In the Fallbrook case the Federal officials, after their pleadings had been revealed and reported to Congress, said, "We are not claiming the paramount right, we are not claiming the same rights over the Santa Margarita River as on the marginal sea lands."

However, if the Senator will look at the Federal pleadings in that case, involving an inland river, he will find at the very end of the pleadings the Government included the phrase "and paramount rights" as being claimed by the Government in those waters.

I am sure the Senator is familiar with the North Platte River case, in which Nebraska and Wyoming were suing over the waters of the North Platte River. That was in 1935. In that case the Secretary of the Interior intervened and claimed that the Federal Government owned the waters within the North Platte River. By the way, the Court did not decide the point. It left it undecided, as to whether the Federal Government was the original owner of those particular waters.

So, Mr. President, I say that those who accuse us of trying to mislead inland States are not looking at the facts and the evidence, or they would realize why 47 States have sent officials to the Congress asking for the enactment of the very legislation now pending.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas, and I wish to express my interest, as a Senator from the State of Arizona, in this subject, as stemming from the fear that if the Federal Government can encroach on the rights of the Senator's State, it can encroach on the rights of Arizona. The fear I express today is but a continuation of the feeling that has been expressed by the Attorney General of Arizona in 1948 and 1949.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas very much.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I compliment and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Texas on the real contribution which he is making to the debate, in pointing out so clearly that the so-called inland-waters rule is nothing in the world but a derivation and an extension of the rule already existing and announced earlier with reference to the bottoms of our coastal belt or marginal sea.

In connection with that matter, I remind the distinguished Senator that the Federal Government has already clearly indicated its attitude toward the so-called inland-waters rule. I quoted yesterday from the brief of the Federal attorneys in the California case on that precise point. For instance, those attorneys said, as appears on page 11 of the brief——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida read the next sentence?

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish the Senator from Illinois would permit me to ask my question. He will then have ample time to propound such other questions as he may desire. To continue, the Senator from Texas will recall also that able Federal counsel in the case to which I have alluded continued in the showing of their displeasure with the inland-waters rule, or disapproval of that rule, by using such words as "erroneous," "unsound," wrong," "patently unsound," "fallacy," and "a legal fiction," all those words relating to the inland-waters rule.

The question I wish to ask the distinguished Senator is this. Was not the fact that Federal counsel so referred to the inland-waters rule, at a time when they were attacking the mother rule, that is, the rule relating to the beds of the marginal sea, a completely logical course and almost a necessary course if Federal counsel desired to be fair and honest, in that they were calling attention to the fact that while they were disapproving and attacking and seeking to set aside the marginal-sea rule, they could not at the same time approve the inland-waters rule, which they knew to be derived from and a part of the general rule which the Senator has so ably mentioned?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Florida is certainly correct, and I thank him for bringing out that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If it was logical and necessary for Federal counsel to make that point, is it not also logical and necessary for those who are defending the rights of the States, including the attorneys general and the other representatives of the States which have inland waters, to come to that precise conclusion, and to recognize and realize the fact that the Federal attorneys in attacking the rule applicable to submerged lands under the marginal sea were already challenging, and were honest enough to say so in their brief in the California case, the titles of the States to the submerged lands under their inland waters?

Mr. DANIEL. Certainly, the Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would not it be well for the Senator from Florida to quote and for the Senator from Texas to take into account not only the sentence from the Government's brief which the Senator from Florida read, as follows:

> However, we submit that ownership of submerged lands is not related to sovereignty at all, and that the decisions of this Court dealing with tidelands and lands under inland waters have proceeded upon a false premise—

But also the express disavowal contained in the following sentence of the brief, which I now read:

> The Government does not ask that those cases be overruled; indeed, it suggests that in the interest of clarity and certainty they be reaffirmed herein.

In other words, was not the Government saying that the Court should not overrule the decisions in these cases in regard to inland waters, but should in effect reaffirm them?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Illinois has correctly read from the Government's brief in the California case. However, the answer is that in that case the Supreme Court did not follow the suggestion. The Court did not reaffirm the rule of State ownership of lands

beneath inland waters within the boundaries of the States.

Furthermore, anything the Government attorneys wrote in their brief as to what should be done by way of equity is not binding on the United States.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Illinois that on the same day when the Government filed that brief, in which the Government attorneys criticized the State ownership of lands under inland waters, but said it is all right for the Court to reaffirm that ownership—thus giving assurances to the inland States, as it were—the Attorney General of the United States, when in the Supreme Court Building, handed to the newspaper reporters a news release in which he said:

"Whatever the decision of the Court may be in the California case, it would not be decisive as to the rights of any other State. The United States bought California from Mexico and paid $15 million for it. When it was admitted to the Union it was with the express statutory mandate that the United States retain all of the lands within its boundaries. Other coastal States are on an entirely different footing."

When asked regarding his native State of Texas, the Attorney General pointed out that Texas had been an independent nation—a republic—for 10 years before it joined the Union. As a republic it owned all of the land within its boundaries, including the marginal sea, commonly called tidelands. This area, similar to that involved in the California case, extended into the Gulf of Mexico, and was under the sovereignty of Texas all during the republic, and was retained by it under the provisions of the Act of Admission.

In spite of that assurance, only a little more than a year later a lawsuit was filed against my State, and my colleagues know the result of that suit.

The point is that we cannot take the assurance of Federal officials that the inland States are in good condition and do not need to worry, any more than it was safe to take the assurance of the Attorney General that Texas would not be sued, for the same Attorney General later filed suit against the State of Texas, as the President directed him to do.

So Congress needs to act, if all 48 of the States are to be safe in the ownership of their lands beneath navigable waters.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there any more reason for the States which have inland waters to trust and rely upon the assurance given in the brief of the Federal Government attorneys in the California case which has just been read by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, than there was reason for the States to believe that they could rely upon the earlier assurances given by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, and by all his predecessors in that office, to the effect that the States owned the submerged lands under the offshore waters within their boundaries?

Mr. DANIEL. There is less reason to believe the assurance contained in the brief than there was to believe the assurances which were given as to our marginal belt by all the Federal officials for more than 100 years. They went back on their word when it came time to try to take some land from the coastal States, and they might do it in the future as to inland States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that in the California case, as reaffirmed in the Texas case and in the Louisiana case, we are given the definite warning by the Supreme Court that it will not apply in favor of States whose property is jeopardized or taken away by the Federal Government, equitable defenses such as estoppel, laches, adverse possession, and other equitable defenses which would apply as between individuals, and will not give any real effect to recitals, no matter from how dignified a source—even from the President himself—to the effect that the rights of the States are not jeopardized, if later officials come to a different conclusion and decide to attack the titles of the States in proceedings before the United States Supreme Court? Is not that true?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Florida is correct.

In the California case the Court said:

No estoppel can arise here from any possible mistaken or unauthorized acts, statements, or commitments of officers of the United States.

In the same decision the Court said:

Officers who have no authority at all to dispose of Government property cannot by their conduct cause the Government to lose its valuable rights by their acquiescence, laches, or failure to act.

Mr. President, until 1937 there was less reason for the coastal States to worry about the ownership of their land than there is for the inland States to worry now. Today we are faced with a different situation, and both the coastal States and the inland States have just cause to ask for the enactment of this proposed legislation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Were not the facts such that in the California case the State of California presented a great number of examples and much evidence to show that in many instances the Federal Government had recognized California's title and contended that the Federal Government was bound by the doctrine of estoppel? But did not the Supreme Court simply brush aside that point by saying that Federal agents could not be estopped, but that they could change their minds the next day and could move to attempt to have those lands seized, and that they had a right to do so?

Mr. DANIEL. That is the effect of the decision.

Mr. LONG. Is it not also true that the same Solicitor General who told us that we need not worry about having the Federal Government change its mind and need not urge that the decisions be reversed is the same person who told us that previously he had urged that the Court reverse its position, and that he felt the Court should reverse its position, in the long line of decisions relating to racial discrimination?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Florida cites the words of the Government's attorneys as threatening the ownership rights of inland States, is it not equally proper to cite other words of the Government's attorneys to neutralize the alleged threats on these points?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes; and then it is proper to decide which we shall believe—in other words, whether we shall believe that they are going to recognize State ownership or whether we shall believe that they will deny it and will file suit against us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But do not the rights of the States in the submerged lands under the inland waters and in the tidelands rest not only on the assurances of the Government attorneys but also upon the long and unbroken chain of decisions on these points? I believe I have read approximately 52 cases which refer either to (a) the tidelands proper not only on bays but on the open sea, and many of those cases were quoted by the distinguished Senator from Texas; or (b) submerged lands under bays, harbors, ports; or (c) submerged lands under rivers; or (d) submerged lands under the Great Lakes.

In all those cases the Court said that those submerged lands belonged to the States. But until the California case arose, the Court never had before it a case involving submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark.

The question is whether the Court is bound by general words or statements in earlier opinions which must be applied immutably to individual cases no matter how different the facts may be, or whether the common law arises from individual cases and can be adapted to new conditions and to new situations which present themselves for decision.

Mr. DANIEL. I shall show the Senator from Illinois that the Supreme Court did consider the matter of ownership of oyster beds and fisheries attached to the soil within the 3-mile belt. That occurred in the Abbey Dodge case and in the case of Manchester against Massachusetts.

But at this time I prefer to cite the Senator from Illinois a case applying to his own State, namely, the case of Illinois Central Railway Co. against the State of Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted to have that case cited.

Mr. DANIEL. If that case is not directly in point in holding that the States own the lands under the open sea waters within their boundaries, then I do not know how a case can be in point.

First, Mr. President, let me call attention to the case of the *Genessee Chief* (12 How. 443 (1851)), in which it was held that the Great Lakes were the same as the open seas with respect to admiralty jurisdiction. I wish to quote from that case in order to lay the foundation to show the Senate that the Great Lakes have been held to be open seas, and that the same rule was applied to them as had been applied to the coastal States along the borders of the sea.

From the Genessee Chief case, I read from the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States the following:

A great and growing commerce is carried on upon them—

That is, upon the Great Lakes—

between different States and foreign nations which is subject to all the incidents and hazards that attend commerce on the ocean. Hostile fleets have been encountered on them, and prizes been made, and every reason which existed for the grant of admiralty jurisdiction to the Federal Government on the Atlantic seas applies with equal force to the lakes. There is an equal necessity for the instance and for the prize power for the admiralty court to administer international law, and if the one cannot be established, neither can the other.

Then, in the case of United States against Rodgers, the Supreme Court went even further, saying——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield in a moment. The Supreme Court went even further in United States against Rodgers, because it had to consider a law of the Congress which made the commission of certain acts on board a vessel on the high seas crimes, and in this case the vessel was on the Great Lakes. In that case the Supreme Court said:

The Great Lakes possess every essential characteristic of seas. They are high seas.

I am quoting the words of the Court. The Court went on to say that, regardless of the name you apply to them, they are high seas.

And the Supreme Court compared them to the Mediterranean, the Baltic, and the Black Seas, and then to the Atlantic Ocean and to the Pacific Ocean. The Court concluded that this law by the Congress applies to the Great Lakes because they are high seas, not inland waters.

Then, Mr. President, in 1893, the Congress passed an act applying to navigation in harbors, rivers, and inland waters of the United States. Did the Congress include the Great Lakes as inland waters? No; Mr. President, the Congress of the United States put in that act these words:

The words "inland waters" as used in this act shall not be held to include the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributory waters as far east as Montreal.

Mr. President, in view of the ruling by the Supreme Court that the Great Lakes were "open seas," when it came time to decide whether the State of Illinois had ownership of the soil seaward of low-tide on Lake Michigan, what rule did the Supreme Court apply? Did it apply an inland-water rule? No, Mr. President, it applied the rule of State ownership of lands on the borders of the sea.

As proof of this I should like to read from the case of *Illinois Central Railway Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1892. The State of Illinois today claims ownership of 976,000 acres of land beneath Lake Michigan, within its borders, because that lake and the other Great Lakes are similar to the seas along the coasts of the States. This is what the Court said:

It is the settled law of this country that the ownership of and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by the tidewaters within the limits of the several States belong to the respective States within which they were found, with the consequent right to use or dispose of any portion thereof, when that can be done without substantial impairment of the interest of the public in the waters. * * * This doctrine has been often announced by this Court and is not questioned by counsel of any of the parties.

The Court cites Pollards Lessee against Hagan and Weber against Harbor Commission.

The same doctrine is in this country held to be applicable to lands covered by fresh water in the Great Lakes, over which there is extended commerce with different States and foreign nations. These lakes possess all the general characteristics of the open seas.

Did the Court say they were inland waters? No; the Court said they were seas, open seas. As the Court said in the Rodgers case, even though they are inland seas, they are high seas, and the same rule should apply as to admiralty jurisdiction that applies to the high seas along the Atlantic and Pacific. Continuing from the Illinois Central case:

These lakes possess all the general characteristics of open seas, except in the freshness of their waters and in the absence of the ebb and flow of the tide. In other respects they are inland seas, and there is no reason or principle for the assertion of dominion and sovereignty over and ownership by the State of land covered by tidewaters that is not equally applicable to its ownership and dominion and sovereignty over lands covered by the fresh waters of these lakes.

The Supreme Court of the United States goes on to say:

The Great Lakes are not in any appreciable respect affected by the tide, and yet on their waters, as said above, a large commerce is carried on, exceeding in many instances the entire commerce of States on the borders of the sea.

Does it say "exceeding the commerce of States on their inland waters"? No—

exceeding in many instances the entire commerce of States on the borders of the sea. When the reason of the limitation of admiralty jurisdiction in England was found inapplicable to the condition of navigable waters in this country, the limitation and all of its incidents were discarded. So also by the common law, the doctrine of dominion over and ownership by the Crown of lands within the realm under tidewaters is not founded upon the existence of the tide over the lands, but upon the fact that the waters are navigable, tidewaters and navigable waters, as already said, being used as synonymous terms in England.

And here, Mr. President, is the final holding of the Court, saying that Illinois owns these 976,000 acres of land:

We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes applies, which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea—

Does it say anything about the same rule as applies to inland waters? No, Mr. President; it says that same rule applies to these Great Lakes as applies to ownership by the States of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea. And the Court continues—

and that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other, and subject to the same trust and limitations.

That is why I say it would be unfair for the Great Lakes State of Illinois to hold on to 976,000 acres of land under Lake Michigan which was obtained under the same rule that applied to the coastal States, and to deny us the land we have within our 3-league boundary off the coast of the State of Texas.

The Illinois Legislature, I am glad to say, agrees with the argument I have just made. It disagrees with the distinguished Senator from Illinois. There will be found in the record of the hearings a joint resolution passed by the Illinois Legislature, which interprets these cases exactly as I have interpreted them for the Senate. The Illinois Legislature says:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Illinois Central Railroad Company* v. *State of Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), held the Great Lakes to be "open seas" and that Illinois' ownership of that portion of Lake Michigan within its boundaries rested upon the same rule of law as "lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea"; and

Whereas State ownership of lands beneath the waters within the seaward boundaries of the State has been challenged and clouded by Federal officials in recent years, all of which constitutes a threat against the State of Illinois and its political subdivisions and grantees in connection with its ownership of the above-mentioned land.

It goes on, and the Legislature of the State of Illinois resolves that Congress be petitioned to pass legislation at the earliest possible moment which will guarantee to the State of Illinois the continued ownership of the lands beneath those waters.

Mr. President, the reason why I have gone into all this history with reference to certain States—and all 48 States having navigable waters, and lands under them, with natural resources which are valuable—is that the lands are being held under the same rule of law as that under which Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and all the other coastal States have held their ownership all these years. They have done so in good faith under the same rule of law as was applied to the inland States and the Great Lakes States. I simply wish to stress the point that if Congress does something for some of the States with regard to submerged lands it should do the same thing for all the States.

The Anderson bills, supported by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], are unfair to the 21 coastal States, because they give more lands to the inland States than are involved in the coastal belt. The only fair thing for Congress to do is to write a rule of law for the future exactly as we understood it to be in the past, with all the States owning all lands and natural resources beneath the navigable waters within their boundaries, and not make fish of one and fowl of the other, because they all hold their lands under their navigable waters under the same rule and in good faith.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I should like to ask a question dealing with the memorial of the Illinois Legislature. Is it not a fact that all the legislature asked was that the title of Illinois to the submerged lands under the Great Lakes be confirmed?

Mr. DANIEL. I believe the Senator is correct.

The memorial says the Congress of the United States is petitioned to enact legislation at the earliest possible date which would confirm the State's ownership and full rights in all lands——

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Texas knows perfectly well that the two Anderson bills, Senate bill 107 and Senate bill 1252, provide precisely that. I am supporting those bills, and I am, therefore, conforming to the wishes of the Legislature of Illinois and supporting the long-established ruling of the Supreme Court on this precise point. That is the position of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other Senators.

Mr. DANIEL. That is exactly the point I am trying to make. The junior Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Illinois will support the Anderson bills, which will give nearly a million acres to the State of Illinois and a million and a half acres to the State of Minnesota, together with valuable minerals under the lands, but they will not support a resolution which will give the same justice and equity to the State of Texas, the State of Louisiana, the State of Florida, the State of Maryland, the State of Delaware, and all the other coastal States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It appears that so long as proposed legislation does not give anything to the coastal States it is all right with the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DANIEL. That seems to be the argument.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Possibly my able colleague is not taking the right approach in trying to persuade the Senator from Illinois to go along with him.

A year ago the Senator from Illinois wanted to apply tolls on all inland waterways except on the Great Lakes. He finally agreed to amend his bill so that tolls would also apply on the Great Lakes. So I think that perhaps the Senator from Texas should suggest to the Senator from Illinois that, if the Senator from Texas is not successful in getting passed the bill which he is supporting, perhaps the Senator from Illinois will then join us in putting all lands beneath navigable waters into one common Federal pot rather than discriminate against coastal States.

Mr. DANIEL. I made the suggestion earlier this afternoon that those who think the coastal States should be stripped of their lands so they could be put into a common pot should be willing to do the same with the lands of their own States which have been held to be under the high seas, and not hold on to those millions of acres. If the rule is applied to the coastal States, it should also be applied to the Great Lakes States. Their land is just as valuable, and there is twice as much of it as there is in all the coastal State marginal belts put together.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I want to express my appreciation for the generous sentiments of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Texas. I appreciate their great concern for Minnesota and Illinois. But would it not be a little more desirable, rather than saying we should make it a matter of equity, under their interpretation, to recognize that the Supreme Court has ruled in both the cases referred to——

Mr. DANIEL. I yielded for a question, not for a speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Court has ruled in the case of Illinois Central against Illinois that the Great Lakes are inland seas and are, therefore, subject to the jurisdiction of the States bordering on them. The Court has ruled in another case that they are marginal seas.

My question is this: Is there any doubt in the Senator's mind that the Supreme Court, when it made its respective rulings, one in reference to inland seas and the other in reference to marginal seas, had all the facts before it pertaining to all the things the Senator is now presenting to the Senate?

Mr. DANIEL. There is no question in my mind but that the Court had those facts before it. I do not know where the Senator from Minnesota was when I first laid the foundation for my argument on this point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was present.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the Senator going to ignore the Supreme Court when it rules against him, and stand up for it when it rules in favor of him?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. DANIEL. In the case of United States against Rodgers the Court stated that the Great Lakes possessed every essential characteristic of seas and that the character of these lakes as seas was recognized by the Court in the Chicago Lakefront case.

The Senator from Minnesota knows what the Court held in the Illinois Central case. Later, did the Supreme Court in the Rodgers case say it held that the Great Lakes were inland waters and based its decision on that fact? No. It said in the Rodgers case, and I quote:

> The character of the lakes as seas was recognized by this Court in the recent Chicago Lakefront case, where we said, "These lakes possess all the general characteristics of open seas * * *."
>
> * * * bodies of water of an extent which cannot be measured by the unaided vision and which are navigable at all times, in all directions, and bordering on different nations or States or peoples, and find their outlet in the ocean as in the present case, are seas in fact, however they may be designated.

That is the Supreme Court of the United States speaking. It does not say anything about inland waters or inland seas.

There is nothing which the Senator from Minnesota can read into these decisions that would distinguish the theory of the Great Lakes decisions from the rule of law which applies to the marginal seas, the open seas, and the high seas, because the Court itself drew that kind of an analogy. The Court did not say the Great Lakes are inland waters. It said that the same rule applied as applied under tidewaters—I am now reading from the court's decision—"under tidewaters on the borders of the sea." The marginal sea is all that the Court could have been referring to.

So I say that if it is fair for the Great Lakes States to continue holding their immensely valuable property under the open seas or high seas or inland seas, however it may be desired to designate them, based upon the same rule of law under which the coastal States have held their land, then certainly it is fair for Congress to allow the 21 coastal States to hold an area less than half as great under the marginal seas within their respective boundaries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator from Texas saying that the Supreme Court has ruled, in cases pertaining to the Great Lakes, that the resources and the land under the water are the property of the States? Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. DANIEL. I am saying that the Court has said that lands under the Great Lakes are the property of the States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. That is based upon the same rule under which the States on the borders of the sea own their submerged lands. The Supreme Court has said that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other.

Now, subsequently the Supreme Court has said that coastal States do not own their lands on the borders of the sea, and therefore the rule applicable to my State and your State has been abrogated. I say it would be only fair that the Government, if it is going to hold on to our lands, should prosecute a case against the Great Lakes States, because their submerged lands are held under the same rule. It would be grossly unfair and discriminatory for the Federal Government to take away our lands and not apply the new rule to the Great Lakes States and take your lands. I do not want to see that done. I merely say that it would be unfair to take away our lands and at the same time allow the Great Lakes States to retain their lands, when both groups of States hold the lands under the same rule of law.

I believe the fair procedure would be to have Congress say to the Great Lakes States and the coastal States, "You may continue to have the ownership you thought you had in good faith since the beginning of the Nation."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator then is stating that, under the ruling of the Court, lands under the Great Lakes are the property of the States. Is that his statement?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes, subject to what has been done to the rule by the recent decisions of the Supreme Court. It seems to me that the decisions in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases have destroyed the rule. I think the Attorney General of the United States could go into court and obtain the same kind of judgment against the Senator's

State of Minnesota as was obtained against the State of Texas, if the Attorney General would be willing to try that procedure. The same rule of law has always applied.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not contest the prophetic vision of the Senator from Texas, but I am considering the matter according to the way in which the Court ruled. The Court has ruled, insofar as inland waters or insofar as the Great Lakes are concerned, however the Senator wishes to designate them—they are known on the map as the Great Lakes—that lands under those waters are the property of the States. Is that the case?

Mr. DANIEL. The Supreme Court ruled that lands under all navigable waters within all State boundaries are owned by the States, and up until the California tidelands decision, the Court had never limited its decisions to inland waters or to the Great Lakes—never.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Texas was a member of the Association of Attorneys General, was he not?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator recall that the Association of Attorneys General in its effort to muster support for the position now held by the Senator from Texas indicated to the respective States through their governors, attorneys general, and other officials, that the Federal Government might attempt to take control of and claim property under the Great Lakes?

Mr. DANIEL. I imagine the Senator's statement is correct, because officials from 47 States came to Congress and testified before its committees that they thought the proposed legislation was needed in order that State ownership of their submerged lands could be protected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yet is it not the basis of the Senator's argument this afternoon, in an effort to claim what he considers to be equity for the coastal States, that Congress should legislate to give to coastal States what the Senator says the Supreme Court has already definitely stated belongs to inland States in the Great Lakes area? Is not that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. DANIEL. No; I have stated my position. If the Senator had been here since I began my argument, I believe he would have understood it fully. My position is that for more than 150 years all the States have been held by the Supreme Court to own all the lands beneath navigable waters, whether inland or seaward. All the States have been acting in good faith. Then the Court came along and said to the 21 coastal States, "You do not own your land any more. The Federal Government can take it away."

The question now before Congress is, Shall we ask Federal officials to see how far that doctrine applies? Shall we ask the Federal Government to sue the Great Lakes States and perhaps take their lands; or sue the inland States and take their rivers and other waters? Or shall Congress, in the public interest and in all fairness to those who claim such lands in good faith, allow all States to continue to own what was believed by all the courts to have been owned by the States for more than 150 years? That is the question before Congress.

I simply say that the fair thing for Congress to do is to treat all States alike with respect to lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries, because it would be most unfair to allow, for instance, the Great Lakes States to continue to hold 38 million acres of land under the same rule of law that coastal States have been holding their 17 million acres of land, and then take away the 17 million acres owned by the 21 coastal States. They should be treated alike.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. PASTORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Texas is delivering a splendid address to the Senate. I regret that I was not in the Chamber to hear all of the Senator's remarks, but I may say that much of the argument has been reviewed, and I think I am familiar with the general phases of it.

I have asked the Senator one or two very simple questions. I asked, first, Is it the argument of the Senator from Texas that, insofar as the Great Lakes and the States bordering on the Great Lakes are concerned, the Supreme Court has held, up until this day, April 8, 1953, that the resources and land beneath the waters of the Great Lakes are the property of the States? That is a simple question and can be answered yes or no, if I may make that suggestion to the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. I will answer the question but I shall explain my answer. The answer is "Yes." The Supreme Court in early decisions has held that the Great Lakes States own the lands beneath the Great Lakes within their boundaries; but under the same rule of law, the Court said, by which the coastal States own lands within their seaward boundaries. More recently these decisions have been overruled. Therefore, I say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that since his State holds under the same rule of law by which we held our land, your claim today is no stronger than ours. The Supreme Court has destroyed the rule under which title to land beneath the Great Lakes was given to the Great Lakes States. The Senator's State is in the same boat with Texas and Louisiana, but he does not seem to know it yet.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Texas for his incisive remark. I think he is trying to play both sides of the street. He says, on the one hand, that the States bordering the Great Lakes have ownership. On the other hand, in order to win support for his claim of ownership, he says that the Great Lakes States may not have ownership. I am beginning to think there is a third hand being shown. The Senator says that the Great Lakes States hold title to the land beneath the Great Lakes based on the same rule of law that applies to land beneath tidewaters and inland bays.

Mr. DANIEL. This is becoming a pretty long question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The latter part of it is very simple. Does the rule of law which applies to the coastal States, so far as that rule of law refers back to the Great Lakes decisions, apply to the tidewaters, the inlets, and the bays, rather than what are known as the open and marginal seas?

Mr. DANIEL. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator read the decision of the Court again?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Texas will be glad to read the decision again. The question has been asked, In writing the decision did the Court mean all tidewaters, or did the Court mean only land under inland waters?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are talking about the land under the tidewaters. What does the word "tidewaters" mean? The word "tidewaters" refers to the ebb and flow of the tide, between low and high tide.

Mr. DANIEL. Technically, tidelands are only the beaches, from low tide to high tide.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he is asking me about the meaning of that word. Is the Senator asking me what the Court means by the term "tidewaters"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am asking the Senator this question——

Mr. DANIEL. That is an easy "yes" or "no" question. Is the Senator asking me——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am asking the Senator what he means by tidelands?

Mr. DANIEL. I have already answered the question as to what is meant by tidelands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept that answer.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Minnesota now asks me about the meaning of "tidewaters." Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the Senator about the rule of law to which he referred, which he said conditioned the decisions in the Great Lakes cases. Every time I ask the Senator about the Great Lakes decisions, he says they are based upon a rule of law by the Court. Then he goes back——

Mr. DANIEL. The rule applies to tidewaters on the borders of the seas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want the Senator to quote the language of the Court again.

Mr. DANIEL. I will quote the language of the Court again. Then I shall quote the language of the Supreme Court as to what it meant by tidewaters on the borders of the sea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall await the answer.

Mr. DANIEL. This is what the Supreme Court said in the Illinois Central case about the ownership of the Great Lakes States in their lands. After calling the Great Lakes open seas and saying that they had the same characteristics as the Atlantic and the Pacific, the Court said:

> We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the

navigable waters of the Great Lakes applies, which obtains at the common law as to dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea—

Not inland tidewaters, but "tidewaters on the borders of the sea"—

and that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other.

Is it not a simple statement that the same rule of law applies to the marginal seas of the coastal States as applies to the Great Lakes?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to complete my discussion of the tidewater question. I thought the Senator from Minnesota wanted to know what "tidewaters" meant.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DANIEL. I read now from the Supreme Court decision in the case of Manchester against Massachusetts. It will be seen that the waters within the 3-mile belt, or whatever belt is used, are tidewaters. As a matter of fact, a distinguished author—an American, I believe—named "Angell" wrote a book in 1826 called Tide Waters. I got that book out the other day because I had heard that the Senator from Minnesota wanted to know what was meant by "tidewaters." The entire book relates to lands below low tide, in the marginal belt. Angell himself says that the only complete work previous to his book on this subject was Lord Hale's De Jure Maris, or The Law of the Sea.

The Supreme Court said, with relation to the Great Lakes, that tidewaters are waters which are moved by the tide, or affected by the tide. They cover all the salt waters along the borders of the sea within the marginal belt. The Supreme Court said in Manchester against Massachusetts, on that very point, referring to the tidewaters in the 3-mile belt:

We think it must be regarded as established that, as between nations, the minimum limit of territorial jurisdiction of a nation over tidewaters is a marine league from its coast.

I do not know how any clearer answer could be given by the Supreme Court of the United States as to what is meant by "tidewaters on the borders of the sea" than this one, which defines the territorial jurisdiction of a nation over tidewaters as a marine league from its coast, or 3 miles.

The same case holds that Massachusetts, since the Revolution, has the same rights as the King had before the Revolution, to the lands, the fish, and the waters within the area underneath those tidewaters on the borders of the sea within the 1-league belt, or 3-mile belt of Massachusetts.

I will say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that his State has no better title to the lands under the 1,400,000 acres of Great Lakes within the boundaries of his State than the 21 coastal States have to their marginal belts on the borders of the sea, because the title of his State rests on the same theory of law, and on decisions which the Supreme Court has now overruled. If it is fair for the Great Lakes States to continue to hold their lands, it is only fair for the coastal States to continue to hold the same type of property.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has made the statement that the courts have held that the Great Lakes belong to the States. However, I do not believe he will find that the Supreme Court has ever held that Lake Superior belongs to the State of Minnesota, for example. I believe he will find that he must rely upon a case involving Lake Michigan, which does not involve an international boundary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not involve what?

Mr. LONG. The case related to Lake Michigan, which, so far as I know, has no international boundary in it. Lake Superior has an international boundary in it, and in that respect is much more susceptible to the threat of the Federal Government seizing it. The opportunity to make a distinction between the Great Lakes and the other inland waters has been pointed out by Mr. Philip Perlman based upon the fact that an international boundary runs through all the Great Lakes except Lake Michigan.

If the Senator is relying upon reasoning by analogy that because Illinois owns the bed of Lake Michigan the State of Minnesota would own the bed of Lake Superior, I point out to him that the Court said in Martin against Waddell that the States own all the waters within their boundaries, and therefore the State of New Jersey owned the bed of Raritan Bay. Later, when the Court had an opportunity to say, "We have just decided a case involving Raritan Bay, in which we said the States owned the lands beneath all their waters," it said in effect, "Oh, no. We have a case involving waters outside the bay, and we prefer to lay down a different rule to apply to waters outside inland waters within State boundaries."

So the Court laid down a different rule.

If the Senator wishes to rely upon the 52 Supreme Court decisions, I believe he will find that there is different thinking on the Court today, in many respects, than there was when those 52 decisions were handed down. Because there is different thinking, the Court is being asked to reverse some of its previous decisions.

There was a long line of cases involving the so-called separate-but-equal doctrine, holding that a State could provide one school building for white children and another for children of another race. That doctrine was laid down time after time. Some people disagreed with it, and the Court is now being asked to overrule a long line of decisions. I am curious to know whether the Senator from Minnesota would like to have the Court overrule that long line of decisions.

Mr. DANIEL. I think I can answer that question for the Senator from Minnesota, but I should like to get along with my presentation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a final question?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since we are discussing the Court, I remind my able, distinguished, and beloved friend from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that in the case of Massachusetts against New York, which involved Lake Ontario, which has an international boundary, the Court ruled that the Illinois Central case rule applied to that case. In the Illinois Central case the Court also talked about these lakes. It did not talk merely about Lake Michigan.

I now get down to the final question. In cases between the States and the Federal Government, the Constitution, I believe, provides that the Supreme Court may be the court of original jurisdiction. In other words, such a case may go directly to the Supreme Court. There was a real purpose in that provision, as I understand from the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention. It was a way to protect what we call the Federal system, and the respective rights of the States and the Federal Government.

Is it not true that the court decisions in the cases involving inland waters, in cases involving the Great Lakes, which are considered a part of the inland waters, and the court decisions involving the coastal States with respect to the submerged lands in the open seas, have all been handed down by the Supreme Court, and that the rule of law in each case has been applied back to other cases which the Supreme Court has decided, and that in each and everyone of those decisions the Court has held that where the open seas are involved on the coasts of the United States, the submerged lands belong to the Federal Government, and that in the inland waters, bays, inlets, and Great Lakes, the submerged lands belong to the States? Is not that the rule of the Court, as of 1953?

Mr. DANIEL. That may be the rule of the Court as of 1953——

Mr. HUMPHREY. But——

Mr. DANIEL. Just a moment. The Senator, in his remarks, has made reference to all the court decisions of the past relating to lands beneath navigable waters. What the Senator has stated is not true as to all the decisions of the past. For over a hundred years, in 52 separate decisions, the Supreme Court of the United States wrote the rule as to State ownership of lands beneath navigable waters broad enough to cover all navigable waters, both inland and seaward. Not one case can the Senator find in which the Supreme Court limited the rule to inland waters. The present Supreme Court, in the California decision, conceded that. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota is familiar with Justice Black's statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am familiar with that.

Mr. DANIEL. He said that many times the Court had stated the rule broad enough to indicate that it believed that the States own all lands beneath the navigable waters within their boundaries, whether inland or seaward. If the rule was stated well enough to make the former courts believe the States owned the lands both inland and seaward, it

certainly must have been stated well enough to make the States believe they were in good faith in claiming the property.

Mr. President, to show exactly how specific the courts have been in stating this rule in the past, and what outstanding justices have stated the rule, I wish to quote from at least one decision. I know the Senator from Minnesota has a high regard for Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed I have.

Mr. DANIEL. Let me read a sentence from an opinion concurred in by Justice Holmes while he was on the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, in which he follows a former decision of the Massachusetts court relating to lands within the marginal belt 1 mile from shore. This was in *Massachusetts* v. *Manchester* (152 Mass. 230 (1890)), opinion by Justice Field, concurred in by Justice Holmes, as follows:

> There is no belt of land under the sea adjacent to the coast which is property of the United States and not property of the States.

It would seem to me that is pretty plain English; and how anyone can stand on the Senate floor and say that the Supreme Court Justices have not written the law broad enough to cover the marginal belt of the coastal States, when they themselves in their own States claim their submerged lands under that same rule of law, is beyond me.

Mr. President, I am glad to say that the Legislature of Minnesota in past years, and the Governor in past years——

Mr. HUMPHREY. In past years; yes.

Mr. DANIEL. And the attorney general of Minnesota this year, have informed our committee that they think that the legislation now proposed is essential to enable the State of Minnesota to continue to enjoy ownership of its 1,400,000 acres of land beneath the Great Lakes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield so that we may correct the RECORD?

Mr. DANIEL. I am glad that someone from Minnesota agrees, and sees the danger that is impending, as does the Governor and attorney general and senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and as officials from all the States except one happen to see it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Minnesota never discussed this issue until this year. This year the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota had an open debate on the very subject matter we are now discussing, and by a vote of 2 to 1 the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota asked that the submerged lands be maintained under Federal ownership and control, the Governor notwithstanding. He, by the way, has not dared make a public statement on this issue in the State of Minnesota, in spite of all the talk about the Great Lakes and the confusion which it has been attempted to bring into the debate.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, may I have unanimous consent to reverse the usual order and ask the Senator from Minnesota a question without losing the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Texas may ask the question.

Mr. DANIEL. The senate of the State Legislature of Minnesota has not acted on the matter, has it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The house of representatives, the people's body, where the people are well represented, has acted.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator answer my question? Has the State senate acted on the resolution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The senate has not.

Mr. DANIEL. In the resolution passed by the House of the Legislature of Minnesota, in which they said they wanted the Federal Government to hold on to the submerged lands of the coastal States, to be divided up among all the people, did they offer to put in the 1,400,000 acres of submerged lands of Minnesota in the common pot to be shared by all the people?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Legislature of the State of Minnesota merely asked that the Congress of the United States abide by the decisions of the Supreme Court, and when they asked that, they took into consideration the decisions concerning the Great Lakes which my dear friend from Texas has explained with greater eloquence than any court could employ. They also asked that the decision with respect to the submerged lands along the coasts of Alabama, Louisiana, and Texas be sustained. In other words, the legislature believes the Court to be an honorable institution, that it is not engaged in forensics or debate, but in decision rendering on the basis of facts. I applaud the house of representatives of the legislature of my State for their judicious action.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota is correct in his statement, it would seem that the house of representatives in Minnesota approved the 3 most recent decisions, which do not happen to be against his State, and disapproved the 52 previous opinions, under which we hold our lands in the coastal States, and under which Minnesota now holds its submerged land. If the same thing happens to the Senator's State that has happened to Texas, there will not be any land under the Great Lakes left under the control of his State, but the Federal Government will own all the submerged lands.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Texas know whether or not the resolution passed by the House of the Legislature of Minnesota urged that the Congress pass the Anderson bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to give the information to the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I must hasten on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know the Senator from Texas wants a full discussion. By the way, his discussion is a brilliant contribution to the debate.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Texas has almost persuaded me, considering the evidence with which he has had to work. His argument has been remarkable; and I say that in all seriousness.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator; and now I am ready for the next blow. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are indeed debating with the experts. The Senator from Texas knows his facts and knows them well, and I shall yield to him when I have the floor, but I shall not be so technical as he is, as I shall discuss the matter from a layman's standpoint.

The house of representatives of the legislature of my State did take into consideration the decisions pertaining to our Great Lakes, also the argument that the lands might come under Federal jurisdiction. After due consideration they arrived at the resolution which they passed, and I shall present it to the Senator so that he can study it and make his comments.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am grateful to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I wish to conclude as soon as possible. I have two or three short arguments I should like to complete this afternoon, and leave the floor, in not more than an hour, so that another speech may follow on the same subject. I understand a Senator on the opposition is to speak this afternoon, so I should like to hasten my remarks.

Mr. President, I am sure the exchange between the Senator from Minnesota and the junior Senator from Texas sums up as well as anything could the points I have been trying to make in the Senate this afternoon. Briefly summarized, they are as follows:

All our States, all 48, have natural resources, valuable lands, under navigable waters. The States have all held them for over 100 years, under the same rule of law, and the only fair thing to do for the future is to leave the law as it has been, and not give the Great Lakes States their valuable lands and take away our smaller area of land beneath the marginal sea. Since we have held the lands under the same rule, it would be discrimination if a different rule were applied to the coastal States without even testing the claims of the Federal Government as to the Great Lakes States.

Especially is that true when we see what the Governor of Minnesota wrote to our committee as to the need of legislation such as that now proposed, and as to the valuable land under the Great Lakes within the State of Minnesota. He said that under those lands were copper, nickel, cobalt, gold, and other precious minerals.

I believe the Senator from Minnesota was not in the Chamber when I made the statement earlier this afternoon that the Governor of Minnesota said to the committee:

> To date about $2 million has been collected by the State in royalties covering iron ore removed from submerged lands.

I stated that that was more royalty than we in Texas have received on oil

from the submerged lands within our boundaries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What governor was that?

Mr. DANIEL. The Governor of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What lakes was he talking about, in saying that $2 million in royalties had been received from the lands under them? I live in Minnesota, and I never heard of any of the Great Lakes that has beneath it any iron ore from which we ever received any royalties.

Mr. DANIEL. I am quoting from the report of the Governor of Minnesota, as given to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In the report he says:

> Please note that to date about $2 million has been collected by the State in royalties covering iron ore removed from submerged lands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If he means from under Pike Lake, up in the woods—a lake across which a person can almost reach—I agree. But certainly he was not talking about Lake Superior.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I yield only for a question, not for an argument. If the Senator from Minnesota wishes to discuss this matter further, he can do so later on his own time.

GOOD FAITH OF COASTAL STATES

The coastal States have been in complete good faith in their possession and ownership of the seabed within their historic boundaries for more than 100 years.

This was admitted by the Supreme Court in the California case. It said the previous courts "many times" had indicated that they "believed that the States owned soils under navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

That the coastal States have possessed and developed these submerged lands in good faith was also admitted at the recent committee hearings by former Solicitor General Perlman. The question and answer—page 694—speak for themselves:

> Senator DANIEL. I would like to ask the Solicitor General if he does not agree that, prior to the [Federal] assertions made in 1937 for the first time, the States were in good faith, those of us who did claim to own these lands?
>
> Mr. PERLMAN. Yes, Senator, I do. I have to do that because I recall that prior to that time the Secretary of the Interior himself said that he thought the States had title.

This record of our hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 13 is full of instances in which Federal officials acknowledged State titles to their marginal sea lands over a period of 100 years. Many of them were instances in which the Federal Government purchased or obtained grants from the States to lands below low tide for lighthouses, jetties, and other improvements.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has already mentioned a long list of such particular instances in which the Federal Government purchased, if you please, submerged lands beyond the low-tide mark—purchased them from the States for use for Federal purposes.

NOT A GIFT

Under such circumstances, Mr. President, restoration of these lands to the States will not be a gift. One does not give away something he never had. Until recently the Federal Government never thought it owned these lands, and even until now it has never possessed or used them. The lands are still in the possession of the States, awaiting action by Congress on the final question of future ownership. The passage of the pending proposed legislation will simply permit the States to keep what they have always had since the foundation of the Union. It will be an act of justice and equity—the same type of equity that would be applied by a court if one family had possessed a tract of land in good faith for over 100 years and another tried to take it away on some newly discovered theory of law.

The Supreme Court said it could not apply such rules of equity when the the United States is involved.

Of course, Mr. President, in land suits between individuals, the lower courts do apply such rules of equity. If for 100 years no claim to a certain piece of land has been made by a family, the courts do not permit a member of that family thereafter, by instituting suit, to obtain the land, thus taking it away from a family that had claimed it and developed it in good faith for 100 years or more. The Supreme Court said it could not apply that rule of equity as against the United States, but the Court clearly said that Congress has the power to do so. That is precisely what this proposed legislation would do. It would apply the moral equity that the Court felt itself without authority to apply. It would write the law for the the future as all Supreme Courts and Federal and State officials believed it to be in the past.

This proposed legislation would treat all the States alike, both inland and seaward, by continuing in effect one rule of State ownership, applicable to all lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

TEXAS' SPECIAL TITLE

Mr. President, at this time I should like to refer to my last point, namely, the special title under which Texas claims its submerged lands, and under which it has owned and developed them since Texas entered the Union, and even before then, when Texas was an independent nation. Texas has a special claim under its annexation agreement with the United States, and that claim should be confirmed by this legislation.

In addition to the previously long-recognized rule applicable to all the States, Texas has a special claim to the submerged lands within its historic 3-league-seaward boundary, and that claim should be recognized and defended by this Congress and by every Federal official who has the slightest regard for a solemn agreement between two independent nations.

Texas was a republic for nearly 10 years before it became a State. The First Congress of the Texas Republic on December 19, 1836, fixed the boundaries of the new nation. The boundary in the Gulf of Mexico was set at 3 leagues from shore, in the following words:

> Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande. (Laws of the Republic of Texas (1836), I, 133.)

Then the inland boundaries were stated.

Title to the land and minerals within these boundaries was won from Mexico by conquest, a conquest which was forced upon the Texans in order to protect their lives and liberties from the dictatorship and oppression of the Mexican President, General Santa Ana. As said by President Andrew Jackson:

> The title of Texas to the territory she claims is identified with her independence.

TEXAS BOUNDARY RECOGNIZED

The records indicate that copies of the Texas Boundary Act were sent to the major nations of the world before they recognized Texas as an independent republic. At least we are sure from the congressional records that Senator Walker, of Mississippi, placed the United States Senate on notice of the boundaries both before adoption of the resolution recognizing Texas' independence and before adoption of the resolution of annexation—CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 1st session, 28th Congress, Appendix, pages 548, 550.

Mr. President, I can refer to numerous instances in which the United States Government has recognized the Texas 3-league boundary.

In the first place, after Texas entered the Union, the United States Government, following the Mexican War, entered into a treaty. The entrance of Texas into the Union caused the war with Mexico. The United States won that war, and thereafter, in 1848, the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was entered into. The 3-league gulfward boundary of Texas was recognized by the United States and Mexico in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, July 4, 1848, which significantly provides:

> The boundary line between the two Republics shall commence in the Gulf of Mexico, 3 leagues from land, opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande, otherwise called Rio Bravo del Norte (9 Stat. 922).

Of course, that war was fought because of the dispute over the boundary, namely, whether, in connection with the boundary, the line claimed by Texas should be followed or the line claimed by Mexico. I believe I can summarize this boundary argument, and not go into it in detail unless questions are asked by my colleagues, by referring the Members of the Senate to the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which specifically followed the Texas 3-league boundary.

Later by the Gadsden Treaty, signed in 1853, such limits of the State were further confirmed—Tenth United States Statutes at Large, page 1031—and still later in 1911 they were actually surveyed by the International Boundary Commission. A map published by the State Department showing this boundary in the gulf is printed opposite page 411 of the transcript of the committee hearings now on Senators' desks.

For instance, Mr. President, in 1911, according to State Department records, the International Boundary Commission ran the 3-league boundary between Texas and Mexico out into the Gulf of Mexico. If Senators who wish to do so will examine the map shown opposite page 411 in the committee hearings, they will find folded there in the hearings a map which was printed in two sections by the State Department. The map has been reduced in size, but there Senators will see the boundary in the Rio Grande between the United States and Mexico, and then out into the Gulf of Mexico. On sheet No. 30, the Senators will see a red line going out into the Gulf of Mexico 1 marine league, as marked about the middle of sheet No. 30. At that point on the sheet Senators will see the following words:

International boundary begins 3 leagues from land—

Not 3 miles, but 3 leagues—

and opposite the mouth of the Rio Grande.

And to the right of that line Senators will see that the 3-league point is stated to be a certain number of meters beyond the edge of this sheet. The depth of water there is shown to be 27.3 meters. I think there can be no doubt that the boundary of Texas has been recognized as being three leagues from shore ever since Texas entered the Union; and the boundary of Texas will remain there under the pending measure. Similarly, I think there is no question that title to the lands out to that 3-league boundary should be confirmed to Texas, because the 3-league boundary was the one which existed at the time when Texas entered the Union.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that in 1838 there was negotiated between the Republic of the United States of America and the Republic of Texas a convention under which a boundary commission was created to fix the boundary between the United States and Texas, and that that boundary did not extend seaward 3 leagues?

Mr. DANIEL. No; that is not correct. The Senator from Alabama is partially correct. Let me explain what happened in 1838. I am now reading from Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America, published by the State Department, volume 4, page 85. The Senator will find there a complete history of the boundary agreement between the United States and Texas, in 1838, and of the manner of running of the boundary. The Senator will find printed on page 136 of these proceedings, issued by the State Department, the complete boundary of Texas, set forth exactly as the boundary was submitted to those who were to run it in 1838, and it goes 3 leagues out into the gulf. They did not want to actually mark the entire boundary between Texas and the United States. That was not at all the purpose. The purpose was to run only that portion of the boundary from the mouth of the Sabine River up to a certain latitude. If there is any doubt about that, I will read from page 141 of the State Department proceedings relative to that particular boundary, wherein it is stated:

And it is to be particularly observed, moreover, that this convention provided for the immediate demarcation of only a portion of the boundary between the United States and the Republic of Texas, namely, that which extends from the mouth of the Sabine, where that river enters the Gulf of Mexico, to the Red River, a distance of less than 300 miles

Only a small segment of the boundary was run. They did not run that part of the boundary which extends south out into the gulf 3 leagues; they did not run that part of the boundary which extends north above the Red River. They ran only a segment of 300 miles, which did not involve our seaward boundary at all.

Mr. HILL. That is the proposition, exactly. The Sabine River goes into the gulf, does it not?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The boundary starts at the mouth of the Sabine River. They were running that boundary for approximately 300 miles; but they made no claim at all regarding 3 leagues out into the gulf. I may say to my good friend from Texas that I have a map here, and I shall be glad to let him examine it.

Mr. DANIEL. I cannot let the Senator's statement remain unchallenged in the RECORD that Texas made no claim whatever about the 3 leagues into the gulf. I must read into the RECORD at this point the boundaries which were claimed by the Republic of Texas in 1838, in the official instructions submitted by the Government of Texas through its secretary of state. I shall quote from a State Department book, volume 4, of Miller's Treaties, page 136. Here is a description of the boundaries which were being considered:

The present boundaries of Texas as fixed by an act of Congress are as follows, viz, Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land to the mouth of the Rio Grande——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield in a moment. Let me finish this. This is taken from Miller's own writing. He goes on to say:

That description of the boundaries of Texas was taken almost literally from the Texan Act of December 19, 1836, to define the boundaries of the Republic of Texas, which contained the following provisions (Laws of the Republic of Texas, I, 133–134):

"That from and after passage of this act the civil and political jurisdiction of this Republic be, and is hereby declared to extend to the following boundaries, to wit: beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River, and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land, to the mouth of the Rio Grande."

Mr. President, so that the record may be clear, let me say that I am reading from the 1838 Boundary Convention Proceedings, reported by the State Department, about which the Senator from Alabama is inquiring, and, though I cannot read all of the proceedings, all that any Senator needs is to read the proceedings, and he will see that only a segment of the boundary between Texas and the United States was intended to be run at the time. Only one segment of it was in dispute. The boundary out in the gulf and north of Red River was not in dispute. Here is the State Department record saying that that was all, and that only a portion of the boundary between the United States and the Republic of Texas was to be run by the commissioners "that which extends from the mouth of the Sabine, where that river enters the Gulf of Mexico, to the Red River."

Mr. HILL rose.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Senator have another question?

Mr. HILL. Is it the contention of the Senator that this boundary was only to be a part of the boundary between Texas and the United States?

Mr. DANIEL. That is exactly what the State Department's records show, and that is all they ran. They did not run the boundary between Texas and the United States out in the gulf, or north of the Red River. There marked only 300 miles of a boundary that extends at least twice that far between the United States and the then Republic of Texas.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield for another question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has been speaking of the boundary extending out 10½ miles into the gulf.

Mr. DANIEL. Three leagues; that is 9 marine miles, or 10½ statute or road miles.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, however, that for several years the Legislature of the State of Texas sought to extend its boundary seaward approximately 140 miles?

Mr. DANIEL. Several years ago the Legislature of Texas sought to extend its boundary to the edge of the Continental Shelf. I believe no limits were mentioned at that time.

Mr. HILL. That would be roughly a distance of 140 or 150 miles, would it not?

Mr. DANIEL. In the very farthest and most extreme places, it might run that far. But let me say to the Senator from Alabama I hope the Senator does not mean to imply that the pending joint resolution covers any land beyond the 3-league boundary, so far as Texas is concerned. It certainly does not.

Mr. HILL. I appreciate that fact.

Mr. DANIEL. This measure is limited to lands within the boundaries of the State of Texas as they existed at the time Texas entered the Union, which, very clearly, from the records of the United States State Department itself, was 3 leagues from shore.

Mr. HILL. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Texas has no wish and no desire in any way to make any claim on behalf of Texas beyond the 3 leagues?

Mr. DANIEL. Not in the pending joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. Not in the pending measure; I appreciate that. But I did not limit it to the pending measure. I asked whether he has any desire or any intent or any wish at all to make any claim, in any way, shape, fashion, or form, beyond 3 leagues.

Mr. DANIEL. I might have the desire, yes, to make the claim, just as I fear the Senator from Alabama might have a desire to make a claim to some of our Texas land. I might have a desire to claim more, but I do not, by this joint resolution, claim more than that which lies within the three-league boundary. I have no intention of claiming ownership for the States of anything beyond their historic boundaries. I may say, however, that I think it would be only fair to the coastal States to give them a percentage of the revenues derived from the federally owned lands beyond our historic boundaries, because every State in the Union that has federally owned lands within its boundaries receives 37½ percent of the revenues from the lands. But that is outside the scope of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator claim that the area beyond the three leagues is within the boundary of Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. No; that is not within the original boundary of the State of Texas. I say it undoubtedly should be brought within the boundaries of the adjacent State for certain police purposes; otherwise, there would be an area without any local law. A crime might be committed, and there would be no way to punish the criminal. I doubt whether even the Senator from Alabama would want the Continental Shelf outside the original boundaries of the State of Alabama to become a no man's land, consisting of nothing but some federally owned submerged land, without any State or local law applicable to it. That is all I am asking for the State of Texas.

I shall not yield further, Mr. President, for any question on lands beyond historic boundaries, because such lands were eliminated from the resolution specifically for the purpose of confining it to lands within historic boundaries. The resolution confirms the jurisdiction and control of the United States Government over the resources outside the historic boundaries of the coastal States. So I do not care to yield for questions on anything except points relating to my discussion of the pending resolution.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Texas does not want to make for Texas claim to any submerged land beyond three leagues as of now, as I understand.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not care to go beyond the three leagues as of any time so far as State ownership of the property is concerned.

Mr. HILL. The Senator spoke about 37½ percent beyond the three leagues, and, as I recall——

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Alabama asked me if I would never want to go out any farther. I said the only thing I would ever ask beyond our original boundaries would be the same percentage of revenues which other States receive from federally owned lands. I am not sure I am going to ask for that in this session of Congress.

I do not care to yield further on that point, because there is something within the historic boundaries which is more important. I want to impress upon the Members of the Senate the fact that the Texas seaward boundary has been recognized by the Federal Government time and again.

Let me refer to a book entitled "Geological Survey Bulletin No. 817," published in 1929 as House Document No. 131 by the 71st Congress, 1st session. On page 36 of the book, which gives the boundaries of all the States and the amount of land brought into the United States by them it is stated:

> The area which Texas brought into the Union was limited as follows, as defined by the Republic of Texas, December 19, 1836:
>
> "Beginning at the mouth of the Sabine River and running west along the Gulf of Mexico 3 leagues from land to the mouth of the Rio Grande."

Every time we find that the Federal Government recognized that the boundary of Texas goes 3 leagues out from shore.

THE ANNEXATION AGREEMENT

The people of Texas were anxious for annexation to the United States but their first overture was rejected in 1837 and thereafter withdrawn. The next offer to the United States was in 1844. A treaty was signed between the two nations under which Texas would cede "all its territories," including "vacant lands, mines, minerals," and so forth, and the United States was to assume all debts of the Republic—approximately $10 million—Senate Document No. 341, 28th Congress, 1st session, 1844. This treaty was defeated in the United States Senate. A major objection was the assumption of Texas' debt in exchange for what was regarded by some Senators as worthless land, consisting of "marshes, tadpoles, and terrapins."

Because the United States wanted Texas to keep its "worthless" land, and pay its own debts, the Congress adopted a joint resolution offering annexation on those terms. It is most important to note that originally under the second section of the joint resolution Texas was to cede all its mines and minerals to the United States. However, on motion in the House of Representatives this was stricken—Appendix to CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 28th Congress, 2d session, page 389. Texas was allowed to keep her minerals and the resolution of March 1, 1845, provided:

> . . . said State, when admitted into the Union, after ceding to the United States all public edifices, fortifications, barracks, ports, and harbors, navy and navy yards, docks, magazines, and armaments, and all other property and means pertaining to the public defense belonging to said Republic of Texas, shall retain all the public funds, debts, taxes, and dues of every kind which may belong to or be due and owing to the said Republic, *and shall also retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits*, to be applied to the payment of the debts and liabilities of said Republic of Texas, and the residue of said lands, after discharging said debts and liabilities, to be disposed of as said State may direct; but in no event are said debts and liabilities to become a charge upon the Government of the United States. . . . (9 Stat. 797, CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 29th Cong., 2d sess. (1845), 362, 272.)

In accordance with the resolution and the consent given thereto by the Texas Congress on June 23, 1845, and by the people in convention assembled on July 4, 1845, a new constitution was adopted and transmitted to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, as we are now considering the admission of a new State, we can think back about what went on in 1845, when Texas adopted its new constitution, and it was submitted to the United States Congress. The Texas constitution provided that all its laws then in force should remain in effect, and that of course included its Boundary Act.

The Texas constitution of 1845 provided, in section 20, article VII, the following:

> SEC. 20. The rights of property and of action which have been acquired under the constitution and laws of the Republic of Texas shall not be divested * * * but the same shall remain precisely in the situation which they were before the adoption of this constitution.

So, Mr. President, it was provided that all property rights should remain the same, that all laws, including the boundary laws, should remain the same, and there was a specific reservation of all vacant and unappropriated land within the boundaries of Texas.

The Texas constitution of 1845 was laid before the Congress of the United States on the first Monday in December 1845. A final joint resolution of Congress was passed, and approved by the President of the United States on December 29, 1845, admitting Texas as a State in accordance with the "proposals, conditions and guarantees" contained in the first and second sections of the joint resolution of March 1, 1845, above quoted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator has said that Texas was annexed to and joined the United States of America not by the treaty of 1844, which, as he correctly says, was never ratified by the Senate, but by the joint resolution of 1845 for the admission of Texas. Is not that correct?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct. Of course, the joint resolution constituted an international agreement which, I think the Senator from Illinois will concede, is just as solemn and should be respected and lived up to just as much as a treaty.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the joint resolution of admission there was no mention of boundaries? It merely stated that Texas should enter the Union on an equal footing with the original States; did it not?

Mr. DANIEL. No; that is not correct. The Senator is picking out only one part of the final formal admission act. That was not a part of the agreement at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not the equal footing clause a part of the joint resolution of admission?

Mr. DANIEL. Not of the joint resolution submitted to Texas by which Texas was to enter the Union. The resolution about which the Senator from Illinois is talking was the final resolution, a mere formality after the agreement had been proposed by the joint resolution of March 1, 1945. After the constitution was approved, a resolution was adopted

approving it, and formally admitting the State on an equal footing. That was never submitted to Texas. It was never involved in the proceedings by which Texas agreed to come into the Union.

Certainly the Senator from Illinois does not believe that the inclusion of the words "equal footing" by the Congress alone, without even mentioning it to Texas, could alter the terms and guarantees by which Texas agreed to enter the Union?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator from Texas whether the first joint resolution of Congress delineated the boundaries of Texas?

Mr. DANIEL. No; the first resolution of March 1, 1845, simply referred to all lands properly within the boundaries of Texas. The boundaries were not specifically delineated in the resolution, but they were read on the floor, just as in the case of the boundaries of Hawaii. I do not understand that Hawaii's boundaries are set forth in any bill providing for the admission of Hawaii into the Union, but Congress will certainly want to know what those boundaries are—at least, I certainly hope so—and the matter will be brought up in discussion on the floor. That was exactly what was done in connection with the resolution of March 1, 1845. The boundaries of Texas were read on the floor. As a matter of fact, earlier in 1844, President Tyler was asked to furnish a map. He furnished one, on which reference was made to the December 19, 1836, boundaries of the Republic of Texas. There is no question that Congress knew they were bringing Texas into the Union as Texas had described itself in the act of 1836.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Texas permit the Senator from Illinois to read a section of the joint resolution of admission of December 29, 1845?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield to the Senator from Illinois so that he may ask me any question he may have in mind, but not for the purpose of having him make an argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that that joint resolution of December 29, 1845, provided as follows:

> That the State of Texas shall be one, and is hereby declared to be one, of the United States of America, and admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Illinois realizes, does he not, that that joint resolution was not submitted to Texas, and forms no part of the agreement between the United States and Texas? That was a unilateral act of Congress, a mere formality approving what had been previously agreed to by the United States and Texas.

President Polk had said previous to that: All Texas will have to do will be to pass its resolution accepting the resolution of the United States Congress of March 1, 1845, and we will consider Texas a member of the Union in accordance with the terms and guarantees proposed in the March 1 resolution.

In the resolution to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, which was a mere formality, the Senator will note that Congress did not add a little catch phrase in order to take away any property from Texas or to go back on any of the terms and guarantees made in the original resolution. In the very first part of the resolution of December 29, 1845, to which the Senator has referred, Congress said:

> Whereas the Congress of the United States, by a joint resolution of March the 1st, 1845, did consent that the territory properly included within and rightly belonging to the Republic of Texas, might be erected into a new State—

The resolution continues—

> which consent of Congress was given upon certain conditions specified in the first and second sections of said joint resolution; and whereas, the people of the said Republic of Texas, by deputies in convention assembled, with the consent of the existing government, did adopt a constitution and erect a new State, with a republican form of government, and in the name of the people of Texas, and by their authority, did ordain and declare, that they assented to and accepted the proposals, conditions, and guarantees contained in the first and second sections of said resolution.

Then, the Senate and House of the United States Congress admitted Texas on an equal footing with the original States, but in accordance with the "guarantees" contained in the previous exchange of resolutions.

The Senator from Illinois has read from the equal footing clause and has ignored the "proposals, conditions, and guarantees" the United States made with Texas. If the Senator believes as does the Supreme Court, that the adding by Congress of some words in the formal act of admission could have taken away something which Congress agreed that Texas ought to keep, and was to keep, then the Senator certainly is saying that the Congress of the United States would commit an act that I do not believe should be attributed to any Congress of this Nation.

That would be similar to making a proposal to Australia to enter the Union, and agreeing that Australia shall keep all its unsold lands, including all submerged lands, within its 3-mile belt or 3-league belt. We might say to Australia, "Keep it all. It is all yours." Suppose Congress were to submit such a proposal to Australia, and Australia should accept it. Then, having accepted it, and having adopted a constitution, suppose Congress then passed a formal act of admission, in which Australia was admitted into the Union with the other States, but with an equal footing provision, which would have the effect of taking away her submerged lands, after we had specifically agreed that Australia should keep such lands.

That is the argument which is made by the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Senator is agreeing with it, if he wishes to give weight to the equal-footing clause, instead of giving weight to the guarantees made by the Congress of the United States that Texas was to keep all lands within its limits.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been lenient, but he wishes to say that the rules of the Senate require that Senators first address the Chair before asking a Senator to yield. It is entirely within the prerogative of the Senator having the floor to state whether he desires to yield for a question.

Does the Senator from Texas yield further to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield for one more question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Texas aware of two comments by leading members of the Texas constitutional convention, which bear on this very point? The first was in a speech by Mr. Ochiltree, who is quoted in the Debates of the Convention, at page 47, as follows:

> The people have determined from one end of the land to the other to go into the American Union and to abide all the consequences of their choice. They ask no exclusive privileges; they would not willingly accept any privileges granted to them, and denied to every other member of the Confederacy. * * * I believe the people have determined to accomplish the great measure of annexation at every risk, regardless of consequences.

Is the Senator from Texas aware of that statement?

Mr. DANIEL. I have heard of that statement, but Mr. Ochiltree's views did not prevail at that convention. If the Senator will read the contract of agreement between the United States and Texas, he will see that Texas was given some rights which other States do not have for instance, the right to divide into four additional States. The Senator from Illinois will realize that Mr. Ochiltree's contentions were not accepted at that convention.

I do not know if it should be said that Texas asked for more than the other States received. It was not the proposal of Texas. Texas did not propose to enter the United States under a deal by which it would keep all its lands or divide itself into four States. Texas originally proposed to come into the Union in 1844 as a Territory, and to give the United States all its lands, but the United States Senate turned down that proposal and made a counter proposal to Texas. It was not the idea of Texas that she should be especially favored. Nowhere in the records can I find where Texans initiated the idea. To tell the truth, Texas also thought the lands were worthless. The United States Congress initiated the idea and said, "Texas, you are the only State to which this proposal has been made: Pay your own indebtedness of $10 million, and keep all lands lying within your limits."

The people of Texas accepted that proposal.

I say to the Senator from Illinois that the fact that certain property now has been found to be valuable should not make any difference whatsoever. If the United States Government made a bad deal with Texas, it ought to adhere to the deal and keep its solemn contract, just as the United States has always kept its word in dealing with other nations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator permit me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois address the Chair if he desires to ask the Senator from Texas to yield?

Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to proceed with my statement; however, I do not wish to decline the request of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to impose on the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. Suppose I complete my statement, and then I will yield to the Senator from Illinois.

From 1845 until 1948 both Texas and the United States interpreted their annexation agreement as leaving unto the State full and complete ownership of all submerged lands within its boundaries. We dedicated to our public-school fund all the submerged lands and dry lands which we kept. Some people say that the public schools ought to have the revenues from submerged lands. In Texas every dime we receive from such lands goes to our public schools. Such funds amount to something for one State. If they were divided among all the States, they would not amount to very much for any one State. However, they do amount to something for our Texas public-school fund.

There were many such official interpretations of the contract, and none to the contrary. Even former Secretary of the Interior Ickes said:

> Texas may have a legal right to its tidelands, because it came into the Union voluntarily and as an independent country.

I have read the statement made by the former Attorney General, now Justice Tom Clark, of the United States Supreme Court, outlining his opinion as to the title of Texas. This statement was made by him on the day he argued the California case:

> Texas had been an independent nation, a republic, for 10 years before it joined the Union. As a republic it owned all of the land within its boundaries, including the marginal sea, commonly called "tidelands." This area, similar to that involved in the California case, extended into the Gulf of Mexico and was under the sovereignty of Texas all during the republic and was retained by it under the provisions of the act of admission.

Even President Truman, during his campaign tour in Texas in 1948, led us to believe that he recognized our title when he said in Austin:

> Texas is in a class by itself; it entered the Union by treaty.

That was during the campaign. A few weeks after the election Mr. Truman instructed the Attorney General to file a law suit against our State for the submerged lands within its seaward boundaries. Senators know the result. The Supreme Court decision in United States against Texas was against our State by a vote of 4 to 3. The case is reported in Three Hundred and Thirty-ninth United States Reports, page 707, 1950. I had the honor of representing my State as its attorney general throughout the entire litigation, and I personally argued the case before the Supreme Court. I am not here to retry the lawsuit, but simply to say to the Senate that the Court decision was rendered without hearing any evidence of the long and consistent interpretation of our solemn agreement of annexation. Federal officials moved for judgment on the pleadings alone, and our entire argument before the Court was based upon the point that evidence should be heard before judgment was rendered. I explained what that evidence would be. There were associated with me 10 of the world's leading authorities on international law and interpretation of agreements between nations, in support of my argument that the Court should consider the evidence which I had accumulated. I offered to the Court their evidence and the work which they had performed. They said that the Court should hear evidence in a case of this kind, but this the Court refused to do, by a vote of 4 to 3.

This was the first time in the history of the Supreme Court that it refused to hear evidence offered by a State in a contested lawsuit. It was the first time in the history of the Supreme Court that it refused to interpret or apply a solemn contract between the United States and another government.

In a caustic criticism of this action by the Supreme Court, Prof. James William Moore, of Yale, author of Moore's Federal Practice, applies these words of Mr. Justice Field in the case of *Windsor v. McVeigh* (93 U. S. 274):

> A sentence of court pronounced against a party without hearing him, or giving him an opportunity to be heard, is not a judicial determination of his rights, and is not entitled to respect in any other tribunal. • • • For jurisdiction is the right to hear and determine; not to determine without hearing.

Under these circumstances I have never accepted this Court decision as final. I have felt it my duty to present the matter to the Congress, because the Congress made the agreement with Texas and it has the power to keep that agreement by restoring our property.

Only a few examples of the type of evidence which the Court refused to hear will convince Members of the Senate that the Congress of the United States and the Congress of the Republic of Texas intended and agreed that Texas was to retain all of its unsold lands, both dry and submerged when Texas entered the Union.

The best evidence is the contemporary and subsequent interpretation by the officials of the two Governments. That interpretation began immediately after Texas entered the Union when both Federal and State officials showed by their words and actions that the only property intended to be ceded to the United States was that which was to be itemized, conveyed and delivered *after* Texas was admitted into the Union. I have filed with the Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs a complete folio of evidence which shows that the new State passed a law on March 26, 1846, authorizing its governor to "cede, transfer, and deliver" to the United States all public defense properties provided for in the agreement of annexation; that the governor informed the President of the United States that he was then "ready on the part of the State, and beg to be informed what manner you propose to receive the property."

They were going to itemize it and deliver it. If there had been any submerged lands intended to be conveyed, they would have been set out in a deed of cession and itemized. But there were none involved in any of these transactions.

I filed with the committee a letter showing that Secretary of State Buchanan requested the Congress of the United States to provide funds for a representative of the United States to go to Texas "to receive this property"; and another record showing that the only property mentioned by the letters of executive officials and by the United States Congress was that which had been used by the Republic of Texas in its public defense; copies of letters appointing officials of the United States to receive and itemize all property intended to be ceded by Texas to the United States together with the inventories; receipts, and other items showing that complete fulfillment was made by Texas and that all property intended to be delivered was actually delivered and receipted for; and that none of these letters, inventories or receipts covered any of the submerged lands now in controversy. This folio of evidence has been numbered and indexed in the files of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for such examination and use as Members of the Senate may desire to make of it.

UNITED STATES RECOGNIZES TEXAS TITLE

Other examples of this consistent interpretation of the meaning of the annexation agreement and recognition by Federal officials of Texas' title to its lands below low tide in the Gulf of Mexico are as follows:

First. In 1880 the United States, through the United States Lighthouse Engineer, requested from the State of Texas and paid the sum of $1 for a deed from the State to the United States for 9.98 acres of submerged land for a lighthouse site in Galveston County at the point where Galveston Bay flows into the Gulf of Mexico. A copy of this deed, dated December 6, 1880, is filed with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs showing clearly that the land is seaward of low tide, out in the Gulf waters. Title to this land was approved by the Attorney General of the United States back in 1880.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How far out was the land?

Mr. DANIEL. This particular tract was between the headlands of Galveston Bay, and in the Gulf waters.

Mr. FERGUSON. How far from land?

Mr. DANIEL. I should say at least 2 miles from land.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then it was not in the twilight zone between the 3-mile limit and the 10-mile limit?

Mr. DANIEL. No. It was clearly outside.

Second. The Judge Advocate General of the War Department, on August 10, 1886, wrote an opinion in which he said clearly that no land or property passed from the Republic or State of Texas to the United States unless the property was used by the Republic of Texas at the time of annexation for public defense purposes mentioned in the

annexation agreement. A copy of this opinion is also in the files of the committee.

Third. In 1888, the United States Government made application to the State of Texas for a grant to certain lands running out into the Gulf of Mexico for the purpose of building lighthouses and jetties. A copy of this deed from the State of Texas to the United States, dated October 30, 1888, is filed with the committee.

If the Federal Government obtained those submerged lands, seaward of low tide, and within our boundaries, by the annexation agreement, or by any paramount-rights theory, it would not need to come to Texas to obtain deeds to the lands. The Federal Government came to Texas because it recognized the fact that Texas kept such lands under the annexation agreement.

Fourth. In 1904, the State of Texas filed suit against Capt. Edgar Jadwin, et al., of the United States Engineers, for title to and possession of a certain tract of land on the east end of Galveston Island, including submerged lands of Galveston Bay and the Gulf of Mexico. The Court of Civil Appeals rendered judgment in favor of the State (85 S. W. 490), in which the court said:

> The land beyond the island belonged to the State. Equally, the waters of the bay and the gulf for 3 leagues from shore.

This case was appealed by the Attorney General of the United States to the Supreme Court of the United States, but the appeal was dismissed by the Solicitor General—*Jadwin* v. *State of Texas* (209 U. S. 553 (1908)).

Fifth. In 1912 the United States, through the United States Engineers, applied to the State of Texas for a deed to the east end of Galveston Island and the submerged lands and tidelands involved in the Jadwin case, above, and a strip of land running out into the Gulf of Mexico, for a jetty, a distance of approximately 16,000 feet.

If anyone cares to know exactly the land for which the United States Government desired a patent from the State of Texas off Galveston beyond low tide, I have here a map, prepared by the United States Engineers, which shows this particular piece of land lying 16,000 feet from low tide out into the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the presentation of the brief submitted to the Supreme Court by the Senator from Texas, who, at the time, was the attorney general of the State of Texas, was this exhibit included?

Mr. DANIEL. I am not being facetious when I ask the Senator from Minnesota where he has been. I just explained to the Senate that I was denied the opportunity by the Supreme Court, by a 4-to-3 vote, to produce evidence on the subject. In my statement to the Court I did refer to the fact that the map was one piece of evidence I should like to have the Court appoint a master to examine, but the Court did not do it, and so the map is one of the matters of evidence I am presenting to the Senate which was not gone into by the Supreme Court, because it refused to hear evidence in the Texas case.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. What did the Senator present to the Supreme Court when he brought his case to the Court?

Mr. DANIEL. I presented everything the Court would let me present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator wish to document his evidence?

Mr. DANIEL. It included the main argument, and the only argument before the Court, on a motion by the Federal attorney for judgment on the pleadings alone. Think of that. In a case involving more than 2 million acres of land the Federal Government comes before the Court, and says, "Give us judgment on the pleadings alone, without hearing evidence." I had asked that a master be appointed to hear the evidence, or that the evidence be taken before the whole Court, but the Justice Department came forward and said, "You do not need to hear the evidence. Give us judgment on the pleadings alone."

I presented my brief, all of it devoted to the point that the court, in a contested matter such as that was, between the Federal Government and a State, ought to hear the evidence. And I will say to the Senator that, if the court had heard the evidence, the decision would not have been rendered against the State of Texas. As it was, it was decided against us by only one vote. But if the court had heard the evidence as the Senate is hearing it, the decision would have been different. After Senators have heard all the facts and the evidence, I believe the Senator from Minnesota will be bound to agree that those who made the annexation agreement intended that Texas should keep all the lands within its boundaries that were unsold. The Senator is being kind enough to listen to the evidence, and I thank him for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I see the record which the Senator has?

Mr. DANIEL. I shall be glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have reviewed this record. Of course, I have not had the intimate knowledge the Senator from Texas possesses, since he was a participant in the hearings before the court.

Does the Senator say that the court did not even look at this material?

Mr. DANIEL. No; I do not at all say that the court did not look at the material.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator say that the court did not, in its capacity as a judicial body, review and weigh the merits of the material in this document?

Mr. DANIEL. I say that the court weighed the material in this document, but this is a brief for the State of Texas in opposition to a motion for judgment on the pleadings. This is not the evidence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that.

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator from Minnesota knows that the court did not hear a bit of the evidence which is ordinarily heard before a master or before a court.

Mr. President, I wish now to complete my statement, because I am informed a Senator in opposition is ready to proceed this afternoon. Am I correct in that?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I hope we can proceed with the opposition this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield, let me ask what was the date of the Texas decision?

Mr. DANIEL. As I recall, it was June 5, 1950.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Were there other decisions prior to the Texas decision?

Mr. DANIEL. There was the California decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Supreme Court listen to evidence in the California case?

Mr. DANIEL. No evidence was presented by the State of California. It was agreed that the case would be decided on the pleadings.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is not an attorney, as is the Senator from Texas. When we talk about pleadings, in ordinary laymen's language does that mean what is presented to the court on which it bases its decision?

Mr. DANIEL. That is not correct. It is a petition, and the answer of the defendant. The defendant answers whatever is filed against him. The pleadings do not have anything to do with the evidence. The court hears the evidence after the pleadings have been filed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the petition contain material which would be relevant to the decision of the court?

Mr. DANIEL. Some of it would be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the petition in the California case contain any material relating to offshore oil, and kindred subjects?

Mr. DANIEL. Nothing but that the Federal Government ought to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am speaking of the California case.

Mr. DANIEL. There was a very short petition, a formal petition, saying that the Federal Government had paramount rights to the ownership of the land.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was the reply of California?

Mr. DANIEL. California filed a three-volume reply.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was in the three-volume reply?

Mr. DANIEL. I am not going to yield for more questions about California. I am talking about Texas. Has the Senator any further questions about Texas?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DANIEL. For a question on Texas only.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator believe that the Texas case is at all germane to the joint resolution before the Senate?

Mr. DANIEL. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Texas believe that the Texas case is related to and a part of the general case which he is now making in support of the joint resolution?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know that the Texas decision by the Supreme Court is

a part of any argument I am making except in my effort to point out to the Senate that in the Texas case the Court did not hear the evidence that I am now trying to present to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator say that because of the Court decisions in the Texas case, the Louisiana case, and the California case, the Senator from Texas feels it necessary to make his arguments as he is presenting them today?

Mr. DANIEL. I dare say that if it had not been for the Court decisions the States would all have their lands, and we would not be here considering the joint resolution. Because the Court decisions were contrary to what we thought the law was and contrary to the annexation agreement with Texas, we are here asking Congress to restore the property exactly as we claimed it for more than 100 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DANIEL. I do not wish to yield further until I have completed my statement, but I shall be glad to do so then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I was referring to the map in connection with which the Federal Government acknowledges that Texas owns the lands seaward from low tide in the Gulf of Mexico for at least 16,000 feet.

A grant of this land was authorized by the Texas Legislature; and deed from the State of Texas to the United States, dated June 28, 1912, and title opinion of the Attorney General of the United States are filed with the committee.

The title opinion of the Attorney General of the United States on the so-called Texas tidelands or submerged lands, for which application for a deed was made to Texas, recites:

> The legislature in passing Senate bill 121, ceding the land to the United States, as well as the submerged lands, intended to treat and did treat said Wallace location and patents as unauthorized and void, and there appears to be no question that Senate bill 121 vested in the United States a perfect title to all the land described in said bill and that the United States need not now do anything to get title—it cannot be made better.

Mr. President, a better title than the one Texas can give to the lands seaward from low tide, within her historic boundaries, cannot be made, according to the 1912 opinion of the Attorney General of the United States.

Sixth. On April 4, 1908, the Attorney General of the United States wrote an opinion holding that title to the abandoned bed of the Rio Grande, around what is known as Cordova cutoff, was in the State of Texas, rather than in the Federal Government. Although this involved inland submerged lands, the opinion was broad enough to show the general interpretation of the Texas annexation agreement as retaining all submerged lands.

The Attorney General of the United States then said:

> I am, therefore, of opinion that all vacant and unappropriated lands within the limits of Texas which belonged to the Republic of Texas now belong to and are vested in the State of Texas and that the title to the same has never been in the United States, the United States owning in the State of Texas only such lands as have been acquired by purchase or condemnation under the laws of Texas and such land as was excepted by the joint resolution referred to above.

Seventh. Mr. President, I now come to the seventh item of evidence, and I am about to bring this presentation to a close. This is a very significant piece of evidence which the Court did not hear, but which I think the Congress should hear. On April 4, 1925, the Secretary of the Interior denied a permit requested by Leonard J. Benckenstein for an oil and gas prospecting permit in the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Texas, on the grounds that the lands were not public lands of the United States, but that they belonged to the State of Texas.

This was property beyond low tide within the Gulf of Mexico, upon which an applicant sought a lease from the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior said:

> For information concerning the ownership of lands located within the State of Texas and under tidal waters adjacent to the State your attention is invited to the following:
>
> The Republic of Texas was admitted as a State on December 29, 1845, upon "guaranty" made by the United States that Texas "shall also retain all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits" (5 Stat. 797, and 9 Stat. 108). See also B. F. Nysewander (47 L. D. 372). Texas has, for more than three-quarters of a century, governed and disposed of its own public lands, with the consent and approval of the United States. Moreover, the Supreme Court of Texas has said: "The legislature of the State has the power to dispose of the unappropriated lands within the State" (*Victoria* v. *Victoria County* (100 Texas, 438)).
>
> Aside from the question of the ownership, by the State of Texas, of all vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its borders by virtue of the conditions under which it was admitted into the Union, all lands, under tidal waters and below the line of ordinary high tide belong to the State by virtue of its sovereignty (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229); *Knight* v. *U. S. Land Association* (142 U. S. 161, 183)).

Eighth. In 1941, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made a loan of $1,100,000 to the city of Galveston, through purchase of revenue bonds, on a municipal recreation pier which was constructed out into the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of approximately 2,000 feet from low tide. If any Member of the Senate cares to see a picture of the pier, the title of which was approved by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation attorneys, and upon which a $1,100,000 loan was made by the RFC—the pier being erected upon a tract of land which the Supreme Court of Texas had already said belonged to the State of Texas before it made a grant to the city of Galveston—I have here a picture of the pier, and I shall pass it among my colleagues.

Before approving the bonds and the title to the land, attorneys for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had before them a decision of the Supreme Court of Texas in the case of *City of Galveston* v. *Mann* (143 S. W. 2d 1028 (1940)), involving the exact parcel of land and holding that the State of Texas owned the waters and submerged lands and that the bonds of the city of Galveston for construction of the pleasure pier were not subject to approval by the attorney general of Texas without a grant or easement from the Texas Legislature. By Senate Bill No. 13, the 47th legislature in 1941, the legislature granted the land to the city of Galveston, retaining the mineral rights and providing that "the tidelands and waters of the Gulf of Mexico" should not pass to any purchaser at a foreclosure sale. All of this was recited in the title and bond opinions now in the files of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, copies of which are filed with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Another reason we may be sure that it was the intention of the Congress of the United States in 1845 that Texas was to retain all lands beneath navigable waters within its boundaries is the fact that at that time the Congress and the Supreme Court believed that this type of property belonged to all of the States. The rule in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212, 229 (1845)) has already been written by the Supreme Court, as follows:

> 1. The shores of navigable waters, and the soils under them, were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively.
>
> 2. The new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction over this subject as the Original States.

As to Texas, one other reason may be given for this proposed legislation. It is a promise written by the President of the United States, James K. Polk, to Sam Houston while annexation proceedings were in progress. Sam Houston wanted to know whether the United States would defend our title to the lands within the boundaries we claimed as against Mexico. President Polk wrote to Sam Houston a letter in which the following statement was made:

> Of course I would maintain the Texian title to the extent she claims it to be.

That was before Texas finally agreed to accept the proposal for annexation. President Polk kept that promise. Every other President of the United States except President Truman kept the promise.

Mr. President, lately some persons have written that President Roosevelt had these suits filed against the coastal States, but I want the RECORD to be made perfectly clear that President Roosevelt did no such thing. It was not until after the death of President Roosevelt that the filing of any such suit against the coastal States was authorized. President Truman's actions against Texas have made it necessary for the Congress to intervene in order that a promise and a contract of this Nation will not remain broken. His actions against the other States have made it necessary for the Congress to restore also to them the property which they have possessed in good faith for more than 100 years.

END NATIONALIZATION OF PROPERTY

Most important of all is the need for Congress, through this legislation, to stop further nationalization of property under this newly discovered conception of

"paramount rights" first announced in the so-called tidelands cases.

The Supreme Court did not hold that the Federal Government owns these lands. In the California case it said that the needs and powers of the national sovereign are paramount to "bare legal title" and transcend the rights of "a mere property owner." Those words were used by the Court, which also said that such paramount governmental powers give the Federal Government the right to take and use property within the established boundaries of a State without having ownership or paying compensation.

In the Texas case the Supreme Court went further. It said:

> Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign.

As said recently by Dean Roscoe Pound:

> It is a startling proposition to tell Americans that sovereignty, which we have thought of as political, must be proprietary as well—must include ownership of the soil.

If this rule is extended to its logical conclusion, Dean Pound says the Federal Government could take any land, public or private, within the entire country—Critique on the Texas Tidelands Case, by Roscoe Pound, Baylor Law Review, winter 1951, volume III, page 120.

The American Bar Association and the American Title Association have pointed out that this new doctrine is a threat to private ownership of land and minerals, because the Federal Government has the same needs for national defense and the same paramount powers and responsibilities with respect to private lands and minerals under private lands as it does with respect to lands beneath navigable waters.

This new application of paramount rights is closely akin to the Truman theory of "inherent powers." Both disregard the constitutional concept that property rights are separate from political powers and cannot be taken by the Government without due proces of law and just compensation. Both could lead to further nationalization of property and untold centralization of government. They are part of a dangerous trend which can be stopped to a large extent by the enactment of the terms and principles contained in Senate Joint Resolution 13.

Mr. President, the pending joint resolution would provide that for the future, proprietary rights, although they are subordinate to Federal governmental powers over these lands, shall be separate and apart from the governmental powers, and shall be held by the States, rather than by the Federal Government.

We believe that the pending joint resolution will do much toward stopping a dangerous trend toward further nationalization of property, in disregard of the rights of the States and of property ownership in this Nation.

At this time I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas does not mind doing so I should like to have him return to the case, as noted in the opinion of the Supreme Court, of United States of America, plaintiff against the State of Texas, decided on June 5, 1950.

According to the comments made by the Senator from Texas, I have been led to believe that, literally, the State of Texas was denied any opportunity to present to the Court any material of any consequence.

Mr. DANIEL. Perhaps the Senator from Minnesota does not intend to misquote me, but I did not say that Texas was denied the right to produce "any material" before the Court. I said over and over again that Texas was denied the right to introduce evidence. I said I had asked for the appointment of a master to hear the evidence. That was all I said. Certainly we presented material. We presented our pleadings and we presented a brief in which we pleaded with the Court please to hear the evidence and not to decide the case on the pleadings alone. But the Court rejected our request.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course the Senator from Texas is very familiar with the decision of the Court in that case, for the Senator from Texas is an outstanding attorney and since he is vitally concerned with that case, I am sure he has read again and again the opinion in the case.

Has the Senator from Texas read in that decision the following language:

> As an affirmative defense Texas asserts that as an independent nation, the Republic of Texas had open, adverse, and exclusive possession and exercised jurisdiction and control over the lands, minerals, etc., underlying that part of the Gulf of Mexico within her boundaries established at 3 marine leagues from shore by her first congress and acquiesced in by the United States and other major nations; that when Texas was annexed to the United States the claim and rights of Texas to this land, minerals, etc., were recognized and preserved in Texas; that Texas continued as a State, to hold open, adverse, and exclusive possession, jurisdiction, and control of these lands, minerals, etc., without dispute, challenge, or objection by the United States; that the United States has recognized and acquiesced in this claim and these rights; that Texas under the doctrine of prescription has established such title, ownership, and sovereign rights in the area as preclude the granting of the relief prayed.
>
> As a second affirmative defense Texas alleges that there was an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Texas that upon annexation Texas would not cede to the United States but would retain all of the lands, minerals, etc., underlying that part of the Gulf of Mexico within the original boundaries of the Republic.
>
> As a third affirmative defense Texas asserts that the United States acknowledged and confirmed the 3-league boundary of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico as declared, established, and maintained by the Republic of Texas and as retained by Texas under the annexation agreement.

I have read from some of the passages of the decision.

My question is, If the Court in its decision takes note of the fact that Texas had three affirmative defenses, how did the Court get those affirmative-defense assertions, unless the Senator from Texas, who was at that time the attorney general, presented that material to the Court?

Mr. DANIEL. By the pleadings which were filed by the State of Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. DANIEL. Our affirmative defenses were stated in the pleadings. That was not evidence. We wanted to take up those affirmative defenses, and hear evidence in support of them. The Supreme Court refused to hear the evidence. If the Senator will read further in the opinion——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I have read further.

Mr. DANIEL. If the Senator will read far enough to get the points that are against that argument, as well as those that might be in favor of the argument, he will find that the Court said that it did not see any necessity of taking evidence and would not hear any evidence.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator permit me to quote that portion of the decision?

Mr. DANIEL. No; I will yield only for questions that may be propounded, because the Senator can bring all that out in his own argument, I believe, without my holding the floor any longer. If the Senator has a question, I will yield. I believe the Senator from Florida has a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have this question: Is it not true that the Court said:

> If there were a dispute as to the meaning of the documents and the answer was to be found in diplomatic correspondence, contemporary construction, usage, international law and the like, introduction of evidence and a full hearing would be essential.
>
> We conclude, however, that no such hearing is required in this case. We are of the view that the equal-footing clause of the joint resolution annexing Texas to the Union disposes of the present phase of the controversy.

Is the Senator familiar with that language?

Mr. DANIEL. I am familiar with that language, and have told the Senate about it. The Supreme Court, instead of hearing evidence, used the words "equal footing," contained in the mere formal resolution admitting Texas into the Union. It used those words, which were never submitted to Texas, to take away from Texas in excess of 2 million acres of land which Texas had owned, but which the Court held should go to the United States. I have gone into all that, and I have shown that such interpretation is contrary to the express terms of the annexation agreement.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator, but my question would have been addressed to bringing out the fact which I think has now been made clear, namely, that the Supreme Court declined to hear evidence, declined to take depositions, and declined to grant the motion of the State of Texas for the appointment of a special master, all because of the ruling of the Court that—

> We are of the view that the equal-footing clause of the joint resolution annexing Texas to the Union disposes of the present phase of the controversy.

It specifically declined to hear any testimony in support of the three affirmative defenses, which have been read into the record out of the pleadings as cited by the Senator from Minnesota.

Is the Senator from Florida correct in his understanding that the ruling of the Supreme Court was to the effect that no depositions could be taken, that no master could be appointed, no evidence could be offered, and all because of the fact that the Court had made up its mind that its ruling on the equal-footing phase of the situation made it unnecessary to take any evidence in the case?

Mr. DANIEL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator from Florida also correct in his understanding that, by that ruling, the State of Texas was precluded from affirming or supporting or maintaining any of the affirmative defenses which it set forth in its able answer, and which it stood ready to defend and sustain, had it been allowed to offer evidence?

Mr. DANIEL. That is correct as to all of the defenses, which were based upon evidence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield in a moment. While we are on the subject of "equal footing," I should like to state for the record that throughout the history of this country the words "equal footing" have been held by our courts to apply to political rights, and not to property rights; certainly not to any property rights that would be taken away from States and granted to the Federal Government. We find that in the negotiations for the annexation of Texas there was an alternative clause, section 3, which would provide for further negotiation of a treaty and terms entirely different from sections 1 and 2 which were actually submitted and accepted. Equal footing was mentioned in the alternative and unused section 3 of the March 1, 1835, resolution, but it was never submitted to Texas and was never agreed to by Texas. The closest the negotiators ever come to mentioning "equal footing" was when the negotiator for the United States had an instrument, on the original copy of which he had written the words "equal footing." He struck out the words "equal footing" and in their place inserted "the most favorable footing." I get that from the State Department's own records, from which I quoted.

Texas never had the words "equal footing" submitted to it as a part of the agreement. It never considered the words at all, and certainly no one ever dreamed that those words, inserted in the subsequent joint resolution which was passed by Congress as a mere formality, would be used later in the manner in which they were used by the Supreme Court, to take away property which it was theretofore agreed Texas should retain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to my colleague, the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I could not let this opportunity pass without commending my colleague for the very able and thorough and patient manner in which he has made his great presentation of this subject. I do not know that I have ever heard a cause more ably and eloquently presented. I only regret that every Member of the Senate could not have been here to hear the junior Senator from Texas this afternoon. I believe I can with certainty speak for the 8 million people of our State in saying that we are very, very proud of the tolerance the Senator has shown, and of the able manner in which he has handled himself. I think the Senator has really been devastating in some of the answers he has made to some of the arguments advanced.

Mr. DANIEL. The junior Senator from Texas wants to thank the senior Senator from Texas. I fear he is a little bit prejudiced, but I do appreciate his very kind remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I yield to the Senator form Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas upon the very able argument he has made on the submerged lands issue, and also upon the manner in which he conducted himself during the hearings on this matter, in seeing that all the evidence was developed, in seeing that the case was fully presented, and in seeing that the very voluminous hearings, which we have before us, reflected all the evidence available and which could be obtained. I believe that he has given perhaps the best presentation of the argument for the submerged lands case on the States' side that I have heard presented before the United States Senate.

Mr. DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Montana whether he will yield to me for about 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. If it does not mean that I lose the floor, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT III, AMBASSADOR TO IRELAND

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, last week the Senate advised and consented to the nomination of William Howard Taft III to be the United States Ambassador to the Republic of Ireland. I heartily concur in this action. I had intended to make an observation or two on this nomination at the time but almost constant attendance on a variety of committee meetings at the time made it inopportune. I do wish to detain the attention of the Senate for a few moments to felicitate our country as well as the Republic of Ireland on the wisdom and timeliness of this choice.

As a general thing, I believe it may be safely said that the kind of a foreign minister who is most likely to succeed in behalf of his country is one who not only knows the culture, traditions, history, and policy of his own country but also that of the country to which he is assigned. By this standard, William Howard Taft III is destined not only for success in this field but will make a real contribution to closer and better relationships with the people of Ireland.

Certainly one of his primary duties will be to bring the American viewpoint to the Irish people. This cannot be done by mere formal pronouncements, social display, or an aloof manner. It must be done through contact with every facet of Irish life and activity. To this task, Mr. Taft brings a singular talent.

After securing his bachelor's degree at Yale and his doctor's degree in literature at Princeton, he returned to Yale to teach after serving with Central Intelligence, and during that time made a sustained study of Irish literature, history, and language. He is quite proficient in Gaelic. No attribute is so appealing to a nation as to have a representative who knows their country, their aspirations, their viewpoint, and the problems which are inherent in national character. There could be no better background for foreign service than this.

But Mr. Taft's background is not a mere matter of academic study, because he had a sustained opportunity to apply and utilize it in the very country to which he goes. In 1948, he was assigned to Ireland as special assistant to the Chief of the ECA Mission. This gave him 3 years of opportunity to study the economic problems of Ireland, maintain close contact with the United States Embassy, to become acquainted with Irish officials, and to make useful contacts with the people in all walks of life. He has spoken to a great variety of groups in every one of the 26 counties. These include chambers of commerce, business and industrial groups, labor unions, farm clubs, students, and others. These contacts not only provided him with an opportunity to appraise Irish reaction to the problems of the day but gave the people a chance to assess him and the viewpoint which he brings to them. He is no stranger to Ireland. He has already found a place in their respect and their affection.

But his special fitness for this particular assignment does not stop there. As special assistant to the chief of the ECA mission in Dublin, he was called upon frequently to exercise responsibility at many levels. Because the mission was small, he was called upon to perform a variety of administrative and negotiation tasks. This meant serving as the mission information officer, its controller, its technical assistance officer on labor and industry. In this connection, he had frequent opportunity to meet and negotiate with members of the Irish Cabinet and other officials and to get a comprehensive concept of the economic problems and what is necessary to properly encourage programs in the field of tourism, mineral development, and other fields for the advancement of Irish progress and the improvement of Irish-American relations.

One other fact should be added to this recital. Because there was but a modest ECA mission in Dublin, it was in close and constant contact with our Embassy and Foriegn Service personnel. This

provided diplomatic experience on a broad scale and a thorough working knowledge of the duties and responsibilities which go with our Embassy in Dublin.

Today William Howard Taft III is well known to Irish officialdom, to the Irish press, and to Irishmen in all walks of life. To all this, he brings one other advantage, that of a young family. He himself is a young man. The youngsters that he and Mrs. Taft will take to Dublin will be a real diplomatic asset. Children can open doors when diplomatic subtlety fails.

On the basis of the record, it may be said therefore that no appointee in the whole diplomatic service is better equipped for his task than William Howard Taft and to it all there must be added a scholarly mind, boundless energy, impeccable character, and a thoroughgoing American viewpoint.

And when he lands in Dublin, he will be saluted in Gaelic, they will wish him the top of the morning, and probably shout, "Up the O'Taffe."

And there will be some reason. Up in the Nutmeg State, they can tell you about the original Peter Taft and the Alphonsos, one of whom used to walk from the village of Townsend to Yale University and back each year, a journey which took him from one boundary of the State to the other. It was Alphonso who left New England to go to Cincinnati. He was the father of President Taft, the grandfather of Majority Leader TAFT and the great grandfather of Ambassador Taft. And up in the Nutmeg State they still refer to the family as the O'Taffe's. And so in Dublin they will be happy about a young man with a great family tradition. And as he and his fine young family take over the Embassy in Phoenix Park there will be a housewarming to warm the cockles of the heart and they shall say "Up the O'Taffe." That will enrich the Irish-American relationship.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very glad to hear the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and I am sure we are all very pleased with the caliber, attainments, and ability of our new Ambassador to Ireland.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my distinguished colleague from Montana.

TITLE TO CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to discuss some phases of the pending legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 13, the so-called Submerged Lands Act.

I intend, in opening, just to glance at the basic subject before the Senate and I intend, later, in the course of my discussion, to go further into details.

This measure proposes to grant to the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana valuable oil and gas deposits discovered in the Continental Shelf, which extends from their coastlines for varying distances out under the seas. These coastal States have for a number of years been claiming title to and ownership in these submerged deposits within what they term their "historic boundaries." They had undertaken to carry on programs for administering and developing these deposits. I shall go into these claims of title in greater detail at a later time in the course of my remarks.

The United States Government, however, claimed paramount rights and full dominion over these submerged lands and the valuable oil and gas deposits found therein.

In order to determine the question of dominion and control over these resources, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States caused suits to be brought in the United States courts to settle this question. While these cases were pending in court, the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana sought to defeat the purposes of that litigation by having Congress enact legislation purporting to quitclaim to them all the rights of the United States in and to said deposits. Legislation of this character was put through the Congress while these suits were pending, but it was vetoed by President Truman during his administration. Finally, these suits were heard by the Supreme Court of the United States, which determined by final decree the question of dominion over and control of these mineral resources in three decisions dealing with California—1947—Louisiana—1950—and Texas—1950.

The decrees entered by the Supreme Court of the United States in these cases declared that the United States has paramount rights in and full dominion and power over the lands, minerals, and other things in the offshore areas where these mineral deposits were found, and that the coastal States do not own and never did own such submerged lands or have title to the oil and other mineral deposits that may be found therein. The Supreme Court used identical language in all three decrees, declaring that the States have "no title thereto or property interest therein." The States of California, Texas, and Louisiana now seek to overrule and reverse the decisions of the Supreme Court through the enactment of the legislation proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 13.

It must be apparent at once that this proposed reversal of the rulings of the Supreme Court and granting of title to these valuable oil deposits to the claimant States places a grave responsibility upon the members of this body. As Members of the Congress of the United States, we must realize that we are serving in the nature of trustees of this vast underseas wealth, and in the years to come we will be called upon to account for our stewardship. If we fail to conserve this great reservoir of wealth in gas and oil which the Supreme Court holds belongs to the United States, and if we permit it to be diverted from its proper use in the defense, security, and welfare of our country, we will have committed a tragic error. We will be guilty of a flagrant failure of duty and responsibility to the people. The tremendous national debt that our country has accumulated, and the need of conservation of our resources and wealth for the defense and security of our country and the welfare of our people, present a matter of the gravest concern.

Notwithstanding all the high-sounding phrases about "historical boundaries" and the fanciful claims, assertions, and pretensions of these States regarding their so-called historic rights and their so-called sovereignty, they failed in the hearings held before the Senate committee to establish any legal right or interest whatsoever in these offshore deposits. They seem to assert, however, that they have some claim of equity to this offshore wealth. They assert that ever since these oil deposits were discovered in the Continental Shelf, the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana always thought that they possessed a just claim and title to them, and on that assumption they have undertaken to explore, administer, and develop these deposits through leases and contracts for such development.

THE ISSUE BECOMES A POLITICAL FOOTBALL

In the face of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, the proponents of this legislation have continued to press for its enactment. This struggle to gain control and dominion over these valuable oil deposits soon developed into a hot political issue. Political bargaining began in earnest. Twice this sort of legislation had been forced through the Congress, but in each instance it met a presidential veto. Still, the political phase of the struggle continued. Politicians and oil speculators became highly excited over the issue. In the presidential election campaign of 1952 General Eisenhower was induced to promise that if he were elected he would sign any bill that would be put through the Congress giving California, Texas, and Louisiana these valuable oil and gas deposits. Then the political drums began to beat in earnest.

I am confident that General Eisenhower did not choose to get involved in this political war between the States. He was the victim of his political friends and advisers. In the midst of his campaign he was confronted with this issue and, under political pressure, induced to promise his support and his signature if the legislation were enacted. I have a letter from a prominent citizen of Texas in which he says the President was terribly imposed upon. It was contrary to his character to make such an agreement in the election campaign, and it is only fair that he should be released from it. He can be released from it by defeating the pending measure.

The proponents of the pending measure seem to be laboring under the mistaken notion that the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana have acquired some sort of an equity which would give them the right to have Congress turn over these oil deposits in dispute and deprive the remaining 45 States

of the Nation of any participation therein.

We have listened during the day to the very able arguments made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], in which he discussed the cases in the Supreme Court and undertook to convince the Senate that the States concerned did not receive a fair hearing before that Court and were denied the right to present facts which they deemed would be sufficient to justify a decison in their favor by the Supreme Court. That argument is questioned by many Senators who have been studying this matter and who believe that the rulings of the Supreme Court were correct and sound in every particular.

Of course, Congress should not perpetrate such an injustice. All the remaining States are as much entitled to participate in the proceeds derived from the administration of these huge oil deposits as the three States of California, Texas, and Louisiana. The three claimant States, however, are dissatisfied with the Supreme Court decisions and ask that they be overruled and reversed by this legislation.

During the course of hearings on this legislation the present Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell, Jr., the highest legal officer of the Eisenhower administration, stated that to undertake to quitclaim this property to the aforesaid States would raise a constitutional question. He advised that some scheme or method might be used to accomplish the same result while, at the same time, avoiding the constitutional bar.

Thereupon, the proponents of this legislation, with the assistance of Attorney General Brownell, prepared the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 13, which seems to take two stabs at the problem. First, it undertakes to grant title directly to these States. If the direct grant of title is unconstitutional and void, then, as an alternative, the measure purports to give these three States the full and complete right to administer and develop the oil deposits found in the marginal seas and retain all the proceeds therefrom. This, of course, would exclude the 45 remaining States from any participation whatever. The proponents of this legislation feel that by this procedure they would avoid the constitutional question arising out of granting direct title to the States. By this alternative method they would give these States all the fruits of title by allowing them to retain all the proceeds gained from the administration and development of these valuable oil deposits. This, of course, would be an apparent subterfuge, a plain effort to avoid the constitutional bar.

Against this background the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and I have filed a minority report expressing our strong opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 13, reported by the majority of the committee. We recommended the enactment of S. 107, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, which provides that these offshore oil deposits shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior and shall be developed for our national defense and other purposes beneficial to the Nation. The Anderson amendment provides that 37½ percent of the royalties derived from these vast resources shall be proportionately allotted to the 48 States. We also recommend the adoption of the amendment to S. 107, sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and 21 other Senators from both sides of the aisle.

The Hill amendment provides that—

> All other moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be held in a special account in the Treasury during the present national emergency and, until the Congress shall otherwise provide, the moneys in such special account shall be used only for such urgent developments essential to the national defense and national security as the Congress may determine and thereafter shall be used exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

The Hill amendment provides further that—

> It shall be the duty of every State or political subdivision or grantee thereof having issued any mineral lease or grant, or leases or grants, covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf to file with the Attorney General of the United States on or before December 31, 1953, a statement of the moneys or other things of value received by such State or political subdivision or grantee from or on account of such lease or grant, or leases or grants, since January 1, 1940, and the Attorney General shall submit the statements so received to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS ARE RAISED BY THIS PROPOSED GIVE-AWAY LEGISLATION

First. Has Congress the moral right to give away to 3 States the share of the people of 45 States in their heritage under the marginal seas?

Second. Has the Federal Government, weighted as it is with vast responsibilities and expense, the right to give away valuable assets and sources of revenue which would relieve tax burdens and provide for the national defense?

Third. Have 3 States the right to all benefits from assets in the marginal seas while taxpayers of 48 States must support and regulate navigation, commerce, and international relations in this area, as well as provide protection by the Coast Guard in peacetime and full-scale defense in time of war?

Fourth. Has Congress the constitutional power to give title of the marginal seabed to individual States when the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that such lands belong to the Federal Government, by virtue of its national external sovereignty, and the Justice Department under Democratic and Republican administrations has warned us that such a grant may be unconstitutional?

Fifth. Has Congress the right to extend any offshore boundaries, as this legislation does, beyond the 3-mile limit, an extension which the State Department has just told us violates international law?

Sixth. Does the Senate intend to repudiate a joint resolution introduced by Senator Nye and adopted unanimously by the Senate on August 19, 1937, that authorized the Attorney General of the United States "to assert, maintain, and establish the title and possession of the United States to the submerged lands aforesaid, and all petroleum deposits underlying the same; to stop and prevent the taking or removing of petroleum products by others than the United States from the said submerged lands"?

Seventh. Do Senators wish to override the clear words of the Supreme Court in the case of *United States* v. *Texas* (1950), namely:

> Once a low-water mark is passed the international domain is reached. Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign * * *. If the property, whatever it may be, lies seaward of the low-water mark, its use, disposition, management, and control involve national interests and national responsibilities.

Before discussing the details of Senate Joint Resolution 13, I would first like to review some of the high points in the background of this controversy, and indicate some of the facts on the great value of the offshore mineral resources.

I will then endeavor to demonstrate that the enactment of this legislation, even if it were upheld in the courts—which is highly doubtful—would have the following six disastrous effects:

First. It would weaken the security of the United States.

Second. It would encourage extravagant boundary claims by Russia and other nations.

Third. It would undermine the Federal Government's power program.

Fourth. It would imperil the United States fishing industry.

Fifth. It would set off a chain reaction of other giveaways of the public domain.

Sixth. Since it does not define State boundaries, it would produce endless litigation over the extent of the oil lands which are given to the States.

I. THE BACKGROUND OF THIS GOVERNMENT

FEDERAL CONTROL OF OFFSHORE LANDS FIRST ESTABLISHED BY THOMAS JEFFERSON

In 1793 Thomas Jefferson, who was then Secretary of State, put forward the first official American claim for a 3-mile zone off the coast of the United States. This claim won general international acceptance.

During the decades that followed many controversies developed over the control of tidelands, that is, the lands between the points of high and low tide, and the beds of navigable inland waters. They were settled in a long series of Supreme Court decisions which established control of such lands in the hands of the States. But none of those decisions dealt with the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, which begins at the point of low tide and extends out to the sea.

CONGRESS AFFIRMED UNITED STATES RIGHTS TO PUBLIC LAND IN ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA

On September 9, 1850, Congress, in admitting California to the Union, specified that—

> The people of said State, through their legislature or otherwise, shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the public lands within its limits, and shall pass no law and do no act whereby the title of the United States to, and right to dispose of the same shall be impaired or questioned; and that they shall never lay any tax or assessment of any description whatsoever

upon the public domain of the United States.

WITH DISCOVERY OF OIL, QUESTION OF RIGHTS BECAME IMPORTANT

It was not until the discovery of important oil deposits in the Continental Shelf that the question of rights in such submerged lands became important. The assertion of claims to the Continental Shelf by the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas, and the issuance of oil and gas leases on Continental Shelf lands by these States beginning as early as the 1920's in the case of California, as I have heretofore stated, led to the institution of litigation against them by the Federal Government for the purpose of having the Supreme Court decide whether the United States or the several coastal States had the right to develop the oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf.

SUPREME COURT AFFIRMS, AND REAFFIRMS, FEDERAL RIGHTS

The Supreme Court settled the question of control over and rights in the Continental Shelf and its mineral resources in three decisions dealing with California, 1947; Louisiana, 1950, and Texas, 1950.

The decrees of the Court held, as I have heretofore stated, that the United States of America has "paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things" in the offshore area, and that the coastal States, as such, do not own and never did own such submerged lands. The Court used identical language in all three decrees, declaring that the States have "no title thereto or property interest therein."

In another decision, the Court pointed out that—

Neither the Thirteen Original Colonies nor their successor States separately acquired "ownership" of the 3-mile belt (*Toomer* v. *Witzell* (334 U. S. 385)).

GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION TWICE VETOED

The advocates of granting title to these lands to the three States attempted in 1946 to forestall Supreme Court action through legislation to give the offshore lands of the Continental Shelf to the coastal States. This effort was defeated by a Presidential veto.

After the Supreme Court had acted, the give-away advocates attempted to nullify the effect of the decisions. In 1952 this effort was also defeated by a Presidential veto.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT UNABLE TO LEASE CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS FOR MINERAL DEVELOPMENT

In 1947 the Solicitor of the Interior Department ruled that the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 was not applicable to the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. This ruling was contested in a number of court cases. These cases have not as yet been finally decided.

It became evident, therefore, that Federal legislation was needed if the Federal Government were to develop the offshore oil and gas resources of the Continental Shelf. The enactment of such legislation, however, has been prevented by the opposition of the give-away advocates. As a result, the proper development of the offshore oil and gas resources has been stalled.

LOUISIANA AND TEXAS DEFIED THE SUPREME COURT

When the Supreme Court was considering the California case Louisiana and Texas intervened and presented their views to the Court. After the case was decided in favor of the United States, Louisiana and Texas defied the Supreme Court ruling. Louisiana continued to issue oil and gas leases on, and Texas initiated a program of leasing for oil production, Continental Shelf lands, including lands situated seaward of their so-called historic boundaries. These States profited by many millions of dollars, even after it was clear from the Supreme Court's ruling in the Louisiana case, that they were trespassing on property belonging to all the people of the United States. Passage of quitclaim legislation would put a premium on deliberate defiance of the law.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BROWNELL WARNS AGAINST QUITCLAIM LEGISLATION

Attorney General Brownell on March 2, 1953, in his testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, advised against giving title to any marginal seas.

Mr. Brownell stated:

My recommendation would mean, in legal terms, that instead of granting to the States a blanket quitclaim title to the submerged lands within their historic boundaries, the Federal Government would grant to the States only such authority required for the States to administer and develop the natural resources.

SECRETARY OF STATE DULLES OPPOSES BOUNDARIES BEYOND 3-MILE LIMIT

On March 6, 1953, in a letter to Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of the Interior Committee, Secretary Dulles, through an Assistant Secretary of State, stated:

Extension of the boundary of a State beyond the 3-mile limit would directly conflict with international law.

So much for the talk in the giveaway bill of historic boundaries which go beyond the Nation's 3-mile limit.

NO VALID REASON EVER ADVANCED FOR GIVEAWAY OF PUBLIC TRUST TO STATES

During the hearings the advocates of Senate Joint Resolution 13 were challenged to produce a single valid reason why the United States should surrender its vast oil properties in the submerged lands of the marginal sea.

They undertook to submit two reasons: One was that they had enjoyed such rights over a long period of time, asserting ownership since entrance into the Union. This contention was rejected by the Supreme Court of the United States. It has no valid basis in fact or in law. It is irrelevant in considering legislation on the subject.

The other alleged reason was that during the argument in the California case the Attorney General of the United States had promised that equity would be done the States concerned. This "reason" would embrace the preposterous idea that a mere promise of equity meant that the United States would give up everything it won in the litigation.

The complete answer is that equity—and more than equity—has already been done. California, Louisiana, and Texas have been permitted to keep all the many millions they received through their unlawful trespasses on Government property. The Government did not ask, as would be done in the case of private controversies, that the owner be reimbursed for the losses sustained. Moreover, the United States agreed to ratify and confirm existing leases in the marginal sea held by the States' lessees or assignees, an agreement which involved enormous losses for the United States, because the States retained all the down payments, or bonuses, paid for such leases.

So these unsound reasons have no basis. And without them, there is not a shadow of a pretense that any justifiable ground exists for stripping the United States of its natural resources in the submerged lands of the marginal sea.

II. THE VALUE OF OFFSHORE MINERAL RESOURCES

One of the reasons why the giveaway legislation has not been more vigorously opposed in the past has been that most people have not realized the tremendous value of the oil and gas resources on the Continental Shelf. In fact, some supporters of the legislation have displayed an understandable interest in underestimating the great wealth that would be given away under their proposals—or in obscuring it behind a smokescreen of complicated legal disputation.

OIL

The estimated potential reserves of our offshore oil resources in the Continental Shelf lying seaward of the coasts of California, Louisiana, and Texas is a little more than 15 billion barrels.

This figure can be compared with the 33.7 billion barrels of proved reserves for the upland area within the United States as a whole. It is 45 percent of the estimated proved reserves.

Both these estimates are set forth in the table entitled "Estimated Proved and Potential Petroleum Reserves," prepared by the Department of the Interior and printed in the minority report.

The total value of the 15 billion barrels of oil at the current price of about $2.65 per barrel is about $40 billion.

It should also be kept in mind that there are probably vast oil reserves in the Continental Shelf off the coast of Alaska. The total area of the shelf off Alaska is estimated to contain 600,000 square miles, more than twice the 290,000 square miles in the Continental Shelf off the United States itself. An estimate of the United States Geological Survey, based upon the studies of L. G. Weeks for the American Association of Geologists, suggests that in the case of Alaska "the reserve estimate would be 23.6 billion barrels." This would bring the total estimate up from 15 billion barrels to 38.6 billion barrels.

When Alaskan reserves are included, the total estimate rises from 15 billion barrels to 38.6 billion barrels. At the current prices, the total offshore potential reserves would thus be worth not $40 billion, but over $102 billion.

GAS

The estimated potential reserves of gas in the offshore lands amount to 68.5 trillion cubic feet. This is more than one-third of the proved reserves of 196 trillion cubic feet within the land area

of the United States. At an average of 15 cents per thousand cubic feet the total value of the potential gas reserves in the Continental Shelf amounts to a little more than $10 billion.

OTHER MINERALS

There is no reason to believe that oil and gas are the only mineral resources in the offshore lands.

Geologists have already found sulfur in the offshore lands off the coast of Texas. The October 1952 report of Texas geologists and engineers estimates 120 million long tons of sulfur at a price of $25 per long ton. The sulfur reserves alone would be worth more than $3 billion.

As the offshore resources are developed during the coming years, it is highly likely that other valuable minerals will also be discovered in sizable quantities.

POTENTIAL REVENUES

As already indicated, the value of oil and gas resources in the offshore area can be conservatively estimated at $40 billion and $10 billion, respectively—or a total of $50 billion.

If royalties are estimated at 12½ percent—also a bare minimum figure—the potential revenues from these $50 billion worth of assets will be $6.25 billion.

This sum is practically equivalent to the total annual interest paid each year on the national debt.

These estimates, however, are extremely conservative. They do not take into account the value of either Alaskan reserves or sulfur reserves or any other things of value that may be found, such as uranium. They assume prices no higher than the present prices. Moreover, they do not take into account the estimates contained in the October 1952 report of the Texas geologists and engineers.

A summary of the Texas report appeared in the Houston Post of Sunday, October 26, 1952. According to this group of experts:

> The submerged lands off the shore of Texas are reported to hold gas, oil, and sulfur worth an estimated $80 billion.

The inclusion of any of these additional considerations would add substantially to the $6.25 billion estimate of royalties. With Alaskan reserves included, with price increases assumed, and with a $3 billion estimate for sulfur included, the total value would be $186 billion. At the rate of 12½ percent, royalties on this amount would be more than $23 billion.

REVENUES ALREADY ACCRUED

Even though the development of offshore resources has thus far proceeded at a snail's pace because of the submerged lands controversy, substantial revenues have already accrued since the Supreme Court upheld the rights of the Federal Government.

For example, the offshore oil deposits along the California coast have produced revenues aggregating more than $47.3 million since the case against California was decided favorably to the United States in 1947.

The revenues derived from the continental shelf lands off Louisiana and Texas have aggregated approximately 15 million dollars and half a million dollars, respectively, since the cases against Louisiana and Texas were decided in 1950.

Thus, a grand total of approximately $62.8 million, derived from the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, is awaiting disposition either to the Federal Government or to the three States at the present time. A little more than $27 million of this amount has been impounded by the State of California. A little more than $35 million is held in escrow by the United States.

III. THE GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION WOULD WEAKEN THE SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Continental Shelf is a vitally needed oil reserve. The potential oil reserves of the submerged-land areas represent one of the richest accessible sources of supply susceptible to exploratory development. The Materials Policy Commission recommended "that the Federal Government encourage immediate exploration for oil on publicly owned offshore lands; that leases to private companies, whether by the Federal Government or the States, contain provisions requiring well spacing or withdrawal rates calculated to increase the normal life of the pools with a view to providing faster withdrawals if ever such action is required to meet the needs of war"—Materials Policy Commission report, volume 1, chapter 17, page 110, column 2.

The urgency of discovering and bringing oil resources to the point of production in case of emergency may well make it advisable for our Government to start that work at once. But it would certainly be folly for the United States to dispossess itself—to quitclaim away—of a vital resource to which its legal title has been upheld by the highest Court in the land, without first being completely assured that its retention is not essential to any potential defense emergency.

GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION NEGLECTS DEVELOPMENT OF OIL OUTSIDE THE SO-CALLED HISTORIC STATE BOUNDARIES

Senate Joint Resolution 13 provides in section 9, as follows:

> Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to affect in any wise the rights of the United States to the natural resources of that portion of the subsoil and seabed of the Continental Shelf lying seaward and outside of the area of lands beneath navigable waters as defined in section 2 hereof, all of which natural resources appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed.

Yet Senate Joint Resolution 13 provides no program for the development of that portion of the Continental Shelf lying seaward of State boundaries, whatever they may happen to be. Of the total estimated oil reserve in the entire Continental Shelf, it is estimated that 80 percent is located seaward from the areas claimed by the States to be within their historic boundaries. No administrative machinery is established to govern the development of these vital reserves either by the Federal Government or by the coastal States. Failure to provide for the overall development of the entire Continental Shelf will seriously jeopardize the necessary expansion of our production potential essential for national defense.

GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION WOULD RETARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF OIL WITHIN THE SO-CALLED HISTORIC BOUNDARIES OF THE COASTAL STATES

Clouded issues would foster endless litigation. The majority apparently are of the opinion that passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 will operate to terminate legal controversy as to allow full-scale development of submerged lands within so-called historical boundaries of States. Such is far from true. On the contrary, passage of Senate Joint Resolution 13 will result in endless litigation.

Senate Joint Resolution 13 makes no attempt to identify the physical location of such State boundaries, other than to provide that they be such as existed at the time a State entered the Union or such as might have heretofore been or hereafter be approved by Congress. Under the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 13, it would be practically impossible to determine whether any given point lies within or without the area in which this resolution attempts to vest title in the States. The oil industry will thus be reluctant to lease and develop any specific area when doubt exists whether the area to be covered by the lease is under Federal or State jurisdiction. Such doubt will not contribute to orderly development of the submerged-land oil resources.

IV. THE GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION WOULD ENCOURAGE EXTRAVAGANT BOUNDARY CLAIMS OF RUSSIA AND OTHER NATIONS

Only a few days ago, a small group of Republican Senators shocked the country by their attack upon the man whom President Eisenhower had nominated as Ambassador to Russia.

Today, a much larger group of Republican Senators, with the blessing of the Senate Republican policy committee, is planning another, and a much more serious, attack upon the foreign policy of the new administration.

On repeated occasions, representatives of our new Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, have warned Congress against offshore oil legislation which tries to give certain States boundaries beyond the 3-mile limit.

Yet, the oil giveaway proposed legislation, which has just been reported by the majority of the Senate Interior Committee, tries to extend the boundaries of certain States to so-called historic limits, far beyond the 3-mile limit.

The proponents of this legislation aim to transfer to the three States of California, Texas, and Louisiana control of the rich oil reserves off our coasts, oil reserves which belong to the people of all the States.

Yet, in their eagerness to give away these rich resources, they have turned a deaf ear to the repeated pleas of the Department of State.

The Soviet Union today claims a strip of territorial sea extending 12 miles from its shores. The United States' position has been to refuse to recognize any claim that goes beyond the 3-mile limit. The State Department has written to the Senate Interior Committee, as follows:

> If this Government were to abandon its position on the 3-mile limit it would perforce abandon any ground for protest against claims of foreign States to greater breadths

of territorial waters. * * * Hence a realistic appraisal of the situation would seem to indicate that this Government should adhere to the 3-mile limit (letter of March 4, 1953, from Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs).

It would be a tragic mistake at this critical stage in world history if the Republican majority of the United States Senate were to undermine the position of our Secretary of State, who is attempting to maintain our historic policy of freedom of the high seas for our naval, merchant marine, and fishing vessels.

V. THE GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION WOULD HALT THE GOVERNMENT'S PUBLIC POWER PROGRAM

Subsection (a) of section 6 of this measure declares, in effect, that the Federal Government's power under the commerce clause of the Constitution—article 1, section 8, clause 3—shall not be deemed to include the right to use lands beneath navigable waters.

If this provision should be enacted, it would—assuming its constitutionality—halt the Government's program for the multiple-purpose development of the water resources of the Nation's navigable rivers in order to improve navigation, control floods, impound water for the irrigation of arid lands, and generate electric power for agricultural, industrial, and domestic uses.

The development by the Federal Government of the water resources in our navigable rivers for the purposes previously mentioned—a program that is vital to the prosperity and welfare of the Western States and is also highly important to other parts of the country—is carried on pursuant to the Government's "great and absolute" power under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

That constitutional power includes the right to use the beds of navigable rivers as sites for the dams and other structures that are needed for the furtherance of the multiple-purpose program of water resources development, even though the legal title to such submerged lands is vested in the States through which the navigable rivers run.

The legal title of the owner of the bed of a navigable river is servient to the right of the Government to use the bed of the stream for structures incident to the exercise by the Government of its power under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

Therefore, in declaring that the Federal Government's power under the commerce clause of the Constitution shall not hereafter be deemed to include the right to use the beds of navigable rivers, this measure undertakes to reverse the Supreme Court with respect to a well-established principle of constitutional law, and thereby to halt the Federal Government's multiple-purpose program of water resources development for navigation, flood control, irrigation, and electric power. Obviously, that program cannot be carried forward unless the Government can use the beds of navigable rivers for the dams and other structures essential to it.

In this connection I would like to read a letter which I have recently addressed to the Secretary of the Interior on this subject:

MARCH 31, 1953.

The Honorable DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing for the purpose of calling your attention to certain provisions in the proposed offshore oil legislation (S. J. Res. 13, as reported from the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) which would halt the Federal Government's program of developing our Nation's water resources for electric power, flood control, irrigation, and navigation. The provisions I am referring to consist of a few harmless looking words buried in section 6 (a) of the bill (pp. 18 and 19).

But, although they look harmless at first glance, a closer examination indicates that they would strip the United States of its right to use the beds of navigable streams as sites for dams. In effect, this language says that the Federal Government's power under the commerce clause of the Constitution shall from this time on be construed as not including the right to use the beds of navigable rivers.

This, it would seem, would have the effect of reversing a long series of Supreme Court decisons which have held that even though the States hold the legal title to the beds of navigable rivers the Federal Government has the right to use the riverbeds for the building of dams.

Of course, section 3 (d) of the "oil giveaway" legislation says that nothing in the joint resolution shall affect the development of 'said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power * * *" (p. 16).

When these two sections are read together, what they say is this: "The Federal Government can go right ahead with the multiple-purpose development of our rivers just so long as it does not rest any dams upon the bed of a river."

I should therefore like to inquire whether your engineers and other experts have yet developed a method of building a dam across a river without allowing it to touch the riverbed.

I should also like to inquire whether (1) you or any representative of the Department of the Interior recommend this language in section 6 (a) of Senate Joint Resolution 13 or were consulted upon it, and (2) you find it acceptable as it now stands.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY.

I am eagerly awaiting Secretary McKay's reply.

VI. THE GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION WOULD IMPERIL THE UNITED STATES FISHING INDUSTRY

Legislation proposing to convey offshore oil resources to the several States by quitclaiming all rights within so-called historic boundaries constitutes a multiple threat to the United States fishing industry.

An example of how United States fisheries can be affected by any divergency or presumed divergence from the 3-mile rule is the recent action taken by Mexican authorities in seizing United States shrimp boats.

Our Government must insist on the rights of United States fishermen to follow the traditional practice of obtaining fish or crustaceans from the high seas beyond the 3-mile zone wherever they may find them.

But such insistence will be difficult and final results uncertain if the Congress extends the territorial waters of 3 States to 10½ miles seaward beyond the low-tide line. How can our diplomats with good grace argue for adherence to the 3-mile limit by other nations while bound to a 10½-mile rule in waters adjacent to several American States?

VII. THE GIVEAWAY LEGISLATION WOULD SET OFF A CHAIN REACTION OF OTHER GIVEAWAYS OF THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Offshore oil cannot be considered as an isolated case. Many special interests are pressuring for the Federal Government to give away the offshore resources even though they have no direct interest in the coastal States or in oil alone. These are special interests who frankly see it as a first step in reversing a historic policy of public domain. Once we give away oil, the door is open to every special interest greedy for the Nation's wealth.

In the first half of the 20th century a great fight has been waged and won. The fight established the principle that the natural riches of our continent belonged to all the people. The victory had two aspects—a reversal of the wasteful exploitation that had seriously depleted the resources of the land and affirmation that benefits from the natural riches be distributed fairly among all our citizens.

We are involved in that very battle here. Offshore oil is a precious commodity, still unexploited, but limited in amount. The same is true of the natural gas beneath the sea waters. Carefully regulated extraction will make those treasures last longer and save great quantities from total dissipation through careless methods. As a nation, we learned the conservation lesson the hard way after losing many of our most precious resources.

No provision whatever is made under the "give-away" measure for uniform, in fact for any protective regulation at all, of oil and gas extraction. We may be reminded what serious results this irresponsible attitude can bring by reviewing the sad lessons of our other resources. Before permitting the first step to be taken in giving over public wealth to special interests, it would be well for all to understand the meaning of the people's stake in our natural wealth.

One hundred and sixty million people own some 409 million acres of land in this country—just under one-fourth of our national area—and about 360 million acres in Alaska. The value of this land has been estimated at well over a trillion dollars.

LANDS HELD IN PUBLIC TRUST TO SAVE THE BASIS OF OUR WEALTH

First let us remember just why we own this land, what the situation was when we allowed our natural riches to waste with startling rapidity by those who grabbed, spoiled, and ran.

By the turn of the century, for example, 800 million acres of original virgin forest had been reduced to 200 million. Erosion and rape of mineral resources were the rule. To deal with the drastic situation, Republican President Theodore Roosevelt set up an Inland Waterways Commission which reported to him in May 1907:

Hitherto our national policy has been one of almost unrestricted disposal of natural resources. * * * Three consequences have ensued:

(1) The unprecedented consumption of natural resources.

(2) Exhaustion of these resources, to the extent that a large part of our available public lands have passed into great estates or corporate interests.

(3) Unequaled opportunity for private monopoly.

A year later President Theodore Roosevelt convened the governors of the States and said to them:

The occasion for meeting lies in the fact that the natural resources of our country are in danger of exhaustion if we permit the old wasteful methods of exploiting them longer to continue.

We are coming to recognize as never before the right of the Nation to guard its own future in the essential matter of natural resources. In the past we have admitted the right of the individual to injure the future of the Republic for his own present profit. This time has come for a change. As a people we have the right and duty * * * to protect ourselves and our children against the wasteful development of our natural resources.

This was no dictation, no Federal mandate. The governors of the States themselves, realizing the seriousness of the depletion of our resources and their own inability to cope, issued at that time a declaration asking for help from the United States Government. They declared:

We agree that the sources of national wealth exist for the benefit of the people, and that monopoly thereof should not be tolerated. We declare the conviction that in the use of the natural resources our independent States are interdependent and bound together by ties of mutual benefits, responsibilities, and duties * * *.

We especially urge on the Federal Congress the immediate adoption of a wise, active, and thorough waterway policy. We recommend the enactment of laws looking to the prevention of waste in the mining and extraction of coal, oil, gas, and other minerals with a view to their wise conservation for the use of the people and to the protection of human life in the mines.

Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity. Let us today recall what might again come to pass, what once did come to pass when in 1908 all the States had to plead for a united policy against the loss of the basis of our national wealth. Let us guard against ill-considered inroads of our public lands. Let us not permit a few men in a hurry to persuade leaders from all the States to reverse a policy of conservation their own governors once requested with such urgency.

PUBLIC LANDS SERVE ALL THE PEOPLE

Forest lands: There are about 160 million acres of national forest in the continental United States. An additional 20 million acres are located in Alaska. There are about one-fourth of all forest lands today. Instead of the waste that cut our virgin forests down to one-fourth in the early years of our Republic, we now have regulations that keep the land regularly reforested; as trees are cut down others must be planted. Moreover, the Federal Government puts up large sums of money to build access roads for protection of these deep forests, which in turn permits small timber companies to share in the cutting, while the Government is repaid from their fees. Our cutting and replanting and access policies are improved, but nowhere near what they should be.

Grazing lands: Some 230 million acres or about half of our continental Government-owned lands serve for crop grazing. Regulations as to numbers of animals and seasonal directives preserve this land for continued good grazing. Constant rehabilitation preventing erosion, drought, and so forth, maintains this land in good order for the benefit of all cattlemen, large and small.

Minerals: In the early part of the century Republican President William Howard Taft established a Bureau of Mines and withdrew from public sale considerable area of oil, coal, and timberland. This began a policy that, in contrast to the overcentralized development of the coal mines in the hands of a few big interests, soon put under Federal regulation great values of minerals. It is estimated that today the Federal Government owns 111 trillion cubic feet of gas, 324 billion tons of coal, 4 billion barrels of oil, and 130 billion barrels of oil in the form of shale. Such fuels must last us forever, and by regulation they are extracted with care from the earth. It was with luck we discovered that priceless uranium existed on public lands. No one would ask that all benefits of uranium, vital in atomic production, be turned over to special interests.

Power projects: The Federal Government has put to work vast sums in harnessing power from the natural forces of our continent. Some $3¼ billion of Federal money, $600 million of this in the Tennessee Valley Authority, is invested in power projects and irrigation plants. Millions of acres of productive farmland, reclaimed grazing land, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of productive decentralized private industrial enterprise have resulted from these great projects that no private wealth could have underwritten. The all-important preference clause assures the widespread distribution of the benefits of these public investments by giving the first chance to the organizations that serve the public, such as municipalities, Navy installations, rural-electric co-ops. The great atomic plants at Hanford and Oak Ridge were possible only with the power made available by public projects. Is the job finished?

The facts give little backing to those who say that public domain may have been necessary once, but is no longer necessary. The truth is we are still short of many vital resources, and looking to future increasing needs, we must save many resources from imminent depletion. Vast sums will be needed as in the past; private sources cannot supply them all.

(a) We are facing a serious wood shortage. Industrial demands require almost double the current supply, and yet we are already overcutting our forest lands. The Materials Policy Commission report of 1952 estimated that replanting and woodland management for the near future ought to have an additional public annual investment of $77 million plus a capital investment of $360 million.

(b) We are facing crop shortages. The Materials Policy Commission estimated that by 1975 we shall need 42 percent more produce from the land than in 1950. Some 115 million acres of cropland are going to be lost to us in another decade from erosion; this is about one-fourth of our potential good cropland. Another 115 million acres need treatment within the next 3 decades. Investment of some $7 billion is needed here in the next 30 years.

(c) We need more meat. Our meat-eating population is expanding rapidly. Cropland of perhaps 100 million acres is already lost, but with the investment of perhaps $1 billion over the next decade, may be saved for good pastureland. We must drain swampland, prevent incipient dustbowls, to keep and expand pastureland for meat animals.

(d) We are short of energy. Our demands for fuel and electricity are increasing so rapidly that the Materials Policy Commission estimated that the 1950 supply would need to double by 1975. Today we are already net importers of oil. Our kilowatt potential of hydroelectric energy lies somewhere between 60 million kilowatts and 105 million kilowatts. Tremendous investment must be made to raise us from the position of less than 15 million kilowatts today. The cheapest developments have been built; those to be built will cost more. Our situation is urgent. We must conserve and expand all sources of energy.

WHO IS AFTER THE PUBLIC DOMAIN?

The public domain is not sacrosanct. Only as long as the people are deriving benefits should lands and material remain in the hands of the Federal Government. What is important is that special interests do not make inroads in the public domain when the people will stand to lose. But already many special groups are preparing a chain reaction of inroads on valuable public projects; all they await is the giveaway of the offshore oil lands, and they feel the first step has been made away from the policies set by Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft.

First. The electric-power companies are leading the attack against the preference clause; in fact, some are asking that the actual properties be sold to private interests. This would mean that banks, corporations, insurance companies, and wealthy individuals, a tiny percent of all citizens, would get more than 75 percent of property built from the taxes of all the people. They could set their own rates, choose their own customers, and insure no prior right to organizations that represent all the people. We are not in the field of idle threats here. Members of Congress have already made speeches suggesting that great public enterprises such as TVA be turned over to private interests. Few voices, if any from any walk of life in the Tennessee Valley itself, echo this attack against the basis of productivity and progress in the area—which has, indeed, also benefited the whole Nation.

Second. The chambers of commerce are joining the fight to free rangelands. They complain that under Federal regu-

lation designed to save the ranges, the large cattle owners cannot graze their cattle when they please. Associations representing the large woolgrowers and cattle grazers are in the fight which would help the large growers and squeeze out the small-business men. They are asking, not for ownership, but for title in perpetuity to lands they use to advantage but not license today.

Third. Already there is legislation before the Senate asking that all mineral rights be turned over from the United States to individual States.

Fourth. Private forestry interests are making wild attacks on Government policies, claiming that despite the figures of our forests cut to one-fourth of the original size by 1900, President Theodore Roosevelt's aide, Gifford Pinchot, combated a nonexisting forest famine in the States. The prohibitive price of lumber today is indication enough of the extent of our timber shortage.

Fifth. From many sides the special interests cry "socialism." This is nonsense. The policies were initiated by staid Republican Presidents and governors. Even today the benefits from public projects are so great that the Republican 80th Congress renamed Boulder Dam Hoover Dam. Moreover, all manner of private business worth billions of dollars flourishes in our country today on the base of economically distributed natural resources.

OIL IS NO EXCEPTION; IT NEEDS A UNIFORM CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Let us be sure before we give away the public domain for which we fought so hard, that it is no longer needed to serve the people in the two ways in which we agree is to our best national interest: First, conserves and utilizes to advantage the resources of our land, and, second, assures that the benefits of our resources be distributed fairly among all the people.

Offshore oil, taken as an isolated case, demands public care on both scores. First, to prevent waste and hasty overuse, standards must be established. The States provide absolutely no unified set of regulations and standards for the extraction of this wealth. We have no assurance that special interests cannot at some time press through hasty or wasteful methods to despoil the great treasure. Second, and the benefits from offshore oil and gas we all know to be vast. The public has serious need of these benefits. Our deficit is large; we cannot afford the schools our children deserve. There is no reason here to alter our historic policy that the benefits of the natural wealth of the continent be distributed fairly among all the people.

LET US NOT REVERSE THE PROGRESS MADE IN CONSERVATION

If we let offshore oil go, we reverse the few good chapters of our conservation history, and open the door for the attack on our whole public domain.

VII. SINCE IT DOES NOT DEFINE STATE BOUNDARIES IT WOULD PRODUCE ENDLESS LITIGATION OVER THE EXTENT OF THE OIL LANDS WHICH ARE GIVEN TO THE STATES

In our minority report on this legislation the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Washington, and I pointed out that Senate Joint Resolution 13 does not refer to historic boundaries. That phrase does not appear anywhere in the resolution. The phrase will undoubtedly be used again and again in debate and in the courts, as "tidelands" was and is being used, for purposes of confusion. Nobody knows what "historic boundaries" really means, or when applicable history started or ended.

We also made the following statement:

The majority of the committee has rejected the advice of Attorney General Brownell that Senate Joint Resolution 13 include provisions or a map on which a definite line be drawn to mark the seaward boundary of all coastal States. Senate Joint Resolution 13, as reported out of committee, does not do this. The failure to describe boundaries definitely, or to draw the exact lines on a map, invites litigation. Senate Joint Resolution 13 leaves the question as to the extent of State boundaries outside of the 3-mile belt, if there are to be any, in confusion. There must be further legislation to clear up the point, unless the courts find a way to settle it.

During the course of the debate on the floor of the Senate on April 1, our contention concerning the inevitability of endless litigation was greatly strengthened by repeated observations made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

At one point in the discussion the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked:

Is it possible today to know what the historic boundaries of the various coastal States are?

The Senator from Oregon replied that in his opinion in many instances either there will have to be agreement between the United States and the States in question, delimiting or fixing the boundaries, or the boundaries will have to be determined by litigation.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] then asked what is the legal boundary line of the State of Texas under Senate Joint Resolution 13.

The Senator from Oregon answered this question with his customary frankness—and I quote from page 2621 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1:

If the Senator wants an answer to that question, he will have to get it from the Supreme Court.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] then asked a similar question concerning the boundary under Senate Joint Resolution 13 of the State of Florida on the west coast of Florida.

The reply of the distinguished Senator from Oregon reads as follows:

That question can be determined and should be determined in 1 of 2 ways, either by agreement through a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida and by Congress, or by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In the light of the very helpful observations made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon I believe we can now all agree that no clear limit is established by Senate Joint Resolution 13 on the extent of the oil and gas resources which are given to the State.

This fact completely undermines section 9 of the resolution, which section, in the words of the majority report, "provides that nothing in this act shall affect the rights of the United States to the resources of the Continental Shelf outside State boundaries."

On the face of it section 9 seems to be a very excellent and wise provision. It seems to say that the submerged resources from the Continental Shelf outside of State boundaries "appertain to the United States, and the jurisdiction and control of which by the United States is hereby confirmed."

But—and here is where the trouble begins—the legislation before us does not attempt to delimit or fix these State boundaries.

The door is left open for subsequent legislation which fixes State boundaries at the outer edge of the Continental Shelf. The door is left open for the development of new theories concerning the boundaries in existence at the time a State entered the Union and for the settlement of such questions in the courts.

But the distinguished Senator from Oregon has suggested that litigation with respect to the seaward boundaries of California; Texas, and Louisiana is to be expected even if the so-called Anderson bill is enacted into law. Let me quote from the statement of the Senator from Oregon on page 2632 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 1, 1953:

Earlier this afternoon question was raised as to where the boundaries of these States may be in the sea. My answer then, which I reiterate now, is that the pending measure does not identify the location of those boundaries. It is not within the philosophy of the joint resolution that they be so identified. If they were so identified, that identification would have no legal effect. The joint resolution leaves that question where it found it.

QUESTION OF BOUNDARY LOCATION LEFT OPEN

It is the same question, left open here, that must be left open under any situation which can arise or which could have arisen after the pronouncement of the decision in the California case. When the Court in that case set the boundary of the area of paramount interest of the United States as adjoining inland waters, that question was raised. It will remain to be adjudicated if we pass no proposed legislation and if we simply stand on the legal effect of the three decisions in the California case, the Texas case, and the Louisiana case. That question will remain for determination if we pass the so-called Anderson bill. It will remain for determination under any conceivable arrangement by which the State retains its sole ownership and rights under inland waters.

The committee felt that this was a problem which it found unsettled and a problem which it could not legally settle.

Of course, it is probably true that some amount of litigation can be expected on the subject no matter what action is taken by the Congress, but if the legislation composed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is adopted, there will be no litigation concerning the dividing line between the lands controlled by the States and the lands controlled by the Federal Government. Under the legislation proposed by the Senator from New Mexico, this question is solved very simply by the maintenance of Federal control. Thus the leaseholders and operators will be

able to proceed confidently with the development of these resources instead of being bogged down in an endless and costly morass of litigation.

It is thus difficult to understand how anyone can legitimately claim that these boundaries questions will be handled in the same way under both the Anderson bill and under Senate Joint Resolution 13. Under the Anderson bill the Federal Government's rights and powers over offshore mineral resources beyond the low tide mark will be maintained no matter what happens to State boundaries. Under Senate Joint Resolution 13 every extension of the State boundary will give a State additional rights and control over the offshore mineral resources. Since the great bulk of these mineral resources lie outside the 3-mile limit the 3 States of Louisiana, Texas, and California will undoubtedly initiate action both through legislation and litigation to extend the boundaries farther and farther out on the Continental Shelf.

This fact is borne out by the very words used by the Attorney General, Mr. Herbert Brownell, in his testimony before the committee. Let me quote from page 926 of the hearings:

> If the statute merely refers in words to "historic boundaries," or in words describes a line beginning at the edge of the States' inland waters or tries to describe in words bays or other characteristics of the coast, unnecessary litigation will almost surely result.

On page 932 he made the following statement:

> We believe instead of trying to do it with words only, which, as you know, would perhaps raise as many questions as it would settle, we would like to see the bill draw an actual line on an actual map, and we believe that it would eliminate an awful lot of future controversy.

Yet we are now told that the Attorney General has changed his opinion.

On April 2 the distinguished Senator from Oregon stated that "with the agreement of the Department of Justice" the idea of drawing the boundary line on a map was abandoned.

The Senator from Oregon went on to explain that the discussion which led to the abandonment of this idea was a personal discussion between himself and the attorney general. He did not indicate that the attorney general had in any way changed his mind on the inevitability of protracted litigation resulting from the failure to draw a precise line.

If anyone has any doubts what the effect of this legislation will be, I should like to refer him to the testimony of Fred LeBlanc, attorney general of the State of Louisiana. This testimony may be found on pages 277 and 278 of the hearings.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] asked the Louisiana attorney general what the boundaries of Louisiana were when Louisiana came into the Union. Mr. LeBlanc answered as follows:

> I am not prepared to answer that question Senator * * * it is a little bit obscure, it has never been officially determined.

And a little later Mr. LeBlanc made the following observation:

> It may well be that if the Senate passes the Holland bill, litigation will have to be resorted to in order to determine exactly the boundaries.

Thus even one of the most ardent proponents of Senate Joint Resolution 13 tells us that passage of this measure will result not in the prompt and orderly development of offshore mineral resources, but in litigation which will impede the development of these resources.

It is therefore my sincere hope that when the Members of the Senate become more familiar with the details of Senate Joint Resolution 13, they will join with the minority of the committee in voting for substitute legislation that will be proposed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

At a subsequent time I plan to speak again on the proposed legislation, for the purpose of explaining the great advantages to the Nation that would be derived through the adoption of the substitute measure proposed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

RECESS

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.